![UK Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence logo]

UK COLLABORATIVE CENTRE FOR HOUSING EVIDENCE

Road to Home:

University of Glasgow Homelessness Initiative Scoping Study

Jocelyne Fleming

December 2022

housingevidence.ac.uk

Foreword

The University of Glasgow established the homelessness initiative Road to Home in 2021. It is a major strategic commitment by the University to make a meaningful contribution to reducing homelessness in the city of Glasgow and surrounding areas. This follows on from previous major civic programmes to recognise and act on the University's colonial past and its role contributing to slavery, as well as pledging to the goal of establishing a net zero University by 2030.

Homelessness is recognised as a complex series of problems created by a combination of structural and individual factors. The focus is not just on street homelessness but takes a wider view that incorporates the numbers of people experiencing homelessness. This may include those applying for help with housing who are assessed as homeless, the various forms of homelessness relating to not having a settled home, and looking at those in temporary accommodation. The initiative also considers the underlying drivers of homelessness, as well as the policy interventions and systems set up to address these challenges. We are also concerned with the prevention of homelessness for those at risk of losing their home.

We are fortunate to be able to call upon many experts and colleagues who are helping shape our plans. These include practitioners and academics who work in places like Heriot-Watt University and Cardiff University but also the 'what works' Centre for Homelessness Impact (CHI). There are also many experts on different aspects of homelessness working at the University of Glasgow.

We support the practical definition of seeking to end homelessness in Glasgow adopted by CHI, to paraphrase: after drawing on evidenced interventions to tackle these multiple dimensions of homelessness, any remaining experiences of homelessness should be rare, brief and non-recurring.

The initiative started out with a number of themes or ways we felt that the University could contribute to reducing homelessness in Glasgow. We want to use our skills, human capital and value-added as effectively as possible and not tread on the toes of those already doing the job and making important contributions in the field. We therefore thought that we might contribute via:

- Teaching and education

- Research and knowledge exchange

- Drawing on the University community to make a difference (students, staff, alumni) to volunteer, including drawing on those skills colleagues possess

- Drawing on other university resources to work in partnership to leave a lasting contribution.

We are actively drawing up plans in these areas and have set up a sounding board of University colleagues to help us in that process. As a first step in putting this work together we have funded this report as a scoping exercise involving literature review and interviews with key professionals working in and around homelessness in Glasgow as well as talking with people with lived experience. Jocelyne Fleming has done a great job carrying out this work efficiently and carefully, with light touch editorial input from Ken Gibb. We think this is an excellent first step in both framing our work and focusing on what is possible and desirable.

The Initiative is always looking for further help, insight and guidance from people across the University community. Please do get in touch with our development officer, Caragh Keith at Caragh.Keith@glasgow.ac.uk, or either of us, and we would be pleased to discuss further how we might better understand and help tackle homelessness and the loss of home in Glasgow. Our website is at https://www.gla.ac.uk/connect/civic/roadtohome/.

Professor Kenneth Gibb, Director UK Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence and Urban Studies, School of Social and Political Sciences (Ken.Gibb@glasgow.ac.uk)

and

Dr David Duncan, Chief Operating Officer, University of Glasgow (David.Duncan@glasgow.ac.uk)

Co-Leads, Road to Home University of Glasgow, Homelessness Initiative

Contents

Executive Summary

Road to Home is the University of Glasgow's homelessness initiative. It seeks to draw on the University community's wide set of relevant skills, expertise and networks, so that it can, over a period of years, make a meaningful difference to support the goal of ending homelessness in Glasgow.

This scoping report is our first core publication. It provides background, context and a sense of the trajectory of Glasgow's homelessness problems and the services, policy and practice that seek to address those problems, both symptomatically and deeper causes. The report also explores the Initiative's forward agenda and how it speaks to the evidence presented here from both key stakeholders and a focus group of people with lived experience of homelessness.

The report asks what do we mean by homelessness and what in practice does it mean to seek to make a meaningful difference to ending it in a city like Glasgow? Homelessness covers many issues and challenges:

- Street homelessness

- People who are officially homeless and counted in the system and for whom the state has a duty to help

- People experiencing multiple exclusion homelessness who need multidisciplinary support to both address their housing situation but also make progress with their other challenges

- Women and children experiencing homelessness because they are fleeing domestic abuse

- People at risk of imminent homelessness or in insecure accommodation

- People relying on informal arrangements such as 'sofa surfing' but without a permanent address

- Households stuck in temporary accommodation because of a lack of permanent housing supply that can be provided to meet their needs

- People, often asylum seekers, with no recourse to public funds

- Further upstream, we need to better understand the causes and explanations of these and other different strands, if society is to better prevent future homelessness and repeat cycling of homelessness presentations.

While we recognise that it will not ever be possible to completely eliminate homelessness, we wholeheartedly support the principle espoused by Crisis, the Centre for Homelessness Impact and now DLUHC (the Whitehall ministry responsible for homelessness), that where it exists, homelessness should only be rare, brief and non-recurring.

Scotland is distinctive in its approach to homelessness with some of the strongest rights for people experiencing homeless anywhere in the world. This sense of clear direction has been recently reinforced by the Government's commitment to make further progress on rough sleeping, and now on homelessness prevention, too (in the latter case where Scotland arguably has lagged behind other parts of the UK, but now seeks to go further).

However, despite much progress made, homelessness remains a significant issue in Glasgow. Across different metrics, Glasgow has the worst Scottish performance on homelessness outcomes: it has a disproportionate number of homelessness applications relative to its population share and the highest proportion of people in temporary accommodation. This is despite evident progress being made on both criteria (of course, there are other criteria to consider – see main report) but the city is relatively affordable in terms of available supply, albeit in a context where, recently, private rents have been accelerating by more than 10% a year. At the same time, the new Alliance consortium model of delivering services for people experiencing homeless across the city is an exciting innovation, for which there are strong positive expectations.

At the root of all this is a clear sense of what factors cause homelessness. Evidence about this is essential to guide prevention and diagnostic service responses to homeless presentations, within the existing legal system of rights and duties. The literature recognises both structural factors (e.g. poverty, housing system failures, the benefits system, asylum and migration policy, etc.) as well as individual-level factors representing risks associated with different complex needs or situations. Both sets of factors can trigger homelessness and will often require complex, wraparound responses. In the longer term, the structural causes have to be responded to if progress is to be made and create an environment where assistance can be best provided for individual needs.

To deepen our knowledge of homelessness in Glasgow, interviews were carried out with a range of professional stakeholders but also with a focus group of people with lived experience of homelessness. Many points arose from these discussions, which are discussed more fully in the report. Here, we note a selection of key findings:

- While it is undoubtedly the case that numbers of street homelessness have fallen substantially, there remain questions about how accurately we quantify rough sleeping. It was suggested that the University could contribute a more rigorous citywide enumeration.

- Covid-19 responses saw homelessness as a potential public health emergency and used empty hotels and other solutions effectively and moved emergency housing away (permanently) from unsafe congregate solutions.

- Many commentators recognised an improving but still problematic challenge of moving people from Temporary Accommodation to permanent social housing solutions.

- The stakeholders and focus group respondents noted positive and negative developments within the homelessness services system – a sense of improvement and lessening of certain issues, careful optimism about innovations such as Housing First, but also concerns about the complexity of homelessness services, as well as the urgency of better matching of households in temporary accommodation to properties becoming available in the social housing sector. Those with lived experience pointed to the Simon Community Hub as a particularly effective and well-functioning part of this system.

- The University was seen by these stakeholders and by the focus group as possessing specific skills that can support the trajectory of improving homelessness services: through research, education, legal support, and physical assets.

The report concludes with a range of ideas for future research for the Initiative and this helps us to articulate our likely future research and engagement agenda.

- Student homelessness and the shortage of student housing in the private rented sector, in a context of growing student demand.

- Systems analysis of homelessness policy & practice including matching permanent available homes for the needs of people in temporary accommodation.

- Pregnant women and mothers with children experiencing homelessness

- Evaluating comprehensive hub services for the homeless – Simon Community

- Education routes, including: homelessness-relevant vocational and professional micro credentials, developing secondary school modern studies curricula, and, investigating a new professionally accredited post graduate certificate qualification for homelessness case workers in Glasgow (and across Scotland).

- Volunteering, including: working with student initiatives, specialist advice and examining the scope to introduce University wide staff volunteering schemes, partnership with the Centre for Homelessness Impact and their impact chapters programme of work.

A Note About Language Use

Recognising the power of language in shaping understanding and meaning within research is essential. For this reason, the term 'individuals experiencing homelessness' was consciously chosen in place of terms like 'homeless people' or 'the homeless' in an effort to recognise the importance of language in maintaining the humanity and dignity of individuals experiencing homelessness. This term aims to reflect the episodic nature of homelessness and avoid positioning one's housing status at the forefront of their identity.

Acknowledgements

We thank Shelter Scotland for help recruiting the focus group, we also thank our focus group participants and key stakeholder interviewees, as well as two peer reviewers.

1. Introduction

This report will confirm that homelessness remains a salient issue in the City of Glasgow. Challenges of rough sleeping and access to permanent, settled accommodation linger despite a progressive national policy environment and the City's relatively affordable supply of housing.

The objectives of this report are threefold:

1. To provide an overview of homelessness, its causes and the national and local policy framework in which Glasgow operates

2. To identify challenges, opportunities and key themes within Glasgow's context

3. To set out opportunities for the University of Glasgow to provide meaningful and appropriate resources in support of eradicating homelessness within the City

Scope of Report

The report aims to create a high-level, holistic picture of the nature and extent of homelessness in Glasgow. It seeks to outline the approaches to addressing homelessness across the city and map the organisations working to provide accommodation and services to those in need. In so doing, it strives to identify systems-level (O'Sullivan et al., 2004; Meadows, 2008; Monat and Gannon, 2015) challenges and opportunities for improvement. Finally, it threads together key themes and outlines areas where University resources could effectively and positively contribute to ending homelessness and rough sleeping in Glasgow.

Research Methods

Literature Review

A rapid review of relevant literature was undertaken. Both academic and grey literature were included in the search, supported by a systematic online search and subsequent engagement with the author's own knowledge of relevant publications as well as other relevant publications recommended by colleagues. Abstracts and executive summaries were reviewed to establish relevance. Additional literature from the extant body of work examining homelessness was included to support a theoretical discussion of the causes of homelessness and to set the Scottish and UK contexts within a wider global understanding.

Key Stakeholder Interviews

Key stakeholder interviews were conducted across organisations operating within the City of Glasgow and Scotland more broadly. Individuals span a range of seniority levels and across governmental and third sector organisations. These interviews sought to identify challenges and opportunities within the City and to highlight areas where individuals working within the sector felt that the University could positively contribute. The topic guide used to direct these interviews is available in Appendix One.

Lived Experience Focus Group

It is essential that the voices of individuals with lived experience are included when conducting research and, indeed, in co-producing programmes and policy. Individuals with lived experience of homelessness in Glasgow were engaged as subject matter experts to discuss the opportunities and challenges facing the City's homelessness and housing systems (O'Sullivan et al., 2004; Gibb and Marsh, 2019) from their perspectives.

Structure of the Report

First, a discussion of homelessness and its causes is situated and frames the research. From there, the specific policy contexts experienced in Scotland and Glasgow are outlined. Next, a high-level overview of the organisations and services currently operating within the City of Glasgow is provided. This is then followed by an examination and discussion of themes from key stakeholder interviews and focus groups. Finally, opportunities for the University to positively contribute to this system are explored.

2. Understanding homelessness

What is Homelessness?

Often, 'homelessness' is conceptualised in its most visible forms – rooflessness and sleeping rough. However, as a vast body of literature has recognised, homelessness as a 'catch-all' term encompasses a wide variety of groups and experiences of housing need (Hulchanski et al., 2009). As Williams argues (cited in Fitzpatrick, 2005, p. 11), "there is no such thing as homelessness, but instead a range of heterogeneous characteristics that give rise to a wide range of symptoms that we term homelessness."

Several definitions and typologies have been developed to understand and classify these disparate experiences. The most widely used is the European Typology of Homelessness and Housing Exclusion (ETHOS). ETHOS outlines thirteen operational categories of homelessness, across four conceptual categories (ranging from 'Roofless' – people living rough – to 'Inadequate Housing' – people living in unfit or overcrowded housing (FEANTSA, 2007). Often, homelessness statistics focus on the Roofless and Houseless categories. For instance, recent figures from Crisis UK suggest that an estimated 14,250 Scottish households experience 'core homelessness'[1] – "the most severe and immediate forms of homelessness" – per night (Watts et al., 2021, p. xv).

The accepted definition and understanding of homelessness within a particular system or society has significant impacts on the policy solutions offered to address the problem. As will be discussed further, Scotland's legally entrenched definition is relatively broad-reaching and includes housing need beyond just rooflessness and sleeping rough. This, importantly, undergirds a robust housing support system and interventions focussed on preventing homelessness before experiences of rough sleeping have occurred.

What does 'eradicating homelessness' really mean?

There is an active effort by government and sector partners to 'end' or 'eradicate' homelessness in Glasgow and across Scotland. However, there is a lively debate about what we mean when we say we're striving to 'end' or 'eradicate' homelessness.

For instance, the Centre for Homelessness Impact outlines their vision for "a society in which any experience of homelessness is rare, brief and non-recurring[2]", recognising that even in the best of policy and housing systems, experiences of emergency homelessness will arise in some circumstances (e.g., in cases of domestic abuse) (Centre for Homelessness Impact, 2019). This is a vision that is now recognised in Whitehall by the Department for Levelling-up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC)[3]. Similarly, for the Glasgow Alliance, which strives to end homelessness and rough sleeping in the City by 2030 (Glasgow Alliance to End Homelessness, n.d. "our ambition"), prevention must be at the centre of the homelessness response and, further, that work is done to "reduce the scale of and time people spend in temporary accommodation" (Glasgow Alliance to End Homelessness, n.d. "our vision"). The Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group, convened by the Scottish Government, focused their final report on recommendations to end homelessness in Scotland. While these recommendations are well-evidenced and consider structural and individual causal factors, the report does not necessarily provide a clear definition of what an 'end' to all forms of homelessness and rough sleeping would mean for Scotland (Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group, 2018).

---

[1] Crisis UK's research found that 'core homelessness' rates in Scotland (0.57% of households) are "substantially lower" than those in England and Wales (0.94% and 0.66%, respectively) (Watts et al., 2021, p. xviii).

[2] A phrase earlier used by Crisis: https://www.crisis.org.uk/media/239951/everybody_in_how_to_end_homelessness_in_great_britain_2018.pdf

[3] See: https://www.homelessnessimpact.org/post/a-vision-for-ending-rough-sleeping-in-england

What causes homelessness?

A robust body of literature has been developed, especially in the UK, which attempts to conceptualise and distil the causes of homelessness. The socially diagnosed causes of homelessness have a direct impact on the policy remedies that can be offered in response.

Historically, conceptual discussion of the causes of homelessness was broken down into two dichotomous categories: agency and structure. Agency-based understandings of homelessness focus on the circumstances of an individual's life. These factors can include relationship breakdown, mental health challenges or substance misuse. Within this school of thinking, there is a further divide in understanding, perceiving of these individuals as either deserving (not to blame for their circumstances and therefore more worthy of social supports) or undeserving (culpable for their plight and consequently less worthy of public interventions). The second 'camp' focuses on structural causes of homelessness, which create the societal-level conditions in which homelessness will occur (Fitzpatrick, 2005, p. 4). These factors cover a wide range of issues from poverty, to welfare and benefit levels, to housing market conditions. Helpfully, scholarly work has lobbied against this false dichotomy, with several theoretical models and practical interventions now focused on the "constellation of risk factors" that drive homelessness (Farrugia and Gerrard, 2016, p. 272).

Homelessness, in reality, is complex, varied and likely to include factors from and between these categories. The causes of homelessness are, in some ways, unique to each case and policy and housing context. As Fitzpatrick et al. argue, access (or lack thereof) to affordable healthcare and childcare, labour and housing market conditions and levels of violence can all be understood to drive levels of homelessness within a particular polity (2019, p. 83).

Beyond the undeniable, central role played by poverty, research from the Salvation Army found that, "homelessness [in Scotland] is most often the result of other issues in a person's life – relationship breakdown, poor mental health, domestic abuse, family breakdown" (2021, p. 33). Scottish Government statistics support these findings: the three most common reasons cited during a homelessness application in Scotland are related to the breakdown of familial relationships (Scottish Government, 2021, p. 15). While this may denote the need to closely consider individual-level causes (and remedies) for homelessness, it is imperative to note, as the vast majority of homelessness research has, that truly eradicating homelessness, in all its forms, will require a systems-level transformation and commitment from policymakers to tackle issues of housing affordability (including ensuring sufficient supplies of secure low cost housing), poverty and social support levels (Littlewood et al., 2017, p. iii).

Beyond Bricks and Mortar

The impacts and experience of homelessness go beyond the absence of secure housing. People experiencing homelessness and rough sleeping have disproportionately high rates of poor physical and mental health, both of which are exacerbated by the experience of homelessness itself (Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership, n.d.). Theoretical academic discussion, and, recently Scottish policy discourse, often considers the non-material elements of homelessness, examining ontological security – "a sense of stability and being at home" (Stewart, 2018, p. 1119) – and the emotional and non-material ramifications of the absence of 'home' (Gurney, 2021; Somerville, 1992). These discussions are important, because, as Stewart highlights, policy interventions that are cognisant of, or tailored to, addressing these non-material needs can be vastly beneficial for individuals experiencing homelessness and can increase successful tenancy sustainment rates (i.e. keeping people in their homes longer) (2018, p. 1122).

Multiple Exclusion Homelessness

Housing insecurity and homelessness is often experienced alongside compounding difficulties; referred to as 'multiple exclusion homelessness'[4]. As defined by Johnsen and Fitzpatrick (2012, p.1) an individual can be understood to be experiencing MEH if:

> "they have been 'homeless' (including experience of temporary/unsuitable accommodation as well as sleeping rough) and have also experienced one or more of the following other domains of 'deep social exclusion': 'institutional care' (prison, local authority care, mental health hospitals or wards); 'substance misuse' (drug, alcohol, solvent or gas misuse); or participation in 'street culture activities' (begging, street drinking, 'survival' shoplifting or sex work).

International best practice tells us that, in cases of MEH, wrap-around, flexible supports are likely required in addition to (and, ideally, alongside) the provision of stable, secure, long-term housing (Homeless Network Scotland, 2019). The number of individuals experiencing MEH that present to local authorities is increasing, especially in Glasgow.

Responses to Homelessness

Responses to homelessness in Scotland are underpinned by a progressive legislative framework that has evolved over several decades. The Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977 – subsequently consolidated into The Housing (Scotland) Act 1987 (The 1987 Act) – established statutory requirements for local authorities to provide assistance to households experiencing or at risk of homelessness (Scottish Government, 2019). These responsibilities extended to the provision of accommodation, but only in certain circumstances. The 1987 Act has since been amended by the Housing (Scotland) Act 2001 (The 2001 Act), and subsequently the Homelessness etc. (Scotland) Act 2003 (The 2003 Act). Crucially, the 2001 Act established a single regulatory framework for the social rented sector and introduced a duty on registered social landlords to assist local authorities in rehousing individuals experiencing homelessness (Marks, 2019; Scottish Government, n.d. "Homelessness"). The 2003 Act advanced the rights of individuals experiencing homelessness, establishing that "by 2012, anyone finding themselves homeless through no fault of their own must be entitled to settled accommodation" (Scottish Government, n.d., "Homelessness", n.p). The 2003 Act thereby amended the 1987 Act and was enshrined into law alongside the Homelessness (Abolition of Priority Need Test) (Scotland) 2012, which extended the right to settled accommodation to all unintentionally homeless households. More recently, Scottish Government has made further policy changes to support homelessness prevention. For instance, by the end of 2018, all thirty-two local authorities were asked to develop Rapid Rehousing Transition Plans to outline their framework for providing individuals experiencing homelessness with settled accommodation without extended periods spent in temporary accommodation (Marks, 2019).

There are several approaches to tackling homelessness, which are often conceptualised to fall on a spectrum from 'upstream' programmes focusing on prevention, to 'midstream' interventions focuses on those immediately at risk of homelessness to 'downstream' initiatives providing emergency support (Fitzpatrick et al., 2021a; Gibb, 2017; Puttick, 2012). Recent literature has problematised this tripartite model and instead offer a five-part typology that is better positioned to map responses to homelessness by both the groups being targeted and the time-ordering of the intervention.

---

[4] This report engages with the terminology 'multiple exclusion homelessness.' However, in some cases, this group is also referred to as individuals with 'multiple and complex needs'.

The 'Five-Level Typology of Homelessness Prevention' as outlined by Fitzpatrick et al. (2021, p. 82), has been engaged by sector stakeholders within the UK. It posits that the core stages of homelessness prevention are:

- **Universal** – preventing or minimising homelessness risks across the population at large.

- **Upstream** – early-stage prevention focussed on high-risk groups, such as vulnerable young people and risky transitions, such as leaving local authority care, prison, or mental health in-patient treatment.

- **Crisis** – preventing homelessness likely to occur within a foreseeable period.

- **Emergency** – support for those at immediate risk of homelessness, especially rough sleeping;

- **Repeat** – prevention of recurrent homelessness, especially rough sleeping.

Outlined below are some key concepts/models, which have informed historical policy approaches and/or are representative of current priorities in Scotland or reflective of international best practice.

Treatment as Usual

Treatment as Usual (TAU) models – sometimes called Staircase models or 'Tenancy Ready' models – have comprised much of the historical approach to providing individuals with accommodation; falling largely within the 'emergency' classification defined above. TAU requires individuals experiencing homelessness to progress through a series of conditional housing types in order to demonstrate their 'readiness' for a long-term, secure tenancy (Clapham, 2018, p. 173). These conditions range, but often include mandatory engagement with services, sobriety, and for young people especially, enrolment in skills-development programmes (Stewart, 2018). As has been noted within homelessness literature, there is little evidence to support the merits of this model in supporting individuals to exit homelessness – with Clapham (2018, p. 173) noting that "few people ever leave the staircase model".

Housing First

Similarly focussed on supporting individuals immediately experiencing or at risk of homelessness, Housing First has emerged as a holistic and well-evidenced means of addressing homelessness and supporting successful tenancies. Housing First is predicated on the rapid provision of safe, long-term, unconditional housing, coupled with a resource system that "provides flexible support for as long as an individual needs it" (Homeless Network Scotland, 2019, no page). Housing First has been established as best practice for supporting individuals experiencing multiple exclusion homelessness in several pilot programmes internationally (Macnaughton et al., 2013; Piat et al., 2014; Watts et al., 2021). The unconditionality of housing is central to the Housing First model and, indeed, to achieving the many benefits that have been noted in several Housing First trials and studies globally (Baxter et al., 2019; Watts et al., 2021). Support must be available as long as it is needed, and not a condition of maintaining the housing on offer (Homeless Network Scotland, 2019, no page).

As The Homelessness Monitor report outlines, positive impacts of Housing First interventions include "tenancy sustainment, wider benefits to the choice and control of tenants, and gains in relation to partnership working" (Watts et al., 2021, p. 52). International evidence has found "impressively high" tenancy maintenance rates – over 90% after one year (Littlewood et al., 2017, p. 33). This success has already been repeated within the Scottish context. The recent Housing First Pathfinder programme, piloted in five Scottish cities, including Glasgow, saw 85% of the 500 tenancies initiated sustained to date (Watts et al., 2021, pp. 51–52). While there is positive evidence on the efficacy of the Housing First model emerging internationally, detailed evaluation, including impact evaluations, are only now underway in the UK and Scotland.

Despite the wide-reaching benefits and international evidence base supporting the model, there have been challenges to Housing First identified. The most concerning of these is the inconsistent degree of fidelity to the core principles of the model (Watts et al., 2021, p. 52). Several Housing First programmes have been established both in the UK, but their adherence to the model and the robustness, duration and suitability of services have been challenged. Experts have noted that the overwhelming tenancy success that has been demonstrated internationally cannot be expected if these models do not incorporate and sustain all principles of true 'Housing First' programming (Watts et al., 2021).

Moving upstream: prioritising prevention

Homelessness literature has identified a 'prevention turn' in homelessness responses around the world (Fitzpatrick et al., 2021a). As outlined further in the following section, this shift in focus toward prevention is similarly present in the Scottish context, though it has notably lagged behind other nations within the UK (Fitzpatrick et al., 2019b).

Housing Options

The Housing Options approach is the process of providing advice and information that local authorities are duty-bound by the 2001 Act to engage when they receive a homeless application or enquiry from an individual experiencing a housing challenge (Scottish Government, n.d.). Housing Options takes a person-centred approach to managing housing problems, which examines an individual's choices in a holistic way (Marks, 2019, p. 20). This approach has continued to receive Scottish Government support, as outlined in the Ending Homelessness Together Action Plan (2020), and focuses on prevention first, assisting individuals in understanding and exploring all the housing options available to them as well as providing resources to assist with related challenges like debt, family difficulties and mental health challenges (Scottish Government, 2020a, p. 15, n.d.).

3. The Scottish Policy Context

Between April 2020 to March 2021 there were 33,792 homeless applications made in Scotland, with 27,571 households assessed as being homeless (Shelter Scotland, 2021c). As highlighted earlier, the primary cause of homelessness in recent Scottish reporting is relationship breakdown (Shelter Scotland, 2021c). However, there is considerable heterogeneity in the groups included in the applications, even amongst the single homelessness statistics. We note the need to avoid over-generalising and encourage policy thinking about responses to do the same. These statistics are also influenced by Scotland's legal definition for homelessness (as outlined in the Housing (Scotland) Act 1987), which is relatively inclusive, considers housing need beyond experiences of rooflessness and rough sleeping, and supports a robust legislative framework:

"A household is homeless if they have no accommodation in the UK or elsewhere, or have accommodation but cannot reasonably occupy it. A household is threatened with homelessness if it is likely they will become homeless within two months" (Scottish Government, 2020b, p. 4).

Scotland has been recognised globally for its progressive approach to addressing homelessness (Burns, 2020; Littlewood et al., 2017). Prior to 2012, priority need criterion embedded in Scottish legislation limited the right to housing to certain groups, including vulnerable individuals, individuals with children, and people experiencing domestic abuse. A change to the Homelessness etc. (Scotland) Act at the close of 2012 removed the test of priority need and, consequently, nearly all non-intentionally homeless households are entitled to housing (Shelter Scotland, 2019). Under current Scottish legislation, local authorities have an obligation to provide permanent accommodation to individuals who present to them as homeless and those who are threatened with homelessness in the following 90 days[5]. While there are some important exceptions to this entitlement, the legal entrenched right to housing and relatively robust social support systems are important pieces in tackling the homelessness puzzle.

Indeed, the Homelessness Monitor determined that, as a result of Scotland's increased devolved control over some portions of the benefits system, rough sleeping is "at a lower level" than it would otherwise be under the UK-wide policy environment (Watts et al., 2021, p. 76). This additional policy protection is significant, given the oft-cited challenges to preventing homelessness posed by ongoing benefits cuts from Westminster.

Despite Scotland's broad legal definition and supportive policy environment, homelessness remains a "significant problem" in the nation's major cities (Littlewood et al., 2017, p. iii). In 2020, there were 200 deaths related to homelessness nationally, with more than half of homeless deaths classed as drug related (Williams, 2021).

Recently, the Scottish Government has increased its focus on homelessness, with the First Minister setting a "very clear objective…to eradicate homelessness" (Scottish Reporter, 2020, no page). Taking tangible policy steps to achieve this goal, the Scottish Government convened the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group (HARSAG) to make recommendations to advise government on the steps needed to end rough sleeping and address challenges with temporary accommodation. The group produced several reports, with their final recommendations published in June 2018. Further, HARSAG fed into the Scottish Government's joint report, the Ending Homelessness Together Action Plan, which highlights the government's homelessness objectives and plans for transforming the policy system's responses. HARSAG was later reconvened to publish further recommendations on post-pandemic responses to homelessness (Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group, 2020).

[5] The final report from HARSAG recommends that this 'at risk' period be six months (Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group, 2020, p. 23).

The most recent version of the Ending Homelessness Together Action Plan recognises the value of Housing First models, and the need to provide "trauma-informed, person-centred" responses to homelessness (Scottish Government, 2020a, p. 14). Critically, the plan signals a significant prioritisation of prevention and the immediate provision of long-term housing. Further underscoring the Government's focus on prevention, a government working group, the Prevention Review Group, was formed, chaired by a homelessness and housing scholar. The Prevention Review Group published several reports to make recommendations for the eradication of homelessness (Fitzpatrick et al., 2019a; Prevention Review Group, 2020; Reid, 2021). The Plan outlines the Government's directive to end the use of emergency night shelters in dormitory-style settings, instead focussing on the provision of "rapid and settled" housing options (Scottish Government, 2020a, p. 40). Since 2019, in response to this national directive, Local Authorities have been developing Rapid Rehousing Transition Plans (RRTPs). The purpose of these RRTPs is to outline context-specific plans to realign existing homelessness and housing systems to the Scottish Government's preferred "housing-led approach" (Evans and Littlewood, 2018, p. 9).

Further underscoring the Government's focus on housing-led models, national legislation has been amended to include the enforcement of the Unsuitable Accommodation Order (UAO). The UAO, as initially introduced in 2004, prohibited local authorities from placing households with children or pregnant woman in Bed & Breakfast or other unsuitable accommodation for longer than 14 days. This time period was lowered to 7 days with a 2014 amendment to legislation (Marks, 2019, p. 19). In 2020, the Scottish Government extended the UAO, meaning that as of 31st January 2021 the 7-day limit on unsuitable accommodation applies to all homeless households (Marks, 2019; Scottish Government, 2020a, p. 45).

Statutory Rights & Limitations

Despite Scotland's relatively robust housing and homelessness support system, there are still limitations within the framework that leave some individuals without housing protections. As outlined above, Scottish legislation requires local authorities to provide settled accommodation to all applicants who are entitled to it under the law. In assessing whether an individual or household is entitled, a three-stage assessment determines:

"a) Whether the household is homelessness or not;
b) If the household is homeless, whether this is 'unintentional' or 'intentional'; and
c) If unintentionally homeless, whether there is a connection to the local authority to which the application was made and/or to any other (Scottish) local authority" (Scottish Government, 2020b, p. 4)

As is clear in the stages of this process, households must be found to be homeless (or at risk of homelessness in the next 90 days), they must be unintentionally homeless and be able to demonstrate local connection.

In Scotland, a household is intentionally homelessness if:

"you deliberately do, or fail to do something, that causes you to leave housing that is available to stay in. The housing must have been reasonable to be lived in by you and anyone expected to live with you." (Shelter Scotland, 2021a, no page).

If an individual is found to be intentionally homeless, the Local Authority does not have a statutory requirement to provide housing (Shelter Scotland, 2021a, no page).

Similarly, the local authority must be able to establish local connection, meaning the household "has lived in the area (and for how long), has family connections in the area, works in the area, [or] has a connection with the area for another reason" (Shelter Scotland, 2021b, no page)

If local connection is not established, or is established in another region, the original local authority may decline to provide accommodation, or transfer the case to that other jurisdiction (Scottish Government, 2020b, p. 10) so long as the household is not at risk of abuse (Shelter Scotland, 2021b, no page). This clause has been strongly defended by local authorities, who have suggested that removing the requirement for local connection could overwhelm their housing and homelessness services.

No Recourse to Public Funds

An excluded group under current legislation are those with No Recourse to Public Funds, meaning migrants, EEA and asylum seekers without access to the social support system. Increasing enquiries from these groups have been noted by stakeholders to present challenges to Glasgow's homelessness and housing systems (Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership, n.d., p. 20).

COVID-19

As was repeatedly highlighted in our key stakeholder interviews, the COVID-19 pandemic had a significant impact on the experiences of and responses to homelessness and rough sleeping. The COVID-19 pandemic posed arguably the greatest risk to the groups facing the most deprivation due to existing poor health and exposure (Bibby et al., 2020, p. 1). In response to these risks (and, as argued by Parsell et al., the knock-on risks posed to the general public by these groups (2020)), a "radical and rapid nation-wide shift" was mounted in the UK to address the "most extreme forms of homelessness" (Fitzpatrick et al., 2020, p. vi).

Given Scotland's legally-entrenched right to housing and 2012 abolition of priority need test, the immediate response to the COVID-19 pandemic was less stark, relative to other parts of the UK (Fitzpatrick et al., 2021b). Nonetheless, significant funding was allocated to supporting individuals into hotel accommodation, to increase Discretionary Housing Payments, and support individuals with No Recourse to Public Funds (ibid., p. 18).

Beyond the programming aimed at eradicating rough sleeping, several changes to the wider social support network during COVID-19 provided preventative protections against homelessness for vulnerable households. These changes included job retention and furlough schemes, temporary increases to benefits and temporary bans on evictions (Watts et al., 2021, p. 15). As several experts and key stakeholders have noted, the policy response to the pandemic shifted the framing of homelessness and appropriate policy responses to a more inclusive model. The pandemic response sought to provide services to all in need (including those with No Recourse to Public Funds) and took a holistic, multi-agency public health approach to service provision (Fitzpatrick et al., 2021b; Rogers and Power, 2020; Watts et al., 2021). Notably, the pandemic has quickened, if not catalysed, long-term policy developments in Scotland. The Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group (HARSAG) published their report with recommendations for eradicating homelessness in a post-pandemic setting, all of which were subsequently accepted and reflected in the Scottish Government's Ending Homelessness Together Action Plan (Fitzpatrick et al., 2021; Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group, 2020; Scottish Government, 2020a).

 Given the long-standing and well-documented health inequalities associated with homelessness (Bibby et al., 2020; Cumming et al., 2020; Kirby, 2020; Morrison, 2009), many were optimistic that the pandemic would catalyse a permanent shift to more assertive, trauma-informed and multi-dimensional homelessness service provision. While these measures supported individuals into accommodation and in some cases acted as a barrier to homelessness, the end of the pandemic threatens a worsening of the problem as temporary benefits increases and evictions bans come to an end. Further, there is increasing concern about rising poverty levels and an ongoing cost-of-living crisis as food and fuel prices soar. As will be outlined further in the Findings section, key stakeholders have identified important challenges and opportunities that will come in the wake of the pandemic.

4. Homelessness in Glasgow

In Glasgow, homelessness and rough sleeping remains an ongoing and acute challenge. The city handles a disproportionate number of homelessness applications, relative to its population size (Scottish Government, 2020b, p. 9) and has been identified, prior to the pandemic, as having "by some margin" the biggest rough sleeping problem in the country (Littlewood et al., 2017, p. iv). Recent statistics identified that Glasgow has the highest proportion of households in temporary accommodation (Scottish Government, 2020b, p. 10) and research has indicated that Glasgow has "performed below the national average" in providing access to settled accommodation for homeless households (Littlewood et al., 2017, p. 65).

Beyond the sheer volume of homelessness applications within the city, Glasgow faces additional challenges in providing adequate homelessness and emergency services. As has been well documented, poverty and complex needs like mental ill health and substance misuse can act as both drivers to homelessness and can make service provision more complex. Poverty remains a structural challenge in Glasgow, with 47% of the City's residents living in the 20% of most deprived areas in Scotland (Glasgow Centre for Population Health, n.d., no page). Further, Glasgow accounted for 30% of Scotland's annual drugs deaths – in a year when the overall numbers were the highest ever recorded (Crawford and Dougall, 2019, p. 3). Further, many applicants to homelessness services in Glasgow are asylum seekers, which, as outlined above, can pose challenges to entitlement for those with No Recourse to Public Funds (Littlewood et al., 2017, p. 87).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, then, Glasgow has historically struggled to meet its statutory requirements (Littlewood et al., 2017, p. 65). As per national legislation, Glasgow City Council has a legal obligation to:

- "Provide advice and assistance and prevent and alleviate homelessness wherever possible;

- Make an assessment of a household's circumstances when they seek assistance from the Council;

- Provide suitable emergency and temporary accommodation when required;

- Make a reasonable offer of settled accommodation where a household is deemed to be unintentionally homeless;

- Provide housing support to households if they are assessed as requiring it"

(Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership, n.d., p. 8)

The vast majority of instances where local authorities failed to meet their statutory requirements in Scotland overwhelming occurred in Glasgow (86%) (Shelter Scotland, 2020a, p. 2), with access to emergency housing provision "particularly problematic" in the city (Littlewood et al., 2017, p. vi). As a result, Shelter Scotland raised legal action against Glasgow City Council. This legal action was paused, however, as the Scottish Housing Regulator announced its own intervention initiative (Shelter Scotland, 2020a, p. 2), publishing an Inquiry Report on the City's homelessness and emergency accommodation services – administered through the Glasgow Health and Social Care Partnership (GHSCP) (Homeless Network Scotland, n.d.). The SHR found "a number of inefficiencies, bottlenecks and failure points" that generate "a significant amount of work for the council and its partners" (Scottish Housing Regulator, 2018, p. 8) and made several recommendations for improvement. The GHSCP accepted the recommendations of the report (Homeless Network Scotland, n.d.) and, with the SHR, the Council has agreed on an improvement plan to for its homelessness services (Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership, n.d., p. 18).

Glasgow-specific Challenges

While, as will be discussed in the Findings section of this report, several informants identified significant improvements in service provision since the SHR report, Glasgow nonetheless faces unique challenges in addressing the city's homelessness. First and foremost, the city receives the country's highest number of homeless applications each year (Glasgow Health and Social Care Partnership, n.d.) amounting to over 5000 households in need of accommodation (Glasgow Alliance, n.d. "Glasgow's Homeless"). Of these applications, Glasgow receives the highest proportion of applications from individuals who are considered to have complex or multiple needs (Littlewood et al., 2017).

Housing supply continues to be identified as a challenge. The City's "longstanding failure" to meet its legal obligations to provide temporary accommodation to all individuals entitled to it has created a backlog of cases (Watts et al., 2021, p. 42), further compounded by "bottlenecks into the transition into permanent accommodation" (Crawford and Dougall, 2019, p. 4). These bottlenecks, in part, have been attributed to the City's status as a stock-transfer authority (Burns, 2020, p. 13), meaning the council does not own its own social housing stock, but works in partnership with the city's 68 Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) to secure housing for homeless households (Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership, n.d.). This partnership has presented challenges with "long-standing tensions" noted between RSLs and City Council (Littlewood et al., 2017, p. 65). In previous reports, stakeholders have identified challenges with this system, highlighting a "shortfall of property for use for temporary furnished accommodation" (Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership, n.d., p. 17) and a "lack of through-put", which, in Glasgow, included challenges in "matching available supply to homeless people's needs and wants" (Littlewood et al., 2017, p. 85).

Mapping Homelessness Services in Glasgow

cross the City, dozens of organisations provide services and accommodation with different funding sources, remits and degrees of inter-weaving. Many of these services are commissioned by Glasgow City Council (Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership, n.d., p. 29). While not an exhaustive list, the following section outlines many of the organisations working within the city and provides a high-level understanding of their missions and remits.

Glasgow City Council (GCC)

A critical actor within the homelessness system is the local authority itself. While, as will be discussed further below, many of the homelessness services commissioned by the City now fall under the purview of partnership organisations, GCC still receives and distributes funding for homelessness services. As Scottish Government funding is not specifically ring-fenced, this leaves a great degree of discretion for funding with the local authority. Further, city staff – homelessness caseworkers – are charged with receiving and assessing homelessness applications (Burns, 2020, p. 129).

Glasgow Health and Social Care Partnership

Glasgow's Health and Social Care Partnership is the agency through which the local authority's statutory obligations are discharged and combines elements of both council social work with NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde health board. The City's approach to addressing homelessness is outlined in the Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership Homelessness Strategy and is comprised of two key principles:

> "Firstly, that we prevent homelessness where we possibly can, by providing access to good quality advice, assistance and support. Secondly, where people do become homeless, we work with them to access emergency, temporary and settled accommodation and support which meets their needs" (Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership, n.d., p. 4)

As the GHSCP and NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde identified, there is a need to provide a "multi-faceted public health response" that operates across various sectors and organisations to provide adequate support and eradicate homelessness in Glasgow" (Crawford and Dougall, 2019, p. 3). Relatedly, the City has moved to an alliancing model, with a newly formed organisation – the Glasgow Alliance to End Homelessness – tasked with commissioning over £20 million in funding annually (Littlewood et al., 2017, pp. 23–24). Organisations from across the sector were invited to join this alliance to "improve service provision…influence system changes, and deliver creative and innovative solutions to end homelessness" (Kelvin, 2021, no page).

Glasgow Alliance to End Homelessness (the Alliance)

As outlined above, the Alliance is tasked with commissioning the City's homelessness services. The Alliance is a partnership between the Glasgow Health and Social Care Partnership, Aspire, Crossreach, Loretto Care, the Mungo Foundation, Sacro, the Salvation Army and Ypeople. The Alliance's mission is to "end homelessness in Glasgow by 2030" (Glasgow Alliance to End Homelessness, n.d. "our vision"). Though there have been some challenges in the relatively nascent alliancing system, the alliancing model aspires to bring together services to better serve people experiencing homelessness in the City.

Registered Social Landlords

Another key component of the homelessness network within the City of Glasgow is its 68 Registered Social Landlords. These associations consist of community-based local housing associations, larger regional and national players and the Wheatley Group, the receiver of the original Glasgow local authority stock transfer (Glasgow Housing Association, now a subsidiary of Wheatley and the largest housing association in the city). As GCC is a stock transfer authority, access to the housing stock needed to provide accommodation for individuals experiencing homelessness who make an application and are assessed as being entitled to housing must be secured in partnership with RSLs. Some RSLs also lease housing stock to the Council for its use as temporary accommodation (Scottish Housing Regulator, 2018, p. 5).

Housing Association Trade Bodies

Housing association trade bodies (also known as membership bodies) support best practice, knowledge transfer and advocate on behalf of RSLs in Scotland. There is representation at the national and regional level.

Scottish Federation of Housing Associations

The Scottish Federation of Housing Associations (SFHA) is the national membership body for co-operatives and housing associations. The SFHA takes on an advocacy role, building awareness of the role of co-operatives and housing associations in providing housing across Scotland, and engages in the policy and public affairs sphere on matters related to affordable housing (Scottish Federation of Housing Associations, 2022a). Further, the SFHA provides leadership on best practice and governance resources for its membership, and conducts and commissions research on a wide range of subjects related to affordable housing (Scottish Federation of Housing Associations, 2022b, 2022c).

Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations

After operating as part of the SFHA for three decades, Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations became an independent organisation in 2003 as a result of Glasgow's initial stock transfer (Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations, 2022a). GWSF advocates on behalf of community-controlled housing associations with policymakers and external stakeholders, as well as encouraging information sharing and collaboration amongst its members (Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations, 2022b). Several housing associations are members of both trade bodies.

City Ambition Network

The City Ambition Network (CAN) was established in 2015, representing a partnership between several key organisations working in Glasgow: Simon Community, Glasgow City Mission, The Marie Trust, Turning Point Scotland and the GHSCP. CAN endeavours to provide assertive outreach or 'sticky services', meaning that workers will continue to engage with individuals experiencing homelessness throughout their journey and regardless of changing circumstances (Crawford and Dougall, 2019, p. 7).These 'sticky services', are imperative as losing contact with individuals experiencing homelessness remains a challenge: the SHR noted that the local authority loses contact with "around a quarter" of individuals in the time that they are waiting for a home after making an application (Scottish Housing Regulator, 2018, p. 1).

Glasgow City Mission

A part of the City Ambition Network, Glasgow City Mission also provides a variety of services within the City of Glasgow. These include a drop-in day centre, which provides means and support services; a street outreach team who work with individuals who are reluctant to come indoors (Glasgow City Mission, 2020) classes and programmes for upskilling and employment; and an internship scheme (ibid.).

Glasgow Overnight Welcome Centre

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Glasgow City Mission ran the Winter Night Shelter – emergency overnight accommodation for rough sleepers provided during colder months. Services were limited, with accommodation provided in a congregant setting with mattresses laid out on the floor (Burns, 2020, p. 135). During the pandemic, however, service provision pivoted and the Glasgow City Mission partnered with the Scottish Government and GHSCP to run the Glasgow Overnight Welcome Centre. The Centre provided accommodation and support services from a city centre hotel. The Glasgow City Mission provided operational services for the initiative. While the centre was set up as a temporary, immediate response to the pandemic, it has been noted that the provision of these services has spurred a shift in framing which has made "a return to mattresses on the floor" unacceptable to service providers and policymakers (Glasgow City Mission, 2021, p. 4).

Shelter Scotland

Shelter Scotland operates at a national level, providing policy and advocacy support on housing and homelessness issues. They have published several guides to provide advice and information to individuals at risk of or experiencing homelessness. Further, they operate in Glasgow and provide one-to-one supports via telephone, online chat, and in person (Shelter Scotland, 2020b)[6].

Simon Community Scotland

The Simon Community Scotland operates throughout Scotland, and is an important component part of Glasgow's homelessness and housing system. The Simon Community operates its own services in the City, as well as working in collaboration with partners at the City Ambition Network (Simon Community Scotland, 2020). The Simon Community offers a diverse range of supports and services, including their frontline Stream Team (working with individuals at risk of or currently rough sleeping), emergency and supported accommodation, and their Access Hub, which provides multi-agency support to individuals from a central point of contact (Simon Community Scotland, 2022).

---

[6] In-person supports are currently suspended due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

5. Primary Research Findings

A review of the relevant literature has provided context on the history of homelessness in Glasgow, spotlighting challenges that have been widely noted within the existing literature. To inform this report, face-to-face interviews were conducted with key stakeholders involved in various ways with the housing and homelessness system in Glasgow, whether exclusively or within the context of a national focus. These interviews were semi-structured, informed by a topic guide. In total, seven interviews were conducted with sector stakeholders. Representatives from Glasgow City Council, the Scottish Government, and third sector agencies working at national and local levels were engaged in these discussions. In order to ensure that the research outputs provide as holistic a picture of Glasgow's homelessness system as possible within the project's scope, a lived experience[7] focus group was conducted to provide insights from the perspective of those who have navigated the system personally.

When conducted online, all interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim with informed consent from participants. Where conducted in-person, audio recordings were taken and transcribed, again with informed consent from participants. Interview transcripts and recordings were thematically analysed to identify and explore emerging themes (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Stakeholders are numbered rather than named to protect the anonymity of participants. Individual organisations will not be identified. Key stakeholders are numbered with their sector listed (e.g., Stakeholder 1, Government). Lived experience Focus Group participants are similarly numbered, with the prefix "FG" denoted for clarity (e.g., FG Stakeholder 1).

The project received ethics approval from the College of Social Sciences at the University of Glasgow under the amended umbrella approval for Glasgow-led research by the UK Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence, reflecting the challenges of working with potentially vulnerable adults who might experience distress as a consequence of undertaking discussion in interview or focus group.

While research participants often referred to the historical challenges recognised within the literature, they frequently alluded to recent progress and improvements made across the housing and homelessness systems. Stakeholder 1 (Government) noted a "huge turnaround" after, historically, "people were being turned away, there were refusals to accommodate and that". Stakeholder 3 (Third Sector) identified a "real crisis around being able to provide just any accommodation let alone suitable accommodation, and that really seems to have reversed, which is really positive". Similarly, for Stakeholder 7 (Housing), "[the local authority is] really upfront about improving it and working closely with housing associations definitely". With this context in mind, this chapter outlines the feedback received from stakeholders operating within different component parts of the housing and homelessness systems inside and outside Glasgow. Broadly, this feedback aligned with existing research, and key themes emerged across many categories. However, it is important to note that the input received from key stakeholders working in the sector was far more positive than feedback from the lived experience focus group members, who highlighted more challenges and limitations within the system. This dichotomy underscores the importance of including the perspectives of individuals with lived experiences in conducting research and suggests that some key stakeholders may not have a complete understanding of the challenges of navigating the system when experiencing homelessness. The more positive position from stakeholders may also, to an extent, reflect seeing the effects of processes and outcomes evolving over longer periods of time and hence generating more of a relative sense of progress.

---

7 'Lived experience' refers to the understanding and expertise of a particular subject gained through an individual's practical engagement with a particular phenomenon. This report and research adhere to qualitative research principles that recognise the importance of lived experience in informing holistic analysis and "add[ing] richness" to its findings (Collins, as cited in Cameron et al., 2021, p. 357).

What are the drivers of homelessness in Glasgow?

Mirroring much of the extant literature on homelessness (Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group, 2018; Mackie et al., 2019; Watts et al., 2021), participants identified a wide variety of circumstances that drive homelessness in Glasgow. These include both structural and individual causes, further underscoring the complexity of homelessness as a social phenomenon and the importance of considering the intersection between macro and micro causes.

There was broad agreement across most of the stakeholders interviewed about poverty's role in causing homelessness. Stakeholder 1 (Government) succinctly described the role of poverty and early life experiences as precursors to and predictors of homelessness:

> "The drivers, they're multiple and varied, but poverty is a huge driver, there's been a lot of research into this, and huge links between like childhood poverty is a very strong indicator of homelessness in adulthood, so poverty is huge, but there are also other things, experience of trauma, childhood experiences, abuse, there are different things like that, that can lead people to have multiple complex needs."

Echoing these sentiments, Stakeholders 4 (Third Sector) and 8 (Government) highlighted the specific challenges with poverty and deprivation that are facing Glasgow more acutely than in other contexts:

> "Glasgow's deprivation and poverty, it still remains a key issue…the evidence is dead clear around if you're living in areas where that's higher then you've more likelihood to present potentially as homeless" Stakeholder 8 (Government).

> "It's a city that's affected by poverty, by deindustrialisation, by unemployment" Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector).

Additionally, Stakeholders 8 (Government), 6 (Housing), and 3 (Third Sector) highlighted the role of family or relationship breakdown in driving homelessness presentations[8]. This observation aligns with the most recent statistics released by the Scottish Government, where the top three reasons given in homelessness applications were: asked to leave, non-violent and violent relationship breakdown, respectively (Scottish Government, 2020b).

One cannot unproblematically delineate the causes of homelessness between structural and individual factors, as they are intimately and inextricably intertwined. Speaking to this interconnectivity, Stakeholder 8 (Government) drew the experiences of poverty and relationship breakdown together:

> "there's real concerns of poverty and neglect within a household and stuff. Parents disclosing [that] we will have choices around the limited household budget, and that's going to then put stress on relationships. It's going to put stress on families. It then brings with it broader cohorts that, in the past, would not come to our attention" Stakeholder 8 (Government)

Several stakeholders, when discussing the financial drivers of homelessness, have cited ongoing concern that the city will face increasing homelessness presentations as economic challenges mount in the wake of COVID-19. These concerns varied but point to compounding pressures facing vulnerable households on several fronts.

---

[8] 'Homeless presentation' refers to the formal application that a household must make to the local authority in order to start the process of securing temporary accommodation and settled housing as part of the local authority's statutory obligations set out by Scottish legislation.

Several participants expressed concern about waning social supports as pandemic relief packages end. Stakeholder 7 (Housing) spoke to concerns about lowering benefits rates as the pandemic supports dissipate, "you had maybe tenants in private houses that they had the money to maybe pay the extra over the local housing allowance, they won't get that through Universal Credit. So, I think there was maybe a wee bit of an increase in situations like that coming to the casework team as well". Similarly, Stakeholder 3 (Third Sector) expressed concerns with the end of pandemic-based evictions protections "we're easing out of [the pandemic], and we have started to see some evictions… that's going to create a lot of pressure on the homelessness system and in particular in Glasgow".

Other participants focused their concern on the broader economic system. Stakeholders 1 (Government) and Stakeholder 8 (Government) cited concerns with mounting costs of living, with the latter offering:

> "You add in fuel costs, fuel poverty… you're looking at more and more lower-income families now requiring access to food banks et cetera and stuff. You can see yourself that it is likely to translate and then increase homeless presentations."

In addition to financial drivers and familial challenges, participants also highlighted additional compounding factors that often play a role in driving homelessness:

> "The drivers are poverty; the drivers are trauma, the drivers are addiction and mental health" Stakeholder 5 (Government)

> "I think relationship breakdowns, certainly for that complex needs cohort, then underlying drug and alcohol issues, underlying mental health issues, underlying prison and A and E presentations" Stakeholder 8 (Government)

Much of the focus group discussions focused on the ties between trauma, mental illness, addictions and homelessness, with FG Stakeholder 1 noting that "mental health, addiction and homelessness go hand-in-hand".

Once the drivers of homelessness were outlined, participants were asked to consider the challenges and barriers to eradicating homelessness within the city.

What are the barriers to eradicating homelessness?

It is critical that the structural drivers of homelessness, complex and interlinked with individual causes as they may be, are recognised and understood. This recognition is especially crucial as the Scottish Government and local authorities continue to work toward a prevention agenda that seeks to provide support and assistance before households become homeless in the first place (Scottish Government, n.d.). Under current legislation, regardless of the specific causes in any particular case, the vast majority of Scottish households are legally entitled to housing if they are unintentionally homeless.

Despite these legal protections and an arguably strong governmental commitment to eradicating rough sleeping, homelessness persists. As such, the challenges of, and barriers to ending homelessness must be understood and considered. There was some variation identified by participants, arguably due to their differing perspectives and roles within the system. However, key themes emerged throughout the interviews, highlighting new and longstanding barriers to truly eradicating homelessness in the city. As Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector) offered, "if you just understand Glasgow and the history of it, you can see that it has a problem to contend with as its starting point".

Stakeholders 1 (Government), 4 (Third Sector) and 8 (Government) cited the sheer volume of homelessness presentations in Glasgow as itself a challenge to tackling the problem. As outlined elsewhere, Glasgow has the largest proportion of homeless cases in Scotland, which are disproportionate to the City's population size (Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership, n.d., p. 12). Other challenges identified through the interviews largely overlap with existing research and point primarily to systems-level challenges borne out of Glasgow's unique and highly complex housing and homelessness systems.

These challenges were often situated within discussions of limited inter-agency collaboration, restricted scope for collaborative prevention, and systems-level concerns, such as "siloed [working]…with no interaction between drugs, homelessness, mental health and even health [services]" (Stakeholder 5 – Government). Underscoring this perspective, the focus group participants cited significant concerns with under-resourced and limited mental health and addictions services. They advised that the insufficiency of these services plays a central role in perpetuating homelessness and undermining prevention and housing efforts, as well as the ability of individuals facing complex needs to maintain tenancies.

Housing stock

For many cities across the globe, one of the primary challenges in eradicating homelessness is an insufficient supply of affordable, mainly social housing. However, Stakeholder 1 (Government) noted that there is a "reasonable amount of social housing in Glasgow", and Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector) offered that "this idea of low supply just doesn't feature in Glasgow the same way it might in other big cities." This perspective aligns with Fitzpatrick's recent thoughts on the causes of homelessness in Glasgow, who noted that Glasgow's social housing supply is "stronger than in many other UK cities" (2022, no page).

Instead, the issues highlighted regarding Glasgow's housing stock focused on the complexity inherent with the system of matching individuals in need with the housing available in the city. As was outlined in the literature review, Glasgow is a stock transfer authority. Most participants cited challenges posed by the Council's lack of ownership over social housing. Stakeholder 1 (Government) explained a "complex picture with many housing associations", noting the importance of the relationship between these associations, who have the housing, and the Council, which has the statutory duty to provide housing. Stakeholder 2 (Housing) described this process as "herding cats", with the Council relying on "voluntary buy-in" from the nearly seventy providers operating independently within the city[9].

Perhaps indicative of the tensions and gaps within this relationship, when housing supply was problematised by participants, it was mainly regarding its suitability and location. Stakeholders 6 (Housing), 3 (Third Sector) and 1 (Government) noted the lack of larger properties available for families in need. These challenges were mirrored in focus group discussions, with two participants reporting that, at the time of interview, they were in housing of an unsuitable size, with one having more space than needed and the other with only one bedroom for her and her two children. Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector) noted both challenges with the size of stock and location, advising that "the actual postcodes or local communities where the housing is doesn't always match where people want to live".

---

[9] And this is in spite of the fact that there is a Section 5 duty on the part of housing associations to accommodate homeless households, a provision stronger than in any other part of the UK.

Several participants spoke about the problems with this matching system from governmental and housing providers' perspectives. Stakeholder 1 (Government) called the matching process "very challenging for the authority". Similarly, participants representing housing providers echoed these sentiments, with one calling the matching process "that dysfunctional thing…we don't control the assessment or the registration process" (Stakeholder 2, Housing). These perspectives indicate that, from both sides of this process, systemic problems leave all parties feeling strained. As Stakeholder 6 (Housing) highlights, these challenges can have hugely detrimental impacts on throughput, resulting in many refusals from people in need of housing. They advised that in some cases, this resulted from "not recognising that somebody had a medical condition that meant they couldn't go up flights of stairs, or…getting a referral for an inappropriate size of property". Participants noted that a new matching process is being piloted in Glasgow, which proffers improvements for the future. Nonetheless, participants repeatedly underscored the impact of these challenges, with Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector) stating, "because of its complex housing system, it means that the big barrier to getting people resettled quickly is literally that end-to-end process".

Housing system

In light of the challenges presented by Glasgow's status as a stock transfer authority, amongst other compounding factors, one housing consultant referred to Glasgow as the "most complex housing system in the UK" (Stakeholder 4, Third Sector). Given the challenges highlighted above, it is perhaps unsurprising that all participants cited systems-level challenges as the primary barriers to ending homelessness and rough sleeping within the city. Stakeholder 2 (Housing) offered that "anything about how well the system is working or not working is heavily anecdotal".

Underpinning this discussion were several concerns about Glasgow's extensive use of temporary accommodation. Further speaking to systemic throughput challenges, Stakeholder 1 (Government) noted that "there are still way too many households in temporary accommodation for far too long". Stakeholder 3 (Third Sector) suggested that temporary accommodation and meeting the requirements of the Unsuitable Accommodation Order is "probably one of the biggest [challenges] at the moment".

Stakeholder 2 (Housing) articulated the challenges posed by this overuse of temporary accommodation in the broader housing system:

"I have to say it's a bit of a mystery to me how the whole temporary furnished accommodation works with the council because we seem to give them lots and lots of properties, and it just seems to be a bottomless pit."

Offering further evidence of the systemic challenges – though recognising the lack of data on where problems exist – Stakeholder 2 (Housing) noted that there is "something fundamentally flawed here". They said, "if 10 per cent turnover is natural in all the housing providers, that's 10,000 plus houses available every year before we build a single new house. That should be able to hoover up all the homeless cases in a given year". Nonetheless, Stakeholders 2 (Housing) and 3 (Third Sector) advised that Glasgow's Registered Social Landlords are continually pressed to provide more and more housing for homelessness presentations, with the former saying, "we never seem to get ahead of ourselves."

It's all about the process

Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector) mirrored this notion, saying "from when somebody becomes homeless, right through to them being resettled in their new place, everything that happens in between those two points in spaghetti and that is the main problem that confronts Glasgow's homelessness system". Focus group participants further illuminated some of these processual challenges, noting the difficulties for individuals in difficult circumstances to navigate these complexities: "fill out this form and fill out that form and fill out this form" (FG Stakeholder 2). FG Stakeholder 5 highlighted the challenges of meeting the system requirements to obtain housing and services, feeling she was "run ragged" trying to make appointments across the City while taking care of children and navigating the processes required to be rehoused.

Further highlighting the challenges of this process, focus group participants highlighted the challenges of transitioning out of incarceration and the cyclical nature of homelessness, poor mental health and addiction. Three participants spoke about their experience of leaving prison, denoting that they could not make a homeless application until they were released. At a critical juncture in their housing journey, participants noted an absence of supports, saying, "here's a week's money…before you know it, you're back in that cycle of selling drugs or selling your body" (FG Stakeholder 2). For FG Stakeholder 3, leaving prison without secure accommodation meant a revolving door into homelessness: "if you're going back into a hostel, you're going right back into it, you're going right back to jail. Nothing's changing."

Participants did not necessarily offer discrete solutions to the processual challenges they outlined. Stakeholder 5 (Government) suggested that the "siloed nature of the system" is one key concern, leading to burnout as staff "can't refer anybody anywhere". Many interviewees, recognising the significance of the systems-level barriers, expressed a desire for more information and data on the end-to-end process to identify and mitigate these issues. Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector) even suggested that "if we could just underpin that with a good process for people, that we might not have much homelessness to talk about, at all, in Glasgow." Focus group feedback mirrored the need to rectify systems-level processes, with participants citing the need to streamline the application process and legal requirements for individuals experiencing homelessness.

What's going well

Despite noting many ongoing and emerging challenges, participants highlighted several improvements within Glasgow's homelessness response (we noted earlier in this section the broad sense that the response was improving when compared to earlier, even recent periods). Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector) indicated that "Glasgow's doing well in stuff around complex needs. It's taking a city-wide approach." Several participants noted the importance of inter-agency working. Three stakeholders cited the recent transition to the alliancing model – under the direction of the Glasgow Alliance to End Homelessness – as an opportunity for improvements in the city while also noting that the model has some challenges and "still needs clarity" (Stakeholder 1, Government).

As summarised above, key stakeholders highlighted vast improvements in homelessness responses within Glasgow, in particular pertaining to meeting the local authority's statutory requirements. Stakeholder 1 (Government), noted that despite previous challenges, significant improvements have been made in reducing the numbers of households that were refused accommodation in the city. Similarly, Stakeholder 3 (Third Sector) highlighted the City's enhanced ability to meet temporary accommodation duties, and called Glasgow "by far one of the least punitive" local authorities based on its handling of homelessness decisions. In outlining these improvements, interviewees pointed to the recent shift toward the alliancing model, underscoring the importance of inter-agency working, as well as the City's early adoption of Housing First approaches, through Turning Point Scotland's Pathfinder programme.

Finally, as will be further outlined in the following section, pandemic-related shifts in ways of working, alongside policy changes which extended service provision and resourcing have catalysed positive changes throughout the sector. Stakeholders remained cautiously optimistic that these changes will extend far beyond the immediate

pandemic response, setting the stage for long-term improvements in the sector's approach to homelessness responses, including the eradication of congregate emergency accommodation.

Simon Community

With an overwhelming consensus, all participants in the lived experience focus group cited the work of the Simon Community as the pinnacle of what is going well within Glasgow's housing and homelessness systems. Aligned with the importance of inter-agency working outlined during key stakeholder interviews, one of the strongest assets provided by the Simon Community was its role as a central hub for wider support services. FG Stakeholder 1 called the Simon Community a "one-stop shop", explaining that individuals can see vets, dentists, hairdressers, GCC casework teams and nearly thirty different services in any given month via the Simon Community. FG Stakeholder 3 highlighted the "support you get aff 'em" as the organisation's strength, noting that "even if they close at 5 o'clock, the street teams are out until 11…you call them, they'll come and meet you where you are". Focus Group participants agreed that there was a general awareness of the value of these services amongst the community, with FG Stakeholder 4 advising that "when [she] moved to Glasgow in 2015, [she] found them straight away".

The positive feedback received regarding the Simon Community, beyond highlighting the organisation's exceptional work and contribution to the city, aligns with research that has noted the importance of 'sticky services' (Crawford and Dougall, 2019, p. 8; Reid, 2021) and 'assertive outreach' in order to meet individuals where they are and provide consistent, central supports throughout one's homelessness and housing journey, respectively (Reid, 2021). Further, the focus group feedback highlights the challenges with disparately located services, previously noted by Burns (2020), and the considerations that should be given to providing services from a central location and the value/importance of removing siloed working within the sector.

COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacted homelessness, drove policy reform, and changed the emergency responses to sleeping rough overnight. Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector) applauded the sector: "how charities responded, and local authorities responded. It was so fast. Almost overnight, hundreds of people were brought indoors, out from the streets, and people had been there for months."

Stakeholder 8 (Government) perhaps described the impact of COVID best as "a bit of a yin and a yang". All participants mirrored this sentiment, articulating several benefits of the pandemic's shift in response and several concerns and challenges faced by the sector both during the lockdowns and into the future as pandemic responses fall away and ongoing economic challenges threaten vulnerable households.

A shift in perspective – the impact of COVID-19

As well noted in the literature, COVID-19 arguably catalysed a shift in the perspective through which homelessness and rough sleeping were understood. As Parsell, et al. (2020) argue, the pandemic reframed rough sleeping from an issue facing certain members of a population to that of a public health crisis that threatened all members of society. Stakeholders 1 (Government), 3 (Third Sector) and 8 (Government) all noted this shift in perspective within Glasgow, advising that the homeless and housing sectors generally adopted a public health approach during the pandemic. Stakeholder 8 (Government) further highlighted that Police Scotland also transitioned to this perspective with a positive effect.

Stakeholders 1 (Government) and 3 (Third Sector) applauded the use of public health grounds during the initial pandemic response to provide services and accommodation to historically excluded groups, namely, those with No Recourse to Public Funds.

An additional positive takeaway from the pandemic was increased collaboration between agencies within the sector. Stakeholder 1 (Government) outlined "much closer working between the third sector and local authorities." Similarly, Stakeholder 8 (Government) noted that the response had catalysed a more trauma-informed response to homelessness, further offering, "the closer we've worked together, there's been a much greater sharing and exchange of skills and knowledge".

"We could have done this the entire time" – changing our ways of working.

Another positive outcome of the pandemic identified by the research has been a shift in the ways of working across the sector. Stakeholder 8 (Government) advised that a new, multidisciplinary team has been developed throughout the pandemic to address complex needs and "engage on an outreach basis", borne out of the hotel accommodation programme that operated within the city during the pandemic response. Moreover, this shift in ways of working has extended to the provision of emergency shelter. Stakeholder 1 (Government) noted that the pandemic elucidated the dissatisfaction with congregate night shelters and how the Welcome Centre programming, providing accommodation in hotel settings, made the sector "realise it's not acceptable for people to sleep in those communal settings, the mattress on the floor". For Stakeholder 3 (Third Sector), this shift prompted a broader realisation that "everyone that was rough sleeping were just in hotels and it was like, the sense that we could have done this the entire time, and so I guess the pandemic has accelerated a move away from rough sleeping…and that is very much to be welcomed".

Though the hotel programmes were upheld as a positive alternative to the emergency night shelters, participants were careful to caution against their improper use: "a hotel is alright for a week but after six or nine months…" (Stakeholder 5, Government). Further, focus group participants shared scepticism about the safety of the hotel programmes with "hundreds of people in hotel with all sorts of complex needs – drugs addictions, alcoholism, trauma, childhood trauma" (FG Stakeholder 1) with relatively limited supports to address these issues.

Stakeholder 4 cautioned that these programmes are not themselves enough to end homelessness, advising that "it's a constant guard against rough sleeping and the reason that it's low isn't just because people were moved into hotel rooms", noting the importance of services in tackling the long-term challenges of rough sleeping: "it's that there are teams of people out there, constantly connecting and preventing. It's one of those jobs that's almost never done".

No Recourse to Public Funds

Several stakeholders expressed concerns about the end of emergency pandemic programming and the resultant risks posed to individuals with No Recourse to Public Funds. As identified elsewhere in this report, the public health approach adopted during the immediate crisis was lauded as a means of providing accommodation for groups that would otherwise be excluded from Scotland's legally entrenched right to housing. Stakeholder 1 (Government) advised that it will be "harder" for local authorities to provide housing as the immediate public health crisis wanes. Similarly, Stakeholder 3 (Third Sector) identified "kind of a question mark" around when the provision of accommodation for these groups would end. For FG stakeholder 1, the sector is "waiting on a tsunami" of challenges as the public health grounds on which supports are being offered to EEA nationals and those with NRPF end.

6. University Opportunities

As a primary objective of this research aimed to identify areas for collaboration between the homelessness and housing sectors and the University of Glasgow, participants were asked for their views on how University resources could be allocated to making a meaningful contribution to ending homelessness and rough sleeping. Several themes emerged. In support of these themes, further opportunities for university involvement have been pulled from recent research published by the Centre for Homelessness Impact (Hurst, 2022)[10].

Research

Understandably, many of the suggestions centred around the University's research and data capabilities and expertise. In particular, stakeholders pointed to a desire to understand better the challenges inherent in the current structure of Glasgow's housing and homelessness system. Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector) highlighted the credibility that the University could lend to research in the field: "it's such a respected institution and that anything that is brought into this space around housing and homelessness, from a knowledge, teaching, learning side, would be welcome and wonderful."

Stigma arose as a key theme in the research; identified by both key stakeholders and focus group participants. It was repeatedly suggested that the University could play a central role in addressing issues of stigma and educating various stakeholders on the challenges surrounding homelessness, stigma and self-worth.

For Stakeholder 2 (Housing), the University could provide "systemic analysis…thinking about it as a housing system and a start, middle and an end and all the different players that are involved…. continuous over a period of time trying to map what is going on in this system". Stakeholder 5 (Government) suggested that research ought to focus on the "unbiased mapping of what works and doesn't work".

Similarly, it was suggested that research would be beneficial that provides insights into social housing stock itself: "there is some research or analysis to be done around where there are three- or four-bedroom properties like social properties in Glasgow like what percentage of them are being let to homeless applicants, what are the average waiting times for larger families" (Stakeholder 3 – Third Sector).

As has been well rehearsed within extant research, there are ongoing issues with quantifying the extent of rough sleeping and homelessness around the globe. Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector) outlined the challenges with the data set currently being engaged in Glasgow. To establish estimated rates of rough sleeping, the sector relies upon the stitching together of three separate data sets, considering point-in-time counts and rates of homelessness presentations. Stakeholders noted limitations inherent in each methodology and the significant discrepancies between the resultant data. As such, they suggested that this is an area where the University's research expertise could be applied to great effect. It is important to note that data challenges and accommodations must be made in designing and conducting such research. Careful consideration of data protection and privacy legislation is vital, especially when working with vulnerable individuals and handling commercially sensitive information. However, the University of Glasgow's vast research expertise and experience, coupled with its adherence to best practices in regards research ethics, mean that the organisation is well positioned to address and overcome these challenges, mitigating possible concerns from prospective participants and potentially fostering a collaborative working environment.

[10] Indeed, the Homelessness Initiative is working collaboratively with Hurst and Centre for Homelessness Impact colleagues to see how we can maximise the community/Glasgow-level impact that the initiative can have, initially through our approach to volunteering.

Finally, it was envisioned that the University could conduct research that would help provide an evidence base for future systems planning: "we're still trying to map out, project, where we might be in two, five, ten years' time, with regards to how much of this tenure type we require" (Stakeholder 8, Government).

Providing Legal Support

Focus Group participants clearly outlined the value of the legal supports they obtained through third-sector agencies like Shelter and the Simon Community. FG Stakeholder 2 noted that "they don't tell you your rights as a human being…people should be made aware of their rights". Similarly, the stark difference in service provision experienced by focus group participants before and after accessing legal supports was noted. FG Stakeholder 1 currently assist individuals in making homeless applications, noting that often their clients had made multiple unsuccessful attempts to engage with the local authority on their own, with housing only secured after they had retained third sector legal support and advocacy.

Focus group participants unanimously agreed on the importance of this legal support and resources. Those currently working or volunteering with third sector agencies highlight significant resourcing concerns, however, noting that "we don't have capacity" and other charities are engaged to keep up with demand. It was suggested that the University's ample legal expertise amongst staff and students could be leveraged in a volunteer capacity to provide further legal supports to third-sector organisations and individuals experiencing homelessness.

An Employer and Trainer

Poverty and job loss are well-recognised catalysts for experiences of homelessness. Key stakeholder interviewees highlighted the prevalence that both factors play in Glasgow's context specifically. Further, research commissioned by Social Bite noted that employability was "especially challenging" for individuals experiencing homelessness (Littlewood et al., 2017, p. v). The University of Glasgow is one of the largest employers in the city and the University's Career Service has links to over 10,000 employers (University of Glasgow, n.d.). Evidence has identified that training, access to work schemes, and 'peer worker' programmes have positive outcomes for individuals experiencing multiple exclusion homelessness (Littlewood et al., 2017). Research from the Centre for Homelessness Impact suggests that universities are well positioned to leverage their position as employers to deepen the evidence base on employment and training programmes for individuals experiencing homelessness (Hurst, 2022). The University could consider engaging in training and employability initiatives to offer individuals experiencing homelessness opportunities for upskilling and paid employment, alongside research to assess the efficacy of such programming.

Awareness and Stigma

Stakeholders 2 (Housing), 4 (Third Sector), 5 (Government) and 8 (Government) highlighted the ongoing challenges of stigma both on the provision of housing within communities and on individuals experiencing homelessness themselves. All focus group participants further noted the issues of stigma and self-esteem experienced by those struggling with housing challenges. FG Stakeholder 1 explained that no one sets out to be homeless, "no one grows up thinking 'someday I'll live under a bridge'" and noted the immediacy with which homelessness spurs feelings of worthlessness:

"very quickly, you're sitting with a cup in your hand; you're begging. You're going through the bins to get a McDonald's sticker for a free coffee in the morning. No self-esteem, no self-confidence, no nothing."

Stakeholder 2 (Housing) noted that "very little work [is] put into preparing communities for tackling what is a community-based problem". They continued, "it's not like these folks are coming from planet Mars; they are coming from within the communities that are also hostile to them coming back into them". It was suggested by multiple stakeholders that the University could be engaged to develop understanding and awareness of the complexities and nature of homelessness within Glasgow for various audiences, including students, volunteers, medical professionals and policymakers. This sentiment is mirrored in recent research, which has highlighted the roles universities can play in setting cross-departmental curricula that provides information and training for students, staff and practitioners (Hurst, 2022).

Physical Resources

In addition to these intellectual contributions, stakeholders suggested that the University's stock of accommodation could be used strategically as housing provision in response to homelessness. In particular, Stakeholder 4 (Third Sector) suggested that unused (i.e. surplus or redundant) student accommodation might provide critical resources and solutions to the challenges posed by accommodating individuals with No Recourse to Public Funds. University assets could be offered as gifts-in-kind to third sector partners to use for their programming, whether permanently or on an ad-hoc basis (Hurst, 2022).

Key stakeholders and research from the Centre for Homelessness Impact further suggest that university resources – physical, financial and human – could positively contribute to homelessness programming within the city, from running sporting or arts events to hosting educational and awareness events for students and those experiencing homelessness.

The findings of this research indicate that there are significant opportunities for the University of Glasgow to contribute meaningfully to improving Glasgow's homelessness and housing systems and, in so doing, support efforts to eradicate homelessness and rough sleeping in the city. These opportunities will be further explored in this report's conclusions.

7. Conclusions and future homelessness initiative research

This scoping report was commissioned to identify opportunities for the University to make a meaningful contribution to ending homelessness in the city of Glasgow and surrounding areas. As has been outlined in this report, homelessness remains a salient concern in the city of Glasgow, despite the substantive changes to ways of working and to the legal framework under which the sector operates before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. As such, there are several avenues through which the University could meaningfully and positively contribute to the homelessness and housing sector within Glasgow and to the evidence base undergirding homelessness interventions more broadly.

Key stakeholders and lived experience focus group participants cited challenges with systems-level processes within the City and described the significant – and in some cases life threatening – consequences of these inefficiencies, bottlenecks and breakdowns. In many cases, these challenges could be ameliorated by University-supported research and data analysis initiatives. Research could make a meaningful contribution in supporting sector partners to have a clearer picture of Glasgow's homelessness system, providing unbiased analysis of what works and what doesn't work, the size and location of Glasgow's social housing stock, and, fundamentally, supporting systems-level analysis of the housing and homelessness sector writ large. Further, an in-depth mapping exercise, perhaps focusing on creating a visual representation of the homelessness and housing system in Glasgow and the pathways through it, would provide an illustrative foundation through which to analyse and assess the network as it operates within the city.

Further, focus group participants underscored the role of stigma in worsening their experiences of homelessness, outlining the speed and near immediacy with which their self-esteem was eroded by the experience of sleeping rough. As one key stakeholder noted, re-establishing an individual's self worth is an integral part of addictions treatment and in rehabilitation. It is suggested that further research on self-worth, addictions and homelessness could be a fruitful and interesting research topic and the findings could make a meaningful contribution to trauma-informed and person-centred practice within the sector.

Next Steps and our Agenda

We work with a reference group or sounding board within the University consisting of academics with direct expertise across different dimensions of homelessness. We will use this report as a way of developing our short- and medium-term research and work planning priorities. Below we list a number of the research, volunteering and educational ideas that emerge from this work and which we will discuss with the reference group.

- A research project that examines the failings within housing systems (e.g withdrawal of the private rented sector) and other pressures such as precarity, would be to examine the homelessness problems associated with students in Glasgow. We know this is an issue in the city and is something we can reflect back on to University services and how they work with other agencies to understand, quantify and address such issues. How should the higher education sector in the city respond to such evidence? What practical solutions can be offered in a joined-up way?

- Understanding the end to end homelessness response system in Glasgow – a systems thinking approach. This might include developing systems-level planning tools that can help with key blockages e.g. developing models of allocating available vacant social housing to people in temporary accommodation

- Research on the experiences of particular groups experiencing homelessness e.g. pregnant women mothers, often fleeing domestic abuse.

- What works about the Simon Community Hub model – can it be evaluated?

- On the education front, can the University lead on micro credential course for professionals working across homelessness services e.g. in health, law, social work, etc.? Is there scope to work on secondary school curriculum development e.g. Modern Studies modules on homelessness. The University is also exploring developing professional accredited courses for homelessness case workers for Glasgow and Scotland.

- How can the University best draw on its community to make a difference in volunteering on homelessness questions? This will probably involve a mix of activities from specialist subject skills (e.g. legal students offering bespoke advice and problem solving), to building on organised student work in this area, and even exploring the role the initiative could play in establishing a staff volunteering scheme.

References

Batterham, D., 2019. Defining "At-risk of Homelessness": Re-connecting Causes, Mechanisms and Risk. Housing, Theory and Society,[e-journal] 36(1), pp. 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2017.1408678

Baxter, A.J., Tweed, E.J., Katikireddi, S.V., Thomson, H., 2019. Effects of Housing First approaches on health and well-being of adults who are homeless or at risk of homelessness: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. J Epidemiol Community Health, [e-journal] 73, pp. 379–387. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2018-210981

Bibby, J., Everest, G., Abbs, I., 2020. Will COVID-19 be a watershed moment for health inequalities? [online] The Health Foundation. Available at: <https://www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/2020-05/Will%20COVID-19%20be%20 a%20watershed%20moment%20for%20health%20inequalities.pdf> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Braun, V., Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, [e-journal] 3(2), pp. 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Burns, A., 2020. Journeys through homelessness: an ethnographic investigation into the lived experiences of homelessness in Glasgow, PhD thesis. University of Glasgow, Glasgow. Available at: <https://theses.gla.ac.uk/81869/> [Accessed 08 March 2022].

Cameron, J., Humphreys, C., Hegarty, K., 2021. Knowledge translation activity of a domestic violence research network: a scoping survey. Journal of Gender-Based Violence, [e-journal] 5(2), pp. 349–362. https://doi.org/10.1332/239868021X16191835307584

Centre for Homelessness Impact, 2019. Ending Homelessness for Good. [online] Centre for Homelessness Impact, London. Available at: <https://assets-global.website-files.com/59f07e67422cdf0001904c14/5cf50e1873a6235c38b7ae41_ CHI_STRATEGY_REPORT_FOR_WEB.pdf> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Centre for Homelessness Impact, n.d. Our mission and impact [online] Available at: <https://www. homelessnessimpact.org/mission-and-impact> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Clapham, D., 2018. Remaking Housing Policy: An International Study, [e-book]. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315639086

Clapham, D., 2003. Pathways approaches to homelessness research. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, [e-journal] 13, pp. 119–127. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.717

Crawford, F., Dougall, R., 2019. Supporting vulnerable people on Glasgow city centre streets: views of service providers. [online] Glasgow Centre for Population Health and NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Glasgow. Available at: <https://www.gcph.co.uk/ assets/0000/7562/Supporting_vulnerable_people_on_Glasgow_city_centre_streets.pdf> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Cumming, C., Wood, L., Davies, A., 2020. People experiencing homelessness urgently need to be recognised as a high risk group for COVID-19. Health Promotion Journal of Australia, [e-journal]. pp. 1-2. https://doi.org/10.1002/hpja.355

Evans, A., Littlewood, M., 2018. Scotland's transition to rapid rehousing. [online] Social Bite, Edinburgh. Available at: <https:// social-bite.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Rapid_Rehousing_Guidance1.1.pdf> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Farrugia, D., Gerrard, J., 2016. Academic Knowledge and Contemporary Poverty: The Politics of Homelessness Research. Sociology, [e-journal] 50(2), pp. 267–284. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038514564436

F.E.A.N.T.S.A., 2007. A Retrospective Module on Homelessness for Household Surveys.

FEANTSA, Brussels.

Fitzpatrick, S., 2022. Why is there still homelessness in Glasgow? 27 April, Glasgow.

Fitzpatrick, S., 2005. Explaining Homelessness: a Critical Realist Perspective. Housing, Theory and Society, [e-journal] 22(1), pp. 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/14036090510034563

Fitzpatrick, S., Mackie, P., Wood, J., 2021a. Advancing a Five-Stage Typology of Homelessness Prevention. International Journal on Homelessness, [e-journal] 1(1), pp. 79–97. https://doi.org/10.5206/ijoh.2021.1.13341 [Accessed 27 August 2022].

Fitzpatrick, S., Mackie, P., Pawson, H., Watts, B. and Wood, J., 2021b. The COVID-19 crisis

response to homelessness in Great Britain: Interim report. Collaborative Centre for

Housing Evidence. Glasgow [Accessed 29 August 2022].

Fitzpatrick, S., Mackie, P., Wood, J., 2019a. Homelessness prevention in the UK: Policy briefing. [online] UK
Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence, Glasgow. Available at: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/135330/1/
Homelessness-Prevention-in-the-UK-Policy-Brief-July-2019-final.pdf> [Accessed 15 August 2022].

Fitzpatrick, S., Pawson, H., Bramley, G., Watts, B., Wood, J., Stephens, M., & Blenkinsopp,

J. (2019b). The Homelessness Monitor: Scotland 2019. London: Crisis. [Accessed 27   August 2022].

Fitzpatrick, S., Watts, B., Sims, R., 2020. Homelessness Monitor England 2020: COVID-19 Crisis Response
Briefing. [online] Crisis UK, London. Available at: <https://www.crisis.org.uk/media/242907/homelessness_
monitor_england_2020_covid19_crisis_response_briefing.pdf> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Gibb, K. and Marsh, A., 2019. Housing and systems thinking. [online] UK Collaborative   Centre for Housing Evidence, Glasgow.
Available at: <https://thinkhouse.org.uk/site/assets/files/1416/cache0719b.pdf> [Accessed 15   August 2022].

Gibb, K., 2017. What works in Prevention. What Works Scotland, Glasgow.

Glasgow Alliance to End Homelessness, n.d. Glasgow's Homeless [online] Available at: <https://
www.glasgowalliance.org/glasgows-homeless/> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Glasgow Alliance to End Homelessness, n.d. Our Ambition - End Homelessness in Glasgow [online] Available
at: <https://www.glasgowalliance.org/our-ambition/> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Glasgow Alliance to End Homelessness, n.d. Our Vision: Transforming Glasgow's Approach to Homelessness.
[online] Available at: <https://www.glasgowalliance.org/the-alliance/> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations, 2022. About Us. [online]
Available at: <https://gwsf.org.uk/about-us/> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Glasgow City Mission, 2021. Glasgow Overnight Welcome Centre. [online] Available at: <https://www.
glasgowcitymission.com/what-we-do/glasgow-overnight-welcome-centre/> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Glasgow City Mission, 2020. Our Mission. [online] Glasgow City Mission, Glasgow. Available at: https://www.glasgowcitymission.
com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/A5-12pp-GCM-Vision-Strategy-digital-version.pdf [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Glasgow Centre for Population Health, n.d. Overview. [online] Available at: <https://www.
understandingglasgow.com/indicators/poverty/overview> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership, n.d. Homelessness Strategy 2015 - 2020. [online] Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership,
Glasgow. Available at: <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/chttphandler.ashx?id=34784&p=0> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Gurney, C., 2021. 'Ontological security. A term of contradictions', Housing Studies Association, 20 July. Available at: <https://www.
housing-studies-association.org/articles/318-ontological-security-a-term-of-contradictions> [Accessed 21 July 2021].

Homeless Link, n.d. Housing First. [online] Available at: <https://homeless.org.uk/areas-of-expertise/housing-first/> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Homeless Network Scotland, 2021. Branching Out. [online] Homeless Network Scotland, Glasgow. Available at: < https://
homelessnetwork.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Branching-Out-HF-NF-NOV-2021-UPDATE.pdf> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Homeless Network Scotland, 2019. The Principles of Housing First. [online] Available at: <https://
homelessnetwork.scot/hfs-know-how/principles/> [Accessed 8 March 2022].

Homeless Network Scotland, n.d. Homelessness Improvement Plan. [online] Homeless Network Scotland, Glasgow. Available

at: <https://homelessnetwork.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/GHIFT-SHR-Report.pdf> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group, 2020. Tackling homelessness in Scotland following the coronavirus pandemic - Recommendations from Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group. [online] Scottish Government, Edinburgh. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/corporate-report/2020/07/homelessness-and-rough-sleeping-action-group-final-report-tackling-coronavirus/documents/harsag-final-report-on-homelessness-after-coronavirus/harsag-final-report-on-homelessness-after-coronavirus/govscot%3Adocument/HARSAG%2BCovid%2Bfinal%2Breport.pdf> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group, 2018. Ending Homelessness: The report on the final recommendations of the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Group. [online] Scottish Government, Edinburgh. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/homelessness-and-rough-sleeping-action-group-final-report/> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Hulchanski, J.D., Campsie, P., Chau, S.B.Y., Hwang, S.W., Paradis, E., 2009. 'Homelessness: What's in a Word?' in Hulchanski, J.D., Campsie, P., Chau, S.B.Y., Hwang, S.W., Paradis, E. (eds.), Finding Home: Policy Options for Addressing Homelessness in Canada, [e-book]. University of Toronto, Toronto, pp. 1–16. Available through: GoogleBooks <https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/Finding_Home_Policy_Options_for_Addressi/aHemBXz1sZEC?hl=en&gbpv=1&printsec=frontcover> [Accessed 11 May 2021].

Hurst, G., 2022. Could Universities do more to end homelessness? [pdf]. Higher Education

Policy Institute, Oxford. Available at: < https://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp- content/uploads/2022/07/Could-universities-do-more-to-end-homelessness.pdf>   [Accessed 27 August 2022].

Johnsen, S., Fitzpatrick, S., 2012. Multiple Exclusion Homelessness in the UK: Ex-Service Personnel Briefing Paper No. 3. Heriot-Watt University and Economic & Social Research Council, Edinburgh. [accessed 27 August 2022].

Kelvin, M., 2021. More of the same won't do. Glasgow Alliance. [online] Available at: <https://www.glasgowalliance.org/meet-glasgow-alliance/> [18 July 2022].

Kirby, T., 2020. Efforts escalate to protect homeless people from COVID-19 in UK. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine, [e-journal] 8, pp. 447–449. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30160-0

Littlewood, M., Bramley, G., Fitzpatrick, S., Wood, J., 2017. Eradicating "Core Homelessness" in Scotland's Four Largest Cities: Providing an Evidence Base and Guiding a Funding Framework. [online] Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh. Available at: <https://social-bite.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/EradicatingCoreHomelessness.pdf> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Mackie, P., Johnsen, S., Wood, J., 2019. Ending street homelessness: what works and why we don't do it. European Journal of Homelessness, [e-journal] 13(1), pp. 85–96. Available at: <https://www.feantsa.org/public/user/Observatory/2019/EJH/EJH_13_1/Feantsa-2019_13-1_Think-Piece-1.pdf? [18 July 2022].

Macnaughton, E., Nelson, G., Goering, P., 2013. Bringing politics and evidence together: Policy entrepreneurship and the conception of the At Home/Chez Soi Housing First Initiative for addressing homelessness and mental illness in Canada. Social Science & Medicine 82, pp. 100–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.01.033

Marks, A., 2019. Homelessness in Scotland (SPICe Briefing No. SB-19-69). Edinburgh: Scottish Parliament.

Meadows, D.H., 2008. Thinking in Systems: A Primer. White River Junction, Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing Company.

Monat, J.P., Gannon, T.F., 2015. What is Systems Thinking? A Review of Selected Literature Plus Recommendations. American Journal of Systems Science, [e-journal] 4(1), pp. 11–26. Available at: <https://mycourses.aalto.fi/pluginfile.php/1187882/mod_label/intro/Monat%20%20Gannon_2015_What%20is%20systems%20thinking%20-%20A%20review%20of%20selected%20literature%20plus%20recommendations.pdf> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Morrison, D., 2009. Homelessness as an independent risk factor for mortality: results from a retrospective cohort study. International Journal of Epidemiology, [e-journal] 38, pp. 877–883. https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyp160

Neale, J., 1997. Homelessness and theory reconsidered. Housing Studies, [e-journal] 12(1), pp. 47–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673039708720882

O'Sullivan, T., Young, G., Maclennan, D., Gibb, K., McLaren, J., Britain, A., Dowie, A., Thorton, C., 2004. Local housing system analysis good practice guide. Communities Scotland, Edinburgh. Communities Scotland, Edinburgh.

https://www.gov.scot/publications/centre-for-housing-market-analysis-list-of-guidance/.

Parsell, C., Clarke, A., Kuskoff, E., 2020. Understanding responses to homelessness during COVID-19: an examination of Australia. Housing Studies, [e-journal] pp. 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2020.1829564

Piat, M., Polvere, L., Kirst, M., Voronka, J., Zabkiewicz, D., Plante, M.-C., Isaak, C., Nolin, D., Nelson, G., Goering, P., 2015. Pathways into homelessness: Understanding how both individual and structural factors contribute to and sustain homelessness in Canada. Urban Studies, [e-journal] 52(13), pp. 2366-2382. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098014548138

Prevention Review Group, 2020.'Meeting 6'. 9 July 2020. Scotland. Online at: https://www.crisis.org.uk/media/242897/prgmeeting6-final.pdf. [Accessed   15 March 2022]

Puttick, R., 2012. Innovations in Prevention. [online] Nesta, London. Available at: <https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/innovations_in_prevention.pdf> [Accessed 15 August 2022].

Reid, B., 2021. Preventing Homelessness in Scotland. [online] Scottish Government Prevention Review Group, Scotland. Available at: <https://www.crisis.org.uk/media/244558/preventing-homelessness-in-scotland.pdf> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Rochefort, D., Cobb, R., 1992. Framing and Claiming the Homelessness Problem. New England Journal of Public Policy, [e-journal] 8(1), pp. 49-65. Available through: Digital Commons <https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp/vol8/iss1/5/> [Accessed 11 May 2021].

Rogers, D., Power, E., 2020. Housing policy and the COVID-19 pandemic: the importance of housing research during this health emergency. International Journal of Housing Policy, [e-journal] 20(2), pp. 177–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/19491247.2020.1756599

Scotsman Reporter, 2020. 'Nicola Sturgeon: Too few countries set objective to eradicate

homelessness'. The Scotsman, 5 July. Available at:

<https://www.scotsman.com/news/politics/nicola-sturgeon-too-few-countries-set-objective-eradicate-homelessness-2904589> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Scottish Federation of Housing Associations, 2022a. Who we are. [online] Available at: <https://www.sfha.co.uk/our-work/who-we-are> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Scottish Federation of Housing Associations, 2022b. Our Work. [online] Available at: <https://www.sfha.co.uk/our-work> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Scottish Federation of Housing Associations, 2022c. Research. [online] Available at: <https://www.sfha.co.uk/our-work/research> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Scottish Government, 2021. Homelessness in Scotland: 2020-21. [pdf] Available at:

<https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/statistics

/2021/06/homelessness-scotland-2020-2021/documents/homelessness-scotland-2020-21/homelessness-scotland-2020-21/govscot%3Adocument/homelessness-scotland-2020-21.pdf> [Accessed 15 August 2022].

Scottish Government, 2020a. Ending Homelessness Together: Updated action plan, October 2020. [pdf] Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/ending-homelessness-together-updated-action-plan-october-2020/> [Accessed 23 February 2021].

Scottish Government, 2020b. Homelessness in Scotland: 2019 to 2020. [pdf] Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/homelessness-scotland-2019-2020/> [Accessed 27 February 2021.

Scottish Government, 2019. Homelessness in Scotland: 2018 to 2019. [pdf] Available at

https://www.gov.scot/publications/homelessness-scotland-2018-   2019/pages/9/#:~:text=The%20Housing%20(Homeless%20Persons)%20Act,providin   g%20accommodation%20in%20certain%20circumstances. [Accessed 21 September   2022].

Scottish Government, n.d. Homelessness prevention. [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/policies/homelessness/homelessness-prevention/> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Scottish Government, n.d. Homelessness. [online] Available at:

https://www.gov.scot/policies/homelessness/ [Accessed 21 September 2022]/

Scottish Housing Regulator, 2018. Housing people who are homeless in Glasgow. [online] Scottish Housing Regulator, Glasgow. Available at: <https://www.housingregulator.gov.scot/landlord-performance/national-reports/thematic-work/housing-people-who-are-homeless-in-glasgow> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Shelter Scotland, 2021a. Intentionally or unintentionally homeless. [online] Available at: <https://scotland.shelter.org.uk/housing_advice/homelessness/the_councils_assessment/intetionally_unintentionally_homeless> [18 July 2022].

Shelter Scotland, 2021b. Local connection and homelessness. [online] Available at: <https://scotland.shelter.org.uk/housing_advice/homelessness/the_councils_assessment/local_connection> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Shelter Scotland, 2021c. Housing and homelessness statistics. [online] Available at: <https://scotland.shelter.org.uk/housing_policy/key_statistics/homelessness_facts_and_research> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Shelter Scotland, 2020a. Scottish Government homelessness statistics: updated to September 2019. [online] Shelter Scotland, Edinburgh. Available at: <https://scotland.shelter.org.uk/professional_resources/policy_library/briefing_scottish_government_homelessness_statistics_update_to_september_2019> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Shelter Scotland, 2019. Priority Need. Shelter Scotland. Online at:

https://scotland.shelter.org.uk/professional_resources/legal/homelessness/main_categories [Accessed 23 March 2022]

Simon Community Scotland, 2022. Our Services in Glasgow. [online] Available at: <https://www.simonscotland.org/our-services-and-activities/glasgow/> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Simon Community Scotland, 2020. Design at heart of well-being ethos of new advice and support centre for homeless people. [online] Available at: <https://www.simonscotland.org/news/design-at-heart-of-well-being-ethos-of-new-advice-and-support-centre-for-homeless-people/> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Somerville, P., 2013. Understanding Homelessness. Housing, Theory and Society, [e-journal] 30(4), pp. 384–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2012.756096

Somerville, P., 1992. Homelessness and the meaning of home: rooflessness or rootlessness? International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, [e-journal] 16(4), pp. 529–539. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.1992.tb00194.x

Stewart, A.B.R., 2018. Housing rites: young people's experience of conditional pathways out of homelessness. Housing Studies, [e-journal] 34(7), pp. 1117-1139. https://www.tandfonline.com/action/showCitFormats?doi=10.1080/02673037.2018.1520818

The Salvation Army, 2021. Homelessness in Scotland. [online] The Salvation Army, Edinburgh. Available at: <https://www.salvationarmy.org.uk/scottish-homelessness-report> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

University of Glasgow, n.d. Facts and figures - Employability [online]. Available

at: <https://www.gla.ac.uk/explore/facts/employability/> [Accessed 1 September   2022].

Watts, B., Bramley, G., Fitzpatrick, S., Pawson, H., Young, G., 2021. The homelessness monitor: Scotland 2021. [online] Crisis, London. Available at: <https://www.crisis.org.uk/ending-homelessness/homelessness-knowledge-hub/homelessness-monitor/scotland/the-homelessness-monitor-scotland-2021/> [Accessed 18 July 2022].

Appendix 1: Topic Guide – Homelessness Scoping Report

Introduction

- Explain nature and purpose of research

- Secure consent, confirm on the record

- Their job title/role; how long they have been in that position/organisation

- Role and nature of organisation – remit, focus, relationship to other organisations within Glasgow

Glasgow Context

- What do you consider to be the major challenges tackling homelessness in the City and its environs?

- What are the main drivers of homelessness in the City, and how are they changing?

- What are the key short and long-run problems facing tackling homelessness in Glasgow? How might they be overcome or ameliorated?

- What is going well? Are there programmes, services or initiatives that are having a positive impact?

- Has any progress been made in scaling up Housing First responses for those experiencing homelessness alongside complex needs?

  > Organisation dependent: What is the minimum support an individual must engage with in order to retain accommodation?

  > Are there any challenges to the programme or barriers to scaling it up?

- What strategies are in place to direct efforts to address homelessness in the City?

  > What are your views on these strategies?

- Where is there collaboration amongst organisations within the City? Are there opportunities/challenges to expanding collaboration?

- What does funding look like for homelessness services within Glasgow? Where are there challenges/opportunities?

Vignettes:

- If a single male with complex needs presented to the Local Authority as homeless, what would his likely journey through the system be?

  When would support services be engaged? Disengaged? Can someone re-engage with services at a later date?

- If a young person was to present to the Local Authority as homeless after being kicked out of their housing by family, how would you handle their case and what could they expect as they engage with different parts of the system?

COVID-19

- What has been the impact of COVID-19 on homelessness in Glasgow or your organisation's operations more specifically?

- What do you feel have been the most impactful policy changes in response to COVID-19?

- Looking ahead, what challenges will arise as a result of changes made during COVID-19?

- Looking ahead, what opportunities will arise as a result of the pandemic response?

Data

- What data is being collected by your organisation?

- What opportunities do you see for data sharing/collection within the City?

- What challenges do you see for data sharing/collection within the City?

University

- What do you think the University should focus on, and how could we add the most value?

- Are there any critical organisations or documents you feel it would be beneficial for this research to engage with to map out a holistic picture of homelessness and the response within the City?