

Draft

CABINET ITEM COVERING SHEET PROFORMA

AGENDA ITEM

REPORT TO CABINET

13 JUNE 2013

**REPORT OF CORPORATE
MANAGEMENT TEAM**

CABINET DECISION

Leader of the Council – Lead Cabinet Member - **Councillor Bob Cook**

YEAR ONE OF THE 'TROUBLED FAMILIES' PROGRAMME

1. Summary

This report provides an outline of the progress achieved during the first year (April 2012 to March 2013) of delivering the 'Troubled Families' programme in Stockton, and makes proposals for the delivery of the remainder of the programme.

2. Recommendations

1. That the delivery of the programme is extended for a fourth year, subject to satisfactory performance and to the availability of funding within the 'Troubled Families' budget.
2. That a further report be submitted during 2014/15 examining in more detail the case for continuing funding from the Council's 'Invest to Save' budget to a continuation of the programme beyond 2015/16.

3. Reasons for the Recommendations/Decision(s)

1. In order to provide greater stability in relation to proposed delivery, particularly in relation to the retention of skilled and experienced staff by the Council's delivery partners, and to make clear the incentive for good performance.
2. To ensure that a proper informed decision is made about the costs and benefits of continued delivery of the programme in a timely manner, before skills and experience are dissipated.

4. Members' Interests

Members (including co-opted Members) should consider whether they have a personal interest in any item, as defined in **paragraphs 9 and 11** of the Council's code of conduct and, if so, declare the existence and nature of that interest in accordance with and/or taking account of **paragraphs 12 - 17** of the code.

Where a Member regards him/herself as having a personal interest, as described in **paragraph 16** of the code, in any business of the Council he/she must then, **in accordance with paragraph 18** of the code, consider whether that interest is one which a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest and the business:-

- affects the members financial position or the financial position of a person or body described in **paragraph 17** of the code, or
- relates to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to the member or any person or body described in **paragraph 17** of the code.

A Member with a personal interest, as described in **paragraph 18** of the code, may attend the meeting but must not take part in the consideration and voting upon the relevant item of business. However, a member with such an interest may make representations, answer questions or give evidence relating to that business before the business is considered or voted on, provided the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose whether under a statutory right or otherwise (**paragraph 19** of the code)

Members may participate in any discussion and vote on a matter in which they have an interest, as described in **paragraph 18** of the code, where that interest relates to functions of the Council detailed in **paragraph 20** of the code.

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

It is a criminal offence for a member to participate in any discussion or vote on a matter in which he/she has a disclosable pecuniary interest (and where an appropriate dispensation has not been granted) **paragraph 21** of the code.

Members are required to comply with any procedural rule adopted by the Council which requires a member to leave the meeting room whilst the meeting is discussing a matter in which that member has a disclosable pecuniary interest (**paragraph 22** of the code)

AGENDA ITEM

REPORT TO CABINET

13 JUNE 2013

**REPORT OF CORPORATE
MANAGEMENT TEAM**

CABINET DECISION

YEAR ONE OF THE 'TROUBLED FAMILIES' PROGRAMME

SUMMARY

This report provides an outline of the progress achieved during the first year (April 2012 to March 2013) of delivering the 'Troubled Families' programme in Stockton, and makes proposals for the delivery of the remainder of the programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the delivery of the programme is extended for a fourth year, subject to satisfactory performance and to the availability of funding within the 'Troubled Families' budget.
2. That a further report be submitted during 2014/15 examining in more detail the case for continuing funding from the Council's 'Invest to Save' budget to a continuation of the programme beyond 2015/16.

DETAIL

1. Members will recall that the Council, along with all other principal local authorities in England, agreed to take part in the Government's 'Troubled Families' programme over the three year period April 2012 – March 2015, and that the programme is targeted on families identified through a set of national criteria which includes juvenile offending, involvement of any family member in Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), exclusion from school or unauthorised absence levels of 15% or more, and receipt of a range of worklessness benefits.
2. Contracts have been set up with Tees Valley Housing (i.e. our existing Family Intervention Project – 'FIP') for 60% of the programme which started on 1 August 2012 and with the VCS Synergy Consortium, supported by Catalyst, for the other 40% which started on 1 October 2012, and the Consortium has nominated A Way Out, the Children's Society, Corner House Youth Project/KnowHow North East, and Eastern Ravens Trust as its four lead organisations for this work.
3. The profiles of family numbers to be allocated for the three years are now as set out below (Year 2 and Year 3 figures are approximate):-

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
FIP	97	136	27	260
Consortium	<u>72</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>181</u>
	169	227	45	441

Although these are the formal start years for the purposes of claiming 'attachment fees' from the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) there will inevitably be some 'smoothing' of workload, due to staggered starts during Year 2 and the accumulation of non-responsive cases from the first two years.

4. Based on these projections, the revised budget projections for the programme are set out at Appendix A. Members will note that there is a significant projected surplus over the three years, and it is proposed to use this to support a fourth year of programme delivery if the figures turn out as forecast, with the possibility of extending to five years on the basis of the current funding package.
5. In recent months CLG have published two key documents, the first of which, issued in December 2012 covered 'Working with Troubled Families: A guide to evidence and good practice' and set out five key principles for working with families i.e.
 - (i) A dedicated worker, dedicated to a family
 - (ii) Practical 'hands on' support
 - (iii) A persistent, assertive and challenging approach
 - (iv) Considering the family as a whole – gathering the intelligence
 - (v) Common purpose and agreed action.
6. The second key document, published in January 2013, was on 'The Cost of Troubled Families' and presented a brief literature review to date of work from 16 local authorities on the savings and/or averted costs arising from family intervention programmes. It is anticipated that CLG will place an increasing emphasis on 'mainstreaming' of family intervention work and re-design of services in the remaining lifetime of the national programme. In our Year 1 cohort, 15% of the families had children who were live to social care, 65% of the families had children with social care history, and only 20% were unknown to social care. Since September 2012 the staff in Children's Services who undertake similar work have been organised into a discrete Family Support Team and caseload comparison and an agreed allocation system have been put in place to avoid duplication of effort between the Family Support Team and the 'Troubled Families' delivery partners..
7. For the purposes of release of 'attachment fees' in Year 2 of the national programme, local authorities are being placed into one of three categories, depending on the progress made in Year 1. Stockton will be a 'group one' authority, receiving the earliest release of funding, on the basis of our progress on Year 1.
8. A brief survey of the number of families for which 'success payments' have been claimed across the Tees Valley as at 4 January 2013 shows the following:-
 - Darlington – nil
 - Hartlepool – nil
 - Middlesbrough – 39
 - Redcar & Cleveland – nil
 - Stockton-on-Tees – 13 (note: we achieved successes with 16 families, but all success claims are reduced by one sixth to reflect the CLG view that success will be achieved with one sixth of the national target of 120,000 families by virtue of existing services).
9. Work is taking place with the University of Durham to prepare a formal evaluation of the performance of the work of the Tees Valley Housing Family Intervention Project in Stockton looking across both the 'FIP'/'edge of care' cases which have been referred to the Tees Valley Housing team in recent years and to their 'Troubled Families' work on 2012/13. Ethics Committee approval has been secured and a report is expected later this year.
10. Part of the rationale for the contract with the Consortium, in addition to the straightforward need for increased delivery capacity arising out of the 'Troubled Families' programme, was to promote collaborative working in the Third Sector locally, and to do so in a relatively low risk

environment. The Consortium has been invited to reflect on the value of this experience and have provided commentary as follows:-

- (a) Consortium working in Stockton has been developing for over three years and the Troubled Families programme is the first contract to be delivered via the Consortium approach. There has been a lot of learning and development for Synergy that has been provided via the opportunity that SBC have given through this programme.
 - (b) Delivery has now been taking place for six months and the most important part of the whole Consortium experience is being able to improve the lives of those in need within our communities. Using the presence that members have built within local communities over many years; to reduce distance between support services & to sustain this beyond the end of the Troubled Families programme through the Consortium partnership is key to delivery. All lead providers are fully staffed and engaging with families. They are embedded within the structures developed via SBC and ensuring that the outcomes of the programme are met is the focus of the on-going work.
 - (c) Reflecting over the nine months of planning and delivery to date it can be seen how the Consortium partnership has been tested; difficulties faced and overcome and how this learning is being embedded in future practice. Without the opportunity to be part of the delivery of 'Troubled Families' this would not have been possible.
 - (d) The robustness of the approach used to encourage collaborative working is a key aspect of Consortium working and will prove the added value that Synergy can provide. The 'co-creation' approach that was adopted to find the four lead deliverers was the first test of this; and where feedback has been received the appropriate development is taking place to improve transparency, communication, involvement & trust across the Consortium membership. The membership process has been amended as a direct result of the method used in identifying the lead providers for the programme. The Synergy Board has decided to move away from 'Full' & 'Associate Members' to a membership process that evaluates organisations on specific information that would be complemented by further policy evidence on engagement in programme delivery. This will provide a simpler & more inclusive process; drawing on the experience of developing the Consortium response to Troubled Families & ensuring that members are not disadvantaged due to internal administrative difficulties.
 - (e) When working with a large membership base as Synergy has (27 members at the time of writing) it is not always possible to ensure that all members get part of delivery or are happy with each decision. The relationships within the membership have been tested accordingly. Where there has been disharmony the feedback into the Board has not always followed the correct channels; this has provided the opportunity to strengthen structures including Codes of Conduct & expectations on members so that similar situations can be better addressed if they arise in future. Developmental work across the Synergy membership is being planned for 2013/14 to further develop the identity and internal community that the Consortium is building.
11. One other notable piece of information relates to the interaction between 'Troubled Families' and 'welfare reform'. A list of 122 families likely to be affected by the £500 per week benefit cap later this year was compiled, and this has been compared with the Year 1 'Troubled Families' cohort of 169 families. Only 9 families appear on both lists. This challenges the assumption that behavioural problems and high costs in benefits go together, which seems to be the basis of some media coverage of these issues. It is believed that colleagues in Sunderland have found similar results when undertaking this exercise.
12. At the time of writing the process of identification of families to form the Year 2 cohort is well underway, and it is hoped that the cases will be allocated to Tees Valley Housing and the Consortium in June (subject to the speed of progress with the Department of Work and Pensions next matching process for the benefits information). The education criteria set by CLG

have been amended from the original basis of children with 15% or more unauthorised absence, three or more fixed term exclusions or permanent exclusions etc, to allow for the identification of families of 'equivalent concern' to Head Teachers. For Year 2 we will be using additional local criteria, including 'family of particular concern to YOS' and 'any child open to Children's Services', with an extra weighting for 'Child in Need' status, as ways of refining the identification criteria to ensure that we target the families in greatest need of intervention.

13. CLG have clarified that success claims will not be related individually to the three annual cohorts within the programme, but will all be paid at Year 1 rate until the Year 1 target figure is fully achieved, then at the Year 2 rate until the Year 2 target figure is fully achieved etc. However, they have also clarified that claims can be made in support of any family meeting the identification criteria and subsequently reaching the success criteria, irrespective of the amount of work needed to achieve the success criteria. In view of these changes, the Financial Analysis set out at Annex A has been recalculated on the basis of a 75% success rate over the three years with the first 40% paid at the Year 1 rate and the remaining 35% at the Year 2 rate. This improves the position by £75,600 over the three year programme, compared to the original report.
14. CLG have let a national evaluation contract to ECORYS UK, working with Ipsos MORI, the National Institute for Economic and Social Research, Clarissa White Research, Bryson Purdon Social Research, and the Thomas Coram Research Unit. It has also been reported in the trade press that the National Audit Office is to undertake an evaluation of the national programme, with particular reference to the payment by results mechanism.
15. At a recent event hosted by the Institute for Local Governance (the consortium of five North East universities) a presentation was given on a report written by Howard Reed for Action for Children, The Children's Society and the NSPCC. The key conclusions of this report included
 - (a) between 2008 and 2015 it is estimated that the number of families with five or more vulnerabilities will increase from 130,000 to 150,000 (nearly 15%) and the number of children in such families from 310,000 to 365,000 (approximately 18%);
 - (b) families with five or more vulnerabilities will lose approximately £3,000 per year between 2010 and 2015 due to changes in the tax and budget systems, a decrease in total living standards of about 7%; and
 - (c) by 2015 there will be significantly more vulnerable families than there were in 2010.
16. On this basis, it appears that although the 'Troubled Families' programme provides extra resources to do good and worthwhile work with families which will improve their life chances, the effects of other Government policies will have a contradictory effect.

17. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The financial implications are covered at paragraphs 4 and 12 and Annex A.

18. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no new legal implications arising from this report.

19. RISK ASSESSMENT

This programme is categorised as low to medium risk. Existing management systems and daily routine activities are sufficient to control and reduce risk.

20. SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS

Economic Regeneration and Transport

Successful delivery of the programme will result in reductions in worklessness and reliance on benefits among the target families.

Safer Communities

Successful delivery of the programme will result in reductions in crime and anti-social behaviour

Children and Young People

Successful delivery of the programme will result in reduced pressure on Children's Services and improvements in educational engagement and attainment.

Healthier Communities and Adults

Successful delivery of the programme will result in improved health among the target families.

Environment and Housing

Successful delivery of the programme will result in fewer evictions and reductions in other tenancy enforcement action.

Supporting Themes:-

Stronger Communities

Successful delivery of the programme will reduce some of the factors which erode community cohesion.

Older Adults

There may be some benefit to grandparents, as well as to older adults in the wider community.

Arts Leisure and Culture

No current implications.

21. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- This report is not subject to an Equality Impact Assessment because it does not seek approval of a new policy, strategy or change in the delivery of a service.

22. CONSULTATION INCLUDING WARD/COUNCILLORS

None

Name of Contact Officer: Mike Batty

Post Title: Head of Community Protection

Telephone No. 01642 527075

Email Address: mike.batty@stockton.gov.uk

Education related? Yes

Background Papers Documents as cited published by CLG Families Unit

Ward(s) and Ward Councillors: All wards except for Hartburn, Ingleby Barwick West, Northern Parishes and Yarm had at least one family in the Year 1 list.

Property No property implications.