

## **Consultation outcomes report – review of positive leisure-time activities for young people**

May 2014

### **1. Introduction**

This is the report from the public consultation on the future of youth work and activities.

For the purposes of this report the terms ‘youth activities’, ‘youth provision’, ‘youth offer’ and ‘youth work’ are all used to describe positive leisure-time activities for young people.

Wiltshire Council launched a 10-week public consultation exercise on the future of youth work and activities which ran from 3 February 2014 until 14 April 2014.

The public consultation related to a proposal to develop an operating model which would better reflect the needs of young people, and give local communities a greater influence over future provision.

The consultation sought opinion from schools, young people, staff, voluntary and community sector organisations, parents and local communities.

The consultation asked stakeholders for their opinion on four possible options for the future delivery of youth work and activities but also provided the opportunity for them to present alternative options for future provision.

We used feedback from young people that we had canvassed over the last 2 years in order to shape and inform the following 4 possible options:

1. Retain the current in-house service but reduce the value – a number of options would be considered to make the required savings and deliver a service that meets the needs of young people in local community areas.
2. Outsource the service – this option would involve developing a new service specification for the provision of positive leisure-time activities; shaped by key stakeholders, including young people based on the resources available.
3. Encourage and support staff to form a Public Service Mutual (PSM) - a mutual can deliver a public service involving a high degree of employee control. It can operate for profit, not for profit, charity, social enterprise and community interest company.
4. Develop a community-led approach – this would empower communities via community area boards, with funding from the council, to develop and make available positive leisure-time youth activities within their local area.

## 2. Summary

### 2.1. Key consultation activities

A broad range of consultation has been undertaken throughout Wiltshire with a range of stakeholders using a variety of tools and methods:

- 23 face to face focus groups were held with young people as well as 3 secondary school assemblies. 557 young people participated in the focus groups.
- Specific focus groups took place with disabled young people; looked after children and young people; young carers; those not in education, employment or training; and young people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender.
- A county wide consultation event for Youth Advisory Groups was held on 19 February.
- Young people formally presented their views at 6 Community Area Boards.
- 1760 survey responses were received from young people across the county mainly aged 11-19.
- 5 petitions with a combined total of 3451 signatories opposing proposals to change youth services were received by the council: -
  - Corsham petition– handed to Laura Mayes at the Corsham Area Board meeting on 20 March at Corsham Town Council.
  - Pewsey Petition – handed to Richard Gamble at the Pewsey Area Board on 10 March at Burbage Village Hall.
  - Malmesbury petition – presented to Laura Mayes and Richard Gamble at the area board on March 5 and then formally brought with additional names and presented with additional signatures by Simon Killane and members of Malmesbury YAG outside county hall on 31 March to Richard Gamble and Laura Mayes.
  - [www.change.org](http://www.change.org) petition (Bass Connections) - A petition with 2,522 signatories presented at Full Council on 25 February by Mr Chris Baker.
  - Trowbridge and Bradford on Avon petition– received by post on 7 April
- A staff consultation ran for four weeks from 31 January to 28 February 2014. During this period 95 staff attended one of three collective consultation events held in Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury. Over 40 e-mails and written communications were received. 22 employees (mainly team leaders and youth development coordinators) met directly with the Head of Service for Early Intervention, Youth and Prevention on 19 February 2014 to feedback their views and comments. A summary of the staff consultation can be found as appendix 1
- Presentations about the proposed changes to youth work and activities were given at Wiltshire's 18 Community Area Boards led by Cabinet members and the Council's Corporate Leadership Team. These enabled members of the public to express their views and ask questions of elected members and senior council officers.

- A total of 25 voluntary and community sector organisations and bodies responded to the consultation. 10 organisations took part in an engagement event held in Devizes. This included two bodies charged with representing the sector (The Wiltshire Compact and Wiltshire Children and Families Voluntary Sector Forum). 7 responses were received to an online VCS survey on the proposals as well as comments via 8 e-mails.
- On 28 January 2014 the Children's Select Committee established a task group to scrutinise proposals and respond to the consultation. The group met on six occasions and received written and verbal evidence from a range of witnesses as well as undertaking considerable evidence gathering. A report outlining the group's methodology, findings and recommendations was published on 17 April 2014.
- Representing nearly 1,000 parents/carers, three consultation events were facilitated by the Wiltshire Parent Carer Council (WPCC) with parents/carers of young people with learning difficulties and disabilities. These took place in the month of March in Trowbridge, Chippenham and Salisbury. A total of 18 parents and carers attended to give their views. The WPCC also received written comments from parents who were not able to attend the consultations. Key findings and recommendations are set out in the report as Appendix 2.
- Angus Macpherson submitted a response to the consultation dated 14 April on behalf of Wiltshire Police, from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. A copy of this report can be found as Appendix 3.
- 200 Members of the public also expressed their views through Budget Participatory events that took place at County Hall on Monday 10 February. The budget events are there to provide an opportunity for members of the public to have their say on the council's budget. Throughout the day young people attended these events to express their concerns about the changes to youth work and activities.
- 12 formal responses were received from local Town and Parish Councils.
- 37 direct communications, such as letters and emails delivered to elected members, senior officers or the voice and influence email box.
- Protest groups on social media (such as Facebook and Twitter) were also initiated; some of these include:
  - A 'Friends of Wiltshire Youth Services' campaign to keep and protect a viable youth service for Wiltshire and in particular Salisbury. This included a 'Dirty protest' live-music event which took place on 8 March at Salisbury Arts Centre for young people.
  - 'Save Wiltshire Council Youth Centres' campaign involving 433 members.

The council received over 2400 individual responses to the consultation and about 2300 of these were young people; these are all set out below. In addition to this, 3451 members of the public supported petitions in opposition to the proposals. All the feedback provided a valuable insight into the views of Wiltshire's communities about youth work and activities and the key messages moving forward. Through analysis of the views of respondents across a range of stakeholders a number of important findings have been identified. Feedback includes:

- Young people and their communities should be supported to have a greater influence over youth services and activities in their area, with a stronger emphasis on community working.
- Young people want access to a wide range of activities and places to go, with sport and leisure being a high priority.
- Safeguarding and support for vulnerable young people is important, particularly for those with learning difficulties and disabilities and those at risk.
- Young people value having local access to trained and trusted adults they can talk to.
- The voluntary and community sector should play a greater role in the provision of positive activities, with support from the council and better coordination of local provision.
- Youth work is highly valued, and is an example of early intervention & prevention and makes a positive difference to young people's lives.
- Existing users of the current service and some members of the public were of the view that youth work should be retained, with no change.
- The youth offer should be promoted more effectively to reach more young people.

The community-led option was favoured across a range of stakeholders including the majority of young people who responded to a SNAP survey (47.7%) as well as the voluntary and community sector.

During the consultation a number of alternative options were proposed. Many of these suggested a 'middle' way, mainly by combining the 'keep the service in-house' and 'community-led' options, with a mixed economy of providers, and the council focusing resource on those who are most vulnerable and disadvantaged.

## **2.2. Young people's key messages**

To allow Cabinet to consider and meet the council's statutory duty to secure for young people aged 13-19 access to sufficient positive leisure-time activities which improve their well-being, and the provision of sufficient facilities for such activities the key messages from young people included:

- Sports and leisure activities are the activities that young people use most and want to retain in their local areas
- Arts based activities come out strongly in terms of activities that young people want to see more of – theatre, music and dance
- Existing users of council youth work do not want to lose the current service and young people still want a youth club in their local area
- Young people want a say in how money is spent in their local area
- Young people want a wide range of activities available in their local area

- Young people want activities that are easy to get to / good transport links
- Face to face support from staff is important for young people's emotional wellbeing
- A community led option was preferred by the majority of young people that were involved in both the focus groups and canvassed through the SNAP survey.
- Young people stress that youth workers are more important than buildings
- The importance of trained / knowledgeable staff that know how to work with young people (this was particularly highlighted by disabled young people and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender young people)
- Young people think that anti-social behaviour will increase with all of the options and so there will not be a saving as more will need to be spent on policing

Specific messages from disabled young people are included below in addition to those highlighted in the key messages above:

- Campuses could be big / overcrowded / noisy and disabled young people could be fearful of entering a building where they do not know everyone
- Change is not good for disabled young people, especially autistic young people - things have to be done gradually
- Disabled young people need somewhere to go where they feel safe
- Swimming was an activity of particular importance to disabled young people

Specific messages from looked after young people are included below in addition to those highlighted in the key messages above:

- Looked after young people think there will be a rise in anti social behaviour if youth clubs close
- Looked after young people highlighted the real importance of having somewhere to go that you feel comfortable and isn't full of staff and young people that you feel look down on you

Specific messages from lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) young people are included below in addition to those highlighted in the key messages above:

- LGBT young people want to have access to an LGBT youth group within their area
- LGBT young people want somewhere to go to talk and not feel pressured, particularly time pressured

A summary table of the key messages from the perspectives of young people and adults is set out at the end of this report.

### **3. Consultation process**

The consultation was facilitated and managed by the Wiltshire Council Voice and Influence Team.

Consultation was undertaken through focus group work, school assemblies, community area boards and various engagement events. The consultation was widely publicised using various media channels such as local newspapers, the Wiltshire Council website, local radio and various social media sites.

Specific consultation took place with disabled young people; looked after children and young people; young carers; those not in education, employment or training; and young people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender. Under the Public Sector Equality Duties we have given due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relationships between different groups of young people. A breakdown in demographics of respondents to the SNAP Survey and attendees at the 23 Focus Groups compared with those using the service and Census 2011 and Census 2012 mid population data shows very little variation (i.e. the responses received by the protected characteristic groups of sex, disability and ethnicity are nearly in line, if not exceeding (disability and ethnicity) with those accessing the service and mid-population estimates). This indicates that the survey and focus groups reached and heard from a representative sample of young people.

Consultation activities were held across the county at various times, including evenings, to ensure young people and others had the opportunity to have their voices heard.

At all of the consultation events young people and other stakeholders were given the time and space to openly discuss their views and ask questions. The proposed changes and options for the future of youth work and activities were thoroughly discussed and explained at all events. Powerpoint presentations were used at the engagement events that highlighted the key points of the consultation in order that the participants could make an informed choice.

The consultation events provided an opportunity to find out from stakeholders what youth work and activities they particularly value in their local area by exploring what is currently well used, what they attend personally and what they would like to see more of. All of this information is important to understand in order to ensure that any future youth work and activities meet the needs of modern day young people and is providing the best value going forward.

In addition to the consultation events an electronic SNAP survey was also used throughout the consultation period to canvass young people's views on the proposed changes and ensure that any previous information we had from other canvassing over the last 2 years was up to date. The SNAP survey was hosted on [www.sparksite.co.uk](http://www.sparksite.co.uk) (Wiltshire's website for young people) where there was also more detailed information for young people to read about the review. The SNAP survey contained both open and closed questions in order to provide qualitative (narrative responses) and quantitative information during the consultation process.

20,000 text messages promoting the consultation were sent out on 7 March to young people that had voted in this year's Wiltshire Assembly of Youth elections.

Every secondary school in Wiltshire was contacted by a member of the Voice and Influence team and given the opportunity to have a focus group or assembly at their school.

A voluntary and community sector engagement event was held on 12 March that invited voluntary and community sector organisations from across Wiltshire to come together and give their views on the review. Furthermore 3 focus groups covering key areas of the county were facilitated for representatives from Wiltshire Parent Carer Council.

Voluntary sector organisations were also encouraged to fill in paper based surveys that were promoted on [www.sparksite.co.uk](http://www.sparksite.co.uk). The surveys had 3 open ended questions where VCS organisations were asked about their views on the proposed changes to youth work and activities.

All stakeholders were also given the opportunity to submit their views by emailing the voice and influence team directly ([voiceandinfluenceteam@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:voiceandinfluenceteam@wiltshire.gov.uk)); this was promoted on all of the media steams and presentations.

Some stakeholders sent in or handed over personal letters or petitions to officers, local councillors or cabinet members. All of these comments were fed into the consultation process.

During the consultation, a range of questions were raised by members of the public, particularly young people. In response, the Council provided answers to a set of Frequently Asked Questions. These were published on Sparksite toward the end of the consultation period.

The collation and analysis of all the information and results has been undertaken by the Voice and Influence Team.

#### **4. Management information**

##### **4.1. Young people's focus groups**

<b>Focus groups – total participants: 557</b>														
Gender		Age						Disability	Ethnicity					
Male	Female	10	11-12	13-14	15-16	17-18	19 and over	No. of young people in the group that consider themselves disabled	White	Mixed Heritage e.g. White and Asian	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Other – please specify	Not known
223	334	8	46	302	126	55	20	116	535	2	11	4	2	4

The following groups all participated in focus groups that were facilitated by the Voice and Influence Team throughout the consultation period:

- Countywide forums / events
  - Children in care council
  - Young Commissioners
  - Wiltshire Youth Disabled Group
  - Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender group
  - Wiltshire Assembly of Youth
  - Youth Advisory Groups (YAGs) countywide
  
- Schools
  - Corsham School
  - Melksham Oak School
  - Trafalgar School, Downton
  - Wyvern college, Salisbury
  - Hardenhuish School, Chippenham
  - Lavington School, Devizes
  - South wilts girls school, Salisbury
  - Avon valley college, Durrington
  - St Edmonds girls school, Salisbury
  
- Special schools
  - St Nicholas school, Chippenham
  - Rowdeford school, Devizes
  - Fairfield Farm, Westbury
  
- Community based youth voice groups
  - Malmesbury YAG
  - Salisbury YAG
  - Chippenham children's parliament
  
- Voluntary and community sector groups
  - National Citizenship Service
  - Community First – Resilience Group



## 4.2. SNAP Survey

SNAP survey – total participants: 1760												
Gender		Age					Disability	Ethnicity				
Male	Female	11-13	14-16	17-18	19 - 25	Under 11 or over 25	No. of young people in the group that consider themselves disabled	White	Mixed Heritage e.g. White and Asian	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Other
1010	749	726	800	91	25	117	81	1620	31	32	23	54

<b>SNAP Survey: Community Area</b>		
<i>Please note - this is estimated based on the postcodes that young people gave</i>		
	Number	%
Amesbury Community Area	180	10.2%
Bradford on Avon Community Area	145	8.2%
Calne Community Area	104	5.9%
Chippenham Community Area	367	20.9%
Corsham Community Area	29	1.6%
Devizes Community Area	40	2.3%
Malmesbury Community Area	34	1.9%
Marlborough Community Area	14	0.8%
Melksham Community Area	37	2.1%
Pewsey Community Area	18	1.0%
Salisbury Community Area	203	11.5%
Southern Wiltshire Community Area	41	2.3%
Tidworth Community Area	116	6.6%
Trowbridge Community Area	126	7.2%
Unknown/Out of county	201	11.4%
Warminster Community Area	8	0.5%
Westbury Community Area	51	2.9%
Wootton Bassett Community Area	46	2.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1760</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### **4.3. Assemblies**

Every secondary school in Wiltshire was contacted by a member of the Voice and Influence Team and given the opportunity to have a focus group or assembly at their school.

Assemblies were conducted by the Voice and Influence Team at the following schools and students were encouraged to complete the survey:

- Abbeyfield School, Chippenham
- Bishops Wordworth, Salisbury
- Stonehenge School, Amesbury

#### **4.4. Community Area Boards**

6 groups of young people presented at their local area boards and their presentations and discussions were fed into the consultation process:

- Bradford on Avon Area Board
- Malmesbury Area Board
- Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Area Board
- Salisbury Area Board
- South West Wiltshire Area Board
- Southern Wiltshire Area Board

#### **4.5. Voluntary and community sector organisations**

An engagement event was held for the voluntary and community sector – 10 organisations took part, 2 of which were bodies charged with representing the sector (Wiltshire Compact and Wiltshire Children and Families Voluntary Sector Forum). 7 responses were received to an online voluntary and community sector survey on the proposals as well as comment via 8 emails. For the purposes of this report parish/town councils are included in this section.

The following organisations / bodies responded to the consultation either by email or submitted the voluntary and community sector survey:

- Army Welfare
- Cricklade Rugby Club
- Pewsey campus operational board
- Aldbourne Community Junction
- Valley News
- Splitz
- Wilton Church
- Broughton Gifford Church
- Salisbury Multi Agency Forum
- Salisbury Diocese
- Wiltshire Scrap Store
- Green Square
- Corsham Primary School
- Splash
- Youth Action Wiltshire
- Broughton Gifford & Holt Youth work Project
- Trowbridge Town Council
- Grafton Parish Council
- Mere Parish Council
- Pewsey Parish Council
- Wilton Town Council
- Upper Deverills Parish Council
- Downton Parish Council
- Maiden Bradley and Yarnfield Parish Council
- Cricklade Town Council
- Holt Parish Council
- Marlborough Town Council
- Westbury Town Council

#### 4.6. Other feedback

- A further 21 emails and / or letters were received from young people
- Emails and letters were received from 38 members of the public
- Children’s Select Committee established a task group to scrutinise proposals and respond to the consultation
- 3 consultation events were facilitated by the Wiltshire Parent Carer Council – 19 parents and carers attended to give their views
- A response to the consultation was submitted from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
- 5 petitions were received from members of the public, with a combined total of 3451 signatories
- Members of the public also expressed their views through Budget Participatory events, protest groups on social media, attendance at area boards and direct communications such as letters and emails

#### 5. Analysis

In this section there is analysis of the information obtained during the consultation phase which is broken down into the following sections: -

- 5.1 Focus Groups and SNAP surveys.
- 5.2 What are young people’s priorities.
- 5.3 Young People’s ratings of the options.
- 5.4 Young People’s preferred option.
- 5.5 Additional comments from Young People.
- 5.6 Community Area Boards.
- 5.7 Voluntary and Community Sector Organisations.
- 5.8 Members of the Public.
- 5.9 Children’s select Committee Scrutiny Task Group
- 5.10 Wiltshire Parent Carer Council.
- 5.11 Office of Police and Crime Commissioner.

#### Focus Groups and SNAP Surveys

##### 5.1. What do young people think about the activities currently available?

Young people were firstly asked to think about the activities that are currently available in their local area, what activities they attend and what they would like to see more of. These questions were asked in order to ensure that the council could understand the needs of modern day young people and ensure that any future provision was able to take on board young people’s views and therefore provide the best value for young people going forward.

The information in the table below from the focus groups shows that young people say they attend sports clubs and leisure centres the most.

What activities do you attend at least once a week?	Number of responses	Ranking
Sports clubs	197	1

What activities do you attend at least once a week?	Number of responses	Ranking
Leisure	185	2
Wiltshire Council Youth Centre	72	3
Arts and drama	64	4
Dance	58	5
Uniformed clubs	51	6
VCS youth group	45	7
Alternative sports	35	8
Music	27	9
Youth Council	14	10
LGBT groups	10	11
Young carers	7	12
Faith Groups	5	13
Disabled young people's groups	2	14

Information gathered from the SNAP surveys also shows that leisure and sports clubs are the most popular activities amongst young people. The table below shows that 80 – 90% of young people say that their local area has sports clubs, leisure centres and uniformed groups. However, it also highlights that more could be done to promote and advertise leisure time activities and facilities.

<b>Q7a) What activities do you have in your local area? (tick all that apply)</b>			
	Responses (1655)		Ranking
	Number	%	
Q7.i.a. Sports clubs e.g. football, rugby, tennis, netball, etc. - What activities do you have in your local area?	1434	86.6%	1
Q7.i.b. Leisure centre and activities e.g. swimming, badminton, etc. -	1370	82.8%	2
Q7.i.c. Uniformed clubs e.g. scouts, guides, army cadets, St John Ambulance -	1313	79.3%	3
Q7.i.f. Dance classes or clubs e.g. ballet or street dance. -	976	59.0%	4
Q7.i.l. Alternative sports group or venue e.g. skate park, bmx track, parkour group. -	974	58.9%	5
Q7.i.g. Wiltshire Council youth centre -	913	55.2%	6
Q7.i.j. Faith groups or church youth groups. -	893	54.0%	7
Q7.i.d. Art or drama clubs e.g. stagecoach -	819	49.5%	8

<b>Q7a) What activities do you have in your local area? (tick all that apply)</b>			
	Responses (1655)		Ranking
	Number	%	
Q7.i.h. Voluntary/community youth group e.g. a charity or run by volunteers -	674	40.7%	9
Q7.i.e. Music groups and clubs e.g. DJ workshop, community choir, etc -	671	40.5%	10
Q7.i.k. Disabled young people's group e.g. Barnardos. -	590	35.6%	11
Q7.i.i. Youth councils e.g. youth town council -	581	35.1%	12
Q7.i.m. Young carers group. -	379	22.9%	13
Q7.i.n. Lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender youth groups e.g. GoGs or BoBs	254	15.3%	14
	11841	715.5%	

The table below shows that 40 – 50% of respondents to the SNAP survey say that they attend a leisure centre or sports club at least once per week. 23% of young people say that they attend a Wiltshire Council Youth Centre or Uniformed club at least once per week. We can see that there is capacity to engage more young people in more leisure time activities.

<b>Q7b) What activities do you attend at least once a week? (tick all that apply)</b>			
	Responses (1281)		Ranking
	Number	%	
Q7.ii.a. Sports clubs e.g. football, rugby, tennis, netball, etc. - What activities do you attend at least once a week?	629	49.1%	1
Q7.ii.b. Leisure centre and activities e.g. swimming, badminton, etc.	497	38.8%	2
Q7.ii.g. Wiltshire Council youth centre	295	23.0%	3
Q7.ii.c. Uniformed clubs e.g. scouts, guides, army cadets, St John Ambulance	290	22.6%	4

<b>Q7b) What activities do you attend at least once a week? (tick all that apply)</b>			
	Responses (1281)		Ranking
	Number	%	
Q7.ii.l. Alternative sports group or venue e.g. skate park, bmx track, parkour group.	175	13.7%	5
Q7.ii.f. Dance classes or clubs e.g. ballet or street dance.	155	12.1%	6
Q7.ii.e. Music groups and clubs e.g. DJ workshop, community choir, etc	150	11.7%	7
Q7.ii.d. Art or drama clubs e.g. stagecoach	147	11.5%	8
Q7.ii.j. Faith groups or church youth groups.	108	8.4%	9
Q7.ii.h. Voluntary/community youth group e.g. a charity or run by volunteers	105	8.2%	10
Q7.ii.i. Youth councils e.g. youth town council	72	5.6%	11
Q7.ii.n. Lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender youth groups e.g. GoGs or BoBs	64	5.0%	12
Q7.ii.m. Young carers group.	47	3.7%	13
Q7.ii.k. Disabled young people's group e.g. Barnardos.	42	3.3%	14
	2776	216.7%	

When young people were asked in the focus groups what they would like in their area, leisure and sports based activities is highlighted often, as is having access to a Wiltshire Council Youth Centre.

<b>What activities would you like to have in your area?</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Leisure	171	<b>1</b>
Wiltshire Council Youth Centre	130	<b>2</b>
Sports clubs	120	<b>3</b>
LGBT groups	113	<b>4</b>
Music	75	<b>5</b>
Disabled young people's groups	72	<b>6</b>
Alternative sports	39	<b>7</b>
Young carers	26	<b>8</b>
Arts and drama	25	<b>9</b>
VCS youth group	23	<b>10</b>

What activities would you like to have in your area?	Number of responses	Ranking
Uniformed clubs	20	11
Youth Council	10	12
Dance	7	13
Faith Groups	0	14

Responses canvassed from the SNAP survey that are highlighted in the table below also show that leisure and sports based activities are a need for young people and something that they would like to continue to have available in their area. We can also see that there is a need for arts based activities such as music, art and drama.

Q8) What would you like to have in your area (tick top 3)			
	Responses (1526)		Ranking
	Number	%	
Q8b. Leisure centre and activities e.g. swimming, badminton, etc.	676	44.3%	1
Q8a. What would you like to have in your area (tick top 3) - Sports clubs e.g. football, rugby, tennis, netball, etc.	668	43.8%	2
Q8l. Alternative sports group or venue e.g. skate park, bmx track, parkour group.	440	28.8%	3
Q8e. Music groups and clubs e.g. DJ workshop, community choir, etc	371	24.3%	4
Q8d. Art or drama clubs e.g. stagecoach	353	23.1%	5
Q8g. Wiltshire Council youth centre	326	21.4%	6
Q8f. Dance classes or clubs e.g. ballet or street dance.	243	15.9%	7
Q8c. Uniformed clubs e.g. scouts, guides, army cadets, St John Ambulance	200	13.1%	8
Q8k. Disabled young people's group e.g. Barnardos.	157	10.3%	9
Q8n. Lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender youth groups e.g. GoGs or BoBs	144	9.4%	10
Q8h. Voluntary/community youth group e.g. a charity or run by volunteers	142	9.3%	11



<b>Q8) What would you like to have in your area (tick top 3)</b>			
	Responses (1526)		Ranking
	Number	%	
Q8i. Youth councils e.g. youth town council	114	7.5%	12
Q8m. Young carers group.	112	7.3%	13
Q8j. Faith groups or church youth groups.	60	3.9%	14
	4006	262.5%	

The responses from the focus groups differ very slightly from the survey results, although both leisure centres and sports clubs are again in the top 3, we can see from the focus groups that Wiltshire Council youth centres are the 2<sup>nd</sup> most popular choice for young people and the want for more alternative sports falls down the rankings. We can also see that clubs and groups for protected characteristic groups come up as a higher need from young people in the focus groups than the surveys. When young people were given free rein to come up with one new activity that they would like in their area, there were a vast range of responses, as you would expect given its openness and freedom for any type of response.

The answers to this question back up young people's responses to Q8 of the SNAP survey - even when young people are asked openly about what new activities they would like to see in their area we can clearly see that having access to sports and leisure activities (with a particular desire for skate parks) is of high priority.

Again we can see that the arts is of high importance to young people with music, drama and dance all coming within the top 10 things young people would most like to see in their area.

The table below shows the top 10 responses from the SNAP surveys and focus groups:

<b>Activity/facility</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Skate park	1
Sports clubs (tennis, running, squash, rugby etc... excluding football)	2
Leisure Centre and Swimming	3
Ice skating	=4
Youth Centre	=4
Football clubs	5
Music clubs (choir, DJing etc.)	6
Drama	7
Dance	8
Cinema	9

In summary we can see that almost half of the young people surveyed said they currently attended a leisure centre or sports club at least once a week, and when asked what they would like in their local area, sports based activities came up very

strongly. The results from young people's focus groups differed slightly from the survey in that leisure services were still the most important; however access to a local Wiltshire Council youth facility was the second most popular choice. When young people are asked openly what one new activity they would like to see in their area sports and leisure activities are of high priority to Wiltshire young people.

## 5.2. What are young people's priorities?

The second part of the focus groups and SNAP survey asked young people about their priorities and what they felt the council should be prioritising when making the changes to youth work and activities.

The following 2 tables show that the rankings from the surveys almost marry up completely with the responses from the focus groups. Overwhelmingly young people's top two priorities are to have a say in how money is spent and for there to be a wide range of activities available for all young people. Young people clearly want to be part of any decision making process about how money is spent in their local area and about what activities and facilities are available.

<b>Q10) When we plan these changes what do you think should be our top two priorities (tick your top 2)</b>			
	Responses (1760)		Ranking
	Number	%	
Q10a. Young people are involved in decisions about how money is spent in their local area.	924	52.5 %	1
Q10d. A wide range of activities should be available for all young people.	728	41.4 %	2
Q10b. Local people (including young people) should decide what activities and support is available for young people in their community.	494	28.1 %	3
Q10i. More activities and support in the evenings, weekends and during school holidays.	379	21.5 %	4
Q10g. Staff who run groups are well trained in how to work with young people	358	20.3 %	5
Q10h. Activities are well advertised and promoted.	223	12.7 %	6

<b>Q10) When we plan these changes what do you think should be our top two priorities (tick your top 2)</b>			
	Responses (1760)		Ranking
	Number	%	
Q10e. Support and activities are targeted at young people most in need of support.	158	9.0%	7
Q10c. The council should decide what activities and support is available for young people in their community.	90	5.1%	8
Q10f. Voluntary and community groups should have a bigger role in offering activities and support to young people.	86	4.9%	9
	3440	195.5%	

<b>When we plan these changes what do you think should be our top 2 priorities?</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Young people are involved in decisions about how money is spent in their local area.	226	1
A wide range of activities should be available for all young people.	127	2
Local people (including young people) should decide what activities and support is available for young people in their community.	104	3
Staff who run groups are well trained in how to work with young people	90	4
More activities and support in the evenings, weekends and during school holidays.	80	5
Activities are well advertised and promoted.	63	6
Support and activities are targeted at young people most in need of support.	45	7
The council should decide what activities and support is available for young people in their community.	4	8
Voluntary and community groups should have a bigger role in offering activities and support to young people.	1	9

In summary when asked about their two priorities when making changes to youth work and activities, young people said they wanted to have a say in how money is spent and for there to be a wide range of activities available for all young people.

### 5.3. Young people's ratings of the proposed options

Young people were finally asked to rate the proposed options and give feedback about each one. As stated previously they were also given the opportunity to develop an alternative option. The following section will detail what young people have said about the proposed options with an analysis of the feedback including what young people think are the positives and negatives of each option and with some direct quotes from young people.

The table below shows that 78% of young people responding to the SNAP survey would describe the community led option as good or very good.

<b>Q11. How do you rate Option 1 - A community led model?</b>		
	Number	%
Very poor	178	10.1
Poor	208	11.8
Good	1086	61.7
Very good	288	16.4
<i>Total</i>	<i>1760</i>	<i>100.0</i>

319 young people made additional comments about a community led model (Q12). The key messages are:

<b>Positives:</b>	<b>Negatives / concerns:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young people get a say in how money is spent</li> <li>• Young people's voice's are listened to</li> <li>• Vulnerable people get priority</li> <li>• Communities know their local needs best</li> <li>• Chance for other groups to expand</li> <li>• Could lead to new and fresh ideas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young people's opinions might be ignored</li> <li>• Everybody might not get their fair share of the money</li> <li>• Would no longer have qualified trained youth workers</li> <li>• No building for young people</li> <li>• Gap between the campuses opening and youth clubs closing</li> <li>• Hard to ensure that ALL young people are having a say</li> <li>• Cross county differences (some Area Boards are good but others are not so good with young people)</li> <li>• Older young people lose out as voluntary and community sector clubs have lots of the younger age range</li> </ul>

Below are some of the quotes from young people about the community led option:

#### **POSITIVES**

"It gives us a say in what is happening and we have a better idea of what we want in our area"

"Children actually help decide and have an input"

“A chance for young people to debate the best things to do”  
 “It makes sense to have a community based model as the people on the whole know what is needed and can channel the money to purposeful activities. I never attend the youth clubs they are out dated and rubbish”  
 “Gives other clubs that young people enjoy a chance to get bigger and better”

### NEGATIVES / CONCERNS

“Youth's voices may not be listened to as adults will think their ideas are better and look down on us”  
 “The level of training/assistance needed for this work warrants a paid professional”  
 “Where would young people go for confidential support, advice and help?”  
 “Every young person becomes vulnerable when they have no place to go”  
 “It wouldn't provide the support needed for the young people in our area. There wouldn't be enough activities being run, due to less staff and buildings. And less 1-2-1 support for those in need”  
 “Voluntary youth clubs can be too childish”

The table below shows that 57% of young people would describe outsourcing the service as good or very good:

<b>Q13. How do you rate Option 2 - Outsource the service?</b>		
	Number	%
Very poor	228	13.0
Poor	531	30.2
Good	870	49.4
Very good	131	7.4
<i>Total</i>	<i>1760</i>	<i>100.0</i>

133 young people made additional comments (Q14) about outsourcing:

<b>Positives</b>	<b>Negatives/concerns</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Company / organisation would have a full focus on young people</li> <li>• Lose the fear of constant cuts</li> <li>• Paid on quality of service - good incentive to do well</li> <li>• New ideas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will we know they are doing a good job</li> <li>• Might not be as good as what we have</li> <li>• Young people don't have a say</li> <li>• Could be about money rather than quality</li> <li>• Could end up with cross county differences if taken over by more than one provider</li> <li>• Won't know us and our community</li> </ul>

Below are some of the quotes from young people about outsourcing:

### POSITIVES

“It could be really good if the charity is experienced with working for youth”  
 “Likely to want to do a good job if their pay is relying on it but might not be for the

right reasons”

“Managers actually care about youth work unlike the managers at Wiltshire Council that have to manage loads of different things”

### **NEGATIVES / CONCERNS**

“I don't want a company to decide what's best for us and profit from it”

“The Council and our local workers know us”

“If we go for this model the local authority will just cherry pick the services that it wants to fund in this way and this will give less choice to young people as to what they want”

“We want to keep it as it is”

“I think that the youth workers in my area are very well trained and are very helpful and polite. As well as the above I think that it will be a waste of resources if they had to throw away their current training.”

The table below shows that 59% of respondents describe the staff public mutual as a good or very good option:

<b>Q15. How do you rate Option 3 - Encourage staff to form a public mutual?</b>		
	Number	%
Very poor	200	11.4
Poor	522	29.7
Good	875	49.7
Very good	163	9.3
<i>Total</i>	<i>1760</i>	<i>100.0</i>

226 young people made additional comments about a staff public mutual (Q16):

<b>Positives</b>	<b>Negatives/concerns</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep the staff we know</li> <li>• Staff are already well trained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unrealistic time frames</li> <li>• Strong commitment by staff- Not all the staff might want to do this</li> <li>• Youth workers are workers not managers</li> <li>• All about profit</li> <li>• Risky – uncertain about the long term</li> </ul>

Below are some of the quotes from young people about staff public mutuals:

### **POSITIVES**

“The staff would more likely be more willing to be there which will make for a better experience for young people”

“Because I like the staff I'd rather have people I know running the centre than people I don't”

“Good that they're properly trained”

### **NEGATIVES / CONCERNS**

“If they wanted to be business people, wouldn't they have gone into business?”

Youth workers are so good at what they do, isn't it better to enable them to continue to provide their vital services for their community?"  
 "However more emphasis would be put on money not necessarily the quality of service"  
 "Not many people would be happy to start their own company"  
 "Staff can't just set up a company just like that!"

The table below shows that when young people were asked to rate the option to keep the youth service in house 52% of young people describe it as good or very good.

<b>Q17. How do you rate Option 4 - Keep the Youth Service 'in house'?</b>		
	Number	%
Very poor	311	17.7
Poor	527	29.9
Good	730	41.5
Very good	192	10.9
<i>Total</i>	<i>1760</i>	<i>100.0</i>

There were 311 additional comments about keeping the youth service in house (Q18):

<b>Positives</b>	<b>Negatives/concerns:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The option that keeps the service as it is</li> <li>• Focuses on vulnerable young people</li> <li>• Could mean we get modern buildings that are well used</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel</li> <li>• Four 'hubs' is not enough</li> <li>• All about money saving and not about giving us a better service</li> <li>• Some young people will lose their local youth workers and youth clubs</li> <li>• Losing the current level of support</li> <li>• Wiltshire Council is still in charge</li> <li>• Cuts back what is currently available</li> <li>• Not enough change to encourage new young people to attend</li> </ul>

Below are some of the quotes from young people about keeping the youth service in house:

#### **POSITIVES**

"Good as focuses on the most needy"  
 "I think this option is the best because it's the one I would be most comfortable about and I would still use my youth centre"  
 "Could mean that we get rid of the youth centres that not many young people use and keep the best ones"  
 "Could get rid of run down and scanky buildings and have nice new ones that are well used and appealing – young people actually don't mind being seen in them"  
 "Out of the very limited and vague options given this is the best, it's the only one that supports the existing system which has a fantastic track record"

**NEGATIVES /CONCERNS**

“All young people need is a place to go otherwise they get blamed for the problems around the towns”

“Based on where these hubs are located there would be many young people left out because there simply wouldn't be enough hubs in order for all the young people's needs to be supported. Also a dramatic cut in the youth work budget would mean that not as many young people would be able to be supported”

“Although I chose 'good' as my answer - This is only because it is 'the best of a bad bunch' so to speak. I opt that there should be another option. Option 5 - Keep the Youth Service in house, but NO CUTS. Thank you”

“The already inadequate transport system becomes even more inadequate and this becomes a postcode lottery. Volunteers are good but they seem to be tasked with running everything these days and cannot be relied upon to the extent of paid, experienced staff”.

“Youth centres don't appeal to a lot of young people – so they still wouldn't attend with this option”

**5.4. Young people's preferred option**

Once young people had assessed the detail of each option they were asked to pick their preferred option. The table below shows that young people who responded to the survey clearly favour the community led option as a way forward when Wiltshire Council implements change. Young people do highlight some concerns with this option though, namely assurance that they will have a say in the decision making process, the fear of losing trained workers and a young people friendly space.

<b>Q19. Of the following four options which one do you think would be the best way forward?</b>			
SNAP survey	Number	%	Ranking
Option 1 - A community led model	840	47.7%	1
Option 4 - Keep the youth service 'in house' but spend less.	427	24.3%	2
Option 3 - Encourage staff to form a public service mutual.	263	14.9%	3
Option 2 - Outsource the service	230	13.1%	4
<b>Focus Groups</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>		<b>Ranking</b>
Option 1 - A community led model	226		<b>1</b>
Option 4 - Keep the youth service 'in house' but spend less.	89		<b>2</b>
Option 2 - Outsource the service	51		<b>3</b>
Option 3 - Encourage staff to	44		<b>4</b>



Focus Groups	Number of responses	Ranking
form a public service mutual.		

### 5.5. Additional comments from young people

335 additional comments were received in response to Q20 (is there anything else you think we should know or you think that we have missed?).

85 of the additional comments related to keeping the youth clubs open and not changing them.

34 young people specifically referred to the importance of trained staff.

Some young people stated that they did not like any of the options and a few young people complained that the options and the survey was hard to understand.

The key messages from the additional comments are below:

- Advertise things / better promotion of what is available
- Young people should always be involved in the decision making process
- Maintain youth workers / Qualified staff
- Keep the youth service as it is
- Young people should have a say in how money is spent
- Opportunity for fresh ideas

### 5.6. Community Area Boards

Key messages from Area Boards:

- Youth work is highly valued for its role in supporting young people with their personal and social development – it makes a positive difference to young people's lives and should be invested in
- Young people need access to appropriately qualified youth workers – some concerns were expressed about relying on volunteers due to their limited availability, skills and experience
- Places to go and meet for young people are highly regarded
- Youth services must be accessible, available locally and shaped by young people and their communities
- Safeguarding and support for vulnerable young people e.g. the bridging projects, are very important
- Transport is a major barrier to accessing services, particularly for those living in rural areas
- Voluntary and community sector organisations are a key part of ensuring youth services meet young people's needs but they require support to do this
- A few young people were fairly critical of Sparksite's role in promoting youth services in terms of accessibility and usage.
- Data on the use and impact of the youth work team is unreliable
- Youth services should meet the needs of all young people, including those in outlying villages and who are not vulnerable

## 5.7. Voluntary and community sector organisations

Voluntary and community sector organisations were asked to consider 3 key questions; the questions were as follows:

Do you/your organisation think the voluntary and community sector should have a greater role in the delivery of positive leisure-time activities for young people within your community? If so, how would you see this role?
What support do you/your organisation think the voluntary and community sector requires in order to enhance their involvement in the provision of positive leisure time activities and support for young people in your area?
Which of the four options (found on <a href="http://www.sparksite.co.uk">www.sparksite.co.uk</a> ) do you/your organisation prefer and why?

Overwhelmingly voluntary and community sector organisations believe that they should have a bigger role to play in the delivery of positive leisure time activities in the community with nearly all organisations that fed back stating this. Despite this they all felt that Wiltshire Council had a key role to play in enabling this to happen. Particular concerns came around the need for the trained youth work role in early intervention, the need for additional administration support and funding and more staff in order to utilise wider community buildings to their full potential such as schools and churches.

Based on the responses from all of the organisations (the 15 VCS and 12 Parish/Town councils) the feedback for the preferred option is as follows:

Community Led	11
Outsource	0
Staff Mutual	0
Retain in house	9
Community led or outsource	1
Combination of community led and in house	3
No preferred option given	2
Alternative option	1

Key messages:

- Need for appropriately qualified workers - youth workers are needed for youth work but volunteers / other voluntary and community sector organisations can easily offer positive activities – there is a need for a consistent worker
- Local / community delivery is key but with Wiltshire Council support
- Wider use of current community buildings / community agreements
- Access to grants will enable new innovative ideas that are young people led
- A need for guidance and central administration
- Retain YAGs – young people’s engagement in local decision making and how money is spent

## Concerns:

- Lack of informal education (drug and alcohol education, sex and relationship education, emotional wellbeing, living skills – cooking)
- Reach (numbers of young people engaging with voluntary and community sector organisations)
- Development – it seems to be about numbers rather than the child’s journey / progression
- Grants / funding to be ring fenced for young people
- 8 full-time posts and 2 full-time equivalent posts are inadequate for the community led model
- Other stakeholders use of the youth club buildings e.g. Splitz
- Community buildings unaffordable (local community agreements on hire charges - it is unrealistic to assume these are not only available but affordable)
- Funding should be easy to apply for and report on (VCS organisations and particularly volunteers have little time to fill out a vast amount of forms)
- Transition period / lead in time
- Border differences (young people’s projects and their friendship groups can spread over area boards areas - will there be Area Board agreements for this?)

The notes from the Youth Activity Review VCS Engagement Event are included as appendix 4 to this report.

### 5.8. Members of the public

Several members of the public opted to send in personal responses during the consultation process as below:

Referring to / from	Number of responses	
Importance of Bridging projects / Barnardos	4	All retain in house
Importance of Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme	1	Retain in house (No cuts)
Wiltshire Council staff	4	X3 retain and 1 community led
Importance of Wiltshire Youth Arts Partnership	4	None state a preferred option
Various other comments / suggestions	16	8 do not state a preferred option X5 retain in house X2 community led X1 combination of in house and community led
Ex service users	5	All retain in house
Emails stating ‘None of the above’ as the subject	3	None state a preferred option
	<b>37</b>	

## Key messages:

- The need for professionally trained staff – even if a community led model is the way forward Wiltshire Council should retain the workers / management and monitoring of projects
- Young people need trained, consistent, regular workers they can trust
- Youth workers are key to early intervention, early advice, transition and social engagement
- Youth workers are easy for young people to access for information, signposting and guidance
- Schools opening themselves up for youth activities
- Giving the communities ownership is positive. It actually creates community.
- Better promotion of what is available
- During the consultation, the council was contacted by some former users of the youth service who shared how youth workers had been of crucial importance in making a major difference to their lives

## Concerns:

- Timescales (unrealistic)
- Redundancy costs
- Area Boards managing the funding – cross county disparities / inequalities, small amount of money- how much can it really achieve? How will we ensure young people get the most out of it? Have we truly assessed the risks / impacts of this?
- Increase in Anti Social Behaviour
- A suitable space for multi agency working face to face with young people – e.g. NEET (not in education, employment or training) project work
- Gaps in implementation (between decision being made and having a service in place)
- Voluntary and community sector capacity – number of staff / volunteers, training, are they realistically able to take on 4000+ young people?
- Volunteers are there to enhance not substitute
- Organisations / other service providers that currently use youth club buildings e.g. Barnardos weekend clubs, parent and toddler groups (it is unrealistic to assume that there are other spaces available within the community)
- Could have organisations that are good bid writers and get funding but actually the impact on young people is minimal

### **5.9. Children's Select Committee Scrutiny Task Group**

On 21 January Cabinet considered a part 2 report proposing that it reviews how it meets its statutory duty to secure young people aged 13-19 access to sufficient positive leisure-time activities that improve their wellbeing, and sufficient facilities for such activities. The report stated that the proposals should be robustly scrutinised by the Children's Select Committee. On 28 January the Committee established a task

group to respond to the consultation. A report was published on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2014 outlining the following findings and recommendations:

- Data on the reach and impact of the youth service is unreliable and should be improved, including information on value for money.
- Change is needed within the youth service; however current timescales and pace risk changes being made without time for their implementation or impact to be fully considered. Sufficient time is also required to support transition to any new operating model.
- Proposals could have been better informed by other local authority youth service models and earlier involvement from scrutiny.
- There is not enough detail about how the preferred community-led option will work in practice and be implemented. The group had particular concerns with the Area Board money not delivering new services but instead funding the same ones as in previous years but simply from a different pot.
- Some officers feel undervalued by the council as a result of the review. Youth work is valued and has a positive impact on young people's lives. It has an important role to play in early intervention and prevention and the relationships young people have with qualified youth workers are highly regarded.
- There is a difference between 'activities for young people' and 'youth work'.
- Any reduction in service could result in reduced participation in youth work and increase costs in the long-run e.g. anti-social behaviour
- The group has concerns about all four options; however a community-led model should be adopted with some key adjustments.

#### **5.10. Wiltshire Parent Carer Council**

The full consultation report conducted by the Wiltshire Parent Carer Council in partnership with Wiltshire Council is included as appendix 3.

Developing a community led approach was the option most favoured by the parents and carers who attended the 3 consultation events. However, everyone who attended made it clear that where it was working it should continue i.e. Devizes and Salisbury hubs. There was major concern that in any future change the voice of disabled young people, parents and carers must be sought in the decision process at all levels.

The key messages from the report are set out below:

- Overall bridging projects are highly valued particularly as they bring young people with learning difficulties and disabilities together with mainstream young people in safe, supportive and secure environments – provision is 'hit and miss' in some areas
- The voice of young people with learning difficulties and disabilities and their parents and carers must be considered as part of any future operating model

to ensure needs are met – WPCC should be involved in the design, development and review of any new service

- Specific funding for bridging projects should be allocated and ring-fenced for this purpose
- Youth work and activities which promote independence , local friendships and trying out new and varied opportunities is important as well as 1:1 support
- To meet the needs of young people with learning difficulties and disabilities, provision must be local, easily accessible, inclusive, safe, structured and provided regularly by trained and experienced staff – the needs of those with personal care requirements, severely challenging behavior and mediation needs should also be provided for
- Sessions need to give parents / carers enough time to do other things (2 hours minimum)

### **5.11. Report from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner**

The full report from the office of the Police and Crime Commissioner is included as appendix 3.

The key messages from the report are set out below:

- A lack of facilities for children, anti-social behaviour and young people hanging around are particular concerns for local residents across Wiltshire and Swindon
- It is believed that there is a correlation between the perception of a lack of facilities and the observation of young people hanging around
- Solutions to youth issues should be found in the community and the public sector has a facilitating role, including the Police and Crime Commissioner and Wiltshire Council
- The recently established Police Innovation Fund is supporting innovative projects to engage young people and reduce offending and re-offending behaviour
- A major strength within Wiltshire Council is the Area Board network and the Youth Advisory Groups that report to it
- The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner embraces the concept of Asset Based Community Development, which entails communities doing things for themselves and supports the community-led option

### **5.12. Alternative options**

During the consultation a number of alternative options were put forward for consideration. Many suggested a ‘middle’ way, mainly by combining the ‘keep the service in-house’ and ‘community-led’ options, with a mixed economy of providers, and the council focusing its provision on those who are most vulnerable and disadvantaged.

Six alternative operating models were submitted by staff. These focused on retaining professional youth work staff, focusing on community development work with voluntary and community sector organisations. Other options included proposals to

reduce costs and generate income through closer partnership working, shorter youth work sessions, reviewing lettings charges, trading services (e.g. Duke of Edinburgh, Sparksite and Oxenwood Outdoor Education Centre), reducing the number of youth groups and introducing a temporary pay cut for staff. Several models suggested the use of apprenticeships and traineeships, and in some cases less funding to community area boards.

Voluntary and community sector organisations developed a new community-led option that included stronger support for youth groups and a mixed economy of providers. A key feature involved the establishment of local networks which would bring partners and youth providers together to coordinate provision and develop a locally tailored youth offer. Funding for area boards would be ring-fenced but far more flexible. Trained youth workers in each community area would focus on development work and targeted youth support for vulnerable young people.

Several alternative models were also submitted through consultation events with community areas. The Malmesbury youth advisory group suggested the development of a central youth service hub which provides community areas access to resources and qualified detached youth workers. The Southern Wiltshire area board and youth work team collaborated to put forward a locality cluster approach based on the 'keep the service in house' option. Key features involved trained youth workers focusing on community working and income generating activities as well as the local promotion of youth activities through social networking. The Southwest Wiltshire youth advisory group proposed a mix of the 'community-led' and 'keep the service in-house' options, with the council continuing to fund facilities and a youth work coordinator for each area. Sparksite would be replaced by social networking, volunteers trained by coordinators and a stronger emphasis on income generation activities.

The Scrutiny Task Group suggested an indicative alternative community led model. This included robust criteria for the use of devolved funding to area boards to maximise benefits to young people as well as enhanced officer support for area boards, youth advisory groups and voluntary and community groups. Each community area would have a named appropriately qualified youth worker, with the council continuing to provide open access youth work. 5 targeted youth workers would focus on the lower level threshold of need through early intervention and building supportive relationships with young people, whilst the Community Youth Workers will be concentrating on facilitating open access youth work across the community area. Other key aspects included the use of apprenticeships and improving the measuring and monitoring of service impact.

In considering how best to meet the needs of young people with learning difficulties and disabilities, the parents/carers who participated in consultation events facilitated by the Wiltshire Parent Carer Council suggested that a scheme called the 'get out there club' be explored. This is a project currently run in Cornwall which combines the idea of able young people being trained and mentoring disabled/vulnerable young people at various venues across the county. As part of the programme minibuses are used to collect people and take them to places for activities.

These additional options were evaluated using a matrix which assessed the key factors of achievability, improved outcomes for young people and safeguarding. Each model was given a score out of 30 – the higher the score, the more favourable the option.



## 6. Conclusions

- Young people favour the community-led option but want assurance they will be involved in decision-making. They are also keen not to lose access to appropriately qualified youth workers and want a youth friendly space to be available within their local communities.
- Having access to sports and leisure activities is a high priority for Wiltshire's young people.
- Some responses received during the consultation from young people and other stakeholders expressed a view that open access youth work should be retained, with no budget reduction and closure of buildings. This was particularly the case for current users of the service.
- Young people want access to a trusted adult in their community to talk to – the professionalism and experience of youth workers is highly rated and they make a positive difference to young people's lives. Youth work is highly valued for its important role in preparing young people for adulthood, helping to develop life skills and for the positive relationships that youth workers form with young people. The majority of service users felt that the relationship with their youth worker was of critical importance as they were the trusted adult to go to within their communities for information, advice and guidance in times of need. Many stressed the importance of having access to professionally trained and experienced youth workers.
- Young people and their communities should be supported to have a greater influence to shape youth services and activities. Youth advisory groups are valued and help young people to have a voice in their community.
- Those against proposed changes were particularly concerned about the potential long-term impact of any reduction in service on young people's lives and the costs associated with this, such as an increase in youth crime, anti-social behaviour, substance misuse and increased demand on children's social care services. During the consultation the council was contacted by some former users of the youth service who shared how youth workers had been of crucial importance in making a major difference to their lives. Many considered the youth service to be an example of prevention and early help and an investment in the future of Wiltshire's young people.
- Many service users and members of the public identified facilities/space for young people and associated activities as being very important to them and their communities for a variety of reasons.
- Supported by the completion of extensive wide-ranging community mapping exercise, the consultation highlighted a vast range of youth provision and space for young people provided by voluntary and community sector organisations. Direct feedback from the voluntary and community sector reiterated this and the view that this could be enhanced further. Some other stakeholders, however, expressed concern about whether the sector has the capacity, skills, experience, interest and funding to grow its existing provision and take on the overall delivery of open access youth work and activities.
- Many voluntary and community sector organisations highlighted the importance of appropriate support (including funding and training) from the council to help them grow and improve provision. It was felt that existing youth work and activities could be coordinated more effectively and organisations encouraged by the council to work better together.

- There were many respondents across all stakeholder groups who stressed the importance of continuing to provide services and support for vulnerable young people, particularly those with learning difficulties and disabilities. The value of bridging projects were highlighted, however some parents/carers of young people with learning difficulties and disabilities felt this provision could be more consistent across the county and improved further.
- Many service users felt very strongly that youth services needed to be promoted much more effectively and some stakeholders were critical of Sparksite's role in achieving this in terms of accessibility and usage. A few respondents were keen for the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme and Wiltshire Youth Arts Partnership to continue
- Service users need to be supported in the transition to any new operating model.

Report Author:

Christina Gregory – Voice and Influence Policy and Research Coordinator

Stakeholder	Key messages
<b>Young people</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The community-led option is favoured by the majority of young people.</li> <li>- Young people want a say in how money on youth services is spent in their local area.</li> <li>- Sports and leisure activities are by far the activities that young people use most and want to retain in their local communities. Many young people would like to see more arts-based activities e.g. theatre, music and dance.</li> <li>- Existing users of council youth work do not want to lose their current service.</li> <li>- A wide range of activities should be available for young people in their local area.</li> <li>- Access to knowledgeable and trained staff is important.</li> <li>- Activities should be accessible and easy to get to, with good transport links.</li> </ul>
<b>Youth work staff</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The council should retain a professional youth work presence, including qualified youth workers.</li> <li>- All young people deserve to have access to services and not just those with the most pressing issues.</li> <li>- The provision of universal services, including open access youth work should be maintained because of the positive impact they have on children and young people's lives – they are an example of prevention/early intervention which is better than cure.</li> <li>- Only the community-led and reduce the service options have a chance of being implemented. The others are not realistic given the timescales involved.</li> <li>- A community-led option would require a transition period and time to grow of around 1-3 years.</li> </ul>
<b>Community areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Youth work is highly valued for its role in supporting young people with their personal and social development. It makes a positive difference to young people's lives and should be invested in.</li> <li>- Young people need access to trained youth workers. Some concerns about relying on volunteers due to their limited availability, skills and experience.</li> <li>- Places to go and meet for young people are highly regarded.</li> <li>- Youth services must be accessible, available locally and shaped by young people and their communities.</li> <li>- Safeguarding and support for vulnerable young people e.g. the bridging projects are very important.</li> <li>- Transport is a major barrier to accessing services, particularly for those living in rural areas.</li> <li>- Voluntary and community sector organisations are a key part of ensuring youth services meet young people's needs but they require support to do this.</li> <li>- Sparksite is not very accessible or well used and questions raised about whether this funding could be better spent.</li> <li>- Data on the use and impact of the youth service is unreliable.</li> <li>- Youth services should meet the needs of all young people, including those in outlying villages and who are not vulnerable.</li> </ul>
<b>Children's Select Committee Scrutiny Task Group</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data on the reach and impact of the youth service is unreliable and should be improved, including information on value for money.</li> <li>- Change is needed within the youth service; however current timescales and pace risk changes being made without time for their implementation or impact to be fully considered. Sufficient time is also required to support transition to any new operating model.</li> <li>- Proposals could have been better informed by other local authority youth service models and earlier involvement from scrutiny.</li> <li>- There is not enough detail about how the preferred community-led option will work in practice and be implemented. The group had particular concerns with the Area Board money not delivering new services but instead funding the same ones as in previous years but simply from a different pot.</li> <li>- Some officers feel undervalued by the council as a result of the review. Youth work is valued and has a positive impact on young people's lives. It has an important role to play in early intervention and prevention and the relationships young people have with qualified youth workers are highly regarded.</li> <li>- There is a difference between 'activities for young people' and 'youth work'.</li> <li>- Any reduction in service could result in reduced participation in youth work and increase costs in the long-run e.g. anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>- The group has concerns about all four options; however a community-led model should be adopted with some key adjustments.</li> </ul>
<b>Office of the Police and Crime</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A lack of facilities for children, anti-social behaviour and young people hanging around are particular concerns for local residents</li> </ul>

### Appendix 3

<p><b>Commissioner</b></p>	<p>across Wiltshire and Swindon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is believed that there is a correlation between the perception of a lack of facilities and the observation of a problem of young people hanging around.</li> <li>- Solutions to youth issues should be found in the community and the public sector has a facilitating role, including the Police and Crime Commissioner and Wiltshire Council.</li> <li>- The recently established Police Innovation Fund is supporting innovative projects to engage young people and reduce offending and reoffending behaviour.</li> <li>- A major strength within Wiltshire Council is the area board network and youth advisory groups that report to it.</li> <li>- The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner embraces the concept of Asset Based Community Development, which entails communities doing things for themselves and supports the community-led option.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Voluntary and Community Sector organisations</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The community-led option is favoured - the VCS could play a greater role and needs sufficient support from the council to do this (e.g. training, help with funding applications etc)</li> <li>- The council needs to understand the impact of changes on communities and young people – any reduction in services may lead to further costs down the line and a transition plan put in place</li> <li>- Any new operating model needs to be sustainable with a long-term commitment from the council.</li> <li>- Youth provision needs to be better coordinated at a local level and support for Youth Advisory Groups is important.</li> <li>- Facilities for youth work and activities must be affordable and suitable space for young people should be available within community campuses.</li> <li>- A youth work approach is valued for its role in supporting young people’s social and emotional development.</li> <li>- Funding to community area boards should be ring-fenced for youth activities, flexible and application &amp; monitoring processes not overly cumbersome.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Wiltshire Parent Carer Council</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall bridging projects are highly valued particularly as they bring young people with learning difficulties and disabilities together with mainstream young people in safe, supportive and secure environments. Provision; however is ‘hit and miss’ in some areas.</li> <li>- The community-led option is favoured by parents and carers who took part in the consultation events but bridging projects should continue in those areas where they are working i.e. Devizes and Salisbury.</li> <li>- The voice of young people with learning difficulties and disabilities and their parents and carers must be considered as part of any future operating model to ensure needs are met. WPCC should be involved in the design, development and review of any new service.</li> <li>- Specific funding for bridging projects should be allocated and ring-fenced for this purpose.</li> <li>- Youth work and activities which promote independence, local friendships and trying out new and varied opportunities is important as well as 1:1 support.</li> <li>- To meet the needs of young people with learning difficulties and disabilities, provision must be local, easily accessible, inclusive, safe, structured and provided regularly by trained and experienced staff. The needs of those with personal care requirements, severely challenging behaviour and medication needs should also be provided for.</li> <li>- Sessions need to give parents/carers enough time to do other things (2 hours minimum).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Members of the Public</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There should be no reduction to youth services and activities.</li> <li>- Young people need access to professionally trained youth work staff. Youth workers build positive trusting relationships with young people and provide access to information, advice and guidance.</li> </ul>

### Appendix 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Concerns expressed about voluntary/community sector capacity and reliance on volunteers.</li><li>- Youth work is highly valued for its important role in early intervention and prevention. Failure to invest in this will result in long-term costs e.g. anti-social behaviour.</li><li>- Giving communities ownership of youth services is positive and creates a sense of community.</li><li>- There should be better promotion of what services and activities are available to young people.</li><li>- The impact of changes on young people must be understood, with realistic timescales for implementation of any new model.</li></ul>
--	--

# Appendix 1

## SUMMARY OF YOUTH WORK

### STAFF FEEDBACK ON THE REVIEW OF POSITIVE LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES

(Vers 1.0) 01/04/14

1. Staff consultation on the Review commenced on 31 January 14 and finished on 28 February 2014. A comprehensive archive has been compiled which contains details of all communications and submissions to and from staff. This information is not attached.
2. In terms of extent of the feedback response; this is outlined below:-
  - 95 members of staff attended collective consultation events in Salisbury, Trowbridge and Chippenham on 31 January 2014
  - Over 40 emails and items of written communication were received during the period.
  - 22 members of staff (primarily team leaders and youth coordinators) met directly with the Head of Service on 19 February 2014 to feed back their views and comments.

A table of key issues and 'hits' (i.e. the number of times a specific theme or issue was raised) is outlined in Annex 1.

3. Overall there is a strong desire to retain a professional youth work presence within whatever option is chosen. It was made clear that the proposed Youth Support Workers are not youth workers and therefore will not be able to provide the current service. The view of staff is that these posts will be accessed via some form of referral process which will mean that only a limited number of young people will be able to access the service. There is also a concern that other services which have become more targeted have had their thresholds raised which means that even less young people can access those services. The staff view is that if the Council continues in the current direction that only those young people who have the most pressing issues will have any chance of getting a service.
4. The Youth Work Team are clear about the positive impact of maintaining universal services such as Open Access as they believe that in the longer term this is more cost effective than moving to a more targeted service; as prevention is better than cure and open access youth work should be central to the Council's Early Help Strategy. If the Council wants to improve the outcomes for young people it needs to invest in universal services such as youth work rather than cut them.
5. Staff fed back that they felt that the Council were selective in the messages put out at the start of the consultation which they considered did not present a balanced picture. In particular, the implication heard by staff was that the reason for changes was down to a need to modernise and a low take up by young people; whereas staff considered that the programme is primarily about saving money. Staff do acknowledge that it is a difficult time for everyone in Local Government with cuts to budgets. The consultation exercise has however affected staff morale.
6. There was a view that only 2 of the options had any chance of being implemented notably the Community Led model and the reducing the service model. It was felt that neither external commissioning out nor a staff mutual option were realistic given the short timescales involved and the need to save money now.

# Appendix 1

7. With regard to the Council identified preferred option; that of a community led model. Staff felt that there was the potential to deliver this but it would take time to allow the model to develop and the transition period in the consultation was not long enough. It was considered that there needs to be at least 1-3 years to allow this grow. If there is to be community budgets it should be the whole of the Youth Work budget rather than a proportion as outlined in the Community led model. Consideration should also be given to ensuring that a professional youth work approach is included in any model implemented through the employment of appropriately qualified and skills workers.

**Mal Munday**  
**Head of Service**  
1 April 2014

# Appendix 1

## Annex 1

Table of 'Hits\*' in respect of key themes and issues raised by staff during the Positive Leisure Time Activities youth Review.

No	Theme	Number of 'Hits'
1.	Specific HR questions/issues relating to individual situations and the process	23
2.	How best to deliver across the totality/rurality of Wiltshire?	2
3.	Concerns that key partners including voluntary sector are not equipped/able/motivated to work with a community led model/approach.	16
4.	Impact on young people/how best to explain the changes to them.	7
5.	Concerns that the 'message' being outlined in the consultation is not balanced (the veracity of the consultation).	9
6.	How can new arrangements guarantee increased participation/what is the evidence base for the approach that outcomes will be improved?	30
7.	Concerns that Area Boards will struggle to deliver key outcomes or are not set up to within proposed new arrangements.	6
8.	Specific comments about the consultation and importance of bridging projects.	14
9.	Lack of understanding about the difference of a 'Positive Activities' and a 'Youth Work' approach/loss of a professional safety net leading to poor early intervention outcomes.	9
10.	Lack of clarify around the use of buildings and property and how this is related to the overall approach/plan	4
11.	Impact on related targeted activity and securing key outcomes e.g. tracking NEET destinations for school years 11-14.	3
12.	Issues linked to guidance for staff who are union members during the period of the consultation.	6

\* The number of times a specific theme or issue was raised.



## Appendix 2



# Youth Services Consultation Conducted by the Wiltshire Parent Carer Council in Partnership with Wiltshire Council

## **Consultation Report**

April 2014

# Appendix 2

## Contents

---

Background	3
Overview of Consultation Events	4
Option 1	5
Option 2	6
Option 3	7
Option 4	8
Option 5	9
Bridging Projects	10
Conclusion	11
Recommendations	11
Appendix and Submissions	12

# Appendix 2

## Background

As part of an overall budget reduction strategy, Wiltshire Council announced planned reductions in the region of £250,000 to Youth Services in Wiltshire.

As a result of publicity in the press and youth workers speaking to parents, many parents and carers were concerned that youth services and Bridging Projects for disabled young people were going to be adversely affected.

Wiltshire Council's Voice and Influence team have been conducting consultations with many users of the existing youth services and the Wiltshire Parent Carer Council (WPCC) worked with them to focus on youth services provision for our disabled young people. During this consultation Bridging Projects were also discussed at length.

In partnership with the Voice and Influence Team and James Fortune, the Lead Commissioner tasked with the Youth Service consultation and review, the WPCC facilitated three consultation events with parents and carers across the county. These took place in the Trowbridge area on 24th March, the Chippenham area on 25th March and in Salisbury on 26th March. A total of 18 parents and carers attended these events and gave their views. The WPCC also received written comments from some parents who weren't able to attend the consultations.

Wiltshire Council, as set out in the Education Act, is duty bound to provide positive activities for all young people across Wiltshire to help encourage good outcomes for them. With this in mind and knowing there was a need to make savings, they proposed for consultation 4 options on ways the new youth services could possibly operate.

The options presented were:

1. Develop a Community led approach
2. Outsource the Service
3. Encourage the sport staff to form a public Service Mutual
4. Retain the current in-house service but reduce the value

## Appendix 2

Each consultation followed the same format with a presentation at the beginning followed by consideration of the proposed options and an opportunity to explore other suggestions. The presentation was made on behalf of Wiltshire Council by James Fortune - Lead Commissioner Children's Services, Damian Haasjes - Voice and influence Team Manager, Lauren White – Voice and Influence Project Officer Project Manager, and Christina Gregory - Voice and influence Research and Policy Coordinator.

Bridging Projects currently being run in county were discussed additionally as there is ring fenced funding for such a scheme. Although it is established that the level of funding will not decrease, the type of provision may possibly change. This funding is to make provision for vulnerable young people aged 13-25 and again is embedded in the Education Act for disabled young people.

## Appendix 2

### Option 1. Develop a community led approach Votes = 11/18

This option was explained to be the Council's preferred option and was given the most time thorough discussion in all three consultations. It was explained that the funding would be delegated to the 22 local area boards within county to fund leisure activities locally. It was assumed that local community groups would provide activities and in order to ensure a certain standard was maintained a quality kite mark for safety, equality and insurance etc would be needed. It was also stated that within this option, 8 youth support workers would be provided to co-ordinate activities for vulnerable young people as well as 4 half-time youth advisors employed across county to help with the support of those setting up and running activities.

#### **Parent/Carers Views and Concerns:-**

- Would area boards really know what the local needs are when they are requested for this funding?
- Would area boards have a duty to have representation on this board for disabilities to ensure these needs are considered?
- Will area boards participate with and seek guidance from disability forums/ WPCC when funds are being requested by organisations to ensure ALL needs are met not just the box being ticked as a gesture?
- Will the area boards ensure they are giving funding to a wide variety of requests?
- Would these area boards ensure they hold meetings at appropriate times so all views are taken into account? Often meetings are in the evening when parent/carers have to care for their young people so are unable to attend meetings.
- Parents were very concerned that voluntary community services across the county are patchy. Some locations are excellent but some are non-existent.
- Relying upon voluntary community services to increase is risky as it was considered not very likely.
- Parents were concerned that sharing the building with other organisations of a different age can lead to huge conflict
- If the existing building is working well for the community why move to a campus?
- If it is to be a shared building it must be ensured that disabled young people have appropriate allocation of time for their use.
- Where will equipment be stored for the different groups in a shared space?
- How will the services be monitored and reviewed and what will complaints process be?
- How will kite mark ensure young people are kept safe and high standards of service maintained?
- Will there be a time lag involving disruption of services in order to get the new service running?

## Appendix 2

### Option 2. Outsourcing the Service

Votes = 6/18

Any Organisation could bid to offer a service across the county to an agreed sum and they could receive positive enhancements if service outcomes were very positive. The council would monitor the service ongoing. An example of this is Barnardos who run the Wiltshire Short Breaks Scheme.

#### **Parent/Carers Views:-**

- Some felt this would not work.
- They were worried that the organisations could sub-contract and Wiltshire Council would have no control over this.
- Parents were worried that new organisations are not good for young people because of significant change.
- They feared that a new service would not necessarily be aware of the true needs across county.
- Parents were concerned that bigger voluntary groups/ charities can be very good at preparing impressive tenders and proposals but will they deliver on them?
- Services in different areas could be patchy and inconsistent so there would need to be careful monitoring.
- Parents, carers and young people must be involved in decisions about new services.
- There is uncertainty as to whether existing staff would necessarily be transferred over - this depends on who takes on the contract.
- Some felt it could be a cost effective option as it would take less time for an already up and running organisation to start the sessions.
- Parents and carers could be involved in the monitoring via the WPCCC.
- Some felt it could work as the council already give some funds to the NAS in Wiltshire for activities for young people and this empowers groups, parents and carers who get involved and help raise additional funds for more activities they want to do.

## Appendix 2

### Option 3. Encourage and support staff to form a Public Service Mutual (PSM)

Votes = 0/18

At present no current Wiltshire Council staff have shown interest in taking up this option although it is understood this model has worked well in Kensington and Chelsea.

## Appendix 2

### Option 4. Retain the current in-house service but reduce the value.

Votes = 1/18

The number of hubs for youth services would decrease from 22 to 4-6 possibly located in Trowbridge, Salisbury, Devizes, Chippenham and 2 other areas. Youth workers would go out to hubs to deliver training and provide support for services where needed.

#### **Parent/Carers Views:-**

- These hubs will not be local so transport will be a major issue in terms of time, cost and availability - in many areas bus services are very poor.
- There would be far fewer staff to help young people who have a high level of need.
- Some young people would find it hard to share their facilities with larger numbers of young people.
- What would happen to the buildings and equipment that is across the county?



## Appendix 2

### Option 5 : Any Other Suggested Options/ None of the Above

It was suggested that a scheme called “The Get Out There Club” currently run in Cornwall be considered which combines the idea of able young people being trained and mentoring disabled/ vulnerable young people at various venues across county. Minibuses are used to collect people and take them to places for activities.

## Appendix 2

### Bridging Projects

Wiltshire Council have stated that in any future scenario for delivery of youth services, specific funding will be maintained for a service equivalent to, but not exactly the same, as the current bridging projects. The Bridging Projects are run for vulnerable young people aged 13-25. Parents at the consultations were asked for their views on the existing Bridging Projects and to identify the core values they would ascribe to any future projects. Views from the consultations are written below, further views that were submitted can be seen in appendix 1.

#### **Parent/ Carers Views:-**

- Parents were full of praise for the Devizes and Salisbury Bridging Projects which are clearly meeting needs. A combination of excellent staff and buildings suited to the needs of young people with disabilities.
- Parents liked the groups that were promoting independence, local friendships and trying out new and varied activities.
- Salisbury parents loved that the session was for 2 hours which gave parents an opportunity to do other things in this time unlike most activities which are for only 1 hour.
- In all other areas it was very hit and miss.
- In the Chippenham location it was felt that it was too unstructured.
- In some areas the age range was too wide i.e. 11 to 18.
- Personal care was not available for young people who need it.
- The needs of young people with severely challenging behaviour were not able to be met.

The presenters really wanted parent carers to identify the most important values that they thought should be included in any future Bridging style Projects and the following were identified as really important:-

- Trained experienced staff - must include personal care, being able to meet severe challenging behaviour needs, able to give 1:1 support, able to give medication etc.
- Inclusive, safe and secure, structured and regular sessions.
- Must be local and accessible by transport.
- Age appropriate peer mentors trained and needs led.
- Setting/ building important - having its own dedicated space.

# Appendix 2

## Conclusion

The Council were very honest and said their preferred option was Option 1, developing a community led approach. This option was most favoured by the parents and carers who attended though EVERYONE made it clear that where it was working it should continue i.e. Devizes and Salisbury hubs. There was major concern that in any future change the voice of disabled young people, parents and carers must be sought in the decision process at ALL levels especially if local area boards are going to receive the funding. Bridging Projects funding MUST remain ring fenced for disabled young people and not merged into the general funds for young people.

## Recommendation

The WPCC recognises that the way services will be run may change but in such an event, the WPCC would be grateful if the following would be considered when commissioning the new service:-

- As with all other commissioned services for children and young people with SEND, the WPCC, in representation of nearly 1,000 parent carers across Wiltshire, is involved in the design and implementation of the news service from the outset.
- Full engagement with parent carers and young people is established as the new service is designed and implemented to ensure that Bridging Projects continue to meet the needs of the young people who will use them.
- As with all other commissioned services for children and young people with SEND, the WPCC is involved in quarterly service provider reviews to ensure the customer voice is heard and shapes the service as it develops and ensures positive outcomes for children and young people.

# Appendix 2

## Appendix 1

### Comments that were submitted in writing, additional to the consultation events.

- However, while I was investigating this I found an online survey for young people to complete. Great, I thought!! I looked at it with a view to completing it with my daughter when she got in from school. As a service user I thought that her opinions would be really valuable to the Council. Apparently they're not! I was wrong! She wouldn't understand the questions for a start, not to mention the implications. The questions are too long, too complicated, far too involved and detailed, my daughter wouldn't have a clue and would be extremely confused by the whole thing. Even with my support.
- The Bridging Projects are unique, in that they bring together young people with a range of special needs and disabilities with mainstream young people, in a safe, secure, supportive, fun, loving, nurturing, familiar environment.
- My daughter doesn't have the opportunity to make friends with her mainstream peers in any other area of her life. This just happens when she goes to the Bridging Project as my daughter's learning disability is so severe that she can only access targeted and specialist services.
- The project is unique because it teaches these young people to respect each other and support each other. It teaches them the value of community.
- One day, last summer, I was out with my daughter, walking through a park in Salisbury to feed the ducks and have a picnic. We saw one of the lads from the Bridging Project and my daughter recognised him straight away and started to call his name out and wave. The lad is a mainstream young man who was with a group of his friends and I just expected him to acknowledge my daughter and move on. But he biked over on his BMX, left his friends, to come over and chat with us. He was genuinely interested in what we were doing, where we were going, how my daughter was feeling, what she'd been up to.... It was a very unique experience to have had with my disabled daughter! This situation would never have happened without the Bridging Project bringing these two 'worlds' together.
- And this is just ONE example of how the Bridging Project has impacted on my daughter's life in a very beautiful and positive way. The space offered by the facility on Wilton Road is incredible and really suits it's function as a centre for the youth of the community.

## Appendix 2

There are so many rooms and spaces available for the various different groups and even a sports hall. But the best thing is that it is a youth development centre and the space is only shared with similar groups who will want to do similar things!

- Two hours is a nice length of time and very, very unusual.
- Another unusual aspect of the Bridging Project (here in Salisbury, at least) is that it continues to run through the school holidays. All of my daughter's other activities stop just before every one of the school holidays. During the school holidays, if nothing else, my daughter and I know that we can look forward to her Thursday night club.
- My concern if this was to move to the community campus would security. How can you be sure that these children wouldn't run out of the building? This is a very real danger with many of the young people who currently access this project. The whole idea of the community campus is that anyone from the community should be able to access it easily and use the facilities. But how can we ensure that OUR young people will be safe and secure inside at all times? These children can spot an open door in the blink of an eye. AND, how can we be sure that members of the public who shouldn't be able to be around our young people are kept away from these very vulnerable young people?

# Appendix 3



## Response of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner on the review of positive leisure-time activities for young people.

The Police and Crime Plan for 2013-2017, is sub titled “*partnership, pro-activity and prevention*”. Within the plan there are several key initiatives which are directed towards young people and the prevention of crime:

- Shared Community budgets

- Multi-agency-redesign of services to tackle ASB

- Launch of Police Cadet Scheme

- Promotion of school-related life education and youth offending preventative services.

Since the creation of the OPCC, my office has continued the survey work on crime and anti-social behaviour undertaken in Wiltshire. Wave 9 has recently been completed. Of particular interest to my office are the concerns of local people that relate to safety or the perception of safety within a community.

The first question within the survey requires residents to provide a “Yes” or “No” response to a **prompted** question about possible concerns in their local area.

*Lack of facilities for young children* continues to be the largest area of concern with over half of all residents surveyed confirming this is an issue.

Anti-social behaviour also remains a concern for over a third of all residents (34%). RWB & Marlborough are significantly less concerned than other area, recording 23% as having concerns.

Concern about unemployment has seen a significant drop from 39% to 32% since last year. RWB & Marlborough and Salisbury are showing positive exceptions for this measure whilst Swindon Central and Swindon West are both recording negative exceptions to the force average.

Following on from this we ask an unprompted question where residents are asked to mention any crime or ASB issues in their local area. “Young people hanging around” is consistently top of the concerns expressed. There has been a 2.9 percentage point (17.6%) increase in the proportion of residents who declared Young People Hanging Around is a problem in their local area (from 16.5% to 19.4%).

When broken down by gender there is no difference in the results. However, when viewing the results by age, we see there has been an increase across all age groups. Those aged 35-54 recorded the highest percentage with a quarter (25.2%) stating this is a problem in their local area. Those aged 55+ are least likely to say this is an issue whilst there has been a 4.3pp (27%) increase recorded for those aged 16-34.

At sector level we see a very similar picture to the results for Waves 7&8 where the difference between the lowest and highest sector is more than double.

There have been increases across all sectors with the exception of the lowest three which have all seen a slight decrease. The highest increases are recorded for Swindon North (5.4pp / +29%) and Swindon East (4.2pp / +25%).

Our working hypothesis is that there is a correlation between the perception of a lack of facilities and the observation of a problem of young people hanging around.

As expressed in the consultation paper, I firmly believe that the solutions should be found in the community and “authorities” whether the OPCC or Council have a facilitating role. In the last financial year I set up an Innovation Fund for this purpose. The fund received 124 applications totalling £4.5m. The applications were assessed against the six objectives of the Police and Crime Plan, one of which is to reduce offending and reoffending.

Several of the successful bids demonstrated innovative approaches to engaging with young people. Whilst it is too early to evaluate these, I particular mention BIOS (Mobile Youth Club), Outboxing (Boxing Clubs), Swindon 105.5 (Broadcasting), “Our Place”, (Youth Cafe), Youth Adventure Trust, Wheels Workshop and Wiltshire Wildlife Trust, that latter making a firm connection between NEETS and crime.

# Appendix 3

From the projects that were assessed, there was an underlying theme of developments that responded to the modern lives of young people and one that was shaped by their views. I believe that a major strength within Wiltshire Council is the Area Board network and the Youth Advisory Groups that report to it.

The Police and Crime plan recognises that my office, like Wiltshire Council, will receive less central funding in the next few years, and that spending priorities will be focus on the greatest risk or vulnerability. To that end it embraces the concept of Asset Based Community Development (ABCD), which entails communities doing things for themselves; and the enabling / support role of authorities especially around the inclusion of young people.

The key actions for delivery expressed at paragraph 95 of the consultation are fully aligned with the Police and Crime Plan, and this office would support the community led approach expressed in option D.

Angus Macpherson

14.4.14

# Appendix 4

## Youth Activity Review VCS Engagement Event

12 March, 2014

Present:

Name	Organisation
David Hughes	EPIC Pewsey
Carolyn Beale	Wiltshire CFVSF
Lizzie Whitbread	Salisbury Diocese
Simone Matthews	SPLASH
Jayne Moverley	SPLASH
Steve Crawley	Youth Action Wiltshire/Community First
Lynn Gibson	Youth Action Wiltshire/Community First
Peter Baxter	Wiltshire Compact
Pamela Woods	Relate Mid Wiltshire
Simon Futcher	The Bridge Youth Project
Jenny Oliver	Wiltshire Parent Carer Council
Steve Dewar	Bath/Wiltshire Youth for Christ
Richard Gamble	Wiltshire Council – Councillor
Laura Mayes	Wiltshire Council – Councillor (Cabinet Member)
James Fortune	Wiltshire Council – Commissioning & Performance
Damian Haasjes	Wiltshire Council – Commissioning & Performance

Format:

Damian Haasjes and James Fortune delivered a session where the key outlines of 4 proposed options for the future of youth activities in Wiltshire were presented and then discussed in two groups. Each group had a Wiltshire Councillor on it and a Wiltshire Councillor officer to take notes and support the discussion. Attendees were asked to consider each option from their organisations viewpoint and the wider view of the voluntary sector.

Notes from the groups

**Group One Membership** – – David Hughes, Pamela Woods, Simon Futcher, Jenny Oliver, Steve Dewar, Cllr Laura Mayes and Damian Haasjes.

**Group Two Membership** Carolyn Beale, Lizzie Whitbread, Simone Matthews, Jayne Moverley, Steve Crawley, Lynn Gibson, Peter Baxter, Cllr Richard Gamble and James Fortune.

### **Community Led Model**

Group 1

- Concern that 4 part time Area Co-ordinators is not enough as this is a complex role and Youth Advisory Groups (YAGs) will need to be improved and would need continuing support (particularly as YAG membership will keep changing).
- Questioned whether there would be enough sensitivity in this model to local needs and issues.
- A heavy reliance on VCS organisations could be an issue as that in turn means a heavy reliance on volunteers. It is always difficult to get volunteers.
- How would different VCS organisations be made to work together e.g. Link is not interested in working with young people?
- This model would need LOTS of NON-VOLUNTARY support to make it happen.
- Specific Area Board Issues
  - Difficult for county wide VCS groups to get to all 10 ABs.
  - VCS not eligible for funding via current AB model (capital vs revenue)
  - How will education link with Youth work / positive activities?



# Appendix 4

- AB's need to think about long term support of schemes and projects (sustainability, not just short term funding).
- How do VCS groups work across AB's to provide viable, cost effective services. How will this be balanced and managed against local politics, issues and decisions?
- Will money be spent wisely?
- Positives for the model
  - Would be great to get communities involved in young people's lives.
  - Opportunity to tailor services locally.
  - Opens door to VCS run long term projects.
  - Better scrutiny on performance.
  - Allows a real focus on youth work – not big admin/management, etc.
- Questions
  - How can AB's give money to religious groups? Christian youth groups are one of the biggest youth service providers in the county.
  - How can we tackle issues of bias, ignorance or prejudice? Elected members may need some education on certain youth related issues.
  - How can we apply for or fund volunteer training in this model? This would particularly apply to the quality mark.

## Group 2

- Would this really be voluntary sector led? Feel like it would still be council led with the council trying to shape the voluntary sector into what it needs.
- Real concerns about the advisors. There is no way that 4 half time posts could cover all of Wiltshire and achieve what needs to be done. Would need at least 6-8 posts.
- Would really need to know the needs of each area and would rely on the use of non-funded non council facilities to work.
- County wide groups would really struggle under this model, particularly specialist groups such as young carers.
- May lead to better opportunities for partnership working.
- Some organisations already have a quality – would need to take this into account and possibly accept certain pre-established quality marks.
- Community groups may be disadvantaged against larger voluntary organisations.
- Would be good to use resources already in place e.g. Youth Action Wiltshire have a good picture of local groups and have a quality mark scheme.
- Long term and continuation funding would be issues in this model – sustainability!!
- Would be essential to map current services and know where there are gaps.
- Would need tight funding specifications which are well monitored to ensure the money is well spread out and goes to the areas of need, not the loudest shouters.
- Would need to see the details for the AB funding and would like to be able to contribute to this as a VCS.

# Appendix 4

## Outsource the Service

### Group 1

- This could mean less change for young people.
- Concern that very few Wiltshire organisations could do this – would it then need to be a bigger national organisation who does not know Wiltshire?
- Christian organisations may find it restrictive for their beliefs.
- Would one organisation be able to manage one scheme across a diverse county?
- It would make youth work a business model; target driven, not relationship driven.
- Would any of the service remain universal??
- Charities tend to give more for their money. Some large organisations are prepared to run services at a loss to get the work/get foothold in a new local authority area, but would they provide a good service.
- It would be hard for new organisations to hit the ground running. Would take about two years to bed in so would need a long contract to make it viable.
- It just shifts responsibility from the council to another contractor without any real accountability.

### Group 2

- You would lose locally led involvement.
- Easy option for the council. Not too much risk from their side, but hard to monitor impact and less likely positive impact for young people.
- Only larger organisations would really be able to take part in a tender of this size.
- Would be likely that professional out of area organisations would get involved so it would be important to ensure that local knowledge was included in the service specification.
- This would help the council to focus on outcomes and try to measure these.
- It is a risky model in regards to quality – if you get one bad organisation running the whole thing, it is hard to change. The community led model would be more diverse and engage a wider range of providers and organisations.

## Staff Mutual

This model was not greatly discussed as at the time no staff had shown any interest in the development of mutual and time was limited.

## Keep In-House but Spend Less

### Group 1

- Too few places to meet would make the service meaningless to many young people due to geography.
- The voluntary sector would have to fill the gap left by reduction in service but they couldn't even afford the transport.
- Young people shouldn't have to travel a long distance to access youth services; it is a waste of time.
- This solution reduces young people's options and they would get less from this.

### Group 2

- This is really a shift from universal services open to all, to a centralised services which are harder to access.
- Less of what we have and this model is open to further cuts.

## Other Ideas and Wider Discussion

It is essential that the council fully understands the impact of a budget cut – has it fully examined the real impact on communities and young people. This may just lead to further money needing to be spent in other areas e.g. more specialised services or engaging with antisocial behaviour.

## Possible option 5 ideas

# Appendix 4

1. VCS could play a greater role in the delivery of activities, but would need support of the council to help enable them to do this e.g. co-ordinate training, help with funding applications and financial help for VCS infrastructure groups, etc.
2. Qualified youth workers working with the VCS in each area board area i.e. 18 youth workers, rather than 4 community workers and 8 targeted workers. More focus on community development and targeted services for most vulnerable.
3. Option 1 with a wider remit for how area boards give funding.