Ipsos MORI Social Research Institute

May 2019

lpsos

Troubled Families Programme

National Evaluation

Survey among Troubled Families Co-ordinators

Conducted by Ipsos MORI on behalf of MHCLG

J16-010831-01 | Final version | Public | This work was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the international quality standard for Market Research, ISO 20252, and with the Ipsos MORI Terms and Conditions which can be found at http://www.ipsos-mori.com/terms. © MHCLG 2018

Contents

1	Introduction	1			
	Background	1			
	Methodology	1			
2	Management of the Troubled Families Programme	4			
	The profile of Troubled Family Coordinators	4			
	Programme management	6			
3	Overall views of the Troubled Families Programme	. 10			
	Effectiveness of the programme	10			
	Challenges to delivery	17			
4	Workforce and workforce development	20			
	Troubled families staff	20			
	Current skill levels	22			
	Whole family working	23			
	Workforce development	26			
5	Needs-based commissioning	30			
	Attitudes towards commissioning	30			
	Wider influence of Troubled Families Programme	32			
6	Identifying and supporting families on the programme	35			
	Identifying and prioritising	35			
7	Service transformation	44			
	Leadership and governance	44			
	Partnership working	47			
	Local services	50			
	Links to wider local and national programmes	52			
8	The national programme	55			
9	Conclusions	58			
A	Appendices				
	•				

Introduction

Background

Methodology

1 Introduction

Background

This report presents findings from the fourth wave of research among Troubled Families Coordinators (TFCs), conducted by Ipsos MORI on behalf of the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). TFCs are those responsible for coordinating the delivery of the programme in local authorities.

The Troubled Families Programme aims to support up to 400,000 complex families with multiple high-cost problems. It is designed to help families with severe and persistent problems make significant and sustained progress towards their goals. Key features include promoting a whole family, early help approach across partner agencies including the police, housing, schools, voluntary sector and health.

This research is one element of the national evaluation, alongside a longitudinal quantitative family survey, qualitative case studies and monitoring via data collected as part of the National Impact Study and Family Progress Data.

The evaluation aims to explore the level of service transformation driven by the programme as well as the impact of the whole family working approach on outcomes for families themselves, and the cost benefits that this has for the taxpayer. In 2018 new questions were asked to further explore whole family intervention and the efficacy of the programme in relation to children at risk of becoming looked after.

Methodology

Data was gathered from TFCs through an online survey. MHCLG provided email addresses for TFCs across all 152 local authorities, who were then sent an email with a direct link to the survey. In total, responses were received from 89 TFCs and the overall response rate to the survey was 57%. The majority of these local authorities (73) also completed the survey in the previous wave. Fieldwork was conducted between 17 October and 16 December 2018.

Separate reports present findings for similar surveys of Troubled Families Employment Advisors (TFEAs) and Troubled Families keyworkers or front-line practitioners.

The staff surveys among TFCs, TFEAs and keyworkers or front-line practitioners are designed to run annually over the five years of the evaluation; this is the fourth in the series.

The questionnaire for the TFC survey was updated between waves to reflect changes in the delivery of the programme. However, many questions are consistent allowing for comparison over time. TFCs were asked to complete all questions in the survey, unless they do not commission other partners to deliver aspects of the programme.

The following table outlines the fieldwork dates and sample sizes for each wave of research. As a guide, when looking at how a result varies between waves, differences should be between ± 6 to 10 percentage points to be sure they represent statistically significant (or 'real') differences and are not due to chance (based on 95% confidence intervals).

	Fieldwork dates	Sample size	Response rate	
Wave 1	26 th October- 30 th November 2015	118 TFCs	78%	
Wave 2	31 st October- 9 th December 2016	93 TFCs	61%	
Wave 3	23 rd October- 13 th December 2017	109 TFCs	72%	
Wave 4	17 th October- 16 th December 2018	89 TFCs	57%	

Where the 2018 result is significantly greater than in previous years this is highlighted by the use of a blue box, where it is lower it is highlighted by the use of a yellow box.

Result has significantly increased since the previous wave.

Result has significantly decreased since the previous wave.

Notes for the reader

'N/A' is used to signify that a year-on-year comparison is unavailable due to the survey question not being asked in a comparable format, or at all.

Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. Where percentages do not add up to 100, this may be due to computer rounding or multiple responses.

Where data is available for more than two waves of the survey, this is shown in a line chart or included in tables in the report appendices. To ensure the bar charts are easy to read, where an answer is three per cent or lower the figure is not shown.

Management of the Troubled Families Programme

Troubled Families Co-ordinator profile

Programme management

2 Management of the Troubled Families Programme

TFCs are mostly female, aged 45 or over, and educated to NVQ4/ degree level or higher.

The profile of TFCs



Troubled Families Co-ordinators tend to be...

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QD2, QD1, QD3) * 'Prefer not to say'

Almost all TFCs are employed by a local authority and work at manager level or above in their organisation.

In line with previous years, the majority of TFCs (97%) are **employed by a local authority**. The chart below illustrates the breakdown by type of organisation, agency, department or team: around a third (35%) of TFCs would say they work in a **children**, **young people and families' team**, three in ten (30%) say they work in a **specific Troubled Families team** within their local authority, and nearly three in ten (29%) say they work in an **Early Help service/ team**. Early help is commonly defined as support for families before problems reach a stage where statutory services such as children's social care need to intervene.

TFCs participating in the 2018 survey are mostly **senior managers** (43%) or **managers or supervisors** (30%). Nearly a fifth (19%) describe their role as head of service, and a small proportion are Assistant Directors (3%) or Director (1%).



Troubled Families Co-ordinators tend to be...

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QA4, QA5, QA6)

5

The delivery of Troubled Families Programmes is mostly led by children, young people and families' departments.

Programme management

The majority of Troubled Families Programmes are led by children, young people and families' departments (62%). Three in ten report that the delivery of the programme is led by an Early Help team within their local authority (28%). Only small proportions say they are led by Adult and community services (three per cent), combined children and adult services (two per cent), or combined Adult, Children and Health services (one per cent).

Which local authority department is leading the delivery of your Troubled Families Programme?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC1)

Pre-codes have changed over time, as such a degree of caution should be taken in comparing trend data.

Most local authorities commission partners to deliver part of the programme, with the voluntary and community sector a key partner.

Approaching three in five TFCs (56%) report commissioning other partners to deliver part of the programme, whilst two in five (40%) deliver the Troubled Families Programme entirely within their local authority.

Where local authorities commission others to deliver aspects of the programme, the voluntary and community sector is a key partner: 29% of TFCs report that the voluntary and community sector provides whole family keyworkers, nearly a quarter (24%) commission voluntary and community sector specialist services, and 16% commission the voluntary sector for step down services from the programme. One in five (19%) commission schools to help deliver the programme.



Who do you commission to deliver the programme in your local authority area?

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC2)

Where partners are involved in delivering the Troubled Families Programme, they typically deliver 20% of services or less.

Where local authorities commission partners to deliver elements of the programme, partners typically deliver up to 20% of the programme (52% of local authorities). Nine percent of TFCs who commission other partners for the Troubled Families Programme in their local authority report that these partners deliver more than half of the services.

Approximately what proportion of the programme is delivered by commissioning other partners?



Base: TFCs who have commissioned other partners to manage some elements of their programme (54): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W2Q2)

Overall views of the Troubled Families Programme

Effectiveness of the programme

Challenges to delivery

3 Overall views of the Troubled Families Programme

Most TFCs are positive about the programme's effectiveness in achieving whole family working, a focus on early intervention and long term positive change in families' circumstances.

Effectiveness of the programme

TFCs are most positive about the effectiveness of the programme in achieving **whole family working**: In 2018 almost all TFCs (99%) report that the programme is effective at achieving this, including nearly three fifths (57%) who say the programme is *very* effective.

Approaching nine in ten TFCs (87%) consider the programme to be effective at achieving long term positive change in families' circumstances (an increase from 77% in 2017) and achieving a focus on early intervention in their local area (85%). The programme is also seen as effective at achieving data sharing between agencies (72%), although only one in ten (11%) would say that the programme is *very* effective in this respect.



How effective or ineffective would you say the delivery of the Troubled Families programme is at achieving...

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC22)

Efficacy of Troubled Families Programme: Trend data (2015-2018)

How effective or ineffective would you say the delivery of the Troubled Families programme is at achieving...



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC22). Statements on 'Data sharing between 'agencies' and 'A focus on early intervention in your local area' first asked in 2017. Efficacy of 'Whole family working' first asked in 2016.

11

TFCs are increasingly positive about the programme's ability to achieve wider service transformation in their area.

Nearly four in five (79%) TFCs consider the Troubled Families Programme to be effective at achieving **long term positive change in wider system reform/service transformation** in their local authority: an increase from 67% in 2017.

How effective or ineffective would you say the delivery of the Troubled Families programme is at achieving...?



Long term positive change in wider system reform/service transformation in your local authority

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC22)

TFCs continue to feel that the programme is less effective at achieving outcome based commissioning and cost saving than the other principles of the programme.

The programme continues to be considered less effective in other aspects: half (51%) of TFCs consider the programme to be effective at reducing **demand for statutory services in their area**. However, more than a quarter (27%) say it is neither effective nor ineffective at doing this and 12% feel that it is fairly ineffective.

A similar proportion (48%) think the delivery of the Troubled Families Programme is effective at achieving **outcome based commissioning**, and three in ten (29%) are again unsure, saying it is neither effective nor ineffective in this area.

Two in five (37%) think the programme is effective at delivering **cost saving in their local area** and 36% say that it is neither effective nor ineffective in this respect.

These findings are unchanged over the last year.

How effective or ineffective would you say the delivery of the Troubled Families programme is at achieving...



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC22)

TFCs continue to feel that their local programme manages demand on children's services well.

Nearly two thirds (65%) of TFCs think their local Troubled Families Programme is able to **manage demand on children's services** fairly or very well, for example, through evidence of reducing children in need and child protection numbers.

Just 19% of TFCs feel that the programme in their area is **not** doing well at managing demand on children's services. While fewer are negative than in 2017, more say they are unsure (16% 'don't know', compared with six per cent in 2017).

How well, if at all, would you say that the Troubled Families Programme in your local authority area is able to manage demand on children's services (for example, through evidence of reducing children in need and child protection numbers)?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W3QTFC7)

TFCs feel the programme is effective at *preventing* issues that lead to children becoming children in need, but are less confident that it helps to prevent children being taken into care.

For the first time in 2018, TFCs were asked how effective the Troubled Families Programme in their local area has been at **preventing** certain issues for families who have been on the programme.

The majority of TFCs (81%) feel that the programme effectively prevents children becoming children in need (as defined under Section 17 of the Children Act 1989). However, fewer TFCs consider the programme effective at preventing children being stepped up to a child protection plan (67% agree) or being taken into care (56% agree).

Among families that have been on the Troubled Families Programme, how effective, if at all, has the programme in your local authority area been in preventing issues that would lead to..



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W4Q3TFC)

TFCs highlight the programme's effectiveness at *resolving* issues relating to children becoming children in need, but are less confident in terms of children being taken into care.

In 2018, TFCs were also asked how effective the Troubled Families Programme in their local area has been at **resolving** the same issues relating to children in families who have been on the programme.

Findings reflect a similar pattern to that seen in terms of prevention. The majority of TFCs (78%) feel that the programme is effective at resolving issues leading to **children becoming children in need** (as defined under Section 17 of the Children Act 1989), but fewer TFCs consider the programme effective at resolving issues leading to children being **stepped up to a child protection plan** (70% agree) or being **taken into care** (56% agree).

Among families that have been on the Troubled Families Programme, how effective, if at all, has the programme in your local authority area been in resolving issues that would lead to..



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W4Q4TFC)

Cuts to core services remains the most frequently mentioned challenge to delivery.

Challenges to delivery

Cuts and capacity problems in core services continue to be identified as the main challenge facing the delivery of the Troubled Families Programme (mentioned by 70% of TFCs). The programme's funding model of **payment by results** remains another key challenge, as well as the programme being **too data driven** (highlighted by 49% and 42% of TFCs respectively).

Concern around **too much bureaucracy** has fallen in 2018, from half of TFCs (50%) raising this issue in 2017 to 30% in 2018.

Other key challenges are shown in the chart below and have remained conisistent with findings in 2017. A full table of results for all previous waves is included in the appendix.

2018 68% 70% Cuts to core services/ capacity problems in... 70% 53% **49%** Payment by results 49% 42% 42% Too data driven 42% 30% 33% Lack of funding generally 33% 50% 30% Too much bureaucracy 30% 21% **29%** Targets are too ambitious 29% 28% 26% Funding streams not shared across local partners 26% 29% 21% Senior Leadership Team changes or restructuring 21% No/lack of data sharing 21% 28% 21% 15% 17% Lack of partnership working 17% 12% 15% Too many families to reach 15% Staff recruitment 6% 6% 6% Programme funding ending in 2020 3% N/A 3% Other **1%** 7% 1%

What would you say are the main challenges facing delivery of the Troubled Families Programme in your local authority?

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC23)

Overall views of the Troubled Families Programme - Summary

TFCs are most positive about the effectiveness of the Troubled Families Programme in terms of achieving whole family working and are increasingly certain about the programme's efficacy with regards to achieving long term positive change in families' circumstances. TFCs also view the programme as effective in terms of achieving a focus on early intervention in their local area. While the programme is regarded as effective at achieving data sharing between agencies, few would say that the programme is *very* effective in this respect.

Overall, the Troubled Families Programme continues to be considered less effective in other aspects, such as reducing **demand for statutory services in their area**, achieving **outcome based commissioning by their local authority** and **cost savings**.

Most TFCs think their local Troubled Families Programme is able to **manage demand on children's services** fairly or very well, for example, through evidence of reducing children in need and child protection numbers. While a small proportion continue to suggest that the programme in their area is not doing well at managing demand on children's services, this has declined since 2017.

The majority of TFCs feel that the programme effectively *prevents* children becoming children in need (as defined under Section 17 of the Children Act 1989) and also believe that it is good at *resolving* these issues. However, fewer TFCs consider the programme effective at preventing or resolving children being stepped up to being on a child protection plan and, specifically, being taken into care.

Cuts and capacity problems in core services continue to be identified as the main challenge facing the delivery of the Troubled Families Programme. The programme's funding model of **payment by results** remains another key challenge, as well as the programme being **too data driven**. However, concern around **bureaucracy** has fallen.

Workforce and workforce

development

Troubled Families staff

Current skill levels

Whole family working

Workforce development

4 Workforce and workforce development

Numbers of frontline staff, management and support staff, and data analysts are consistent with 2017, but more 'other lead professionals' are involved in delivery this year.

Troubled families staff

TFCs were asked to report the number of staff involved in delivering the Troubled Families Programme in their local authority across various roles. All numbers are expressed as full-time equivalents.

The mean number of management and support staff (eight) and data analysts (two) has remained the same since 2016. The mean number of dedicated intervention workers in 2018 (45) is consistent with 2017, but the number of other lead professionals (89) has increased, suggesting the overall number of staff involved in delivering the Troubled Families Programme has increased: a trend continued from 2017 and overtaking reported staffing levels in 2015.

Approximately how many staff in each of the following roles are involved in delivering the Troubled Families Programme within your local authority area?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC4)

Troubled Families Programme Workforce: Trend data (2015-2018)

Approximately how many staff in each of the following roles are involved in delivering the Troubled Families Programme within your local authority area?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC22)

J16-010831-01 | Version TFC | Public | This work was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the international quality standard for Market Research, ISO 20252, and with the Ipsos MORI Terms and Conditions which can be found at http://www.ipsos-mori.com/terms. © MHCLG 2018

22

TFCs feel that Children's Social Care and Youth Offending services have better skills to deliver the whole family approach than in 2017, but confidence in some services remains low.

Current skill levels

TFCs were asked to consider the extent to which they agree that staff across a range of services in their area currently have the skills to deliver the whole family approach:

- Almost all TFCs (90%) agree that staff in **Children's Social Care services** are well equipped to deliver the whole family approach, an increase from 2017 (77%).
- TFCs are increasingly confident that **Youth Offending services** and **health visitors** have the skills they need both increasing significantly from 2017 (to 66% for Youth Offending and 61% for health visitors). While more say that that **education services** have the skills required to deliver the whole family approach (57% compared with 48% previously), this increase is not significant.
- Fewer (47%) agree that staff in **employment services** have the skills they need, along with **housing services** (40%). TFCs continue to feel that the **police** are not well equipped to deliver the whole family approach: a quarter (25%) agree that the police have the required skills while around a third (34%) disagree.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that <u>staff in the following services</u> currently have the skills which allow them to deliver the whole family approach in your area? Select one response for each statement.

Strongly agree Tend to	o agree 💻 Neith	ner 🗖 Tend to d	isagree 🗖 Stro	ongly disagree	Don't know	2017	2010
Children's Social Care	39	%	-	51%	6%	77%	90%
-	-	70		5170	070	E 40/	6694
Youth Offending Service	17%	49%		18%	12%	54%	66%
Health visitors	14%	47%		25%	11%	46%	61%
Education	11%	46%		29 %	11%	48%	57%
Employment	12%	35%		35%	15%	54%	47%
Housing	7%	34%	349	6	21% 3 <mark>%</mark>	47%	40%
Police	<mark>3% 21%</mark>	3	7%	28%	<mark>6%</mark> 5%	30%	25%

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. Percentages only shown if 3% or more. (QTFC5)

TFCs feel that whole family working is embedded well across children's services.

Whole family working

New questions were included in this fourth wave of the research series to explore TFCs' opinions of the extent to which whole family working has been embedded across a range of services in their local area.

Almost all TFCs are positive that **whole family working is embedded in children's services**, both across Children's Social Care services and wider children's services, including early years at least a fair amount (92% and 100% respectively).

To what extent , if at all, has whole family working been embedded across the following services in your local area?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W4Q1TFC)

TFCs are less confident about how well embedded whole family working is across other services, particularly the police.

TFSs are less confident about how well whole family working is embedded in other services, and these views are less strongly held with only small proportions saying 'a great deal': for example, one in seven (14%) consider it to be embedded in youth offending services and one in ten (10%) in health visitor services.

TFCs are also less positive about other services, with half (55%) saying whole family working is embedded at least a fair amount in relation to education welfare officers (but with 19% saying 'a great deal'), and slightly fewer (46%) for housing services. The police are a particular area of concern: half (51%) of TFCs say whole family working has **not** been embedded very much or at all across these services.

To what extent , if at all, has whole family working been embedded across the following services in your local area?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W4Q1TFC)

The majority of TFCs say that most or all families known to children's social care are receiving a whole family intervention.

For the first time in 2018 TFCs were also asked how many **families known to children's social care are receiving a whole family intervention**, defined as working with families against all their identified headline problems. Almost all TFCs (96%) say that at least some families known to children's social care are receiving whole family interventions, and slightly more than half (53%) report that this applies to most families. However, just one in six (16%) say that all families known to children's social care are receiving a whole family intervention.



How many families known to children's social care are receiving a whole family intervention?

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W4Q2TFC)

TFCs are more positive than previous years about workforce development and local agencies having a shared understanding of whole family working.

Workforce development

Almost all TFCs feel that frontline staff have a clear understanding of the impact of their work (88% agree). TFCs also agree (84%) that frontline staff have clear access to shared performance incentives, objectives and training opportunities. These findings are consistent with 2016 and 2017.

TFCs are more confident than previous years that all local agencies have a shared understanding of whole family working (81% in 2018 compared with 65% in 2017) and that systems allow for shared opportunities and development of the workforce across statutory, community and voluntary sectors (71% in 2018 compared with 57% in 2017).

To what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statements about workforce development for staff working in the Troubled Families Programme in your local authority area? % agree



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. Percentages only shown if 3% or more. (W2Q3TFC)

To what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statements about workforce development for staff working in the Troubled Families Programme in your local authority area?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W2Q3TFC)

Workforce and workforce development – Summary

The mean number of management and support staff, data analysts and dedicated intervention workers has remained the same since 2016. However, **the number of other lead professionals has increased**, suggesting the programme has been mainstreamed within other services, and the overall number of staff involved in delivering the programme has increased.

There has been an increase in the proportion of TFCs who agree that staff in Children's Social Care services and Youth Offending services are well equipped to deliver the whole family approach. TFCs are also increasingly confident that both health visitors and education services have the skills required to deliver the whole family approach. However, TFCs continue to be less confident that staff in employment, housing services and, most notably, the police are sufficiently well equipped to deliver the whole family approach.

New questions were included in the fourth wave of the research series to explore TFCs opinions of the extent to which whole family working has been embedded across a range of services in their local area. Reflecting findings in terms of skills, **almost all TFCs agree that whole family working has been embedded in children's services**, both across Children's Social Care services and wider children's services. Most also consider whole family working to be embedded across Youth Offending services and Health Visiting. Again, **TFCs are less positive about the extent to which whole family working has been embedded across Education, Housing and the police**.

Almost all TFCs feel that frontline staff have a clear understanding of the impact of their work and agree that these staff have clear access to shared performance incentives, objectives and training opportunities. These findings are consistent with 2016 and 2017. TFCs are more confident than in previous years that all local agencies have a shared understanding of whole family working and that systems allow for shared opportunities and development of the workforce across the statutory, community and voluntary sectors.

Needs based commissioning

Attitudes towards commissioning

Wider influence of Troubled Families Programme

5 Needs-based commissioning

TFCs continue to be positive about the commissioning process.

Attitudes towards commissioning

TFCs were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they are with a range of aspects of the commissioning process funded by the Troubled Families Programme in their local authority.

In line with previous years, the majority of TFCs are satisfied that the Troubled Families Programme commissions services **based on evidence of what works in practice** (80%) and **based on an effective assessment of local needs** (75%).

More than two thirds of TFCs are satisfied that the commissioning process is **based on comprehensive and reliable data** and has **appropriate input from a range of agencies** (69% each). However, TFCs are less convinced that the commissioning process is **based on cost benefit analysis**: more than half (51%) say they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied or that they do not know¹.

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that the process of commissioning services funded by the Troubled Families programme within your local authority...



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. Percentages only shown if 3% or more. (QTFC11)

¹ A statement on 'cost benefit analysis' was first added in 2017, so no further trends are available.

J16-010831-01 | Version TFC | Public | This work was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the international quality standard for Market Research, ISO 20252, and with the Ipsos MORI Terms and Conditions which can be found at http://www.ipsos-mori.com/terms. © MHCLG 2018

Attitudes towards commissioning services: Trend data (2015-2018)



How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that the process of commissioning services funded by the Troubled Families programme within your local authority...

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. *First asked in 2016. (QTFC22) TFCs feel that the programme has influence on commissioning local authority and partner services, but less so in relation to voluntary and community services.

Wider influence of Troubled Families Programme

In line with 2017, TFCs feel that the Troubled Families Programme has had an influence on their local authority's wider approach to commissioning services:

- More than four in five TFCs (84%) feel that **commissioning of local authority services has been influenced** a great deal or a fair amount by the Troubled Families approach.
- Slightly fewer (71%) feel that commissioning of partner services has been influenced by the Troubled Families approach.
- TFCs feel there has been **less influence on voluntary and community services**. Nearly two in five (38%) say these services have **not** been influenced very much or at all.

To what extent, if at all, would you say the Troubled Families Programme has influenced your local authority's approach to the commissioning of services beyond Troubled Families in each of the following areas?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC13)
Needs-based commissioning – Summary

In line with previous years, the majority of TFCs are satisfied that the Troubled Families Programme commissions services **based on evidence of what works in practice** and **based on an effective assessment of local needs.** Most TFCs are also satisfied that the commissioning process is **based on comprehensive and reliable data** and has **appropriate input from a range of agencies**, but are less convinced that the commissioning process is **based on cost benefit analysis**.

In line with 2017, TFCs feel that the Troubled Families Programme has had an influence on both the local authority's wider approach to commissioning services and partner services. However, the programme's influence continues to be less strongly felt with regards to **voluntary and community services**.

J16-010831-01 | Version TFC | Public | This work was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the international quality standard for Market Research, ISO 20252, and with the Ipsos MORI Terms and Conditions which can be found at http://www.ipsos-mori.com/terms. © MHCLG 2018

Identifying and supporting

families on the programme

Identifying and prioritising

Employment support

6 Identifying and supporting families on the programme

Local authorities continue to use a mix of partner agencies and data analysis to identify eligible families.

Identifying and prioritising

Half of TFCs (53%) say that their local authority identifies families to bring on to the programme using a combination of partner agencies and data analysis. Just over a third (36%) say that partner agencies use a referral process to identify eligible families and nearly one in ten (eight per cent) identify families through data analysis or matching.

Approaches to identifying eligible families have remained consistent with previous findings.

Which of the following approaches does your local authority take to identify eligible families to bring onto the programme (i.e. families who have two or more of the six headline problems)?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC14)

Identifying and prioritising families: Trend data (2015-2018)

Which of the following approaches does your local authority take to identify eligible families to bring onto the programme (i.e. families who have two or more of the six headline problems)?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC22)

Families with the greatest need or problems are prioritised to receive support through the programme, in line with previous years.

Once families have been identified as eligible, local authorities employ a range of approaches in order to prioritise those who receive support through the Troubled Families Programme, and some use a combination of methods.

The most common approach, mentioned by nearly half of TFCs (49%), is to prioritise **those with the greatest need or problems first**. Two in five (38%) adopt a **first come, first served** method; an approach that has been more commonly used in 2018 than previously (38%, compared with 25%). Conversely, fewer TFCs in 2018 reported that they have the **capacity to work with all families identified**.

Approaches less commonly used include prioritising those meeting local priorities (19%) and those identified as costing the most to the public sector. Nearly one in ten (nine per cent) say they don't have a method of prioritising families.

A table detailing the trend data for approaches taken to prioritising families (2015-2018) is included in the appendices.

Once a family has been identified as eligible for the programme, what approach, if any, is used to prioritise the families who receive support through Troubled Families?



TFCs identify children in need of help as the most important priority for the Troubled Families Programme in their local authority area.

When asked about the two or three most important priorities for the Troubled Families Programme in their local authority area, four in five (81%) TFCs identify **children in need of help** as a top priority, and more than half (55%) highlight **domestic abuse**.

Nearly half (47%) mention **children not attending school** as a key priority and a third say that **health problems** (physical and/or mental) are an important factor for the programme in their area (34%).

The proportion of TFCs who identify **adults out of work** as one of their most important priorities has fallen from around two in five (44%) in 2017 to a third (33%) in 2018.

Which of the following, if any, are the two or three most important priorities for the Troubled Families programme in your local authority area? Select all that apply.



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W3QTFC15)

Employment support continues to be considered an integrated part of the programme

Employment support

The majority of TFCs (92%) believe employment support is an integrated part of the programme in their local authority, including nearly half (46%) who say 'a great deal'. This is consistent with findings from 2016 and 2017.

And to what extent, if at all, do you think employment support is an integrated part of the Troubled Families programme in your local authority?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W2Q9TFC)

In line with previous years, TFCs generally feel that employment support is offered to families at about the right time

Most TFCs are also positive about the **timing of employment support** being offered to families: three in five (60%) say it is **offered at the right time**.

No TFCs feel that employment support is offered to families far too late, but almost a quarter (24%) say it is offered to families a little too late.

In general, would you say that employment support is being offered to families too early, too late or at about the right time during their time on the programme?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W2Q8TFC)

TFCs are consistently positive about the TFEA model.

TFCs are overwhelmingly positive about the way in which the TFEA model works in relation to improving outcomes for families, which is consistent with findings from the 2017 survey. Most (89%) feel that the TFEA model has been successful at **providing support to keyworkers when having a conversation about employment with complex families** and in **supporting joint operation working between local authorities and Jobcentre Plus** (70%).

Nearly two thirds (66%) consider the TFEA model to be successful in terms of moving claimants with complex needs into, or closer to, employment, and a similar proportion feel the model successfully drives a focus on employment (mentioned by 64%). More than half (56%) say the model has been successful at working directly with claimant groups with complex needs.

In which of the following ways, would you say that the TFEA model has been successful in improving outcomes for families? 2017 2018 Providing support to keyworkers when having a 89% 84% 89% conversation about employment with complex families Supporting joint operation working between 73% 70% 70% local authorities and Jobcentre Plus Moving claimants with complex needs into, 69% 66% 66% or closer to, employment 68% 64% 64% Driving a focus on employment 52% 56% Working directly with claimant groups 56% with complex needs 7% 10% 10% Other

None of these 1%

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W3QTFC10)

2%

1%

Identifying and supporting families on the programme - Summary

TFCs say that their local authority typically uses a combination of partner agencies and data analysis to identify families to bring on to the programme, and once identified, the most common approach to prioritising families is based on **those with the greatest need or problems**. More TFCs mention a **first come, first served** method for prioritising families in 2018, compared with 2017. Whereas, in 2018 fewer TFCs reported that they have the **capacity to work with all families identified**, than in 2017.

TFCs consistently identify the most important priorities for the Troubled Families Programme in their local authority area as **children in need of help**, and **domestic abuse**. This is a consistent finding year-on-year. However, the proportion of TFCs who identify **adults out of work** as one of their most important priorities has fallen.

Employment support is consistently held-up as a successful element of the Troubled Families Programme: TFCs are overwhelmingly positive about the way in which the TFEA model works in relation to improving outcomes for families. Most feel that the TFEA model has been successful at providing support to keyworkers when having a conversation with complex families about employment and in supporting joint operation working between local authorities and Jobcentre Plus. It is regarded as an integrated part of the programme and most TFCs are also positive about the timing of employment support, sensing that it is offered at the right time.

Service transformation

Leadership and governance

Partnership working

Local services

7 Service transformation

TFCs are positive about how the programme is led and governed in their local authority, particularly in terms of senior leaders.

Leadership and governance

TFCs confidence in how the Troubled Families Programme is led and governed in their local authority continues to grow. Almost all TFCs (96%) now agree that **senior leaders ensure a focus on services that best meet local families' needs**.

Three quarters (76%) agree that strong evidence and analysis of demand informs commissioning of services for families and the proportion who feel that strong governance arrangements are in place to manage demand and deliver value for money and cost savings has increased since the 2017 survey (75% agree in 2018, compared with 65% in both 2017 and 2016).

To what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statements about how the Troubled Families programme is led and governed in your local authority area?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W2Q3TFCA)

Leadership and governance: Trend data (2016-2018)

To what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statements about how the Troubled Families programme is led and governed in your local authority area?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W2Q3TFCA)

TFCs feel more confident than previously that all agencies share a common purpose.

When asked about how the programme is led and governed, TFCs are less convinced (compared with the statements above) that **all agencies in their local area have a common purpose, commissioning services designed to deliver whole family outcomes**. However, there has been a steady increase in the proportion agreeing since it was first asked about in 2016.

To what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statements about how the Troubled Families programme is led and governed in your local authority area... All agencies in the local area have a common purpose, commissioning services designed to deliver whole family outcomes?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W2Q3TFCA)

TFCs remain positive about the way in which the programme communicates shared values to staff and the way in which staff actively take ownership of these values.

Partnership working

TFCs remain positive about partnership working. Most say that **shared values are communicated to staff well** (reported by 93%), and that staff do well at **actively taking ownership of values, working across boundaries to deliver support** (mentioned by 92% of TFCs).

Troubled Families involves local agencies in a shared commitment to transform the way services work with families with complex needs and whole family working. How well would you say...



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W2Q4TFC)

48

Partnership working: Trend data (2016-2018)

The following chart demonstrates how confidence in the way the Troubled Families Programme involves local agencies has remained high.

Troubled Families involves local agencies in a shared commitment to transform the way services work with families with complex needs and whole family working. How well would you say...



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W2Q4TFC)

TFCs are increasingly positive with regards to how well delivery structures enable staff to work together to share priorities and outcomes.

The vast majority of TFCs (90%) say that **delivery structures enable staff from different disciplines to work together to share priorities**, an increase from 2017.

Troubled Families involves local agencies in a shared commitment to transform the way services work with families with complex needs and whole family working. How well would you say delivery structures enable staff from different disciplines to work together to share priorities and outcomes?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W2Q4TFC)

TFCs remain positive that the programme allows staff to work together effectively, specifically in terms of an agreed approach to whole family assessments, and increasingly in relation to data systems and data sharing

Local services

Most TFCs (85%) agree that there is a single agreed form and understanding of whole family assessments in their local area. Seven in ten (70%) agree that outcomes evidence is effectively used to drive delivery and improve performance.

Fewer TFCs say that shared analysis of evidence informs future service demand (62%) or that data systems and sharing allow access to data on demand (57%). However, there has been a general increase in TFCs confidence around data systems since 2016 (as shown in the trend data chart below).

And to what extent would you agree or disagree that the Troubled Families programme in your local area allows staff to work together effectively in the following ways?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. Percentages only shown if 3% or more. (W2Q6TFC)

Local services: Trend data (2016-2018)

And to what extent would you agree or disagree that the Troubled Families programme in your local area allows staff to work together effectively in the following ways?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018 (W2Q6TFC)

TFCs continue to be positive about how well their local programme links to wider service reforms in children's services and, increasingly, health integration.

Links to wider local and national programmes

Almost all TFCs (94%) agree that the Troubled Families offer in their local area links to wider local and national transformation programmes in relation to **reform of children's services**. While this view is not as strongly held for wider **health integration** programmes there has been an increase since 2017 (65% in 2018, compared with 54% previously).

Fewer TFCs (28%) agree that **adult social care** is linked to wider transformation programmes. In fact, a similar proportion disagree (30%) and a third (36%) are unsure either way.

To what extent do you agree the Troubled Families offer in your local authority area links to wider local and national transformation programmes in the following areas?



Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (W3Q7TFC) Percentages only shown if 3% or more

Service transformation - Summary

TFC's confidence in how the Troubled Families Programme is led and governed in their local authority continues to grow. Almost all TFCs agree that senior leaders ensure a focus on services that best meet local families' needs and three quarters agree that strong evidence and analysis of demand informs commissioning of services for families. The proportion who feel that strong governance arrangements are in place to manage demand and deliver value for money and cost savings has increased since 2017.

TFCs also remain positive about partnership working. Most say that shared values are communicated to staff and that staff do well at actively taking ownership of values and working across boundaries to deliver support. More TFCs in 2018 say that delivery structures enable staff from different disciplines to work together to share priorities than in 2017.

The Troubled Families Programme continues to be viewed positively in allowing staff to work together effectively, specifically in terms of an **agreed approach to whole family assessments**, and **the use of outcomes evidence**, but also increasingly so in relation to **data systems and data sharing**.

Almost all TFCs (94%) agree that the Troubled Families offer in their local area links to wider local and national transformation programmes, particularly to **reform of children's services**. This year TFCs feel more confident that their local offer links to wider **health integration** programmes. However, they continue to feel less convinced that **adult social care** is linked to wider transformation programmes.

The national programme

Attitudes towards the national Troubled Families team

8 The national programme

TFCs continue to regard the national Troubled Families team as successful in terms of offering clear vision, leadership, policy guidance, and clarity of roles and responsibilities.

TFCs are positive about the success of the national Troubled Families team (MHCLG), particularly in terms of providing clarity in terms of **vision and leadership** (75%) and **policy guidance** (74%, up from 55% in 2017). Three in ten (70%) say the national team also successfully provides **clarity of roles and responsibilities** (70%).

Seven in ten TFCs (70%) continue to regard the national team as successful at **providing support to those delivering the programme**. In 2018, more think the national team is successful at **driving national policy** (69% from 52% previously). TFCs continue to be largely supportive of the national team in terms of their success at **consulting and engaging stakeholders** (63%).

TFCs consider the national team to be more successful than in all other years at **developing effective monitoring and evaluation techniques** (58%, up from 48% in 2015). More detail is provided in the table in the appendices.

How successful or unsuccessful would you say the national Troubled Families team (MHCLG) is in achieving each of the following?

	irly successful				% suce	cessful
Very unsuccessful	iirly unsucessfu	ul ∎Don't kno	W		2017	2018
Offering clear vision and leadership	11%	64%	179	6 <mark>5%</mark>	69%	75%
Providing clear policy guidance	² 12%	62%	17%	5 <mark>5%</mark>	55%	74%
Providing support to those delivering the programme	19%	51%	19%	7%	71%	70%
Providing clarity of role and responsibilitie	12/0	57%	20%	<mark>7%</mark>	64%	69%
Driving national polic	y 12%	56%	18%	<mark>7%</mark>	52%	69%
Consulting and engaging stakeholder	s 10%	53%	23%	10%	64%	63%
Developing effective monitorin and evaluation technique	110/	47%	19%	16%	40%	58%

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018 Percentages only shown if 3% or more (QTFC19)

The national programme - Summary

The national Troubled Families team (MHCLG) continues to be viewed positively in terms of successfully providing clarity of **vision and leadership**, and **roles and responsibilities**. The national team is also seen as successful in terms of offering **clear policy guidance**, and has improved in this respect since 2017.

The majority of TFCs continue to regard the national team as successful at **providing support to those delivering the programme** and more are likely to view the national team positively in terms of **driving national policy** than in 2017. TFCs continue to be largely supportive of the national team in terms of their success at **consulting and engaging stakeholders**.

TFCs consider the national team to be more successful than all other years at **developing effective monitoring and evaluation techniques**.

Conclusions

9 Conclusions

This is the **fourth annual survey of Troubled Families Coordinators (TFCs)** involved in delivering the Troubled Families Programme. The research set out to explore their views on the level of service transformation driven by the programme alongside the impact of the family intervention approach.

Findings are mostly consistent with those found previously – both in terms of the TFC role and their views of the programme. Where year-on-year changes occur, they typically suggest improvements in the way the programme is operating, although some persistent challenges remain.

Management of the Troubled Families Programme

Almost all TFCs are employed by a local authority (97%) and work at a senior management level in their organisation. They are well-qualified (82% have an NVQ4+ or equivalent), mostly female (63%) and aged 45 or over (64%). Around a third (35%) work within a Children, young people and families team, with similar proportions working as part of a specific Troubled Families team (30%) or an Early Help service team (29%).

The voluntary and community sector is a key partner for local programmes providing a range of services including whole family keyworkers (29%), specialist services (24%) or step down provision (16%). However, where partners are involved in delivering the Troubled Families Programme, they typically deliver small proportions of the programme; only nine per cent say that 50% or more of the programme is delivered by other partners.

Local authorities typically use a combination of **partner agencies and data analysis** to identify families to bring on to the programme (53%), and once identified, the most common approach to prioritising families is based on **those with the greatest need or problems (49%)**. More TFCs mention a **first come**, **first served** method for prioritising families in 2018 (38% compared with 25% in 2017). However, this year fewer TFCs report that they have the **capacity to work with all families identified** (27% compared with 37% previously).

TFCs consistently identify the most important priorities for the Troubled Families Programme in their local authority area as **children in need of help** (81%) and **domestic abuse** (55%). However, the proportion of TFCs who identify **adults out of work** as one of their two or three most important priorities has fallen; to 33% from 44% last year.

TFCs are positive about their workforce. Almost all feel that frontline staff have a clear understanding of the impact of their work (88%) and agree that frontline staff have clear access to shared

performance incentives, objectives and training opportunities (84%). These findings are consistent with 2016 and 2017. TFCs are also more confident that all local agencies have a shared understanding of whole family working (81%) and that systems allow for shared opportunities and development of the workforce across statutory, community and voluntary sectors (71%).

Confidence in skill levels varies by service, with more saying staff in **Children's Social Care services** and **Youth Offending services** are well equipped to deliver the whole family approach. TFCs are also increasingly confident in both **health visitors** and **education services**. However, TFCs continue to be less confident that **staff in the police** are sufficiently well equipped to deliver the whole family approach.

These views are reflected in responses to new questions which explore the extent to which whole family working is embedded across these services. Almost all TFCs are positive that **whole family working has been embedded in children's services**, but they are less positive about the extent to which whole family working has been embedded within **the police service**.

Employment support is consistently held-up as a successful, integrated element of the Troubled Families Programme: TFCs are overwhelmingly positive about the way in which the TFEA model works in relation to improving outcomes for families. Most feel that the TFEA model has been successful at **providing support to keyworkers when having a conversation about employment with complex families** (89%) and in **supporting joint working between local authorities and Jobcentre Plus** (70%). Three in five (60%) TFCs are also positive about the **timing of employment support**, sensing that it is **offered at the right time**, but, as in previous years, a notable minority (24%) feel that it is offered too late.

Implementation of the Troubled Families Programme

TFCs continue to be positive about the effectiveness of the Troubled Families Programme in terms of achieving whole family working (99%) and are increasingly certain about the programme's efficacy in achieving long term positive change in families' circumstances (87%). TFCs also view the programme as effective in terms of achieving a focus on early intervention in their local area (85%). While the programme is regarded as effective at achieving data sharing between agencies (72%), few would say that the programme is *very* effective in this respect (11%).

TFCs are increasingly positive about the programme's ability to effectively **achieve wider service transformation in their area** (79% in 2018, compared with 67% in 2017). However, the Troubled Families Programme continues to be considered less effective in other areas, such as reducing

demand for statutory services (51%), achieving outcome based commissioning (48%) and cost saving (37%).

The majority of TFCs (65%) continue to feel that their local programme manages demands on children's services well and are less likely to be negative about the programme's ability to do so (19% say 'not very/at all well' in 2018, compared with 28% in 2017.

In line with previous years, the majority of TFCs are satisfied with the commissioning process within their LA. Most feel that the Troubled Families Programme commissions services **based on evidence of what works in practice** (80%) and **on an effective assessment of local needs** (75%). Over two-thirds are also satisfied that the commissioning process is **based on comprehensive and reliable data** (69%) and has **appropriate input from a range of agencies** (69%), but they are less convinced that the commissioning process is **based on cost benefit analysis** (45%).

TFCs' confidence in how the Troubled Families Programme is led and governed in their local authority continues to grow. Almost all TFCs (96%) agree that senior leaders ensure a focus on services that best meet local families' needs and 76% agree that strong evidence and analysis of demand informs commissioning of services for families. The proportion who feel that strong governance arrangements are in place to manage demand and deliver value for money and cost savings has increased since the 2017 survey (75% agree in 2018, compared with 65% in 2017).

TFCs also remain positive about partnership working. Most say that shared values are communicated to staff well (93%) and that staff do well at actively taking ownership of values, working across boundaries to deliver support (92%). More TFCs say that delivery structures enable staff from different disciplines to work together to share priorities (92% in 2018, compared with 80% in 2017).

The national Troubled Families team (MHCLG) continues to be viewed positively in terms of successfully providing clarity of vision and leadership. There is also evidence of progress in terms of the national team offering clear policy guidance, driving national policy and developing effective monitoring and evaluation techniques.

Areas for development

The annual Troubled Families Co-ordinator survey set out to explore the level of service transformation driven by the programme as well as the impact of the whole family working approach on outcomes for families themselves. TFCs are consistently positive about the programme, but many aspects are increasingly held in high regard areas for development continue to exist:

- TFCs are overwhelming positive about the effectiveness of the Troubled Families Programme in terms of achieving whole-family working and are increasingly confident about the programmes' ability to achieve long term positive change in families' circumstances and effectively achieve wider service transformation in their area. However, concerns remain in respect to achieving cost savings.
- In line with previous years, TFCs are satisfied with the commissioning process within their local authority. Most feel that the Troubled Families Programme commissions services based on evidence of what works in practice and using effective assessments of local needs, but continue to be less convinced that the commissioning process is based on cost benefit analysis. TFCs also say that the Programme has influenced the local authority's wider approach to commissioning services, but there is perhaps more work to do with voluntary and community services.
- TFCs' confidence in how the Troubled Families Programme is led and governed in their local authority continues to grow and the proportion who feel that strong governance arrangements are in place to manage demand and deliver value for money and cost savings has increased since 2017. TFCs also remain positive about partnership working: Most say that shared values are communicated to staff well and that staff actively take ownership of these values, working across boundaries to deliver support. Almost all TFCs agree that the Troubled Families offer in their local area links to wider local and national transformation programmes in regards to reform of children's services and are increasingly confident that their local offer in health integration links to wider programmes. However, TFCs report fewer links to wider local and national transformation programmes in adult social care.
- Confidence in staff skills varies by service; TFCs are most confident that those working in Children's Social Care and Youth Offending Services have the skills to deliver the whole family approach. They are also increasingly confident in health visitors and the education, and agree that whole family working is embedding well in these services. However, a skills gap remains apparent specifically in terms of employment and housing services along with the police.

- Focusing on children at risk, while most TFCs are confident that their local programme can prevent and resolve issues that lead to children becoming children in need or being stepped up to a child protection plan, they are less confident whether the programme can effectively address and resolve issues around children being taken into care.
- Cuts and capacity problems in core services continue to be identified as the main challenges facing the delivery of the Troubled Families Programme. The programme's funding model of payment by results remains another key issue, as well as the programme being too data driven. However, concerns around bureaucracy have fallen.

Appendices

Appendices

Trend data tables

Fig 10.1: Challenges facing delivery of the Troubled Families Programme (Trend data 2015-2018)

What would you say are the main challenges facing delivery of the Troubled Families Programme in your local authority? 2015 2016 2017 2018 Cuts to/ capacity problems in core services 70% 73% 71% 68% Payment by results 25% 47% 53% 49% Too much bureaucracy 30% 26% 50% 30% Too data driven 42% 32% 32% 42% Lack of funding generally 30% 33% 28% 26% 21% Senior Leadership Team changes or restructuring N/A 33% 29% No/ lack of data sharing 21% N/A N/A 28% Funding streams not shared across local partners 30% 26% 28% 26% Targets are too ambitious 24% 31% 21% 29% Lack of partnership working 17% 16% 20% 15% Too many families to reach 15% 14% 17% 12% Staff training/ support 8% 4% 6% -Staff recruitment 11% 7% 6% 6% Programme funding ending in 2020 N/A N/A N/A 3% Other 9% 7% 1% 13%

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018.

Pre-codes have changed over time, as such a degree of caution should be taken in comparing trend data. (QTFC23)

Fig 10.2: Approaches taken to identify eligible families (Trend data 2015-2018)

Once a family has been identified as eligible for the programme, what approach, if any, is used to prioritise the families who receive support through Troubled Families?

any, is used to prioritise the families who	2015	2016	2017	2018
Those with greatest needs/ problems first	65%	59%	47%	49%
As and when families are identified or referred (first come, first served)	27%	34%	25%	38%
Capacity to work with all families	N/A	N/A	37%	27%
Those meeting local priorities	N/A	17%	18%	19%
Those identified as costing the most to the public sector	22%	14%	11%	11%
No prioritisation approach in place/ required	N/A	8%	17%	9%
n the process of changing prioritisation approach	N/A	2%	7%	3%

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC15)

Pre-codes have changed over time, as such a degree of caution should be taken in comparing trend data.

Fig 10.3: The national programme (Trend data 2015-2018)

How successful or unsuccessful would you say the national Troubled Families team (MHCLG) is in achieving each of the following?

g	2015	2016	2017	2018
Providing support to those delivering the programme	72%	69%	71%	70%
Offering clear vision and leadership	86%	74%	69%	75%
Providing clarity of roles and responsibilities	74%	61%	64%	69%
Consulting and engaging stakeholders	62%	55%	64%	63%
Providing clear policy guidelines	65%	68%	55%	74%
Driving national policy	N/A	61%	52%	69%
Developing effective monitoring and evaluation techniques	48%	50%	40%	58%

Base: All TFCs (89): Fieldwork dates 17 October to 16 December 2018. (QTFC22)

Pre-codes have changed over time, as such a degree of caution should be taken in comparing trend data.

Rachel Williams Research Director rachel.williams@ipsos.com

Emily Mason Research Executive emily.mason@ipsos.com

Anna Tench Graduate Research Executive <u>anna.tench@ipsos.com</u>

For more information

3 Thomas More Square London E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

www.ipsos-mori.com http://twitter.com/IpsosMORI

About Ipsos MORI's Social Research Institute

The Social Research Institute works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector. Its c.200 research staff focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. This, combined with our methods and communications expertise, helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.