

## Appendix 2(v)

<b>Contract title:</b>	<b>Housing Related Support Service for Adults – Flexible Support (Lot 5)</b>
<b>Contract Number:</b>	EC09/01/2454/E
<b>Service Provider(s):</b>	Home Group Ltd
<b>Commissioning Organisation:</b>	Southampton City Council
<b>Contract start date:</b>	1 July 2017
<b>Current contract end date:</b>	30 June 2022
<b>Maximum contract end date:</b>	30 June 2022
<b>Current financial year value £:</b>	£1,473,108

### **Service Summary**

This service is part of a group of support services providing housing related support (HRS) to vulnerable people in the city. This service is the largest in the group and offers short-term (up to a maximum of two years), flexible support to individuals in the city who are vulnerable due to homelessness, mental health issues, learning disability issues and other reasons. The support enables individuals to live independent lives within supported accommodation.

The housing support services have recently been reviewed and the proposal for re-commissioning was approved by the Cabinet on 13 September 2021 and will be considered at Council on 11 October 2021, with proposals for re-commissioning of the housing support services through a framework approach in 2022.

### **Contract Performance**

For the majority of Performance Indicators (PI) the Flexible Support Service reports separately against Accommodation and Non-Accommodation. Contract summaries (see the tables below) across the 4 years shows mixed performance, although year 4 is not reflective of the commissioned service as a result of Covid-19. Establishing the contract monitoring forms over the initial 12 – 24 months of the contract was challenging. The service draws on complex metrics. Our standard contract monitoring methods did not adequately capture the flow of residents in and out of properties and providers found it harder to extract data around some metrics than originally thought during pre-contract negotiations. Solutions were put in place and reporting improved in a number of areas in year 3 and 4.

## Appendix 2(v)

Move on has presented challenges for all services with a reduction (up to the pandemic) of private rented sector (PRS) options. Other areas took time to establish (year 1) and results started to show, and be addressed in year 2, such as contingency planning.

Apart from year 4, the non-accommodation service showed improvements against performance indicators. The accommodation service showed some areas of improvement, with other areas struggling to maintain the required levels of delivery.

For those areas indicated as red the following should be noted

<b>NB: For all KPI's the RAG rating indicates the performance in comparison to the previous year and not the target.</b>	
<b>Accommodation</b>	
Utilisation	Lower performance was impacted by a high level of voids arising from the quality of available properties. Improved void reporting is now in place and helps track delays. Not all delays are avoidable.
Percentage of people who make a planned move on from accommodation	Year 2 was a difficult year and steps taken to address move on saw improvements in year 3. Move on slowed to an almost halt last year due to the pandemic.
% of people who access community placements.	This was a new area for the contracts and sought to show how services engaged with community opportunities to support clients. This area of development was improving over years 2 and 3 but was impacted by covid in year 4.
% of clients who signed their PCP	Year 1 took time to establish but went on to exceed the target in years 2 and 3. Red indicator in year 3 shows a reduction in performance on previous year but <b>the performance remained above target</b> . In year 4 the reduction was the result of reduced face to face work with clients, impacting on the ability to sign PCPs
% of service users who have a contingency plan in place	This indicator was not fully implemented until year 3, dropping off in year 4 during the height of the pandemic.
% of service users who have agreed an outcome And % of service users who have achieved an outcome	Providers took time to develop mechanisms for capturing the outcomes information. Year 2 showed the need for clarification around the definition of the indicator, which led to a clearer reporting in year 3 but the red indicator reflects a drop in performance on the previous year despite being close to target.
% of service users achieved the agreed	After taking time to develop the indicator in year 1, as with the above, year 2 showed the need for

Appendix 2(v)

outcome of those who identify and agree outcomes	clarification around the definition of the indicator, which led to clearer reporting in year 3, but the red indicator reflects a drop in performance on the previous year despite being <b>above target in years 3 and 4</b>

<b>NB: For all KPI's the RAG rating indicates the performance in comparison to the previous year and not the target.</b>	
<b>Non Accommodation</b>	
Utilisation	The flexible nature of the service led to more staff hours being allocated to the Accommodation element and not the Non Accommodation element of the contract. This was addressed and utilisation came close to target by year 3 but fell away again during the pandemic period.
% moved on in a planned way	The provider has worked to retain and support individuals with complex needs, but increasing complexity of cases led to increased levels of unplanned move on rates. The pandemic has reduced the unplanned move on rates due to a block on evictions, however this will have unintended consequences elsewhere.
% of people who access community placements.	This was a new area for the contracts and sought to show how services engaged with community opportunities to support clients. This area of development was improving over years 2 and 3 but was impacted by covid in year 4.
% of clients who signed their PCP	Year 1 took time to establish but went on to exceed the target in years 2 and 3. In year 4 the reduction was the result of reduced face to face work with clients during the pandemic, which affected the ability to sign PCPs
% of service users who have a contingency plan in place	This indicator was not fully implemented until year 3, dropping off in year 4 during the height of the pandemic.
% of service users who have agreed an outcome And % of service users who have achieved an outcome	Providers took time to develop mechanisms for capturing the outcomes information. Establishing clear definitions, data capture and reporting was required and led to varying performance. Outcomes are reported over 4 domains (e.g. behaviour) and 3 time periods (short, medium and long). Despite pre contract discussions it resulted in mixed and varied reporting by the provider.

## Appendix 2(v)

In addition to the contract monitoring forms, providers submit a series of reports covering quality, service user accountability, equality and diversity and financial matters. These reports provide a detailed and qualitative insight into the service delivery and provide some additional assurance to commissioners. Reports were not submitted during 2020 due to covid-related suspension of contract monitoring, but more detailed discussions took place through outbreak planning meetings and other Covid-related forums.

At a service level, there have been positive outcomes throughout the life of the contract, with strong community connections established early on, but diminished during the last 18 months due to Covid-19. The service has also supported a number of positive moves into independent or appropriate accommodation (e.g. Extra care). However, there have been challenges and areas of poor performance prior to the pandemic which would indicate the service was not achieving the level of outcomes desired or sought through the contract. High voids and long term tenancies led to fewer units of accommodation being available for individuals in other services to move into. Void reporting and length of tenure will feature more in the performance reporting of the new contracts. Commissioners have also recognised that for some individuals, there is a long term need for low level support. This is reflected in the new service specifications.

At an individual level, many clients have benefited from a positive, supportive and adaptive service. Individual case studies highlight approaches and positive outcomes for individuals. Enabling individuals to set, agree and achieve outcomes in the short, medium and long term look positive in the performance data. However, through this review and the wider Rough Sleeper Initiative work it is evident this service has not been able to support those with complex or higher levels of support needs. New service specifications will be clearer about the need to undertake crisis interventions and offer intensive support.

### **Financial Data**

The contract operates on a 'block' basis, which means that the annual sum does not change unless there is an agreed variation. The contract received a temporary 10% uplift in 2020 in respect of Covid-19 relief given by the government. There were no other variations to this contract and no increases to the contract value over the five years of the contract.

### **Operational Issues and Good Practice**

Over the past 18 months, providers commissioned to deliver HRS to vulnerable single adults, young people and young parents across Southampton have, like so many support providers, shown the depth and breadth of their commitment to these often excluded groups during the pandemic. The commitment of staff, high standards of hygiene and collective working is believed to be a key contributor behind the very low numbers of individuals in the HRS setting contracting the virus. Adopting best

## Appendix 2(v)

practice around staffing rotas, working innovatively in the provision of 'distraction packs' to those needing to isolate and drawing on experience to engage and encourage individuals to make step changes in their often chaotic lives has also been recognised locally, regionally and nationally.

Staff worked with all individuals identified as vulnerable, whether insistent on staying on the streets, in unsuitable accommodation or in hostel and supported accommodation to explore ways to keep them safe, protect those who were identified as clinically vulnerable and help them make step changes to protect themselves and others.

Individuals having no recourse to public funds present a number of unique challenges, whether the individual is homeless or fleeing domestic violence. Commissioned services, while restricted through the use of the public purse, find ways through flexible options and their own resources to offer support and in some cases accommodation to these vulnerable individuals.

Appendix 2(v)

Contract Summary -- Home Group Limited - Accommodation																	
Performance Indicator number	Service Specification reference/descriptor/target	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3				Plus 1 (Year 4)			
		Year 1 Target	YTD Performance	YTD Difference to Target	Direction of Travel (against previous YTD)	Year 2 Target	YTD Performance	YTD Difference to Target	Direction of Travel (against previous YTD)	Year 3 Target	YTD Performance	YTD Difference to Target	Direction of Travel (against previous YTD)	Year 4 Target	YTD Performance	YTD Difference to Target	Direction of Travel (against previous YTD)
PI 1	Utilisation	98%	95%	-3%	↔	98%	91%	-7%	↓	98%	85%	-13%	↓	98%	85%	-13%	↔
PI 2	Percentage of people who make a planned move from an accommodation service into a more independent setting within the required timescales	75%	80%	5%	↔	75%	41%	-34%	↓	75%	83%	8%	↑	75%	21%	-54%	↓
PI 3	% of people who access community placements	60%	0%	-60%	↔	60%	18%	-42%	↑	60%	29%	-31%	↑	60%	4%	-56%	↓
PI 4	% of people provided with 'healthy conversation'	80%	0%	-80%	↔	80%	185%	105%	↑	80%	402%	322%	↑	80%	672%	592%	↑
PI 5	% of Service Users who have participated, signed and own their PCP	80%	24%	-56%	↔	80%	85%	5%	↑	80%	82%	2%	↓	80%	46%	-34%	↓
PI 6	% of Service Users who have contingency plan in place	80%	0%	-80%	↔	80%	0%	-80%	↔	80%	93%	13%	↑	80%	66%	-14%	↓
PI 7	% of Service Users who have agreed outcome	80%	0%	-80%	↔	80%	139%	59%	↑	80%	71%	-9%	↓	80%	79%	-1%	↑
PI 8	% of Service Users who have achieved an outcome	60%	0%	-60%	↔	60%	128%	68%	↑	60%	55%	-5%	↓	60%	62%	2%	↑
PI 9	% of Service Users who report improved levels of self-confidence / self-worth	60%	0%	-60%	↔	60%	65%	5%	↑	60%	145%	85%	↑	60%	163%	103%	↑
PI 10	% of Service Users who report improved life skills (reported against all outcomes achieved as %)	60%	0%	-60%	↔	60%	37%	-23%	↑	60%	103%	43%	↑	60%	122%	62%	↑
PI 11	% of Service Users achieved the agreed outcome out of those who identify and agree outcomes	70%		#DIV/0!	↔	70%	187%	117%	↑↑↑	70%	79%	9%	↓	70%	78%	8%	↓

Appendix 2(v)

**Contract Summary – Home Group Limited – Non-accommodation**

Performance Indicator number	Service Specification reference/descriptor/target	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3				Plus 1 (Year 4)			
		Year 1 Target	YTD Performance	YTD Difference to Target	Direction of Travel (against previous YTD)	Year 2 Target	YTD Performance	YTD Difference to Target	Direction of Travel (against previous YTD)	Year 3 Target	YTD Performance	YTD Difference to Target	Direction of Travel (against previous YTD)	Year 4 Target	YTD Performance	YTD Difference to Target	Direction of Travel (against previous YTD)
PI 1	Utilisation	98%	58%	-40%	↔	98%	79%	-19%	↑	98%	81%	-17%	↑	98%	39%	-59%	↓
PI 2	% of people who have left the service in a planned way	75%	71%	-4%	↔	75%	58%	-17%	↓	75%	63%	-12%	↑	75%	72%	-3%	↑
PI 3	% of people who access community placements	60%	2%	-58%	↔	60%	19%	-41%	↑	60%	12%	-48%	↓	60%	8%	-52%	↓
PI 4	% of people provided with 'healthy conversation'	80%	0%	-80%	↔	80%	0%	-80%	↔	80%	0%	-80%	↔	80%	0%	-80%	↔
PI 5	% of Service Users who have participated, signed and own their PCP	60%	68%	8%	↔	60%	91%	31%	↑	60%	94%	34%	↑	60%	47%	-13%	↓
PI 6	% of Service Users who have contingency plan in place	60%	0%	-60%	↔	60%	13%	-47%	↑	60%	96%	36%	↑	60%	80%	20%	↓
PI 7	% of Service Users who have agreed outcome	80%	71%	-9%	↔	80%	184%	104%	↑	80%	206%	126%	↑	80%	196%	116%	↓
PI 8	% of Service Users who have achieved an outcome	60%	18%	-42%	↔	60%	46%	-14%	↑	60%	65%	5%	↑	60%	50%	-10%	↓
PI 9	% of Service Users who report improved levels of self-confidence / self-worth	60%	11%	-49%	↔	60%	94%	34%	↑	60%	110%	50%	↑	60%	116%	56%	↑
PI 10	% of Service Users who report improved life skills (reported against all outcomes achieved as %)	60%	5%	-55%	↔	60%	58%	-2%	↑	60%	76%	16%	↑	60%	92%	32%	↑