

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
PUBLIC SERVICE PLAZA
CIVIC CENTRE ROAD
HAVANT
HAMPSHIRE P09 2AX



Havant
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Telephone: 023 9247 4174
Fax: 023 9248 0263
Website: www.havant.gov.uk

Cleaner, Safer,
More Prosperous

CRIME AND DISORDER PANEL AGENDA

Membership: Councillor Patrick (Chairman)

Councillors Hart, Keast, Perry, Shimbart, Smith D, Thomas and Turner (Cabinet Lead)

Meeting: Crime and Disorder Panel

Date: Thursday 2 March 2017

Time: 5.00 pm

Venue: Hollybank Room, Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road,
Havant, Hants PO9 2AX

The business to be transacted is set out below:

Nick Leach
Monitoring Officer

22 February 2017

Contact Officer: Mark Gregory 023 9244 6232
Email: mark.gregory@havant.gov.uk

	Page
1 Minutes	1 - 2
2 Review of Havant Safety Partnership - Troubled Families Programme	3 - 94
3 Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policy Act 2014	

To receive an update from the Neighbourhoods Development Team Leader.

GENERAL INFORMATION

IF YOU WOULD LIKE A VERSION OF THIS AGENDA, OR ANY OF ITS REPORTS, IN LARGE PRINT, BRAILLE, AUDIO OR IN ANOTHER LANGUAGE PLEASE CONTACT DEMOCRATIC SERVICES ON 023 9244 6231

Internet

This agenda and its accompanying reports can also be found on the Havant Borough Council website: www.havant.gov.uk

Public Attendance and Participation

Members of the public are welcome to attend the Public Service Plaza and observe the meetings. Many of the Council's meetings allow the public to make deputations on matters included in the agenda. Rules govern this procedure and for further information please get in touch with the contact officer for this agenda.

Disabled Access

The Public Service Plaza has full access and facilities for the disabled.

Emergency Procedure

Please ensure that you are familiar with the location of all emergency exits which are clearly marked. In the unlikely event of an emergency an alarm will sound.

PLEASE EVACUATE THE BUILDING IMMEDIATELY.



DO NOT RE-ENTER THE BUILDING UNTIL AUTHORISED TO DO SO

No Smoking Policy

The Public Service Plaza operates a strict No Smoking policy in all of its offices, corridors, meeting rooms and toilets.

Parking

Pay and display car parking is available in the Leisure Centre car park opposite the Plaza.



Havant
BOROUGH COUNCIL
 Civic Offices, Havant, Hants, PO9 2AX
 Telephone (023) 9247 4174

This page is intentionally left blank

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Crime and Disorder Panel held on 26 January 2017

Present

Hart, Keast, Patrick (Chairman), Shimbart and Smith D

5 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Perry and Thomas.

6 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Crime and Disorder Panel on 14 November 2016 were AGREED as a correct record.

7 Discussion With Representatives of Agencies Involved in the Troubled Families Programme

The Panel invited Karen Gamblin (Supporting Families Employment Adviser, Department of Work and Pensions), Sam Cofie (Havant Service Manager, Motiv8) and Sarah Goodwin (Team Leader for Fareham, Gosport, Havant and East Hampshire, Barnardos) to discuss their experiences of working in the Troubled Families Programme and any issues they had faced. The Neighbourhood Support Team Leader and Community Safety Officer were also present to answer any members questions.

The discussion covered the background of the programme, the experience of the agencies working within the programme and any areas that could be improved moving forward.

The following areas were discussed:

- One of the key aims for the Troubled Families Programme had been to improve partnership working between the relevant agencies. It was the view of the officers present that this had been successful;
- The experience of the Troubled Families Programme had initially presented a steep learning curve as officers adapted to new working practices, but these were now considered to be 'business as usual';
- It was the experiences of the officers present that families had been more receptive to multiple agencies being involved in their support. In each case, a single contact was established to lead on their support and this helped ensure a person was available to co-ordinate any issues;

- The success of the Programme was evident in the reduction of families repeatedly visiting the Council in need of support;
- The addition of the DWP to the Troubled Families Programme had enabled access to important advice and guidance for families;
- The use of quantitative aspects to measure the success of the scheme such as school attendance or employment status did not reflect all the positive impacts on families. The predicted success rate under these criteria for families with intensive support was 30%. However, officers commented that almost every family that had agreed to participate had benefitted from the process.
- There had been instances where differences in IT platforms had resulted in issues in the past. This had been resolved however with improved co-ordination between the agencies.

In response to questions from the Panel, the officers identified the following areas as possible changes to be made to the programme:

1. Relaxation of timescales in relation to the contracted intensive support service for working with families – this would allow for work to continue when needed past the scheduled timescales. It was accepted however that budgetary and contractual obligations made this a challenging area. The Panel were reassured that no family was left without support at the end of the intensive support package.
2. Restraints on data sharing – While the programme had greatly improved the circulation of data between agencies in the programme, it was difficult to get any information from DWP. This could improve the programme as several potential nominations visit Job Centre Plus, but current processes do not allow for them to be referred this way; and
3. Extension of Grants – An extension for County grants to be given over a 3 year period would allow for long-term planning and resource allocation by partners.

The Panel thanked the officers for their attendance and their contribution to the discussions.

The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and concluded at 6.10 pm

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Crime and Disorder Panel

2 March 2017

Review of the Troubled Families Programme

FOR RECOMMENDATION

KEY DECISION NO

REPORT BY: Crime and Disorder Panel

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This review was undertaken to review the effectiveness of the Safer Havant Partnership with regard to dealing with troubled families.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The Scrutiny Board recommend to Cabinet that;

2.1.1 Hampshire County Council be requested to relax the scheduled timescales for working with families within the Troubled Families Programme to allow for full support to be given;

2.1.2 Hampshire County Council be requested to extend the length of grant funding to be given over a three year period to allow for long-term planning and resource allocation; and

2.1.3 The Department of Work and Pensions be requested to allow for the access of data for agencies within the Troubled Families Programme.

3.0 RESOURCES:

3.1 The above recommendations can be delivered within the existing budget.

4.0 LEGAL:

4.1 The Department of Work and Pensions currently restricts the sharing of information on the grounds of confidentiality. It is unclear whether they would be willing to share this information within the Programme.

5.0 STRATEGY:

5.1 The Troubled Families Programme is a key example of how the Council looks to work with partners to help ensure the health and well being of residents, while also promoting partnership working to realise financial efficiencies.

6.0 RISKS:

6.1 There are no risks arising from the contents of this report.

7.0 COMMUNICATIONS:

7.1 N/A

8.0 FOR THE COMMUNITY:

8.1 The recommendations seek to improve the processes and procedures of the Troubled Families Programme and allow for better support for vulnerable families within the Borough.

9.0 METHODOLOGY

9.1 The Council is required to review how the Havant Safer Partnership discharges its function every year. In view of the wide range of functions delivered by the Partnership it was decided to limit this year's review to the procedures and processes involved in the Troubled Families Programme

9.2 The Crime and Disorder Panel held an initial meeting with the Neighbourhood Development Team Leader and Community Safety Officer to discuss the procedures and processes of the Troubled Families Programme.

9.3 From this discussion, the Panel identified four agencies to interview further on their experiences of working within the Programme. Representatives from Barnardos, Motiv8 and the Department of Work and Pensions met with the Panel and held a detailed discussion with members on the Programme. There was no response to the invitation sent to Havant Academy.

9.4 Full details of the methodology of the project are set out in the separate Findings Pack.

10.0 KEY FINDINGS

10.1 The Panel were pleased to note that there had been tangible successes to the Troubled Families Programme. All agencies interviewed felt that the aim for improved partnership working had been a big success that had allowed for support to be delivered in a more effective manner to vulnerable families and individuals.

10.2 The multi-agency approach allowed for a wide range of support and advice to be available for vulnerable families, and also ensured that the relevant

support was easier to access. The addition of the Department of Work and Pensions in particular had enabled access to important advice and guidance.

- 10.3 There were however areas within the Programme that could be improved. The criteria for evaluating the success rate of the Programme only measured outcomes by statistics (such as improvements in the percentage rate of school attendance), and did not consider other positive impacts on families.
- 10.4 The timescales set out in the Programme in some cases had proved inadequate. As of April 2016, agencies had a maximum timescale of 6 months engagement with a family, which raised concerns as some vulnerable families may not receive full support from the Programme due to these restrictions. Recommendation 2.1.1 seeks to relax these timescales to allow for families to receive a full support package.
- 10.5 One of the areas that the agencies identified for possible improvement is the timescales for the allocation of Hampshire County Council grants. Grants were allocated on an annual basis which inhibited the partnership agencies from making long term plans for this much needed service and made it difficult to properly allocate resources to this service..
- 10.6 Although the Programme had allowed for improved partnership working, it had proved difficult to access information held by the Department of Works and Pensions and in particular for the DWP to refer families who visit their job centres to this Programme..
- 10.7 Full details of the findings of the project are set out in the separate Findings Pack.

Appendices

None

Background Papers

Findings pack for the review

Contact: Councillor Diana Patrick
Title: Chairman of the Crime and Disorder Panel
Telephone: 02392 482480
E-Mail: diana.patrick@havant.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

FINDINGS PACK

Review of the Havant Safer Partnership

Crime and Disorder Panel

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
PUBLIC SERVICE PLAZA
CIVIC CENTRE ROAD
HAVANT
HAMPSHIRE P09 2AX

Telephone: 023 9247 4174
Fax: 023 9248 0263
Website: www.havant.gov.uk

2017

		Page
A	Introduction	1 - 2
B	Recommendations	3 - 6
C	Panel Membership	7 - 10
D	List of Contributors	11 - 14
E	Methodology	15 - 18
F	Key Findings	19 - 22
G	Supporting Troubled Families Programme in Hampshire	23 - 42
H	Performance Reports	43 - 48
I	Independent Evaluation of the Hampshire Supporting (Troubled) Families Programme	49 - 56
J	Hampshire County Council- Supporting (Troubled) Families Programme Update Report	57 - 68
K	Key Partners	69 - 72
L	Agencies Brief	73 - 78
M	Meeting Notes	79 - 86

Introduction

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Recommendations

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Scrutiny Board recommend to Cabinet that;

- (a) Hampshire County Council be requested to relax the scheduled timescales for working with families within the Troubled Families Programme to allow for full support to be given;
- (b) Hampshire County Council be requested to extend the length of grant funding to be given over a three year period to allow for long-term planning and resource allocation; and
- (c) The Department of Work and Pensions be requested to allow for the access of data for agencies within the Troubled Families Programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

Panel Membership

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Crime and Disorder Panel

Scrutiny Lead:

Councillor Patrick

Panel Members:

Councillors Hart, Keast, Patrick, Perry, Shimbart, Smith D and Thomas

Cabinet Leads who Assisted in the Review:

Councillor Turner (Cabinet Lead for Communities and Housing)

The attendance record for meetings of the Panel is shown below:

Attendance Record – Panel Members

Councillor	Total Expected Attendances	Present as Expected	Absences (Inc Apologies)
Councillor Hart	3	2	1
Councillor Keast	3	3	0
Councillor Patrick	3	3	0
Councillor Perry	3	1	2
Councillor Shimbart	3	3	0
Councillor D Smith	3	3	0
Councillor Thomas	3	1	2

Attendance Record – Guests

Councillor	Total Attendances
Councillor Francis	1

Attendance Record – Cabinet Lead

Councillor	Total Attendances
Councillor Turner	1

This page is intentionally left blank

List of Contributors

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Contributors to the Review

Who?	Contribution	When?
<i>Tim Pointer - Neighbourhoods Development Team Leader</i>	Provided information and advice on the Troubled Families Programme	Throughout the whole review
<i>Harriet Scotney – Community safety Officer</i>	Provided information and advice on the Trouble Families Programme	Throughout the whole review
<i>Karen Gamblin – Supporting Families Employment Adviser, Department of Work and Pensions</i>	Discuss her experience of working with the Troubled Families programme.	26 January 2017
<i>Sam Cofie – Havant Services Manager, Motiv8</i>	Discuss his experience of working with the Troubled Families programme.	26 January 2017
<i>Sarah Goodwin – Team Leader for Fareham, Gosport, Havant and East Hampshire Barnados</i>	Discuss his experience of working with the Troubled Families programme.	26 January 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Methodology

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

SCOPE

Section 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 requires the Council to scrutinise the way in which Havant Safer Partnership discharge their functions.

In view of the wide range of functions delivered by the Partnership, the Panel decided to limit their review to the way the partnership delivers the Troubled Families Programme

Link with the Corporate Strategy and Business Plans

One of the key aspects of the Council's Corporate Strategy is a commitment to making the Borough and pleasant and safe place to live.

Benefits to the Council and Its Residents

Residents and local business owners alike benefit from safer communities.

The Project Included

Interviews with

- Neighbourhoods Development Team Leader
- Community Safety Officer
- Agencies included in the Safer Havant Partnership

This page is intentionally left blank

Key Findings

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

KEY FINDINGS

The Panel were pleased to note that there had been tangible successes to the Troubled Families Programme. All agencies interviewed felt that the aim for improved partnership working had been a big success that had allowed for support to be delivered in a more effective manner to vulnerable families and individuals.

The multi-agency approach allowed for a wide range of support and advice to be available for vulnerable families, and also ensured that the relevant support was easier to access. The addition of the Department of Work and Pensions in particular had enabled access to important advice and guidance.

There were however areas within the Programme that could be improved. The criteria for evaluating the success rate of the Programme only measured outcomes by statistics (such as improvements in the percentage rate of school attendance), and did not consider other positive impacts on families.

The timescales set out in the Programme proved inadequate. As of April 2016, agencies had a maximum timescale of 6 months engagement with a family, which raised concerns as some vulnerable families may not receive full support from the Programme due to these restrictions. Recommendation 2.1.1 seeks to relax these timescales to allow for families to receive a full support package.

One of the areas that the agencies identified for possible improvement is the timescales for the allocation of Hampshire County Council grants. Grants were allocated on an annual basis and recommendation which inhibited the partnership agencies from making long term plans for this much needed service and made it difficult to properly allocate resources to this service..

Although the Programme had allowed for improved partnership working, it had proved difficult to access information held by the Department of Works and Pensions and in particular for the DWP to refer families who visit their job centres to this Programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

Supporting Troubled Families Programme In Hampshire

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Supporting Trouble Families Programme in Hampshire

Havant Local Coordination Group Terms of Reference

Local Coordination Group: Havant
Senior Responsible Officer: Harriet Scotney

Programme Vision Statement

The Supporting Troubled Families Programme in Hampshire aims to target appropriate support in a better co-ordinated and more efficient way at those families with a troubled lifestyle. This will make lasting positive changes to the lives of families in Hampshire, which will benefit local communities and future generations, whilst also providing long term savings to the public purse.

Overall Programme Aims and Objectives

The Supporting Troubled Families Programme (STFP) in Hampshire will develop a new model of cross agency working to drive real lasting change to some of the most vulnerable families and communities in Hampshire.

This will seek to prevent the escalation of problems which lead to poor long term outcomes for families with complex needs, and therefore avoid significant future costs to public services.

It will focus on improving the effectiveness of targeted preventative interventions, and work with cross agency partners at a local level to improve the coordination of existing interventions at the family level and maximise the efficiency and effectiveness of public sector spend.

The programme will seek to deliver a sustainable and lasting change to at least 100 Havant families per year (until 2020) whilst also working with partners to ensure that other families do not fall into troubled status.

Who are "Troubled Families"?

It is intended that the families included within the programme are high need families which potentially constitute a high cost to the public purse. Many of these will already be known to the variety of public sector agencies involved in working with disadvantaged families in Havant.

Troubled families are characterised by meeting **two of the following six** criteria:

1. **Crime/anti social behaviour** – Households with 1 or more under 18 year olds with a proven offence in the last 12 months and/or where 1 or more member has an anti-social behaviour order, anti-social behaviour injunction, anti-social behaviour contract or where the family has been subject to a housing-related anti-social behaviour intervention in the last 12 months.
2. **Education** – Households where a child has been subject to permanent exclusion, 3 or more fixed school exclusions across the last 3 consecutive terms; or is in a pupil referral unit or alternative provision because they have previously been excluded or is not on a school roll; and/or a child has had 5% unauthorised absences or more from school across the last 3 consecutive terms.
3. **Work** – Households which also have an adult on DWP out of work benefits.
4. **Children who need help** – Early Help Hub cases, Pre school children who do not thrive, children going missing.
5. **Parents and children with a range of health problems** – Adults or children with mental health problems, Adults or children with substance or alcohol problems. Obesity and malnutrition concerns.
6. **Families affected by Domestic Violence and Abuse** – victims of domestic violence or domestic abuse or perpetrator of domestic abuse.

Families who meet all of the criteria will automatically be included within the programme, but a **local discretion** filter can be applied for families who **meet any two** of the criteria above. This local discretion will be agreed with each Local Coordination Group.

Supporting Trouble Families Programme in Hampshire

Local Discretion Filters

Local discretion filters can be used to determine locally families that are cause for concern. However, **in order to draw down DCLG funding, the family must meet two of the three criteria identified above.** The LCG can identify a range of issues to prioritise and identify these families who are high cost to the public purse. Filters may include:

- Families containing a child who is on a child protection plan;
- Families subject to frequent police call-outs or arrests or containing adults with proven offences in the last 12 months;
- Families where a child is of concern to the Headteacher of a school and or the SRO

Objectives for the Local Coordination Groups (LCG's)

The programme will establish LCG's across Hampshire, these will comprise of senior cross agency representatives determined by local partners. The LCG's will work closely with the overall programme team to support the design and delivery of the STFP at a local level within Hampshire.

It is expected that these groups will be flexible and dynamic, making best use of existing partnerships and local knowledge and influence.

Key objectives for LCG's are:

- Work with the Supporting Troubled Families Programme team to use local knowledge and discretion to confirm the troubled families cohort;
- Identify the types of intervention that will be successful at a local level;
- Inform the design and delivery of centrally commissioned interventions to ensure they deliver local need and agreed outcomes;
- Develop and take ownership of family plans for each of the families included within the cohort;
- Commission and/or oversee the delivery of some targeted interventions at a local level;
- Take responsibility for delivering a more coordinated cross-agency and joined up approach to family intervention at the local level;
- Share the risks of the payments by results (PBR) financing provided by central government;
- Where appropriate, identify additional resources from local organisations who will directly benefit from the successful outcomes of early intervention and prevention;
- Review local performance at a family level and provide a consistent performance monitoring return on a quarterly basis;
- Provide key links and maximise effective working with existing local partnerships.

Funding will be made available to support the development of these groups.

Funding will also be available for the groups to work locally with providers in new ways to deliver interventions for families around a single family plan. Funding will be granted on an outcome based risk share basis.

Local resources will be critical to the long term success of this programme and it is expected that all agencies will gain financial benefit from successful targeted early interventions for high cost families.

Havant Local Coordination Group Membership


Supporting Trouble Families Programme in Hampshire


Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) - Harriet Scotney

Representatives from

Hampshire County Council
Local Schools
Department of Work and Pensions
Transform Lead
Youth Offending Team
School Nurses
Action for Children
MOTIV8
Havant Police
Childrens Services
Home Start
MIND
Active Communities Network (ACN)
Fire Service
Housing providers

Programme Governance





Full Screen
Close Full Screen

Supporting Families in Hampshire

A new start

Trying to deal with more than one problem can make it difficult for families to get the right help and support. Many families have issues relating to:

- Children in trouble with the police
- Children not going to school
- Finding it hard to get a job
- Getting the right help and support
- Not coping, or getting depressed
- Physical or mental health problems
- Drugs and alcohol
- Domestic violence or abuse in the home
- Risk of homelessness
- Unhealthy weight or malnutrition

Many families tell us they know help is available, but trying to get the right help from the right organisation at the right time is not always easy.

Supporting Families in Hampshire is a new way of doing things – providing extra practical help early on to stop problems getting worse.

We ask families about the things that are important to them, about the things that might help and what we can do differently to support them. This is how we start working together to get things back on track

What help is available?

It will vary from family to family and will depend on the sort of support you need. For example, some families may need help with getting children to school regularly and help with finding work.

Others may have family members involved in crime or with addiction problems. Some may have all of these and more.

What's different about this?

Supporting Families is about working with the whole family, not just the children or a single family member.

Each family will have a main point of contact that they get to know, who will help coordinate support services with them and who they can contact when they want to talk about things or need further help. We also work with you to put together a single family plan for help and support.


What's in it for my family?

When we talk to families, most say they want support and encouragement.

They want to be listened to, have their needs understood, have people do what they say they are going to do and to get back to them, and they want services that work for, not against them.

The aim is not just to fix problems but to help people discover their own abilities and become more independent.

This is what we hope you will get from being involved in Supporting Families.



How long does the help last for?

We would expect to be working with you for anything from a few months to a year and beyond.

What happens if I don't want to take part?

You don't have to take part, but we would really like you to join the programme, which can help you deal with a range of difficult issues— from truancy, unemployment and offending to difficult behaviour/relationships, housing, alcohol/drugs and budgeting.

The programme can help, if you are facing: threat of eviction; prosecution because your children are not going to school regularly; court action for anti-social behaviour or offending.

What happens next?

If you and your family want to know more, we will arrange a meeting with you and start work on building your family plan together.

Once you're happy with the plan, we will all sign it, and regularly look at it together to make sure that you continue to get the help and support you need.

Data-sharing

In order to identify and support families who need help Hampshire County Council and partner organisations share relevant personal information with each other.

Personal information of individuals is also shared for research purposes and to evaluate the programme.

For further information please see:

www.hants.gov.uk/families/supporting-troubled-families/about-troubled-families or ask your local coordinator.

Contacts:

Central Programme Team

Telephone – 01962 847773

Email troubled.families@hants.gov.uk

Local area contact:

For more information, visit:

www.hants.gov.uk/supporting-troubled-families

© Hampshire County Council Supporting Families Project
Version 3 - August 2015

Supporting Families in Hampshire



Havant Supporting Families Plan



FAMILY NAME: [REDACTED]			
LEAD NOMINATING AGENCY FOR THIS FAMILY: Portsmouth City Council Housing			
Name:	[REDACTED]	Role:	Housing Officer
Team:	Leigh Park Office	Contact Tel:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]		
Details of professional completing STFP summary: As Above			Date Information collated: 31/10/2016

Programme Criteria:

Please note that families **must meet at least two of the six family problems** (1-6) to be eligible for the programme, each family. Families only meeting one family problem will need to be discussed with the central STFP support team prior engagement.

(1) EDUCATION:

Households where a child:

Who in the household does this apply to?

- Has less than 90% school attendance for an average across the last 12 months.
- Has received at least 3 fixed term exclusions in the last 3 consecutive school terms;
- At primary school has had at least 5 school days of fixed term exclusion in the last 12 months;
- Of any age who has had at least 10 days of fixed term exclusion in the last 12 months;
- Has been permanently excluded from school within the last 3 school terms;
- Is in alternative educational provision for children with behavioural problems.

Child 1

Comments:

(2) ASB/CRIME:

Households including:

Who in the household does this apply to?

- An adult or child with a recorded anti-social behaviour (ASB) incident in the last 12 months.
- A child who is known to YOT and has committed a proven offence in the previous 12 months.
- An adult prisoner who is less than 12 weeks from release date and will have parenting responsibilities on release.
- An adult who is currently subject to licence or supervision in the community, following release from prison, and has parenting responsibilities.
- An adult currently serving a community order or suspended sentence, who has parenting responsibilities

Mother

Comments:

(3) CHILDREN WHO NEED HELP:

Households where a child:

Who in the household does this apply to?

- Has been identified and assessed as needing early help.

Whole Family

Havant Supporting Families Plan



<input type="checkbox"/> Is not taking up the free Early Years Education offer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Has developmental delays identified at the 2 year old health check	
<input type="checkbox"/> Does not achieve a Good Level of Development (GLD) and in particular does not achieve the expected or greater level of development in all Personal Social Emotional Development aspects	
<input type="checkbox"/> Has been reported missing from home	

Comments:

(4)EMPLOYMENT AND RISK OF FINANCIAL EXCLUSION: Households where:	Who in the household does this apply to?
● An adult is in receipt of out of work benefits.	Mother
<input type="checkbox"/> A young person who is about to leave school, has no/ few qualifications and no planned education, training or employment.	
<input type="checkbox"/> A young person is not in education, training or employment	
● The family received a warning letter for breach of tenancy	Mother
● The family member received a notice of Seeking Possession (NOSP)	Mother
<input type="checkbox"/> The family member received an eviction order	
<input type="checkbox"/> The family is in rent arrears and/or has unmanaged debts (for example credit card loans, school meals)	

Comments:

(5)DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND ABUSE: A household where:	Who in the household does this apply to?
<input type="checkbox"/> A young person or adult known to local services as having experienced domestic violence or abuse in the last 12 months	
<input type="checkbox"/> A young person or adult known to the police as having perpetrated an incident of domestic violence or abuse in the last 12 months	
<input type="checkbox"/> The household has been subject to a police call out for a domestic incident in the last 12 months	

Comments:

(6)FAMILIES WITH HEALTH PROBLEMS: Households where:	Who in the household does this apply to?
<input type="checkbox"/> An adult with mental health problems who has parenting responsibilities or a child with mental health problems	
● An adult with parenting responsibilities or a child with a drug or alcohol problem.	Mother

Havant Supporting Families Plan



A child or an adult is affected by excess weight (overweight, obesity)

A child or an adult is affected by malnutrition

Comments:

Family composition and details - include all those living in the family home

Family address (including postcode): [REDACTED] Havant PO9 [REDACTED]

Family's telephone numbers: [REDACTED]

Full name	D.O.B. EDD	Sex	Family member? e.g. Mother father, child	Which criteria did the family member meet
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	F	Mother	OOW Risk of financial Exclusion
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	M	Child	Education Mental Health
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	F	Child	
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	M	Child	

N.B Tab down to increase number of rows

Details of any other significant family members (include DOB, relationship, and address if different):

[REDACTED] not in the family home

Details of professionals currently involved with any of the family members:

Worker Name	Supporting Who	Role/Team/Agency	Contact details	Consulted during assessment
[REDACTED]	Family	Social Worker CP	[REDACTED]	Y
[REDACTED]	Family	Housing Officer		Y
				Y/N
				Y/N
				Y/N
				Y/N
				Y/N



What is known about the child and the family (previously received support)?

	Briefly describe the support received	When?	Who delivered support?
Learning and Behaviour	Child is a non attender at school and this is an on ongoing issue	Ongoing	XXXX Senior School
Offending	██████ has recently been released from prison this year but will not be returning back to the property have a number of offences and has parenting responsibility.	2015	Probation Service – Havant
Mental Health			
Domestic Violence/abuse			
Housing/Financial exclusion	The family are at risk of losing their tenancy due to known youth entering and causing ASB	On going	████████████████████ housing pcc
Substance misuse	Referral made to the Orion centre for substance misuse	2015	Declined Appointment
Health			
Employment			
Other - define			

Further information about the family

Child(rens) first language	English	Parent(s) first language	English
Is an interpreter or signer required?	N	Has this been arranged?	N
Family GP	Middle Park Way Practice	Family ethnicity	White British

Havant Supporting Families Plan



Details of any family member's disability	None Known		
Are there any known risk factors (e.g. lone working / home visiting)	[REDACTED]		
Any other relevant information <i>Refugee/asylum seeker</i>	[REDACTED] and now released but he is not returning back to the family home.		

Supporting Families High Level Family Plan



Known key issues and areas of support; please be clear whether the priority area/need/action is for an individual family member or the whole family.

Actions must include those relating to the relevant family problems.

Priority area –identified need –	How has the need been identified?	Proposed next steps –Action –	By who?	What resources will be available to the family? What is additional?	How will the action impact on the individual/family and improve outcomes?
Improving educational attendance and outcomes	<p>█████ attends XXX – 87% attendance. Younger child is not registered with a nursery or a pre school.</p> <p>XXX attendance reflects on poor boundaries and parenting within the home – no bedtime routines and will often be in school with unwashed uniforms or in correct uniform.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transform to contact XXX and agree a way ahead TAF Meeting to be made in school – so actions can be confirmed To check if funding has been applied for school for the younger children Parenting Support to be implemented within the home – routines/home conditions 	<p>Transform –</p> <p>Xxx Family Support Worker</p> <p>Xxx secondary school</p>	<p>Regular progress reports to see what are the outstanding needs – TAF Meetings every six weeks</p> <p>To look at school for the younger children – are they attending any settings/ have funding been applied for?</p> <p>Practical support around morning/bedtime routines to be implemented</p>	<p>All children to have the ability to leave school with some good educational qualifications and have the ability to access higher education or employment</p> <p>Attendance to remain over 90%</p> <p>Younger children to be attending</p> <p>Children to have the correct uniform</p>
Reducing crime/anti-social behaviour	<p>Family are living in a XXX Property and they are at risk</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To work with Mother around her behaviour and her responsibility to 	<p>Transform</p> <p>█████ Housing –</p>	<p>Empowering change</p> <p>Sustaining Tenancy</p>	<p>Family to be able to remain in their current accommodation</p> <p>Children not to be exposed to</p>

Supporting Families High Level Family Plan



	<p>of losing it as Mother has previously had youths in the property that have been a risk and continues to cause low level anti social behaviour</p>	<p>maintain her tenancy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting the needs of the children first • Engagement to be met with housing at all times • To safeguard the children at all times 	<p>██████████</p>	<p>Parenting Groups to be sought - Mother to be educated and supported around her parenting ability</p> <p>Putting things into practice</p>	<p>youths within the property</p> <p>Family home to be maintained</p> <p>Routines to be in place so children do not have comings and goings</p>
<p>Improving outcomes for children who need help</p>	<p>Case was discussed at the Havant Early Help Hub; children have been subject to Child in Need Plan historically, mother unable to sustain change.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been identified that Mother is in need of intensive support particularly around parenting and prioritising her children's educations and health needs. 	<p>STFP – Transform</p>	<p>Support from Transform under the STFP Programme</p> <p>To monitor engagement</p>	<p>Supporting the family on an intensive services- improving the lifestyles of families , empower change and helping parents with the tools and strategies to parent effectively and pass on life skills to their children</p> <p>Reinstating the basics within the household</p>
<p>Getting adults into work and reducing financial exclusion</p>	<p>Mother is out of work and on benefits, ██████████ property is also at risk due to recent reports of ASB.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transform to liaise with ██████████ housing and to ensure that engagement is met at all times • Long term plan – to see if there is any plan for mother to go back to college or look for part time employment 	<p>Transform</p>	<p>121 support for mother</p> <p>Long term plan – mother to be supported in looking at part time employment or education placements</p>	<p>Family to be able to remain in their property</p> <p>121 support for mother – Looking at her needs / confidence/ self esteem</p> <p>To be a positive role model</p>

Supporting Families High Level Family Plan



<p>Parenting</p>	<p>It has been identified that mother need support around prioritising health appointment for the children, being a protective factor, morning routines and parenting. On previous visits to the property the conditions have been poor and the children have been very dirty.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referral to the family links nurturing programme • Parenting Strategies • 121 support for mother from Transform around parenting • Bedtime routine to be implemented • Housing routine to be implemented 	<p>Transform</p>	<p>Empowering change</p> <p>Making positive steps towards the future</p> <p>Being a positive role model for the children</p> <p>Engaging with services</p>	<p>Mother to be able to care for her children appropriately</p> <p>Mother to be able to provide the basics</p> <p>Children to be clean and tidy</p> <p>Mother to have the ability to prioritise the needs of her children and parent effectively</p>
<p>Improving Family Health Problems</p>	<p>Mother is not taking Child 3 to all his health appointments. Children look grubby and not looked like they have been bathed. There has been a concern that mother smokes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transform to speak to the school nursing team to see if child 1 has any outstanding medical needs – immunisations • To contact the Health Visiting Team for joint working • To ensure that the 	<p>Transform</p> <p>School Nurse Health Visiting Team</p>	<p>Signposting to agencies</p> <p>Ensuring all children's health needs are met</p> <p>Ensuring mother has all the relevant information with regards to health</p> <p>Bedtime/Morning Routines – to ensure children's needs are met and</p>	<p>All children to be up to date with their immunisations</p> <p>Family to be healthy and be able to live a healthy lifestyle</p> <p>All children to be registered to a dentist and doctors</p>

Supporting Families High Level Family Plan



	Cannabis	children are cared for appropriately	wellbeing is met
FSW Target Summary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case to be allocated within 10days of being received • FSW to arrange a TAF within 30 days • Parenting Support • Housing Support • Unemployment Support • Educational Support • Health support • Quarterly SafetyNet updates • Clear Step-down/closure summary to be added to SafetyNet 			

Has this Family Plan been shared/discussed with the family? <i>(if answered yes please seek information sharing consent below)</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Action Plan to be confirmed/agreed with the family by? <i>(the Action Plan should be agreed within six to eight weeks, and reviewed at least every eight weeks)</i>	Date:

Notes/views/comments:
 (Please indicate if these are the comments of the child / young person, parent / carer and /or the person completing this summary)

Supporting Families High Level Family Plan



Information Sharing Consent*:

I understand that information gathered regarding myself and my family will be used only for the purpose of providing, coordinating and evaluating services to my family under the Hampshire Supporting Families Programme.

I agree that information about me can be shared with other professionals and organisations where this is necessary to provide coordinate and evaluate services to support the family under the supporting families programme. I understand that this may include health organisations, police, youth offending team, criminal justice, registered social landlords, DWP, education, housing and social care services and also services that have been obtained both locally and across Hampshire to co ordinate, evaluate and provide support to families on the programme.

I understand that information about me will only be shared without my consent if the information suggests a person is at serious risk of harm or to prevent a crime being committed. Where the information suggests significant harm to an infant, child or young person local safeguarding children board procedures will be followed and this has been explained to me.

Parent/Carer/ Signature:

Name:

Date

Supporting Families High Level Family Plan



Young Persons/ Signature:

Name:

Date

Professional's Signature:

Name:

Date

**Please note that consent to share information should be sought for each family member, aged 12 and over.*

This page is intentionally left blank

Performance Reports

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Havant Local Performance Report - Year 5 (Phase 2)

Families Nominated*

	Oct	Sept
Open	61	49
Closed	58	47
Nominated to Transform	3	7
<small>since April 2016</small>	35	25

Families nominated under the following Criteria




	Oct	Sept
Health	56	44
Children Who Need Help	48	38
Education	44	35
Employment and Finance	25	23
ASB/Crime	11	10
Domestic Violence and Abuse	11	9

Nominations From

	Oct	Sept
Early Help Hub	41	30
Education	5	5
Children's Services	5	4
Homestart	2	2
PCSO	1	2
SDAS	1	2
Action for Children	1	1
Little Gems Nursery	1	1
PCC-Housing Officer	1	1
Health Visitor	1	1
Refuge Project Worker	1	1
Health Visitors	1	1
Total Nominations	61	49

Lead Agencies

	Oct	Sept
TRANSFORM	31	24
Havant Community Safety	5	6
MOTIV8	8	7
Home Start	4	3
Schools - Havant	3	2
SDAS	2	2
Action for Children	1	1
MIND	5	4
None	2	0
Total Nominations	61	49



Number of Families nominated under

	AUG	Jul
2 criteria	12	10
3 Criteria	30	22
4 Criteria	4	12
5 Criteria	5	5
6 Criteria	0	0
Total	61	49

Source Nominations to EHH

	Oct	Sept
Education	24	17
CAMHS	1	1
Locality team	2	1
Homestart	1	1
Health Visitor	2	1
Unknown	10	8
Active Communities	1	1
Total Nominations	41	30

Nominations from schools

	Oct	Sept
	30	23
	49%	47%


Single Parent Families

	Oct	Sept
	34	25
	56%	51%



Supporting Troubled Families monthly highlight report

Families against Target to date



Area	Havant	Period	October 2016
Families engaged (ytd)	98	Havant	Overall 502
Transform nominations to date	98		777
Target nr of families (ytd)	81		391
Max Transform target (ytd)	163		1334
Target nr of families for Year 5	11		98
Nr of successful Phase 2 outcomes claimed			

LCG	Apr-16	May-16	Jun-16	Jul-16	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Nov-16	Dec-16	Jan-17	Feb-17	Mar-17
Families without a Lead Agency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transform												
Phase 2 nominations (YTD)	10	10	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Nr of families actively engaged with	0	2	5	9	15	16	20	20	20	20	20	20
Step downs (qtr planned)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Step downs (ytd)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Families open over 12 months (of	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nr of families (Phase 1 + 2) assigned	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Nr of Phase 2 families engaged w	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Nr of Phase 2 families achieving 5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

*including	*not including
families on waiting list	Case withdrawn by SRO
	Did not engage
	Family moved out of area
	Case escalated <3 month open transform
	Inappropriate Referral/Criteria not met



Havant Local Performance Report - Cohort 5

01-Feb-17

Families Nominated Phase 5 **94** Open 60 Closed 34

Nominated to Transform **48**

Families nominated under the following Criteria


Education	70	74%
ASB/Crime	20	21%
Children Who Need Help	69	73%
Employment and Risk of Financial exclusion	40	43%
Domestic Violence and Abuse	18	19%
Families with Health Problems	75	80%

Nominations From


Police	1	1%
Havant EHH	27	29%
Home Start	7	7%
Education	46	49%
MIND	3	3%
AfC	1	1%
SDAS	2	2%
Ports CC	1	1%
Havant Health	2	2%
ACN	4	4%
Total Nominations	94	100%

Lead Agencies


	Open	Overall	
Home start	6	7	7%
Transform	23	48	51%
PBSS Primary Behaviour Support Service	2	2	2%
Education	11	13	14%
AfC Action for Children	1	1	1%
Motiv8	5	10	11%
locality	1	2	2%
SDAS Southern Domestic Abuse Service	2	2	2%
HNQ Havant Neighbourhood Quality	2	2	2%
MIND	3	3	3%
ACN Active Communities Network	4	4	4%
Total Nominations	60	94	100%



Criteria	Count	Percentage
2 Criteria	16	17%
3 Criteria	54	57%
4 Criteria	22	23%
5 Criteria	2	2%
6 Criteria	0	0%
Total	94	100%



Source	Count
Havant R&A	6
Education	19
CIN Team	0
Unknown	2
Total Nominations	27



Category	Count	Percentage
Single Parent Families	57	61%

Category	Count	Percentage
Nominations from schools	65	69%
Nominations Led by Schools	13	14%

Months	<1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Families open	5	3	8	8	6	6	9	2	0	11	1	0	1	60

This page is intentionally left blank


Independent Evaluation of the Hampshire Supporting (Troubled) Families Programme

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Case studies of families receiving support from Hampshire's Supporting (Troubled) Families Programme

Professor Carol Hayden, with Sukh Hamilton

OCTOBER, 2014

"We normally say 'Supporting Families'.....We just try and miss the 'troubled' out."

(staff)

"I am the happiest mum, honestly. If you asked me this a year ago, I'd probably... these are happy tears in my eyes."

(mother)

"She would get back...if she's in a meeting and the meeting took two hours, she would phone me after that two hours. If she was in a meeting that took another five minutes, she would phone me in five minutes. She gets back to me as soon as she can, she's just...my life support at the moment!"

(mother)

"[we've] actually got somebody that's started to listen to us instead of fobbing us off...."

(mother)

"...it was nice just to feel a part of things, to feel involved and obviously I was getting out soon so I was going to be involved, but I think [the support worker] kind of went out of his way to involve me earlier than maybe other people would have."

(father who had recently returned home from prison)

"I feel more positive and more in control.....They [the children] know if I say something now I mean it. Like all kids, they're going to try, and I'm like, 'no, that's it now'..... They know that I'm not going to buckle like I used to. It's just getting yourself back in control really, and with a little bit of help and support you can do it."

(mother)

"I wanted to say, thank you....Well, how they did it this time was that they came out. It was the right person. They weren't pompous. I'm not trying to say that, but that's how other people speak. They weren't stuck up."

(mother)

"I just think for me, they need to realise how valuable this is in terms of not just for us as a family but for other families that need help as well. There's an ongoing commitment to keeping a service like this because it's a massive thing to kind of come from where we've come from and to be where we are now. We couldn't have done that just on our own and yes, like the service that these guys provide is invaluable really for us and it will be for a lot of other people."

(father)

"I think it's just about people doing this job because they want to do it, and they genuinely care and have a passion for the people that they're working for, to make a difference and get the right outcome from them, and even with the housing, not to give up, tap into any other avenues that you can tap into as a support worker."

(staff)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The report is based on **11 in-depth case studies** of families, who had made positive progress in Hampshire's Supporting Troubled Families Programme (STFP) during 2013-2014. Each case study involved STFP staff obtaining informed consent from the family, the provision of some background information on the case. Staff introduced the researcher (face-to-face) to the family in all but one case, where the introduction was by telephone. Each case study included an interview with family members and a separate interview with staff.

The focus of the interview was to capture what kind of help the family had experienced from the STFP, the progress the family and staff perceived they had made and their evaluation of aspects of the programme. Families were asked about the kind of help and support they had experienced in the past; and, what had been most and least helpful. Staff interviews had matched themes, so that perspectives on a case could be compared.

The case studies set out to capture the **complexity of family needs**, identify common needs and issues across families, as well as use each case study to illustrate some aspect of the issues families present to the programme, alongside the focus of the national criteria.

Family composition and circumstances

Who lived together in a household as a family was often complex and dynamic: 8 of the 11 households had some change in who lived together during (or after) the support from STFP. Typically this involved teenage or young adult children moving out (or back) into the main household.

- ↓ Family type: single parents (5); both birth parents (4); includes one step-parent (2)

Families were large with a wide range in the age of children (to the same birth mother):

- ↓ Mean **family size** at the time of interview: **5.2**
Mean **number of children to the same birth mother**: **5**; typically the age range was from a few years old to late teenage/young adult
Mean number of **children and young people resident** in the same household: **3.6**
- ↓ 10 of the 11 families lived in rented accommodation
- ↓ 4 of the 11 families were in full-time employment before the intervention
- ↓ All families had at least one child with school attendance, exclusion or behaviour problems

- ↓ 10 of the 11 families had at least one child or young person who was involved in crime and/or ASB

Common issues across cases (in addition to the three main national criteria)

- ↓ **Housing problems (10 of 11 cases):** debt or arrears (5); overcrowding (3); cleanliness/household conditions (2); damage to property from violent behaviour (1); not suitable for children – upstairs flat (1). One family was facing eviction at the time of interview.
- ↓ **Health issues (10 of 11 cases):** mental health (6); physical (5)
- ↓ **Child protection, child in need (10 of 11 cases):** past (5); ongoing (3); recent (2). Child development was a concern in all cases.
- ↓ **Parenting (8 of 11):** concerns were wide-ranging. All 8 cases included concerns about behaviour management and boundary setting. Other concerns included: emotional abuse (1) and neglect (1), cleanliness and hygiene (1)
- ↓ **Domestic violence (7 of 11 cases):** said to be in the past in 4 cases; current in 3 cases, including one clear case of child to parent violence.

Other themes highlighted by the case studies

As well as the already complex family circumstances and changing household composition and the issues highlighted above, case studies illustrate particular additional problems (or specific aspects of problems) and considerations for how the STFP works with families. These include:

- ↓ The timing and nature of social services involvement with a family
- ↓ Child to parent violence
- ↓ Special educational need and learning disability
- ↓ Teenage pregnancy
- ↓ Parent returning home from prison

Evaluation of support provided

Families were very appreciative of the personal qualities of staff; supporting the argument that **'who works'** may be more important than arguments about **'what works'**.

Families were generally **positive about the changes they had made** and were optimistic that they could sustain them. At the same time most families had one individual (at least) about whom the spokesperson added some caveats, about their potential impact on the household. In general STFP staff endorsed these latter concerns.

Table 1: Overall evaluation of aspects of the help and support provided or co-ordinated

1= 'not at all'

5 = 'to a great extent'

Extent to which the help/support provided or co-ordinated (staff) or received (family)	Staff mean (n=10)	Family mean (n=10) ¹
Take account of the needs of the whole family	4.1	4.6
Involve bringing in help from other professionals	4.2	4.7
Take account of the priorities of the family	4.7	4.8
Focus on practical problems	4.5	4.8
Do something different	4.3	4.5

Table 1 illustrates the strength of positive experiences from both practitioners and families, in relation to key aspects of what STFP is setting out to do. Families gave more positive ratings in all respects, compared with practitioners.

Table 2: Extent to which the family changed in a positive way because of the help/support received

1= 'not at all'

5 = 'to a great extent'

Staff mean (n=10)	Family mean (n=10)
4.3	4.3

Staff and family mean ratings in Table 2 are almost the same. Many of the comments made around the ratings given revealed that both staff and families also wanted to give some credit to family members for being able to make changes.

Table 3: Extent to which the positive changes in the family can be maintained (whether the changes made are 'sustainable')

1= definitely CANNOT be maintained

5= definitely CAN be maintained*

Staff mean (n=10)	Family mean (n=10)
4.2	4.5

¹ Totals in Tables 1-3 are based on 10 cases because one interview followed a child protection conference which would be highly likely to invalidate the family responses.

Services used in the past

Most families had used **a range of support services in the recent past (some were still ongoing)**. Children's services (both social services and school/education based services) were universal, as were police call-outs for a range of reasons. GPs were cited as sources of past (and usually ongoing) support in 9 cases. Other commonly cited services included housing (9); CAMHS (8); YOT (or equivalent) (8). Less common were domestic violence services (5), adult mental health (4); probation (3); children's centres (3); youth work (3); substance misuse (2). A very wide range of 'other services' had been involved with 5 families. These included: NSPCC, Salvation Army, Prince's Trust, Citizen's Advice Bureau, and various counselling services.

Key messages from families and staff

↓ From families these included:

How people communicate with them and whether calls were responded to promptly
The importance of the personal qualities of the STFP staff
The need for one person to act as a meaningful contact

↓ From staff these included:

A reminder that there are no quick fixes to complex family situations
A difference of opinion about the merits of SafetyNet
Positive comments about their role and working with other services
The need for flexibility

Conclusions: changes made and programme criteria

The families in the case studies in this report are coping with multiple problems but have made some positive changes with the help of the STFP. In the main, the families and staff are optimistic about maintaining the changes made. However, most still have major issues to deal with, some are ongoing (such as SEN, mental and physical health, particular relationships within the immediate family) others are more immediate (such as eviction). So the demands on staff of working in this context cannot be over emphasised.

- ↓ The case studies show very complex family situations with professionals working with a wide range of issues and individuals across families.
- ↓ Getting these families engaged and making positive change is a major achievement.
- ↓ There is evidence throughout these case studies of behavioural and practical changes made with the support of STFP.
- ↓ There is also evidence of progress to work and family members getting into paid work within these case studies.
- ↓ Families appreciate the family centred approach, the personal qualities and enthusiasm of staff. This was often contrasted with what they had experienced in the past (and were still experiencing in some cases).

Hampshire County Council
– Supporting (Troubled)
Families Programme
Update Report

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Message from Cllr Mans

Lord Bourne Visit

Phase 2 family nominations

Staff changes in the Central Team

Commissioning update

Family Case Study

Message from Cllr Keith Mans

Many of you will have seen the recent negative headlines about the national evaluation of the Troubled Families Programme. I have to say that the criticisms levelled at the national programme are not congruent with our [your] hard work and the experience here in Hampshire.



This is supported by the independent evaluation provided by the University of Portsmouth back in September 2015, an academic partnership arrangement we are seeking to replicate for the second phase of the programme. Amongst the recent publicity we were pleased to see a more balanced view (which refers to our own evaluation) published in The Guardian.

I know we are continuing to identify 'real' families with 'real' complex problems through effective local multi-agency arrangements. The positive family outcome results we have claimed for are only submitted for families who have made evidenced positive progress against one or more of the criteria under which they are nominated. We aim to build resilience within families through our interventions that can help them to overcome other existing or future problems that they may encounter.

We are seeing real transformative practice from partners that support whole family working and places families at the centre of decision making and prioritises their needs leading to better outcomes for staff and families.

This programme aims to break the cycle of inter-generational problems within families. This isn't a programme focusing solely on money in versus money out; this is about costs avoided now and in the future.



This page is intentionally left blank

**HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
HAMPSHIRE PARTNERSHIP**

Date considered:	10 November 2016	Item: 3
Title:	Supporting (Troubled) Families Programme Update Report	
Directorate:	Children's Services – Hampshire County Council	

Contact names: Ian Langley

Tel: 01962 845722

Email: ian.langley@hants.gov.uk

1. Purpose

- 1.1. To provide the Hampshire Partnership with an overview of progress made in both Phase 1 (2012-15) and the first part of Phase 2 (2015/16 onwards) of Hampshire's Supporting (Troubled) Families Programme (STFP). It also provides a summary of the independent academic evaluation of Phase 1 of the programme by the University of Portsmouth.

2. Introduction

- 2.1 The Supporting (Troubled) Families Programme (STFP) in Hampshire was established in May 2012 and is led by a small central team based at the County Council which since 2013 has included a senior Police Officer. As with all Local Authorities nationally the County Council is the accountable body for the programme
- 2.2 From the outset the STFP programme has been fortunate to have high level support both at political and senior officer level from agencies across the county. To enable the programme to make a strong start the County Council invested £1.4m of its own money in the programme alongside Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) grants.
- 2.3 The principles of the national Troubled Families programme, as set out below, align with the County Council's own transformational ambitions up to and beyond 2020;
- a) Improved outcomes and lasting positive changes to the lives of families.
 - b) Greater inter-agency co-operation and more effective partnership working.
 - c) Reducing the current and future costs of high need families on the public purse.
 - d) Challenging and changing the way we work, not just more of the same.

e) Demonstrating to communities where families reside that positive and sustained change has been made.

2.4 Communicating the transformational ambition to key stakeholders such as Head Teachers and GP's has been critical to our success. For example, we have distributed thousands of two sided postcards summarising the programme to professionals across Hampshire (see below).

Hampshire's Supporting (Troubled) Families Programme
Phase 2

The goal: to target 5,600 Hampshire families with multiple, complex issues, delivering solutions to persistent problems that lead to lasting, positive change for families and communities.

How:

- **Early Help** - tailored and intensive support
- **Single family plans** - putting the whole family at the centre of service planning
- **Co-ordinated multi-agency approach** - local services working more effectively together
- **Transforming the way we work** - local innovation, system changes, dedicated, assertive and persistent approach.

Hampshire County Council
 Email: troubled.families@hants.gov.uk Web: www.hants.gov.uk/supporting-troubled-families

Hampshire's Supporting (Troubled) Families Programme

Who:

Targeting families with problems relating to:

- **Crime** and anti-social behaviour
- **Education**, children not in school
- **Worklessness**, adults on out-of-work benefits
- **Young people not in employment**, education or training
- **Problems with drugs** and/or alcohol
- Physical or **mental health problems**
- **Domestic violence** and abuse
- **Families at risk of homelessness** or unmanaged debts
- **Young children failing to thrive**
- **Unhealthy weight** and/or malnutrition concerns

The result:

- Children attending school regularly
- Parents and young adults in jobs or training
- Lower levels of crime or anti-social behaviour
- Improved physical and mental health
- Reduced number of reported domestic incidents
- Children with increased levels of development and health check scores
- Families working better as a unit, able to look after and support each other

Hampshire County Council
 Email: troubled.families@hants.gov.uk Web: www.hants.gov.uk/supporting-troubled-families

3. Phase 1

3.1 In Phase 1 families with children with poor school attendance, young people offending, family members committing anti social acts or claiming out of work

benefits were targeted for support. By the end of 2014/15 Hampshire had exceeded the (DCLG) phase 1 target to identify/engage 1590 families by identifying/engaging an additional 372 families.

- 3.2 This performance enabled Hampshire to maximise the amount of grant drawn down from DCLG both for attaching families to the programme, an average of £2,400 per family.
- 3.3 In terms of Phase 1 positive family outcomes (referred to by DCLG as 'turning families around'), an average of £1600 reward grant per family was available. In total Hampshire secured £1.8m of reward grant (which has been reinvested in the programme) however, the achievement of the transformational ambition (see 2.3) has been the bigger prize rather than the chasing of reward grant.
- 3.4 Tracking of positive phase 1 family outcomes a year after submission to DCLG shows the sustainability of outcomes with 4 out of 5 families still with improved school attendance, reduced school exclusions/anti social behaviour/youth offending or remaining in employment.
- 3.5 The two year follow up of 459 phase 1 families for whom a positive family outcome was recorded with DCLG for education and anti-social behaviour between July 2013 and August 2014 shows half of those families would still meet the reward claim criteria demonstrating sustainability of progress made.
- 3.6 The strong progress in relation to identifying/engaging the cohort of (troubled) families and positive family outcomes reported to DCLG in phase 1 enabled Hampshire to commence phase 2 of the programme three months early on 1/1/15.

4. Phase 1 Independent Academic Evaluation

- 4.1 In 2012 Hampshire commissioned an independent academic evaluation of the first phase (2012-15) of our local Supporting (troubled) Families Programme (STFP) from the University of Portsmouth led by Prof Carol Hayden. We believe it to be the most comprehensive evaluation of the programme from any Local Authority area. The evaluation started in early 2013 and the final report was completed by September 2015.
- 4.2 The final evaluation report is available on our website via the following link <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/childrens-services/universityofportsmouth-evaluationreport-july2015.pdf>
- 4.3 The evaluation consisted of a multi-method approach involving the collection and studies, analysis of local programme data and in depth interviews with families and front line staff who had participated in Hampshire's STFP. The evaluation concluded (p4);

'Hampshire's STFP is promoting positive change in professional practice with families. There is more inter-agency co-operation and understanding, better information sharing, more targeted work with families, more whole family working, more positive experiences for service users.....The STFP also

appears to be a more cost effective way of responding to families with multiple and complex needs.'

- 4.4 The above conclusion from the evaluation demonstrates a programme that moves beyond transactional and process driven activity towards a programme that challenges service culture, delivery and transformation for both the benefit of the public purse and more importantly for the benefit of families. It also demonstrates movement toward the transformational ambition described in 2.3.
- 4.5 The evaluation report (p31) also notes;
- a) **87.9% reduction in the prevalence of families with a child persistently absent from education from baseline to comparison year**
 - b) **54.9% reduction in the prevalence of families experiencing temporary exclusion from baseline to comparison year**
 - c) **48.4% reduction in the prevalence of families with a young offender (with a record of offending with the Youth Offending Team) from intervention to comparison year.**
- 4.6 Section 5 (p32) of the evaluation includes an economic assessment of the programme which provides **an estimate of 'costs avoided' to the public purse** (in terms of reduced police call outs, reduced benefit claims and reduced growth of Looked After Children numbers) **of £2.4m per annum**. It is notable that this figure does not include health or housing costs.
- 4.7 Much of this is in contrast to the findings of the national Troubled Families evaluation published by DCLG on 17/10/16 which is currently the subject of an enquiry by the Public Accounts Committee. Hampshire County Council have submitted evidence to the inquiry including the independent academic evaluation of phase 1 by the University of Portsmouth.
- 4.8 STFP is currently conducting a commissioning process to appoint an independent academic provider to undertake an evaluation of Phase 2 (2015-2020) of the programme. This evaluation which will include an economic assessment of health and housing costs which were not included within the Phase 1 evaluation. It is intended that this report will be finalised in 2019 to inform Hampshire's strategy beyond 2020 when the programme is likely to end.
- 5. Phase 2**
- 5.1 In December 2014 the Government announced Phase 2 of the Troubled Families Programme 2015 to 2020 would significantly increase the number of families nationally to be targeted for support from 120,000 to 400,000 families. The three criteria used to identify families in phase 1 (see 2.1) were extended by DCLG in Phase 2 to include families with children who need help and those experiencing domestic abuse issues or health problems (6 criteria in total).

- 5.2 This has meant a significant increase in the number of families (5540) Hampshire is now required to identify/engage and where possible 'turn around' by the end of Phase 2 in 2019/20. On average Hampshire needs to identify/engage 1108 families per annum (92 per month) which is over double the Phase 1 average of 530 families each year (44 per month).
- 5.3 In Phase 2 DCLG have reduced attachment fees to £1000 per family with £800 available as a reward for 'turning around' families against any of the 6 family criteria that may apply to each family, making the claiming of reward grant significantly harder.
- 5.4 Poor Health is the most prevalent issue within families (55% of phase 2 families nominated under this criterion) and of these 4 out of 5 are for mental health issues. This need has been recognised by the lead Clinical Commissioning Group in Hampshire for children and young people (NE Hants and Farnham CCG) by the attachment of a senior health manager to the STFP central team to improve partnership working with key professionals such as GP's, School Nurses and Health Visitors.
- 5.5 Significant numbers of families are also nominated under the poor school attendance, requiring early help and being in receipt of out of work benefits criteria. There are also notable numbers of families nominated for anti-social behaviour, rent arrears/financial difficulties and domestic abuse issues.
- 5.6 Comparison with other Local Authority areas indicates that the proportion of families identified with domestic abuse issues is lower in Hampshire than most areas. The senior Police Officer within the STFP central team is establishing stronger links within Hampshire Constabulary to ensure families where domestic abuse is/has occurred who would benefit from STFP support, are not missed.
- 5.7 Few families are nominated with adult offenders, with young people with developmental issues, at risk of eviction or with malnutrition issues. Discussions have taken place with the Hampshire Community Rehabilitation Company to ensure that families with adult offenders with parenting responsibilities are considered for nomination to the programme.
- 5.8 In the first year (2015/16) of Phase 2 Hampshire 'carried over' the 372 additional families nominated in Phase 1 (see 2.3) which enabled it to exceed the DCLG target (1223) for that year by 226 families. As a result Hampshire in agreement with DCLG claimed additional attachment fees for 200 of those families (200k) at the end of 2015/16.
- 5.9 The first part of 2016/17 has seen an 11.5% reduction of families nominated on average each month compared to the previous year, although activity is still significantly higher than it was in Phase 1. It is notable that Early Help Hubs, a significant source of family nominations for phase 2, have also seen a slowdown in activity during this period.
- 5.10 The current projection for end of 2016/17 indicates Hampshire will fall short of the DCLG target by about 200 families. Whilst there is no financial risk in 2016/17 to

the programme, if this trend continues the financial risk will increase in terms of a reduction in DCLG attachment fees that can be drawn down.

- 5.11 An action plan is in place to remedy the slowdown in nominations. Any support members of the Hampshire Partnership can provide to promote the programme within their own agencies to increase nominations of families to the programme would be valued.

6. Phase 2 Positive Family Outcomes

- 6.1 There is no doubt that because positive family outcomes must be sustained for at least six months (an academic year for school attendance) against all of the family issues (up to six rather than two or three in phase 1) there is a higher success threshold in phase 2 compared to phase 1. The only exception remains where a family member claiming an out of work benefit enters and continues in employment for a least 6 months for which a claim can be made in its own right.
- 6.2 September 2015 (26 claims) and January 2016 (72 claims) saw the first reward claims for 98 positive family outcomes under the new and more challenging phase 2 reward criteria. A further 120 reward claims have been submitted in the current reward window which if accepted by DCLG will bring the total to 218.
- 6.3 The one remaining claim window in 2016/17 (November – December 2016) has just been extended by DCLG into the first quarter of 2017. The current trajectory of positive family outcomes would suggest a claim of a further 100 to 120 positive family outcomes by the end of 2016/17. This would give a total approaching 340 for 2016/17 and a success rate of 25.5% which is significantly lower than the phase 1 success rate.
- 6.4 All the positive family outcomes submitted to DCLG by Hampshire have been subject to scrutiny by Hampshire County Council's internal auditors as well as a DCLG spot check on 16/9/16. Formal written feedback on the DCLG spot check is still awaited but the verbal feedback given has been largely positive.

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

- 7.1 Progress has been made toward the transformational ambition described in 2.3. Nethertheless, it is clear that whilst HCC may be the accountable body for STFP it cannot alone ensure the success of the programme and continuing partnership working across Hampshire is crucial to the continuing success of the programme.
- 7.2 The Hampshire Partnership are asked to note;
- a) The positive independent evaluation of the STFP in Hampshire.
 - b) Sustainability of outcomes for families for whom a positive family outcome was claimed one and two years previously.
 - c) The strong performance in Phase 1 and in the first year (2015/16) of Phase 2 of the programme.
 - d) Promote the STF Programme within their own agencies to increase the numbers of families nominated to the programme and enable their staff to lead on family work where appropriate.

STFP Key Actions for 2016/17

- Identify/engage at least 1334 families.
- Positive family outcomes recorded for at least 500 phase 2 families.
- Review Hampshire's Troubled Families Outcome Plan (TFOP) taking account of learning from the Phase 2.
- Ensure STFP is aligned with the new 0-19 Family Support Service.
- Increase nominations of families by health/housing/Police/Probation.
- Improve the quality of health/housing data to demonstrate outcomes.
- Increase involvement with and engagement of Mental Health partners
- Undertake first one year follow up of Phase 2 positive family outcomes.
- Continue to undertake 2 year follow up of phase 1 positive family outcomes.
- Establish the STFP budget for each financial year up to/including 2019/20.
- Ensure re-commissioning of Intensive Family Support is completed for new contract to start on 1/4/17.
- Innovation Grant round to encourage involvement of local volunteers or families who have been on the programme to support families currently on the programme.
- Appoint independent academic evaluator for Phase 2.
- Increase FareShare use to assist communities with food/furniture issues
- Review STFP Governance arrangements

This page is intentionally left blank

Key Partners

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Key partners delivering under Supporting Troubled Families (Havant)

<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Contact Details</u>	<u>Main point contact</u>
Motiv8 South	The Hub, 39 Park Parade Leigh Park PO9 5AA 02392 470484	stevie.waight@motiv8south.org.uk
Havant & East Hants MIND	Leigh Park Community Centre, Dunsbury Way, Havant PO9 5BG	maria@easthantsmind.org
Home Start Havant	Mill Hill Early Years Centre/Mill Rd, Waterlooville PO7 7DB	maggie.e@homestart-havant.org.uk
Havant Early Help Hub	Havant Plaza PO9 2AZ	Andy.kennedy@hants.gov.uk
Active Community Network	Leigh Park Community Centre, Dunsbury Way, Havant PO9 5BG	julian@activecommunities.org.uk
Portsmouth City Council Housing	Leigh Park Housing Office Wecock Farm Housing Office	Leigh Park Housing Office Wecock Farm Housing Office
Karen Gamblin	STF Employment Coordinator	karen.gamblin@dwp.gsi.gov.uk
Havant Academy	Wakefords Way, Havant PO9 5JD	A.Blandford@havantacademy.co.uk
Woodlands Education Centre	52 Norden Way, Havant PO9 4AF	A.Miller-Adams@woodlands.hants.sch.uk
Prospect School	Freeley Road, Havant Hampshire PO9 4AQ	pbroadhurst@prospectschoolhavant.com
Primary Behaviour Support Service	Mill Road Waterlooville PO7 7DB	lucy.peters@hants.gov.uk
Hampshire Police	Hampshire Police	julian.ainsworth@hampshire.pnn.police.uk darren.woolvin@hampshire.pnn.police.uk
Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service	Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service	mark.jones@hantsfire.gov.uk
Transform Service	Fareham Civic Offices	Sarah.Goodwin@transformhampshire.org.uk
Southern Domestic Abuse Service	Havant PO9	claire.chatwin@southerndas.org
Cowplain Community School	Hart Plain Avenue, Waterlooville PO8 8RY	NickB@cowplainschool.co.uk
Waterloo School	Warfield Avenue, Waterlooville PO7 7JJ	A.Alexander@waterloo.hants.sch.uk
Youth Offending Team	Fareham Civic Offices	andrew.diggle@hants.gov.uk
Radian Housing	Petersfield GU32 3NG	louise.brown@radian.co.uk
Health Visiting Team	The Old Gymnasium, Fort Southwick, James Callaghan Drive	angela.gard@southernhealth.nhs.uk
School Nursing Team	The Old Gymnasium, Fort Southwick, James Callaghan Drive	claire.cullum@nhs.net
Children Services	Havant Plaza PO9 2AX	Childrens Services Department

Department		Havant Plaza PO9 2AX
Cllr Yvonne Weeks	Havant Plaza PO9 2AX	yvonne.weeks@havant.gov.uk

Agencies' Brief

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Review of Troubled Families Programme

AGENCIES BRIEF

Panel Meeting with Sarah Goodwin (Team Leader for Fareham, Gosport, Havant and East Hampshire, Barnardos), Sam Cofie (Havant Service Manager, Motiv8) and Karen Gamblin (Supporting Families Employment Adviser, Department of Work and Pensions)

Transform Background

The Transform consortium was led by Barnardos and consisted of three main partners – motiv8, Family Lives and Step-By-Step. Transform supported the Troubled Families Programme across the Hampshire area. The support comprised of three main areas:

- Practical support and help – i.e. parenting skills support
- Emotional help –
- Co-ordinate professionals around and with family.

Transform put the action plan for each family referred to them together and ensure this moves forward with a fully integrated approach for all partner agencies. The current arrangements were due to end in March 2017.

Motiv8 Background

Motiv8 provides support for young persons and families in conjunction with work carried out by Hampshire County Council. The support consisted of the three following main areas:

- Education – There were support programmes for key stages 2, 3 and 4 in Gosport and Havant. There was also a bike academy / workshop facility at Highbury College.
- Community – The aim was for open access hubs to enable young people to ‘drop-in’ and access support. Open hubs were situated on Hayling Island (Community Centre), Wecock Farm (Acorn Centre) and Springwood Centre. The work of the open hubs had proved successful.
- Employment – The aim to enable young persons to find work was key to the work of motiv8. Motiv8 engaged with young people to find apprenticeships, work placements and work experience.

Motiv8’s funding is made up of charitable funds, grants from Hampshire County Council and local interests, commissions from projects (e.g. schools paying for motiv8 to present to pupils) and BBC Children In Need. There are however significant cuts to funding, with funds reduced from £121,000 to £33,000 in a 12-month period. Officers are working to secure lesser funds to enable hubs to be kept open at reduced hours. Focus will also be given to providing one-on-one support for troubled individuals / families.

Motiv8 involve the whole family in their support of an individual, and also liaise with other agencies within the partnership for specialised support. The support motiv8 offers is tailored to meet the needs of the area.

DWP Background

The Supporting Families Employment Adviser role was specified solely for work within the programme. The role also had access to the systems and details stored by each agency on a particular family.

The work of the department differs to that of the DWP / Job Centre Plus in general, as there was a more soft and supportive approach to finding employment.

The typical person supported by this role was someone whose benefits or general well-being meant they did not have to look for work. The aim was for the support to get that person into a position to look for employment / be able to visit the job centre.

The main elements of the Supporting Families support were:

- Direct Family Work – engaging with those not required to go to Job Centre Plus. Support included access to volunteering / training opportunities (including attending courses with the individual if necessary) and advice on any issues.
- Promote Work Agenda – Aim to promote employment and highlight access to support. This includes providing preparation for Universal Credit and benefit changes to vulnerable people affected.
- Work with Job Centre Plus – work alongside work coaches at Job Centre Plus to ensure individuals are able to find employment.

Agencies Experience of the Troubled Families Programme

Families may be experiencing issues with behaviour, mental health and criminal activity, and the programme benefits from a multi-agency approach as there are a number of individuals / organisations who help engage with these individuals.

Support ranges in intensity – with more needy families engaged with up to 6 hour per week, while less needy for 1 hour per week. The type of support and lead agency for a specific case was decided on a family by family basis. The success of referrals to a large extent depends upon the families' willingness to engage with the project.

One of the key aims of the Troubled Families Programme was to get agencies working together to support families and for this to become 'business as usual'. Reflecting the backdrop of reducing central government funding, the aim was to promote partnership working. The process of the Council referring families to the programme had initially presented a steep learning curve for officers.

Initial contact with an individual / family is considered vital to the process. In an ideal situation, the referral would be passed down in such a way as to enable 'a warm handshake' (i.e. the family not meeting a stranger). The partnership way of working had allowed this to happen more frequently.

70% of referrals are made to the programme in relation to financial issues. Mismanagement of finances was also a key cause for mental-health problems.

Any safeguarding issues within families that are part of the programme were immediately reported to Children's Services. The aim of the programme is to prevent children going in to care.

Successes of the Troubled Families Programme

- The aim for improved partnership working within the programme had been successful. Good partnership working had allowed the Council to reach vulnerable people in a much timelier and effective manner, and enabled similar agencies with common goals to meet and communicate on a regular basis.
- The programme allocated the best agency to support any particular vulnerable people.

- The addition of the DWP to the Troubled Families Programme had enabled access to important advice and guidance for families.
- It was the experience of the officers present that families had been more receptive to non-statutory agencies being involved in their support. In each case, a single contact was established to lead on their support and this helped ensure a person was available to co-ordinate any issues. Families helped by the scheme relied less on Council services.

Concerns over the Troubled Families Programme

- It was difficult to quantify the success rate of the programme as a success for the programme was based the outcomes by statistics (e.g. improvements in the percentage of a child's attendance at school, to obtain employment and remain in work for at least 6 months). The predicted success rate for the payment by results element was approximately 30% and this depended on measurable sustained improvement over a range of factors across the whole family and not just an overall improvement in family circumstances.
- There were however invaluable considerations that were not included in the statistics. Positive impacts on families were not captured by the data and were not reflected in the success rates of the programme. It also means that unless certain data thresholds are met, the programme will not receive funding for their work with a family.
- The timescales within the programme were inadequate (reduced to 6 months as of April 2016). Although extensions can be granted on a case-by-case basis, there is concern vulnerable families do not receive full support from the agency due to these restrictions.
- There had been instances of issues regarding different IT platforms and with sharing personal information between agencies in the programme. These had been largely overcome however with effective co-ordination and communication and the use of Safetynet as a shared platform.

Possible Areas for Improvement

- Relaxation of timescales for working with families – this would allow for work to continue when needed past the scheduled timescales. It was accepted however that budgetary and contractual obligations made this a challenging area. The Panel were reassured that no family was left without support at the end of the intensive support package.
- Restraints on data sharing – While the programme had greatly improved the circulation of data between agencies in the programme, it was difficult to get any information from DWP. This could improve the programme as several potential nominations visit Job Centre Plus, but current processes do not allow for them to be referred this way.
- Extension of Grants – An extension for County grants to be given over a 3 year period would allow for long-term planning and resource allocation by partners.

Source meeting: Crime and Disorder Panel, Thursday 26 January 2017 and comments from Tim Pointer, Neighbourhood Support Team Leader.

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting Notes

(Review of the Havant Safety Partnership)

Crime and Disorder Panel

2017

This page is intentionally left blank

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Crime and Disorder Panel held on 25 October 2016

Present

Keast, Patrick (Chairman), Shimbart and Smith D

Councillor Turner attended as the Cabinet Lead
Councillor Francis was invited to attend

1 Future Scrutiny Projects

The Panel received the draft project plans for the scrutiny of the Safer Havant Partnership and the scrutiny of a proposal to adopt the provisions of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policy Act 2014 and the effectiveness of current dog byelaws.

The Neighbourhoods Development Team Leader was invited to provide the Panel with a background to the Safer Havant Partnership and it was suggested that the Panel could investigate the effectiveness of the 'Troubled Families' programme as part of its next scrutiny review.

It was AGREED that;

- 1) The Crime and Disorder Panel would undertake a scrutiny of the Safer Havant Partnership in relation to the Troubled Families Programme;
and
- 2) The scrutiny of a proposal to adopt the provisions of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policy Act 2014 and the effectiveness of current dog byelaws be added to the Panel's work programme.

The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and concluded at 5.29 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Crime and Disorder Panel held on 14 November 2016

Present

Hart, Keast, Patrick (Chairman), Perry, Shimbart, Smith D and Thomas

2 Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

3 Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Crime and Disorder Panel held on 25 October 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4 Introduction to Troubled Families Programme

The Panel invited the Neighbourhoods Development Team Leader and the Community Safety Officer to introduce the Troubled Families Programme and answer members' questions.

The Panel received an information pack on the Troubled Families Programme, which provided current data on the programme, the Terms of Reference and working documents for the Havant Local Coordination Group and a list of partners that the Council works with.

Members were given an overview of the processes in place and the plans used within the programme.

The Council was expected to identify/engage with 160 families in 2016/17; this figure was allocated centrally based upon previous performance and the demographics of the area. The Council was currently involved with 72 families. The current projection for 2016/17 was that Havant would fall short of the Department of Local Government and Communities (DCLG) target by approximately 30 to 40 families which reflected the slowdown in nominations experienced across the County: the officers were comfortable with this position as they were focussing on the families that were most in need of support, some of which required more support because of the extended number of relatives and complexity of the presenting issues.

In response to questions raised by members of the Panel, the Officers advised that:

- (a) the Council's target was based on statistics provided by the DCLG which identified Havant as having higher levels of deprivation than other Hampshire areas

- (b) 56% of the nominations were for single parent families;
- (c) there was no evidence to show that the scheme proved more successful with younger children: motiv8 had been successful with older reclusive children;
- (d) the scheme sought to identify/engage with families at an earlier stage than previous schemes;
- (e) nominations for the scheme could only be made by a participating agency; neighbours or friends wishing to nominate a family had to report their concerns to Children Services, who would then investigate the matter and nominate, if considered appropriate;
- (f) service providers from the voluntary sector had adopted a more selective process on targeting families due to recent funding cuts;
- (g) progress had been made in encouraging schools to become more involved in the scheme;
- (h) Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) were struggling to cope with the increase in the number of referrals relating to adolescents, which consequently delayed the provision of psychiatric treatment;
- (i) measures had been taken to reduce the risk of children losing their psychiatric treatment once they achieved adulthood;
- (j) On Hayling Island the scheme worked closely with schools, church groups and the Lions
- (k) involving general practitioners into the scheme was problematic; the Council was currently piloting schemes whereby a volunteer would hold surgeries at doctors' clinics to offer help and advice to troubled families.

It was AGREED that;

- 1) The Chairman after consultation with the Neighbourhoods Development Team Leader submit a list of potential interviewees to discuss their experience of the working relationship within the Safer Havant Partnership; and
- 2) The Panel choose three partners from the list referred to 1) above.

The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and concluded at 5.55 pm

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Crime and Disorder Panel held on 26 January 2017

Present

Hart, Keast, Patrick (Chairman), Shimbart and Smith D

5 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Perry and Thomas.

6 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Crime and Disorder Panel on 14 November 2016 were AGREED as a correct record.

7 Discussion With Representatives of Agencies Involved in the Troubled Families Programme

The Panel invited Karen Gamblin (Supporting Families Employment Adviser, Department of Work and Pensions), Sam Cofie (Havant Service Manager, Motiv8) and Sarah Goodwin (Team Leader for Fareham, Gosport, Havant and East Hampshire, Barnardos) to discuss their experiences of working in the Troubled Families Programme and any issues they had faced. The Neighbourhood Support Team Leader and Community Safety Officer were also present to answer any members questions.

The discussion covered the background of the programme, the experience of the agencies working within the programme and any areas that could be improved moving forward.

The following areas were discussed:

- One of the key aims for the Troubled Families Programme had been to improve partnership working between the relevant agencies. It was the view of the officers present that this had been successful;
- The experience of the Troubled Families Programme had initially presented a steep learning curve as officers adapted to new working practices, but these were now considered to be 'business as usual';
- It was the experiences of the officers present that families had been more receptive to multiple agencies being involved in their support. In each case, a single contact was established to lead on their support and this helped ensure a person was available to co-ordinate any issues;

- The success of the Programme was evident in the reduction of families repeatedly visiting the Council in need of support;
- The addition of the DWP to the Troubled Families Programme had enabled access to important advice and guidance for families;
- The use of quantitative aspects to measure the success of the scheme such as school attendance or employment status did not reflect all the positive impacts on families. The predicted success rate under these criteria for families with intensive support was 30%. However, officers commented that almost every family that had agreed to participate had benefitted from the process.
- There had been instances where differences in IT platforms had resulted in issues in the past. This had been resolved however with improved co-ordination between the agencies.

In response to questions from the Panel, the officers identified the following areas as possible changes to be made to the programme:

1. Relaxation of timescales in relation to the contracted intensive support service for working with families – this would allow for work to continue when needed past the scheduled timescales. It was accepted however that budgetary and contractual obligations made this a challenging area. The Panel were reassured that no family was left without support at the end of the intensive support package.
2. Restraints on data sharing – While the programme had greatly improved the circulation of data between agencies in the programme, it was difficult to get any information from DWP. This could improve the programme as several potential nominations visit Job Centre Plus, but current processes do not allow for them to be referred this way; and
3. Extension of Grants – An extension for County grants to be given over a 3 year period would allow for long-term planning and resource allocation by partners.

The Panel thanked the officers for their attendance and their contribution to the discussions.

The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and concluded at 6.10 pm