



Heriot-Watt University
Research Gateway

Fair Way Scotland Evaluation Progress Report (Year 1)

Citation for published version:

Watts-Cobbe, E, McMordie, L, Bramley, G, Young, G & Rayment, M 2023, *Fair Way Scotland Evaluation Progress Report (Year 1)*. Heriot-Watt University. <https://doi.org/10.17861/c8hy-7j14>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.17861/c8hy-7j14](https://doi.org/10.17861/c8hy-7j14)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Heriot-Watt Research Portal](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Heriot-Watt Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

Heriot-Watt University has made every reasonable effort to ensure that the content in Heriot-Watt Research Portal complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact open.access@hw.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Fair Way Scotland Evaluation Progress Report (Year 1)

Beth Watts-Cobbe, Lynne McMordie, Glen Bramley (I-SPHERE)
Gillian Young (Newhaven Research)
Matt Rayment (Rayment Consultancy Services)

August 2023



I·SPHERE

Institute for Social Policy, Housing and Equalities Research



Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction	3
Background to Fair Way Scotland	3
The Fair Way Scotland service model	4
About this evaluation	5
Structure of the report	7
Chapter 2. Process and systems impacts evaluation: emerging findings	9
Individual-level aims and theory of change	9
System-level aims and theory of change	11
Context	12
Progress and challenges: cross cutting themes	15
Progress and challenges: mobilising the key components	19
Conclusion	25
Chapter 3. User profile and outcomes evaluation	29
Fair Way Scotland service use	29
Quantitative user profile and outcomes survey: development and implementation	31
Quantitative user profile and outcomes survey: substantive content	35
Conclusion	36
Chapter 4. Costs and Benefits of Fair Way Scotland: Scoping Assessment	38
Introduction	38
Costs of Fairway Scotland	38
Benefits and Cost Savings	42
Conclusion	45
Chapter 5: Concluding discussion	47
<i>Appendix: Fair Way Scotland Evaluation – Service User Survey</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>References</i>	<i>67</i>

Chapter 1. Introduction

This report updates on the progress of the evaluation of Fair Way Scotland commissioned by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) and being conducted by the Institute of Social Policy, Housing and Equalities Research (I-SPHERE). This introductory chapter provides an overview of Fair Way Scotland – its origins, aims and key service components; summarises the evaluation approach and outlines the structure of the report.

Background to Fair Way Scotland

Fair Way Scotland is a partnership of third sector organisations, which aims to tackle destitution and homelessness among those with no recourse to public funds (NRPF)/other restricted eligibility (RE) for welfare and housing support (henceforth NRPF/other RE) by advocating for policy and systems change and providing people with a safe place to stay, case work support, weekly cash payments and legal advice. Its origins lie in the step change in responses to homelessness prompted by the COVID-19 pandemic, which saw groups usually excluded from assistance accommodated on public health ground. In the early stages of the pandemic, the Everyone Home Collective – a group of third and academic sector organisations – came together to protect progress made and establish key principles to guide next steps. One of the Collective’s four route-maps focused on preventing destitution and homelessness among those with NRPF/other RE.¹ Towards the end of 2020, the Scottish Government commissioned Homeless Network Scotland to facilitate a service design process that further developed the route-map into a costed delivery plan. Partners were invited to participate from across the Everyone Home Collective and this process resulted in the five-year Fair Way Scotland delivery plan.²

Underpinning the route map and delivery plan is an understanding that outwith this unprecedented pandemic context, UK Government immigration policy (a reserved matter) is a key driver of homelessness and destitution for this group. Given the direction of UK immigration policy, there appears to be little prospect of changes to these drivers of homelessness and destitution under the current Westminster Government. Indeed, the provisions of the Nationality and Borders Act and Illegal Migration Bill reflect a ramping up of the ‘hostile environment’ and are expected to create novel drivers of destitution and homelessness by, for example, disallowing asylum applications from those who arrive via irregular or unsanctioned routes.³

As well as driving homelessness and destitution, UK immigration policy limits the capacity of Scottish Government and local authorities to prevent and respond to these needs. Local authorities are legally constrained from assisting ineligible groups under, for example, homelessness legislation, though they are able and sometimes obliged to assist under social

¹ Everyone Home Collective (2020) Route-Map 2 Scotland’s Ambition to End Destitution and Protect Human Rights. <https://everyonehome.scot/pdf/route-map-2.pdf>

² Homeless Network Scotland (2021) Fair Way Scotland: Gateway to a safe destination, support and advice for people with no recourse to public funds. <https://homelessnetwork.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Fair-Way-Scotland-Delivery-Plan-FINAL-051021.pdf>

³ Refugee Council (2023) Briefing: Illegal Migration Bill – Assessment of impact of inadmissibility, removals, detention, accommodation and safe routes. <https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Refugee-Council-Asylum-Bill-impact-assessment.pdf>

work legislation where there are safeguarding concerns. This applies in particular to households including children but can also apply to adults in specific circumstances.⁴ These aspects of UK immigration law are recognised to constrain Scottish Government's ability to achieve its aims in relation ending homelessness and ending destitution⁵ and there is little confidence in any imminent change in these respects.

The Fair Way Scotland service model

Fair Way Scotland combines an emphasis on systems change and influencing, direct service provision and learning/evaluation. By providing services directly to those with NRPF/other RE at risk of or experiencing destitution/homelessness, and evaluating that provision and its outcomes, Fair Way partners hope to maximise their ability to influence policy, practice and systems change at the local, devolved government and UK level.

The intended Fair Way Scotland model of service provision involves an integrated offer of:

- A safe place to stay (primarily in shared or single community flats)
- Cash payments for those in Fair Way accommodation
- Specialist legal advice and advocacy
- Practical and emotional support, advice and information

Core to the high-level theory of change laid out in the delivery plan is the proposition that individuals will be better able to benefit from legal advice, advocacy and support when they are safely accommodated and not destitute. Destitution is addressed in the Fair Way model via the provision of cash payments to those accommodated via the programme, in order to avoid dependence on food banks and safeguard people's dignity. The emphasis on dispersed community flats reflects the value placed by partners on mainstream accommodation as opposed to congregate settings.

A telephone helpline offers a point of entry into Fair Way services (alongside other routes), and interpretation and translation services are integrated in order to address potential language barriers to engagement.

The key service provider organisations are:

- Refugee Survival Trust
- Simon Community Scotland, which merged with the original fifth service delivery partner Safe In Scotland in 2022
- Scottish Refugee Council
- Turning Point Scotland

⁴ Scottish Government/COSLA (2019) Migrants' Rights and Entitlements to Local Authority Services and Support - National Guidance. <https://migrat.dev.bluesword.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Migrants-Rights-and-Entitlements-Guidance.pdf>

⁵ Scottish Government (2022) Ending Homelessness Together: Annual report to the Scottish Parliament. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/ending-homelessness-together-annual-report-2022/>; COSLA/Scottish Government (2022) Ending Destitution Together: Progress Report – Year One 2021.2022. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/ending-destitution-together-progress-report-year-one-2021-2022/pages/2/>

Through funding from Scottish Government, the Scottish Refugee Council commissions a coalition of legal firms to provide 'second-tier' legal advice and training for Fair Way staff who are in support and advice roles. This means that advice is provided to staff about cases rather than people accessing legal advice directly. The initial learning curriculum includes 3x half-day courses on the rights of people who are destitute and seeking asylum, EEA nationals and other people with NRPF conditions. The legal coalition is Just Right Scotland, Latta & Co, Legal Services Agency and Shelter Scotland).

Homeless Network Scotland has facilitated the partnership development and design process and its ongoing work (including budget and fund management) and plays the role of secretariat for the partnership and local liaison groups. COSLA and Scottish Government are strategic partners committed to working with Fair Way Scotland on its objectives.

Fair Way Scotland's 5-year delivery plan laid out a phased approach to national mobilisation via the pre-existing Housing Options Hub structure, with the estimated costs across the full five years totalling approx. £5.5m, with £1.8m anticipated as being needed in year one. JRF are involved as learning partners and funders of the independent evaluation of which this year one report is the first output.

About this evaluation

I-SPHERE was engaged as a learning partner early in the development of Fair Way Scotland, with JRF committing to funding a 3-year evaluation from April 2022, the initial mobilisation date for the programme. Given early engagement between I-SPHERE and the Fair Way Scotland partnership, the evaluation design was developed before Fair Way's initial mobilisation. This interim report thus gives an opportunity to review the proposed methodology given realities on the ground over the first year of Fair Way's operation. In this section, we summarise the proposed evaluation methodology. Having reviewed project and evaluation progress in subsequent chapters, we lay out the implications for evaluation design and methodology in the concluding chapter.

The study's overarching objective is to evaluate Fair Way Scotland, with the following five specific research questions set out to guide the work:

- RQ1. What are the **aims** of Fair Way Scotland and **how** does it intend to achieve them?
- RQ2. To what extent is Fair Way being **delivered as intended** and what has helped/hindered?
- RQ3. What **outcomes**, if any, are being achieved **for individuals** – what is and isn't working for whom, and why?
- RQ4. What **wider outcomes**, if any, are being achieved – such as policy, practice or wider system change – what is helping/hindering?
- RQ5. How much does Fair Way cost? What can that tell us about the broader **costs and benefits** of an alternative approach?

The research design developed to answer these questions was informed by a critical realist approach that asks *what works, for whom, in what contexts, and how*⁶. This approach focuses on defining and understanding the core elements that come together to form a social intervention (such as Fair Way Scotland) and how these elements are *intended* to interact with one another to produce the desired outcomes. We refer to these distinct elements as “components” and to the intended pattern of interaction as a “theory of change”. Social interventions are of course implemented in a real-world setting where they interact with a complex web of external components (such as UK immigration policy) and with distinct groups of people whose needs and experiences differ (such as EEA nationals or asylum seekers). Critical realism seeks to identify and define the main external and individual-level components, to understand how they interact with the core components of the given social intervention, and what effect this interaction has on the actualisation of desired outcomes. Where individual components – or an interaction between components – are found to produce an outcome (intended or otherwise), we refer to this component or clustering of components as a “generative mechanism”. This approach will allow us to identify the generative mechanisms that function to produce particular outcomes, for particular people, in particular contexts, and to offer a clear rationale as to how and why these outcomes are produced. Note that throughout the report, the term 'service user' will be used as a shorthand to mean people who have access the support, accommodation and advice services provided by Fair Way partners. In future phases of the work we will cease to use this terminology in favour of more person centred language in line with Fair Way Scotland practice.

The proposed mixed methods approach involves three key elements, summarised below:

1. *User profile and outcomes evaluation*

This strand of work was designed to provide key data enabling the research team to answer RQs 3 (individual impacts) and 5 (costs and benefits), and comprises two main elements:

- a) *Quantitative user profile and outcomes survey*

Data on the profile, circumstances and needs of Fair Way service users, and how these change following access to Fair Way services was planned to be collected via a quantitative survey of all those accessing Fair Way during the evaluation period. A baseline/ follow up design was anticipated that surveyed individuals at the point of accessing Fair Way and again either at service exit or after a particular time period (e.g. 6 months) had elapsed. Chapter 3 of this report reviews the development and piloting of the baseline survey during year one of the evaluation and sets out plans for this element of the evaluation going forward.

- b) *Qualitative longitudinal interviews*

Qualitative interviews at two time points (in years two and three of the evaluation) with a panel of 50-60 Fair Way service users will explore people’s experiences of engaging with Fair Way services, the differences these services have made, and their perspectives on how services could be improved. An augmented longitudinal design was proposed, involving

⁶ Westhorp, G. (2014) *Realist Impact Evaluation: An Introduction*. London: Overseas Development Institute. <https://cdn.odi.org/media/documents/9138.pdf>

repeat interviews with some service users at wave two in addition to interviewing new service users who hadn't participated at wave one. This approach takes account of the likely attrition between waves if a purely longitudinal design were pursued and seeks to capture the experiences of service users entering Fair Way services when they are further developed. The proposed sampling strategy will seek to ensure diversity across key variables including geography, migration status, and key demographic characteristics.

2. Process and systems impact evaluation

This strand of work was designed to provide key data enabling the research team to answer RQs 1 (aims/theory of change), 2 (implementation) and 4 (system impacts) and comprises two main elements:

a) National key stakeholders

Focus groups and interviews with 15-20 national key stakeholders were planned at two time points: spring 2023 (mobilisation and embedding phase i.e. the beginning of year two of the evaluation) and spring 2024 (outcomes and lessons learned phase i.e. beginning of year three of the evaluation). At the time of writing (April 2023), interviews with 12 key stakeholders have been undertaken, and we report high level findings from these in chapter 2.

b) Hub-level interviews and focus group with service managers and frontline staff

Two waves of focus groups and interviews with service managers and frontline staff across Fair Way Scotland partner agencies will be undertaken (in years two and three of the evaluation). It was initially envisaged that focus groups would be conducted in each of the five hub areas at each time point, with individual interviews (e.g. with service managers) undertaken as appropriate. The move from a five hub to a three city approach will mean that at least the first wave of fieldwork with the Fair Way Scotland workforce will be focused in Glasgow, Edinburgh and Aberdeen.

3. Economic Analysis

The evaluation also seeks to understand the costs and benefits of Fair Way Scotland via economic analysis, including estimates of the cashable savings or cost avoidance it may generate, by for example, enabling service users to access work (where they are legally permitted to), avoid homelessness, improve their general health and wellbeing, avoid public service use etc. Uncertainties at the proposal development stage regarding the extent to which we will be able to generate data on the monetary value of the benefits of Fair Way means that a staged approach to economic analysis was proposed, involving an initial scoping feasibility stage leading either to a full cost benefit analysis in later stages of the project or an alternative approach to analysing the benefits of the programme. Chapter 4 of this report provides an update on initial economic analysis scoping work and lays out options for future work in this area.

Structure of the report

The next chapter reports on progress with the process and systems impact evaluation, and specifically initial findings from key stakeholder interviews conducted in early spring 2023. In chapter three, we update on progress with the user profile and outcomes evaluation, and

specifically with developing the service user survey. In chapter four, we update on progress with the economic analysis strand of work. Chapter five concludes the report, highlighting key substantive findings in relation to progress mobilising Fair Way Scotland over its first year or so of operation. The concluding chapter also describes how the evaluation design will shift in response to developments over the past year.

Chapter 2. Process and systems impacts evaluation: emerging findings

This chapter reports findings from interviews with 12 key stakeholders with specific insight into Fair Way Scotland's development over its first year of operation (2022-23). Interviews took place in March/April 2023 and the sample includes participants from the third sector (n=6) and statutory sector (n=6). The former group included those in service and sector leadership roles in the homelessness, asylum and migrant advice spheres. Statutory stakeholders included those working in local, national and representative/sector leadership roles. Interviews were flexibly guided by a topic guide seeking to elicit perspectives and information relevant to the evaluation's research questions. All interviews were recorded with the participant's consent, transcribed verbatim and thematically analysed. We cover the findings from this initial tranche of interviews under the following five themes: individual-level aims and theory of change; system-level aims and theory of change; context; progress and challenges: cross cutting themes; and progress and challenges: mobilising the key components.

Individual-level aims and theory of change

There is a strong shared vision among partners and wider stakeholders regarding the individual-level aims and high-level theory of change underpinning Fair Way Scotland. These closely align with those laid out in the delivery plan, which identifies preventing and relieving homelessness' as Fair Way Scotland's primary pursued outcome, with preventing and relieving destitution listed first among other outcomes sought.

In this first round of key stakeholder interviews, the wider set of outcomes articulated in the delivery plan (supporting health and wellbeing, supporting opportunity [e.g. employment], providing access to meaningful activities, enabling participation in the design and delivery of Fair Way services) were not generally mentioned, likely reflecting the prioritisation of the aims seen as primary at what is still perceived as an early stage of the partnership's development. Other aims listed in the delivery plan – enabling access to legal advice and advocacy, providing access to practical and emotional support – seemed to be conceived mainly as means to the ends of preventing and relieving homelessness and destitution for the target group, rather than ends in themselves.

The aims were framed more broadly as seeking a humane way to respond to this group in the 'hostile' context of UK legislation, which functions as a core external driver of destitution and homelessness. A stark contrast was drawn between this UK-level context, and the more welcoming orientation to migration seen to prevail in Scottish politics and leadership. Fair Way was seen as part of an effort to address this gap, and in particular, the disjuncture between welcoming Scottish narratives on migration and statutory responses to this group 'on the ground' that reflect the UK legal position. The partnership was developed as a direct response to local authorities' limited ability to assist this group.

There is also a strong consensus on the high-level theory of change via which these primary individual level aims of preventing and relieving destitution and homelessness are thought to be achievable, that is, via the combination of four key service components: accommodation, cash payments, specialist legal advice and advocacy, and emotional and

practical support, advice and information. These components are understood to function together to create conditions for positive change and, importantly, to interact positively with the pre-Fair Way Scotland service landscape in particular ways. Notably, it is recognised that pre-Fair Way Scotland, there was some existing advice provision, particularly for asylum seekers, albeit not necessarily at levels sufficient to meet demand. Advice provision for EEA-nationals was recognised to be less well established, and Fair Way Scotland is seen to provide an opportunity to address that imbalance. Crucially, by bringing together relevant partners, Fair Way was intended to strengthen the existing advice component, by developing capacity and expertise within the homelessness, asylum, and migrant sectors to process appeals and provide advice and advocacy more effectively. Key here was linking tier one advisers to a group of second tier legal specialists.

While pre-existing strengths were identified in the advice landscape, accommodation options for the target group were acknowledged to have been extremely limited prior to the pandemic. As such, the provision of accommodation via Fair Way Scotland was seen to be an integral component of the approach in adding value to existing provision, and preventing a cliff edge in provision as public health measures associated with the pandemic come to an end. Providing such accommodation is also conceived of as interacting positively (i.e., adding significant value) to the advice component, in enabling people to engage with that advice more effectively from a place of safety and (relative) stability. The cash component, (i.e., direct payments designed to be attached to accommodation provision) was explicitly designed to enable service users to be able to meet their basic living needs *with dignity*, i.e. without relying on emergency food aid (i.e. food banks), in line with Scottish Government's Ending Destitution Together strategy.⁷

In critical realist terms, the theory of change underpinning Fair Way Scotland is to utilise the four components noted above to:

1. *enable people to avoid* the strong generative tendency (i.e. tendency to provide a particular outcome) of UK immigration policy to push those with NRPf/other RE into destitution and homelessness, via the following potential components/mechanisms:
 - access to legal advice/case work, which enables people to regularise their migration status and access public funds/gain eligibility to statutory support;
 - help to access existing but possibly underutilised 'spaces' within existing statutory frameworks (but without regularising their status/gaining eligibility), that is, by (re)accessing Section 4 support, or social work support on safeguarding groups;
 - support to access employment, which diminishes the need for access to public funds/eligibility for benefits and (partially) counters generative tendencies towards homelessness and destitution;
 - an (informed) offer of assistance return home, which removes individuals from the UK-specific tendencies towards homelessness and destitution.

And/or:

⁷ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/ending-destitution-together-progress-report-year-one-2021-2022/pages/2/>

2. *mitigate against the outcomes* of this generative tendency of UK immigration policy to push this group towards destitution and homelessness directly via provision of

- accommodation
- cash payments.

Securing the four service components – and activating their generative power in practice - was envisaged, in turn, as achievable by leveraging independent funding, housing stock, and voluntary and statutory sector capacity and expertise. Absolutely key was a partnership approach, bringing key players together to achieve more than they could do separately, including for example, advocating for local authorities to maximise the use of their powers to assist this group thereby minimising the scale of the challenge that remains for Fair Way partners to address. The idea that as a partnership, Fair Way Scotland could achieve more than the sum of its parts is key to the theory of change.

The clarity of and consensus surrounding these individual aims and associated high-level theory of change is striking and offers a strong foundation for progress and impact. Key stakeholders were clear, however, that despite this shared vision and understanding of the route to achieving it, its implementation in practice has to date, been challenging. Later in this chapter, we review the key challenges faced. We describe the theory of change laid out in the delivery plan and articulated by key stakeholders as ‘high-level’ as we see scope to usefully specify: how service components will be secured; who is responsible for securing them (both within and outwith the partnership); how they will be allocated to partners and/or service users; what resources need to be in place for them to be secured (e.g. human resources, leadership, training, etc); the risks that might be incurred in these activities and how they might be minimised, mitigated and responded to. Development of a finer grained theory of change focused on all key actors’ roles and responsibilities may provide a means to address some of the challenges identified below.

System-level aims and theory of change

Alongside these individual-level aims and the associated theory of change, key stakeholders articulated a series of *system*-level aims. The aim of changing UK Government immigration policy to remove the primary generative mechanism of homelessness and destitution for the target group was not emphasised particularly strongly, beyond a general aim for Fair Way as a partnership to ‘lobby for change at every level’. This likely reflects the view that direct changes to NRPF conditions or restrictions on eligibility for benefits etc. for EEA-nationals is highly unlikely under the present Conservative Government. In this sense, no theory of change is being offered regarding how to secure such policy change over the short- to medium- term via Fair Way. Parallel work is being led by JRF to identify opportunities for credible change to either reform and reduce the harm of immigration policy (e.g. via the next General Election and a new Government) and/or to allow Scotland, through legislative or policy change, to take a different approach at the legal/national policy level.

A series of other system-level aims were identified by key stakeholders, including: to understand the make-up, circumstances and needs of those with NRPF or other restrictions on eligibility; to understand what works in assisting them; to build the capacity and

collective impact of the organisations working to address their needs; and to build national ownership over preventing destitution and homelessness for the target group, including the widest possible interpretation of local authority and Scottish Government's ability to assist them, in the current UK legislative and constitutional context.

A less tangible aim was also identified, this being for organisations working in this area to come together to collectively 'hold' or 'share the pain' associated with working in this area. This reflects the enormous challenges of being able to effectively assist those with NRPF/other RE in the current context, and that many of the organisations involved have been working in this area for some time. Coming together as a partnership was seen to be extremely important, both in maximising the strength of the four components and the opportunity for positive interaction between them, but also in organisations and their staff supporting each other, both in terms of information and expertise, but also in a broader sense of solidarity.

In terms of the theory of change underpinning these system-level aims, a few features of the Fair Way approach appear to be key: first the design of Fair Way as an 'action and learning partnership and plan'⁸, with an in-built evaluation and JRF's involvement as partner focused on action learning and influencing strategy. Second, the structure of Fair Way as a partnership and the emphasis at inception on joint working and shared ownership of the challenge. The partnership and shared ownership of the problem operates at least three levels:

1. Fair Way Scotland is a strategic and learning partnership of organisations working together to pursue these aims;
2. Fair Way is an operational partnership of organisations working together as a community of practice to achieve these aims for individuals; and
3. the success of Fair Way is dependent upon the collaboration and contribution of a *wider* set of partners: local authorities, Scottish Government, housing providers, independent funders etc.

Over the course of the first year of Fair Way's mobilisation, the critical dependence of Fair Way's success on the involvement and contribution of this wider set of partners became increasingly clear: the partnership itself cannot achieve its aims without the wider group of stakeholders creatively maximising their contribution too.

Context

This section reviews the context in which these aims have been pursued in the first year of Fair Way's operation, focusing on three themes: the UK legal context, the Ukraine war, and the stepping down of public health accommodation.

The evolving UK legal context facing asylum seekers and other migrants was identified as a key external component that interacts closely with Fair Way Scotland and is central to an understanding of its function. Over Fair Way's first year of operation, the direction of travel

⁸ P.9 in Homeless Network Scotland (2021) Fair Way Scotland: Gateway to a safe destination, support and advice for people with no recourse to public funds. <https://homelessnetwork.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Fair-Way-Scotland-Delivery-Plan-FINAL-051021.pdf>

is towards an even more hostile environment for migrants entering the UK. The passing of the Nationality and Borders Act in April 2022, and the tabling of the Illegal Migration Bill in 2023 will create new drivers of homelessness and destitution for migrants entering the UK. To the extent that these changes deter entry, this may see reduced demand for Fair Way services in the future. This was not the anticipated outcome among key stakeholders, however, who instead foresee an increase in the proportion of entrants to the UK who cannot access mainstream forms of support (e.g. via the Home Office), an increase in the legal complexity of their cases, and a decrease in organisations' ability to regularise their status. While this was primarily a practical concern for Fair Way in the future, some stakeholders suggested that this direction of travel at the UK level had the effect of hardening LA attitude to those with NRPF/other RE on the ground, making current implementation of Fair Way even more challenging.

The outbreak of the Ukraine war in early 2022 was also identified as an important external backdrop against which Fair Way's first year of operation must be understood. In particular, the displacement of those living in Ukraine has placed increased pressure on the housing system and local authorities in Scotland. To put the scale of this impact into context, in the first six months of the conflict, more people arrived in the UK via relevant schemes (including Scotland's 'super-sponsor' scheme) than the total who were resettled via general asylum and refugee routes between 2016 and 2021 inclusive.⁹ Ukrainian arrivals are not subject to the NRPF condition and are eligible for support via the benefits and homelessness systems in the UK. This has put local authorities' homelessness services and temporary accommodation under acute pressure, in a context where they were already accommodating record numbers in temporary accommodation as a legacy of the COVID pandemic, additional funding linked to the pandemic has ceased, and they are also navigating the impacts of a cost-of-living crisis.¹⁰ Reflecting these pressures, a recent Scottish Housing Regular report concluded that:

*"Some councils are reaching the limits of their capacity to respond effectively to the demands from people applying for help... and... there is an emerging risk of systemic failure in the provision of homelessness services, particularly in securing temporary and permanent accommodation."*¹¹

Key stakeholders also noted that the Ukraine war has led to a widening of the dispersal of asylum seekers and refugees beyond Glasgow. This heightens the urgency for Fair Way services to build relationships with LAs and establish infrastructure beyond the three cities in which it currently operates, as there will be increasing demand for accommodation, advice and support across the country. More positively, the challenge of accommodating arrivals from Ukraine has led to rapid capacity building of community hosting as an accommodation option for those in housing need, and several key stakeholders suggested this may also open up community hosting as an option for Fair Way Scotland service users.

⁹ The Migration Observatory (2022) Briefing/Q&A: The UK and the Ukraine refugee situation.

<https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/briefings/qa-the-uk-and-the-ukraine-refugee-situation/>

¹⁰ SOLACE Scotland (2023) Housing in Scotland: Current context and preparing for the future. <https://solace.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Solace-Current-Context-and-Preparing-for-the-Future-1.pdf>

¹¹ See p. 12 in Scottish Housing Regulator (2023) Homelessness services in Scotland: A thematic review.

<https://www.housingregulator.gov.scot/media/1884/homelessness-services-in-scotland-a-thematic-review-february-2023.pdf>

Also key to understanding the operation and evolution of Fair Way Scotland over its first year is the winding down of accommodation provided on public health grounds to those not usually entitled to it by Local Authorities and the Home Office. At the time of writing, ‘negative cessations’, that is the ending of support to individuals accommodated by the Home Office on public health grounds during the pandemic but who are no longer eligible for that support (e.g. because they have been refused asylum, are appeal rights exhausted, have no children and have not successfully applied for section 4 support) are expected to begin in Glasgow imminently. One key stakeholder reported that over 300 people are currently at risk of eviction from Home Office accommodation as a result of negative cessations, and while voluntary sector partners are seeking to advise those impacted, key stakeholders are of the view that while many effected will end up sofa surfing, cessations will inevitably lead to an increase in rough sleeping in the city. This will increase demand for and pressure on Fair Way Scotland services, as well as increasing the perceived moral imperative to offer that support, and in particular to be able to offer accommodation and prevent homelessness and destitution among those effected.

Local authorities also accommodated individuals on public health grounds during the pandemic regardless of their NRPF status or other restrictions on their eligibility for support under homelessness legislation. The three cities in which Fair Way Scotland is operating appear to be managing the winding down of such provision differently in at least two respects, relating to offers of accommodation to those newly presenting and the ending of placements for those already accommodated.

First, Glasgow and Edinburgh stopped offering accommodation on public health grounds to those newly presenting as homeless with NRPF/other RE in 2022 (June and October respectively), whereas in Aberdeen there has been no formal end date for newly accommodating this group. Glasgow were reportedly accommodating 70 such individuals when they ceased accommodating those newly presenting, and Edinburgh c. 300 individuals.

Second, LAs appear to be taking different approaches to ending existing accommodation placements for those in this group. One of the three LAs in which Fair Way is operating (Edinburgh) is taking an active approach. All those in such accommodation have been approached by a case worker and offered support to find alternative solutions or routes forward. In Autumn 2022, the city council began to issue Notices to Quit where all avenues had been explored. The impact of this process on rough sleeping levels was not reported to have been significant to date, not least because of its suspension during the coldest winter period, but stakeholders anticipate impacts during 2023. Stakeholders also noted that people have begun to leave such accommodation of their own accord, perhaps anticipating that it will cease to be offered in the near future. Aberdeen and Glasgow are not reported to be taking an enforcement-based approach to moving people on from such accommodation. This difference in approach is understood to reflect the acute housing pressures faced in Edinburgh, albeit that some stakeholders also emphasised an acute concern on the part of public officials in the city to act within the legal limits of their role. We were not able to establish the numbers who will be impacted by this process to date.

There also seems to be variation in local authorities' perceived ability and/or willingness to accommodate individuals with NRPF under social work legislation. Households including children with NRPF are owed support via social work teams, with individuals' ability to access such support depending on whether they are assessed as having care or support needs. Recent survey of Scottish local authorities by COSLA in partnership with the Centre for Migration, Policy, and Society (COMPAS) at the University of Oxford¹² indicates that in 2021/22 there were 1343 referrals for such support, with 811 of those cases receiving support. These figures represent increases of 48% and 40% on the previous year respectively. In the majority of these cases referrals were made and support provided under the Children Scotland Act, followed by the Public Health Act. The survey suggests that local authorities spent at least £5.9 million supporting people under these powers, the majority of that expenditure on accommodation. Key stakeholders we spoke to as part of the Fair Way Scotland evaluation suggested that in Glasgow and Aberdeen (where there are less acute pressures on housing supply than in Edinburgh), local authorities are maximising their use of these powers. Stakeholders suggested that the establishment and mobilisation of Fair Way Scotland – alongside guidance on and work in this area by COSLA and 'healthy challenge' from the voluntary sector – has helped clarify the scope of local authorities' duties to those with NRPF/other RE, and ensure that those owed a statutory duty for assistance receive it, including those that do not have children.

Progress and challenges: cross cutting themes

This section discusses progress made and the main challenges faced during the mobilisation and early implementation of Fair Way Scotland. It covers the following three themes: funding and geographic scope; the core partnership; engaging wider partners.

Funding and geographic scope

While £1.8 million was estimated to be needed to fully fund year one of Fair Way Scotland, in practice, funding of only £873 thousand was secured, via The Oak Foundation, The Robertson Trust, Scottish Government, JRF and City of Edinburgh Council. This was after a larger scale funding application to a different Scottish Government programme was unsuccessful. As a result, initial roll out of Fair Way services was prioritised in three cities understood to have the highest need: Glasgow, Edinburgh and Aberdeen, and a one year implementation 'plan B' developed on this basis. This decision, while necessary, has limited the ability of Fair Way Scotland, at least at this initial stage, to achieve its aims of building a national safety net for those with NRPF/other RE.

Key stakeholders also noted that operating nationally had certain strategic advantages, in terms of enabling access to a more varied set of accommodation opportunities and in opening up the partnership to organisations and players who showed high levels of buy-in during the developing of the original delivery plan. As such, key players in the Fair Way partnership were keen to get back to the five hub, nationwide structure as soon as funding permitted. However, challenges in year one (discussed later in this chapter) mean that it is not yet considered the right time to pursue further funding to enable this geographic

¹² Migration Scotland/COSLA (2023) COSLA Survey of Local Authority NRPF Support.
<https://migrationscotland.org.uk/policyarea/cosla-survey-of-local-authority-nrpf-support/>

expansion. In this sense, the scaling up of Fair Way Scotland beyond the three cities is dependent upon its successful mobilisation at this more limited geographic scale.

The core partnership

Core to the Fair Way Scotland approach is the establishment of a partnership of organisations with complementary aims and expertise. The bringing together and maintenance of this partnership is a clear and key early success of the programme. Some stakeholders made the point that the work of the Everyone Home Collective from 2020 in bringing homelessness and destitution among those with NRPF/other RE to the fore and ensuring its centrality in discussions about the shape of the pandemic response was a profoundly important first step. Fair Way has subsequently built upon this, establishing a partnership to take forward the agenda beyond the public health emergency. Stakeholders explained that while discussions about creating such a partnership were not new, the unique context of the pandemic and work of the Everyone Home Collective made it possible to turn these discussions into sustained action for the first time.

Since Fair Way Scotland has mobilised, the partnership-driven nature of the approach continues to be identified as a feature of immense value. From a policy and system-level perspective, the partnership gives those working in this area a stronger, firmer, and more credible voice than the pre-existing and dispersed set of smaller organisations had. Stakeholders from organisations working in this area prior to Fair Way reported that they used to struggle to secure engagement from other agencies because issues associated with NRPF were seen to be 'too complicated'. The establishment of Fair Way has gone some considerable way to addressing this, helping to build ownership for these issues beyond the organisations for whom it is their core focus. Wider stakeholders outside the core partnership (including national and local government) also value Fair Way as a single forum and interface with collective expertise that they can engage with. Having the partnership as a single, independent grouping was seen to have been invaluable as a means of hearing first-hand about issues on the ground and exploring statutory partners' role in potential solutions.

From a practice perspective, the partnership has built confidence and expertise among the organisations involved. Examples include:

- establishing a three-city community of practice with whom problems and challenges can be shared, and the chance of resolving them maximised;
- establishing governance structures that institutionalise regular contact between key agencies at operational and strategic levels;
- enabling partners to broaden their expertise (e.g. an organisation previously focused on advice and support provision has been supported to take on the role of accommodation provider through the partnership); and
- providing structured and funded access to second tier specialist advice.

During its first year, the partnership has faced a number of challenges (discussed further below), and even where the solution to these remains unclear, stakeholders emphasised that having an established structure within which to build understanding, and actively seek ways forward is extremely important.

Though the establishment and maintenance of the partnership was identified as a major early achievement, the partnership working that it has engendered has not been without challenge. The first year of operation was described as a steep and challenging learning curve for Fair Way partners, and it was acknowledged that the organisations had not always worked effectively together. One issue was seen to be the focus of some partners on organisational rather than partnership-wide aims and priorities, for example in decisions regarding who should manage new units of accommodation secured as part of Fair Way (see below), and in seeking independent funding as individual organisations rather than collectively.

These challenges must be understood in the context of the need to mobilise with funding at a far lower level than planned, and of working in an area where wider legal and policy systems design-in the outcomes (destitution and homelessness) that the programme is seeking to achieve. This may have created an environment of scarcity and limited efficacy that make collaboration extremely challenging. A linked relevant factor specific to Glasgow is the merger of two key partner organisations in 2022 (Simon Community Scotland and Safe in Scotland), which changed the dynamics of the partnership. The merger also had important implications for the model of accommodation provision pursued by Fair Way Scotland. The emphasis in the delivery plan was on the phasing out of congregate HMO or hostel-type provision in favour of (more cost effective, and desirable) mainstream community-based accommodation. The lower level of funding secured for year one of Fair Way, however, made this phased approach more difficult, and led the partnership to prioritise acquisition of new self-contained accommodation. This situation led to a set of difficult trade-offs regarding the sustainability of a pre-existing congregate accommodation project in Glasgow that have been difficult to navigate.

In light of these challenges, stakeholders were eager for greater emphasis to be placed on strengthening relationships between partners and building the collective efficacy of Fair Way in the future.

Engaging wider partners

Beyond the core Fair Way partners, there are a wider set of stakeholders relevant to the pursuit of its aims. These include, most notably, Scottish Government, COSLA and local authorities. We have already reviewed the varying practice of LAs in continuing to accommodate those with NRPf/other RE on public health grounds and have also noted the positive role COSLA (alongside Fair Way and other voluntary sector partners) have played in clarifying local authorities' obligations to this group on safeguarding grounds. While some local statutory sector stakeholders were very positive about the value of the Fair Way Scotland partnership (as a forum of expertise, as a source of useful challenge etc.), some were more critical.

Particular challenges appear to have been faced in Edinburgh. One key issue has been the perceived gap between Fair Way's offer to bring new accommodation and advice capacity for this group to the table, and their struggle in practice to do so. Local stakeholders were also concerned that Fair Way Scotland partners may not be advising service users about their option to return home, and supporting them to do so, where appropriate, despite a

commitment at strategic levels that this was part of the approach. Finally, while a local liaison group established by Fair Way Scotland continues to facilitate cross sector priorities, the operational group established as the forum for organisations in the city to engage in individual case work was disbanded. The key issue appears to have been difficulty securing a data sharing agreement with all members, but concerns were also raised about the critical or hostile tenor that meetings could take. At the time of writing, there was a view the potential contributions of both Fair Way and local stakeholders had been clarified, with relationships improving as a result. Some were of the view that the disbanded operational group could play a useful function as a forum for discussion (albeit at the general rather than individual case level), and ought to be reinstated.

Providers of cold weather provision in Edinburgh and Glasgow are also relevant Fair Way partners, as they provide a form of accommodation accessible to this group for some of the year, and (during that time) offer a route into Fair Way services. During the pandemic, the two existing communal night shelters in Scotland (in Glasgow and Edinburgh) were closed on public health grounds, and Scottish Government have subsequently committed to ending the use of night shelter and dormitory style provision in Scotland. In their place, Welcome Centres offering immediate access to single-room accommodation were established and in operation during winter 2022-23, run by Glasgow City Mission in Glasgow and Bethany in Edinburgh. Those with NRPF/other RE are able to access both Welfare Centres, and the respective services' annual reports¹³ indicate high usage from those with NRPF/other RE as well as extensive partnership arrangements being in place to effectively assist this group. Nevertheless, positive move on outcomes for this group are especially hard to achieve. Bethany's annual report indicates stays of on average 18 days for those with NRPF (compared to 9 nights for others).¹⁴ Stakeholders we spoke to indicated that access for those with NRPF/other RE is on a time limited basis, but the circumstances, if any, under which such a time limit is enforced are unclear, and the move on outcomes for this group largely unknown. Stakeholders reported that the Edinburgh Welcome Centre operated at full capacity during winter 2022/23, and in these circumstances it is not clear that those with NRPF/other RE (as well as others) would be able to access emergency accommodation. Despite these concerns, stakeholders in both cities were clear that rough sleeping levels remain (for the time being at least) low, and well below their pre-pandemic levels, with the Welcome Centres seen as a much improved form of winter provision than their predecessor night shelters.

As noted in the introduction, Scottish Government are strategic partners committed to working with Fair Way Scotland on its objectives, with civil servants leading on the Ending Destitution and Ending Homelessness Together Action plans involved in regular meetings with Fair Way. Scottish Government also fund legal advice and advocacy elements of Fair Way, as well as Homeless Network Scotland's infrastructural role. Some stakeholders were of the view that Scottish Government are operating right up to legally permitted limits in

¹³ Bethany Christian Trust (2023) Rapid Re-accommodation Welcome Centre: Annual Report 2022-2023. <https://bethanychristiantrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Rapid-Re-accommodation-Welcome-Centre-Report-2022-2023.pdf>; Glasgow City Mission (2023) Overnight Welcome Centre 2022/23. <https://www.glasgowcitymission.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/OWC-Report-2022-23.pdf>

¹⁴ Bethany Christian Trust (2023) Rapid Re-accommodation Welcome Centre: Annual Report 2022-2023. <https://bethanychristiantrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Rapid-Re-accommodation-Welcome-Centre-Report-2022-2023.pdf>

relation to preventing homelessness and destitution among those with NRPF, citing the Ending Destitution Together Action Plan as key evidence of this, so too Scottish Governments continued contribution to Fair Way Scotland as a strategic partner. Others were felt there was scope for Scottish Government to play a more active role. While acknowledging the legal limits on Scottish Government, some felt that they could be doing more to pursue actions detailed in the Ending Destitution Together strategy and that they could play a more prominent symbolic role deploying their 'soft power' creatively to support Fair Way Scotland partners' efforts to secure further funding e.g. by communicating to independent funders their inability to fund accommodation for this group, but their strong desire for independent funders to do so.¹⁵

A wider set of partners are also relevant here. Several key informants commented that there is still insufficient understanding among health partners and providers regarding the ability of those with NRPF to access their services, despite clear policy and guidance in this area. Another stakeholder made the point that for EEA migrants with restricted eligibility for benefits and homelessness assistance, access to employment could be a crucial route out of destitution and homelessness, with employment support services thus playing a potentially important role in helping existing Fair Way partners achieve their aims. Finally, several stakeholders noted that even when case workers achieve a successful outcome with a Fair Way service user that establishes access to public support (benefits, homelessness assistance etc.) there can be a challenge managing their 'exit' from support where wider services that would help them avail themselves of these newly accessible forms of support are not available or subject to long waiting lists. For this reason, case workers could find themselves supporting people beyond the resolution of their case (within the parameters of the Fair Way model), putting more pressure on already stretched caseloads.

Progress and challenges: mobilising the key components

This section focuses on progress made and challenges faced mobilising the four key components of the Fair Way Scotland service model, these being: accommodation, cash payments, specialist legal advice and advocacy, and emotional and practical support, advice and information.

Accommodation

Accessing accommodation has been a central challenge for Fair Way Scotland. While Fair Way services supported hundreds of people with NRPF/other RE in its first year of operation (see chapter 3), between April 2022 and March 2023, only 6 people have been accommodated in Fair Way funded flats, all of these in Glasgow, in accommodation run by the Refugee Survival Trust (2 units) and Simon Community Scotland (3 units). In addition, Fair Way has also funded a small number of short-term hotel accommodation placements in Edinburgh and Glasgow during cold weather. Fair Way partners provide other accommodation to those with NRPF/other RE that is *not* funded as part of Fair Way, with the largest provision here being the congregate accommodation referred to above which accommodates 17 individuals at any one time.

¹⁵ The Scottish Government has a strong track record in strategic co-financing which levers in additional funding, and widens reach e.g the collaboration with the Hunter Foundation to test new ways to end and sustain child poverty <https://www.thehunterfoundation.co.uk/the-innovation-fund/>; the Partnership Drugs Initiative <https://www.corra.scot/grants/partnership-drugs-initiative/>; Scottish Futures or Social Investment Scotland.

In this section we explore the main external and internal challenges to scaling Fair Way's accommodation offer more swiftly. A key point to make up front, however, is that there has as yet been no cliff edge ending to the provision of Local Authority and Home Office accommodation provided to this group on public health grounds, though evictions from accommodation in Edinburgh have now begun, and negative cessations effecting large numbers in Home Office accommodation in Glasgow are expected imminently. While the small scale of Fair Way accommodation has so far not left a gap in provision leading to an increase in rough sleeping (especially in Glasgow and Aberdeen), key stakeholders in Glasgow and Edinburgh are clear that there is an imminent risk of this going forward. There is thus an urgent need to address the challenges of procuring and scaling up the Fair Way accommodation.

The first external component to have inhibited the partnership's ability to secure accommodation is housing supply, an especially acute issue in Edinburgh. Considering intense pressure on social housing stock in the city that pre-existed but has been intensified by the arrival of those fleeing the war on Ukraine, it became clear via the Fair Way Scotland Local Liaison Group that accommodating service users in such stock would not be an option. At the time of writing, Fair Way partners were developing plans to seek appropriate accommodation outside of the city of Edinburgh. Housing supply issues are less intense but still relevant in Glasgow and Aberdeen, with pressures in Glasgow also far greater in the context of the Ukraine war. In Glasgow, the willingness of housing associations to prioritise units for the Fair Way target group has not been fully explored, for reasons explained below. There was a sense among stakeholders across the three cities that it can be very hard to exact commitment of stock from providers for this group given the wider pressures they are under, but also because of concerns about the legality of doing so. While it is perfectly legal for housing association to allocate stock to this group, and this has been clarified, effectively communicating this to providers remains an important ongoing task. It could, for example, be made more explicit in revised Scottish Government allocations guidance¹⁶ or wider sector guidance¹⁷, including a link to Fair Way Scotland for further information. Stakeholders also noted the high demand and competition for private rented sector units, including in Glasgow from Mears, the contractor responsible for accommodating asylum seekers on behalf of the Home Office.

The second external component inhibiting access to accommodation and emphasised by key stakeholders is funding, and in particular a reluctance on the part of independent funders to finance such accommodation because doing so is expensive, and the cost ongoing, given lack of access to benefit income to cover rents. There was also a feeling that funders may be reluctant to fund accommodation that is seen to directly undercut the intentions of the UK government, regardless of its technical legality. Independent funders are noted to be far more willing to fund advice provision. Key stakeholders emphasised that even high quality

¹⁶ See p. p.75 in Scottish Government (2019) Social Housing Allocations in Scotland: a practice guide. <https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/advice-and-guidance/2019/02/social-housing-allocations-scotland-practice-guide/documents/social-housing-allocations-scotland-practice-guide-february-2019/social-housing-allocations-scotland-practice-guide-february-2019/govscot%3Adocument/social-housing-allocations-scotland-practice-guide-february-2019.pdf>

¹⁷ See for example: National Housing Federation (no date) Helping people with No Recourse to Public Funds avoid homelessness: What housing associations can do? <https://www.housing.org.uk/globalassets/files/resource-files/helping-people-with-no-recourse-to-public-funds.pdf>

and abundant advice provision cannot effectively prevent homelessness and destitution for many of the Fair Way target group, and that accommodation is essential, both to preventing homelessness, but also to maximising people's ability to engage effectively with advice. In other words, key stakeholders were resolute that the individual level theory of change underpinning Fair Way (see above) is right, but that the funding challenge (among others) is impeding capacity to secure the necessary service components, especially accommodation, thus preventing its effective implementation.

Two internal factors are also relevant to understanding the limited scale of Fair Way accommodation to date. First, it has taken time to establish processes, policies and agreed ways of working in partnership to enable newly available accommodation units to come on stream. In Glasgow, Fair Way secured welcome agreement from Maryhill Housing Association to use 10 of their flats for Fair Way, and two of these are now up and running with support and management provided by Fair Way partners. Drawing down the remaining units is phased in line with the local housing association's available turnover.

Overall, the Fair Way partnership recognise that they did not reach early enough agreement on matters including what counts as a suitable (or 'good enough') offer for this group (in terms of the location of newly offered units, for example) and who among the partnership would manage these flats. With regards to this latter challenge, the partnership has faced trade offs between distributing new units evenly between relevant partners or seeking to take advantage of existing expertise and/or economies of scale. Because of these delays, Fair Way Scotland has not fully tested Glasgow housing providers' appetite to contribute properties to the programme.

At the time of writing, an accommodation development plan had recently been developed to clarify how newly secured units will be managed and avoid further delays. Progress in this regard is seen to be essential in demonstrating that Fair Way is delivering tangible benefit to the target group, and also to enable Fair Way partners to embark on further fundraising activity to scale provision. Delays securing the planned level of accommodation during year one mean that there has been an underspend relative to the programme budget, and there was a view that in this context, a strong focus on additional fundraising was not possible.

A second internal factor that has delayed securing accommodation for Fair Way concerns the nature of accommodation that has been available. This was the main factor explaining why no accommodation has yet been secured in Aberdeen. Turning Point Scotland, the Fair Way service delivery organisation in the city, had been offered congregate accommodation to use for Fair Way service users, but had not pursued this option, seeking instead to find alternative community housing in line with the Fair Way delivery plan. This decision was informed by confidence that the Fair Way target group in the city were either being accommodated by the local authority or in informal living arrangements with friends/family, rather than sleeping rough.

Looking to the future, some stakeholders raised the question of whether alternative forms of accommodation should become a stronger focus for the partnership e.g. community hosting. It was also recognised that the Implementation Lead funded through the partnership was intended to play a crucial role in building relationships with housing

providers, but that delays in recruiting to this post and the prioritisation of other tasks meant this had not been a core focus of the role in year one. It was hoped that year two will see positive developments in this regard.

Cash payments

Fair Way Scotland seeks to prevent destitution in part by providing cash payments of £50 per week to those residing in Fair Way accommodation. Key stakeholders gave different explanations of the rationale for residence in Fair Way accommodation being a qualifying criterion for accessing such cash support. For some, this approach was simply a clear way to ration payments given the resources available. For others, the approach reflected an effort to prioritise according to need, as it was intended that those in the most acute circumstances would be accommodated. Key stakeholders reported no implementation issues in administering cash payments and that those residing in Fair Way accommodation are receiving them regularly. However, because the numbers accommodated by Fair Way are small, the numbers benefiting from cash support are also limited.

Those receiving advice via Fair Way services can access financial assistance in other ways. Several of the Fair Way provider organisations reported that they can give ad hoc, small scale cash support to clients in particular need. The most significant external source of cash support is through the Scottish Government Hardship Fund administered by the British Red Cross. Those who successfully apply to the fund received two to three payments of c. £100 over a three month period, and applications are limited to one per year. This is seen as a valuable form of support for those with NRPF/other restricted eligibility, but it was also noted that the application and administration process take time, and that quicker access would be valuable. Stakeholders also made the point that the model of paying a small number of lump sums over a six-month period best suits those experiencing a short-term crisis, rather than persistent destitution, as is often the case for those with NRPF/other RE. Some stakeholders suggested that it would be valuable to review the process via which Fair Way Scotland service users access the Hardship Fund and consider other means to better meet the nature of need for this group.

Future stages of this evaluation will explore the extent to which Fair Way service users in receipt of regular cash payments (as intended in the programmes theory of change) are enabled to avoid destitution, as well as the wider impacts of these payments on their circumstances and wellbeing. The potential power of cash payments to directly alleviate destitution is manifestly clear, however, and the policy of rationing access to these payments on the basis of accessing a component of the service model that partners cannot yet reliably supply (i.e. accommodation) seems ripe for review. Alternative means of brokering access to an (albeit necessarily limited) supply of cash support could, for instance, be developed based on an assessment of need.

Specialist legal advice and advocacy

A core component of the Fair Way service model and theory of change is the provision of casework, support and advice from OISC Level 2 advisers specialising in the asylum system (e.g. appealing asylum support decisions and supporting those who are appeal rights exhausted to engage effectively with their solicitors and work toward submitting fresh submissions to the Home Office) and issues facing EEA nationals in Scotland (e.g. supporting

people to apply to the EU settlement scheme, including providing rationales for late applications). This component is seen as (relatively speaking) easier to fund than accommodation for these groups, and the landscape of provision more also seen to be more positive before the pandemic and Fair Way's launch than was the case for accommodation. Fair Way benefits from a well-established asylum/appeal rights exhausted advice sector and the pre-existence of a large and highly experienced team of case workers at the Scottish Refugee Council. This advice work takes primarily in Glasgow as (until recently) Scotland's only dispersal area.

There are, however, concerns about the capacity and case load of the asylum-focused case work team, both currently but also in the context of anticipated increases in demand linked to legislative change at the UK level (i.e. the Nationality and Borders Act, the Illegal Migration Bill) and, crucially, the anticipated start of negative cessations from Home Office accommodation provided on public health grounds during the pandemic. Case workers in this team are intended to have a caseload of no more than 50, but stakeholders noted that carrying caseloads at this level can be extremely challenging, given the intensive nature of the work often required. This intensity reflects not only the legal challenges and trauma associated with a service users' cases, but also language barriers, with the use of interpreters described as doubling the time it takes to work with someone. It is also clear from working with these organisations over the first year of the project that there are concerns about the wellbeing of the case work team.

The scale of advice provision available to EEA nationals with restricted eligibility for benefits and homelessness support is insufficient relative to demand, and this is a challenge for Fair Way services in Edinburgh and Aberdeen, where this group are concentrated. This under-resourcing of advice is especially problematic given the very diverse nature of the group, and level of background research and documentation often needed to progress their case. One Glasgow based stakeholder reported that there was a three-week waiting list for support, and the Aberdeen workers' case load was closed to new service users in Spring 2023. Some concerns were also raised about the level of training and skills received by the case work team in Glasgow given the complexity and intensity of the work. Language barriers are also a key issue for this group, and access to interpreters appears to be challenging, with no Fair Way budget available to cover this for EEA advice work. Securing such funding or gaining access to existing national or local translation services is a priority for the future.

Modes of access to Fair Way services differ for the EEA and asylum/appeal rights exhausted groups. A helpline and online gateway hosted by the Scottish Refugee Council is the central means of accessing Fair Way services, but historically has been used by asylum seekers/refugees only. Stakeholders participating in this research were not confident that it is well enough known by or promoted to EEA nationals needing support. This group can access Fair Way services via other routes, namely street outreach workers, the Welcome Centres and walk-in crisis services run by Simon Community Scotland/Streetwork. Stakeholders were of the view that the helpline could offer a wider and more effective route into Fair Way services for all groups if it is intentionally and proactively communicated and promoted with this in mind.

Beyond these broad distinctions between EEA nationals with restricted eligibility and those with NRPF as a result of being appeal rights exhausted via the asylum system, key stakeholders identified more specific groups within the Fair Way service user cohort who are particularly difficult to assist and support. So called 'post Brexit EEA arrivals' who have restricted welfare and housing entitlements, are not entitled to work, are facing homelessness and/or destitution, and who do not wish to return to their country of origin/Europe are a group of particular acute concern. There are potentially high numbers of people in this group, and the prospect of assisting them to avoid destitution and homelessness in the UK is daunting to Fair Way partners. Some question whether this group are in fact 'in scope' for Fair Way Scotland, as they were not a group for whom the service model was designed and sustainable solutions to their circumstances are seen as incredibly hard to find. There is a concern that the only means to address their needs in the UK would be to fund accommodation and cash payments long-term.

Roma/Romanian individuals with restricted entitlements face additional challenges, including particularly acute language barriers, little appetite to return home, and especially high barriers to accessing support. These barriers include (according to some stakeholders we spoke to), stigmatising attitudes on the part of some services with respect to this group, and/or concerns about their behaviour in services.

Another group seen to be especially hard to support are those with complex needs. In addition to access to welfare and/or housing support, stakeholders emphasised that those with complex needs, including addiction issues, need highly tolerant and elastic services to support engagement and enable progress to be made on their case. It is felt that those with complex needs within the Fair Way cohort are not especially well served at present. Better access to flexible, low threshold health and addiction services is likely to be important, as well as access to employment and decent accommodation. Stakeholders noted that this group's circumstances improved during the provision of accommodation to all groups on public health grounds.

Key stakeholders also noted a set of issues around participation in the 'black economy' and people's exposure to exploitation. Stakeholders felt that at present there is very little they can do to address these issues, beyond advising people about their rights and entitlements, including in the case of asylum seekers that they are not legally permitted to work. For this group, access to cash support might be particularly important to reduce engagement with exploitative and informal work. Future stages of the evaluation will explore the challenges facing particular groups within the Fair Way service user cohort, and how the service model might better address their needs.

The Fair Way model incorporates specialist tier two legal advice made available to tier one case workers and provided by a consortium of legal partners (see chapter 1). Access to this specialist support was seen to be a particular strength of Fair Way Scotland, though internal data collected by the partnership suggests that it is only utilised in a small number of cases. It is an aspect of the model that we intend to explore in greater depth in future phases of the evaluation. One point made by stakeholders involved in this stage of the research is that while training made available via the consortium was valuable, there is a need for a bespoke training offer for case workers focused on asylum versus EEA cases.

Practical and emotional support, advice and information

The final component of the Fair Way service model considered here is practical and emotional support, advice and information. This can be provided to Fair Way service users via two key routes: first, via housing support provided to those in Fair Way Scotland accommodation, and second, via case workers providing legal advice and advocacy. While the latter case worker support will be centrally focused on people's immigration status (appealing a negative asylum application; delayed application under the EU settlement scheme etc.), advice workers also play a crucial broader role in terms of direct provision of wider practical and emotional support, advice and information in relation to health, housing education and other needs, and by referring on to/pulling in support from other relevant services. The staffing capacity across Fair Way providers in year one of the project is weighted towards casework, support and advice (spanning organisations/workers with expertise in EEA and asylum issues): 6.5 full time equivalent case worker posts are funded by Fair Way, with 1.3 full time equivalent posts funding housing support. The emphasis on support via case workers is obviously enhanced in the context of the low numbers being accommodated in Fair Way accommodation.

Future stages of the evaluation will explore the provision of practical and emotional support, advice and information via both of these routes more fully, examining its role in preventing homelessness and destitution, supporting people's engagement with legal advice and advocacy, and enhancing Fair Way service users' general wellbeing, health and use of wider services. Key here will be data gathered from interviews and focus groups with the case workers and housing support workers funded via Fair Way, the survey of people accessing Fair Way services (see chapter 3), and qualitative interviews with Fair Way service users.

Conclusion

This chapter has reported high level findings from key stakeholder interviews conducted as part of the process and systems impact evaluation. The analysis makes clear that the Fair Way Scotland partnership rests on strong foundations of a firm consensus regarding the individual-level aims of the programme (to prevent and alleviate homelessness and destitution among those with NRPF/other RE) and the associated high-level theory of change via which they are thought to be achievable (by combining the four main service components). There is strong buy-in to and support for these aims, both among core Fair Way partners and wider stakeholders, including Scottish Government, local authorities and among the housing providers and independent funders who have come on board to support Fair Way to date. There may be utility in Fair Way partners developing the theory of change more fully, and in particular specifying the roles and responsibilities of relevant partners and stakeholders, the resources needed, the combination of components thought to benefit particular groups; and the risks to implementation and how they might be mitigated.

Alongside these individual-level aims are a set of system level aims, these being: to understand the make-up, circumstances and needs of the target group; to understand what works in assisting them; to build the capacity and collective impact of the organisations working to address their needs; and to build national ownership over preventing destitution and homelessness for the target group, including the widest possible interpretation of local

authority and Scottish Government's ability to assist them. Sharing the immense challenge, even 'pain', of seeking to assist this group is also identified as an aim, or at least positive aspect of the partnership. Core to the theory of change supporting these systems-level aims are 1) a partnership approach, requiring all partners and wider stakeholders to maximise their contribution to the aims of Fair Way and b) an action and learning programme (with evaluation and learning partners involved from the start).

These aims are immensely ambitious and represent a major step forward in organised cross-sector approaches to address the needs of those with NRPF/other RE. These ambitions are being pursued in an acutely challenging context. UK immigration law actively generates homelessness and destitution among this group, and limits the ability for statutory partners to prevent or alleviate these social ills. The large-scale arrival of households displaced by the Ukraine way significantly exacerbates an already challenging housing market context in which to procure accommodation for this group, most acutely in Edinburgh. While the stepping down of local authority and Home Office accommodation provided to this group on public health grounds has, at least so far, been gradual, the ramping up of this process in the coming months further exacerbates the immensely challenging context Fair Way partners face.

Fair Way Scotland partners decided to mobilise in three cities despite these challenges and despite securing significantly less resource from independent funders than sought. As well as forcing Fair Way to phase the roll out of a national safety-net, the resource scarcity in which the partnership has mobilised has created challenges. While the collaboration that underpins the Fair Way model is seen as one of the key strengths of the programme, and necessary to its success, in practice joint working has been hard, with organisational and partnership-level aims and goals sometimes being in tension with each other. Given the enormously ambitious aims of Fair Way and the challenging context in which these are being pursued, strengthening the partnership stands out as a key priority for year two.

The involvement of stakeholders beyond the core partnership is also fundamental to Fair Way's ability to achieve its aims, and it is testament to the work of the partnership that all relevant local authorities, Scottish Government COSLA and others have come to and remained 'at the table'. While some stakeholders were of the view that Scottish Government are operating right up to legally permitted limits in relation to preventing homelessness and destitution among those with NRPF/other RE, some suggested that there was scope for Scottish Government to play a more active role deploying their 'soft power' creatively to help bring funding, housing and other resources to the table and encourage local authorities and other stakeholders to maximise their contribution to this agenda. Local authorities appear to vary in the extent to which they are willing or able to act to prevent and alleviate destitution and homelessness for this group. Some are clearly interpreting their space to contribute in the widest possible terms, continuing to accommodate some in this group on public health grounds, not taking enforcement-based approaches to move on from such accommodation, and interpreting obligations to assist on safeguarding grounds as broadly as possible. Others, influenced by high demand, a challenging housing market context and/or anxiety about overstepping the legal limits of their role, are taking a different approach, though remain engaged with the partnership. Scope was also identified

to increase the contribution of health partners and employment support providers in assisting those with NRPF/other RE.

The provision of accommodation is a central component in the Fair Way model, and represents an area where the partnership can add significant, transformative value to existing provision. It is the most direct and immediate means via which Fair Way can prevent homelessness and help individuals avoid the damaging consequences of UK immigration policy. The scaling of accommodation to date has been limited by a combination of factors, including acute pressures on housing supply, limited funding and a perceived (but as yet not fully tested) reluctance on the part of social housing providers to allocate stock to this group. It has also taken time to agree policies and processes for accepting accommodation offers and agreeing how they will be managed, and partners have also, understandably, turned down opportunities to use congregate forms of accommodation. Addressing these external and internal challenges is a clear priority for Fair Way partners.

The provision of regular cash payments to Fair Way service users represents a powerful and direct mechanism to prevent or alleviate destitution, but the power of this mechanism in achieving the partnership's aims is currently limited by the linking of access to such payments to being accommodated in Fair Way-funded housing. Reviewing this policy, and considering alternative means to prioritise and allocate cash payments, would be useful area of focus in year two.

Specialist legal advice and advocacy is a crucial mechanism via which people with NRPF/other RE can temporarily or permanently escape the destitution-generating impacts of UK immigration policy. This case work is complex and demanding. While a well established, expert asylum advice sector pre-existed Fair Way, and is part of it, demand for its services is high and anticipated to increase. Advice to EEA migrants is less well established, less well-resourced and staff capacity and expertise lower. In addition, interpreting support for EEA advice work is not uniformly funded by Fair Way. Routes into Fair Way support for this group are also less well established and it is not clear that the helpline meant to serve as a gateway to Fair Way services is known by and sufficiently publicised to this group. There are a number of specific groups who are identified by stakeholders as especially hard to help or a particular cause for concern, these being Roma individuals, those with complex needs, and so called 'post Brexit arrivals' who are seen as having very limited routes to regularisation/sustainable livelihoods in the UK. There are acute concerns about people with NRPF/other RE's engagement with the informal 'black economy' and providers see themselves as able to offer little help in this area.

The provision of practical and emotional support, information and advice by case and housing support workers is an area largely unexplored in the evaluation to date, but this will be addressed in future stages of the study.

Chapter 3. User profile and outcomes evaluation

In this chapter, we review current data on the scale of demand for Fair Way Scotland services in Glasgow, Edinburgh and Aberdeen, and update on progress developing and implementing the survey of Fair Way service users that forms a key part of the evaluation methodology.

Fair Way Scotland service use

Table 3.1 (next page) shows the number of individuals accessing Fair Way services between April 2022 and March 2023 (the first year of the partnership's mobilisation), by partner organisation, city, and service component the individuals in question are using. This data is collated by Homeless Network Scotland from the relevant partner organisations. Some key points of note include:

- 1,205 individuals accessed Fair Way services in this period, with 730 (around two thirds) accessing them on an ongoing basis i.e. beyond accessing the Scottish Refugee Council helpline.
- There is a relatively even balance between those who are Appeal Rights Exhausted (ARE) asylum seekers (n=352) and EEA nationals with restricted eligibility (n=372) accessing Fair Way services. The delivery plan makes clear that there are other groups who also have NRPF (e.g. visa overstayers, those who entered on a spousal visa and have subsequently separated from their partner) and we will be exploring these groups in more detail in future years.
- ARE asylum seekers accessing Fair Way are concentrated exclusively in Glasgow, with EEA nationals dispersed across Edinburgh (n=291), Glasgow (n=60) and Aberdeen (n=21). This distribution reflects the known geographic concentration of these groups, but may to some extent also reflect service availability.
- Very small numbers have so far been accommodated by Fair Way Scotland, and are consequently receiving linked cash payments, and all of these are in Glasgow (n=6).





Internal Fair Way Scotland data offers the potential opportunity to revisit the estimate, used in the delivery plan, that c. 500 people at any one time would be in need of Fair Way services across Scotland.¹⁸ This headline estimate is national, and a point in time figure, and thus not comparable to the data presented in table 3.1, which includes all those individuals who have accessed Fair Way services over the specified time period. Future phases of the evaluation offer the opportunity to revisit these Destitution study estimates based on new data collected in 2022 and expected to be published in Autumn 2023, and to triangulate these estimates with internal Fair Way data returns and the emerging results of the evaluation service user survey. These endeavours offer an important opportunity to improve understandings of the scale and nature of need among those with NRPF/other restricted eligibility in Scotland.

¹⁸ This estimate was made by a member of the evaluation team (Bramley), based on data from the JRF-funded Destitution in the UK research project.

Table 3.1a Total number of people who used Fair Way Scotland services (April 2022 to March 2023)

	Partner Organisation				Total people, year one
	Refugee Survival Trust	Simon Community Scotland	Scottish Refugee Council	Turning Point Scotland	
Total people using each service	5	351	832	23	1,211
Total individuals					1,205

Table 3.1b. For whom the following services were provided:

	Service Component	Glasgow	Edinburgh	Glasgow	Edinburgh	ARE	EEA	Aberdeen	
	Community Flats with Housing Support	2	0	4	0			0	6 people in 4 flats with 5 rooms
	Telephone Helpline					831	1		832
	Support & Advice (EEA)			60	291			21	372
	Casework (ARE)					352	0		352
	Cash Payments	5	0	1	-			0	6

The data shown in table 3.1 is the only data collected for all Fair Way Scotland service users during year one of the partnership's mobilisation. JRF, Homeless Network Scotland, the Fair Way Scotland implementation lead and the evaluation team intend to work with Fair Way partners in year two of the programme to understand and map the information being collected at the organisation level and work to build upon the data collection processes reported in table 3.1 is underway at the time of writing. Developing pan-Fair Way data collection processes independent of the evaluation will be a key means of building long-term understanding about the nature of the client group and how it is changing over time. Beginning to record outcome/move-on information via internal data collection processes should be an important future priority for the partnership. Alongside these efforts to develop Fair Way Scotland *internal* data collection infrastructure, a key component of this independent evaluation is a survey of Fair Way service users. Progress implementing this survey is discussed further below.

Quantitative user profile and outcomes survey: development and implementation
Part of the evaluation design is a baseline (service entry) and follow up survey aiming to shed light on the scale, circumstances and needs of those with NRPF/other restricted eligibility and track the impacts of accessing Fair Way Scotland services on service users' circumstances, needs and experiences. This section provides an overview of survey development and piloting during year one of the evaluation. Table 3.2 summarises key developments.

The evaluation team began work to develop the survey in May 2022, meeting with the Consortium Management Team, as well as service managers/frontline staff to co-design the content and ensure usability of the survey. Given the nature of the client group and the resourcing available for the evaluation, the design was premised on the survey being administered by case or housing support workers. As such, practicalities surrounding its implementation were a focus from the start. These efforts culminated in the piloting of version 1 of the survey in October-December 2022. Only a very small number of responses to the pilot were received, and as a result the pilot was suspended in December 2022. During February/March 2023, the evaluation team undertook a root and branch review and redesign of the survey with a focus on maximising its usability in the real-life context of service delivery. The evaluation team consulted with the Consortium Management Team as well as directly with services to understand the barriers inhibiting its effective implementation. Key themes arising from this review and consultation included the following:

- The evaluation and survey design process began at the same time as Fair Way Scotland mobilised. This offered the opportunity to develop the quantitative survey and begin collecting data as early as possible in the partnership's development. In practice however, developing the survey at the same time as Fair Way services and the partnership were themselves mobilising was challenging. Partners were focused on recruiting staff, establishing the partnership, setting up basic programme infrastructure and supporting service users and some basic infrastructure that would help facilitate the development and launch of the survey was not yet in place e.g. the Implementation Lead was not in post until August 2022, and processes to allocate a Unique Identifier to each Fair Way service user are still to be settled.

Table 3.2 Timeline of survey design and implementation

Timeline	Activities
May 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-inception meeting with Homeless Network Scotland, Joseph Rowntree Foundation and Scottish Government • Inception meeting with Consortium Management Team (CMT) and JRF: consideration of early draft (baseline) survey circulated for discussion
June 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to initial survey draft based on CMT feedback • Workshop for frontline staff (mainly attended by service managers)
July 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised survey draft developed in response to feedback and comments from Scottish Government. Circulated to JRF/HNS for comment
August 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with JRF/HNS. Agreed to proceed with survey pilot in September subject to final refinements • Survey uploaded onto online survey platform (Lime Survey) • Supporting Guidance written and training event for staff held
September 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised survey drafted based on feedback at training event and finalised for pilot stage • Guidance note designed (by HNS) • Pilot not progressed due to operational issues discussed at meeting between evaluation team, HNS and FWS implementation lead, including whether survey to be administered to helpline callers; scope of FWS sample (see below); and who will complete the survey (accommodation-based staff or caseworker)
October - December 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following clarification of operational issues, survey piloted with agreement to review progress in January 2023 • Low response rate leads to suspension of pilot prior to planned January review
January 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original evaluation PI (Watts-Cobbe) returns to work following parental leave and reviews project progress
February 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation team undertake root and branch redesign of the survey and implementation challenges
March 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation lead meets with Consortium to discuss revised survey and trouble shoot barriers to implementation. Forward plan developed and circulated to Consortium. • Agreed to take bespoke approach to survey launch across Fair Way Scotland services and to pilot in two service contexts initially (Turning Point Scotland, Aberdeen; Fair Way Scotland flats, Simon Community Scotland, Glasgow) to fully test new survey design.
April 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilateral meetings with pilot services to discuss survey draft and implementation needs in each specific setting (e.g. technological requirements, who will administer, need for translated materials etc.) • Content of revised pilot version of survey finalised

May-June 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey uploaded to Lime Survey and pilot launched in two services. Extended to three services in June.
---------------	--

- The evaluation design and costing relied upon case workers being able to avail themselves of interpreting support to administer the survey where necessary, but as discussed in chapter two, resources for interpreting are unevenly distributed across the partners. Furthermore, pressures on staff mean that the prospect of administering a survey via an interpreter is particularly daunting. Interpreting requirements for survey administration are now being considered on a service by service basis.
- It was initially unclear who would fill out the survey: case workers providing legal advocacy or housing support workers. In practice, this will depend on the service and service user in question. Where the service user is residing in Fair Way funded or partner provided accommodated, the survey will usually be administered by the housing support team. In other cases, case workers or researchers will administer the survey instead (see below).
- Successfully implementing the survey requires a balance to be struck between (1) designing a 'gold standard' survey instrument, using validated/tested questions and measures, to generate a comprehensive picture of the needs and circumstances of those with NRPF/restricted eligibility and maximising comparability with other data sources to also feed into the economic analysis, with the need to (2) ensuring that the survey instrument is not experienced as unreasonably time consuming by practitioners. Learning in year one has pushed the evaluation team to a stricter prioritisation on usability in service contexts. The pressure on case workers in Fair Way services, and discussed in chapter two, is clearly highly relevant to their capacity to engage with survey design and implementation. As such, an even stronger focus is now being placed upon securing buy-in from staff teams, and working with Fair Way Scotland services on an individual basis to find ways to implement the survey as effectively as possible.
- While in some services, staff are able and willing to administer the survey to service users as per the original evaluation design, in other, larger scale services, this may not be possible. Alternatives include researchers administering the survey, and/or that rather than taking a 'census survey' approach (i.e. seeking to invite all service users to complete the survey), a sampling approach is pursued, targeting service users during a particular time window, for example.
- There was an initial lack of clarity among services regarding who is 'in scope' for the evaluation and thus should be asked to complete a survey. It has subsequently been clarified that anyone who has an NRPF condition attached to their visa/has other restrictions on their eligibility for welfare/housing support and is receiving support from Fair Way Scotland partners (whether or not these services are funded by Fair Way itself) is 'in scope', but that individuals who only access one off advice via the helpline are not in scope.
- Some of the developments and challenges described in chapter two have implications for the intended baseline/follow up design of the survey. The baseline stage was intended to involve administering the survey at or soon after individuals enter Fair Way Scotland services (thereby establishing a 'baseline' set of data regarding their circumstances at and recently before engaging with Fair Way). However, challenges getting the survey into the field early in year one mean that a focus on surveying only those who have recently entered Fair Way services would radically limit the sample size and mean that data was not collected for those who have been engaged with Fair Way

services for longer. As such, the evaluation team will work with Fair Way partners to administer the survey to all (or a representative subset of, see below) current service users, not just recent entrants. A follow up survey will only be conducted with a subsample of those who complete the initial 'baseline' survey close to their entry into Fair Way Scotland services, thus retaining the baseline / follow up design that will enable us to track the impact of Fair Way services effectively.

- Given challenges scaling the Fair Way accommodation offer (see chapter 2) only a small number of individuals are currently receiving the 'full package' of Fair Way support, including accommodation and cash payments as well as legal and wider advice and support. The baseline / follow up survey design was originally envisaged as tracking the impacts of provision of this full package. In practice, the follow up survey will allow us to track the impact of engagement with different combinations of service components, including legal and other advice and support only and (as the Fair Way accommodation portfolio grows) the 'full package' of support.

As a result of this work, the evaluation team decided to: minimise the need for case workers to use discretion/judgment in the process of administering the survey; integrate the consent process into the online form; and take a bespoke approach to implementing the survey in different service contexts. Turning Point Scotland (Aberdeen) and some services provided by Simon Community Scotland as part of Fair Way (in Glasgow) volunteered to pilot the new survey instrument and process to test its usability, impact on service provision and troubleshoot to inform the process of implementation more widely. Survey content was reviewed according to the following criteria, and changes made accordingly: central relevance to the aims of the evaluation; proportionality of level of detail sought; cultural sensitivity; emotional/psychological sensitivity; language concerns; and capacity to explore issues adequately via qualitative work rather than the survey. At the time of writing, the survey has been piloted following bespoke engagement with key staff in three service contexts. Following a final set of minor refinements, the mainstage survey will be launched in Summer 2023 and rolled out via a bespoke service-by-service approach to all Fair Way service delivery partners.

Quantitative user profile and outcomes survey: substantive content

The survey instrument now being piloted in three Fair Way service settings is included in full in the appendix to this report. It begins with two information sections, one directed at the case/support worker and the other directly at the service user. These sections explain the nature and purpose of the study, the broad content of the survey, and establish consent for participation. The service user information section will be provided to services as a separate paper document translated into relevant languages where this is requested by staff/service managers. Section A 'Pre-survey information' is designed to be completed by the case worker. If the service user has consented, the case worker can complete this section without the service user being present. It covers which Fair Way Scotland service components the individual is using/has used and for how long, as well as their immigration status and the basis upon which they have an NRPF condition attached to their visa or restricted access to welfare/housing support. Sections B-H are designed to be completed with the service user present. Section B covers basic demographic information, section C the service user's general health and wellbeing, and section D recent and current housing circumstances and experiences, including of different forms of homelessness. Section E

covers the individuals' financial situation, including work status and questions to establish whether they are currently destitute. Section F covers the individuals use of public services, key to the economic analysis component of the evaluation (see chapter 4). Section G allows the respondent to add any comments they wish to in their own words, and section H seeks permission to recontact the service user for future stages of the study.

In designing the questions included in the survey, reference was made to the following existing data sources outlined in table 3.4:

Table 3.3 Data sources used to inform survey design

Reference/source	Survey topic	Comments
Scottish Government core harmonised survey questions	Demographic situation of client (age, ethnicity nationality, country of birth, time in UK & living with partner etc)	Questions stripped back to minimum variables essential for evaluation to reduce survey burden
Rough Sleeper Survey (England)	Time in the UK	
Destitution survey	Current accommodation; housing situations and housing problems experienced in last 12 months (or since arrived in UK if less than a year); work and income situation and lack of material goods	Trimmed down questions and pre-set answers to reduce survey burden. Question revised to include Home Office/ FWS supplied accommodation
Migrant Destitution Study	Housing situations and housing problems experienced in last 12 months (or since arrived in UK if less than a year)	Question revised to include Home Office/ FWS supplied accommodation
Homeless HL 1 return	Housing situations and housing problems experienced in last 12 months (or since arrived in UK if less than a year)	Question revised to include Home Office/ FWS supplied accommodation
ONS & NRS Census and other surveys	General health	
WEMWBS	Validated measure of adult subjective well-being and self-esteem.	Important measure for tracking change in wellbeing between entering and existing FWS. Important for economic analysis
Housing First Evaluation Survey	Contact/use of healthcare and criminal justice (police)	Shorter version developed to reduce survey burden
UN migration survey	Service user views of how well informed of their rights and FWS support sought	Track service user sense of empowerment and alert to any gaps in services. Removed to reduce survey burden. Theme to be explored via qualitative interviews

The follow up survey, which is yet to be designed, will focus on changes in the service user's circumstances in order to measure the impacts of Fair Way services.

Conclusion

Internal Fair Way Scotland data currently records the number of individuals using key service components, by partner organisation. Year one returns show that 1,205 people accessed Fair Way services in this period, the majority (around two thirds) of which

accessed them on an ongoing basis i.e. beyond one off helpline advice. There is a relatively even balance between those who are Appeal Rights Exhausted asylum seekers (n=352) and EEA nationals with restricted eligibility (n=372). There is a distinct geography to the distribution of these groups, with those seeking asylum concentrated in Glasgow and EEA nationals in Edinburgh and (at a smaller scale) Aberdeen. Small numbers have so far been accommodated by FWS during this time and received linked cash payments were restricted to this group.

In year two JRF, Homeless Network Scotland, the Fair Way Scotland implementation lead and the evaluation team will work with partners to understand and map the information currently collected and explore ways to build upon existing processes. Developing internal data collection processes to be more complete, to capture new clients on a month by month (or similar) basis, and to capture key move-on/outcomes data would be a useful focus of ongoing infrastructure development for the partnership. The evaluation team-led survey seeks to offer a rich data source over the course of the three-year study, and the design and implementation of this survey can inform future development of internal data collection processes.

The survey of Fair Way service users proposed as a key part of the evaluation methodology and will provide a robust and detailed picture of the circumstances and needs of those with NRPF/other RE, a group who while well known to the services who work with them day-to-day are hidden from view from broader society and, perhaps easy to ignore or neglect in policy terms as a result. This chapter has detailed efforts made to design and launch a survey that 'works' in the real world context of service delivery, and updated on progress. At the time of writing, the survey has been successfully piloted in three services, and launch of the 'mainstage' survey is imminent. The data collected from this baseline survey and the follow up survey yet to be launched will offer insights that can help Fair Way Scotland achieve its aims, and leverage and support broader systems level change in Scotland and the wider UK.

Chapter 4. Costs and Benefits of Fair Way Scotland: Scoping Assessment

Introduction

This evaluation seeks to assess the costs and benefits of Fair Way Scotland. In order to do so, the costs of the programme need to be fully quantifiable, and the benefits valued in monetary terms. The first year of work has focused upon identifying all relevant costs and benefits, and quantifying and valuing them as far as possible. This chapter updates on progress made, challenges encountered and implications for future stages of the economic analysis.

Costs of Fairway Scotland

Work to establish the costs of Fair Way Scotland to date has included: scoping of the expected costs and benefits of the programme and the data likely to be available; discussions with programme partners to attempt to gather cost data; and inputting into the design of the service user survey (see chapter 3) to enable the collection of data on potential changes in individuals use of public sector services (to enable analysis of associated costs).

Types of costs

The costs of delivering Fair Way Scotland are expected to include:

- **Core programme delivery costs** – the costs to programme partners of delivering FWS, funded through the programme budget;
- **In kind resources** – any additional resources provided by partners to support the delivery of FWS that are not funded through the programme budget – e.g. including non-core staff time, premises and other resources;
- **Unfunded support services** – any additional services provided to FWS clients that are not funded by the core programme budget – e.g. training or mental health services accessed through the programme but not charged to the programme budget.

Core programme delivery costs

The core programme delivery costs are detailed in a programme budget and have been provided to the evaluation team. This sets out budgeted expenditures broken down by funders and providers, and by certain categories of expenditure.

The overall programme budget amounts to £2.55 million over 3 years, 2022/23 to 2024/25. Table 4.1 summarises the budget by programme component and funding partner.

Table 4.4 Fair Way Scotland Programme Budget (£)

Funder	Programme Component	Delivery Partners	Details	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	TOTAL
Oak Foundation	Advice and Support	Turning Point Scotland Simon Community Scotland	Support and advice workers Implementation lead Communication tools Survey Incentives (yr 2-3) Travel Cards	166,667	166,667	166,666	500,000
Scottish Government (EDT)	Helpline, Advice and Support	Scottish Refugee Council	Staffing Office, IT and running costs Commission Second Tier Legal Advice & Training Interpretation Costs	337,633	332,006	332,006	1,007,406
Joseph Rowntree Foundation	Research and Evaluation	Heriot-Watt University	Research & Evaluation	100,000	100,000	100,000	300,000
The Robertson Trust	Accommodation Costs	Refugee Survival Trust Simon Community Scotland Turning Point Scotland	Social rents Housing management Housing support Cash Payments	183,334	166,667	166,666	516,667
Scottish Government (EHT)	Infrastructure	Homeless Network Scotland	Planning, Coordination, Finance & Fundraising	75,000	75,000	75,000	225,000
City of Edinburgh Council	Secondment	Simon Community Scotland	Support & Advice Worker	10,766	0	0	10,766
				879,161	840,340	840,338	2,559,839

The main categories of expenditure are set out in Table 4.2 and include:

- Staffing costs
- Volunteer expenses
- Office expenses
- Second-Tier Legal advice & training
- Communication
- Interpretation and translation
- Accommodation and support costs
- Research and evaluation.

Research and evaluation costs are recorded in the programme budget but are rather separate from the costs of programme delivery, and, since they do not contribute directly to the delivery of programme outcomes, can be excluded from the economic analysis.

Conducting a cost benefit analysis of Fair Way Scotland relies upon access to data on actual expenditures against the main categories and sub-categories detailed in the first and second columns of table 4.2 and was provided to the evaluation team in March 2023.

Other Costs

In addition to the direct financial costs of delivering the project outlined above, the project may potentially consume additional resources and services not included in the financial cost budgets. The evaluation team will work with partners to understand whether these unbudgeted resources are significant and need to be quantified. These other costs potentially include:

- **In kind resources** – resources committed by project partners but not budgeted for/ reimbursed. These may include management time, unfunded staff costs, office costs etc.
- **Unfunded support services** – the budget includes accommodation costs and provision of services by support staff. We would also like to understand whether delivery of Fair Way Scotland depends on significant access to other services provided by the public and/or voluntary sectors which are not costed through the project budget – e.g. targeted personal support, mental health, training and education services where these help to achieve outcomes.

If it proves possible to quantify in-kind resources, and unfunded support services deployed in delivering Fair Way Scotland, these will be added to the core costs and programme monitoring data quantifying the number of people supported (see chapter 3) will be used to calculate the unit costs per person.

Table 4.5 Fair Way Scotland – Categories of Expenditure according to Programme Budget

CATEGORY	SUBCATEGORIES	PARTNERS (according to budget)
Staffing costs	Salaries On costs (NI, pensions) Travel expenses Training Useful to break down by subcategory	TPS funded by Oak Foundation through HNS SCS funded by Oak Foundation through HNS SRC funded by SG RST and SRC (and TPS year 2) funded by TRT through HNS HNS (co-ordination) funded by SG
Volunteer expenses		SRC, funded by SG
Office expenses	IT, telecomms, rents, utilities Not essential to break down by subcategory	TPS funded by Oak Foundation through HNS SCS funded by Oak Foundation through HNS RST and SRC (and TPS year 2) funded by TRT through HNS SRC funded by SG
Legal advice		Funded by Oak Foundation, commissioned by HNS (Partnership Agreement) Funded/ commissioned by Scottish Govt (through SRC) (second tier legal advice and training)
Communications and animation		External commission funded by Oak Foundation through HNS
Interpretation and translation		Interpretation needed for SRC case work funded by SG
Research and evaluation		HWU funded by JRF
Accommodation and support costs	Rent Council tax Utilities Furnishings Cash payments to service users Useful to break down by subcategory	RST and SRC (and TPS year 2) funded by TRT through HNS (2022/25)

Benefits and Cost Savings

This section details the approach being pursued to establish the benefits of and cost savings associated with Fair Way Scotland. By preventing or alleviating homelessness and destitution among people with NRPF, the programme may provide benefits to:

- **Service users**, through enhanced personal income, health and well-being.
- **Government (Scottish Government, local authorities, HM Treasury)**, through possible reductions in costs of public services, growth in tax revenues and future cost savings through prevention of future homelessness.

There is a shortage of existing evidence about the benefits and costs of providing services to people with NRPF, although various studies and evaluations have examined the costs of homelessness and the benefits of initiatives to address it.

A study by the LSE undertook a social cost benefit analysis of NRPF policy in London, demonstrating that, with some strong assumptions, a range of values can be put on the costs of NRPF status and therefore on the benefits of interventions. While the LSE study examined the costs and benefits of policy change (rather than support services for those with NRPF), and not all the changes examined are applicable to Fair Way Scotland, some of the values examined (e.g. changes in wellbeing related to quality and security of housing, relief of problem debt, income and productivity) are potentially relevant to the current evaluation. The study estimated the net present value of two options to extend access to public funds in London at £428 million and £872 million.¹⁹

In this evaluation, since there is no comparison group, the intention is that benefits assessment would focus on changes among service users since entering the programme – i.e. by assuming a static counterfactual, and that any changes in public service costs and benefits to service users can be attributed to support received through Fair Way Scotland. The methodological intention is that evidence on benefits will be collected through the survey of service users (see chapter 3), and include changes relating to:

- Personal income
- Access to secure and good quality housing
- Physical and mental health
- Financial status, including destitution and problem debt
- Use of public services.

Below we describe how these changes will be measured through the survey design. Most measures require information to be collected on individual circumstances before and after accessing FWS services. As discussed in chapter three, this requires a baseline/follow-up survey approach and we intend to administer a follow up survey to a subset of service users who complete the main 'baseline' survey having recently entered Fair Way services. In order to calculate the benefits of Fair Way services robustly, we estimate requiring baseline/follow up survey returns for c. 30-50 individual service users.

¹⁹ Benton (2022) Social Cost Benefit Analysis of the no recourse to public funds (NRPF) policy in London. <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/scba-nrpf-policy-in-london>

Benefits for service users

The main relevant direct benefits to service users fall into two categories: personal income and personal wellbeing.

Personal income

Changes in personal income for the supported group can be measured through the service user surveys. Service users' financial and work situation are covered in Section E of the current draft survey instrument (see Appendix).

For employment income, it may be appropriate to apply an adjustment to take account of displacement, since it is likely that some of the jobs filled by supported individuals will be at the expense of others – i.e. not all of the increase in personal income will be additional to the economy overall.

Personal well-being

Support through Fair Way Scotland is expected to enhance the well-being of service users, particularly by tackling homelessness and destitution and giving service users the time to resolve or stabilise their circumstances. This support could potentially benefit a variety of aspects of health and well-being. Those most amenable to valuation are:

- Security of access to housing;
- Overall mental health and well-being, as measured by the 7-point Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS);
- Overall health.

The survey questions proposed (see Section D of the appendix) will enable changes in secure access to housing to be assessed for the subset of respondents who complete a main 'baseline' stage and follow up survey. Estimates of the value of the benefit of having secure access to housing are available.²⁰

Question C1 of the draft survey asks respondents to rate aspects of their mental wellbeing, which enables an assessment of changes in wellbeing using the WEMWBS scale for those who complete both stages of the survey. The value of changes in the WEMWBS scale can be assessed by using an approach developed by HACT.²¹

Economic values are also available for the overall wellbeing benefits of good health, although only basic questions on health status are included in the survey (Questions C2 and C3); some strong assumptions would have to be applied to enable any economic assessment based on this survey question.

Other contributors to well-being – as covered by questions in the survey (e.g. aspects of personal safety, physical and mental health, access to support, aspects of financial wellbeing) would allow a qualitative assessment of benefits; it might be possible to value

²⁰ E.g. HACT social value data, as used in LSE (2021) [Social Cost Benefit Analysis of the NRPF policy in London](#)

²¹ Trotter, L., Rallings Adams, M-K (2017) Valuing improvements in mental health: Applying the wellbeing valuation method to WEMWBS. HACT. London, UK

some of these benefits on an ad hoc basis (e.g. monetary values are available for relief of problem debt).

Benefits to public budgets

The potential benefits of Fair Way Scotland to public budgets include: cost savings in relation to housing/homelessness services, policy and criminal justice services, and health services; increases in tax revenues; and cost savings associated with avoiding future homelessness. These may impact on Scottish Government, local authorities or the UK Exchequer, depending on the services/ revenues affected.

Cost savings

While homelessness programmes have been shown to deliver substantial cost savings through reductions in costs of public services, the scope for cost savings through support for people with NRPF is likely to be much reduced, albeit that this reasoning only applies outwith the context of accommodation being provided to this group on public health grounds. Firstly, people with NRPF have reduced eligibility for public services. Secondly, existing evidence suggests that people with NRPF, while at risk of homelessness and destitution, might be less likely to experience complex needs relating to e.g. addiction and involvement in the criminal justice system as compared to the UK- nationals experiencing homelessness.²²

The public services where support to people with NRPF is most likely to deliver cost savings are:

- Housing/ homelessness services – where people with NRPF have stayed in housing provided by the Home Office, or in other forms of emergency/temporary accommodation;
- Police and criminal justice services – where NRPF status has led people to actions or behaviours that have brought them in contact with the police, courts and/or prison services;
- Health services – where NRPF has impacted adversely on people’s health and increased their use of physical and mental health services;
- Social work – where local authorities are involved in assessing complex entitlements and offering interim services to some of those effected by NRPF.
- Third sector organisations supporting people with NRPF.

Any avoided costs may help to relieve pressures on existing budgets but are unlikely to deliver significant cashable savings (because of high levels of competition for services, as well as the likely relatively small numbers involved).

FWS may increase the consumption of some public services – e.g. through provision of physical and mental health services to the supported group – possibly offset by reductions in demand for crisis services.

²² Fitzpatrick, S., Johnsen, S., & Bramley, G. (2012). Multiple exclusion homelessness amongst migrants in the UK. *European Journal of Homelessness*, 6(1).

Changes in costs of public service use can be assessed by surveying peoples' use of services in the preceding six months and the timing of this in relation to access to Fair Way Scotland services. Questions have been included in the survey (sections D and F), and cover the extent of use of homelessness, police and criminal justice services, and health services. Once again, for those who complete both survey stages, we will be able to track housing status prior to and after support through FWS.

Unit cost data are available from a range of sources, including:

- [Costs of the criminal justice system in Scotland dataset](#), 2016/17
- [Public Health Scotland Costs Book](#) 2018/19
- [Greater Manchester Unit Cost database](#) 2019
- [PSSRU, Unit Costs of Health and Social Care](#), 2020/21

An analysis based on unit costs from these sources has recently been undertaken for the evaluation of the Housing First Pathfinder in Scotland.²³ However, the ability to be able to quantify any changes in service use depends on receiving sufficient survey respondents for users before and after support through Fair Way Scotland.

Tax revenues

Changes in taxes paid by service users can be estimated from changes in personal income, measured through the baseline and follow-up surveys (Question E4).

Costs of avoiding future homelessness

There are potential cost savings if support for those with NRPF prevents long term homelessness and its multiple costs for public budgets. These could potentially be estimated by estimating the proportion of service users protected from long term homelessness and applying a cost saving per person (from existing evidence).²⁴ However, while the survey collects data on housing status, overall effects on future homelessness could only be estimated by applying assumptions and scenarios about what might have happened to service users over time.

Conclusion

Year one of the evaluation has been focused on scoping the costs and benefits associated with Fair Way Scotland, how these will be recorded and quantified them (pre- and post-intervention), and the extent to which benefits can be valued in money. Cost data (for year one) has now been made available by the partners and this will allow the evaluation team to move forward with an assessment of core and other costs, with a view to calculating a unit cost per person. A hybrid approach will be taken to the baseline/follow up survey design, which will generate a dataset of changes in the needs, circumstances, wellbeing etc. of a subset of Fair Way service users who complete the main 'baseline' survey at or near the point of service entry and a follow up outcomes focused survey six months later. This will

²³ <https://researchportal.hw.ac.uk/en/publications/scotlands-housing-first-pathfinder-evaluation-final-report>

²⁴ E.g. Nicholas Pleace and Dennis P. Culhane (2016) Better than Cure? Testing the case for Enhancing Prevention of Single Homelessness in England. https://www.crisis.org.uk/media/20680/crisis_better_than_cure_2016.pdf; and DCLG (2012) Evidence review of the costs of homelessness. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7596/2200485.pdf

provide key data on the benefits of Fair Way Scotland to service users and to public budgets.

Chapter 5: Concluding discussion

This chapter concludes this interim report by revisiting the key themes of the research questions guiding the evaluation and laid out in chapter one: aims and theory of change, delivery and implementation, individual-level impacts, system-level impacts, and costs and benefits. The chapter closes by summarising the implications of the interim report for the future of the evaluation itself.

Aims and theory of change

Fair Way Scotland rests on the firm foundations of a clear consensus among core partners and wider stakeholders regarding its aims, and the high-level theory of change via which these can be achieved. The individual level aims of the programme are to prevent destitution and homelessness among those with NRPF/other RE, and in so doing improve their general wellbeing. The high-level theory of change guiding this work starts from a recognition that UK immigration policy generates a strong tendency towards homelessness and destitution for this group. Four core service components are postulated by the partnership as necessary to counter this tendency, namely accommodation, cash, legal advice and support. These components (altogether, separately or in some other combination) can support those with NRPF/other RE to avoid destitution and/or homelessness by enabling them to avoid this generative tendency (e.g. by regularising their immigration status and securing access to public funds or helping them (re)access section 4 support) and/or by mitigating its impacts (by providing accommodation and cash directly).

At the system-level, Fair Way Scotland aims to build understanding of the make-up, needs and circumstances of the NRPF/other RE group; to understand what works in assisting them; to build the capacity and collective impact of the organisations working to address their needs and help these organisations 'share the pain' of this highly ambitious and challenging agenda together; and to build ownership among national/local statutory partners and third sector organisations over preventing destitution and homelessness for the target group, including by encouraging local authorities to maximise use of available legal powers to assist those with NRPF/other RE. Key to achieving these system level aims is the design of Fair Way Scotland as an action and learning endeavour, and its conception and operation as a partnership. The importance of the partnership approach has been underlined and specified in this year one report. Critical for Fair Way's success is the effectiveness of the internal partnership, both strategically and operationally, but also the effectiveness of a wider set of partners beyond Fair Way itself in contributing to the aims of preventing homelessness and destitution for those with NROF/other RE, including: local authorities, Scottish Government, housing providers, independent funders etc. Only the combination of Fair Way partners and these wider stakeholders maximising their contribution can these highly ambitious goals be reached, especially given the challenging context in which they are being sought.

There is scope to further develop the Fair Way Scotland theories of change underpinning both these individual and systems-level aims by specifying: how service components will be secured; who is responsible for securing them; how they will be allocated to partners and/or service users; what resources need to be in place for them to be secured (e.g. human resources, leadership, training, etc); what particular combination of components works to address the needs of which groups of service users; and the risks that might be incurred in

these activities and how they might be minimised and mitigated. Development of a finer grained theories of change focused on the roles and responsibilities of key actors within and beyond the partnership may provide a means to address some of the implementation challenges faced in year one, and underline the dependence of Fair Way's success on the wider ecosystem of support available to the target group.

This work could usefully include revisiting the foundational question 'who is Fair Way Scotland for?'. At the systems-level the answer to this question is most clear – the partnership aims to improve responses to those with NRPF/other RE across Scotland. From the perspective of service delivery, however, it is arguably less clear, as indicated by (1) an apparent focus in practice on only the Appeal Rights Exhausted asylum seeking and EEA nationals with restricted eligibility groups and (2) questions about new groups of people with restricted eligibility, including the so called post-Brexit arrivals group. Those arriving via unsanctioned/illegal routes and therefore not able to claim asylum following the implementation of the Illegal Migration Bill are likely to become an additional group of focus in the future. The geographic focus of Fair Way Scotland in year one raises the question of whether a national roll out is desirable and/or feasible and or what timescale. How potential service users should be prioritised for accommodation, cash support and/or advice is also an important question going forward.

Delivery and implementation

One year in, Fair Way Scotland's delivery differs from the approach originally conceived in the five-year delivery plan in three key respects. First, the resources needed to mobilise nationally were not secured via independent funders, and as a result the approach has been rolled out in three cities rather than nationally. Second, accessing accommodation has been challenging for the partnership and the number of flats secured remains small and concentrated in Glasgow. Third, access to cash payments have been limited on the supply side by a policy to only provide such payments to those in Fair Way accommodation.

Difficulties accessing accommodation are perhaps the most striking and fundamental challenge faced in year one, and they reflect the coming together of a series of external and internal factors. Externally, the housing supply context is extremely challenging, especially but not only in Edinburgh, and this has been exacerbated by the housing impacts of large-scale displacement of people by the war in Ukraine. Providing accommodation is also the most expensive element of the programme, and the hardest to fundraise for given the reticence of independent funders to bear high and ongoing rental costs in this area. Internal factors have also been relevant, and in particular it has taken the partnership time to develop policies, procedures and agreements to enable the mobilisation of new accommodation. Concern not to rely upon new congregate accommodation options has also been a factor, and desire to phase out existing provision of this type a challenge.

Fair Way Scotland builds upon positive previous service landscape in terms of advice provision for those with NRPF linked to their asylum status. Access routes to this advice are well established, though there are concerns about the complexity of cases and workload of staff, with expectations of increased demand in the near future as a result of the Illegal Migration Bill. EEA advice is less well established, and demand outstrips supply, with waiting lists for support reported in at least two cities. There are also concerns about the skills and

capacity of staff to address the needs of this group given their highly varied circumstances and the onerous background research and documentation requirements. Roma/Romanian nationals and those with complex needs are seen as especially hard to assist within the current Fair Way model. Funding for interpreting to support advice work is not uniformly available across Fair Way partners.

Individual level impacts

It is too early in the evaluation period to report on the individual impacts of the programme. Future elements of the study will enable us to do so in future outputs, in particular, qualitative interviews with Fair Way service users, qualitative work with Fair Way case/support workers and the service user survey. However, the findings detailed in this interim report give a clear sense of the extent to which the individual-level theory of change is operating as intended. A positive finding is that key stakeholders all endorse the theory of change outlined in the delivery plan as the right one. The challenges lay in its implementation.

The UK legislative context is a key driver of destitution and homelessness for those with NRPF/other RE, and the power of this driver is being purposefully strengthened by ongoing legal reforms. The impacts of this are being compounded by two further external components: one, the Ukrainian refugee crisis (which increases demand on available accommodation); and two, the ending of public health measure accommodating this group. These core external components are not fixed. Changes in UK legislation, an easing of the housing crisis, or local authorities' consistently maximising the use of their powers to accommodate and support this group would rapidly accelerate and/or enable realisation of the Fair Way Scotland agenda. Fair Way Scotland's ability to shape these factors is limited, though this is a key focus of their strategic work.

As such, the operational work of the partnership involves the pitting of the four core service components against the tendencies of these powerful external drivers. Our findings show that it is possible to deploy the core service components in a way that removes people (partially or entirely) from the harms generated by the UK immigration policy component, and to do so even in the face of a deeply challenging external environment. Key stakeholders involved in Fair Way's operational work could all give examples of positive outcomes for Fair Way service users and future stages of the evaluation will evidence these further. Examples included regularising people's immigration status (rendering them eligible for public funds, benefits and housing assistance), supporting people to re-access Section 4 Home Office or local authority support provided on safeguarding grounds, assisting people (where safe and appropriate) to return to their country of origin; and/or directly providing accommodation and financial support.

However, each of the four service components – as things currently stand – are compromised. The Fair Way accommodation offer is currently limited in scale, though accommodation provided by local authorities and Home Office on public health grounds has been extended and its stepping down so far gradual. Cash, as well as housing support, is accessed via Fair Way funded accommodation, meaning very few Fair Way services users are accessing these forms of support, and key stakeholders are clear that there is unmet need that could be addressed by the scaling of these components. The availability of legal

advice is insufficient relative to demand, caseloads high and workers challenged by the complexity (and psychological burden) of cases.

There is clear potential to strengthen the four core service components by leveraging the involvement and contribution of two external factors, both of which are likely more amenable to shaping and influence by the Fair Way partnership in the short- to medium-run than the more antagonistic external components noted above – namely independent funders and housing providers, in particular registered social landlords. Strengthening of the four components can also be achieved by determinedly building the generative potential of two core internal components – namely partnership working (within and beyond the core Fair Way consortium) and operational structures, policies and processes (including e.g. joint working forums, data collection processes, etc), both of which are well within the grasp of the partnership. Changes entirely internal to the partnership also have capacity to strengthen these components – a revised training offer, a reviewed approach to the allocation of cash support, and resolving internal challenges to accommodation mobilisation, for instance.

System level impacts

Key stakeholders report that Fair Way Scotland's work has helped clarify and shine a light on Scottish local authorities' obligations to support and accommodate some individuals with NRPF/other RE on safeguarding grounds. Fair Way's presence may also have contributed to the gradual manner in which accommodation provided on public health grounds has been stepped down. It is also clear that Fair Way Scotland is highly valued as a single forum for statutory partners to discuss and better understand issues associated with this group. The work of COSLA has also been important in this regard. Of course, policy changes at the UK level could radically enable the prevention and alleviation of destitution and homelessness among this group, and work supported by JRF on behalf of Fair Way Scotland is exploring avenues for lobbying and influencing for such change.

Core to the theory of change supporting these systems-level aims are a partnership approach and an action and learning programme (with evaluation and learning partners involved from the start). This initial evaluation report has rendered clear that future progress against Fair Way's aims depends upon wider stakeholders spanning Scottish Government, local authorities, other statutory partners (e.g. health), independent funders and housing providers maximise their potential contribution to minimising homelessness and destitution among those with NRPF/other RE in a creative and sustained way. Given expectations of increased need in the near future, Fair Way can only hope to meet the needs of those who fall through the gaps if other tiers of government, other service areas and sectors maximise the role they play and minimise the demand left on third sector organisations to pick up the pieces of a UK immigration system that designs in destitution from the start.

Costs and benefits

This report has updated on work scoping the possibilities for economic analysis, including a full cost-benefit analysis of Fair Way Scotland. Initial data on costs and expenditure has now been secured by the evaluation team, though uncertainty remains about our capacity to quantify the value of in-kind resources and unfunded support services used in the delivery

of Fair Way services. Capturing the benefits to service users and the cost savings that accrue to HM Treasury as a result of Fair Way service provision will be captured in the survey of service users, and in particular the baseline/follow up survey conducted with a subset of phase one survey respondents.

The evaluation

This report has also presented the findings of the first tranche of qualitative key stakeholder interviews, and these have given an insight into the process of mobilisation in year one, the challenges faced, how these have or might be resolved, and the priorities moving forward. The implications of these findings for Fair Way Scotland partners' priorities going in to year two of delivery are discussed in the next and final section. The next steps for the evaluation team include full implementation of the baseline survey across Fair Way organisations, design and implementation of the follow-up service, qualitative focus groups with service managers and frontline staff, and individual qualitative longitudinal interviews with a diverse sample of Fair Way Scotland service users.

Future priorities for Fair Way Scotland

The interim findings presented in this report suggest a series of areas that it may be especially valuable for Fair Way Scotland partners, and wider stakeholders, to focus on in year two. These include, **developing a finer-grained theory of change**, explaining the mechanisms via which both the individual and system-level aims of Fair Way Scotland are intended to be achieved. This could usefully focus on the roles and responsibilities of internal partners and wider stakeholders and the resources required, and involve an assessment of the risks faced in relation to these roles, responsibilities and resources. Part of this exercise could very usefully involve a **reconsideration of the foundational question 'who is Fair Way Scotland for?'**, in terms of both system level aims, but also direct service provision. Fair Way Scotland could also usefully **invest more time in building and sustaining the partnership itself** as a core component of its business and one upon which the effectiveness of its work depends. **Resolving internal factors slowing the scaling up of Fair Way provided accommodation** has emerged as an essential priority for year two of the programme. Alongside this, our findings would suggest that **reviewing approaches to the dispersal of cash payments** would be a useful focus in year two. Given the partnerships focus on building knowledge of those with NRPF/other RE, two additional useful areas of focus are **developing common internal data collection and reporting processes** and, in partnership with the evaluation team, **building buy in to the external evaluation**, and perhaps in particular the service user survey.

Preventing destitution and homelessness among those with NRPF/other RE will only be possible if wider stakeholders outside the Fair Way partnership maximise their contribution to this agenda in a creative and sustained way. **Scottish Government's** strategic and direct financial support of Fair Way has been essential in securing progress to date, but these initial findings raise the possibility that both policy-makers/officials and political leaders²⁵

²⁵ See Scottish Government and Scottish Green Party (2021) Draft Shared Policy Programme: Working together to build a greener, fairer, independent Scotland.
www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/agreement/2021/08/scottish-government-and-scottish-green-party-shared-policy-programme/documents/scottish-government-and-scottish-green-party-draft-shared-policy-programme/scottish-government-and-scottish-green-party-draft-shared-policy-

within Scottish Government could play a more active role in encouraging independent funders, housing providers, local authorities and other key players to bring their muscle, resources and capacity to the table. This could usefully build, for example, on the emphasis on better meeting the needs of those subject to NRPF as a priority in the Green-SNP cooperation agreement. With the originally intended Ending Destitution Together Action Plan period coming to an end, working with Fair Way to plan next steps and not lose momentum is also important. This should include explicitly addressing areas of unmet need identified in this evaluation, including concerning post Brexit arrivals, the likely impact of the Illegal Migration Act and responses to those with NRPF/other RE who also have complex needs. In addition, mechanisms for distributing the British Red Cross delivered Hardship Fund could be altered to maximise positive impacts on those with NRPF/other RE who experience destitution on an ongoing basis, rather than as a short-term shock.

Housing providers and **independent funders** have a crucial role to play in contributing housing units and funding, and sharing the risk of supporting those with NRPF/other RE alongside Fair Way Scotland. While the costs of providing housing to a group not entitled to housing benefit are significant and ongoing, independent funders and housing providers are uniquely placed to fill this gap and to make a radical contribution to homelessness and poverty-prevention in so doing. **Local authorities** have played the central role in preventing homelessness among those with NRPF/other RE during and since the COVID-19 pandemic. Their ongoing role in doing so is extremely challenging in the context of multiple, competing priorities and stretched resources. A core and incredibly valuable focus, however, would be on local authorities consistently maximising their use of legal powers to assist those with NRPF/other RE and sharing and implementing best practice. Their ability to do so would be greatly enhanced by revised guidance and adequate funding from the **UK Government**, as well, of course, as a radical change of direction in immigration policy and access to public funds, welfare and housing support for those with NRPF and other RE. **Third sector organisations** not directly involved with the Fair Way Scotland also have a role to play in considering how they can mainstream a concern with those with NRPF/other RE into their work and **health services** too have an important role to play in understanding their considerable scope to assist those with NRPF/other RE address physical and mental health issues. In short, all of these players can contribute to preventing homelessness and destitution for this group by jointly owning the challenge, coming and staying 'at the table' and maximising their contribution within the legal and resource parameters they face. This report indicates that it is possible to make inroads into a problem that to date has seemed intractable with concerted, committed, creative and sustained cross-sector working. Future evaluation outputs will be able to track progress against this essential but difficult task.

Appendix: Fair Way Scotland Evaluation – Service User Survey

Information for case / support workers

Fair Way Scotland is a partnership tackling destitution and homelessness among people with no recourse to public funds. The charities involved are the Scottish Refugee Council, Simon Community Scotland, the Refugee Survival Trust, and Turning Point Scotland. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation have asked a team at Heriot-Watt University led by Dr Beth Watts-Cobbe to evaluate Fair Way Scotland. This survey forms one integral part of that evaluation. It will gather information on the circumstances and needs of people with no recourse to public funds and help to demonstrate the effectiveness and value of Fair Way Scotland services.

You are being asked to complete this survey with all Fair Way Scotland service users, that is, anyone accessing Fair Way Scotland support and advice work, accommodation and/or cash payments. It does not need to be completed for service users accessing *one-off* advice e.g. via the Scottish Refugee Council helpline.

It is important that all Fair Way service users are asked to complete the survey, whether they have entered the service recently or have received support longer-term. For new service users, the survey will ideally be completed soon after (within four weeks) entering Fair Way Scotland services, or as soon as possible thereafter.

Please note: If the service user has consented to participating in the survey, you may wish to complete section A (Pre-Survey information) before you meet with them to complete the main sections of the survey (B to E). If the service user consents to you doing so, and where you know answers to questions in sections B to E of the survey due to your familiarity with their case, you can complete questions without reading out the question / answer options to the service user.

The survey interview should be conducted in a private place, where the service user cannot be overheard. It is important that you do not share any information discussed while completing the survey with anyone else.

You do not have to complete the whole survey in one sitting. You can save and return to it later by clicking on the 'Resume Later' button on the top right-hand side of the window and creating log in details to return to the survey at a later point.

Before proceeding, please read the information below to the service user and/or provide it to them in writing. Translations of this text are available in Farsi, Arabic, Polish and Russian.

Please contact your manager or the evaluation team lead Beth Watts-Cobbe (b.watts-cobbe@hw.ac.uk) if you have any questions and queries about the survey or the wider evaluation.

Information for service users

Fair Way Scotland is a partnership between four charities seeking to help those struggling to get by because of their immigration status. The partnership is being independently

evaluated by a team at Heriot-Watt University, so we can understand what kinds of support and assistance help people the most. This survey forms one important part of that evaluation. You have been invited to take part because you are accessing support from the Scottish Refugee Council, Simon Community Scotland, the Refugee Survival Trust, and/or Turning Point Scotland. The information will be used to inform the future development of services and policy to help people in circumstances like yours. You'll be asked questions about:

- housing
- finances
- health and wellbeing
- use of public services

Responses will be sent only to the evaluation team at Heriot-Watt University. Taking part in the survey is voluntary. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to. Your decision about whether or not to take part will not affect the service you receive from any services or agencies.

Taking part in the survey is confidential. The person helping you complete the survey and the evaluation team will not share your answers with anyone else. Survey results will be used for statistical purposes only. This means we will only report numbers and will not identify individuals. We will not use your name or identify you in any other way in reports from the evaluation.

Informed consent

Do you understand the purpose of the survey and that your participation is voluntary and the answers you give confidential?

[MANDATORY]

Do you consent to participating in the survey?

[MANDATORY]

Are you happy for your case / support worker to answer questions in the survey on your behalf if they know the answer due to their familiarity with your case?

Section A: Pre-survey information

Please note: if the service user has consented to participate, you may wish to complete this section before you meet with them to complete the main sections B to E.

A1. Case worker name [open text] [MANDATORY]

A2. Case worker organization [MANDATORY]

- Refugee Survival Trust
- Scottish Refugee Council
- Simon Community Scotland
- Turning Point Scotland
- Other

If other, please specify [open text] [VOLUNTARY]

A3. Case worker local authority area [Drop down list] [MANDATORY]

A4. Case worker email address [open text] [MANDATORY]

A5. What is the service user's Unique Identifier number, provided by the Fair Way Scotland Implementation Lead, if available [open text] [VOLUNTARY]

A6. Service user survey respondent code [open text] [MANDATORY]

Please enter based on the following formula: LA area first 3 letters – Service user initials – date of the month on which service user birthday falls e.g. EDI-BWC-03

A7. Is the service user an asylum seeker?

- Yes (route to 7b)
- No (route to 7b)

A7a) If yes to A7, What is their current asylum status? [MANDATORY] (route to 8)

- Claimed asylum and awaiting a decision (including appeal)
- Asylum Rights Exhausted
- Unaccompanied child aged out of care system but yet to receive determination.
- Don't know/unclear
- Other

If other, please specify [open text] [VOLUNTARY] -

A7b) If no to A7, Is the service user an EU, EEA or Swiss national? [MANDATORY]

- Yes (route to A7bi)
- No (route to A7bii)-

- Don't know (route to A8)

A7bi) If yes to A7b. Why does the person have No Recourse to Public Funds? [MANDATORY] – then route to A8

- Has pre-settled status but without a qualifying right to reside
- Entered on EU Settlement Scheme Family Permit but relationship has broken down
- Awaiting decision on EU Settlement Scheme status and currently has no qualifying right to reside
- Does not have leave to remain (e.g., undocumented, overstayed visa or broke visa rules)
- Arrived in the UK from 1 January 2021 with valid visa but No Recourse to Public Funds.
- Don't know/unclear
- Other

If other, please specify [open text] [VOLUNTARY]

A7bii) If no to A7b. Why does the service user have No Recourse to Public Funds? [MANDATORY]

- Work or study visa/permit with an NRPF condition attached
- Spouse visa /maintenance undertaking (someone responsible for the persons financial support and accommodation)
- Does not have leave to remain (e.g. undocumented, overstayed visa or broke visa rules)
- Don't know/unclear
- Other

If other, please specify [open text] [VOLUNTARY]

A8. Is the service user currently residing in Fair Way Scotland accommodation? [MANDATORY]

- Yes (route 8b)
- No – but the service user has resided in Fair Way Scotland accommodation in the past (route to Q9)
- No – the service user has never resided in Fair Way Scotland accommodation (route to Q9)
- Don't know (route to Q9)

If yes to A8, how long has the service user been staying in Fair Way Scotland accommodation? MANDATORY

- Less than a month
- At least 1 month but less than 3 months
- At least 3 months but less than 6 months
- At least 6 months but less than a year

- A year or more
- Intermittently
- Don't know

If intermittently, please specify how long ago the service user first accessed Fair Way Scotland accommodation [open text] [VOLUNTARY]

A9. Is the service user currently receiving regular cash payments from Fair Way Scotland? [MANDATORY]

- Yes (route 9a)
- No – but the service user has received cash payments from Fair Way Scotland in the past (route 10)
- No – the service user has never received cash payments from Fair Way Scotland (route 10)
- Don't know (route 10)

If yes to A9, how long has the service user been receiving regular cash payments from Fair Way Scotland? [MANDATORY]

- Less than a month
- At least 1 month but less than 3 months
- At least 3 months but less than 6 months
- At least 6 months but less than a year
- A year or more
- Intermittently
- Don't know/Prefer not to say

A10. Is the service user currently receiving case worker support from a Fair Way Scotland partner (that is, support in relation to their migration status and eligibility for public funds, benefits and/or homelessness assistance)? [MANDATORY]

- Yes (route 10b other responses to A11)
- No – the service user is waiting for case worker support from Fair Way Scotland to commence
- No – but the service user has received case worker support from Fair Way Scotland in the past
- No – the service user has never received case worker support from Fair Way Scotland
- Don't know

If yes to A10, how long has the service user been receiving case worker support in relation to their migration status/eligibility for public funds from Fair Way Scotland? [MANDATORY]

- Less than a month
- At least 1 month but less than 3 months
- At least 3 months but less than 6 months
- At least 6 months but less than a year
- A year or more

- Intermittently
- Don't know/Prefer not to say

If intermittently, please specify how long ago the service user first accessed Fair Way Scotland case worker support [open text] [VOLUNTARY]

A11. Has the service user's case worker sought or received second tier legal advice about the case through Fair Way Scotland? [MANDATORY]

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

A12. Does the service user have a lawyer helping them in relation to the immigration status? [MANDATORY]

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

A13. Is the service user currently receiving wider forms of support from a Fair Way Scotland partner not related to their migration status/eligibility for public funds? [MANDATORY]

- Yes (route to A13b)
- No (route to B1)
- Don't know (route to B1)

If yes to A13, what are the main forms of support being provided? [open text] [MANDATORY]

[select all that apply]

- Help to access to food, clothing and other essential items
- Help to access to education and training, including learning English
- Emotional support and counselling
- Practical help (e.g. with budgeting, booking)
- Help to access to health care (e.g. GP, dental care, hospital and addiction services etc)
- Help with attending appointments
- Other (please specify)

Section B: About you

B1. How old are you? [DROP DOWN BOX] [MANDATORY]

B2. How would you describe your sex or gender? [MANDATORY]

- Male
- Female

- Identify in another way
- Prefer not to say

B3. How long have you been (continuously) living in the UK? [MANDATORY]

- Less than 12 months
- At least 1 year but less than 3 years
- At least 3 years but less than 5 years
- 5 or more years
- Not applicable (e.g., always lived in the UK or came as young child)
- Prefer not to say

B4. What was your main reason for coming to the UK/Scotland?

- Forced displacement (to seek asylum, temporary protection, as a refugee etc.)
- Settlement (long-term/permanent stay)
- Work (to take up a job offer or to seek work)
- Study (education or training)
- Marriage, family reunification or family formation
- Came to UK with family as baby/ young child
- Prefer not to say
- Other (routing)

If other, please specify [open text]

B5. Are you single or living as part of a couple? [MANDATORY]

- Single
- Living as a couple (with spouse, civil partner or unmarried partner)

B6. Which country were you born in? [MANDATORY]

Please write answer here or enter 'Prefer not to say' [open text]

B7. How well do you speak English? [MANDATORY]

- Very well
- Well
- Not well
- Not at all
- Prefer not to say

Section C: General health and wellbeing

C1. Over the last two weeks how often, if at all, would you say...[MANDATORY]

	None of the time	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time	Don't know	Prefer not to say
I've been feeling optimistic							
I've been feeling useful							
I've been feeling relaxed							
I've been dealing with problems well							
I've been thinking clearly							
I've been feeling close to other people							
I've been able to make up my own mind about things							

C2. How would you describe your mental health? [MANDATORY]

- Very good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Very poor
- Don't know
- Prefer not to say

C3. How would you describe your physical health? [MANDATORY]

- Very good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Very poor
- Don't know
- Prefer not to say

C4. In the last 12 months, have you experienced any of the following? [MANDATORY]

[select all that apply]

- Domestic abuse

- Alcohol or drug problems
- Getting in trouble with the police
- Forced to work for little/no money doing something you did not want to do
- None of these things

Section D: Accommodation

D1. In what sort of place are you living at the moment? [MANDATORY]

- Flat or house of their own, rented or owned (route D1a all other responses D2))
- Temporary flat/house arranged by the Local Authority or another support agency (excluding Fair Way Scotland and the Home Office)
- Temporary flat/house arranged by Fair Way Scotland
- Temporary flat/house arranged by the Home Office
- Room in a hotel / Bed and Breakfast provided by the Local Authority
- Room in a hotel / Bed and Breakfast provided by the Home Office
- Hostel, refuge or shelter (include accommodation provided by a charity or agency)
- Family/friend's house (e.g., sofa surfing)
- Sleeping rough (including on the street, in a park, in a bus/train station)
- Unconventional space (include car, bus, train, garage, tent or squat)
- Caravan, mobile home or boat
- Prefer not to say
- Other (routing)

If other, please specify [open text] [VOLUNTARY]

D1a. [If selected flat or house of their own in response to D1] Are you...?
[MANDATORY]

- ...renting from a Local Authority or Housing Association
- ...renting privately
- ... a home owner
- Prefer not to say

D2. Which of the following living situations have you experienced over the last 12 months (or since you arrived in the UK if less than one year)? [MANDATORY]

	Yes	No	Prefer not to say
Temporary flat/house arranged by council or another support agency			
Bed and breakfast hotel accommodation			
Hostel, refuge or shelter (include accommodation provided by a charity or agency)			
Family/friend's house (e.g., sofa surfing)			
Sleeping rough (including on the street, in a park, in a bus/train station)			

Unconventional space (include car, bus, train, garage, tent or squat)			
Caravan, mobile home or boat			

D3. Have you experienced any of the following housing issues in the last 12 months (or since you arrived in the UK if less than one year)? [MANDATORY]

	Yes	No	Prefer not to say
Left accommodation with nowhere else to go			
Had to leave accommodation for personal safety			
Lived in Home Office provided accommodation			
Moved to different accommodation multiple times by the Home Office			
Been asked to leave Home Office accommodation			
Moved home two or more times because they could not afford to pay the rent or because the landlord has asked them to leave			
Experienced a lot of difficulty finding a flat or house to rent			
Asked the Local Authority for help because they had nowhere to sleep or had no money			
Lived in crowded conditions sharing bedroom with strangers or sleeping in living room or on the floor			

Section E: Work and finances

Please remind the respondent that the information gathered in this survey is entirely confidential, and will not shared with any other individuals or agencies.

E1. What is your current work situation? [MANDATORY]

[select all that apply]

- Regular employment
- Casual or informal work (including cash in hand work)
- Unemployed - seeking work
- Not working due to caring obligations
- Not working due to ill health
- In education or training
- Not permitted to work due to migration status (e.g. asylum seeker or EEA national without permission to work in the UK)
- Prefer not to say
- Other (routing)

If other, please specify [open text] [VOLUNTARY]

E2. Do you currently have any regular source of income (including Section 4 support via ASPEN card or cash provided by Fair Way Scotland)? [MANDATORY]

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

E3. In the last month, have you received money from...? [MANDATORY]

	Yes	No	Prefer not to say
Family/relatives			
Friends			
Other charities/churches/ community groups or organisations			
Begging			
Home Office funds (e.g., asylum support payments)			
Local authority funds (e.g. via Social Work)			
Social security/benefit payments (e.g. from DWP)			
Other source (routing)			
No source at all			

If 'other source', please specify [open text] [VOLUNTARY]

E4. In the last month, what was your total income (after paying any taxes, including Section 4 support via ASPEN card)? [MANDATORY]

- None at all
- £1-£59 per week (£1-£250 per month)
- £60-£84 per week (£260-£360 per month)
- £85-£109 per week (£370-£470 per month)
- £110-£134 per week (£480-£580 per month)
- £135 or more (£590 or more per month)
- Prefer not to say.

E5. In the last 12 months (or since you arrived in the UK if less than one year) have you....? [MANDATORY]

	Yes	No	Not relevant	Prefer not to say
Been in debt, including being behind on rent, utility bills (gas, electricity etc) or council tax				
Been or been threatened with or experienced eviction from your accommodation due to rent arrears				
Borrowed money to meet everyday living costs				

	Yes	No	Not relevant	Prefer not to say
Had to rely on charitable support for food or other essential items (e.g. from a foodbank)				

E6. In the past month have you experienced any of the following? [MANDATORY]

	Yes	No	Not relevant	Prefer not to say
Had two or more days when you didn't eat at all, or had only one meal, because you couldn't afford to buy enough food				
Lacked money to buy suitable clothes and shoes or clothes needed to allow you to dress appropriately for the weather				
Lacked money to buy basic toiletries (soap, shampoo, toothbrush, toothpaste or sanitary items)				
Lacked money to heat your home for five or more days				
Lacked money to light your home for five or more days				

E7. In the last month, have you received any in-kind (i.e. non cash) help getting food, clothing, toiletries, or other necessities from...? [select all that apply] [MANDATORY]

- Friends/family
- Food banks
- Charities/churches and other community groups, including Fair Way Scotland services
- Other (routing)
- None of the above

If other, please specify [open text] [VOLUNTARY]

Section F: Public service use

F1. Have you had any of the following experiences in the last six months, and if so, how many times? [MANDATORY]

	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6 or more times	
Visited a GP surgery								Route F1 i
Appointment for a physical/ mental health or drugs/ alcohol issue (at hospital or community treatment service)								Route F1 ii

Been in an ambulance (as patient)								Route F1 iii
Attended Accident & Emergency								Route F1 iv
Been cautioned by police								Route F1 v
Been arrested								Route F1 vi
Attended court								Route F1 vii

F1b i – If 6 or more times, please write in actual or estimated number here
F1b ii – If 6 or more times, please write in actual or estimated number here
F1b iii – If 6 or more times, please write in actual or estimated number here
F1b iv – If 6 or more times, please write in actual or estimated number here
F1b v – If 6 or more times, please write in actual or estimated number here
F1bvi – If 6 or more times, please write in actual or estimated number here
F1bvi – If 6 or more times, please write in actual or estimated number here

F2. Have you experienced any of the following in the last six months, and if so for how many nights? [MANDATORY]

	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6 or more times	
Stayed in a hospital overnight for a physical/ mental health/ drugs or alcohol issue								Route F1 i
Been held in police custody overnight								Route F1 ii
Been in prison								Route F1 iii

F2b i – If 6 or more times, please write in actual or estimated number here
F2b ii – If 6 or more times, please write in actual or estimated number here
F2b iii – If 6 or more times, please write in actual or estimated number here

Section G: In your own words

G1. Is there anything you would like to say about your current circumstances and recent experiences before you finish the survey?

[open text] [VOLUNTARY]

Section H: Permission to recontact

H1. The evaluation team AT Heriot-Watt University would like to ask you to take part in follow-up research for this study in the next year or so. Would you be happy to be invited to take part in more research? [MANDATORY]

- Yes
- No

H2. If yes, please provide your contact details:

- Name [open text] [MANDATORY]
- Phone number [open text] [VOLUNTARY]
- Email address [open text] [VOLUNTARY]

H3. Would you be happy for the evaluation team to contact you via the organization/case worker helping you complete this survey if they are unable to reach you using the contact information you have provided? [MANDATORY]

- Yes
- No

H4. If the evaluation team cannot reach you via the contact information provided or through the organization/case worker helping you complete this survey, could they contact you through a friend or family member? [MANDATORY]

- Yes
- No

If yes, please provide the name and number of the family member (open text)
[MANDATORY]

H5. Is there any other means you can be contacted by? (open text) [VOLUNTARY]

WE ARE VERY GRATEFUL FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS SURVEY. PLEASE ACCEPT OUR SINCERE THANKS FOR YOUR TIME AND WILLINGNESS TO SHARE YOUR EXPERIENCES.

References

- Benton (2022) Social Cost Benefit Analysis of the no recourse to public funds (NRPF) policy in London. <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/scba-nrpf-policy-in-london>
- Benton, E., Karlsson, J., Pinter, I., Provan, B., Scanlon, K. and Whitehead, C. (2021) Social Cost Benefit Analysis of the NRPF policy in London. LSE. <https://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case/new/publications/abstract/?index=9187>
- Bethany Christian Trust (2023) Rapid Re-accommodation Welcome Centre: Annual Report 2022-2023. <https://bethanychristiantrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Rapid-Re-accommodation-Welcome-Centre-Report-2022-2023.pdf>
- COSLA/Scottish Government (2022) Ending Destitution Together: Progress Report – Year One 2021.2022. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/ending-destitution-together-progress-report-year-one-2021-2022/pages/2/>
- DCLG (2012) Evidence review of the costs of homelessness.
- Everyone Home Collective (2020) Route-Map 2 Scotland’s Ambition to End Destitution and Protect Human Rights. <https://everyonehome.scot/pdf/route-map-2.pdf>
- Fitzpatrick, S., Johnsen, S., & Bramley, G. (2012) Multiple exclusion homelessness amongst migrants in the UK. *European Journal of Homelessness*, 6(1), 31-58.
- Glasgow City Mission (2023) Overnight Welcome Centre 2022/23. <https://www.glasgowcitymission.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/OWC-Report-2022-23.pdf>
- Homeless Network Scotland (2021) Fair Way Scotland: Gateway to a safe destination, support and advice for people with no recourse to public funds. <https://homelessnetwork.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Fair-Way-Scotland-Delivery-Plan-FINAL-051021.pdf>
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7596/2200485.pdf
- Johnsen, S., Blenkinsopp, J., & Rayment, M. (2022) Scotland's Housing First Pathfinder Evaluation: Final Report. Heriot-Watt University. <https://doi.org/10.17861/8GJ7-SV28>
- Migration Scotland/COSLA (2023) COSLA Survey of Local Authority NRPF Support. <https://migrationscotland.org.uk/policyarea/cosla-survey-of-local-authority-nrpf-support/>
- National Housing Federation (no date) Helping people with No Recourse to Public Funds avoid homelessness: What housing associations can do? <https://www.housing.org.uk/globalassets/files/resource-files/helping-people-with-no-recourse-to-public-funds.pdf>
- Pleace, N. and Culhane, D. (2016) Better than Cure? Testing the case for Enhancing Prevention of Single Homelessness in England. https://www.crisis.org.uk/media/20680/crisis_better_than_cure_2016.pdf
- Refugee Council (2023) Briefing: Illegal Migration Bill – Assessment of impact of inadmissibility, removals, detention, accommodation and safe routes.

<https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Refugee-Council-Asylum-Bill-impact-assessment.pdf>

Scottish Government (2019) Social Housing Allocations in Scotland: a practice guide. <https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/advice-and-guidance/2019/02/social-housing-allocations-scotland-practice-guide/documents/social-housing-allocations-scotland-practice-guide-february-2019/social-housing-allocations-scotland-practice-guide-february-2019/govscot%3Adocument/social-housing-allocations-scotland-practice-guide-february-2019.pdf>

Scottish Government (2022) Ending Homelessness Together: Annual report to the Scottish Parliament. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/ending-homelessness-together-annual-report-2022/>

Scottish Government and Scottish Green Party (2021) Draft Shared Policy Programme: Working together to build a greener, fairer, independent Scotland. www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/agreement/2021/08/scottish-government-and-scottish-green-party-shared-policy-programme/documents/scottish-government-and-scottish-green-party-draft-shared-policy-programme/scottish-government-and-scottish-green-party-draft-shared-policy-programme/govscot%3Adocument/SG%2BSGP%2BTalks%2B-%2BDraft%2BPolicy%2BProgramme%2B-%2Bversion%2B7%2B-%2BFINAL%2B-%2BOFFSEN.pdf

Scottish Government/COSLA (2019) Migrants' Rights and Entitlements to Local Authority Services and Support - National Guidance. <https://migrat.dev.bluesword.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Migrants-Rights-and-Entitlements-Guidance.pdf>

Scottish Housing Regulator (2023) Homelessness services in Scotland: A thematic review. <https://www.housingregulator.gov.scot/media/1884/homelessness-services-in-scotland-a-thematic-review-february-2023.pdf>

SOLACE Scotland (2023) Housing in Scotland: Current context and preparing for the future. <https://solace.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Solace-Current-Context-and-Preparing-for-the-Future-1.pdf>

The Migration Observatory (2022) Briefing/Q&A: The UK and the Ukraine refugee situation. <https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/briefings/qa-the-uk-and-the-ukraine-refugee-situation/>

Trotter, L., Rallings Adams, M-K (2017) Valuing improvements in mental health: Applying the wellbeing valuation method to WEMWBS. HACT. London, UK

Westthorp, G. (2014) Realist Impact Evaluation: An Introduction. London: Overseas Development Institute. <https://cdn.odi.org/media/documents/9138.pdf>



Fair Way Scotland Evaluation Progress Report (Year 1)

By: Beth Watts-Cobbe, Lynne McMordie, Glen Bramley (I-SPHERE)
Gillian Young (Newhaven Research)
and Matt Rayment (Rayment Consultancy Services)

Published August 2023

I-SPHERE, Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh

ISBN: 978-1-9161385-5-1

doi.org/10.17861/c8hy-7j14

 @ISPHERE_HWU