

Agenda item 4(i)

Interaction Partnership; 13 May 2008

Appraisal application form for Interaction NMP Board

A Summary and basic information

| | | | |
|--|---|--------------------|---------|
| 1. Title of proposal | The Tendring Outreach Service – Application for continuation funding | | |
| 2. Date submitted | 5 April 15th April 2008 | | |
| 3. Summary of proposal (max 150 words) i.e. what does the proposal involve and what will it achieve? | | | |
| <p>Tendring Outreach Service aims to reduce the level of deprivation in the Tendring District, especially the Jaywick area. It will do this by continuing to employ two part time members of staff, an Outreach Worker and Administrative Assistant which will be members of the already established Tendring Home Improvement Agency. They will access clients by visiting groups and local clubs and giving presentations/ talks and also continue to hold already established surgeries in various locations and visit these on a regular basis. Once clients are identified they will visit them in their own homes to carry out benefit checks and assist with benefit applications, support, advice and signposting. The scheme will be evaluated and clients will be asked if they would like to participate in shaping the service.</p> <p>The agency has run this service now for 3 years, initially the service was funded through the Pension Service and over the last year has been funded by Inter Action, Safer Stronger Communities and Guinness Trust, so the service already has the relevant networks and has built trust within the community. Therefore this scheme will be building and expanding on work already in underway.</p> | | | |
| 3. How much will the proposal cost in total? | | | |
| | From NM | From other sources | Total |
| Capital | | | |
| Revenue | £13,200 | £22,160 | £35,360 |
| Total | £13,200 | £22,160 | £35,360 |
| 4. Organisation | | | |
| Name of contact and position | Jayne Albone Manager | | |
| Address | Tendring Home Improvement Agency, 61 Frinton Road, Holland-on-Sea, CO15 5UH | | |
| Phone | 01255 814 410 | | |
| e mail | jayne.albone@guinness.org.uk | | |

B The proposal

1. What is the problem you are trying to address?

Set out the problems and causes, using statistics and evidence where available – referring to the delivery plan and its targets and outcomes.

The District of Tendring and in particular Jaywick (Golf Green Ward) is the third highest priority wards of the Index of Multiple Deprivation. Government statistics (2004) show that Tendring has a population of 138,539 with over 32% over 60, the highest in Essex. There are 24% of the population are registered with people with limiting long term illness.

In Jaywick the percentages are even higher with 45% of the population over 60 and 37% with long term limiting illness.

There are 31,000 income deprived people and 7,700 employment deprived people in Tendring which is the second highest in Tendring.

All this evidence proves that there is a need for this type of Outreach service in the area to decrease levels of deprivation and provide the necessary levels of support to improve the District therefore increasing residents satisfaction in their neighbourhood. Clients will also have the opportunity to help shape the service by giving feedback on the service and being asked to join the Agencies Advisory Group.

2. Proposal objectives?

List the objectives for the proposal (these should be measurable)

Increasing the wealth of 150 people through the uptake of benefits.

Increasing the knowledge of the Outreach service and other services available through giving monthly talks and presentations to local clubs and groups to reach around 800 people.

Implementing referral systems to main partnering organisations and signposting 100 clients a year for additional help/support.

Implementing an evaluation form for all clients receiving a home visit to ascertain their views and gain greater client participation and feedback on the Outreach service. Clients are given a further option to act as an advisor to the service over the phone or join our Advisory Group that meets quarterly.

Actively support vulnerable clients in other issues relating to their welfare to give greater confidence and independence.

3. How do you propose to address the problem?

List the activities and set out who will benefit.

The Outreach Worker will continue to network within the Jaywick area promoting the service and building on the excellent work already underway. Lesley has been setting up holding regular surgeries in Golf Green Hall and Jaywick Community Centre. Put leaflets and posters shops cafes, clubs, pubs, the Health Centre and schools to name a few to spread the word and reach as many people as she can to help with benefits and advice. Visits are made to client's homes to complete forms to claim benefits once it is known they are eligible. Lesley also refers clients to other agencies such as Help the Aged for debt advice, the Fire Service, the Handyperson Scheme, Social Care Direct, Falls prevention and the Warm Front Scheme which helps to improve client's lives by improving their homes.

We aim to help all older and/or disabled and low income people in the Jaywick District, they will benefit through increased income and knowledge of what is available to increase their standard of living and decrease deprivation the District.

4. How does this proposal address the problem. List activities and describe evidence from similar initiatives if possible.

The scheme will increase access to services and look to provide a single point of information for the vulnerable and low income people in the District. By increasing people's incomes by applying for benefits that are entitled to and improving the home in which they live it will simply improve their life and may lead to them having greater independence if they are older, improved confidence and choice if they are a family on low income and in turn help to regenerate the area of Jaywick and increase residents satisfaction in their neighbourhood..

Clients have been and will continue to be targeted through presentations to groups and clubs and also surgeries that have been set up in Golf Green Hall and Jaywick Resource Centre. Clients will also be visited in their own homes for the completion of benefit forms, advice, support and signposting.

The scheme that run previously from April 2006 to March 2007 saw 833 clients through talks and surgeries and helped the following:

| | |
|-----------------------------|----|
| Pension Credit | 9 |
| Attendance Allowance | 30 |
| Disability Living Allowance | 17 |
| Council Tax Benefit | 2 |
| Housing Benefit | 3 |
| Carers Allowance | 5 |
| Referral to other agencies | 82 |

This scheme was limited to older people as funding was awarded from the Pension Service which has since come to an end. As can be seen from the statistics above 148 clients were helped. If the remit could be widened to include all ages then more people can be helped.

The figures from since receiving Inter Action, Safer Stronger Communities Funding from May 2007 to 31st March 2008 are:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| Pension Credit | 18 |
| Attendance Allowance | 41 |
| Disability Living Allowance | 22 |
| Council Tax Benefit | 3 |
| Housing Benefit | 1 |
| Carers Allowance | 11 |
| Referral to other agencies | 63 |
| Benefit Checks undertaken | 77 |
| Home visits undertaken | 184 |
| Number of clients contacted/seen | 845 |

5. Community involvement

How have residents been involved in developing the proposal?

All clients that use the service will be asked to complete an evaluation form; this form asks their views on the service that they have received and asks for ways that we can improve. They are also asked as part of this form if they wish to join our Advisory Committee
A clear written agreement about the respective roles and powers of the Committee and managing body has been drawn up and agreed. This Group meets quarterly.
This group has three members that are service users and they help to shape the services that the Agency offers.

6. Management arrangements?

Describe the arrangements for ensuring the proposal is managed, monitored and delivered as planned. Please give names of two references or referees (people that you've worked with before) that we can contact in advance of the appraisal process.

Management of the Home Improvement Agency, Tendring, falls within the existing management structure of the Guinness Trust Group. Tendring Home Improvement Agency comes under the management of the Housing East Area, which is part of the South East Region. The Agency is managed by the Operations Manager, based in Holland-on-Sea and there is a Strategic Manager responsible for the Chelmsford, Maldon and Tendring Agencies who is based in Chelmsford. (Currently on Maternity Leave until Oct 08)
To ensure that local needs and experiences are recognised and developed an Advisory Group has been set up involving local people from users, the statutory and voluntary sectors. A clear written agreement about the respective roles and powers of the committee and managing body has been drawn up and agreed. This Group meets quarterly.

7. Risks

Set out the risks associated with this proposal and how you plan to minimise them.

There are little of no risks to the scheme. The two members of staff employed for the scheme under the Pension Service were employed on fixed term contracts which are due to end at the end September 2008. If we are successful with funding for 2008/09 then these contracts can be extended for a further fixed term period to cover the year on year funding. The equipment purchased to operate the scheme was a desk and laptop which was financed by the Pension Service and is being re used by the Home Improvement Agency on termination of the scheme.

The Outreach Worker has been trained on Benefits and can be updated on benefit changes as they occur; this is of minimal cost to the scheme. Indemnity Insurance will be provided already to the agency by the Guinness Trust as there are Technical Officers giving advice to clients and therefore this should be able to cover the Outreach Worker in post if needed.

The risks to the Guinness Trust are minimal and far outweigh the benefits that the scheme will do for the Partnership's reputation in the District

C Finances

1. What is the total cost of the proposal?
 Itemise the total spend as much as possible and set out the period this will cover, indicating what proportion is required from NM

| | item | £ year 1 | £ year 2 | £ year 3 | Total |
|----------------------|---|---------------|----------|----------|-------|
| Capital (NM) | | | | | |
| Revenue (NM) | Project Manager 0.2fte | 6,308 | | | |
| | Outreach Worker 0.5 fte | 14,552 | | | |
| | Admin Assistant 0.6fte | 10,600 | | | |
| | Hire of accommodation for surgeries | 200 | | | |
| | Core costs such as rent and telephone | 2,000 | | | |
| | Travel costs | 500 | | | |
| | Training costs | 300 | | | |
| | Office costs | 500 | | | |
| | Publicity | 400 | | | |
| Total (NM) | 50% of the Outreach workers salary | 13,200 | | | |
| | 50% of the Admin salary | | | | |
| | 10% of Managers salary | | | | |
| Other funding | Essex Community Foundation | 5,000 | | | |
| | Essex CC | 7,992 | | | |
| | Guinness Trust plus C/F | 9,168 | | | |
| Total | | 35,360 | | | |

2. Value for money

Explain how this proposal provides value for money.

The Management system and expertise is already set up within the Tendring Home Improvement Agency and therefore these can be utilised to support the Outreach service. The Outreach worker currently employed was sourced from the Department of Work and Pensions and has a high level of expertise in the area of benefits and therefore recruitment costs and initial training can be avoided. Also equipment for this scheme has already been purchased. Therefore there are no start up cost.

3. What resources are already invested by your, and other, organisations in the area on this issue?

Help the Aged have recently recruited a debt advisor however this project is only aimed at Debt advice for the elderly. Greenwood Fisher Jones Solicitors provide free legal advice and aid in the District however this again is a specialist area and they are based in Colchester so do not have a local presence.

Tendring Home Improvement Agency have been operating in the area for 6 years people providing people centred, cost effective assistance to tackle poor and unsuitable housing enabling clients to remain at home. Another major part of our support and advice service has been to maximise client's income however we recognise that we need a dedicated resource to provide this service due to the level of deprivation.

We have built strong links and trust with the community of Jaywick and are known by the community as a contact that they can approach for help in this area. Lesley is now becoming more of a part in the community and is treated with friendliness instead of the initial hostility and enjoys meeting the residents of Jaywick where a strong community spirit exists.

4. Why is NM money needed?

Funding from the Pension Trust ceased from April 2007 and was not going to be continued as the Project was a 2 year pilot project only.

Therefore funding last year was needed to be sought from other sources. Guinness Trust and Inter Action money was sourced and this has funded the continuation of the Outreach Service since May 2007.

We have been successful in Securing money in November from Safer Stronger Communities and from Essex County Council from April 2008 and funds from the Guinness Trust and a carry forward from 07/08. Therefore, this money will keep the service running until the end of August 2008. We now need to source further funding to run the service from September to March 2008.

5. Can you be paid this money in arrears, or do you need it to prime the project?

We are able to continue to run the service on funds available until August 2008, but in order to have staff contracts extended from September 2008, we would need confirmation of funding as soon as possible, in order for Guinness to issue extended contracts to current staff.

6. Who are your organisation's auditors? (Please attach a copy of your last set of audited accounts)

Please see attached accounts provided by The Guinness Trust Accountant.

D Options

1. What other options have been considered to address this proposal and if they were, why have they been rejected?

The Pension Service provided the original Outreach service to older residents of the Tendring District through The Tendring Home Improvement Agency but funding was only over a 3 year period and this has now ceased despite the success of the project.

The Outreach worker needs to be based within the community for publicity and promotion purposes and therefore to try and run an Office based service such as the solicitor have based in Colchester I feel is not feasible.

E Measuring and sustaining the impact

1. What outcomes do you hope to achieve? (i.e. overall results and benefits that relate to the delivery plan)

How will the outcomes be measured?

Increase in benefit take up in the District. Complete a minimum of 120 benefit forms.

Increase income for Vulnerable and Elderly residents by 100k over a two year period.

An increase in knowledge of other services available in the District.

A reported increase in residents feeling supported to live in their neighbourhood

Undertake a minimum of 200 Home visits

Clients using the service will be asked to complete an evaluation form reporting the above, the results will be collated monthly and can be provided for funders on a monthly or quarterly basis.

2. What monitoring arrangements will be put in place?

Set out your milestones (what you will have done by when) and outputs (things you can count to measure your activities) How will spend be monitored?

Staff members are already employed so the scheme will continue.

Presentations are booked monthly for various clubs and groups and publicity material is already completed and regularly given out.

Evaluation; clients that have received a home visit are sent an evaluation form and asked to notify the scheme once they know of their benefit award, this information is collated monthly. Budget spend is monitored monthly on an excel spreadsheet by the Operational Manager and full reports will be available if

required monthly or quarterly.

3. Evaluation

How will you measure success and use lessons learnt?

Statistics are kept as to the number of people spoken to via talks and presentations, following presentations surgeries we monitor the number and type of enquiries to the scheme and note the best places to identify appropriate clients, benefits raised for clients including back pay which is also a measure of success.

4. The long term and future

How will the benefits be sustained when NM resources are no longer available?

The scheme will always have to be funded to operate and it is not a service that would qualify for statutory funding. Therefore bids and tenders will always have to be prepared if the scheme is to continue. If the District of Tendring is regenerated sufficiently to not require the service then the scheme will cease and staff's contracts will be terminated.

Appraisal and approval structures

| Amount of funding | Appraisal method | Approval required |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Up to £2.5k | Neighbourhood Manager can carry out appraisal and submit for approval | Neighbourhood Manager and 2 Board members one of whom should be a resident board member if possible |
| Over £2.5k | Neighbourhood Manager and two board members one of which should be a resident board member if possible must go through the project appraisal form and submit for approval | Full Board |

Signed:(project proposer) Date:

Name:

Tendring Outreach Service

Appraised by; John Wolton

Date; 22 April 2008

Appraisal Checklist – Interaction NMP Board

| Summary | Yes/no | Notes / changes required |
|---|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Does this proposal impact on mainstream services or resources? | no | |
| Do we know what level of service are delivered by and resources committed to the area by this organisation? | yes | |
| Will this help us achieve our agreed outcomes? | yes | |
| Is it based on the needs and wishes of local people? Have they been involved in the creation of the project idea? | yes | |
| Will it make a lasting difference? | yes | |
| Is this a substitute for mainstream funding? | no | |
| Does it provide best value? | yes | |
| Is it too risky? | no | |
| Are we confident it will be well managed, monitored and evaluated? | yes | |
| Section A | Yes or no | Notes / changes required |
| Is it clear what is being proposed? | yes | |
| Is it clear how much money is required? | yes | |
| Is it clear who the responsible organisation is? | yes | |
| Section B | | |
| Is it a convincing proposal in | yes | |

| Summary | Yes/no | Notes / changes required |
|---|---------------|---------------------------------|
| terms of setting out problems, objectives and activities? | | |

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| Will the proposal contribute to the delivery plan outcomes? | yes | |
| Is it clear how the proposal relates to existing service delivery in the area, and neither substitutes nor duplicates related services? | yes | |
| Have residents been adequately involved in developing the proposal (or their views taken into account)? | yes | |
| Are management arrangements adequate? | yes | |
| Have risks been adequately considered and planned for? | yes | |

| Section C | Yes or no | Notes / changes required |
|---|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Are the finances clear and reasonable and do they provide adequate detail? | yes | |
| Does the proposal provide value for money? | yes | |
| Is adequate information provided on the resources already invested by the organisation? | yes | |
| Is an adequate explanation provided for why NM money is required? | yes | |
| Section D | | |
| Have other options been adequately considered? | yes | |
| Section E | | |
| Have measurable outcomes been identified? | yes | |
| Are adequate monitoring arrangements in place? | yes | |
| Are mechanisms in place for | yes | |

| | | |
|--|-----|--|
| evaluation? | | |
| Is it clear how the benefits can be sustained? | yes | |

Decision of appraisal panel

| | |
|--|-----|
| Recommend approval | yes |
| Do not recommend approval | |
| Recommend changes required before approval | |
| If so, please state or refer to above sections | |

| | |
|---------------|-------------|
| Name | John Wolton |
| Signed | |
| Date | 22.04.08 |

Tendring Outreach Service

Appraised by Elizabeth Foss-Smith

Date 24/04/08

Appraisal Checklist – Interaction NMP Board

| Summary | Yes/no | Notes / changes required |
|---|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Does this proposal impact on mainstream services or resources? | yes | Increased take-up of benefits |
| Do we know what level of service are delivered by and resources committed to the area by this organisation? | yes | |
| Will this help us achieve our agreed outcomes? | Yes | |
| Is it based on the needs and wishes of local people? Have they been involved in the creation of the project idea? | Yes | |
| Will it make a lasting difference? | Yes | |
| Is this a substitute for mainstream funding? | no | |
| Does it provide best value? | Yes | |
| Is it too risky? | no | |
| Are we confident it will be well managed, monitored and evaluated? | Yes | |
| Section A | Yes or no | Notes / changes required |
| Is it clear what is being proposed? | Yes | |
| Is it clear how much money is required? | Yes | |
| Is it clear who the responsible organisation is? | Yes | |
| Section B | | |
| Is it a convincing proposal in | Yes | |

| Summary | Yes/no | Notes / changes required |
|---|---------------|---------------------------------|
| terms of setting out problems, objectives and activities? | | |

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| Will the proposal contribute to the delivery plan outcomes? | Yes | Proposal has the potential to: Give greater prosperity to elderly & vulnerable; improve well-being of residents; improve housing standards; improve perception of safety; improve capacity of voluntary sector; |
| Is it clear how the proposal relates to existing service delivery in the area, and neither substitutes nor duplicates related services? | Yes | |
| Have residents been adequately involved in developing the proposal (or their views taken into account)? | Yes | |
| Are management arrangements adequate? | Yes | |
| Have risks been adequately considered and planned for? | Yes | |

| Section C | Yes or no | Notes / changes required |
|---|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Are the finances clear and reasonable and do they provide adequate detail? | Yes | |
| Does the proposal provide value for money? | Yes | |
| Is adequate information provided on the resources already invested by the organisation? | Yes | |
| Is an adequate explanation provided for why NM money is required? | Yes | |
| Section D | | |
| Have other options been adequately considered? | Yes | |
| Section E | | |
| Have measurable outcomes been identified? | Yes | |

| | | |
|--|-----|--|
| Are adequate monitoring arrangements in place? | Yes | |
| Are mechanisms in place for evaluation? | Yes | |
| Is it clear how the benefits can be sustained? | Yes | |

Decision of appraisal panel

| | |
|--|-----|
| Recommend approval | Yes |
| Do not recommend approval | |
| Recommend changes required before approval | |
| If so, please state or refer to above sections | |

| | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Name | ELIZABETH FOSS-SMITH |
| Signed | <i>Elizabeth Foss-Smith</i> |
| Date | 24 th April 2008 |