

1 Tables referred to in text

In the following tables, percentages have usually been rounded to nearest percentage and no percentages are given for very small numbers.

Table 1 Referrals and services provided (number of families full cohort).

Referral year	Referred	Service accepted	Completed
2009	174	67	9
2010	104	57	65
Jan- April 2011	28	11	18
Total	306	135	92

Table 2 ‘Main’ parent/s at time of referral (full cohort) and age of main parent (mother’s age if 2 parents)

Main parent	Main parent	Age group of main parent	Percentage (Small sample)
Biological mother or mother and male partner	96	18-24	19%
Biological father	2	25-39	41%
Guardian/ relative/social father	2	40+	41%

Table 3 Family composition at time of referral to FRP

Child/ren living with:	Number of families (full cohort)	Number of families (small sample)	
Both biological parents	64	13	20%
Single mother	19	8	25%
Single father	1	1	
Birth parent plus parent of one but not all resident children	6	2	
Birth parent plus partner not a parent of any resident child	7	7	22%
Relative/ guardian/ friend	3	1	

Table 4 Number of children of ‘main’ parent (full cohort)

Number of children	Number of families
1	11
2	34
3	16
4	20
5	11
6	3
7	5

Table 5 Age groups of children

Age grouping	Full cohort	Intensive sample
All under 5	8	7 22%
All 5-12	6	2
All 13+	29	7 22%
5-12 and 13+	28	11 34%
Under 5 and 5-12	11	2
Under 5 and 13+	8	2
All age groups	8	1

Table 6 Age of youngest child (percentages)

Age of youngest child	Full cohort	Intensive sample
Under 5	32%	37%
5	39%	41%
13+	29%	22%

Table 7 Age groups by early and later referral date (full cohort)

Earlier or later referral	Youngest child 0- 4		Youngest 5-12		Youngest child 13+		Total	
Earlier referral	13	27%	17	35%	18	38%	48	100%
Later referral	19	36%	22	42%	11	21%	52	100%
Total	32	38%	39	33%	29	29%	100	100%

Table 8 Number of children by early and later referral date (full cohort)

Earlier or later referral	1-2 children		3+ children		Total	
Earlier referral	15	31%	33	69%	48	100%
Later referral	29	56%	23	44%	52	100%
Total	44	44%	56	56%	100	100%

Chi-square: 6.090, df: 1 p: <.05

Table 9 Problems/ disabilities of parent/ carer in family (percentages where this problem recorded)

Problem/difficulty	Full cohort (female)	Full cohort (male)	Small sample (female)	Small sample (male)
Acute/chronic health problem			9%	9%
Problems alcohol use	14%	9%	16%	22%
Problem drugs use	18%	22%	25%	22%
Mental health problems	58%	10%	71%	21%
Criminality/ anti-social/nuisance behaviour	19%	35%	*	*

- In the small sample there had at some time been police involvement in 75% of the families; action with respect to anti-social behaviour in 56% of the families and a criminal conviction with respect to a member of 53% of families. It was not always clear whether this was with respect to adults or young people. In addition, some criminal activities were of concern where evidence which would lead to a conviction was not apparent.

Table 10 Problems/ disabilities of any child/ young person in family

Problem/difficulty	Full cohort of 100 (%)	Small sample % (N=32)
Acute/chronic health problem(including obesity)		34%
Problems alcohol use	7%	3%
Problem drugs use	20%	22%
Mental health problems	20%	40%
Behaviour problems		53%
Criminality/ anti-social/nuisance behaviour	41%	28%
Problems around school attendance/conduct/attainment		62%

Table 11 Cases where there were child protection concerns (small sample: more than one answer possible)

Concern	Number of families %	
Parenting ability/ style	29	93%
Child at risk of statutory intervention	28	90%
Increase safeguarding an aim of intervention	21	67%
Concerns about neglect (current or previous)	21	67%
Reducing impact of domestic abuse is an aim of intervention	14	45%
Remain on or be placed on CP plan or application for care order made or used as a possible sanction	16	52%
Child on CP plan at referral to FRP (6) or during case	10	31%
Any child of 'main' parent ever on CP plan/ CP register but not at time of referral	8	25%
CP team social worker was lead professional for child or member of TAF	9	28%

Table 12 Grouping of needs/ problems identified for children

Type of problems	Number of families (%)	
Troubled child aged 13+	3	
Middle years child 'on edge of care'	12	37%
Child protection <5	9	28%
Child protection 5+ (where no imminent risk of care)	3	
Complex child and parent problems where no imminent risk of care or formal child protection	5	16%

Table 13 Researcher rating of broad ‘family type’

Type of family	Number of families	Percentage of FRP families	Percentage of 105 ‘significant harm’ cases*
Short term problem	1		
1 single or 2 linked specific issues	14	44%	27%
3 linked specific issues	1		
Acute distress	1		25%
Families with long term and multiple problems	11	34%	40%
Complex but none of above	4	12%	8%

- Brandon et al, 1999

Table 14 Source of referral

Referral Agency	100 Cases	Small sample	% of small sample
ChnS loc	26	14	44
DAT	21	6	19
Housing	6	3	9
Anti Social Behaviour Action Group (ASBAG)	5	0	0
PCT	5	0	0
Family Centre	5	0	0
Child Protection	5	2	6
Not stated	4	0	0
SSD unspec	4	0	0
Education	4	2	6
Youth Inclusion and Support Panel (YISP)	3	1	3
YOT	2	1	3
MARAC	2		0
ChSerHosp	2	2	6
ch serRemod	2	0	0
CWD	1	0	0
YPP Panel	1	0	0
Children with Disabilities Team (CWD)	1	1	3
FDA Court	1	0	0

Table 15 Lead workers

Professional	for adult/s	for one/all children	for adult/s and child
FRP Intensive outreach worker	22	4	5
Locality team social worker		12	
Child protection team social worker		7	
FRP health visitor	1		
FRP adult mental health worker	2		
FRP domestic violence worker	2		1
FRP education worker		1	
YOT /YISP worker		2	
Teacher		1	
Health visitor/ early years worker		2	
Special education Unit worker		1	
Children with disabilities social worker		1	
Role unconfirmed at TAF		1	

Table 16 FRP membership of teams around the family (including cases with a lead professional role)

Professional	Number of cases	% of small sample cases
Intensive outreach / social worker	32	100
Benefits adviser	16	50
Addictions specialist	15	47
Adult mental health worker	15	47
Health visitor	13	41
Domestic violence worker	11	34
Domestic violence risk assessment worker	9	28
Education worker	6	19
Housing specialist	7	22
Attached police officer	4	13
ASB caseworker	3	9
Employability worker	3	9

Table 17 Non- FRP membership of teams around the family (including cases with a lead worker role)

Professional	Number of cases	% of small sample cases
Teacher/ special education unit worker	18	56
Special education unit professional	7	22
EWO or other education worker	5	16
School nurse	6	19
Children's services locality team social worker	14	44
Children's services child protection or looked after team social worker	11	34
Adult mental health social worker	10	31
YOT / YISP/ young people's service worker	17	53
Probation officer/ crime and disorder reduction service manager/ noise reduction officer	10	31
Housing officer	15	47
Psychiatrist/ psychiatrist	10	31
Family centre worker	15	47
Health visitor	4	13
Voluntary agency worker	3	9
Children's services disability or hospital social worker	3	9
Drugs and alcohol team worker	2	6
Employability worker	2	6
Connexions worker	1	3
IOW (WCC)	1	3

Table 18 FRP contribution to teams around the family

TAF composition	Number of cases	%
Mainly FRP: IOW plus co-ordinating network meetings	6	19%
Mainly FRP: IOW plus FRP specialists and co-ordinating network meetings	7	22%
Half FRP and half outside agencies	13	41%
Mainly non-FRP but with IOW and FRP case co-ordination	6	19%

Table 19 Approaches to ‘care with consequences’

Approach used	Number of cases	% s
Heavy emphasis on rewards	9	22%
Rewards, and light touch sanctions	14	44%
Heavy emphasis on sanctions	7	28%
No reference to ‘sanctions’ or ‘rewards’ in plan	2	

Table 20 Sanctions referred to in contract or care plan

Sanctions referred to	Number of cases	%
Child into/ remain in care	11	34%
Formal CP plan initiated/remain (but no likelihood of care)	5	16%
ASBO made/retained/ YP court	3	
ASBO/ court child and adult (criminal or truancy)	2	
Eviction/ not re-housed	5	16%
Eviction plus child into care/ CP	1	
No sanctions referred to	5	16%

Table 21 Was a trusting relationship established between the ‘main’ parent/ carer and at least one member of the FRP team*?

	Number of families	Percent
No	6	19
Ambivalent	13	41
Trusting	13	41
Total	32	100

*This was usually but not invariably the IOW and in some cases more than one family member formed a trusting relationship with more than one FRP team member.

Table 22 Were specific methods or programmes used?

	Frequenc y	Percent
None apparent	12	37
Specific parenting programme (manualised)- group or individual	6	19
Aspects of parenting programme adapted in home	8	25
Aspects of other adapted in home	6	19
Total	32	100

Table 23 Was a specific casework approach used?

	Frequency	Percent
None mentioned/apparent	3	
Broadly behavioural	2	
Broadly psycho-social	15	47
Problem-solving/solution-focused	12	38
Total	32	

Table 24 FRP broad service approach

	Frequency	Percent
Mainly practical- IOW parenting advice and networking	12	38
Mainly IOW emotional support and networking	6	19
Mainly FRP specialist advice	3	9
All or above	11	34
Total	32	100

Table 25 Duration of cases (months)

Duration	Number (%)	
3-4 months	3	
5-6 months	7	22%
7-11 months	11	34%
12-17 months	10	31%
18+ months	1	

2 long-running cases had been open for several months at the time the research ended. This cut-off date is used so this table slightly underestimates the number of the longest-running cases

Table 26 Intensity and duration of cases

Intensity and duration (short: <6 months) (lower intensity = FRP contacts average 2 per week or less)	N.	%
Short term/ high intensity	8	25
Short term: less intensive	5	16
Longer term intensive throughout case	6	19
Longer term intensive-moving to less intensive	11	34
Short term- no/little engagement	2	

Table 27 Involvement of children's 'targeted' services teams

Extent of involvement	Number (%)	
None	1	
Brief prior- not after	2	
Extensive prior-not after	3	
Brief prior-brief after	3	
Extensive prior and some after	23	72%

Table 28 Case aims/goals and whether achieved: adults/ whole family (n= 32 for aim column and 29 closed cases for outcome columns) Outcome columns sometimes total more than aims columns as additional aims were added in later TAF meetings

Case goals	number of cases in which this was a goal	% cases in which fully achieved	% cases in which partially achieved	% cases not achieved
Improve engagement with services	25	16	44	20
Improve relationships between adults*	7			
Improve parent/child or sibling relationships (*outcome for any family relationship improvement)	17	13*	41*	22*
Enhance parenting skills	25	20	38	22
Enhance safeguarding	23	13	41	19
Improve mental health of parent/parent figure	20	10	35	16
Improve physical health of a parent/parent figure	14	7	26	13
Reduce drug/alcohol use any adult in household	14	7	22	16
Reduce domestic abuse between adults in household	15	16	20	13
Reduce level of anti-social behaviour adults/ teenagers	13	20	13	10
Encourage engagement in positive activities	22	20	32	20
Review benefits/ reduce family debt	17	32	13	7
Prevent eviction	10			
Enhance quality of housing	19	26	16	20
Increase employment/employability	12	3	17	22

Table 29 Case aims/goals and whether achieved: children (number of cases and percentage of 32 cases in which this aim achieved/ not achieved)

Aim/goal	Number of cases this aim in initial plan	% in which achieved	% in which aim partially achieved	% in which aim not achieved
Improve mental health of child/ren	12	*		
Improve physical health of a child/reduce impact of a child's disability	8	*		
Improve behaviour of child/ren	18	10	32	16
Reduce impact of parental health problems on child/ren	2	6	6	3
Reduce impact of parental mental health problems on child/ren	11	*		
Reduce impact of domestic abuse on child/ren	13	*		
Reduce/prevent offending by a child/ young person	15	*		
Increase school attendance	17	10	44	0
Improve educational attainment	18	10	32	13
Improve further education/employment of young person	4	2	5	0
Arrange/improve nursery attendance	6	6	3	0

***Outcome not differentiated between adults and children in household in recording system or not routinely specified in records or at case closure**

Table 30 Changes in children's overall wellbeing (researcher rating) ADD IN Case 99

Interim outcome	Number of families
Deteriorated for one/no change for other/s	1
Deteriorated for 1 / improved other/s	4 13%
No change only child or all	6 19%
Some improvement all	11 35%
Marked improvement all	7 22%
No change but greater clarity has enabled coherent child welfare plans to be made	2

Table 31 Interim outcome for ‘main’ parent: change in wellbeing (researcher rating) **ADD IN Case 99**

Change in parent wellbeing		
Deteriorated	2	
No change	14	44%
Some improvement in some areas	6	19%
Much improvement	9	29%

Table 32 Interim outcome change in parenting capacity (researcher rating) **ADD IN 99**

Change in parenting capacity		
Deteriorated	1	
No change	11	35%
Some improvement in some areas	12	39%
Much improvement	7	22%

Table 33 Interim outcome: changes in material circumstances of family (researcher rating) **ADD IN 99**

Material circumstances		
No change	8	26%
Some improvement	15	48%
Substantial improvement	8	26%

Table 34 Interim outcome: overall wellbeing of child/ren (researcher rating)

Overall wellbeing		
All below average	12	37%
One/some below average- one/some average	10	31%
All average	10	31%

Table 35 Overall interim outcome for family following FRP service . Researcher rating

Interim outcome for family		
Unsuccessful: No change in wellbeing of adults or children	4	13%
Some aims achieved, still serious problems family not accessing help	4	13%
Some aims achieved still serious problems family accessing help	3	9%
Some aims achieved, still some problems and family accessing help	8	26%
Successful: most aims achieved- still some problems, family managing/accessing help/ will seek timely help in future	8	26%
Successful. Aims mainly achieved, family managing well. Children's wellbeing satisfactory	2	6%
Still serious problems but FRP helped to achieve a coherent case plan to improve wellbeing	3	9%

Table 36 Variations in cost to FRP and to other agencies

Cost to FRP	Costs to other agencies			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Low	1	3	4	8
Medium	3	5	4	12
High	1	1	10	12
Total	5	9	18	32

Table 37 Prediction (researcher rating) of future service needs (all family members) at case closure to FRP

Likely service needs	Number of families %	
Short-term/ not intensive then remain closed	3	
Short term intensive/ then remain closed	1	
Long-term episodic	17	53%
Long term intensive	8	25%
One or more children in long-term care	2	
Child and/or parent in prolonged custody	1	

Table 38 Likely future costs to adults, children health, social care and justice services

	Frequency	Percent
Low	9	28
Medium	9	28
High	14	44
Total	32	100

Table 39 Is there evidence that FRP involvement is likely to have reduced future costs?

	Frequency	Percent
No	6	19
Some indications	12	37
Strong evidence	14	44
Total	31	100

2 References

More to do

- Allen, G. and Duncan Smith, I. (2010) 'The cross-party challenge: early intervention for children and families', *Journal of Children's Services*, 5(1), pp. 4- 8.
- Barlow, J. and Scott, J. (2010) *Safeguarding in the 21st Century – where to now?* Totnes: Research in Practice.
- Barlow, J., and Schrader-Macmillan, A (2009) *Safeguarding children from emotional abuse – what works?* London: DCSF website DCSF-RBX-09-09
- Bell, M. (2002) Promoting children's rights through the use of relationship. *Child and Family Social Work*, 7, 1-11.
- Berry, M., Brandon, M., Chaskin, E., Fernandez, H., Grietens, A., Lightburn, P., McNamara, P., Mundford, R., Palacio-Quinton, J., Sanders, C. & Warren-Adamson, C. (2006) 'Identifying sensitive outcomes of interventions in community-based centres'. *International Journal of Child and Family Welfare*, 9, 2-10.
- Boddy, J., Statham, J. Mcquail, S, Petrie, S. and Owen, C. (2009a) *Working at the 'edges' of care? European models of support for young people and families*. London: Thomas Coram research Unit.
- Brandon, M. & Connolly, J. (2006) Are Intensive Family Preservation Services Useful: A UK Study. *Journal of Family Preservation*, 9, 56-69.
- Brandon, M. & Thoburn, J. (2008) Safeguarding children in the UK: a longitudinal study of services to children suffering or likely to suffer significant harm. *Child and Family Social Work*, 13, 365-377.
- Cabinet Office (2007) *Reaching Out: Think Family*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Daniel, B. and J. Taylor (1999) The rhetoric versus the reality: a critical perspective on practice with fathers in child care and protection work. *Child and Family Social Work* 4: 209-220.
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (2008) *Youth Task Force Action Plan- give respect, get respect- youth matters*. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families.
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (2009b) *Think Family toolkit: Guidance Note 4, Family Intervention Projects*. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families.
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (2010b) *Think Family Pathfinders: Research Update*. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families.
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (2010c) *Early Intervention: Securing good outcomes for all children and young people*. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families.
- Department for Children, Schools and Families. (2009) *Safeguarding children research initiative* <http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/research/programmeofresearch/index.cfm?type=0>
- Department of Health (1995 b) *Child Protection: Messages from Research*. London: TSO.
- Department of Health (2001) *The Children Act Now: Messages from Research*. London: TSO.

- Dixon, J., Schneider, V., Lloyd, C., Reeves, A., White, C., Tomaszewski, W., Green, R. and Ireland, E. (2010) *Monitoring and evaluation of family interventions (information on families supported to March 2010)*. London: Department for Education.
- Edwards, J. (1998) Screening out men: or 'Has mum changed her washing powder recently?' *In: Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare*. Eds J. Popay, J. Hearn and J. Edwards. London., Routledge.
- Featherstone, B. (2001) Putting fathers on the child welfare agenda: A Research review. *Journal of Child and Family Social Work* 6(2): 179-186.
- Flint, J., Batty, E., Parr, S., Platt-Fowler, D. And Nixon, J. (2011) *Evaluation of intensive Intervention Projects* London: DfE
- Garrett, P.M. (2007) 'Sinbin' solutions: the 'pioneer' projects for 'problem families' and the forgetfulness of social policy research', *Critical Social Policy*, 27, (2), pp. 203-230.
- Gregg, D. (2010) *Family intervention projects: a classic case of policy-based evidence*. London: centre for Crime and Justice Studies.
- Henggeler, S. W., Schoenwald, S. K., Rowland, M. D., & Cunningham, P. B. (2002). *Serious emotional disturbance in children and adolescents: Multisystemic Therapy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Hosking, G., Walsh, I. and Pillai, B. (2010) *International experience of early intervention for children, young people and their families 2010*. Croydon: C4EO and Wave Trust.
- Hughes, N. (2010) 'Review Article: Models and Approaches in Family-Focused Policy and Practice', *Social Policy and Society*, 9(4), pp. 545-555.
- Kendall, S., Rodger, J. and Palmer, H. (2010) *Redesigning provision for families with multiple problems- an assessment of the early impact of different local approaches*. London: Department for Education.
- Leschied, A, and Cunningham, A. (2002) *Seeking effective interventions for young offenders: Interim results of a four year randomized study of multisystemic therapy in Ontario Canada*. London, Ontario: Centre for Children and Families in the Justice System.
- Lindsay, G, Davies, H., Band, S., Cullen, M A, Strand, S., Hasluck, C., Evans, R. and Stewart-Brown, S. (2008) *Parenting Early Intervention Pathfinder Evaluation: Research Brief*. DCSF website DCSF-RBW054
- Lindsay, G, Strand, S., Cullen, M A, Cullen, S.,, Band, D., Davies, H., Conlon, G., Barlow, J. And Evans, R. (2011) *Parenting early Intervention Programme Evaluation*. London: DfE Research Report DFE-RR121(a)
- Littell I, J. (2005) 'Lessons from a systematic review of effects of multisystemic therapy' *Children and Youth Services review*. 27 pp 445-463
- Littell, J. (2006) 'The case of multisystemic therapy: Evidence of orthodoxy?' *Children and Youth Services Review*. 28, pp458- 472
- Littell, J., Popa, M. and Forsythe, B. (2005) 'Multisystemic therapy for social, emotional and behaviour problems in youth aged 10 to 17' *Cochrane Library, Issue 3, 2005*. Chichester: Wiley
- Local Government Leadership and City of Westminster (2010) *Repairing broken families and rescuing fractured communities: Lessons from the front line*. London: Local Government Leadership and City of Westminster.

- MacMillan, H., Wathan, N., Barlow, J., Fergusson, D., Leventhal, J. & Taussig, H. (2008) 'Interventions to prevent maltreatment and associated impairment'. *The Lancet* Special edition on Maltreatment.
- Morris, K., Hughes, N., Clarke, H., Tew, J., Mason, P., Galvani, S., Lewis, A. & Loveless, F. (2008) *Families at risk: literature review*. , Birmingham, University of Birmingham.
- National Centre for Social Research (2009) *Antisocial Behaviour Family Intervention projects: Monitoring and Evaluation: Research Brief*. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families.
- Nixon, J., Parr, S., Hunter, C., Myers, S., Sanderson, D. and Whittle, S. (2006) *Anti-social Behaviour Intensive Family Support Projects: An evaluation of six pioneering projects*. London: Communities and Local Government.
- Nixon, J., Parr, S., Hunter, C., Myers, S., Sanderson, D. and Whittle, S. (2008) *The longer term outcomes for families who had worked with Intensive Family Support Projects*. London: Communities and Local Government.
- Pawson, H. Davidson, E., Sosenko, F., Flint, J., Nixon, J., Casey, R. and Sanderson, D. (2009) *Evaluation*
- Pawson, H., Flint, J., Scott, S., Atkinson, R., Bannister, J., McKenzie, C. and Mills, C. (2005) *The Use of Possession Actions and Evictions by Social Landlords*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- Quinton, D. (2004). *Supporting parents: Messages from research*. London: Jessica Kingsley
- Rose, W., Aldgate, J., McIntosh, M. & Hunter, H. (2009) 'High-risk children with challenging behaviour: changing directions for them and their families'. *Child and Family Social Work*, 14,2, pp178-188.
- Scott, S. (2006) Tackling anti-social behaviour: an evaluation of the Dundee Families Project, in J. Flint (ed.) *Housing, Urban Governance and Anti-social Behaviour: Perspectives, policy and practice*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 199- 217.
- Scott, S., Knapp, M., Henderson, J. and Maughan, B. (2001) 'Financial cost of social exclusion: follow up study of antisocial children into adulthood', *British Medical Journal*, 323; 191-4.
- Stein, M. (2009) *Quality Matters in Children's Services: Messages from research*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Sundell, K et al (2009) *Interventions and Costs: Multisystemic therapy (MST) and treatment as usual (TAU)* Stockholm The Institute for Evidence-based Social Work Practice Full text as yet only available in Swedish
- Thoburn, J. and Making Research Count consortium (2009) *Effective interventions for complex families where there are concerns about, or evidence of, a child suffering significant harm* www.C4EO.gov.uk
- Tunstill, J. Aldgate, J. & Allnock, D. (2007) *Understanding the Contribution of Sure Start Local Programmes to the Task of Safeguarding Children's Welfare*. London, DfES.
- Tunstill, J. & Blewett, J. (2009) *The Delivery of Targeted Family Support in a Universal Setting*. London, Action for Children.
- Tunstill, J., Aldgate, J. & Hughes, M. (2006) *Improving Children's Services Networks: Lessons from Family Centres*. London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

- Utting, D., Monteiro, H. & Ghatge, D. (2007) *Interventions for children at risk of developing antisocial personality disorder* Cabinet Office/ Policy Research Bureau.
- Utting, D., Monteiro, H. & Ghatge, D. (2007) *Interventions for children at risk of developing antisocial personality disorder* Cabinet Office/ Policy Research Bureau.
- Whittaker, J. (2009) 'Evidence-based intervention and services for high risk-youth: a North American perspective on the challenges of integration for policy, practice and research'. *Child and Family Social Work*. 14,2, pp 166-177.