

Report to the Cabinet Member for Adult and Community Services and Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Schools
Report submitted by: Executive Director of Adult Services, Health and Wellbeing and Interim Executive Director for Children and Young People
Date: 6 November and 11 November 2014

Part I

Electoral Divisions affected:
All

Reconfiguration of Supporting People Funded Services
(Appendices 'A' - 'C' refer)

Contact for further information:

Sarah McCarthy, (01772) 530551, Adult Services, Health and Wellbeing Directorate
sarah.mccarthy@lancashire.gov.uk

Executive Summary

A reduction of £4 million to the Supporting People Budget was agreed in the County Council's Revenue Budget 2014/15. However, it was clearly identified in the Equality Analysis submitted as part of those proposals that consultation would be undertaken prior to decisions being made regarding savings to individual services. This report seeks approval to reduce funding for a range of services including a reduction of £1.558m for floating support services, a reduction of £0.1m for supported lodgings services and the decommissioning of family intervention projects. Information is also provided regarding the approach being adopted in relation to commissioning short term accommodation based services

This is deemed to be a Key Decision and Standing Order 25 has been complied with.

Recommendation

The Cabinet Member for Adult and Community Services is recommended to:

- (i) Approve reduction of funding of floating support services by £1.558m (from £2.858m to £1.300m);
- (ii) Approve reduction of funding of supported lodging services by £0.100m from £0.462m to £0.362m;
- (iii) Approve the decommissioning of family intervention projects;
- (iv) Note the approach which is being adopted to re-commissioning short term accommodation based services as set out in the report.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Schools is recommended to approve the de-commissioning of family intervention projects.

1. Background and Advice

As part of the County Council's Revenue Budget 2014/15, proposals for a reduction in the total budget for Supporting People of £4.000m by 1 April 2015 were approved. However, it was clearly identified in the Equality Analysis submitted as part of those proposals that consultation would be undertaken around specific proposals. Consequently, approval was obtained in July 2014 to consult on proposals in relation to:

- Family Intervention Projects
- Supported Lodgings
- Floating Support
- Sheltered Housing

This report outlines the feedback to the consultation and resulting recommendation in relation to Family Intervention Projects, Supported Lodgings and Floating Support, as well as providing information in relation to the approach being adopted to re-commissioning short term supported accommodation.

2. FAMILY INTERVENTION PROJECTS (FIPS)

2.1 Description

Small intensive floating support services set up to support some of the most troubled and challenging families.

Supporting People funding for family intervention projects is £0.242m.

In the region of between 30 and 40 people received support during 2013/14.

A snapshot of service users was undertaken around December 2013. Details were received for all services, with the exception of Burnley. At that time around 25 people were being supported, of which 9 people were appearing on the Working Together with Families lists.

2.2 Original Proposals

- Family Intervention Projects (FIP) funded by Supporting People are decommissioned.
- Within the proposals there was a recognition that since the Supporting People funded FIP/Vulnerable Household Projects were set up around 2008, Lancashire County Council has adopted the Working Together with Families (WTWF) approach and the Government has launched the Troubled Families Programme. Consequently, the context in which the FIPs operate has changed.

However, in terms of the future, it has not been decided if the County Council will enter Phase 2 of the Troubled Families Unit (TFU) programme. The County Council is completing a cost benefit analysis and will report this to the WTWF Governance Group later this year.

The TFU financial framework for Phase 2 is not yet available, but the Department of Communities and Local Government has indicated that funding will be significantly less than Phase 1 and that the programme will have to reach a greater number of families which would indicate that this type of intensive approach would be even less sustainable going forward.

In Lancashire, the WTWF approach agreed by its Governance Group is not based on a FIP model. The Working Together With Families (WTWF) approach and the Prevention and Early Help (P&EH) service going forward operate on a lead professional model and we would expect this lead professional (LP) to be drawn from the appropriate service across the partnership and for the work to form part of their "normal" caseload, so if the primary needs are housing there could be an expectation that many of the LPs came from District Housing Authority or the Registered Social Landlord.

- In the event that the proposal to decommission services is agreed, there would be clear transition arrangements so that existing service users receive appropriate levels of support. The Lancashire Children and Young People Safeguarding Board (LCSB) and Children and Young People Trust have agreed a Continuum of Need (CON) and Common Assessment Framework (CAF) as the mechanism for identifying thresholds for access to different services. This means that some families may not be eligible for support.

2.3 Consultation Process

- 516 people were sent the link to the FIP consultation proposals and questionnaire, including all providers on the framework agreement, district councils and a range of other organisations.
- Two responses were received to the formal consultation – both responses were from district councils.
- An offer was made to meet with providers to discuss the proposals – one provider took up this offer.
- A report detailing the full consultation process and feedback is included within the Equality Analysis at Appendix 'A'.

2.4 Consultation Feedback

- Fylde Borough Council supports the recommendations.
- "Pendle Borough Council are concerned that the removal of FIPs, although only working with a small number of families in Pendle, will leave a gap which will not be filled by the Working Together with Families (WTWF) approach. FIPs work positively on a daily basis with families who need intensive, personalised support to stabilise initially and then move on and improve to become more viable: less of a concern to the communities where they live and the agencies who support them. The dedicated FIP worker and holistic family approach

cannot be replicated by the WTWf Lead professional and Team Around the Family approach with the most difficult to manage families. The FIP team, working in the Partnership office in the Town Hall, have also helped to support a small number of families of young people identified through the Prevent and Deter Panel of the Community Safety Partnership".

- Provider Feedback - there was a recognition by the Provider of the changing landscape since the FIPs were established and of the financial position of the County Council. However, the following points were raised:
 - The Early Support contracts are of a shorter duration and offer less intensive support than FIPs. Therefore Early Support services could partially replace some elements of the support offered by the FIPs, but for a shorter duration. Decisions have not yet been made as to whether or not these contracts will be extended beyond March 2015
 - Working Together with Families is about changes to ways of working rather than delivering a service. There is a lack of clarity about who would be the lead professional in relation to WTWf.
 - Recommendation that there is a requirement to undertake independent evaluation of services within contracts in order to inform future commissioning, e.g. consider whether it is appropriate to commission more intensive services for smaller numbers of people or less intensive service for more people.
 - Recommendation that consideration is given to the increased role that charities can play e.g. in relation to national campaigning.

2.5 Recommendation

We are recommending the decommissioning of Family Intervention Projects.

It is acknowledged that due to the lack of certainty regarding the future of Working Together with Families it is difficult to describe the level of support which will be available to individuals who would have previously accessed Family Intervention Projects. In the future families will be assessed against the eligibility criteria for services which are in place after April 2015. This means that some families may not be eligible for support.

Floating support would not be able to replace the FIP in terms of the holistic nature of the support. However, there may be opportunities to work with other agencies as part of a multi-agency team to support families where there is a high risk of homelessness. This offer is likely to only be available to a very small number of families given the significant reduction in the capacity of the floating support contracts and the refocussing of the service on shorter term interventions.

In the event that the proposal is agreed, services will stop accepting new referrals so there are unlikely to be many existing service users requiring support when the contract ceases.

3.0 SUPPORTED LODGINGS

3.1 Description

Supported lodgings services provide a young person with a room of their own in a private home where they are a member of the household, but are not expected to become a member of the family. The householder, or host, provides a safe and supportive environment, working alongside professional services to help and support the young person in gaining skills for independent life.

3.2 Original Proposal

- Reduction in funding from around £462,000 to £362,000.
- Recommended that the service is tendered in three geographical lots, although one provider could bid for all three and deliver greater economies of scale.
- Development of a specification which will facilitate greater consistency across Lancashire and improve links between supported lodgings providers and district councils.

3.3 Consultation Process

- 514 organisations were sent the link to the consultation proposals. This included all providers on the framework agreement, district councils and a range of other organisations.
- A total of 12 people attended the stakeholder consultation event. Those in attendance included representatives from existing supported lodgings provider organisations, the Leaving Care service, District Housing Teams, the Youth Offender Team and a Drug and Alcohol service.
- 21 young people attended 4 consultation groups and 4 young people completed the questionnaire.
- 9 householders responded to the householders questionnaire
- A report detailing the full consultation process and feedback is included within the Equality Analysis at Appendix 'C'.

3.4 Consultation Feedback

- Support for moving to a fully generic service which includes the requirement to meet the needs of young offenders and those at risk of offending. This will lead to the need to recruit flexible and adaptable host households to meet a wide range of young people's needs.
- In general, there was support for the three lots, although there were some concerns expressed regarding ability of small providers to bid. Consequently, we will make clear that we will allow a variety of consortium arrangements to deliver the service, provided appropriate arrangements are in place to protect the County Council and service users.

- Whilst some concerns were expressed by providers regarding the revisions to the payment processes to address utilisation, the proposal is to proceed with the original recommendation (i.e. providers will only receive the host contribution when there is a young person in placement). This decision has been made on the basis that confirmation was received from the providers that they do not make payments to host households when there are no young people being supported. Providers will continue to receive funding for the support workers irrespective of the utilisation levels.
- Following feedback from stakeholders to our proposals to reduce the upper age limit to 21, we decided to retain the original age range of 16 - 25 years as providers said that lowering the age range would exclude some people who were in need of the service.
- Our original intention was to have a county wide approach to recruitment and training, however following the consultation we are proposing that some elements will be countywide and others more local. We will promote a county wide approach for advertising, induction training and specific issues training, whilst there will be local arrangement for recruitment for specific needs and the assessment and approval of host households.
- Vacancy information being shared with district housing teams was supported; however feedback from stakeholders was that this should be, where possible, through existing Panel arrangements. This proposal is supported by district councils.
- Feedback from the young people's consultation highlighted the issue of sharing which had previously not been considered. Young people expressed some concern about how this is currently managed. We propose to highlight in the specification that providers will need to carefully manage host households who take more than 1 young person at the same time to avoid existing placements becoming destabilised.
- A new proposal which emanated from the consultation with young people was that all host householders should have a profile available for young people to read before deciding whether to meet the host householder.
- A new proposal from the stakeholder events was that additional outcomes relating to householders should be included in specifications e.g. developing a positive relationship with the householder.

3.5 Recommendation

- To reduce funding from around £460,000 to £360,000.
- To include issues outlined above under consultation feedback within the service specification.
- To tender three area based lots.
- To use a resource allocation formula based on 60% deprivation and 40% population.

4.0 FLOATING SUPPORT

4.1 Description of Service

Visiting housing related support service.

4.2 Original Proposal

- Reduction in funding from £2.8m to between £1.2 million and £1.5 million.
- Floating support to be clearly identified as a targeted service within the overall Integrated Well Being Framework.
- The core Integrated Well Being Service will provide a triage function for the floating support service in order to enable better targeting of services.
- Promotion of asset based approaches in order to help mitigate the impact of the budget reduction.
- Joint working with all stakeholders, including providers and district councils, during the next few months:
 - to determine if the generic service will continue to support all current client groups or if some funding will be extracted to procure floating support services through alternative arrangements;
 - to develop a more targeted specification to reflect the reduction in funding.

4.3 Detailed Proposal Developed Following Consultation

Two consultation events were held which focussed on working with stakeholders to develop the future service model. The first workshop focussed on generating ideas and the second event focussed on consulting on a more detailed service model. A report detailing the full consultation process and feedback is included within the Equality Analysis at Appendix 'B'.

Whilst having a housing support focus, the current service is geared at promotion of independence and has broad outcomes, developed by CLG, which reflected the Every Child Matters outcome domains: Economic Well Being, Enjoy and Achieve, Being Healthy, Stay Safe, Positive Contribution.

Whilst providers were required to report on all outcomes, the largest identified need for support, both locally and regionally, tended to be in relation to maximising income, reducing debt, maintaining or securing accommodation, contact with external agencies and assistance to better manage physical and mental health.

The proposed future service model outlined below seeks to target funding where there will be the greatest impact. Consequently, the proposal is to focus a greater proportion of the service on short interventions which prevent homelessness or a crisis leading to homelessness.

This proposal reflects:

- the current identified need as outlined above;
- responses from service users as part of the consultation in relation to what they feel the most valuable elements of the service are;
- district feedback in relation to the success of drop ins;
- initiatives already adopted by providers under their contract to help manage demand which have proved to be successful;
- general feedback at the stakeholder events.

Whilst there is a majority, but not total, consensus to adopting this approach, there are concerns regarding the impact of floating support not addressing underlying causes of homelessness. Consequently, we are seeking through identifying floating support as a targeted services within the Integrated Wellbeing Service to provide a more joined up approach. This will enable individuals to obtain information and support to access universal services and community resources, thereby provide ongoing links with local communities. It will also enable individuals to be referred to services which focus on lifestyle or behaviour change where this is appropriate.

The table below compares the existing service with the proposed model.

Issue	Current Model	Proposed Future Service Model
Service Model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stand alone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the targeted services under the Integrated Well Being Service in order to facilitate more joined up approach and greater efficiencies
Aim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To promote independence, social inclusion and improved quality of life (from contract) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To prevent homelessness and to prevent crises leading to homelessness
Elements of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short to medium term floating support • Outreach • Resettlement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phone/email advice only (Signposting) • Crisis intervention • Pre-tenancy work • Resettlement • Short to medium term floating support • Maintenance in the community
Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access via two provider gateways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder (e.g. districts) - direct access to providers • Member of the public – via the information and signposting element of the Integrated Wellbeing Service
Proportion of service users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not specified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signposting, crisis, resettlement, pre-tenancy: 60% • Short term floating support: 30% • Maintenance in the community: 10%

Duration of support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 2 years • The average duration is 4 to 5 months 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signposting: one off/up to a week • Crisis intervention: 4-6 weeks • Pre-tenancy work: 4 weeks • Resettlement: 4 weeks • Short to medium term floating support: 3-6 months • Maintenance in the community: periodic (e.g. quarterly, maintenance checks, facility for rapid re-engagement)
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic well being • Enjoy and achieve • Being healthy • Stay Safe • Positive Contribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic wellbeing • Staying safe (maintenance of accommodation or securing accommodation) • May have some other outcomes for 40% receiving a longer term service but this will be subject to negotiation with provider and districts once we are clear about the profile of people accessing these services and the service required to best meet their needs

4.4 Consultation – Stakeholders

Consultation Process

- Links to proposals and electronic questionnaire were sent to 516 organisation on 4/08/2014. This included all providers on the framework agreement, district councils and a range of other organisations;
- Two stakeholder events were held – 11/09/2014 and 02/10/2014;
- A report detailing the full consultation process and feedback is included within the Equality Analysis at Appendix 'B'.

Stakeholder Feedback - Electronic Questionnaire Specific Questions– 17 respondents

- 82% of respondents agreed with the proposal to link the floating support service with the integrated wellbeing service;
- 65% of respondents agreed with the proposal to have a single point of access and a triage function for the floating support service;
- 76% of respondents agreed with the proposal to target floating support on the prevention of homelessness by increasingly signposting to other support services;
- 71% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the county council's outline proposal in respect of floating support;

Comments have been included in wider consultation feedback below.

Stakeholder Feedback – Events and Comments Included in Electronic Questionnaire

Key issues from the consultation (full report contained within the Equality Analysis at Appendix 'B'):

- A recognition that floating support service delivery already included many 'hidden' elements which mirrored the proposed approach;
- A majority consensus that the proposal is realistic and deliverable if not ideal given that the funding cuts are substantial;
- Support for re-tendering in the same three locality lots;
- A need to develop full definitions of crisis to enable providers to target and prioritise effectively;
- Concern around levels of re-presentation from more complex or higher level needs clients resulting from the use of shorter term crisis interventions;
- A request for flexibility in service provision, particularly in regard to the length of support delivered, and a need to avoid inflexible targets or streaming;
- Support for the idea of rapid re-engagement but some mixed views about who should be able to re-engage quickly and in what circumstances;
- A request for clarity around pathways into and out of the service plus information about other services that may be available in the context of enabling joint working with the integrated wellbeing service;
- A consensus that greater flexibility and less focus on monitoring hours was a positive development;
- Concerns around losing quality with proposed shorter term work;
- One of the respondents to the stakeholder consultation did say that they thought that the proportion of cuts was disproportionate and that it would have been better if the short term accommodation based proposals had also been available at the same time. (See section 5.0 regarding short term accommodation based services).

Initially, the current split of savings was proposed as there were thought to be more opportunities to reconfigure sheltered housing services and to find alternative ways to deliver floating support through working with the integrated well-being services and making links with asset based approaches.

4.5 Consultation - Customers

Process

- A total of 1,100 questionnaires were circulated by the current floating support providers Disc and Calico on behalf of Lancashire County Council and service users could complete and on line survey;
- As of 14 October an overall total of 99 responses had been received from service users.

Feedback

- There is broad support for providing an increased range of services of different lengths in order to better manage demand;
- A majority of respondents indicated they did not want the length of support to be limited in order to reduce waiting times for support and indicated that they would prefer the length of support to be flexible;
- A quarter of respondents indicated that they had received a duplication of support from more than one agency whilst receiving floating support. The most commonly reported areas were in the area of emotional/mental health needs and social support;
- The three highest priority areas of support identified by service users included helping to prevent people losing their homes, helping people with money/debt/budgeting problems and helping people to move home if they needed to move;
- The three lowest priority areas of support identified by service users included helping people with the development of practical living skills; helping people improve their employment, training and volunteering opportunities; and helping people improve their social lives.

4.6 Recommendation

The recommendations for floating support are:

- To reduce the budget to £1.3 million and to reshape services as outlined above, whilst ensuring that the links with the Well Being Service are clear and that there is some flexibility in terms of deliverability without losing the overall aim of the service (i.e. the majority of people supported for short durations).
- To use a resource allocation based on a 60% deprivation and 40% population formula which broadly reflects the original allocation of funding.
- To include issues outlined above under consultation feedback in service specification.
- To work with the districts and providers to agree the most appropriate local models of service delivery (e.g. drop ins. etc.), whilst not losing a focus on the overall aim of the model.

5.0 SHORT TERM SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION

One of the respondents to the stakeholder consultation stated that they thought that the proportion of cuts was disproportionate and that it would have been better if the short term accommodation based proposals had also been available. This type of service includes refuges, supported accommodation for 16-25 year olds, supported accommodation for offenders, homeless families supported accommodation.

Initial proposals to focus most of the savings on sheltered accommodation and floating support arose from the assumptions that there would be more opportunities:

- to reconfigure sheltered accommodation;
- to work with the integrated well-being services and community resources to deliver some of the support which would have initially been delivered via the floating support services.

There are still £600,000 savings to be identified from another efficiency savings programme. Consequently, we are now working with districts to identify how we can reconfigure short term services to achieve greater efficiencies and meet strategic priorities. However, this needs to be done on an individual service by service basis, prior to tendering services, with a view to new contracts being in place by July 2015.

We are also exploring the most appropriate approach to procuring services in relation to grouping services within tenders and to defining lots. This will be determined in conjunction with Procurement and Legal Services.

Implications

Procurement

Floating support services, supported lodgings and short term accommodation based services will be re-procured via mini competition from the Housing Support Framework Agreement.

Financial

The savings identified in this report total £1.900m. An additional £0.118m savings have been negotiated with mental health providers. It is proposed that the remaining £2.000m savings are achieved through reducing funding to sheltered housing. Sheltered housing providers are currently consulting with their service users. Following consideration of all the feedback, a report will then be submitted to the Cabinet Member during December 2014.

Equality and Diversity

Equality Analyses are set out at Appendices 'A' - 'C'.

List of Background Papers

Paper	Date	Contact/Directorate/Tel
N/A		
Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate		
N/A		