

Report of the Director of Children's Services

Report to Inner West Area Committee

Date: 25th March 2014

Subject: Families First

Are specific electoral wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, name(s) of ward(s): Armley, Bramley & Stanningley		
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for call-in?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:		
Appendix number:		

1. Summary of main issues

2. Families First is the Leeds interpretation of the national 'Troubled Families' Programme. The initial phase of the programme has been delivered since April 2012 and will be completed in May 2015. The priority for the remainder of phase 1 of the programme is to embed 'whole family' approaches to working with families with multiple and complex needs and ensure all existing identified families are receiving appropriate support.
3. Households meeting the Families First criteria are distributed unevenly across the city with high concentrations in some wards/clusters, including the ACES and Bramley clusters.
4. For the clusters in the Inner West a total of 110 families or 46% of the identified cohort have made sufficient progress to achieve Payment By Results – 'turned around'. This compares with 41% for the city overall and a national average of 33% based on other local authority submissions. Further work is needed to measure the impact of the programme more broadly in terms of services to whole families and service transformation.
5. Progress against individual risk factors is variable, with good progress in reducing crime/anti-social behaviour, but fewer improvements in school attendance. Challenges remain in terms of moving adults back into employment.
6. The programme is located within Children's Services but the work with whole families cuts across the children's and adults agendas, with a strong focus on

supporting adults into employment. Further work continues to develop more integrated ways of working across directorates and the wider partnership.

7. Recommendations

8. The area committee is asked to:
9. Note the content of this report and recognise that the programme is in continuous development, with a good evidence base of impact.
10. Identify ways in which the area committees, in partnership with services and the Families First programme, can support further improvements, particularly in respect to supporting adults into employment.
11. Identify how the area committees and children's services can work towards sustainably embedding the Families First model in the future and beyond the life of the programme.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to brief the Inner West area committee on the Families First Leeds programme and to seek the support of the area committee in embedding the programme over the next 12 months.
- 1.2 The report outlines the purpose and structure of the programme, provides highlight data relating to Families First in the Inner West, and outlines a number of the challenges and successes of the programme. Two case study examples are also attached.

2 Background information

- 2.1 The Families First Programme in Leeds is being delivered through existing structures and services across a range of different agencies already working with children and families. Individuals who are taking on the role of 'lead practitioner' come from a range of professional backgrounds. The programme is built around delivering family support utilising a 'whole family approach'.
- 2.2 Families are eligible for the programme where there are multiple issues identified relating to crime (U18 offending), anti-social behaviour, poor school attendance/multiple exclusions, individuals in the household claiming out of work benefits, in addition to local concerns. Families are classed as 'high' 'medium' or 'low' risk/need and an appropriate level of provision identified to address the identified needs, utilising the whole family approach of a lead practitioner providing hands on support and co-ordinating a 'team around the family'

3 Main issues

- 3.1 The programme is just over halfway through. Results achieved so far, as measured by the payment by results element of the programme, are outlined below.

PBR Overall Passes	Year 1			Year 2			All Families		
	Total Y1	Y1 Passes	% Y1 Passes	Total Y2	Y2 Passes	% Y2 Passes	Total Y1 &Y2	All Passes	% Passes
ACES	36	28	77.8%	64	19	29.7%	100	47	47.0%
Bramley	54	38	70.4%	85	25	29.4%	139	63	45.3%
Inner West	90	66	73.3%	149	44	29.5%	239	110	46%
West North West	286	202	70.6%	291	82	28.2%	577	284	49.2%
Leeds	890	643	72.2%	838	247	29.5%	1728	890	51.5%

PBR progress against individual criteria

AREA	ACES BRAMLEY NOS	ACES BRAMLEY %	WNW NOS	WNW %	Proportion of Area	Difference
Crime / ASB	144	60.3%	370	64.1%	38.9%	-4%
Crime / ASB Passes	132	91.7%	321	86.8%	41.1%	5%
Crime Fails	12	8.3%	49	13.2%	24.5%	-5%
Education	172	72.0%	393	68.1%	43.8%	4%
Ed Passes	63	36.6%	163	41.5%	38.7%	-5%
Ed FAILS	80	46.5%	179	45.5%	44.7%	1%
Ed Data Missing	29	16.9%	56	14.2%	51.8%	3%
Employment	207	86.6%	487	84.4%	42.5%	2%
Moved to Continuous employment.	4	1.9%	6	1.2%	66.7%	1%
TOTAL FAMILIES	239	100.0%	577	100.0%	41.4%	-

- Aces & Bramley families make up 41.4% of the area households.
- Crime and ASB families make up 60% of household issues, slightly lower than the area level of 64%.
- Pass rates for people with crime issues (this includes families that failed for other reasons) are around 5% higher in ACES/ Bramley than in comparison with the wider area.
- Educational issues of attendance and exclusion affect 72% of FF families in ACES & Bramley, 4% higher than the whole area proportion.
- Education PBR pass rates are 5% lower than the overall area.
- Missing/gaps in education data account for a number of failures in this area – some cases flagged for concerns regarding attendance are to be treated with caution as early identification may include people of over school age.
- Employment and work benefits flags exist for 86.6% of families, very similar to wider area numbers.
- 4 of the 6 people moving into continuous employment for West North West have come from the ACES Bramley areas.

3.2 As the programme moves towards its final year, focus is needed on embedding the model of working into mainstream delivery, to ensure sustainability beyond the funded period. A more increased engagement in localities and areas is key to this.

3.3 Development of the cost/benefit analysis may inform future funding/commissioning for this way of working and is a priority activity.

3.4 Whole family working needs to be underpinned by more integrated working between agencies and directorates. Continued work with between adults and

children's services/commissioners and the implementation of the revised "Think Family" protocol is needed to support this.

- 3.5 Further plans are in development to support Workforce Development, including support for managers to provide effective supervision.
- 3.6 Work is continuing to consult with families regarding service development.
- 3.7 A renewed focus on school attendance is needed and engagement with schools to achieve progress in this area. Locally an increased engagement of key schools is reported.
- 3.8 The numbers of families being supported into employment needs to increase substantially.
- 3.9 The programme may be extended for a further year. Proposals need to be developed and submitted to Department for Communities and Local Government outlining how we would seek to appropriately target and deliver the next phase of the programme.

5. Risks and Issues:

- 5.1 There is still a need to ensure that all agencies take on the lead practitioner role wherever appropriate to ensure all families have been supported by the end of May 2015.
- 5.2 The situation regarding gathering education data for PbR continues to remain problematic and does impact on our returns and income generation. Work is underway across a number of service areas to address this.
- 5.3 Substantial progress has been made in supporting service transformation and culture change in order to deliver work to whole families. If results are to be sustained and savings realised, clear organisational commitment and strategic drive is required to embed the practice beyond the lifetime of the programme
- 5.4 There are still significant barriers around information sharing between health agencies and broader partners, which can undermine the integrated approach to working with families.

4 Corporate considerations

4.1 Consultation and engagement

- 4.1.1 This report is for area committee meetings, which involve a wide range of partners and stakeholders. Consultation and engagement is integral to the work of Children's Services and the Children's Trust, as evidenced in child friendly city work.

4.2 Equality and diversity/cohesion and integration

- 4.2.1 Equality issues are implicit in the information provided. The differences shown illustrate that there are different levels of need and of outcomes across the city. Additional equality analysis of the information provided is undertaken, and the

detailed information already provided to clusters is powerful intelligence that can be used to help focus priorities and narrow the gap.

4.3 Council policies and city priorities

4.3.1 A significant proportion of the information included in this report relates to the city priorities for children and young people and the outcomes contained in the CYPP.

4.4 Resources and value for money

4.4.1 There are no resource implications in this report.

4.5 Legal implications, access to information and call in

4.5.1 This report is not eligible for call in, due to being a Council function.

4.6 Risk management

4.6.1 There are no risk management implications in this report. The priorities reflected in this report are monitored through Leeds City Council performance and, where appropriate, risk management processes.

5 Conclusions

5.1 Not applicable, as this report is information based.

6 Recommendations

6.1 The area committee is asked to:

6.1.2 Note the content of this report and recognise that the programme is in continuous development, with a good evidence base of impact.

6.1.3 Identify ways in which clusters and services, area committees and the Families First programme can deliver further improvements, particularly in respect to supporting adults into employment.

6.1.4 Identify how the area committees and children's services can work towards sustainably embedding the Families First model in the future and beyond the life of the programme.

7 Background documents¹

7.1 Case study below

Families First Case Study (Bramley Cluster)

Family Composition

Mum and Dad have 5 children aged between 3 years and 13 years of age. Two of secondary school age, two of primary school age and the youngest attending nursery at a

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

different primary school to elder siblings. Parents had elected to home educate (EHE) the eldest child. Eligibility for the Families First Programme (FFP) relate to Dad being unemployed and the previously recorded persistent absenteeism of the eldest child. The family live in privately rented accommodation. The family have a history of agency involvement including common assessments (CAFs) and requests to Children Social Work Service. Over the past four years there has also been a trend of disengagement when the parents have experienced high challenge with high levels of support. A part of their response had been to remove their children from school or move them to other settings.

The issues identified through assessment

Just weeks prior to notification that the family was to be a part of the FFP, the Cluster's Targeted Service Leader (TSL) had been approached by the Family Intervention Service (FIS) for guidance as to how to progress work with this family. FIS had worked with the family for over a year and the need for intensive support was no longer considered to be required. The outcomes of the CAF (focused upon implementing routines and boundaries within the home to improve behaviour) had been met and the case was expected to close. In addition, the TSL had been notified of the EHE and a safeguarding visit by the Attendance Improvement Officer (AIO) was planned. As the TSL investigated how best to progress the case, information shared by partners suggested new needs were emerging as well as inconsistencies in the views of practitioners about the level of risk and range of presenting issues. Furthermore it was evident that the eldest child was not receiving any home education. The AIO started to build a relationship with the parents and successfully supported them to accept that a return to mainstream school was in the best interests of the eldest child and the family. The TSL, securing Mum and Dad's consent, made a decision to organise a multi-agency meeting to hear the views of everyone. This one meeting, with representatives of 3 settings and 4 agencies and Mum, enabled the formulation of a new holistic family assessment and the launch of a new plan for the family.

Specific needs related to: the eldest child's re-integration to mainstream school; all of the children accessing activity to develop their social and personal development; emotional health needs for two of the children; support for Mum and Dad to sustain parenting strategies and especially their management of the eldest child's volatile behaviour within the home; Dad to re-enter the employment market; financial advice for Mum and Dad to manage a reduction in a high level of debt and the securing of affordable housing.

What we did and who was involved

It was agreed that an intensive approach by a single agency, such as FIS, would not adequately meet the needs of the family at this stage. Furthermore given the age range of the children a new FIS service would have to be requested which would demand a high quality assessment and a plan of work tried and tested. That said, an approach whereby each child had an individual plan within the broader context of the family plan with interventions offered by a range of local agencies and settings was agreed. On Mum's request, the AIO was designated Lead Professional (LP) and focused specifically on the

transition plan for the eldest child to return to school. This involved representing the family at the Fair Access Panel, negotiating with the secondary school a transition plan and some individual work with the child to motivate and encourage a return to school. The Cluster's Senior Family Support Practitioner (SFSP) started working with the family to revisit the family dynamics, behaviours within the home and Mum and Dad's parenting approach. With support of the LP the CaMHS offer of a parenting programme was revisited. In addition, the SFSP met with the four younger siblings to capture their wishes and feelings and this has been added to the assessment and used to inform interventions. Dad has been offered employment support through the Community Work Team. Barca-Leeds have started working with the three eldest children through group activity and for the eldest child, one-to-one support had been initiated. Work to review the family's accommodation has started given the impact of their current housing type on their level of debt.

The difference made

Within a three month period of successful engagement with this family:

*high quality information shared by partner agencies across the education, health and voluntary sectors led to a quality assessment being written within a short timeframe and, their commitment to allocate resource, produced a plan that was initiated with immediate effect;

* a child who has not received an education for over 6 months (and before this was persistently absent) has re-started mainstream school with a support package in place that will maximise the child's chance to cope with maintaining attendance and engaging in learning;

* Mum and Dad are being supported to access the CaMHS Parenting Programme;

* all of the children are starting to benefit from activities outside of the home that will develop their interests and raise their aspirations;

*Dad has accepted the support of the Community Work Team coach to find employment;

*Mum and Dad are to access Citizen's Advice Bureau to manage their debt;

*Housing services are now involved to secure the family local authority housing;

*the views of the children are within the assessment and have shaped the plan. As such some interventions identified by practitioners for the children have not been pursued and instead others have been sought.

On-going challenge

Work with the family has affirmed their lack of trust in agencies and the trend to withdraw when dealing with challenging issues. Sustaining their engagement is proving to be particularly time consuming and, the parents' commitment to appointments has not been

maintained on numerous occasions. The volatile nature of the family dynamics has emerged. Understanding this, the potential impact upon relationships within the family and the implications for the children's behaviour within and outside of the home, notwithstanding their health and welfare, is now a focus. This being the case, the on-going assessment and reviewing of the plan will determine if this case needs the intervention of a specialist service, such as MST (Multi-Systemic Therapy).

Julia Pope
TSL Bramley