Agenda Item No: **12**

CITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON COUNCIL	Cabinet Meeting 24 February 2016		
Report title	HeadStart Wolverhampton Submission of Phase 3 Funding Bid to Big Lottery		
Decision designation	AMBER		
Cabinet member with lead responsibility	Councillor Val Gibson Children and Young People		
Key decision	Yes		
In forward plan	Yes		
Wards affected	All		
Accountable director	Viv Griffin, Disabilities and Mental Health Mark Taylor, Director Finance		
Originating service	HeadStart		
Accountable employee(s)	Kevin Pace Tel Email	HeadStart Program 01902 556817 <u>kevin.pace@wolve</u>	-
Report to be/has been considered by	•		18 January 2016 26 January 2016

Recommendation(s) for action or decision:

The Cabinet is recommended to:

1. Delegate authority to the Cabinet member for Children and Young People in consultation with the Strategic Director People and the Service Director – Disability and Mental Health to agree the phase three funding submission to Big Lottery by 26 February 2016.

1.0 Purpose

- 1.1 City of Wolverhampton Council is one of 12 HeadStart partnerships across the UK which were successful in securing £500,000 from Big Lottery in July 2014 to run a series of test and learn pilot programmes to test new ways of supporting children and young people aged 10-14 and their families to promote positive mental well-being and resilience building. The age-range was increased to 10-16 by Big Lottery in the summer of 2015. The focus of Headstart is on early intervention and prevention of mental ill health. The programme has worked intensively with 21 schools across the city (including primary, secondary and special schools) and a range of voluntary sector organisations.
- 1.2 A bid for extension funding of £406,000 was approved by Big Lottery in the Summer of 2015 in order for HeadStart Wolverhampton to extend the phase two pilot programme for the current academic year until 31 July 2016, and to build capacity within the Wolverhampton partnership in order to prepare its phase three proposals for further funding from July 2016 to July 2021.
- 1.3 Big Lottery is currently inviting phase three bids from the 12 HeadStart Partnerships to roll out the phase 2 pilot. These will range from £6m £10m. The final submission deadline for phase three proposals is 26 February 2016.

2.0 Background

2.1 The overarching aim of HeadStart Wolverhampton during its phase two delivery (and extension to 31 July 2016) has been to test ways in which the traditional tiers one and two of CAMHS (children's and adolescents mental health services) can be extended and adapted through innovative methods to raise the profile of mental well-being, break the stigma of mental health amongst young people, parents and communities, educate and up skill young people with coping strategies, and provide access to early support when and where it is required. The current phase two delivery programme therefore has a number of different work streams at different stages of their life cycle, and all are in the process of being evaluated in order to inform the thinking for phase three.

Within schools two mental wellbeing resilience programmes have been adopted SUMO (Stop Understand and Move On) and PRP (Pennsylvanian Resilience Programme) and 2366 children have benefited from the resilience training. There have been some powerful successes in terms of benefits to these children and these have been formally evaluated by a team from Wolverhampton University (See appendix 1: Summary of Evaluation Report). In addition 1145 young people have engaged in voluntary sector commissioned activities including Gazebo (Kuumba Arts) 'A Place to Be Me', Changing Lives 'Girls Can Do' Base 25 'Satellite Project', Inspiring Futures 'Creative Family Craft and Play Sessions' plus digital and radio broadcasting projects.

2.2 The preparation for HeadStart Wolverhampton's phase three bid began in September 2015 and has been led by the Programme Manager, supported by a comprehensive project delivery plan. The bid has been subject to wider consultation and input from the HeadStart Executive Group, Partnership Board, service specialists, professionals, Big

This report is PUBLIC [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

Lottery Consultants, the young people's writing group and other key partners. The Headstart Partnership Board has overseen the phase two pilot and its progress and has driven the development of the Phase three bid. The close multi agency working across schools, Wolverhampton University, voluntary sector, social care, health and the police has been one of the key successes of Headstart. The Headstart Partnership Board has been shadowed throughout its duration by the 'Headstarters' who are a group of children and young people who have continuously engaged in the programme and provided us with a rich source of young people's opinions and helped us to shape the entire programme. The detail of the bid has been captured under a set of headings outlined by Big Lottery (see appendix 2 HeadStart Bid Structure). Within the bid is a detailed Programme Design Proposal that covers key themes including:

- Voluntary sector engagement
- Core programme governance costs
- Young people and family engagement
- Digital Technology
- A Specialist Support Team / School Support Services
- Events and Place to Go inreach and outreach (HeadSpace)
- 2.3 Partners are required by Big Lottery to submit proposals which meet a minimum bar, including a 'confidence' test in key areas including strategy and outcomes; leadership; governance; engagement; and sustainability. The phase three bid will focus on four geographic areas:
 - A. Low Hill, The Scotlands and Bushbury South
 - B. Springfield, Heath Town , Park Village, Old Heath / Eastfield
 - C. Bilston East
 - D. All Saints, Blakenhall, Parkfields and Ettingshall

These areas have been identified through detailed needs analysis undertaken by public health colleagues and CAMHS commissioners. The programme will continue to focus on the test and learn ethos of what works best in terms of promoting children's mental health wellbeing.

Phase three will cover significant breadth in terms of geographic coverage and will impact upon approximately 6500 children based in 25 schools plus participants of commissioned activity through the voluntary sector. Its depth will focus on universal services, universal plus services and targeted interventions. Universal services will include: commissioned activity, multi-agency working and school-based activity. Universal Plus services will include single point of contact and a Peer Support Programme. Targeted Services will include regular contact with trained HeadStart staff, CYRM (Children's Youth Resilience Measure) screening and a wraparound programme for parents and carers.

The submission of the written bid will be followed by interviews and presentations to England Committee and Big Lottery during late April to early May, with a decision at the beginning of June.

This report is PUBLIC [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

2.4 A process of continuous assessment is also in place whereby Big Lottery's Relationship Manager and other senior staff are maintaining a watching brief over HeadStart activity, including attending Partnership Board meetings and regular meetings with the Programme Manager and Strategic Lead, which is designed to assess the strength of leadership and management, strategic approaches, delivery and young people engagement and involvement in order to make recommendations to Big Lottery's England Committee, which is the final decision-maker for phase three.

3.0 Financial implications

- 3.1 The current HeadStart funding of £906,000 covers the period until 31 July 2016. Monitoring of the current budget and preparation of the projected phase three bid is being carried out with colleagues in Finance.
- 3.2 Possible additional funding of up to £10 million for the period 2016 to 2021 is dependent on the successful award at phase three by Big Lottery Fund. This funding programme will taper over the period with the aim that it becomes self- sustaining by the end of the five year period. [GS/12012016/Q]

4.0 Legal implications

- 4.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.
- 4.2 The activities described in this report meet the requirements of the terms and conditions of the Big Lottery grant. The phase three proposals would see significant sums of money being committed to the voluntary and community sector, schools and other organisations and the Council's Procurement team is supporting the preparation of the implementation plans for phase three. [TC/13012016/A]

5.0 Equalities implications

- 5.1 The HeadStart equality analysis shows that there are no adverse impacts to a continuation and development of the existing programme, and that HeadStart could assist in eliminating discrimination, advancing equality and fostering good relations amongst people belonging to a protected characteristic.
- 5.2 HeadStart Wolverhampton has an equalities group of Council professionals, including members of the Equalities Team, and this group acts as a critical friend to the Programme Manager and the HeadStart Partnership Board. The Group is involved in supporting the determination of priority groups within the phase three target population.

6.0 Environmental implications

6.1 None

7.0 Human resources implications

- 7.1 HeadStart staff and contractors are all subject to contracts and agreements which do not place any liability on the council beyond the current phase two end date of 31 July 2016.
- 7.2 Current staff contracts will be extended and new staff appointed to posts included in the resources plan submitted to Big Lottery if phase three funding is awarded.

8.0 Corporate landlord implications

8.1 HeadStart currently occupies Council premises at Shaw Road. Appropriate notice of future occupation intentions will be provided from May 2016 when the Big Lottery has made its decision about Wolverhampton's phase three funding bid.

9.0 Schedule of background papers

9.1 None

Appendix 1: Summary of Evaluation Report

The findings summarised here are a for the most part, a synthesis of findings from both primary schools (SUMO) and secondary schools (PRP) though some findings pertain to specific programs where applicable:

- Both staff and pupils responded positively to the programs and both programs were seen as a useful addition to the work and life of the schools. There were some initial concerns around the amount of content (PRP) and the challenges of delivery against timetabling and curriculum demands.
- Pupils reported initial apprehension (PRP) but becoming increasingly positive as the program progressed and any anxieties were quickly overcome. Pupils found the language very accessible (SUMO) giving them a shared vocabulary for talking about emotions and responses to difficult/challenging situations. The adoption of a shared language arising from both PRP and SUMO was reported as an indicator of success regarding whether programs had become embedded in the life of the school.
- Pupils were better able to deal with challenges they face and there was a tangible improvement in terms of pupil behaviour.
- There was a noticeable increase in the capacity of pupils to draw on resources/strategies that support and sustain well-being and resilience. Pupils understood the objectives of the programs and recognised the positive influence the programs had upon attitudes and behaviours.
- For PRP pupils, the benefits of sharing experience were significant and reported as being very powerful in encouraging alternative perspectives and increasing tolerance and understanding.
- Staff-to-pupil and pupil-to-pupil relationships had seen a marked improvement thereby increasing social capital.
- Pupils reported significant personal gains from the programs: improved social relationships, capability to manage friendships more effectively, ability to manage personal behaviour and positive impact upon academic learning and achievement.
- Both pupils and Key members of staff (KMS) felt programs were sustainable given adequate numbers of trained staff, which would enable wider roll out of the programs. Sustainability would also be enhanced through reach beyond the school to parent/carers and communities.
- Schools reported innovative ways of adapting both SUMO and PRP delivery to respond to schools individual needs. Some schools drew on external resources and outside agencies to support program delivery and all pupils could independently draw on skills and techniques whilst at school. However, few pupils used such techniques beyond the school environment.
- Concurrent across KMS and pupils regarding Main Significant Changes was improved pupil behaviour and ability to deal with the challenges they may face. Other MSC included: increased confidence, improved decision-making skills, increase in self-esteem and improved stress management and reflective skills.

Appendix 2: HeadStart Bid Structure

The HeadStart phase three funding submission will be set out using the following headings as per Big Lottery's requirements:

HeadS	HeadStart Phase 3 – Bid Application Section Headings		
1.	Executive Summary		
2.	History of HeadStart Wolverhampton		
3.	Description of Wolverhampton A. Geography B. Population C. Key strengths / assets D. Particular challenges E. Young people needs analysis F. Implications for HeadStart Demographic		
4.	Overview of Phase 2 Partnership composition: A. Who B. Governance arrangements C. Overview of activity to date D. What E. Scale F. Impact G. Lessons learned		
5.	 Changing context A. Geography 5.1. Population phase 2: B. Further retrenchment of services C. CAMHS transformation 		
6.	HeadStart Phase 3: A. Mission B. Target Population C. Young People D. Where E. Adults F. Outcomes G. Programme design H. Client journey I. Digital elements		

HeadStart Phase 3 – Bid Application Section Headings
 7. Governance and Programme Management A. Governance B. Org structure Description of different bodies C. Programme management arrangements D. Programme Lead
 7.1. Other central delivery roles: A. Project management B. Youth engagement C. Impact (performance management, evaluation) D. Digital E. Communications
 8. Sustainability A. Sustainability strategy B. Sustainability safeguards: i. Type of interventions ii. Governance iii. Matched funding already brought in
 9. Youth engagement A. Describe activities to date B. Provide tangible evidence of how young people have shaped the decisions described here above C. Describe how young people will continue to be engaged after award
10.Implementation plan A. High level implementation plan with key milestones B. Key risks and mitigation
11. Finance - high level budget