

Chichester District Council

CABINET

7 April 2015

Think Family Neighbourhoods – Selsey Pilot Evaluation

1. Contacts

Eileen Lintill - Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Community Services
Telephone: 01798 342948
E-mail: elintill@chichester.gov.uk

Steve Hansford – Head of Community Services
Telephone 01243 534789
Email: shansford@chichester.gov.uk

Amy Loaring – Partnerships Officer
Telephone 01243 534726
Email: aloaring@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the SelseyWorks project be supported in its transition to a sustainable service model and that the Council's services outreach support be continued.**
- 2.2 **That the lessons learnt at paragraph 5 be noted and continued support for the Think Family Neighbourhood work in the areas identified at paragraph 5.10 be endorsed.**

3. Background

- 3.1 In March 2012 Chichester in Partnership agreed to a pilot project in the Selsey area to investigate whether a targeted approach by partner organisations to work in the area would be feasible. This approach was approved by the Cabinet in May 2012. Following research an action plan for the Selsey area was developed and approved by the Cabinet on 5 February 2013 and by Chichester in Partnership Core group on 7 February 2013.
- 3.2 The action plan focused on:
 - a) Concerns about underperforming educational achievement at KS4
 - b) The lack of local employment opportunities
 - c) Transport and access to local services
 - d) Access to health provision
 - e) Limitation of youth activities and provision
 - f) Large amount of low income families
- 3.3 This report links to an Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) Task and Finish group, which during October and November 2014, considered the performance of schools in Chichester District and the state of secondary schools and children's

readiness for school (i.e. the under 5's at first entry to primary school). The OSC received presentations and questioned officers from WSCC and The Kemnal Academy Trust (TKAT). Recommendations related to support for Early Help for families.

4 Outcomes to be achieved

4.1 This evaluation has identified the outcomes of the Pilot Project which are set out in (Appendix Section 4). The pilot has delivered a number of projects including:

- SelseyWorks
- Activity days at Schools
- School Breakfast Club
- Health services leaflet

4.2 Outcomes expected from this project were:

- Reduction in the number of Job Seekers allowance claimants
- Improved performance in students at Key stage 3 and 4
- Improved access to services and facilities
- Increased activities and support measures for young people

5. Lessons Learnt

5.1 This project has been difficult to deliver. Engaging the correct partners at the appropriate level, finding resources and the development of solutions to local problems have all been issues. Nearly all the local partners have been going through reviews and facing significant resource pressures. Consequently partners tended to engage where projects met their own aims. The aim of such partnership work is to find shared outcomes that many partners can support and engage but often when it is a single outcome or the outcomes are more intangible it will only be the benefitting agencies that will engage.

5.2 The project had no specific funding and sought support through partner resources rather than cash funds. CDC performed the facilitating presence that supported community efforts providing a stimulus, advice, guidance and signposting support and funding where possible. However, it is the strength of any partnership that the right agencies are identified and brought together in a way that takes forward projects like SelseyWorks as a focus for the community and a single access to services which can have multiple benefits and outcomes.

5.3 Legitimacy was an issue initially. Partners questioned why CDC was involved, especially where an issue was not a statutory duty or previously an area of particular interest e.g. education

5.4 The issue of engagement and funding becomes critical in sustaining projects. Whilst "start-up" funding was secured, recurring funding is limited. It is therefore difficult to ensure a project can be established and integrated into mainstream services.

5.5 Identifying data which is sufficiently local and collected regularly enough to track change is an issue, e.g. census data is only available on a 10 year cycle. Therefore choosing appropriate measures is key.

- 5.6 A cost benefit analysis of the SelseyWorks project has been undertaken. Using the DCLG cost savings tool as the basis for this analysis, in one year SelseyWorks has saved the public purse £1,194,956 against the original partnership funds raised of £105,000, but this does not factor in partner staff time. It is recognised that the benefit to CDC has not been specifically quantified but case studies show that an early intervention will have saved higher cost later intervention, such as a housing emergency. In addition increases in employment mean that more people are economically active reducing benefit payment or risk of debt. A full analysis can be found in the evaluation report attached at the Appendix.
- 5.7 For the whole of the Selsey project it is still too early to evaluate the long term impact that these projects will have on the neighbourhood and some of the positive outcomes are intangible. However, there seems to be a feeling of excitement in Selsey and an enthusiasm from the community to become involved with different projects. We will repeat the public survey work during 2015 to assess whether the feelings of change are sustained.
- 5.8 One of the most important aspects of this project was the role on the Town Coordinator. This role has been an integral part of this project. Selsey Town Council's investment into this post has been good value for money and the importance of local council support is an important success factor.
- 5.9 By working closely with the community on this project hidden needs within the community were identified which have traditionally been difficult to reach. It has helped improve local networks and ensure that residents are signposted to the correct services. It is proving itself to be a highly effective "early help" service and links well to the Early Help Network and Think Family work.
- 5.10 It is, therefore, proposed that, based on the positive outcomes achieved via the Selsey pilot, Chichester District Council continues "neighbourhood working" in the identified areas of Chichester East, Chichester South and Tangmere.

6. Resource and legal implications

- 6.1 Officer time has been devoted to this project from within their core time. This was therefore an opportunity rather than an additional cost. Grant funding has been identified from existing funding and has been used to lever in other partner resources.
- 6.2 In order to mainstream the services of Selseyworks into a sustainable model a proposal to adapt part of Selsey Town Council (STC) building is being explored together with use of their existing reception staff. STC has made financial provision for the necessary building works and the Communities Team are supporting the cost of training existing reception staff from the Think Family Neighbourhood budget. If this model is adopted the revenue costs will be mainstreamed within existing STC budgets. A business case for a part time Project Officer @ £12,000 per annum is being developed to seek an ongoing funding source/s.
- 6.3 Officers from Benefits, Economic Development, Well Being and Housing who have supported SelseyWorks with 'outreach/surgery' time will continue to be available from within their core time. The Partnerships officer will continue to monitor and support the work taking place in Selsey as part of the role.

7. Consultation

- 7.1 All partners were consulted via the Chichester in Partnership core group meeting on 9 September 2014.
- 7.2 The Asset and Amenities Committee of Selsey Town Council was consulted on 19 February 2015. Feedback was positive and they consider that relations with CDC have improved through this work.

8. Community impact and corporate risks

- 8.1 The proposals contained within this report have the potential to deliver positive impacts for families. It offers the potential of more effective spending and savings to the public purse.
- 8.2 The corporate risk will be in the level of expectation that is made of CDC to invest resources in support of this way of working. However, it offers the opportunity to improve services to residents and reduce crisis demand. This work must be clearly linked to other projects such as Early Help, Think family and Getting People into work.

9. Alternatives Considered

- 9.1 CDC could choose not to commit its support this method of working. The risk of following this alternative is the loss of opportunity for greater partner engagement; lose engagement with local communities; lose the ability to influence service commissioning and delivery decisions affecting our district and more vulnerable residents.

10. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder – Neighbourhood working could prevent the development of ASB in an area.	x	
Climate Change		x
Human Rights and Equality Impact – The support will be available to all those needing help in an equitable way and will support those at risk of exclusion	x	
Safeguarding Impact.		x

11. Appendices

Appendix - Selsey Think family Neighbourhood Pilot – Evaluation

12. Background papers

None