

Withdrawn

This publication is withdrawn.

This publication is no longer current.

Universal Credit

Local Support Services
Expression of Interest
Trialling Prospectus

Contents

Introduction	3
Section 1: Background.....	3
Section 2: Objectives and aims	4
Section 3: Eligibility and selection of trials	5
Section 4: Content and focus of the trials.....	6
Section 5: Evaluation of the trials.....	9
Section 6: Funding and resource.....	10
Section 7: Working with other partners	11
Section 8: Governance, support and reporting	11
Section 9: Next steps and EOI event.....	12
Annex A: What LSSF robust trials will cover	13
Annex B: Overview of learning strands.....	21
Annex C: Expression of Interest template	22
Annex D: Expression of Interest Assessment Process and Criteria.....	29
Annex E: Universal Credit success criteria for LSSF	33
Annex F: Good Practice Example developed from LA led pilots.....	35

Introduction

1. This document is for you if:
 - you work for DWP Jobcentre Plus or a Local Authority (LA) where Universal Credit (UC) has not currently gone live and will not do so during the 12 month trialling period, and are keen to trial many of the elements of LSS set out in **Annex A**;
 - your DWP/LA partnership can commit to supporting a trial for 12 months;
 - your DWP/LA partnership would be interested in attending an Expression of Interest (EOI) event to further develop your trialling proposals and may subsequently submit the EOI to trial template by close of play **13 June 2014**;
 - you are not sure if your DWP/LA partnership would like to be involved in robust trialling of LSSF but are keen to find out more; or
 - your partnership does not intend to get involved in robustly trialling Local Support Services Framework (LSSF) over the next 12 months but you would like to know more about the approach in order to inform your own partnership activities.

Section 1: Background

2. The LSSF is the product of joint working between DWP and Local Authority Associations (LAAs) to develop an approach that ensures those who need support to make and manage a UC claim receive it. This support is tailored to the needs of the local population and is delivered in partnership between DWP Jobcentre Plus and LAs.
3. The first Framework was published in February 2013 and an Update and Trialling Plan in December 2013. The Trialling Plan recognises the opportunities created by the re-set of UC, to trial elements and learn more about local support services ahead of full UC roll-out. This learning will inform the final iteration of the Framework and decisions about funding for local support services in the outline UC business case in 2015 and full UC business case.
4. There are 4 key strands of learning that will contribute to the development of LSSF principles over the next 12-18 months – not just trialling. In summary they are:
 - 1) **Robust trialling sites** – a small number of sites selected following an EOI process (template attached at **Annex C**), testing a number of LSSF elements. Thorough outputs will inform the final version of LSSF, UC business case and the DWP UC Test and Learn Programme. **This strand is the main focus of this prospectus** and will be subject to independent, externally commissioned evaluation.

- 2) **Informal trialling sites** – sites that are independently trialling elements, or an element, of LSSF principles but there is no cap on the number of these sites and evaluation resource is not provided. Sites are not selected via the EOI process and capturing learning/evaluation is the responsibility of the partnership.
- 3) **Live UC service sites** – an opportunity to learn about local support services in a live UC environment.
- 4) **Ongoing partnership development** – work across all partnerships, including those involved in trialling, to further their preparations for UC roll out.
5. **Annex B** also provides some further information on these strands.
6. This document sets out how partnerships can get involved in the robust trialling of LSSF principles (strand 1). Information on the other strands will be provided through ongoing communications to Jobcentre Plus Districts and LAs; we are keen for all partnerships to undertake activity to prepare for UC roll out.
7. It is strongly recommended that you read this document in conjunction with:
 - LSSF https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/181395/uc-local-service-support-framework.pdf
 - LSSF Update and Trialling Plan https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/263490/universal-credit-local-support-services-update-trialling-plan.pdf

Section 2: Objectives and aims

8. The results of LSSF trialling activity will enable early evaluation of local support services principles as to how we can best support those who need additional help to make and manage a claim to UC, and inform future Framework development.
9. LSSF is a core part of the UC Test and Learn approach. This brings together work across DWP to provide learning on a number of UC related services and activities, with a focus on providing robust evidence to support future strategic and funding decisions. This strand of LSSF trialling is therefore focused on ensuring thorough findings to feed in to this programme of work.

Section 3: Eligibility and selection of trials

10. We intend to select around 6 partnerships to trial local support services alongside a clear package of learning from informal trialling sites and live service sites in addition.
11. We intend to run at least 1 trial in Scotland and 1 in Wales. There may be more trials in either location if this presents an opportunity to maximise learning and a depth of experiences. Our assessment criteria will take into consideration the geography (i.e. urban/rural) and demographics of the partnerships involved to maximise the learning from the trials.
12. The EOI **must be jointly submitted by the Jobcentre Plus and LA partnership** – we will not accept templates from only one lead partner, or a lead partner and another support service provider.
13. Partnerships that are already involved in other trialling activity are encouraged to submit an EOI. We are interested to hear from those involved in additional initiatives which may be relevant to LSS, such as the Troubled Families programme, Strategic Skills Pipeline (Scotland) or those accessing wider funding streams which may be used to support LSSF activity, such as the European Social Fund (England) and the Flexible Support Fund. There is space to tell us about this on the EOI template so that we can understand more about what this means for your LSSF trial. We will need to ensure we will be able to capture clear findings in relation to LSSF specifically.
14. We expect that partnerships involved in other related trialling activity would be in a position to develop effective baseline information to support a thorough evaluation of their LSSF trial.
15. We are keen to gather learning from live UC service sites and will continue to work with them in further elaborating our findings. However, this will be through a separate strand of learning (**Annex B**). Engagement will therefore not be through the EOI process and live service sites will not be selected for this strand of trialling.
16. Interested partnerships should submit their completed EOI to the LSSF inbox (LSS.FrameworkTeam@dwp.gsi.gov.uk) following the EOI event. EOIs must be submitted no later than close of play **13 June 2014**. Returns received after this date will not be considered.
17. Decisions will be made on the final robust trialling sites following an accountable process, against the criteria attached at **Annex D**. EOIs will be assessed by a representative panel of DWP, LAAs and others. Decisions will be communicated week commencing 30 June 2014.
18. Selection will be based on the written EOI only and therefore the more comprehensive and evidenced submissions are more likely to be successful.
19. The sites that have been selected will then begin their preparation activity and baseline evaluation will take place. Sites must be able to commit to mobilising their trial quickly – this is one of the assessment criteria of the EOIs – and by the start of September 2014 at the latest.

Section 4: Content and focus of the trials

20. We want to show that investment in local services to support those who need it, helps transform lives and is value for money by:
 - improving financial responsibility – leading to more people being able to manage the standard monthly payment;
 - improving digital inclusion – both in moving claimants closer to work and as an enabler to manage their relationship with UC digitally; and
 - bringing people closer to work.
 21. We want to test the inputs that will help us achieve this:
 - The design of 3 key ‘services’ – triage, Personal Budgeting Support (PBS) and digital inclusion.
 - Partnership, data sharing and finance models in support of the delivery of the key services – including the processes of governance and decision making around these.
 22. Trialling will also allow us to further develop key assumptions about volumes and unit costs to refine our understanding of the cost to provide local support services.
 23. All partnerships will be required to have partnership working in place as the foundation of their trial, so we can learn more about how lead partners effectively work together to deliver local support services. Partnerships must also outline their plans for safe data sharing as one of the key eligibility criteria (**Annex D**).
 24. Beyond this, we intend to trial two different finance models and various approaches to triage, digital inclusion and financial inclusion services. When considering the design of these services, partnerships should consider a number of questions that we are looking for the trials to answer. These are set out in the table at **Annex A**.
 25. In order to provide sufficient coverage of all LSSF elements and where it is required to ensure robust evaluation can take place, we may ask partnerships to adapt or refine certain elements of their trial. This does not mean, however, that we have prescribed service models that we wish to see tested.
 26. Partnerships do not have to trial all the elements set out in **Annex A**. However, in order for the trial to represent how LSS is likely to work at full UC roll out and provide a sufficient coverage of learning we will be looking for EOIs that cover at least two of the key ‘services’ (triage, PBS and digital inclusion). **Annex A** sets out the minimum number of examples we expect to trial, looking across the whole group of partnerships involved.
- ### Trialling triage
27. Partnerships can choose how triage will work across their organisations provided that the approach will ensure learning in response to the key questions set out in **Annex A**.

28. **Annex F** sets out an example of good practice developed from the LA led-pilots which shows how a triage process may filter complex and vulnerable claimants to the right support.

Trialling digital inclusion and Personal Budgeting Support

29. It is for partnerships to decide what service they will provide to improve the digital and financial skills of claimants. Examples of good practice which partnerships may wish to build on are provided in the Update and Trialling Plan. However, partnerships must be able to gather evidence that will provide answers to the questions set out in **Annex A**.

Trialling partnership working

30. **Annex A** sets out the aspects of partnership working that will be included within the trials, including different models that may be used, accessing funding sources, assessing and mapping services, data sharing and co-location.
31. There is robust and compelling evidence regarding the effectiveness of co-location in delivering welfare reform and supporting vulnerable households, a key insight derived from the LA-led Pilots. We wish to explore co-location as best practice for future partnerships, recognising this requires creative local organisation of estates, data and available provision to serve mutual interests. We welcome EOIs that explore co-location as a core design feature of local partnerships and the proposed trial.

32. The LA-led pilots and wider partnership experiences demonstrate the innovative ways in which co-location can be implemented and exploited, from libraries to Jobcentre and LA hubs, exploiting key features for the delivery of local triage and coordinated services. Co-location can help identify the holistic view of household support needs, enabling effective early intervention to deliver better outcomes – which we are keen to evaluate precisely – including the efficiency of such arrangements, from estate savings to back-end processing. We appreciate, given current legislation, data sharing agreements will need to be agreed locally as we leverage learning and best-practice to advise Ministers on the strategic data sharing solution necessary longer-term.

Trialling the finance models

33. DWP may provide limited funding for services to enable trialling partnerships to see how the finance models support local support services delivery. Partnerships should set out in their EOI if they require additional funding to provide the service.
34. There are two models that will be tested – the guaranteed/activity/outcome model and a block funding model. More detail on these models can be found in the Update and Trialling Plan.

35. In both models funding will be managed by the partnership, who will work together to decide how the funding should be spent. Funding will be held by the DWP District Manager. However, unlike in the guaranteed/ activity/outcome model, in the block funding model an overall amount will be determined for the provision of the service which is not dependent on the outcomes of that service.
37. These claimants may have different vulnerabilities or complex needs but should represent the types of claimants who are likely to need local support services as UC rolls out. They may include claimants receiving any of the existing benefits that will be brought together as part of Universal Credit.²

Trial size

36. In order to gather as much reliable and valid evidence as we can from the trials we are ideally looking for each partnership to cover around 2000 claimants as part of its trial.¹
38. We will not rule out trials that intend to cover less than this figure but it will be an important consideration in the selection of partnerships.

¹ This will provide statistically significant findings, not only for all claimants but also to allow detailed analysis by sub-group e.g. vulnerability or particular demographic groups.

² Income-based Jobseeker's Allowance, income-related Employment and Support Allowance, Income Support, Child Tax Credits, Working Tax Credits, Housing Benefit.

Section 5: Evaluation of the trials

Evaluation resource

39. We propose to undertake independent monitoring and evaluation to assess the trials. Independent external research contractors from the Economic and Social Research Framework will be appointed to carry out the evaluation, and assist in developing an appropriate research design. The external evaluator will support partnerships to provide evidence on how successfully each trial has delivered its objectives. This will be funded by DWP.
40. The evaluation will cover the range of partnerships in six local authority areas across England, Scotland and Wales. The evaluation will make use of bespoke surveys and analysis, administrative data and secondary data sources and explore the experience of claimants, Jobcentre Plus staff, local authority staff (e.g. benefits, housing and social services, other landlords/housing managers and advisors) and develop key assumptions about volumes and unit costs to refine our understanding of the cost to provide local support services.
41. We expect the monitoring and evaluation to be undertaken over a twelve month period from September 2014, with preparatory work taking place during July and August.

Partnership commitment to evaluation

42. To ensure rigorous evaluation of their delivery and outcomes, partnerships will be required to co-operate fully with the externally commissioned evaluation as a condition of being accepted. Partnerships will be expected to work towards an initial 6 month evaluation point – around February/March 2015 – to inform learning about local support services in good time. This will provide learning on the trials so far and feed into the next LSSF publication, UC outline business case and future full UC full business case.
43. Following this 6 month checkpoint, the next major milestone for evaluation will be at 12 months in September 2015, to inform a final version of the LSSF. Trials must therefore run for 12 months.
44. Partnerships will be expected, as a minimum requirement, to provide 6 monthly reports of learning with light touch review points every other month. Partnerships may choose to continue with the elements they have put in place after the formal trialling period is complete, and evaluation activity may take place beyond this date, but this is not mandatory and funding for this will not be provided as part of the trial.

45. Effective evaluation is crucial to developing the learning we need from trialling LSSF principles. Having the right data to allow this evaluation is critical and partnerships must be able to support this activity. As part of the proposal, partnerships should set out how they will monitor and measure their trial in support of this, setting out initial thoughts in the EOI.
46. It is recognised that some elements of the trial are less easily evaluated through quantitative methods. Partnership working is recognised as the foundation to ultimately deliver services to claimants who need help but is challenging to evaluate precisely. Partnerships should therefore ensure that as well as providing learning about partnership working, there is a real focus on delivering meaningful outcomes (**Annex A**) about the services provided.
47. We are interested to hear from partnerships as to where they may be able to provide a control group and use random sampling to determine a population for the trial, to strengthen findings about the impact of the services offered to claimants. Control groups and random sampling will not be mandated but these assessment criteria will play an important part in the selection of sites for trialling.
48. As the trials are seeking to show the benefits of the provision of these services, a control group provides a comparator. However, support required by statute for claimants in the control group should not be removed to ensure that no claimant is at risk as a result of being in this group.

Section 6: Funding and resource

49. To support this activity DWP will provide funding for reasonable administration costs and if required, funding for a project manager for the duration of the trial. It will be for the partnership to decide where this project manager is based (i.e. employed by either the LA or Jobcentre Plus) however they must work closely with both partners and the evaluation team. They will be responsible for ensuring the trial runs effectively and that the MI the evaluation team needs will be made available.
50. Funding may also be provided to enable the finance models to be tested and for the provision of new services as part of the trial. The partnership should set out in their EOI the amount of funding they require, why this cannot be funded through existing resource and which finance model they intend to trial (**see Annex A**).
51. Partners are asked to provide examples of benefits or efficiencies, either in terms of financial or human resource, they anticipate realising as a result of trialling and partnership working. We appreciate that there may be varying degrees of certainty and detail which partnerships will be able to provide. Partnerships will need to provide evidence on subsequent delivery of these efficiencies/benefits during the lifetime of the trial.

Section 7: Working with other partners

52. Although EOIs must be submitted by DWP/LA lead partners, we are keen for trials to involve many other local support service providers, to build further evidence as to how local support services may work in future and this will be taken into account when assessing EOIs.
53. The EOI template asks partnerships to set out examples of previous effective partnership working as well as partnerships you plan to set up.
54. Partnerships must detail how they intend to work with other organisations in their EOI and are required to attach a letter of endorsement from each of those organisations to the completed EOI. Failure to do so will result in the EOI not being evaluated. This is to ensure that trials are only agreed where all key partners in the proposal are supportive of the planned approach.

Section 8: Governance, support and reporting

55. As previously noted, DWP will provide a set amount of funding, if required, to support a project manager role within each partnership to support the trialling. It is for the partnership to determine who the project manager is employed by.
56. Partnerships will also be supported more generally by an LSSF Relationship Manager. Each DWP Work Services Directorate (7 in total across Great Britain) will have a Relationship Manager responsible for supporting the progress of LSSF partnership development. Their remit will be wider than supporting individual trialling sites but will provide a link between the central LSSF programme of work and partnerships in their locality.
57. Externally commissioned evaluation will feed into the current DWP UC governance structure. Partnerships will be required to co-operate fully with external evaluators who will co-ordinate the overall evaluation effort. Any central evaluation reports will have to be agreed by DWP Ministers (in line with usual research protocols).

Section 9: Next steps and EOI event

58. If your partnership plans to submit an EOI to trial local support services, you are encouraged to attend the EOI event, details of which will be provided at the webinar.
59. In order to get the most out of the event, we ask you to attend in partnership and bring with you a completed draft of the EOI template for your trial. There will be an opportunity to ask questions and work together to further develop and finalise your plans before submitting your EOI; we strongly advise that partnerships do not wait until after the event before they begin to develop their proposals.
60. If you plan to attend the event, please email the LSSF inbox (LSS.FrameworkTeam@dwp.gsi.gov.uk), including the names of representatives from both DWP and LA. Places at the event are limited; until final numbers are confirmed we are unable to accommodate more than 2 attendees per partnership at this time.
61. Completed EOIs should be returned to the LSSF inbox no later than close of play **13 June 2014**. EOIs submitted after this date will not be considered.
62. If your partnership will not be submitting an EOI but is interested in being involved in sharing learning to contribute to one of the other strands, particularly the informal trialling strand, please contact the LSSF inbox. We are exploring ways to share good practice between partnerships on a regular basis, not just on publication of the final LSSF.
63. If you have any questions about trialling LSSF principles that have not been answered by the webinar, please contact the LSSF inbox.

Annex A: What LSSF robust trials will cover

A summary of what the LSSF robust trials will cover to provide learning on how we can best support those who need help make and manage a UC claim

Note – EOIs should cover a number of different elements of the following table. All EOIs should cover a model for partnership working, data sharing and a focus on moving claimants closer towards work in the services they provide. All other aspects of trialling are open to local partnership development e.g. you may trial PBS but choose not to trial digital inclusion. However we will be seeking sufficient coverage of all elements across the trialling sites to provide a comprehensive overall picture and therefore encourage proposals that cover at least 2 of triage, PBS or digital inclusion.

Service Delivery: Triage

What we will trial and/or further develop	What the trial will establish and what outcomes we want to test	Coverage in robust trialling
<p>Which approaches to triage provide a good service for the claimant whilst understanding the costs associated with the approach? Different approaches to triage may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • triage provided from a ‘hub’ or one-stop-shop; • telephone triage; or • triage provided by providers other than the lead partners. 	<p>The most effective methods of identifying claimant needs through triage and subsequently signposting them to the right services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to best identify the claimant’s needs and at the most appropriate point – considering both initial contact and providing triage again if there is a change of circumstances. • The level of resource required for different models of triage. • What the role of other service providers should be in the process. 	<p>Optional – but require triage to be trialled in at least 5 sites.</p>

	<p>Desired outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Better service for claimant and reduced cost/resource for partnership as there are less repeat contacts and claimant is more quickly provided with support:<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Triage of claimant identifies all needs at current time.o Claimant is signposted/warm hand off given to all the required services needed to support.o Claimants are signposted to the support they need within a reasonable time period.• Claimants that do not need local support services self-serve, and do not present for support unless there is a change of circumstances.• A change of circumstances does not result in a crisis point (e.g. rent arrears/debts/sanctions) i.e. triage model enables support for claimant after their first contact.• Staff are trained and able to provide triage which enables desired outcomes above.• Data shared between organisations to enable warm handover.	
--	--	--

Service Delivery: Digital inclusion – online access and digital support		
What we will trial and/or further develop	What the trial will establish and what outcomes we want to test	Coverage in robust trialling
<p>Different methods of providing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • online access; and • digital support. <p>to enable the claimant to make and manage their claim online. Approaches may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • peer support; • identifying opportunities for claimants to buy their own IT equipment at a lower cost; • how to maximise the use of Internet Access Devices (IADs) in Jobcentre Plus; and • increasing wifi access. 	<p>Which approaches are the most effective in getting claimants with little or no digital skills/access to make and manage their claim (or activity similar to claiming benefit) online, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how much resource is required initially vs. how much repeat support is required to manage their claim; and • what represents the most value for money. <p>Did the support given lead to more claimants accessing services (comparative to claiming UC) online? What savings were produced as a result of this channel shift? Desired outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More claims (or other self-serve activity similar to making a claim) are made online. • The cost to the partnership of providing service is reduced by increasing use of digital/IT as a channel. • The cost to the partnership of providing IT support is reduced over time. • Claimant has improved IT skills which enable them to make a claim online (and demonstrates move closer towards work). • Claimant has improved IT skills which enable them to manage a claim online (and demonstrates move closer towards work). • Claimant is able to access the IT they need to make and manage a claim online. 	<p>Optional – but digital inclusion to be trialled in at least 5 sites.</p>

Service Delivery: Financial inclusion and Personal Budgeting Support		
What we will trial and/or further develop	What the trial will establish and what outcomes we want to test	Coverage in robust trialling
<p>Different approaches to encourage take up of support and providing the support that meets individual’s needs at that time.</p> <p>Different channels and approaches to delivering PBS, which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • face-to-face; • telephone; and • group support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to best identify when individuals need support. • How to best get take up of support. • Which channels are most effective at delivering PBS. • How partnerships can ensure claimants’ needs are met within set/reasonable boundaries. <p>Desired outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claimant less likely to require Alternative Payment Arrangements when UC rolls out. • Claimants able to independently manage their money (without arrears/debts) (moving them closer to work). • Claimants have the right financial products to be financially independent e.g. bank account, Direct Debit (moving them closer to work). • Partnership able to identify claimants that need PBS/ financial inclusion support. • Claimants identified as requiring support take up the support offered to them. 	<p>Optional – but financial inclusion/PBS must be trialled in at least 5 sites.</p>

Partnership working Providing the foundation for delivery of the services set out above.		
What we will trial and/or further develop	What the trial will establish and what outcomes we want to test	Coverage in robust trialling
<p>Delivering services through different models of partnership working, for example, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWP District working with County Councils in England (on behalf of a range of other Councils); • small number of combined LAs working in partnership with 1 or more DWP District; and • single DWP District and single LA working in partnership. 	<p>Building on the experience and best practice of the Direct Payment Demonstration Project (DPDP) and the LA led pilots, the challenges and best practice of different partnership models in delivering LSS, so we understand more about what works and what doesn't for future partnerships in LSS roll-out, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting all levels of those involved in partnership signed up to a common goal and understanding of what is required and to efficient governance arrangements (with moving the claimant closer to work in mind). • How to best work with a range of local support service providers, not just those in the partnership. • Most effective and efficient governance arrangements. • Escalation processes where decisions cannot be reached by the partnership. • Admin costs of the partnership and what Management Information (MI) is needed to support the partnership. • What provides the best foundation for providing LSSF and a joined up service for claimants. <p>Desired outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership is agreed on common goal of moving claimants closer to work. • Partnership model delivers necessary service provision for claimants and does not create unnecessary additional resource pressures. • Partnership model has clear decision making processes in place. 	<p>Required – All sites must trial a model of partnership working – the focus will be new aspects of partnership working, building on existing learning about partnerships. We will be seeking trials covering the 3 examples given as a minimum. There may be more than one trial using each model to enable comparisons e.g. success of a single DWP District and single LA in a rural area versus an urban area.</p>

<p>How partnerships identify and access possible funding sources to support LSSF work.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best way to map funding already in place. • The most effective techniques for identifying current or future funding sources e.g. ESF in England and avoiding double funding. • How to make joint decision making an effective means of deploying resources where they are most needed. <p>Desired outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership has accessed all funding available to support LSSF. • Partnership has an accurate map of the funding already being received. • Partnership is using existing funding streams in a new way to support LSSF wherever possible. 	<p>Optional – but require at least 5 sites to trial this.</p>
<p>Different approaches to how partnerships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assess local needs; • map services; and • identify gaps. 	<p>Building on the experience and best practice of the DPDPs and LA led pilots to assess, monitor and refresh mapping of local needs and services, including for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the level of resource involved in undertaking the exercise vs. the accuracy/detail of the outputs. • How easy it would be to repeat the exercise on a regular basis to ensure information is up to date. <p>Desired outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership has an accurate picture of their locality enabling planning to commission/engage the right delivery partners and improve service for claimants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Partnership has identified and resolved any gaps in service provision. o Partnership provides the right level of service provision (does not over/under commission). 	<p>Optional – but require at least 5 sites to trial this.</p>

<p>Data sharing between the partnership and where possible, to provide a joined up services, involve other service providers and share as much as possible electronically.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What information needs to be shared between organisations in order to effectively implement LSSF. • Legal gateways required to ensure effective LSSF delivery. • How to overcome any issues around data sharing and how to do this in a low resource, digital way wherever possible. <p>Desired outcomes (first 2 are longer term outcomes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warm hand offs enabled between service providers. • Data sharing enabled by technology between service providers to minimise resource. • Robust, legal ways to share data within current legislation identified. • Options for future approaches identified. 	<p>Required – extent to which partnership implements innovative approaches to data sharing is flexible.</p>
<p>Co-location – exploring different ways in which co-location can be implemented and exploited.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploring different approaches to co-location, including for the delivery of front end services such as triage where it can help identify a holistic view of support needs, through to back end processing “joint teams” which can be more efficient and joined up as well as helping overcome with some of the traditional data sharing issues. <p>Desired outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding as to whether model of co-location used supports partnership working including the efficiency of arrangements e.g. estate savings, back-end processing. • Enables effective early intervention to deliver coherent claimant journey/effective support to claimant. 	<p>Optional – though would like a variety of examples of co-location across a number of the bids.</p>

Finance models		
What we will trial and/or further develop	What the trial will establish and what outcomes we want to test	Coverage in robust trialling
<p>Providing funding to allow partnerships to test out different financial models:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘outcome’, ‘activity’ and ‘guaranteed’ approach. • Block funding. 	<p>How partnerships best work together to determine the use of funding, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The best way to reach agreement within the partnership to develop the approach. • The percentage split of elements of the guaranteed, activity, outcome model. <p>The ‘logistics’ of operating the model, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admin costs of operating the model. • The MI needed. • Ease of gathering data to support the use of the model <p>Desired outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volumes to support the finance models enable accurate funding. • Partnership is able to use the finance model without significant administration/resource costs. 	<p>Optional – but the 2 models must be trialled at least twice for comparison (therefore at least 4 partnerships required to test a finance model).</p>

Annex B: Overview of learning strands

Learning Strand no.	Description of Learning Strand
1 – Robust trialling sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A small number (around 6) of volunteer sites to ‘shadow’ test LSSF approach and principles. • Identified through EOI bid process, with support targeted to those who are interested in applying. • Each bid must meet all the mandatory assessment criteria and should aim to deliver at least two of the three key ‘services’; triage, PBS and digital inclusion/access, underpinned by one of the financial models proposed, to ensure sufficient coverage of all elements across the trialling sites to provide a comprehensive overall picture. • All bids should cover a model for wider partnership working, data sharing and a focus on moving claimants closer towards work in the services they provide with particular emphasis on claimants with complex needs. • Sites must be prepared to produce robust evaluation outcomes to feed into UC Business Case and final LSSF Framework (evaluation funded by DWP). • Live UC sites will not form part of this element of the trialling.
2 – Informal trialling sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger number of volunteer sites undertaking their own trialling – no limit, no EOI. • Light touch approach – not ‘robust’ trialling and no allocated evaluation resource. • Keen to capture learning – sites are encouraged to identify themselves and share what they are doing so we can share good practice via access to a restricted on-line resource.
3 – Live UC service LSSF sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live UC sites including NW expansion. • UC expansion provides a unique opportunity to learn more about LSSF approach in a live environment – ‘non-standard’ volumes will be low until claimant scope expands therefore initially we will apply a light touch LSSF approach to ensure continued safe delivery of UC. • Keen to capture learning from creative partnership proposals for the integration of local services to support non-standard claimants to make and manage a claim to UC.
4 – Ongoing Partnership development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work ongoing across all partnerships to further their preparations for UC including those involved in more focused trialling of LSSF – no limit. • Needs partnership development measures and milestones to monitor progress.

Annex C: Expression of Interest template

This EOI template asks you to provide information that will help us to select areas to undertake trialling of local support services in preparation for Universal Credit. Submissions will be considered by a joint panel including LAAs and Scottish and Welsh Governments. Those successful will work closely with the DWP UC Programme.

It is strongly recommended that partnerships read both the EOI trialling prospectus and the Update and Trialling Plan before submitting a completed version of this template.

The assessment of applications will be based on the criteria outlined at **Annex D**.

The EOI allows you to provide the following information:

Part 1: Local authority/Jobcentre Plus District details.

Part 2: Summary of current partnership working.

Part 3: Summary of the proposed trial.

Your completed application form should be returned by close of play on **Friday 13 June 2014**.

If you have any queries about the application or require a word version of the EOI template, please email the DWP LSS Framework Team at

lss.frameworkteam@dwp.gsi.gov.uk

Part 1: Local authority/DWP District details

Local authority name	
Type of authority	
Chief Executive – name	
Chief Executive contact details	
Testing and Trialling lead – name	
Testing and Trialling lead – contact details	
DWP District name	
District Manager – name	
District Manager – contact details	
Testing and Trialling lead name	
Testing and Trialling lead – contact details	

1. Please provide a short summary of your proposal, making clear which elements of Annex A you will be trialling (including your plans for data sharing and finance model) (up to 300 words)

2. Please provide a brief demographic overview of your area including:

- **Population**
- **Rural/urban**
- **Specific challenges/insights etc (up to 300 words)**

This information will not be scored but will be used by the panel to ensure an appropriate level of coverage across all areas.

Part 2: Summary of current partnership working

3. Please describe current processes/examples of good practice/existing partnerships (including Third Sector organisations) in place in support of claimants with complex needs³ or who require additional support (up to 500 words)

³ Complex needs means a claimant with a need that requires detailed and ongoing support and which cannot be resolved by one specific transaction or contact. For further information please see p.24 of the UC Local Support Services Framework published February 2013 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/181395/uc-local-service-support-framework.pdf

- 4. Please tell us about any other activities/projects you are undertaking that may impact or be linked to your proposal to trial local support services and/or that reach claimants with complex needs or those who need additional support, for example troubled families. (Up to 500 words)**

Part 3: Summary of proposed trial

- 5. Please explain how the lead partnership will be set up and how you intend to work together to manage the delivery of services and funding, including any examples of co-location, governance arrangements and dispute resolution procedures. Any diagrams or organisational charts must be included within the stated word limit. (Up to 500 words)**

- 6. Please describe how your partnership will deliver a coherent claimant journey and engage with other key delivery partners. Please ensure that you attach a letter of endorsement from each of these organisations to your application. Any applications that do not include letters of endorsement from all named organisations will not be evaluated. (Up to 500 words)**

- 7. Please explain more about the aspects of service provision (triage, PBS, digital) you plan to trial. (Up to 500 words)**

- 8. Please outline what outcomes your partnership expects to deliver, how these will be measured and how the partnership will ensure that data is robust. You should include the likely size of the proposed trial and any opportunities to build control groups or random sampling. (Up to 500 words)**

- 9. Please provide a clear implementation plan including key activities and a timeline to show how your partnership will mobilise to commence delivery of the proposed trial by September 2014. (Up to 500 words)**

- 10. Please tell us what potential benefits you anticipate realising as a result of LSSF trialling and partnership working, any expected costs and how your proposal demonstrates value for money. This could include, but is not limited to, financial or human resource efficiencies. (Up to 500 words)**

- 11. Funding will be provided for evaluation costs, a project manager and reasonable administration costs associated with the trial. Beyond this, a limited amount of additional funding may be available to further support trialling, for example for the provision of an additional service. Please tell us what specific, additional funding you might need, how it will be used and why existing funding is not sufficient. Please also state how you would adjust your proposal if additional funding is not provided. (Up to 500 words)**

12. Please tell us about any other funding streams that you and/or your partners are accessing to contribute towards your proposal and how the partnership plans to manage funding. (Up to 500 words)

Declaration

Statement by applicant

I can confirm that any funding received from the Department for Work and Pensions for participation in the UC LSSF trials will only be used to fund discrete activity that is additional or exceptional to the current and established practices of the local partnership.

I confirm that I am willing to provide the data requested to enable project evaluation.

I confirm that the results of any trialling undertaken will not be shared more widely until findings have been agreed and signed off by DWP. DWP expects that any findings will be made available in a coordinated and timely way.

Both lead partners should sign the application

Signed	
Job title	
Date	

Signed	
Job title	
Date	

Thank you for completing the application form for the LSSF trialling. Please email your application to the LSSF inbox: LSS.FrameworkTeam@dwp.gsi.gov.uk.

You will receive an acknowledgement email. If you have any queries about your application in the meantime, please contact the DWP Local Support Services Framework team inbox.

Annex D: Expression of Interest Assessment Process and Criteria

Assessment Panel Participants

Panel members have been selected on the basis of their experience and knowledge in the context of LSSF and to provide a balanced and considered view to the selection of successful LSSF robust trialling bids. The panel will be made up of members from the following organisations/areas:

- LGA.
- WLGA.
- COSLA.
- DCLG.
- Scottish Government.
- Welsh Government.
- DWP LA Liaison team.
- DWP LSSF Strategy.
- DWP Finance.
- DWP Commercial Group.
- DWP Operations.
- DWP UC Analysis Division.

Assessment Criteria

The panel will use agreed assessment criteria to evaluate bids. A staged process will be used, as set out below.

Partnerships must not exceed the stated word limit for each question on the EOI template. The panel will not assess any information provided beyond the given word limit.

Step 1

Partnership expressions of interest must fulfil all the eligibility criteria below. Where any of these are not met, applications will not be evaluated any further:

- The EOI is **jointly** submitted and signed by the JCP / LA partnership;
- The partnership can commit to the required evaluation activity of the trials delivery and outcomes including providing, as a minimum, 6 monthly reports of learning, with light touch reports every other month;
- The partnership can commit to starting the LSSF trials by 1 September 2014 at the latest;
- The partnership has provided evidence/examples of working together on previous occasions, in order to provide a foundation for the trial;

- The partnership has outlined how they plan to safely share data within current legislation; and
- If working with other partners, letters of endorsement from them must be attached.

Step 2

For assessment criteria 1-5 and 8-13 below, evidence from the EOI bids will be rated using a simple assessment scale:

0 – Totally fails to meet the requirement

1 – Meets some of the requirement

2 – Meets most of the requirement

3 – Fully meets the requirement

4 – Exceeds the requirement

Step 2a

- The panel will first look at criteria (1)-(5) which will enable us to identify the bids which have sufficient coverage of services and will deliver the learning required.
- The EOI must score 2 or above on:
 - o two out of three of the following criteria: (1), (2) or (3); and
 - o both criteria (4) and (5).
- This means the EOI will not be assessed further if it scores 0 or 1:
 - o on more than one of (1), (2) or (3); and/or
 - o on either or both of (4) and (5).

	Criteria
1	Describes a service offer that effectively identifies and assesses claimants' needs
2	Describes a service offer that effectively supports claimants requiring online access and digital support
3	Describes a service offer that effectively supports claimants requiring budgeting advice and support
4	Describes a service offer that effectively supports claimants with complex needs
5	Describes what outcomes they expect to deliver and how these will be monitored and measured robustly

- Provided the required standard is met, the next set of criteria at step 2b will be considered.

Step 2b

- The panel will then look at criteria (6) and (7) together
- For these criteria only, the following scoring will be used:
 - o 3 - Randomised Control Trial
 - o 2 - A comparable control group is proposed (e.g. split is by postcode or Housing Association with some ability to check characteristics of control and trial groups are similar)
 - o 1 - No ideal control group but good pre-trial baseline data available that gives some way to measure effects.
 - o 0 - No baseline or comparison group information available.
- The EOI must score 1 or above using the scale directly above to be considered any further. Where it does not, it will be placed on a reserve list and may be reconsidered if the final list of EOIs does not provide sufficient coverage of trialling elements and UC Analysis colleagues believe the format of the trial could be strengthened.

	Criteria
6	Trial will include a control group
7	Trial will include random sampling

Step 2c

- The panel will then look at criteria (8)-(13) and score these using the standard 0-4 system shown at step 2.

	Criteria
8	Describes a service offer that identifies and optimises existing funding streams to deliver LSSF services
9	Coherent claimant journey ⁴ including Housing (social landlords) and Voluntary and Community Sector Organisations involvement
10	Involved in/joined up with other initiatives which may be relevant to LSS and that reach vulnerable and complex claimants, such as troubled families
11	Services/interventions delivered (PBS and digital) include support/activities that may help bring claimant closer to work
12	Manages funding at partnership level
13	Demonstrates value for money (assessing the impact of local support services for claimants and on the local area)

⁴ Local arrangements for ensuring that agencies supporting claimants with complex needs, to apply for and manage their UC claim, are working to a single, high level, plan, which is tailored to the individual claimant's needs. The aim is to ensure that support and services are holistic, joined-up and avoid unnecessary hand-offs, and that claimants are not given conflicting messages by different agencies.

Step 2d

- A total score, based on the scores given to all criteria (1)-(13), will then be allocated to each EOI that has satisfied the stages above.
- The EOIs will then be ranked, with the highest scoring at the top.

Step 3

The ranked list (highest scoring first) will then be considered against the overarching criteria below, to provide the necessary range of examples and maximise learning from the trials.

Factors that will be considered are:

- Geography of the partnership – urban/rural locations;
- Co-location status and potential;
- Demographic profile of the partnership – e.g. age, race, sex, level of education, economic status, employment;
- Range of key services and coverage of Annex A; and
- Trial size (2000 claimants in the treatment group is the ideal number to maximise learning but it is recognised this may not be possible in all partnership EOIs).

This could mean that a partnership with a similar, or slightly lower score to another, will be selected as it provides a different demographic group or geography to other partnerships selected for trialling. For example, we would not select 6 partnerships all in urban locations even if they are the highest scoring out of all EOIs. We would need to look at the high scoring partnerships in rural areas to bring a different evidence base.

Annex E: Universal Credit success criteria for LSSF

UC is intended to deliver a fairer and more affordable welfare system that tackles poverty, worklessness, welfare dependency and helps people into work. It has three main goals:

- To help claimants and their families manage their benefits and wages independently, and where possible to become independent of the state.
- To close the gap between the experience of being out of work and that of being in work and receiving a wage.
- To make work pay so that people are always better off in work.

UC will create the opportunity to increase digital and financial inclusion to help claimants and their families become more independent.

To meet its strategic goals, UC needs to:

- maximise the number of people claiming UC with an employment focus;
- remove barriers to employment in the operation of the welfare system;
- inform the delivery of services post 2013;
- move claimants towards self service and automation and away from face to face delivery;
- move claimants towards self-sufficiency and financial independence;
- reduce administration costs; and
- reduce fraud and error.

Local support services have to be focused on delivering appropriate outcomes for claimants, communities and wider society. Although individuals will present specific challenges, and so require a tailored pathway to bring them closer to the labour market, the broad criteria for success are:

- constructing a service that claimants, agents and intermediaries view as easy to use, easy to understand and easy to access – giving them confidence in the system;
- helping individuals, especially those who need extra support, to make and manage a claim to UC;
- providing a joined up and holistic support service to claimants ensuring minimum hand-offs between different agencies;
- substantially improving work incentives and the recognition that work pays; and
- increasing the number of people in employment when compared to the equivalent point of the previous economic cycle.

Annex F: Good Practice Example developed from LA led pilots

