

## REPORT TO LSP EXECUTIVE

Subject of report	<b>Northolt Project: Project Evaluation Report</b>
Lead partner	<b>Olivia Hargadon, District Operations Manager, DWP</b>
Author	<b>Ned Sharpe, Northolt Project / Ealing Jobcentre Plus, DWP</b>
For <b>DECISION</b> by	<b>LSP Executive Board</b>
Date	<b>1st April 2019</b>

### Reason for report

- This report is the evaluation report for the 2-year Northolt Project that is due to end at the end of March 2019.
- The LSP Executive is required to make a decision on the preferred option contained within the report, specifically relating to options A-C.

### Report Summary

The Northolt Project was conceived in 2017 as a LSP project that was designed to last for two years. Following the experiences of the two-year project, the LSP would review the future direction. The attached report reflects on the success and areas of learning for the project stakeholders. There have been notable impacts to peoples' lives who have accessed the services on offer. Over the two-year life of the project, there have been challenges with maintaining continuity with stakeholder participation and the commitment of volunteers. Estimates on the number of users predicted to access the services were not matched with the actual number of users accessing the services offered, but for those who did, the quality and impact of support was strong.

The lead partner (DWP) for the project has engaged stakeholders on the evaluation, which has resulted in three options being presented in the evaluation report. The three options broadly suggest the following, which the LSP Executive is required to make a decision based on:

- Option A** – To not continue the Northolt Project beyond the end of March 2019
- Option B** – To continue the project, maintaining the level of funding previously set
- Option C** – To pause and comprehensively review the aims, design, delivery and governance of the project, with the view to determining whether it continues in i) an updated form, ii) continues through other delivery routes, or iii) does not continue.

Added to these options, should the project continue, is the decision concerning i) how an updated project is led and resourced, and ii) whether the governance for the project should move away from the LSP Executive and move to a project delivery group, made up of relevant stakeholders.

## **Recommendations**

The recommendation is to support a review, in Option C, to identify the most appropriate way to target vulnerable groups in the borough. Option C allows for the pausing the project for a set period and commissioning the right approach to review.

There are some practical points to also consider, these are:

1. The pause should have a clearly defined timescale.
2. The pause will not adversely affect users of the Northolt Project, as there will be continuity of service to users who have been accessing services at Northolt Library, as part of the normal provision, that our partners at GNP and GOSAD offer.
3. Any changes to what's on offer should have clear communications attached, for example, posters, leaflets and informing users face to face when they visit the Northolt Library.

As part of the Option C route, a question should be asked about whether a future project needs to sit within the LSP Executive for decision-making and co-ordination. The funding and resourcing decisions are all connected to the individual partner organisations and these organisations could still operate to deliver the project, independent of any sponsorship from the LSP Executive. The added benefit of this approach is that the project moves more fluidly, yet still connected to stakeholders who are members of the LSP Executive.

As part of a thorough review of the aims of the original project and other services and initiatives on offer, it is recommended that an Option C review be resourced by Ealing Council policy team. The timescale for the review will coincide with the next LSP Executive meeting in July 2019, where the final recommendation is made.

## **Interim arrangements and costs**

The current facilities on offer as part of the Northolt Project include a room and IT suite at the library. These are rented for a weekly total of £190.

Northolt Library also allows the Northolt Project free use of a space by the main entrance, which some providers use as a more visible location to set up their stalls. This is a good-will gesture on the part of the library and they have indicated they are happy to continue. The providers currently using this space every week are GNP (offering health and lifestyle advice) and Uxbridge College (promoting a variety of courses and apprenticeships).

All of the services described are funded by means separate to the Northolt Project.

During the review period, we could cease to use the IT suite, as this has not been as popular as had been hoped. The room at the library can be rented for less time, as the vast majority of activity/interactions occur between 10am-2pm. This would reduce costs by over half to £80 per week. All the providers that currently attend on a weekly basis would still be able to provide their services under an arrangement like this.

Therefore, the recommendation suggests that as part of Option C, the LSP Executive agree to fund the reduced cost at the library for the next three months.

# Northolt Project– Evaluation Report

## KEY TASKS for this meeting – the LSP is asked to

1.	Note the achievements and progress of the Project over its lifetime, and its continued potential to contribute to the wider Future Ealing planning.
2.	Note the challenges the Project has faced as well, in particular those that have presented recurring problems.
3.	Consider the report's recommendations, and take decisions on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Whether to extend the project beyond March 2019;</li><li>• Whether and what changes to the existing structure of the Project should be introduced.</li></ul>

## A. Executive summary

The Northolt Project (hereafter “the Project”) was conceived to reduce unemployment, build community capacity and improve health outcomes for the residents of Northolt West End and Mandeville wards, and also as a means of trialling a new model of partnership working on projects led by the LSP. It was planned to run for two years, with the potential to extend it beyond this initial cycle upon its conclusion in March 2019. The target cohort was:

- Working age adults in receipt of benefits who reside in Northolt West End or Mandeville wards (i.e. 1058 residents at time of project plan, March 2017).
- The Community Champions also take wider referrals from the Northolt Community.

Funding for the first year (not including non-financial commitments) resources came from the following sources:

- DWP - £150,000
- London Borough of Ealing
  - Chief Executives Office - £11,000 (for hub-venue costs)
  - Public Health - £25,000
  - Community Safety - £5,000 (of £10,000 initial commitment)
- NHS, Ealing Clinical Commissioning Group - £25,000.

No funding was committed for the second year.

The following table lists the Project's most significant stakeholders; whether they are currently actively involved; and, where possible, their primary points of contact.

Organisation	Contact(s)	Currently actively involved? (Y/N)
DWP	Olivia Hargadon, Edward Sharpe	Y
GNP	Lainya Offside-Keivani, Zeina Mehio, Shabnam Nasimi	Y
GOSAD	Sharmake Diriye, Mukhtar Handule	Y
NHS – CCG	Neha Unadkat, Parmjit Sagu	Y
LBE Public Health	Rubinder Bains, Mona Sahota	Y
LBE Community Safety		N
Shaw Trust	Saeed Bock	Y
Uxbridge College	Giles Strachan	Y
Get Set	Krishma Jotangia	Y
Open Age		N

This project evaluation is split into four main sections. Section B looks at the outcomes the Project has achieved over the previous two years, highlighting both the achievements and the missed targets, and areas in which important lessons have been learned. Section C deals with the processes that have been employed in pursuit of the Project's objectives, and again highlights the key lessons learned. Section D builds on the previous two sections by dealing with broad issues of sustainability, and Section E outlines the options for going forward.

The following three broad options are presented:

- **Option A: The Northolt Project concludes in March 2019**
- **Option B: The Northolt Project is extended beyond March 2019**
- **Option C: The Northolt Project is paused while a new approach is devised, and then re-launched once ready**

Options B and C also encompass the following recommendations:

- Stakeholders should consider whether project management responsibilities are best located within the DWP;
- All partners should redouble efforts to address issues of continuity and resilience;
- Partnership working model should adapt to reflect the lessons learned, and better address other persistent issues (including around data sharing, referral pathways, customer tracking, and publicity);
- A different approach to the role of work coaches within the Project should be trialled;
- Further research into the needs of the area should be considered;
- And not all Project activities should cease during the pause (Option C only).

To reach these conclusions, this evaluation has drawn from the previous reports published on the Project, the available evidence from public consultations, and the expertise and experience of the various partners working on it. The overall picture it offers is one of a project that has delivered some significant outcomes in difficult circumstances, but that has also been prevented from realising its full potential as a result of persistent problems. Some of these difficulties were external to the Project (such as the introduction of GDPR) and others are internal (such as the lack of ownership and accountability for key work streams). The overall argument is that it would be ill advised to end the Project at this juncture as the problems in Northolt that necessitated the Project's initiation persist, and important lessons have been learned over the past two years that could inform its future development into a project that can deliver lasting positive change in the area.

## B. Outcomes evaluation

This section includes a consideration of the Project's performance against the originally devised SMART measures (see *annex i* for a table containing SMART objectives from the Project Plan) and also any further outcomes it has delivered. The analysis will demonstrate that the Project has delivered several valuable outcomes over its lifetime, and will also consider why the Project failed to live up to expectations in some areas.

### Reducing Unemployment

Table 1 shows the numbers of the target cohort that have found work over the Project's lifetime so far:

Organisation	Year 1		Year 2	
	Target	Achieved	Target	Achieved (to date)
<b>DWP</b>	100	150	200	138
<b>GOSAD</b>	40	23	N/A	N/A
<b>Get Set</b>	40	25	N/A	N/A
<b>Open Age</b>	30	1	N/A	N/A
	Total: 210	Total: 199	Total: 200	Total: 138
	<b>Cumulative total achieved: 337</b>			

The numbers alone can be misleading however, so the bullet points below provide important context:

- The targets for the providers (GOSAD, Get Set and Open Age) were based on overly optimistic assumptions about both the level of foot traffic they could expect at the Thursday hub, and how many referrals they would receive. Despite providers' best efforts, actual referrals were considerably lower than expected (e.g. GOSAD received only 53 referrals in the Project's first year).
- Providers were also operating on a time-frame that saw their funding expire six months before the official conclusion of the first year, which in effect reduced the time they had in which to deliver their services. This was due to a delay in initiating the Thursday hub at Northolt Library that occurred early in the Project's lifetime, and which was not effectively communicated to all delivery partners.

- The numbers also do not reflect the continued support that GOSAD provides to the people it helps into work, which is instrumental in ensuring that they sustain their employment.
- Previous reports have also described difficulties in data collection which were never entirely resolved, so it is possible that there are others from the area that found work without being captured in these figures.

The Project also adds value by connecting Northolt residents to key provision available to them locally. Such provision is vital to helping those with the most complex needs, and that are the hardest to reach in society, and supporting them to overcome their barriers and become work ready. The list below summarises some of the activity and outcomes of the relevant providers.

- **GOSAD** supported claimants' journey into employment/self-employment through Specialised Multilingual Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG); Tailored Skills Development (ESOL, Personal Development and Business Planning training); Community Based Support on issues including housing/homelessness, debt problems, mental health challenges, welfare rights, and sports provisions; and Sustainability and After Care Support. The following figures summarise GOSAD's impact as part of the Northolt Project:
  - 53 users have accessed ESOL training.
  - 12 users have accessed self-employment (Business Planning) training.
  - 33 users have been supported overcome/manage; housing, debt and other pressing personal issues.
  - 10 users supported manage their mental health problems.
  - 21 users supported access in-work benefits/support.
  - See *Annex vi* for two positive cases studies of individuals helped by GOSAD and the Northolt Project.
- **Work and Health Programme (WHP). Shaw Trust** has been attending the Thursday hubs weekly since September for discussions with residents about the WHP which helps people with significant barriers become work ready.
  - Over 50 residents have been engaged in this way.
  - Of those that expressed interest, 6 have been successfully referred to the WHP so far. The number is this low because of the strict criteria applied to candidates, whereby they must be driven to find work, and be in a position where it is a realistic prospect for them within 12 months.
  - The WHP includes provisions aimed at helping vulnerable people, including refugees and young people at risk of becoming involved in gangs. A significant number of Northolt residents have these characteristics, so the WHP has strong potential to deliver a positive impact in the area.

- **Get Set** have continued to be involved with the Project on an ad hoc basis despite their FSF funding having expired. They focus on supporting BAME women to become work ready and find work.
  - They recently committed to attending on a fortnightly basis to accept referrals.
  - In the past 3 months they have held 3 employability workshops at the Thursday hub.
  - The most recent helped 10 attendees secure interviews for work.
  
- **Uxbridge College** have recently become involved with the Project. They promote a variety of apprenticeships and free training courses for people in receipt of benefits.
  - They are moving forward with 12 applications to their courses from Northolt residents.
  - They are also trialling weekly attendance at the Hub until February.
  
- **Strive** attended once in October to promote a warehouse training course, and recruited 2 trainees as a result.
  
- **Launch Pad** received 11 referrals from lone parents to an employment support programme they offer.

All of the outcomes listed above would be enhanced if the attendance at the Thursday hubs were higher, but as the relevant delivery partners cannot compel people to attend the numbers each week are inconsistent. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports.

### **Increasing Community Capacity**

*Annex ii* (pg. 22-24) contains a summary table of activities completed as part of the community capacity work stream, which was led by **Greenford, Northolt and Perivale Community Forum** (GNP). The express aim of the Community Capacity element of the Project was to recruit Community Champions from within the Northolt community who would work with existing community groups to support their service users into the hub and also help identify group support needs to enhance this link to potential Northolt Hub service users. In short, the champions would conduct outreach and promotional work to generate referrals to the Project, thus contributing to its sustainability. In return, the training and experience Champions gained would improve their employability, and they would usually ultimately move on to paid employment or other voluntary work. GNP's approach represents a positive model for active citizenship in the Borough of Ealing, and they can offer a lifeline of support to some of the most vulnerable and socially excluded people in the area by connecting them to a variety of social activities and health and lifestyle opportunities.

GNP commenced as a partner in the earliest stages of the Project in November 2016 when it was awarded funding to deliver the Community Capacity element. It had been established for at least 7 years with a track record of effective delivery, but at that point had only constituted as an independent body (Community Interest Company). GNP has therefore had the twin challenges of developing its internal capacity as a newly constituted community organisation whilst establishing an innovative approach to improving community capacity in Northolt.

It is clear that some of the assumptions underpinning the shape of the Project tended to overstate Northolt's existing community capacity and the prevalence of community organisations. For example, the Project Plan stated that GNP would support '10 identified & engaged community organisations', creating a network that could 'access local people, share knowledge, identify potential volunteers and extend the reach beyond the life of the project'.<sup>1</sup> In reality the groups in existence were low in number and not in a position to facilitate this work with Community Champions due to limited capacity, and the available project update reports do not definitively list these organisations or their key functions.<sup>2</sup> This has stymied a key element of the community capacity work because the need for more intensive community asset development of existing community groups in Northolt was not recognised as a dependency that underpinned the broader outreach activity. GNP has now mainstreamed the health work and has appointed a Community Asset Development work for 3 months to pilot an asset-based model of community capacity building and community development to start to bridge this deficit. This has resulted in GNP continuing its engagement its work beyond its envisaged with the Project beyond the end of the funding which concluded October 2018.

Over the Project's lifetime this work stream has seen mixed successes. Early successes included 20 Champions recruited and trained in the Project's first year (exceeding the target of 15). The numbers of active champions has fluctuated as they found jobs or moved on for other reasons such as to study to take up other volunteering they became aware of through the programme. It is also likely that as time went on the most enthusiastic candidates to volunteer have come forward, and so sustaining the momentum inevitably becomes more challenging. To date, a cumulative total of 25 Community Champions have been recruited and trained. 2 former Champions have recently been reengaged, and there are currently 5 active Champions working in the Northolt area.

Champions that found paid employment have cited the peer support and mentoring they accessed as a result of being a Champion as a contributing in their job outcomes. One Case study from a previous report describes a resident who found two volunteering roles and a fulfilling part-time job in addition to fulfilling the Champion role. Another Champion came to the Hub suffering from health issues, but later found stability and confidence and ultimately returned to a self-employed role.<sup>3</sup> These examples demonstrate that the Champion model is an effective means of making significant positive changes in an individual's life; however the turnover in Champions shows that it is a more resource intensive area of work than was envisaged.

18 months into the Project (May-July 2018) there was an effective hiatus in various associated activities due to a trio of disruptive events coinciding with one another. The events in question were; the departure of the Community Champions Coordinator in June 2018 for health reasons; the vacancy for the same period of a regional manager in the DWP, compromising its strategic overview; and the collapse of the Council Library service provider, Carillon, resulting in key stakeholders believing the Library was closing, and the Hub with it, due to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Northolt Project Plan 24 April 2017*, p.9.

<sup>2</sup> *Northolt Project Early Evaluation, 30 October 2017*, The most significant passage of writing regarding these organisations identifies just six of them: 'We have established and engage with 10 community groups, including The Citizens Trust, Community First Foundation, Ealing Mediation Service, Ealing CVS, EASE and Muslim Matters. A renewed focus over the next period will be on developing some of these relationships further.'

<sup>3</sup> *Northolt Project Update Report, 30 October 2017*, p.3.



miscommunication. This was swiftly addressed when the new DWP regional manager came into post and GNP recruited a highly experienced urban community development and regeneration professional. The GNP Interim Director has worked closely with the Regional DWP Manager and new DWP project manager who together have been instrumental in getting the Project back on track, and identifying some of the underlying issues with the previous delivery model which needed to be addressed.

For example, in recognition of some of the difficulties that this area of work has faced, GNP has since recruited a Community Assets Development Worker to compliment and support the work of the Champions. This staff member will look at the existing resources including groups their needs, premises, etc., in the area and work to develop them with the community to achieve increased and improved outcomes for local people. They will also help to sustain good relations between local community organisations to enhance opportunities for effective partnership working, and to contribute to the sustainability of community capacity work in the area by ensuring there is a varied network of local organisations that are willing and able to support the work of the Champions. This work will be complimentary to the work of a Champions volunteer coordinator.

### **Improving Health Outcomes**

London Borough of Ealing’s Public Health team and the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group each committed £25,000 for the delivery of this work stream in the first year of the Project, but there is some disagreement around which body retained ultimate responsibility for driving the health agenda, and it is unclear how the work was to be divided up. Some partners understood that LBE Public Health were responsible for coordinating this work stream, but some in LBE Public Health thought it was DWP’s responsibility as the lead partner. This confusion contributed to the failure to deliver on some elements of the health related work (elaborated on further below in ‘Section C: Governance and Monitoring’). It also emphasises the importance of clearly delineating each partner’s roles and responsibilities on a collaborative project, and capturing this information in a service level agreement.

The table below contains information on recent healthcare based activity delivered by GNP.

<b>Activity or health test delivered (August 2018 - January 2019)</b>	<b>Number of people engaged/referred</b>
GNP health stall at Thursday Hub	148
Referrals to Ealing One You 6 week health trainers programme	6
Referrals to Mindfood Growing Wellbeing Courses	2
Referrals to local exercise sessions	25
Referrals to GP	9
Referrals to Ealing Healthy Homes	15
Referrals to Green Doctors	5
Referrals to cervical cancer screening	1
Referrals to Spectra health checks	22
Referrals to Ealing One You health checks	31
HIV tests	5
Blood pressure checks	55
Sexual health info provided	66
Alcohol awareness	19
Diabetes awareness	11
Mental Health awareness	13

These are activities that would not be happening without the Project, and the gravity of some of the health issues they address demonstrates the potential the Project can have to deliver significant, positive impacts for Northolt residents.

### **Underachievement and Barriers to Success**

A significant missed target for the Project was the failure to make any referrals to the CCG's Care Coordination team, which was a result of the absence of an effective referral pathway between GNP and the CCG. This is dealt with in more detail under the 'Governance and Monitoring' heading in 'Section C' below.

The departure of the original Champions Coordinator accompanied by the exit of the remaining 7 Champions then working on the Project at a critical point (i.e. the point at which it should have been consolidating delivery and learning) was a significant setback for the project as a whole. For example, it meant that the primary means of publicising the Project's activities locally was temporarily lost. As a result, in a recent insight forum with Northolt residents, few attendees had heard of the Northolt Project.<sup>4</sup> This contributed to the development of a circular problem at the Thursday hubs, whereby the falling attendance of customers in turn deterred providers from coming, and then the resultant loss of provision reduced customer numbers further. This was compounded by changes in DWP personnel assigned to the Project, which further compromised the existing network of providers as incoming staff were unfamiliar with key contacts.<sup>5</sup> This is illustrative of how the institutional memory of the majority of stakeholders fell short of what was required for the Project.

Another key barrier to delivering the outcomes outlined in the Project Plan is that some of the targets and outcomes were overly ambitious or based upon incorrect assumptions. For example, the Early Evaluation Report recognised that the resources necessary for a personalised approach to every customer had been underestimated.<sup>6</sup> This resource issue is a likely reason behind why a "person-centred combined assessment tool" that was described in early reports never materialised.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, some of the Champions recruited to the Project had significant vulnerabilities, such as long term health issues, including mental health issues, which made it more challenging to fulfil all the demands of the role. In addition to this there is only limited information on the local organisations that were recruited to sustain the Community Champions work stream, and no indication of exactly how they worked with the Project.<sup>8</sup> These examples suggest that a simpler, and in some cases less ambitious approach that was designed around the capabilities of the actors involved could have yielded better results. Also, as stated in the 'Increasing Community capacity' section above, GNP have recently recruited a Community Assets Development Worker to help address some of the issues identified here.

---

<sup>4</sup> See *Annex v – Results from Customer Insight Forum*. Forum was held by DWP on 27/11/2018.

<sup>5</sup> See *Annex iii*, table from 2017 identifies several similar issues to those outlined here.

<sup>6</sup> *Northolt Project Early Evaluation, 30 October 2017*, p. 2.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid*, p. 3. The most significant passage on this issue reads: 'We have established and engage with 10 community groups, including The Citizens Trust, Community First Foundation, Ealing Mediation Service, Ealing CVS, EASE and Muslim Matters. A renewed focus over the next period will be on developing some of these relationships further.'

Finally, an unfortunate fact is that many of these issues and barriers had been identified as early as October 2017, as evidenced by the table from the Project's Early Evaluation (reproduced in *Annex iii*). This suggests that an overarching issue has been a lack of accountability and ownership of key work streams throughout the Project's lifetime.

## C. Process Evaluation

This section focusses on areas of the process where there is room for improvement, providing the key context to the recommendations in Section E.

### Project Resilience

The previous Update Reports for the Project demonstrate that it has gone through peaks and troughs of activity and impact, and a key reason for the inconsistency has been changes in leadership within the organisations responsible for delivering it. It was particularly unfortunate in the case of the Northolt Project that both the DWP and GNP lost key lead personnel at around the same time, but it also serves to emphasise the importance of project resilience. Experience to date suggests that across most of the Project's stakeholders institutional memory and handover procedures were insufficiently robust to allow incoming staff to pick the work up with minimal disruption. DWP has started to address this (e.g. by reorganising the Project's data and information archives to make vital information more easily accessible to incoming staff) but more needs to be done. Section E offers some further suggestions.

### Governance and Monitoring

The Project Plan outlines the governance arrangements in more detail than any other aspect of the Project, but over the Project's lifetime governance practices have significantly diverged from those originally devised. For example, the Coordinating Group and the Working Group are no longer meeting regularly, but on an ad hoc basis instead.<sup>9</sup> This is not an issue in and of itself as the Plan anticipated that the structures could develop over time, but it does suggest that the initial structure may have been too prescriptive, and lacking in resilience. If the project is extended then it will be necessary to outline a new governance structure that draws upon lessons learned up to this point, and encourages improved collaborative working.

A more significant governance issue relates to the Project's monitoring procedures, which have at times proven ineffective in following up on whether previously identified problems are being addressed. Several of the update reports identified the same issues, but only included vague information on how they were to be mitigated or sometimes no information at all. An illustrative example is provided in the following key questions, identified by the Coordinating Group in the July 2017 Update Report:

- "How can we understand the totality of services available to Northolt residents, so that we can all effectively refer/signpost?"
- How can we share information appropriately and relevantly?
- How can we develop a joined-up referrals process?

---

<sup>9</sup> The most recent meeting took place on 30/11/2018. In attendance were representatives of DWP, GNP, CCG, and GOSAD.

- How can we engage and motivate residents, market the Northolt offer and build support networks?
- How can we make the best use of the hub, based at Northolt Library on a Thursday?
- How can we track an individual's progress?"<sup>10</sup>

These questions contributed to the development of the Project Plan and an additional Action Plan that was presented to the LSP later that year; however several of them remain unresolved. For example, information gateways and referrals processes were never sufficiently sophisticated to deliver on the expectations of the Project, and as a result the tracking of individuals' progress was done in a fragmented way across various partners. This suggests that the monitoring of key work streams has not always been robust enough, which will also have impacted upon the Project's overall resilience.

A further governance issue is the lack of clear audit trails covering how delivery partners such as GNP, GOSAD, Get Set and Open Age were recruited for the Project. If this information had been recorded and made available throughout the implementation of the Project it could have helped all partners better understand one another's capabilities and limitations, which would have contributed to a more open, mutually supportive and therefore resilient working relationship. Any future iteration of the Project should learn from this, and ensure such records are kept and made available to those who may need them.

As referenced in the above sections under the headings 'Improving Health Outcomes' and 'Underachievement and Barriers to Success', a functioning referral pathway between GNP and the CCG's Care Coordination Team was never established. As part of this work 15 Champions were trained in Making Every Contact Count and Patient Activation Measures,<sup>11</sup> however the turnover of champions and the departure of the previous Champions Coordinator meant that those who had received this training also ceased their involvement with the Project.<sup>12</sup> The chief barrier however was the failure to address outstanding questions around information governance and patient consent, which meant that partners were not certain of their data protection obligations. The lack of clarity around who was responsible for driving this work stream meant that no one seized the initiative, and consequently the referral pathway was never established.<sup>13</sup> Any future iteration of the Project should therefore clearly identify and record the owners of key work streams and actions to ensure key work is not allowed to slip in this way again.

## **Project Management**

Project management issues have been an unfortunate feature of the Project, which have in turn negatively impacted upon some of its other areas (including partnership working, continuity and resilience, and monitoring). As the lead partner, DWP were accountable for the overall management of the Northolt Project, and it is important to recognise the factors that

---

<sup>10</sup> *Northolt Project Update Report, 17 July 2017, p.2.*

<sup>11</sup> See Annex i.

<sup>12</sup> *Northolt Project Update Report, 16 July 2018*, includes a table of relevant work streams that suggest that the work on establishing the pathway had hit a hiatus, and it is also the report that describes the departure of the previous Champions coordinator.

<sup>13</sup> The CCG thought LBE Public Health were coordinating the health related elements of the Project, but LBE Public Health thought it was the DWP's responsibility as the lead body. DWP however has no authority or capacity to drive the health agenda, and GNP were then in no position to lead on it, and could not have done so without instructions and consent from CCG.

often made it difficult to do so effectively. Most important of these is the fact that it was arguably not the most appropriate body to take on this responsibility in the first place, and it is not clear that it was effectively empowered to do so by the agreement of the other partners.

Although the DWP's and JCP's role has expanded in recent years to encompass support for people with complex needs, this function is primarily carried out within the context of its traditional remit of helping people to find work and administering the benefits system. It therefore lacks the administrative authority and institutional capacity to effectively oversee all of the Project's processes. A further handicap is that JCP does not employ or train project management specialists. This is reflected in the numerical and qualitative evidence collected in previous reports, which demonstrates that DWP has succeeded relatively well in helping Northolt residents find work whilst other areas of the Project faltered.

In addition to these issues, the failure to clearly delineate the responsibilities of each partner at the Project's outset made DWP's job significantly more difficult as it was unclear who should be held accountable for completing key tasks. All of this contributed to a situation in which Update Reports would often correctly identify issues affecting the Project, but fail to generate clear actions with assigned owners to address them.

Going forward, discussion around the future of the Project should therefore encompass a discussion of which partner organisation would be best placed to take on project management responsibilities. Clear service level agreements should also be drafted to capture the specific duties of each partner, making it easier to identify lines of accountability for each area of work.

### **Service Provision**

The Northolt Project primarily connects its target cohort to providers through the Thursday hubs held in Northolt Library, and given the limited space available it is important that the providers there are appropriate to the needs of Northolt residents. The providers that attend regularly have changed over the Project's lifetime, and the current provision is generally attracting more attendees than previously, though numbers remain inconsistent.<sup>14</sup> Recently added services were targeted based on the results of a recent insight forum, which suggests that responding to the requests of the target cohort is an effective approach to selecting provision, as well as being a key element of a place based approach to local development.

Despite this, convincing additional providers to attend the hubs remains difficult due to fluctuating numbers of Northolt residents attending, which many providers do not consider to be sufficient to justify maintaining a presence there. This makes it difficult to fulfil all the requests arising from the recent insight forum. An additional barrier in some cases is the uncertainty over whether the Project is to continue as some organisations would be interested in joining a long-term Project, but less interested if it may be ending within the next few months.<sup>15</sup>

### **Partnership Working**

As stated in the above section, a great deal has been learned in relation to effective partnership working on the Northolt Project, but that the full potential has yet to be realised. It

---

<sup>14</sup> Providers currently regularly attending are: GOSAD, GNP, Shaw Trust, Uxbridge College, Get Set.

<sup>15</sup> Ealing JCP staff recently met with A2Dominion to explore the possibility of collaboration. A2D were interested, but could only commit if the future of the Project was secured.

is important to recognise that developing the partnership model was always envisioned to be a learning process, and that the lessons learned could help to inform approaches to partnership working in the future, so this should be viewed as a work in progress rather than a failure.<sup>16</sup> A key lesson has been gaining an understanding of the factors that can impede effective collaboration. The most important of these are:

- A lack of clarity around the precise roles and responsibilities of each of the partner organisations within the Project;
- The continuity gaps and knowledge/relationship loss resulting from leadership changes in key partners;
- Insufficiently clear objectives and actions arising from previous reports, often without deadlines or specified owners;
- Loss of potentially useful information and data;<sup>17</sup>
- The failure to establish key processes before the Project entered its delivery phase.<sup>18</sup>

### **Data Collection and Customer Tracking**

Due to issues with data sharing and the lack of uniform referrals processes across partners, customer tracking was not done as effectively as it could have been. From a DWP perspective, the LMS software system used in administering the old benefits regime was able to perform all the necessary functions for tracking a customer's journey through the Northolt Project. However, the rollout of Universal Credit Full Service in Ealing and the introduction of GDPR then made the job considerably more difficult as the UCFS software does not currently offer all of these functions. Previous Reports have recognised that this was an issue, but the difficulty of addressing it was underestimated. In short-hand, the key problems are that:

- The LMS and UCFS software systems do not communicate with one another;
- There is no existing database that holds the data of all the relevant customers across both benefits systems;
- Existing software that might have been able to perform most of the functions required for tracking are unable to do certain specific, but vital things (e.g. DCAMS lacks a feature that can indicate whether a person has found employment, or attach notes to their case);
- GDPR rules, and DWP's own internal guidance, create additional barriers to creating an appropriate database using other software (e.g. Excel);

A long term solution to this issue could be to look again at developing a person-centred combined assessment tool for tracking customer journeys through the Project, which would require the input of several delivery partners to develop. This should be discussed as part of broader discussions around the future of the Project, and issues surrounding cost and who should be responsible for it will have to be addressed.

---

<sup>16</sup> *Northolt Project Plan 24 April 2017*, p.11.

<sup>17</sup> There are references to various events in the previous reports (e.g. the July 2017 *Update Report* describes a Referral Workshop) but it appears that any documents that collated the results of these sessions have been lost.

<sup>18</sup> This is another reference to the failure to establish a referral pathway between the GNP and the CCG, and also other data-sharing agreements between key delivery partners. Some previous reports also describe the intention to develop a "person centred combined assessment tool" which was never developed. It would have made sense to develop this tool in advance of delivery.

## Recruiting and Retaining Community Champions

The difficulties faced in delivering on the Champions' areas of responsibility have been described already, but it is also important to recognise that ensuring sufficient continuity in their work has been a more demanding job than the planning documents seem to suggest. Part of the appeal of becoming a Champion has always been to increase the likelihood of finding employment by developing key skills through voluntary work. Some Champions that found paid work were subsequently unable to continue working on the Project due to the increased demands on their time, which means that sustaining the work of the Champions is an on-going, cyclical task of recruitment and training. In addition to this, it may be wise to improve the offer made to prospective Champions by offering funding for additional training in areas of their choice, as this would help with recruitment and encourage a positive approach to personal development. Finally, it should be recognised that GNP's recent recruitment of a Community Asset Development Worker will make all work associated with the Champions run more smoothly and sustainably.

## D. Sustainability

The sustainability issues surrounding some of the specific processes involved in the Project have been covered already, so this section deals with the broader sustainability picture.

The number of people the Project has helped find work and signposted towards local health and social initiatives indicates potential for it to encourage positive and lasting behavioural changes in its target cohort. The basic formula of making relevant services more accessible to people in Northolt and using passionate local people to promote these opportunities represents a relatively low cost means of engaging with vulnerable citizens in a deprived and geographically isolated area of the Borough. However, one lesson learned is that this approach is not self-sustaining as new Champions need to be recruited as and when existing ones move on.

There has been a recent increase in activity at the Thursday hub both as a result of efforts to better respond to the needs and demands of Northolt residents, and increasing promotional activity among the Champions and at the Jobcentre. Continuing to respond to the community's requests would therefore be an effective way of ensuring the Project is relevant and well utilised. The recent public consultation on the Project revealed that the service attendees would most like to see delivered at the hub is an advisory service to that covers a variety of citizens' issues, such as tax and housing advice.<sup>19</sup> GOSAD has recently started providing such a service in Northolt, but there is room for additional provision in this area. The possibility of collaborating with the existing Housing Hub should also be explored.

It can take several years to embed the kinds of lasting changes it is the Project was designed to contribute to, and so if it concludes in March it is likely that much of what has been achieved already would be lost. In addition to this, withdrawing from the Project could entail reputational damage for the public bodies involved by exacerbating the existing sense of helplessness and

---

<sup>19</sup> See *Annex iv* for results of recent customer insight forum.

dissatisfaction experienced by some Northolt residents.<sup>20</sup> This could also make securing the trust of the local population for any future public interventions in Northolt more difficult.

A final sustainability point that should be considered is whether any boundary changes within the Borough of Ealing are likely to impact upon the target wards of the Project. If the relevant ward boundaries are shifted then it will be necessary to decide whether adjust the target cohort along the same lines, and whether the changes entail any other significant changes (e.g. placing sections of the current target cohort within the catchment area of a different Jobcentre).

## **E. Options for going forward**

This section outlines the broad options for going forward, including some detail on their positive and negative aspects, and the different permutations that they could entail.

### **Option A: The Northolt Project concludes in March 2019**

#### ***Positives:***

- No further financial resources would be invested.

#### ***Negatives:***

- Probable reputational damage for public bodies among both Northolt residents and delivery partners as project has not realised full potential of initial investment;
- Loss of credibility for public bodies would in turn undermine efforts to develop an innovative partnership working model in the Borough of Ealing;
- Loses a valuable opportunity to address persistent socio-economic issues in Northolt area;
- It would compromise the value to be achieved from the experiences and delivery learnt from the Project to date – the Champions' working model, and the partnership model developed between the stakeholders could all be lost as there has not been time to secure external independent resources to sustain the positive aspect of the programme. This would represent very poor value for money for the investments made in the Project to date.

### **Option B: The Northolt Project is extended beyond March 2019**

#### ***Positives:***

- Changes could be introduced based on the lessons learned to date improving the delivery for all areas of the Project.
- It would capitalise on the work completed over the previous two years (i.e. by sustaining the complementary working model of the Community Champion and the partnership between stakeholders which delivers a powerful synergy).

---

<sup>20</sup> As recorded in the customer insight forum in November 2018. Attendees described often feeling frustrated and alienated by their interactions with public bodies, especially the Council and Jobcentre. (See annex v).



- It would demonstrate a shared commitment to addressing persistent socio-economic issues in the Northolt area that has experienced a perception of neglect relative to other deprived areas.
- It would be an opportunity to continue to develop an innovative partnership working model that can contribute to broader plans in the Borough through replication and tailoring of the model, and inform other similar projects in the future.
- It would allow for the current project manager (who is leaving the position at the end of March) to engage in a comprehensive handover process with an incoming manager to mitigate against an immediate recurrence of the continuity issues that the Project has previously faced.
- GOSAD and GNP are committed to sustaining their current provision, so extending the whole project would align all partners around the same approach.

### **Negatives:**

- There is the risk that the limited resources can not address the scale of the socio-economic challenges in Northolt to deliver sustainable change.
- There is an acute time constraint that must be effectively managed to discuss and agree upon required changes to the delivery model (e.g. with data collection, referrals, customer tracking and to conduct community co-design workshops to determine whether additional provision should be procured).

### **Costs**

These are estimated costs based on experience of working on the Project so far, and the knowledge of the relevant leads in each body identified.

- DWP:
  - 1 x work coach, 1-3 days a week: Circa £5180-15,540 per annum
  - 1 x project manager: circa £30k per annum
- LBE:
  - Use of library resources: Circa £260 per week
- GNP:
  - Sustaining the work of 5-10 Community Champions: Circa £24k per annum, which includes;
    - 1.5 days staff costs per week for specialist volunteer coordinator
    - 2 days staff costs per week for community assets development worker
    - Recruitment, training and placement of Champions on a rolling basis (i.e. there will be 5-10 active Champions at any given time throughout the year, not 5-10 Champions recruited in total).
  - The costs of sustaining the Champions are estimated to be lower now as a functioning working model has now been established.
  - This funding would ideally be provided through a shared budget created to for the purpose of funding the continuation of the Project. Contributors could include the LA and DWP. GNP would look to match funding through other sources as the Project continued.

Other organisations currently providing services as part of the Project would not require immediate funding to continue to do so as they are able to source the funds for this activity

from elsewhere. This situation is unlikely to be sustainable in the long-term however, and it may become necessary to engage with existing providers on their funding arrangements.

Any additional funding requirements would be determined by the appetite to procure further provision for the Project. It would be advisable to conduct further public consultations as soon as possible to better understand what provision would be most useful in the area.

**Option C: The Northolt Project is paused while a new approach is devised, and then re-launched once ready**

***Positives:***

- Allows for additional time for partners to take stock of lessons learned, and conduct additional research into how the Project could be adapted to both address its existing issues, and enhance its potential for long-term positive impact on the area.
- This could include consideration of whether the Project's objectives need updating.
- It has the potential to retain the positive aspects of continuing with the Project whilst minimising the potential for continuing with activities that deliver negative outcomes or do not represent value for money.

***Negatives:***

- Cessation of a Project even for a short period means that momentum is lost and it can be difficult to re-establish quickly or cost effectively.
- Fixed term contract staff will be lost along with their knowledge and social capital.
- It is difficult to determine how long the pause should stand as its dependent on the input of many stakeholders.
- It could cause problems for current providers that use the Library's facilities to deliver services as it could confuse clients already in the habit of accessing services at the hub (this is especially pertinent for GOSAD and GNP).

The future costs of the reconstituted Project would be determined during the pause.

If **Option B** or **Option C** is chosen there are additional areas that would also have to be considered to reflect the lessons learned so far:

***Who should take responsibility for project management?***

- 1) Responsibility remains with DWP.
  - i. The DWP would continue to commit the time of a Work coach to contribute to the delivery of the Project and designate a new project leader.
  - ii. This would maintain the likelihood that the Project's persistent management issues would continue to recur (see 'Section C', Project Management).
- 2) Responsibility is given to a different partner.
  - i. **CCG/NHS** has a similarly restricted remit to DWP, and it is not clear that there would be any advantage to conferring project management responsibility on to them.

- ii. **London Borough of Ealing** The LA has a broader remit than the DWP, so would arguably be better placed to manage all of the Project's areas of concern (i.e. it could exercise a degree of authority over the work being done on employment, health, and community capacity). It is also in the best position to develop the Project in line with the broader goals for the Borough as expressed in the Borough Plan. However, the LA is not structured to deliver area based projects such as this, so a project manager would be effectively imposed from outside the current partnership which might dislocate established relationships and ways of working developed over the past 2.5 years. There is comparable outreach project running on the Beaver Estate in Hounslow which is successfully led by the Local Authority with Hounslow JCP involved, though only limited information is available on this project at this time. There is likely to be resistance from the LA in Ealing to take on this responsibility without significant discussion beforehand.
- iii. **Voluntary Sector Stakeholder: GNP** has 7 years experience of delivering partnerships and networks and would arguably be well placed to take on project management responsibilities. It is also a generalist organisation that is taking the strategic overview of Northolt rather than single issues and themes. It has developed a track record of learning and connections to develop both in the community and with service providing stakeholders so can connect these together effectively. Fundamentally sustainability of this approach lies within the community and therefore a community rooted organisation is arguably best placed to continue working with service agencies and communities in the long term. The community sector also has access to financial and other resources that public bodies cannot access. There is the question as to how a voluntary organisation with much less resources behind it can corral the large public sector partners, however governance systems such as clearly defined Service Level Agreements and delivery plans will bring transparency and accountability which can be monitored and reported to the LSP. It would be vital to settle all outstanding questions around data collection and sharing between partners in advance of designating GNP as the Project lead too to ensure it is able to fulfil its reporting obligations. There are many successful partnerships across the borough that are led in this way by the Community Sector working with public agencies.

### ***Continuity issues***

All partners should commit to developing an effective procedure for handing over responsibility for Northolt Project related activity in the event of personnel changes in order to avoid the disruption that this has caused in the past. These plans should:

- be shared between partners;
- include provisions for introducing incoming staff to the network of partners to maintain the partnership network's integrity;
- Include lines of accountability to the Project Leader to ensure that they are actually put into action when required.

A comprehensive map detailing the contact details and roles of all those individuals involved in the Project should also be created and regularly updated to reflect any changes in relevant personnel.

### ***Prioritising collaborative solutions to persistent problems***

Several of the key issues that the Project faced were identified early on in its lifetime, but never satisfactorily addressed. As the evaluation makes clear, there were various factors that contributed to these failures, but a common characteristic of some was that they required the input of multiple partners to resolve. These included:

- data collection and customer tracking deficiencies;
- the lack of effective referral pathways to key partners;
- and an inconsistent communications strategy.

This is an issue that speaks to the need for improved governance and project management arrangements, but it also relates to partners' commitment to the Project. There is therefore a need for service level agreements that clarify what is expected of each partner in terms of collaborating to solve problems; i.e. to make them properly accountable to one another for their work on the Project.

For example, where there is an issue that needs the input of multiple stakeholders to resolve (e.g. any of those listed in the paragraph above) there should be an obligation for all relevant partners to find out exactly what they need for their respective processes to work, and then make this clear to the other partners. This list of needs must then be converted into a list of concrete actions with named, accountable owners, to ensure all partners have clarity on their responsibilities to one another. The project manager will also know who to contact to monitor progress, and so key pieces of work would not be left incomplete.

### ***The role of Work Coaches***

DWP should trial offering some Jobcentre services as part of the Thursday hubs, starting with some light-touch services (e.g. work search reviews) but with the possibility to expand if appropriate. Although there was initially a desire to adapt the role of work coaches to define the customer experience of the Project from the Jobcentre, in practice this has often meant that Work Coaches are underutilised when attending the Hub. If this recommendation is adopted then it would be vital that the relevant work coach(es) are equipped with departmental laptops. Some arguments in favour of trialling some JCP services are:

- Work coaches receive specific training to offer these services, so they should utilise these skills;
- The introduction of UCFS means that many JCP services can be delivered more easily remotely, and customers may appreciate the option of being able to access these services closer to home;
- It should help to increase attendance at the hubs, and therefore connect people to useful local provision;
- It would make referral procedures much simpler in some instances as a warm handover could be done in person at the hub, and would hopefully therefore increase referrals for the providers that attend;

## **Social research**

Partners should consider reaching out to an academic to explore the possibility of their conducting some social research on the needs of the Northolt area. The results of such research could supplement the results of any insight forums to help determine the most appropriate provision for the area. Basing future objectives on the findings of such research would also act as a bulwark against counter-productive arguments between stakeholders concerning the Project's strategic direction.<sup>21</sup>

### ***Should all Project activities be paused? (Only applies to Option C)***

There could be a compromise by which certain Project activities continue during the pause to avoid disrupting the delivery of valuable services, and to maintain good relations between partners. It would also demonstrate a degree of good faith with the community that the Project Stakeholders are serious in their commitment to the Northolt area.

The English classes provided by GOSAD have proven very popular, with demand outstripping supply, and they could continue at a minimal cost. The room they are delivered in costs £25 per hour, and is divided in two by a sound-proof retractable wall so in practice GOSAD only use half of it. It may therefore be possible to negotiate this price down lower. Furthermore, GOSAD would need it for around 3 hours, so in theory this could cost as little as £32.50 per week for the duration of the pause. It therefore seems reasonable that the LA continue to fund this activity during the pause as it is making a demonstrable positive impact on people's lives for a minimal cost. Furthermore, if the Library is receiving this payment it may also be happy for some other providers (e.g. GNP and Uxbridge College) to continue to use other Library floor space to promote their services at no additional cost (as is currently the case).

In addition to this, it is worth considering providing circa £10k to GNP to cover the wages and associated costs of the recently recruited Community Asset Development Worker during the pause, assuming this could not be covered by existing funding.<sup>22</sup> The work being funded would include:

- The building and maintenance of relationships with local community organisations;
- Scouting for placements for future Community Champions;
- Engaging with the community to better understand its needs;
- Reporting back to other partners with key insights.

The work of this individual would therefore significantly contribute to the development of the plan for a future iteration of the Project, and in laying and maintaining the foundations upon which to launch it.

---

<sup>21</sup> The aforementioned Beaver Estate project benefitted from academic social research that helped to shape its model.

<sup>22</sup> Figure based on an estimate that the pause would last for around 3 months.

## Annex i: Table of SMART measures from original plan

High Level Outcome	SMART measures	Targets	– by when	Workstream Lead
Reduced unemployment (target is 20% of cohort for Year 1)	Number of people back into employment	A minimum of 100 people back into employment (Year 1) Year 2 – to be determined at review	January 2018	Jess Deallie
	GOSAD – number of people back into employment	A minimum of 40 people back into employment	25 by end 06/17; 40 by end 09/17	Jess Deallie
	GetSet UK - number of people back into employment	A minimum of 40 people back into employment	3 by end 06/17; 13 by end 09/17; 28 by end 12/17; 40 by end 03/18	Jess Deallie
	Open Age - number of people back into employment	A minimum of 30 people back into employment:	2 by end 06/17; 11 by end 09/17; 24 by end 12/17; 29 by end 03/18; 30 by end 04/18	Jess Deallie
Increased community capacity/improved health outcomes	No. of Community Champions recruited	15 Community Champions recruited	June 2017 (3 by April, total 10 by end May, total 15 by end June)	Jackie Chin
	No. of Community Champions trained	15 Community Champions trained	Ongoing	Jackie Chin
	No. of community groups engaged with development support	10 groups engage with Development Support (inc. funding support)	May 2017	Jackie Chin
	No. of residents signposted to local services	2220 residents signposted to local services (30 new people per week for 74 weeks)	May 2017 – October 2018	Jackie Chin

	Capacity of at least 10 community organisations will be built through improved links with statutory services and voluntary organisations	10 groups are ready to support Community Champions	October 2018	Jackie Chin
	The number of residents referred to the core multi-agency team		On-going	Manisha Parmar
	The number of patients with long term conditions who volunteer		On-going	Manisha Parmar
	The number of GPs who refer to the multi-agency team		On-going	Manisha Parmar
	The number of people who are socially isolated		On-going	Manisha Parmar
	No of residents trained in Making Every Contact Count	15 residents trained in MECC	October 2018	Manisha Parmar
	No. of residents trained in the Patient Activation Measure (PAM)	15 residents trained in PAM	October 2018	Manisha Parmar
	Percentage increase in the PAM score level amongst residents signposted through the project	10% increase in the PAM score level (denominator = care coordinator caseload)	October 2018	Manisha Parmar

## Annex ii: Table of outputs from Community Capacity Work Stream<sup>23</sup>

Expected outputs	By when e/o	Status at Oct 18
Up to date mapping of the community and residents' groups in the area.	Jan 2017	Ongoing
<b>Detail</b> Initial mapping completed. Full scale mapping of the community is an ongoing task.		
All groups informed about the Northolt Initiative and the Community Champions through email, literature and/or visit.	April 2017	Ongoing
<b>Details</b> Work continues through regular promotion using email updates to local community groups (43 groups), residents associations, primary schools GNP Facebook page (375 followers), ECVS e-newsletter, face-to-face outreach at events, talks, fitness classes, word of mouth: neighbours, parents at school, friends.		
10 groups engage with Development Support (inc. funding support).	May 2017	Ongoing
15 Community Champions recruited Health Champion (2 days), Mediation awareness and communication skills (1 day) and are trained to by Co-ordinator.	April 2017	Achieved
<b>Details</b> ongoing as Champions move on to employment and new Champions recruited		
PAMs Training session provided to Community Champions and the Community Champions to carry out PAMs Assessments.	July 2017	New session needed for new recruits.
A secure NHS email account for non-NHS organisations to be created. CCG Network Relationship Manager supported Community Champions Co-ordinator to set up NHS account for sending secure electronic referrals to the Care Co-ordination team.	March 2018	Not achieved
Referral Pathway from GNP to Care Co-ordination Team created by CCG with GNP. Referrals expected from Community Champions.	February 2018	Not achieved
15 Community Champions provided with initial and ongoing training.	Dec 2016 (ongoing)	Achieved
<b>Detail</b> Latest training for new CCs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- X2 Make Every Contact Count MECC training referrals</li> <li>- 2-day RSPH "Help Your Health" Community Health Champions training: CC signed up to attend on 15/16 Nov in Hanwell</li> <li>- First Aid training: CC signed up to attend on Fri 2 Nov at Grand Union Village Community Centre</li> <li>- Mindfood Growing Wellness courses x2</li> </ul>		

<sup>23</sup> Taken from *Northolt Project Update Report*, 5 November 2018.



<p>Community Champions signpost the equivalent of 30 new people to local services per week for 74 weeks = 2220 including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connecting people to health services and activities in the community</li> <li>Connecting people to Domestic violence services</li> <li>Connecting people to legal advice and debt counselling</li> <li>Connecting people to adult learning and language support</li> <li>Long term health issues referred to care co-ordinator</li> <li>ASB issues referred to Community Safety Team</li> <li>Employment issues – JC+ team</li> </ul>	<p>May 2017- e/0 Oct 2018</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p><b>Detail</b></p> <p>Recent health-based activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CCs led health fair in July.</li> <li>- Weekly Health &amp; Community information Stall August – October at Hub Offering signposting and leaflets/booklets about various health issues and barriers, physical activity focus throughout August, self-care, cancer awareness, signposting to local events, programmes and exercise classes.</li> <li>- 30 August: Ealing One You health check offered: 12 Blood Pressure (BP) checks,</li> <li>- 3 referrals to free 6-week health trainers programme,</li> <li>- 1 GP referral</li> <li>- 06 September: Ealing Healthy Homes (12 people visited the stall to talk to specialist advisor, 4 Green Doctor referrals for home visits)</li> <li>- (12 people) engaged on health and community info stall discourse blood pressure</li> <li>- 13 September: Spectra health checks (11 health checks), sexual health info, BP checks (13), HIV checks (1), GP referrals (8) + health and info stall</li> <li>- 20 September: Ealing Healthy Homes (3 people visited the stall, 1 Green Doctor referral for home visit) + health and community info stall (7 people visited), 27 September: Ealing One You health checks + health and community info stall</li> <li>- 03 October: Health and community info stall, mental health awareness focus throughout October</li> <li>- 11 October: Ealing One You health checks (4 BP checks, no referrals required) + health and community info stall</li> <li>- 18 October: Health and community info stall (3 people)</li> <li>- 25 October: Ealing One You health checks (15 BP checks, + health and community info stall (10 people)</li> </ul> <p>Recent outreach activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 30 June: Greenford Carnival, Ravenor Park (information made available to 215 people, community champion supported the GNP healthy eating activity and health info stall)</li> <li>- 15 August: Diabetes awareness talk by community champion Anna at Elm Lodge Carers Centre, Northolt (11 carers)</li> <li>- GNP “Ladies only” Zumba class, Greenford Community Centre (16 ladies reached, community champion Mona volunteering)</li> <li>- GNP “Ladies only” multi-sports sessions, Hall next to Pure Gym Northolt (12 ladies reached, champion Mona volunteering)</li> <li>- 16 September: Perivale End of Summer Fayre and Parade, Perivale (171 people, 12 people referred to Northolt Hub, champion Mona supported the event)</li> <li>- 22 September: The Big Scout Event Northala Fields, Northolt (60 people, 2 people referred to Northolt Hub)</li> <li>- 29 September: Apple Day at Horsenden Farm, Perivale (75 people, 3 people referred to Northolt Hub, Champions Manjit and Mona supported the event)</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vicar's Green Primary School, Northolt: Mona left information for the head of school to consider and spoke to parents at the school (12 parents)</li> <li>- Teacher Support training referral participant starts on Friday 2 Nov</li> <li>- Harrison's catering training referral participant awaiting decision after attending interview</li> <li>- ESOL English classe referrals at least 1 lady joined as a result of GNP signposting</li> </ul>		
Delivers 16 group supervision sessions for the Community Champions	e/o Oct 2018	Achieved
GNP to put in funding applications for additional monies – Award for All, Ward Forum, Lloyds? /People's Postcode etc to make up shortfall etc	By e/o August 2017	Ongoing
Provides monthly written and/or verbal updates	throughout	Ongoing
Attends regular multi agency meetings and if appropriate Joint Care Mtg	throughout	Ongoing
10 groups are ready to support Community Champions	e/o Oct 2018	Awaiting outcome of bid.
<b>Detail</b> Outcome of Community Connectors bid will impact the capacity of groups to support Community Champions.		

## OUTCOMES

<b>Community Champions</b>	Increased knowledge of services Increased skills and qualifications Increased network of support and partners Increased confidence Improved employability
<b>Community Organisations</b>	Improved links with statutory services and other voluntary sector orgs If required, improved policies and procedures and infrastructure Increased partnership working Raised profile in the community and with the LA Increased capacity of staff and volunteers
<b>Community</b>	Increased access to services Improved confidence in local community groups Increased support networks
<b>Initiative</b>	Sustainability Improved take up of services Information/ services embedded in the community

The following list gives some additional figures regarding outreach work completed since August 2018 via the Community Capacity Programme delivered by GNP:

- 12 outreach events completed, with 634 people reached
- 29 direct referrals to Northolt Hub by champions
- 2 schools approached by champions
- 43 community groups, residents associations, primary schools and other organisations contacted
- 393 followers to GNP's Facebook page.

## Annex iii: Table of outputs from Community Capacity Work Stream<sup>24</sup>

<b>Barrier</b>	<b>Issues / resolution</b>	<b>Current status</b>
Workforce development:	Culture change needed in role of front-line worker's relationship with residents from one of ensuring compliance to an enabling role. This evolved during the partnership sessions, and it was then appreciated that the Work Coach role needed to be different when working in the Hub compared to working in JCP regular role.	Role of work coach is starting to flex For future, need to consider what the characteristics of a front-line role should be across 'one public service' in Ealing.
Leadership	Large turnover of leads involved with the project have impacted on continuity. DWP Project Manager appointed in August 2017 who is now actively supporting operational delivery at the hub. Co-ordination of project was not factored in to original planning in 2016.	DWP strategic and operational leads in place Ongoing capacity needs to be sustained.
Lack of project methodology	The project endured a long lead-in time before substantive delivery started and the outcomes from the project are only now starting to be realised. At the same time, the methodology for the project – its USP – is still being developed within individual organisations and between partners. A clear business case and detailed methodology from the outset – which could still be reviewed as learning progressed – could have given the LSP the assurance it needed.	Project methodology clear to key partners, but further clarity on referrals pathways still needed to fully engage wider partners. Project plan provides the basis for monitoring reports to LSP.
Partnership operational engagement	Partners have attended the 4 design and planning workshops, a variety of roles represented including operational colleagues.	Not all wider partners have yet been able to link their provision into the Northolt offer.

<sup>24</sup> Taken from *Northolt Project Early Evaluation Report*, 30 October 2017.

Understanding of roles	Whilst there are governance arrangements for the project's working group, there are not role descriptors in full for operational roles. The DWP Project Manager was appointed in August and has been contacting partners and arranging operational meetings including starting case-conferencing.	Some partners express a lack of understanding of the operational roles, e.g. Project Lead or Work Coach role.
Resources not identified or clearly understood	Not all aspects of the project had appropriate resources identified at the start of the project. The terms and conditions of externally funded provision were not all visible for LSP oversight of the project.	Resources identified. Closer collaboration on provision by external providers (i.e. DWP's contracts for FSF provision) by e.g. providers attending partnership workshops and present at the Hub.
Lack of agreed approach to referrals	Partners were not always clear on how to refer to other organisations, or cognisant of the full range of provision available.	Initial mapping of provision is complete. Informal case-conferencing has started at Hub to promote new ways of working between partners around needs/assets of the residents rather than just sign-posting or referring on.
Organisational barriers to digital platforms	A digital platform (Slack) was set up for informal partnership conversation about the project and to promote joint problem-solving. There was interest in using the Council's Bubble platform to promote the project to residents, but no action yet taken.	Not all partners can access Slack, and limited dialogue by those who can, but non-sensitive information is shared and transparent. Benefits not fully realised as yet, but has potential.

### Findings of Customer Insight Forum: 27/11/2018

#### Key concerns of residents

Despite recognising that Northolt had some good transport connections (e.g. access to the Central Line) and local facilities (e.g. Leisure Centre) the attendees generally had a negative view of life in the area. The key concerns they expressed are expanded on under the subheadings below.

#### Limited local employment opportunities

Some attendees felt that a significant barrier to their finding work was that there are very few jobs available in the area. Northolt does not have an identifiable shopping area/high street, and so the main employment opportunities attendees saw were in local takeaways and small shops. Some also complained that the employers in the area would only offer part-time hours.

Very few attendees were aware that a new Lidl was being built, and was recruiting staff nearby, which suggests that even when local employment opportunities exist they are not well publicised.

One attendee even suggested that Northolt's reputation could act as a barrier to some work as employers could be less inclined to employ someone from a Northolt estate than other parts of West London.

#### Limited local training available

Some attendees complained that there was no local college, and very few other local training opportunities. One person complained about the quality of local schools, saying that they preferred to send their children to school outside Northolt.

#### Crime

There were complaints about a wide spectrum of crime, which ranged from minor offences (such as shoplifting and vandalism) to much more serious, violent crime (e.g. shootings and knife crime). The prevalence of gang crime was highlighted as a key issue that residents felt was holding the area back.

#### Insufficient opportunities for young people

This issue was raised both in relation to the perceived lack of training opportunities, and the prevalence of gang activity and crime in the Northolt area. It was felt that there were not very many positive activities for young people to get involved in, or safe environments in which they could socialise, such as youth clubs.

#### Poverty

Several of the attendees described living in conditions of relative poverty, and suggested that this was typical of others in the area. Frequent features of the accounts they gave included:

- Budgeting difficulties;
- Debt, and trouble with bailiffs;
- Housing insecurity, or homelessness;

- Health problems, particularly related to mental health.

#### Limited ability in vital skills for some residents

Though most attendees spoke good English several were interested in improving their abilities further, and all recognised that there were numerous people in the area who spoke little or no English.

Several people also complained of having had only limited exposure to digital technology. For some this was because they were of an older demographic, and for others it was due to their being from outside the UK. This not only impacted upon their job prospects, but an increasing variety of aspects of life in the UK as companies and public bodies progressively move more of their activity online.

#### Other

A feature of a lot of the responses people gave was a sense of helplessness. People were either unaware of the support that might be available to them, or had struggled to access the support despite knowing it was there. Some attendees bemoaned a lack of knowledge around important relevant issues (such as tenants' rights, the child maintenance obligations of divorced parents, or the appropriate place to raise civil complaints) and a parallel lack of awareness of where such information could be found.

Several people also complained that their interactions with public institutions (including the DWP and local Council) often felt adversarial in nature. There was also a general dissatisfaction at an increasingly digitised approach to communicating with the public, even among those that were computer literate. Some attendees described experiencing genuine distress at their experiences of trying to navigate government websites in search of support or information on a variety issues. Difficulties in navigating tax obligations were particularly prevalent among attendees, who all claimed to have tried to find answers to questions via various means (including online and over the phone) but with limited success.

#### **Services requested**

When asked what support and information they would like to see offered by the Northolt Project and at the Thursday hubs in particular, attendees offered the following suggestions.

#### Citizens' advice service

Most in attendance said they would find it very useful to have someone they could visit for advice on a variety of issues including taxes, tenants' rights, council housing, migrants' rights to work, labour rights, legal issues, etc. Essentially, they were asking for a service akin to that performed by the Citizens Advice Bureau (which does not have a branch in Ealing).

#### Council worker

Some attendees said they would like to see someone from Ealing Council at the Thursday hubs to discuss similar issues to those mentioned above (housing, tax, local services, etc.). There was also some enthusiasm for someone who could simply help them to navigate the Council website.

#### Mental health support

Some attendees expressed an interest in the possibility of counselling, and whilst the Thursday Hub would not be an appropriate space for this it would be a good forum in which

to promote local provision. There was general support for the idea of providing further information on/referrals to the mental health support available in the area.

#### Family and lone parent support

A range of family issues were raised in the session, including issues of domestic violence and the non-payment of child support by absent parents. Attendees felt that advice and support for troubled families and lone parents should be available at the Thursday Hub.

#### Debt management and financial advisory services

Almost all attendees felt that a service offering a variety of financial advice would be very useful. The issues they requested support on included household budgeting advice and debt management.

#### Universal Credit advice and support

Almost all attendees, including both existing UC customers and those still receiving legacy benefits, suggested it would be useful to have people in the Library who could answer some of their questions on UC. They also liked the idea of having people there who could give them basic digital support whilst they completed some of the online tasks associated with UC (e.g. work searches, or updating journals).

#### ESOL and digital skills classes

Several attendees asked for free English and Digital skills classes to be offered. ESOL classes are already provided as part of the project, but the class is already at capacity and cannot take on new students at this time. Some felt it would be useful to have information available about other English classes being provided locally.

#### Housing advice and services

Several attendees had housing issues of some variety and thought it would be useful to have support and advice available from the Thursday Hub.

#### Youth clubs

Some attendees felt it would be useful to have information on local opportunities for young people, including opportunities for social activities, e.g. youth clubs. Even if young people themselves do not regularly attend the Thursday Hubs the information would be useful for their parents to have.

#### Training and employment services

Some attendees requested a bespoke employment support service that goes beyond the traditional package of help with CV writing and work searches, and instead takes account of the specific circumstances and needs of the individual it supports.

There was also some interest in learning about opportunities for apprenticeships. Some attendees with children in school requested information on employment opportunities that would allow them to around their children's schedules.

## Questionnaire responses

- Few attendees had heard of the Northolt Project before, which suggests publicity is an issue.
- Almost all were able to reach the library in 15 minutes or less by foot or bus, which suggests the location is appropriate (however it could just be that those who attended were always more likely to be those that lived closest).
- Attendees were interested in a broad range of services, but housing advice was the one cited most frequently.
- They were also interested in a variety of employment and training opportunities, but the most popular were in health and social care, retail, ESOL classes and IT classes.
- People would prefer to hear about activity at the hub through email, and when visiting the Jobcentre.

More attendees said they would be likely to attend the hub if the right opportunities were offered than said they would be unlikely to attend.



### Case Study 1: Deon McLaren:

Deone joined the GOSAD's Northolt project on August 2017 Deone is over 50yrs old and somehow ended up wanting to work with GOSAD but the option to work with Open Age was provided. Deon last worked 25yrs ago and it is only this year that she has had the opportunity to start looking for employment. In the past 25yrs, Deon has been looking after her severely disabled son by herself as she had split from her son's father. Early this year, her son's father took over caring for him, hence Deone's desire to start seeking employment.

Deon had very low expectations regarding her job goals and she was willing to take on any type of employment with less consideration for her own ambitions. She was also overly concerned about her age and at times, she believed that she was unemployable. Deone had difficulties reading and writing and had never used a computer before in her entire life. GOSAD's experience of working with clients with multiple barriers to employment started the process by developing an action plan after conducting an in-depth needs assessment.

Deone was exposed to a number of intervention activities whilst at GOSAD and this included; literacy and numeracy training; pre-employment training; ICT training; Information advice and guidance and motivation and confidence building sessions. In particular, Deon was exposed to extensive confidence and motivation building sessions. Every client different needs and Deon was also exposed to GOSAD's intensive job interview simulations.

Deone was put forward to a number of opportunities but she was eventually offered an opportunity for a job interview through Heathrow Academy. Heathrow academy had just been made aware of a new opportunity from Qantas airline who were about to open an exclusive and plush lounge for business/celebrity travelers. The interview was based in 'assessment center' model but with Deone she had to undergo four preparatory sessions with GOSAD instead of the normal one session. On the day of the interview, Deon had be reassured over the telephone and motivated to go ahead with the interview. Dione succeeded and was offered the job opportunity. GOSAD supported her in meeting all employer requirements including the application for a comprehensive DBS and securing references and supporting letters.

Despite securing employment, Dione started having doubts and was more concerned about losing the job should something go wrong or if the company decides to go for a younger and more qualified young candidate. In preparation for the launch of the Qantas Lounge, Dione had to undergo written and observation based training and throughout the process GOSAD helped her along the way. Deon was supported to access her emails and respond to set tasks by the employer. She was also supported in having the confidence in the attire provided by the employer which she thought was too flashy.

Deone is being provided a tailor-made after care support to ensure that she sustains and most importantly, enjoys her job. Dion is so appreciative of the support given to her by GOSAD that she surprised GOSAD staff and volunteers with 'cards' of appreciation.

## **Case Study 2: Shobha Rathod.**

Shobha joined the Northolt project on 24/08/17, Sobha presented complex barriers to employment during the Initial assessments and action plan did not capture the complexity and personal struggles Shobha was experiencing. After the fourth week of engagement with Shobha, she was able to trust her advisor and was able to divulge sensitive and personal issues that she was facing. Shobha had undergone a very difficult divorce that had affected all spheres of her life. As an example as GOSAD is not at liberty to divulge such sensitive information, it was discovered that Shobha was not accessing Housing Benefit and Council tax support and had living arrangements that meant that she had to pay half of her monthly JSA funds towards her accommodation.

Shobha was deeply affected by depression and had sought no further support as she believed such support was not necessary. Shobha joined the ESOL classes and was also taken through GOSAD's extensive and tailored pre-employed and motivation confidence building training sessions.

Additional support provided to Sobha included; financial literacy awareness training; mental health support (GOSAD's Mental Health project) and access of GOSAD's food bank provisions. Shobha was deemed and even in her own assessment quit far away from being job ready. With the combination of support offered by GOSAD, Sobha was offered a volunteering opportunity working with mainly the Punjabi speaking beneficiaries. We also discovered that Shobha preferred not be indoors and wanted to volunteer every single day.

The transformation and journey travelled by Shobha had been quite incredible. Shobha has now secured employment with Royal Mail, Shobha continues to volunteer for GOSAD whenever she can and is being provided with tailored after care support.