

Priority Families (PF) programme update

SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

This purpose of this report is to provide CYP Overview and Scrutiny with:

- An understanding of the service delivery model that has been developed and the need for this to be embedded into Children's services delivery model
- An update on the PF intelligence and an understanding of the impact the work is having on family outcomes

This report along with a presentation, an Intensive Family Support Worker case studies and a service user testimonial will give CYP Overview and Scrutiny an update on programme developments.

1.1 Identification/Nomination Process

Year 2 target for identification of families is 550 families currently 428 families have been identified further targeted work is being undertaken with partners to identify the additional families.

An e form has also been developed and distributed to partners to identify and nominate families who qualify for the Priority Families Programme.

1.2 Family Intervention Model

The family intervention delivery model outlined in the presentation has been developed and the role of the Intensive Family Support Workers (IFSW) is now supporting the delivery model of Children's services and would need to be linked to any future review of services.

Whilst capacity for the intensive interventions can be met through the IFSW role there is a risk that that the medium level intervention will put additional pressure on Multi Agency Teams to allocate this work, therefore a strategy will need to be agreed as to how this is managed.

1.3 Performance Monitoring and Evaluation

All "lead workers" will provide performance monitoring in relation to the three PF core criteria this will be verified using YOIS, FLARE and Education data bases.

Additional more detailed performance monitoring will be provided by all "lead workers" who provide a high level intervention.

A detailed evaluation of impact and sustainability will be undertaken on a minimum 10% sample.

Derby will provide management information and a report on performance measures quarterly to the Department for Communities and central Government (DCLG).

Family case studies and service user feedback will be collated through the IFSW caseload to evidence progress and impact and also to assess household cost avoidance.

1.4 Phase Two 2015 – 2016

The DCLG have announced a phase 2 for the programme, 2015 – 2016 will be the first year of a potential 5 year programme dependant on any political changes.

There is currently no detail to the target group or progress measures for phase two although early indications appear to be that they will be different to the current programme and may focus more on younger children and earlier interventions.

Further details on this are expected in the Autumn.

RECOMMENDATION

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">2.1 To note the programme developments to date and the interface with the broader CYP service delivery model2.2 To note the emphasis on measuring impact to family outcomes to inform future service developments |
|--|

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">3.1 To ensure all CYP Overview and Scrutiny are updated on local programme developments3.2 To consider feedback from CYP Overview and Scrutiny in future project developments |
|--|

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

4.1 Identification/Nomination of PF

A detailed report of current PF intelligence is provided in the presentation.

Highlights of this report are :

- 425 families/households now identified for PF programme
- 1453 individuals are reported to live within these households
- 312 currently have "lead workers"
- 395 young people are 14 – 17 Year olds
- 245 households qualified for education criteria
- 230 households qualified for crime criteria
- 80 households qualified for anti social behaviour criteria
- 422 households qualified for unemployment qualifier
- 130 payment by results have been claimed

4.2 Family Intervention Model

High Level Intervention - capacity for high level interventions will be met through the commissioning of 12 Intensive Family Support Workers (IFSW's), Multi Systemic Therapy (MST) programme and the 5 Family Intervention Programme (FIP) workers employed by Derby Homes.

Medium Level Interventions – it is anticipated that a high proportion of this group will be managed in Multi Agency Teams (MAT) by Early Intervention Workers. The increase of PF nominations from partners may put pressure on the allocation of cases through Vulnerable Children's Meetings (VCM).

Further scoping work will be undertaken as a matter of priority to understand:

- pressures this may cause to case allocation in MAT teams
- how VCM cases will be prioritised for allocations
- other agencies that should undertake "lead worker" role

Low level interventions – lead workers will need to be identified in partner agencies and will need to provide a report on outcomes and understand how to access additional resources to support families to achieve family change and the PBR.

4.3 Dynamic Purchasing System

Following a successful tender process 11 local providers have been awarded a contract for inclusion in the dynamic purchasing system (DPS) for Priority Families.

Additional support services including parenting, mentoring, mediation and counselling will be advertised through the DPS in November 2013.

4.3 Performance Monitoring/Evaluation

In addition to the progress measure required by the DCLG in relation to the PBR against the three core criteria it is paramount that we have clear programme outcomes that measure impact and evidences public purse savings.

Therefore the programme needs to continue to build the evidence of impact including the narrative on how families are progressing and to be clear on the outcomes that link to PBR and the local discretionary criteria impact measures.

To ensure this information is collated effectively the PF Commissioning Group have made the following recommendations in relation to Performance Monitoring and evaluation:

- To develop a Cost Benefit Tool that builds on previous FIP service unit cost calculator work undertaken in 2010
- Work with the National Evaluation Team (level is still yet to be confirmed)
- Develop a Performance Framework for an Evaluation Plan to evidence outcomes and impact
- Collate case studies from lead workers
- Provide quarterly reports to summaries the IFSW performance monitoring returns to identify service demand / service gaps
- Complete 6 month review of families following service closure to measure sustainability
- Commission a Local Evaluation from Derby University

4.4 PBR Trajectory

Due to the timescales of families entering the programme, achieving the required results and sustaining the change as outlined in the financial framework it is difficult to accurately predict both time taken to achieve a result and if a result is achievable therefore the financial trajectory for project developments has been based on a 60% success rate and the final PBR claim being May 2015.

100% success would be 660 claims to date a total of 130 PBR have been claimed.

This report has been approved by the following officers:

Legal officer	N/A
Financial officer	N/A
Human Resources officer	N/A
Estates/Property officer	N/A
Service Director(s)	Frank McGhee
Other(s)	N/A

For more information contact: Background papers: List of appendices:	Liz Perfect 01332 642660 liz.perfect@derby.gov.uk None Appendix 1 – Implications Appendix 2 – Parent Feedback October 2013 Appendix 3 – Priority Families – case study Appendix 4 – Priority Families Update
---	---

IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money

1.1 N/A

Legal

2.1 There are no legal implications that need to be considered at this time

Personnel

3.1 N/A

Equalities Impact

4.1 An EIA will be completed for the tender process and providers will be required to address EI in their applications

Health and Safety

5.1 N/A

Environmental Sustainability

6.1 N/A

Property and Asset Management

7.1 N/A

Risk Management

8.1 N/A

Corporate objectives and priorities for change

9.1 N/A

