

Short profile: Working well

<p>Country: UK Name of the case study: Working Well Period: 2014 onwards Target population: Long-term unemployed, especially those with physical and mental health needs Life stage: Developing Investment theme: employment activation</p>
<p>Short description of the program:</p> <p><i>Working Well</i> is a city-wide program that aims to <i>activate</i> those claiming out-of-work benefits, recognising that those who have been unemployed in the medium to long term are very likely to also have physical and mental health needs that if unaddressed create a barrier to employment. This action is created by the city, with powers that are in the process of being devolved to this level as opposed to being run by the national government. It was justified and funded by central government through a process in which the city government made their case to the Treasury.</p> <p>The city government commissioned two organisations to do this work, one being a private sector 'welfare-to-work' provider, and the other being a community sector organisation. These two organisations were contracted on a Payment by Results (PbR) basis, such that they received funding for each person worked with, and a further payment when individuals moved into work. The organisations used this funding to employ keyworkers to help individuals, and to commission other work (e.g. training, mental health services). The keyworkers also referred participants into other state and community sector provision. Through this, the keyworker creates a personalized package of support.</p>
<p>Policy Area:</p> <p>1. Active Labour Market Policy 2. Health</p>
<p>The legislative and regulatory frame work:</p> <p>'In 2014, Greater Manchester's Devolution Agreement set out new powers and responsibilities around - amongst other things - welfare reform and employment support. It enabled Greater Manchester to (i) expand the Working Well Pilot and (ii) engage in joint commissioning of the Work Programme with the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP).' (2016 Annual Report, p.12)</p>
<p>Main actors:</p> <p>City wide government, borough local governments, private sector provider/ community sector provider, health care system</p>
<p>Innovative elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 'individually-tailored packages of support' – personalization• PbR – Payment by Results
<p>Links to to key policy documents, previous research, news reports, etc.</p> <p>2016 Annual Report: https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/downloads/file/215/working_well_annual_report_2016</p>

Short profile: *Troubled Families in Greater Manchester*

Country: UK

Name of the case study: *Troubled Families in Greater Manchester*

Period: Launched in 2012 with an extended version (Phase 2) from 2015 – 2020.

Target population: Families with multiple problems. The Troubled Families programme in Greater Manchester looks to work with an average of 5,254 families per annum between 2015 and 2020

Life stage: Children and parents

Investment themes: early intervention in the life course and employment activation

Troubled Families in Greater Manchester is a sub-regional implementation of a highly controversial national programme in England intended to offer joined-up services targeted at families with multiple needs, representing the highest costs to the public purse. Its goals of reducing dependency through worklessness and improving children's educational outcomes align with the Social Investment paradigm. The funding mechanism is a version of Payment by Results (PbR) in which local authorities are paid partly through submitting data to demonstrate to central government that they have met outcomes.

Despite early enthusiasm (some say hype) from central government about the success of the national programme, the official evaluation released in October 2016 reported that it has had no significant or systematic impact on family outcomes. Other research has been more nuanced, with evidence of some achievements in supporting families and better co-ordinating diverse services, but little impact on parental worklessness. The INNOSI evaluation study in Greater Manchester is consistent with this position.

The case study report highlights the local context, and shows that this strongly influences how the programme is delivered across the ten boroughs of Greater Manchester. There are variations in the services involved, with emphases on early education, worklessness or health in response to local needs and population characteristics. To some extent, when implemented at a local level, the national agenda loses its importance. However, the programme retains elements that are consistent across Greater Manchester. It uses specific approaches (whole family, life-course, strengths-based, place based). There is a common understanding that better coordination of services can stop escalation of problems, and case workers operate across traditional boundaries.

Decision makers in Greater Manchester see the programme as a catalyst to more general public service reform, especially better integrated working across the various services provided for families. The INNOSI evaluation shows that Greater Manchester's Troubled Families programme has underpinned a shift towards service integration as intended. There have been significant advances in better communication and information sharing, despite IT systems not being up to date. Another successful element is that family plans are co-produced, taking the families' perspectives into account. Families speak highly of their key workers but some think there is nothing really new, just old services repackaged.

The 'Payment-by-results' (PbR) element is used in different ways to pay for different things across Greater Manchester. Some but not all boroughs pass on a proportion of the PbR to commissioned services. Senior decision makers welcome PbR as a means to set priorities, incentivise partners and help ensure a common understanding of expected outcomes. At the local borough level, in contrast, managers and front-line staff claim that PbR is administratively burdensome, and can make

collaboration more difficult. Overall, there was evidence that PbR could be a source of tension between different services and sectors. It was not, therefore, supportive of the desired new and positive relationship between public services, communities, individuals and enterprises.

Policy Areas:

Early intervention in the life course (parenting, improving school attendance); active labour markets; crime and anti-social behavior, mental health.

The legislative and regulatory frame work:

Under the *Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009*, Combined Authorities were established in England with the remit to coordinate strategies, policies and services across local authorities. The first in the country was Greater Manchester, comprising 10 boroughs. In 2014, Greater Manchester's Devolution Agreement set out new powers and responsibilities for the Combined Authority. *Troubled Families* forms part of a broader programme of reform across Greater Manchester.

Troubled Families is a non-statutory intervention in that families are not compelled to sign up.

Main actors:

The Greater Manchester Combined Authority and 10 local boroughs. Other partners vary from borough to borough. Schools, health visitors (NHS), social housing landlords, community organisations and faith groups are actors in some but not all boroughs.

Innovative elements:

- PbR – Payment by Results
- Co-produced family plans
- An individualized approach to a family's needs and inter-agency case management

Links to to key policy documents, previous research, news reports, etc.

Documents from national government

Prime Minister's Office, *Troubled Families Speech*, 15 December 2011

<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/troubled-families-speech> (Accessed 24th Jan 2017)

Department for Communities and Local Government, 10th March, 2015 (Accessed 24th Jan 2017)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/more-than-105000-troubled-families-turned-around-saving-taxpayers-an-estimated-12-billion>

Department for Communities and Local Government, 22nd June 2015 (accessed 24th Jan 2017)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/pm-praises-troubled-families-programme-success>

Evaluations

National Evaluation of the Troubled Families Programme, released 18th October 2016 (Accessed 24th Jan 2017)

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/560504/Troubled Families Evaluation National Impact Study.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/560504/Troubled_Families_Evaluation_National_Impact_Study.pdf)

London Councils Troubled Families Programme (14th November, 2014)

<http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/our-key-themes/leadership-devolution-and-democracy/public-service-reform/troubled-families-programme>

News reports

The Guardian 18th October 2016 <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/oct/18/troubled-families-programme-ministers-data>

Mail on-line 25 November 2013 <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2513177/1-6-Britains-120-000-Shameless-families-turned-ministers-order-nonsense-crackdown.html> (Accessed 24th Jan 2017)

Manchester Evening News 12th September 2013 <https://www.questia.com/newspaper/1P2-36520534/helping-these-troubled-families-is-not-new-idea>

Greater Manchester policy documents

GM Troubled Families Business Case

http://archive.agma.gov.uk/cms_media/files/121031_tf2_business_case.pdf?static=1

Greater Manchester Combined Authority *Troubled Families* https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/info/20013/troubled_families