

ARTEMIS TWO PROJECT

City of Westminster - Changing Futures
Multiple Disadvantage and the Criminal Justice System Project

Experiment Blueprints

Dom Williamson Consultants
30 June 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
INTRODUCTION	5
2. Background and content of this report.....	5
3. Project aims, objectives and approach	6
4. Proposed delivery methods – Core Components and the Gold Standard.....	7
5. Rapid learning, improvement and hardwiring the change in the system	7
6. Co-production	7
7. Preparing for the experiments.....	8
EXPERIMENT 1: A STRATEGIC COORDINATION TEAM	9
8. Aims and objectives	9
9. Delivery methods.....	9
10. Feasibility assessment.....	14
11. Resources and cost	15
EXPERIMENT 2: DELIVERING BESPOKE, TRAUMA-INFORMED RELATIONAL SUPPORT	17
12. Aims and objectives	17
13. Delivery methods.....	17
14. Feasibility assessment.....	19
15. Resources and cost	20
EXPERIMENT 3: CREATING A BESPOKE “ONE-STOP SHOP” EXPERIENCE ON THE DAY OF RELEASE	21
16. Aims and objectives	21
17. Delivery methods.....	21
18. Feasibility assessment.....	24
19. Resources and cost	26
EXPERIMENT 4: DESIGNING AND COMMISSIONING INTEGRATED HOUSING, SUPPORT AND TREATMENT PATHWAYS	28
20. Aims and objectives	28
21. Delivery methods.....	29
22. Feasibility assessment.....	31
23. Resources and cost	32
PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE	34
LEARNING AND METRICS FRAMEWORK.....	35

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The project team for Artemis Two was Jo Crellen, Pricilla Van Slooten and Dominic Williamson.

We would like to thank the members of the project advisory group who supported our work on this project:

- Alice Kavanagh – Westminster City Council
- Christy Issac – Changing Futures specialist service
- Claire Hopkins – St Mungo’s SOS outreach team
- Leon Nicholson – Turning Point
- Paul Grieve – Connection at St Martins
- Rachel Smith – Turning Point

We are also very grateful to all the participants who took part in the workshops, especially the members of Revolving Doors Agency’s lived experience Forum who generously shared their stories and insights.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report is for the Westminster City Council Changing Futures (WCC-CF) Multiple Disadvantage Partnership Board. It provides a set of blueprints for four “experiments” that were recommended in our [Artemis One report](#) (2 March 2023). We hope it will enable the board and colleagues across the council to take forward the proposed experiments, adopting our recommended approach centred on rapid learning, improvement and iteration.
- 1.2 In the Artemis One report we estimated that around 400 to 500 people in Westminster experience multiple disadvantage and contact with the criminal justice system. Through a series of exploratory stakeholder workshops we heard that this group often fall in the gaps between services and systems. People leaving prison face a confusing “mess” of services and an almost impossible set of expectations and challenges. While there are lots of good services, they are largely uncoordinated and sometimes operate in ways that create barriers to meeting people’s urgent needs, including for accommodation.
- 1.3 We recommended that WCC-CF support the establishment of four “experiments” that might improve outcomes for this group and reduce costs and harms to individuals and the community. These experiments would create and test:
 1. A strategic coordination team
 2. Access to an intensive support service model
 3. Coordinated services on the day of release from prison
 4. Commissioning fully integrated pathways.
- 1.4 We were subsequently asked to undertake the next phase - Artemis Two - to design these four experiments and consider their feasibility. In this report we present blueprints for each experiment that were developed through collaborative co-design involving professionals from a wide range of relevant services and systems, including frontline practitioners, service providers, commissioners and people with lived experience.
- 1.5 The proposed delivery methods for each experiment are separated into two categories: Core Components and the Gold Standard. The core components aim for better joint working and efficiencies at the lowest possible cost, while the Gold Standard includes additional activities building on good practice and would require additional resources. The feasibility of each experiment is assessed based on feedback from the stakeholders.
- 1.6 We recommend each experiment includes arrangements to enable rapid learning and improvement of the model as it is implemented. While they are envisaged as time bound activities, if any experiment demonstrates its effectiveness in achieving the aims of the Changing Futures programme and the priorities of the council and its partners, a business case should be made to continue the approach and hardwire it as a business-as-usual activity. To facilitate this iterative approach, we have included a proposed Learning and Metrics framework. We also recommend that the approach embeds co-production, with people with lived experience working alongside professionals at all stages, including the learning.
- 1.7 We hope that these blueprints provide enough detail to enable the MD Partnership Board to support the implementation of the experiments. Following a decision to proceed in principle, they will inform the detailed planning by the designated managers.
- 1.8 Ultimately, we hope our proposed approach will shift how the system works for this vulnerable group, with significant benefits for individuals and communities.

INTRODUCTION

2. Background and content of this report

- 2.1 The overall aim of the Westminster Changing Futures Artemis programme is:
- To improve outcomes for men and women experiencing multiple disadvantage in Westminster who are in contact with the criminal justice system.
- 2.2 In the diagnostic phase - Artemis One - we shone a light on the experiences of people with multiple disadvantage who are in contact with the criminal justice system in Westminster. Given the complexity of the ecosystem of services that they encounter, we applied a methodology recommended by Human Learning Systems¹ and other approaches to change in complex systems.
- 2.3 During Artemis One we worked with stakeholders to develop a vision for Westminster:
- We want to improve the way services are commissioned and operate so that men and women experiencing multiple disadvantage and contact with the criminal justice system in Westminster receive a coordinated, integrated and personalised package of services including accommodation, support and treatment, so that it is much easier for them to address their immediate needs on leaving prison and then to begin and sustain their longer-term recovery journey.
- The evidence strongly suggests this could enable more people to live longer, healthier, and more fulfilling lives while reducing their reoffending, engagement in crime and ASB, homelessness, substance use and their expensive repeat use of crisis services.
- 2.4 Our [report](#) from that phase suggested four potential ‘experiments’ that together or alone could lead to changes in the way services work and to improved outcomes for individuals.
- 2.5 The four experiments are outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: proposed experiments

Experiment one: strategic coordination team	Experiment three: improving day of release
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Virtual team within WCC Using multiple sources to identify a cohort Coordinating services around individuals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A more integrated response on day of release from prison Including support and accommodation Working with partners to remove barriers
Experiment two: intensive support	Experiment four: designing fully integrated pathways
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring local delivery of trauma-informed relational support Sustained relationship with specialist worker who has skills, knowledge and time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More strategic, long-term approach Engaging commissioners and services to create fully integrated pathways

¹ <https://www.humanlearning.systems/>

- 2.6 We also suggested that to give the best chance of success, each experiment or set of experiments should proceed through a further process that includes:
- Co-design and feasibility
 - Implementation
 - Test and adapt.

3. Project aims, objectives and approach

- 3.1 The specific aim of this phase, the Artemis Two Project, was to co-design each of the four experiments, undertake feasibility assessments and consider necessary resources and costs.
- 3.2 By “co-design” we mean bringing relevant stakeholders together to:
- define objectives for the experiment
 - design the key components of each experiment
 - assess the feasibility of designs
 - consider options for delivering the experiment at different scales, *and*
 - outline an implementation plan.
- 3.3 Our approach has been informed by:
- the principles of the Changing Futures programme
 - learning from the Fulfilling Lives programme² which preceded it
 - emerging thinking and practice around creating change in complex systems including Human Learning Systems
 - work by organisations such as MEAM³ and the Revolving Doors Agency⁴.
- 3.4 Co-production is an essential strand in all these approaches we have involved people with lived experience in the design of the experiments.
- 3.5 The endeavour to achieve lasting and meaningful change within complex human systems is increasingly recognised as essential in addressing some of the “wicked problems” societies face. Improving outcomes for people facing multiple disadvantage is one of these challenges. We hope that by sharing our approach and the lessons we have learned, we can contribute to the growing body of knowledge that will help accelerate this change going forward. If we are successful, the impact for people who currently face extreme exclusion from society – and for communities more widely – could be considerable.
- 3.6 Our recommendation to the WCC Changing Futures programme is that the four experiments are established using the designs described below. We labelled them as “experiments” rather than “pilots” to encourage an approach that focuses on rapid learning and iteration so that, if they are shown to be effective, they can be quickly hardwired as business-as-usual into the system. While we encourage partners to remain open minded and curious about how successful they will be, our hope is that they will contribute to the legacy of the Changing Futures programme in Westminster. In the longer term we hope that this approach will create a permanent shift in the way the council and its partners across housing, health, public health and social care work together to achieve better outcomes for people experiencing multiple disadvantage.

² <https://www.fulfillinglivesevaluation.org/>

³ <http://meam.org.uk/>

⁴ <https://revolving-doors.org.uk/>

4. Proposed delivery methods – Core Components and the Gold Standard

- 4.1 We were asked to provide options for delivering the experiments at different scales. We have therefore separated the activities into two categories: the Core Components, and the Gold Standard. In making this distinction we have been mindful of the many urgent social issues which compete for political priority and access to a finite pool of resources.
- 4.2 The ‘core components’ of each experiment borrow the concept of “Minimum Viable Product” from agile innovation methodologies. They set out the lowest level of resource investment needed to achieve the expected benefits for local priorities and agencies, as well as for people experiencing multiple disadvantage, through better joint working and efficiencies at minimal extra cost. We believe that taking such a cross-agency, streamlined approach that pools the existing resources of everyone involved has the potential to make a significant difference.
- 4.3 We also recognise, through good practice that exists nationally and locally, as well as the expertise of local services and people with lived experience, that there are additional activities that could potentially add significant value to these core components. In these blueprints, these are called the Gold Standard activities. These are likely to involve additional cost and consequently may be regarded as less feasible in the current climate. They are included here as an ambition and as a guide to where any additional available resources may be used.

5. Rapid learning, improvement and hardwiring the change in the system

- 5.1 We recommend each experiment includes arrangements to enable rapid learning and improvement of the model as it is implemented. Options include:
- Appointment of one member of the governance board to act as a “critical friend”, meeting regularly with the project delivery officer and the team
 - Appointing an external Learning Partner to provide independent encouragement and challenge, acting as a link to external expertise and other sources of good practice
 - Capturing learning, adaptations and evidence of effectiveness on an ongoing basis.
- 5.2 While these experiments are envisaged as time bound activities, if they successfully demonstrate their effectiveness in achieving the aims of the Changing Futures programme, the council and its partners, a business case should be made to continue the approach and hardwire it as a business-as-usual activity. The evidence and data that will be needed to inform this business case should be gathered from the outset. We have suggested a Learning and Metrics Framework to assist with this, in section 25 below.

6. Co-production

- 6.1 Co-production is a core principle of the national Changing Futures programme, and people with lived experience were involved in both phases of the Artemis project and the design of the four experiments. We recommend that co-production is built into the next phase, including development of the implementation plans and delivery. People with lived experience should also be involved in the learning and rapid iteration, as their insights and ability to gain feedback from the people that we are seeking to reach will be invaluable. The Changing Futures team should consider how its current co-production groups can contribute to this and whether additional external support will be required to ensure that this work is done effectively. Costs for this will need to be included in the budget for the implementation phase.

7. Preparing for the experiments

7.1 Preparing to deliver one or more experiment will include the following tasks, which we assume are likely to be undertaken by the Changing Futures Programme Lead and her team:

- Decision to proceed in principle
- Allocation of project to appropriate manager / head of service
- Development / allocation / sign off budget
- Agreement of appropriate governance arrangements
- Developing the co-production approach
- Contracting of learning partner
- Drawing up of job description for project delivery officer/project manager
- Development of Project Initiation Document based on this blueprint
- Final gateway approval to proceed with experiment.

EXPERIMENT 1: A STRATEGIC COORDINATION TEAM

8. Aims and objectives

- 8.1 A key insight from Artemis One was that Westminster has a wide range of services that have a huge amount of expertise in working with people experiencing multiple disadvantage. However, there is a lack of coordination and services often end up “working in silos”. As a result, people continue to experience barriers to receiving the support they need and often fall into the gap between services, especially when they are in contact with the criminal justice system.
- 8.2 Based on the workshops and our review of national evidence, the theory of change underpinning this experiment is:
- That a new virtual team working proactively with services, their commissioners and stakeholders across different silos, could improve coordination and joint working and be able to identify and tackle the barriers that people face.
 - By improving the way services work together, more people will receive the coordinated, integrated services they need and achieve better outcomes.
 - The ultimate impact of this will be that more people progress in their recovery journey towards a safe, fulfilling life while reducing harms to individuals and communities.
- 8.3 The overall aim of this experiment is to reduce systemic barriers for people experiencing multiple disadvantage who are in contact with the criminal justice system.
- 8.4 The specific aims are to:
- Clarify which individuals require coordinated services and are experiencing barriers
 - Improve communication and coordination of support between services
 - Reduce systemic barriers.
- 8.5 The objectives are to:
- Recruit a project delivery officer (or project manager – see below) to oversee the experiment
 - Establish a virtual team to improve communication and coordination of support
 - Identify people within a target cohort, coordinate services around them and track their progress
 - Identify systemic barriers experienced by the cohort and work with senior stakeholder to reduce or remove these.

9. Delivery methods

Core components

- 9.1 There are four core components to this experiment:
- Employment of a project delivery officer to oversee coordination work
 - Establishment of a virtual team to coordinate cases
 - Identification of individuals
 - Reporting to a governance board.

- 9.2 The intention is to operate this experiment for two to three years, subject to resources. If successful, the experiment could be hardwired as “business-as-usual” within this time frame.

Employment of a project delivery officer

- 9.3 The experiment will be led by a part-time project delivery officer.
- 9.4 Participants in the workshop suggested that the post should be based within Westminster City Council and be graded at Band 3. This is to ensure that the post has appropriate authority and access to commissioners. The post holder will work across all departments but would be best located within the Community Safety or the Housing department.
- 9.5 The project delivery officer role has three central functions. These are:
- To convene the virtual coordination team (see section 9.9)
 - To work with existing services to coordinate packages of housing, support, healthcare and substance use treatment around targeted individuals, using a proactive partnership approach. This goes beyond signposting and requires actively liaising with services to ensure that people are receiving appropriate support.
 - To identify systemic barriers that cannot be overcome by the virtual team or by working with services. The project delivery officer will take these issues to the governance board (see section 9.28) for help in identifying steps that may be taken to reduce or remove them.
- 9.6 In addition, the project delivery officer will:
- Prepare regular learning reports for the governance board. We anticipate this will be done quarterly.
 - Act as the main point of contact between the virtual team and the governance board
 - Feed back decisions and actions taken to reduce barriers, and the impact of these decisions and actions in practice.
- 9.7 The project delivery officer role may also include a broader remit that will enable it to act as the development lead for other experiments and pieces of work arising from the Artemis Programme. This could include pulling together a project team to take forward experiments two and/or three (see sections 12 and 16), as well as coordinating multi-agency training to support better understanding of the needs of people with multiple disadvantage in Westminster. Should this be included in the remit of the project delivery officer, it may be necessary to recruit someone at Band 4 rather than Band 3 as proposed.

Skills and competencies required

- 9.8 The project delivery officer will be pivotal to the success of the experiment. We suggest that recruitment should focus on finding someone with the following competencies, knowledge and track record:
- Ability to work with and influence senior stakeholders
 - Excellent communication skills
 - Strong analytical and problem-solving skills
 - Organisational skills
 - Facilitation skills
 - Experience of project management

- Knowledge of services, structures and commissioning across at least one relevant domain e.g. housing, NHS, public health.

Convening a virtual team to coordinate services

- 9.9 The project delivery officer will be supported by a virtual team who will work together to coordinate the packages of housing, support, healthcare and treatment around the targeted individuals. The team will include representatives from the following departments:
- Public health
 - Substance misuse
 - Housing, homelessness and rough sleeping
 - Criminal justice including probation
 - Services working specifically with adults experiencing multiple disadvantage
 - Data analysis / business intelligence.
- 9.10 For each individual being discussed, the team will include an appropriate person acting in an advocacy role, who is able to represent the perspective, aspirations and concerns of that person.
- 9.11 The team will meet fortnightly at the outset, and then at least monthly to discuss individual cases, using a multi-agency risk assessment conference (MARAC)⁵ style arrangement. Actions will be agreed, shared and reviewed at subsequent meetings. Notes from the meeting will be circulated to all virtual team members.
- 9.12 In between the meetings, the members of the team will be expected to undertake actions to improve coordination of services that fall within their specialism. This may include, for example, liaising with service managers, convening discussions between different services to improve joint work and coordination or liaising with colleagues in other parts of the system where this is needed to unblock barriers.
- 9.13 The project delivery officer will draw up terms of reference with the team setting out expectations and agreed ways of working.
- 9.14 The virtual team meetings will be the forum through which the project delivery officer tracks progress of the individuals on the list. Decisions may be taken at these meetings to add or remove someone from the list or to change their status (from e.g. being approached to being actively worked with).
- 9.15 The virtual team will provide updates on active cases as well as on individuals who have progressed and are no longer being actively worked with but who are being monitored for learning and impact purposes. Existing reporting may already fulfil this function, but specific requirements will be discussed and agreed at the outset of the work.
- 9.16 Once a quarter the project delivery officer and the representative from the data team will produce reports based on the work of the virtual team for the governance board. These reports will include key barriers that have been identified, what action has been taken and the impact of this action. They will also include a summary of learning from the experiment (see section 9.24 below.)
- 9.17 We estimate that each member of the virtual team will need to allocate roughly 5 hours of time per week for the duration of the experiment.

⁵ See e.g. <https://safelives.org.uk/practice-support/resources-marac-meetings>

Identification of individuals

- 9.18 We suggest that the coordination of support targets a specific cohort of identified individuals. The criteria will be:
- Adults aged 18 and over, *with*
 - A history of criminal justice contact (with a focus on those with repeated spells in custody)
 - At least two / three of the four additional areas of disadvantage (domestic abuse, homelessness, mental health, substance misuse)
 - A history of residing, sleeping rough or repeated contact with services in Westminster, *and for whom*
 - Services have previously encountered barriers in meeting their needs.
- 9.19 The size of the cohort should be kept small, initially up to 20 people, although this could be adjusted depending on the capacity of the team. This will help keep the workload manageable and leave capacity for learning. The initial 20 is likely to comprise 15 people identified through the data exercise described below, keeping five places for new people referred in/released from prison. The cohort could rise to 40 in subsequent years.
- 9.20 Identification of the initial 15 will be achieved through a combination of services nominating individuals as well as data collection on their needs, history of criminal justice contact, and barriers previously experienced. The project delivery officer will work alongside the virtual team to propose and agree the final list. If required, additional criteria may be added to the above to narrow down the list including frequency of use of acute services or offending behaviour.
- 9.21 The team will regularly review the cohort. It is envisaged that as the experiment progresses, the cohort will include people who:
1. Have been identified but not approached as yet
 2. Have been approached but are not yet engaging with services
 3. Are being actively worked with
 4. Have disengaged with services but are still considered an open case while efforts are made to re-engage the
 5. Are on hold (e.g. because they are in prison for a longer sentence), *and*
 6. Have transitioned to follow on services but are being monitored for learning/outcomes.
- 9.22 Estimated timeframes for each of the above categories are as follows:
1. Being approached – initially proposing up to three months but this may need to be extended for particular individuals
 2. Being actively worked with – up to six months
 3. On hold – dependent on circumstances e.g. length of prison sentence
 4. Transitioned and being monitored – for 12 months following being actively worked with.
- 9.23 Recognising that people’s lives can be complex and that the experiment will iterate as it learns, the structure of the list should be adapted as required.

Rapid learning and iteration

- 9.24 The intention is that each experiment is designed to allow for rapid learning, testing and development. This contrasts with the classic piloting approach in which a designed model is rigidly adhered to for the whole period with the evaluation happening at the end. By contrast,

one of the signatures of success for this and the other experiments will be that it looks different at the end than we have envisaged in this blueprint.

- 9.25 For this experiment changes in the approach might be based on evidence including:
- Patterns of service use by the cohort prior to, and after the intervention
 - Changes in the way that services work with the target cohort
 - Lasting changes in service arrangements that will benefit others beyond the target cohort
 - Costs of any changes in service delivery
 - Methods of escalating concerns to strategic bodies to unblock issues
 - Short- and longer-term outcomes achieved by the cohort.
- 9.26 The project delivery officer will need to work with the virtual team to create a culture of trust, challenge and creativity, ensuring there is time for reflection, learning and for capturing changes in the way the team is working.
- 9.27 We recommend that significant proposed changes to the way the experiment is operating are reviewed and approved by the governance board.

Reporting to a governance board

- 9.28 The governance board for this experiment will be the same as that agreed for the wider Artemis Programme and should oversee all the experiments that proceed to implementation. For the purposes of this experiment, the governance board's role will be to:
- Support the work of the coordination team through its members' influence in the various silos
 - Identify actions to unblock barriers for people that the virtual team has not been able to overcome
 - Review and assess learning to feed into wider systems and projects
 - Review and approve changes to the way the team is operating.
- 9.29 Options for governance arrangements are discussed further on page 34.

The Gold Standard

- 9.30 In addition to the core components, extra resources could lead to greater success through provision of the following elements.

A "Safety Net" Budget

- 9.31 A 'safety net' budget to be held by the project development officer that could be used by the team for individuals who would benefit from the "spot purchase" of elements that would enhance their support package. This could be used for minor items such as clothing, furniture, identification or travel or, depending on the size of the fund, for a deposit etc for accommodation. In line with good practice, the use of the budget should be analysed regularly to highlight gaps or barriers in provision and any learning included in the reports prepared to the governance board.

Funding for third sector participation

- 9.32 Another possible enhancement to the experiment, subject to availability of funding, could be additional contributory funding for third sector members of the virtual team to compensate

organisations for their time to attend meetings, coordinate support packages, and collect relevant data. It is not anticipated that this will be required for statutory organisations, whose remits already cover the proposals suggested here.

10. Feasibility assessment

- 10.1 Stakeholders have been enthusiastic about this experiment during the consultation and co-design phases of the work. They felt it was both valuable and practical in response to a clearly identified need. There was also agreement that this experiment should be developed first, with the others following as sub-projects led by the coordination team.
- 10.2 In assessing the feasibility of the experiment, we have identified a number of enablers that will be critical for the experiment to be implemented and delivered successfully. These are included in Table 2 below, alongside suggested actions to increase the likelihood of the enablers being realised.

Table 2: enablers

Enabler	Suggested animating actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear buy-in at senior governance level for the duration of the experiment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use an existing partnership board for governance • Create a Task and Finish sub-committee of the governance board to oversee the work in greater depth and make recommendations to the full board • Establish specific Terms of Reference for this work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People having the time to come together as a virtual team and carry out actions between meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure support from team members' line managers • Include involvement in the project in individuals' work objectives • Provide contributory funding towards third sector members of virtual team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The involvement of probation and prisons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation of a probation worker to the virtual team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finding a way to identify and engage people soon to be released from prison, especially those on remand or serving short sentences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link to the work of the new Resettlement Panels • Project delivery officer to have access to the Prisons Intelligence Notification System (PINS) and Delius (either directly or via member of virtual team)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information sharing agreements in place between the project delivery officer, virtual team and related services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring in resource to develop this from within WCC

Enabler	Suggested animating actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to suitable accommodation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link to ongoing developments such as CAS3 and AFEO • Include housing commissioners in virtual team

11. Resources and cost

- 11.1 The core components for this experiment include the employment of the part-time project delivery officer within WCC. We have assumed that it would not be feasible to repurpose an existing post to take on this role, if this was turned out to be a realistic option this could further reduce costs. Time will also be needed from members of the virtual team, including a data officer within WCC.
- 11.2 For the Gold Standards elements suggest above it will be beneficial to consider including one or more of the following:
- Contributory funding towards the voluntary sector representatives of the virtual team that will free up members of that team to attend meetings, coordinate support packages, and collect relevant data.
 - An allocated probation worker to enhance joint working with the probation service.
 - A 'safety net' budget as discussed at section 9.30.
- 11.3 The resource implications of these options are outlined at Table 3 below. These will need to be verified as the budget for the project is developed.

Table 3: resources for core components and Gold Standard

Resource	Estimated Costs
Core components	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment of part-time project delivery officer within WCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If standalone (see Experiments 2/3 for wider remit) • 0.5 FTE - Band 3 - £25k per year • 1.0 FTE – Band 3 – £50k • 1.0 FTE – Band 4 – £60k
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time of members of virtual team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-kind from relevant agencies • Approximately 5 hours per week • Analytical resource from Changing Futures/City Wide Operations • Single point of contact within probation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of a data officer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-kind from WCC • Approximately 2 hours a week
Gold Standard	

Resource	Estimated Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Contributory funding towards virtual team members to free up time for work	<ul style="list-style-type: none">£5-10k per year for up to five voluntary sector organisations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Allocated probation worker	<ul style="list-style-type: none">In-kind from probation
<ul style="list-style-type: none">'Safety net' budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none">£500 per person (year 1 - £10,000, subsequent years - £20,000)

EXPERIMENT 2: DELIVERING BESPOKE, TRAUMA-INFORMED RELATIONAL SUPPORT

12. Aims and objectives

- 12.1 The evidence review carried out for Artemis One found that bespoke, trauma-informed relational support is most effective in supporting people experiencing multiple disadvantage. We also found that several services already exist within Westminster that deliver part or all of this model to different client groups. These include those delivered by the different Housing First services, as well as Starting Over, Minerva, The Passage and CSTM.
- 12.2 The theory of change for this experiment is:
- Drawing on existing local and national good practice, and by mapping current service provision, it will be possible to determine what enhancements will be required to create additional capacity for people experiencing multiple disadvantage who are in contact with the criminal justice system in Westminster
 - By working with local services and their commissioners it will be possible to adjust or enhance existing services, or build a business case for additional service provision that will ensure that more people from the target cohort receive this model of support
 - By increasing the number of people from the target cohort receiving this model of service, they will be supported to make progress in their recovery, reducing harm to themselves and communities, and moving towards an increasingly stable and fulfilling life.
- 12.3 The overall aim of this experiment is to increase the availability of bespoke, trauma-informed, relational support to adults experiencing multiple disadvantage who are in contact with the criminal justice system.
- 12.4 Its specific aims are to:
- Build consensus around the model
 - Identify gaps in provision
 - Implement solutions to increase capacity.
- 12.5 The objectives of the experiment are to:
- Define a locally agreed standard specification for bespoke, trauma-informed relational support
 - Map existing provision against the specification
 - Identify options for reconfiguration of existing services or additional resources
 - Work with commissioners and services to implement the preferred options.
- 12.6 This experiment is a development project that may be led by the project delivery officer described in experiment one or by an alternative designated project manager.

13. Delivery methods

Core components

- 13.1 The core components to this experiment are:
- Securing project management resource
 - Defining the standard specification for bespoke, trauma-informed relational support

- Mapping existing provision against the specification
- Identifying options for additional resources or reconfiguration of services
- Implementing the preferred option(s).

13.2 The intention is that any additional or reconfigured services will be resourced to meet the new specification for at least two years. During the co-design of this experiment, some stakeholders expressed a strong view that it would not be acceptable to offer this sort of support to individuals if it was limited to a shorter period. Their argument recognises that building trusting relationships with people who have experienced relational trauma takes time, and to withdraw that relationship too quickly once trust has been established can potentially be re-traumatising.

Securing project management resource

- 13.3 Project management will be required to lead the experiment, engage relevant partners and report back to governance structures. Given the involvement of commissioners as partners stakeholders suggested that this role may need to be graded at WCC's salary Band 4.
- 13.4 It may be possible to combine this role with the project delivery officer described in experiment one, if they have been recruited with appropriate capacity and skills.
- 13.5 Alternatively, project management support could be secured from within existing commissioning teams or externally.

Defining the standard specification

- 13.6 Based on the evidence review and our discussions with stakeholders in the co-design workshop, we can begin to define the standard specification for the service that we envisage. The essential features are likely to include:
- A keyworker with strong interpersonal competencies, knowledge of relevant systems (mental health, substance use, housing etc)
 - Low caseloads per worker, to allow for intensive work and regular contact – maximum 6 clients per case worker and capacity in the team to provide cover during holidays and other absences, *and*
 - A remit to work proactively to build a relationship with the individual in the community or while in prison and to remain alongside that person as they start their recovery journey
 - An approach that is strengths-based and trauma informed
 - High quality support and supervision from a line manager, ensuring containment of the emotional work that is required
 - A co-production ethos, so the client feels empowered and involved in the work
 - Coordinates a “team around me” approach – ensuring that information is shared between different systems to reduce need for repeated assessments
 - Access to peer support
 - Separation from any criminal justice requirements or potentially punitive elements.
- 13.7 The specification will also need to ensure that women have access to specialist services that can meet their needs appropriately.
- 13.8 The project manager will work alongside commissioners, service providers and people with lived experience to add further detail to this outline, incorporating local knowledge in finalising the specification.

Mapping existing provision against the specification

- 13.9 The project manager will then identify relevant local services and compare these to the standard specification. Some services may meet the specification entirely, others only partially perhaps due to resourcing or differing cultures and approaches. People with lived experience should again be involved in reviewing how services meet the standard specification.
- 13.10 The output of this stage will be a report setting out the nature and scale of the gap between existing services in Westminster and the standard specification.

Identifying options for additional resources or reconfiguration of services

- 13.11 Working alongside commissioners and service providers, the project manager will identify options for solutions that will close this gap. This might include:
- Redesigning existing services within current contract parameters so that they can meet the standard specification i.e. adapting current practice. This might involve reducing the intensity of support for some clients, while increasing it up to the specification level for others.
 - Working with commissioners to introduce variations to contracts to enable existing services to meet the new specifications.

Implementing the preferred option(s)

- 13.12 Based on the options identified, the project manager will then develop and monitor an action plan to implement the preferred options.
- 13.13 If this experiment is run in conjunction with experiment one, the coordination team and the governance task and finish group could support the implementation of the plan.

The Gold Standard

- 13.14 In addition to the core components, if extra resources were available for this experiment it could enable services to add to their existing capacity, rather than simply using that capacity differently. This might enable services, for example, to reduce caseloads for some keyworkers in the team and backfill their posts.

14. Feasibility assessment

- 14.1 The evidence behind bespoke, trauma-informed relational support is strong and local stakeholders are keen to proceed with this experiment to explore how capacity might be improved. Some already deliver services that are believed to be close to the intended model.
- 14.2 It is recognised that resourcing such support at any scale requires significant investment of money and time, and this is seen as the biggest barrier the experiment is likely to encounter. Stakeholders were keen to avoid offering a service that will be unsustainable, believing that building trust with people only to then prematurely withdraw the service could be harmful and counterproductive.
- 14.3 As such, in assessing the feasibility of the experiment, we have identified a number of enablers that will be critical for the experiment to be implemented and delivered successfully. These are included in Table 4 below, alongside suggested actions to increase the likelihood of the enablers being realised.

Table 4: enablers

Enabler	Suggested animating actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for additional capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider low-cost reconfiguration options as first approach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having clear transition plans should the service not continue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a communications plan at the outset for how the service is described to people to avoid raising unrealistic expectations Build in transition planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The service will need to be able to offer continuity of support for people who move out of Westminster 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learn from existing services providing support out-of-borough Build flexibility of location into service contracts Consider co-commissioning options with other boroughs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to suitable accommodation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link to ongoing developments such as CAS3 and AFEO

15. Resources and cost

- 15.1 The core components for this experiment include securing project manager time. Time will also be needed from services and commissioners to agree the specification, map provision, and implement options to reconfigure existing provision.
- 15.2 For a Gold Standard approach, additional resources could add capacity to existing services, enabling them to meet the new specification while continuing to deliver current service offers.
- 15.3 The resource implications of these options are outlined at Table 5 below.

Table 5: resources for core components and Gold Standard

Resource	Estimated Costs
Core components	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Manager/expanded project delivery officer post to oversee wider developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of project delivery officer time at Band 4 - £55-60k (replacing need for cost of standalone project delivery officer in Experiment 1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time of services and commissioners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within existing capacity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variation of contracts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within commissioner capacity
Gold Standard	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adding capacity to existing services – 2 key workers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £100,000 a year

EXPERIMENT 3: CREATING A BESPOKE “ONE-STOP SHOP” EXPERIENCE ON THE DAY OF RELEASE

16. Aims and objectives

- 16.1 In Artemis One we estimated that between 100 and 125 people experiencing multiple disadvantage are released from prison into Westminster each year. This equates to two or three people per week. In this stage, stakeholders noted that this is likely to be at the lower end of actual levels as some people leaving prison will not show up in service databases. Data from the recently constituted Resettlement Panels should provide a more accurate picture in due course. A key insight was that people who are experiencing multiple disadvantage face an impossible set of expectations on leaving prison that make it extremely difficult for them to get their needs met.
- 16.2 Our theory of change for this experiment is:
- That a proportionate and appropriate support service on the day of release can be made available for this target group
 - This can be done by coordinating or co-locating existing services and enhancing these with targeted specialist support.
 - This new service arrangement will better meet people’s needs and make it easier for them to access the support and resources they need to begin their journey to recovery and resettlement.
- 16.3 The overall aim of this experiment is to transform the experience on the day of release from prison so it becomes a positive start in people’s journeys towards stability and recovery.
- 16.4 The specific aims are to:
- Ensure people leaving prison are met at the point of release by a trusted, engaging and supportive person, or when that is not possible, then within the first hour or so
 - Improve the communication and coordination of other support services, including accommodation, health, substance misuse etc.
 - Ensure people can access the accommodation, support and other resources they require in the first few days after leaving prison.
- 16.5 The objectives are to:
- Meet people at the gate upon release
 - Establish a community-based one-stop shop that will be available to people on their first day and from which services can be coordinated.

17. Delivery methods

Core components

- 17.1 The core components to this experiment are:
- Securing project management resource
 - Improving knowledge of release dates so that everyone experiencing multiple disadvantage can be met at the gate upon release
 - A community-based one-stop shop

- 17.2 This experiment is a development project that may be led by the project delivery officer described in experiment one. It is intended to operate initially for two years, subject to resources, using a learn and adapt approach. If successful, we hope that it will be hardwired into business-as-usual service arrangements.

Securing project management resource

- 17.3 Project management will be required to oversee the experiment, engage relevant partners and report back to governance structures. In line with proposals in experiment two at section 13.3 we believe this role will need to sit at Band 4 within WCC.
- 17.4 It may be possible to combine this role with the project delivery officer described in experiment one, if they have been recruited with appropriate capacity and skills.
- 17.5 Alternatively, project management support could be secured from within existing commissioning teams or externally.

Meeting at the gate

- 17.6 The project manager will work to improve communication links with HMPPS and via access to data systems such as PINS to find out when people in the target group are due to be released. The new Resettlement Panels will help with this. This information will be shared with the project delivery officer from experiment one, if this person is different to the project manager.
- 17.7 Several services in Westminster already aim to meet people at the gate when they have capacity and when they know that someone with multiple disadvantage is due to be released. The project delivery officer will work with the virtual team and resettlement panels to determine who is best placed to do this for specific individuals.

One-stop shop

- 17.8 The one-stop shop will be a place for people leaving prison to go where they can access the range of services and support they require on their first day or two. The service will be linked with or close to an immediate offer of accommodation.
- 17.9 Stakeholders informed us that an existing service delivered by Advance Minerva already aims to provide this type of service for women. As part of this experiment it will be necessary to assess whether this service can meet the needs of women facing multiple disadvantage from Westminster. If it does, the one-stop shop being proposed here will only need to be available to men.
- 17.10 The one-stop shop will require a physical space that is welcoming and which includes rooms to allow for confidential one-to-one conversations. We do not anticipate it needing to be large or new facility, and the experiment will need to assess whether existing space such as at the Passage could be repurposed for this use.
- 17.11 Immediate access to emergency temporary accommodation is an essential element of this approach and the one-stop shop will need to be located with or near this accommodation.
- 17.12 Given the relatively small number of people who will need to use the hub, it is not proportionate to operate a physical multi-agency hub five days a week. One option may be for the one-stop shop to be staffed by two navigators, using existing navigators subject to capacity. These navigators will coordinate support for individuals from other relevant agencies on a virtual basis, using video- and telephone-based calls and appointments. Agencies may choose to locate a member of staff in the space physically on particular days if practical.

- 17.13 The navigators will support people with urgent needs such as ID documents, benefits, accommodation and health, as well as practical items including food and toiletries. While the focus will be on the first couple of days, navigators (alongside peer supporters) will also work with the person to identify their goals and will help them to access employment support, positive activities, social networks and other routes to wellbeing.
- 17.14 The efficacy of the one-stop shop will be dependent on services signing up to the approach and being willing to use video or telephone calls in place of face-to-face contacts (see enablers in Table 6).
- 17.15 Some services will be critical to this approach including probation, DWP advisers / Job Centre Plus, a GP service, and substitute prescribing service. Other desirable services might include food banks and employment agencies. Developing protocols, service level agreements and information sharing agreements to operate in this way is likely to take up a significant amount of time at the outset.

Preparing people to move on

- 17.16 During the co-design workshop for this experiment we heard about a service that has created an information pack for people who are coming to the end of their time being supported by a floating support in Westminster known as “What If...?” packs. These include information about common scenarios, helping people know what to do and who to call for help. They aim to help people to cope better with the challenges they may face and are believed to have contributed to fewer people seeking support from their floating support workers after leaving the service. For this experiment, such packs could be co-created with Change Communication to ensure they are accessible for people with a range of needs.

The Gold Standard

- 17.17 Other ideas discussed during the design of this experiment included the use of trained peer supporters who themselves have lived experience of time in prison. The benefits of this model have been set out in multiple national evaluations⁶. Ideally, in the gold standard for this experiment, there will be at least two peer support workers available, one male and one female. They could be employed by a charity with experience of delivering this model, such as St. Giles or St. Mungo’s. Ideally, peer supporters will receive accredited training such as Level 3 Advice and Guidance or Level 2 Award in Peer Mentoring. This might be offered in the community or within prison, helping to identify and recruit appropriate people.
- 17.18 Peer supporters will meet people at the point of release (predominantly prison, but this may also include meeting people at court where they are immediately released). They will provide emotional and practical support and have a small budget to cover expenses such as travel. They will also accompany the person to the one-stop shop (see below) or other relevant appointments. Peer supporters will offer to remain in contact with those they support for up to 12 months, continuing to provide structured emotional and practical support as people progress in their journeys from prison.
- 17.19 The employing charity will need to ensure that peer supporters receive appropriate support and guidance, including clinical supervision. The paid peer supporters may be supplemented with volunteers to ensure availability of support at the right time and to manage the workload.

⁶ See e.g. The Young Foundation (2016) *Saving Lives, Saving Money: How Homeless Health Peer Advocacy Reduces Health Inequalities* and Welford, JD. Milner, C. and Moreton, R. (2021) *Improving transitions for people experiencing multiple disadvantage: Prison release*.

17.20 Other ideas that were suggested could be part of a Gold Standard approach include:

- **A prison-based hub:** similar to the one-stop shop, this will involve creating a multi-agency space close to or even inside the prison for people being released. Such hubs have been trialled in ‘departure lounge’ pilots, including at HMP Manchester, through Manchester’s Street Engagement Hub.
- **Digitised portal for documents:** access to digital identification documents, in particular the Resettlement Passports⁷ currently being developed by the government through its Reducing Reoffending Programme.
- **Empowerment passports:** a digital platform that holds assessments and information about people and can be accessed and communicated to inform support. This builds upon Empowerment Passports for people with long-term health conditions or disabilities⁸, and is currently being trialled at HMP Doncaster.
- **Trusted assessor scheme:** Trusted Assessor schemes are a national initiative developed by the NHS to reduce unnecessary delays in discharging people from hospital⁹. They allow social care agencies in the community to accept the assessments of trained, trusted people within the hospital. Such an approach applied in our context could lead to fewer repeated assessments and better information sharing.
- **Training:** as with the wider Artemis Programme, this experiment will be enhanced if underpinned by cross-sector trauma-informed training. This could be delivered by the Workforce Development lead already in place through the Changing Futures programme.

Pre-release support

17.21 The scope of this experiment is limited to the community response once people are released from prison. However, such approaches will be greatly enhanced if pre-release work could be improved. We outline here the key areas that those involved in this co-design felt could support such developments:

- Pre-release planning being completed for every prisoner, including those on remand
- Benefits and accommodation being confirmed ahead of release
- Information about upcoming releases being routinely shared with support agencies
- Access to people in prison for navigators or peer supporters, so that a relationship can start to be built
- Information about the peer support and one-stop shop being provided to prisoners through means such as prison radio.

18. Feasibility assessment

18.1 First day of release is recognised as a major problem for people with multiple disadvantage leaving prison and a key point at which people’s chances of success in their recovery journeys is determined. As such, there was strong support among stakeholders for developing a more

⁷ See e.g. <https://blog.insidegovernment.co.uk/criminal-justice/the-resettlement-passport-what-is-it-and-how-does-it-work>

⁸ See <https://empowermentpassport.co.uk/>

⁹ See e.g. https://www.cqc.org.uk/sites/default/files/20180625_900805_Guidance_on_Trusted_Assessors_agreements_v2.pdf

effective, coordinated response in Westminster. However, stakeholders also identified a range of risks, resulting from:

- The resources required to support a small number of individuals
- The challenge of knowing when people are going to be released
- The difficulty of responding without effective planning or liaison ahead of release
- The ability of a large number of agencies to deploy resources to a one-stop shop.

18.2 Accordingly, in assessing the feasibility of the experiment, we have identified a number of significant enablers that will be critical for the experiment to be implemented and delivered successfully. These are included in Table 6 below, alongside suggested actions to increase the likelihood of the enablers being realised.

Table 6: enablers

Enabler	Suggested animating actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant services agree to working virtually to assess and support people on the first day of release 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior management engagement to persuade agencies to participate • Service Level Agreements (SLAs) to be drawn up with relevant agencies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information sharing agreements in place for the different services signed up to the one-stop shop approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring in resource to develop this from within WCC • Consider introducing a shared casework system such as ECINS¹⁰ which is already used in some services in Westminster
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Means to identify people being released 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project delivery officer and one-stop shop navigators have links within prisons and to Resettlement Panels • Project delivery officer and one-stop shop navigators have access to Prisons Intelligence Notification System (PINS) • Awareness of one-stop shop to be promoted among court staff and defence solicitors for people being immediately released from court
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear buy-in at senior governance level for the duration of the experiment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a governance board that includes the local authority, MOPAC, the London Prison Group and HMPPS • Use an existing partnership board for governance if possible • Establish specific Terms of Reference for this work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A safe single-sex space for women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link with Advance Minerva

¹⁰ <https://ecins.com/>

Enabler	Suggested animating actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to suitable accommodation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link to ongoing developments such as CAS3 and AFEO • Ringfence one or two units of suitable, emergency accommodation perhaps linked to the one-stop shop • Consider developing an accommodation route straight from prison to rehab • For prison leavers who are drug free or on stable reduced scripts, avoid placement in high needs hostels where residents are using drugs and/or alcohol

19. Resources and cost

19.1 Resources required to meet the core components for this experiment include:

- Securing project manager time to develop and coordinate the experiment
- A small budget for individuals on the day of release for expenses
- Two navigators (part time)
- Physical space for the one-stop shop
- Personal budgets available through the one-stop shop

19.2 For a Gold Standard approach, additional resources could be used towards:

- Two part-time peer support workers, plus support and management
- Training and accreditation costs for peer supporters
- Project management time to explore additional development options such as a prison-based hub, incorporating resettlement passports and a trusted assessor scheme.

19.3 The resource implications of these options are outlined at Table 7 below.

Table 7: resources for core components and Gold Standard

Resource	Estimated costs
Core components	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project management time to develop and coordinate the experiment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of project delivery officer time at Band 4 - £55-60k (replacing need for cost of standalone project delivery officer in Experiment 1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2x navigators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use existing navigators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical space for the one-stop shop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use existing space (may require a contribution towards overheads)

Resource	Estimated costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personal budgets for individuals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £5,000 per year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accommodation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using hotel rate of £100 per night as proxy, assuming 2 people per week, 3 nights required each episode - £31,200 per year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “What If...?” pack 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £500 if compiled by the navigators
Gold Standard	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2x part-time peer support workers, including support and management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £50,000 per year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training and accreditation costs for peer supporters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £2,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project management time on other developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional project delivery officer or project management time

EXPERIMENT 4: DESIGNING AND COMMISSIONING INTEGRATED HOUSING, SUPPORT AND TREATMENT PATHWAYS

20. Aims and objectives

- 20.1 Another key insight from Artemis One was that people’s needs are interconnected and that they change over time. Therefore, to effectively support recovery over the long term, people require access to a flexible, personalised “package” of support, treatment and housing that can be developed and adjusted in collaboration with the individual as their needs change. Without this too many people experiencing multiple disadvantage end up stuck for significant periods in chaotic “revolving door” situations in high support environments such as hostels, creating a logjam that prevents others from benefiting from those services.
- 20.2 For some people who have substance use needs, a period in a residential detox and rehab will be beneficial but this will need to be followed by access to appropriate accommodation and support that takes people away from their previous networks and the places where they used to buy and use their drugs. For people who are not prepared for this route, alternative approaches should be available, focused on harm minimisation, building trust, providing psychological support and offering alternatives that enhance health and wellbeing and reduce engagement in negative behaviour patterns. Strengths-based engagement with meaningful activity and ETE services can help avoid boredom and a drift back to old negative social circles and patterns of behaviour.
- 20.3 The benefits of coordinating and integrating services for people experiencing multiple disadvantage are recognised in guidance published by the National Institute of Health and Care Excellence (NICE) which says: “Commissioners of health, social care and housing services should work together to plan and fund integrated multidisciplinary health and social care services for people experiencing homelessness, and involve commissioners from other sectors, such as criminal justice and domestic abuse, as needed. These services should contribute to the government's aim of ending rough sleeping and preventing homelessness.”¹¹
- 20.4 Building on these insights, our theory of change for this experiment is:
- By engaging and securing the buy-in of strategic commissioners across the different domains of multiple disadvantage in Westminster, along with strategic and political support for greater collaboration, commissioners will work together to identify opportunities to commission integrated housing, support and treatment pathways.
 - This will improve how services meet the needs of people facing multiple disadvantage in Westminster.
 - With the result that more people are supported to achieve stability and to progress towards recovery and a safer, more secure and fulfilling life.
- 20.5 The overall aim of this experiment is to create more personalised and more effective housing, support and treatment pathways that accelerate people’s recovery and their capacity to move towards greater independence.
- 20.6 The specific aims are to:
- Identify opportunities where commissioner priorities align with the needs of people experiencing multiple disadvantage who are in contact with the criminal justice system

¹¹ <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng214/chapter/Recommendations#planning-and-commissioning>

- Improve awareness of these interconnected needs among relevant strategic and commissioning partners and best practice solutions that can help meet these needs
- Increase the ability of those partners to contribute to multi-agency initiatives responding to these needs.

20.7 The objectives are to:

- Engage strategic commissioners from across the relevant domains
- Identify opportunities to influence and align policy and strategic priorities
- Strengthen collaborative relationships between commissioners across the relevant domains and with service providers and people with relevant lived experience
- Develop a joint strategic commissioning framework and needs analysis for multiple disadvantage in Westminster
- Identify short term and longer term opportunities to fill gaps in provision
- Undertake joint commissioning to create new integrated pathways or personalised packages of housing, treatment and support
- Embed a rapid learning approach to ensure continuous improvement of service arrangements
- Prepare evidence and submissions to support the business case for investment in new services to fill gaps.

21. Delivery methods

Core components

21.1 The core components to this experiment are:

- Securing project management resources
- Identifying influencing opportunities
- Securing strategic commissioner commitment across domains
- Identifying short- and longer-term opportunities for collaborative commissioning
- Developing strategic commissioning framework and needs assessment

Securing project management resources

21.2 We recommend that a senior responsible officer (SRO) is appointed to oversee this experiment. Given the cross-domain nature of this work it will be advisable that this role has sufficient seniority but perhaps sits outside of the structures that we are seeking to influence.

21.3 A project manager (0.5 FTE) will be required for this experiment. This project manager should have experience in working with senior and strategic stakeholders across organisational boundaries and knowledge of at least two of the multiple disadvantage domains.

Identifying influencing opportunities

21.4 Westminster is a complex setting with many services and existing governance and commissioning structures. Strategic direction is set across differing boundaries – some solely focused on Westminster, others bi-borough with RBKC, and yet others tri-borough including LBHF. Influencing in the right places will require recognising these complexities and identifying opportunities that may cross local authority boundaries.

- 21.5 We are already aware of several upcoming reviews where it will be important to raise awareness of these needs, which include:
- The bi-borough Health and Wellbeing Strategy¹² – which has a consultation deadline of 25 June 2023
 - The borough’s Fairer Westminster Delivery Plan¹³
 - Westminster’s Homelessness Strategy – to be developed in the second half of 2023
 - Housing commissioning priorities review
 - Safer Westminster Partnership strategy – being drafted in 2023
 - Combatting Drugs Partnership strategy – currently in development
 - The integrated neighbourhood teams¹⁴ (a bi-borough model of health and social care) currently being prototyped – being led by Rachel Soni and Anna Raleigh.
- 21.6 Relevant structures and partners to consider engaging include:
- Primary Care Networks
 - Place-based partnerships in health where the ICB and housing come together along with public health, the main providers of health care, and a VCS representative
 - Community Safety Partnership
 - Safer Westminster Partnership
 - The Reducing Adult Reoffending Board
 - Combatting Drugs Partnership
 - Council Executive Leadership team
 - Supporting Families
 - Adult Social Care
 - MOPAC who commission pan-London
 - Probation through its Regional Outcomes Innovation Fund.
- 21.7 There are also initiatives focusing on the needs of particular groups that will have cross-over with people in our target population. These include the Enhanced Vulnerability Forum, the Deaths Review Forum, and the Integrated Care Board’s high intensity users work, which is being developed around people who are frequently in and out of hospital. This work will need to recognise that people who require A&E services are often taken to hospitals that lie outside NHS NW London such as St Thomas’ and UCH, which lie in adjacent integrated care systems.
- 21.8 A key part of influencing these opportunities will come through understanding each agency’s funding and commissioning cycles. For example, Community Safety MOPAC funding via the London Crime Prevention Fund and Violence Reduction Unit funding is committed until March 2025.

Securing strategic commissioner commitment across domains

- 21.9 The SRO and the project manager will work with relevant commissioners and senior managers to secure a commitment to collaborate to achieve the aims of the experiment.

¹² <https://consult.rbkc.gov.uk/communities/bi-borough-health-and-wellbeing-strategy-2023/>

¹³ <https://www.westminster.gov.uk/delivering-our-plan-build-fairer-westminster>

¹⁴ <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1J5WRtb3urcqwW1M24n5zc-0Y7X39zKfn/view?usp=sharing>

Identifying short- and longer-term opportunities for collaborative commissioning

- 21.10 Commissioners will work with each other and with their teams to identify short- and longer-term opportunities to collaborate to improve service pathways for people experiencing multiple disadvantage.
- 21.11 In the co-design workshop for this experiment, stakeholders suggested that we should “begin with what we have” and seek additionality, rather than adding whole new services or approaches to the already complex service ecosystem in Westminster. This might include, for example expanding the remit of the Starting Over service to work with more people experiencing multiple disadvantage who are in contact with the criminal justice system.
- 21.12 Stakeholders also felt that closer collaboration among commissioners might open up opportunities for changes in service arrangements that will not require additional resources, for example encouraging services to adopt more flexible working arrangements or co-location of services.

Developing a strategic commissioning framework and needs assessment

- 21.13 This experiment has the potential to create a long-term shift in the way that services are commissioned for people experiencing multiple disadvantage in Westminster. With commitment from the commissioners and support from their teams, the project manager will support the development of a strategic commissioning framework for multiple disadvantage. This will help secure the work of this and the other experiments, and the wider work of the Changing Futures programme.
- 21.14 Given the long term and strategic nature of this proposal, it will need to be adopted as a strategic aim of the Changing Futures legacy plan and gain support from the WCC executive and cabinet.
- 21.15 This work will be able to draw on lessons from across the national Changing Futures programme and learning from the Fulfilling Lives programme.¹⁵
- 21.16 The framework will create links and identify opportunities across commissioning strategies and needs assessments from the various domains of multiple disadvantage, with the goal of creating effective integrated housing, support and treatment pathways.

The Gold Standard

- 21.17 A gold standard approach to this experiment would enhance the capacity of the project team perhaps by making the project manager full time or by adding project support to their team through a 0.5 FTE project officer role.
- 21.18 Additional dedicated analytical capacity to support the work of the project team would help to identify cross-cutting needs and enable work with commissioners’ teams to build business cases for improvements.

22. Feasibility assessment

- 22.1 Supporting commissioners to recognise the needs of people experiencing multiple disadvantage who are in contact with the criminal justice system and how they align with

¹⁵ E.g. <https://www.thinknpc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Re-thinking-Outcomes-Guide-for-Commissioners.pdf>

existing priorities is seen as feasible and a viable way to work towards longer-term pathways of personalised packages of support, treatment and housing.

- 22.2 Our consultation with senior commissioners during the co-design of this experiment suggested that responding to these needs is unlikely to be achieved by pursuing fully integrated, joint commissioning. Previous efforts to do this have been challenging, and it is difficult to align commissioning cycles across the broad range of areas that will be required for people experiencing multiple disadvantage who are in contact with the criminal justice system.
- 22.3 The biggest challenge will come in navigating the complexity of Westminster’s systems – its various strategies, governance boards and initiatives that are constantly changing.
- 22.4 Accordingly, in assessing the feasibility of the experiment, we have identified a number of enablers that will be critical for the experiment to be implemented and delivered successfully. These are included in Table 8 below, alongside suggested actions to increase the likelihood of the enablers being realised.

Table 8: enablers

Enabler	Suggested animating actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership and project capacity that can work across domains 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appoint a strategic SRO Appoint senior project manager
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commissioner buy-in, understanding and commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Begin with a coalition of commissioners already engaged with the Artemis project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include in Changing Futures legacy planning Engagement of cabinet and executive team Alignment with WCC priorities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity to identify influencing opportunities and prepare cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement of commissioners’ teams, analytical capacity and service providers

23. Resources and cost

- 23.1 Resources that will be needed to meet the core components for this experiment include:
- Project management resource
 - Time of commissioning partners to support with identifying priorities and preparing cases
- 23.2 The resource implications of these options are outlined at Table 9 below.

Table 9: resources for core components

Resource	Estimated Costs
Core components	

Resource	Estimated Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project management time to develop and coordinate the experiment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0.5 FTE Project manager - Band 4 - £55-60k Pro rata (Consider alignment with need for standalone project delivery officer in Experiment 1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time of commissioning partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-kind support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-kind support
Gold Standard	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.0 FTE – Band 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project officer resource 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0.5 FTE – Band 3

PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE

- 23.3 A clear governance structure will be needed to oversee the experiments proposed through the Artemis project. Its remit will be to provide accountability, strategic support, and troubleshooting as the experiments progress. It will also enable learning to be shared and spread more widely across the borough and neighbouring boroughs.
- 23.4 Stakeholders involved in the co-design of these experiments expressed a strong preference that an existing governance structure be used if possible. While all existing structures have advantages and disadvantages, the proposal is to feed into the Reducing Adult Reoffending Board. This is a tri-borough board that reports into the respective sovereign Community Safety Partnerships. The rationale for preferring this structure includes its strong links with probation and the police.
- 23.5 In order to provide greater support and scrutiny we recommend that a task and finish subcommittee of this board is established, with three or four representatives from the board, which acts as a project board for the experiments. One or two additional members could be brought in from other strategic bodies if there were felt to be gaps in representation. It will be important to include within its membership:
- Community Safety
 - Changing Futures
 - Probation
 - Housing and/or rough sleeping
 - Police/IOM
 - Providers such as CSTM, St Mungo's, Turning Point.
- 23.6 The project manager / officer and the SRO or manager will bring update reports to this subcommittee for scrutiny prior to submission to the full board.
- 23.7 Due to overlapping priorities, we also propose that learning reports are shared with other governance structures, including the Integrated Care Board, the Combatting Drugs Partnership and the Changing Futures Partnership Board.

LEARNING AND METRICS FRAMEWORK

24. Experiment 1

Theory of change

Aims and Objectives	Envisaged change	Milestones	Learning metrics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruit a project delivery officer to oversee the experiment Establish a virtual team to improve communication and coordination of support 	<p>Recruit PDO</p> <p>Establish team</p> <p>Team functioning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management arrangements PDO appointed Induction completed Team established Team minutes Log of contact with services 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify people within a target cohort, and track their progress Improve communication and coordination of support between services Clarify which individuals require coordinated services and are experiencing barriers Identify systemic barriers and work with senior stakeholder to reduce or remove these 	<p>Identify individuals</p> <p>Improve coordination</p> <p>Improve communication</p> <p>Improve joint working</p> <p>Tackle barriers</p> <p>Services more integrated</p> <p>Achieve better outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cohort definition finalised Information sharing protocol Log of barriers created: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence and measures Actions taken Results Log of new protocols, SLAs, etc Feedback - services and service users Baseline evidence of needs and previous service use by cohort Service user feedback Agency feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of cohort identified % of identified barriers where sufficient action has been taken % of identified barriers which have been removed % of identified barriers which have been flexed for individuals
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To reduce systemic barriers for people experiencing multiple disadvantage who are in contact with the criminal justice system. 	<p>More people progress in recovery</p> <p>Reduced harms – individuals</p> <p>Reduced harms – communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use existing service measures Reoffending rate Retained clients Duration of engagement Discharge status 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in reoffending rate % of cohort in stable housing % of cohort in substance misuse treatment

25. Experiment 2

Theory of change

<p>By mapping current service provision against a best practice model we will determine what additional enhancements are required</p> <p>We will adjust or enhance existing services, and /or build a business case for additional provision</p> <p>So more people from the target cohort receive this a relational, trauma informed model of support</p> <p>More people progress in their recovery, reducing harm to themselves and communities.</p>			
Aims and objectives	Envisaged change	Milestones	Learning metrics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define a locally agreed standard specification for bespoke, trauma-informed relationship support 	<p>Define specification from national and local good practice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specification completed – consensus around contents 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map existing provision against the specification 	<p>Map current provision against this</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mapping exercise complete Gap analysis complete 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify options for reconfiguration of existing services or additional resources 	<p>Determine what enhancements are required</p> <p>Identify commissioning options</p> <p>Business case for additional provision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costed options for enhancements completed Business case for additional capacity Outcomes baseline and interval assessments Identification of budget for additional capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish baseline for business case etc Analysis of reoffending data etc
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with commissioners and services to implement the preferred options. 	<p>Adjust or enhance existing services</p> <p>Increased availability of service model</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments to existing services agreed with commissioners and providers Log changes in services towards model Mobilisation of new service arrangements Quarterly change in number engaged with model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of people engaging with specified service - % increase v baseline Change in reoffending rate % of cohort in stable housing % of cohort in substance misuse treatment Reduction in use of blue light services

26. Experiment 3

Theory of change

<p>By coordinating or co-locating existing services and enhancing these with specialist support</p> <p>We can establish a proportionate and appropriate support service on the day of release from prison</p> <p>Which will be better at meeting the needs of people facing multiple disadvantage</p> <p>Making it easier for them to access the support and resources they need to begin their journey to recovery and resettlement</p>			
Aims and objectives	Envisaged change	Milestones	Learning metrics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure people leaving prison are met at the point of release by a trusted, engaging and supportive person, or when that is not possible, then within the first hour or so. 	<p>Services identified</p> <p>Protocols and processes established</p> <p>People met at point of release</p> <p>People trust and engage with worker</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant services / resources identified Arrangement and process developed to meet people at gate. Cohort definition finalised Information sharing protocol Log of new protocols, SLAs, etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number met at gate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve the communication and coordination of other support services, including accommodation, health, substance misuse etc. 	<p>Improved communication</p> <p>Improved coordination</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information sharing protocol Log of barriers created: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence and measures Actions taken Results Log of new protocols, SLAs, etc Feedback - services and service users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of identified barriers where sufficient action has been taken % of identified barriers which have been removed % of identified barriers which have been flexed for individuals Baseline evidence of needs and previous service use by cohort
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a one-stop-shop that will be available to people on their first day and from which services can be coordinated 	<p>One stop shop established</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services and arrangements identified Services commissioned SLAs and protocols in place 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure people can access the accommodation, support and other resources they require in the first few days after leaving prison. 	<p>Accommodation</p> <p>Support</p> <p>Health</p> <p>Substance misuse / scripting</p> <p>Other urgent services and resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service user feedback Agency feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of people engaging with specified service - % increase v baseline Change in reoffending rate % of cohort in stable housing % of cohort in substance misuse treatment Reduction in use of blue light services

27. Experiment 4

Theory of change

<p>By engaging strategic commissioners across different domains</p> <p>We will identify opportunities to commission integrated housing, support and treatment pathways</p> <p>Which will improve how services meet the needs of people facing multiple disadvantage</p> <p>So that more people are supported to achieve stability and to progress towards recovery.</p>			
Aims and objectives	Envisaged change	Milestones	Learning metrics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage strategic commissioners from across the relevant domains Identify opportunities to influence and align policy and strategic priorities 	<p>Commitment from strategic commissioners across domains</p> <p>Political support</p> <p>Opportunities for collaboration identified</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Register of relevant commissioners Sign off by cabinet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement of commissioners – create scaled measure of engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen collaborative relationships between commissioners across the relevant domains with providers and people with relevant lived experience 	<p>Collaboration between commissioners</p> <p>Coproduction approach</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Log of opportunities for improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence and measures Actions taken Results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of opportunities converted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a joint strategic commissioning framework and needs analysis for multiple disadvantage in Westminster Prepare evidence and submissions to support the case for new investment. 	<p>Strategic needs analysis</p> <p>Commissioning framework</p> <p>Business case</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources to undertake SNA SNA completed Commissioning framework completed Business case completed 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify short term and longer-term opportunities to fill gaps in provision 	<p>Identify gaps in services</p> <p>Opportunities for rapid contact change to fill gaps</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Log of opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence and measures Actions taken Results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baselines established for new services
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake joint commissioning to create new integrated pathways or personalised packages of housing, treatment and support 	<p>Joint commissioning</p> <p>Pathways are more integrated including accommodation, support and treatment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint services specifications designed Tender processes completed Mobilisation of new service arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number engaging with service - % increase v baseline Change in reoffending rate % in stable housing % in substance misuse treatment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Embed a rapid learning approach to ensure continuous improvement of service arrangements 	<p>Rapid learning</p> <p>Continuous improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapid learning protocols and arrangements in place 	