Report Title:	Intensive Family Support Progress report
Contains Confidential	NO - Part I
or Exempt	
Information?	
Member reporting:	Councillor N. Airey, Lead Member for Children's
	Services
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet- 27 April 2017
Responsible Officer(s):	Kevin McDaniel, Director of Children's Services
Wards affected:	All
wards arrected.	/ All



## **REPORT SUMMARY**

- 1. The Troubled Families programme was launched in April 2012. The Government initiative notes that Troubled Families are families who both have problems and often cause problems where children are truanting or excluded, where there is youth crime or anti-social behaviour and where parents are not working. They also tend to have other problems including domestic violence or drug or alcohol abuse and cost local services and the taxpayer a lot of time and money<sup>1</sup>. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead has been delivering early help support services for Troubled Families through the Intensive Family Support programme since April 2012.
- 2. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead has worked with 484 families overall since April 2012. Through innovative practice, including a health worker within the team, the Intensive Family Support programme has directly worked to improve the lives of 301 of those families. Overall 214 families are considered to have made a sustainable change to their lives.
- 3. This report summarises some of the work the programme has undertaken with residents to support them in addressing the issues that were causing them concerns and stopping from engaging positively in the community. In addition, it outlines how the Intensive Family Support programme will continue to work with Troubled Families up until the end of phase 2 in 2020, at a total cost of £932,200 from April 2017 to March 2020. This is funded by the Department for Communities and Local Government and includes £295,200 funded on a payment by results basis.

## 1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

#### **RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet:**

- I. Notes the progress made in supporting our residents whose families have multiple and complex needs to turn their lives around.
- II. Commits to continue to support vulnerable families within The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, through the Intensive Family Support programme, for the duration of phase 2 of the national Troubled Families programme which runs until March 2020.

<sup>1</sup> Understanding Troubled Families, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2014

# 2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

## **Background national picture**

- 2.1 In April 2012, the Troubled Families Unit at the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched the £448m phase one Troubled Families programme in England, with the aim of 'turning around<sup>2</sup>' the lives of 120,000 with multiple and complex needs to achieve an overall shift in public expenditure from reactive service provision towards earlier intervention.
- 2.2 Nationally, data indicates that a typical Troubled Family has the following characteristics:
  - On average 2.5 children compared to 1.7 children in whole population.
  - 40% of families have three or more children compared to 16% nationally.
  - 25% have children under 5 years old.
  - 49% are lone parent households, compared to 16% nationally.
  - 78% were recorded as White British.
- 2.3 In June 2013, the Government announced plans to expand the Troubled Families programme for five years, through to 2019/20 so that a further 400,000 families across England could be reached.
- 2.4 Progress of the programme nationally is now reported via an annual report, first published in April 2017, called "Supporting disadvantaged families. Troubled Families Programme 2015-2020: Progress so far". The national summary of impact<sup>3</sup> is:
  - In more than 9,100 families, one or more family members has come off out of work benefits and achieved continuous employment.
  - Nearly 44,000 families have made significant and sustained progress on all of their problems.
  - Parents and carers report that keyworkers are giving them practical support and the confidence to tackle their problems.
  - Staff say the programme is delivering long-term change with families, as well as encouraging professionals from different agencies to work together and provide better support to families.

# The local picture - phase one Troubled Families

- 2.5 The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) delivers the Troubled Families programme through its Intensive Family Support programme (IFSP). During phase one of the project, 209 families have been worked with<sup>4</sup> and 160 of those received direct support<sup>5</sup> from the IFSP. 140 of these families have been assessed as achieving sustainable change and therefore are considered to have been 'turned around'.
- 2.6 The IFSP prioritises working with families as early as possible, in line with the Borough's Early Help Strategy which is informed by national research. This is achieved by linking the work of IFSP to existing universal services such as Children's Centres, as demonstrated in case study A, box 1.

<sup>4</sup> Worked with means that a professional within RBWM has been involved with the family.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 'Turning around' means that: a family has reduced involvement with crime and anti-social behaviour; or adults are progressing along the path to work; or children are improving their attendance at school.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Troubled Families Programme:2015-2020: Progress so far. Page 7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Direct support from IFSP means that a member of the team coordinated all activity for a family.

#### **Box 1: Intensive Family Support Case study A**

A single mother of two children was struggling with her son's behaviour which was significantly impacting school attendance and home life. An IFSP key worker was allocated to help mother with these difficulties whilst providing ongoing support with parenting. The IFSP worker identified issues with the family's housing and mother's lack of confidence to seek the help available to her.

The IFSP intervention has led to a reduction in the identified family difficulties, including a successful reintegration into school for the son who is now engaging well and making expected educational progress. The mother says "The work we did really helped. IFSP are very helpful and you get all the support you need".

2.7 The Royal Borough is one of the few local authorities whose delivery of the Troubled Families programme has provided intensive therapeutic and practical support to families attached to the programme for an average of nine months as seen in case study B, box 2.

# **Box 2: Intensive Family Support Project Case study B**

IFSP worked successfully with a mother who had fled with her two children from a domestically abusive relationship and were placed in a refuge. The allocated keyworker established that the children's educational progress was being held back by a range of factors in the family situation including accommodation, contact and management of behaviour.

The IFSP worker co-ordinated a range of services so that the family was moved to permanent accommodation, mother was supported to engage with the DASH, a domestic abuse support charity, and mediation for the parents about contact and safety took place. As a result the children are now settled in school with attendance at 100% and mother has secured employment..

- 2.8 The specialist support provided to families by the IFSP is more intensive than that provided through statutory provision. It is often delivered at home or locally to promote family engagement. A range of different strategies are used including family meetings or mediations to address presenting concerns.
- 2.9 The IFSP specialist parenting worker undertakes targeted work within the Muslim community in the Borough, including a parenting programme linked to Islamic values, which is unique in the UK. This work has also led to the first accreditation of Muslim girls group by the Duke of Edinburgh's Award. This work has raised participants' awareness of their rights including education, training and employment and provided increased empowerment as described by one participant in box 3.

# **Box 3: IFSP Muslim community group impact**

A participant told us: "I suffered domestic violence for 18 years and I used to think women just have to suffer. Social services got involved with my case ten years ago. But I was scared of social workers and felt suffocated. I felt no one was able to understand me... I suffered from depression and started self harming. The IFSP told me about the rights of women in Islam...I did my family links parenting course incorporating Islamic values which changed my life. My children never listened to me. My son was going in anti social activities and I was feeling helpless.

When I did the parenting programme, I learnt about positive discipline and empathy. I joined Asian Woman group and did confidence building and stress management where I learnt that stress is part of our life and self harming is not the solution. I learned how to manage my emotions and it helped me to bring my inner strength back. I used to love cooking and in this group, I got the opportunity to teach cooking to other ladies, which boosted my confidence. I have started my own catering company now and today the food is from my company!"

2.10 Prompted by the success of this work and the concern about the reach and inclusivity of parenting interventions, the IFSP undertook research with local Scholars and the Muslim College to develop a booklet with information about Islamic values which could be used in conjunction to the Parenting Links programme. As a result of this work, three programmes, each of ten weeks' duration, are delivered annually to men and women. The aim is that via educating this cohort of parents, potential future difficulties may be prevented.

# Troubled Families programme: phase two

2.11 Phase two of the Trouble Families programme will target a wider group of families and high performing local authorities, such as the Royal Borough, were invited to be an early starter into phase two. The target for the Royal Borough is to help 460 families make a sustainable change to their lives, see table 1:

Table 1: Reach of programme

#### Criteria of inclusion in phase one -Criteria for inclusion in phase two target 123 families meeting criteria target 460 families meeting criteria Adult in receipt of out of work Adult in receipt of out of work benefits. benefits Persistent school absence or Persistent school absence or exclusion exclusion Adult/youth offending or Anti-Adult/youth offending or Anti-Social Behaviour Social Behaviour Children who need help Families affected by Domestic Abuse Parents and children with a range of health problems

2.12 IFSP involvement with each family can last for up to a year with the average being nine months to ensure changes are sustained. This is demonstrated by

the low re-referral rate of families who have been subject to IFSP intervention. In February 2017, this re-referral rate for RBWM was 10.9% compared to statistical neighbours at 22.9%.

2.13 Between January 2015 and March 2017, the IFSP has identified 275 families meeting the criteria for phase two of the programme and they have been attached to the programme to secure part of the funding from the DCLG. Of the 275 families, the IFSP has directly worked with 141 and secured sustainable change for 74 families.

### Eligible families

- 2.14 Given that local provision is targeted at those families presenting with multiple complex difficulties but for whom the threshold for statutory intervention is not met, most families in phase two are already known to a number of agencies. Assessments have often already been completed and work to improve outcomes is underway.
- 2.15 The investment in IFSP provides the borough with the capacity to work directly with approximately 45 families at any point, which equates to, on average, 130 children. To meet the DCLG target of 460 families worked with, the Royal Borough also report cases that have met the threshold for statutory intervention and engaged by local authority services other than IFSP.
- 2.16 Families are included on the programme via referrals from professionals or the public through the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) or via an identification process which looks at a range of multi-agency data sources<sup>6</sup>. This includes key intelligence sources from partners, for example, names of families that may be at risk of financial exclusion as a result of welfare reforms, or families who are known to police through their community workers. This data encompasses about 10% of families within the Borough.

## Measuring success and the verification of results (PbR claims)

- 2.17 Phase two of the programme uses a payment by results (PbR) approach and pays additional money where the Royal Borough is able to demonstrate tangible success through the Outcomes plan for each family.
- 2.18 In 2015-16, the first year of phase two, the Royal Borough has worked with 125 families and PbR claims were made for 17 families. In 2016-17 the Royal Borough has worked with a further 150 families and made PbR claims for 57 families.
- 2.19 Identification of historic families which meet at least two of the criteria does not necessarily guarantee suitability for a PbR claim as the family may fail to satisfy the measurements required during the monitoring period. In addition, investigation could result in a withdrawal of the case due to factors such as insufficient evidence or inappropriate timelines with regard to benefit claims.
- 2.20 Not only is it necessary to evidence a successful turn around within the defined monitoring period for each of the claimable criteria, but proof is also required that any criteria not being claimed for were not an issue for the family.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Troubled Families Programme 2015-2020: Progress so far, page 59.

2.21 The Royal Borough has put in place robust result verification and validation systems to secure assurance that payment by results claims are genuine and evidence-based. The Government will undertake regular spot checks of a sample of claims for payment and should the Royal Borough be spot checked, IFSP is confident that everything required could be evidenced to satisfy scrutiny.

**Table 2: Options** 

Option	Comments
Continue to support vulnerable families within The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, through the Intensive Family Support programme, for the duration of phase 2 of the national Troubled Families programme	Vulnerable families in the borough will continue to receive the targeted support they need to secure positive outcomes.
which runs until 2020  This is the recommended option	
Do nothing	Vulnerable families will not receive the support they need and they are likely to escalate to specialist services.

## 3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Phase two of the programme leads to the key implications in table 3.

**Table 3: Key Implications** 

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
Total number of families involved in phase two of the programme.	< 365	365- 374	375-389	> 389	31 March 2018.
The number of families achieving sufficient change to claim PbR.	<130	130- 137	138-150	> 150	31 March 2018.

## 4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 4.1 The IFSP has been funded from central government. Funding covered four areas:
  - Service Transformation Grant (STG)
  - 25% of Future STG brought forward
  - Upfront Attachment fees for expected volume of families
  - Payment by results for families

4.2 In phase one of the project, the Royal Borough was funded for 150 families through the attachment fees and was able to claim PbR for 140 families as listed in table 4.

Table 4: Phase one 2012 to 2015:

Year 1 attachment fees	43 x £3200 = £137600
Year 2 attachment fees	70 x £2400 = £168000
Year 3 attachment fees	53 x £1600 = £84800
PBR claimed for Families turned around	140
Year 1 2012/13	36 claims = £27600
Year 2 2013/14	58 claims = £88200
Year 3 2014/15	46 claims = £102000

4.2 In phase two, the proposed funding from DCLG is set out in table 5 with an annual draw down target of £397,000.

Table 5: Phase two 2015 to 2020

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Service	£150,000	£150,000	£150,000	£150,000	£150,000
Transformation	,	·	,		,
Grant (STG)					
25% Future STG	£0	£37,500	£0	£0	£0
brought forward		·			
Attachment fees	£123,000	£150,000	£95,000	£92,000	£0
(£/families)	123	150	95	92	
Payment by	£13,600	£59,200	£104,000	£108,000	£83,200
results	17	74	130	135	104
(£/families)					
Total	£286,600	£359,200	£349,000	£350,000	£233,200

Note: Funding levels have yet to be confirmed by DCLG for the last two years of phase two. Figures in table 5 are based on an assumption of similar drawdowns to those in years one and two and are therefore subject to change.

- 4.3 In 2016-17 it has been possible to claim PbR for 57 families against the maximum of 74 in table 5, leading to £13,600 unclaimed PbR which cannot be carried forward for future claims. The DCLG is proposing to review PbR during 2017-18 in consultation with local authorities.
- 4.4 The base line budget for service delivery for the IFSP is set against the Service Transformation Grant and attachment fees which are paid annually. This amounts to £637,000 between April 2017 and March 2020. It is assumed that the annual PbR claims will be utilised in year five of phase two to offset the reduced attachment fees and ensure continuation of the service to March 2020 by providing a maximum of £295,200 income.

#### 5 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The Intensive Family Support programme has been agreed with the Department for Communities and Local Government to meet the requirements of the national Troubled Families programme.

#### **6 RISK MANAGEMENT**

6.1 Table 6 sets out the risks to the delivery of the IFSP and its funding.

Table 6: Risk to PbR claims

Risks	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
Delay in evidence provided by partner agencies	Medium	Report and escalate to partners via Community Safety Partnership	Low
Inability to collate the necessary data manually to achieve the increasing number of claims over the remainder of the programme	High	Close liaison between services to easily identify necessary data in line with increasing number of claims	Low
Reduced resource from for example staff sickness	Medium	Utilise support from other service areas though negotiation with the directorate management team	Low
Lack of IT support to capture the required data	High	Implement reporting though PARIS and inPhase performance management software.	Low

6.2 Whilst the Royal Borough does not have to use specific software, DCLG expect part of the transformation grant to be used to provide systems to manage the Troubled Families data.

### 7 POTENTIAL IMPACTS

7.1 The IFSP works with the most vulnerable families and will take note of individual requirements as part of the development of plans to work with the families involved.

#### 8 CONSULTATION

8.1 The report will be considered by the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel and comments will be reported to Cabinet.

#### 9 TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 The timetable for implementation is set out in table 7.

**Table 7: Implementation timetable** 

Date	Details
April 2017	Continued case work in phase two of the programme

#### 10 APPENDICES

10.1 There are no appendices to this report.

#### 11 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 11.1 The background papers include
  - Intensive Family Support Project Progress Report, Cabinet Report, 26 April 2012.
  - Intensive Family Support Project- six month progress, Cabinet Report, 24 October 2012.
  - Intensive Family Support Project, Progress update after year 1, Cabinet Report, 27 June 2013.
  - The First Troubled Families Programme, 2012 to 2015, Department of Communities and Local Government, October 2016
  - Supporting disadvantaged families. <u>Troubled Families Programme 2015-2020: Progress so far</u>, Department for Communities and Local Government, April 2017.

# 12 CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date	Commented
		sent	& returned
Cllr Airey	Lead Member for Children's	30/3/17	30/3/17, 10/4
	Services		
Alison Alexander	Managing Director	30/3/17	30/3/17, 10/4
Russell O'Keefe	Executive Director		
Andy Jeffs	Executive Director		
Rob Stubbs	Section 151 Officer		
Terry Baldwin	Head of HR		

## REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?
Key decision - No	No
Report Author: Marie Bell, Ad	cting Head of Health, Early Help, MASH, Duty &
Assessment	