

Tripartite Youth Services Meeting

27 September 2011

Notes

Present:		Local Children's Partnership	
Charlie Adie	The Alliance Vice Chair/Chief Executive Motiv8	Gosport Co-Chair	CA
Jonathan Andrew	Fairbridge Solent Manager		JA
Jenny Bonsor	Headteacher Bayhouse School	Gosport Co-Chair	JB
Claire Branson	Hampshire County Council Children's Services Department Senior Development Officer Commissioning		CB
Maria Galway- Kennedy	Hampshire County Council Children's Services Department Youth Support Services Manager Fareham & Gosport		MCK
Brian Corral	Hampshire County Council Children's Services Department Youth Support Services Manager New Forest		BC
Mark Dixon	Chair of The Alliance/Chief Executive Youth Options		MD
Ria Emery	Hampshire County Council Children's Services Department Youth Support Services Manager Havant		RE
Nicki Griffis	Hampshire County Council Children's Services Department Commissioning & Contracts Manager		NG
Steve Handforth	Hampshire County Council Children's Services Department Area Director Western		SH
Lynn Martin	Headteacher Hook Junior School	Hart Chair	LM

Ian Milsom	The Alliance Development Manager		IM
Mike Simpson	The Alliance/Chief Executive Winchester YMCA	Winchester	MS
Lisa Willis	Hampshire County Council Children's Services Department Strategic Workforce Development Manager		LW
Apologies:			
Dawn Murphy	The Alliance/Children's Links Development Manager	East Hants - Bordon	

1. Welcome and introductions

MD and **SH** co-chaired and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Notes of the previous meeting

CA went through the notes of the previous meeting (5 July 2011) which, like today's meeting, is part of an ongoing process of engagement - in the process of reconfiguring Youth Support Services (YSS) - between Hampshire County Council Children's Services and, via The Alliance, the voluntary sector. **CA** highlighted the voluntary sector consultation event which The Alliance hosted in May 2011 and which provided an opportunity for the voluntary youth sector to feed into the YSS consultation process.

At the Executive Lead Member decision day (29 July 2011) referred to in the notes, the YSS proposals were approved, with the addition of a further recommendation that officers working with Local Children's Partnerships and the new commissioning board should establish a clear and reliable method by which young people at a local level can play a direct part in the decision making about the allocation of the funds for locally commissioned services.

CA touched on the process whereby Local Children's Partnerships (LCPs) had prepared statements of commissioning intent, which informed the YSS commissioning process of locally identified need.

The only outstanding action point from the previous meeting is today's follow up event.

3. Matters arising from the notes

Transitional Funding

SH provided an overview and update. Transitional funding is an amount (£0.75m) allocated across the county to maintain key services during the service change process. Grants in excess of £5,000 require

Executive Lead Member approval. There will be an emergency Lead Member decision day in mid-October to deal with these allocations. Proposals to be circulated. Decisions on grants below £5,000 will rest, primarily, with Youth Support Services Managers. Transitional grants are available to voluntary sector providers who can provide services in localities. LCPs are involved in identifying providers.

There followed a discussion during which The Alliance raised questions as to the openness and transparency of awards of transitional funding to voluntary sector organisations. **SH** stressed that, due to the timescale involved, the allocation of transitional funding was not a competitive process. **MCK** added that the needs of young people are paramount in this transitional process. To ensure continuity it is necessary to pull in nearest available providers.

MD suggested that The Alliance could have a role in broader communication with potential voluntary sector providers in those areas where LCPs and Youth Support Services Manager are struggling to identify providers. This suggested approach was welcomed and it was agreed that **SH** would work with Youth Support Services Manager to highlight gaps. This information will be passed to **IM**, who will circulate via The Alliance networks. This information will be accompanied by a suitable form of words – to clarify the contextual framework of these limited grant opportunities – which **SH** and **IM** will agree.

4. **YSS commissioning update**

MD highlighted meeting he attended on 23 September with Steve Crocker and **NG**. Items discussed were the YSS draft specification and the proposed cross-county information events.

SH and **NG** updated on the commissioning timeline and process.

Timeline

- October 2011- March 2012 transitional grants to maintain key services
- 6 October 2011 – draft specification issued
- During October 2011 – series of consultation and information events (HCC CSD Commissioning Team and HR leading)
- To 31 October – Expressions of interest
- Applications – Opens 14 November 2011. Closes 21 December 2011
- During November 2011 – series of information events
- Evaluation of bids – January 2012
- April 2012 – March 2013 New provision funded by grants.
- December 2012 – review process and look at a more robust contract-based commissioning process with possibly longer-term contracts April 2013

TUPE

CA expressed his understanding that HCC will assume full responsibility for pension and redundancy liabilities for services provided under 12 month grant process April 2012-March 2013. **MD** requested that this clarification around TUPE responsibilities be available at consultation and information events. **JA** added that trustees in small voluntary organisations may not be fully aware of their responsibilities and it is important that this be clarified at the information events.

MD highlighted that pension liability was a key consideration for voluntary organisations. However, this was not the only area of concern and that, e.g. long-term sickness arrangements, may make smaller organisations wary of bidding. **CA** suggested that a possible solution would be a lead body/sub contractor consortia approach. **NG** confirmed that this provider structure would be considered.

Buildings

HCC is mapping the extent of those available. These will remain available to service providers with HCC continuing to meet the contribution to running costs. These contributions will not be deducted from the total service pot.

Quality assurance

SH confirmed that there would be clarity around the Local Authority's quality assurance expectations.

There was a discussion around the planned consultation and information events and the following were confirmed:

- Marketing. Events will be jointly marketed via HCC and The Alliance websites and networks (former will include schools network and Hampshire Association of Local Councils [HALC]).
- Evening timings. There will be one evening event in each round of consultation and information events.
- Community Development Facilitators (CDFs). Will not be appointed until after 6th October. It is unlikely that they will be able to attend the events. However this will depend on timeframe for appointment and the individuals' availability. The concern is that as CDFs new to post, their clarity on their tasks will be limited. Within this context however, HCC CSD we will try to ensure their attendance.

The Alliance requested that the second round of events are also utilised to highlight the continuance of the CSI grant.

5. Workforce development

To aid discussion on this issue, **LW** circulated a brief paper 'Proposed route for youth work in the voluntary sector'. This is attached as an appendix to these notes.

LW stressed that this was a first draft for consultation on a decision concerning minimum levels of capability for youth workers employed by voluntary organisations funded by Hampshire County Council to deliver YSS to young people. The minimum level agreed, which should accommodate an understanding concerning career guidance, will be written into YSS grant and contract specifications. This quality information will be conveyed at the consultation and information events.

The workforce development proposals were broadly welcomed. During a wide-ranging discussion the following points were raised/made:-

- Needs to be clarity that this covers paid staff and volunteers in voluntary sector organisations who are working directly with young people
- Sensitive communication around the agreed standards will be important to secure buy-in from the voluntary sector
- Implementation of the standards needs to be based on an agreed timescale for their achievement. This in conjunction with a suitable form of words, e.g. "Working towards these standards"
- There are links to the Common Assessment Framework
- Equivalency. There needs to be recognition of equivalent standards and a process of 'passporting' in relation to these.
- The role of the Community Development Facilitators in relation to the standards needs to be clarified
- Consortiums will help to trickle down and cross-fertilise standards
- Service specifications should focus equally on outcomes for young people

CA asked if there was a national quality assurance scheme and if there was anything governing what HCC must comply with in terms of quality assurance. **CB** thought that the National Council for Voluntary Youth Services (NCVYS) may be currently looking at a scheme for the voluntary sector. **SH** advised that HCC was not bound to compliance with any particular quality directive.

CA mentioned the process for providing monitoring data, i.e. a paper-based or web-based system.

LW is working with **MD** in looking at how Hampshire County Council can support development of the voluntary sector youth workforce. **LW** asked for volunteers to join a small group to help take forward the minimum standards outlined in her paper. **All**

6. An LCP perspective

A major issue has already been identified in terms of the timescales. It has been challenging for LCPs to feed in as envisaged, and at the same time trying to hang on to local solutions in the context of a central commissioning process.

Another major challenge has been trying to balance workload expectations and responsibilities with limited resources (LCPs are leaning heavily on Youth Service Managers). This raises a question as to whether there should be a clear statement of LCP roles and responsibilities

MS emphasised the critical importance of monitoring and evaluation in the initial year of service delivery by the voluntary sector and suggested that the Community Development Facilitators could support LCPs in this role. **MD** agreed, suggesting it was unfair to solely burden LCPs with this task. **MD** felt also that the Community Development Facilitators have a role in supporting the engagement of Alliance Representatives with their respective LCPs.

7. AOB

MD asked for The Alliance to receive guidance on messages which it issued relating to YSS to ensure that information is timely and accurate.

SH felt that this group helpfully provides an informative and broad-ranging perspective on issues and it was agreed that the group should meet again between 17 October and 14 November 2011. **MD** will liaise with **SH** to agree a date. **MD/SH**

Proposed route for youth work in the Voluntary Sector (to link with anticipated SLA)

It is anticipated that there will be different requirements of organisations in the voluntary sector depending on the level of service to be offered.

Therefore, the proposed recommendation for minimum levels of capability for youth workers employed by voluntary organisations to deliver services to young people will be in line with the complexity of the work undertaken.

The capabilities will be linked to the Qualifications Curriculum Framework (QCF) for Working with Young People

It is recommended that there should be three tiers of capability, linked to provision as follows

Level 1 Safety and Awareness –

Minimum capability requirement of all staff employed to undertake work with young people through youth provision.

This would comprise approx 28hrs of training (4 days) which would equip the worker to have a **basic level of skill** to be a safe practitioner in a management structure where there is a line manager with overarching responsibility. The training would comprise:-

- Health and Safety Training
- Safeguarding Awareness
- Roles, Responsibilities and Boundaries of Work with Young People
- Basic Interpersonal Skills
- Equality and Diversity Awareness
- Drugs and Alcohol Training (Tier 1)
- SRE (Tier 1)

Level 2 Assuming responsibility

In addition to the Level 1 training identified above, Level 2 would comprise more detailed training (approx 6 days) which would equip the worker to deliver at a higher level of complexity to include managing others. Those wanting to attain the level of e.g. part-time worker in charge of a project would be required to undertake training at this level. This training would comprise:-

- Groupwork Skills
- Leadership and Management
- Attitudes and Values
- Drugs and Alcohol Training (Tier 2)
- SRE (Tier 2)

Level 3 Professional Youth Worker Status

In addition to the Level 1 and 2 requirements identified above, any full-time youth worker in a voluntary organisation would be expected to have (or be working towards) a full time professionally validated qualification in youth work

Organisations should be required to meet these standards in any SLA set out between the Local Authority and the Voluntary Organisation being commissioned.