



Staffordshire Children's Trust
Working together to improve the lives of children and young people

Integrated Youth Support Service (IYSS)

Consultation December 2007 – 14 February 2008

Consultation Report

This document is a result of the IYSS Consultation held with staff and partners during the period December 2007 - 14 February 2008 and the wider Consultation through the Children's Trust Board. A total of three half day sessions were held with all staff and partners. An IYSS representative was also at the District Trust Board Meetings held in January 2008 – February 2008.

A detailed consultation questionnaire was prepared and all colleagues were invited to take part in the consultation.

This report provides a composite of the responses to the consultation document

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide an overview, background and summary on the IYSS Consultation Process in Staffordshire and to summarise the responses to the initial consultation phase.

To advise staff, partners and stakeholders of the next steps proposed next steps in developing Integrated Youth Support in Staffordshire.

Consultation Process

IYSS Consultation commenced in December 2007, following extensive work by the Project Board and Project Team.

It was explained in the presentation to support the IYSS Consultation Briefings that this initial consultation period commenced in December 2007 and will end on 14 February 2008.

The purpose of the Consultation is to share information on IYSS and how we may design an IYSS in Staffordshire. A paper was produced in December, 'Developing an Integrated Youth Support Service (IYSS) v 10 and this was made available to all staff and partners and was published on the Children's Trust Website. This document was compiled by the Project Board and Project Team which has representatives from all partners and stakeholders.

Invitation to respond to the Consultation Questions was made available for responses to be sent via email or in the post and this was co-ordinated by Staffordshire County Council.

All of the District Trust Board Chairs were contacted by letter in November 2007, to ask how they wanted to consult on IYSS and the offer of a representative from the Project Group to attend their board meetings in January – February 2008 was accepted by all.

In addition all Staff were invited to one of three half-day consultation sessions at Yarnfield Park Conference and Training Centre.

The purpose of these sessions was to update our position in the process and to give examples of how IYSS is developing in other local authorities. Members of the Project Board were at the sessions and a considerable amount of time was given to people answering certain key questions contained within the Consultation Document at facilitated tables. There was also the opportunity to share views and to post questions which were addressed in a document produced following the three sessions.

It must be noted and stressed that there will be ongoing consultation both with Young People, staff, partners and stakeholders.

The next consultation with Young People will take place in July 2008 at their six monthly conference/event.

Consultation Feedback

Response to the consultation has been low but positive. We have received 23 responses via email and five responses in the post.

The majority of feedback was received at the half day sessions. These sessions saw approximately 316 in attendance with representatives from Connexions, Youth Service, Youth Offending Team, Teenage Pregnancy, DAAT, SCYVS. Connexions made up 50% of attendees at the events.

Responses have been received by:

- SCVYS Co-ordinators
- Lichfield District Council
- Staffordshire Scouts
- Staffordshire Youth Service
- Be Together
- Connexions Staffordshire
- Children and Lifelong Learning Research Team
- High School
- Youth Service – East Division
- Unidentified Personnel
- Individual responses

Summary

It is clear from the responses and the consultation sessions that there is broad consensus support for both approaches as described in the consultation document. Naturally there have been concerns raised over both approaches and they are detailed later in this document. These issues or points of detail will need to be addressed in developing IYSS in Staffordshire as any option presents many opportunities and significant challenges.

In particular we need to acknowledge the need to further consult with Young People.

Next Steps

This initial consultation process has begun and the briefings have encouraged everyone to engage with this process and to provide up to date information on the progress of the development of IYSS in Staffordshire.

At the end of this initial consultation process the Project Board will consider all responses and make this document available on the Children's Trust Website.

The amount of information collected from this initial consultation has been vast and varied. It is therefore pertinent that this document and the individual response sheets are used alongside the transition plan to shape the delivery of IYSS in Staffordshire.

A paper on IYSS in Staffordshire is due to go to Cabinet in April 2008.

Summary of responses to Consultation Questions in the Consultation Document Version 10

A summary of the response to each question can be found below. A full report of detailed responses to the consultation questions can be made available upon request.

1. Is there anything the IYSS should be delivering for young people which is not currently reflected in the key aims? If so, please clearly identify what this is.

Key Aim 1:

The provision of services to young people should be more than just services; rather it is to provide 'Positive Activities'

Key Aim 2:

This is right but not complete. The provision of activities needs to encompass all opportunities, so that the maximum level of activities can be delivered at the minimum cost. The solution is wider than just the use of buildings, it is the wider use of all facilities.

Key Aim 3:

This is really part of Key Aim 1 on the provision of positive activities. The consultation paper does not reference the important role that employers will play in the delivery of work related skills and support for positive progression of young people through both universal and targeted offer. Employer engagement beyond community involvement needs to be better reflected in the narrative.

Key Aim 4:

This is fine.

General comments:

There is a missing aim to deliver TYS – 'to provide better and more personalised intensive support for all young people who are in greatest need and at risk of poor outcomes'. This should be listed as a separate, clear key aim.

A general theme here is around Young People. Have we asked Young People what they want and is this what they need? The comment has been raised; do these key aims reflect what adults and government want?

2. Are there any further benefits to Approach One which have not been identified in the document? If so, please clearly describe what they are.

- See table at the end of this document

3. Are there any further challenges to Approach One which have not been identified in the document? If so, please clearly describe what they are.

- See table at the end of this document

4. Are there any further benefits to Approach Two which have not been identified in

the document? If so, please clearly describe what they are.

- See table at the end of this document

5. Can you identify any further challenges to Approach Two which have not been identified in the document? If so, please clearly describe what they are.

- See table at the end of this document

6. On the continuum is there any other approach that could deliver IYSS in Staffordshire?

In general the overall response to this was that we need Approach Two and we could start off at any point on the continuum. Approach Two offers a more challenging but potentially more rewarding route consistent with community empowerment and local flexibility. It may be best to start off with a light touch approach and plan to move to a fully integrated model.

A mid point on the continuum would be workable in terms of governance and structure, with the commitment of the strategic managers of partner organisations. There would be an agenda for synergy of change within a specified timescale. We need a faster and clearer change than Approach One whilst providing a slower but more aligned and sustainable change than Approach Two.

7. What other methods could be developed of delivering integrated services in localities?

Many responses commented on the fact that co-location of teams and the pooling of resources was a positive move. There are numerous specific methods detailed in the responses. Themes are listed below:

- Schools and extended schools
- One stop shops
- Jobs Bus
- Home visits
- Leisure settings
- Catalogue of services
- Integration on a geographical basis
- Children's Centres
- Libraries

What are the key management decisions to be made to develop integrated services in districts?

Identifying local need (now and projected future) and configuring District IYSS teams accordingly (so not one size fits all), with resources allocation proportionate to support this.

Accessibility of services to YP and where they want them, maybe making better use of faculties within local government buildings.

Key themes:

- Governance and Accountability
- Staff training
- Communications
- Needs analysis by district

- Involve YP in the decision making process
- Clear responsibilities and boundaries
- Facilities
- Business Plan
- Appointment of a project manager – key stakeholders, workstreams (identification of) – limit duplication of workstreams
- HR

9. Do you have any comments on governance arrangements for Approach One or Approach Two? (Please clearly identify which approach you are referring to)

Approach One:

See table at the end of this document

Approach Two:

See table at the end of this document

10. Do you have any views on how the approaches identified could improve outcomes for young people?

There are some generic themes that have come out of the consultation:

- Duplication would be avoided in terms of resources.
- Approach Two – favourable option. Can only improve the standing of YP in Staffordshire. It is also a faster process, things will get done quicker, up to date contact with networks and a better awareness of the services available. It is also a more holistic approach allowing 'prevention' approach.
- One point of entry for YP.
- Communication would be improved, due to fewer bodies being concerned, should lead to faster, more effective response and more unified approach to development. This would aid information sharing and referral.
- Improved outcomes for YP by the use of a targeted approach with Approach Two.

A fully integrated service should result in less 'back office' and management structure (and premises) costs allowing more time to be utilised to the benefit of YP.

Are there any key actions that have been overlooked in the timeline?

There is such a varied response to this that key points raised have been directly copied;

- Open discussion with Young People.
- Consultation with schools and parents – this has not happened.
- Timescales not realistic. The timeline is vague and unrealistic – change of this scale will take 2-3 years to achieve.
- Facilities for recreational activity are poor – no meaningful investment in the county – why is more use of school facilities still not being made?
- We have to ensure the inclusion agenda is not dominant and to the detriment of the 90% - the universal service matters and schools matter in this respect.
- Concern about the damage to Connexions. We should look at the Cheshire Model where Connexions is the lead body.
- We do not mention Mental Health.
- What about Neighbourhood Wardens, PCSOs.
- Good to see a clear focus on impartiality.
- Is this all about saving money or getting the best value out of the funding we have.

- Need to define LDD – who is in/out of this definition – causes issues now so needs to be addressed for IYSS.
- Why have we not visited more LA's.
- Review of the Implementation.
- The timeline is very useful, but could include; Reposition the Launch Event from October 2008 to February/March 2008 to coincide with communications on IYSS. Increase time for communicating or add further communication to ensure stakeholders are aware and/or engaged this is a major task and not to be underestimated). Include evaluation in the timeline – unclear whether the consultations are with service users, the workforce or both. Consultation can inform an evaluation of progress.

12. What age range should the new integrated youth service cover?

- a) **13 to 19 year olds (up to 25 for young people with learning difficulties or a disability and those leaving Local Authority care).**

Or should it be extended to cover:

- b) **11 and 12 year olds (as eleven is a key transition year for children moving into secondary education)**
 c) **From age 8 upwards (some authorities are taking this approach)**

In general most people favoured the 11-19 year old age range with the ability to extend up to age 25 for people with learning difficulties, a disability or leaving Local Authority Care. This also will give a fit with the current transition to secondary school at 11 and recognises the changes in staying in learning age (17 and 18) by 2015.

Age 8 upwards caused concern over lack of resources and the philosophy and activities offered to children is and should be different to that offered to teenagers.

Six people opted for age range 13-19, 37 people opted for age range 11-19 and 28 people opted for age range 8-19. This is where individuals specifically stated an age range.

As a new approach should the Integrated Youth Support Service have a new name that reflects both the partnership base and the range of services?

In general the consensus of opinion from people was to change the name and get the young people to decide what the service should be called and a logo is also favourable, seeking marketing advice. IYSS is not an acronym that people favoured and it does not sound user friendly. Connexions and the Youth Service had reservations around a name change as they wanted to keep their branding as it is known and positive. Comments and concerns over cost of re-branding and advertising are noted.

This table covers responses to questions: 2, 3 & 9

Approach One		
Further Benefits	Further Challenges	Governance Arrangements – Comments
<p>To deliver the IYSS agenda in Staffordshire a clear responsibility that encompasses the whole county is needed. Splitting into districts will not give a single co-ordinated approach which is the aim of IYSS. This is the only practical approach. This approach would enable us to gain a more considered perspective and working understanding of IYSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single County Approach • Seamless transition • Opportunity to fully engage other partners in working towards a truly integrated approach • Allows for political change • Young People – reap the benefits with less communication and they will not see any major change • Easier to implement • Job retention • Allow greater focus on process rather than structure • Potential to offer a vision that is better informed and more aligned to the needs of the client groups. • Less threatening to staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not engaging all partners • No different to what happens now • Lack of consistency between partners • Does not offer the luxury of a quick fix • Duplication in terms of work and effort • Less opportunity for staff development • Opportunity for staff to revert to old ways of working • Inconsistency in Service Delivery • Continuity of service • Allows separate philosophies to hinder and linger 	<p>This approach causes concerns over who would sit on the IYSS Board and not everyone would be equal in the delivery and the strategy of the service. It could also be seen that there may be an element of ‘conflict’ as various managers vie for their aspect of work to take a degree of precedence. In delivering this approach the IYSS Board may find it difficult to implement and strategies.</p>

The table covers responses to questions: 4,5 and 9

Approach Two		
Further Benefits	Further Challenges	Governance Arrangements – Comments
<p>It is seen that this approach will bring a new identity for the Youth Service, a fresh start. Whilst this will bring short term disruption in the longer term there will be clarity of purpose. This approach will have a more robust management structure and through this we will be able to respond to needs, whatever they are and wherever they may occur. Common agendas and better joint working would be to the benefit of young people. Shared resources will enable us to know more about what other services do and there will be more people trained to deliver a wider ranging service. The issues regarding data sharing would also be resolved.</p>	<p>It must be noted that SCVYS is an independent registered Charity with its own Board of Trustees, and therefore could not automatically move into a central IYSS Board. Potential 'buy in' from other partners and agencies who sit outside the arena of young support with the assumption that the IYSS was being 'done unto them' rather than fully engaging them in the evolving service. This approach will obviously take longer to implement and therefore this could result in staff morale being lowered over this period. It could also be seen that we have to increase costs in the short term before any savings are made.</p> <p>It is quite clear that this approach needs to be carefully managed with a clear business plan and clear and accepted processes. This would enable existing staff to be integrated into a new delivery structure, ensuring that staff are left feeling motivated and 'bought in'.</p> <p>In delivering this approach we need to be mindful that whilst leading to a 'focused provision' it could be seen to be focusing on</p>	<p>Once again responses indicate that this is the favourable approach as it is a clearer model with clear responsibilities and accountabilities. It is a Young Person centred approach and is more likely to achieve improved outcomes. Partners are more likely to sign up to shared targets. However this approach is clearly going to provide the greatest challenge in bringing together what are currently three separate and autonomous arrangements.</p>

	<p>'negative provision' and not positive provision', therefore alienating some young people from the service.</p> <p>It is essential to differentiate between strength of intent and appropriateness of policy. The commissioning of services may produce a gradual decline in service quality.</p> <p>There is concern over the timescale to implement and what factors over time may affect delivery in the future.</p>	
--	---	--