

## Main Grants 2017-18 report

<b>Name of organisation</b>	<b>Sydenham Garden (SG)</b>
<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Monday 05 September 2015</b>
<b>Names and positions of attendees</b>	Tom Gallaher – Director, SG Dr Jim Sikorski – Chair of Trustees, SG Lucy Formolli - Cultural Services Development Officer, LBL James Lee - Head Culture and Community Development, LBL

<b>Group Name:</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>					
Total funding received 2015-16	£29,337	N/A	£9,779	£9,779	£9,779					
Total funding to be received 2016-17	£39,116	£9,779	£9,779	£9,779						
<b>Outcomes</b>										
<b>Support</b>										
People experiencing mental ill-health improve their wellbeing, mental health, physical health, independence levels and confidence (therefore reducing the need for statutory services).										
People with a broad range of mental illnesses use Sydenham garden activities as an alternative to day services.										
Adults with a complex range of social needs take part in positive group activities building their self-esteem.										
Adults with Dementia (the vast majority of who are older adults) improve the cognitive function, independence, general health and wellbeing.										
<b>Outputs:</b>	2015-16 Target	2015-16 Q2	2015-16 Q3	2015-16 Q4	<b>2015-16 Total</b>	<b>% Achieved</b>	2016-17 Target	2016-17 Q1	2016-17 Q2	<b>% Achieved TD</b>
4 Gardening sessions PQ	12	4	4	4	<b>12</b>	<b>100%</b>	16	4	<b>N/A</b>	<b>25% - target on track</b>
3 Sow & Grow sessions and 3 Growing Lives sessions, along with supplementary activities including Tai	16	6	6	9	<b>21</b>	<b>132%</b>	24	7	<b>N/A</b>	<b>29% - Target on track</b>



## 1. Remove funding from under-performing groups/those performing least well

Have you achieved at least 90% of the agreed reporting outputs and outcomes in all quarters since the start of the programme?

Yes. All targets have been met or exceeded. The one anomaly in Q3 / Output 3 (2015-16) is due to no new sessions starting in that quarter, the 4 attendees monitored replaced drop-offs. Other projects that are not on this monitoring (funded via alternative streams) also go on daily/weekly.

As this is a referral only project and groups are full, there is a waiting list for sessions. Sydenham Garden have learned to approach 'Co-Workers' nearer the time that a space is becoming available which is helping to manage initial drop-off after first contact. The drop-off rates are low.

The grant predominantly funds the Outreach Manager post. There is much work that goes on behind the scenes with 'Co-Workers' mainly delivered through the outreach manager involving being the single point of referral, meeting each person, assessment and meetings throughout the programme, liaising with community services, evaluating the person and so on.

There is feedback from the CCG that Sydenham Garden does reduce need for many statutory services. Sydenham Garden produce an annual evaluation of the services provide and the wellbeing outcomes for all 'Co-Workers' using WEMWBS and the Likert scale. This is measurable and qualitative and ensures they are demonstrating how they are meeting their outcomes as well as outputs fully and in many cases exceeding. There is a culture throughout the whole team and board through training of the importance of evidencing and capturing data on outcomes for 'Co-Workers'

Have you achieved all of the wider outcomes outlined in the initial grant application?

These outcomes have been achieved and the wider outcomes of the application has been met.

Sydenham Garden were not awarded the full amount requested in their initial application they were unable to undertake the transitional work for 'Co-Workers'. This was confirmed at the beginning of the grant process and is therefore not reflected in the outputs and outcomes for 2015-16-17 and beyond.

Where Sydenham Garden has exceeded their wider outcomes is through their outreach to men. Traditionally men's engagement in activity through IAPT (IAPT Lewisham is a free and confidential NHS service which offers a range of psychological therapies to adults 18 years and over, who live or are registered with a GP in the borough) is closer to 25%. At Sydenham Garden in 2015-16, 48.5% of their 'Co-Workers' are men, as the service fulfils a need that others are finding difficult to meet. The style of the 'Co-Worker' programme at Sydenham garden appears to appeal more to men than the more traditional talking services for mental health wellbeing improvement. As a whole the demographic of attendees at Sydenham Garden reflect that of Lewisham.

SG have also had a success in bringing people back into the workplace and have launched an excellent new website and created a video for users, referrers and funders.

Outputs and outcomes are as agreed in the original application

If no to either of the above:

- what are the mitigating factors?
- what plans are in place for improving performance?
- what progress has been made against actions agreed with your Development Officer?

- There are no issues with outputs/outcomes therefore no mitigating factors need to be evidenced.
- An agreement was made at this meeting to make the quarterly monitoring even more comprehensive to include more detail of who is attending sessions, registers and so on, as well as information on gender split, BME and so on
- Sydenham Garden is strong in recognising issues quickly and making plans for improvement. Example being they recently noticed an unusual slippage in the diversity of 'Co-Workers' and are investigating if there is a cause for this. They are also working to improve their offer for minority groups, in particular refugees suffering from PTSD building on the successful work with Tamil Refugees, and overall improve the offer for all co-workers with PTSD.

What local support/evidence of need can you identify for the work you are undertaking?

The evidence of need is clear - this can be evidenced simply through the number of people being referred and those on the waiting list as well as many local and national evidence for the need of support adults experiencing mental illness. Lewisham has a higher than national average of mental health illness in a broad range of complex health conditions supported through Sydenham Garden, such as Bi-Polar Disorder, Depression, Schizophrenia, anxiety, Alzheimer's Disease PTSD and sever social isolation

SG is strong in networking and is a key member of the Lewisham Dementia Action Alliance and work closely with the Lewisham CCG as commissioners of some project work. SG is a key partner of Bromley and Lewisham Mind and Lewisham Mindcare. SG also works extremely closely with VSL and feel VSL are vital to their delivery of the service and currently have around 80 volunteers. SG connects adults with other organisations such as RG Timebank and Carers Lewisham, Grow Mayow.

SG would find bi monthly networking meetings and information exchanges useful. They would also like to help spread the message of the purpose of the charity though LBL links, POSAC etc.

## 2. Negotiate reductions and seek alternative funding streams

Are there any proposals that you can put forward that will deliver significant saving against current expenditure? This can include capital investment to change your delivery/business model.

The organisation had a significant reboot 4 years ago and many saving plans were put into place at this time and a different business model was put in place then. There is no

scope for capital investment. Training of staff to stay in budgets and to try and operate slightly below budget is part of the culture at the organisation.  
The organisations to projections for savings and do fundraising events and activities.  
They have recently strengthened their marketing for funders.

What alternative funding streams are you already pursuing?

Finances are always tight as money from funders tends to be specifically project driven and restricted and sometimes incur costs such as the CCG whose commissioning budget only covers around 50% of the costs of the 2 projects commissioned.

SG have made a significant return of 7.5% of their budget through hiring out the venue for parties, weddings etc. and will look into a cost exercise to ensure they are getting maximum rental income for the offer. The venue rental has now grown to need an hourly paid workers to manage the building for rental. They are hoping to raise this to 10% of income over the next year or so. The income from the rental predominantly goes to building fixtures and costs involved in maintaining 2 sites.

SG have big lottery funding and feel it is likely that they will be eligible for the next stage of extension as long as the priorities of the Big Lottery don't change, which is unlikely. The Henry Smith funding has come to an end in April - however SG were able to negotiate an extension of 35% on this. This loss of funding combined with a cut to LBL funding is significant and potentially puts the organisation in a difficult financial situation.

Are there any other funding streams that you can identify that the council can support you to access?

LBL officers will discuss full cost recovery with the CCG on the projects outlined above.

### 3. Work with groups to consider mergers or asset sharing

Are there any organisations doing similar work to you in the borough who you may consider sharing resources or merging with? Who have you considered/approached?

Merger is not really an option as this was explored 4 years ago with the reboot of the Charity. SG do however have strong partnerships and are renting their small office space to IAPT talking services, but this would not make a significant impact.

SG are very open to ideas of partnership working and resource sharing where possible, but are already at capacity of rental of space

Are there other groups in the local area that you could share resources with even if they are delivering a different type of service? Again, who have you considered/approached?

Although this is not directly a sharing of resources SG are working closely with businesses to deliver company away days – this is accessing a different type of user and generating income.

What support might you need to move these suggestions forward?

Sydenham Garden could possibly use support re-negotiating their arrangement with the Lewisham Clinical Commissioning group as the organisation feel that although they are commissioned to deliver services, they are having to take much of the financial burden (nearly 50% in some cases). SG requested that C&CD help facilitate this discussion this with the Joint Commissioners.

#### 4. Pro-rata reductions across all groups

What would a 25% cut in your grants look like in service delivery terms? What are the wider impacts?

As the LBL grant pays for the Outreach post – which is one of the most significant members of staff in the organisation, one option is to make this post redundant over a 12 month period of wind down. This is the most drastic outcome, but a very real possibility.

The result on this loss to the organisation could potentially lead to the longer term wind down of the organisation as the outreach worker is essentially the main point of contact for all project work and 'Co-Workers'. The organisation has no additional resources through admin, secretarial, PA etc. so the Outreach worker does much of that work. Without these staff positions and with the Henry Smith, it is very unlikely the Charity could continue to operate.

However although the above is a possible outcome, the Board would likely make the decision to reduce the number of projects running at the charity which would have a direct impact on 'Co-Workers' with regard numbers reached and outcome improvements made, it would also inevitably lead to a reduction in hours for paid staff

Sydenham Garden were keen to emphasise the fact that if anything this service needs more investment as the knock on effect of the service really does impact on costs to the state.

They also were keen to emphasise the organisations appreciation for the support given to them over the years by Lewisham Council, in particular around the time of the re-boot.

Have you modelled this cut and developed an action plan for its implementation?

The organisation has done some modelling and have some "risky" potential plans to improve their financial situation. These ideas are only at best 25% likely to come off. The organisation felt it was too soon to go into detail.

The board would likely consider the 2 CCG funded projects to be the ones most likely to face the brunt of the cut. The reason for this being when financially modelled, the CCG funding cover only approximately 50% of the costs of running those sessions. Despite the fact that the CCG state what is happening at Sydenham Garden as a success story for saving money and reaching people in a different way to usual talking services, which are not suitable for all.

They are continuing to pursue alternative streams of funding.

Sydenham Garden did want to emphasise that they feel that good performing organisations should be considered differently with regard the cut and should not face the full brunt of 25%. There was a discussion about the process and past decisions were made and how decisions will be made over the next few months.

## Conclusion

### Any other comments / areas discussed

Lead Officer wanted to state on the record that Sydenham Garden should be very proud of how their organisation has turned round since the re-boot 4 years ago, how the way they measure wellbeing outcomes through WEMWBS should be considered a lead in the borough and would like to extend this to more organisations. The evidenced based improvements for 'Co-Workers' is excellent

### Conclusion and recommendation

Sydenham Garden has met and or exceeded all targets and outcomes.

Sydenham Garden provide a valuable service to Lewisham with regard helping improve the outcomes for people with a broad range of mental health and Dementia issues at an early intervention stage. There evidenced based reporting is second to none and produces qualitative and quantitative analysis of the benefits to their 'Co-Workers'.

They are reaching men, (48.5%) of 'Co-Workers', which is extremely difficult for talking mental health services to do, as well as reflecting Lewisham as a whole with regards their ethnicity breakdown.

The charity works hard to broaden their financial stability, but as funding is increasingly hard to attract from external sources, a 25% cut from LBL will have a significant impact in terms of delivering front line services in the first instance, likely resulting in the stoppage of the delivery of 2 of their projects.

Sydenham Garden has taken steps to reduce costs where possible and have fully maximised their valuable space through rentals resulting in a 7.5% return, hoping to increase to 10%.

A full merger was explored at the time of their reboot after a period of shrinkage, but is not feasible as would add little or no value.

Sydenham Garden has been excellent in proactively pursuing networks and partnerships such as with BL Mind and the Lewisham CCG. They are fully open to exploring any ideas and potential sharing of assets with other organisations wherever possible, practical and providing benefit for the organisation.

In conjunction with the projected ending of a large proportion of their Henry Smith Grant, the LBL cut of 25%, could potentially threaten the organisation's stability in the longer term should the need arise to wind up their Outreach Worker position, which is the front line of all referrals and support to 'Co-Workers' – this would happen if necessary over a period of 12 months

**It is recommended that Sydenham Garden receive a pro-rata cut.**

Equalities groups disproportionately impacted by recommendations

Ethnicity:	x	Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	x	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:	x	Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:			

Commentary and potential mitigations:

Sydenham Garden provide services primarily for older people and the impact will be felt by this group. SG also provide services specifically for people suffering with Dementia, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and other mental health conditions experienced by refugees, currently working primarily with Tamil Refugees

There is a danger that this cut will have a knock on impact to wider services commissioned by the CCG and LBL officers will discuss this with colleagues as a matter of urgency.