



**Evaluation of
Fulfilling Lives:**
Supporting
people with
multiple needs

April 2019
Hayley Lamb
Rachel Moreton
Dr Joanna Welford
Sarah Leonardi
Peter Howe

01

Why we need to invest in multiple needs

This is the first in a series of briefings on multiple needs, drawing on data and insight from the National Lottery Community Fund's Fulfilling Lives: Supporting people with multiple needs programme. Multiple needs are defined as experience of two or more of homelessness, substance misuse, reoffending and mental ill-health. The statistics are based on data from over 600 people who have received help from the Fulfilling Lives programme for roughly a year or more. To show the baseline position we use data from the first three months of beneficiaries' engagement with the programme. This is the best data available to us and provides an indication of people's behaviour before the programme has had time to have an impact. The information in this briefing provides a unique and valuable addition to the evidence base on multiple needs.

Further information, including data sources, can be found in the accompanying methods note. The Fulfilling Lives programme demonstrates how sustained, flexible and person-centred support for people with multiple needs helps to reduce use of negative and crisis services, creating potential cost savings and providing the foundation for a more fulfilled life.

Key messages

- Everyone deserves the opportunity to reach their full potential. The current system is not working for people with multiple needs. Many of their interactions with public services are negative and/or avoidable. Few receive the treatment they need.
- This results in substantial cost to the public purse. When people first join the Fulfilling Lives programme they are each using, on average, over £25,000 in public services per year. Across all Fulfilling Lives beneficiaries this equals over £88.5million.
- In addition, there are serious social and economic impacts, such as homelessness, crime and anti-social behaviour, not to mention the tragic waste of human life and potential. 1 in 20 beneficiaries have died since the start of the programme.
- Fulfilling Lives offers a different approach – involving persistent and ongoing support, free from restrictive timescales and focusing on beneficiaries' priorities.
- Dealing with complex needs takes time and will require a long-term investment.
- Yet after just one year, the evidence suggests that Fulfilling Lives reduces negative behaviours and misdirected demand for services.
- This creates the opportunity to use resources differently; the initial annual reduction in service use is worth at least £2,100 per beneficiary per year. Across all Fulfilling Lives beneficiaries this equals £7.3million per year. This is mainly as a result of reductions in evictions, homelessness and interactions with the criminal justice system.

Multiple needs is a serious problem



58 per cent of beneficiaries were homeless


There is a pressing need for the kind of support provided by Fulfilling Lives. The 2015 report *Hard Edges*¹ estimated there were 58,000 people annually who had contact with homelessness, substance misuse and criminal justice services. Since 2014, Fulfilling Lives, working in just 12 areas of England, has worked with 3,480 people. Partnerships delivering the programme have experienced high levels of demand for their services, with some having to stop taking referrals.

Lack of effective support for people with multiple needs can result in a tragic waste of human life and potential. Since the start of the programme, at least 171 people have died – five per cent of all those who have engaged with the programme. This equates to 49 deaths per 1,000. The crude death rate (not adjusted for age) for the population of England and Wales as a whole in 2016 was nine deaths per 1,000 people.² The average age of people on the Fulfilling Lives programme who died was 43 for men and 39 for women. In the general population, the average age at death is 76 years for men and 81 years for women.³ The youngest person on the programme to die was just 21 years old.

During their first three months with Fulfilling Lives, 58 per cent of beneficiaries were homeless⁴ at least some of the time. 25 per cent experienced rough sleeping.⁵ Almost all join the programme with substance misuse issues and mental health problems. Many also have other complex needs or experience of trauma, including disabilities, long-term health conditions and domestic violence. For further information about the characteristics of people with multiple needs see briefing 2 in this series: *Understanding multiple needs*.

Since the start of the programme, at least 171 people have died – five per cent of all those who have engaged with the programme

The current system is not working



Over 1 in 4 attended A&E at least once

Many interactions with public services are negative and avoidable

Not all people with multiple needs are frequent users of emergency services or are involved with the criminal justice system – but some are, and this kind of avoidable use of public services can be costly.

27 per cent⁶ attended A&E at least once during their first three months with Fulfilling Lives. One person attended as many as 25 times – that's £4,000⁷ in A&E attendances in just three months.

During the first three months with Fulfilling Lives 14 per cent of beneficiaries⁸ were evicted from a tenancy. The average cost of eviction from a tenancy for local authorities is £6,387 per incident.⁹

Yet people with multiple needs are not getting the treatment they need

Almost all those getting help from Fulfilling Lives have a mental health need. Yet few received specialist services during their first three months with Fulfilling Lives. Of those with a mental health need:



21 per cent¹⁰ had any contact with a community mental health team (CMHT)



9 per cent¹¹ received counselling or psychotherapy



9 per cent¹² attended a mental health hospital outpatient appointment

Similarly, most also have a substance misuse problem when they join the programme. Of these, during the first three months:



54 per cent¹³
had contact with drug
and alcohol services




5 per cent¹⁴
spent any time
in detox



1 per cent¹⁵
entered residential
rehabilitation

Fulfilling Lives partnerships describe many reasons why it can be difficult for people to get the help they need. People can fall between thresholds for different services – their needs being too complex for general services but not severe enough for specialist help. Cuts to services mean limited availability of specialist support or that staff lack the time needed to work with people with multiple needs. Some do not have the necessary experience or understanding. Missed appointments, lack of a fixed address and use of alcohol and drugs are all reasons why someone may find themselves excluded from a service. Opening hours are often limited, waiting lists long, bureaucracy cumbersome and inflexible (such as only communicating through letter or telephone) and there is a strong stigma associated with multiple needs.

For further information about the systemic barriers to people accessing services see the other briefings in this series.




Over £25,000
per beneficiary
per year

There is a substantial cost to the public purse

When people first join the Fulfilling Lives programme they are each using, on average, public services costing over £6,370 per quarter – over £25,000 per beneficiary per year. Across all Fulfilling Lives beneficiaries this equals over £88.5 million per year. This is an underestimate as it does not include all types of interactions with public services, such as ambulance call outs or prescription costs, or the cost of delivering support programmes, such as Fulfilling Lives. It is also an average, and some people generate much higher costs. For example, one individual had four Crown Court proceedings in three months – with an estimated cost of £49,820.

The costs of multiple needs affect a wide range of agencies and organisations, including HM Courts and Tribunals Service, HM Prison and Probation Service, local police forces, NHS Trusts and Care Commissioning Groups.

Average annual cost per beneficiary – who pays



To provide some context to these figures we can compare them to public spending on similar services for the population of England generally. In 2017/18 total public spending on public order and safety (including police services, law courts and prisons) was just £441 per person in England. Total expenditure on health was £2,168 per person.¹⁶ This illustrates the disproportionate use of some services by people with multiple needs.



**Over 1 in 4
arrested at
least once**














Lack of effective support also has social and economic impacts

As well as the cost to the state of misdirected demand for public services, there is a societal cost associated with crime and anti-social behaviour. 28 per cent¹⁷ of beneficiaries were arrested at least once during their first three months on the programme – the estimated average cost of arrest is £720 per incident. One person was arrested 11 times. 19 per cent¹⁸ of beneficiaries spent at least one night in police custody and 11 per cent¹⁹ spent time in prison.







15 per cent²⁰ were convicted of at least one offence in the first three months with Fulfilling Lives. The estimated average economic cost generated by this crime (such as increased insurance costs and loss of property) is £200 per beneficiary per year.²¹ The average social cost (based on the physical and emotional impact on direct victims of crime) is £488 per beneficiary per year.







14 per cent of beneficiaries admit to receiving income from begging when they first engage with the Fulfilling Lives programme. 6 per cent say they undertake sex work and 13 per cent get income from other illegal activities.²² The real figures are likely to be higher as beneficiaries may not admit to these activities, particularly in the early stages of working with the programme.

Average quarterly interactions with different services

	Average cost per beneficiary per quarter	Proportion who experienced interaction	Average interaction per beneficiary	Range of interactions	Cost of maximum interaction
Crown court proceedings	 £788	5%	0.1	0–4	£49,820
Nights in prison	 £394	11%	4.1	0–92	£8,740
Magistrates court proceedings	 £237	21%	0.3	0–5	£3,985
Average cost per beneficiary per quarter to Ministry of Justice		£1,419			
Arrests	 £351	28%	0.5	0–11	£7,920
Police cautions	 £41	8%	0.1	0–6	£2,076
Nights in police custody	 £37	19%	0.4	0–48	£4,560
Average cost per beneficiary per quarter to Home Office		£429			
Mental health service inpatient attendances	 £525	6%	1.4	0–92	£34,224
Inpatient episodes	 £255	16%	0.4	0–21	£13,146
Face to face contacts with CMHT	 £177	20%	0.9	0–40	£7,920
Presentations at A&E	 £121	27%	0.8	0–25	£4,000
Outpatient appointments	 £51	17%	0.4	0–15	£2,010
Mental health service outpatient attendances	 £35	8%	0.2	0–12	£1,932
Counselling or psychotherapy sessions	 £28	9%	0.4	0–79	£5,135
Average cost per beneficiary per quarter to Department for Health and Social Care		£1,192			

01 Why we need to invest in multiple needs

	Average cost per beneficiary per quarter	Proportion who experienced interaction	Average interaction per beneficiary	Range of interactions	Cost of maximum interaction
Evictions from a tenancy	 £1,037	14%	0.2	0–4	£25,548
Face to face contact with drug and alcohol services	 £371	52%	3.0	0–40	£4,920
Nights rough sleeping	 £295	25%	12.4	0–90	£2,143
Nights in temporary accommodation	 £254	25%	15.1	0–90	£1,517
Days in in-patient detox	 £66	4%	0.4	0–34	£5,338
Weeks in residential rehabilitation	 £45	1%	0.1	0–13	£9,087
Average cost per beneficiary per quarter to local authorities		£2,068			

	Average value of benefits per beneficiary per quarter	Proportion receiving benefit
Employment Support Allowance	 £704	74%
Housing benefit	 £450	47%
Jobseekers Allowance	 £38	4%
Incapacity benefit	 £36	3%
Income Support	 £19	2%
Universal Credit	 £8	1%
Funded by Department for Work and Pensions		£1,256

**Fulfilling Lives
partnerships take
a personalised
approach, working
alongside mainstream
services to better
coordinate the
support that
people receive**

Fulfilling Lives does things differently

Fulfilling Lives partnerships take a personalised approach, working alongside mainstream services to better coordinate the support that people receive. As well as providing support they aim to change the way that other services and the wider systems work to help people with multiple needs. We know the following features make a difference to beneficiaries.

- **Persistent and ongoing support** is essential for engaging chronically excluded people. Staff don't give up on beneficiaries or close the case if someone misses appointments.
- Complex and entrenched needs take time to address. Fulfilling Lives partnerships are **free from the time-limits** that restrict some other commissioned services.
- The long-term approach, coupled with **small case-loads** for workers, means they can **build personal relationships based on trust** with beneficiaries. This is a key ingredient in providing effective support.
- Partnerships work to provide **holistic support** and **focus on beneficiaries' priorities**, rather than working to externally set targets.



Fewer arrests, cautions, convictions, visits to A&E and evictions



**Rough sleeping
down from
25 per cent
to 14 per cent**

Change takes time, but is possible

Lack of accessible and coordinated services for people with multiple needs means they often turn to emergency and crisis services.²³ The help people get from Fulfilling Lives appears to change things. Overall, after nearly a year with the programme people have fewer negative interactions with public services. On average, there are fewer arrests,¹⁷ police cautions,²⁴ convictions,²⁰ presentations at A&E⁶ and evictions from tenancies.⁸

Supporting people to access safe and stable accommodation can help to reduce use of crisis and emergency services and contact with the criminal justice system.²⁵ There is a reduction in rough sleeping, down from 25 per cent to 14 per cent. Fewer people spend time in temporary accommodation (such as hostels), down from 25 per cent to 17 per cent. More people are living in supported accommodation or their own tenancy.⁵

Securing the correct benefits for people is an essential element of addressing multiple needs and lack of income is a risk factor for petty acquisitive crime (such as theft) and begging.²⁶ 84 per cent were in receipt of some form of welfare benefit during their first three months with Fulfilling Lives. This increases to 90 per cent after approximately a year with the programme.²⁷

Other evidence also shows similar patterns, with reductions in the use of crisis and negative services such as A&E and interactions with the criminal justice system.²⁸

There are no significant changes in the levels of use of other, more therapeutic or treatment services. This highlights the need for wider systemic change to make services more accessible to those who need them. There is also a need to continue to work with people over the long-term.

For more information about the achievements of the Fulfilling Lives programme, see the final briefing in this series: What the Fulfilling Lives programme has achieved.

This creates the potential to use resources differently

The initial reduction in use of public services described above is worth £539 per person per quarter, equivalent to over £2,000 per year. This includes the average increase in welfare benefits. Across all Fulfilling Lives beneficiaries this equals over £7.5million per year.

Average value of reduced service use per beneficiary per quarter

Presentations at A&E	-£36
Arrests	-£96
Police cautions	-£17
Eviction	-£362
Rough sleeping	-£151
Temporary accommodation	-£79
Total	-£740

Average value of increase in benefits per beneficiary per quarter

ESA	+£60
Housing benefit	+£90
Incapacity benefit	+£24
Income support	+£6
Universal Credit	+£19
Total	+£201

£2,156 total value of reduced service use per beneficiary per year

We estimate that approximately £906 of the reduction in service use per beneficiary could be converted to reduced expenditure (cashable savings) in the short term, increasing to £1,654 per beneficiary per year in the longer term.²⁹ This would benefit local authorities, the NHS and local police forces.

In this briefing we have only shown reductions in public service use over the short-term (peoples' first 12 months on the programme). The long-term nature of the Fulfilling Lives programme and evaluation allow the opportunity for longer term savings to be explored in future.

**After nearly
a year with the
programme people
have fewer arrests,
police cautions,
convictions, A&E
visits and evictions**

Further information about Fulfilling Lives

The National Lottery Community Fund has invested £112 million over 8 years in local partnerships in 12 areas across England, helping people with multiple needs access more joined-up services tailored to their needs. The programme aims to change lives, change systems and involve beneficiaries. The programme is not a preventative programme, but instead aims to better support those with entrenched needs who are not otherwise engaging with services. The programme uses coproduction to put people with lived experience in the lead and builds on their assets to end the revolving door of disjointed care for adults. The programme also has a strong focus on systems change, so that these new ways of working can become sustainable.

For more information about the Fulfilling Lives programme visit tnlcommunityfund.org.uk or contact laura.furness@tnlcommunityfund.org.uk

For more information on the evaluation of Fulfilling Lives, including local partnership evaluations, visit www.mcnevaluation.co.uk or contact rachel.moreton@cfef.org.uk

References

1. Bramley, G. and Fitzpatrick, S. (2015) *Hard Edges: Mapping severe and multiple disadvantage* Lankelly Chase Foundation.
2. Hawkins, O. (2018) *Mortality in the UK*. House of Commons Library Briefing Paper number CBP8281.
3. ONS (2018) *Deaths of Homeless People in England and Wales: 2013 to 2017* [Online](#) Accessed 14 January 2019.
4. We define homeless here as either rough sleeping, in temporary accommodation (such as a hostel or bed and breakfast) or staying temporarily with friends and family (sofa surfing).
5. Accommodation n=1,197
6. Presentations at A&E n=678
7. See the accompanying methods notes for details of unit costs used in this briefing.
8. Evictions n=776
9. See the accompanying methods notes for details of unit costs used in this briefing.
10. Face to face contact with CMHT and mental health need n=660
11. Counselling or psychotherapy sessions and mental health need n=654
12. Mental health hospital outpatient appointment and mental health need n=639
13. Contact with drug and alcohol service and substance misuse need n=683
14. Days in detox and substance misuse need n=679
15. Weeks in residential rehab and substance misuse need n=681
16. HM Treasury (2018) *Country and regional analysis November 2018* HM Treasury.
17. Arrests n=701
18. Nights in police custody n=640
19. Nights in prison n=690
20. Conviction n=653
21. This is based on the estimated average economic costs across all types of crime. See the accompanying methods notes for further information.
22. Income from unsafe and illegal source n = 767
23. Diamond, A. Adamson, J. Moreton, R. et al (2013) *Multiple and complex needs: a Rapid Evidence Assessment*. CFE Research.
24. Police cautions n=657
25. Pleave, N. and Quilgars, D. (2017) *The Inspiring Change Manchester Housing First Pilot: Interim Report* University of York.
26. Pollard, N and Rice, B (2018). *A model of Specialist Welfare Advice and Advocacy at VOICES*. Independent Evaluation Report, July 2018.
27. Receipt of welfare benefits n=884
28. Moreton, R. Welford, J. Mulla, I. and Robinson, S. (2018). *Promising Practice: Key findings from local evaluations to date*. CFE Research.
29. See the accompanying methods note for details of how cashable savings were estimated.

Evaluated by



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

