

Appendix 2 - Local Commissioning of Youth Activities

Summary of learning – 19 January 2016

Positives / Opportunities	Negatives / Challenges
<p>Creating an evidence based Needs Assessment that responded to local circumstances</p> <p>After an initial period of concern LJC's positively took on local youth commissioning and involved young people and stakeholders in local conversations.</p> <p>Shropshire Youth Association provided support to LJC's and Community Enablement Officers in their local commissioning roles.</p> <p>The opportunity to co-opt stakeholders onto LJC "working groups" and the adoption of a less formal approach to working.</p> <p>The process has worked best where there is strong local leadership and a diverse group of local stakeholders have been supported to get involved.</p> <p>The involvement of young people and stakeholders from early on in the process has generally been positive with stakeholders bringing different experiences and expertise to the table.</p> <p>Some new approaches to local youth provision, less dependent on a "traditional youth club approach", have emerged.</p> <p>Positive partnership approach taken by some parish / town councils to finding local solutions.</p> <p>The opportunity for creative local discussion about the future of youth centres within the context of the Community Asset Transfer process.</p> <p>Shropshire Youth Association engagement with local youth delivery grant / contract opportunities.</p> <p>The opportunity for Community Enablement Officers to develop skills in local commissioning.</p>	<p>Youth commissioning has been a challenging area to choose as a first attempt at local commissioning; limited initial skills and experience of local commissioners.</p> <p>Uncertainty of the specific role and responsibility of the LJC and local Member/s with respect to decision making and evaluation.</p> <p>Working within LJC boundaries sometimes fails to recognise how people use services across boundaries.</p> <p>Project governance, roles and responsibilities, prompt decision making, adoption of a consistent shared approach, the interface between the many different dependencies and communications have all been difficult to manage.</p> <p>Full project risks need to be understood at the beginning and mitigated as much as possible.</p> <p>TUPE and pension obligations have caused delay and uncertainty in the award of grants / contracts.</p> <p>A relatively "resource hungry" and complex process. Questions about value for money.</p> <p>Running and managing the Community Asset Transfer process for youth centres at the same time as the local commissioning of youth activities has sometimes caused confusion.</p> <p>It has been difficult to apply the very high level children's plan outcomes to the very local context for youth commissioning.</p> <p>When to use grants and contracts.</p> <p>The length and complexity of contracts might deter smaller organisations; administrative burden to providers might be disproportionate to the funding</p> <p>Undeveloped provider market has resulted</p>

	<p>in the absence of competition and has potentially compromised local innovation; a stronger emphasis on early market engagement and a longer lead in time might help in the future.</p> <p>Ambiguity of the role of SYA as both provider of infrastructure support (including provision of support for LJC's) and potential provider of youth activities caused some confusion prior to subsequent clarification.</p> <p>Sometimes has been difficult to confirm local venues and management committees have on occasions been "anti-young people".</p>
--	---