Department for Education

Statistical Release

OSR 14/2011

14 September 2011

Coverage: England

Theme: Health, well-being and Care

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

Telephone:
Press Office
020 7925 6789
Public Enquiries
0370 000 2288

Statistician
Shamim Rahman

Email
info@education.gsi.gov.uk

Internet
http://www.education.gov.uk/

Monitoring and Evaluation of Family Intervention Projects and Services to March 2011

This publication provides data on 'family intervention projects and services', which provide support to families with social, economic, health and behaviour problems. It reports national and local level data for all family intervention services in England up to 31st March 2011. All services use a similar model of intervention, providing intensive and persistent support for the whole family, coordinated by a single key worker; and contribute to the Prime Minister's commitment to turn around the lives of families with multiple problems. This is an annual publication and is the second one in the series.

The National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) have established a secure web-based Information System for project staff to record details of the families they work with at various stages throughout an intervention. This statistical release presents analysis of data entered into the Information System up to and including 31st March 2011. This release reports on seven measures.

- A cumulative measure of service capacity, showing the total number of families who worked with a family intervention service between January 2006 to 31st March 2011
- An annual measure of service capacity, showing the total number of families who worked with a family intervention service during the financial year 2010-2011
- An annual measure of service engagement, showing a breakdown of whether families are still working with a family intervention service. Where families have exited a service the proportion of families who leave for a successful, unsuccessful or inconclusive reason is provided
- The percentage of families who are considered to have a successful outcome in four separate domains:
    - Family functioning and risk
    - Crime/ anti-social behaviour
    - Health
    - Education/ employment

KEY POINTS

The cumulative measure of service capacity is 8,841 families (compared to 4,870 families up to March 2010, an increase of 82 per cent).

The annual measure of service capacity for the financial year 2010-2011 is 5,461 families (compared to 3,518 in 2009-10, an increase of 55 per cent).

The annual measure of service engagement for the financial year 2010-2011 is 89 per cent (compared to 93 per cent in 2009-10).

There was, on average, a 47 per cent reduction in the proportion of families experiencing risks associated with poor family functioning including poor parenting, marriage, relationship or family breakdown, domestic violence or child protection issues (this is the same level of reduction that was reported for families supported up to March 2010).

There was, on average, a 50 per cent reduction in the proportion of families involved in crime and anti-social behaviour (compared to 47 per cent reduction for families supported up to March 2010).

There was, on average, a 34 per cent reduction in the proportion of families with health risks including mental or physical health and drug or alcohol problems (this is the same level of reduction that was reported for families supported up to March 2010).

There was a 53 per cent reduction in the proportion of families with education problems (compared to a 54 per cent reduction for families supported up to March 2010).

There was a 14 per cent reduction in the proportion of families with employment problems (compared to 15 per cent reduction for families supported up to March 2010).

CUMULATIVE MEASURE OF SERVICE CAPACITY

The cumulative measure of service capacity is 8,841 families.

There were 12,850 referrals to a family intervention service up to and including 31st March 2011[1], compared to 7,231 up to and including 31st March 2010.

Of the 12,850 referrals up to and including 31st March 2011:

- 8,841 referrals (69 per cent) resulted in families being offered and agreeing to work with a service. This is compared to 4,870 (67 per cent) as at 31st March 2010.

- 3,338 referrals (26 per cent) resulted in a family not being offered a service. This is compared to 1,860 referrals (26 per cent) as at 31st March 2010. Families were not offered a service if they did not meet the referral criteria (e.g. ASB levels were too low or not at risk of homelessness); were not suitable for a service to work with, were working with another more appropriate service or they were not engaging with the service during the referral process.

- 363 referrals (3 per cent) resulted in a family declining the offer of a service. This is compared to 203 (3 per cent) as at 31st March 2010.

- 308 referrals (2 per cent) resulted in families being placed on a waiting list prior to a Support Plan being put in place. This is compared to 298 families (4 per cent) as at 31st March 2010.

ANNUAL MEASURE OF SERVICE CAPACITY

The annual measure of service capacity for the financial year 2010-2011 is 5,461 families. This compares to 3,518 in 2009-10, an increase of 55 per cent.

This is the total number of referrals which resulted in a family accepting the offer of a service between 1st April 2010 to 31st March 2011 (3,423 families) plus those families that were still being worked with from previous years (2,038).[2]

[1] There are a small number of families (554) who are referred to intervention services more than once; this data includes families every time they are referred. For example, a family is counted twice if they have been referred to a service two times, and they are counted three times if they have been referred on three occasions.

ANNUAL MEASURE OF SERVICE ENGAGEMENT[3]

The annual measure of service engagement for the financial year 2010-2011 is 89 per cent, compared to 93 per cent for the financial year 2009-10.

This measure is based on the percentage of families who were still receiving a family intervention service on 31st March 2011 (3,655 families), or had exited for a 'successful' reason (1,219 families) between 1st April 2010 and 31st March 2011, shown as a percentage of the total number of families that accepted a service over this period (3,423 families), plus those families that were still being worked with from the previous year (2,038).

This measure shows how effective the service is in supporting families. Outcome measures are reported later in this statistical release.

Family Intervention workers were asked the reason that the family exited the intervention. They were provided with a range of possible reasons and were allowed to select as many as applied. The responses were categorised as 'successful', 'unsuccessful' or reasons that were inconclusive because they could not be counted as either a successful or unsuccessful. See annex 1 for a classification of the reasons for leaving an intervention. If workers only selected one or more reasons that could be counted as a 'success' then a family was recorded as leaving for a successful reason. If they only selected reasons that could be counted as 'unsuccessful' they were recorded as having left for an unsuccessful reason. Families where the worker selected a combination of successful and unsuccessful reasons were excluded from the analysis but a combination of (i) successful reasons and (ii) reasons which were inconclusive so could not be counted as successful or unsuccessful, was counted as a success.

A total of 1,806 families exited a service during this period. Two hundred and seventy-five families were excluded from the analysis because workers either recorded both successful and unsuccessful reasons for leaving, or they did not give a reason for leaving. Of the remaining 1,531 families, 1,219 (80 per cent) were classified as leaving for a successful reason, 211 families (14 per cent) for an inconclusive reason and 101 families (7 per cent) for an unsuccessful reason. When we include all the 1,806 families in this analysis 67 per cent were classified as leaving for a successful reason, 12 per cent for an inconclusive reason, 6 per cent for an unsuccessful reason and for the remaining 15 per cent workers had provided both successful and unsuccessful reasons for leaving, or no reason for leaving was given.

A total of 3,675 families exited a service up to and including 31st March 2011. Six hundred and forty-eight of these families were excluded from the analysis because workers provided both successful and unsuccessful reasons for leaving, or no reason for leaving was given. Of the remaining 3,027 families, 2,569 (85 per cent) were classified as leaving for a successful reason, 316 families (10 per cent) for an inconclusive reason and 142 families (5 per cent) for an unsuccessful reason. When we include all the 3,675 families in this analysis 70 per cent were classified as leaving for a successful reason, 9 per cent for an inconclusive reason, 4 per cent for an unsuccessful reason and for the remaining 18 per cent workers had provided both successful and unsuccessful reasons for leaving, or no reason for leaving was given.

---

[2] This measure includes families that left a service during the year. It also includes the 554 families who are referred on more than one occasion (i.e. they return to the service). Where this occurs a family is included each time they are referred so they are counted twice if they have been referred to a service two times, and they are counted three times if they have been referred on three occasions.)

[3] This was referred to as the measure of service effectiveness in the 2010 Official Statistics publication.

OUTCOME MEASURES

Four 'domains' were identified - family functioning; crime and anti-social behaviour; health; and education and employment. For each of these four domains a number of relevant indicators of each outcome domain were combined and a percentage reduction in risk calculated.[4] [5] This percentage was based on assessments at the point a support plan was put in place (the 'before' or baseline measure) and at the time the family left the intervention (the after measure). Workers were asked to only include factors which they had evidence that they were an issue for a family. The base for each measure includes all families who exited the intervention since January 2006 (3,675 families).[6] Without an impact assessment we cannot establish whether the outcomes achieved by families can be directly attributed to the family intervention service as some change amongst families might occur 'naturally' over time or because of other services or interventions families received. **In addition, families may still be at risk when they complete a family intervention service even though the level of that risk may have reduced.**

Family functioning

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

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

- Poor parenting: 49 per cent reduction in the number of families with the issue - from 67 per cent to 34 per cent (a 33 percentage point reduction)
- Marriage, relationship or family breakdown: 47 per cent reduction in the families with the issue - from 30 per cent of families to 16 per cent (a 14 percentage point reduction)[7]
- Domestic violence: 57 per cent reduction in the number of families with the issue - from 28 per cent to 12 per cent (a 16 percentage point reduction)
- Child protection issues including neglect, emotional abuse, physical abuse and sexual abuse: 34 per cent reduction in the number of families with these issues - from 27 per cent of families with the issue to 18 per cent (a 9 percentage point reduction).

Crime and Anti-social behaviour

There was, on average, a 50 per cent reduction in the proportion of families involved in crime and anti-social behaviour.

Crime is considered to be an issue if a family intervention worker reports that any family member has been arrested for a criminal offence at any stage during the service. Workers were asked if any member of the family was on bail or probation, receiving a tag or conditional discharge at the time the support plan was put in place and the time the family left the intervention. Anti-social behaviour is defined by the Home Office/National Audit Office (2006), as 'acting in a manner that causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household [as the family intervention family]'. Family intervention workers are then asked to specify whether there is evidence that the family has been involved in any types of anti-social behaviours including rowdy behaviour, street drinking, vandalism etc. since their previous review.[8]

---

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

[5] The percentage reduction rates reported below are based on un-rounded proportions.

[6] Some measures were based on fewer families due to missing data, the base for all measures ranged from 3,423 to 3,675.

[7] When this is restricted only to families with valid before and after data there is a 46 per cent reduction (from 30 per cent of families with the issue to 16 per cent which is a 14 percentage point reduction based on un rounded percentages).

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

The measure is an un-weighted average of the percentage reduction in:
- Crime: 41 per cent reduction in the number of families with this issue - from 35 per cent to 20 per cent (a 14 percentage point reduction)
- Anti-social behaviour: 58 per cent reduction in the number of families with this issue - from 81 per cent to 34 per cent (a 47 percentage point reduction)

Health

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

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

The measure is an un-weighted average of the percentage reduction figures for:
- Mental health: 23 per cent reduction in the number of families with this issue - from 36 per cent to 28 per cent (a 8 percentage point reduction)
- Physical health: 26 per cent reduction in the number of families with this issue - from 9 per cent to 7 per cent (a 2 percentage point reduction)
- Drug or substance misuse: 40 per cent reduction in the number of families with either of these issues - from 32 per cent to 20 per cent (a 13 percentage point reduction)[9]
- Drinking/alcohol problems: 48 per cent reduction in the number of families with this issue - from 29 per cent to 15 per cent (a 14 percentage point reduction).

Education and employment

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

Family intervention workers were asked if any children in the family had problems relating to truancy, exclusion or bad behaviour at school. Workers were also asked to record the number of adults over 16 in the family who were not in education, employment or training.

The measure is an un-weighted average of the percentage reduction figures for:
- Truancy, exclusion or bad behaviour at school[10]: 53 per cent reduction in the number of families with these issues - from 58 per cent to 28 per cent (a 31 percentage point reduction based on unrounded percentages)
- No adult in the family in education, employment or training: 14 per cent reduction in the number of families with this issue - from 68 per cent to 58 per cent (a 10 percentage point reduction).

Tackling Anti-social Behaviour (2006) p.9 Home Office/ NAO

[9] When this is restricted only to families with valid before and after data there is a 39 per cent reduction (from 32 per cent of families with the issue to 20 per cent which is a 13 percentage point reduction based on un rounded percentages).

[10] Please note that this does not take into account changes in school attendance or behaviour due to family members no longer being of school age.

Tables

Table 1.1 Number of families offered and accepted an intervention in 2010-11 and cumulative number of families referred to Family Intervention Projects by local authority area, including district council/borough where relevant

Table 2.1 Service engagement and reason for exiting intervention by local authority area

Table 3.1 Outcome measures by local authority area

Statement of Quality

This is a National Statistics publication. National Statistics are produced to high professional standards set out in the National Statistics Code of Practice. They undergo regular quality assurance reviews to ensure that they meet customer needs. They are produced free from any political interference.

Technical Notes

This Statistical Release is based on all data entered into the Information System about families supported up to 31st March 2011 before the cut off date of 5 April 2011. Figures relating to the 2009/10 financial year were reported in the 2010 Statistical Release which used a cut off date of 23 April 2010 for all families supported up to 31st March 2010.

Figures are suppressed at the Local Authority level to avoid disclosure of counts between 1 and 9. Percentages are suppressed to avoid disclosure of counts fewer than 50. Please see the keys for individual tables for more details. Local Authorities were asked for their permission for local level figures to be published, if this permission was not given tables show all figures and percentages as 'x'.

ENQUIRIES

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

Analysis and Research Division
Department for Education
Sanctuary Buildings
Great Smith Street
London SW1P 3BT
E-mail: Shamim.Rahman@education.gsi.gov.uk

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

Press Office News Desk
Department for Education
Sanctuary Buildings
Great Smith Street
London SW1P 3BT
Telephone Number: 020 7925 6789

Table 1.1 Number of families offered and accepted an intervention in 2010-11 and cumulative number of families referred to Family Intervention Projects by local authority area, including district council/borough where relevant Years: January 2006 to March 2011 Coverage: England

Local Authority	Offered and accepted 2010-2011 only	Offered and accepted	Offered and declined	Offered and put on waiting list	Not offered intervention	Total number of families referred
Barking & Dagenham	*	13	*	*	*	**13**
Barnet	x	x	x	x	x	x
Barnsley	26	95	*	*	38	**134**
Bath and North East Somerset	*	11	*	*	*	**16**
Bedford	14	33	*	*	29	**64**
Bexley	15	20	*	*	*	**26**
Birmingham	26	77	*	*	39	**119**
Blackburn	54	185	16	*	17	**218**
Blackpool	36	139	*	*	41	**183**
Bolton	x	x	x	x	x	x
Bournemouth	21	78	*	*	32	**111**
Bracknell Forest	*	14	*	*	*	**24**
Bradford	62	124	*	*	21	**148**
Brent	z	z	z	z	z	z
Brighton	z	z	z	z	z	z
Bristol	20	136	11	*	48	**196**
Bromley	x	x	x	x	x	x
Buckinghamshire	x	x	x	x	x	x
Bury	10	14	*	*	*	**14**
Calderdale	*	22	*	*	*	**27**
Cambridgeshire	*	16	*	*	*	**18**
Camden	x	x	x	x	x	x
Central Bedfordshire	13	14	*	*	*	**29**
Cheshire East	*	10	*	*	*	**19**
Cheshire West and Chester	37	44	*	*	31	**80**
Cornwall	*	14	*	*	11	**25**
Coventry	21	101	*	11	59	**180**
Croydon	10	15	*	*	*	**21**
Cumbria	*	17	*	*	10	**34**
Darlington	33	61	*	*	*	**73**
Derby	20	73	*	*	*	**84**
Derbyshire	34	97	*	*	38	**137**
Devon including Exeter	x	x	x	x	x	x
Doncaster	21	51	*	*	10	**63**
Dorset	13	17	*	*	*	**29**
Dudley	10	17	*	*	*	**19**
Durham including Derwentside	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ealing	12	18	*	*	39	**58**
East Riding of Yorkshire	*	*	*	*	*	*****
East Sussex including Hastings	42	87	*	*	37	**125**
Enfield	*	13	*	*	*	**18**
Essex including Harlow	48	75	*	*	38	**115**

Local Authority	Offered and accepted 2010-2011 only	Offered and accepted	Offered and declined	Offered and put on waiting list	Not offered intervention	Total number of families referred
Gateshead	24	68	*	*	21	**94**
Gloucestershire including Gloucester	10	33	*	*	34	**68**
Greenwich	x	x	x	x	x	x
Hackney	x	x	x	x	x	x
Halton	21	51	*	*	43	**99**
Hammersmith and Fulham	x	x	x	x	x	x
Hampshire	x	x	x	x	x	x
Haringey	33	45	*	*	*	**48**
Harrow	*	*	*	*	*	**10**
Hartlepool	33	70	*	*	14	**88**
Havering	*	10	*	*	*	**15**
Herefordshire	*	11	*	*	*	**14**
Hertfordshire	52	64	*	*	20	**85**
Hillingdon	x	x	x	x	x	x
Hounslow	10	19	*	*	*	**30**
Isle of Wight	x	x	x	x	x	x
Isles of Scilly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Islington	16	28	*	*	*	**37**
Kensington and Chelsea	*	*	*	*	*	*****
Kent	15	24	*	*	*	**29**
Kingston upon Hull	34	113	*	*	*	**121**
Kingston upon Thames	14	22	*	*	*	**27**
Kirklees	13	73	*	*	33	**113**
Knowsley	x	x	x	x	x	x
Lambeth	x	x	x	x	x	x
Lancashire	25	80	*	*	36	**117**
Leeds	45	212	11	*	131	**354**
Leicester	22	95	*	*	25	**125**
Leicestershire including Melton	15	42	*	*	12	**61**
Lewisham	*	44	*	*	*	**50**
Lincolnshire	27	33	*	*	10	**46**
Liverpool	x	x	x	x	x	x
Luton	13	26	*	*	*	**29**
Manchester	92	261	*	*	105	**371**
Medway Towns	x	x	x	x	x	x
Merton	*	14	*	*	*	**20**
Middlesbrough	46	152	*	*	50	**209**
Milton Keynes	*	25	*	*	10	**37**
Newcastle-Upon-Tyne	x	x	x	x	x	x
Newham	29	86	*	28	45	**165**
Norfolk including Norwich and Ormiston (Great Yarmouth)	145	331	*	*	136	**475**
North East Lincs	54	139	16	*	255	**410**
North Lincolnshire	15	31	*	*	*	**35**
North Somerset	x	x	x	x	x	x
North Tyneside	19	35	*	*	*	**35**
North Yorkshire	40	51	*	*	15	**68**
Northamptonshire	36	68	*	*	*	**77**
Northumberland	20	28	*	*	22	**50**
Nottingham	x	x	x	x	x	x
Nottinghamshire	39	106	*	*	53	**162**

Local Authority	Offered and accepted 2010-2011 only	Offered and accepted	Offered and declined	Offered and put on waiting list	Not offered intervention	Total number of families referred
Oldham	42	223	*	*	17	**248**
Oxfordshire	14	23	*	*	*	**26**
Peterborough	x	x	x	x	x	x
Plymouth	29	99	*	*	72	**175**
Poole	*	42	*	*	*	**50**
Portsmouth	20	94	*	*	12	**112**
Reading	18	23	*	*	13	**37**
Redbridge	*	24	*	*	*	**27**
Redcar and Cleveland	30	99	*	*	*	**114**
Richmond upon Thames	x	x	x	x	x	x
Rochdale	x	x	x	x	x	x
Rotherham	20	64	*	*	51	**124**
Rutland	x	x	x	x	x	x
Salford	61	154	*	*	27	**184**
Sandwell	*	49	*	*	20	**74**
Sefton	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sheffield	69	161	*	*	78	**244**
Shropshire	24	25	*	*	*	**39**
Slough	x	x	x	x	x	x
Solihull	x	x	x	x	x	x
Somerset	16	20	*	*	*	**26**
South Gloucestershire	*	*	*	*	*	**10**
South Tyneside	35	83	*	*	56	**142**
Southampton	16	95	*	*	23	**123**
Southend on Sea	17	82	28	*	36	**146**
Southwark	*	49	*	*	*	**55**
St Helens	x	x	x	x	x	x
Staffordshire	36	50	*	*	24	**76**
Stockport	20	36	*	*	*	**49**
Stockton-on-Tees	16	33	*	*	*	**33**
Stoke	71	180	13	*	148	**341**
Suffolk including Ipswich	71	156	*	16	12	**186**
Sunderland	31	141	*	*	77	**222**
Surrey	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sutton	*	16	*	*	11	**28**
Swindon	*	10	*	*	*	**10**
Tameside	62	99	*	31	17	**149**
Telford & the Wrekin	22	32	*	*	*	**39**
Thurrock	28	41	*	11	*	**52**
Torbay	38	64	*	*	*	**70**
Tower Hamlets	30	120	*	19	34	**174**
Trafford	x	x	x	x	x	x
Wakefield	x	x	x	x	x	x
Walsall	*	20	*	*	*	**23**
Waltham Forest	x	x	x	x	x	x
Wandsworth	*	12	*	*	*	**17**
Warrington	14	27	*	*	*	**28**
Warwickshire	15	19	*	*	12	**35**
West Berkshire	10	17	*	*	*	**18**
West Sussex	14	14	*	*	13	**34**
Westminster	x	x	x	x	x	x

Local Authority	Offered and accepted 2010-2011 only	Offered and accepted	Offered and declined	Offered and put on waiting list	Not offered intervention	Total number of families referred
Wigan	38	62	*	*	15	**82**
Wiltshire	*	17	*	*	*	**22**
Windsor and Maidenhead	*	12	*	*	*	**20**
Wirral	79	155	*	15	25	**198**
Wokingham	x	x	x	x	x	x
Wolverhampton	11	16	*	*	*	**16**
Worcestershire	56	131	*	14	71	**216**
York	30	33	*	*	*	**40**
Total	**3,423**	**8,841**	**363**	**308**	**3,338**	**12,850**

Source: The NatCen Family Intervention Projects Information System

Key

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

N/A- No data entered for families.

x This Local Authority has not given permission for their figures to be published. This may be because the Local Authority used a different Information System and may believe that the data available nationally does not reflect the true extent of their work with families.

z The intervention service in this Local Authority has closed and statistics cannot be provided.

Information entered onto the information system after 5th April 2011 concerning families supported up to 31st March 2011 has not been included. This means that data may not provide a complete record of the number of families supported in every area.

Table 2.1 Service engagement and reason for exiting intervention by local authority area

Years: January 2006 to March 2011
Coverage: England

Local Authority	Total number of families offered and accepted intervention to 31 March 2011	Annual measure of service engagement[1]	Number of families exiting for a successful reason[2]	Number of families exiting for an unsuccessful reason[3]	Number of families exiting for another reason
Barking & Dagenham	13	*	*	*	*
Barnet	x	x	x	x	x
Barnsley	95	*	43	*	*
Bath and North East Somerset	11	*	*	*	*
Bedford	33	*	*	*	*
Bexley	20	*	*	*	*
Birmingham	77	89%	19	*	*
Blackburn	185	69%	66	*	*
Blackpool	139	95%	55	*	*
Bolton	x	x	x	x	x
Bournemouth	78	*	25	*	*
Bracknell Forest	14	*	*	*	*
Bradford	124	90%	41	*	*
Brent	z	z	z	z	z
Brighton	z	z	z	z	z
Bristol	136	*	61	*	*
Bromley	x	x	x	x	x
Buckinghamshire	x	x	x	x	x
Bury	14	*	10	*	*
Calderdale	22	*	*	*	*
Cambridgeshire	16	*	*	*	*
Camden	x	x	x	x	x
Central Bedfordshire	14	*	*	*	*
Cheshire East	10	*	*	*	*
Cheshire West and Chester	44	*	*	*	*
Cornwall	14	*	*	*	*
Coventry	101	*	33	*	*
Croydon	15	*	*	*	*
Cumbria	17	*	*	*	*
Darlington	61	*	22	*	*
Derby	73	*	30	*	*
Derbyshire	97	97%	15	*	*
Devon including Exeter	x	x	x	x	x
Doncaster	51	*	24	*	*
Dorset	17	*	*	*	*
Dudley	17	*	*	*	*
Durham including Derwentside	x	x	x	x	x
Ealing	18	*	*	*	*
East Riding of Yorkshire	*	*	*	*	*
East Sussex including Hastings	87	88%	26	*	*
Enfield	13	*	*	*	*
Essex including Harlow	75	94%	*	*	*

Local Authority	Total number of families offered and accepted intervention to 31 March 2011	Annual measure of service engagement[1]	Number of families exiting for a successful reason[2]	Number of families exiting for an unsuccessful reason[3]	Number of families exiting for another reason
Gateshead	68	91%	21	*	*
Gloucestershire including Gloucester	33	*	15	*	*
Greenwich	x	x	x	x	x
Hackney	x	x	x	x	x
Halton	51	*	13	*	*
Hammersmith and Fulham	x	x	x	x	x
Hampshire	x	x	x	x	x
Haringey	45	*	*	*	*
Harrow	*	*	*	*	*
Hartlepool	70	*	14	*	*
Havering	10	*	*	*	*
Herefordshire	11	*	*	*	*
Hertfordshire	64	90%	*	*	*
Hillingdon	x	x	x	x	x
Hounslow	19	*	*	*	*
Isle of Wight	x	x	x	x	x
Isles of Scilly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Islington	28	*	*	*	*
Kensington and Chelsea	*	*	*	*	*
Kent	24	*	*	*	*
Kingston upon Hull	113	50%	40	*	*
Kingston upon Thames	22	*	*	*	*
Kirklees	73	*	28	*	*
Knowsley	x	x	x	x	x
Lambeth	x	x	x	x	x
Lancashire	80	*	25	*	*
Leeds	212	96%	91	*	**11**
Leicester	95	*	43	*	*
Leicestershire including Melton	42	*	15	*	*
Lewisham	44	*	*	*	*
Lincolnshire	33	*	*	*	*
Liverpool	x	x	x	x	x
Luton	26	*	12	*	*
Manchester	261	95%	88	*	*
Medway Towns	x	x	x	x	x
Merton	14	*	*	*	*
Middlesbrough	152	75%	58	*	**10**
Milton Keynes	25	*	*	*	*
Newcastle-Upon-Tyne	x	x	x	x	x
Newham	86	*	19	*	*
Norfolk including Norwich and Ormiston (Great Yarmouth)	331	93%	111	*	**13**
North East Lincs	139	86%	81	*	*
North Lincolnshire	31	*	*	*	*
North Somerset	x	x	x	x	x
North Tyneside	35	*	*	*	*
North Yorkshire	51	*	16	*	*
Northamptonshire	68	94%	12	*	*
Northumberland	28	*	10	*	*
Nottingham	x	x	x	x	x
Nottinghamshire	106	91%	34	*	*

Local Authority	Total number of families offered and accepted intervention to 31 March 2011	Annual measure of service engagement[1]	Number of families exiting for a successful reason[2]	Number of families exiting for an unsuccessful reason[3]	Number of families exiting for another reason
Oldham	223	83%	74	*	*
Oxfordshire	23	*	*	*	*
Peterborough	x	x	x	x	x
Plymouth	99	85%	26	*	*
Poole	42	*	11	*	*
Portsmouth	94	*	52	*	*
Reading	23	*	*	*	*
Redbridge	24	*	*	*	*
Redcar and Cleveland	99	95%	35	*	*
Richmond upon Thames	x	x	x	x	x
Rochdale	x	x	x	x	x
Rotherham	64	*	29	*	*
Rutland	x	x	x	x	x
Salford	154	85%	43	*	*
Sandwell	49	*	16	*	*
Sefton	x	x	x	x	x
Sheffield	161	91%	62	*	*
Shropshire	25	*	*	*	*
Slough	x	x	x	x	x
Solihull	x	x	x	x	x
Somerset	20	*	*	*	*
South Gloucestershire	*	*	*	*	*
South Tyneside	83	84%	31	*	*
Southampton	95	*	45	*	*
Southend on Sea	82	*	30	*	*
Southwark	49	*	16	*	*
St Helens	x	x	x	x	x
Staffordshire	50	*	*	*	*
Stockport	36	*	*	*	*
Stockton-on-Tees	33	*	*	*	*
Stoke	180	90%	55	*	*
Suffolk including Ipswich	156	94%	46	*	*
Sunderland	141	*	59	*	*
Surrey	x	x	x	x	x
Sutton	16	*	*	*	*
Swindon	10	*	*	*	*
Tameside	99	93%	*	*	*
Telford & the Wrekin	32	*	*	*	*
Thurrock	41	*	*	*	*
Torbay	64	92%	18	*	*
Tower Hamlets	120	80%	42	*	*
Trafford	x	x	x	x	x
Wakefield	x	x	x	x	x
Walsall	20	*	*	*	*
Waltham Forest	x	x	x	x	x
Wandsworth	12	*	*	*	*
Warrington	27	*	*	*	*
Warwickshire	19	*	*	*	*
West Berkshire	17	*	*	*	*
West Sussex	14	*	*	*	*
Westminster	x	x	x	x	x

Local Authority	Total number of families offered and accepted intervention to 31 March 2011	Annual measure of service engagement[1]	Number of families exiting for a successful reason[2]	Number of families exiting for an unsuccessful reason[3]	Number of families exiting for another reason
Wigan	62	91%	10	*	*
Wiltshire	17	*	*	*	*
Windsor and Maidenhead	12	*	*	*	*
Wirral	155	93%	61	*	*
Wokingham	x	x	x	x	x
Wolverhampton	16	*	*	*	*
Worcestershire	131	91%	30	*	*
York	33	*	*	*	*
Total	**8,841**	**89%**	**2,569**	**142**	**316**

Source: The NatCen Family Intervention Projects Information System

Key

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

[1] Annual measure of service engagement figures suppressed to avoid disclosure if the number of families exiting the intervention plus the number still receiving the intervention is fewer than 50.

[2] Successful reasons are based on practitioner assessment of families on leaving on the reason, including any of the following: The intervention was successful, Support plan goals were satisfied, Family nominated to move back onto council housing list, Formal actions in place against family lifted, Family no longer eligible for FIP intervention, Family no longer at risk of homelessness, Anti-social behaviour levels reduced, Worklessness no longer an issue, Youth crime no longer an issue or Intervention successful for another reason. Please see the annex to the Official Statistics for more details.

[3] Unsuccessful reasons are based on: Family refused intervention or Family not engaging with the project.

N/A- No data entered for families.

x This Local Authority has not given permission for their figures to be published. This may be because the Local Authority used a different Information System and may believe that the data available nationally does not reflect the true extent of their work with families.

z The intervention service in this Local Authority has closed and statistics cannot be provided.

Information entered onto the information system after 5th April 2011 concerning families supported up to 31st March 2011 has not been included. This means that data may not provide a complete record of the number of families supported in every area.

Figures for families exiting are based on the number of families who were classified as leaving for a successful, inconclusive or unsuccessful reason (3,027 families) and excludes the 648 families who were recorded as leaving for both successful and unsuccessful reasons, or for whom no reason was given.

Table 3.1 Outcome measures by local authority area

Years: January 2006 to March 2011
Coverage: England

Local Authority	Reduction in the number of families with education problems	Number of families used for education reduction	Reduction in the number of families with employment problems	Number of families used for employment reduction	Reduction in the number of families with health risks	Number of families used for health risks reduction	Reduction in the number of families experiencing risks associated with poor family functioning	Number of families used for poor family functioning reduction	Reduction in the number of families involved in crime and ASB	Number of families used for crime and ASB reduction
Barking & Dagenham	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Barnet	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Barnsley	66%	59	17%	58	56%	58	71%	59	52%	59
Bath and North East Somerset	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Bedford	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Bexley	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Birmingham	***	26	***	21	***	25	***	26	***	25
Blackburn	46%	106	7%	96	-10%	104	13%	106	48%	104
Blackpool	36%	83	29%	78	1%	83	17%	83	29%	83
Bolton	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Bournemouth	***	33	***	32	***	33	***	33	***	33
Bracknell Forest	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Bradford	70%	56	17%	56	51%	56	67%	56	40%	55
Brent	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z
Brighton	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z
Bristol	48%	89	23%	90	32%	88	36%	89	39%	88
Bromley	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Buckinghamshire	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Bury	***	13	***	14	***	13	***	13	***	13
Calderdale	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Cambridgeshire	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Camden	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Central Bedfordshire	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Cheshire East	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Cheshire West and Chester	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Cornwall	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Coventry	***	36	***	35	***	36	***	36	***	34
Croydon	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Cumbria	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Darlington	***	25	***	24	***	24	***	25	***	25
Derby	***	40	***	39	***	39	***	40	***	40
Derbyshire	***	18	***	19	***	18	***	18	***	18
Devon including Exeter	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Doncaster	***	33	***	31	***	30	***	33	***	29
Dorset	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Dudley	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Durham including Derwentside	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Local Authority	Reduction in the number of families with education problems	Number of families used for education reduction	Reduction in the number of families with employment problems	Number of families used for employment reduction	Reduction in the number of families with health risks	Number of families used for health risks reduction	Reduction in the number of families experiencing risks associated with poor family functioning	Number of families used for poor family functioning reduction	Reduction in the number of families involved in crime and ASB	Number of families used for crime and ASB reduction
Ealing	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
East Riding of Yorkshire	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
East Sussex including Hastings	***	34	***	30	***	33	***	34	***	33
Enfield	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Essex including Harlow	***	19	***	18	***	19	***	19	***	19
Gateshead	***	27	***	25	***	27	***	27	***	25
Gloucestershire including Gloucester	***	19	***	18	***	19	***	19	***	19
Greenwich	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Hackney	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Halton	***	16	***	14	***	16	***	16	***	16
Hammersmith and Fulham	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Hampshire	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Haringey	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Harrow	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Hartlepool	***	22	***	22	***	22	***	22	***	21
Havering	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Herefordshire	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Hertfordshire	***	10	***	10	***	10	***	10	***	<10
Hillingdon	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Hounslow	***	14	***	15	***	14	***	14	***	14
Isle of Wight	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Isles of Scilly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Islington	***	11	***	11	***	11	***	11	***	11
Kensington and Chelsea	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Kent	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Kingston upon Hull	60%	90	13%	90	44%	90	29%	90	67%	85
Kingston upon Thames	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Kirklees	***	40	***	41	***	40	***	40	***	38
Knowsley	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Lambeth	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Lancashire	***	41	***	37	***	41	***	41	***	39
Leeds	65%	115	34%	103	64%	114	69%	115	57%	116
Leicester	31%	54	21%	54	1%	52	43%	54	53%	54
Leicestershire including Melton	***	20	***	18	***	19	***	20	***	20
Lewisham	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Lincolnshire	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Liverpool	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Luton	***	15	***	15	***	15	***	15	***	15
Manchester	56%	117	22%	117	32%	115	49%	117	56%	116
Medway Towns	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Merton	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Middlesbrough	65%	96	20%	90	36%	95	48%	96	49%	96
Milton Keynes	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Newcastle-Upon-Tyne	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Newham	***	23	***	14	***	23	***	23	***	23
Norfolk including Norwich and Ormiston (Great Yarmouth)	52%	159	1%	155	22%	157	42%	159	42%	156

Local Authority	Reduction in the number of families with education problems	Number of families used for education reduction	Reduction in the number of families with employment problems	Number of families used for employment reduction	Reduction in the number of families with health risks	Number of families used for health risks reduction	Reduction in the number of families experiencing risks associated with poor family functioning	Number of families used for poor family functioning reduction	Reduction in the number of families involved in crime and ASB	Number of families used for crime and ASB reduction
North East Lincs	56%	102	4%	73	38%	101	48%	102	47%	102
North Lincolnshire	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
North Somerset	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
North Tyneside	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
North Yorkshire	***	20	***	20	***	20	***	20	***	20
Northamptonshire	***	20	***	16	***	20	***	20	***	20
Northumberland	***	12	***	12	***	12	***	12	***	10
Nottingham	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Nottinghamshire	***	40	***	28	***	40	***	40	***	42
Oldham	41%	106	3%	92	4%	105	39%	106	46%	107
Oxfordshire	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Peterborough	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Plymouth	***	43	***	42	***	41	***	43	***	41
Poole	***	16	***	15	***	16	***	16	***	16
Portsmouth	53%	56	-7%	56	51%	56	69%	56	46%	58
Reading	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Redbridge	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Redcar and Cleveland	***	38	***	39	***	38	***	38	***	40
Richmond upon Thames	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Rochdale	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Rotherham	***	40	***	38	***	38	***	40	***	40
Rutland	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Salford	32%	64	11%	60	52%	64	35%	64	56%	65
Sandwell	***	19	***	19	***	19	***	19	***	18
Sefton	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sheffield	47%	86	32%	83	34%	83	54%	86	33%	85
Shropshire	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Slough	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Solihull	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Somerset	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
South Gloucestershire	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
South Tyneside	***	45	***	45	***	44	***	45	***	44
Southampton	53%	57	15%	57	12%	57	63%	57	44%	59
Southend on Sea	***	44	***	48	***	44	***	44	***	45
Southwark	***	19	***	18	***	18	***	19	***	19
St Helens	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Staffordshire	***	21	***	21	***	21	***	21	***	19
Stockport	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Stockton-on-Tees	***	11	***	12	***	11	***	11	***	11
Stoke	56%	74	15%	69	28%	74	57%	74	55%	75
Suffolk including Ipswich	76%	56	2%	56	55%	56	62%	56	74%	50
Sunderland	50%	74	10%	61	65%	73	67%	74	34%	73
Surrey	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sutton	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Swindon	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Tameside	***	11	***	<10	***	11	***	11	***	11
Telford & the Wrekin	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Thurrock	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Torbay	***	24	***	24	***	23	***	24	***	23
Tower Hamlets	31%	61	16%	62	-13%	61	50%	61	17%	57
Trafford	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Local Authority	Reduction in the number of families with education problems	Number of families used for education reduction	Reduction in the number of families with employment problems	Number of families used for employment reduction	Reduction in the number of families with health risks	Number of families used for health risks reduction	Reduction in the number of families experiencing risks associated with poor family functioning	Number of families used for poor family functioning reduction	Reduction in the number of families involved in crime and ASB	Number of families used for crime and ASB reduction
Wakefield	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Walsall	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Waltham Forest	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Wandsworth	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Warrington	***	11	***	11	***	11	***	11	***	11
Warwickshire	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
West Berkshire	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
West Sussex	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0	***	0
Westminster	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Wigan	*	15	*	15	*	15	*	15	*	14
Wiltshire	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0
Windsor and Maidenhead	*	<10	*	<10	*	<10	*	<10	*	<10
Wirral	53%	71	14%	68	6%	71	39%	71	56%	72
Wokingham	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Wolverhampton	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Worcestershire	***	40	***	30	***	39	***	40	***	40
York	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10	***	<10
Total	**53%**	**3,634**	**14%**	**3,423**	**34%**	**3,628**	**47%**	**3,634**	**50%**	**3,590**

Source: The NatCen Family Intervention Projects Information System

Key

*** Figures suppressed to avoid disclosure of counts fewer than 50.

<10 shown where less than 10 families were used for percentage reduction figures to avoid disclosure.

N/A- No data entered for families.

x This Local Authority has not given permission for their figures to be published. This may be because the Local Authority used a different Information System and may believe that the data available nationally does not reflect the true extent of their work with families.

z The intervention service in this Local Authority has closed and statistics cannot be provided.

Information entered onto the information system after 5th April 2011 concerning families supported up to 31st March 2011 has not been included. This means that data may not provide a complete record of the number of families supported in every area.

Annex 1

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

* This code is no longer offered in the Family Intervention Information System at Review stage
** This code was added to the Family Intervention Information System in July 2009
> In January 2009 these codes were removed for families leaving at Exit stage, meaning that there were no longer any unsuccessful reasons for leaving an Anti-social behaviour family intervention at the Exit stage.
*** i.e. children taken into local authority/ foster care
**** i.e. unsafe for family intervention staff to continue visits