

**By:** Angela Slaven, Customer and Communities Directorate,  
Director - Service Improvement

**To:** Supporting People

**Subject:** Floating Support Impact Assessment

**Classification:** Unrestricted

---

### **Summary**

This is the third quarterly assessment of the impact of the reduction in April 2011 of the capacity of floating support services.

The report covers the period July-October 2011 and shows that there are fewer people waiting for a service than before the capacity of services were reduced. During this quarter waiting times have fallen overall and have been reduced significantly for those in most need.

## **1. Introduction**

(1) Following the non-renewal of district and borough based floating support contract from April 2011, the Commissioning Body requested that an assessment be carried out and reported each quarter in order to determine the impact upon the numbers of people waiting to receive a service.

(2) The data shows that although waiting times rose for a short time whilst existing users of the district and borough based services were transferred to replacement services, the length of wait and the number of people waiting has decreased each subsequent quarter, despite the reduction in capacity. The current number of people waiting and the length of wait are both now lower than it was prior to the non-renewal of the district and borough based services.

(3) The contribution that an increase in performance has made to this improvement is described in another paper on this agenda, but these include

- Improved throughput
- Improved utilisation
- Improved focus on outcomes
- Reduction of the maximum term from 2 years to 1 year

## **2. Context**

(1) There has been no change in the number of floating support units commissioned as at 11.11.11, and the number and distribution of these units is shown in **Appendix**

1. The table shows that the number of commissioned units is higher in the east of the county than in the west.

### 3. Applications

#### Priority Band

(1) The programme accepted 831 applications for floating support during the period July–Oct 2011, comparing evenly with the 866 received last quarter. **Appendix 2** shows an analysis of these applications. The majority of new applications (81%) were found to be in highest priority (Band A).

#### Primary Client Group

(2) For the third period in a row, the highest number of applicants were those identified as Single Homeless with Support Needs. These applications represented 23% of all of those made during the period - a figure consistent with last period. All but 6 of the applications for this group were given a priority of Band A. Of the 192 “Single Homeless with support needs” applications received, 156 were living in temporary situations, including lodging with relatives or sofa surfing.

#### Locality

(3) Once again this period, there were more applications received from east Kent (62%) than west Kent (38%). This distribution is consistent with last period. As in the previous two quarters, more applications (108) came from Thanet than any other district. However, the borough with the greatest proportion of A banded applications was Dartford, where 51 of the 53 applications (96%) were banded A. Overall, Band A applications represented 81% (673) of all applications made.

### 4. Referrals to Providers

(1) Applications can be referred to support services when vacancies within them arise. The programme has continued to work intensively with providers to improve throughput and utilisation in these services. Further information about the performance improvement brought about is available in performance report at this meeting. **Appendix 3.0** shows that the result of this work is that 1285 applications were referred on to providers for service delivery to begin.

(2) Of the 1285 applications referred onto providers, 1003 (78%) were banded A

(3) The greatest number of referrals passed to providers came from the single homeless with support needs, mental health, generic and domestic abuse groups which collectively account for more than half (56%) of all referrals passed to providers.

(4) The greatest number of referrals passed to providers was for people living in Thanet, Shepway and Ashford. These referrals alone accounted for over a third (36%) of all referrals made to providers.

(5) In every district or borough, the number of referrals made to providers in the period exceeded the number of new applications received.

## **5. The Waiting List**

(1) By the end of the period, the number of people in Band A waiting to receive a service had fallen to 137. This represents a fall of 234 since the last report and 731 people (85%) since the first impact assessment in May of this year. An analysis of the 137 cases is provided below.

### **Waiting time**

(2) The waiting time for applicants to receive a service has been reduced across all client groups and in all districts and boroughs. In a marked improvement since the last report, most Band A referrals (82%) have been waiting less than 1 month and all Band A referrals have been waiting under 12 weeks.

### **Primary Client Group**

(3) The number of people waiting fell during the period across all client groups, as compared with last period but the most notable impact of this fall can be seen in Domestic Abuse (-85%), Offenders (-63%) and Single Homeless with support needs (-59%). The greatest single fall in those waiting was seen again in the Domestic Abuse client group, where the number of people waiting fell to 12. The number of people waiting before the capacity reduction was 55.

(4) The number of people with mental health problems waiting for a floating support service also fell to 22, a decrease of 79% since the first analysis in May 2011. The greatest concentration of demand for mental health services is in Thanet (7).

### **Locality**

(5) The number of people waiting fell in each district/borough during the period compared with the first analysis. The most notable reduction in numbers occurred in Thanet (-58) where 19 people were waiting; a reduction of 30% since the last report.

(6) Of those still waiting, a greater number are waiting in east Kent (89) than in the west of the county (47) Thanet and Shepway have the highest number of people waiting in any one district (19 people in each district, 28%)

(7) The programme has assertively managed the referrals that have been assessed in lower priority i.e. Band B and C. It has become apparent upon assessment of the applicants that many do not require a housing related support service at all. In such cases signposting to the service required such as advocacy, choice based lettings or housing advice teams has enabled the applicant to access the help they need without waiting any further.

(8) Where relevant, new applicants whose support needs fall into these lower priority bands are being signposted to district-specific help that is more appropriate to their needs. This approach will continue and be enhanced in future protocols and processes devised for floating support and discussed in another paper on this agenda.

## 6. Future commissioning of Floating Support

(1) As reported in the previous analysis, the programme will shortly embark upon an exercise to manage the transition from the current commission position to the revised position. A further report to this meeting describes the revised principles upon which floating support will be delivered in the future.

## 7. Conclusion

(1) The Commissioning Body requested that an assessment be carried out and reported each quarter in order to determine the impact upon waiting list for floating support, following the non-renewal of district and borough based floating support contracts from April 2011.

(2) The assessment has shown the number of people waiting has reduced successively each quarter following the non renewal of these contracts and that the number of people currently waiting for a service is lower than the number waiting prior to the non renewal of district based services.

(3) The Programme continues to receive high numbers of applications for floating support, though the rate has stabilised over the last two quarters. The Programme has continued to work with providers to continue to improve throughput and utilisation, ensuring that the number of referrals made to providers has exceeded the number of applications received.

(4) There has been a significant reduction in waiting times for the most urgent referrals since the first assessment in May and 82% of these referrals are in receipt of a service in less than 4 weeks.

(5) The programme has enabled those who have non-urgent needs or who do not require a housing related support service to alternative sources of help to meet their needs.

(6) The analysis supports the proposal that there is a need to revise the principles upon which floating support will operate in the future and these are set out in another report on this agenda.

### Recommendations

1. The Kent Supporting People Programme Commissioning Body is asked to **note** the contents of the report

### Background Documents

None

### Contact details –

**Claire Martin**  
**Supporting People**  
**01622 221179**

[Claire.Martin@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Claire.Martin@kent.gov.uk)

Melanie Anthony  
Performance and Review Manager  
01622 694937  
[Melanie.Anthony@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Melanie.Anthony@kent.gov.uk)

## **Appendices**

**Appendix One Analysis of current commissioned services as at 23.05.11**  
**Appendix Two Analysis of Applications Received**  
**Appendix Three Applications Referred to Providers**

**Appendix One      Analysis of current commissioned services as at 11.11.11**

<b>Primary Client Group</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>Kent</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>Alcohol Problems</b>	50			50*
<b>Domestic Abuse</b>	108	88		196*
<b>Drug Problems</b>	53	66		119
<b>Generic</b>	267	347	87	701
<b>HIV / AIDS</b>			22	22
<b>Homeless Families</b>	78	91		169
<b>Mental Health</b>	82	148	85	315*
<b>Offenders</b>	30	25		55
<b>Older people</b>			168	168
<b>Phys/Sens Dis</b>			36	36
<b>Rough Sleeper</b>	32	47		79
<b>Teen Parents</b>	47	69		116*
<b>Young People at Risk</b>	24	134		158*
<b>Total</b>	<b>771</b>	<b>1015</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>2184</b>

(35.3%)    (46.47%)    (18.22%)

\* Figure includes units delivered in lieu of future accommodation based services

**Appendix Two Analysis of Applications Received By district/Borough and Band**

	District	A	B	C	Total
<b>East</b>	Ashford	78	9	3	90
	Canterbury	47	15	2	64
	Dover	67	17	2	86
	Shepway	76	12	6	94
	Swale	51	18	2	71
	Thanet	86	21	1	108
	<b>East total</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>513</b>
<b>West</b>	Dartford	51	1	1	53
	Gravesham	66	6		72
	Maidstone	54	11	3	68
	Sevenoaks	28	10	1	39
	T/Wells	34	6		40
	Ton & Mall	35	8	3	46
	<b>West Total</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>318</b>
	<b>All Kent</b>	<b>673</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>831</b>

### Appendix Two Analysis of Applications Received by district/Borough and Band

	Alcohol	Domestic Abuse	Drug Problems	Families	Frail Elderly	Generic	Learning Dis	Men Dis Off	Mental Health	Offenders	Older people	OP MH Dem	Phys/Sens Dis	Rough Sleeper	Single H'less	Teen Parents	YP Care	Yp RISK	Grand Total	
SUDistrict																				
East	Ashford	1	7		17	7	1	1	10	1	3		2	2	15	9		14	90	
	Canterbury		7	1	1	11	3		8	1	3	1	5		13	6	2	2	64	
	Dover	2	5	3	5	1	10	4	3	1	2	2	5	1	22	3	1	16	86	
	Shepway	4	11	2	11	2	6	3	12	1	2	1	4	3	16	5	2	8	94	
	Swale	3	7	2		4	11	2	12		1	4	1		15	5	2	2	71	
	Thanet	1	3	3	3	1	12	2	18	3	5	4	5		30	4	4	11	108	
East total	11	40	11	37	8	57	15	1	63	7	16	12	22	6	111	32	11	53	513	
West	Dartford	3	3	1	3	3	1		3		1	2	1		29	1	1	1	53	
	Gravesham	2	7	5	4		6	5	8		2	1	1	1	21	1		6	72	
	Maidstone	1	4	5	2	2	7	3	8	3	3		4	1	12	9	1	3	68	
	Sevenoaks		4		2		12		7	1			2		7		1	3	39	
	Tunbridge Wells	1	3	1	3	0	7	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	10	4	0	2	40	
	Tonbridge & Malling	3	10	1	0	0	4	1	12	3	1	0	2	0	2	3	0	4	46	
West Total	10	31	13	14	2	39	12	2	42	10	7	3	10	2	81	18	3	19	318	
Grand Total	21	71	24	51	10	96	27	3	105	17	23	15	32	8	192	50	14	72	831	



## Appendix Three Applications Referred to Providers

	Band			Total
	A	B	C	
<b>Alcohol</b>	32	1	1	<b>34</b>
<b>Domestic Abuse</b>	143			<b>143</b>
<b>Drug Problems</b>	36	2	1	<b>39</b>
<b>Families with Support Needs</b>	51	25	7	<b>83</b>
<b>Frail Elderly</b>	2	2		<b>4</b>
<b>Generic</b>	101	40	4	<b>145</b>
<b>Learning Disability</b>	24	20		<b>44</b>
<b>Men Disordered Offenders</b>	2			<b>2</b>
<b>Mental Health</b>	131	49	7	<b>187</b>
<b>Offenders</b>	27	11	2	<b>40</b>
<b>Older people</b>	14	1	14	<b>29</b>
<b>Older People Mental Health Dementia</b>	7	1		<b>8</b>
<b>Physical/Sensory Disability</b>	25	16	3	<b>44</b>
<b>Rough Sleeper</b>	10			<b>10</b>
<b>Single H'less with Support needs</b>	237	10	4	<b>251</b>
<b>Teen Parents</b>	56	38	1	<b>95</b>
<b>Young people Leaving Care</b>	14	5		<b>19</b>
<b>Young People at Risk</b>	91	15	2	<b>108</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1003</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>1285</b>

## Appendix Three Applications Referred to Providers

