



Report of the Director of Neighbourhoods and Housing

Inner South Area Committee

Date: Monday 26th March 2007

Subject: Inner South Area Committee Mobile Youth Provision and Priority Neighbourhood Development Worker – next steps

Electoral Wards Affected:

Beeston & Holbeck

City & Hunslet

Middleton Park

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

Council
Function

Delegated Executive
Function available
for Call In

Delegated Executive
Function not available for
Call In Details set out in the
report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a review of two projects commissioned by this Area Committee in order that Members can determine the next steps for both initiatives for 07/08 and 08/09.

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 At this Committee's February 2007 meeting, Members requested that a report be submitted to the March meeting regarding the two initiatives which had been commissioned by the Area Committee and which had started last year to run for an initial 12 month period with an in principle support for a further year(s). The two initiatives this report focuses on are the Mobile Youth Provision (managed by St Luke's Cares) and the Priority Neighbourhood Development Worker (managed by South Leeds Health For All).
- 1.2 The purpose of this report is to assist the Area Committee to determine the next steps for these initiatives.
- 1.3 Why determine the next steps now when there is over 4 months remaining of the trial year for the Priority Neighbourhood Development Worker and 3 months remaining for the Mobile Youth Provision?

It is recommended that the Area Committee consider the next steps at this stage as this leaves sufficient time for the Area Committee to review how the initiatives are going and determine whether each initiative should continue with the current provider and with any amendments to the contract(s) and be able to prepare for a second year; be retendered; or to end the initiative(s) allowing time for either or both of them to wind down.

2.0 THE AREA COMMITTEE'S PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT WORKER

2.1 Background to the Priority Neighbourhood Development Worker

a) In February 2006 the Inner South Area Committee gave the Area Co-ordinator the go ahead to commission and tender for an organisation to manage a well-being funded Priority Neighbourhood Development worker post. A procurement exercise followed and South Leeds Health For All (SLHFA) successfully won the bid from a shortlist of 3 organisations. SLHFA and the Area Co-ordinator jointly recruited to the post appointing Richard Lancaster who started in August/September 2006.

b) The Committee had approved a first year of this post with a further 'in principle' support for funding from future Area Well Being budgets up to a maximum of 2 further years based on the evaluation & review of the first year of the project. Whilst the below provides some evaluative points of the initiative to date, SLHFA has drawn up a more detailed review from their perspective (see appendix).

c) The cost of the initiative is £32,800.00 for 12 months (approx £5,000 management/ staff resource costs and £27,800 salary). The Area Committee, through the South Area Management Team, leads on the strategic and day to day operational management of the post holder whilst SLHFA employs, manages, supports and provides an office and administrative support for the member of staff.

d) The original aim of the post was to assist the Area Committee and Inner South Area Management Team with community consultation and involvement and supports the implementation of actions identified through the Neighbourhood Improvement Planning (NIP) process. The intention was that the post holder would work in different neighbourhoods across the Inner South Leeds area particularly in accordance with NIPs being carried out. Consequently the worker has worked in Cottingley and continues to work in Cottingley as part of the agreed exit strategy from the NIP. He has also worked in central Middleton and has begun work in Manor Farms with some links starting to be made in Hunslet.

2.2 Achievements

a) The worker has particularly helped enhance the involvement of local people and built the capacity of local groups and developed some projects such as with the (now named) Middleton Community Group, Tenants and Residents Association in Cottingley (TRAC) and Cottingley in Bloom. He has advised a residents group in Hunslet and has started a revised Manor Farms residents/tenants/community association and provided some support to ManorField Hall. He has wherever possible encouraged local people to attend either the Area Committee meetings themselves or at least local neighbourhood forums/groups. There is more work to do in this respect and the worker's attention could be turned more this way.

b) The worker has supported some of the actions as part of the NIPs in Cottingley and Middleton such as:

- increasing resident involvement in groups/meetings and developing a smaller action sub-group
- helping with revising group constitutions/officer roles and improving recordkeeping, publicity and
- production and distribution of newsletters
- encouraging the development of Neighbourhood Watch
- advice on applying funding
- developing intergenerational work
- developing small projects such as hanging baskets, welcome boards,

c) Apart from carrying out work in the new NIPs, the worker's next steps for groups in Cottingley and central Middleton includes:

- Encourage more resident involvement and publicity of local community groups/resident associations
- Help the Middleton group to organise small clean ups and other events.
- Develop Middleton in Bloom with garden competition.
- Further small group meetings with specific agencies.
- Encourage TRAC to take greater control of the Cottingley Newsletter as well as 2 x 'Community Groups in Cottingley Flyers to be mailed out in between Newsletters;
- Have at least one 'community fair' over the next year in Cottingley.
- Monitor actions that still need to be completed from the NIP.

2.3 Some key matters for consideration for any future development

a) It is worth noting that whilst there may be the need for longer term, ongoing support for the sustainability of some groups, this principle can be at odds with the need for the Priority Neighbourhood Development Worker to cover the priority neighbourhoods across the Wards and particularly with new NIPs as they develop. It will therefore be important, in any second year that the Area Committee may approve, for the post holder to ensure that systems are put in place as soon as possible to enable the groups to be more self running and less reliant on the post holder.

b) It will also be important to distinguish the role of the worker in their primary function of community engagement and consultation compared with the need to co-ordinate agency action on identified local issues which would be taken more up by local councillors, Area Management team and individual agencies and in many cases form part of a NIP.

3.0 THE AREA COMMITTEE'S MOBILE YOUTH PROVISION

3.1 Background to the Mobile Youth Provision

a) In February 2006, the Area Committee approved the commissioning of a mobile youth provision scheme (MYP) to operate across the inner south area. The Committee approved the service for a one year pilot, with support being given in principle for a further year, based on the evaluation of the project outcomes. A brief review of the service to date is outlined below with a more detailed report from the provider's perspective in appendix.

b) The original aim of the project was to provide an alternative way to engage with young people particularly in street based locations where young people tend to gather and in locations without centre based youth provision. The vehicle is a transit van converted into a space where small groups of young people can do simple activities such as creative art, discussion, watch educational dvds and receive guidance and advice from qualified youth workers on a range of matters.

c) Part of the £49,680 well being funding approved by the Area Committee was to cover sessional youth workers to manage the activities being delivered from the vehicle. As part of the conditions attached to the contract in the tendering process, it was indicated the mobile youth provision should be operational at least four weekday evenings per week and that 11 weeks of the school holidays should also be covered. Because of the time young people have on their hands Members wanted more hours allocated to the school holiday time than in term time.

d) There were three organisations considered to be appointed to this contract. St Luke's Care was the successful tender and began delivering the provision from July 2006. A timetable was produced to outline where and when the vehicle would visit key locations across the area, so that this could be promoted to local young people through schools, youth service and local youth organisations. The timetable has been revised usually on a termly basis in line with Elected Member's views and the experience of the provision to date.

e) The scheme was officially launched in December 2006 along with a new timetable for the provision of the service in the three wards based on. At the moment in term time, there are two sessions per night operating on 3 nights per week (one night per Ward). Since Early Sept/Oct 2006 there were 3 part time members of staff appointed as dedicated to the provision: a driver/worker and 2 youth workers.

3.2 Achievements

In the first 6 months of operation achievements have been as follows:

- 909 young people visited the mobile youth provision. This averages at 153 visits per month, equivalent to 73 young people per week. 705 young people have accessed some form of previously untouched mainstream activity. 1399 visited the provision up to February 2007.
- Young people have participated in a range of positive and enjoyable activities including physical (sports), healthy eating (encouraged to eat healthy snacks, fruit and drink water), arts and crafts, reading, music.
- 16 young people who are not in employment, education or training (NEET) have been signposted to Connexions Teams and one to one support has been given on a range of personal and social issues.
- 2 volunteers working on a regular basis with interest from another 6.
- Made the provision accessible and known through publicity and the issuing of a mobile phone number for use by local residents and young people.
- Worked in hotspots where young people have gathered and been flexible to respond to work on new issues/areas.

- Started some closer working with potential partners such as Youth Service, Crossroads Youth Project, The Cupboard, University's and local schools and with families and residents who have been involved in volunteering.
- Young people have been consulted about the provision (including the name and design for the 'bus') and they have provided positive and constructive feedback.

3.3 Some key matters for consideration for any future developments

3.31 Matters arising from the how the provision has operated in Inner South

a) Part of the contract was to promote the use of the vehicle by other organizations with the potential of receiving an income to help identify how the provision can become more sustainable in the future. Although St Luke's have done some publicizing of the vehicle, there is further work to do to confirm take up by organisations. The vehicle is underused and has capacity during the weekday daytime (e.g at lunchtimes and after school) and most weekends.

b) In order to make the resource go further, the contract stated that the provision should work in partnership with other organisations. Some examples of this have begun to take place as outlined under achievements however there is capacity for building on current partnerships and developing new ones.

c) The costs for the mobile youth provision scheme was £49,680. This is broken down to £32,000 for the provision of youth workers for the provision and management costs, plus £17,680 for the hire of the vehicle, fuel costs and insurance. A second year of the lease would be at a 50% reduction costed at £150 per week for 52 weeks as opposed to £300 per week. Members may wish to consider whether the £150 'saving' remains with the Area Committee's well-being fund or is put back into the mobile provision used such as for additional staff hours and an additional session(s).

d) To maximize the funding made available for staff (with or without an increase), it might be worth exploring a number of different options for the use of staff time. Are 3 needed each session? If some partners were signed up and committed to providing staff for certain sessions then could perhaps the St Luke's dedicated bus staff run additional sessions?

3.3.2 Matters arising from the how similar schemes in other parts of Leeds have operated

In addition to building on the good practice of the provision in Inner South, some lessons might be learnt when looking at other similar schemes across the city (see below).

a) In both West and North West areas, the same converted vehicle from the same supplier has been leased with area committee well-being funding the hire costs only. The Service however is staffed and managed by the Youth Service delivering activities similar to the provision in inner south. In Outer West the Youth Service has dedicated their detached team of five members to providing youth work from the vehicle allowing it to run six nights per week with two sessions per evening. Whilst there are regular locations visited, a 'floating' session is likely to be programmed in

order to be responsive to areas of concern or to a patch that's not covered by the regular visits. Local PCSO's are notified of when and where the provision will be, in order for them to refer any young people along to the activities which will be taking place.

b) In year 2 the Outer West Youth Service is exploring the addition of to open up a number of opportunities to provide additional and alternative activities to what is being already provided. Also, the hire of a large bus is also being explored so more young people can participate in on board activities.

c) Although the North West initially struggled to have dedicated youth workers, they have one dedicated part-time (18.5 hours) senior worker supplemented by 72 hours of area youth work staff and 3 hours per week of youth service manager's time. When youth clubs are closed or there's no attendance, staff are expected to work with the MYP. The vehicle covers two Area Committee areas with 4k of PCT funding. The vehicle operates every lunch time, after school and evening ie 3 sessions a day , 5 days a week. It has secure free parking at the Police Station!

d) In summary points from the above to consider in any future development are:

- the role of the Youth Service in being able to support and potentially expand the provision (e.g through allocating staff time especially of detached workers and workers who's club's have low attendance);
- in addition to equal number of sessions or each ward the consideration to having a floating session each week to be more responsive to the latest 'hotspots';
- ensuring that all key agencies/local organisations are kept informed as to the timetable for the provision including PCSOs;
- a larger vehicle with more space and capacity to work with more young people; additional activities e.g attaching a trailer;
- the seeking of funding from agencies;
- secure parking at a local police station.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 The Area Committee are asked to note and make comment on the review of the work carried out to date by
i) SLHFA in managing the Area Committee's Priority Neighbourhood Development Worker post
and ii) the work by St Luke's Cares in managing the Area Committee's Mobile Youth Provision

4.2 The Area Committee are asked to take into consideration this report and comments of both initiatives, and determine the next steps. In particular to consider, amongst those Members might come up with, some of the suggested options as follows:

a) For the Neighbourhood Development Worker post

Option (1) To extend the Area Committee's Priority Neighbourhood Development Worker post with the same provider (ie SLHFA) for a further 12 months (from August 07 to August 08) with the same level of well-being funding (£32,800) and to request that the Area Management Team amends the contract in line with areas of improvement identified by Elected Members and the Team.

Option (2) To retender the contract from August 07 with amendments recommended by Members and the Team

Option (3) To end the initiative allowing time for it to wind down by August 07.

b) For the Mobile Youth Provision

Option (1) To extend the scheme with the same provider (ie St Luke's Cares) for a further 12 months (from July 07 to July 08) with the same level of well-being funding (£32,000) and to request that the Area Management Team amends the contract in line with areas of improvement identified by Elected Members and the Team.

Option (2) As for (1) above but with an altered level of funding e.g moving the reduced amount of vehicle hire for year 2 of £7,800 (£150 per week) to enable more staffing hours and sessions per week.

Option (3) To retender the contract from July 07 with amendments recommended by Elected Members

Option (4) To end the initiative allowing time for it to wind down by August 07.