

**Wiltshire Council**

**Children's Select Committee**

**29 April 2014**

---

**Final Report of the Positive Leisure Time Activities  
for Young People Task Group**

**Purpose**

1. To present the conclusions and recommendations of the Positive Leisure Time Activities for Young People Task Group for endorsement.

**Background**

2. 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 sets out a range of options, with a provisional recommendation to develop a community led approach, subject to formal consultation. The Cabinet report (amended to be appropriate for a part 1 meeting) is attached at **Appendix 1**.
3. 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 and this was endorsed by the O&S Management Committee on 5 February 2014. Responsibility was delegated to the Children's Select Committee chairman and vice-chairman for making the necessary arrangements. Following established protocol, all non-executive members were invited to express an interest in sitting on the task group. The chairman and vice-chairman then selected the membership to as far as possible achieve a geographical and political balance.
4. It should be noted that the report to Cabinet on 21 January referred to a targeted reduction to the Integrated Youth Service 2014/15 budget of £500,000. However, when the 2014/15 budget was considered by Full Council on 4 February it was agreed that this reduction would be reduced to £250,000 through savings found in other areas.
5. The final decision on which option will be adopted will be taken by Cabinet on for 15 May 2014.

**Methodology**

6. The Task Group comprised the following membership:

Mr Kaylum House (Young People's rep on the Children's Select Committee)  
Cllr Jon Hubbard (Chairman)  
Cllr George Jeans  
Cllr Jacqui Lay  
Cllr Howard Marshall  
Cllr Pip Ridout

7. From the outset, the Task Group sought to work towards the following outcomes:
  - a) Providing the positive leisure time activities that young people want (in line with Section 507B of the Education Act 1996)
  - b) Providing young people with opportunities to develop
  - c) Ensuring all young people are aware of the activities available in their area
  - d) Ensuring access to youth work and positive leisure time activities for all young people, including those from groups vulnerable to exclusion
  - e) Ensuring safe accessibility to safeguarding and early intervention services
  - f) Exploring the unintended consequences of any proposals
  - g) Ensuring our youth workers have the appropriate skills and training
  - h) Exploring opportunities for partnership working and other funding opportunities
  
8. The Task Group met on six occasions and received written and verbal evidence from the following witnesses:
  - Cabinet Member for Children's Services
  - Portfolio Holder for Schools, Skills and Youth
  - Cabinet Member for Campuses, Area Boards, Libraries, Leisure and Flooding
  - Portfolio Holder for Area Boards
  - Chairman of Royal Wootton Bassett Area Board
  - Representatives from Community First and Youth Action Wiltshire
  - 11 youth workers currently employed by Wiltshire Council, from a variety of posts and locations
  - Associate Director, Children's Social Care and Independent Youth Service
  - Head of Service: Early Intervention, Youth & Prevention
  - Lead Commissioner, Commissioning, Performance and School Effectiveness
  - Project Manager, Transformation Team
  
9. The Task Group also held a focus group session with 15 young people from across Wiltshire. These included service-users and non-service-users, and representatives of the council's disabled young people group, Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) group, Young Commissioners, Wiltshire Assembly of Youth (WAY) and the Children in Care Council. Members interviewed the young people about what was important to them in terms of youth work and activities.

10. The task group wish to express their gratitude to all of the witnesses for making themselves available to assist with this overview and scrutiny review.

## Findings

### General comments

11. It was reported to Cabinet on 21 January that only 8 percent of the 13-19 population access the council's Youth Development Service<sup>1</sup>. The task group questions whether this figure is accurate as it reflects only those young people who are formally registered with a council-run youth centre. The task group has received evidence suggesting that there are some young people who engage with the Youth Development Service and are not formally registered, for example those engaging with street-based youth work, skate park committees and outreach work in schools. The average estimate of the youth workers interviewed was that a further 12 percent of young people had some unrecorded contact with the service. The 8 percent figure quoted also refers to a period during exam season and school summer holidays when youth clubs are traditionally at their quietest. These omissions may have led to a pessimistic picture of the current reach of the youth service being presented.
12. The report to Cabinet referred to a further report being forthcoming in April once formal consultation with young people, affected staff and other key stakeholders had been undertaken. The task group welcome the announcement that the decision-making timescale has been extended and that the second report to Cabinet will now be considered at an extraordinary meeting on 15 May 2014.
13. The task group acknowledges that financial pressures and employment regulations have to some degree dictated the pace of the review of activities for young people. However, it remains concerned that the timescale being followed risks major changes being made without time for their implementation or impact to be fully considered. There is a lack of detail about how the preferred option for remodelling the youth service would work in practice. **A significant concern is how young people currently engaged with the youth service, some of whom rely on established relationships with their youth workers, would be supported through any transition period.**
14. The report to Cabinet (in Appendix 3) references several local authorities who have significantly reduced their in-house youth service or are in the process of doing so. However other youth service models where spending has been maintained or increased do not appear to have been integrated into the review and could also have been used to develop the four options now out for consultation. From 2009 Surrey County Council, undertook a three-year root-and-branch review of its youth service that yielded 25% (£4.5M) savings with no youth centres being closed and no youth workers being made redundant.

---

<sup>1</sup> Represents 3,585 individuals covering the period 01/04/2013 to 30/09/2013.

15. Though some youth service models adopted by other local authorities are briefly described, the report to Cabinet does not contain evidence of what has been learned from these models or which are examples of good practice that Wiltshire could benefit from.
16. The task group regrets that the Cabinet did not involve overview and scrutiny in its review of activities for young people at an earlier stage. Doing so would have enabled non-executive members to contribute to designing the options now out for formal consultation. This may have addressed many of the concerns raised in this report and prevented the anxiety now felt by stakeholders across the county, particularly young people.
17. One regrettable consequence of the review is that some officers in the Integrated Youth Service now feel that their contribution is not valued by members of this council. The task group's own investigations have actually highlighted the positives of the work of the service and how valued it is by young people.

### **Options presented to Cabinet**

18. The 21 January report to Cabinet presented four options for the future of the Youth Development Service, with 'D' being proposed as the preferred option:

Option A – Retain the current in-house service but reduce value

Option B – Outsource the service

Option C – Encourage and support staff to form a Public Service Mutual

Option D – Develop a community led approach

19. The Children's Select Committee were invited to respond to the consultation, so the task group have focused on addressing each of the four options. Because Option D is preferred, more emphasis has been placed on considering this in detail. However, members also looked at the viability of Options A, B and C.

### **Option A – Retain the current in-house service but reduce value**

(described in paragraphs 41-47 of the report to Cabinet)

20. It is reported that this internal restructuring option could be to develop four hubs covering North, South, East and West (with the option of an additional rural hub covering Mere and Tisbury) and these hubs would take on a developmental role in the delivery of local positive leisure-time activities.
21. The task group agrees that, although this option would to some extent retain the knowledge and skills of the existing workforce, the significant reduction in staff posts would greatly reduce the service's capacity. It would also make the required savings difficult to achieve, particularly when taking into account the terms and conditions of existing staff, and it is unlikely that such a model would be sustainable in the longer term.

22. A four hub model could diminish the use of important local networks and could have a negative impact on young people living in rural areas without good transport links.

### **Option B – Outsource the service**

(described in paragraphs 48-55 of the report to Cabinet)

23. This option would involve developing a new service specification and holding a competitive tendering exercise to identify and select a preferred provider. There would be the option to select a number of providers to deliver in different parts of the county.
24. The task group agrees that under Option B, securing one overall provider to cover the whole county would be unlikely, resulting in multiple contracts that could potentially prove difficult to manage. New providers may also lack local knowledge and may not have the infrastructure in place to deliver sufficient provision in rural areas, concentrating instead on the large urban towns.
25. The task group is also concerned that Option B could end up costing more for less overall provision due to the hidden costs. The current Integrated Youth Service access many council services essentially for free and this would not apply to an external provider.
26. There is a risk that the bidder who pitched lowest and shouted loudest would win the contract. Profit-led businesses might also neglect the less lucrative areas of provision, such as in rural areas.
27. The Council has had previous experiences of outsourced services coming back in-house due to poor performance.
28. The timescale of the review also means that outsourcing the service does not appear to be a viable option.

### **Option C – Encourage and support staff to form a Public Service Mutual**

(described in paragraphs 56-62 of the report to Cabinet)

29. Under this option a service specification and contract would be developed between the council and the mutual, shaped by key stakeholders and managed by commissioners. A payment by results funding system could be used where payments are made to the mutual based on the outcomes achieved.
30. The task group agrees that this option could empower staff to take ownership of the youth service, retain the knowledge and skills of the existing workforce and help to minimise redundancies. However, strong commitment from staff would be needed, and it may prove difficult to provide the savings needed within the required timescales due to the complexities involved in establishing a new organisation.

31. The task group would also be concerned that the business skills and knowledge required to manage a youth service are very different to those required to deliver youth work.
32. The task group is not aware that this option has been actively encouraged or supported by the council and therefore it does not seem a viable option at this stage of the review.

### **Option D – Develop a community led approach**

(described in paragraphs 61–117 of the report to Cabinet)

33. The task group recognises that this is the Cabinet’s preferred option. Under this model community areas would have an annual budget for youth activities, and would consult with young people to identify local needs and priorities and decide how this resource was deployed. This approach would involve the council moving from a direct provider of youth activities to an enabling role supporting VCS groups to provide activities using funding distributed by area boards.
34. Option D means that 50.3 FTE posts in the current integrated youth service would be made redundant (affecting approximately 144 staff), with some redeployment opportunities being available. It also includes the creation of several new posts described as follows in the report to Cabinet:
  - a) “Youth Support Worker (8 Full-time posts, 2 per existing children’s services locality) – the purpose of these posts is to strengthen local safeguarding arrangements by providing early help to the most vulnerable young people. These staff will also coordinate the delivery of targeted youth activities for young people with learning difficulties and disabilities.
  - b) Community Development Youth Advisers (4 part-time posts) will provide professional advice and support (enabling function) to the area boards and home-grown youth groups, as well as providing practical capacity on the ground to help young people have a voice in local decision making. This will include work with area boards to support the development of Youth Advisory Groups [these posts will be subject to ongoing review]. Advisers will target support to area boards in most need of assistance.”

### **Budgets**

35. Under Option D, a youth activities budget for each community area would be set and distributed using the existing youth work or area board funding formula, taking into account factors such as population, deprivation and sparsity. Funding in the form of grants would be available for individuals and community-led groups to set up new youth projects. The task group welcomed clarification that this money would be revenue funding, ringfenced for use on positive activities for young people.
36. At present many VCS groups providing positive activities for young people energetically fundraise in order to do so. The task group are concerned that

under Option D, some of these groups would understandably rely on the new funding available from area boards and reduce their wider fundraising efforts. This would effectively yield the same number of activities as currently provided by VCS groups, but at a higher overall cost to the council. The task group has received no details of what measures will be put in place to mitigate this risk.

37. In 2012/13 Wiltshire area boards spent a total of £291,000 on activities or projects for young people through their (non-ringfenced) grant allocations. Under Option D, area boards will have to spend the new ring-fenced funding on youth activities, but may spend their non-ringfenced grant allocations on something else. The increased funding available at community level would therefore be benefiting other priorities at the cost of activities for young people. **There is therefore a significant risk that the cut to spending on positive activities for young people would effectively be increased by £291,000k. The task group has received no details of what measures will be put in place to mitigate this risk.**
38. The task group has not received details of the criteria that will be used to determine which schemes could be considered to be providing a positive leisure time activity under Section 507b and therefore be eligible for the ring-fenced funding. The task group are aware that at present some area board funded initiatives with only a partial connection to young people are recorded as being 'for young people'.
39. The Integrated Youth Service uses a range of services provided by other council departments effectively for no fee, such as legal advice, HR and payroll. Some VCS groups may have appropriate infrastructure in place, but the task group are concerned that there would be gaps. Communities and less established VCS groups may struggle, for example, with the costs of additional DBS checks and the financial and legal responsibilities of employing members of staff, such as obtaining public and employer liability insurance. The Integrated Youth Service also have use of the council's fleet of Multi Purpose Vehicles (MPVs) and it would need to be ensured that these were available to be used by VCS groups. Prior consultation with young people has shown that transport can be a major barrier to accessing positive leisure-time activities. These could all represent additional hidden costs that would reduce the funding VCS groups could spend directly on positive activities for young people.

### **Strategic oversight**

40. Under Option D, each area board would establish a sub-group to oversee the development and provision of activities for young people in their community area. The sub-groups would be based on the model currently used for Community Area Transport Groups (CAT-Gs) and would make recommendations to the area board and also monitor local provision.
41. The task group notes that CAT-Gs receive comprehensive support from Highways officers and are given clear guidance on how their budgets can be

used. Most elected members are not experts in commissioning activities for young people and would need equally comprehensive support and a clearly defined role to meet this new responsibility. As the report to Cabinet states, there would need to be careful consideration of area boards' understanding of the consistency and application of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) to ensure equality of access and inclusion and of Section 507B of the Education Act 1996 to secure access to sufficient positive leisure-time activities. Without appropriate support, there is a risk that some types of activity or group, such as sports clubs, could predominate, leaving the needs of some young people unmet.

42. The report proposes that for the 18 area boards (covering 20 community areas), 4 new part-time Community Development Youth Advisors (2 FTE) would carry out this supporting function, with some additional support potentially being available from Sports Development Officers. The task group is not convinced that this would be a sufficient resource for the scale of this task, particularly during a transition period when area boards would be developing their local offers.
43. Youth workers coordinate Youth Advisory Groups (YAGs) across the county (the task group recognises that some area boards have more than one YAG), involving young people in shaping local services and activities that affect them. Under Option D, YAGs would be coordinated differently with several youth participation events or workshops taking place annually in each community area. It is proposed that four part-time Community Development Youth Advisers would provide officer support to YAGs countywide. The task group are not convinced that this would be a sufficient resource. A key message from consultations with young people is that they want their YAG, where they exist, to have greater influence, so any change to how they are run and supported must be properly thought through and costed. The task group is concerned that in areas where YAGs have not been established there would not be sufficient resource for developing new groups.
44. Youth workers and representatives from the VCS youth sector, have reported that while most VCS youth groups deliver their provision through volunteers, this provision is often underpinned by advice and leadership from the council's Integrated Youth Service. As part of its own consultation response, the VCS group Youth Action Wiltshire compiled an extensive list of the support provided by the Integrated Youth Service to VCS youth groups across the county. There is a risk around the ability of some VCS groups to continue to function effectively were the current youth service to be diminished.

### **Targeted Youth Work and Safeguarding**

45. The report to Cabinet states that in moving toward a community-led approach the council would strengthen safeguarding arrangements for the most vulnerable young people by re-investing resource into early help and targeted support provided by eight new full-time Youth Support Workers. The task group is concerned that the proposed removal of 50.3 FTE posts undertaking universal work and their effective replacement with 8 Youth Support Workers



undertaking targeted work (plus 4 part-time posts with other duties) would actually represent a reduction in the number of genuinely early interventions taking place.

46. Under Option D, more resources would be directed toward VCS youth groups providing activities for young people. However, witnesses interviewed including youth workers, VCS youth groups and young people, cite an important difference between “activities for young people” and “youth work” – a difference not referred to in the report to Cabinet. While the value of the leisure time activities provided by VCS groups is not in question, the central purpose of many of them is to develop a specific skill or interest (football or theatre, for example). Although these opportunities are undoubtedly beneficial, their central purpose is not to proactively protect and develop young people’s general welfare and emotional wellbeing.
47. The report to Cabinet states that a quality mark scheme would be developed for VCS providers of positive leisure-time activities and that through an accreditation exercise, providers would need to meet certain criteria in order to achieve the quality mark. The task group supports any measure for supporting VCS youth groups to meet appropriate safeguarding standards. However, having robust child protection procedures in place is different to undertaking youth work that is focused on developing and supporting young people’s general welfare. Unless the quality mark scheme proposed was prescriptive enough to ensure that providers delivered this kind of youth work (as opposed to specific activity-based provision), it would not lead to an offer that is equivalent to the current Integrated Youth Service.
48. By introducing a quality mark scheme the council would effectively be taking a responsibility for ensuring the quality and safety of activities provided by VCS groups. The task group is concerned that the report to Cabinet does not describe how such a scheme would be managed or maintained or how assessments of individual providers would be undertaken. **Inadequate implementation of such a scheme could potentially expose the council to significant financial and reputational risk, and more importantly inadvertently expose young people to significant harm due to young people and parents incorrectly believing quality-marked provision to be safe.**
49. Open access youth work gives young people the chance to speak to youth workers if and when they feel ready to. Young people have told the task group that many VCS youth groups are run by volunteers from the local community and that they would be less likely to confide in them due to their potential links with family or school. Such local youth group leaders are also not necessarily trained to recognise signals that could indicate a young person would benefit from further help or have a good working knowledge of the targeted services available and the referral mechanisms for accessing them.
50. As stated in the Cabinet report, the lives of young people have changed considerably in recent years with the expansion of home entertainment and social networking. It is also acknowledged that not all young people view

council-run youth centres favourably. However, many of the young people interviewed engage with the Integrated Youth Service primarily to access supportive relationships with youth workers and other young people in a safe environment. This was particularly the case with young people who are less confident and find accessing some forms of activity-based youth provision (for example, sports) intimidating. These relationships in themselves represent important early intervention work that may reduce the possibility of young people needing targeted services further down the line.

51. The task group also understands that many of the VCS groups providing activities for young people have long waiting lists due to demand outstripping supply. Evidence received from VCS groups has demonstrated that while many groups have a willingness to deliver they lack sufficient volunteers to fulfil this. The task group is concerned that it has not been demonstrated that enough suitable volunteers with a specific interest in the challenges presented by youth work can be found. Neighbourhood police officers have also expressed concern that a consequence of any reduction to the provision of activities for young people could be an increase in antisocial behaviour (ASB) or in the perception of ASB.
52. The task group are unclear about what the relationship would be between the council and VCS youth groups (both existing and new) with regard to the sharing of personal data. Currently council youth workers work closely with council social workers to safeguard young people and this involves some degree of data sharing. The task group would like clarification on whether, under Option D, equivalent arrangements for VCS youth workers would need to be explored.
53. It has been reported that the Integrated Youth Service has historically not instigated a significant number of Common Assessment Frameworks (CAFs) or Single Agency Referral Forms (SARFs). This has been cited as evidence that there has been limited targeted youth work undertaken. The task group questions this conclusion for the following reasons:
  - a) It has been reported that as at 4 February 2014 the youth development service had only 15 CAFs open, while secondary schools had 272. This would appear to be a significant difference until one considers that secondary schools have contact with almost all 11-16 year olds in the county and that their contact time with each individual is significantly more than any youth service could hope to achieve.
  - b) CAFs and SARFs are appropriate for young people who may require a tier 2 service (see **Appendix 3** for a guide to tiers of need). The task group questions whether it is meaningful to use a tier 2 measure to judge the success of the Integrated Youth Service, which is at present a tier 1 (i.e. universal) service.
  - c) Rather than suggesting a lack of impactful activity, a low number of CAFs and SARFs being raised by youth workers could equally demonstrate the

positive impact of the preventative work they do with young people before they reach the tier 2 threshold of need.

54. The task group is concerned that the proposed 8 Youth Support Workers will act as quasi social workers carrying caseloads of young people who have reached the tier 2a and 2b threshold of need. This would mean that they were not engaging with young people until they reach some degree of crisis. Therefore the task group does not view this as true early intervention work. Recent data provided by officers shows that between 1 April and the end of September 2013 3,585 13-19 year olds engaged with the youth development service. These contacts are not formally recognised as 'casework', but may represent important preventative work. It is acknowledged that, although outcomes from this kind of low-level, preventative work are difficult to record and measure, the Integrated Youth Service must improve its ability to demonstrate its value.
55. Under Option D, a young person identified by a VCS group or other party as needing targeted support would presumably be referred to one of the 8 proposed Youth Support Workers. Given the scale of the county, it is unlikely that the Youth Support Workers would have substantial existing relationships with the young people referred to them. This concerns the task group because young people have reported that this would make them less likely to give youth workers their trust and accept the support offered.
56. The purpose of the proposed Youth Support Worker role is de to strengthen local safeguarding arrangements by providing early help to the most vulnerable young people (and coordinating the delivery of targeted youth activities for young people with learning difficulties and disabilities). It has been confirmed that this is a different role to the council's Adolescent Support Workers, who work with young people at the edge-of-care or tier 3 level of need.
57. In summary, the task group is concerned that Option D represents a move away from truly preventative work and towards intervention at a later stage when the consequences for the young person, the community and public finances are likely to be worse. The task group celebrates the non-targeted work that the council is already undertaking with young people, such as the development of the YAGs. Wiltshire is now reaping the benefits of this long programme of activity with young people playing an increasing role in shaping their communities. An approach of significant upfront investment for long-term reward is also evident in the council's community campus programme. The task group sees no reason why the same approach should not be taken to working with young people and the task group is deeply concerned that the preferred option risks saving money now to spend more later. Of greater concern is the significant negative impact on young people's lives if access to supportive relationships with youth workers is reduced.

### **Further comments**

58. The report to Cabinet states that some staff affected by redundancy could be reemployed by town or parish councils to continue to undertake youth work. Town and parish councils are already being asked to take on additional responsibilities and may struggle with the further responsibility of commissioning activities for young people. While larger town councils might play a role in youth services, smaller parish councils would struggle to do so. Even if a town or parish council was minded to contribute, the likely introduction of a cap on their precepts would hamper their ability to do so in a meaningful way. It should also be noted that providing positive leisure time activities for young people is a legal duty of the council and not of town or parish councils.

### **Option D – summary of concerns**

59. In summary, the task group are concerned that Option D in its original form could lead to:

1. An overall reduction in the provision of positive leisure time activities for young people due to a) the loss of open-access youth work, and b) the swallowing-up of the proposed new area board funding for youth activities (due to factors set out in paragraph 35 to 39);
2. A less coherent offer of positive activities that does not meet the needs of all young people in Wiltshire, particularly those from vulnerable groups;
3. A reduction in capacity for developing new YAGs, supporting existing YAGs and a consequent reduction in young people's ability to shape the services in their communities;
4. A significant negative impact on those VCS youth groups that currently rely on the support and advice of the Integrated Youth Service to operate effectively;
5. A reduction in young people's ability to access supportive relationships with trained youth workers;
6. A reduction in the preventative work currently being done by youth workers and a consequent increase in later interventions once the young person has reached a higher level of need, with the potential for significant long-term impacts on the young person, their community and the public purse.

### **Option D+ (an alternative model)**

60. The task group has concerns about the four options proposed to Cabinet but also accepts that reforms are needed to the council's current youth service: Hitherto the council has not measured the impact of the youth work it has provided adequately, due in part to inconsistent record-keeping across the service. The council is therefore at risk of taking decisions about the future of the youth service based on incomplete or unreliable data.

The task group has therefore considered whether an alternative service model could retain the strengths of the current Integrated Youth Service, address existing weaknesses, mitigate the risks of the preferred option, and transform the service to increase community involvement in activities for young people by giving area boards greater commissioning responsibilities. The example model set out in **Appendix 2** is intended to demonstrate that this can be achieved whilst still making the necessary savings from the budgets in scope. The model includes a named youth worker for every community area, retains Youth Support Worker resource for providing early help to the most vulnerable young people and working with young people with learning difficulties and disabilities, creates youth worker apprenticeship opportunities for 9 young people and still leaves £365,100 to be allocated to area boards to spend on positive leisure time activities for young people in their community areas.

## **Recommendations**

**In forming a response to the consultation on positive leisure time activities for young people, the task group has considered the four options proposed to Cabinet and commented on each. Having considered the evidence, the task group recommends that:**

- 1. Option A is not implemented for the reasons set out in paragraphs 20 to 22 of this report;**
- 2. Option B is not implemented for the reasons set out in paragraphs 23 to 28 of this report;**
- 3. Option C is not implemented for the reasons set out in paragraphs 29 to 32 of this report;**
- 4. Option D is implemented only if amended in the following ways:**
  - a) Robust measures are put in place to ensure that the proposed ringfenced funding available to VCS youth groups through area boards supplements, rather than replaces, VCS groups' existing sources of funding. (see paragraph 35)**
  - b) Robust measures are put in place to ensure that the new ringfenced funding supplements, rather than replaces, area boards' existing (non-ringfenced) funding for positive activities for young people. (see paragraph 36)**
  - c) Appropriate criteria are designed to ensure that the area board funding ring-fenced for youth activities is only used for activities and schemes of genuine benefit to young people in line with guidance under Section 507B of the Education Act 1996(see paragraph 37)**
  - d) Consideration is given to the council services currently accessed by the Integrated Youth Service effectively at no cost to the Service and steps**

are taken to avoid these becoming additional hidden costs to VCS youth groups as their role in providing positive leisure time activities for young people increases. (see paragraph 39)

- e) Consideration is given to establishing a mechanism by which communities can employ a youth worker through the council, providing a way in which employment issues can be effectively and affordably managed. Public and employer liability insurance should also be taken into account when developing this framework. (see paragraph 39)
- f) Mechanisms are put in place to monitor what positive activities for young people are provided in each community area to ensure that an appropriate range for all young people is provided and the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and responsibilities under Section 507B of the Education Act 1996 are met. (see paragraph 41)
- g) The proposed area board sub-groups responsible for developing youth provision are given clear and specific parameters to work within and clear guidance on how their ringfenced youth activity budgets can be spent, in line with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and Section 507B of the Education Act 1996 (see paragraph 41)
- h) The proposed level of support for the area board sub-groups responsible for developing youth provision is enhanced significantly to ensure that an appropriate range of positive activities for all young people is provided and the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and responsibilities under Section 507B of the Education Act 1996 are met across every community area. (see paragraph 42)
- i) The proposed level of support for Youth Advisory Groups (YAGs) is enhanced significantly to ensure the continuance and growth of the valuable development opportunities YAGs provide and reflecting feedback from young people that they should have greater influence on services that affect them. (see paragraph 43)
- j) The proposed level of support for providing professional advice and an enabling and coordinating function for VCS youth groups is enhanced significantly so that the resources available across each community area can be considered strategically and used in a joined-up way that meets local needs and circumstances. (see paragraph 44)
- k) Some council resource for facilitating open-access youth work is retained in every community area, to ensure that:
  - young people can continue to access and develop supportive relationships with youth workers whom they feel able to confide in;
  - the vital early intervention work undertaken by youth workers with young people before they reach the tier 2 level of need continues, avoiding significant additional costs in the long term.(see paragraphs 45 to 55)

- l) The proposed Youth Support Worker role is clearly defined as working with young people at the tier 2a and 2b level of need, rather than young people at the edge-of-care or tier 3 level of need (who are currently supported by the council's Adolescent Support Workers). (see paragraph 56)**
  - 5. The Cabinet considers adopting the principals behind Option D+ (set out in Appendix 2), which is an indicative delivery model that achieves the necessary savings from the budgets in scope and addresses the weaknesses of Option D set out under Recommendation 4.**
- 

### **Positive Leisure Time Activities for Young People Task Group**

Report author: Henry Powell – Senior Scrutiny Officer  
01225 718052 [henry.powell@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:henry.powell@wiltshire.gov.uk)

#### **Appendices**

1. Report to Cabinet – 21 January 2014
2. Option D+ An indicative youth service model
3. Thresholds for Safeguarding Document produced by WSCB and the Children's Trust

#### **Background papers**

None