

Conference: Housing and Social Justice

Teacher Building, Scottish Engineering Centre, St Enoch Square, Glasgow 1 October 2004

Workshop Session 1 (b): Dr Ann Rosengard, Ann Rosengard Associates

Supporting People – the Initial Programme: Issues for Equity, Inclusion and Effectiveness





SUPPORTING PEOPLE

The Initial Programme

Issues for Equity, Inclusion and Effectiveness

Supporting People

- New integrated funding framework for housing-related support services
- Enhanced advice and practical support, targeted to help people
 - disadvantaged and excluded
 - to access, settle in & sustain accommodation
- Announced by the (then) DSS (Dec'98)
- Implemented April 2003.
 - DETR (1998) Supporting People: A new policy and funding framework

Housing Support Services

• Grew provider-driven & piecemeal in 1980s/90s - in response to known support gaps, research & guidance

• Outreach support - funded through:

- LA grants to voluntary orgs & higher H.B.
- SNAP (Scotland) & SNMA (England)
- DSS Resettlement Grant
- RSI
- Charitable funds

Wide range of client groups

 core community care groups; homeless people; those leaving institutions; vulnerable young people; fleeing domestic violence; refugees/ A.S's

Thrust towards equitable access, inclusion, tackling disadvantage

- Good practice guidance sought more positive & sustainable solutions for disadvantaged tenants & owners
 - To prevent tenancy failures & need for institutional care
 - Person-centred, flexible or "floating", practical & emotional support
 - To fluctuate with needs
- Funded to separate management of accommodation and support to enable
 - full, secure tenancy rights (not occupancy)
 - choice of support providers
 - clear information about rights and duties
 - written occupancy and tenancy agreements

Inclusive and equitable aims

"We are committed to tackling poverty and disadvantage and the Supporting People programme has a vital role to play in ensuring that the most vulnerable in our society are able to live independently, either in their own homes or in supported accommodation."

Margaret Curran - Scottish Executive Communities Minister - - Announcing 2004 SP allocation

Drive and Momentum to SP

- Shift to SP policy & operational framework - policy & professional led
- Like thrust to CITC a key catalyst was policy-level concerns (re costs of HB)
 - L.A's to be lead players
 - Transitional framework demandled & funded through THB (2002-03)
 - Complex and demanding system for LA's and support providers
 - But enabled development & growth
 - THB ended 31.03.03 funds
 transferred from DWP to S.P. grant.

Opportunity driven and planned development of SP

- Robson Rhodes review (2004) in last months of THB, floating support costs *increased* from £160 to £332 million.
- THB funded housing support services:
 - previously funded by LA's or Health
 - by RSL's and vol orgs for vulnerable groups
 - formerly registered as SW care
 - formerly funded through a mix of HB and charitable sources e.g Lottery. May have been supplemented through SW funding of personal care or counselling.
 - enabled more flexible funding, more rights and higher personal income for tenants

Benchmark - SP Objectives 1998

- Prevention: To sustain people in community & to address problems before crises arise
- Promote independence: To enable people to take own decisions
- Alleviate crisis: To help through crises
- Resettlement: To help people settle in new home and community
- Inclusion: To support people who may not seek support; may have difficult behaviour or unconventional lifestyles, or who may have multiple needs, or fall outside traditional CITC client groups
- Focus on people: To provide flexible services moulded around people and the way they choose to live their lives.

Early outcomes

- SP high consensus across stakeholders
- Huge energy to make it work massive benefits & potential for service users
- Programme costs, bureaucracy and administration multiplied
- Cuts in England concerns about cuts in Scotland - Sep 04
- 2nd major Review (House of Commons 2004) concluded in spite of teething problems, SP "successful in meeting its objectives"
- Some key players believe SP "too successful for its own good in that it has stirred up expectations".

Scotland - Rigorous Regime

- Good practice developed, building on community care experience and systems
 - Clear policy framework & objectives,
 - National standards, specified eligible services; regulations and guidance
 - LA as lead planner and commissioner
 - Local strategic requirements SP
 Assessments and Plans in context of JW
 - Person-centred support needs assessments and support planning
 - Guidelines stress flexibility of support service to meet individual needs and
 - User involvement in support planning
 - Regulatory framework Care Commission / Audit Commission

The scale of SP programme

- 149 "Administering Authorities" + 6000 providers (England). 32 A.A.'s (Scot)
- Initial budget for UK based on LA estimates £350 £750 million
- England ODPM allocation
 - Allocation rose from £1.4 billion (03/04) to £1.8 billion (04/05) then major reviews
- Scottish L.A.s received from Scot Exec:
 - <u>2003-04 £421 million</u> coupled with Review
 of funded services *effectiveness and VFM*
 - <u>2004-05 £408 million</u>
 - Edinburgh (11%) and Glasgow (17.59%) jointly receive almost 29% of total.
 - Given reviews & 7.5% cut in England Sep 04
 Scottish providers are concerned about future SP funding and impact on services

Outcomes, equity and inclusion

- SP programme opportunity to deliver
 - social support creatively
 - on individualised, participatory basis and
 - to promote social networks and inclusion
- 2 years on
 - more housing-related support and tenancy sustainment on offer to meet wider needs
 - some very creative initiatives and positive JW
- Reviews indicate constraints on:
 - service user choice and control where accommodation and support are tied
 - service responsiveness and flexibility
 (bureaucracy; funding; eligibility)
 - inclusiveness of services (commissioning priorities may dominate) "hard to reach' require pro-active services and joint work (Watson 2003)
 - on cross-tenure access to SP and on access to response for other occupants than householder

Organisational impacts - constraints, risks & competition

- Vol orgs & RSLs agents of local authorities?
- High risks management, financial, service sustainability - providers concerned may stifle innovation and pro-active services
- Competition and financial insecurity
 - Easier for larger providers to deal with admin systems & personnel requirements
 - Inhibits joint work
- Significant admin demands system/ regulation
- Providers compete for housing support staff
- Variable quality of provision
- Training & staff support
 - critical to quality & effectiveness

Yet aims & achievements of SP widely valued