

REPORT OF REGENERATION AND SOCIAL INCLUSION SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Supporting Socially Excluded Adults	Classification Public	Enclosures Appendix 1
	Ward(s) affected All	

1. FOREWORD

London is one of the wealthiest cities in the world where many residents enjoy economic and social prosperity. However, some groups of residents find it difficult to access and maintain the basic necessities of normal everyday life. This review focuses on four adult groups who are particularly vulnerable to all forms of deprivation and social exclusion. These are:

- Care Leavers
- Offenders under probation supervision
- Adults with secondary mental health problems
- Adults with moderate to severe learning disabilities

Despite the excellent work of many committed individuals, the national indicators on housing and employment for these groups remain well below that of the wider population. Within Hackney the outcomes for adults with learning disabilities and offenders fall in the lowest quartile of all local authorities in the UK.

The effectiveness of services in this area is incredibly important as they impact not only on the individual service user but on the wider community also. If our fellow Hackney residents are struggling to find employment, maintain housing and avoid social exclusion, there will inevitably be negative consequences for the entire community.

During this review members have gratefully received evidence from a number of agencies and most enlighteningly of all from services users themselves.

Councillor Angus Mulready-Jones
Vice-Chair of the Regeneration and Social Inclusion Scrutiny Commission

Lead councilor for the review.

2 INTRODUCTION

A home and a job are key aspects of normal everyday life that all individuals should be able to aspire to. They provide excluded adults with the foundations for getting their life back on track. Because there are no composite measures of social exclusion the Government has devised a set of other indicators which will help to measure performance and outline the scale of the task. These indicators are:

- % of offenders in settled and suitable accommodation
- % of former care leavers in suitable accommodation
- % of learning disabled living in the community
- % of mentally ill in settled accommodation
- % of offenders in employment
- % of care leavers in employment, education or training
- % of learning disabled in employment
- % of mentally ill in employment

Using these indicators to focus on the identified groups is important because it provides us and our partners with an opportunity to make a difference. These 4 groups are all at crucial transition points in their lives life that bring them into contact with services. Because of this they are within reach of services and we should therefore use the opportunity to do all we can to assist them.

The government identified a need to act on this because nationally :

- Over 30% of care leavers are not in education, employment or training at age 19 compared to 13% of all young people.
- A third of all prisoners about to leave prison said they have nowhere to stay.
- 70,000 people with severe mental health problems are on incapacity benefit.
- only 10% of people with learning disabilities in touch with services are doing any form of paid work.

Joint working is critical to delivering proper support for these client groups and the Council will need to work closely with Jobcentre Plus, the local primary care and mental health trusts, the London Probation Service, third sector service providers as well as local employers and education providers in the borough.

a) Context – a new Public Service Agreement

The 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review includes a Public Service Agreement (PSA) aimed at reducing social exclusion among the most vulnerable adults. It was proposed that in concluding its review of social inclusion, which this Commission initiated in 2006/7, that it carry out a scrutiny review to assist the Council in preparing to implement this Public Service Agreement.

A Public Service Agreement is a voluntary agreement negotiated between a local authority and the Government that aims to improve delivery of local public services by focusing on targeted outcomes.

The purpose of this PSA is to:

Increase the proportion of socially excluded adults in settled accommodation and in employment, education or training.

The PSA focuses on four client groups who are particularly vulnerable to multiple forms of disadvantage and who may be negotiating a difficult transition such as leaving prison or long term care. These two factors make them particularly at risk of falling into persistent exclusion, but may also means that they are in contact with the services that could and should make a difference. These four groups are:

- **Care leavers**
- **Offenders under probation supervision**
- **Adults with secondary mental health problems**
- **Adults with moderate to severe learning disabilities**

Adults with multiple needs are typically in contact with a range of services, but tend to benefit less from the support they receive because their lives and engagement with these services are too chaotic. Effective inter-agency working is therefore crucial in ensuring a more coherent and personalised response to their wider needs.

This is the first time there has been a PSA focused on vulnerable adults and the lever of the PSA should encourage prevention and early intervention by focusing on transition points, when individuals can be helped to avoid long term exclusion. It should promote joint working by setting out a shared cross-government commitment to tackling exclusion. It should also focus resources by sending a clear signal that helping these groups is a priority and it should incentivise and drive delivery, through a clear performance management framework for tackling social exclusion among adults.

b) Origin of proposal

The Overview and Scrutiny Board took an overview of how Council services cater for hard-to-reach groups during its 'Directorate Question Times' held in 2006/07. The Board found that while there is much good work taking place across the Council, this work could be better co-ordinated at a corporate level. There was concern that Councils do not have specific targets for measuring how they are meeting the needs of the most disadvantaged and that good overall performance on a given outcome can mask underachievement among a small minority. The Board has requested the Regeneration and Social Inclusion Scrutiny Commission take some of the identified issues forward, as agreed in the review's terms of reference.

The Chair of Regeneration and Social Inclusion Scrutiny Commission subsequently visited the Cabinet Office Social Exclusion Task Force on 18 May to hear more about the Government's key concerns and plans to address social exclusion, including a new PSA for Socially Excluded Adults. It was agreed that scrutiny involvement would be timely and add value to the borough's preparation process.

c) Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for the review was agreed as follows:

- *To determine current awareness of numbers of care-leavers, ex-offenders, adults with secondary mental health needs, and adults with learning difficulties resident in Hackney; and their current employment and living situations.*
- *To identify the typical barriers these groups face to gaining education, employment and training and to living independently, and support arrangements in place.*
- *To monitor conclusions of forthcoming research by the Social Exclusion Taskforce in this area.*
- *To investigate good practice in other local authority areas in supporting these groups to find education, employment and training and live independently.*
- *To make recommendations that will assist the Council and its partners in improving performance in this area.*

In assisting the Council to prepare for the PSA for socially excluded adults, the review will aim to assess the scale of the issue, support arrangements currently in place, and local performance.

The Commission will also look at the barriers that hinder performance on these issues by looking at national research, talking to professionals in Hackney, and talking to individuals from the groups affected about their experiences.

One of the key principles identified by the Government for tackling social exclusion is the need to ensure joined-up service areas; the review will therefore hear from a wide range of services including LBH Policy and Performance, LBH Adult Social Services, East London NHS Foundation Trust (the local mental health trust), Job Centre Plus and the London Probation Service.

The Commission will monitor relevant developments at Government level, and consider the views of professionals, good practice from other authorities and findings of Social Exclusion Taskforce research in making recommendations that aim to place Hackney in a good position to implement the resulting PSA.

d) Methodology

The Commission appointed Councillor Angus Mulready-Jones to lead on the review. The review was conducted between September 2007 and February 2008 by the following methods:

(1) Site Visits:

- (i) To **St Mungo's** in Hackney on Tuesday 20 November 2007.

St Mungos helps single homeless people in London who have been or are in danger of sleeping rough. Visit led by Cllr Mulready-Jones.

- (ii) To **Outward** on Monday 26 November 2007.

Outward provides a range of housing support and care services to vulnerable and disabled people including services to people with learning disabilities, people with mental health problems and autism spectrum disorders. Visit led by Cllrs Mulready-Jones, Oguzkanli and McShane

(iii) **One Support** on Monday 26 November 2007

One Support supports people to live independently within the community as well as providing living spaces for young people. They promote independent living and links to training and employment opportunities.

This visit was led by Cllr Mulready Jones and included a site visit to a supported housing unit at 18 Allen Rd which is a high support service for 16-24 years olds.

(2) Evidence presented at formal Commission meetings (full list at item 8.1)

(3) Review of key policy, guidance and research documents (full list at item 10).

DRAFT

3. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 After hearing the evidence as outlined in this report, the Commission makes the following summary and recommendations, which are elaborated in Section 6 of the report:

RECOMMENDATIONS RELEVANT TO ALL FOUR GROUPS IN THE PSA

Recommendation One - General

Members noted that Hackney's performance, compared to the London and national averages, for the particular set of indicators used to measure performance on this PSA, was excellent or good in relation to care leavers and adults with moderate to severe learning disabilities but was poor in relation to ex-offenders and those with secondary mental health problems. This comparative analysis is based on the data from the Cabinet Office's Social Exclusion Task Force as outlined in Appendix 1 of the report.

The summary evidence submitted by the London Probation Service raised some general concerns such as that Hackney had a higher proportion of prisoners when compared with other boroughs and that Hackney offenders were more likely to prove a high risk of harm to the public and that they have a higher risk of reconviction than the general offender population in London.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Community Services and Neighbourhoods and Regeneration Directorates consider how the borough and, if appropriate, its partners, may respond to the needs of those individuals covered by the PSA and develop proposals that assure both the Cabinet Member and this Scrutiny Commission that individuals are assisted during what may often be challenging periods of transition. The focus should be on early intervention to prevent more complex problems possibly arising later on.

Above all the Commission wishes to be assured that clients' needs are met in the both the medium and the longer term and that in so doing life opportunities are fully realised but also that any potential future responsibility of statutory service providers can be minimised. The Commission wishes to be advised by no later than November 2008 how this might be done.

Recommendation Two – rent deposit schemes

Members heard about the operation of the private sector rent deposit schemes for clients with low support needs and a concern was expressed that the number of landlords in the scheme was diminishing because they were being offered more money by other London boroughs to house their tenants and some also preferred a rent guarantee system. Consequently members expressed concern that cross borough or sub-regional co-operation in this area needed to be improved. Members welcomed the news that a new rent deposit scheme, which was a three way partnership with Supporting People, Home Link and Housing Advice and Options, had commenced in September 2007.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Neighbourhood and Regeneration and Community Services Directorates ensure that the Council, through its chairing of the East London Homelessness Group, implements a framework to monitor and improve the operation of rent deposit schemes across boroughs. It cannot be in the interests of any London Borough to be in competition with each another.

Recommendation Three – dual-diagnosis clients

Members heard that ‘dual diagnosis’, when clients have, for example, both mental health issues and an alcohol problem, is widely recognised as a major issue for all mental health service providers. Clients with dual problems e.g. drugs and alcohol or drugs and mental health issues require more complex interventions. Building up dual diagnosis services is identified as a priority in Hackney’s Mental Health Strategy 2007-2010. Members heard that Supporting People had begun to pilot a small scheme as part of the Community Outreach Support Team (COST). The pilot scheme establishes a dedicated post within the COST team to work in a community outreach role to provide low-medium floating support to up to 15 mental health service users with diagnosed severe mental illness and substance misuse issues. It is noted that the pilot scheme runs from March 2007 to September 2008.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Community Services Directorate (Housing Needs) investigate and report back to Members on the outcomes of the COST team’s pilot project to provide low-medium floating support to ‘dual diagnosis’ clients with a view to exploring ways in which this scheme could be extended or mainstreamed. The Commission wishes to receive a report detailing such considerations by November 2008.

Recommendation Four – accessibility of Hackney Choice

Members encountered some concerns that the number of Hackney Choice users had decreased sharply, which may have arisen because some users were being disadvantaged owing to an inability to access or use the new computerised system.

It was noted that an equalities impact assessment on Hackney's choice based lettings system had been carried out which indicated that no particular group (as at Sept 2007) had been adversely affected by the introduction of 'Hackney Choice' and that a six month review had also confirmed this.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Neighbourhoods and Regeneration Directorate continues to monitor the accessibility of the Hackney Choice system to ensure that clients such as care leavers, ex offenders, those with mental health issues or with mild learning disabilities are not excluded.

Recommendation Five – third sector commissioning

Members learned that some concerns exist relating to the consistency and quality of service provision to some harder to reach groups, including the four client groups who are the subject of this review. For example, some services for refugees continue to house people long after they exceed the standard definition of refugee status (someone within 2 years of being granted leave to remain or changed asylum status). These services are often run by small, Council funded community groups where the quality of provision can vary and where there may be little evidence relating to how such provision assists integration. We heard that the Supporting People programme was struggling to intervene in one area because of a lack of data on refugees to properly assess need and therefore we suggest that the commissioning criteria for these services might require closer attention.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends to the LBH Director of Partnerships to develop a Third Sector Commissioning Framework which would lay down a consistent approach to third sector commissioning across the Council. In so doing LBH would commit to ensuring that the commissioning and grant criteria applied to the voluntary and community sector was robust and rigorously applied at all times.

Recommendation Six – extending employment opportunities

Members learned that the Council's Customer and Corporate Services Directorate is working with the Learning Disabilities Service to pilot the 'Workright' scheme, developed by Mencap, to provide employment opportunities within the Council to people with learning disabilities and those with mental health problems. The project relied on "job carving" where existing vacancies were assessed to see if tasks could be identified which would be suitable for these client groups - creating a new role consisting solely of these tasks.

Members believe that increasing the employment opportunities for these groups is a key responsibility of the major employers in the borough, who also happen to be public sector employers – organisations that should lead by example.

Members also learned that while the mental health service providers try to tailor services for different communities patient diversity was not reflected in the staff. For example, a third of the in-patient nurses in the Mental Health Trust are of African origin but they are not able to employ enough Turkish or Jewish workers. Though we were pleased to be advised that LBH's Housing Needs division had both Turkish and Orthodox Jewish outreach workers.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends to the Customer and Corporate Services and the Community Services Directorates:

- (a) Explore how the Workright project could be mainstreamed and to report back to the Commission on its progress in November 2008.
- (b) Develop a standardised approach assisting socially excluded groups access routes to employment across the Council and that this forms a key part of the borough's current work on developing a recruitment and retention strategy. Such an initiative is likely to assist in the borough's desire to tackle worklessness.
- (c) That at such time as LBH has developed a commonly applied policy in this regard that the outcomes are shared and promoted through Team Hackney and that the partnership should then itself, in turn, consider the approaches taken by all partner organisations.
- (d) That the Commission is particularly keen to ensure that the Borough's access routes to employment scheme responds to and reflects the evidence, as exists, that work is the major factor in improving people's

mental health. LBH should lead the by setting high but achievable targets, in relation to identifying suitable positions for those with mental health needs and in so doing may seek to influence other employers in this regard.

- (e) That all mental health service providers in the borough explore ways of ensuring that their services are culturally and religiously appropriate, for example by attempting to recruit employees whose profile more closely matches that of their service users. The Commission requests a report by November 2008 on what challenges exist and how progress could be made.

Recommendation Seven – Olympics/Paralympics volunteering and employment opportunities

The Commission heard from experts that work, paid or voluntary, was a major contributor to good mental health. For the 4 client groups considered by this review, but in particular for those with mental health problems, having the opportunity to participate in the volunteering opportunities which will arise around the Olympic and Paralympic Games would be of great benefit. On our site visit to St Mungo's Members also heard of that charity's interest in exploring opportunities for supporting their clients into work or volunteering around London 2012.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Director of Community Services ensures that the employment and volunteering opportunities available for socially excluded adults through the already planned programme of work for the Olympic and Paralympic Games are maximised and to report to the Commission by November 2008 as to how this may be achieved.

The Commission would also encourage LBH to promote any such initiatives and to support a shared understanding being developed on this issue across the five Olympic boroughs.

Recommendation Eight – Improving COMIS

On our site visits Members learned that having a single point of reference for finding out about the provision of adult social care services would be very beneficial to both service providers and service users. It was noted that the source data on the COMIS database was out of date and not always functioning properly. It was suggested that a system for keeping this information up to date needed to be put in place. Best practice in other boroughs included producing a regularly updated booklet, however we questioned the efficiency of producing a booklet which would quickly

go out of date. Members heard about delays with implementing the SPOCC data base which assists Supporting People provision. The Commission considered that on-line information alone was not sufficient for socially excluded service users unless the information was clearly signposted and readily accessible.

Members learned about the national Supporting People programme website www.spkweb.org.uk which proves to be very user friendly for service users and suggested that it be clearly signposted from Hackney's website.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the ACE Communications and Consultation ensures that the online COMIS database is optimised for both the groups and individuals who need to access it for information on social services provision in the borough. The Commission also believes that the Supporting People programme would benefit from the scheduling of a regular review of all literature and webpages.

The Commission would ideally envisage a commitment to a longer term programme of work that would result in the publication of a short directory of what is funded by the Council for each particular age group.

Recommendation Nine – joint referral protocol for homeless

On our visit to St Mungo's Members learned about the problems associated with referring homeless clients on to other service providers when their hostels were full. LB Camden was singled out as best practice where there is a single referral protocol, whereby clients only have to fill in one form and have one interview. They then receive a bed and are subsequently referred on to whichever provider would cater best for their particular needs.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends to Neighbourhoods and Regeneration Directorate and Community Services Directorate jointly explore with providers such as St Mungo's how a joint referral protocol for homeless clients might work or be adopted in Hackney.

The Commission believes such an approach would benefit both service users and agencies if, as elsewhere, LBH can gather information based upon a shared understanding and commonality of protocols between agencies.

Recommendation Ten – LAA targets

Members learned that local areas should now be able to prioritise socially excluded adults by including one or more of the PSA indicators as improvement targets in their new Local Area Agreements.

The Commission is aware that a number of Hackney's selected priorities in its LAA submission relate to the PSA for Socially Excluded Adults. The PSA is by its nature cross cutting and so has relevance to a number of Hackney's new draft LAA priorities but the following six have a direct relevance:

Target	Description	PSA 16 client groups affected
NI30	Re-offending rates of prolific and priority offenders	Ex offenders
NI80	Achievement of a level 3 qualification by the age of 19	Care Leavers
NI141	Number of vulnerable people achieving independent living	All groups
NI149	Number of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in settled accommodation	Adults in contact with secondary mental health services
NI150	Number of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in employment.	Adults in contact with secondary mental health services
NI151	Overall employment rate PSA8	All groups

Recommendation

The Commission welcomes the inclusion of targets relevant to the PSA in the proposed Local Area Agreement and therefore the borough's focus upon these areas and requests that the Cabinet collectively champion these when agreeing the final set of targets which will make up Hackney's new LAA.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELEVANT TO CARE LEAVERS

Recommendation Eleven – barriers to employment for young people

On our visit to One Support's sheltered housing unit for young people leaving care, Members learned that there was a lot of frustration felt by young people about the how Job Seekers Allowance provisions took no account of courses being taken elsewhere. Any training in excess of 16

hrs per week would result in claimants benefits being cut. The result was that these young people had to take time out of their own particular courses to complete the requirements for receipt of the JSA i.e. attending compulsory Working Links courses. These clients also questioned the quality and relevance of much of the Working Links courses and resented these taking time away from the courses they actually wanted to pursue.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the matter of barriers, perceived or otherwise, to unemployed young people taking up employment and training opportunities, be considered in the current work being undertaken by the Council and its partners on the Worklessness agenda.

The Commission would also encourage the Economic Development Partnership to discuss such issues with a possible outcomes being Job Centre Plus and Working Links lobbying for a more flexible interpretation of the 16 hour rule, particularly for these client groups who are most vulnerable to any enforced changes in their circumstances and to ensure that personalised pathways to work, particularly for care leavers, are used which ensure that they end up on appropriate and relevant courses. The Commission would also welcome a report back on progress in November 2008.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELEVANT TO INDIVIDUALS WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES

Recommendation Twelve – Learning Difficulties services

Members learned that the Learning Difficulties Services were targeted at those at the more challenging end of the learning disabilities spectrum because access to the service was set by a national standard. We expressed a concern about how those who might fall just beneath this threshold might fare. It was suggested that, where possible, early intervention and transition planning was important to improve quality of life for these individuals and prevent them from subsequently becoming users of services.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Community Services and Children and Young People Directorates jointly explore ways in which services to those with learning difficulties could be targeted more effectively at individuals who may be deemed to have less complex needs, so that vulnerable people, just below the thresholds for accessing support, could also receive some appropriate attention and assistance.

The Commission wishes to be advised how this might be achieved by no later than October 2008.

Recommendation Thirteen – supported housing provision

Members learned from the Learning Difficulties Service that challenges existed in providing supported housing in the borough to all those who aspired to independent living. This resulted in clients often being placed out of the borough, which proved unsettling for many as it took them away from their family support networks. It also proved a more costly option for the Council.

Members noted that funding had been made available in the 2008/9 budget, to make provision for 30 additional supported housing care units for the borough's most vulnerable residents. It was noted that there was currently an over-reliance on residential placements out of the borough, which were at a relatively high cost and that the need to rebalance this provision had also been highlighted in a Commission for Social Care Inspection report. Members stressed that the Council should recognise the absolute necessity that all those requiring supported housing are afforded appropriate support to their circumstances.

Recommendation

- (a) The Commission requests the Cabinet Member for Community Services assure herself that appropriate resources are in place to maximise the possibility that those individuals with learning disabilities or mental health problems, who want to live independently, can do so within the borough.
- (b) The Commission also recommends to the Neighbourhoods and Regeneration Directorate that the Council's Planning Department ensures that when applying planning policies relating to the provision of supported housing that they support this priority. The Commission would welcome receipt of a report detailing activity in this area during November 2008.

Recommendation Fourteen – fear of crime/bullying

Members learned that being a victim of crime or bullying or fear of crime and bullying were key concerns for those with learning disabilities. Concerns were raised about how vulnerable people could be targets for bullying when placed in their own accommodation and how those placing them needed to be more sensitive of such a prospect. It was also

suggested that the community safety partners could also do more to promote safety and perceptions of safety amongst this client group.

Members also suggested that there needed to be better information sharing of relevant information about vulnerable people between housing associations, the Council and the police in order to ensure that these people were not taken advantage of when housed in the community.

Recommendation

(a) The Commission recommends to the Neighbourhoods and Regeneration Directorate and Community Services Directorate to ensure that mechanisms are in place to support any safety and well-being implications for socially excluded adults are carefully reviewed before they are offered neighbourhood housing solutions/housing in the community. The Commission requests a report on what mechanisms are in place by November 2008.

(b) The Commission recommends that the Neighbourhoods and Regeneration Directorate ensures that there is better information sharing about vulnerable people between the police, housing associations and the Council in relation to the housing of people with learning difficulties in the community, who may be vulnerable to bullying and intimidation. The Commission also recommends that a multi agency approach is applied which will ensure that any risks to these individuals are mitigated.

(c) The Commission recommends to the community safety partners that the profile of this issue (bullying of vulnerable clients in the community) continues to be raised, particularly amongst schools and youth groups.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELEVANT TO OFFENDERS UNDER PROBATION SUPERVISION

Recommendation Fifteen – engagement of Probation Service

Members heard from a number of service providers who support offenders under probation supervision and noted that the percentage of offenders in settled accommodation or employment was significantly below the London and national averages. The Commission recognises the role of the London Probation Service as absolutely critical in the provision of services and reduction in levels of social exclusion experienced by offenders. Unfortunately, despite a number of attempts throughout the course of its review, the Commission has proved unsuccessful in obtaining a clear picture of the work of the service and therefore how LBH and other partners do and should interact with it.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the relevant Cabinet Member assure himself that the engagement of this statutory provider is both adequate and appropriate at all levels within LBH and within Team Hackney.

The Commission welcomes the undertaking from Supporting People to prioritise during 2008 the remodeling of services for offenders to provide supported housing for offenders with complex needs, as well as floating support for those with lower needs. The Commission wishes to be advised on the progress of this remodeling of services for offenders in November 2008.

DRAFT

4 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 There are no financial considerations arising directly from this report. However, some of the recommendations, particularly those that increase the service offer currently in place, for example provision of low-medium floating support to dual diagnosis clients (recommendation 3) or providing support to clients falling just below our eligibility criteria (recommendation 12) will give rise to financial implications that may not be contained within current approved budgets.
- 4.2 Prior to the implementation of any of the service developments contained within this report a full financial appraisal should be undertaken to ensure that the costs can be contained within approved budgets or, if necessary, a proposal for additional resources be developed for consideration by Members as part of the Resourcing our Priorities process.

5 COMMENTS OF THE MONITORING OFFICER

- 5.1 The report makes a host of recommendations regarding supporting socially excluded Adults. Comments are made against each Recommendation:

Recommendation 1:

No comment.

Recommendation 2:

A cross Borough scheme will require agreement of all Boroughs concerned. Officers from the specified Directorates should be invited to confirm the feasibility of this proposal and who will lead on it over what timescales.

Recommendations 3, 4:

No comment.

Recommendation 5:

No comment, save that the Director of Partnerships should be invited to comment in person or in writing on the feasibility of this proposal.

Recommendation 6:

No comment, save that the current work going on to establish Local Involvement Networks (LINKS) with a consultation role will also pick up on some of the work streams envisaged albeit as an independent forum.

Recommendation 7:

No comment.

Recommendation 8:

No comment, save that Members may benefit from the Director or her nominee attending to respond to this and the recommendations.

Recommendation 9:

No comment, save that Members may benefit from the Director or her nominee attending to respond to this and the recommendations.

Recommendations 10, 11, 12:

No comment.

Recommendation 13:

No comment save that the relevant Directors will need to respond in writing or in person to this service based recommendation.

Recommendations 14, 15:

No comment.

- 5.2 Members have conducted a thorough review and made extensive recommendations. The relevant officers will need to respond in writing or in person on their response and proposals to the recommendations. There are no other comments.

6. FINDINGS

6.1 Defining Social Exclusion

Social exclusion is a term used to describe the inability of individuals to participate effectively in political, social, economic or cultural life. The notion of social exclusion has gained currency because it encapsulates the ideas that people are not just disadvantaged because of a lack of money but may also be excluded from the day to day norm of living standards by fact of a physical disability, being isolated due to poor services, being discriminated against in the job market because of where they live and other factors. It can be argued that these social needs should be recognised in their own rights as they are all important in terms of how people are able to live their lives. They all relate to how local Councils provide services which help all local people fulfill their potential.

Closely linked to poverty, it is generally recognised that social exclusion is caused by a combination of the following interrelated drivers:

- **Low income** – mainly associated with family type and employment circumstances.
- **Unemployment** – a key indicator of social exclusion and also caused by other drivers such as ill-health or lack of education.
- **Poor education** – affects success in the labour market.
- **Ill-health** – drug and alcohol misuse, mental health, teenage conceptions and premature mortality can drive social exclusion and social exclusion itself can result in poor health.
- **Housing** – individuals who are sleeping rough or staying in temporary or insecure forms of accommodation.
- **Transport** – lack of affordable, reliable and safe transport can restrict access to work, education, services, food shopping and socio-cultural activities.
- **Social capital** – tends to be lower in deprived areas.
- **Crime** – often driven by community deprivation and income inequalities resulting with unemployment. A criminal record itself is likely to lead to exclusion.
- **Fear of crime** – a severely restricting phenomenon strongly associated with age, gender, ethnicity and poverty.

A variety of groups are disproportionately likely to be affected by these issues, including ex-offenders, people with mental health problems, people with learning difficulties and care-leavers.

Tackling social exclusion can have economic as well as social benefits:

e.g. Mental health problems are estimated to cost the country more than £77 billion a year through the costs of care, economic losses and premature death.

Current approaches focus on early intervention and prevention of social exclusion – identifying those at risk and taking action before they become excluded.

As well as acting to address the drivers of social exclusion, the Government's Action Plan on Social Exclusion states that public services must personalise their services to ensure they are accessible to the hard-to-reach.

Prevalence of these problems in Hackney

Attached at Appendix 1 is the *Summary of indicator data for the London area* supplied by the Cabinet Office's Social Exclusion Task Force. This provides the data for the numbers of people in these client groups and compares our performance in supporting them as against the other London boroughs and the national rates.

This useful snapshot demonstrates that our performance in supporting care leavers and those with mental illness is good because we are either at or just below the London or national averages. Though this does not mean we should not aspire to do more, as detailed in our recommendations. Our performance in relation to supporting ex offenders and disabled people is less good as we are well below the national or London averages.

6.2 Finding from the Commission's work on Social Inclusion in 2006/7

Hackney's Community Strategy sets out the Council's approach to tackling social exclusion by reducing poverty and inequality, but Members wished to explore whether social inclusion issues were clearly understood and addressed across the Council. The Commission therefore resolved as part of its work programme for 2006/07 to take an overview of how Council departments take into account and provide for hard-to-reach groups in their day-to-day activities. It pursued this inquiry by means of the Overview and Scrutiny Boards' Directorate Question times, where the five Directorates were required to report on this issue at individual meetings of the OSB between September 2006 and February 2007.

From this exercise the Commission noted the following issues for further consideration:

- There appeared to be an over-emphasis on measures to include BME groups as opposed to other kinds of groups. While certain ethnic

groups are more likely to be socially excluded and their needs should be catered for accordingly, they are not the only at-risk groups.

- There was also the suggestion that some departments equate social inclusion with the equalities and diversities agenda. Obviously they are highly interlinked as people can be excluded from accessing services and employment because of their age, ethnicity, sexuality and so forth, but this misses the close links between poverty and social inclusion.
- Directorates acknowledged that it is possible for them to meet their generic performance targets without meeting the needs of hard-to-reach groups.
- All directorates aim to consult with the hard-to-reach but it is very difficult to measure success in this area. Use of satisfaction surveys can only cover the views of those people using the services in the first place.
- Some generally recognised hard-to-reach groups, such as single mothers, are not currently considered as a designated section of the community.
- The Council appeared to focus on providing translation services rather than on teaching English which would have longer-term inclusion benefits.

BARRIERS FACED BY THE FOUR CLIENT GROUPS IN THIS REVIEW AND PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

6.3 ALL GROUPS

6.3.1 Recommendation One – General

Members noted that Hackney's performance, compared to the London and national averages, for the particular set of indicators used to measure performance on this PSA, was excellent or good in relation to care leavers and adults with moderate to severe learning disabilities but was poor in relation to ex-offenders and those with secondary mental health problems. This comparative analysis is based on the data from the Cabinet Office's Social Exclusion Task Force as outlined in Appendix 1 of the report.

The summary evidence submitted by the London Probation Service did raise some general concerns such as that Hackney had a higher proportion of prisoners when compared with other boroughs and that Hackney offenders were more likely to prove a high risk of harm to the

public and that they have a higher risk of reconviction than the general offender population in London.

Recommendation One - general

The Commission recommends that the Community Services and Neighbourhoods and Regeneration Directorates consider how the borough and, if appropriate, its partners, may respond to the needs of those individuals covered by the PSA and develop proposals that assure both the Cabinet Member and this Scrutiny Commission that individuals are assisted during what may often be challenging periods of transition. The focus should be on early intervention to prevent more complex problems possibly arising later on.

Above all the Commission wishes to be assured that clients' needs are met in the both the medium and the longer term and that in so doing life opportunities are fully realised but also that any potential future responsibility of statutory service providers can be minimised. The Commission wishes to be advised by no later than November 2008 how this might be done.

6.3.2 Recommendation Two – rent deposit schemes

Increasing the proportion of these four groups into settled accommodation is a key priority for this PSA. Members learned about the work of the LBH's Housing Needs department which carries the bulk of this responsibility.

Members learned that a Single Homeless Forum had been established as a vehicle to facilitate service improvement for single homeless people and this forum meets weekly and is supported by a dedicated Single Homelessness Officer.

The LBH's Housing Needs section has a dedicated Single Homeless Team providing advice and developing housing options for single people. The team works with supported accommodation providers in Hackney and has established a referral protocol, a vacancy notification system and access to floating support for service users, which have enabled service users to access accommodation with support provision relevant to their identified needs.

Members also learned about the operation of rent deposit schemes

A private sector scheme (the rent deposit scheme) has been developed for clients with low support needs. This is a three way partnership with the Supporting People team, Home Link and Housing Advice and Options which commenced in September 2007.

A Mental Health Protocol has been agreed with the Locality Mental Health Team, to improve access to Hackney services for service users discharged from hospital or other institution.

Recommendation Two – rent deposit schemes

The Commission recommends that the Neighbourhood and Regeneration and Community Services Directorates ensure that the Council, through its chairing of the East London Homelessness Group, implements a framework to monitor and improve the operation of rent deposit schemes across boroughs. It cannot be in the interests of any London Borough to be in competition with each another.

6.3.3 Recommendation Three – dual-diagnosis clients

Members learned about the operation of the ‘Supporting People’ programme in the borough.

The then Office of the Deputy Prime Minister set up Supporting People in 2003 to combine the previously diverse funding schemes for supported accommodation into one programme. This has been a positive development as it gives local authorities control over commissioning services to ensure they are strategically relevant.

The Supporting People programme started as a means of ensuring better quality services through direct funding by central government. Its purpose is to deliver housing related support to vulnerable people within the community to help guide them to develop and sustain independence. The programme is overseen and receives funding by the local authority. On a national scale, Supporting People delivers this support to 1.2 million people. As of April 2003 there were 6000 providers, approximately 37,000 different contacts and £1.7 billion national pot.

Housing related support is provided to:

- help people to maintain their homes by providing advice and support, which can include paying rent and debt management;

- assisting people to develop life and social skills and to expand their social networks;
- helping people to gain access to further training and education.

These services are designed to complement existing local services.

It was noted that Housing Support gives advice to people but it does not carry out these services for people. They will however support people to help themselves with for example shopping, cooking, personal care or housing management.

The types of housing related support services include good accommodation provision, floating support, visiting support, sheltered housing, homes improvement services and a new recent development which is telecare services. These services are there to encourage people to move towards independent living.

The clientele of Supporting People include:

- Homeless or rough sleepers
- Ex-offenders
- Travellers
- Teen parents
- Young people at risk
- People with mental health problems
- People at risk of domestic violence
- People with drug and / or alcohol problems
- People with learning difficulties
- People with disabilities
- People with long term health issues e.g. HIV / AIDS

There are short term and long term services. Short term services last up to two years and the aim is for service users to move to independent accommodation. There is no charge to the service users as the service is fully grant funded. Long term care is delivered on a continuous basis which is designed to help people maintain their independence and this service is chargeable.

The Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) has a main responsibility for the programme and monitors the performance. They also provide a grant to the administering authorities whose responsibility it is to implement the programme in their area.

All Supporting People funded services are inspected by Quality Assessment Framework (QAF) in six key areas:

- Needs and risk assessment
- Support planning
- Health, safety and security
- Protection from abuse
- Diversity and inclusion
- Complaints

DCLG has introduced an outcomes framework for Supporting People services, which are based on the five themes in “Every Child Matters”: Achieve economic wellbeing; enjoy and achieve; being healthy; staying safe and making a positive contribution.

All Supporting People teams are required to produce a five year strategy, which looks at any gaps in the service and how they can be developed further to meet local needs.

Facts and figures for Supporting People in Hackney:

Budget of	£22.2 million
Reduction of	9% from 2003

Split between Sub Boards:	
Learning difficulties	£ 2.62 m
Older People	4.54
Mental health	3.78
Physical Difficulties	0.13
Young People	2.11
Vulnerable People	8.33

60 Providers
90 services

Key priorities over the next year in Hackney are:

- Remodel sheltered housing and develop floating support for older people
- Remodel generic floating support
- Remodel services for ex offenders
- Develop services for people with substance misuse issues
- Introduce telecare
- Remodel individual services

Supporting People is currently investigating if there are any gaps in the services provided or areas where services could be remodelled to widen

their reach. The service is also consulting a range of people including service users to ask them what if any changes they would like to see.

Members welcomed the range of support being provided by the programme however they learned from the mental health service providers about the importance of dual diagnosis, when clients have for example both mental health issues and an alcohol problem. Building up dual diagnosis services was also identified in Hackney's Mental Health Strategy 2007-2010. Members welcomed hearing about a pilot project in this area as part of Supporting People.

Recommendation Three – dual diagnosis clients

The Commission recommends that the Community Services Directorate (Housing Needs) investigate and report back to Members on the outcomes of the COST team's pilot project to provide low-medium floating support to 'dual diagnosis' clients with a view to exploring ways in which this scheme could be extended or mainstreamed. The Commission wishes to receive a report detailing such considerations by November 2008.

6.3.4 Recommendation Four – accessibility of Hackney Choice

Members learned that Housing Needs provides support to clients for accessing the Hackney Choice System (the choice based letting system of LBH's arms length management organisation, Hackney Homes). It assists clients through the system of bidding for accommodation. A total of 10 PCs are located in libraries across the borough for residents to access the system and 48 members of staff have been trained to give basic advice about internet bidding.

In terms of future service developments, focus groups for non-bidders in the higher priority bands are being set up to identify the reasons for non-bidding. The results of a customer satisfaction survey also didn't reveal any evidence that particular groups were being disadvantaged by the system.

Recommendation Four – accessibility of Hackney Choice

The Commission recommends that the Neighbourhoods and Regeneration Directorate continues to monitor the accessibility of the Hackney Choice system to ensure that clients such as care leavers, ex offenders, those with mental health issues or with mild learning disabilities are not excluded.

6.3.5 Recommendation Five – Third sector commissioning

Members learned that there were some concerns about the quality of service provision to some harder to reach groups. For example there are a number of services refugees but these often continue to house people long after they exceed the standard definition of refugee status (someone within 2 years of being granted leave to remain or changed asylum status). These services are run by small Council funded community groups and the quality of provision can vary and they provide little evidence that they provide support and integration. Members learned that the Supporting People programme had struggled to intervene in this area because of lack of data on refugees to assess the need. Members enquired whether the commissioning criteria for these services needed closer attention. Members welcomed that initial work had begun by Team Hackney on revising the borough's Compact and that a significant sector of this work related to improving third sector commissioning.

Recommendation Five – Third sector commissioning

The Commission recommends to the LBH Director of Partnerships to develop a Third Sector Commissioning Framework which would lay down a consistent approach to third sector commissioning across the council. In so doing LBH would commit to ensuring that the commissioning and grant criteria applied to the voluntary and community sector was robust and rigorously applied at all times.

6.3.6 Recommendation Six – Extending employment opportunities

Members heard from the Council's Head of Equality and Diversity and the Cabinet Adviser for Equalities (Cllr Mulready) on the progress being made to move the Council to the next level of the Equalities Standard. A number of significant changes had taken place within the national equalities legislation and guidance, and that Cabinet Members had asked the Equalities Team to measure the Council's success against these new criteria. Ultimately, the Equalities team was working towards a unified equalities and diversity framework for the whole borough, while simultaneously focusing targeted interventions on identified groups with particular needs.

The Centre for Public Scrutiny had recently published some helpful guidelines on how Scrutiny Commissions could hold the Executive to account on equalities and diversity issues and the Head of Equalities and Diversity would be working with the Commission on this issue in the future.

Members learned about the Valuing People and Employment Initiatives Project – a scheme to provide employment opportunities within the Council to people with learning disabilities. This project, known as the **Workright Scheme**, had been developed by Mencap and piloted effectively in LB Sutton.

We found that the Equalities Team was working closely with Hackney Recruitment Partnership (HRP) on this project, and had extended the original intention to offer work to those with learning disabilities to include those with mental health issues as well. Agreement had been obtained from the Council's Management Team to pilot the scheme in the Customer and Corporate Services Directorate. It was noted that the project relied heavily on 'job carving', a process by which existing vacancies were assessed to see if it would be possible to identify a number of tasks from that role that would be suitable for a person with learning disabilities or mental health issues, and to create a new role consisting solely of those tasks. Once a person had been placed in a role, HRP would provide ongoing support and assistance to the individual and to the team they had been placed in.

£10K had been allocated to get the project up and running, but it was hoped that eventually it would become part of the mainstream recruitment process and no additional funding would be required.

Members suggested that increasing the employment opportunities for the four client groups in this review should be part of the responsibility of the major employers in the borough and these happened to be public sector. It was suggested therefore that the Council, PCT and Homerton Hospital should lead by example.

Members also learned from the mental health service providers of the desirability of tailoring services for different communities to ensure that the profile of the staff working with these clients matches, to some extent, the profile of the service users. It was noted that a third of in-patient nurses in the Mental Health Trust were of African origin and that they would benefit from employing more Turkish or Jewish staff to work with their clients.

We also considered that it was important for mental health service providers to ensure that they provide a range of culturally and religiously appropriate services as this would best meet clients' needs and therefore improve their well being.

Worklessness – the Hackney context

Supporting these four groups into employment or training is the other main aim of this PSA. Members noted that Hackney has the third lowest employment rate in the UK (at 59%), after Tower Hamlets (53%) and Newham (58%), and the borough's employment rate for women has declined since 2002.

Only 67% of Hackney's working age population (96,900 out of 140,000) are economically active. This is significantly lower than either London (75%) or the rest of Britain (79%), and this gap is even greater in relation to women (only 57% of Hackney's female working age population is economically active, compared to 74% nationally).

Unemployment is higher in Hackney (at 12%) than across London (8%) or Britain (5%), and an estimated 5.5% of Hackney's working age population are claiming Job Seekers Allowance (compared to 2.6% nationally). However, a much higher proportion of Hackney's working age population are claiming long-term benefits, including Incapacity Benefits (9.4% in Hackney, compared to 6% for London) and Lone Parent benefits (5.4%, compared with 3% for London). Overwhelmingly, mental and behavioural difficulties are the most common reasons for being in receipt of incapacity benefit (cited by 48% of claimants). More than 36% of Hackney's workless individuals have never worked – some 20,000 working age people (Census 2001).

Low levels of employment and economic activity are important factors explaining poverty and deprivation in the borough. Supporting enterprise and access to jobs is a key theme of Hackney's current 2005-2015 Community Strategy. Increasing local employment opportunities (including better paid jobs) and creating pathways to work, including job related training, were identified as key to helping residents get jobs by 70% of respondents to the 2004 Household Survey.

Support available from Job Centre Plus

Members heard from the External Relations Manager of Job Centre Plus – City and East London District that 50% of the incapacity benefit claimants in the borough were claiming due to mental health related illnesses or conditions.

We were advised of the size of the labour market, the types of vacancies received and the type of vacancies filled. It was noted that access to JCP services was via internet, telephone or face to face at Jobcentres in Hackney, Hoxton and Dalston supplying the following kinds of advisers:

- New Claims Personal Advisers
- Private Sector Led Pathways Advisers
- Lone Parent Adviser
- Disability Employment Advisers
- Personal Advisers
- Prison Advisers
- Fresh Start (for ex prisoners)

They also contract some services such as the **New Deal for Young People** (NDYP) which is delivered under a private sector new deal initiative by the company Working Links. This scheme, aimed at those aged 18-24 and unemployed for six months provides tailored assistance to clients who are required to attend an 'option' of either full time education, training or work with the voluntary or environment sectors. Early entry into these programmes is available for those with learning difficulties and ex offenders.

The New Deal programme also includes:

- New Deal Employment Subsidy (worth up to £60pw to employers for 6 months)
- New Deal 25+
- New Deal 50+
- New Deal for Lone Parents (help with fees, books & equipment and childcare costs)
- New Deal for Partners (including substitute care for carers)

JCP also provides other forms of provision such as: Programme Centres, the Workstep programme (for clients with disabilities), the Self Employment Provision (test trading a new business venture), Mentoring and the New Deal for Musicians and Progress to Work (supporting those recovering from drug misuse).

The Learning and Skills Council also provides an Employability Skills Programme and JCP has contracted further provision available under the European Social Fund. A new round of tendering was taking place for the 2007-2013 European Social Fund programme which was focusing on pre vocational training (making the most of Olympic jobs opportunities; work in the care industry; English for Speakers of Other Languages).

From December 2007 we heard that, '**Pathways to Work**' was introduced for Incapacity Benefit customers. The aim is to help these individuals to better understand and manage their health condition or disability and improve their chances of returning to work. Incapacity Benefit claimants will have a work focused interview 8 weeks after the start of their claim

followed by a further five mandatory interviews, during which a work focused action plan would be agreed.

The **Local Employer Partnership** is a vehicle where in return for a bespoke vacancy handling service, employers could agree with JCP a number of specific measures including: 2-4 week Work Trials; a target number of places for New Deal participants wishing to participate in the subsidized employment options; working with JCP or LSE on the design of pre-employment training to ensure it is relevant; encouraging employees of these companies to volunteer to provide one-to-one mentoring for long term benefit claimants in order to prepare them for work and the opportunity for these employers to review their application processes to ensure that local benefit claimants are not inadvertently excluded.

To date 26 employers have signed up for this in Hackney and 401 vacancies have been forecast between Jan-Mar 2008. 14 employers have started recruiting under LEP arrangements. 170 job outcomes have been achieved and 128 work trials have been undertaken.

We also learned about the range of financial assistance packages which were available to clients including: Adviser Discretionary Fund, Travel to Interview Scheme, Tax Credits, Work Trials, Employer Subsidies, Housing Benefit/Council Tax run on; In Work Credits, Return to Work Credit and Workstep and Access to Work.

The **East London City Strategy Pathfinder** is a multi agency consortium covering Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets, Greenwich and Waltham Forest which aims to increase employment rates and reduce child poverty with a particular focus on disadvantaged customers. We noted that it was piloting radically different ways of working and at present it was developing a suite of services aimed at workless parents (New Deal for Families) and 'single points of access' aimed at increasing engagement via outreach.

Members learned about JCPs partnership working in Hackney including:

- a) Outreach teams working at Shoreditch NDC, Hacshac and Groundwork East London.
- b) Partners Outreach for Minority Ethnic (POEM) which aims to engage non JCP customers and partners of single earning couples
- c) Hackney On-Site where JCP and LBH are focusing on construction industry vacancies relating to the Olympics and regeneration.

While the job market in Hackney was buoyant, the number of those claiming benefits remains fairly static and the picture is a very transient one, with many people moving on after they secure jobs. The jobs being provided by JCP in East London were predominantly in administration, IT,

hospitality and estates management and Canary Wharf is a major source of these. The big challenge is to engage with those individuals who are not availing themselves of the opportunities being provided. JCP noted the concerns of some care leavers about the restrictions around receiving more than 16 hours of training but re-iterated that the Working Links provided courses for these clients were a necessary condition for the receipt of their Job Seekers Allowance.

There has been criticism nationally of the effectiveness of the multitude of New Deal schemes but it is anticipated that the changes being brought about with the new provision from October 2009 should improve the situation.

We discussed with JCP the culture change which would be required to convince people to get off benefits and into employment, education or training. Certain groups in the borough were the most disaffected and were not availing of any opportunities and much needed to be done to tackle a culture of worklessness in the borough. We became aware of the fact that 20,000 working age people in Hackney have never worked. It was suggested that greater multi agency partnership working, such as that provided by the City Strategy Pathfinder, could be instrumental in tackling this.

Support available from Working Links

Working Links in Hackney advised us about the challenges faced by the clients forming part of this review.

It was noted that clients with mental health problems presented particular challenges as they required very high levels of support. These clients also suffered from low self esteem and poor self confidence which limited their options. Warehouse work had in the past provided many appropriate low level and low stress jobs appropriate to some of these clients, however in the recent past, many companies who provided these jobs have re-located their warehouses out of London.

Working Links advised that most of their clients who were under probation supervision experienced problems with accommodation, employment and substance misuse and many had complained of having inadequate preparation for their release. Helping these ex offenders to tackle their social and personal problems, to improve their cognitive skills and to sustain the motivation to change their lives were the main challenges here. Overcoming prejudice and assisting these clients to re-integrate into the community was also a major task.

Working Links stressed that interventions must address individual circumstances and that service delivery in Hackney could be improved through better co-ordination by mainstream agencies, expanding “through care”, more ‘offending behaviour’ programmes, increased focus on motivational support and finding ways of improving ex offenders links with their families and local communities.

Working Links also stated that all the public sector agencies must treat ex offenders as a priority group and ensure that there are tailored plans and interventions for clients. The aim should be to have a flexible, personalised system based on relational continuity that addressed welfare issues, thinking skills, motivation and personal development of these clients in a structured way.

Members learned about the EXITE (Ex-offenders Into Training and Employment) project which provides tailored service for ex offenders by providing a one-stop-shop for assisting clients from pre-release through to gaining sustainable employment. Most of the providers taking part in this multi agency programme are Hackney based.

Recommendation Six – extending employment opportunities

The Commission recommends to the Customer and Corporate Services and the Community Services Directorates:

- (a) To explore how the Workright project could be mainstreamed and to report back to the Commission on its progress in November 2008.
- (b) To develop a standardised approach across the Council to assisting these socially excluded groups to access routes to employment and that this forms a key part of the borough’s current work on developing a recruitment and retention strategy and part of the borough’s responsibility to help tackle worklessness.
- (c) That at such time as LBH has developed a commonly applied policy in this regard that the outcomes are shared and promoted through Team Hackney and that the partnership should then itself, in turn, consider the approaches taken by all partner organisations.
- (d) That the Commission is particularly keen to ensure that the Borough’s access routes to employment scheme responds to and reflects the evidence, as exists, that work is the major factor in improving people’s mental health. LBH should lead the by setting high but achievable targets, in relation to identifying suitable positions for those with mental health

needs and in so doing may seek to influence other employers in this regard.

(e) That all mental health service providers in the borough to explore ways of ensuring that their services are culturally and religiously appropriate, for example by attempting to recruit employees whose profile more closely matches that of their service users. The Commission wishes to receive a report by November 2008 on what the challenges are here and how progress could be made.

6.3.7 Recommendation Seven – employment /volunteering on the Olympics

The Commission heard from experts that work, either paid or voluntary, was a major contributor to good mental health. For the 4 client groups in this review, but in particular for those with mental health problems, having the opportunity to participate in the volunteering opportunities which will arise around the Olympic and Paralympic Games would be of great benefit. On their site visit to St Mungo's Members also heard of that charity's interest in exploring opportunities for supporting their clients into work or volunteering around London 2012.

The Hackney 2012 Unit is developing a fully inclusive volunteer programme with appropriate opportunities opened up to socially excluded groups. The plans include:

The Personal Best Programme: Hackney was selected as one of the boroughs to pilot the Pre-volunteering programme whose principles are diversity, inclusiveness, flexibility and mutual respect. Phase 1 delivered 47 volunteers the most successful of the 5 pilot boroughs. The programme specifically targeted the following groups: 50+, 16-24 year olds, BME groups, disabled people, lone parents, ex-offenders, long-term unemployed. Local specialist training providers were specially selected to deliver a comprehensive training package to meet the needs of these diverse groups. The following training providers were selected because of their expertise and experience in working with hard to reach groups:

Training Provider	Target Group
ELATT- East London Advance Technology Training	Unemployed Adults
Lifeline	Young people- Aged 16-25

Hackney Community College	School leavers & unemployed adults
Rising Tide	Disadvantaged and isolated groups of young people- BME groups and NEET groups.
Age Concern	Older people

Phase 2 is due to complete in July 2008 with an estimated 80 volunteers successfully completing the programme. The following additional specialist training providers have been selected to delivery training to their client groups:

Training Provider	Client Group
Federation of Black Housing Organisations	BME groups
Turkish Education and Development Association	Turkish Community
Hackney Voluntary Action	Providing a diverse range of volunteer placements for all volunteers
Workskills Learning	Young people not in school and unemployed adults.

An Olympic Road Show event will take place at Ocean and Town Hall Square on March 13 2008 called “**Get Set Hackney**” which will include a jobs fair with 35 stalls providing information about Games related job opportunities, careers advice and training. 40 volunteers will be recruited to help with this event alone from the ‘Personal Best Programme’ and from the student ambassadors from Hackney College. In order to promote the event to socially excluded residents organisers are working with key council departments to ensure that transport is provided to assist key groups to attend and get the most out of the day.

There will also be numerous other events coming up in the borough linked to 2012 including The Hackney Festival, Stoke Fest and East London Mini Marathon. These will all provide good volunteering opportunities for local groups and organisers are working in partnership with local agencies to minimise the barriers which can prevent socially excluded groups from volunteering and extra support will be provided where necessary to enable people to volunteer.

Recommendation Seven – Olympics volunteering/employment

The Commission recommends that the Director of Community Services ensures that the employment and volunteering opportunities available for socially excluded adults through the already planned programme of work for the Olympic and Paralympic Games are maximised and to report to the Commission by November 2008 as to how this may be achieved.

The Commission would also encourage LBH to promote any such initiatives and to support a shared understanding being developed on this issue across the five Olympic boroughs.

6.3.8 Recommendation Eight – improving COMIS

On our site visit we learned that having a single point of reference for finding out about the provision of adult social care services would be very beneficial to both service providers and service users. We noted that the source data on the COMIS database was out of date and not always functioning properly. It was suggested that a system for keeping this information up to date needed to be put in place. Best practice in other boroughs included producing a regularly updated booklet, however the efficiency of producing a booklet which would quickly go out of date was questioned. Members heard about delays with implementing the SPOCC data base on Supporting People provision. Members noted that on-line information alone was not sufficient for socially excluded service users unless the information was clearly signposted and readily accessible.

Member learned about the national Supporting People programme website, www.spkweb.org.uk, which was user friendly for service users and it was suggested that clients needed to be directed to this from Hackney web pages.

Recommendation Eight – Improving COMIS

The Commission recommends that the Assistant Chief Executive – Communications and Consultation ensures that the online COMIS database is optimised for both the groups and individuals who need to access it for information on social services provision in the borough. The Commission also believes that the Supporting People programme would benefit from the scheduling of a regular review of all literature and webpages.

The Commission would ideally envisage a commitment to a longer term programme of work that would result in the publication of a short directory of what is funded by the Council for each particular age group.

6.3.9 Recommendation Nine – joint referral protocol for homeless clients

On our site visit to St Mungo's we learned about the problems associated with referring homeless clients on to other service providers when their hostels were full. The St Mungo's representatives singled out LB Camden for best practice here where there is a single referral protocol, whereby clients only have to fill in one form and have one interview. They then receive a bed and are subsequently referred on to whichever provider would cater best for their particular needs.

Recommendation Nine – referral protocol for homeless clients

The Commission recommends to Neighbourhoods and Regeneration Directorate and Community Services Directorate jointly explore with providers such as St Mungo's how a joint referral protocol for homeless clients might work or be adopted in Hackney.

The Commission believes such an approach would benefit both service users and agencies if, as elsewhere, LBH can gather information based upon a shared understanding and commonality of protocols between agencies.

6.3.10 Recommendation Ten – incorporating PSA indicators into Hackney's new LAA

Boroughs have to choose which of the performance indicators from the National Indicator Set will be adopted as priority targets for their new LAA's which are currently being negotiated with central government. In terms of delivering the outcomes for the client groups in this PSA, it will obviously assist if relevant indicators get incorporated into the final LAA.

Each Council will of course be required to report annually on all of the indicators as part of the new Comprehensive Area Assessment (which replaces the CPA), but the selection of indicators and the setting of the targets associated with these indicators at the appropriate level is of vital importance in establishing what the priorities will be. This PSA is very

cross cutting therefore a number of the selected indicators have some relevance to these groups e.g. drug related offending rates, alcohol-harm related hospital admissions and drug users in effective treatment, however we've identified the following six from the list of thirty four as being directly relevant:

Target	Description	PSA 16 client groups affected
NI30	Re-offending rates of prolific and priority offenders	Ex offenders
NI80	Achievement of a level 3 qualification by the age of 19	Care Leavers
NI141	Number of vulnerable people achieving independent living	All groups
NI149	Number of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in settled accommodation	Adults in contact with secondary mental health services
NI150	Number of adults in contact with secondary mental health services in employment.	Adults in contact with secondary mental health services
NI151	Overall employment rate PSA8	All groups

We note also that indicators NI141 and NI149 directly correspond to the PSA and welcome their inclusion.

Team Hackney has now selected the 34 improvement targets for the Hackney's new LAA and negotiations with central government have commenced. The new LAA will be signed in June.

Recommendation Ten – incorporating PSA indicators into Hackney's new LAA

The Commission welcomes the inclusion of targets relevant to the PSA in the proposed Local Area Agreement and therefore the borough's focus upon these areas and requests that the Cabinet collectively champion these when agreeing the final set of targets which will make up Hackney's new LAA.

6.4 CARE LEAVERS

We heard from the Group Manager for Children's Social Care and the Principal Manager for Looked After Children about the services they provide.

Looked After Children (LAC) provision is centred on the Leaving Care Act and the five key outcomes identified in "Every Child Matters" (staying safe, being healthy, enjoying and achieving, making a positive contribution, and achieving economic wellbeing). A further key indicator was the number of care leavers who were Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEET).

The Leaving Care Service is split into two key areas: the Pathway Team and the 18-24 Team.

The Leaving Care service works to Department of Health indicators and was also benchmarked against other local authorities to ensure consistency. The aim of the service is to provide a holistic approach to the young person's personal wellbeing.

It was noted that the current priorities for the service were as follows:

- Ensuring young care leavers were supported to find meaningful employment.
- Providing support around housing issues. Young people no longer have to go straight into independent living, but instead can take a 'stepping stone' approach through Supporting People accommodation.
- Ensuring care leavers were able to access effective healthcare. An LAC health nurse was now available to provide safe sex advice and an immunisation programme. In addition, work was being undertaken with young people who were unable to access healthcare provision due to their immigration status.
- Providing additional support for disabled young people to assist with their transition to adult services.
- Working closely with the Connexions Service over the NEET issues.
- Careful tracking of care leavers to ensure they remained engaged and did not slip through the cracks.
- Engaging the young people in education. Members learned that a pilot study had been undertaken recently with The Learning Trust, working with young care leavers who had been identified as hard to engage academically.

A number of services for care leavers have been decommissioned since 2003 however the focus is now on improving the overall range of services provided, by commissioning more varied levels of support from a wider range of organizations than in the past.

On a visit to One Support's sheltered housing unit for young people leaving care, Members learned that there was a lot of frustration felt by young people about the how Job Seekers Allowance provisions took no account of courses being taken elsewhere. Any training in excess of 16 hrs per week would result in claimants benefits being cut. The result was that these young people had to take time out of their own particular courses to complete the requirements for receipt of the JSA i.e. attending compulsory Working Links courses. These clients also questioned the quality and relevance of much of the Working Links courses and resented these taking time away from the courses they actually wanted to pursue.

Recommendation Eleven – barriers to employment for young people

The Commission recommends that the matter of barriers, perceived or otherwise, to unemployed young people taking up employment and training opportunities, be considered in the current work being undertaken by the Council and its partners on the Worklessness agenda.

The Commission would also encourage the Economic Development Partnership to discuss such issues with a possible outcomes being Job Centre Plus and Working Links lobbying for a more flexible interpretation of the 16 hour rule, particularly for these client groups who are most vulnerable to any enforced changes in their circumstances and to ensure that personalised pathways to work, particularly for care leavers, are used which ensure that they end up on appropriate and relevant courses. The Commission would also welcome a report back on progress in November 2008.

6.5 ADULTS WITH SECONDARY MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS

The East London NHS Foundation Trust (the local mental health trust) provides secondary mental health services across City, Hackney, Tower Hamlets and Newham.

Scale of the problem

We learned that nationally, one in 200 people is diagnosed with schizophrenia, with Hackney having three times the rate of national admissions to hospital. One in 6 people is affected by anxiety depression phobias. A third of GP consultations (half of Hackney GP consultations) are related to mental health. Hackney has the highest national mental index (a measure of mental health problems in a borough) in the country.

Only 24% of those affected by mental health problems are employed and two thirds of men under 35 years who commit suicide are unemployed.

900,000 people nationally are on sickness or disability benefits owing to mental health problems. Hackney has the second highest rate of Incapacity Benefit Claimants in London. Mental health problems are estimated to cost the country more than £77 billion a year through the costs of care, economic losses and premature death.

Fewer than four in ten employers say they would recruit someone with a mental health problem. People with mental health problems are three times as likely to be in debt as those without. People with mental health problems have difficulties maintaining tenancies. People with severe mental health problems are three times more likely to be divorced than those without. People with mental health problems are more likely to be victims than perpetrators of violence, and are stigmatised.

Evidence shows that the best way to improve mental health is to work. The East London NHS Foundation Trust employs occupational therapists and employment workers. Hackney College employs someone to both help people who experience mental health issues at college to find a job and also to help people with mental health issues enrol at the college. Team Hackney has a project to address its target of reducing Incapacity Benefit (see below). They are also working to ensure people in the first stages of mental health problems keep their jobs.

Example of good practice – Moving On project

Team Hackney's Economic Development Partnership has funded a project under its 'worklessness' strand to address barriers to employment for incapacity benefit recipients. This project, aimed at those with mental health conditions, aims to deliver specialist mental health support including one-to-one support, information and guidance from four employment advisors as well as the opportunity to attend weekly 'moving on' groups where clients can receive peer support in setting weekly goals in all areas of their lives. It will also support employers in making reasonable adjustments and to providing mental health awareness training.

Example of good practice – Positively Mental Attitude Football League

The Positive Mental Attitude (PMA) football league started in 2004 and is the first of its kind. It was officially affiliated with the Football Association in 2005. Today the league has registered 14 teams from within 6 London mental health NHS Trusts. At least 180 service users have participated in the PMA League this year. Each individual team is applying for £9,000 Football Foundation funding over a 3 year period. Links with professional

football clubs to include mental health in their mixed disability teams are developing.

Hackney Football Club uses football as a therapeutic tool to aid the recovery of males and females, aged 17 and over, who have enduring mental health issues, promoting mental and physical wellbeing and challenging stigma by providing a positive example of what people with mental health issues can achieve. The club aims to provide a sustainable service whose model can be replicated and to pioneer and promote the inclusion of a mental health strand within Disability Football and Sport generally.

We learned of the excellent results of this scheme whereby 73% of users reduced their psychiatric medication; 75% have a better social and family life; and 75% have taken up employment or education. 71% lost weight; 79% took more exercise on top of football; 82% reduced or stopped smoking; and 74% atet more healthily.

Example of good practice – CORE arts, 4Sight, Stereohype

The Trust also funds arts projects to encourage people with mental health problems back into social life. CORE Arts is a visual arts project set up by a local artist at St Barnabus church near the Homerton Hospital.

'4 Sight' is a drama project that started with 30 young black males 2 years ago to develops their experiences of being on mental health wards into four plays, which are now used to train staff with one having a focus on countering racism. Members noted that 44% of people detained under the mental health act in Hackney are from BME communities.

The Stereohype project puts on a show every 2 months. The East London NHS Foundation Trust also uses music on wards and organises musical events.

The Trust also works with the Supporting People programme on accommodation issues. A frequent criticism is that too much money in Hackney is spent on high-cost residential placements especially for forensic clients. Some of these individuals stay on wards for 2 years because there is not enough appropriate accommodation. The Trust is therefore working to reduce high cost residential care and increase provision of supported accommodation. The Supporting People Panel has helped in bringing together statutory services, registered social landlords and the voluntary sector to increase the numbers of difficult clients they take on.

Since October 2007, community health teams are being divided into Rehabilitation and Recovery Teams, who will receive increased funding, and Assessment and Brief Treatment Teams working with Primary Care with the aim of keeping people out of long-term services and a greater emphasis on prevention.

We welcome that Supporting People was funding, jointly with Respect, a project for 20 problem families which include those with offending backgrounds and/or mental health problems.

The 'Think Family' approach

We also welcome the government's launch in January 2008 of a new approach to local services to improve support for the most disadvantaged families and prevent problems passing down from excluded parents to children. The "Think Family" report – published by the Social Exclusion Task Force in the Cabinet Office – aims to ensure adult services support whole families not just individuals, and the government announced a £16m programme of local pilots, led by the Department for Children, Schools and Families to support this.

A 'think family' approach encourages local services to adopt the following basic principles:

- *No wrong door* – contact with any service offers an open door into a system of joined-up support, eg a probation officer or housing officer identifies the adult language difficulties of a client and refers them to English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) training;
- *Look at the whole family* – services working with both adults and children take into account family circumstances and responsibilities, eg an alcohol treatment service combines treatment with parenting classes while supervised childcare is provided for the children;
- *Provide support tailored to need* – tailored and family-centred packages of support are offered to all families at risk, eg a Family Intervention Project works with a family to agree a package of support best suited to their situation;

6.6 ADULTS WITH MODERATE TO SEVERE LEARNING DIFFICULTIES

6.6.1 Recommendation Twelve – Learning Difficulties services

The Head of the Learning Difficulties Service advised us about the detailed aspects of the Learning Difficulties Service.

Support is targeted at those at the more challenging end of the learning disabilities spectrum, as access to the service was set by a national

standard. The service was currently supporting about 550 people, half of whom were living in residential care out of the borough, but who were still the responsibility of Hackney.

Recommendation Twelve – Learning Difficulties services

The Commission recommends that the Community Services and Children and Young People Directorates jointly explore ways in which services to those with learning difficulties could be targeted more effectively at individuals who may be deemed to have less complex needs, so that vulnerable people, just below the thresholds for accessing support, could also receive some appropriate attention and assistance.

The Commission wishes to be advised how this might be achieved by no later than November 2008.

Those with learning disabilities were a highly socially excluded group, with a 90% unemployment rate. The Learning Difficulties Service was working closely with HRP and the job centres to address this issue. In addition, the transition to adulthood and adult services was a particularly vulnerable time for this group.

6.6.2 Recommendation Thirteen – supported housing provision

Another challenging issue for those with learning disabilities was finding suitable accommodation and support. Learning Difficulties Service workers found that there was insufficient supported housing to offer to people who wanted to try independent living, and that this often resulted in people being placed out of borough. This could often be detrimental, as the disruption could be unsettling and it took individuals away from their family support networks. It was also more expensive option for the borough. Members welcomed that funding had been made available in the 2008/9 budget, to make provision for 30 additional supported housing care units for the borough's most vulnerable residents and expressed the hope that the Council would consider accelerating this funding in the future.

Recommendation Thirteen- supported housing provision

- (a) The Commission requests the Cabinet Member for Community Services assure herself that appropriate resources are in place to maximise the possibility that those individuals with learning disabilities or mental health problems, who want to live independently, can do so within the borough.
 - (b) The Commission also recommends to the Neighbourhoods and Regeneration Directorate that the Council's Planning Department ensures that when applying planning policies relating to the provision of supported housing that they support this priority. The Commission would welcome receipt of a report detailing activity in this area during November 2008.
-

6.6.3 Recommendation Fourteen – fear of crime/bullying

We learned that being a victim of crime and fear of crime or bullying were key concerns for those with learning disabilities. Receiving adequate health care could also prove a challenge for these clients if there was inadequate means to facilitate communication between the patient with learning disabilities and a health professional.

Recommendation Fourteen – fear of crime/bullying

- (a) The Commission requests the Cabinet Member for Community Services assure herself that appropriate resources are in place to maximise the possibility that those individuals with learning disabilities or mental health problems, who want to live independently, can do so within the borough.
 - (b) The Commission also recommends to the Neighbourhoods and Regeneration Directorate that the Council's Planning Department ensures that when applying planning policies relating to the provision of supported housing that they support this priority. The Commission would welcome receipt of a report detailing activity in this area during November 2008.
-

We heard that the underlying cause of most of the concern was a feeling amongst those with learning disabilities that they were second-class citizens. It was suggested that more could be done to address this,

particularly through encouraging the use of mainstream services and the promoting of safety and perceptions of safety amongst this group.

A recurring issue in provision of services to these clients was staff turnover and maintaining a level of appropriately qualified support staff to provide consistency and continuity for these clients.

Funding had now been made available in the 2008/9 budget, to make provision for 30 additional supported housing care units for the borough's most vulnerable residents. It was noted that there was currently an over-reliance on residential placements out of the borough, which were at a relatively high cost and that the need to rebalance this provision had been highlighted in a Commission for Social Care Inspection report. Members stressed that the Council should recognise the absolute necessity that all those requiring supported housing are afforded appropriate support to their circumstances.

6.7 OFFENDERS UNDER PROBATION SUPERVISION

The Probation Service advised us in their submission that offenders in Hackney are more likely to pose a high risk of harm to the public and they have a higher risk of reconviction than the general offender population in London.

45% of Hackney offenders are assessed as having accommodation difficulties (10% higher than London average) and 65% have employment training and education deficits relating to their offending (9% higher than London average).

More generally we established the role of other service providers in supporting ex offenders in the borough. LBH's Housing Needs department refers ex-offenders to the Foundation Training Company (FTC), whose primary objective is the development of resettlement programmes and to provide each client with the opportunity to consider fully the options open to them upon their release from custody and provide them with relevant training, support, information, advice and guidance to meet their immediate and mid-term aims.

Housing Needs also carries out prison outreach with FTC to prisons where inmates from Hackney have been identified and work closely with the London Probation Service and with services providing dedicated support for BME prisoners, for example St Mungo's project for Muslim ex-offenders.

The provision of accommodation is crucial for risk management, successful resettlement of ex-offenders and reduction of crime in the

borough. Hackney Homelessness Unit is one of the main agencies of Multi-Agency Public Protection (MAPPA), working closely with the Public Protection Unit (PPU). The multi-agency approach includes Police, Probation, Housing, Health and Social Services. All ex-offenders who pose a risk to the public are identified, monitored and managed. Information sharing, pro-active approach and support from different agencies are key aspects for effective resettlement.

Hackney MAPPA won the public protection achievement award in April 2007 for consistent performance, dedication to improving service delivery, commitment to partnership working and creative, innovative approaches to public protection.

The Priority and Prolific Offender (PPO) Programme has been in place since 2004. Hackney Homelessness Unit has been a main partner since the outset. Offenders who are most prolific, most persistently anti-social and pose the greatest threat to the community are identified. They are predominantly young people, with an average age of 25, and male. The emphasis is on prevention, rehabilitation and resettlement. Data sharing, partnership work, and resources are targeted on those who need most support. Training, employment and housing are the most frequent needs.

Hackney Homelessness Unit's working relationship with Hackney PPO was praised by the Home Office in a press release in February 2007 and Hackney Homelessness Unit has been visited by two boroughs, Hounslow and Ealing, to learn more about its successful partnership working with the PPO and to share good practice.

We welcome the re-opening of St Mungo's Mare St hostel which has undergone a £4m refurbishment and that the Council is working closely with London Probation Service and the Drug and Alcohol Action Team on developing services for its users.

We are also pleased to learn that Supporting People is remodelling services to offenders over the coming year to provide supported housing for offenders with complex needs as well as floating support.

6.7.1 Recommendation Fifteen – engagement of Probation Service

Members heard from a number of service providers who support offenders under probation supervision and noted that the percentage of offenders in settled accommodation or employment was significantly below the London and national averages. The Commission recognises the role of the London Probation Service as absolutely critical in the provision of services and reduction in levels of social exclusion experienced by offenders. Unfortunately, despite a number of attempts throughout the course of its

review, the Commission has proved unsuccessful in obtaining a clear picture of the work of the service and therefore how LBH and other partners do and should interact with it.

Recommendation Fifteen – engagement of Probation Service

The Commission recommends that the relevant Cabinet Member assure himself that the engagement of this statutory provider is both adequate and appropriate at all levels within LBH and within Team Hackney.

The Commission welcomes the undertaking from Supporting People to prioritise during 2008 the remodeling of services for offenders to provide supported housing for offenders with complex needs, as well as floating support for those with lower needs. The Commission wishes to be advised on the progress of this remodeling of services for offenders in November 2008.

7. CONCLUSIONS

We are conscious that a scrutiny review such as this can only begin to elaborate on the complex issues involved and we were heartened by the commitment and hard work of all those we met who are involved in providing support to these groups.

If we are serious about the regeneration of the borough without the negative aspects of gentrification, we need to ensure that these groups maintain a stake in the community. The challenge for the Council and its partners is to ensure joined up working amongst the mainstream agencies that support these groups but at the same time to aim for as personalised a response to clients as possible. The recommendations in this report are aimed at enabling people to find work and housing within Hackney, and with the support of their local communities.

Members have made recommendations which cut across a number of directorates as well as Team Hackney partners. In arriving at these recommendations the following themes emerged which will need further attention:

- The need to continue and where possible strengthen provision for clients with 'dual diagnosis'.
- The attitudes of employers to many of the issues that these groups face needs to change as ultimately it will be the ability of these people to find and maintain employment which ends their exclusion. Hackney needs to take its responsibility as a major employer to affect real

change by doing more to find innovative ways of supporting these individuals into work and take a lead along with the Team Hackney partners in employing members of these groups.

- The need to maximise the volunteering and employment opportunities for these groups arising from the Olympic and Paralympic Games.
- The need to ensure an adequate mix of provision especially for care leavers who are at a crucial transitional stage in their lives.

Finally, there is a real need for those working with these individuals and for potential employers to be prepared to take more risks and we would like to conclude by quoting from Peter Smith, Captain of the Hackney Football Club (part of the Positive Mental Attitude football league), a former mental health user and now a member of the mental health trust's staff:

“We should now look seriously at the opportunities that recovery can bring, instead of focussing on risk, because in the long term, if we don't pay attention to this we will have more and more service users remaining and needing long term care and not benefiting from leading a normal life. Living with a mental illness doesn't mean the end, but the beginning of an adventure in which we are in control of our destiny. Once we realise, persevere and believe, we can succeed and achieve our goals”

Lead Councillor: Councillor Angus Mulready-Jones

Scrutiny Officer: Jarlath O'Connell, Sarah Harrison

Monitoring Officer Comments: Winston Brown

Financial Considerations: Tim Sylvester

8 CONTRIBUTORS

8.1 The following gave evidence at meetings of the Commission:

- 11 September 2007 – East London NHS Foundation Trust (Sue Balmer, Borough Director Hackney)
- 11 September 2007 – LBH Housing Needs (Molly Wallis, Interim AD)
- 11 October 2007 – LBH Equalities Team (Rosalind Hardie-Ejiohuo, Head of Equality & Diversity and Shiavangi Medhi, Equality & Diversity Policy Officer)
- 11 October 2007 - LBH Cabinet Adviser for Equalities (Cllr Sally Mulready)
- 11 October 2007 – LBH Learning Difficulties Service (Joanna Davies; Head of Learning Difficulties).
- 11 October 2007 – LBH Children’s Social Care (Amelda Williams, Group Manager, Children’s Social Care; Paul Owen Principal Manager for Looked After Children)
- 3 December – LBH Supporting People (Christine Chambers, Programme Development Manager)
- 3 December 2007 – LBH Housing Needs (Peter O’Kane, AD Housing Strategy)
- 11 February 2008 – Job Centre Plus (Derek Harvey, External Relations Manager, City and East London District)

8.2 The following additional people provided information on other occasions or by correspondence:

Gary Atherton, Assistant Chief Officer - Hackney and Tower Hamlets,
London Probation Service

Stephen Nation-Tellery, Working Links

9 MEMBERSHIP OF THE SCRUTINY COMMISSION

- Councillor Deniz Oguzkanli (Chair)
- Councillor Angus Mulready-Jones (Vice Chair)
- Councillor Feryat Demirci
- Councillor Jacob Landau
- Councillor Jonathan McShane
- Councillor Sem Moema
- Councillor Tom Price

- Scrutiny Officer: Sarah Harrison followed by Jarlath O’Connell

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following documents have been relied on in the preparation of this report and were either presented to the Scrutiny Commission or referred to during the meetings:

- 1) Reaching out: an action plan on social exclusion, HM Government; September 2006
- 2) The drivers of social exclusion, a review of the literature for the social exclusion unit, in the breaking the cycle series, ODPM, Sept 2004
- 3) PSA delivery agreement, 16, HM Government, October 2007.
- 4) Socially excluded adults PSA – indicator date set for London, HM Government, November 2007
- 5) Supporting people: 5 year strategy 2005-2010, LBH, 2005
- 6) Review of supporting people grant fund services for vulnerable people, Robert Frew Research for LBH, 2006.
- 7) The employability of ex-offenders, National Probation Service London, 2006
- 8) Mind the gap: Hackney’s strategy to reduce inequalities and poverty, community strategy 2005-2015, LBH, 2005
- 9) Draft Mental health strategy 2007-2010, City and Hackney Mental Health Local Implementation Team, October 2007
- 10) Overview and Scrutiny Board Minutes. Social Inclusion was the theme for the “Directorate Question Times” during 2006/7. Minutes of the

meetings on 11 Sept 2006, 15 Nov 2006, 18 Jan 2007 and 13 Feb 2007.

- 11) 'Member briefing, report of chair of Regeneration and social inclusion scrutiny commission: initial findings on social inclusion' drawn from Directorate Question Time sessions as above, May 2007
- 12) Regeneration and social inclusion scrutiny commission agendas and minutes: 12 July 2007, 11 September 2007, 11 October 2007, 8 November 2007, 3 December 2007, 11 February 2008

ABBREVIATIONS AND GLOSSARY

JCP	Jobcentre Plus is a government agency supporting people of working age from welfare into work, and helping employers to fill their vacancies. They are part of the Department of Work and Pensions.
LAA	Local Area Agreement – an agreement struck between government, the local authority and its partners in an area (working through the local strategic partnerships) to improve public services.
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) support the assessment and management of the most serious sexual and violent offenders. Introduced in 2001 they bring together the Police, Probation and Prison services. Other agencies are under a duty to co-operate with MAPPA include social care, health, housing and education services.
PSA	Public Sector Agreement – A PSA reflects the Government's high level priorities. They set out the specific improvements that the Government wants to achieve and the performance indicators that will be used to measure progress. Each PSA is underpinned by a Delivery Agreement which outlines how improvements will be achieved and who will be accountable for delivery.

Summary of indicator data for the London area

Local Authority	Outcome 1: Settled accommodation				Outcome 2: Employment, education or training (EET)			
	% of offenders in settled and suitable accomm (2006/07)	% of former care leavers in suitable accomm (2005/06)	% of learning disabled living in community (2005/06)	% of mentally ill in settled accomm (2006/07)	% of offenders in employment (2006/07)	% of former care leavers in EET (2005/06)	% of learning disabled in employment (2005/06)	% of mentally ill in employment (2006/07)
Barking & Dagenham	69	70	73	--	24	38	8	9
Barnet	84	72	57	--	26	43	6	13
Bexley	87	88	59	--	55	60	18	23
Brent	72	92	68	--	32	86	7	12
Bromley	69	92	75	--	40	60	--	15
Camden	66	88	78	--	16	86	10	20
City Of London	--	--	--	--	--	100	9	--
Croydon	73	96	75	--	33	85	15	19
Ealing	70	98	61	--	32	58	7	12
Enfield	73	89	66	--	18	63	2	11
Greenwich	73	90	81	--	40	62	8	12
Hackney	64	100	60	--	21	67	9	15
Hammersmith & Fulham	61	82	69	--	34	64	12	10
Haringey	65	85	58	--	33	69	--	10
Harrow	80	96	76	--	43	80	1	--
Havering	79	80	55	--	46	67	2	11
Hillingdon	84	96	52	--	46	75	9	12
Hounslow	82	89	80	--	53	60	11	6
Islington	82	96	72	--	21	70	15	16
Kensington & Chelsea	43	74	63	--	24	63	18	20
Kingston Upon Thames	80	96	63	--	51	60	13	36
Lambeth	76	87	57	--	31	69	2	25
Lewisham	64	90	63	--	23	67	6	12
Merton	77	82	65	--	46	67	11	17
Newham	78	94	77	--	34	62	23	11
Redbridge	90	100	80	--	34	75	8	2
Richmond Upon Thames	78	100	63	--	22	100	10	19
Southwark	77	96	64	--	32	71	12	18
Sutton	78	N/A	69	--	47	--	17	24
Tower Hamlets	73	97	67	--	28	57	13	20
Waltham Forest	71	91	58	--	26	71	18	14
Wandsworth	72	92	61	--	30	71	10	14
Westminster	60	79	65	--	17	71	11	11
London	78	80	87	--	34	87	8	16
England	77	88	88	--	38	82	10	20

