

Report for: *INFORMATION*



Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	<i>NO - Part I</i>
Title	Outstanding 2014/15 Bright Idea Projects
Responsible Officer(s)	Russel O'Keefe, Strategic Director Corporate and Community Services
Contact officer, job title and phone number	Kevin Mist, Head of Communities and Economic Services
Member reporting	Cllr. Claire Stretton, Principal Member for Culture and Communities
For Consideration By	Big Society Panel
Date to be Considered	27 January 2016
Implementation Date if Not Called In	Immediate
Affected Wards	All wards with a town or parish council

REPORT SUMMARY

1. This report updates the Big Society Panel with the current position in relation to winning/ runner up Bright Idea Projects that were not delivered in 2014/15 and identifies options for addressing the issue.
2. It recommends that:
 - i) The Panel accepts that the concept of a ball dispensing machine that would return users money when the ball is returned is not deliverable and consider purchase of a simple vending machine that will dispense balls.
 - ii) The Panel agree proposals for delivery of the Leihoma (Substitute Grandmother) Project as an intergenerational project based at Broom Farm that will bring together older residents and army families who do not have local grandparents.
 - iii) The Panel agree that Youth Services should organise a cycle related event to which pupils from the winning school would be invited.
3. These recommendations are being made to support the Council's commitment to the Big Society and to delivering the Bright Idea competition which is a manifesto commitment.
4. Funding for the projects has been carried forward from the 2014/15

budget. If they are not delivered there will be a potential saving of between £4k-£7k which could be carried forward to the 2015/16 competition.

If recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit	Dates by which residents can expect to notice a difference
1. The Bright Idea competition is an opportunity for residents to put forward and receive support for ideas that will benefit the local community.	Various

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION: That the Big Society Panel:

- I. Accept that the concept of a ball dispensing machine that would return users money when the ball is returned is not deliverable and consider purchase of a simple vending machine that will dispense balls.
- II. Agree proposals for delivery of the Leihoma (Substitute Grandmother) Project as an intergenerational project based at Broom Farm that will bring together older residents and army families who do not have local grandparents.
- III. Agree that Youth Services should organise a cycle related event to which pupils from the winning school would be invited.

2. REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 1.1 There were a number of issues in relation to the 2014/15 competition that meant three of the six winning runner up projects have not yet been delivered. The issues have been addressed for the 2015/16 competition which is currently at the shortlisting stage with the winners to be announced in March. It is important to draw a line under the 2014/15 competition and focus on new projects that have been thoroughly evaluated to ensure their deliverability.
- 1.2 The options that have been considered in relation to the 2014/15 projects that have not yet been delivered are as follows:

Option	Comments
The Panel agrees to 'draw a line under' the projects that have not been delivered and to focus on delivering 2015/16 projects.	<p>The implications of recognising that the projects will not be delivered are outlined in the report and are different for each project.</p> <p>Lessons re evaluating projects thoroughly to ensure that they can be delivered have been learned and acted</p>

Option	Comments
	<p>on but whilst the winning and or runner up projects can not be delivered as first envisaged it is important that they are delivered to the extent that this is possible.</p> <p>This is not the recommended option.</p>
<p>The Panel consider purchasing a vending machine that would dispense balls; accepting that a machine that could return a users money when the ball is returned is not currently available and may not be a commercially viable proposition.</p>	<p>This is the recommended option for the ball dispenser project.</p>
<p>The Panel agrees actions proposed by the lead officer for delivery of the Leihoma (Substitute Grandmother) Project consisting of an intergenerational project bringing together older residents and army children from Broom Farm who do not have local grandparents.</p>	<p>Reasons why the projects could not be delivered as originally proposed are outlined in the report. Officers have put forward alternative proposals consistent as far as possible with the original idea.</p> <p>This is the recommended option for the Leihoma (Substitute Grandmother) project.</p>
<p>The Panel agrees a budget of £1,000 for Youth Services to organise a cycle related event for young people.</p>	<p>There have been difficulties working with the winning school to agree a suitable date and format. It is proposed Youth Services should go ahead and organise an event (that pupils from the winning school will be invited to participate in if they so wish).</p> <p>Youth Services anticipate that they will be able to organise a cycling course and an organised ride for young people.</p> <p>This is the recommended option for the cycle related project.</p>
<p>The Panel agree an alternative option in support of cycling by contributing £1,000 from the Bright Idea budget to 'Ride Leader' Training.</p>	<p>Award of the junior prize to a cycle related idea was intended to recognise a large number of cycle related ideas that came forward.</p> <p>For £1,000 - 10 people could be given British Cycle Leaders Training allowing them to lead groups of young people on</p>

Option	Comments
	<p>organised rides. This proposal has been discussed at and would have the support of the Council's Cycle Forum but 'ride leaders' have to be over eighteen so it would not be of immediate benefit to young people.</p> <p>This is not the recommended option.</p>
<p>The Panel requires officers to deliver the ideas as originally proposed.</p>	<p>This is not practical for reasons outlined in the report.</p> <p>This is not the recommended option.</p>

2.1 The 2014/15 winners each received a cash prize in addition to a trophy for their winning ideas. An £800 prize was awarded for the winning Leihoma idea, £100 for the cycle related junior idea and £75 for the junior 'ball dispenser' idea. The expectation was that winning entrants would then be supported to deliver their winning idea but this was not made clear at the outset so that the winners, an individual and a school, hadn't thought through how the project could be delivered and didn't necessarily have the time or expertise to deliver it.

2.2 It is also the case that officers who would be responsible for supporting the winners were not involved in evaluating the projects or at a sufficiently early stage so that insufficient consideration was given to viability of the projects.

2.3 The three outstanding ideas are as follows:

The idea	Why it wasn't delivered	The Proposed Way Forward
<p>Leihoma (Substitute Grandmother) Project</p> <p>Lead Officer: Allison Bradshaw (Children's Services).</p> <p>This is an Austrian idea that pairs older (usually women) with young families as a source of child care. In Austria/ Germany this works on a commercial basis rather like hiring an au pair.</p>	<p>The entrant liked the idea but did not have a clear view of how it should be delivered or sufficient time/ capacity to take it forward.</p> <p>Children's Services had concerns around safeguarding issues. In particular working protocols discourage close personal relationships between staff/ volunteers and children.</p> <p>There was a suggestion that</p>	<p>Officers have met with the entrant and agreed that we move ahead with adapting the idea to fit within Children's Services safeguarding parameters.</p> <p>Children's Centres and Innovations are working in partnership to explore some intergenerational service delivery in the</p>

	<p>the scheme should be piloted on a small scale at the winner's church but this did not get off the ground.</p>	<p>community.</p> <p>Project leads visited local sheltered accommodation to talk to residents to promote a pilot intergenerational session. Unfortunately to uptake of interested residents was not as strong as hoped. In January 2016 the project leads visited Sandpark Care Home, Dedworth and they have arranged an afternoon tea, crafts and music session with 15 residents, five parents from Broom Farm and their eight children. This is with a view to establishing regular sessions at the care home. The event has been met with much enthusiasm of all involved.</p>
<p>Cycle Related (Junior) Project</p>	<p>There were particular issues with how the junior competition was judged last year.</p> <p>Because the deadline had been extended it was agreed that the junior competition would be judged by the youth ambassadors (a group of young people nominated by their schools).</p> <p>The ideas were put to a vote rather than tested for their feasibility and unfortunately the winning idea put forward on this basis was for a 'Boris Bike' scheme and/or a cycle network neither of which were</p>	

	<p>deliverable within the available budget.</p> <p>The prize was awarded, as a compromise, for a 'cycle related event' involving the school who submitted the ideas. This was intended to reflect a significant number of cycle related ideas that had been received.</p> <p>Officers and Councillors met with the Head and pupils of the winning school and agreed in principle a cycle related event that the school would participate with.</p> <p>The school is understandably driven by its academic priorities and school has been slow to respond to officers' communications re proposed dates for the event, which would have to take place during school holidays. Holiday periods have passed with no agreement on when an event should take place or how the school's pupils would be involved.</p>	
<p>Ball Dispenser idea</p> <p>This idea was submitted by a Claires Court pupil. Her idea was for people using parks who don't have any netballs or tennis balls they should create ball dispensers. It could work like shopping trolleys, put a pound in, use the equipment, get your pound back. If you don't return the ball back the machine will take the money and that will go to purchase some new</p>	<p>The idea chosen by the youth ambassadors is original but the equipment does not currently exist and seems unlikely to be a commercial proposition particularly as it relates to netballs (i.e. you would either have to charge significantly more than £1 or there would be little incentive to return the ball after use).</p> <p>There are vending machines that would dispense tennis balls http://corevend.com/products/</p>	

balls.	details/TB1000-Tennis-Ball-Vending-Machine/p_534.html but not that would take and return a coin after use. It is proposed, as a compromise that consideration should be given to installing a simple vending machine at one or more of the borough's sports facilities.	
--------	--	--

2.4 The 2015/16 competition ran through September/ October 2015. Judges met to shortlist the winning ideas in early December and the winners will be announced in March following a thorough evaluation to ensure that they are deliverable.

2.5 The focus of the competition has been shifted for 2015/16 from 'coming up with an idea' to ensuring that it can be delivered and the prize structure has been altered accordingly with more of the available cash going to deliver the winning ideas rather than just coming up with them.

2.6 There are some interesting and exciting ideas coming forward from the 2015/16 competition and bringing the 2014/15 ideas that have stalled for various reasons to a conclusion will allow the focus to switch to the current competition.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 To bring matters to a conclusion there needs to be agreement for each of the projects as to if and how they will carried forward.

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date they should be delivered by
No. of projects concluded within six months.	1 or less by 31 August 2016	2 or more by 31 August 2016	All 3 by 31 August 2016	All 3 delivered by 31 August with one or more by 31 st March.	1 September 2016

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS

Financial impact on the budget

- 4.1 The Bright Idea Working party December 2014 agreed:
- £3,000 to fund the Leihoma Project
 - £2,000 to fund the ball dispenser project
 - It was agreed to defer allocation of funding to the cycle project until it was clear what would be delivered.
- 4.2 £11,500 funding was carried forward to 2015/16 with an expectation that any unspent balances would be used to publicise the 2015/16 competition.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 None

6. VALUE FOR MONEY

6.1 The budget for 2014/15 projects will only be spent if there are clear outcomes for residents.

7. SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT APPRAISAL

7.1 None

8. RISK MANAGEMENT

Risks	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
Failure to deliver 2014/15 projects could undermine the reputation of the competition and deter future entries.	Medium	Changes have been made to the 2015/16 competition to reflect problems with the previous competition and ensure future projects are viable and can be delivered.	Low
Focusing on 2014/15 projects could detract from the 2015/16 competition which is approaching its climax.	Medium	2015/16 awards will be announced in March 2016. Outstanding issues should have been resolved by then.	

9. LINKS TO STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

9.1 The Bright Idea competition supports the Residents First Strategic Priority. The junior competition supports the Supporting Children and Young People sub priority.

10. EQUALITIES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND COMMUNITY COHESION

10.1 There are no equalities impacts arising from this report.

11. STAFFING/WORKFORCE AND ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS

11.1 None

12. PROPERTY AND ASSETS

12.1 None

13. ANY OTHER IMPLICATIONS

13.1 None

14. CONSULTATION

14.1 None

15. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Date	Details
31 January 2016	Pilot inter generational project to be launched at Broom Farm.
31 March 2016	Simple vending machine that will dispense balls installed at one or more of the Council's sports venues.
31 March 2016	Date to have been agreed for a cycle related event in the Easter or Summer Holidays.

16. APPENDICES

16.1 None

17. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

17.1 The 2014/15 competition took place during August/ September 2014. There were over 130 entries.

17.2 The remaining ideas were successfully implemented.

- The **Amazing Maidenhead (maze) project** raised £10,665 sponsorship, consisting of bricks sponsored by local residents and inscribed with their

name to establish a maze in Oaken Grove Park, Maidenhead. A granite/brick drinking fountain was also delivered as part of the project.

- A **Maidenhead Park Run** was established and regularly attracts 150-200 runners per week – supported by 15-20 volunteers.
- The **Wildlife Homes** junior project was delivered in conjunction with the British Barn Owl Trust and delivered bird homes to sixteen borough schools.

17.3 Entries for the 2015/16 competition closed on 30 October. There were sixty three entries of which seven were from young people under eighteen. There were fewer entries than the previous year (130 of which 30 were junior) but there have been some key changes to the competition to emphasise delivery of the winning ideas rather than simply coming up with them.

17.4 The shortlisting panel met on 23rd November and identified a number of entries for further consideration:

- o Exploring potential collaboration between 4/5 entries related to **community allotments/ surplus food from allotments/ community café** – contacting various entrants and reporting back to panel.
- o **Erection of a ‘swift tower’** to help threatened birds.
- o **Personalised shopping bags** – a local company printing designs created by customers onto bags, with a possible link to the green redeem scheme.
- o **A Story Circle** meeting once a month to allow people to share their stories.
- o **A health fair/ competition** (Junior entry).
- o **‘Bin bags’ outside shops** to promote re-use of plastic bags (Junior entry).

17.5 Judges will reconsider these ideas in the light of further evaluation and the winners will be announced in February/ March 2016.

18. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held and Department	Date sent	Date Received	See comments in paragraph:
Internal				
Cllr Burbage	Leader of the Council	25/01/16		
Cllr Bateson	Chair of Big Society Panel	25/01/16		
Cllr. Stretton	Lead Member for Community and Culture	25/01/16	25/01/16	Changes to recommendations and options considered.

Russell O'Keefe	Strategic Director Corporate and Community Services	22/01/16	25/01/16	
Kevin Mist	Head of Communities and Economic Development	21/01/2016	22/01/16	
Andrew Brooker	Head of Finance	22/01/2016		
Sean O'Connor	Interim Head of Legal Services	22/01/2016	25/01/16	
Allison Bradshaw	Family Support Manager	22/01/2016	25/01/16	
Felicity Screen	Youth Engagement Officer	22/01/2016	22/01/16	

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?
Non-key decision	No

Full name of report author	Job title	Full contact no:
Andrew Green	Community Partnership Officer	01628 682940