

**CHRISTIAN CONCERN FOR OUR NATION  
& THE CHRISTIAN LEGAL CENTRE  
RESPONSE TO THE DEPARTMENT FOR  
SCHOOLS CHILDREN AND FAMILY  
CONSULTATION ON THE (CYPF) GRANT  
PROGRAMME TO THIRD SECTOR  
ORGANISATIONS**

October 2009



*Changing Society to put the  
Hope of Christ at its Centre*



Andrea Minichiello Williams, Barrister Director of Christian Concern for our Nation and the  
Christian Legal Centre  
020 7467 5427 07712 591164 [www.ccfon.org](http://www.ccfon.org) & [www.christianlegalcentre.com](http://www.christianlegalcentre.com)

## **Review of the Children, Young People and Families (CYPF) Grant Programme.**

**Closing Date:** Monday 5 October 2009. The Consultation can be found here:  
<http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/consultations/index.cfm?action=consultationDetails&consultationId=1612&external=no&menu=1>

Consultation responses can be completed online at [www.dcsf.gov.uk/consultations](http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/consultations) by e-mailing [cypf.consultation@dcsf.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:cypf.consultation@dcsf.gsi.gov.uk)

### **About Us**

Christian Concern for Our Nation (CCFON) is a policy and legal resource centre that identifies changes in policy and law that may affect the Judeo-Christian heritage of this nation. The team of lawyers and advisers at CCFON conduct research into, and campaign on, legislation and policy changes that may affect Christian Freedoms or the moral values of the UK. CCFON reaches a mailing list of 25,000 supporters. <http://www.ccfon.org>

CCFON is linked to a sister and separate organisation, the Christian Legal Centre, which takes up cases affecting Christian freedoms. <http://www.christianlegalcentre.com>

### **Executive Summary**

1. CCFON & CLC welcome the opportunity to provide a response to the consultation<sup>1</sup> on a Review of the Children, Young People and Families (CYPF) Grant Programme.
2. The consultation explains that: “The Children, Young People and Families (CYPF) grant programme provides funding to third sector organisations for activities which support delivery of the Every Child Matters agenda and the Department's Children's Plan. This consultation seeks the views of the third sector and any other interested parties on the future approach and shape of the grant programme.”
3. CYPF are said to have now run four rounds of the CYPF grant and awarded funding in excess of £140 million to more than 200 third sector organisations. For the most recent grant round, which closed on 31 October 2008, over 700 applications were received, significantly exceeding the available funds. They made 107 awards worth £47 million over the two years 2009-11. Of these, 69 awards were for strategic work and 38 for innovative projects.<sup>2</sup>
4. This consultation response supports a return to the situation before April 2006 when there were 6 separate funds. In particular, our response supports the restoration of grants specifically allocated for Marriage and Relationship support. Judging by the allocation to this specific fund in 2005-2006, proportionately this should amount to about a third of the annual CYPF grant allocation. A comparatively small price to pay to support marriage compared to the costs of marital breakdown. Such costs of family breakdown to the exchequer were estimated in 2007 to be well over £20bn per annum.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See: <http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/consultations/index.cfm?action=consultationDetails&consultationId=1612&external=no&menu=1>

<sup>2</sup> See point 1.4 of this consultation.

<sup>3</sup> See Family breakdown: June 2007:

## Response to Questions – scope and purpose of the CYPF grant programme

### Question 1: How useful has a single CYPF grant been in increasing coherence and reducing unnecessary bureaucracy?

It is not useful to have a single CYPF grant as it loses the important distinct aims and objectives of the six separate fund sources available prior to April 2006, particularly those supporting marriage. The only bureaucratic advantage is to have a single application process. However, it ought to be possible to separate out the distinct grant areas in the same application form. It is possible to have the best of both worlds by having a single application system to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy whilst allocating specific funding for each distinct grant area. It may be argued that a general fund has flexibility but the result has been less accountability, transparency and just provides an indistinct fund.

A partial regulatory impact assessment reveals how before this change in system, there was a consultation, which stated its aim, was to “rationalise” a number of funding streams into a single grant programme from April 2006. This rationalisation has resulted in the current system.

Prior to this single grant programme, the DfES had six grant programmes including Strengthening Families Grant (formerly Marriage and Relationship Support Grant and Family Support Grant) whose stated aim was as follows:

“The aim of the Strengthening Families grant programme is to support and develop activities which enable families to get access to information, help and advice. The programme has been formed by the merger of the Marriage and Relationship Support (MARS) and Family Support (FSG) grant programmes, following the creation of the DfES Children, Young People and Families Directorate. Development Grants provide funding for work on marriage and relationship support and parenting for up to three years. One year Infrastructure Grants provide funding for work on marriage and relationship support only.

Allocation for 2005-06: £11.4m”<sup>4</sup>

The current consultation clearly illustrates how that important aim and objective of supporting marriage has been lost, as the word “marriage” is not mentioned. It now has the nebulous “overall objective of improving outcomes for children, young people and families”.

### Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed criteria for strategic funding?

No, we strongly disagree with the strategic funding proposed criteria put forward here. It has criteria, which provide nebulous conceptual purposes<sup>5</sup>, both difficult and hard to

---

<http://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/client/downloads/family%20breakdown.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> See: [www.dcsf.gov.uk/consultations/.../partial%20ria%20050616%20rl.doc](http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/consultations/.../partial%20ria%20050616%20rl.doc) – Partial Regulatory Impact Assessment-Rationalisation of Children’s Services Related Grant Funding for the Voluntary and Community Sector.

<sup>5</sup> Funding for strategic purposes should be offered to organisations that can, in relation to children, families and young people: provide a representative ‘voice’ of the third sector at national level and act as an advocate for the third sector

- facilitate effective communication between DCSF and the third sector
- provide leadership to the sector in responding to new opportunities and challenges
- influence national policy through particular experience or expertise, either directly or through the experience of members

comprehend. They do not appear to favour any local support projects. The previous six grants had clearly understood aims and purposes.<sup>6</sup>

**Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed criteria for innovation funding?**

No, we disagree with the proposed criteria for innovation funding. Instead, the basic and simple funding criteria based on the clear aims and objectives for the six grants should be restored, and ideas such as “innovation funding”<sup>7</sup> dropped. It is very inappropriate to look at innovation funding when applications for basic funding are stated to be increasingly oversubscribed.

**Question 4: Would you welcome a proposal to approve applications for innovation projects for 2 years and for strategic funding for 3 years?**

No, we disagree that innovation funding and innovation projects should be taken on board in the first place. This is inappropriate for the reasons stated in answer to question 3. The funding position before April 2006 should be restored with index linking and annual increases. The applications would then be based on the six grant funds not on any innovation projects or strategic funding.

It is unclear how long the six grant funds were provided for in the past but a period of at least 3 years if not longer would seem appropriate.

Unfortunately, no separate annual figures for the CYPF funding are given in this consultation. It is unclear what period the four rounds in excess of £140 million represents for grant money awarded from the CYPF fund programme. If each round is worth about £35 million per year, compared to approx £45 million in 2005-2006. If this supposition is correct then this would demonstrate a decline in resources for this CYPF grant programme. The fact that the programme is increasingly oversubscribed indicates the need for more rather than less funding. An increase in funding should be directed towards marriage and relationship support funding as a cost effective measure.

**Question 11: What more could be done to share knowledge and information on**

- 
- work collaboratively with DCSF, other government departments and other key third sector partners on the development and implementation of departmental policy initiatives
  - work in partnership to build capacity building within the sector
  - provide support to smaller local third sector organisations
  - deliver or develop a service which is key to the achievement of the Department’s key priorities
  - promote and share best practice within and across the sector

<sup>6</sup> Ibid 4.

<sup>7</sup> Proposes that CYPF funding for innovation projects should be used to:

- undertake a genuinely new approach in a identified priority area and share learning of outcomes across the sector
- test the effectiveness of innovative solutions through replication in additional areas
- encourage the development of new service models

## **the progress of CYPF grant funded projects to help organisations learn from each other?**

It is easier for grant funded projects to learn from each other if they are not all treated the same and placed under one general non-distinctive fund. This includes the Marriage and Relationship support fund whose name should be restored so that “marriage” is clearly within the title. The consultation provides no information on the change in the funding position of the type of projects, which would have been under the Marriage and Relationship support fund. It is assumed that these types of projects have suffered because of competing for a single grant with no distinct funding source. In our opinion, the fund should be restored.

## **Question 18: Are there any other ways, not covered in the previous sections, in which we could make the CYPF grant more effective in supporting children, young people and families?**

Yes, by supporting marriage and relationship funding and making that a priority in terms of funding allocation. In doing so, this would have the advantage of supporting children, young people and families all at the same time. Children and young people from stable marital family backgrounds are well known to do better on a range of indices. In the UK, marriage rates are at an all time low and the legal and fiscal system supports lone parenthood.<sup>8</sup> Measures such as providing distinct grants to support marriage will help.

Under section 22 of the Family Act 1996, the Lord Chancellor may make grants with the approval of the Treasury for the provision of marriage support services; research into the causes of marital breakdown; and research into ways of preventing marital breakdown.

Thus, the CYPF grant could be made more effective in supporting children, young people and families in the following ways:

- A separate distinct and well-funded marriage and relationship support funding.
- Retention of the word “marriage” as opposed to “families” in the title
- Restoration of the Marriage Support Directory.

The relative cost of a distinct funding of marriage and relationship support is money well spent compared to the cost of family breakdown. A report by Sir Graham Hart on Funding for Marriage Support in 1999 stated, “It is likely that today public spending caused by family breakdown is running at about £5 billion a year.”<sup>9</sup> Costs of family breakdown to the exchequer are estimated in 2007 to be well over £20bn per annum.<sup>10</sup> Four times the cost estimate only 8 years previously. If this trend continues of a nearly £2bn per annum increase then by 2015 the cost of family breakdown may be estimated at approximately £35bn per annum, seven times the cost in 1999. This means that money spent in supporting marriage is money well spent and is a cost effective measure.

---

<sup>8</sup> See <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/telegraph-view/3623183/Marriage-works-despite-politicians-best-efforts.html>

<sup>9</sup> See Sir Graham Hart on Funding for Marriage Support in 1999.

<sup>10</sup> See Family breakdown: June 2007:

<http://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/client/downloads/family%20breakdown.pdf>

For over 50 years, it has been recognised that family breakdown constitutes one of the greatest risks to their emotional and psychological health and development that children may face during their childhood.<sup>11</sup> Preventing the breakdown of marriage should be a key policy area across all Government Departments including the CYPF grant programme. Cohabiting parents provide less stability for children. The European data shows that by a child's fifth birthday less than 1 in 12 (8%) married parents have split up compared to almost 1 in 2 (43%) cohabiting parents. Crime is strongly correlated with family breakdown - 70% of young offenders are from lone parent families and one third of prisoners were in local authority care (yet only 0.6% of the nation's children are in care at any one time).<sup>12</sup> The term marital status has been removed out of government forms.<sup>13</sup> Marital status was in the Sex Discrimination Act and has been removed as a term from the consolidated Equality Bill with civil partnership added as a protected characteristic for anti-discrimination legislation. Yet marital status is still a term used in European Directives. Marital status needs to be a term reintroduced and retained in legislation, government forms and government vocabulary.

The importance of marriage support and marital status needs to be strongly emphasised in grant support from the CYPF. The imperative in doing so is even clearer by the fact that this consultation does not even mention the term "marriage" once.

The DfES administered six grant programmes for 2005-2006<sup>14</sup> prior to the current single fund, listed as follows:

- **Children and Young People's Consultation Fund** Allocation for 2005-06: £450,000
- **National Voluntary Youth Organisations Grant Scheme** Allocation for 2005-06: £7m
- **Parenting Fund** Allocation for 2005-06: £14m
- **Safeguarding Children and Supporting Families Grants (formerly Section 64 grants)** Allocation for 2005-06: £4.2m
- **Strengthening Families Grant (formerly Marriage and Relationship Support Grant and Family Support Grant)** Allocation for 2005-06: £11.4m
- **Sure Start Unit VCS grant scheme** Allocation for 2005-06: £7.5m
- **Total funding for 2005-06 = approx £45 million**

---

<sup>11</sup> See <http://www.ccels.cf.ac.uk/archives/publications/2005/douglas.pdf>

<sup>12</sup> See Family breakdown: June 2007:

<http://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/client/downloads/family%20breakdown.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> See page 97 *ibid*.

<sup>14</sup> See: – Partial Regulatory Impact Assessment-Rationalisation of Children's Services Related Grant Funding For the Voluntary and Community Sector.

[www.dcsf.gov.uk/consultations/.../partial%20ria%20050616%20rl.doc](http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/consultations/.../partial%20ria%20050616%20rl.doc)

- **Proportionate amount for Strengthening Families Grant (formerly Marriage and Relationship Support Grant and Family Support Grant) =approx 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of annual sum.**

**Question 19: Thinking beyond the CYPF grant, what more might we do within the Department to improve our relationship with the third sector?**

Restore the sensible and clearly understood separate grants prior to April 2006, particularly those of marriage and relationship support funding.

**Please acknowledge this response.**