Hackney

London Borough of Hackney
Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission
Municipal Year 2015/16
Date of Meeting Wednesday, 10th June, 2015

Minutes of the proceedings of the Governance & Resources Scrutiny Commission held at Hackney Town Hall, Mare Street, London E8 1EA

Chair	**Councillor Rick Muir**
Councillors in Attendance	**Cllr Laura Bunt, Cllr Rebecca Rennison and Cllr Nick Sharman**
Apologies:	**Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli and Cllr Will Brett**
Co-optees	
Officers In Attendance	**Joanna Sumner (Assistant Chief Executive) and Ian Williams (Corporate Director of Finance and Resources)**
Other People in Attendance	**Councillor Geoff Taylor (Cabinet Member for Finance), Jacqui Banerjee (Director), Donna Molloy (Head of Implementation) and Sally Mimnagh (Research Manager)**
Members of the Public	
Officer Contact:	**Tracey Anderson** ☎ 020 8356 3312 ✉ tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Rick Muir in the Chair

1 Election of Chair and Vice Chair

1.1 Following formal nominations for the position of Chair, Councillor Rick Muir was elected by the Members as Chair of Governance and Resource Scrutiny Commission.

1.2 The Chair advised the Commission would not be electing a Vice Chair at this meeting. The opposition group were invited to appoint a member to the Commission. It is hoped they will appoint a Member to the Commission at the next Full Council meeting on 22nd July 2015.

2 Apologies for Absence

2.1 Apologies for absence were received form Cllr Deniz Oguzkhanli and Cllr Will Brett.

3   Urgent Items / Order of Business

3.1   None.

4   Declarations of Interest

4.1   The Chair advised the Council's Standards Committee asked all Chairs of Committees, Sub committees and Scrutiny Commissions to remind Members at the first ordinary meeting of their responsibilities regarding ethical governance.

4.2   The Chair read out the following:
Members will be aware of their responsibilities under the Code of Conduct as they relate to transparent and lawful decision making and declaration of pecuniary interest where appropriate.

All Members will have received relevant training and guidance from the Council's Monitoring Officer to ensure that compliance with the Code is understood. For those Members of the Planning Sub and Licensing Sub Committees this is supplemented by the relevant Sub-Committee's Code of Practice together with additional training to support those Members in discharging their duties as decision makers.

The Council's Standards Committee, has asked all Chairs of committees and sub-committees to raise with their members under this item on the agenda the need to be mindful of our responsibilities under the Code of Conduct and the relevant Code of Practice at all times.

Advice to Members relating to Declaration of Interests are included in the agenda pack for each and every meeting and it is important to remember that for every item upon which we are asked to make a decision we ask ourselves the question whether we do have a relevant declarable interest which may prevent us participating in the taking of that decision.

If unclear about whether or not to declare an interest whether pecuniary or non-pecuniary the Member should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance or from the legal officer at the meeting.

It is important that on all matters on which we are asked to make a decision we act and are seen to act fairly, without prejudice and within the law.

Fundamentally we must always have regard to matters which are relevant to our decision and disregard matters which are not relevant and at all times conduct ourselves in a manner which will not bring either ourselves or the Council into disrepute.

5   Minutes of the Previous Meeting

5.1   Minutes of the previous meeting held on 16th March 2015 were approved.

RESOLVED	Minutes were approved.

6   Whole Place, Whole System Approach - Long Term Unemployed with Mental Health Evidence Session

6.1   The Chair welcomed Donna Molloy, Head of Implementation from Early Intervention Foundation.

6.2   The Chair outlined the context of the review; highlighting the Commission invited Early Intervention Foundation (EIF) to talk about their work specialising in early intervention. The aims of their work is to shift spending, action and support for children and families from late to early intervention.

6.3   The substantive points from the presentation were:

6.3.1 Graham Allen MP and Iain Duncan Smith MP co-authored a report "Early Intervention: good parents, great kids, better citizens". Graham Allen MP is an advocate for early intervention and produced 2 reports for the Coalition Government in 2011.

6.3.2 One of the recommendations was to establish an independent organisation to champion and support the effective use of early intervention to tackle the root causes of social problems for children from conception to early adulthood. The Independent organization set-up was Early Intervention Foundation which was launched in 2013 with 3 years funding from 4 Government departments.

6.3.3 EIF has 3 main functions: to assess the evidence; advise commissioners on how to apply the evidence; advocate for early intervention. The focus of their work is on children and families.

6.3.4 Early Intervention is about getting additional, timely and effective support to children who need it – enabling children to flourish and preventing costly, long-term and damaging outcomes. Providing ttargeted, preventive activity, for children (from conception -19/24 and families). Supporting parenting and family life, social and emotional skills, mental health, literacy and language and behavior.

6.3.5 Early intervention is key to:
• Tackling the root causes of social problems
• Improving children's life chances, breaking the often intergenerational cycle of disadvantage
• Reducing the cost of failure to the taxpayer

6.3.6 Using publically available data collated mainly from local authorities; the spending on late intervention for children and young people (in 1 fiscal year) was highlighted. Data specific to London Borough of Hackney was highlighted and the officer advised Hackney has 2 areas of spend that are higher than the national average.

6.3.7 Evidence from economic and social research, established over many years, supports the following principles:

- Wide and persistent gaps in children's wellbeing and development emerge very early in life 70% of the gap in attainment is present at age 7 and this becomes difficult to close as time goes on for that young person
- These factors have important consequences for future and intergenerational outcomes.
- These factors are not set in stone immediately, and can be influenced by timely intervention
- Programmes which successfully improve these factors deliver substantial individual and social benefits over time.

6.3.8 The key elements of an effective early intervention strategy to reduce demand are:
- Using evidence and data about where the real need is
- Breaking down silos - integrated services/teams in localities with shared systems/processes
- Evidence based Interventions that meet local priorities
- A focus on frontline practice – permissive environments in which professionals have the flexibility and scope to deliver what's needed and make real change
- Using the reach and contacts of wider services
- Building community capacity to solve their own problems.

6.3.9 EIF presented examples of early intervention programmes to the Commission from EIF's evidence base. One example from Lancashire demonstrated how they managed to identify the root cause behind frequent callers to emergency services, by bringing all the information that already exists together.

6.3.10 There is a need for integration not collaboration. The challenge now is breaking down silos to have integrated services/teams in localities with shared systems and processes. This is a call for genuine service integration; not partnership working or co-ordination of services. The resolution will come from traditional collaboration or multi-agency working. It is recognised that it is not sustainable to keep paying multiple different professionals to sit in the same room and talk to each other. We need one public/community sector asset not several. A shift to deliver really integrated public service.

6.3.11 EIF developed an online toolkit to help identify the level of impact. If the programme achieved a level 4 the evidence was consistently showing a level of impact.

6.3.12 There are many claims on interventions so EIF supported 20 pioneering places to deliver effective early interventions. The evidence has shown that not all early intervention is effective. Through this process they have identified that it is important to map both in house and commissioned provision; and to consider the strength of the evidence to identify what is known about its effectiveness and fit with local priorities.

6.3.13 EIF assessed the evidence of 13 pioneering places and they found:
- 47% had no known evidence of effectiveness in an established clearing house
- 24% were underpinned by at least one RCT
- 22% had evidence of potentially improving child outcomes from a pre/post evaluation not involving a comparison group

- 4% have a logic model only
- 3% had proven to be ineffective.

6.3.14 This evidence shows that when a service is mapped a number of them could not evidence change or impact. There are some programmes showing to be effective programmes but they are not necessarily tackling the root cause of the issue for that local area.

6.3.15 The Head of Implementation advised in one programme GPs expressed their lack of power to change or help people with low level mental health. Therefore the focus should be on creating permissive environments in which professionals have the flexibility and scope to deliver what's needed and make real change. Moving away from programmes to change practices. Taking the change and embedding it into everyday services.

6.3.16 Early intervention is everybody's business and delivering effective early Intervention will require everyone to think about the role of wider workforces. To make better use of core public sector workforces; through involving them in identifying need and providing basic information to help keep people out of expensive specialist services. Essentially giving front line officers the tools to address need.

6.3.17 EIF highlighted that there is a lot of early intervention work but little evidence to support the impact. In recent years EIF have seen real innovation with a proliferation of models of community based support peer support, co – production, volunteering and paid community capacity building roles. But there is still a lot unknown about what works and the effectiveness of different models. It was highlighted that the models, systems and programmes developed need to be tested for impact.

6.4 **Discussion, Questions and Answers**

Members thanked the Head of Implementation from EIF for her detailed presentation.

(i) Members commented although early intervention programmes are new and not evidenced. Councils did not have access to funding for trails to see if a proposed model will work. In the current climate Council's will have to make a decision and try out different options because of the need to address rising demand and shrinking resources. Although EIF has highlighting there is limited evidence demonstrating what works; this is not a reason to do nothing. Council's will need to move forward and try different options.

(ii) Members enquired if the examples outlined in the presentation had a key worker in their model? Members referred to EIF's expanding remit - from children to the whole family - and queried if this would make a difference long term or were successful outcomes based on the delivery of services to people.

The Head of Implementation from EIF confirmed for complex cases key workers were part of the model. It was noted people have key workers because of the different levels of need. The reason for this is to have a person who can build relationships, challenge and navigate the system to help the family.

Their definition and remit was broad covering conception, childhood and families. It is believed early intervention is applicable from the early sign of need, although the breadth of the remit does make it hard. Some of the solutions and whole place models need multidisciplinary

(iii)   Members referred to the evaluation of policy and queried if there was a problem with the evaluation process for policy planning. Member enquired if this is an area they should look at or if there were specific areas in an evaluation process that went wrong with past evaluations that they should look at.

(iv)   Recognising the need for a permissive environment that will allow staff to respond to need. Members expressed concern about boundaries and enquired how the system could be structured so that frontline staff do not experience more pressure.

The Head of Implementation from EIF recommended mapping the different areas of the workforce to establish recurrent demand. Then think about how the staff member could be equipped to do the right intervention at that time to tackle the problem and address the root cause of need.

(v)   The Cabinet Member for Finance from LBH advised the Council was doing a project in children services like this. He enquired if there was an issue with sharing data.

The Head of Implementation from EIF advised some areas have resolved this issue and some still struggle with this. The Government is looking at this and this is an issue that needs addressing.

(vi)   Members highlighted that information sharing and accountability were key issues that needed to be resolved for the new way of working. Members asked what they should be recommending about this.

The Head of Implementation from EIF recommended the Commission speaks to West Cheshire who have managed to resolve the legal implications this for their EIF model.

The Chair thanked Donna Molloy from EIF for attending the meeting.

7   Information Reports for Whole Place, Whole System Approach - Long Term Unemployed with Mental Health

7.1   The Chair referred to the reports in the agenda:
- Preventing Depression and Anxiety in Working Age Adults by Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission.
- The 21st Century Public Servant by Dr Catherine Needham and Catherine Mangan from University of Birmingham / Economic Social Research Council and Public Service Academy.

7.2   The Chair informed the Commission that the officers from University of Birmingham were unable to attend this meeting date and offered to provide a copy of their report for the commission to review.

7.3   Members were asked to note the reports.

        Members noted the reports.

8   **Whole Place, Whole System Approach - Long Term Unemployed with Mental Health Research Findings**

8.1   The Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission, commissioned BDRC Continental to carry out qualitative research with local residents to show case the 'customer journey'; to help understand the triggers, barriers and their interaction with current local services for the LT unemployed. BDRC conducted 24 qualitative in-depth interviews with residents who are long term unemployed in Hackney. The participants were a mixture of people with and without a mental illness. The participants were recruited through the support organisation they were working with. The age range of the participants was 33-57.

8.2   The aim of this research is to reduce duplication of support and services to the same individual and to support the redesign of services in the system around early intervention or at the point of need.

8.3   The final report was received and circulated to Members in advance of the meeting. Copies of the report were available at the meeting.

8.4   The Chair welcomed Jacqui Banerjee, Director and Sally Mimnagh, Research Manager from BRDC Continental. The officers outlined the main findings from the research. The key points highlighted at the meeting were:

8.4.1   The research participants were grouped into 4 categories. Two of the categories have high need. The people in the high need category were mainly from the older age group.

8.4.2   The participants with a mental illness were better supported and had a support network around them.

8.4.3   The research highlighted that participants were frustrated with the system and seem to go round and round.

8.4.4   The employment support provided by organisations was largely generic.

8.4.5   After speaking with participants the main causes of unemployment were: redundancy, mental health or changing their career.

8.4.6   All the participants interviewed wanted to work.

8.4.7   Barriers to employment identified were:
        • Taking Low paid job roles. This was a key issue for people renting in the private sector
        • The cost of courses. These were courses related to the individuals career aspiration
        • Support and help available for 18-24 year olds but nothing for over 25s.

8.4.8   People on JSA had more pressure to find employment than people on ESA.

8.4.9   The organisation participants expressed the biggest frustration with was Renasi who provided support for the Job Centre Plus (JCP) work programme.

8.4.10   The organisation 'Peter Bedford' appeared to offer a support service that worked well; this was tailored to individual need.

8.4.11   Hackney Community College have a case worker approach and this seemed to work well too.

8.5   Discussion, Questions and Answers

(i)   Members referred to the 4 categories and enquired who had the highest need for support.

Members referred to the 4 categories and enquired who had the highest need for support.

The BDRC officers advised people without a mental illness had the highest support need because they received no support.

(ii)   Reflecting on the research and from observations Members noted that participants appeared to have a strong connection with the support organisation they were accessing.

(iii)   A number of points were made in the discussion these were:
- Members wanted to find out if there was trust in the system or only in specific services
- People were being made to apply for jobs they were not qualified to do. There was emphasis on quantity over quality in relation to job applications with applicants applying for jobs they had little chance of getting.
- The longer people were out of work the harder it was for them to get back into employment.
- The system appeared to be organised in a way that was contradictory to how people find employment. Members highlighted that in reality people build up their skill sets through volunteering etc. when seeking employment.
- The system was being driven by payment plan and targets for results.
- The system may need a key worker a person with empathy and knowledge about where to navigate people. Working inside the system or a trusted professional. The system needs people with the ability to provide in-depth personal support and build relationships with people.

(iv)   The Cabinet Member for Finance from LBH asked BDRC to give their views about this cohort after conducting the research.

The Director from BDRC Continental expressed deep passion for the people interviewed and a sense of despair that they could not help these individuals. The Officers pointed out that after working in this environment for a period of time, it was likely that an officer would become desensitised to the person in-front of them.

After conducting this research, as an organisation they felt they had a duty of care to suggest and provide information to the participants about other support organisations they heard about through the research.

The key pointed noted from the research were:
1) Personalised support was required
2) The ability to progress and move on was an issue. For example participants accessing Core Arts services did not move on from this service. Some research participants were carrying out work duties in the organisation, but did not progress to other volunteering roles or job opportunities
3) Early contact and timely intervention was key. Getting people support at the start of the process was important.

BDRC highlighted the missing link in the system was quality jobs and having agencies that provided access to employers to help service users secure employment.

(v)   Members discussed the demand for work and queried if the issue in Hackney was not the employability of the people but that employers were not taking the risk to employ a person who was LT unemployed. It was important for a support organisation to have networks with access to employers. Agencies that were successful in helping a person secure employment have connections with employers to refer people too.

(vi)   Members highlighted that the research showed a need for ongoing support for people with mental health and the key to success may be connected to the place; namely the individual's positive experience with the place. Therefore the structure of support for people should focus on the place not the person. The organisations people found supportive were those that listened to them. In their experience JCP did not listen to them this was a functional relationship.

(vii)   Member commented the evidence was showing people needed a positive relationship with a place and access to a worker with the knowledge about where to go.

(viii) Members talked about looking at the current workforce in the system to identify current roles e.g. signposting, bespoke service, befriending etc. To understand if the new system would require an expansion of current roles or redeployment of existing roles. As opposed to employing new staff.

(ix)   Members talked about exploring the offer at Core Arts to understand what made it successful with participants and to clarify if employment advisors engaged with the organisation.

(x)   The key to moving people on may be to start with the place they have a positive experience to enable the discussion about moving on.

(xi)   Members referred to the HiH report on Depression and Anxiety in Working Age Adults and commented that the two reviews needed to dovetail.

(xii)   The Chair advised this cannot be achieved by the Council alone it was important to reach outside the Council. The next stage would be to talk to

frontline staff about the research findings to obtain their views about the barriers highlighted by service users and to get a breakdown of the data associated with LT unemployment in Hackney.

(xiii)   Following the engagement with font line staff, a pilot should be conducted to demonstrate if the principles for system change work effectively across all organisations in the system.

(xiv)   Members agreed to postpone the steering group meeting scheduled for Monday 15th June to allow Members time to consider recommendations for the service area in this review. The Chair advised the Overview and Scrutiny Officer would look for a new date.

ACTION	Overview and Scrutiny Officer to do: 1. Send the Commission a breakdown of the LT unemployed data for Hackney 2. Look for a new steering group meeting date 3. Organise a date for the Commission and frontline staff to talk about the 'customer journey' as outlined in the research report.

9   London Living Wage Executive Response

9.1   The Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission held two meetings in spring 2014 to consider the Council's journey to paying all of its staff, including contractors, a London Living Wage. At the time of the Commission's inquiries, Hackney was one contract away from being a total London Living Wage employer.

9.2   The Commission sent a 'Letter of Reference' to the Cabinet Member for Finance asking questions about the Council's work to further promote and strengthen the London living wage both within the Council and more widely.

9.3   The Executive response to the letter was on pages 123-130 of the agenda.

9.4   The Cabinet Member for Finance from London Borough of Hackney explained the Council did make changes to its contract with the provider and the issue about change of hours was interesting and complex. The Cabinet Member agreed to keep a watching brief on the situation.

9.5   Members noted the Cabinet response.

10   Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission - 2015/16 Work Programme

10.1   The Chair referred to the draft work programme on pages 131 – 138 in the agenda.

10.2   The Chair advised the Overview and Scrutiny officer was consulting with relevant officers and stakeholder about scheduling the proposed discussion items into the work programme.

10.3   The work programme will be updated as confirmations are received. The following items were confirmed for the work programme:
- Elections Update July 2015
- ICT Review Recommendation Update and ICT Strategy in September 2015
- Annual Complaints Report September 2015
- HR Strategy October 2015
- Welfare Reform Update April 2016.

10.4   The Corporate Director of Finance informed the Commission there was no clear indication about the impact of the Government's announcement on Right to Buy 2 or how it will operate on a local or national level. It is anticipated there will be a consultation by the Government about their proposals. Once details are received the Commission will be updated.

11   Any Other Business

11.1   None.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.15 pm