

Appraisal application form for Interaction NMP Board

A Summary and basic information

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------------|---------|
| 1. Title of proposal | Inclusion Ventures Ltd-Young People's Project Extension of service provision in Jaywick/continuation of funding 2008/09 | | |
| 2. Date submitted | 22 July 2008 | | |
| 3. Summary of proposal (max 150 words) i.e. what does the proposal involve and what will it achieve? | | | |
| <p>Inclusion Ventures is a charity currently working in the deprived communities of West Clacton and Jaywick. There is an identified lack of provision for children and young people within these areas and we have received some funding to work with those children and young people engaged in anti-social behaviour and criminality, as a means to divert them from these behaviours, encourage and model positive behaviours to get them back into education, training or employment and therefore improve their well being and that of their communities.</p> <p>We currently provide 2 drop-in/youth club type sessions in Golf Green Ward. One in Brooklands at the Resources Centre and the other at Crossways at the Methodist Church. We also have a sports based session at Crossways Park and do extensive outreach work at other times. We also run Girls Only sessions which is a group based work programme working with other agencies looking at identity, health, safety and aspirations of young women from deprived areas.</p> <p>Our proposal seeks to extend our current provision in Brooklands and Grasslands from one session a week to 3 sessions in order to improve the quality and quantity of our engagement with young people and specifically to intensify our work with individuals involved in anti-social behaviour. The additional provision will be sufficiently flexible in order to respond to local needs and conditions and so will consist of drop in and generic activity sessions as well as outreach work. The funding from the Interaction Partnership will contribute to our organisation's annual operating costs.</p> | | | |
| 3. How much will the proposal cost in total? | | | |
| | From NM | From other sources | Total |
| Capital | | | |
| Revenue | £15,000 | £50,000 | £65,000 |
| Total | £15,000 | £50,000 | £65,000 |
| 4. Organisation responsible | | | |
| Name of contact and position | Andrew Mowle Administrator | | |

| | |
|---------|--|
| Address | 12 Crown Road, Clacton-on-Sea, Essex. CO15 1AT |
| Phone | 01255 426560 |
| e mail | agmiem@aol.com |

B The proposal

1. What is the problem you are trying to address?

Set out the problems and causes, using statistics and evidence where available – referring to the delivery plan and its targets and outcomes

From residents surveys and consultation with agencies and community representatives there is an identified lack of engagement with young people in the Jaywick area.

This project seeks to redress that provision by the development and implementation of programmes which encourage children and young people, particularly those who are or at risk of engaging in anti-social behaviour and criminality to divert them from these behaviours, get them back into and encourage and model positive behaviours.

Funding has been awarded by Fair Share Trust for core costs of our work in West Clacton but this has had to be reduced from previous years because of constraints on their available funds. From our experience elsewhere we have identified a shortfall in provision in the number of sessions we currently run at Jaywick Resources Centre. Although progress has been made on improving the attitudes and behaviours of the youngsters we need to increase from the single session we run on a Wednesday night to an additional further two sessions on other days. We need to make a greater impact on the lives of the troubled young people in the Brooklands and Grasslands area.

2. Proposal objectives?

List the objectives for the proposal (these should be measurable) which can be used to evaluate the impact of the project

Our proposals seeks to;

- Increase the number of young people accessing our services in Brooklands and Grasslands
- Improve our service offer by increasing the number of activity sessions in Brooklands and Grasslands.
- Reduce offending rates by young people deemed to be at risk or engaged in anti-social behaviour (asb)

This will be measured by;

- Increased Drop-in sessions at Jaywick Resources Centre
- Increased activity sessions, including sports programmes
- Increased outreach work.
- Numbers of children and young people attending each session
- Service user (young people) feedback and evaluation
- Reduction in youth offending rates of those known to be engaged in asb (info supplied by the Youth Offending Team)

3. How do you propose to address the problem?

List the activities and set out who will benefit.

The project will provide additional drop-in sessions and more outreach work at Jaywick and benefit approx. 50 children and young people and their families by providing a catalyst for the young people to become included into the community and return to education, training and eventually employment.

4. How does this proposal address the problem. List activities and describe evidence from similar initiatives if possible.

Case histories from our work in Jaywick:-

1. S. is 16 yrs old and living in Jaywick with his parents. He has few qualifications from school and has not been involved in any training since leaving school. The detached/outreach workers have engaged with him and signposted him to a local Princes Trust scheme providing life guard training. He has since got employment in a local holiday park and taken up the opportunity to take on further training in sports coaching, with the desire to volunteer with Inclusion Ventures and work with the younger service users.
2. T. is 13 yrs old and has always lived in Brooklands. The family have moved regularly as their circumstances have necessitated renting from unscrupulous landlords and their house was once fire bombed. T is regularly excluded from school and spends his time on the streets, returning home only to sleep. He is always hungry when seen and will try to steal food from the Centre. His behaviour is aggressive, risky and he starts fires and uses drugs. Our relationship with him is still in its early stages but our workers are the first from any agency to engage with him. Like many children from dysfunctional backgrounds he is crying out for boundaries to be set and for someone to trust. Our workers are developing that trust and supporting him to manage his aggressive behaviour, learn about the impact drugs are having on his life and developing links with the fire service to tackle his tendency to arson.
3. P. is 11yrs old and born in Thailand but now lives in Jaywick. He attends school regularly and is doing well academically. He is however, struggling to make friends and his mother is reluctant to let him play out after school. P's mother speaks very little English and both she and P experienced significant amounts of racism where they lived previously and it has made her very protective. Our workers at the sports sessions on Crossways Park have established a relationship with them and he has now made friends and is an active attendee at the sessions.
4. E. is 16yrs old and has been in the SAAIF programme as a witness to domestic violence. We have taken her into the Girls Programme and will continue working with her. E has witnessed domestic violence, served time in prison for violence and is currently in a violent relationship (both sides). Over the past few months that she has been accessing our services are the only times she has ever kept appointments whether court ordered or voluntary and she is now beginning to open up to our workers and talk about the issues in her life and knows she needs to address.
5. N was featured as our case study in March 2007. At that point we had only been working with her for 3 months. Looking back on that case study is like reading about a stranger now. N has transformed. She is no longer aggressive-she is kind, supportive and encouraging to the younger children. She is focussed on getting training, realistically accepting that she still has things to learn and change about herself.

We have taken her on as a Volunteer, giving her the opportunity to take on more responsibility and a leadership role. She would say that she is struggling with this but staff and service users all agree that she is doing really well. Although the final count has not been made yet we know that many of her peers have voted for her to receive July's Jack Petchey Achievement Award.

For us, what demonstrates most clearly the progress she has made is her response to her brother going to prison. This has brought a great deal of stress to the family. She has made a massive shift from believing that her family should not be punished for what they do, to believing that her brother should and must go to prison for a terrible crime.

Not only has she stopped using cannabis and alcohol but she has also become the most vocal in promoting the anti-drugs message. She willingly uses herself as an example, pointing out that people that she respects having faith and patience in her has done more for her than drugs ever did.

5. Community involvement

How have residents been involved in developing the proposal?

In residents surveys they have identified that activities & facilities for children and young people are required in the Jaywick area and our project has been formulated to respond to this.

6. Management arrangements?

Describe the arrangements for ensuring the proposal is managed, monitored and delivered as planned. Please give names of two references or referees (people that you've worked with before) that we can contact in advance of the appraisal process.

The project will be managed and implemented by Andrew Mowle our administrator who has many years experience in handling and managing projects. Regular monitoring reports are completed on all of our sessions and data gathered on all our actions to ensure that they are being delivered in accordance with our stipulated service contracts, working briefs and comply with all statutory legislation.

Regular reports are made to all our funders and Trustees to ensure financial targets and outcomes are met and on time and in accordance with the project proposal.

Referees.

1. Caroline Taylor

Programmes Manager

Essex Community Foundation

121 New London Road, Chelmsford. CM2 0QT

2. Catherine Jameson

Connexions

Essex County Council

County Hall, Room C326

Market Road, Chelmsford. CM1 1QH

7. Risks

| Risk | Impact | Likelihood Low /Medium / High | Importance Low /Medium / High | Contingency and/or mitigation actions |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Initial implementation or build risks for the project | | | | |
| Loss of venues for sessions | No indoor sessions can be held | Low | High | Outreach work would continue |
| Loss of sessional workers | Reduction in sessions | Low | Medium | Core workers would increase hours to cover |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Risk | Impact | Likelihood Low /Medium / High | Importance Low /Medium / High | Contingency and/or mitigation actions |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Ongoing risks if objectives are not met | | | | |
| The nature of the work is long term and the numbers of children and young people needing the services will be there for the foreseeable future | Increased levels of anti-social behaviour and crime | Low | High | Core funding has been secured for the next 3 years and funding bids are constantly being made. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

C Finances

1. What is the total cost of the proposal?

Itemise the total spend as much as possible and set out the period this will cover, indicating what proportion is required from NM

| | item | £ year 1 [**6 month] | £ year 2 | £ year 3 | Total |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Capital (NM) | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Revenue (NM) | £15,000 | £15,000 | | | £15,000 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Total (NM) | £15,000 | £15,000 | | | £15,000 |
| Other funding | £50,000 | £50,000 | | | £50,000 |
| | | | | | |
| Total | £65,000 | £65,000 | | | £65,000 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

2. Value for money

Explain how this proposal provides value for money not only in terms of cost but also in terms of quality

We are the only organisation in the area working with hard to reach and difficult children. We have a trained team of sessional workers who are experienced in dealing with children and young people with emotional problems and have built up a network in the community and with other agencies and their staff to treat the disaffected young people who have become excluded from their communities and education.

The work by its very nature is time consuming and depending upon the problems not of a short duration but we have a proven success record over the last few years of working in other deprived areas of West Clacton where it is recognised both by other agencies and residents that we have made a difference to both the level of anti-social behaviour and crime but also to the well being of the community in which they live.

We have a philosophy of having the minimum of management and on-costs and putting the majority of our resources into work on the ground with the very people who need our help. We believe in using buildings within the community such as Community Centres not only to help them survive but to give the youngsters a focal point within their own community with which they can identify.

The youngsters are encouraged to carry out projects such as graffiti cleaning, planting flower beds and a community mural. They are also encouraged within their community to give back to the community and raise funds for other charitable causes such as Essex Air Ambulance, Children in Need and Macmillan Cancer Relief.

3. What resources are already invested by your, and other, organisations in the area on this issue?

We have been working in the area since October 2006 and are actively involved in promoting the Multi Use Games Area at the rear of the Jaywick Resources Centre to provide the children and young people with much needed play facilities in the Brooklands and Grasslands area. We are the only agency working with problem children in the area but we have strong links with all the other agencies such as Social Services, Youth Offending Team, Tendring Youth Activities Partnership and the schools.

4. Why is NM money needed?

To expand the activities in the Brooklands and Grasslands area of Jaywick and provide more outreach work to contact those disaffected children and young people not attending our sessions.

5. Can you be paid this money in arrears, or do you need it to prime the project?

The money is needed to prime the project.

6. Who are your organisation's auditors? (Please attach a copy of your last set of audited accounts)

Jamesons

Chartered Accountants, 92 Station Road, Clacton-on-Sea, Essex. CO15 1SG

D Options

1. What other options have been considered to address this proposal and if they were, why have they been rejected?

Other funders have been approached but have not as yet been forthcoming.

E Measuring and sustaining the impact

Taking into consideration the objectives for the project set out in section 2, what outcomes do you hope to achieve? (I.e. overall results and benefits that relate to the delivery plan?)

How will the outcomes be measured?

The outcomes will be measured by evaluating the numbers of children and young people attend the sessions, the re-offending rates recorded by the youth offending team, numbers returning to education, training and employment, the evaluation by the children themselves on the impact to their lives and their parents, the levels of juvenile crime in the area and the impact on the community

2. What monitoring arrangements will be put in place?

Set out your milestones (what you will have done by when) and outputs (things you can count to measure your activities) How will spend be monitored?

We will increase the number of sessions and outreach work immediately the funding is available

We are committed to working 52 weeks a year and there will be a monthly record of sessions held, numbers attending and spending per month.

The project will be activated from the day agreement is given and evaluations and assessments are carried out on a weekly basis.

3. Evaluation

Following implementation of the project how will you evaluate if your objectives have been met and ensure that there is continuous improvement?

We are committed to providing the best possible service for our young people and have procedures in place to review the progress or otherwise of all our youngsters.

We have weekly case reviews on the most difficult of cases and implement any actions to ensure that improvement is achieved wherever possible.

4. The long term and future

What is the exit strategy when NM resources are no longer available and how will the benefits be sustained?

We have a funding applications already in place and there is a continuous dialogue with likely funders to ensure that the necessary longer term funding is in place when the existing funds are no longer available.

Appraisal and approval structures

| Amount of funding | Appraisal method | Approval required |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Up to £2.5k | Neighbourhood Manager can carry out appraisal and submit for approval | Neighbourhood Manager and 2 Board members one of whom should be a resident board member if possible |
| Over £2.5k | Neighbourhood Manager and two board members one of which should be a resident board member if possible must go through the project appraisal form and submit for approval | Full Board |

Signed:(project proposer) Date:

Name: Andrew Mowle(Administrator)

Inclusion Ventures; Extension of Service Provision in Golf Green/Continuation of funding 08/09

Appraised by; Gill Bridle

Date; 27 July 2008

Appraisal Checklist – Interaction NMP Board

| Summary | Yes/no | Notes / changes required |
|---|------------------|---|
| Does this proposal impact on mainstream services or resources? | N | |
| Do we know what level of service are delivered by and resources committed to the area by this organisation? | Y | |
| Will this help us achieve our agreed outcomes? | Y | |
| Is it based on the needs and wishes of local people? Have they been involved in the creation of the project idea? | | |
| Will it make a lasting difference? | Y | The case studies show the improvement that can be made. |
| Is this a substitute for mainstream funding? | | |
| Does it provide best value? | Y | |
| Is it too risky? | N | |
| Are we confident it will be well managed, monitored and evaluated? | Y | |
| Section A | Yes or no | Notes / changes required |
| Is it clear what is being proposed? | Y | |
| Is it clear how much money is required? | Y | |
| Is it clear who the responsible organisation is? | Y | |

| Summary | Yes/no | Notes / changes required |
|--|---------------|---------------------------------|
| Section B | | |
| Is it a convincing proposal in terms of setting out problems, objectives and activities? | Y | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Will the proposal contribute to the delivery plan outcomes? | Y | |
| Is it clear how the proposal relates to existing service delivery in the area, and neither substitutes nor duplicates related services? | Y | |
| Have residents been adequately involved in developing the proposal (or their views taken into account)? | Y | Resident's surveys and consultation with community representatives. |
| Are management arrangements adequate? | Y | |
| Have risks been adequately considered and planned for? | Y | |

| Section C | Yes or no | Notes / changes required |
|---|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Are the finances clear and reasonable and do they provide adequate detail? | Y | |
| Does the proposal provide value for money? | Y | |
| Is adequate information provided on the resources already invested by the organisation? | Y | |
| Is an adequate explanation provided for why NM money is required? | Y | |
| Section D | | |
| Have other options been adequately considered? | Y | |
| Section E | | |
| Have measurable outcomes been identified? | Y | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Are adequate monitoring arrangements in place? | Y | |
| Are mechanisms in place for evaluation? | Y | |
| Is it clear what the exit strategy is and how the benefits can be sustained? | | Dialogues are continuing with likely funders. |

Decision of appraisal panel

| | |
|---|---|
| Recommend approval | X |
| Do not recommend approval | |
| Recommend changes required before approval | |
| <p>If so, please state or refer to above sections</p> <p>It is evident from the case studies that this scheme can be beneficial, and by increasing the number of drop-in session's from 1 to 3 should consolidate the trust & involvement of the people it is trying to help.</p> | |

| | |
|---------------|--------------------|
| Name | Gillian Bridle |
| Signed | Gill Bridle |
| Date | 27.07.08 |

Inclusion Ventures; Extension of Service Provision in Golf Green/Continuation of funding 08/09

Appraised by; John Wolton

Date; 29 July 2008

Appraisal Checklist – Interaction NMP Board

Proposal *Inclusion Dancers Ltd Young People's Project.* Date *29-07-08*

| Summary | Yes/no | Notes / changes required |
|---|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Does this proposal impact on mainstream services or resources? | <i>No.</i> | |
| Do we know what level of service are delivered by and resources committed to the area by this organisation? | <i>YES</i> | |
| Will this help us achieve our agreed outcomes? | <i>YES</i> | |
| Is it based on the needs and wishes of local people? Have they been involved in the creation of the project idea? | <i>YES</i> | |
| Will it make a lasting difference? | <i>YES</i> | |
| Is this a substitute for mainstream funding? | <i>No</i> | |
| Does it provide best value? | <i>YES.</i> | |
| Is it too risky? | <i>No</i> | |
| Are we confident it will be well managed, monitored and evaluated? | <i>YES</i> | |
| Section A | Yes or no | Notes / changes required |
| Is it clear what is being proposed? | <i>YES</i> | |
| Is it clear how much money is required? | <i>YES</i> | |
| Is it clear who the responsible organisation is? | <i>YES</i> | |
| Section B | | |
| Is it a convincing proposal in terms of setting out problems, objectives and activities? | <i>YES</i> | |

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| Will the proposal contribute to the delivery plan outcomes? | YES | |
| Is it clear how the proposal relates to existing service delivery in the area, and neither substitutes nor duplicates related services? | YES | |
| Have residents been adequately involved in developing the proposal (or their views taken into account)? | YES | |
| Are management arrangements adequate? | YES | |
| Have risks been adequately considered and planned for? | YES | |

| Section C | Yes or no | Notes / changes required |
|---|-----------|--------------------------|
| Are the finances clear and reasonable and do they provide adequate detail? | YES | |
| Does the proposal provide value for money? | YES | |
| Is adequate information provided on the resources already invested by the organisation? | YES | |
| Is an adequate explanation provided for why NM money is required? | YES | |
| Section D | | |
| Have other options been adequately considered? | YES | |
| Section E | | |
| Have measurable outcomes been identified? | YES | |
| Are adequate monitoring arrangements in place? | YES | |
| Are mechanisms in place for evaluation? | YES | |
| Is it clear what the exit strategy is and how the benefits can be sustained? | YES | |

Decision of appraisal panel

| | |
|--|-----|
| Recommend approval | YES |
| Do not recommend approval | |
| Recommend changes required before approval | |
| If so, please state or refer to above sections | |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Name | John Worton |
| Signed |  |
| Date | 29-07-08 |