

OSR21/2010

15th September 2010

Coverage: England

**Theme: Health and
Social Care**

Issued by

Department for Education
Sanctuary Buildings
Great Smith Street
London SW1P 3BT

Telephone:

Press Office
020 7925 6789

Public Enquiries
0870 000 2288

Analyst

Steve Hamilton

Email

info@education.gsi.gov.uk

Internet

<http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/STR/index.shtml>

Monitoring and Evaluation of Family Intervention Projects to March 2010

This publication provides data on 'family intervention projects' (FIPs), local services which provide support to families with multiple social, economic, health and behaviour problems. The data covers services in England up to 31st March 2010 at a national level and cumulative number of families referred to projects at a local level. The projects use a similar model of intervention, providing intensive and persistent support for the whole family, coordinated by a single key worker; and contribute to the Coalition Government's commitment to investigate a new approach to support families with multiple problems.

The National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) have established a secure web-based Information System for project staff to record details of the families they work with at various stages throughout an intervention. This statistical release presents analysis of data entered into the Information System up to and including 31st March 2010. This release reports on seven measures.

- A cumulative measure of service capacity, showing the total throughput of families from January 2006 to 31st March 2010
- An annual measure of service capacity, showing the total throughput of families for the financial year 2009-2010
- An annual measure of service effectiveness, showing a breakdown of whether families are still receiving family intervention and, for those who have exited, whether the reason for leaving could be classified as successful, unsuccessful or cannot be counted as a success or a failure.
- The percentage of families who are considered to have a successful outcome in four separate domains:
 - Family functioning and risk
 - Crime/ Anti-social behaviour
 - Health
 - Education/ employment

KEY POINTS

The cumulative measure of service capacity is 4,870 families.

The annual measure of service capacity for the financial year 2009-2010 is 3,518 families.

The annual measure of service effectiveness for the financial year 2009-2010 is 93 per cent.

The percentages of families considered to have a successful outcome were as follows:

There was, on average, a 47 per cent reduction in the number of families experiencing risks associated with poor family functioning including poor parenting, marriage, relationship or family breakdown, domestic violence or child protection issues.

There was, on average, a 47 per cent reduction in the number of families involved in crime and anti-social behaviour.

There was, on average, a 34 per cent reduction in the number of families with health risks including mental or physical health and drug or alcohol problems.

There was, on average, a 34 per cent reduction in the number of families with education and employment problems.

CUMULATIVE MEASURE OF SERVICE CAPACITY

The cumulative measure of service capacity is 4,870 families.

Of the 7,231 families referred to a FIP up to and including 31st March 2010:

- 4,870 families (67 per cent) were offered a FIP intervention and subsequently accepted the intervention and agreed to work with the FIP
- 1,860 families (26 per cent) were not offered a FIP intervention
- 203 families (3 per cent) were offered an intervention but declined
- 298 families (4 per cent) were offered an intervention, placed on a waiting list but are still waiting for a Support Plan to be put in place

ANNUAL MEASURE OF SERVICE CAPACITY

The annual measure of service capacity for the financial year 2009-2010 is 3,518 families.

This is the sum of the total number of families that were offered and accepted intervention between 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2010 (2,625 families) plus those families that were still being worked with from previous years (893).

ANNUAL MEASURE OF SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS

The annual measure of service effectiveness for the financial year 2009-2010 is 93 per cent.

This measure refers to the percentage of families who were still receiving a family intervention on 31st March 2010 (2,604 families) or had exited for a 'successful' reason (678 families) between 1st April 2009 and 31st March 2010 shown as a percentage of the total number of families that were offered and accepted intervention over this period (2,625 families) plus those families that were still being worked with from the previous year (893). This measure shows how effective a service is in supporting families rather than necessarily achieving successful outcomes. Outcome measures are reported further on in this statistical release.

Family Intervention workers were asked the reason that the family exited the intervention. They were provided with a range of possible reasons and were allowed to select as many as applied. The responses were later categorised as 'successful', 'unsuccessful' or reasons that could not be counted as either a success or a failure. Annex 1 contains Table 1 Classification of reasons for leaving a FIP. If FIP workers selected at least one reason that could be counted as a 'success' and no reasons which counted as a 'failure' they were deemed to have left for a successful reason. If they selected one or more reasons that could be counted as a 'failure', they were deemed to have left for an unsuccessful reason. Families where the FIP worker selected a combination of successful and unsuccessful reasons were excluded from the analysis but a combination of (i) successful reasons and (ii) reasons which could not be counted as successful or unsuccessful, was counted as a success.

A total of 914 families exited a FIP during this period. Fifty-one families were excluded from the analysis because FIP workers provided both successful and unsuccessful reasons for leaving. Of the remaining 863 families, 678 (79 per cent) were classified as leaving for a successful reason, 95 families (11 per cent) for a reason that cannot be counted as a success or a failure and 90 families (10 per cent) for an unsuccessful reason.

OUTCOME MEASURES

Four 'domains' were identified. These were family functioning and risk; crime and anti-social behaviour; health; and education and employment. For each of these four domains between two and four key relevant measures of family outcome were combined and a percentage reduction in risk calculated against each outcome.^{1 2} This information was based on assessments and other information available to the family intervention worker at the point a support plan was put in place and at the time the family left the intervention. FIP workers were asked to "only include factors which you are certain are an issue for this family. Do not include factors for which there is no specific evidence." The base for each measure includes all families who had exited the intervention (1,788 families)³.

Family functioning and risk

There was, on average, a 47 per cent reduction in the number of families experiencing risks associated with poor family functioning including poor parenting, marriage, relationship or family breakdown, domestic violence or child protection issues.

The measure is an un-weighted average of the percentage reduction figures for:

- Poor parenting (50 per cent reduction from 68 per cent of families with the issue to 34 per cent)
- Marriage, relationship or family breakdown (48 per cent reduction, from 28 per cent of families with the issue to 15 per cent)
- Domestic violence between any members of the family (54 per cent reduction, from 26 per cent of families with the issue to 12 per cent)
- Child protection issues including neglect, emotional abuse, physical abuse and sexual abuse (37 per cent reduction, from 27 per cent of families with the issue to 17 per cent)

Crime and Anti-social behaviour

There was, on average, a 47 per cent reduction in the number of families involved in crime and anti-social behaviour.

Crime is considered to be an issue for a family if the family intervention worker reports that any member has been arrested for criminal offences at referral, when the support plan is put in place and then at each formal review and upon exit. FIP workers were asked if any member of the family was on bail or probation, receiving a tag or conditional discharge at the time the support plan was put in place and the time the family left the intervention.

Anti-social behaviour is defined by the Home Office/National Audit Office (2006), as 'acting in a manner that causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household [as the FIP family]'. Family intervention workers are then asked to specify whether there is evidence that the family has been involved in any types of anti-social behaviours including rowdy behaviour, street drinking, vandalism etc. since their previous review⁴

¹ These were selected to represent key measures that FIP workers could reasonably be expected to influence. The measures were selected in consultation with DfE prior to the analysis being undertaken.

² The percentage reduction rates reported below are based on un-rounded proportions.

³ For some data measures there were slightly less families due to missing data (never less than 1,773).

⁴ The full list is as follows: drug / substance misuse & dealing; street drinking; begging; prostitution; kerb crawling; sexual acts; abandoned cars; vehicle-related nuisance & inappropriate vehicle use; noise; rowdy behaviour; noisy neighbours; nuisance behaviour; hoax calls; animal-related problems; racial or other intimidation / harassment; criminal damage / vandalism; and litter / rubbish. FIP staff are also invited to specify any other behaviour the family have been involved in that they judge to come under the definition of ASB. *Tackling Anti-social Behaviour* (2006) p.9 Home Office/ NAO

The measure is an un-weighted average of the percentage reduction in:

- Crime (38 per cent reduction, from 37 per cent of families with the issue to 23 per cent)
- Anti-social behaviour (57 per cent reduction, from 88 per cent of families with the issue to 38 per cent)

Health

There was, on average, a 34 per cent reduction in the number of families with health risks including mental or physical health and drug or alcohol problems

From a list of risk factors, family intervention workers were asked to record factors they were certain were an issue for the family, including information from multi-agency review meetings where available. For mental health, the type of issues that were included was anxiety and/or panic attacks, depression, lack of confidence, nerves and/or nervousness and stress. For physical health, the types of issues that were included were poor diet and lack of exercise.

The measure is an un-weighted average of the percentage reduction figures for:

- Mental health (18 per cent reduction from 31 per cent of families with the issue to 26 per cent)
- Physical health (28 per cent reduction from 9 per cent of families with the issue to 6 per cent)
- Drug or substance misuse (39 per cent reduction from 34 per cent of families with the issue to 21 per cent)
- Drinking or alcohol problems (48 per cent reduction from 30 per cent of families with the issue to 16 per cent)

Education and employment

There was, on average, a 34 per cent reduction in the number of families with education and employment problems.

Family intervention workers were asked if any children in the family had problems relating to truancy, exclusion or bad behaviour at school. FIP workers were also asked whether adults (over age 16) in the family were not in education, employment or training.

The measure is an un-weighted average of the percentage reduction figures for:

- Truancy, exclusion or bad behaviour at school (54 per cent reduction, from 59 per cent of families with the issue to 28 per cent)
- No adult in the family in education, employment or training (15 per cent, a reduction from 69 per cent of families with the issue to 59 per cent)

TABLES

Table 1.1 'Cumulative number of families referred to Family Intervention Projects by local authority area, including by district council/borough where relevant'.

ENQUIRIES

Enquiries about the figures in this statistical release should be addressed to:

Analysis and Research Division

Department for Education

Sanctuary Buildings

Great Smith Street

London SW1P 3BT

E-mail: Steve.Hamilton@education.gsi.gov.uk

Press enquires should be made to the Department's Press Office at:

Press Office News Desk

Department for Education

Sanctuary Buildings

Great Smith Street

London SW1P 3BT

Telephone Number: 0207 925 6789

Table 1.1
Cumulative number of families referred to Family Intervention Projects by local authority area, including district council/borough where relevant

Years: January 2006 to March 2010

Coverage: England

	Offered and accepted	Offered and declined	Offered and put on waiting list	Not offered intervention	Total number of families referred
Barking & Dagenham	*	*	*	*	*
Barnet	*	*	*	*	*
Barnsley	65	*	*	19	88
Bath and North East Somerset	*	*	*	*	11
Bedford	15	*	*	*	21
Bexley	*	*	*	*	*
Birmingham	44	*	*	34	83
Blackburn with Darwen	109	*	19	*	145
Blackpool	102	*	*	33	136
Bolton	100	*	*	29	151
Bournemouth	51	*	*	19	74
Bracknell Forest	*	*	*	*	*
Bradford	54	*	*	*	75
Brent	*	*	*	*	0
Brighton and Hove	35	*	12	*	56
Bristol, City of	110	*	*	41	166
Bromley	*	*	*	*	0
Burnley Borough Council	41	*	*	20	62
Bury	*	*	*	*	*
Calderdale	14	*	*	*	14
Cambridgeshire	*	*	*	*	*
Camden	28	*	*	16	44
Central Bedfordshire	*	*	*	*	*
Cheshire East	*	*	*	*	*
Cheshire West and Chester	*	*	*	*	*
City of London	*	*	*	*	0
Cornwall	*	*	*	*	13
Coventry	56	*	*	17	88
Croydon	*	*	*	*	*
Cumbria	10	*	*	*	18
Darlington	26	*	*	*	33
Derby	48	*	*	*	60
Derbyshire	61	*	*	24	87
Devon	*	*	*	*	*
Doncaster	30	*	*	*	41
Dorset	*	*	*	*	11
Dudley	*	*	*	*	*
Durham	33	*	*	*	43
Ealing	*	*	*	38	43
East Riding of Yorkshire	*	*	*	*	*
East Sussex	10	*	*	*	15
Enfield	10	*	*	*	15
Essex	*	*	*	*	*
Exeter City Council	32	*	*	26	58
Gateshead	42	*	*	17	59
Gloucester District Council	22	*	*	26	50
Gloucestershire	*	*	*	*	0
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	23	*	*	*	28

Table 1.1
Cumulative number of families referred to Family Intervention Projects by local authority area, including district council/borough where relevant

Years: January 2006 to March 2010

Coverage: England

	Offered and accepted	Offered and declined	Offered and put on waiting list	Not offered intervention	Total number of families referred
Greenwich	*	*	*	*	*
Hackney	81	*	*	14	101
Halton	30	*	*	31	65
Hammersmith and Fulham	*	*	*	*	*
Hampshire	*	*	*	*	*
Haringey	11	*	*	*	12
Harlow District Council	19	*	*	25	47
Harrow	*	*	*	*	*
Hartlepool	34	*	*	*	41
Hastings Borough Council	26	*	*	*	36
Havering	*	*	*	*	12
Herefordshire	*	*	*	*	*
Hertfordshire	12	*	*	*	17
Hillingdon	*	*	*	*	*
Hounslow	*	*	*	*	*
Kingston Upon Hull, City of	78	*	*	*	80
Ipswich Borough Council	60	*	*	*	68
Isle of Scilly	*	*	*	*	0
Isle of Wight	15	*	*	*	15
Islington	12	*	*	*	14
Kensington and Chelsea	*	*	*	*	*
Kent	*	*	*	*	10
Kingston upon Thames	*	*	*	*	*
Kirklees	51	*	*	19	70
Knowsley	60	*	*	18	78
Lambeth	35	*	*	*	51
Lancashire	*	*	*	*	10
Leeds	168	*	*	123	303
Leicester	72	*	*	21	98
Leicestershire	*	*	*	*	11
Lewisham	43	*	*	*	48
Lincolnshire	*	*	*	*	*
Liverpool	68	*	*	31	108
Luton	*	*	*	*	11
Manchester	159	*	*	24	184
Medway Towns	11	*	*	18	35
Melton Borough Council	17	*	*	*	24
Merton	*	*	*	*	0
Middlesbrough	89	*	*	30	130
Milton Keynes	19	*	*	*	28
Newcastle upon Tyne	113	*	*	20	137
Newham	57	*	*	35	97
North East Lincolnshire	80	*	*	108	194
North Lincolnshire	15	*	*	*	19
North Somerset	*	*	*	*	14
North Tyneside	16	*	*	*	16
North Yorkshire	10	*	*	*	13

Years: January 2006 to March 2010
Coverage: England

	Offered and accepted	Offered and declined	Offered and put on waiting list	Not offered intervention	Total number of families referred
Northamptonshire	31	*	*	*	40
Northumberland	*	*	*	13	21
Norwich City Council	160	*	*	73	237
Norfolk	*	*	*	*	0
Nottingham	68	*	*	61	138
Nottinghamshire	59	*	*	40	105
Oldham	121	*	52	*	187
Oxfordshire	*	*	*	*	*
Peterborough	*	*	*	*	15
Plymouth	60	*	*	28	96
Poole	32	*	*	*	41
Portsmouth	65	*	*	12	86
Reading	*	*	*	*	*
Redbridge	17	*	*	*	21
Redcar and Cleveland	69	*	*	*	75
Richmond upon Thames	*	*	*	*	*
Rochdale	52	*	*	25	79
Rotherham	44	*	*	28	72
Rutland	*	*	*	*	*
Salford	73	*	*	24	118
Sandwell	37	*	*	10	57
Sefton	*	*	*	*	*
Sheffield	89	*	*	55	148
Slough	*	*	*	*	11
Solihull	*	*	*	*	*
Somerset	*	*	*	*	*
South Tyneside	47	*	*	41	90
Southampton	74	*	*	16	91
Southend on Sea	63	26	*	*	105
South Gloucestershire	*	*	*	*	0
Southwark	38	*	*	*	43
St Helens	15	*	*	10	31
Staffordshire	12	*	*	*	19
Stockport	16	*	*	*	17
Stockton-on-Tees	17	*	*	*	17
Stoke-on-Trent	107	*	*	102	216
Suffolk	18	*	*	*	20
Sunderland	73	*	*	26	103
Surrey	*	*	*	*	*
Sutton	*	*	*	*	*
Swindon	*	*	*	*	*
Tameside	32	*	*	*	45
Telford and Wrekin	*	*	*	*	*
Thurrock	*	*	*	*	11
Torbay	25	*	*	*	26
Tower Hamlets	83	*	*	31	124

Table 1.1
Cumulative number of families referred to Family Intervention Projects by local authority area, including district council/borough where relevant

Years: January 2006 to March 2010

Coverage: England

	Offered and accepted	Offered and declined	Offered and put on waiting list	Not offered intervention	Total number of families referred
Trafford	*	*	*	*	*
Wakefield	78	*	*	48	129
Walsall	19	*	*	*	21
Waltham Forest	18	*	*	*	22
Wandsworth	*	*	*	*	10
Warrington	13	*	*	*	13
Warwickshire	*	*	*	*	*
West Berkshire	*	*	*	*	*
Westminster	38	*	*	17	60
West Sussex	*	*	*	*	0
Wigan	21	*	*	*	30
Wiltshire	*	*	*	*	*
Windsor and Maidenhead	*	*	*	*	*
Wirral	75	*	*	19	96
Wokingham	*	*	*	*	*
Wolverhampton	*	*	*	*	*
Worcestershire	60	*	*	28	100
York	*	*	*	*	*
Total	4870	203	298	1860	7231

Source: The NatCen Family Intervention Projects Information System

* Figures suppressed to avoid disclosure of counts fewer than 10.

Annex1

Table 1 Classification of reasons for leaving a FIP		
Families who received an ASB FIP intervention		
Successful	Cannot be counted as a success or a failure	Unsuccessful
The intervention was successful	High risk case – unsuitable for FIP staff to visit ****	Family refused intervention>
Support plan goals were satisfied	Family moved away from the area	Family not engaging with the project>
Family nominated to move back onto council housing list	Family no longer live together as a family unit	
Formal actions in place against family lifted	Children taken into care***	
Family no longer eligible for FIP intervention* >	Family referred to another FIP	
Family no longer at risk of homelessness	Family will be referred to another (non-FIP) service	
Anti-social behaviour levels reduced		
Worklessness no longer an issue**		
Families who received a Child Poverty or Youth Crime FIP intervention		
Support plan goals were satisfied	High risk case - unsuitable for FIP staff to visit****	Family refused intervention
Family nominated to move back onto council housing list	Family moved away from the area	Family not engaging with the project
Formal actions in place against family lifted	Family members no longer live together as a family unit	
Family no longer at risk of homelessness	Children taken into care***	
Anti-social behaviour levels reduced	Family referred to another FIP	
Worklessness no longer an issue	Family referred to other non-FIP service(s)	
Youth crime no longer an issue		
Intervention successful for another reason		

* This code is no longer offered in the Information System at Review stage

** This code was added to the Information System in July 2009

> In January 2009 these codes were removed for families leaving at Exit stage, meaning that there were no longer any unsuccessful reasons for leaving an ASB FIP at the Exit stage.

*** i.e. children taken into local authority/ foster care

**** i.e. unsafe for FIP staff to continue visits