



Decision Maker:	Cabinet Committee
Date:	22nd July 2013
Classification:	For General Release
Title:	Report on progress implementing a Troubled Families programme in Westminster
Wards Affected:	All
Policy Context:	Better City, Better Lives. This is Westminster's approach to delivering the Government's Troubled Families programme.
Financial Summary:	The report provides an update on the expenditure of attachment fees from central government to deliver a programme and recommends further expenditure for the remainder of the funded programme. There is no risk to the council's reserves. The detail is contained in the body of the report.
Report of:	Andrew Christie, Tri-borough Executive Director Children's Services

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This paper updates members on progress in establishing and delivering the Troubled Families service in Westminster, within the context of tri-borough arrangements and follows from a previous report to the committee in February 2013. It covers the current budget position, the number of families identified and worked with and the outcomes to date. It makes recommendations for the delivery of the programme for the remainder of the funded period to March 2015.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 To accept the progress report and agree to the continued delivery for the remainder of the funded programme to 31 March 2015.

3. Reasons for Decision

- 3.1 The Troubled Families programme is an important new programme for the tri-borough local authorities and requires considerable annual expenditure of the funding provided by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), to be authorised for Westminster by the Cabinet. This decision gives

approval to complete plans for expenditure and delivery to the remainder of the programme.

- 3.2 The staff is in place to deliver the service. Many families have been identified who could benefit from the additional interventions, as well as the communities they live within. Without agreement to continue the delivery of the programme, the funding (attachment fees) would need to be returned or alternative services identified, with the current service scaled back and staff made redundant.

4. Background

- 4.1 The government launched the Troubled Families programme in December 2010 and in April 2012 announced a payment by results funding mechanism to support the work.

- 4.2 In August 2012 approval was given by cabinet sub-committee to establish a tri-borough service, to be known as Tri-borough Family Recovery incorporating the Westminster Family Recovery programme, the Royal borough of Kensington and Chelsea Family Intervention project and a new tri-borough Family Coaching service. The new and expanded elements of the service commenced in January 2013. See appendix 1 for details of the complete service offer.

5. Progress in the identification of families and allocation to an additional service at 10.7.13.

DCLG target number of troubled families in Westminster over project lifecycle to 31.3.2015	790
No. of families identified	451
No. of additional families engaged with Family Coaches and Westminster FRP. <i>NB this number contains a historic cohort of 98 families where work completed prior to the Troubled Families programme initiation</i>	245
No. of families referred to Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)	4
No. of families triaged and retained in youth offending and children’s early help/ localities and referred to employment interventions where appropriate.	82
Total no. of families currently worked with or where work is completed.	331

6. Outcomes and the process to make claims for Payment by results (PbR).

- 6.1 The results can be submitted to DCLG every three months. The council will make its first claim on 29th July. The council must secure the approval of audit prior to submission, as a condition of the programme set by DCLG. The auditors have informally indicated that the council has met the requirements in

relation to the selection of families and the identification of those meeting the PbR success requirements.

- 6.2 The timing of the cabinet sub-committee meeting is unfortunate as the complete results are not yet available. Officers will be able to table an almost complete set of results on the day, which will give a reliable indication of progress. The reason for the late availability is the need to await the summer term school attendance and the subsequent time required to match this data. Early indications however are that the performance has not been as strong as hoped. Officers have benchmarked these results with other London boroughs and have found that Westminster's indicative performance is similar to comparable London boroughs.
- 6.3 Once the complete results are available in the tri-borough officers will provide them to members for their consideration along with a more detailed analysis of what is working and what requires further adjustment. This will also include bench marking with comparable authorities.
- 6.4 The work of the newest element of the service, the family coaches established in January 2013, has not yet been of sufficient duration to produce results that qualify for PbR. This is because all results must be sustained for a minimum of six months in the case of employment or reduced offending / ASB and for three terms in relation to improved school attendance. Sampling has been undertaken to check the direction of travel of the service and the progress of families being worked with has been reviewed.
- 6.5 There are ten coaches working in Westminster. Five are based in the family coaching team and since April, five more are in the youth offending team and children's localities. They can work with up to 100 families every 6 months.
- 6.6 **Summary of progress.** The following are the results of a random sample of 30 families' progress.
- 6.7 **Examples of progress - Education.** Attendance has improved in 15 families where it was an issue, by an average of 11 percent. 6 families would potentially be eligible for PbR as the attendance has shifted to above 85 percent (eligible for PbR only if this change was sustained for 3 consecutive terms). For the remaining 9 families attendance has improved but it is still below 85 percent. In terms of the types of families worked with, of the 15 it was noted that 1 child had ADHD and another was autistic. It was noted that two young people had enrolled for college in September. One child moved from a pupil referral unit into mainstream school.
- 6.8 **Examples of progress - ASB / Youth Offending** Of the 30 families, 15 had ASB or Youth offending as a criteria, of these in the time working with the family (60 percent) 10 families had an improvement of more than 60 percent (so would be eligible for PbR if this change was sustained for at least 6 months), one family improved by 40 percent. There was no improvement for 3 cases and attendance deteriorated for one family when a child was excluded.

6.9 Examples of progress – Employment. Ten parents have agreed to referrals have being made to the local ESF sub-contractor to Reed, Vital regeneration. Progress data is now awaited from Vital. This lack of progress information is due to on-going problem with the contract let by DWP for the ESF families programme where providers can only send results to Reed and then onto DWP and not to the council. Officers have been working closely with London Councils to address this and other performance issues. These include huge staff turnover and gaps in service and a failure to follow up referrals in a timely manner. There has been an exchange of letters with Reed and the Minster Lord Freud and as a result on 11 July officers attended a meeting chaired by London Councils with DWP, Reed and a group of other local authorities. A commitment was made on the day by DWP to address the information sharing issues. They have also offered large local authorities Job Centre Plus staff to be embedded in troubled families services from July in recognition of the limited progress made in employment as a result of the severe limitations of the ESF contract.

7. Evaluation

7.1 The DCLG is undertaking a national evaluation. There will also be a more detailed evaluation specific to the tri-borough, provided by the University of East Anglia. It is intended to support an understanding of which interventions work, with which families and at what cost. This should inform the development of core services such as youth offending, early help and child protection as tri-borough children's services continues to provide more effective services for less. It may also give evidence to support the commissioning of further more specialist and expensive interventions such as multi-systemic therapy (MST).

8. Community Budgets update and funding post 2015

8.1 Tri-borough Family Recovery was set up as part of a Community Budgets initiative to develop sustainable ways of working with families with potential or actual high cost, high risk needs. The Tri-borough was one of the four pilot areas and has contributed to the Community Budgets Area Plan which was submitted to the DCLG in December 2012.

8.2 In the recent spending review the government signalled the intention to extend the funding for a further year to 2015/6 and for a further four years, subject to the outcome of a general election. The DCLG has indicated a wish to broaden the criteria for families to be included in a future programme and to ensure families can be worked with sooner i.e. early intervention. Officers have been invited to contribute to the development of the programme post 2015.

9. Financial Implications

Spending profile for WCC Troubled Families

9.1 Financial update

Every year each borough is allocated a Troubled Families coordinator grant, and attachment fees are claimed per identified family, with which the borough is working or will be working. There is an additional payment by results funding element secured by achieving specific outcomes. This increases proportionately as the attachment fee reduces over the life of the programme. Details of attachment fees and reward funding were outlined in the previous report (August 2012).

9.2 Shared costs

Westminster City Council is the host borough. The funding of the tri-borough project makes use of these funding streams by cross-charging all shared costs such as for the project management and administration, the Triage Service, and shared parts of the family coaching service (e.g. administration and service manager)

Illustration: WCC Period 9 forecast expenditure for 2012-13

	SHARED COSTS	Budget	Actual	Variance
WCC - Shared	Salaries	132,900	46,279	-86,621
	Non-salaries	100	9,126	9,026
	Corporate SLAs	0	0	0
	Recharges to Tri - borough	0	-6,023	0
	Other grant income	-133,000	-49,382	83,618
	Total	0	0	0

Non-salaries are recharged costs, i.e. costs paid by WCC and recharged using the tri-borough ratio of 34(WCC): 33:33.

9.3 Sovereign costs

When costs are incurred solely by a borough these are paid for directly by the borough.

Illustration: WCC Period 9 forecast expenditure for 2012-13.

	SOVEREIGN COSTS	Budget	Actual	Variance
WCC - Sovereign	Salaries	322,200	191,980	-130,220
	Non-salaries	100,000	0	-100,000
	Corporate SLAs	0	0	0
	Recharges to Tri - borough	0	-103,669	-103,669
	Other grant income	-422,200	-88,311	333,889
	Total	0	0	0

WCC Troubled Families Summary Report: **P9**

2012/13	£
COORDINATOR	-100,000
ATTACHMENT¹	-700,800
TOTAL RECEIVED	-800,800
EXPENDITURE Forecast 2012/13	
SALARIES	238,259
NON SALARIES	9,126
INCOME FROM RECHARGES	-103,669
TOTAL NET EXPENDITURE	143,716

2013/14	
B/F	-657,084
COORDINATOR	-100,000
ATTACHMENT	-525,600
TOTAL RECEIVED	-1,282,684

9.4 Current expenditure and forecast.

The service is currently on target to come in with an under-spend both in 2013/14 and 2014/15, as originally planned in order to ensure that there would be sufficient funding to bring forward to take the programme into 2015/16, whilst we allowed time to project the likely amounts of PbR that would be forthcoming.

Once the scale of PbR is clearer, then the options for how that funding is deployed can be considered. One option will be to continue with the plan to take forward PbR to 2015/16 when it is anticipated that Children's Services will be required to make significant savings as indicated by the recent spending review announcement – the scale of which is likely to require significant reshaping of our services. An alternative option will be to use PbR to deploy or expand the capacity of evidence based programmes (such as Multi-Systemic Therapy) to improve children's outcomes (and in turn drive up our PbR) once we have learned more about what is working from our analysis of the first cohort on the programme.

There are no government grant conditions that require full in –year/ in programme spend. Any proposals would be the subject of a further report and decision.

YEAR	12/13	WCC
YEAR 1	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE	214,194
	INCOME (Attachment and Coordinator fees)	(800,800)
YEAR 2	13/14	
	FORECAST EXPENDITURE	645,200
	Tier 1	186,530
	Tier 2 including locality based workers	487,125

¹ Attachment fees calculated on an average of 219 families per annum

	Tier 3 recharges	129,465
	Additional recharges to H&F	(180,000)
	Non staff costs	22,080
	INCOME	(1,478,606)
	Income brought forward	(586,606)
	New Coordinator fees	(100,000)
	New attachment fees based on 50% families	(792,000)
YEAR 3	14/15	
	FORECAST EXPENDITURE	675,200
	Salaries at current estabs	803,120
	Non salaries same as year 2	22,080
	Additional recharges to H&F	(150,000)
	INCOME	(1,095,006)
	Income brought forward from Year 2	(833,406)
	New Coordinator fees	(100,000)
	New attachment fees based on residual % families	(161,600)
	FORECAST OUTTURN END YEAR 3	(419,806)

10. Legal Implications

There are no legal implications.

11. Consultation

No consultation was undertaken in the preparation of this report. However extensive consultation with council services, partner agencies and the voluntary and community sector has been undertaken in the development of the programme. Further consultation as part of the evaluation will commence in September 2013.

If you have any queries about this Report or wish to inspect any of the Background Papers please contact:

Natasha Bishopp. Head of Tri-borough Family Recovery.

nbishopp@westminster.gov.uk

Other Implications

1. **Resources Implications**
2. **Business Plan Implications**
3. **Risk Management Implications**
4. **Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment including Health and Safety Implications**

The programme targets families where mental and physical ill - health is high and proposes to support families into appropriate treatment. All staff is advised of the lone working policy and risk assessments are undertaken.

5. **Crime and Disorder Implications**

The programme targets families where youth offending and /or anti-social behaviour occur and seeks to address underlying cause to prevent re-offending.

6. **Equalities Implications**

Service users come from a range of communities, faiths, sexual orientation and ability. The services are designed to adapt to individuals needs and strengths. The services have planned contact with community groups in order to ensure fair access. The service has engaged staff with community languages and cultural knowledge to engage some of the more hard to reach families.

7. **Staffing Implications**

None

8. **Human Rights Implications**

None However it should be noted that information to identify and track the progress of families who fit the programme criteria is being shared between the Local Authority, Police and Department of Work and Pensions. This has been enabled by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and specific guidance issued for the programme by DWP.

9. **Energy Measure Implications**

None

10. **Communications Implications**

None

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

- All cited in previous report August 2012.
- FAQ's on Troubled Families framework issued By TFU, DCLG December 2012.
- FAQ's on Troubled Families framework issued By TFU, DCLG May 2013.

Appendix 1

Information for Professionals

Tri-borough Family Recovery

What is it?

Tri-borough Family Recovery is the local branding for the Government's Troubled Families programme. The core objectives are to:

- reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour
- reduce truancy and/or exclusion from school
- reduce the number of people not in work and claiming out-of-work benefits

Who is it for?

To be eligible, a household must meet 2 of the following 3 criteria:

- Adult(s) on out of work benefits
- Children excluded, not on a school role or school attendance less than 85%
- Anti-social behaviour by any member of the family and offending by anyone under 18 in the family.

How to refer?

Any service (statutory or voluntary) in the Tri-borough that works with or is aware of a household that meets the eligibility criteria is encouraged to refer to the service.

You do not need to seek consent from the family to refer them (statutory sector only). You can you download a referral form from

<http://www.westminster.gov.uk/services/healthandsocialcare/familycare/family-recovery/>

Or you can request a form by emailing triboroughfamilyrecovery@westminster.gov.uk.

If you have any queries and want to discuss making a referral please phone: 020 7641 2525.

We will pay the voluntary sector agencies for referrals¹.

¹ Include original footnote 1 which stated "conditions apply". Tri-B Family Recovery Offer Nov2012 Page 2 of 3

Level 1 Intervention – Employability Offer

- Referral to employment and skills services for adults who are out of work, if they are not already accessing services or current services are not sufficient to move them into or closer to employment.

Level 2 Interventions – Family Coaching Service

- Families will be given a family coach who will support them to resolve a range of issues, such as debt, improving their child or children’s behaviour, and connecting them to local community services.
- A family coach will visit the family at least once a week, for up to 6 months, as required.
- A family coach will provide a wrap around service, complementing the work of other professionals already working with the family. The aim will be to work with existing planning meetings and to avoid duplication.

