

Evaluation of the Rhea Project: Interim Report



Dawn Hart & Anne Rathbone

Commissioned for Commonweal Housing and Solace
January 2020

Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
1.1 The partnership.....	2
1.2 Overview of the Rhea project.....	2
2. The evaluation aims and methodology.....	3
2.1 The aims of the evaluation.....	3
2.2 The method.....	4
3. Operating and Support Models.....	5
3.1 The operating model.....	5
3.2 The support model.....	7
3.3 The interaction between the operating and support models.....	8
4. Finances and cost-benefit.....	8
4.1 Costs and income.....	8
4.2 Income.....	10
4.3 Costs.....	11
4.4 Analysis.....	11
4.5 Increasing cost effectiveness.....	12
5. Impacts.....	12
5.1 Impact on Southwark Housing system.....	13
5.2 Impact on survivors and children.....	13
5.3 Next steps for identifying outcomes.....	17
6. Key Challenges and Learning.....	17
6.1 Structures and systems.....	17
6.2 Staffing and caseloads.....	18
6.3 Properties.....	19
7. Issues regarding replication.....	20
8. Recommendations.....	21

1. Introduction

1.1 The partnership

Partners in this project are Commonweal Housing (Commonweal), Solace and London Borough of Southwark Housing Department (Housing Department).

Solace exists to end the harm done through Violence Against Women and Girls. Through the Rhea project it aims to provide services to meet the needs of survivors of domestic abuse through a holistic, empowering approach. Commonweal supports piloting of innovative 'action learning' projects that address an identified social injustice and where a housing element is one part of addressing this on an individual basis. A key aim is to explore replicability in other areas, if this is assessed as being appropriate, realistic and desirable. Solace work closely with Southwark Housing to promote effective practice within the Housing Department to meet the needs of women escaping from domestic abuse. The Rhea project was established as a partnership between Solace and Commonweal, to pilot good quality, temporary housing with tailored support for survivors of domestic abuse. Close working between Solace and Southwark Housing is key to improving the timeliness and appropriateness of referrals in, and move on from, the service.

1.2 Overview of the Rhea Project

The Rhea Project was established as a partnership between Solace and Commonweal, to pilot good quality, temporary housing with tailored support for survivors of domestic abuse. Close working between Solace and Southwark Council is key to improving the timeliness and appropriateness of referrals in, and move on from, the service.

The project is innovative in that it combines three areas of progressive practice. Firstly, it provides a bespoke, home based support to survivors, which distinguishes it

from other projects. Secondly, the emphasis on close working links with Southwark Housing seeks to maximise opportunities for timely move-on to long-term secure accommodation appropriate to need. Thirdly, the project also meets a gap in pre-existing provision in Southwark, in terms of its target group. It does this by providing supported independent accommodation to survivors of domestic abuse who have children, including older male children who may not be accepted in other forms of domestic abuse residential provision. Its value base represents that of Solace in that it works to promote independence through holistic and person centred support, with a focus on empowerment.

Rhea combines the aims of the three partner organisations into shared outcomes. It supports the aims of Solace by promoting independence through holistic and person centred support, with a focus on empowerment. In line with Commonweal's aims, it is an opportunity to pilot a new way of tackling a common social and housing problem, to evaluate and test the potential for replicability elsewhere. It meets the aims of Southwark Housing to meet the housing needs of vulnerable groups. Survivors of domestic abuse are a key group within the homeless population, so to not provide a working solution for them would be to overlook a key vulnerable population cohort.



2. The evaluation aims and methodology

2.1 The aims of the evaluation

- To identify a Theory of Change for the project.
- To identify relevant qualitative and quantitative data to support analysis of cost and benefit, value, challenges or barriers to success, referencing these against the Theory of Change.

- To provide formative feedback and recommendations to maximise the potential of the project for success.
- To make recommendations regarding potential for replicability and, if replicable, to define the key elements necessary.
- To be of use to various stakeholders working (directly or indirectly) with survivors of domestic abuse to share key learning from the project.

2.2 The method

The evaluation method is mixed, combining qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis. To date it has consisted of:

- Initial discussions with managers and lead staff in Commonweal and Solace to establish the context for the project and the needs it is seeking to meet.
- A review of academic and grey literature to establish policy context and any broader evidence base.
- A Theory of Change workshop with relevant leads and staff from Commonweal and Solace (see Appendix A).
- Analysis of survivor and financial data provided by the project.

Findings from all of the above were collated and analysed to establish relevant benchmarks and to agree an evaluation framework. Following this first phase, a series of semi-structured interviews were conducted with stakeholders: four current survivors (identified by Rhea); Housing Manager, Southwark Council; the former key worker and Service Managers of Rhea. Monitoring data was collected from Rhea for the period 1st January 2018 to 31st December 2018. This was analysed and cross referenced with the Theory of Change. Financial data was collected from Rhea for the period 1st April 2018 to 31st March 2019. All of the information gathered to date has been used to identify value, benefits and challenges for the pilot and to inform consideration of replicability.



3. Operating and support models

3.1 The operating model

The operating model was developed in collaboration between the three partners. Commonweal has provided 8 houses of 2 or 3 bedrooms to Solace for their use at a subsidised rent, enabling Solace to pilot the delivery model. The properties are geographically spread across London boroughs to allow survivors to be placed out of area for their own safety if necessary. A key element of the operating model is that the housing provision is safe and of high quality. The Rhea Project is based on the premise that this is a key element in supporting survivors who have experienced domestic abuse to rebuild their lives. Repairs on the properties are provided by Solace.

The project effectively fills a gap in provision for survivors who need low to medium support. This can be defined as a lower level of support than a refuge, but a higher level of support than an advocacy project.

Exclusion criteria for the project are:

- Survivors unwilling to engage with the support package
- The survivors who do not have dependent children
- Level of needs is too high (e.g. complex needs, mental health issues, substance misuse)
- Uncertain immigration status
- Risk of them being found by the perpetrator, which also includes an assessment of risk to staff
- Levels of risk related to the children's schools (e.g. risk of children being followed home)
- Previous evictions

Survivors are identified and referred via Southwark Housing Department. Assessments were previously conducted by Southwark Housing staff but are now done by a Solace staff member who is embedded within the Southwark Housing Team. During the lifespan of the project the approach to this has been refined.

Referrals are processed through Southwark Housing, but conducted by a member of Solace who is embedded within that team. Following placement with the Rhea project, Southwark Housing process the bidding for move on. The role is also to provide a suitable response to survivors in a broader sense. A key function of Rhea has been to raise the profile and response of Southwark Housing to domestic abuse issues, both for Rhea survivors and in general.

Rhea staff, employed by Solace but sited in Southwark Housing, provide management, assessment and support. Their presence within Southwark Housing is seen by the Project Manager (at 12th August 2019) to be essential to building relationships with Housing Assessment and Allocation staff and to the ability to provide an 'on the spot' assessment and needs led response. Good communication with case workers, placements team, managers, income team are important for the delivery of the referral and assessment process and the ongoing support of the service users.

Following acceptance into the project, the Rhea key worker provides holistic key work support to survivors. This is delivered face to face by visits to the properties. It includes practical advice around such issues as children gaining places in new schools, helping with benefits forms, as well as emotional support, for example encouragement and sometimes accompanying women to appointments with key agencies. All support is delivered under an empowerment model whereby women are encouraged to recognise and build their own skills and confidence in preparation for move on. Additionally, Rhea staff are available for out of hours contact by phone and oversee the physical maintenance of the properties. They also manage the project finances and the ongoing relationships with key partners, in particular Commonweal and Southwark Housing.

All survivors receiving this package now receive a Band 2 housing allocation. This means that a full application on move on is not required, which speeds up this process. The expectation is that they will get their band allocation in the first 3 months of their stay with Rhea. Six months is available for bidding for move on properties with a further three months being available as a buffer to allow for any time slippage. The Rhea key worker plays a key role in ensuring that survivors move on from the property and from Rhea support in a timely way, to avoid them becoming dependent on the service and, to enable placement of new referrals.

Ongoing low level support is available through wider Solace services. There is evidence to support this model in the academic literature for the UK and countries that are comparable in terms need and social systems.

Rhea is designed around a 12-month timeframe from assessment. Maximum time between assessment and allocation should be 3 months. Following allocation, six months prior to anticipated move on date, the survivors are supported in the bidding process for move on accommodation. Following this six-month period, during which bidding is taking place, a three-month buffer period is in place to allow for any slippages. At this interim report stage numbers completing this cycle are too low to reliably identify any trends in terms of coherence to this timeline.

3.2 The support model

The support package is provided by Solace in the form of a key worker who visits the survivors in their own properties to provide them with person centred services, using an empowerment approach to promote independence. The capacity for this support worker is 3.5 days delivered over 4 working days. This has been increased over the lifespan of the project. Additional is time allocated to provide capacity building training to Southwark Housing staff. Direct support for children of survivors is not directly provided, although positive 'spin-off' outcomes for children are hoped for. This support is achieved by regular home-based key work sessions and interim contact as appropriate. Support activities identified in the Theory of Change (see Appendix A), were:

- Assessment (which normally need to be immediate, responsive and highly needs led).
- Removing barriers to wellbeing/independence (benefits, language, access to education or training support).
- Linking to and making best use of, other support systems and services, including brokering relationships with other agencies.
- Other bespoke emotional and personal development support, identified through a person-centred approach.

- Support and practical advice on parenting and resolving issues relating to children (for example, regarding school engagement or relationships between the child and the perpetrator).

In the academic literature social support, particularly through an empowerment model, has been found to be key to progression and long-term sustainability of the safety of survivors and their children.

3.3 The interaction between the operating and support models

The interaction of the operating model and the support model is assumed to be key to effectiveness. It is based on the expectation that initial housing and possibility of secure long term housing provides an initial boost to emotional wellbeing. It provides space to focus on goals and actions for improving well-being and that of their children, develop self-belief, confidence and courage to continue towards independence and freedom from domestic abuse.



4. Finances and cost-benefit

4.1 Costs and income

The Rhea operating model is based on the lease by Commonwealth to Solace of high quality and well-maintained properties on a subsidised lease. Two of these properties are 3 bedroomed and the rest are 2 bedroomed properties. Solace are paid by

Southwark Council via Housing Benefit allocations on a nightly rate. The difference between this expenditure by Solace and the income received in Housing Benefit enables the employment of a key worker and covers costs of management and support functions. This maximises the cost-effectiveness of the pilot. This is, however, a contextual arrangement. The availability of below market rate, high quality housing stock (and opportunities for grant funding to cover or subsidise support costs) will differ across areas and time.

The income and costs figures in Tables 1 and 2 below represent costs of properties to Rhea and income generated at full occupancy through Housing Benefit. Table 1 below shows monthly costs of respective properties against the rate of income per night. Table 2 shows the annual cost and theoretical maximum income that could be generated on each property, assuming full occupancy for 365 nights per year.

Table 1: Cost of properties provided by Commonweal at reduced rent against nightly income from LB Southwark

Property	Monthly cost in rent paid to Commonweal	Nightly income from LB Southwark
Property 1	£689.75	£45.50
Property 2	£515.08	£45.50
Property 3	£689.75	£45.50
Property 4 (3 bed)	£630.24	£57
Property 5	£689.75	£45.50
Property 6	£515.09	£45.50
Property 7	£515.09	£45.50
Property 8 (3 bed)	£515.09	£57

NB: Nightly rates higher for Property 4 and Property 8 because they are 3 bedroom properties

Table 2: Cost per year of properties provided by Commonweal at reduced rent against yearly income at full occupancy

Property	Annual rent cost rent paid to Commonweal (monthly charge x 12)	Maximum annual income from LBS (nightly rate x 365)
Property 1	£8,277	£16,607.50
Property 2	£6,180.96	£16,607.50
Property 3	£8,277	£16,607.50
Property 4	£7,562.88	£20,805
Property 5	£8,277	£16,607.50
Property 6	£6,181.08	£16,607.50
Property 7	£6,181.08	£16,607.50
Property 8	£6,181.08	£20,805
Total	£57,118.08	£141,255.00

Rhea advise that the actual rent received for the period was £136,286. The key worker is employed for 3.5 days per week (0.7 FTE) to work across all eight properties. It is useful to note here that a key worker could potentially support more survivors in more properties if properties were less geographically diverse, as travel time would be lessened. Whilst some limited annual leave or sickness cover may be provided by the Solace Housing Independent Domestic Abuse Advisor (IDVA) worker this is minimal and costings for this have not been included in calculations.

4.2 Income

Housing Benefit income makes up the total income for the Rhea Project. Total income for 1st January 2018 to 31st December 2018, net of voids and arrears, was £136,286.

4.3 Costs

The project cost a total of £125,073 in the period 1st January 2018 to 31st December 2018, shown in Table 3. below. The biggest cost was the key worker post at £17,134 plus £6,512 costs of line management and direct office support. This totalled £23, 646. Other costs (travel, training and license fee) totalled £2,368. The cost of the properties totalled £83,587. This included rent, Council Tax and service charges, utilities, repairs, maintenance, TV license and Health and Safety compliance. Infrastructure cost contribution was £15,832.

Table 3: Costs for Rhea Project for period 1st January 2018 to 31st December 2018

Direct Staff and Management costs (including direct staff cost, management, office support and data analyst time)	23,646
Other costs: Travel, IT, License Fee, Recruitment, DBS checks, training)	£2,368
Property costs	£83,587
Proportionate contribution to infrastructure e.g. Finance, HR, Governance & Comms	£15,832
Total costs	£125,073
Surplus	£11,213

4.4 Analysis

The income minus the costs for the period shows a surplus of £11,213. The break-even occupancy rate for the properties, based on these costs, is 89%. The average cost of rent plus support per property is £15,634 per annum. This average cost can be contrasted to the Home & Communities Agency (HCA 2016) report that suggested supported housing across the UK costs between £8,400 and £14,000 per unit.

The 2016 HCA report however does not specify the levels of support provided and is not based primarily on family sized properties (2 and 3 bedroom houses). Both these factors combined may account for the difference.

4.5 Increasing cost effectiveness

There appear to be two main elements of the service that could be adapted in future continuation or replication. Firstly, the allocation of properties that were geographically closer would reduce travel time for the key worker and therefore maximise benefits from that role. Provision of smaller properties (flats) would also decrease costs.

There are, however, two important issues for consideration in type of property allocation. Firstly, the element of choice for survivors in where they are located appears in evaluation to date to be an important part of the appeal and effectiveness of the project (see below 5.2). Secondly, an assessment of likely numbers of children in placements would be necessary before deciding on smaller properties to ensure accommodation of needs. Interviews to date indicate that children feeling happy and settled in the new accommodation is a significant contributor to the survivor's wellbeing and ability to move forward in their lives (see below 7.2).



5. Impacts

Assessment of impact to date has been made on the basis of service data received from Solace and the findings of interviews with 4 survivors. Over the next year, interviews will be undertaken with all further survivors (subject to consent). Further data from Solace for the year 1st January 2019 to 31st December 2019 will be added into the findings below. This will provide an update on impact and will strengthen any findings with greater numbers.

5.1 Impact on Southwark Housing system

The project has stimulated joint working with Southwark Housing, with apparent positive impact for practice. The Rhea Manager (at 12th August 2019) reported that the siting of the Rhea key worker within Southwark Housing has resulted in improved referral pathways, smoother transition, and better outcomes for survivors, stemming from an improved understanding on the part of Housing staff of the aims of the project and the needs of survivors themselves. The training provided by Solace for Housing Staff could, in itself, be written up for learning to be shared across other Local Authorities. Impact could still be embedded further (see 6. Challenges and Learning).

5.2 Impact on survivors and children

Data provided by Rhea for January 1st to December 31st, 2018 shows record of impact for four survivors who moved on from Rhea during that time. In the timespan of January to February 2019, four interviews with survivors who were still in Commonweal housing and receiving Rhea services were carried out. Because of the timing of the interviews (January and February 2019) it can be assumed that they are different women from those who are reported above as having moved on. The combination of this data shows the following impact:

Emotional and psychological well-being

From data received from Rhea, three out of four survivors who have moved on reported **significant or some improvement in emotional and psychological well-being** during their time in the project. Two of these reported specifically that they had **fewer symptoms of trauma and anxiety**. In interviews with survivors still using the Rhea service, three out of four of those interviewed

reported that **their emotional and psychological welfare had significantly increased**. Three out of four of those interviewed reported that they had **increased significantly in confidence**. They linked this to attaining a position of immediate safety but also to the input of the key worker. The same three reported feeling that they felt **empowered** as a result of their time in the project. Two said that they felt **better able to 'stand up for their rights'**, relating this not just to domestic abuse issues but also to self-advocacy with Housing and other services. One said that she had always been a confident and empowered person and this was not an issue for her in coming into the project.

All four interviewees said that they felt their time in the project had given them the space to 'hope and dream' and that they felt positive about achieving new goals. Two said that their goals for the future were to continue to work and develop personally and professionally. Two said that their dream was to continue to establish a safe and secure upbringing for their children and to be the best mother they could be.

Contact with friends and family is a direct indicator of emotional and psychological well-being. The Rhea move on data shows that **one out of four survivors for whom data was provided reported improved contact with friends and family**. The other did not have a recorded outcome.

Present and future safety

The Rhea data from survivors that had moved on from the project, three out of four survivors reported **significant or some improvement in the controlling behaviour shown by the perpetrator**. The same three reported **significant or some improvement in surveillance, harassment or stalking behaviour by the perpetrator**. Related to this, these three survivors self-assessed as having **significantly improved safety** at the time of move on.

One survivor on move on reported that both controlling behaviour and, more specifically, improvement in surveillance, harassment or stalking behaviour had worsened.

All four of these survivors were still separated (i.e. not reconciled) from the perpetrator on move on.

In interviews, **all four interviewees reported that they had changed their perceptions and understanding of the issues relating to domestic abuse** and felt that it was highly unlikely or unlikely that they would get 'drawn in' to abuse relationships in the future. Three reported the proviso that they knew how easy it was for them to succumb to the triggers that might involve them in abusive relationships, which they linked to a greater awareness of the issues that they had reached through Key Work sessions. These three reported extreme wariness about becoming involved in any future relationship, but that if they did they would **'be looking out for the signs'** of it being potentially abusive.

Financial well-being

Three out of four survivors who have moved on from Rhea reported **significant or some improvement in their financial situation**. Of these, two reported that they were better placed to manage debt and another that they were better placed to manage their finances in general. One reported no change. This data was supported by findings from the interviews. **All of the four survivors interviewed** (still under the Rhea Project at the time) **reported that they felt better able to manage their finances now than before they entered the project**.

Employment, training and education

At this stage, there is little data on this, but this should be improved as further interviews are conducted and with any specific survey aligned with Theory of Change outcomes (see Next Steps below). From the data that is available from Rhea in relation to the those who had moved on from the project, **three out of four survivors who had moved on were able to sustain employment**.

Access and use of other support and external agency involvement

From data that includes survivors still in the project as well as those who had moved on (n=12), ten showed external agency involvement. These agencies included: Children's Services (for 7 survivors); GP (for 6 survivors); Housing (for 4 survivors); Citizens Advice Bureau (for 4 survivors); Education (for 1 survivor).

Outcomes for children

In the interviews to date, **three out of four survivors reported that their understanding of parenting and/or their relationships with their children had improved** with the same three reporting that their **children's emotional welfare had significantly improved**. All attributed this to three main factors: the removal of themselves and their children from the violent, abusive situation; their better understanding of positive parenting strategies; the impact on the children of their own improved mental health. Those who reported these impacts found it difficult to extricate the relative importance of these, but all three said that the quality of **support they had had from the Rhea key worker** had had a significant impact on their own and their children's emotional and psychological wellbeing. They all felt that these were sustainable changes.

Three out of four survivors interviewed felt that their children had other positive outcomes, stemming from improved safety, security and emotional and psychological welfare. These were **improved school attendance and engagement** for two survivors' children and **better behaviour at school** for two survivors' children.

Whilst the project does not provide direct support for children, it does aim to provide basic parenting support as part of the holistic package of support for

the survivor. The findings from these four interviews indicate that positive outcomes for children is a potential spin off from the project.

5.3 Next steps for identifying outcomes

Currently the data collected routinely by Rhea does not totally align with the target outcomes in the Theory of Change. A snapshot survey of impact of all survivors who have been involved in the project, specifically as it relates to the Theory of Change, would also provide useful additional data to inform the evaluation and any considerations of replicability. There is also an opportunity to integrate these additional indicators of impact into Rhea datasets.



6. Key challenges and learning

The emerging learning from the evaluation will be followed up further as the initiation and embedding of project structures is established and it moves into a more stable delivery phase for the next year.

6.1 Structures and systems

The relationship between Southwark Housing and Solace is an essential underpinning of the service. Excellent relationships have been established based on **mutual professional respect**, with the Housing Manager's view being that **Solace 'bring excellence to the relationship'** through their gender-based approach, solution focused and needs led approach. **All professional stakeholders interviewed felt that**

partnership working was now embedded within the operational cultures and so would be sustainable. Having a Solace staff member sited within Southwark Housing has improved the suitability of referrals and assessments. It has also built relationships between partners so that conversations and joint working can happen in a more fluid, relational way. In addition, the risk assessment form used by the Solace staff member who is embedded within the Southwark Housing Team has been tightened up. These two factors together mean that referrals are now more appropriate for the criteria of the service.

However, there are contradictions in the data in relation to this issue. It remains the case that current arrangements with Southwark Housing have been largely driven by the current Housing Manager. In order to achieve consistency and sustainability improvements in the ways in which Southwark Housing assess and respond to survivors' needs, **an understanding of domestic abuse issues and dynamics must be fully embedded across Southwark Housing.** This is particularly relevant to front line staff dealing with individual survivors' cases, but also embedding in strategy and policy, with Senior Management understanding and 'buy-in'. A lot of work has been put into this via training, which is now a rolling contract between Southwark Housing and Solace. There were reports from the former key worker about the **mixed quality of response from Housing Officers**, with reports of patchy although improving practice over the duration of the pilot to date. Whilst there is indication of consistent improvement in Southwark Housing responses to survivors' needs, this is still a work in progress, and will take sustained effort to achieve. The operating model has been adjusted since the beginning of the project and should now be a stable model moving forward. However, there has been a degree of staff turnover and successful delivery will ultimately depend upon the skills and abilities of any new staff being employed, their induction and management. **The next year will then be an opportunity to test the robustness of the model.**

6.2 Staffing and caseloads

A key challenge of the project is the capacity of the key worker role. Rhea Managers and the previous Key Work post holder acknowledge the post should ideally be full-

time, but budget restraints have prohibited this. However, time allocation has been increased during the project lifespan to 0.7 FTE. The travel distance and time between the properties presents a challenge to how much support can be provided in finite hours. However, properties do need to be sufficiently dispersed to allow survivors to be accommodated in safety. In relation to replication, the exact optimum arrangement would vary from area to area and would need to be carefully assessed at a local level.

'Emotional labour' demands on the key worker are high and it is important that the role is supported as effectively as possible to avoid burn out and high turnover. The role is highly relational and involves direct support with survivors who are trying to rebuild their lives from crisis situations. The support provided, therefore, is unlikely to be contained to office hours and 'official' working days of a part-time contract. The previous post holder found herself responding by phone to survivors beyond her working/paid hours. There is an out of office support arrangement but, due to the trust and relationships established, survivors would usually only want to speak to her. The interviews with survivors themselves substantiate this. It is important also that the caseload is balanced. Too high a number of survivors with children open to children's social work, is an unsustainable burden on the key worker's capacity.

6.3 Properties

Security is always a prime consideration for housing for survivors of abuse and there may be constraints around this.

Property maintenance and compliance is the responsibility of Solace and is resource intensive. This has been considerably improved by Solace having recently taken on someone with a specific remit to manage health and safety, repairs, compliance and clean-up between tenants in the properties. Apart from property maintenance, Rhea also have a responsibility to ensure that the survivors and lone workers are safe. Solace has a lone worker policy and staff have to check in and out, which increases costs.



7. Issues regarding replication

As described above in 4. the Rhea operating model is based on the lease by Commonwealth to Solace of high quality and well-maintained properties at below market rate. The difference between this expenditure by Solace and the income received in Housing Benefit enables the employment of a key worker and covers costs of management and support functions. This maximises the cost-effectiveness of the pilot. This, however, is a highly contextual arrangement and availability of below market rate, high quality housing stock (and opportunities for grant funding to cover or subsidise support costs) will differ across areas and contexts. The cost/income analysis appears to show good value of the service, especially if emerging outcomes can be validated in the final evaluation.

There appear to be two main elements of the service that could potentially be considered in future continuation or replication, in order to enhance cost effectiveness. The first is in relation to maximising the time effectiveness of the key worker post. The **allocation of properties that were geographically closer** would reduce travel time for the key worker and therefore potentially maximise benefits from that role (conditionally on this arrangement being safe for survivors). A **job share arrangement** could, in theory, decrease travel time if it was split across two geographical areas. However, the risk is that this negatively impacts on the availability of the Key Work post-holder to survivors.

Provision of smaller properties (flats) would also decrease costs, although an assessment of likely numbers of children in placements would be necessary, to ensure that smaller housing provision could accommodate their needs. The average number of children from survivor data provided to date is two.

Rhea managers have reflected that ideally, as with most pilot projects, it would have been more cost effective for some funding to have been provided upfront in the first year, in order to allow for the organisation to set up systems and relationships. This would have avoided many of the 'teething issues' that needed to be ironed out later, for example, relationship building between Rhea staff and frontline staff at

Southwark Housing. This arrangement, however, does not align with the funding model of this project. If, in any replication of the model, there was the option of finding Local Authority or Charitable Trust funding to ‘**pump prime**’ the project, it appears that this would be of benefit and improve cost effectiveness in the long term.

Both Rhea managers and Southwark Housing representatives felt that the project can and should be replicated. Although it should be instigated by Local Authority Housing Departments, any voluntary sector organisation who runs floating support could potentially deliver the service. It would require a good understanding of the fundamentals in operating a floating support model such as effective risk assessment, support for lone working and the demands around property maintenance as well as the issues relating to Violence Against Women and Girls to be effective. Crucially, though, it also requires strong leadership within the Local Authority Housing Department to drive new ways of working forward in a setting that can often be resistant to change.



8. Recommendations

More data on progress for survivors against the interim and higher level outcomes identified in the Theory of Change process would add significant value to the evaluation. It is recommended that a snapshot survey of all current and ex survivors be undertaken (with the survey form prepared by the evaluators and agreed with the partnership) to complement telephone interviews with survivors. It is further recommended that Rhea consider whether these indicators can be integrated into their ongoing monitoring processes, as this data will be highly significant in establishing the case for continuation, expansion or replication in the future.

This will be actioned by the evaluators with Solace and findings included in the final report.

solace

📍 **Solace** Unit 5-7, Blenheim Court, 62 Brewery Road, London N7 9NY

☎ 0207 619 1350

✉ info@solacewomensaid.org

🌐 solacewomensaid.org

Solace Womens' Aid is a registered charity in England & Wales.
Charity Number 1082450. Company Number 3376716.

commonweal housing
Housing Solutions to Social Injustice

📍 **Commonweal Housing Ltd** Unit 306, The Blackfriars Foundry, London SE1 8EN

☎ 0207 199 8390

✉ info@commonweal.org.uk

🌐 commonwealhousing.org.uk

Commonweal Housing Ltd is a registered charity in England & Wales.
Charity Number 1113331. Company Number 5319765.