

Appendix 2

Review of funding in support of the provision of youth activities

20 June 2017

Background

At its meeting on 26th April 2017 the Young People Task & Finish Group confirmed a number of key considerations and design principles that should be used to inform the review of funding in support of the provision of youth activities.

Key **considerations** within the design of the provision of youth activities include:

- 1 Fully integrated tie in between universal support, targeted support and early help provision.
- 2 Within the Council's local commissioning role a focus on:
 - Targeting resources to young people with the greatest potential need within the context of providing better outcomes for young people via service contracts
 - Support for new youth club provision or regular provision that would not otherwise take place, rather than support for existing clubs.
 - Support for "youth work" rather than youth activities
- 3 The development of a mature "provider market" able to offer "professional youth work" support
- 4 The ongoing development of the voluntary and community sector to provide universal access to every child in Shropshire; as part of this work there could be an opportunity to support the voluntary sector via a "small grant scheme"
- 5 Recognition of an ever diminishing Council funding envelope
- 6 An approach that maximises safeguarding considerations and provides clear referral pathways
- 7 An approach that proactively involves young people in the design and evaluation of activities at both a local and strategic level
- 8 An approach that maximises local resilience and sustainable youth club provision. In providing support the Council's aim should be to encourage local sustainable provision that responds flexibly to local need and circumstances, while recognising the role of the Council as an enabler and facilitator.

The following **key points** should underpin the Council's overall approach to the commissioning of youth activities:

- Universal offer - The Council's aim is to ensure that as many young people aged 10 to 19 (24 for those with learning difficulties) as possible, can access a wide range of activities after school, at weekends and in school holidays. These activities are known collectively as Youth Activities and their purpose is to support young people's well-being, development of personal and social education and preparation for adulthood.
Visit: <http://www.sya.org.uk/>
- Targeted offer – Alongside support for universal provision, targeted support will be provided to communities of young people with the greatest need. Targeted provision will be part of Shropshire's "Early Help Offer" for young people.
Visit: <http://new.shropshire.gov.uk/early-help>

- The provision of youth activities will contribute to the following outcome areas in the Shropshire's Children, Young People and Families Plan 2014:
 1. Ensuring all Children & Young People are safe and well looked after in a supportive environment
 2. Narrowing the achievement gap in education & work
 3. Ensuring emotional wellbeing of Children & Young People by focusing on prevention and early intervention
 4. Keeping more Children & Young People healthy and reducing health inequalities
 Visit: <https://shropshire.gov.uk/media/1216935/Shropshire-CYPF-Plan-2014.pdf>
- The active participation of young people in informing key decisions and the review of activities.

Review of our existing approach

Current funding arrangements were determined in 2014 using a funding formula that distributed money to Local Joint Committee (LJC) areas based on **need** and **rurality**.

The needs formula took nine measures and allocated each LJC area a score per measure based on their proportion of the total. The calculation was done using a numerator (children in LJC for any given measure) divided by a denominator (total number of children in Shropshire for said measure). Funding was then allocated based on each of the nine measures calculated in this fashion.

For example, Ellesmere had 1,157 of the 36,866 children registered with the Short Breaks Programme (a proxy measure for disability) aged 10-19 in Shropshire and received a score of 0.03 (1,157/36,866). Each LJC area's scores for the nine measures were combined, leaving a total need score. In all nine points were distributed between all LJC's across the nine measures (a point per measure).

Any area with a combined 'need score' of under 0.29 did not receive needs funding. Above this cut-off 10 of the 23 LJC areas scored between them a total of 7.05 points. These areas were awarded a share of the available funding based on their need score as a proportion of the total. For example, Oswestry had 0.85 of the available 7.05 points and therefore received 12.1% of the available funding.

Table 1 below shows how the areas were scored, ranked by total from top to bottom with the area of highest need (and therefore funding) first.

Table 1

LJC Area	No of 10-19 year olds	Disabled: no of 10-19 year olds reg with Short Breaks	No of 10-19: deprived areas	No of 10-17: offenders	No of 10-19 year: Education Access stats	Referrals to social care ICT 0-17 (1/7/13 - 22/08/14)	Anti-social behaviour year end 2014	Childhood Obesity: Year 6 age 10-12	Mental health information (0-19)	Total Need Score
Shrewsbury-town wide	0.23	0.31	0.46	0.37	0.30	0.31	0.35	0.15	0.00	2.48
Oswestry	0.05	0.05	0.12	0.14	0.09	0.08	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.85
Market Drayton	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.05	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.18	0.00	0.73
Bishop's Castle, Chirbury, Worthen and Clun	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.40	0.59
Gobowen, Selattyn, St Martin's, and Weston	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.12	0.16	0.53
Whitchurch and surrounding area	0.05	0.03	0.09	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.00	0.47
Pontesbury, Minsterley, Longden, Ford, Rea	0.04	0.03	0.00	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.15	0.05	0.47
Ludlow and Clee area	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.33
Bridgnorth, Worfield, Alveley, Claverley & Br	0.06	0.07	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.31
Wem and Shawbury	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.00	0.29
Highley	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.08	0.22
Ellesmere	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.21
Tern & Severn Valley	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.04	0.20
St Oswald	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.20
Strettondale & Burnell	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.00	0.18
Cleobury and Rural	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.07	0.18
Five Perry Parishes	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.17
Craven Arms and Rural	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.17
Shifnal & Sheriffhales	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.13
Bayston Hill	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.09
Broseley and Rural	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.09
Albrighton	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.07
Much Wenlock and Shipton	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.04

The rurality funding was allocated separately based on the population of 10 to 19 year olds per square mile, with areas having less than 26 receiving funding.

Table 2 summarises how funding was allocated to individual LJC areas.

Table 2

LJC Area	Specific Needs Score	2016/17 funding allocation	
		£3,000 Rurality Allocation	Total Funding
Shrewsbury	2.48		£81,500
Oswestry	0.75		£24,640
Market Drayton	0.73		£24,060
Whitchurch	0.47		£15,580
Longden, Ford, Rea Valley and Loton	0.42	√	£16,630
Gobowen, Selattyn, St Martin's, and Weston Rhyn	0.37		£12,120
Ludlow and Clee area	0.33		£10,850
Bridgnorth, Worfield, Alveley and Claverley	0.31	√	£11,620
Wem and Shawbury	0.29	√	£12,450
Bishop's Castle, Chirbury, Worthen and Clun	0.19	√	£3,000
Strettondale and Burnell	0.18	√	£3,000
Ellesmere	0.17	√	£3,000
Five Perry Parishes	0.17		
Tern and Severn Valley	0.16	√	£3,000
St Oswald	0.15	√	£3,000
Craven Arms and Rural	0.15	√	£3,000
Highley and Brown Clee	0.14	√	£1,500
Shifnal and Sheriffhales	0.13		
Cleobury and Rural	0.11	√	£3,000
Bayston Hill	0.09		
Broseley and Rural	0.09		
Albrighton	0.07		
Much Wenlock and Shipton	0.04	√	£3,000

While the measures developed in 2014 in support of the allocation of needs funding are logical, the scoring methodology is more likely to deliver funding to areas of higher overall population, rather than to higher levels of relative need. This meant that funding was allocated where there was **more** need, rather than **higher** need.

Rurality funding did not necessarily correlate with need and in the main there is no strong evidence that funding has been spent on overcoming issues of rural isolation. It is also noteworthy that a number of “rurality” funding allocations relate to funding in areas that have historically not been directly supported by the Council to provide youth activities, and that have a reasonably well developed voluntary sector, supported by the Council’s infrastructure support provider.

Our review of existing funding suggests that where funding isn’t fully meeting local needs it tends to relate to established voluntary youth clubs, who are being supported with the purchase of equipment or to put on additional activities. We are not suggesting that the activities that this funding supports isn’t valuable, but we are questioning its direct impact on young people with identified needs.

Developing a new approach

In developing an alternative approach to allocating **needs funding** we have simplified our approach and used just two measures:

(1) Pupils who are in receipt of **Free School Meals** (FSM). This is an established proxy measure for deprivation used by the Department for Education to calculate Pupil Premium levels for schools.

To qualify for Free School Meals the parents or carers of pupils should be in receipt of one of the following:

- Income Support
- Income-based Jobseeker’s Allowance
- Income-related Employment and Support Allowance
- Support under Part VI of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999
- The guaranteed element of Pension Credit
- Child Tax Credit
- Working Tax Credit run-on
- Universal Credit

Pupils who get paid these benefits directly, instead of through a parent or guardian, can also get free school meals.

For information on free school meals in Shropshire and eligibility visit: <http://www.shropshire.gov.uk/free-school-meals/>

(2) The **number of 10-19 year old children** in each LJC area. To allow for population sizes difference in different LJC areas the FSM measure has been converted to rates per 1,000 young people. This is done by dividing the total number of children in an area by 1,000, then

using the resulting number as a denominator to divide the number for a given measure, FSMs in this case. This approach allows the relative need in each area to be compared as if they had equal populations.

Are Free School Meals and the relative number of 10 – 19 year olds the right measures?

We have brought this together in table 3.

Table 3

	10-19 Year Old Population	Number 10 - 19 on FSM	Rate per 1,000 - 19 on FSM	% of total rate per 10k	% of population	Average of 2 measures
LJC Area						
Albrighton	749	29	38.7	4.1%	2.2%	3.1%
Bayston Hill	501	16	31.9	3.3%	1.5%	2.4%
Bishop's Castle, Chirbury, Worthen and Clun	1215	50	41.2	4.3%	3.5%	3.9%
Bridgnorth, Worfield, Alveley, Claverley & Brown Clee	2312	98	42.4	4.4%	6.7%	5.6%
Broseley and Rural	546	25	45.8	4.8%	1.6%	3.2%
Cleobury and Rural	898	20	22.3	2.3%	2.6%	2.5%
Craven Arms and Rural	580	36	62.1	6.5%	1.7%	4.1%
Ellesmere	1298	50	38.5	4.0%	3.8%	3.9%
Five Perry Parishes	999	36	36.0	3.8%	2.9%	3.3%
Gobowen, Selattyn, St Martin's, and Weston Rhyn	1219	49	40.2	4.2%	3.5%	3.9%
Hghley	605	22	36.4	3.8%	1.8%	2.8%
Pontesbury, Minsterley, Longden, Ford, Rea Valley & Loton	1443	47	32.6	3.4%	4.2%	3.8%
Tern & Severn Valley	912	32	35.1	3.7%	2.6%	3.2%
Ludlow and Clee area	1535	81	52.8	5.5%	4.4%	5.0%
Market Drayton	2713	139	51.2	5.4%	7.9%	6.6%
Much Wenlock and Shipton	352	13	36.9	3.9%	1.0%	2.4%
Oswestry	1926	117	60.7	6.4%	5.6%	6.0%
Shifnal & Sherriffhales	799	34	42.6	4.5%	2.3%	3.4%
Shrewsbury-town wide	8153	508	62.3	6.5%	23.6%	15.1%
St Oswald	935	31	33.2	3.5%	2.7%	3.1%
Strettondale & Burnell	1469	25	17.0	1.8%	4.3%	3.0%
Wem and Shawbury	1797	70	39.0	4.1%	5.2%	4.6%
Whitchurch and surrounding area	1565	86	55.0	5.8%	4.5%	5.1%

In applying this approach we have disregarded any rurality weighting, and used a figure of 3.8% as a cut off (i.e. any areas with a combined total of 3.8% or greater receives needs funding). 12 areas would receive funding - Shrewsbury LJC scored the most and Longden, Ford, Rea Valley and Loton LJC the least. The next highest score is Shifnal and Sherriffhales LJC. 3.8% is the median figure within a range from 2.4% to 15.1%, and represents a logical cut off based on need and past Council support.

Where should the cut off for needs funding be; does 3.9% feel right?

Based on this assessment table 4 shows a suggested hierarchy for Council support for youth provision.

Table 4

LJC Area (in descending order of needs score)	Needs Funding 2014		Needs Funding Revised		
	Needs funding	No of youth clubs supported	Needs funding	Proposed no of youth clubs to be supported	Proposed funding £
Tier 1 – Partner delivery commissioned by Shropshire Council					
Shrewsbury	√	7	√	5	45,000
Market Drayton	√	2	√	2	18,000
Oswestry	√	4	√	2	18,000
Bridgnorth, Worfield, Alveley and Claverley	√	2	√	2	18,000
Whitchurch	√	2	√	2	18,000
Ludlow and Clee area	√	2	√	2	18,000
Tier 2 - Community partnership youth provision supported by Shropshire Council					
Wem and Shawbury	√	2	√	1	4,000
Craven Arms and Rural			√	1	4,000
Bishop's Castle, Chirbury, Worthen and Clun			√	1	4,000
Ellesmere			√	1	4,000
Gobowen, Selattyn, St Martin's, and Weston Rhyn	√	3	√	2	8,000
Longden, Ford, Rea Valley and Loton	√	2	√	1	4,000
Tier 3 – Community provision supported by Infrastructure Support provider					
Shifnal and Sheriffhales					
Five Perry Parishes					
Broseley and Rural					
Tern and Severn Valley					

St Oswald					
Albrighton					
Strettondale and Burnell					
Highley and Brown Clee					
Cleobury and Rural					
Much Wenlock and Shipton					
Bayston Hill					
Approximate no of areas receiving needs funding / Total no of clubs / Total funding	9 areas	26 clubs	12 areas	24 clubs	167,000

The net effect of this approach is a redistribution of funding away from some of the bigger towns across a greater number of LJC areas – Craven Arms, Bishops Castle and Ellesmere did not previously receive funding.

In allocating funding and establishing the value of the total funding pot we have overlain the need scores with local understandings based in particular on our assessment of:

- How many youth clubs / activities the Council should be supporting within each area - this is based on our experience over the past two years on the specific areas where Council support to create and sustain local activity is most needed.
- The cost for providing fully staffed youth clubs within the main market towns and for supporting community clubs within the smaller towns. We have worked on the basis of the following approximate costs, which have been informed by the Council's Infrastructure Support Provider partner:

Tier 1 clubs - The approximate cost for commissioning a single weekly term time only youth club is:

Staffing x3	£5,500
Accommodation	£2,000
Equipment & materials	£400
Insurance	£100
Management overheads x15%	£1,000
Total cost	£9,000

Tier 2 clubs – Based on weekly term time provision supported by a paid “leader in charge”, a local management committee, at least two local volunteers and local fundraising
Approximate cost **£4,000**

Clearly this approach is at best an estimate of the costs of managing activities within a youth club setting. It may be less if accommodation can be provided at a lower cost, sessions are reduced in length and or sessions can be managed with a smaller number of paid staff. On the other hand, it may be more if more paid staff are required, trips are organised or equipment is purchased.

Is the proposed hierarchy for council support for local provision helpful?

Does the suggested number of youth clubs in each LJC area feel about right?