

Funding Scheme for Regional and Local Voluntary Youth Organisations

Consultation Report



Executive Summary	3
--------------------------	----------

Section 1: Introduction & Background	4
---	----------

Section 2: Methodology	5
-------------------------------	----------

Section 3: Consultation Workshops	7
--	----------

Section 4: Individual Responses to Consultation	8
--	----------

Section 5: Postal & Email Responses to Consultation	17
--	-----------

Section 6: Conclusion	20
------------------------------	-----------

Section 7: List of Postal & Email Respondents	21
--	-----------

Appendix	22
-----------------	-----------



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proposals for a new Education Authority (EA) Funding Scheme for Regional and Voluntary Youth Organisations were initiated following the publication of the DE policy Priorities for Youth (PfY) (2013).

PfY identified a number of key actions relating to the transformation of Youth Services and one which specifically refers to replacing historic funding arrangements for regional and local voluntary youth organisations with a converged approach to meeting assessed need through a new funding scheme.

A public consultation on the proposals for a new EA Funding Scheme for Regional and Voluntary Youth Organisations took place from 6th November 2018 – 5th February 2019.

The consultation was hosted on the EA website and Survey Monkey was used to facilitate the public to respond and comment on the proposals. Hard copies of the questionnaire were also provided and organisations and interested parties were able to respond by providing responses in a written format.

The questionnaire, online and in hard copy, generated 1078 responses, with a further 12 responses received either by post or via email in addition to a lobby response.

The purpose of the consultation was to ascertain public opinion on the proposals and determine whether there were significant themes, or alternative models which could assist in establishing a way forward for the development of the proposals for a new funding scheme.

The consultation responses were collated, and it was established that there were few significant common themes emerging and little significant negative opinion or alternative models provided to the recommendations. Overall, there was a high degree of support for the proposals outlined.

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 The publication of PfY states that:

“Historical funding arrangements for local and regional programmes and organisations will be phased out and replaced with a converged (local and regional) approach to securing services on the basis of identified need to meet DE objectives. The new funding scheme will be developed to support local and regional services assessed as needed in the Regional Youth Development Plan, rather than services available. The new funding scheme will be developed to support local and regional services assessed as needed in the RYDP, rather than services available, namely:

- *Project funding - used to finance a specific youth project or outcome;*
- *Development funding - where youth organisations are effectively supported to provide additional or enhanced youth services; and*
- *Strategic funding - that is given to often well established, youth organisations recognised to be of strategic importance and whose continued existence and activities are considered to be beneficial to delivering quality youth services” (PfY; 4.24.1)*

1.2 In view of this the EA carried out an extensive engagement process with a wide range of stakeholders which informed the development of 6 key proposals for a new funding scheme for Regional and Local Voluntary Youth Organisations. These include three proposals at Regional level and three at Local level as follows:

Regional	Local
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal One: Strategic Funding • Proposal Two: Project Funding • Proposal Three: Development Funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal Four: Area Based Funding • Proposal Five: Project Funding • Proposal Six: Non-targeted/(generic) Youth Provision Funding

- 1.3 In order to provide stakeholders with the opportunity to comment, the 6 proposals were put forward for public consultation over a 12-week period from 6th November 2018 to 5th February 2019.
- 1.4 The public consultation generated 1078 survey responses and 12 postal/email responses. These have been collated and the findings presented in this report. In order to report consistently on the data received, the consultation report uses a defined framework of quantitative terms which can be found in Appendix 1.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Pre-Consultation Engagement

- 2.1.1 The EA believes that engagement is integral to a strategic approach to the development of the proposed new Funding Scheme and demonstrates good practice, as outlined in the *Guidelines on Effective Stakeholder Engagement* endorsed by the Northern Ireland (NI) Executive. It also reinforces our commitment to consult with young people in the co-design of services and provision.
- 2.1.2 The EA engaged with key stakeholders, including children and young people, taking their views into consideration in the formulation of proposals for a new Funding Scheme for Regional and Local Voluntary Youth Organisations.
- 2.1.3 Work in relation to the proposed new Funding Scheme commenced in 2015, prior to the establishment of the EA. In 2015/16 initial engagement was targeted at a range of stakeholders, to listen to and discuss views which would help shape the proposed new Funding Scheme. The methodology for the initial engagement comprised a range of engagement sessions, focus groups, workshops and meetings with key stakeholders.
- 2.1.4 Further to the establishment of the EA in 2016, the initial engagement feedback was re-considered and it was agreed to take this work forward through the establishment of a Project Management Board (PMB) and to provide a project focus, based on PRINCE2 methodology.
- 2.1.5 The PMB was established in 2017, with representation from voluntary youth organisations, the Youth Council Northern Ireland (YCNI) and EA Officers. A project plan was developed to take forward this work.
- 2.1.6 A second phase of development and engagement was conducted from March 2017 until March 2018. A Project Team revisited the initial engagement feedback, through

face to face contact with key stakeholders as well as with organisations in Northern Ireland (NI) that have a specific interest in children and young people's services.

- 2.1.7 Feedback arising from the engagement enabled key themes to be identified which have been embedded within the proposals for the new Funding Scheme.

2.2 Pre-Consultation Publicity

- 2.2.1 A Press Release co-ordinated with the Department of Education (DE) Press Office was issued by the EA Communications Team to coincide with the launch of the consultation. This was available on the EA website from the initial date the consultation process began. The consultation was also promoted through the EA social media channels including Twitter and Facebook.
- 2.2.2 Key stakeholders, groups and individuals were informed that the consultation documents were being produced and they were invited to participate in the consultation process.

2.3 Online Consultation

- 2.3.1 The consultation was posted on the EA website on 6 November 2018. It was accompanied by a consultation information booklet, a young person's/easy read version of the booklet, a supporting young person's video with subtitles, a young person facilitated consultation presentation and guidance materials, the consultation questionnaire and a list of planned workshops. The questionnaire design and subsequent data collection was facilitated using the 'Survey Monkey' platform and made available online. The 12-week consultation period closed on 5th February 2019.

2.4 Consultation Events

- 2.4.1 Consultation events with key stakeholders and young people were facilitated by a series of meetings and workshops across Northern Ireland, with the same information being provided using a PowerPoint presentation and script.

2.5 Other Consultation Responses

- 2.5.1 Whilst the preferred methodology for receiving responses was either through the online questionnaire or hard copy the EA accepted all written responses, provided they were submitted prior to the closing date of the consultation.

3 CONSULTATION WORKSHOPS

3.1 Workshop Structure

3.1.1 A series of 17 workshops was held across Northern Ireland in order to facilitate maximum opportunities for stakeholders to attend. These workshops consisted of a PowerPoint presentation with a script which allowed for consistency of approach and information at each workshop. The workshops provided information on the proposals for the new Funding Scheme including an explanation of the key principles. Workshop attendees were also afforded an opportunity for clarification on any points raised.

3.1.2 In addition, a number of consultation events took place for young people, which included guidance along with a video and an easy read version to support this process, again providing consistency of approach and information.

3.2 Workshop Attendance

3.2.1 Outlined in the table below is the list of workshops delivered across Northern Ireland including numbers in attendance.

Registered Group Type	Venue	Date & Time	Number in Attendance
Regional Voluntary Youth Organisations	EA Belfast Office Academy Street Belfast	27 November 2018 7 - 9pm	39
Regional Voluntary Youth Organisations	Derry City Youth Office 40 Dungiven Road Waterside, Derry BT47 6BW	29 November 2018 7 - 9pm	13
Local Youth Groups EA Registered & Level 1 Units	Cookstown Youth Resource Centre 74 Fountain Road Cookstown BT80 8QF	26 November 2018 7 - 9pm	9
Local Youth Groups EA Registered & Level 1 Units	Newry Youth Resource Centre, 4 Carnbane Road, Newry BT35 6QA	29 November 2018 7 - 9pm	9
Full Time Units & Part Time Youth Groups with Paid Staff	Epicentre, 59 Lisanally Lane, Armagh BT617HF	5 December 2018 7 - 9pm	18
Local Youth Groups Buildings Set Aside Units for Youth Work	Broughshane Youth Centre Knockan Road, Broughshane Ballymena, BT42 7LE	3 December 2018 7 - 9pm	24
Local Youth Groups EA Registered Units & Level 1 Units	Antrim Board Centre 17 Lough Road Antrim BT41 4DG	12 December 2018 7 - 9pm	1

Registered Group Type	Venue	Date & Time	Number in Attendance
Local Youth Groups EA Registered Units & Level 1 Units	Sunlea Youth Centre 180 Ballycastle Road Coleraine BT52 2EH	13 December 2018 7 - 9pm	6
Local Youth Groups EA Registered & Level 1 Units	Finaghy Youth Centre 59-73 Finaghy Road South Belfast BT10 0BY	29 November 2018 7 - 9pm	7
Local Youth Groups EA Registered & Level 1 Units	Colin Youth Development Centre 14 Good Shepherd Road Belfast BT17 OPP	4 December 2018 7 - 9pm	4
Full Time Units & Part Time Youth Groups with Paid Staff	EA Belfast Office Academy Street Belfast	5 December 2018 7 - 9pm	18
Local Youth Groups EA Registered & Level 1 Units	Laurelhill Youth Centre 22 Laurelhill Road Lisburn BT28 2UH	16 January 2019 7 - 9pm	19
Local Youth Groups EA Registered & Level 1 Units	Ards Arena 62 South St Newtownards BT23 4JU	10 January 2019 7 - 9pm	22
Full Time Units & Part Time Youth Groups with Paid Staff	Belvoir Youth Centre Belvoir Drive Belfast BT8 7DL	7 January 2019 7 - 9pm	11
Local Youth Groups EA Registered & Level 1 Units	Omagh Youth Centre Old Mountfield Road Omagh BT79 7EG	14 January 2019 7 - 9pm	8
Local Youth Groups EA Registered & Level 1 Units	Derry City Youth Office 40 Dungiven Road Waterside, Derry BT47 6BW	15 January 2019 7 - 9pm	9
Full Time Units & Part Time Youth Groups with Paid Staff	Derry City Youth Office 40 Dungiven Road Waterside Derry BT47 6BW	10 December 2018 7 - 9pm	11

4 INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

4.1 Online Survey

4.1.1 An online survey of stakeholders was conducted as part of the EA Youth Service consultation on the proposed new Funding Scheme. A total of 1,078 survey responses were received, of which 447 were derived from hard copy responses. The data compiled from the survey was collated and thoroughly analysed. The background characteristics of these respondents are shown below.

4.2 Question 1: Respondent Type

Answer Choices	Responses	
As an individual young person	37.1%	397
As an individual adult	9.6%	103
On behalf of a Regional Voluntary Youth Organisation	15.4%	165
On behalf of a local Controlled youth group	24.7%	265
On behalf of a local Voluntary youth group	11.6%	124
On behalf of an education/sectoral body	0.8%	8
Other (please specify)	0.8%	9
	Answered	1071
	Skipped	7

4.2.1 The most frequently occurring respondent was that of an individual young person, accounting for 37% of responses.

4.3 Question 2: If applicable, is your organisation in receipt of EA funding?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	87.9%	818
No	12.1%	113
	Answered	931
	Skipped	147

4.3.1 Most of the survey participants (88%) were replying on behalf of, or associated with, youth groups who are in receipt of EA funding.

4.4 Question 3: Name of Organisation

4.4.1 This was an optional question, whereby respondents provided the name of their organisation.

Answered	806
Skipped	272

4.5 Question 5: Funding Principles

Do you agree with the underpinning funding principles of the Scheme?							
	Agree		Disagree		Uncertain		Total
Reducing Bureaucracy	67.0%	691	15.4%	159	17.6%	182	1032
Benchmarking of Costs	56.7%	582	22.5%	231	20.8%	213	1026
Eligible Core Costs	63.6%	646	18.3%	186	18.1%	184	1016
Full Cost Recovery	61.6%	618	17.6%	177	20.8%	209	1004
					Answered		1040
					Skipped		38
					Comments		146

4.5.1 A majority of respondents (67%) indicated their agreement with the underpinning principles of the scheme particularly in relation to reducing bureaucracy. A minority of respondents (22%) disagreed with benchmarking of costs and 17%-21% were uncertain about each of the underpinning principles.

4.5.2 Analysis of Comments

Of the overall count of respondents, a minority (14%) provided explanatory comments, and of those who did, a perceived lack of clarity of the proposals preventing a clear understanding was most frequently cited (4% of the total responses). A small number of respondents (2%) noted funding concerns i.e. funding may be reduced relative to current levels, and a registration issue which was largely concerned with support for unregistered groups in accessing funding. In addition, a further small number of respondents (1%) cited concerns over a lack of detail around the financial principles, particularly on how benchmarking will operate, noting concerns over possible non-correlation of salaries to existing structures.

4.6 Question 5: Regional Strategic Funding

Do you agree with Proposal 1: Regional Strategic Funding		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	56.7%	606
Disagree	19.0%	203
Uncertain	24.3%	259
	Answered	1068
	Skipped	10
	Comments	149

4.6.1 A majority of respondents (57%) agreed with the proposal for Regional Strategic Funding and minorities of between 19% and 24% expressed disagreement or were uncertain as to how to respond.

4.6.2 Analysis of Comments

In relation to those who expressed disagreement or uncertainty a small number (6%) of the total survey respondents provided comments in relation to registration issues and a concern for young people of non-registered groups. Further concerns were articulated in relation to the types of youth work supported and how funding will be distributed (1%).

4.7 Question 6: Regional Project Funding

Do you agree with Proposal 2: Regional Project Funding		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	60.9%	639
Disagree	16.1%	169
Uncertain	23.0%	241
	Answered	1049
	Skipped	29
	Comments	144

4.7.1 A majority of respondents (61%) agreed with the proposal for Regional Project Funding and minorities of between 16% and 23% expressed disagreement or were uncertain as to how to respond.

4.7.2 **Analysis of Comments**

Of the overall count of respondents a small number (2%) highlighted eligibility issues in relation to accessing Regional Project Funding and queried whether more than one funding stream could be accessed by any one organisation.¹ Under Regional Project Funding they were also concerned regarding the protection of Regional Voluntary Youth Organisations (RVYO) who coordinate regional programmes as well as deliver front-line youth work. This centred around the themes supported by Regional Project Funding including those not prescribed in PfY. A small number of respondents (1%) commented on whether a local focus on funding would be more appropriate.

4.8 Question 7: Regional Development Funding

Do you agree with Proposal 3: Regional Development Funding?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	59.9%	629
Disagree	16.0%	168
Uncertain	24.2%	254
	Answered	1051
	Skipped	27
	Comments	129

4.8.1 A majority of all respondents (60%) agreed with the proposals for Regional Development Funding, a minority of 16% disagreed with 24% of respondents uncertain about Regional Developmental Funding.

4.8.2 **Analysis of Comments**

¹ It was explained at the consultation workshops that organisations could apply to any one or all of the 6 funding proposals.

A small number (6%) of the overall count of respondents who disagreed or were uncertain about the proposals for Local Area Based funding, provided an explanatory comment. These responses were more inclined to note funding concerns rather than registration issues which were prevalently cited in relation to the proposals for regional funding. A small number of respondents (1%) cited a lack of understanding of and a lack detail in the proposals, including issues around eligibility.

4.9 Question 8: Local Area Based Funding

Do you agree with Proposal 4: Local Area Based Funding		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	73.6%	782
Disagree	15.5%	165
Uncertain	10.8%	115
	Answered	1062
	Skipped	16
	Comments	68

4.9.1 A majority of all respondents (74%) agreed with the proposals for Local Area Based Funding and a minority (26%) disagreed or were uncertain. Further analysis has shown that of the overall count of respondents the minority (10%) who disagreed with or were uncertain about the proposals represented RVYO respondents and a small number (3.5%) who disagreed with or were uncertain of the proposals represented local groups.

4.9.2 Analysis of Comments

A small number (6%) of the overall count of respondents who disagreed or were uncertain about the proposals for Local Area Based funding, provided an explanatory comment. These responses were more inclined to note funding concerns rather than registration issues which were prevalently cited in relation to the proposals for regional funding. A small number of respondents (1%) cited a lack of understanding of and a lack detail in the proposals including issues around eligibility.

4.10 Question 9: Local Project Funding

Do you agree with Proposal 5: Local Project Funding?	
Answer Choices	Responses

Agree	74.8%	792
Disagree	14.4%	152
Uncertain	10.9%	115
Answered		1059
Skipped		19
Comments		56

4.10.1 Most respondents (75%) agreed with the proposals for Local Project Funding and a minority (25%) disagreed or were uncertain. Further analysis has shown that of the overall count of respondents a minority (10%) who disagreed with or were uncertain about the proposals represented RVYO respondents and a small number (5%) who disagreed with or were uncertain about the proposals represented local groups.

4.10.2 Analysis of Comments

Of the overall count of respondents a small number (5%) who disagreed with or were uncertain about the proposals for Local Project funding commented to explain their answer choice. The most commonly cited reason in the response was a lack of detail in relation to the proposals and a comment that the focus should be on local providers with a track record of delivery who would be best placed to avail of the local infrastructure (1%).

4.11 Question 10: Non-Targeted/Generic Funding

Do you agree with Proposal 6: Non-targeted/Generic Youth Provision Funding?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	73.9%	778
Disagree	16.9%	178
Uncertain	9.2%	97
Answered		1053
Skipped		25
Comments		63

4.11.1 A majority (74%) of all respondents agreed with the proposals for Non-targeted/Generic Youth Provision Funding whereas only a minority (17%) disagreed. Further analysis has shown that of the overall count of respondents a minority (10%) who disagreed with or were uncertain about the proposals represented RVYO respondents and a small number (5%) who disagreed with or were uncertain about the proposals represented local groups.

4.11.2 Analysis of Comment

Of the overall count of respondents a small number (6%) commented to explain their answer choice. The most commonly cited reasons for this answer choice were lack of clarity in relation to the consultation process and lack of detail relating to the proposals (1%).

4.12 Question 11: Funding Scheme Appeals Process

Do you feel an appeals process should be established within the proposed new Funding Scheme?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	90.6%	935
No	9.4%	97
	Answered	1032
	Skipped	46

4.12.1 Almost all respondents (91%) were in favour of an appeals process being established within the proposed new Funding Scheme. This was particularly pronounced among responses received from local groups which accounted for 35% of the total count of respondents, representing almost all of the respondents in the local group category. A further 15% of the total respondents who were in favour of establishing an appeals process represented RVYOs. This represented almost all of the total of RVYO respondents.

4.13 Question 12: Equality Consideration

Equality Consideration

Under Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998, all public bodies are obliged to consider the implications on nine different groupings before decisions are implemented. In addition, the Good Relations Duty requires that the EA shall, without prejudice to equality obligations, have regard to the desirability of promoting good relations between persons of different religious belief, persons of different political opinions and persons of different racial groups. In light of these obligations, do you consider that the proposed Scheme would impact positively or negatively on Equality of Opportunity and/or the Promotion of Good Relations in any way?

	Positively		Negatively		Don't know		Total
Religious Belief	52.4%	534	18.7%	191	28.9%	295	1020
Political Opinion	43.0%	435	21.4%	217	35.6%	360	1012
Racial Group	53.2%	535	18.8%	189	28.0%	282	1006
Age	51.6%	522	19.2%	194	29.3%	296	1012
Marital Status	40.1%	404	17.2%	173	42.8%	431	1008
Sexual Orientation	51.0%	513	17.8%	179	31.1%	313	1005
Gender	56.3%	569	17.5%	177	26.2%	265	1011
Disability	55.3%	562	18.4%	187	26.4%	268	1017
Dependents	48.2%	485	16.1%	162	35.8%	360	1007
50.1% Answered							1033
Skipped							45

4.13.1 A majority of respondents (50%) believed the proposed New Funding Scheme will impact positively on the above aspects of equality of opportunity and a minority (18%) believed it would have a negative impact on these aspects. Overall, a significant minority (32%) were unsure how to respond, particularly with regard to marital status, political opinion and dependents in the context of the funding proposals.²

4.13.2 Further analysis has shown:

- Almost half of the total responses (48%) made on behalf of local groups, representing 18% of the total response, believed the proposed scheme would have a positive impact. It was equally as common for this group of respondents to express uncertainty, which represented a further 18% of the total response.
- A majority of responses made on behalf of an RVYO believed the proposed scheme would impact negatively on all these aspects of equality, representing 9% of the total consultation responses. A small number (2%) of those

² The New Funding Scheme has been assessed in line with our obligations under Section 75 of the NI Act 1998 and the Rural Needs Act (NI) 2016.

responding as a local group believed the proposed scheme would impact negatively.

4.14 Question 12: Equality Consideration

Answered	325
Skipped	753

4.14.1 A significant minority of the overall respondents (30%) provided additional comments. Of the overall count of survey respondents the most frequently cited issues were recorded as follows; registration (9%) consultation process (8%) support for volunteers (5%) and funding criteria and funding proposals (4%).

5.1 Total Responses

5.1.1 There were 12 consultation responses received by post and email. The following is a summary of those responses.

5.2 Political Parties

5.2.1 One email response was received on behalf of a political party. This welcomed and supported the proposals particularly with regard to streamlining the application process for local groups and enabling more voluntary youth groups to access funding. There was a request for clarity on non-EA registered groups availing of the scheme.³

5.3 Individual Responses

5.3.1 There were two email responses received from individuals; one representing a voluntary youth centre and the other from an MLA. These referred to enquiring as to a definition of eligible core costs, a proposal for a 6-year funding scheme rather than the proposed 3 years and the promotion of support for voluntary organisations for EA registration. They were also of the opinion that EA funded organisations should adhere to JNC conditions for the employment of youth workers

5.4 Church Leaders

5.4.1 One email response was received from a church leadership organisation. This response was supportive of the proposals particularly with regard to the supporting voluntary church-based youth provision through the local funding proposals, the simplification of the registration process, a transitional period for new groups to become EA registered and a phased implementation of a New Funding Scheme. In addition, this respondent asked that the ethos of the faith-based sector continue to be valued and respected.

³ The consultation workshops explained that organisations/groups wishing to avail of EA funding require to be registered youth organisations/groups with EA.

5.5 Locally Funded Organisations

5.5.1 There was one postal response received on behalf of a sub-regional, locally funded organisation. This respondent welcomed the proposals and specifically the continuation of the non-targeted generic youth provision, proportionate reporting and also noted the need for support for organisations for the EA registration process.

5.6 EA Funded Regional Voluntary Youth Organisations

5.6.1 One email response was received from an EA funded RVYO. This gave a positive response to the proposals and in particular agreed with the key principles and the 3-year proposed funding cycle; welcomed the continuation of a partnership approach with the EA and sought to provide further comment on the implementation process.

5.7 Local Voluntary Youth Groups

5.7.1 There were five responses, two postal and three email, received from local voluntary youth groups; four of the respondents were from full-time voluntary clubs and one represented a part-time group.

5.7.2 These responses were very positive and were of the opinion that the proposals better target services to young people in greatest need. Respondents welcomed the 'open call' for project funding, the discontinuation of all historical funding patterns, reduction in bureaucracy, benchmarking of costs, provision of equal access to funding for all groups and a collaborative culture between the voluntary and statutory sectors. They were also in favour of ensuring the Model for Effective Practice was commonly implemented for raising standards and ensuring a high level of governance and quality of service. There was a reference to ensuring that outcomes for young people should be clearly defined and the need for support for training.

5.8 Sporting Organisations

5.8.1 One email response was received from a sporting organisation. This respondent noted a concern that the proposals could impact negatively on their current volunteering partnership arrangements.

5.9 Lobby Response

5.9.1 An additional 870 paper questionnaire responses were received by hand delivery. These consisted of completed survey returns which were later identified as multiple copies of five pre-existing responses. As such, these paper questionnaires have not been included in the analysis as the five original responses had already been completed on-line and included in the finalised dataset.

6.1 Conclusion

6.1.1 The overall responses to the consultation demonstrated a high degree of support for the six proposals outlined in the New Funding Scheme. There were no significant themes identified that impact on the acceptance of the proposed Funding Scheme for Regional and Local Voluntary Youth Organisations, however the following key points should be taken into consideration when taking the scheme forward:

- **Support required for EA registration**
 - Access to support, ensuring reasonable adjustments will be made for existing and new voluntary youth organisations to register and apply for funding
 - Single point of contact should be provided to support the process of registration and applications for funding
- **Easily accessible and user-friendly guidance and application process**
 - Digital first processes should be considered to simplify and increase access
 - Application forms and processes should minimise bureaucracy and administration in both applying for and reporting on funding outcomes
 - Be proportionate to the level of funding received
- **Ensure recognition for and development of volunteers**
 - It is key to ensure the scheme considers the role of volunteers in the delivery of youth work

6.1.2 The information provided in the responses will be referenced to support the implementation of the proposed Funding Scheme for Regional and Local Voluntary Youth Organisations.

7 LIST OF POSTAL AND EMAIL RESPONSES

- Artillery Youth Centre
- Barry Fegan
- Comhairle Uladh (Ulster Council GAA)
- Deanby Youth Club
- Long Tower Youth and Community Centre
- Northern Catholic Bishops (Council for Justice and Peace)
- Paul Frew MLA
- Sinn Fein
- The Boys' Brigade
- YMCA Lurgan
- Youth Work Alliance

Index of Appendices:

i	Framework of Quantitative Terms	Page 23
---	---------------------------------	---------

Appendix i

FRAMEWORK OF QUANTITATIVE TERMS

For the purpose of presenting qualitative engagement feedback in a comprehensive way, general quantitative terms have been applied as follows;

Terminology	Percentage
Almost/nearly all more	90%
Most	75% - 90%
A majority	50% - 74%
A significant minority	30% - 49%
A minority	10% - 29%
Very few/a small number	Less than 10%

