Main Grants 2017-18 report

Name of organisation	Bromley & Lewisham Mind
Date of meeting	9 September 2016
Names and positions of attendees	Ben Taylor, Chief Executive, Mind Dominic Parkinson, Head of Services, Mind Petra Marshall, Community Resources Manager LBL

Group Name:	Total	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Total funding received 2015-16	**£26,179**	N/A	£8726	£8726	£8727
Total funding to be received 2016-17	**£34,905**	£8726	£8726	£8726	

Outcomes	**Support**
	For people accessing the activities: • Reduced isolation • More engaged with mainstream community
	For Peer Support Volunteers: • Reduced isolation • More engaged with mainstream community • Increase in skills and confidence • Move into paid employment

Outputs:	2015-16 Target	2015-16 Q2	2015-16 Q3	2015-16 Q4	**2015-16 Total**	**% Achieved**	2016-17 Target	2016-17 Q1	2016-17 Q2	**% Achieved TD**

1. At least 10 regular Peer Support Activity sessions, with an average of 6 taking place each week	234	147	132	139	**418**	**179%**	312	147		**188%**
2. 24 active Peer Support Volunteers	24	24	22	30	**25 average**	**104%**	24	26		**108%**
3. 188 people benefitting from the service (141 in 2015/16)	141	145 (61 new)	128 (54 new)	166 (80 new)	**279 (195 new)**	**198%**	188	205 (109 new)		

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?

Bromley and Lewisham Mind (BLM) are exceeding all three of their outputs substantially; with almost twice the number of people benefitting from the service than the target. They are on track to meet and exceed their targets for 2016/17 to date. The project is very targeted and specific in its delivery which means they have a small number of outputs.

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

The wider outcomes are very clearly being met. Those that benefit from the peer support service (both those accessing services and the peer support volunteers) show signs of improvement across four outcomes: increase in skills and confidence; moving into paid employment; reduced isolation and more engagement with mainstream communities. These are measured through participant samples every quarter. This follows the Mental Health Recovery Measure.

Case studies further demonstrate the impact that the peer support service is having. For example 'BW' is a trained architect who became unwell a few years ago when she was diagnosed with bi-polar disorder and spent some time in hospital. She approached Mind as she wanted to gain some experience and get back into a routine again. She supports the music group and art group and has really developed in confidence and been able to teach others skills. Her time volunteering has really improved her mental health giving her routine, building self-esteem, and allowing her live a better quality of life. She has recently completed a short construction course gaining her CSCS card and is looking to go back to working with the construction industry and build her way back up to the position she was in when she became unwell. She will continue to volunteer with the art group.

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?

N/A - Mind have delivered well against all output and outcome targets.

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

The large number of people accessing the service and numbers of peer support volunteer enquiries demonstrates the need for the service. The organisation regularly reviews demand and need and the peer support development group make decisions about the project and help plan its delivery, ensuring that the service best meets the needs of those it is aimed at. New groups are started and others put on hold depending on the demand from current participants. For example, The Women's Group and the Stress Management & Relaxation Group started in August 2016.

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.

Main grant funding is for this particular project rather than the organisation as a whole. The organisation itself is not reliant on this funding; and is already funded from a variety of sources (although the majority, 84%, is from the statutory sector – Lewisham and Bromley CCGs and Lewisham and Bromley councils). As such there isn't really scope for significant savings against this particular project.

What alternative funding streams are you already pursuing?

Lewisham is the sole funder of the peer support project. BLM state that many funding bodies and trusts are reluctant to fund ongoing projects and / or projects that may be viewed as a statutory service. BLM suggest that if they were to attract alternative funding for this project they would need to alter and redesign it substantially. There is an understandable reluctance to do this as it is working well currently and clearly meeting a need.

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

The council already supports where needed; for example input into Department of Health bids.

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?

BLM work successfully in partnership with and have a strong relationship with a number of organisations, for example: SLaM, Sydenham Garden, Carers Lewisham, Lewisham CAB, and Age UK Lewisham & Southwark. For their particular work with BME and migrant communities they are linked in with Family Health ISIS, LRMN, AFRIL, and FORVIL. The peer support project is linked with various centres such as the Green Man.

BLM are part of a federated national network of organisations; but are fully self-contained in what they deliver and how they are run. This funded project is a small part of the organisation and its delivery does not impact on the organisation as a whole. It is felt that there aren't any obvious organisations suitable for merging the delivery of this project, or the organisation as a whole.

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?

As above.

What support might you need to move these suggestions forward?
N/A

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?
BLM have indicated that in order to make a 25% cut they would need to make the coordinator redundant and re-advertise the position part time (anticipated approx. 25 hours per week) alongside a reduction in the delivery of activities. BLM believe that the impact on service delivery of this would be greater than 25% because of the economies of scale involved in delivering a service such as this and feel it could be closer to 50% impact. This is in part because they couldn't support the same number of volunteers. BLM suggest that they would need to make a decision as to whether they could still deliver a viable project with the reduction in funding; although believe that this may be possible due to the momentum of the project. This momentum may be compromised however with a change in staffing, with loss of trust and relationship leading to volunteers leaving. BLM suggest there is a need for more investment in this area of work, partly due to funding for other services being reduced (e.g. floating service and RSLs) thereby generating more service demand. The peer support project is the start of the pathway with onward referral for more in depth focussed support when needed; and as such complements the wider delivery of the organisation as a whole. The impact of the cut to this project would have a knock on effect to the outcomes of the wider delivery of the organisation. The project is partly funded from mental health commissioning within the council and 25% pro-rata cut would only apply to the Main Grant element of the funding.

Have you modelled this cut and developed an action plan for its implementation?
BLM have modelled the cut and have been discussing the impact and actions for implementing it; as described above.

Conclusion

Any other comments / areas discussed
None.

Conclusion and recommendation

BLM deliver a much needed service and are performing extremely well against their output targets, exceeding in all areas. Given the nature of the project and its relationship with the wider organisation there are no opportunities for shared resources or mergers. **As such it is recommended that the organisation receive a pro-rata cut.**

Equalities groups disproportionately impacted by recommendations			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:	x	Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:			
Commentary and potential mitigations:			
Bromley and Lewisham Mind provide a peer support service for people experiencing mental health problems. Bromley and Lewisham Mind suggest that a pro-rata cut to their funding would have a disproportionate effect on the protected characteristic of disability; however officers will work with the organisation to mitigate this impact as much as possible when agreeing new outputs for 2017/18.			