

Annex A: Learning from the delivery and evaluation of BIG programmes

NOTE: If you are unfamiliar with Big Lottery Fund Youth focussed programmes it maybe useful to read Annex B first.

1. Learning from the delivery and evaluation of BIG programmes as most relevant to the *strategy for youth services review*

1.1 What is the current distribution of youth services and youth engagement activities available across the country?

Analysis of Big Lottery Fund data suggests that our funding supporting young people has good geographical coverage across England. A strong link is also shown in relation to deprivation at a local authority level.

The table marked as Annex D shows our funding by local authority for the following youth focussed Big Lottery Fund (and its legacy organisation, the New Opportunities Fund) Programmes in England:

- Out of school hours learning – term time and summer school projects
- Out of school hours learning/school sport co-ordinators
- Activities for young people
- Splash Extra
- New Opportunities for PE and Sport
- Do it for Real
- Positive Activities for Young People (PAYP).

The table is ranked by deprivation score and shows

- 28.2% of funding has gone to projects based in the 10% most deprived local authorities
- 50.2% to 20% most deprived
- 62.1% to 30% most deprived
- 69.4% to 40% most deprived
- 74.6% to 50% most deprived.

The table also shows funding per head of population. This continues to show a strong relationship with deprivation, so:

- in total our funding on these programmes has been £15.12 per person
- in the 10% most deprived local authorities it has been £25.50 pp.
- in the 20% most deprived, £23.90
- in the 30% most deprived, £21.78
- in the 40% most deprived, £20.02
- in the 50% most deprived, £18.45.

Not all our programmes have been allocated money according to a formula linked to deprivation, for example, Do it for Real funding was channelled through an award partner, Youth Hostel Association, who were expected to draw beneficiaries from

Big Lottery Fund submission to the HMT/DfES review of Children and Young People.

the whole country, but who were not given explicit targets. However a strong link to deprivation has been possible, in part, because of the way programmes have been designed. For instance PAYP funding was allocated to the government regions according to the index of multiple deprivation, crime and truancy figures. Funding for the Grants to Organisations strand of the Young People's Fund was allocated to regions on a 50/50 combination of the population of school age young people and the IMD.

1.2 Building on the Youth Green Paper, is there more that could be done to improve and sustain the effectiveness in the delivery of existing services and activities?

There is considerable investment in the young people's sector. Over the next 2-3 years, DfES money associated with Youth Matters, money supporting youth volunteering through V and the Big Lottery Fund, through its Young People's Fund, will invest over £300 million in projects that put young people first. This investment and the policy drive surrounding this agenda has stimulated a lot of demand. For example, the Big Lottery Fund received, in total, just over 160 applications to the National Grants strand of the YPF. Money was available to fund just under 30 of these projects. While some of these projects were early rejects, just under forty were projects (of an average value of £1m) that were considered good enough to be fundable. It is likely these projects will remain in the system until they find the resources to take forward their work. In addition, the Grants to Organisations strand of the YPF (which supports local projects up to £150K) has received approximately 3000 outline proposal forms expressing a project idea they would like to be funded, with approximately 1400 applications received. To date approximately 258 grants have been awarded. This indicates the demand in the sector.

BIG funding under the YPF must be committed by March 2009. Projects can run for up to 5 years. Beyond this, there is no guarantee of funding in this sector. If lessons are to be sustained, thinking needs to happen now about what will happen beyond 2009 when the three key funders outlined above will be tapering or ending their investment.

BIGs learning suggests that it is sustainability of outcomes that should be the key aim. In some cases this may mean thinking about how projects can become sustainable, in other cases, it will be about ensuring that mechanisms are in place to ensure sustainability of outcomes, such as the way projects and the sector works with young people.

1.3 What more can we do to support and enable young people to exert a strong demand side influence on provision?

One element of ensuring that young people have real influence over the services and activities available to them is to enable young people to become the decision makers, the designers and the evaluators of these services and activities as the Youth Matters agenda proposes. However if this is to happen successfully and be sustainable then organisations providing these services and activities have also got to change. They need to buy into the benefits of giving young people this level of control and understand that this means the traditional role of the adult needs to change, from that of providing the service, to the adult being the person that enables young people to take a lead. There needs to be recognition that this requires new

Big Lottery Fund submission to the HMT/DfES review of Children and Young People.

ways of working and a different set of skills. This capacity building issue needs to be addressed and the support and development contract (see Annex E) that BIG is letting alongside the YPF in 2007 will go some way to address this in the voluntary and community sector. We would be keen to continue dialogue about how the impact of this resource can be built on to have a wider and more sustained impact.

1.4 What principles and priorities should guide the allocation of current and future resources?

Funders need to try to be more joined up so the key funds in the area are working to similar/same outcomes – including those that sit under the Every Child Matters outcomes; There is a need to ensure there are enough incentives in the system to enable all the key providers - public, private and VCS - to build on their complementary strengths.

The Young People's Fund is only open to the voluntary and community sector to apply (although partnerships are encouraged this is not a condition of grant). We are aware that in spite of the strategic incentives for VCS and statutory providers to work together in delivering a 'local offer' the reality is that some local authority areas are better at bringing partners on board than others. While the experience of joined up working varies considerably, responses to our formal consultation in October 2004 highlighted that there is a desire for better joined up working at this level from both the VCS and the statutory sector.

We are currently in dialogue with DfES to see how we can help in creating stronger links between the VCS and local authorities through the guidance that will be issued to the latter related to their new statutory duty to co-ordinate services to young people. However we are very happy to think further about how we can help foster better co-ordination in the longer term, in particular through working more closely with DfES, DCMS and the Office of the Third Sector. The National Lottery Bill received Royal Assent in July 2006 and now gives BIG new powers to distribute non-lottery funding and loans – this is something we will begin to explore and are happy to discuss further with you.

1.5 What measures and milestones need to be in place to ensure that performance can be assessed and delivery monitored at a local level?

The Big Lottery Fund is an outcomes funder. This means that all our programmes for 2006-2009 has been developed in support of the following outcomes in England:

1. People having better chances in life, with better access to training and development to improve their lifeskills
2. Stronger communities with more active citizens, working together to tackle problems
3. Improved rural and urban environments, which communities are better able to access and enjoy
4. Healthier and more active people and communities.

The YPF will support any activities that have been identified by young people and aims to contribute to the achievement of the above outcomes. In addition, as

Big Lottery Fund submission to the HMT/DfES review of Children and Young People.

outlined in Annex B, YPF aims to help achieve the Every Child Matter Outcomes.

The experience of BIG indicates that, if outcomes are to be measured to make an assessment of achievement, a number of support mechanisms need to be in place. Projects need to understand what the outcomes are and the indicators of success that need to be measured, at the beginning of their projects. They then need the tools they can use to measure these outcomes. Targets, KPIs and grant management processes/key milestone reviews also need to talk in the language of outcomes.

To aid applicants in understanding an outcomes approach, we have produced a booklet 'Explaining the Difference'. This can be downloaded from our website: www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/explaining_the_difference.

We do not want to re-invent wheels. Projects will often argue that the tools do not exist for them to measure outcomes, in particular the softer outcomes. Often this is more of a reflection of capacity and skills and not lack of tools. Attached is a publication put together by the Big Lottery Fund that demonstrates that there are a vast number of self-evaluation guides available for projects to use (see http://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/er_eval_self_evaluation_uk.pdf). In addition, in supporting applicants to deliver the school sport co-ordinators programme, a number of tools and accompanying guidance were provided for projects to use to measure softer outcomes like self-esteem of young people – these are provided in Annex C.

As noted in Annex B, the support and development contract associated with phase 2 of the YPF will also support applicants in measuring against their outcomes. This is a five year investment not only for our grant holders but also into the wider sector. It is a resource that all projects seeking to engage young people should be able to draw on over 2007-2012. We would be more than happy to discuss further how the benefits of this support can be maximised to ensure delivery against outcomes and to secure longer term sustainability (see below). In Annex E we have attached a copy of the Invitation to Tender (which includes the scope of work, page 13-24) for this contract, which we aim to have in place by February 2007.

Finally, in keeping with the ethos of involving young people, BIG is also encouraging young people to take a lead role here on the assumption that young people are best placed to say whether a specific service or activity is meeting their needs. To date we have produced a small booklet '*Engaging young people in evaluation and consultation*' for projects¹. However we recognise that much work is still needed to ensure there are appropriate research methods that allow young people to take a lead and the transfer of these skills to projects. Again the support and development contract as outlined in Annex E will go some way in addressing this need.

1.6 What can be done to improve the ability of universal provision to identify and provide a service to those with greatest need?

Experience at the Big Lottery Fund indicates that activities need to be balanced so that they are open for all young people to access while at the same time meeting the

¹ This can be downloaded from www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/er_res_engaging_young_people_uk.pdf

Big Lottery Fund submission to the HMT/DfES review of Children and Young People.

needs of those with greatest need. As the evaluators of Splash Extra, Cap Gemini Ernst and Young² noted, this approach not only avoids the accusation of 'rewards for naughty boys [and girls]', but also avoids stigmatising young people who attend. In the context of Splash Extra, which was aimed at those most at risk of offending, such an approach also meant that the targeted young people had a non-offending peer group to associate with and previously unknown 'at risk' young people may be identified.

However, the danger of universal provision is that it is easier to miss the groups of young people that were particularly targeted. For example in Do it for Real (formerly Get Real), Splash Extra and the Out of School Hours Learning (OSHL) Programme³ the evaluators questioned how successful the programmes were at targeting those young people *most* at risk of offending and, in the case of OSHL, those *most* disadvantaged.

Therefore, if universal provision is to identify and provide an effective service to those with greatest need, then measures need to be in place to ensure that the effective targeting of young people takes place and that there is space and resources to also have high-intensity work with individuals where this is more suitable.

In Splash Extra, effective targeting was dependent on different agencies working together and ensuring appropriate referral into schemes. Some schemes appointed a specific referral co-ordinator whose job it was to work in partnership with a number of agencies to identify young people at risk; others employed detached/outreach workers who make contact with young people directly; while others used young people as mentors or buddies to help engage young people. The success or not of these approaches varied but success was enhanced where there was time built in to plan effectively and where good joint working between agencies was already established and could be built upon.

The Do it for Real programme aims to provide structured residential experiences during the school holiday period, targeting young people from a variety of backgrounds with the intention of increasing connections among young people from different social groups. Findings from the evaluation in 2004⁴ highlight the benefits for all young people involved, with a large proportion of participants reporting their experience in the programme led to mixing with a significant number of new people from different social backgrounds and having a better understanding of other young people that had an influence on their positive development. Providers were successful at recruiting young people from low-income backgrounds, but very few young people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds or at risk of offending took part in the programme.

Activities for Young People targeted school leavers who were at risk of social exclusion and of becoming out of touch with education, training and employment issues. A key finding in the evaluation of this programme⁵ was the need for providers

² *Delivering summer activities in high crime neighbourhoods: the intensive evaluation of Splash Extra 2002.* New Opportunities Fund, June 2003:RS007.

³ *Achievements and challenges in delivering Out of School Hours learning: final report.* Big Lottery Fund, 2004:Issue5.

⁴ *Get REAL: Evaluation summary report,* Big Lottery Fund 2005:Issue 13.

⁵ *Evaluation of the Activities for Young People Initiative: England, Northern Ireland and Wales.* Third Year Final Report for Big Lottery Fund. SQW Ltd. 2005.

Big Lottery Fund submission to the HMT/DfES review of Children and Young People.

to adopt successful strategies to deal with drop-out of participants in terms of more intensive one-to-one work, with tracking systems and follow-up with individuals outside of the structured activities on offer; but that a more universal approach to service provision and advertising the service would have been less stigmatising and more inviting for young people to remain engaged.

The Splash Extra, Do it for Real and Activities for Young People evaluations also highlight the importance of making expectations clear to providers of the balance between inclusivity and targeting that is being aimed for.

Having learned the lessons of these early programmes, the Young People's Fund expects all grant holders to ensure that while being open access to all young people, at least 40 % of their beneficiaries should come from disadvantaged groups.

1.7 Which projects and programmes in the last 5 years have had a proven and sustained impact and brought innovation to delivery of services for young people?

The Out of School Hour Learning programme has had a sustained impact. As noted by Crossman in *Building the future of learning: a guide to sustaining out of school hours learning* (2004: Big Lottery Fund) as a result of the OSHL programme, which made grants to activities to over 12,000 schools, there was a rapid increase in activities and OSHL moved from being a 'bolt on' feature in most schools to being a national programme, integrated into mainstream education policy and practice. Not only was the programme able to build on the early foundations set by DfES but it was followed by supporting policy structures (most recently the extended schools agenda) with targets at primary and secondary level and criteria in the Ofsted inspection framework⁶.

The above is a good example of how a number of structures, policy drivers and support mechanisms have to be in place over a sustained period of time in order to bring about a cultural change.

1.8 What evidence is there of the benefits that arise from young people's involvement in design and provision of their activities?

YPF has encouraged the active involvement of young people in both delivering the programme and through the projects that have been funded. Below is some the learning that has occurred to date:

Involving young people in the delivery of the programme

YPF has included young people in the decision-making process for grants:

In National Grants this involved having 3 young people on the Committee, recruited from the Camelot Foundation's 4front Awards national leadership and grant-making programme, as well as representatives of organisations specialising in supporting young people's participation in decision-making. These individuals supplemented a group of Board members with an interest in the YPF and in empowering young

⁶ Chapter 2 of *Building the future of learning* details the policy framework that has helped lay the foundations for OSHL

Big Lottery Fund submission to the HMT/DfES review of Children and Young People.

people more generally. Feedback on the performance of the Committee and the quality of its deliberations has been very positive.

In Grants to Organisations we built 9 regional committees around, in each case, 3 young people recruited from local Youth Banks, supplemented by representatives of statutory and VCS young people's services drawn from each region, plus, a member of BIG's existing regional VCS funding committee.

Youth Bank UK were recruited for their experience of supporting young people in grant-making. In addition to recruiting young people with appropriate skills, an important aspect of their role was to support young people and facilitate their involvement in the committee meetings. The level of support was deemed important, to ensure that young people's views were represented and that their confidence and capacity to make decisions of this kind was increased, adding value to the process.

The cost of providing facilitation for each bi-monthly meeting and support for the young people before and after was equivalent to a full-time post, plus overheads and travel costs.

An informal review of this approach suggests that it worked well where decision-making was meaningful – that is, there were difficult choices to be made - but was less successful when there were few good quality applications being considered by the committee and enough money to fund all the projects presented by officers.

We have also found that young people do need support of the nature that was provided by Youth Bank, to ensure that their involvement in such a committee-based decision making process meaningful and consistent, that young people were aware of their responsibilities, read the papers before the meeting and turned up.

A fuller review of young people's involvement in decision making is to take place at the end of this year. The results will be available in early 2007.

Involving young people in the projects we fund through the YPF

In providing guidance about involving young people, we said that projects have to involve young people during project development, project delivery and project evaluation. We said 'This means applicants need to demonstrate how the idea they are putting forward and the outcomes they hope to achieve have been led and guided by what young people want' and 'how applicants plan to involve young people throughout the lifetime of the project'.

Projects struggled to meet this criterion. Lack of meaningful involvement of young people from start to finish has been a key reject reason in the applications we have received under Young People's Fund. For example, in Round One of National Grants, of the 63 eligible applications received, a third (21) were not deemed fundable because they lacked adequate consultation or involvement of young people. This was the main reject reason. This picture is also reflected in Grants to Organisations. As of 30 November 2005, 799 (45%) outline proposal applications had been given a decision of 'unlikely to be funded'. Three of the main reasons for this decision were related to no or inadequate consultation with young people, making up around 23% of all reject reasons. Of the full applications that had been assessed, 131 (50%) were rejected early (that is, not presented to committee) and 22 (8%) rejected at committee. Again, one of the main early reject reasons was inadequate involvement of young people, accounting for 10%, of all early reject

Big Lottery Fund submission to the HMT/DfES review of Children and Young People.

reasons (the highest, at 11%, the inadequacy of the organisations child protection policy).

However, while projects have found meeting this criterion a challenge, it is also true to say that there was a lot of support for the young people participation element of the YPF. At a consultation event with key stakeholders, representing the young people sector, it was felt this criterion was making a positive change to the way the sector works with young people, and that this element of the YPF had added value to the funding landscape. There was also some early evidence from National Grants about what difference this criterion was making and applicants' attitude towards it: As one application stated:

This is the first time that XXX have developed a national bid with young people's involvement and we have found this a very positive, informative and salutary process. It has ensured that we are developing a project, which meets young people's needs and it is something that they want and will improve their lives.

This is not to say there is no room for improvement. Some felt it was important not to neglect those who work with particularly transient/hard to reach groups (for example homeless young people or those suffering from sexual abuse) and who may find these young people particularly difficult to involve. It was also pointed out that smaller organisations probably had fewer resources to change their practices. Another suggestion for improvement was that we should be clearer about what we meant by participation.

These issues are now going to be addressed through the support and development contract that we are commissioning (see Annex E).

2. Learning from the delivery and evaluation of these programmes as most relevant to the *review of disabled children*

2.1 In 1999, BIG launched the £220 million Out of School Hours Childcare programme. The programme complemented the Government's National Childcare Strategy, which (along with its equivalents in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales), set out to improve the quality, accessibility and affordability of childcare for children aged 0-14 (up to 16 for children with special needs). The programme did not specifically set out to target children with special needs or special educational needs. However, as part of the application process, we asked applicants to consider the needs of children with special and special educational needs (SN/ SEN) and encouraged them to create accessible childcare places. Subsequently BIG commissioned a piece of research to look at childcare for children with SN/SEN, to increase our understanding of SN/SEN provision and how it fitted with our Out of School Hours Childcare programme⁷. Key Findings of this research were:

- integrated childcare does not seem to be universal. Most SN/SEN children rely on specialist childcare providers;
- specialist providers are more likely to care for people with profound difficulties while non-specialist providers are more likely to care for children with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties;
- specialist providers offer a wide range of facilities for children with SN/SEN than other providers;
- Two thirds of clubs reported that they needed extra staff to be able to care effectively for children with SN/SEN;
- many clubs face similar staffing issues to those who offer regular out of school childcare including acute recruitment problems;
- suitable and sufficient training appears to be a particular concern for most clubs;
- the high cost of provision threatens the future viability of specialist providers.

⁷ *Childcare for children with special needs and special educational needs*, Big Lottery Fund. 2004: Issue 2.

3. Learning from the delivery and evaluation of BIG programmes as most relevant to the *review of High Cost, high Harm Families*.

3.1 The BIG Family Learning programme to be launched in September 2006 is highly relevant to addressing the cycle of low attainment, high cost and high harm. The programme will provide £40 million over 3 years to increase the opportunities for family learning and make these accessible to disadvantaged families who face particular barriers to participation in learning or to feeling confident to support their children. These might include teenage parents, fragmented families, unemployed parents with low levels of literacy, and those who have had very negative experiences of education.

The Family Learning programme will have beneficial impacts at individual, family and community level. The strength of a family learning approach is that it leads to improvements both in the skills of family members and in family dynamics, which then have a mutually reinforcing effect. A parent who is more confident about supporting their children's learning is more likely to develop their own skills or become a volunteer⁸.

⁸ There is evidence for this in Jackie Horne and Jeanne Haggart, NIACE, *The Impact of Adults' Participation in Family Learning*, a study based in Lancashire, June 2004. Of the parents who had participated in LSC family learning programmes, a third progressed to further learning and 20% became volunteers.