### **Supporting Information and Impact Assessment**

| Budget Proposal:               | Youth Grants   |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Executive Lead:                | Julian Parrott |
| Director / Assistant Director: | Andy Dempsey   |

| Version: 3 | Date: | February 2018 | Author: | Gail Rogers  |
|------------|-------|---------------|---------|--------------|
|            |       |               | ,       | Jan 1 togoto |

### **Section 1: Background Information**

### 1. What is the proposal / issue?

This proposal has been amended in light of consultation feedback and consideration of this feedback by the Mayor. The proposal is to maintain the youth services grant at £330,000 in 2018/19, which means the £30,000 grant funding available to youth groups will remain.

The proposal put forward for consultation in October was to reduce the youth services budget from £330,000 to £300,000 in 2018/19 which would see the withdrawal of the neighbourhood funding grants, the value of which was £30,000 in 2017/18.

Youth grant funding has been in place for six years, but with a clear message year on year that it would not be guaranteed into the future, and that small organisations receiving the grant need to develop their own sustainability strategies. This element of the service is non-statutory.

#### 2. What is the current situation?

There is an annual grant cycle inviting organisations to bid for funding as long as they meet set criteria, and limiting the maximum amount of the bid. Bids are scored against the outcomes required and a panel of community youth sector organisations and of young people evaluates the bids to determine which should be funded and the value of the award.

Organisations have been expected to complete mid-term and end evaluations and have been supported by a senior youth worker. Until this year, funded projects had been enrolled on a national quality assurance programme to support the quality of their provision for young people.

In 2017/18 the grant funding was £30,000 with a maximum of £3,000 to any single organisation or individual. There were 12 organisations who were successful in their bids, representing areas of need across the Bay. All are delivering diversionary activities out of school time.

The provision of these grants is not a statutory requirement of the council.

The Youth Trust will continue to support outcomes for vulnerable Young Carers which is mandated through the Children and Families Act 2014. The service will also continue to provide services for young people on the edge of care or within the safeguarding services to prevent both further expenditure on expensive care placements and poor outcomes generally for children within Torbay. The Youth Trust will also act as a conduit in supporting the development of services through alternative funding streams not available to the Local Authority.

### 3. What options have been considered?

The provision of grants to youth organisations is not a statutory requirement of the council and therefore no further options have been considered. However the proposal has been amended following consultation feedback and the current level of funding will be maintained in 2018/19.

# 4. How does this proposal support the ambitions and principles of the Corporate Plan 2015-19?

The proposal aims for a prosperous and healthy Torbay by focusing the council's limited resources on those vulnerable groups who are at greater risk of poor outcomes. This proposal supports the principle of `using resources to best effect'.

# 5. Who will be affected by this proposal and who do you need to consult with?

Those affected are the community and voluntary groups who have been eligible for grant funding to support their delivery of neighbourhood youth provision.

Young people using these services would also have been impacted if the provision became unviable or had been put at risk due to the withdrawal of the grant funding.

Consultation took place with all the groups currently receiving the grants and the young people attending the provision which is funded by the grants.

### 6. How will you propose to consult?

Consultation on the proposal was conducted in the following ways:

- We contacted all recipients of the current grant funding outlining the proposals and asking what the impact will be and whether they have any means of mitigating the loss of future grant funding.
- This proposal was also included in the general budget consultation.

| Section 2: Implications and Impact Assessment |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| 7.  | What are the financial and legal implications?  |  |  |  |
|   | Youth policy has not provided more than an aspirational set of standards for sufficiency which has been subjective and non-specific. The national picture evidences a 15% budget reduction on average across the country, this proposal represented a 10% reduction in youth service budget.  |  |  |  |
| 8.  | What are the risks?   |  |  |  |
|   | There was the possible risk that removal of this funding would have meant that some of the services provided by community groups were not viable to continue.   |  |  |  |
| 9.  | Public Services Value (Social Value) Act 2012   |  |  |  |
|   | N/A   |  |  |  |
| 10.   | What evidence / data / research have you gathered in relation to this proposal?   |  |  |  |
|   | For organisations who have not received concurrent year's funding, their ability to continue to deliver the service/activity without grant funding is assumed because this is either a pilot project or they have sourced alternative funding. There is a core of eight organisations who have received funding on consecutive years, albeit at a reduced rate year on year, and these (and the young people using them) are the groups which could be most impacted by the decision.               |  |  |  |
|   | The continuation of grant funding does not provide a sustainable solution to good quality youth provision across Torbay; such grants have been removed in many other local authorities for this reason. Young people do have access to a range of services as is evidenced through the Community Directory, compiled monthly by the Youth Service and published in the Family Information Service and across schools and the voluntary sector.  |  |  |  |
|   | Nationally, youth funding has reduced by 15% from 2015/16 to 2016/17 as the increase in demand in safeguarding and child protection rises and budgets fall. Those authorities who are maintaining strong youth services are doing it through innovative partnership arrangements and alternative operating models such as that proposed by Torbay with the emerging Youth Trust. The emerging Youth Trust is now developing links and partnerships with a view to building services for the future. |  |  |  |
|   | Torbay Council has also started a local lottery and organisations are encouraged to generate funding by selling tickets, by doing this they will receive 50% of the sale proceeds of the tickets they sell.   |  |  |  |

### 11. What are key findings from the consultation you have carried out?

The budget for this grant was reduced in 2016/17 and there were many representations made from the community and voluntary sector who have told us that they rely on the funding. At this time, we proposed that the Community Development Trust support these organisations in seeking grant funding and alternative sustainable funding streams and that those organisations receiving funding sought help from them as the sector umbrella organisation.

Feedback from the budget questionnaire is outlined below:

### To reduce the funding given to youth service providers.

This proposal is expected to save £30,000 in 2018/19 and will mean that the council will not provide grants to locality based youth service providers.

These providers deliver activities and services for young people. They will have the opportunity to raise funds through the Torbay Lottery. The proposed budget next year for the Youth Trust would be £300,000 with the provision for youth grants being £0.

|           | Do you support this proposal? |         | Do you feel this proposal will impact on you? |         |  |
|-----------|-------------------------------|---------|---|---------|--|
|           | Number                        | Percent | Number  | Percent |  |
| Yes       | 142                           | 37.1%   | 74  | 19.3%   |  |
| No        | 226                           | 59.0%   | 269   | 70.2%   |  |
| No answer | 15                            | 3.9%    | 40  | 10.4%   |  |
| Total     | 383                           | 100.0%  | 383   | 100.0%  |  |

Representations made noted the fragility of individual organisations who had historically been in receipt of the grant and anger that support for young people may disappear. Individuals were not subsequently contacted, but information was sent out to all of them relating to the Torbay Lottery and the Mayor's Fund. The PHAB club is the organisation most likely to be significantly impacted, and feedback was received from the club manager that loss of this small grant may result in the loss of the support group offered to a large number of disabled young people and adults in the Bay.

## 12. Amendments to Proposal / Mitigating Actions

This proposal has been amended in light of consultation feedback and consideration of this feedback by the Mayor. The proposal is to maintain the youth services grant at £330,000 in 2018/19, which means the £30,000 grant funding available to youth groups will remain.

| Identify the potential positive and negative impacts on specific groups  |                        |   |                |  |
|--|------------------------|---|----------------|--|
|  | Positive Impact        | Negative Impact & Mitigating Actions  | Neutral Impact |  |
| Older or younger people  |                        | Potential cessation of neighbourhood provision for youth aged 13-19. Directory of existing provision available and work through the emerging Youth Trust to develop services across the Bay in Partnership.   |                |  |
| People with caring Responsibilities  | No differential impact |   |                |  |
| People with a disability   |                        | There is an organisation receiving funding which is aimed at young people with disabilities. It is proposed that this organisation seek support from the CDT to source alternative funding, and that it may apply for other local grants or funding specifically for those with disabilities. |                |  |
| Women or men   | No differential impact |   |                |  |
| People who are black or<br>from a minority ethnic<br>background (BME) (Please<br>note Gypsies / Roma are<br>within this community) | No differential impact |   |                |  |
| Religion or belief (including lack of belief)  | No differential impact |   |                |  |

|    | People who are lesbian, gay or bisexual   | No differential impact  |  |
|----|---|---|--|
|    | People who are transgendered  | No differential impact  |  |
|    | People who are in a marriage or civil partnership   | No differential impact  |  |
|    | Women who are pregnant / on maternity leave   | No differential impact  |  |
|    | Socio-economic impacts (Including impact on child poverty issues and deprivation)                                       | Funded provision takes place in target areas of deprivation primarily. If services become unsustainable then young people in these deprived areas may no longer receive this provision.   |  |
|    | Public Health impacts (How will your proposal impact on the general health of the population of Torbay)                 | Potential for young people to engage in risk taking behaviour where they are not engaged in supported youth provision.  |  |
| 14 | Cumulative Impacts – Council wide (proposed changes elsewhere which might worsen the impacts identified above)          | The tapered funding to the Community Development Trust is due to end in this financial year and it is unclear whether they have generated the capacity and resource to provide the level of infrastructure support that they have promised. The support of the CDT will be important for CVS organisations seeking help with funding. |  |
| 15 | Cumulative Impacts – Other public services (proposed changes elsewhere which might worsen the impacts identified above) | The reduction in community policing has already had an impact within our target neighbourhoods and reducing the youth provision within those areas may result in an increase in anti-social behaviour by young people who are not engaged and not subject to oversight and sanction.  |  |