

Committee/Meeting: Cabinet	Date: March 2012	Classification: Unrestricted	Report No: CAB 080/112
Report of: Corporate Director CSF Originating officer(s) Mary Durkin Service Head: Youth and Community Learning		Title: Youth Service Delivery Wards Affected: All	

Lead Member	Oliur Rahman
Community Plan Theme	A Prosperous Community
Strategic Priority	Supporting more people into work and improving employment skills Improving educational aspiration and attainment Fostering enterprise and entrepreneurship

1. **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report assesses the options open to the Authority with regard to the delivery of the youth service. The current youth service contracts expire in 2013, and can be terminated sooner with six months notice. Contractors know that the re-tendering process is due, and a decision is necessary to ensure stability in the service and the appropriate timescales for re-contracting. The time is right to re-assess the service delivery, and to consider whether or not contracting out is still the best option.
- 1.2 The contracts have served the authority well. There is a greatly improved offer for young people, with a far higher take-up than ever before. However, times change, and the members must consider whether management lessons learned through the contracts can be applied to a re-invigorated in-house offer, which may offer economies of scale and increased flexibility.
- 1.3 Service specifications for each LAP must be updated, to take into account current changes in provision for teenagers, the delivery of targeted substance misuse work and other changes in public health, changes in targeted advice and guidance and crime diversion.
- 1.4 Members could consider a transfer of the youth service in house. The report suggests that following the New Tower Hamlets Partnership Structure, brought to Cabinet in February, which is more focused on promoting localism, the youth service, as a service for which localism and partnership working is key, could be transferred to CLC. An in-house service has implications for the service management structure and a review of the central management team will be necessary. Bringing the service in-house

offers a real opportunity to align the work of the service with the localism agenda in CLC, capitalising on links within the Partnership with:

- Community safety
- GP Networks
- DAAT
- Sports
- Parks
- Ward panels

1.5 There will also be implications for the service's relationship with the voluntary sector. Instead of five large contracts, the service will manage a multitude of Service Level Agreements with local third sector organisations, individually negotiated and monitored. There may be some financial implications which need to be considered. Venues currently offered free by schools and RSLs, as part of the contract, will need to be separately negotiated as part of any SLA agreements.

1.6 Draft timetables for TUPE and for re-contracting are appended. In the interests of stability, final arrangements should be delayed until after the Olympics, although preparatory work can be undertaken as indicated.

2. **DECISIONS REQUIRED**

The Mayor in Cabinet is recommended to:

2.1 Bring the youth service back in-house, and consider the location of both the Youth Service and Community Languages Service.

2.2 Take the opportunity offered by an in-house system to align the service more closely to community safety, health and leisure services within the council, strengthening the ties to the partnership and push for localisation.

2.3 Retain the service's compliance with the national MI system.

2.4 Transfer the management of the service to CLC.

3. **REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS**

3.1 Central management should offer flexibility. There are increasing demands on the youth service, as indicated below. An in-house service would be able to adapt to new imperatives without seeking time-consuming contract variations.

3.2 The service has learnt valuable lessons from the contracts, in particular with regard to target setting and monitoring and budgeting. These lessons can be transferred to the in-house service.

3.3 There is scope for a reduction in management cost if the service were taken in house. Currently we have six contractors, each with senior contract managers/directors. Were the services to be returned in-house managed by

a more streamlined, central management team savings could be realised and re-invested into the provision of youth services.

- 3.4 The New Partnership Structure emphasises a need for more citizen centric services to be delivered at a local level. The Youth Service has been a pioneer of localism within the Council, delivering services on a LAP basis. The Youth Service has , as CLC takes responsibility for the partnership, it would help to strengthen the localism and partnership work of the youth service by locating it in CLC.
- 3.5 Transferring the service to CLC will also bring economies of scale in delivering the targeted work, on community safety, drugs and alcohol, sport and leisure. It may offer further management savings.
- 3.6 There may be an increase in rents if the service were brought in-house. RSLs and schools currently holding the contract offer premises at nil cost to the authority, but may choose to charge if the contracts are brought back in-house. It is difficult to quantify the charges at this stage, but any assumed savings must be set against this.
- 3.7 Use of buildings other than those owned by the authority will have to be re-negotiated with the various owners. Buildings currently used by service and not owned by the authority are listed in appendix three.
- 3.8 Bringing the Youth Services in house presents a real opportunity to establish Tower Hamlets as a pioneer in terms of delivery of first class services to local youth and demonstrate 'localism'.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 Members can re-tender the contracts, or bring them back in house, according to the timetables appended.
- 4.2 Members can move the service to CLC, to strengthen the localism work, or leave it in CSF.

5. BACKGROUND

- 5.1 The Youth Service was first contracted out in 2001. Members took this decision after two independent reports, by Ian Comfort and Maureen Banbury (2000), and Marjory Hester (2001) both found that the in-house service was poor value for money and had poor take up by young people. In particular, they pointed to high management costs and programmes offering low-level, unimaginative recreational activities, which were particularly unattractive to girls. Accommodation was noted as poor, and in the second report there was reference to poor take-up and dubious monitoring processes.
- 5.2 The contract specifications were refined over the years, and are now specifically tailored to each Local Area Partnership (LAP), with performance targets linked to the local teenage profile. Staff members were TUPEd and the in-house service was re-structured, so that a leaner team could focus on contract monitoring and the targeted provision that had been retained

centrally (the Rapid Response Team, Targeted Youth Support Service). Significant improvements have been made to the building stock, council owned and independent. Plans are now underway to improve Haileybury and for new buildings in Langdon Park and at Bishop Challoner schools. Skate board parks have been developed in Mile End and on the Isle of Dogs, and in the last five years significant improvement has been made to:

- Attlee (renovation)
- Alpha Grove (renovation)
- Columbia Road (renovation)
- Kingsley Hall (renovation)
- Limehouse (renovation)
- London Met (adaptation)
- Osmani (new build)
- Parnell Road (new build)
- Poplar Boys and Girls (renovation)
- St Andrew's Wharf (rebuild)
- Wapping (renovation)

5.3 The work has paid off. Attendance has risen steadily. Specific targets for accredited outcomes, linked to payments, have ensured that the programme has improved as well as the buildings. Instead of a tired diet of pool and table tennis, the service now offers structured sport and outdoor education, music, IT, first aid, a range of arts activities. Ofsted in 2005 and the JAR in 2008, judged the quality of the service to be steadily improving. The youth service was given a special commendation in the "outstanding" JAR judgement of 2008.

5.4 The current youth work contracts have been running since January 2007, let for five year with provision to extend for a further two. The authority can give notice on the contracts at any point, and must decide whether the current contracting arrangement still represents the best approach, or whether to bring the work in-house.

5.5 Whether the service is in-house or commissioned, service specifications must be updated/refreshed, to take into account current changes in provision for teenagers, including the delivery of targeted substance misuse work and other changes in public health, changes in targeted advice and guidance and crime diversion. The current service specifications can be amended to better reflect the changing landscapes and deliver additional targeted services for young people. Two areas have developed significantly over the last decade: health and community safety.

5.6 The youth service has always included some general work on health, but the new developments offer real opportunity for joint work, in particular the establishment of LAP based GP networks, and the reversion of Public Health to the local authority. Marmot has underlined the links between poverty and health, and the links between health and achievement. 13.3% of our children are obese, and while this has plateau-ed we are still seventh highest in the country. It is estimated that 40% of under-16s have a vitamin D deficiency. The borough is varied. The life expectancy gap between the least and most deprived in the borough is 11.2 years for men and 6.5 years for women. One size does not fit every LAP. Individual youth service LAP specifications

drafted with the GPs and in line with the Local Development Framework will offer a unique opportunity to advance the physical and mental well-being of the young people. These plans can be drafted whether or not the service is in-house, but the presence of a very local provider, with neighbourhood partners, will certainly enhance the offer and accelerate progress. There is a significant opportunity to drive more integrated and innovative work at the local (LAP) level between the NHS and the youth service, in terms of joint planning (with schools, RSLs and GP networks), of shared use of buildings (using youth clubs for health activities, as already happens with alcohol and substance misuse work), and sharing local knowledge and resources

5.7 The Youth Service Rapid Response Team already works closely with community safety and with the police, participating in joint tasking. This team is already managed centrally. Bringing the work within the same management structure as the youth clubs will simplify the youth offer in crime diversion and the response to anti-social behaviour.

5.8 Ministers have championed localism as essential to improving services by devolving power to communities and stripping out government control. The Mayor has also expressed his desire to bring services closer to residents where they can be more aligned to their needs and wishes. One of the key challenges is to ensure that users and partners are engaged in management and delivery of service. The top future competencies required by Local Authorities for the localism agenda are:

- **Commissioning skills.** This includes vigorous collaboration with other services commissioners across geographic and service boundaries. This also includes building strategic understanding of client groups, developing community consensus on required outcomes and choosing viable organisations with whom to partner. *The youth service is an experienced commissioner, and is experienced in tendering, delivering on health and social care contracts (drugs and alcohol education, peer health education, activities for young carers).*
- **Contract Management.** This includes managing complex contracts across outsourced business areas, controlling risks associated with private and voluntary sector suppliers, improving procurement through joint venturing and working with community engagement professionals and commissioners to consider wider use of 'contracting for outcomes'. *The youth service has had national recognition for contract management (see above).*
- **Community Engagement.** This includes generating local interest and engagement for community run projects and services and developing a skills matrix to co-ordinate local authority and community expertise. *The youth service has community engagement at its core. All involvement is voluntary, and the large youth involvement programmes, with the youth council and the young mayor, strengthen every year, increasing already strong democratic participation.*
- **Asset Management.** One focus should be to extract more value from holdings/estates in order to foster community engagement. This could include ways to make more use of libraries, youth centres, community fire stations, schools and leisure services for this purpose. *An-in house service*

would enable a better use of the estate, as outlined above, offering opportunities for joint, cross departmental use, stabilising a local offer.

- **Voluntary Sector Engagement.** For public sector managers and members there is an increasing need to engage partners whose performance can be rigorously assessed through qualitative and quantitative indicators. Also where Councils operate in multicultural communities it is essential that voluntary sector partners act in a manner that reflects the needs of the entire community. *Youth service partnerships with the voluntary sector would be cemented through contracts or SLAs.*

6. **BODY OF REPORT**

- 6.1 When the contract was tendered in 2005, the evaluation criteria used were developed by a dedicated Project Management group which included youth service, Deloitte, legal services, disabled children's services, Finance, Housing, the Local Strategic Partnership, Corporate Procurement, Voluntary Sector, the police, Youth Justice and a Head Teacher. In addition there was extensive consultation with young people.

Headline evaluation criteria were:

- Value for money
 - Management Information System capacity
 - Capacity for, and experience of, local partnership work and available facilities
 - Management and financial capacity and probity
 - Ability to meet the Key Performance Indicators
- 6.2 These criteria remain appropriate. However, the political and economic climate has changed in the last ten years. More is required of the youth service than in the past, and new partners have emerged. The shared agenda with the Health Service (PCT and Public Health) and the imperatives of Localisation are new and major factors. All have been used as the basis for the options appraisal exercise undertaken.
- 6.4 **Value for Money**
- 6.4.1 The service was contracted out specifically because it was deemed to be very poor value for money. The contract value for the current contracts was fixed when the contracts were let in 2005, with a detailed base-line and stretch targets attached. A 10% bonus for reinvestment in local services was available for contractors meeting their stretch targets. The targets increased annually, although the contract sum stayed the same on the grounds that capacity should increase over the years. When members voted for an additional million pounds to be added to the contract sum, targets were raised accordingly. The contract was cited in the CAA 2006-07 (Audit Commission – VFM) – *VFM Self Asst – Education.doc*) as an example of best practice under the Gershon recommendations. Targets are set for contact, participation and accreditation, as well as special activities. An additional target for the training and delivery of substance misuse targeted

work was added to the standard contracts, providing additional work that required no financial uplift, but which represents a saving of £165k per annum to the local authority (the amount previously spent on targeted alcohol and drugs misuse work).

- 6.4.2 The contracts are monitored through quarterly meetings at which reports are presented on performance. These meetings have been recognised as good practice in the NYA Charter Mark assessment. The youth service achieved a Charter Mark with three areas noted as demonstrating outstanding practice. This is currently being re-assessed.
- 6.4.3 On a stand-still budget the service now increases its reach annually – currently standing at 51%. In demographic terms, service take-up is no longer largely a Bangladeshi boys and young men cohort. Monthly, monitored reports show a steady increase in participation across ethnicities as well as from girls and disabled young people.
- 6.4.4 Currently, for the universal service, the in-house management team looks simply at targets. If the service is brought in-house, the team will have responsibility for financial and staff management. The budget could be managed centrally, instead of locally, so there might be economies of scale. Certainly, instead of a five-year settlement we would have annual flexibility.

6.5 Ability to meet the KPIs

- 6.5.1 In the early days of contracting, contracts were let to small organisations without the capacity to manage finances of this size. The specifications are tightly drawn and there is little margin for operational costs. In the 2005 commissioning we were careful to ensure that very small neighbourhood organisations were paired with more robust partners. There are, however, recurring queries about heavy demands being made on smaller partners by contractors in terms of target numbers, and a system of proportionality (according to the borough formula) should be mandatory in any future specification.
- 6.5.2 The local services all have their own reasons for wanting a properly managed local youth service. Schools and Registered Social Landlords know that the constructive use of out-of-school time for teenagers enhances their academic performance, and reduces the incidence of anti-social behaviour. It is therefore in their interests to make back-up staff available, and to offer use as necessary of their own facilities, to augment the contract sum and bring added value to the service. Equally, local services are aware that they cannot offer the necessary variety without the help of the smaller voluntary organisations, and each contractor engages carefully with local third sector providers, to enrich the offer to young people and provide a coherent service, with minimal duplication. However, these arrangements could be secured for in-house services by developing strong SLAs. Bringing the service in-house, aligning it with the local partnership, will bring the work closer to local residents, who will be more informed about the work, and its potential.
- 6.5.3 Accreditation targets measure young people's formal achievement (for example First Aid, Sports Leadership, Arts Awards, Duke of Edinburgh Award and outdoor pursuits), and these were harder to meet. Last year, however, the service was commended for having the highest number of Arts Awards (Arts Council and Trinity Guildhall) of any London borough, and

there has been a dramatic increase in uptake of the D of E. Some accreditation is more valuable than other, and often more expensive to achieve. First Aid certificates, for example, are very common, and very cheap. It costs £12k to get a group of young people through the Duke of Edinburgh bronze, but it is an award very worth having. For the last two years the service has explicitly promoted the award as the accreditation of choice, and we are steadily seeing progress in that direction all of which is being contributing to our young people's future. Our funding reflects the more expensive programmes.

6.5.4 Monitoring data from 2006/2007 – 2010/2011 demonstrates increased take up in Youth Service Provision, with a spike of 918 after investing £1m increased revenue. Details are contained in appendix two.

6.6 Management Information Systems

6.6.1 The current provision has in place a tried and tested reporting and monitoring process. Information is gathered on: peer inspection; training and workforce development; accreditation; involvement; and performance against KPIs. The contracts are monitored through quarterly meetings at which reports are presented on performance, recognised as good practice in the NYA Charter Mark assessment.

6.6.2 One of the most serious criticisms of the 2001 report was that the service's participation data was "fictitious" and this is an accusation that has recurred on occasions over the years. It is a serious accusation, given the national accolades received by the service on the grounds of high take-up and satisfaction. Since the 2001 report the service has subscribed to the national data collecting system "EYS". Contractors are asked to collect information, and to submit it to the in-house team for validation monthly. These data are then scrutinised by the service manager and become the focus of the quarterly monitoring meetings, where discrepancies can be highlighted. This is to ensure that data has been recorded correctly and monitor targets and determine any bonus payments. This validation process is recorded and gives rise to an auditable trail of the results produced. The process has the advantage of objective scrutiny, unlike the previous in-house system. Any suspicions of irregularity will be easily challenged by the service manager.

6.6.3 Providing monthly data was difficult for some of the smaller units sub-contracted in each LAP, with no capacity to make individual returns. Significant support was made needed, especially in the early stages, which had implications for the resources of the in-house team, but the investment more than paid off in the returns on probity (above) and the added benefit of increasing the capacity generally of neighbourhood organisations.

6.6.4 The MI system must be retained, and replaced only with a further developed national data base, and scrupulous, auditable monitoring must be retained and available to the partnership, elected members and residents.

6.7 Partnerships

6.7.1 Taking the contract in house provides an opportunity to ensure that services are let against new and emerging indicators. As part of the commissioning process officers offer surgeries for local voluntary groups, encouraging them to work with larger groups, to build capacity and to ensure involvement in the

programme delivery. This is in line with the new government thinking on local management and delivery.

6.7.2 Under the current arrangements the Local Authority deals with five separate contractors. Sitting beneath each contractor are a number of sub-contractors engaged to deliver the variety of services and functions required. It is the contractors' responsibility to manage their own sub-contractor interfaces. Were the contract brought in-house the Local Authority would be expected to engage with and manage all of the contractual services and relationships, introducing an additional management workload. This is a minimum of twenty-five individual contracts, in addition to direct staff management. However, once a new internal management structure is agreed and the SLAs are settled, it is likely that an in-house service will reduce the percentage of funds being used on management through the contracted and subcontracted services.

6.7.3 The move of schools towards Academy Status would lead to additional contractual arrangements with the local authority. The number of academies does not at present seem likely to expand beyond the three already approved. Members would want to be satisfied with any contractual arrangements between the Youth Services and academy status schools.

6.8 Management and Finance

6.8.1 Co-ordinating borough-wide specialised activity, and ensuring the involvement of individual clubs, might be easier with a single management structure. For example, ensuring that all providers identify young people to sit on the central youth council can be time-consuming, but might be easier with central management. This would be true of other borough-wide programmes and events and could result in the co-ordination borough-wide specialised activity, ensuring the involvement of individual youth clubs.

6.8.2 There is concern as to how much additional strain the in-house team would take. **The £9.040m gross budget for in-house expenditure supports 62 full-time equivalents, plus sessional staff, as follows.**

Service	Full-time equivalent permanent posts	Sessional staff posts
Detached and response	8 fte	12 sessional Youth workers
Quality Assurance	10 fte	15 sessional Peer Educators
Administration	7 fte	
Outdoor Education	6 fte	14 sessional Activity Instructors
Targeted Support	31 fte	
Total	62 fte	41 sessional staff

6.8.3 Poor staff management was a significant driver in the initial contracting decision. Reports commented on irregularities in working practices, erratic opening hours, poor monitoring, and in particular poor absence monitoring. There have been significant improvements in the service since that time, and the service manages a complicated budget well and carefully. The addition of a different kind of off-site management, in buildings variously owned and maintained, and more than doubling the work-force, is a transition not to be taken lightly, but staff have learned management lessons over the last years,

and applying in-house the same rigour that was brought to contract monitoring should ensure that we retain both flexibility and high productivity. Moreover there are likely to be savings made possible through a reduction in different levels of management through the contracted and subcontracted services.

6.9 Localism

- 6.9.1 The youth service pioneered localisation within Tower Hamlets, with individually drafted LAP specifications and LAP youth plans, delivered by local providers. The work is highlighted in the borough's Localisation Annual Report, and is a model for work of its kind. All contractors work closely with the local residents, voluntary organisations and Safer Neighbourhood Teams. Contract terms are drafted to ensure that they keep links with LAP and ward panels and that LAP plans are drafted to fit with local priorities. Some contractors already share premises with the CLC local delivery groups. The youth service will be expected to form links with the GP networks, contributing to a coherent understanding of need at ward level, and ensuring that the local response meets young people's needs. Any prospective providers can expect to respond to the requirement to deliver services within local catchment areas and to engage a number of local community partners.
- 6.9.2 Community Languages also contribute to the localised service, offering the Early GCSE programme on a shared LAP basis, with LAP entitlements based on the local profile. The work is delivered in partnership with Idea Stores, and has strong local support. Significant funding was voted to Community languages through the Participatory Budgeting pilot, demonstrating the strength of local feeling. Its work on mother-tongue teaching, and more recently, on citizenship education in after-school madrassas, demonstrates the local base for the Community Languages Service, and its capacity for responding to the needs of residents..
- 6.9.3 To maximise the use of resources, and to ensure a locally responsive service, key buildings have been identified in every LAP as mandatory for youth service provision. Other buildings are available, but use is subject to the local services' choice. Mandatory buildings may change, as local circumstances change. Because each LAP contract is customised for the particular wards the service is very flexible and adaptable. In LAPs one and two the service already works closely with the CLC localisation initiative, and has staff operating from the local hub.
- 6.9.4 Localism, and working closely with CLC, could beg the question of the location of the youth service within the council. The social education role of the service, core to the whole concept of the youth service, means that alongside links with extended schools, there are particularly strong links with the DAAT and with Community Safety (especially through the Rapid Response Team) and with community cohesion. The youth service currently has strong links with the sports development teams which should be enhanced and developed. Stronger links might also be established with Idea Stores. As part of their consideration of the service, members might want to consider managing the service within CLC in acknowledgement of this wider brief.

7. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

- 7.1 The Youth Contracts for 2011/12 financial year have a budget of £3.1m. Individual LAP contract values are set out in the table below.

Area	Contract Sum £'000
Lap1	361
Lap2	332
Lap3	500
Lap4	365
Lap5	230
Lap6	317
Lap7	351
Lap8	280
A- Team arts (CLC)	170
SEN	20
Outdoor Education Team	180
Total	3,106

- 7.2 The proposal before Cabinet to bring the Youth Service back in house does not come with a detailed analysis of the current and future costs associated with delivering the currently contracted services. Each of the contractors, (ie externally, three schools and a housing association plus two internal contracts) has different arrangements for managing the service and a centralised management structure may offer opportunities for cost reductions and provide a better basis for the organisation of service delivery. However this is something that will need to be tested during implementation.
- 7.3 An in-house delivery of the service may be able to reduce operational management costs, reducing 8 separate management structures for each of the LAPs with a structure based on a smaller number. At a more senior level, the service management may reduce both through the ending of the client role (ie if there is no contract, there is no client – contractor interface) and through the move of the service from Children Schools and Families to Communities Localities and Culture (ie the relocation of services could be accompanied by the reconsideration of the senior management needs of the service).
- 7.4 Any savings arising from restructuring the service may be offset to some extent by any premises costs that are currently provided in kind by the contractors, but which in future may be provided only with a contractual payment. For instance, a school may offer the use of its facilities on a flexible basis when they have the responsibility under the contract to deliver outcomes, but may be less disposed to the same level of flexibility if they have no direct responsibility for those outcomes.
- 7.5 Any net savings arising from the implementation of the proposals in this report can either be used to close the budget gap projected for future years of the Medium Term Financial Plan or can be used for investment in the service. Any additional net cost associated with the implementation of this proposal would need to be factored into the Medium Term Financial Planning process.
- 7.6 The risks associated with a service transformation of this scale and nature would also need to be captured and monitored through the Council's established Risk Management Framework.

8. CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL SERVICES)

- 8.1 The Council is required by section 507B of the Education Act 2006 to provide facilities for education and recreational leisure time activities for all 13 to 19 year olds and some 20 to 24 year olds. This duty can be achieved either by in-house provision or under contract.
- 8.2 In considering the route to be chosen Cabinet must consider the duty of best value under section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999. By virtue of this duty it is required to ensure continuous improvement all its dealings.
- 8.3 If an external contractual route for delivery of the services is selected the European Directive, 2004/18/EC, and subsequently the UK Public Contracts Regulations (2006) set out a clear set of requirements on the Council. However, both sets of legislation allow a "light touch" approach to the procurement of certain services. These are known as Part B services. Part B tenders must comply with the regulations in that they must be "adequately advertised", must include a technical specification, and feedback must be available. The services detailed in this report are Part B services
- 8.4 If the service is brought back in-house then Transfer of Undertakings Regulations will apply to some staff engaged by the current contractors and the Council will comply with any requirements under the Regulations will need to complete an equality impact analysis and this has been annexed to this report.

9. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 Seeking best value from the youth service, and offering good quality open-access across the community, will promote equality and work towards the One Tower Hamlets goals. The service will continue to cement partnerships with the local third sector, and to set internal targets for take-up of the service across the community.

10. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT

- 10.1 There are no SAGE implications.

11. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 The risk is in as yet un-negotiated rents from external organisations,. This can be set against savings in management, but will be carefully negotiated and monitored.

12. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1.1 Good youth service delivery and localised services promote the inclusion of young people, which should have a corresponding impact on the numbers of

first time entrants to the criminal justice system. Close work with ward panels, through localism, should help to reduce levels of anti-social behaviour. Firmer integration of the service into the local partnership should produce a more streamlined approach to public safety.

13. EFFICIENCY STATEMENT

- 13.1 The contracts are already deemed very good value for money. Bringing the service in-house should offer further economies of scale in management. Service re-location offers the opportunity of savings at senior management level.

14 APPENDICES

Appendix 1

INDICATIVE TUPE TIMETABLE	
Notification to contractors of the council's intention to bring the contracts back in-house.	May 2012
Formal announcement to staff. Publication of the TUPE timetable and indicative structure, including a revised management structure. Measures letter circulated.	May 2012
Consultation with staff and trade unions	June/July 2012
Consultation with third sector on SLAs for use of buildings	June/July 2012
Final structure and job descriptions	1 st September 2012
SLAs signed	30 th September 2012
Staff Tupe	1 st October 2012

Appendix 2

Youth and Connexions Services 2010/11 Monitoring Statistics Core Funding and Additional Revenue (Targets and Performance) 1st Apr 10 - 31 March 2011

Population (LAP) 18,964

Annual target (2010/11)

	Contacts		Participants		Recorded Outcome		Accredited Outcome	
	Normal	Stretch	Normal	Stretch	Normal	Stretch	Normal	Stretch
LAP 1 (iLEAP)	939	1,078	564	647	338	388	129	154
LAP 2 (iLEAP)	920	1,021	552	612	331	367	135	153
LAP 3 (Bishop Challoner)	900	1,009	540	605	324	363	131	151
LAP 4 (Bishop Challoner)	974	1,054	584	633	350	379	155	170
LAP 5 (Old Ford)	473	537	284	322	170	193	78	89
LAP 6 (Poplar HARCA)	898	995	539	597	324	359	134	152
LAP 7 (Poplar HARCA)	1,043	1,138	626	683	376	410	160	177
LAP 8 (George Green's)	699	772	419	463	252	278	111	124
A Team	736	762	441	457	264	264	62	63
Involvement	492	492	295	295	177	177	89	89
New Start	370	370	222	222	133	133	67	67
Outdoor Education	784	784	472	472	285	285	146	146
PAYP	3,450	N/A	2,070	N/A	1,242	N/A	621	N/A
Peerwork	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rapid Response	320	320	192	192	115	115	58	58
Osmani Trust	653	N/A	392	N/A	235	N/A	118	N/A
Mainstream Grant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
YIP	150	150	150	150	90	90	45	45
Total	8,560	10,528	5,140	6,381	3,088	3,822	1,350	1,641

NOTES:

- The Targets specified here are a combination of the targets for Core Funding and Additional Revenue; Likewise, the performance is for both funding streams!

- 2010/11 Targets: Only the targets for LAP 1 - 8, A Team Arts and Involvement have been updated so far; The remaining would be updated in future reports;

- This report only pertains to young people aged 13-19

- NB: The Participation is measured by the number of sessions attended by the young person; 5 attendances equate to participation; Please, refer to "Recording Young People's Progress and Accreditation in Youth Work for more information".

- LAP population is derived from GLA 2006 Round Ward Population Projections - 2006/07 Mid-Year Population Estimate.

- The target for Quarter 1 is 40% of the corresponding Annual target and increases by 20% Quarterly i.e. 60% for Quarter 2, 80% for Quarter 3 and 100% for Quarter 4

- Youth Service targets (2010/11) are:

Contacts: 35% of population
Participants (Regular Attendees): 60% of Contacts
Recorded Outcomes: 60% of Participants
Accredited Outcomes: 30% of Participants

- The targets for the LAPs/Teams are agreed with the respective Contractors/Service Providers;

- *The Total may not always be the same as the cumulative total of all of the individual LAPs/Teams because young people are only counted once across the LAPs/Teams even if they attend projects in more than one LAP; The total shown only includes data from e-YS!




- Data outside e-YS e.g. NewStart, Involvement and YIP are not included in the total for boroughwide figures due to the potential duplication in the data; This would be resolved in a later report.

- PAYP data includes all the age groups

- Further input expected from Newstart, YIP and Peer Work

Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

	Contacts				Participants				Recorded Outcome				Accredited Outcome			
	Target (Qtr 4)		Achieved		Target (Qtr 4)		Achieved		Target (Qtr 4)		Achieved		Target (Qtr 4)		Achieved	
	Normal	Stretch	Actual	Annual %	Normal	Stretch	Actual	Annual %	Normal	Stretch	Actual	Annual %	Normal	Stretch	Actual	Annual %
LAP 1 (iLEAP)	939	1,078	1,244	132%	564	647	633	112%	338	388	420	124%	129	154	263	203%
LAP 2 (iLEAP)	920	1,021	1,494	162%	552	612	773	140%	331	367	380	115%	135	153	334	248%
LAP 3 (Bishop Challoner)	900	1,009	1,045	116%	540	605	722	134%	324	363	362	112%	131	151	213	163%
LAP 4 (Bishop Challoner)	974	1,054	1,087	112%	584	633	657	112%	350	379	407	116%	155	170	196	126%
LAP 5 (Old Ford)	473	537	641	135%	284	322	287	101%	170	193	140	82%	78	89	90	116%
LAP 6 (Poplar HARCA)	898	995	851	95%	539	597	500	93%	324	359	297	92%	134	152	163	121%
LAP 7 (Poplar HARCA)	1,043	1,138	1,233	118%	626	683	680	109%	376	410	422	112%	160	177	292	182%
LAP 8 (George Green's)	699	772	972	139%	419	463	438	104%	252	278	255	101%	111	124	137	123%
A Team	736	762	1,004	136%	441	457	337	76%	264	264	266	101%	62	63	65	105%
Involvement	492	492	231	47%	295	295	94	32%	177	177	37	21%	89	89	73	82%
New Start	370	370	203	55%	222	222	164	74%	133	133	164	123%	67	67	90	135%
Outdoor Education	784	784	1,227	157%	472	472	521	110%	285	285	225	79%	146	146	238	163%

Key
 above 100%
 90%-100%
 below 90%

Appendix 3

Buildings currently used by the service owned by the authority
Attlee Centre (leased)
Columbia Road Youth Project
Haileybury Youth Centre
Lime House Youth Club
Meath Gardens
One Stop Shop
Redcoat Youth Project
Skate Park/Arches
St Andrew's Wharf
Urban Adventure Base
Whitechapel Youth Project

Buildings currently used by the service not owned by the authority
Alpha Grove Centre
Bromley by Bow Centre
British Street
Burdett Centre
BYM
Cubbitt Town
Dora Hall
East London Tabernacle
Ensign
George Green's School Swimming Pool
London Met
Marnier School
Parnell Road

Poplar Boys and Girls
Saint Hilda's
Swanlea School
The Linc Centre
The Tower Project
Victoria Park Baptist Church
Village club
Wapping Youth Club
Wessex Centre
Workhouse

Appendix 4

Equality Impact Assessment: Test of Relevance

Name of the savings proposal: Youth Service delivery		
TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES...
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What outcome did the previous intervention seek to achieve? • What evidence do you have about how effective the previous intervention was?
CHANGES TO A SERVICE		
Does the change alter access to the service?	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence that access will be more difficult or costly for some people?
Does the change involve revenue raising?	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence do we have about who will pay? • What impact will this have on the income available for these people?
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence do we have about who will no longer be eligible for the service? • Is this likely to lead to poorer outcomes for those who cannot access the service?
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence do we have on who has benefits from these transfers? • What is the likely impact of the

		removal of the income to current beneficiaries?
Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a need to include promotion of equality in the new contract arrangements?
CHANGES TO STAFFING		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	<p>YES</p> <p>The proposal is to bring the youth service in-house. The restructure of the service will take place after this has happened and will only affect senior management. A full EQIA will be undertaken at that point</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What evidence do we have about the composition of the current workforce? Are there some groups who are likely to be disproportionately affected by the proposed reduction?
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What evidence is there that this could have an impact on equal pay? Does the change reduce the ability of staff to work flexibly?