## Priority Families Update

## November 2013

## Programme

## Introduction

## National Context

- Priority families are defined as those that have problems and cause problems to the community around them, putting high costs on the public sector.
- The government is committed to working with local authorities and their partners to help 120,000 priorities families in England turn their lives around by 2015.
- The government want to ensure the children in these families have the chance of a better life, and at the same time bring down the cost to the taxpayer.


## Priority Families Criteria

## Criteria 1

 Crime/anti-social behaviour- Households with 1 or more under 18-year-old with a proven offence in the last 12 months

AND/ OR

- Households where 1 or more member has an anti-social behaviour order, anti-social behaviour injunction, antisocial behaviour contract, or where the family has been subject to a housing-related anti-social behaviour intervention in the last 12 months


## -Criteria 2

## -Education

-Identify households affected by truancy or exclusion from school, where a child:
-Has been subject to permanent exclusion; three or more fixed school exclusions across the last 3 consecutive terms;

- OR
-Is in a Pupil Referral Unit or alternative provision because they have previously been excluded; OR is not on a school roll;
-AND/OR


## Criteria 3 <br> Work

Identify households that have an adult on Department for Work and Pensions out of work benefits
(Employment and Support Allowance, Incapacity Benefit, Carer's Allowance, Income Support and/or Jobseekers Allowance,Severe Disablement Allowance) -
-A child has had 15\% unauthorised absences or more from school across the last 3 consecutive terms.


## Priority Families Intelligence

## Who are Priority Families

## Concentration of ages within Priority Families



- Concentration of people within each (ten year) age bracket shown on the left.
- The most populous section (concentration of age 11-20) is further broken down to show concentration of age by year.
- People within the 11-20 years old age bracket can fall into several categories, some may be young people residing in parents houses whilst other may be parents themselves and residing as head of their own household.
- Ages span from 1 year old (plus at least two known 'bumps') through to two people aged over ninety.


## Where are Priority Families

| Ward | Total People | \% | Total families | \% |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Sinfin | 238 | 16 | 69 | 16 |
| Normanton | 196 | 13 | 49 | 11 |
| Alvaston | 140 | 10 | 47 | 11 |
| Arboretum | 149 | 10 | 43 | 10 |
| Derwent | 155 | 11 | 40 | 9 |
| Mackworth | 140 | 10 | 35 | 8 |
| Boulton | 66 | 5 | 29 | 7 |
| Chaddesden | 75 | 5 | 24 | 6 |
| Abbey | 66 | 5 | 20 | 5 |
| Darley | 50 | 3 | 17 | 4 |
| Chellaston | 26 | 2 | 10 | 2 |
| Mickdeover | 28 | 2 | 8 | 2 |
| Spondon | 30 | 2 | 8 | 2 |
| Blagreaves | 25 | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| Oakwood | 15 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| Littleover | 13 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Unidentified | 41 | 3 | 15 | 3 |
|  | 1453 |  | 431 |  |


| Locality | Total People | \% | Total families | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| L2 | 470 | 32 | 155 | 43 |
| L 3\&4 | 477 | 33 | 112 | 31 |
| L1\&5 | 465 | 32 | 78 | 22 |
| Unidentified | 41 | 3 | 15 | 4 |
|  | 1453 |  | 360 |  |

- Locality 2 has nearly twice as many families than Locality $1 \& 5$.
- The wards with the highest concentration of Families are only separated by a few per cent.


## Progress measures

| Education PBR | Crime | NSB | Employment | Crime B <br> Education <br> PER Claim |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 46 | 98 | S | 24 | 130 |

Crime \& RAG Status

|  | Amber | Green | Red | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Yl Total | 11 | 127 | 24 | 162 |
| \% of crime |  |  |  |  |
| qualifiers |  |  |  |  |
| (299 families) | 4 | 42 | 8 | 54 |

Employment RAG status

|  | Amher | Girepn | Red | Tntal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $V^{1-o t a}$ | 115 | $\angle$ | 115 | 274 |
| \% o' Emp oyment qua'f'ers 206 fam' "es' | 39 | 15 | 39 | 93 |

Education RAG Status

|  | Amber | Green | Red | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Yl Total | 94 | 69 | 5 | 168 |
| \% of Education <br> quallifiers <br> ¿163 families |  |  |  |  |

ASB Rag status

|  | Amber | Green | Red |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Y1 Total | 40 | 30 | 8 | 78 |
| $\%$ of $A S B$ |  |  |  |  |
| qualifiers |  |  |  |  |
| (66 families) | 61 | 45 | 12 | $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ |

## Priority Families

Programme delivery

## Programme Delivery

Recruitment of 12 Intensive Family Support Workers to offer high level intervention to families complex needs

Budget holding "Lead Workers" to respond to offer creativity in engaging and working with families and to support the use of incentives, social activities and crisis situations.

Procure evidence based services through a Dynamic Purchasing System to support "lead workers" to achieve family change and the required progress measures

Workforce Development to ensure consistent solution focused multi systemic practise and develop a consistent partnership approach

## Tiered Service Intervention Model

## Level of Intervention

High: Families who meet $3 / 3$ core criteria and larger families and/or those with very challenging behaviours and a multitude of issues which require a very intense and persistent level of contact each week, thus demanding smaller case loads for a worker of up to around 6 families.

Medium: Families who meet $2 / 3$ core criteria and a local discretionary criteria and/or Smaller families and/or those with fewer needs may mean it is possible to deliver a less intensive intervention with a family therefore caseloads for lead workers can be slightly higher (for example up to 15 families.)

> Low: Families who meet $2 / 3$ core criteria and a local discretionary criteria that are allocated a lead worker' dedicated to them but the worker continues to be based in and work from their existing service. These workers will need to understand their role as a priority families "lead worker" and have access to additional resources as required

## Lead worker

No. of Families - total 660

## ○ 5 x FIP workers

oMulti Systemic Therapy (5 months) - 12 x Intensive Family Support Workers (to include co working Children In need, Children on Safeguarding Plans and YP on court orders)

> -Multi Agency Teams
> oYouth Offending Service
> oPupil Referral Units
> oCAHMS/Education/Health
> oESF Programme - Working Links
> oRipplez (Family Nurse Partnership)
oEducation - Learning Mentors/Family Workers
oSchool Nurses/Health visitors

- VCS
-Adults Service
-Probation
-Housing

9 - 12 month intervention
(With the exception of MST)
2013-2014-130 families
2014-2015-150 families

## 6-9 month intervention

2013-2014-150 families (100 already claimed PBR)

2014-2015-130 families

3-6 month intervention
2013-2014-50 families
(30 already claimed PBR for)
2014-2015-50 families

## 5 Family Intervention Factors

- 1. A dedicated worker dedicated to the family
- 2. Who looks at what's really happening for the family as a whole
- 3. And gives practical hands-on support
- 4. With an assertive and challenging approach
- 5. Backed by an agreed plan and common purpose among the relevant services.


## Family Identification

- Families who meet two of the three criteria of the core criteria and a local discretionary criteria can be nominated to the programme by providing details on the nomination e form
- The PF need to be notified if:
- (a) you are a lead worker for a PF
- (b) you would like to refer the family for additional support
- Nominations will be forwarded onto Vulnerable Children's Meetings to decide an appropriate level of intervention


## Performance Framework

- Evidence of Progress and Impact will be measured through:
- IFSW quarterly performance monitoring
- Payment By Results Performance Measures
- Quarterly Management Information
- Lead Worker assessments
- Priority families Nominations
- Case studies / service user feedback
- Cost Benefit Tool
- National Evaluation
- Local Evaluation


## Intensive Family Support Worker Case Study

