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# Introduction

This report provides findings from a research review undertaken on behalf of the 22 local authorities in Wales to identify the key components and support material to underpin the development of a common cost savings calculator that can be deployed nationally throughout Wales, but which can be used according to local authority specific contexts and requirements. This followed the identification of the requirement for this tool contained in Section 9 of the Families First guidance issued by Welsh Government in April 2017[[1]](#footnote-1).

This report summarises the requirements for the work, identifies the data sources we have utilised to undertake the research review, and provides detail of the tool and the common language to be used to describe its measurement of the outcomes of the Families First programme in Wales.

## Review Aims

The specific aim for the review was:

* To develop a common National cost savings calculator for use throughout Wales, that allows for flexibility to reflect local authority specific contexts and requirements.

The review was specifically focussed upon development of a savings tool undertaken in consultation with all Local Authorities in Wales to identify:

* A common language of needs and aspirations that services support, and with a common Distance Travelled Tool.
* A common list of statutory support areas addressed by effective preventative family support and including levels of savings to statutory services for each area.
* A simple common Cost Savings Toolkit for preventative services to evidence savings which can be achieved through the Families First programme.

## Research Methods

In summary, the review work captured data from the following sources:

* A policy and literature review focussed on parenting support guidance, annual reports of service delivery, and evidence-based reviews of early intervention, prevention, and the Families First programme.
* Two staff workshops with TAF and Families First staff that explored the variation in language and metrics across the 22 local authorities and how these could be effectively synthesised into a common overarching framework that does not lose the local adaptability.
* A workshop at the Joint Flying Start and Families First National Conference that identified the focus of the review, views on outcomes arising from early intervention/prevention, and potential outcome measures to be included in the final toolkit.
* Online survey of all local authority Families First teams in Wales to identify more detailed information about the key areas where Families First/TAF activities in each local authority area are seen to have impacts for the individuals, and families, they work with. 19 of 22 local authorities provided a combined response for their area.
* Questions and clarifications on the use of the Toolkit at four training workshops held between June and July 2018 with further refinements made to the Toolkit in response to these issues.

The remainder of the report outlines the key findings of our review work; **Chapter 2** provides an overview of the key contexts from policy and other research underpinning our toolkit development, **Chapter 3,** findings from the workshops and surveys with Families First and TAF staff, and **Chapter 4,** concludes the report identifying the detail of the toolkit and our key conclusions against the original review aims.

# Context for the Families First programme

## Policy context.

### The Origin and Evolution of the Families First Programme

The Families First programme succeeded the Cymorth programme (which had run since 2003 with the original goal of establishing a coherent national fund for families), as a response to Welsh Government’s statutory Child Poverty Strategy (2011).[[2]](#footnote-2)

Pilot work for the original Families First programme began in July 2010, with full roll out across the 22 local authorities in Wales taking place from April 2012. Original programme delivery was focussed upon a time span of 5 years to 2017, but successful delivery and the findings across three years of evaluation studies[[3]](#footnote-3) resulted in the Welsh Government committing to the continuation of the programme in Dec 2016[[4]](#footnote-4) with an additional £76 million of funding although no specific dates for the length of the continuation are yet specified.

The key findings from the Year 3 evaluation report (Sept 2015)[[5]](#footnote-5) identified how:

* Supported families and delivery practitioners endorsed that the principles underpinning the design and delivery of the programme were sound and the key to this success were aspects including: multi-agency working to provide whole-family support; and flexible, non-judgemental key worker support for families. If one or more of these principles is missing then there is a greater likelihood of families receiving a poor support experience.
* The numbers of families supported had increased substantially with a noted increase in the flow of families onto the programme suggesting improved referral process and practice.
* In part this was due to the systems redesign, additional multi-agency working, widened service provision, and enhanced learning culture the programme has encouraged at a local level, although some implementation in 2015 was still at an early stage.
* A key finding for this review work is that the evaluation identified that there is potential for large costs savings from Families First support that helps those to avoid negative long term outcomes, but that existing data sources and relative short term monitoring of family outcomes, do not allow robust assessment of whether, and how far in practice, any savings are achieved in practice.
* Furthermore, the significant difference in delivery models and monitoring tools and relatively low levels, in the earliest stages of the programme, of collaboration across local authorities means that direct comparison of delivery and outcomes is very difficult raising particular challenges for this review in developing a substantive cost saving approach.

The evaluation findings led to publication of new programme guidance in April 2017 highlighting a refocusing of the programme as a key vehicle for early intervention and prevention of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) in light of key findings from Public Health Wales (2017)[[6]](#footnote-6) on the medium and long-term impact of these experiences on children and their wider families.

ACEs refer to a range of experiential circumstances that can include substance and alcohol misuse; physical, mental or sexual abuse and/or neglect; domestic violence; parental separation and/or family breakdown; mental illness; and parental imprisonment. However, Families First also has a wider focus on a set of circumstances related to poor parenting, family relationships, social isolation, unemployment and deprivation that may contribute to making ACEs more likely for some children and their families. Thus, Families First seeks to deliver a range of support to Families and Children to ensure families are as confident and resilient as they can be.

It is identified as important in the latest iteration of the Families First, because the Public Health Wales reports[[7]](#footnote-7) highlight how exposure to ACEs can impact on child brain, and immunological and hormonal system development. The concern is that such exposure to ACEs and contributory circumstances do mean that children can be more likely to go on to develop health-harming and anti-social behaviours, often during adolescence, such as binge drinking, smoking and drug use. Furthermore, Public Health Wales identifies that longer term such poor health and social behaviour mean these groups face a greater likelihood of developing diseases such as diabetes, cancer, cardiovascular disease and mental illness in later life.

Public Health Wales focuses on the opportunity to improve health across the whole life course, thus enhancing individuals’ well-being and productivity thus reducing pressures and costs on the National Health Service (NHS). The Families First Guidance 2017 also sees a role across social care, criminal justice and educational systems to get better results for the Welsh population through its early intervention and prevention support delivery.

It is a focus validated by a range of research, but usefully summarised by the Scottish Government who in 2007 highlighted the real value of work to improve family’s internal relationships identifying these as a key protective factor from risk taking behaviour during the difficult transition through adolescence, a time when peer influences become increasingly important:

“Generally, the healthier and more supportive an upbringing a young person has had, the more able he or she is to manage risk-taking with their peers and absorb the more positive peer influences. Equally, young people who have experienced a more damaging and neglectful upbringing will have more difficulty.”[[8]](#footnote-8)

In policy terms, Families First is also underpinned by other key policy agendas important to the needs of this work. The key agendas include:

* **Child Poverty Strategy** - The Welsh Government, since its inception in 1999 has made a conscious effort to reduce child poverty as a part of its broad social justice agenda. The national policies have always had a particular focus upon work to invest in the longer term future for children, young people and their families and Families First was a clear vehicle through which this focus was going to be delivered. Particularly as it outlines a vision for tacking child poverty in Wales and improving the outcomes for both children and parents that are living in low income households. Launched in February 2011, the three strategic objectives of the strategy are to:
	+ Reduce the number families living in workless households;
	+ Improve the skills of parents and young people living in low income households so they can secure well-paid employment; and
	+ Reduce inequalities that exist in health, education and economic outcomes of children and families by improving the outcomes of the poorest.

In March 2015[[9]](#footnote-9), the Welsh Government updated the Child Poverty Strategy emphasising its commitment to eradicate child poverty by 2020 and added two additional objectives around improving the wider circumstances of low income households which were further followed up in a July 2015 Action Plan[[10]](#footnote-10).

* **Taking Wales Forward 2016-2021**[[11]](#footnote-11) details the programme for the Welsh Assembly Government for its next five-year period. It commits the Welsh Government to increasing and improving employment opportunities, delivering a fairer society, improving service delivery, and ensuring a well-connected and sustainable nation.

It focuses on four key areas, areas **2)** facilitating **health and wellbeing** for all Wales residents through improved healthcare services, an up skilled health workforce, tackling mental health and wellbeing, and increasing care options and support for the elderly; and **3)** **raising ambition and learning** for all to provide the best possible start in life for all children; have particular resonance for the work of the Families First programme;

* The **Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015** aims to improve the social, economic and cultural well-being of Wales by placing a duty on public bodies to think and act in a more sustainable and long-term way. The Act puts in place seven well-being goals that public bodies must work to achieve and consider when making decisions. The act has already influenced the focus of the Programme of Government with key Wellbeing objectives[[12]](#footnote-12) being published alongside the Programme for Government. It highlights five ways of working - integrating delivery approaches, working to prevent problems occurring or escalating, working collaborative to involve as many partners as possible, and seeking to focus on long term outcomes and challenges, which whilst not unfamiliar to Families First programme delivery, will have even greater emphasis moving forwards. Indeed the 2017 Programme Guidance emphasises the particular relevance of Families First to two particular Wellbeing Goals - Children and young people are healthy and enjoy wellbeing; and that families are confident, nurturing, resilient, and have healthy relationships.

Thus a key challenge for this work will be to ensure that the costs savings calculations and operation of the tool ensure alignment with these key policy dimensions as well as the specifics of Families First programme delivery, the flexibility of approach at a local authority level, and the Families First Performance Management Framework published in June 2017[[13]](#footnote-13).

## The Specifics of the Families First programme

In developing the Families First programme, Welsh Government have sought approaches that would improve the design and delivery of the services local authorities provide to families, an approach that the evaluation shows has, in general, occurred. Crucial to this is a focus upon support delivery that meets the specific needs of whole families, rather than just individuals within families, and that support is delivered in a coherent way irrespective how many agencies might be involved in that support delivery, and that local services commissioned through Families First are based on an assessment of local needs.

**Figure 2.1** below shows an overview of the range of support needs that the Families First programme seeks to address. This, as the programme guidance identifies, covers a very broad range of different needs, but it is important to remember the programme is not expected to support families or individuals in crisis. Rather these individuals are expected to be supported by statutory or specialist services outside of Families First programme responsibilities.

Figure 2.1: Detail of Coverage of the Families First Programme



Source: Families First Programme Guidance, June 2017.

As **Figure 2.1** shows, Families First is expected to cover:

* Early intervention – families with some additional needs which can be addressed through targeted early intervention support;

It also covers some aspects of the needs of individuals and families with:

* Universal support needs – where families with mostly no additional needs who are in receipt of universal services such as education and healthcare, but may require additional support around parenting, or childcare, for instance to support them to maintain positive outcomes;
* Intensive support needs – families with multiple needs who require a coordinated multi-agency package of support to prevent needs from escalating into crisis that enables them to maintain positive familial or individual behaviours.

However, it is also clear that Families First delivery is not expected to cover the needs of families or individuals who are in crisis, and that in these cases referrals should be made to specific specialist services to address these needs.

What the programme guidance also emphasises is the need for Families First support delivery to be underpinned by effective information sharing protocols to ensure multi-agency delivery is fully able to address needs of those Families First works with.

The Guidance goes on to highlight that there are five main elements of the support delivered by the programme. These include a Joint Assessment Family Framework (JAFF) to provide a comprehensive evaluation of families’ needs, a Team Around the Family (TAF) approach to working with supported families, a strategic approach to commissioning family support services, and specific provision for families affected by disability. Since its commencement, the programme has been underpinned by an action learning element, to ensure that local level learning is shared at local, regional, and national levels.

The original programme design sought:

* innovation within local authorities so they change the way services are delivered, and coordinate better the services delivered by different agencies;
* promotion of an ‘invest to save’ approach to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery; early intervention, prevention alongside the tackling of entrenched problems; and,
* the embedding of learning throughout the programme’s delivery, to help identify and share learning, and to apply those approaches that are proven to be the most successful in improving families’ outcomes.

The 2017 Programme Guidance takes this further, identifying the need for the programme to:

* Design and develop innovative services which can support families to achieve positive and sustainable outcomes.
* Encourage a culture of learning around continued improvement to service delivery, sharing best practice and lessons learned.
* Promote effectiveness and efficiency in service delivery through an “invest to save” approach, which has a sharp focus on early intervention and prevention.
* Work collaboratively and cooperatively with other agencies and programmes to ensure service delivery is aligned with no gaps or duplication in services

Underpinning this delivery are some key guiding principles for service delivery by Families First which include them being:

* Family-focussed – services should take a whole family approach to improving outcomes.
* Bespoke – services should be tailored to individual family circumstances.
* Empowering – services should seek to empower families to take control of their lives, to give them an increased sense of ownership and investment in their outcomes.
* Integrated - services should be effectively coordinated and planned to ensure a seamless progression for families between different interventions and programmes.
* Intensive – a vigorous approach and relentless focus must be maintained which can adapt to families’ changing circumstances.
* Local – services should address the needs of local communities and, where possible, seek opportunities to link in with other local programmes, including Flying Start and Supporting People.
* Pro-active – seeking early identification of need and securing appropriate interventions in a timely way.
* Sustainable – services should always seek to provide long-term sustainable solutions. They should seek to address the root causes of problems and not just the symptoms to enable families to continue to progress after intervention has ceased.

The 2017 Guidance also makes specific requirements for the development of a cost savings tool to facilitate the consistent assessment of the financial benefits arising from the Families First programme that the Years 1-3 Evaluation reports[[14]](#footnote-14) identify could be realised by the programme. In responding to this requirement in the Guidance, this work is clearly a national approach to addressing that requirement. One which will, as we have highlighted above, need to be aligned with a range of key national policy objectives. Concurrently, it will need to provide consistent cost saving information that allows local and sub-regional comparisons, whilst being flexible to local circumstances and resourcing. However, this is a significant challenge given the multi-faceted nature of the needs the programme deals with amongst those it works with, and those it is expected to work with as illustrated in **Figure 2.1** above.

## Challenges for Toolkit Development

The key challenges that arise from these policy insights are as follows:

* What quantifiable measures/outcomes can be identified that relate to the elements of the outcomes framework under which the Families First programme is now operating?
* Given the wide-ranging needs the Families First programme is tasked with addressing are there any common features of these and a common language through which they might be best described?
* Where particularly are there gaps in existing data collection that preclude the measurement of cost saving, and thus inclusion in the overall toolkit?
* Where might existing Distance Travelled Tools and monitoring data need to be improved to address these gaps?

### Potential Outcome Measures and Links to Cost Savings

To begin to identify areas where cost savings might be apparent, our work has sought to look at the outcomes Families First has delivered against in its previous years of operation.

Alongside the 2017 programme guidance, a revised National Outcomes Framework was published which sought to refine a pre-existing list of 19 outcome areas into 14 areas. This reduction in outcome areas reflected the outcomes of a range of discussions between Welsh Government and Families First staff across local authorities in Wales that highlighted the challenge of delivery against some of the previous measures.

Data published by Welsh Government in November 2017[[15]](#footnote-15) illustrate the cumulative number of cases linked to the original 19 performance measures between the 1st April 2015 and 31st March 2017. The figures show some of the reasons for the reduction to 14 performance measures as can be seen in **Table 2.1**, but also show that there are a number of areas where explicit links to quantifiable measures to which cost saving might be attached are challenging.

**Table 2.1** shows outcomes against 19 measures and we have ranked these in order of the greatest volume of successful outcomes. Thus in terms of volumes Families First has achieved particular success in addressing needs for those it has worked with around emotional and mental wellbeing (over 43,000 benefited in this way across Wales), improved family dynamics (over 23,000), changes to lifestyle and behaviour (over 16,000), provided successful parenting interventions (over 12,000), and improved the ability of parents to support their child’s learning and development needs (over 12,000).

We have also highlighted where previous outcome measures have been revised (**orange** text) or have been removed completely (**red** text)[[16]](#footnote-16). Thus outcomes associated with the achievement of qualifications, specific job outcomes, and Domestic Violence referrals have been removed, whilst other measures (improved family dynamics and improvements to basic skills) have been refined to better reflect the nature of the needs that Families First programmes in local authority areas have found themselves delivering against.

Table 2.1: Families First Programme Outcomes (Cumulative) April 2015 to March 2017

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure No. | Detail | Number successful participants | Total number worked with | % |
| Measures Retained |
| 12 | Participants with improved emotional/mental wellbeing | 43,111 | 55,185 | 78% |
| 15 | Families that report they feel they can contribute to changes to their lifestyle/behaviours | 16,301 | 21,800 | 75% |
| 18 | Parents benefitting from a parenting intervention | 12,665 | 16,357 | 77% |
| 11 | Participant parents with improved ability to support their child’s learning and development needs. | 12,567 | 15,685 | 80% |
| 1 | Participants whose financial situation has stabilised or improved | 8,033 | 12,473 | 64% |
| 13 | Families of a disabled child accessing formal and informal respite | 7,044 | 8,314 | 85% |
| 14 | Families affected by disability that report an improvement in family resilience | 6,416 | 7,711 | 83% |
| 17 | Participant parents completing an evidence-based parenting programme | 4,640 | 6,168 | 75% |
| 8 | Secondary school children (up to the age of 16 years at the point of entry) who have improved their school attendance | 3,723 | 5,674 | 66% |
| 7 | Primary school children who have improved their school attendance | 2,019 | 3,308 | 61% |
| Measures Revised |
| 16 | **Individuals that report improved family dynamics** | 23,395 | 31,888 | 73% |
| 9 | **Children who improve their basic skills** | 3,359 | 3,597 | 93% |
| Measures Removed |
| 6 | **Participants that have entered further learning or training.** | 5,712 | 12,814 | 45% |
| 19 | **Domestic violence referrals** | 4,047 | 6,053 | 67% |
| 10 | **Young people (aged 16-24 years) who improve their basic skills** | 2,799 | 3,926 | 71% |
| 3 | **Participant young people (aged 16-24 years) attaining a nationally recognised qualification or accreditation** | 2,517 | 4,923 | 51% |
| 2 | **Participant adults (25 years and over) attaining a nationally recognised qualification or accreditation** | 1,619 | 2,735 | 59% |
| 5 | **Participant young people (aged 16-24 years) entering employment** | 1,380 | 6,284 | 22% |
| 4 | **Participant adults (25 years and over) entering employment** | 531 | 2,467 | 22% |

Source: Welsh Government Families First Performance Report.

**Table 2.2** in **Appendix 2** shows the new 14 National Outcome Measures and their definitions. It is notable how these measures now exclude outcomes associated with the achievement of qualifications, job outcomes, and Domestic Violence referrals. Furthermore, as **Table 2.3** below shows, despite these definitions contained in **Table 2.2**, for a majority of the them there are real challenges in identifying a specific link to an outcome that could be quantified in cost terms, a key element in the rationale developed in this work for the focus of the cost savings tool we outline in **Chapter 4**.

Table 2.3: Links from Measure to Quantifiable Cost Saving

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ref | National Performance Measure | Potential Quantifiable Outcomes |
| 2.1 | Participants whose financial situation has stabilised or improved | Multiple outcomes likely that are almost impossible to quantify/cost. |
| 2.2 | Primary school children who have improved their school attendance | Explicit link to truancy and related to exclusion. Cost information available. |
| 2.3 | Secondary school children (up to the age of 16 years at the point of entry) who have improved their school attendance | Explicit link to truancy and related to exclusion. Cost information available. |
| 2.4 | Children who improve their speech, language and communication skills | Link to educational achievement, but level not prescribed. |
| 2.5 | Participant parents with improved ability to support their child’s learning and development needs. | Link to educational achievement, but level not prescribed. |
| 2.6 | Participants with improved emotional/mental wellbeing | Multiple outcomes likely that are almost impossible to quantify/cost. |
| 2.7 | Individuals that report an improvement in own resilience | Multiple outcomes likely that are almost impossible to quantify/cost. |
| 2.8 | Families that report an improvement in family resilience | Multiple outcomes likely that are almost impossible to quantify/cost. |
| 2.9 | Families affected by disability that report an improvement in family resilience | Multiple outcomes likely that are almost impossible to quantify/cost. |
| 2.10 | Families that report they feel they can contribute to changes to their lifestyle/behaviours | Multiple outcomes likely that are almost impossible to quantify/cost. |
| 2.11 | Individuals that report improved family relationships | Multiple outcomes likely that are almost impossible to quantify/cost. |
| 2.12 | Participant parents completing 75% or more of sessions of an evidence-based parenting programme. | Multiple outcomes likely that are almost impossible to quantify/cost. |
| 2.13 | Participant parents benefitting from an evidence-based parenting programme | Multiple outcomes likely that are almost impossible to quantify/cost. |
| 2.14 | Parents benefitting from a parenting intervention | Multiple outcomes likely that are almost impossible to quantify/cost. |

Source: Welsh Government Families First Performance Outcomes Framework Guidance Worksheet [[17]](#footnote-17).

The key challenge revealed by this assessment is, given the sheer variety of needs being addressed by the Families First programme, and the breadth of most of the measures contained in the 2017 Performance Measures framework, what explicit cost savings can be identified?

However, there are a number of sources that do exist, and the next chapter outlines the details of these, and how we worked with local authorities across Wales to help us come up with a common language to describe quantifiable outcomes that could then form the basis of a first iteration of a toolkit that will be found in **Chapter 4** of this report.

# Identifying the Key Components of the Potential Cost Saving Toolkit

## Consulting Families First Staff

In this chapter, we identify perspectives drawn from workshops and surveys undertaken with staff overseeing the delivery of Families First programmes in local authorities across Wales. Both approaches sought to develop a deep consultative approach so that the resulting toolkit development could be predicated on a set of agreed principles applicable to a majority of local authorities and grounded in the specifics of their delivery approaches and the nature of the cohorts they were supporting.

We also cover details of existing cost savings tools drawn from work on young people Not in Education, Employment and Training (NEET)[[18]](#footnote-18), delivery of the Integrated Family Support Service in Cardiff utilising a cost toolkit developed by the Department of Education in England[[19]](#footnote-19), and a costs database developed by New Economy Manchester for the Troubled Families programme[[20]](#footnote-20).

## Workshop Findings

Two consultation workshops were convened at the end of January/early Feb 2018. Attended by 30 (14 in the 1st workshop; 16 in the 2nd) people from 20 out of 22 local authorities across Wales[[21]](#footnote-21). These individuals represented Families First and TAF delivery across Wales with most attendees (20) being the Families First lead for their respective authority area.

The workshops covered the following:

* Initial Consultation with potential Main Users of the tool on principles, content, and usage of the future tool.
* Reviewing analysis of existing tools and their content;
* Identifying and agreeing principles for a common language and metrics to be used by a future cost saving tool;
* Identifying and agreeing the scope and scale of the coverage of cost saving tool;
* Agreeing preferred methods of completion of the tool and outputs it will provide.

A further workshop session was also convened at the Joint Flying Start and Families First National Conference in Llandudno in March 2018 to consult further on potential cost measures to help fine tune the development of the cost saving toolkit.

#### Key Workshop Findings

The key themes to emerge from the Workshops were as follows:

**Challenges and Barriers**

* Capacity is one of the main challenges and as some result respondents felt strongly that the tool should be as simple as possible. However, there are different capacities from LA to LA – ranging from one-person teams to a team of 4/5 staff, so the tool should include the ability to go into greater detail if needed. Thus a tiered approach like that used by the New Economy model could be considered.
* The toolkit needs to be useful too so that it doesn’t feel like a chore to complete as it will require some additional work – respondents wanted to ensure that it would be something people would want to use. Ideally, it should be consistent with their current monitoring systems and built in to their performance framework, which is something they must do anyway. This would mean it would less likely to be seen as an extra burden. They have performance measures set by Welsh Government, so the tool should work around those.
* General agreement that the toolkit is something authorities want to do and that it hasn’t been forced upon them. There is a general interest in being able to demonstrate that they’re investing to save, particularly given the existing financial pressures all local authorities are under.
* Costs of negative outcomes could be at a Welsh level, but also have the flexibility for more local estimates. Another suggested they could have banded cost figures i.e. the national (Welsh) estimates would be the midpoint but they could scale it up or down.
* One of the biggest challenges is the fact that LAs have so many different models of delivery and are not using a common language to describe all their outcomes. Any toolkit approach needs to allow for the flexibility to reflect on these different delivery models.
* Local Authorities would like the toolkit to produce some outputs for example an infographic approach that could show for every £1 spent, £X was saved.

**Toolkit Measures and Common Language**

Workshop participants were asked about measures that they felt best reflected delivery by Families First. Those most commonly highlighted included:

* Health including physical and mental health, Housing, Education and Finance
* Parenting capacity, Relationships (between parents, siblings, within the community etc.), emotional health (including mental health to a certain level, but not where a statutory service is needed),
* General wellbeing, and learning needs (from early school to adult training).
* In relation to learning needs, employment has been removed as a Families First domain, but Families First does support people to make them more ‘work-ready’ by removing barriers – and several respondents identified that they felt that that should potentially be captured.
* There was a consensus that the toolkit needs to capture clearly claimable impacts so that there is a clear evidence base for the costs associated with it.
* Income, resilience (a cross-cutting theme that links to a range of possible outcomes for individuals.)
* Engagement in schools (including parents too), relationships, behaviour, finance.

To assist respondents in considering common measures and the language used to describe them a Department for Education (DfE) toolkit and New Economy Manchester cost database were demonstrated to identify whether similar approaches would be useful for respondents.

The DfE Family Savings Calculator[[22]](#footnote-22) was developed in 2009 and then utilised for cost saving estimates arising from the Troubled Families Programme. It is an Excel Workbook that allows the calculation of costs savings from work with vulnerable families.

The Family Savings Calculator was developed as a tool to help local authorities provide intensive support services for families with multiple problems in quantifying the cost savings for services and agencies arising from a family successfully being supported. The aim of the tool is to give a broad estimate based upon a list of specified unit costs of overall cost savings across families and the individuals within them.

The calculator includes a list of negative outcomes (83) with an average cost for each one.

These are grouped into seven broad categories:

* Education/Employment
* Crime/Anti-Social Behaviour
* Housing
* Health Care
* Drug and Alcohol Services
* Social Care
* Domestic Violence

The cost database was developed by New Economy Manchester[[23]](#footnote-23) and is a unit cost database covering over 600 national cost estimates derived from government reports and academic studies. It identifies costs from 2015/16 with additional capability to account for inflation. Like the DfE Toolkit, the costs cover crime, education & skills, employment & economy, fire, health, housing and social services and provide a quality assured source of cost data. Unlike the DfE toolkit it provides no other functionality other than as a single source for cost estimates which can then be used to generate estimates.

The workings of the DfE toolkit and content of the New Economy database were demonstrated in the workshop.

Delegates in the workshop highlighted a few concerns about these approaches that particularly related to additional data collection around capturing numbers of incidents around some measures for instance crime or health service engagements.

* A key challenge to this rests on the fact that local authorities have a consensual information sharing agreement with families i.e. they only give information they want to give, so collecting information on some additional hard outcomes could be very difficult. Direct questioning of families could be extremely problematic. Furthermore, current systems don’t record the number of incidents and don’t monitor clients post intervention (one stated they aim to close the intervention support after 6 months) and there are currently no formal follow up procedures.
* Existing Distance Travelled Tools tend to currently only collect data on softer outcomes and measures which differ from data on attendance or behaviour in school that can be drawn from partners own monitoring systems. It is clear that a range of these kinds of sources are used, although this information is not always recorded on DTT/JAFF, but are used in reporting against key outcome areas to Welsh Government.
* There was a strong consensus that the tool from this work will need to be much simpler than the DfE example. There was significant concern that the data collection required to fully implement a DfE style model would create significant burdens for all Families First teams, particularly those with smaller delivery teams.
* A period of piloting will be valued.

**Toolkit Functionality**

* On the question of a comparative dimension – LAs would like to compare between themselves on cost savings made so that they can look at best practice. That would enable them to compare the different models of delivery and look at which are the most effective in getting results in different domains etc. However, they wouldn’t like that analysis to be provided in a league table format to Welsh Government as that would bring undue pressure.
* In terms of frequency of use, the opportunity to complete the tool on an ongoing basis was seen as valuable, but there was general agreement that data submitted into the tool should cover closed cases so the picture relates to the full range of support provided.
* There was a debate on whether a sampling approach could be used on which cases might be included in the toolkit. There was some concern that there would need to be clear rules of engagement on a common sampling approach e.g. picking every tenth case, in order to compare accurately. However, others wanted an element of self-sampling so that they can demonstrate best practice to WG through an indicative picture of cost saving.
* Overall general agreement was reached that there should be a common, random sampling approach for the comparison between LAs and that self-selected cases could be used as case studies for WG. The random sampling approach should be the minimum use of the tool so that LAs can pilot generating an estimate for the cost of investment and cost of saving – with a consistent approach used by all LAs. Beyond that, LAs will be able to make greater use of the tool if they so choose / have the capacity. This approach would be considered in the toolkit development.

The additional workshop at the Joint Families First and Flying Start national conference highlighted a few similar issues to those raised above. In addition, some particularly useful insights included:

* The need to have clear definitions for measures and the associated costs. Some measures, for instance a child being taken into care may be the most appropriate action in a case of need. Therefore, cost savings associated with this should be carefully considered particularly in terms of the cost associated with avoidance of that outcome.
* Important to ensure consistency and clarity in the application of certain costs and measures so that cost saving means the same whichever authority the outcome is achieved in.
* Moves to a single Distance Travelled Tool could undermine the flexibility of Families First to reflect the key needs and issues of importance to the individuals being supported, rather than the needs of a monitoring tool, or toolkit.
* Much of the work of Families First is about preventing escalation to more negative outcomes covering a wide range of areas including child protection/LAC; school readiness; attendance and behaviour in school/exclusion; avoiding engagement with the police, crime and youth offending services; health services, especially mental health. However, it is important to remember that some work may have an impact by increasing uptake of statutory provision and therefore result in an increase in cost (enhancing access to welfare benefits for example).
* A focus on the numbers worked with who don’t escalate to a statutory services intervention could be a useful measure that is already used by some local authorities. Therefore, how many cases have not resulted in an escalation for instance to substance misuse, or have reduced a risk of truancy, is a measure already in use across some authorities and allows for an element of professional judgement in the assessment of cases.
* Inclusion of lots of measures around employment and qualifications as quantifiable measures is confusing as these were previous performance measures and have been removed from the new performance framework because they were deemed less relevant to delivery by Families First. Some respondents were unclear of the value of revisiting these, whilst others were happy with their proposed inclusion as they saw that they had had a role in previous cases. This is a position that is backed up by the data on outcomes shown in **Table 2.1** above.
* Identifying mechanisms to attach costs to improvements, or enhancements, in conditions and the related outcomes is challenging but is at the centre of much of the work of Families First delivery given the continuum of support the programme is expected to address (as illustrated in **Figure 2.1** above).

## Survey Findings

Post-Workshop Survey responses were returned by 19 of 22[[24]](#footnote-24) local authorities. Each were requested to supply a combined response covering input from across their Families First and TAF staff as appropriate. The surveys sought to identify detail of existing Families First delivery against the 14 National Performance Framework measures identified in **Table 2.3** above and **Table 2.2** in **Appendix 2**, measures that could be used to demonstrate ‘success’ against these, and views on the coverage and content of a common Distance Travelled Tool to support the operation of the Toolkit.

Feedback in the workshops highlighted that currently very few authorities (4) use any form of cost savings tool the main reason for this being that authorities were unaware of tools that could be utilised. In terms of a future tool there was a strong emphasis upon its ease of use in line with resources available to local teams, and that it should provide clear insight to justify local/national Families First work.

The post-Workshop Survey identified the following key findings:

* For seven local authorities, all 14 performance measures were of most relevance to their existing Families First delivery.
* However, amongst the remaining 12 authorities (see **Table 3.1** below):
	+ Measures covering participants with improved emotional/mental wellbeing; families affected by disability that report an improvement in family resilience; individuals that report improved family relationships; and parents benefitting from a parenting intervention were identified by all 12 as being most relevant to their Families First delivery.
	+ For 11 of these authorities, Families that report an improvement in family resilience were most relevant to their delivery; and
	+ 10 saw that individuals that report an improvement in own resilience measure as being most relevant to their delivery.
	+ Interestingly, measures for children who improve their speech, language and communication skills (only three authorities) and participant parents with improved ability to support their child’s learning and development needs (not identified as an area of most relevance by any of the 12 authorities) were the least noted by respondents

Table 3.1: Relevance of National Performance Measures to Existing Families First Delivery

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| National Performance Measure | Number of Respondents Identifying |
| All 14 Performance Measures | 7 |
| Participants with improved emotional/mental wellbeing | 12 |
| Families affected by disability that report an improvement in family resilience | 12 |
| Individuals that report improved family relationships | 12 |
| Parents benefitting from a parenting intervention | 12 |
| Families that report an improvement in family resilience | 11 |
| Individuals that report an improvement in own resilience | 10 |
| Children who improve their speech, language and communication skills | 3 |
| Participant parents with improved ability to support their child’s learning and development needs | 0 |

Source: Local Authority Workshop Follow Up Survey, 2018. Total responses = 19.

* Respondents also identified a range of existing evidence sources that could be used to measure performance against the measures, including some already utilised for those carried over from the previous measures prior to June 2017. In the main these focus on the use of Distance Travelled Tools and Joint Assessment Framework for Families (JAFF). However, it is notable that these are not used consistently by all authorities across all measures with other data sources also being used.
* The additional data and evidence sources vary widely from Outcomes Star, Attendance Records, TOPSE (a tool to measure parental self-efficacy[[25]](#footnote-25)), Anecdotal evidence, Reports by Commissioned Providers, and Results Based Accountability (RBA) reports and other monitoring information. Many of these have been developed at a local level without direct reference to tools in other local authority areas and pre-date the 2017 Outcomes Framework. The enhanced partnership working facilitated by this study offers a real opportunity for authorities across Wales to identify greater commonalities across outcome measurement so that there is even greater alignment across measures in Wales.
* It is also clear that, reflecting the wide-ranging needs being addressed by Families First (see **Figure 2.1** above), that a range of support services and approaches are utilised by Families First teams across survey respondents. Whilst the main support sources include TAF delivery, direct delivery by Families First teams these are also supported by school-based support and work by Citizen Advice Bureau (CAB). In addition, examples are provided of a further 26 different service providers that support Families First delivery including health service teams, midwives, Barnardos, Housing Associations, MIND, Domestic Violence teams, Parenting and Family Support Services, and Sexual Health services.

We also asked respondents about other areas in addition to those captured in the National Performance Measures Framework where Families First staff saw outcomes. **Table 3.2** below illustrates these findings showing:

* The main areas where Families First staff reported direct impacts were in addressing mental health issues for children, young people, and adults, reducing school absence and exclusion, preventing neglect and domestic abuse, and in facilitating 16-24 year olds attendance in training/education.
* It is notable that all areas are marked by at least an impact contribution from addressing mental health issues to preventing criminal behaviour.
* However, fewer local authorities noted an impact on the prevention of criminal behaviour in young people and adults, improving literacy and numeracy in adults, improved school grades, moving adults into education or employment, and tackling substance misuse issues.

Table 3.1: Number of Local Authorities Identifying Type of Impact of Families First Delivery by Outcome

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | Had a direct impact | Contributed to an impact | No impact |
| Addressed a child/young persons' mental health issue | 12 | 7 | 0 |
| Reduced absence from school | 11 | 7 | 0 |
| Addressed an adults' mental health issue | 9 | 9 | 1 |
| Prevented domestic abuse issue | 9 | 8 | 1 |
| Preventing neglect | 8 | 11 | 0 |
| Reduced exclusion from school (fixed term and/or permanent) | 8 | 7 | 0 |
| 16-24 year old/s attending training/education | 8 | 10 | 1 |
| Prevented a 16-24 year old from becoming a young person NEET | 7 | 10 | 1 |
| 16-24 year old/s into employment | 6 | 11 | 2 |
| Enhanced reading/writing/number skills for children and young people | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| Prevented criminal behaviour - young person | 5 | 10 | 2 |
| Enhanced reading/writing/number skills for adults | 3 | 7 | 5 |
| Addressed a substance misuse issue | 3 | 12 | 2 |
| Improved grades at school | 2 | 11 | 1 |
| 25+ year old/s attending training/education | 2 | 10 | 5 |
| 25+ year old/s into employment | 1 | 11 | 5 |
| Prevented criminal behaviour - adult | 0 | 9 | 5 |

Source: Local Authority Workshop Follow Up Survey, 2018. Total responses = 19.

These findings emphasise the sheer diversity of Families First delivery that has evolved from the different delivery models and responses to local needs that programme guidance has actively encouraged. It does present some challenges to this work, as an approach needs to be identified that enables at least an indicative picture of cost saving to be created. One option here given the universality of use is to focus upon the DTT and JAFF assessments used across Wales.

Our survey findings here do confirm that there is a common agreement on the need for more commonality in DTT with 16 local authorities identifying this as something they ‘definitely’, or ‘maybe’ agree with. 8 local authorities (of the 16) identify that they ‘definitely’ would value such an approach, whilst one authority was not interested.

Across the 16 authorities above, nine authorities wish to ensure that the DTT remains flexible enough not to affect local delivery detrimentally, but there are concerns across four local authorities that a single DTT would be difficult/expensive to implement because they would require significant changes to existing tools and the monitoring systems into which data are entered and reviewed.

However, despite broad agreement on having a single DTT approach there is much less agreement about the key measures it should cover. Four areas are particularly highlighted by groups (<7) of respondents. These include Mental Health, Family Relationships, Parenting and Education Participation and Outcomes, whilst a further 20 different categories of measures are highlighted across the rest of the respondents.

Again, this reflects the sheer diversity of approach adopted in Families First delivery, yet it does mean that DTT developed to assess this diversity of need have evolved to be very different as our review of DTT showed.

## Review of Distance Travelled Tools

The breadth of issues covered by the DTT was again evident in our analysis. 19 local authorities provided us with copies of DTT or JAFF documents which we analysed using a matrix approach. Each of the original 19 outcome measures and the 14 outcome measures from June 2017 were included in this matrix, so we could identify both previous match to outcome measures and those applying to 2017/18 and onwards delivery.

Our key findings from this review and analysis showed that:

* There was inconsistency in DTT/JAFF as information sources for achievement against the previous 19 National Performance measures. Consequently, our analysis highlighted that there were ten performance measures where at least six or more local authority DTT/JAFF did not explicitly identify information that would enable achievement of those measures to be assessed from the DTT/JAFF data alone (see **Table 3.3**).
* There were nine Pre- 2017 measures with the strongest matches (with 11 or more DTTs providing strong evidence sources) across existing DTT/JAFF (see **Table 3.3**).
* For the 14 Post-2017 performance measures there are eight measures where there is the most mismatch across existing DTT/JAFF (see **Table 3.4**).
* There were five Post- 2017 measures with the strongest matches (with 10 or more DTTs providing strong evidence sources) across existing DTT/JAFF (see **Table 3.4**).

What these findings show is a clear rationale for the change of approach in outcome measurement that this work is taking forward. This is in part because the findings confirm that there are areas where existing DTT can be used to assess performance assuming the measures they use are relevant to the performance measures they are associated with. As a group, the 22 local authorities in Wales need to work together to agree further commonality to their DTT/JAFF to align these better with the new National Performance Measures Framework. To aid this process our work sought to identify areas where this enhancement could assist in the cost savings methodology, as well as aligning such tools better with the 14 National Performance Measures for the Families First programme. A key source for this was material drawing on a number of existing cost savings toolkits.

Table 3.3: Match Between DTT/JAFF and Pre-2017 Performance Measures Across 19 Local Authorities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| National Performance Measure (Pre-2017 - 19) | Poor Match to DTT/JAFF | Strong Match to DTT/JAFF |
| Participants whose financial situation has stabilised or improved |  | ✓ |
| Participant adults (25 years and over) attaining a nationally recognised qualification or accreditation | ✓ |  |
| Participant young people (aged 16-24 years) attaining a nationally recognised qualification or accreditation | ✓ |  |
| Participant adults (25 years and over) entering employment |  | ✓ |
| Participant young people (aged 16-24 years) entering employment |  | ✓ |
| Participants that have entered further learning or training. |  | ✓ |
| Primary school children who have improved their school attendance |  | ✓ |
| Secondary school children (up to the age of 16 years at the point of entry) who have improved their school attendance |  | ✓ |
| Children who improve their basic skills | ✓ |  |
| Young people (aged 16-24 years) who improve their basic skills | ✓ |  |
| Participant parents with improved ability to support their child’s learning and development needs. |  | ✓ |
| Participants with improved emotional/mental wellbeing |  | ✓ |
| Families of a disabled child accessing formal and informal respite | ✓ |  |
| Families affected by disability that report an improvement in family resilience | ✓ |  |
| Families that report they feel they can contribute to changes to their lifestyle/behaviours | ✓ |  |
| Individuals that report improved family dynamics  | ✓ |  |
| Participant parents completing an evidence-based parenting programme | ✓ |  |
| Parents benefitting from a parenting intervention | ✓ |  |
| Domestic Violence Referral |  | ✓ |

Source: Wavehill Analysis of Existing DTT/JAFF, 2018. NB: Poor = 6 or more authorities existing tools did not link directly the relevant performance measure; Strong = 11 or more authorities showing a clear link.

Table 3.4: Match Between DTT/JAFF and Post-2017 Performance Measures Across 19 Local Authorities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| National Performance Measure (Post-2017 - 14) | Poor Match to DTT/JAFF | Strong Match to DTT/JAFF |
| Participants whose financial situation has stabilised or improved |  | ✓ |
| Primary school children who have improved their school attendance |  | ✓ |
| Secondary school children (up to the age of 16 years at the point of entry) who have improved their school attendance |  | ✓ |
| Children who improve their speech, language and communication skills | ✓ |  |
| Participant parents with improved ability to support their child’s learning and development needs. |  | ✓ |
| Participants with improved emotional/mental wellbeing |  | ✓ |
| Individuals that report an improvement in own resilience | ✓ |  |
| Families that report an improvement in family resilience | ✓ |  |
| Families affected by disability that report an improvement in family resilience | ✓ |  |
| Families that report they feel they can contribute to changes to their lifestyle/behaviours | ✓ |  |
| Individuals that report improved family relationships | ✓ |  |
| Participant parents completing 75% or more of sessions of an evidence-based parenting programme. | ✓ |  |
| Participant parents benefitting from an evidence-based parenting programme | ✓ |  |
| Parents benefitting from a parenting intervention | ✓ |  |

Source: Wavehill Analysis of Existing DTT/JAFF, 2018. NB: Poor = 6 or more authorities existing tools did not link directly the relevant performance measure; Strong = 11 or more authorities showing a clear link.

## Options from Existing Cost Savings Assessments

### Estimating the Cost of Being "Not in Education, Employment or Training" at Age 16-18”

This study was work commissioned by the National Audit Office in 2010[[26]](#footnote-26) that sought to update work by the same research team at York University for the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in 2002[[27]](#footnote-27) It adopts an approach which seeks to reduce much of the complexity of the circumstances of how young people fall out of education, employment and training. It seeks to focus on a current cohort of young people seeking to estimate the costs of this scenario in relation to a range of circumstances that may occur for this group compared to an alternative assumption approach applied to a group of young people that had not been in the non-NEET population. Thus, it identifies costs associated with being young people NEET in comparison with costs a group of young people who had not been NEET might have also incurred. By calculating the difference between these amounts conservative estimates of the cost of NEET, and therefore the potential cost saving that could result from moving young people away from this status can be identified.

These costs in the 2002 and 2010 work relate to individuals, their families, the rest of society and the impact on public finance costs. The estimates in 2010[[28]](#footnote-28) identified that the total lowest estimated lifetime cost of being NEET at age 16-18 is £22 billion in resource costs and £12 billion in public finance costs.

These costs were calculated against relatively limited effect areas that included educational underachievement, unemployment, inactivity, experiences of poor physical/mental health and disability, substance misuse and crime. There are some parallels with the work the Families First is undertaking in its delivery such that it also aims to reduce a range of negative impacts on families and the individuals within them and thus detrimental effects on all those associated with the supported families, including the individuals themselves. For example, although not a direct area of focus for much of the Families First work (as highlighted above) unemployment is a significant characteristic amongst many of the families, Families First is working with. The Year 3 Evaluation Report[[29]](#footnote-29) highlights that 73% of families the programme supported in 2013/14 had specific needs related to gaining, and progressing in, employment. Thus, in considering cost saving resulting from the programme work it provides a useful reference point from which to consider our toolkit development, and indeed having it as a specific cost saving measure for inclusion in the final toolkit.

In considering this, the 2010 work identified that current costs of unemployment have an effect on the individual in terms of a loss of earnings and increased risk of mental health. It also affects the family as they will potentially be needed for financial and other support. Current costs apply to society and the economy, through more benefit payments, loss of inactivity resulting in less contribution to tax revenue, and additional health costs.

The medium-term costs of unemployment have similar effects on the individual, for example lower earnings, delay of owning their own property, and poor health and quality of life. The public finance costs at medium-term of unemployment include benefit payments, social housing, and money spent to reduce unemployment. The long-terms costs to the individual of unemployment include a loss of lifetime earnings, the potential for more stress, lower pension and a lack of provision for nursing care. Additionally, the long-term public finance costs consist of income support payments, residential and nursing care and a loss of taxation from occupation pensions.

The approach adopted is beneficial because by focussing on a range of key areas it provides a mechanism to identify a common language around the potential impacts of programme delivery and support provision that can then be used to identify more specific measures of costs. However, it is an approach that is one off and reliant upon analysis capabilities not always available in a local authority Families First team.

## DfE Cost Savings Toolkit

Users enter the number of incidents for each family member pre and post intervention (see **Figure 3.1** below). Users also enter the cost of intervention generated from supplied tables. Grossing up from the incident numbers entered and the recorded difference in these pre-and post-intervention the tool then calculates savings made per family, family member and organisation.

Figure 3.1: Overview of Data Entry for DfE Family Savings Calculator



Demonstration of this tool in the workshop attracted concern from delegates on two main fronts:

1. The resource requirements to collect, collate, and enter the data on incidents for each family, or random sample of families and the individuals in them.
2. That existing data collection tools do not collect this level of information on those they are working with, either at referral, or upon completion of the intervention. Delegates were especially worried that such forms of questioning could undermine their relationship with client families because of the sheer volume of data required, the need for further follow up work with families who are often difficult to get hold of, and that Families First is a voluntary programme.

Despite this, the approach where details around a change in circumstance is identified, does offer an option that could prove successful. Though this would only prove successful as long as it focuses upon a single change in circumstance and an estimate of the level/granularity of that outcome being achieved, rather than a count of the volume of changes seen. For example, identifying if, for instance, an eviction from housing has been avoided because of the intervention by the Families First team. It is clear that a light touch approach is the only realistic option in applying the concept that would be accepted by existing Families First teams across Wales.

# Principles and Focus of the Toolkit

## Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the key principles, common language and components of the proposed cost saving toolkit. These are developed from the key findings identified in **Chapters 2 and 3** above. They have also been discussed with Families First Co-ordinators as part of a National Co-ordinators meeting in April 2018, a Final Report Workshop in June 2018, and four training workshops (June – July 2018 – **Appendix 1** provides details of these attendees) to review and have final agreement from Co-ordinators on the key components of the toolkit.

The following sections show the key components that have been agreed for the final Version 2.0 of the toolkit. This document is accompanied by a short handbook that illustrates how the toolkit should be utilised, though this report provides the critical principles of use agreed by National Coordinators for the Families First programme in all Welsh local authorities.

## Principles of Toolkit Use

The toolkit has been developed to put into practice principles agreed at the Workshops and consultations with Families First/TAF staff. Those principles are:

* That Families First Guidance (2017) wants authorities to ‘actively demonstrate a commitment to calculating costs savings’.
* Its use provides a specific evidence base to exemplify that local authorities in Wales are investigating specific opportunities through an ‘Invest to Save’ agenda.
* It seeks to ensure close alignment with a current role for the Families First programme in addressing the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) agenda and highlighting the ways in which the programme has contributed to mitigating these.
* The approach for allocating costs is based on closed cases (ie what has been achieved) so that assessments are based on completed case records providing a clear evidence base for judgements reached.
* Assessments of impact/outcomes following support receipt from Families First delivery are conducted to reflect a more ‘positive’ assessment of what has been achieved with a family/individual where case files, other written material (self-assessments, client feedback/reports, external data sources (schools, other providers), and the professional judgement of Families First staff provide ‘verifiable’ evidence that those impacts/outcomes have been achieved.
* The mechanism for costing provides a specific opportunity to reflect knowledge of families supported and the particular needs addressed, it should draw on the professional judgement of Families First/TAF staff best placed to identify the needs/outcomes the programme has addressed through its delivery, although some revision will be needed to DTT.
* Ensuring local alignment and ongoing updating in line with specific coverage of the DTT in a particular local area.

In addition, our analysis work, including data drawn from interviews has also provided some further principles, namely that:

* It encompasses a ‘simple’ completions approach allowing for:
	+ Improved links to the National Performance Measure Framework.
	+ Limiting burden on staff to complete.
	+ Reflects ‘graduated’ outcomes for individuals and families given their differing needs and circumstances.
	+ Offering flexibility for comparative use in other programmes – for instance: Flying Start.
* It is focused on cost savings where clear, consistent, information is available through the New Economy Manchester Troubled Families Cost Database and that an explicit change in characteristic linked to Families First intervention can be identified through case assessment by Families First/TAF staff.

## Common Language of Need and Support Areas

The National Performance Measure Framework provides an outline of the breadth of expected support delivery driven by Families First programme. However, as we saw in **Chapter 3** not all of these areas are, in the opinion of current Families First staff, being delivered against. Indeed, existing DTT need some revision to better capture information that will enable these data collection tools to be used more readily to enable local authority staff to report against all the 14 Performance Measures.

Our work for this also identifies that the national group need to actively review existing DTT to identify pan-Wales approaches to collect data on:

* children who improve their speech, language and communication skills.
* individuals that report an improvement in own resilience – these resilience measures should draw directly on the work of the Centre of Resilience for Social Justice centre at the University of Brighton[[30]](#footnote-30).
* families that report an improvement in family resilience[[31]](#footnote-31).
* families affected by disability that report an improvement in family resilience[[32]](#footnote-32).
* families that report they feel they can contribute to changes to their lifestyle/behaviours.
* participant parents completing 75% or more of sessions of an evidence-based parenting programme.
* participant parents benefitting from an evidence-based parenting programme.
* parents benefitting from a parenting intervention.

It is particularly important to ensure that ongoing Families First delivery and Pan-Wales partnership working between local authorities across Wales focuses on further enhancing the evidence base of impact. This will have benefits in enabling authorities to identify, in greater detail, the impacts of Families First delivery illustrating further the key differences to makes to the families, individuals, and communities it works with.

In addition, and most pertinent to the work in this report, it will provide the opportunity to further enhance the robustness and consistency of the cost savings the tool identified in this work is able to demonstrate. Thus, providing stronger evidence at local, regional and national levels of the cost savings that do result from Families First delivery, strengthening the evidence base and the case for the programme against an ever tightening funding settlement across Wales.

### Common Language of Need

In improving the evidence base on outcomes achieved as detailed above, our work shows that the common features of need addressed by the Families First across the 22 local authorities is focused on work with individuals and families to ensure that:

* Individual resilience is enhanced.
* Family resilience is enhanced.
* Child’s speech, language and communication skills are improved.
* Parenting skills are improved.
* Capacity to change lifestyle/behaviours is increased – adults and children/young people.
* Emotional wellbeing and mental health is improved.

We acknowledge that in some local areas there may be additional needs, but our analysis identifies that those shown above are common across the 22 local authorities in Wales.

Our work shows that existing DTT/JAFF may need revision in some local authority areas to fully reflect these areas and that this review, organised through the National Coordinators group, should be aligned with work to ensure full match to the National Performance Measures (2017).

### Common Language and Support Areas

In developing our cost saving model, we have focussed upon areas where those costs are ‘all encompassing’ reflecting the full range of support received, and the positive moves achieved by Families/Individuals from support they receive through the Families First programme.

The choice of support areas has been made on the basis of the availability of cost saving information drawn from the New Economy Manchester Unit Cost Database v.1.4[[33]](#footnote-33). This source has been utilised because the data it contains have been through a rigorous validation process, assessments of the robustness of the original source documentation, considerations of how data have been derived from constituent cost elements, comparison of costs to related data, and review of the availability of more recent/robust sources. Most importantly, the source data has also been reviewed by analysts from the relevant Whitehall departments.

These support areas have been refined through the training workshops with a specific reduction in the number of outcomes around children being taken into care. This meant the removal of measures associated with the potential destination of children (in a residential home or foster care) as staff indicated they were usually unaware on the detail of an ‘in care’ destination for a child.

Following this input from the workshops detailed earlier, the components have been revised to cover specific aspects that Co-ordinators felt best reflected the areas where Families First could be identified as having a particular impact on the individuals and families it works with.

The areas confirmed by this consultation and the further refinement through the training workshops for inclusion in the toolkit are as outlined in **Table 4.1** below.

This shows components of delivery where a clear unit cost can be identified in the New Economy Manchester database that can be linked to support that contributes to the prevention of escalation to more negative outcomes and/or greater statutory service support needs.

These components are:

Table 4.1: Components of a Common Outcome Language for the Families First Programme

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Crime | Employment | Housing |
| Anti-Social Behaviour | Improved Work Readiness/Employment | Complex Eviction |
| Domestic Violence | **Health** | Simple Repossession |
| Adult Offender in Prison | Alcohol Misuse | **Social Services** |
| Youth Offender | Drugs Misuse | \*Child taken into care |
| Education | Adults with Depression or Anxiety |
| Persistent Truancy | Children and Young People with Mental Health Needs |
| Permanent Exclusion from School | \*\*Average cost of child protection core assessment (overall) |
| Non-Readiness for School | \*\*Children in Need - average total cost of case management processes annually (standard cost) |
| \*\*Common Assessment Framework/Proportionate Assessment[[34]](#footnote-34): cost per assessment (overall mean cost) |

\*Category reduced to one measure

\*\*Newly added following recent workshop consultation input.

The costs associated with the components above are shown in **Table 4.2** below:

Table 4.2: Unit Costs by Toolkit Component Outcome 2015/16

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | Cost | Unit |
| Crime |
| Prevented anti-social behaviour | £675 | Per incident |
| Prevented a domestic abuse issue | £2,836 | Per incident |
| Prevented criminal behaviour leading to incarceration - adult | £34,840 | Per person per year |
| Prevented criminal behaviour - young person | £3,620 | Per person per year |
| Education |
| Reduced absence from school | £1,878 | Per person per year |
| Reduced permanent exclusion from school | £11,473 | Per person per year |
| Ensuring a child is ready to enter reception at school | £1,053 | Per person per year |
| Employment |
| Supported an individual to gain employment | £10,321 | Per claimant per year |
| Health |
| Addressed an alcohol misuse issue | £2,015 | Per person per year |
| Addressed a drugs misuse issue | £3,727 | Per person per year |
| Mental Health |
| Addressed an adult's mental health issue relating to depression or anxiety | £977 | Per person per year |
| Addressed a child / young person's mental health issue | £271 | Per person per year |
| Housing |
| Prevention of a complex eviction | £6,680 | Per incident/occurrence |
| Prevention of a simple repossession | £752 | Per incident/occurrence |
| Social Services |
| Prevention of a child taken into care | £52,676 | Per year |
| Average cost of child protection core assessment (overall) | £900 | Per person per year |
| Children in Need - average total cost of case management processes annually (standard cost) | £1,151 | Per person per year |
| Common Assessment Framework/Proportionate Assessment: cost per assessment (overall mean cost)\* | £1,515 | Per person per year |

Source: New Economy Manchester Unit Cost Database v1.4, 2015/16 costs.

\*in line with the requirements for proportionate assessment as prescribed by the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014[[35]](#footnote-35). See Table 4.1 for further details.

### Linking Cost Saving Components to National Performance Measures

Following confirmation of the components we have sought to link these to the current National Performance Measures (see **Table 2.3**). This is illustrated in **Table 4.3** below.

Table 4.3: Match of Families First National Performance Measures to Toolkit Cost Measures

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| National Performance Measure (Post-2017) | Definition | Link to Cost Saving Measure |
| Participants whose financial situation has stabilised or improved | * Enabled to maximise income
 | * Housing – Complex Eviction; Simple Repossession.
 |
| Primary school children who have improved their school attendance | * Reduced unauthorised absence
 | * Education – Persistent Truancy; Exclusion from School; Non- Readiness for School.
 |
| Secondary school children (up to the age of 16 years at the point of entry) who have improved their school attendance | * Reduced unauthorised absence
 | * Education – Persistent Truancy; Exclusion from School; Non- Readiness for School.
* Employment – Improved Work Readiness/Employment
 |
| Children who improve their speech, language and communication skills | * Ability to read, write, numeracy, and communication.
 | * Education – Non- Readiness for School.
 |
| Participant parents with improved ability to support their child’s learning and development needs. | * Understands key aspects of parenting including importance of early learning/education.
 | * Education – Non- Readiness for School.
 |
| Participants with improved emotional/mental wellbeing | * Improved confidence, relationships, mental health, positive feelings, reduced anxiety.
 | * Health - Adults with Depression or Anxiety; Children and Young People with Mental Health Needs.
 |
| Individuals that report an improvement in own resilience | * Better able to balance demands they face within existing capabilities.
 | * No specific direct links.
 |

Table 4.3 cont: Match of Families First National Performance Measures to Toolkit Cost Measures

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| National Performance Measure (Post-2017) | Definition | Link to Cost Saving Measure |
| Families that report an improvement in family resilience | * Better able to balance demands they face within existing capabilities.
 | * No specific direct links.
 |
| Families affected by disability that report an improvement in family resilience | * Better able to balance demands they face within existing capabilities.
 | * No specific direct links.
 |
| Families that report they feel they can contribute to changes to their lifestyle/behaviours | * Confidence building and ability to set goals and strategies.
 | * Crime – Anti-Social Behaviour, Domestic Violence.
* Health – Alcohol misuse; Drug misuse.
 |
| Individuals that report improved family relationships | * Positive family difference parent/child & parent/parent.
 | * Crime – Anti-Social Behaviour, Domestic Violence.
* Health – Alcohol misuse; Drug misuse.
 |
| Participant parents completing 75% or more of sessions of an evidence-based parenting programme. | * Completion of programme and positive distance travelled.
 | * Education – Non- Readiness for School.
 |
| Participant parents benefitting from an evidence-based parenting programme | * Completion of programme and positive distance travelled
 | * Education – Non- Readiness for School.
 |
| Parents benefitting from a parenting intervention | * Completion of programme and positive distance travelled
 | * Education – Non- Readiness for School.
 |

What this review highlighted was:

* The difficulty of matching the National Performance Measures to cost savings areas.
* That there are areas where demonstration of the cost savings could also illustrate attainment against a specific performance measures.
* That a key challenge is identifying cost measures aligned to measures of enhanced resilience for individuals, families and families affected by disability.

This last point is a critical challenge and in developing a common language of outcomes for Families First and the toolkit we reviewed the University of Brighton work on resilience and the definition they identify and sought to identify where elements of resilience could be linked to cost savings measures used in the toolkit.

**Figure 4.1** overleaf shows these areas which are highlighted below by the red symbol. In summary the areas where we identified that links could be made are shown in **Table 4.4** below.

Table 4.4: Linking Resilience and Cost Measures

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resilience Measure | Link to Cost Measure |
| Good enough housing. | * Housing – Complex Eviction; Simple Repossession.
 |
| Enough money to live on. | * Housing – Complex Eviction; Simple Repossession.
 |
| Make school/college life work as well as possible. | * Education – Persistent Truancy; Exclusion from School; Non- Readiness for School.
* Employment – Improved Work Readiness/Employment.
 |
| Map out career or life plan. | * Employment – Improved Work Readiness/Employment.
 |
| Develop life skills. | * Employment – Improved Work Readiness/Employment.
 |
| Understanding of boundaries and keeping within them. | * Education – Persistent Truancy; Exclusion from School; Non- Readiness for School.
* Crime – Anti-Social Behaviour, Domestic Violence, Adult Prison and Youth Justice.
 |

Where authorities are utilising a resilience development model as the foundation for their support through Families First they may wish to incorporate these dimensions into the cost savings assessments using the method outlined in **Section 4.4**.

Figure 4.1: Definition of Resilience and Links to Cost Saving Measures



Source: Hart and Blincow University of Brighton/boingboing.org.uk

## Cost Savings Toolkit

### Overview

In constructing the toolkit, that utilises costs for the areas shown above (**Table 4.1**), we have focussed on the following criteria:

* Data entry based on closed cases in the relevant financial year – involving a **five per cent sample of closed cases** to reflect local level resourcing and case volume between authorities with differently sized resident populations[[36]](#footnote-36). This would cover cases closed in that financial year with the understanding that a family might be rereferred to the programme in subsequent years
* Outcomes associated positive changes around Crime, Education, Employment, Health, Housing, Social Services.
* Graduated response on outcomes achieved to reflect distance travelled:
	+ Outcome achieved – explicit evidence that outcome has been achieved.
	+ Progress towards with support – support ongoing for number of sessions/weeks, some evidence progress has been made.
	+ Referred to support service by Families First/TAF.
* Assessments of impact/outcomes should reflect a more ‘positive’ assessment of what has been achieved with a family/individual where ‘verifiable’ evidence that those impacts/outcomes have been achieved.

The toolkit has been unable to incorporate any assessment of costs incurred in support delivery because no consistent single source of information is publicly available that would ensure a consistent approach to assessing the total costs saved through Families First delivery. For example, enabling the simple calculation:

**Total Savings Made as Calculated by Toolkit - Total Cost of Support Inputs in Financial Year**

It may be that through the National Coordinators group an agreed approach, perhaps using the total grant and other funding utilised to deliver Families First services, at a local authority level could be identified. Interview findings and discussions around the training workshops highlighted that some local authorities had already utilised similar calculations to identify this further picture of cost savings.

However, without agreement on this within the scope of this study we recommend that the National Coordinators group focus on this in future Pan-Wales meetings.

### Assessing Cost Measures Against Case Histories

**Table 4.5** overleaf provides a proposed addition for inclusion in the closure forms for Families First cases[[37]](#footnote-37). The table summarises the key cost measures included in the Toolkit and enables case workers to review at closure to identify where, in their professional judgement and evidenced by case notes and other monitoring tools where support has contributed to the prevention of escalation to more negative outcomes and/or greater statutory service support needs.

Table 4.5: Cost Saving Matrix for Case Closure Assessment for Totals Across Financial Year

|  |
| --- |
| **Identifying where Costs have been Avoided or Mitigated Through Families First Delivery** |
| **Financial Year:** |  |
| **Total Number of Closed Cases:** |  |
| **Total Number of Individuals Involved in Closed Cases:** |  |
| **Crime** | **Housing** | **Health** |
| Anti-Social BehaviourAch Pro Eng | Complex EvictionAch Pro Eng | Alcohol MisuseAch Pro Eng |
| Domestic ViolenceAch Pro Eng | Simple repossessionAch Pro Eng | Drugs MisuseAch Pro Eng |
| Adult Offender in PrisonAch Pro Eng | **Social Services** | Adults with Depression or AnxietyAch Pro Eng |
| Youth OffenderAch Pro Eng | Child taken into careAch Pro Eng | Children and Young People with Mental Health NeedsAch Pro Eng |
| **Education** | Average cost of child protection core assessment (overall)Ach Pro Eng | **Employment** |
| Persistent TruancyAch Pro Eng | Children in Need - case management processes (standard cost)Ach Pro Eng | Improved Work ReadinessAch Pro Eng |
| Permanent Exclusion from SchoolAch Pro Eng | Common Assessment Framework/Proportionate AssessmentAch Pro Eng |
| Non-Readiness for School (Reception)Ach Pro Eng |

**Key: Ach = Prevention Achieved; Pro = Progress towards; Eng = Engaged with Support.**

### Toolkit Data Entry

Data entry is supported by a toolkit that has been set up as an Excel Workbook hosted on an Egress Workspace that enables it to be used by each local authority in real time, but also provides an overall running Wales total as authorities enter their data including dashboard functionality. The workbook contains a specific worksheet that provides definitions of the cost categories to ensure consistent use across Wales local authorities.

This represents Version 2.0 of the toolkit and we would like for local authorities to further test it with the opportunity following this piloting to further refine the content and coverage of the toolkit in future years. Additionally, there is scope to extend the coverage of the toolkit as and when evidence and any additional associated cost saving information becomes available.

When undertaking data entry, reference should be made to the Toolkit Handbook that accompanies this report.

### Additional Assessment Approach

To further facilitate the use of the toolkit we propose that consideration be given at a local level to the use of a cost saving matrix within local authority needs assessment documentation. This would capture a baseline position of the case, illustrating where issues may already be apparent that relate to potential cost savings included in the toolkit.

At needs assessment, we propose that **Table 4.6** would be completed indicating where those issues might already be present for a family/individual so that at case closure cross reference could be made on whether those are areas where Families First support has led to impact or outcomes in those areas.

The National Coordinators group agreed that a Pan Wales approach to the use this process will be implemented.

Table 4.5: Proposed Cost Saving Matrix for Addition to Needs Assessment Documentation

|  |
| --- |
| **Potential Support Needs Identified at Assessment (Tick All That Apply)** |
| **Total Number of Individuals Involved in Case:** |  |
| **Crime** | **Housing** | **Health** |
| Anti-Social Behaviour  | Complex Eviction  | Alcohol Misuse  |
| Domestic Violence  | Simple repossession  | Drugs Misuse  |
| Adult Offender  | **Social Services** | Adults with Depression or Anxiety  |
| Youth Offender  | Child taken into care  | Children and Young People with Mental Health Needs  |
| **Education** | Average cost of child protection core assessment (overall)  | **Employment** |
| Persistent Truancy  | Children in Need - case management processes (standard cost)  | Work Readiness Issues  |
| Permanent Exclusion from School  | Common Assessment Framework/Proportionate Assessment  |
| Non-Readiness for School (Reception)  |

### Case Study Template

In addition, a further component of the cost toolkit that was requested by workshop delegates and agreed by the National Group of Families First projects was the opportunity to provide case studies as illustrative examples of the specifics of localised delivery, and its associated cost savings.

The case studies should be produced on 5-10 cases to provide a further picture of the nature of Families First delivery in each local authority area. Completion of the template should ensure:

* Full anonymity of the individual/family involved.
* Selection of a range of cases that illustrate the full range of support needs commonly found in the local authority from the simplest to the most complex.
* Use of content that can be shared with other colleagues from other local authorities including those from teams outside of Families First delivery.

We propose that these case studies should utilise the template below:

Figure 4.2: Families First Cost Saving Toolkit Case Study Template

|  |
| --- |
| **Local Authority:** |
| **Contact for Case Study:** |
| **Overview of Circumstances Leading to Referral:** |
| **Details of Needs Identified by Assessment:** |
| **Detail of Support Provided:** |
| **Description of Outcomes Achieved:** |
| **Performance Measures Relevant to the Case Study (Tick all that Apply)** |
| 2.1  | 2.2  | 2.3  | 2.4  |
| 2.5  | 2.6  | 2.7  | 2.8  |
| 2.9  | 2.10  | 2.11  |
| 2.12  | 2.13  | 2.14  |
| **Cost Saving Measures Achieved in the Case Study (Tick all that apply)** |
| Anti-Social Behaviour | Persistent Truancy | Alcohol Misuse |
| Domestic Violence | Permanent Exclusion from School | Drugs Misuse |
| Adult Offender in Prison | Non-Readiness for School | Adults with Depression or Anxiety |
| Youth Offender | Child taken into care | Children and Young People with Mental Health Needs |
| Complex Eviction | Simple repossession |
| Child protection core assessment |
| Children in Need - case management processes |
| Common Assessment Framework/Proportionate Assessment |
| Employment Readiness Improved | Employment Achieved |

### Data Sharing

The toolkit includes a data dashboard that provides an overview of cost savings made against specific measures whilst also highlighting total cost savings levels at a local authority level, and a percentage contribution made to an overall All Wales total.

Our interviews highlighted that local authorities were cautious about sharing total savings at local authority levels to avoid any ‘league table’ approaches to delivery assessment. This is primarily because the circumstances of delivery in each local authority area are very different depending on the needs of the population that live there and the resources and support services (commissioned and non-commissioned) that are available in each area.

However, we recommend that the National Coordinator agree how the first round of data of for the 2018/19 financial data might be reported within the group but also what might be shared with Welsh Government whether this be a top line total saving estimate for All Wales accompanied by case study templates or some other set of agreed content.

We further recommend that the National Coordinators groups also agree how the data derived from the tool kit might be further used at future meetings to potentially agree All Wales approaches to issues it might raise in understanding the nature of Families First delivery across Wales.

# Appendix 1: Workshop Attendees

**Families First Training Workshop – 26th June 2018**

**Delegate List**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Authority** |
| Ceri George | Cardiff Council |
| Emily Williams | Cardiff Council |
| Helen Johnson | Cardiff Council |
| Oliver Howells | Cardiff Council |
| Sean Maidment | Cardiff Council |
| Dominic Lewis | Swansea Council |
| Mike Davis | Swansea Council |
| Caroline Davies | Vale of Glamorgan Council |
| Debbie Maule | Vale of Glamorgan Council |
| Emma David | Vale of Glamorgan Council |
| Laura Braggins | Vale of Glamorgan Council |
| Laura Ellis | Vale of Glamorgan Council |
| Minna Moffatt | Vale of Glamorgan Council |
| Sarah Thomas | Vale of Glamorgan Council |
| Ve Van de Voorde | Vale of Glamorgan Council |

**Families First Training Workshop – 2nd July 2018**

**Delegate List**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Authority |
| Janine Patrick | Carmarthenshire County Council |
| Yvonne Hutchinson-Ruff | Carmarthenshire County Council |
| Juliette Hadley | Carmarthenshire County Council |
| Noeline Thomas | Carmarthenshire County Council |
| Liz Wilson | Carmarthenshire County Council |
| Suzanne Cromack | Carmarthenshire County Council |
| Alun Jones | Carmarthenshire County Council |
| Amy Wakefield | Carmarthenshire County Council |
| Cathryn Morgan | Ceredigion County Council |
| Billy Goodfellow | Ceredigion County Council |
| Rhian Rees | Ceredigion County Council |
| Alex Martin | Ceredigion County Council |
| Gary Proven | Ceredigion County Council |
| Anna Henchie | Ceredigion County Council |
| Emma Box | Ceredigion County Council |
| Amy Johnson | Powys County Council |
| Emma Peace | Powys County Council |
| Chris Gough | Powys County Council |
| Trish Mellor | Pembrokeshire County Council |
| Jodie Evans | Pembrokeshire County Council |
| Michael McAteer | Pembrokeshire County Council |
| Kelly Hunt | Pembrokeshire County Council |
| Stephen Jenkins | Neath Port Talbot Council |
| Allison Harris | Neath Port Talbot Council |
| Gemma Northey | Public Health Wales |
| Sarah Skinner | Pembrokeshire County Council |

**Families First Training Workshop – 17th July 2018**

**Delegate List**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Authority | Name | Authority |
| Anne Forsberg | Conwy County Borough Council | Sera Evans Jones | Other |
| Gerald Witherington | Conwy County Borough Council | Helen Edwards | Wrexham County Borough Council |
| Lesley Millband | Conwy County Borough Council | Debbie Jones | Isle of Anglesey County Council |
| Claire Mitchell | Denbighshire County Council | Wena Lloyd Williams | Isle of Anglesey County Council |
| Emma Jones | Denbighshire County Council |  |  |
| Gary Major | Denbighshire County Council |  |  |
| Jan Juckes-Hughes | Denbighshire County Council |  |  |
| Kath Price | Denbighshire County Council |  |  |
| Nicola Battams | Denbighshire County Council |  |  |
| Russ Davies | Denbighshire County Council |  |  |
| Victoria Wood | Denbighshire County Council |  |  |
| Barbara Bell | Flintshire County Council |  |  |
| Dave Chisnall | Flintshire County Council |  |  |
| Jane Turvey | Flintshire County Council |  |  |
| Kirsty Smallwood | Flintshire County Council |  |  |
| Pam Pritchard | Flintshire County Council |  |  |
| Sam Greatbanks | Flintshire County Council |  |  |
| Bethan Williams | Gwynedd Council |  |  |
| Bethan Wrench | Gwynedd Council |  |  |
| Caren Brown | Gwynedd Council |  |  |
| Dan Creek | Gwynedd Council |  |  |
| Eleri Stonehewer | Gwynedd Council |  |  |
| Lyn Owen-Hughes | Gwynedd Council |  |  |
| Medwen Williams | Gwynedd Council |  |  |
| Sara Elin Shorney | Gwynedd Council |  |  |

**Families First Training Workshop – 19th July 2018**

**Delegate List**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Authority / Organisation** | **Name** | **Authority / Organisation** |
| Linda Jones | Barnardos | Shirley Harrell | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council |
| Lindsey Dixon | Barnardos | Bridget Barnett | Monmouthshire County Council |
| Zoe Jones | Barnardos | Catherine Armiger | Monmouthshire County Council |
| Stephen Dobson | Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council | Louise Simpson | Monmouthshire County Council |
| Gareth Clarke | Caerphilly County Borough Council | Stephen Cooper | Monmouthshire County Council |
| Hannah Spokes | Caerphilly County Borough Council | Aimee Wilson | Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council |
| Joanne Davies | Caerphilly County Borough Council | Amy Williams | Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council |
| Karen Jones | Caerphilly County Borough Council | Claire Jones-Barnett | Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council |
| Michelle Jones | Caerphilly County Borough Council | Emma McCarthy | Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council |
| Natalie Daye | Caerphilly County Borough Council | Louise Linton | Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council |
| Rebecca Boulton | Caerphilly County Borough Council | Vanessa Dale | Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council |
| Samantha Baul | Caerphilly County Borough Council | Alexa Tudball | Newport City Council |
| Sandra Kendall | Caerphilly County Borough Council | Gareth Moseley | Newport City Council |
| Emma Davies | Exchange Counselling | Jane Lewis | Newport City Council |
| Jaime Tudor | Families First | Joel Nichols | Newport City Council |
| Susan Calnon | Families First | Martin Young | Newport City Council |
| Taryn Hudd | Merthyr County Borough Council | Meryl Aitken | Newport City Council |
| Angharad Allman | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council | Sue O'Brian | Newport City Council |
| Antony Mee | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council | Catherine Williams | Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council |
| Ceri-Ann Preece | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council | Cheryl Emery | Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council |
| Deb Ryan-Newton | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council | Joanne Davies | Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council |
| Diane Jones | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council | Lisa Lewis | Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council |
| James Watkins | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council | Mandy Perry | Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council |
| Lisa Bruford | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council | Paul Ellis | Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council |
| Nicola Milligan | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council | Gwyneth Davies | Torfaen County Borough Council |
| Rhian Moran | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council | Julie Kendall | Torfaen County Borough Council |
| Sarah Ostler | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council | Simon Rushton | Torfaen County Borough Council |
| Shirley Harrell | Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council | Kelly Woolls | Torfaen County Borough Council |

**Families First Training Workshop – 19th July 2018**

**Delegate List cont.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Authority / Organisation** |
| Bridget Barnett | Monmouthshire County Council |
| Catherine Armiger | Monmouthshire County Council |
| Louise Simpson | Monmouthshire County Council |
| Stephen Cooper | Monmouthshire County Council |

# Appendix 2: National Performance Measures from 2017

Table A2.1: Revised National Outcome Measures for the Families First Programme from 2017/18

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Old ref | New ref | National Performance Measure | National Performance Measure Definition | Examples of evidence(examples given are not wholly exhaustive) |
| 1 | **2.1** | Number and % of participants whose financial situation has stabilised or improved | The participant receives financial information or advice that enables them to maximise their income e.g.:• debt management• access to benefits• household budgeting• financial literacy | Appropriate evidence includes:• record of attendance at appropriate advice service (e.g. CAB) that participant was referred to by a Families First project• self-reported by participant through case review or service questionnaire• debt management plan undertaken• reduction in debt identified• confirmation of additional benefit e.g. letter from benefit provider |
| 7 | **2.2** | Number and % of primary school children who have improved their school attendance | The participant has reduced incidence of unauthorised absence (i.e. number and % of half days) over a quarter. | Appropriate evidence includes:• school attendance records or if not available self-reported at case review or through service questionnaire |
| 8 | **2.3** | Number and % of secondary school children (up to the age of 16 years at the point of entry) who have improved their school attendance | The participant has reduced incidence of unauthorised absence (i.e. number and % of half days) over a quarter. | Appropriate evidence includes:• school attendance records or if not available self-reported at case review or through service questionnaire |

Source: Welsh Government Families First Performance Framework, Nov 2017.

Table A2.1 cont: Revised National Outcome Measures for the Families First Programme from 2017/18

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Old ref | New ref | National Performance Measure | National Performance Measure Definition | Examples of evidence(examples given are not wholly exhaustive) |
| 9 | **2.4** | Number and % of children who improve their speech, language and communication skills | Speech, language and communication skills can be defined as the ability to read, write and communicate and to use mathematics at a necessary level to function and progress at work and in society.  | Appropriate evidence that demonstrates an improvement in speech, language and communication outcomes includes:• project provider's records of the numbers of clients reported through RBA report cards• distance travelled tools involving direct observations to monitor and record speech, language and communication development e.g.Wellcomm toolkit for early years practitioners• school reports• parental reporting |
| 11 | **2.5** | Number and % of participant parents with improved ability to support their child’s learning and development needs. | The participant demonstrates understanding of key aspects of parenting, including healthy diet, regular exercise and reading with their child (at least three or more times in a week). The participant also demonstrates an understanding of the importance of early learning, including the effect on later attainment, the importance of the home environment, parental interest and good pre-school provision. | Appropriate evidence includes:• case review or service questionnaire• evidence of attendance at an appropriate evidence-based parenting class or homework clubs etc. |

Source: Welsh Government Families First Performance Framework, Nov 2017.

Table A2.1 cont: Revised National Outcome Measures for the Families First Programme from 2017/18

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Old ref | New ref | National Performance Measure | National Performance Measure Definition | Examples of evidence(examples given are not wholly exhaustive) |
| 12 | **2.6** | Number and % of participants with improved emotional/mental wellbeing | Emotional/mental wellbeing includes areas such as life satisfaction, optimism, self-esteem, mastery and feeling in control, having a purpose in life, or a sense of belonging and support.With good emotional/mental wellbeing you are able to:• feel relatively confident in yourself – you value and accept yourself and judge yourself on realistic and reasonable standards,• feel and express a range of emotions, • feel engaged with the world around you – you can build and maintain positive relationships with other people and feel you can contribute to the community you live in, • live and work productively,• cope with the stresses of daily life and manage times of change and uncertainty.Number and % of participants accessing an activity/service which by their own judgement has helped make improvements in one or more of the following areas:• Confidence/self-esteem• Relationships• Mental health• Feeling positive• Reduced anxiety | Appropriate evidence includes:• distance travelled tools completed at start of intervention, at end of intervention, and 3 months after intervention• TOPSE evaluations – completed by projects as part of intervention• Five Ways to Wellbeing toolkit – completed by project as part of service delivery• completion of successful interventions – gathered through RBA cards as part of quarterly monitoring• step down from service engagement with service closed – gathered through RBA cards as part of quarterly monitoring• before and after completion of Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale indicating an improved score on the scalehttp://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/med/research/platform/wemwbs/  |

Source: Welsh Government Families First Performance Framework, Nov 2017.

Table A2.1 cont: Revised National Outcome Measures for the Families First Programme from 2017/18

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Old ref | New ref | National Performance Measure | National Performance Measure Definition | Examples of evidence(examples given are not wholly exhaustive) |
|   | **2.7** | Number and % of individuals that report an improvement in own resilience | Individuals feel there have been beneficial outcomes as a direct result of the intervention and are more able to balance the demands they face, within their existing capabilities. | Appropriate evidence includes:• project providers records of the numbers of clients reported through RBA report cards• participation at activities • self-assessment questionnaires• satisfaction questionnaires• distance travelled tool• Citizens perspective evaluation• Positive changes to the number of Step Up/Step Down rates. |
|   | **2.8** | Number and % of families that report an improvement in family resilience | Families feel there has been beneficial outcomes for one or more family members as a direct result of the intervention and are more able to balance the demands they face, within their existing capabilities.(Do not include families in this measure where a disability has been identified as they are included in the measure below) | Appropriate evidence includes:• project providers records of the numbers of clients reported through RBA report cards• participation at activities i.e. designed at upskilling the family to play together more or specialist counselling• self-assessment questionnaires• satisfaction questionnaires• distance travelled tool• Citizens perspective evaluation• reports of issues between family members decreasing• Positive changes to the number of Step Up/Step Down rates. |

Source: Welsh Government Families First Performance Framework, Nov 2017.

Table A2.1 cont: Revised National Outcome Measures for the Families First Programme from 2017/18

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Old ref | New ref | National Performance Measure | National Performance Measure Definition | Examples of evidence(examples given are not wholly exhaustive) |
| 14 | **2.9** | Number and % of families affected by disability that report an improvement in family resilience | Families, where a disability has been identified, feel there has been beneficial outcomes for one or more family members as a direct result of the intervention and are more able to balance the demands they face, within their existing capabilities. | Appropriate evidence includes:• project providers records of the numbers of clients reported through RBA report cards• participation at activities i.e. designed at upskilling the family to play together more or specialist counselling• self-assessment questionnaires• satisfaction questionnaires• distance travelled tool• Citizens perspective evaluation• reports of issues between family members decreasing• Positive changes to the number of Step Up/Step Down rates. |
| 15 | **2.10** | Number and % of families that report they feel they can contribute to changes to their lifestyle/behaviours | An intervention which focusses on confidence building and providing families with skills and knowledge to set and achieve goals and develop effective strategies. | Appropriate evidence includes:• project providers records of the numbers of clients reported through RBA report cards• self-assessment questionnaires• distance travelled tool• individuals express an increase in their ability, willingness and confidence to make and maintain progress • families are empowered to make changes to their lifestyle and behaviour |
| 16 | **2.11** | Number and % of individuals that report improved family relationships | Individuals report improved parent/child relationship, parent/parent relationship or report positive difference made to the family | Appropriate evidence includes:• self-assessment questionnaires• distance travelled tool |

Source: Welsh Government Families First Performance Framework, Nov 2017.

Table A2.1 cont: Revised National Outcome Measures for the Families First Programme from 2017/18

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Old ref | New ref | National Performance Measure | National Performance Measure Definition | Examples of evidence(examples given are not wholly exhaustive) |
| 17 | **2.12** | Number and % of participant parents completing 75% or more of sessions of an evidence-based parenting programme. | Approved evidence-based parenting programmes are defined in Chapter 6, paragraph 6.1 and Appendix B of the Parenting in Wales: Guidance on engagement and support.http://wales.gov.uk/docs/dsjlg/publications/cyp/140910-parenting-in-wales-guidance-en.pdf | Appropriate evidence includes:Record of attendance of an approved evidence-based parenting programme from the provider confirming 75% or more of sessions were attended |
| 17 | **2.13** | Number and % of participant parents benefitting from an evidence-based parenting programme | Approved evidence-based parenting programmes are defined in Chapter 6, paragraph 6.1 and Appendix B of the Parenting in Wales: Guidance on engagement and support.http://wales.gov.uk/docs/dsjlg/publications/cyp/140910-parenting-in-wales-guidance-en.pdf | Appropriate evidence includes:Confirmation from the provider that participant parents showed a positive distance travelled after attending the evidence based parenting programme, *using a standardised measurement tool. Examples of appropriate tools can be found in Appendix C of Parenting in Wales: Guidance on Engagement and Support* |

Source: Welsh Government Families First Performance Framework, Nov 2017.

Table A2.1 cont: Revised National Outcome Measures for the Families First Programme from 2017/18

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Old ref | New ref | National Performance Measure | National Performance Measure Definition | Examples of evidence(examples given are not wholly exhaustive) |
| 18 | **2.14** | Number and % of parents benefitting from a parenting intervention | Informal structured courses are defined in Chapter 6, paragraphs 6.2, 6.3 and Appendices D (One to One parenting Support and Home Visiting Programmes) and E (Group-based Parenting Support) of the Parenting in Wales: Guidance on engagement and support.http://wales.gov.uk/docs/dsjlg/publications/cyp/140910-parenting-in-wales-guidance-en.pdf | Appropriate evidence includes:• project providers records of the numbers of clients reported through RBA report cards• distance travelled tool• TOPSE evaluation• customer satisfaction survey• self reporting by completing a diary to track progress• self reporting questionnaire• support plans |

Source: Welsh Government Families First Performance Outcomes Framework Guidance Worksheet [[38]](#footnote-38).



1. See <http://gov.wales/topics/people-and-communities/people/children-and-young-people/parenting-support-guidance/help/families-first/?lang=en> for April 2017 Guidance document. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://gov.wales/docs/caecd/research/2014/140709-child-poverty-strategy-wales-final-en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See <http://gov.wales/statistics-and-research/national-evaluation-families-first/?lang=en> for more details of the three evaluation reports. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See statement by Carl Sargeant confirming wish to continue the funding of the Families First programme: <http://gov.wales/newsroom/people-and-communities/2016/161207-flying-start-families-first/?lang=en> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The latest evaluation reports can be found here: <http://gov.wales/statistics-and-research/national-evaluation-families-first/?lang=en> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See [http://www2.nphs.wales.nhs.uk:8080/PRIDDocs.nsf/7c21215d6d0c613e80256f490030c05a/d488a3852491bc1d80257f370038919e/$FILE/ACE%20Report%20FINAL%20(E).pdf](http://www2.nphs.wales.nhs.uk:8080/PRIDDocs.nsf/7c21215d6d0c613e80256f490030c05a/d488a3852491bc1d80257f370038919e/%24FILE/ACE%20Report%20FINAL%20%28E%29.pdf) for a full copy of the Public Health Wales report. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See the resilience report here: <http://www.wales.nhs.uk/sitesplus/888/page/94697> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Scottish Government (2007) Working with Hard to Reach Young People: A Practical Guide [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. See http://gov.wales/docs/dsjlg/publications/150327-child-poverty-strategy-walesv2-en.pdf for a copy of the strategy. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See http://gov.wales/docs/dsjlg/publications/150701-tackling-poverty-action-plan-2015-en.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. See http://gov.wales/about/programme-for-government/?lang=en [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. See http://gov.wales/docs/caecd/publications/161104-well-being-a-en.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. See http://gov.wales/docs/dsjlg/publications/cyp/170622-performance-management-framework-en.pdf for full details. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. See <http://gov.wales/statistics-and-research/national-evaluation-families-first/?lang=en> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. See <http://gov.wales/topics/people-and-communities/people/children-and-young-people/parenting-support-guidance/help/families-first/performance-measures-framework/?lang=en> for a copy of the document. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. These measures have been grouped so that they are clear for printing in black and white. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. See <http://gov.wales/docs/dsjlg/publications/cyp/170622-performance-management-framework.ods> for a copy of the Framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. See <https://www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru/research/pdf/NEET.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. See: <https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/560512/Troubled_Families_Local_Authority_Cost_Savings.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. See <http://www.neweconomymanchester.com/our-work/research-evaluation-cost-benefit-analysis/cost-benefit-analysis/unit-cost-database> for more details. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Representative from Denbighshire and Monmouthshire were unable to attend the scheduled sessions. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. See <http://www.neweconomymanchester.com/our-work/research-evaluation-cost-benefit-analysis/cost-benefit-analysis/unit-cost-database> for more details on the database and to access the latest version of costs it captures. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Responses were not received from Denbighshire, Monmouthshire, and Wrexham. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. See <http://www.topse.org.uk/site/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=131&Itemid=163> for more details. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. See <https://www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru/research/pdf/NEET.pdf> for a copy of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. See: [http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130404085927/https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RR346.pdf](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130404085927/https%3A//www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RR346.pdf) for a copy of the full report. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Coles, B. Godfrey, C. Keung, A. Parrott, S. and Bradshaw, J. (2010) 'Estimating the life-time cost of NEET:16-18 year olds not in Education, Employment or Training, University of York. Available at: <https://www.york.ac.uk/media/spsw/documents/research-and-publications/NEET_Final_Report_July_2010_York.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. See p. 64 <http://gov.wales/docs/caecd/research/2015/150930-evaluation-families-first-year-3-en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. See <https://www.brighton.ac.uk/resilience-for-social-justice/index.aspx> for more details. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. In line with individual resilience measures. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. In line with individual resilience measures. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. See <http://www.neweconomymanchester.com/our-work/research-evaluation-cost-benefit-analysis/cost-benefit-analysis/unit-cost-database> for full details. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. The Common Assessment Framework applies in England where the New Economy Manchester model has drawn its data from. However, the focus on Proportionate Assessment as advocated by the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act is strongly aligned with this and this measure reflects that Families First work can help prevent the need for Proportionate Assessment for some clients. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. See <https://gov.wales/topics/health/socialcare/act/?lang=en> for more details. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. **Note:** Authorities may if they wish use the toolkit to capture all closed cases in a relevant financial year. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. We also believe there is enough cross reference to other grant funded programmes including Flying Start and Supported People. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. See <http://gov.wales/docs/dsjlg/publications/cyp/170622-performance-management-framework.ods> for a copy of the Framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)