



## Impact of the Short Break Programme on the Prevention of Disabled Children Entering the Looked After System

Together for Disabled Children  
Boundary House  
2 Wythall Green Way  
Wythall  
Birmingham  
B47 6LW  
[www.togetherfdc.org](http://www.togetherfdc.org)

January 2011  
Version 1.0

## Acknowledgements

Together for Disabled Children would like to thank the following for their input into the development of this product:

The 17 local authorities who took part including:

**Barnet**  
**Durham**  
**Ealing**  
**Enfield**  
**Gateshead**  
**Gloucestershire**  
**Knowsley**  
**North Tyneside**  
**North Yorkshire**  
**Sunderland**  
**Warwickshire**  
**Wigan**  
**Worcestershire**

TDC acknowledges the input of:

**Reshma Spafford** Local Programme advisor  
**Mary Kuhn** Local Programme Advisor  
**Rita Wiseman** Director of Strategy and Stakeholder Engagement  
**Jane Harrison** Regional Programme Lead  
**Helen Jones** Regional Assistant

## Contents

Acknowledgements .....	2
Introduction and Key Findings .....	4
Methodology .....	5
Case Studies .....	7
Value for Money .....	8
Approach to Short Breaks.....	12
Impact on Disabled Children and Young People .....	15
Impact on Parents and Carers.....	17
Impact on Local Area Policy and Practice .....	19
Impact on Practitioners.....	21
Appendices.....	22
Appendix 1 Interview Proforma .....	22
Appendix 2 Case Studies.....	26
Appendix 3 Cost of Short Break Compared to Alternative Option.....	60
Appendix 4 Cost Benefit of Prevention of Disabled Children Entering Looked After System .....	61
Appendix 5 Trend Data .....	62
Appendix 6 County Durham's Formula .....	70

Document Properties			
Document Owner	Rita Wiseman		
Organisation	Together for Disabled Children		
Title	Impact of the Short Break Programme on the Prevention of Disabled Children Entering the Looked After System		
Version History			
Date	Version	Author	Details
28 <sup>th</sup> January 2011	V2.0	Jane Harrison Reshma Spafford Rita Wiseman	Published version

## Introduction and Key Findings

This report sets out the findings of a distinct piece of research on the impact of the Aiming High for Disabled Children short breaks programme on the prevention of disabled children and young people entering the Looked After System.

It should be noted that the local authorities who took part did so voluntarily and that there was no randomisation of selection, therefore these findings may not be representative of the entire population of local authorities.

Three strands were explored:

Strand 1 – Whether there was a reduction on the number of children who entered the Looked After System

Strand 2 – Whether there was a reduction in the numbers of disabled children who were placed out of the area

Strand 3 – Whether there was a reduction in the need for emergency, high cost placement

### Key Findings

Short break services appear to have prevented disabled children entering the Looked After System and thus potentially saved money for the LA.

All participating local areas state that they are focussing on early identification and support as a means of preventing children and young people from requiring emergency and long term Looked After placements.

All local areas have developed a wide range of holiday provision recognising it as the peak time for increased requests for children to be at risk of becoming 'Looked After' or for emergency placements.

Short breaks have reduced the need for costly out of borough placements. In staying closer to home, children are potentially enabled to have improved engagement in their own communities and reduced transition issues.

Targeted support via the Common Assessment Framework has had the added value of improving multi-disciplinary working relationships. Local authorities involved in this study see short breaks as part of their preventative strategy.

## Methodology

This report presents a snapshot of the experiences of children and young people and their families in 17 self-selected local areas across the country.

It specifically considers how the approach used by local authorities in implementing the short breaks programme, and the additional funding has prevented disabled children from entering the Looked After System.

### 2.1 The Sample

The methodology is limited by the fact that research was conducted over a period of three weeks in September. The samples therefore, were self-selected or nominated by their TDC Local Programme Adviser. It is likely then that these areas had a reputation for good practice in this area and may not be fully representative of the field.

### 2.2 The Process

#### Qualitative information

The following process was used to ascertain qualitative information:

Local programme advisers were emailed and asked to identify any local areas that they felt had examples of good practice that they could contribute. Local areas were also contacted directly by email at the end of August. The email gave them some background on the research outcomes and asked them for some preliminary information regarding their achievements. 17 local areas responded. These were:

- North: Durham, Sunderland, Gateshead, Wigan, Knowsley, North Tyneside, North Yorkshire
- Midlands and London – Worcestershire, Warwickshire, A shire County in the North, Barnet, Enfield and Ealing
- South and East – A LA in the South, Gloucestershire, A small LA in the South East , A County Council

Volunteer local areas were contacted and interviewed either face to face or by telephone using a proforma (Appendix 1). **Please note that not all local areas could answer every question due to the short timescale of this study.**

Case studies were developed and agreed by the LA (Appendix 2). In the majority of cases the short breaks lead and the manager responsible for the disabled children's team contributed to the research. The views of parents and young people and levels of satisfaction were ascertained through anecdotal information from those interviewed and analysis of evaluation documents.

#### Quantitative data

The qualitative data was supplemented by quantitative data.

- Costs benefits were analysed by comparing the cost of short break packages with what the local area may have had to pay if short break funding was not available and the child had to enter the Looked After System. Appendix 2.
- The average annual cost of an Out of Borough placement, an in house residential placement and a specialist foster care placement was ascertained from local authorities. Appendix 3 - These figures have not been verified by TDC.
- Anecdotal information was obtained from the Disabled Children's Team in Social Care on their views on the reduction of requests for emergency placements. Anecdotal information on their view on the number of children who were prevented from entering the Looked After System through the use of short breaks in the year 09/10 was also ascertained. Appendix 4.
- LAIMPs (local area improvement plans) for the 17 local areas were also analysed to identify actual and trend data. Appendix 4 and 5.

## Case Studies

Appendix 2 details case studies of individual children or specific developments in local authorities' prevention of disabled children entering the Looked After System.

The case studies examine the circumstances of the child and family, the relevant strand of the study that it refers to, the package that was put in place to prevent the child being Looked After, the cost of the package from short breaks funding, the alternatives for the child had the package not been available and the cost of this option and the impact to the child and his or her parents.

## Value for Money

### 4.1 Cost savings for 22 individual disabled children represented in the case studies (Appendix 3)

17 local authorities contributed to the case studies to demonstrate how short breaks had appeared to have prevented disabled children being looked after. For the 22 children mentioned in the case studies the information is as follows:

- All the children were known to social workers and at risk of being looked after.
- The cost of placements for the 22 children would have been £2,226,162 (no cost was set against three children so the highest amount from another LA was set against the three).
- Reported cost of short breaks for the same children was £374,605
- The potential cost savings for just 22 children identified in the case studies is **£1,851,550**

### 4.2 Cost savings of prevention of disabled children entering the Looked After System (general) Appendix 4

- In addition to children identified through the case studies, some local areas (7) were able to identify additional numbers of disabled children they felt were prevented from entering the Looked After System. There were requests for a further 35 disabled children to be looked after that were prevented by short breaks as an intervention. This represents an annual minimum saving of £1,820,000 (based on the cost of a family placement) to a maximum saving of £7,000,000 (based on the cost of a residential out of borough school placement) in just seven local authorities. This is would represent a significant cost saving if there was a similar trend in across the rest of the 143 local authorities not represented in this sample.
- The cost savings in preventing just a few children from entering the Looked After System exceeds the total short break revenue grant for the whole year in some local areas and represents excellent value for money - e.g. Knowsley believes it prevented four disabled children from entering the Looked After System in 09/10. This represents a minimum cost saving of £208,000 and a maximum cost saving of £800,000. Knowsley's short break allocation in 09/10 was £246,000 and reached 1140 children in 09/10 (Appendix 4).
- Local areas have also extended their reach to far more children (47,000 more disabled children have received some level of short breaks in the time of the programme) and are able to provide an increased volume and range of services that are more tailored to meet their unique needs; particularly those who may have

needed to be looked after therefore delivering better outcomes (Appendix 4) and qualitatively illustrated by the case studies.

- An example of how local authorities are strategically preventing children from being looked after is Durham. They used a summer scheme to prevent 35 disabled children who were identified as being at risk of entering the Looked After System. The scheme operated through the six week school holiday period at a total cost of £90,000, The cost per child per week was £428.50 which gives a total of **£2,571** per child for the six week period. If the children had been placed in a residential setting (based on an annual cost of £200,000), it would have cost £3,846 per child per week which gives a total cost of **£23,076** per child for the six week period. The total residential cost for 35 children over six weeks would therefore have been £807,660, so the scheme resulted in cost savings of **£717,660**.
- Sixteen local authorities were also able to provide numbers of disabled children entering the Looked After System over the past three years and these figures are summarised in the tables below. Detailed evidence is in Appendix 5.

**Table 1. Number of Disabled Children in Looked After in Residential Homes**

<b>Number of Disabled Children Looked After in Residential Homes</b>		
08\09	239	<b>Increase/Decrease</b>
09\10	212	-27
10\11	204	-8
	<b>Overall Decrease</b>	<b>-35</b>

**Table 2. Number of Disabled Children in Family Based Placements**

<b>Number of Disabled Children in Family Based Placements</b>		
08\09	145	<b>Increase/Decrease</b>
09\10	154	+11
10\11	139	-17
	<b>Overall Decrease</b>	<b>-6</b>

**Table 3. Number of Disabled Children in Out of Area Placements over 20 Miles from Home**

<b>Number of Disabled Children in Out Of Area Placements over 20 Miles from Home</b>		
08\09	315	<b>Increase/Decrease</b>
09\10	303	-16
10\11	271	-32
	<b>Overall Decrease</b>	<b>-48</b>

Every type of accommodation for children being looked after has seen a trend in the reduction in numbers. The trend reflects the local areas commitment to reducing the numbers of children looked after especially those in out of area placements evidenced by their projections for 10/11.

Whilst it is impossible to attribute the downward trend totally to short breaks local authorities were confident that this had made a significant impact and really saw short breaks as part of their preventative strategy.

### **4.3 Other Cost Information**

- Durham currently has 24 children in out of county placements at a total cost of £2,761,402 per year. Nine of these children are in residential school with a cost of £200,000 per child per year (Appendix 6)
- Local authorities reported that once disabled children are in the Looked After System it is very difficult for them to return home especially as they get older. The costs

therefore are phenomenal for a number of years. For example, £1,800,000 would need to be spent on Richard (aged 11) alone should he have needed to be looked after. This compares to £132,566 if the current short break package continues. (Gloucestershire).

- Local authorities report that short break packages are as little as 8% of the comparative costs if children are looked after rather than receiving a short break. ( A LA in the South, Warwickshire, Ealing)
- The average costs of services per child are:
  - Family based specialist placement is £1,000 per week per child or £52,000 per annum
  - Out of borough residential school costs average £3,800 per week or £200,000 per year. Costs are usually shared between social care, education and health. In North Tyneside this share is 95% local authority (education and placement budget) and 5% from health.
  - External children's home costs £3461 per week or £180,000 per annum.
  - In house residential children's home costs £2,211 per week or £115,000 per annum.
- However in reality, in-house placements are difficult to source and costly out of borough school placements are used. In the majority of cases this is the only option available even when the primary need is for "care" rather than education.

## Approach to Short Breaks

The following key themes emerged with regard to local areas' approach to short breaks, which made an impact on preventing disabled children entering the Looked After System:

- All the local areas in the survey were focussing on early identification and support as a means of preventing children and young people from requiring emergency and long term looked after placements
- All the local areas in the survey had a multifaceted approach. This included the development of the universal, targeted and specialist sector
- A number of local areas had also empowered parent forums to apply for funding for whole family activities to give the whole family a break (Knowsley, Durham and North Tyneside).

### 5.1 Universal sector

All of the local areas in the survey had easily accessible short breaks funding to develop the universal sector to include disabled children. This may include funding for one-to-one support, equipment or staff training and development, with the funding usually following the child. A key factor of this approach is to address barriers to inclusion by addressing staff anxieties about their abilities to include disabled children. One to one support alongside formal training provides informal opportunities for the development of the staff teams within universal settings. This also has an impact on long-term sustainability as staff may continue to work in the setting and will be able to address the needs of disabled children and young people without extra funding.

### 5.2 Targeted Services

- All local areas in the study have invested in a number of commissioned targeted services delivered either by local authorities or through the voluntary sector or parent groups
- All local areas in the study have developed a wide range of holiday provision after direct consultation with disabled children, young people and their families. Summer holidays are recognised as the peak time for adding stress to families with the result of an increase in the requests for children to be Looked After or emergency placements. Planned opportunities during summer have resulted in no requests for emergency placements in 60% of the local areas who responded to this question.
- The developments for out of school activities are imaginative, child focussed with the emphasis on fun in the belief that disabled children and young people have the right to have the same opportunities as young people of the same age who are not disabled. The variety of activities funded includes sports and leisure, drama, arts and crafts, residential activity weekends, one-to-one befriending support to access the activities and purchase of specialist equipment to facilitate inclusion (over and above Disability Discrimination Act requirements.)

- In order to improve access to an increased range of preventative targeted and universal activities - 100% of those that responded to this question) have developed tiered access criteria. This approach has resulted in a number of professionals being able to access funding e.g. through the Common Assessment Framework (CAF), or directly by applying for grants to access universal services. This results in only those young people with complex needs requiring complex passages of support being referred to the Disabled Children's team.

### 5.3 Family Focused Activities

- A number of authorities have also developed family focussed activities to reduce stress on families and give the whole family a break. This is a response to families stating that family holidays were not an option or was not a break because of extra pressure put on them by other holidaymakers intolerant of some of the challenging behaviour presented by their disabled child. Siblings were also embarrassed by the reaction of other holidaymakers. North Tyneside, Knowsley and Durham developed whole family holiday packages.

*" The children were all having so much fun. Parents felt comfortable that their disabled children could approach the other families who would understand their problems and be warm and friendly, unlike what they are used to, where strangers may judge their children unfavourably, not being able to understand their unique complexities. They were able to delight in their children and not be embarrassed. It was particularly heart-warming to see older siblings being so friendly and helpful to each other."*

Organiser, Center Park Holiday, Knowsley

- Parent groups are also encouraged to apply for short break grants. This approach has an added value as groups increased their skills in writing bids, which provides for long-term sustainability as families can successfully bid for a wider range of funding opportunities. North Tyneside has also noted that an unexpected outcome of this approach was that it was very good value for money as parents used to good housekeeping are able to make a small amount of money go far.

### 5.4 Specialist services

- Local areas have developed a number of short break specialist initiatives for disabled children and young people with complex needs. These initiatives are focused on reducing the need for children to be looked after where the key factor is stress on families. This includes the development of home based care and one-to-one personal assistant support to take the child out, to avoid children being taken into Looked After accommodation on an emergency or long term basis for example, if the key issue was parents' inability to sleep because of the pressure of overnight care for their child. Some of the authorities have invested in developing the personal assistant service by recruiting young people in recognition of the fact that young people would prefer to go out accompanied by other young people.

- Direct payments are being used to develop imaginative packages in a mixed service; a combination of direct payments and commissioned services. Barnet and Gateshead are also piloting individual budgets.

## **5.5 Services for Disabled Children Being Looked After or to Prevent Children Being Looked After**

- Local areas appear to be committed to prevent disabled children being looked after where the only reason for this request is family's capacity to cope due to caring responsibilities. Children who have safeguarding as an issue will continue to require Looked After placements
- Local areas also appear to be committed to bringing children back into the borough if at all possible. The key triggers are the cost of expensive out of borough placements in a financial climate which requires money to be saved
- However this is not the only reason and local areas want to achieve good outcomes for children particularly those that are older because of transition implications (in Section 6 Impact on Children and Young people)
- Most of the children in the case studies as part of his research would be difficult to place within the borough and would have required expensive out of borough placements which may not necessarily meet their needs but be the only option available
- Local areas are developing a number of strategies to provide services in the borough with prevention being the main aim
- Most local areas are using their short breaks residential units to provide a mixed provision for children needing a longer term placement and those needing a short break (North Yorkshire, North Tyneside)
- Residential short break units are also being used as an opportunity to conduct an assessment to develop a longer-term support package. Assessments are multi-disciplinary and focused on preventing children from being accommodated if at all possible
- Staff from short break residential units also provide outreach support and training to parents and other staff on management techniques (North Tyneside, Worcestershire). Sunderland has developed a joint funded outreach resource (health, social care and Aiming High). QUEST is an outreach service led by the psychology department who work predominately with young people with challenging behaviour and severe learning difficulties. They conduct an assessment and develop a behaviour management plan for families and professionals to implement with an offer of ongoing supervision. The plan focuses on recognising triggers de-escalating situations and the reductions of physical restraints. The assessment also considers the young person's overall needs. Worcestershire has developed a similar service linked to their short breaks unit in partnership with CAMHS

- The London Borough of Ealing's Intensive Therapeutic and Short Breaks Service is a collaborative initiative between agencies from the Ealing Service for Children with Additional Needs (ESCAN). These include Clinical Psychology for Children with Disabilities, Ealing Short Breaks Services and Social Services for Children with Disabilities.

## Impact on Disabled Children and Young People

The individual impact of not entering the Looked After system is detailed in Appendix 2.

This section sets out the general impact on disabled children and young people of remaining at home. The key outcome that all local areas that took part in this study wanted to achieve was to enable the young person to remain in the community and with his/her parents and not be accommodated. The impact of short breaks development to young people therefore was:

- It kept disabled children and young people at home and within their communities supported by a package that met their individual needs
- It gave them opportunities for fun and to be involved in activities that their non-disabled peers had access to
- It addressed their care and social needs
- In those cases where a residential placement out of borough was the only resource available the placement was usually within a 52-week school setting. In a number of these cases education was not necessarily the key issue. However shortage or lack of suitable care placements resulted in this being the only option
- The focussed support on behaviour management offered to parents and professionals to prevent children from entering the Looked After system resulted in a reduction in the child's challenging behaviour, which made services within the community more accessible to them. This initiative also increased the ability of families to cope with challenging behaviour and resulted in a better quality of home life for the child, his siblings and his parents/carers
- Out of borough placements have a significant impact on young people when they turn 18. Young people become part of the community that they live in and receive support services from that area. It is then more difficult for them to return and integrate back into their community of origin especially if they are moving back from an urban to a rural area. There are also a range of service providers within their area of origin who also may provide services after the age of 18 thus enabling continuity and smooth transition
- It also has an impact on their relationship with Adult Services. Aiming High has enabled higher levels of support which may not be replicated in adult services
- 100% of local authorities had developed systems to seek young people's feedback and involve them in the delivery of the service. Those that responded to the question had also developed systems and processes to involve disabled young people in the

wider strategic development of services for disabled children in the local authority. Durham has recently won a national competition and will be taking a group of disabled children to Brussels to address their needs with members of the European Parliament.

## Impact on Parents and Carers

The individual impact on parents/ carers of their disabled children not entering the Looked After system is detailed in Appendix 2.

### Emergency Placements

- Short breaks have prevented families reaching a point where they request emergency placements. 60% of local areas who responded to this question said that there were no requests for emergency placements during in 2009/10.
- Local areas believe that this is due to short breaks providing planned packages of support with an increased volume and range of provision which meets the needs of children and families.
- Emergency placements have also been reduced because families are more able to cope when they have a planned and reliable break on the horizon.
- Direct payments and individual budgets have also given families flexibilities for emergencies.
- The summer period is seen as the greatest trigger for family stress to reach such a peak that request is made for accommodation. This has been the experience of disabled children's services managers prior to the implementation of Aiming High. The development of holiday activities has resulted in alternatives being offered that reduce the stress on families:

*"D is very full on hard work, especially in school holidays. We benefited by being able to recharge our batteries and have some quality time."*

Durham parent

The responsiveness of the service to the needs of families has resulted in a general level of satisfaction:

*"We would be very grateful if you could pass on 'officially', our gratitude to J (Lead professional), I would not like to think where we would now be this Christmas without her intervention and support. R and we as parents are receiving the support that we need. Thanks."*

Parent Gloucestershire

- Most local areas have developed very good working relationships with parents and have consulted with them and young people as to the services that most meet their needs. This has resulted in a number of very imaginative initiatives that are local to the particular area.
- Parents have also been encouraged and given access to directly apply for funds to support activities (Knowsley, North Tyneside, Durham). This has added value as parents are now skilled in bid writing and therefore may have access to a number of funding streams such as Children in Need. North Tyneside has also noted that parents are able to make a smaller amount of money go further which has implications for the personalisation agenda.

- Engagement with parents has been key feature of the approach with parents employed as 'parent to parent' consultants. (Enfield)
- Services have been developed that include the training and behaviour management support to families so they are much better able to manage their own families. This has resulted in them feeling empowered and has reduced the requests for children to be accommodated. For example, with the partnership between Durham County Council with the North East Autistic Society (NEAS) mentoring and support has been offered to parents. This has resulted in parents feeling empowered and supported, including through a self help group
- In North Tyneside parents have agreed to the development of an emergency bed in the short breaks unit. To maximise use of resources, parents have agreed to the emergency request takes priority over a planned short break with their short break complement being protected and available at a later date. They have agreed to this because they appreciate that they themselves may have a need for an emergency resource at some time.
- Evaluation reports have highlighted a high parental level of satisfaction with the services on offer through Aiming High.

## Impact on Local Area Policy and Practice

- All local areas identify early intervention and support as the key factor in preventing families reaching a crisis point that results in a request for emergency placement for a disabled child to be looked after.
- There has been a significant increase in the volume and range of provision as a result of Aiming High across all the local areas surveyed. There is some evidence to indicate that the focus on improving the range and quality of short breaks and the additional funding has encouraged providers to be more creative in what they do.
- Access frameworks (in contrast to operating eligibility criteria) have resulted in an increase in capacity and quality of flexible support. Therefore a greater number of disabled children have had services that previously would not have been eligible thus reducing the risk of family breakdown due to stress.
- Local areas have been able to provide more intensive support to disabled children and their families who might otherwise have entered the Looked After system
- The increase in direct payments, short break grants has supported family choice and control over the broader personalisation agenda.
- Targeted support provided by commissioned organisations can also be accessed via the Comprehensive Assessment Framework (CAF) initial assessment by a variety of professionals in the localities. This has the added value of improving multidisciplinary working relationships as assessments conducted by a variety of professionals is accepted without further assessment from Social Care. This has resulted in freeing up the social care disabled children's team to deal with complex packages of care
- Initially all areas reported a surge in referrals to social care. This was believed to be the result of communication and information strategies promoting the initiative. However, signposting and partnership working has resulted in this levelling off
- However, there has been a general increase in referrals as more and more families are aware that a service is available with families requesting services at an early stage.
- This has increased the number of families that have been reached (Appendix 4).
- A number of local areas also recognise the need to identify and engage with children before they reach their teenage years with its added complexities. Internal research by Durham highlighted that of the children and young people who attend Thorn Hill Park (out of borough residential school facility) the majority are now in their late teens. However the majority also entered Thorn Hill Park when they were a lot younger. It is envisaged that those currently in out of borough placements will continue to stay on at Thorn Hill Park until they finish their schooling/reach adult years. However, in order to be effective in reducing out of borough placements, Durham have prioritised a need to intervene prior to children becoming teenagers. A

number of these young people are in the autistic spectrum disorder (and have learning disability with severe challenging behaviour). The strategies that Durham have put in place with the commissioning of NEAS (North East Autistic Society) has resulted in complex packages of support being offered to 35 young people who have been identified by social workers as being at risk of needing an out of county placement

- A LA in the South works in close partnership with two special schools to identify possible young people who need early intervention.
- Sunderland has a comprehensive database and proactively promotes the family support service to parents
- The majority of local areas do not have in-house accommodation to meet the needs of the priority groups of children. A number are allocating beds in short break residential units to accommodate long term children.
- Nearly all local areas are using an out of borough residential school when education is not necessarily the primary need. Costs are shared. In Durham this share is one third each between residential, social care placements budgets and health. However, the share in North Tyneside for the same resource is 95% local area (education and social care) and 5% health.
- Two of the local areas were also using hospital accommodation to provide a service to Looked After children. One of these was a long stay unit at an adult hospital for learning disabilities.
- Out of borough placements have a great impact on children and young people. There are clearly issues around maintaining contact and reintegrating these young people back into the community of origin when they are 18 including the transition to adult services.

## Impact on Practitioners

- Professionals have been motivated as they can provide services for disabled children within the local area in response to assessed needs.
- The ‘fear factor’ of working with disabled children in universal services has been addressed through staff training, such as Knowsley’s development of bridging workers to support staff to support children within universal settings.
- A number of local areas surveyed have brokerage schemes where workers broker what is needed in order for the setting to be able to accommodate that child and then apply for funding to deliver this.
- Current evaluation of the short breaks programme in Sunderland has highlighted good value for money e.g. initially youth clubs received one-to-one funding to support young people accessing their service. The modelling of management techniques coupled with the training on offer has resulted in the skill development of workers within the setting. New young people entering the service do so at no extra cost with the service offering a truly inclusive provision. Those workers who support disabled children with autism and challenging behaviour have benefited from the specialist training on offer to parents and themselves on how to address this issue in order to prevent children and young people from being looked after.
- A LA in the South has used the skills of the wider staff team to deliver training at no extra cost. An added value of providers training together and developing professional relationships has been skill and knowledge development to provide flexible packages of support because of their confidence in their colleagues who they have trained with. It has also improved their signposting knowledge.
- Generally flexibility and choice and “out of box” thinking has greatly improved in all local areas surveyed. Parents’ satisfaction in this development has been recognised in service evaluations and compliments received. This has resulted in increased morale of workers.
- In Enfield a comprehensive training programme has been put in place to develop capacity in all services. A sports toolkit was developed to support and promote inclusion in sports centres and a new training programme to support behaviour management has recently been developed which is being made available to all short break providers – childminders, early years, extended schools and youth service.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1 Interview Proforma

#### Research- Impact of Short Breaks Programme

Dear Colleague

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this small piece of research to explore the **impact of the Short Breaks Programme** and the extent to which it has:

- a) Strand 1 - Reduced the number of children who are in the LAC
- b) Strand 2 - Reduced the number of disabled children who are placed out of their area
- c) Strand 3 – Reduced the need for emergency high cost placements

This research is time limited and has to be completed by the **end of September** as it may assist in informing the Comprehensive Spending Review. The methodology is therefore limited to this and aims to assess the impact and outcomes achieved by short breaks using a case study approach. In undertaking the research it not only seeks to explore Strands 1 to 3 but will seek to examine the longer term impact in terms of return on investment.

Fifteen case studies will be developed across the country (a 10% sample).

- A **Local Programme Advisor** will conduct a telephone/face to face interview with identified staff in your local area and **complete the attached proforma**. This will include analysing the documents that are identified as being relevant
- An overall research report pulling out key themes from the 15 areas will be completed
- Individual case studies will be validated and agreed with yourself
- The overall report will provide an overview of the context and include the fifteen case studies on an individual basis. This will allow for ease of access and comparisons of the case studies to be made

Due to the limited timescale for this research, only **existing quantitative** and **qualitative** information will be used to evidence the impact.

The following **impacts** will be considered as part of this research

- The impact on individual children and young people
- The impact on their families specifically
- The impact on local area policy and practice, generally
- The impact on local authority investment

## Impact of Short Breaks Programme

1	Name of Local Area	
2	Region	
3	Personnel Consulted	
4	Contact Details of Personnel Consulted	
5	Date	
6	Which strand(s) does the case study relate to?	

**Please note that the following sections are generic and not all of which will be relevant to your particular case study.**

- 1. Describe your approach to delivering short breaks in your area.**
  - a. What services and activities have you invested in?
  
- 2. Please give an outline the case study exemplar**
  - a. Describe the context/situation
  - b. If this involves interventions with a child or family, what were the family circumstances?
  - c. What outcomes were you seeking to achieve? Consider:
    - Outcomes for disabled children and young people
    - Outcomes for parents, carers and families
    - Outcomes for local area policy and practice
    - Outcomes for practitioners
  
- 3. What short break services and activity(s) took place in relation to this case study?**
  - a. What impact have short breaks had on the individual or groups described in this case study?
  - b. To what extent did short breaks they meet their needs?
  - c. To what extent have children been able to access short breaks (increased volume and range)
  - d. How were the views of disabled children and young people sought to inform activities?
  - e. How satisfied were the disabled children and young people with their SB?
  
- 4. What impact did SB have parents, carers and their families?**
  - a. To what extent were levels of family stress reduced?
  - b. What were the parental satisfaction levels?
  - c. Was there a reduction in the number of families requesting/requiring emergency placements? If so, by how many?
  - d. Was there a reduction in the number of families requiring out of borough placements? If so, by how many?
  - e. Was there a reduction in the numbers of families whose children entered the LAC system? If so, by how many?
  
- 5. What impact did SB have on local policy and practice?**
  - a. What were the service development priorities? (Evidence – Commissioning document, LAIMP)
  - b. To what extent have SB promoted early support and intervention?
  - c. To what extent have SB reduced the need of children requiring emergency placements, out of borough placements and children entering the LAC system.

- d. What impact has this had in financial terms? Please provide costs to support your view.
- e. To what extent are you providing VFM and how have you demonstrated this?
- f. How will the outcomes of this case study support long sustainability and long term change?

**6. What impact have SB had on practitioners?**

- a. Have they had an impact on the numbers of children requiring an assessment through the disabled children's Social Work Team? If so, by how many?
- b. To what extent have access to services improved?
- c. To what extent have choice and flexibility of services improved? e.g. is there an increase in universal provision?
- d. What has been the impact of SB on customer complaints and compliments?
- e. What has been the impact on workload, early intervention, support and prevention?
- f. What has been the impact on staff e.g. increased knowledge and skills, improved motivation etc.

**7. Were there any unexpected outcomes?**

**Any other comments you would like to share:**

**THANK YOU**

## Appendix 2 Case Studies

### Local Areas

- 1 Barnet
- 2 A Shire County in the North
- 3 Durham
- 4 Ealing
- 5 Enfield
- 6 Gateshead
- 7 Gloucestershire
- 8 Knowsley
- 9 North Tyneside
- 10 North Yorkshire
- 11 A County Council
- 12 A small LA in the South East
- 13 Sunderland
- 14 A LA in the South
- 15 Warwickshire
- 16 Wigan
- 17 Worcestershire

1.

<b>LOCAL AREA BARNET STRAND 3</b>
<b>ELLA'S STORY</b>
<p><b>BACKGROUND</b></p> <p>Ella is 14 years old. She has severe autism and additional learning difficulties. Ella attends a special school in borough. About a year ago, Ella's behaviour was becoming increasingly difficult for her family to manage. Her behaviour at school was also becoming more challenging although the school was coping. Thinking ahead about their daughter's needs, Ella's family decided that her needs would be best met in an independent residential special school. The local authority however, believed that Ella's educational provision was meeting her needs. It appeared to be the time when she was not at school where support was required. They wanted to look at how the Short Breaks Programme could be adapted to meet Ella's emerging needs.</p>
<p><b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b></p> <p>Although Ella had Short Break provision, it was in the holiday time. Looking at Ella's pattern of behaviour it seemed that the period after school each day was time where she needed support.</p> <p>Working with the family, it was agreed after some discussion to try providing Ella with activities each day after school supported by a personal assistant. The agency was chosen to provide a personal assistant for Ella and they were able to identify a young person who would work with Ella in a befriender role.</p> <p>The Short Break Programme paid for the one-off subscription to the agency. The family then took over arrangements paying the worker themselves through their Direct Payments.</p> <p><b>Additional opportunities through local voluntary organisations, funded by short breaks, have helped to ensure a consistent programme of leisure activities for Ella.</b></p>
<p><b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b></p> <p>In contrast, the cost of Ella attending a local school and taking part in extended school leisure activities funded by Short Breaks was £10,010 (i.e. £30,030 over 3 years)</p> <p>The Short Break Provision has cost £150 for the one-off subscription to the agency plus a weekly cost of £182.00 for the befriender (10 hours Mon-Fri and 4 hours at the weekend) paid for from the family's individual budget.</p>

## **ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD**

Fees for the residential school that the family had selected for Ella are £56,857 per annum at the present time. The transport costs involved in sending Ella to the school would have been £12,155. The total cost per annum was therefore to be £69,012.

As Ella was 14 at the time, she was likely to have spent at least 3 years at the school. The total cost (not counting fee increases over the years) would have been £207,036

## **IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON**

Ella's befriender helped her to take part in a range of activities that Ella wanted to do each day. This involved cooking, going shopping, travelling on public transport to clubs, sports and leisure activities Ella enjoyed. The befriender was young and able to relate to Ella as another young person. Ella really enjoyed the time she spent with her assistant and the new arrangements began to have a major impact on her behaviour both at home and in school. She is now much calmer and no longer appears to be frustrated.

## **IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS**

Ella's family is delighted by the change. They can now manage Ella at home and in fact are now relaxed about doing much more with Ella themselves. This summer they took Ella away on holiday – something that they did not feel was possible in the past. Although the new arrangements came about following an appeal by Ella's parents to the SEN and Disability Tribunal, they are now very much in support of the approach and the provision made for Ella.

Just a year ago Ella's parents felt very strongly that only a residential school placement could meet her needs and their view was supported at the time by the CAMHS psychiatrist and the independent residential school where Ella had attended a 3-day assessment placement. The Tribunal however, was not persuaded that the educational provision was the problem and the appeal was not upheld. At the time the parents were very disappointed but now, having seen the transformation in their daughter they are very happy.

At Ella's recent annual review, her mother was full of praise for the system and the support that had enabled Ella to remain with her family in her community. Ella is now making links with organisations and individuals which hopefully will be sustained into adult life and contribute to her sense of belonging within the local community.

2.

<b>LOCAL AREA</b>	<b>A Shire County in the North</b>	<b>STRAND 1,2,3</b>
<b>ANTHONY'S STORY</b>		
<b>BACKGROUND</b>		
<p>Anthony is a 17-year-old young man who has severe learning difficulties and challenging behaviour. His parents' marriage broke up before the summer holidays. His mother who also has additional difficulties could not cope and wanted him placed in full time accommodation. He also had a younger sister.</p>		
<b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b>		
<p>The local area was able to prevent full time accommodation for Anthony by putting in place the following provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional outreach through family support workers, employed within Council who took him out on activities</li> <li>• Weekend residential breaks, provided by a voluntary organisation commissioned by the Council.</li> </ul>		
<b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b>		
<p>Detailed breakdown of costs were not available as the commissioned organisation was subject to a block contract to provide support to a number of children.</p>		
<b>ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD</b>		
<p>Without the package of support from Aiming High Anthony would have required a residential out of county placement (cost £200,000 per year) as the local authority did not have a service to meet this need within the County, either in residential care or in family placement.</p>		
<b>IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It kept him within the community and within his family</li> <li>• Keeping him within the area provided him with continuity of care as he was already involved with CAMHS/learning disability service and assisted with a smooth transition to adult services.</li> </ul>		
<b>IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provided mother with a break from caring responsibilities in the knowledge that her child was safe</li> <li>• A was very tired when he got home and therefore easier to manage</li> </ul>		

- It provided her with an opportunity to deal with the stress of her marriage break compounded by the summer holidays
- It gave her an opportunity to spend time with her younger child.

3.

<b>LOCAL AREA - DURHAM</b>	<b>STRAND 1,2,3</b>
<b>PREVENTING YOUNG PEOPLE WITH ASD FROM OUT OF COUNTY PLACEMENTS</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<p>This exemplar illustrates Durham County Council’s approach to the services provided to children and young people with severe autism/challenging behaviour/learning disability. These young people represent 50% of the caseload of the Disabled Children’s team and are significantly represented in Out of County residential placements. The aim of this approach is to reduce Out of County placements and reinvesting the savings into services within the County.</p>	
<b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b>	
<p>The following stepped approach has been used to address the issues with said children:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A multi agency ASD steering group has developed a comprehensive framework for agency assessments of children and young people with complex social and communication needs including those on the autism spectrum.</li> <li>• Aiming High has funded additional support from the North East Autistic Society (since March 2009) for those children who also have challenging behaviour. This menu of support comprises of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bespoke support packages</li> <li>• Crisis intervention</li> <li>• Short Breaks</li> <li>• Training for families and professionals</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>As part of the preventative strategy Social Workers were asked to identify children and young people who were at risk of being Looked After or needing an Out of County placement. These young people were targeted.</p>	
<b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b>	
<p>In 2009/10 55 families received support from the North East Autistic Society, of these 35 children had intensive packages of support and were deemed to be at high risk of entering the Looked After System. The cost of providing this service over the 6 week summer holidays was £15,000 per week. These young people include those young people at an early age (prior to reaching teenage years). Durham’s research has identified that the majority of children started to attend Out of County placements at a younger age.</p>	

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD**

Out of Borough placement - £200,858 per place. Durham does not have internal family placement or residential units to meet the needs of children identified above.

**IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON**

- It has kept disabled children and young people at home and within their own communities supported by a package that meet their individual needs.
- It's given them opportunities for fun and to be involved in activities that other, non-disabled, peers have

**IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS**

- Support from an organisation that understands their needs and pressures

4.

**LOCAL AREA EALING STRAND 1,3**

**INTENSIVE THERAPEUTIC AND SHORT BREAKS SERVICE**

**BACKGROUND**

The London Borough of Ealing’s Intensive Therapeutic and Short Breaks Service is a collaborative initiative between agencies from the Ealing Service for Children with Additional Needs (ESCAN). These include Clinical Psychology for Children with Disabilities, Ealing Short Breaks Services and Social Services for Children with Disabilities.

Following a successful pilot, the service was funded for two years with the aim of providing a preventative and early intervention approach to management of four young people per year with severe learning disabilities and severe challenging behaviours, who are at imminent risk of requiring residential care.

The service provides short-term intensive interventions, comprising a carefully tailored package of support, short breaks and intensive clinical psychology input, in order to reduce challenging behaviours and provide a break for parents/the young person, so as to enable the young person to remain within their family home and community settings longer term.

**WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?**

In the period May 2009- July 2010 the service worked with five families – four new cases and follow up work with one family. The ages of the children and young people involved ranged from 11–15. In each case the young person’s behaviours were placing severe strain on families. Behaviours included physical aggression against members of the family, absconding, destructive behaviours. In addition all of the young people involved had sleep difficulties.

Parents of all the children/young people were struggling to manage their children’s behaviour and, no longer to cope, they were requesting residential placement for their children.

Comprehensive psychological assessment was completed for each child referred to the service following which appropriate interventions were formulated and put into action. Interventions included:

- designing and implementing consistent positive behavioural approaches across the various care settings
- implementation of a sleep programme to improve sleep
- clinical psychology sessions in community settings with the whole family
- supporting the family in understanding the meaning of specific behaviours and how therefore, to avoid or minimise them

and

- providing short breaks for both the young people concerned and their parents.

### **COST OF SHORT BREAK**

Over the last year the Intensive Therapeutic and Short Break Service has prevented a move to residential placement in the short to medium term for four young people who were significantly at risk.

In 2009-10 the cost of the intervention for the four-children/young people involved, plus the one child who was provided with follow up support, was £40,509.

### **ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD**

Taking the average cost of a residential placement at a conservative estimate of £115k per annum, the service demonstrated a potential saving of £534,491 over a year.

Had the young people been placed in residential provision it is likely they would have remained there for several years. Over just 3 years, the additional cost would have been £1.7m.

Whilst maintaining the service does require additional staff resources and financial support, this is considerably less than the cost of a residential placement (less than 10% of the cost of a residential placement). It therefore represents excellent value for money.

### **IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON**

- A short break for both the child and parent allowed both the parent and child time away from each other.
- The change of scene for the young people supported by skilled and experienced staff help them to adapt their behaviour.

### **IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS**

This was an important time in which parents had the opportunity to have some rest, reflect on the new approaches to behaviour management proposed and regain their ability to manage the situation

At the conclusion of the intervention, each of the families reported improvements against all of the measures.

*“What was really good was the time taken to be listened to and understood. The appointment times meant my husband could come to most of them as well. The way all agencies worked together to help was good. The whole package worked well for us and everyone was friendly, approachable, helpful and kind.”*

5.

<p><b>LOCAL AREA - ENFIELD STRAND 1,2,3</b></p>
<p><b>JONATHAN'S STORY</b></p>
<p><b>BACKGROUND</b></p> <p>Jonathan is a young man aged 14 with Autistic Spectrum Disorder plus learning difficulties and associated challenging behaviour. As he grew bigger and stronger his parent increasingly struggled to manage his behaviour and this was having a significant impact on the whole family. Suffering from exhaustion from sleepless nights, Jonathan's parents were finding it difficult to cope and were at the point of requesting residential provision for him.</p>
<p><b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b></p> <p>Responding to the family's growing need, their short break provision was reviewed and a wider range of short breaks were put in place to provide regular support at different times for Jonathan and his family.</p> <p>A package was put together that offered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• after school activities each day</li> <li>• 2-3 days per week of activity programmes in school holidays</li> <li>• 21 overnight short breaks per year</li> </ul>
<p><b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b></p> <p>The short breaks provided cost £16,512 per annum.</p>
<p><b>ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD</b></p> <p>Had Jonathan gone to a 52-week residential school, the placement would have cost a minimum of £100,000 per annum.</p> <p>Over four years until Jonathan was 18 the total cost would have amounted to a total of at least £400,000.</p>
<p><b>IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON</b></p> <p>Jonathan responded very well to the new arrangements and settled in unexpectedly well to the overnight breaks.</p>
<p><b>IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• His parents could see that he was safe and well cared for and as Jonathan became happier their confidence grew.</li> </ul>

- In time the situation had improved so much that the family felt able to take a week's holiday and go abroad with their other child. Jonathan's mother described the holiday as being 'like winning the lottery!'
- Recently the family were able to attend an extended family event that meant a night away from home knowing Jonathan was safe and happy at his overnight break.
- The provision of short breaks for this family allowed Jonathan's family the week in week out support they needed to manage better.
- Jonathan's mother was able to have some time for her own life and was able to complete a degree she had started.
- She has now gone back to work part-time.

6.

<b>LOCAL AREA - GATESHEAD</b>	<b>STRAND 1,2,3</b>
<b>JILL AND JOHN'S STORY</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<p>Jill (8) has a diagnosis of autistic spectrum disorder; her brother John (7) also has a diagnosis of autism, along with global development delay. Both children lived with their mother for the first few years of their lives, before a Residence Order was granted to their grandmother and her husband in 2006 due to very poor conditions and an unsafe environment in their parental home. In September 2009, their grandmother self referred to the Disabled Children Team, reporting that she had reached a crisis point where she felt unable to continue the full time care of her grandchildren. A number of factors contributed to this; including the death of her husband, the cessation of all contact with Jill and John's mother, and their grandmother's commitments to her full time job.</p> <p>There was a serious possibility that Jill and John would have needed an emergency high cost placement, and possibly be taken into full time care. As well as the sudden change in their home life, an emergency placement may have meant that they changed school and left their local area, leaving no continuity in their lives after an already difficult start in life.</p>	
<b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b>	
<p>As their grandmother lived alone and worked full time, it was clear that support would be needed to ensure that family would be able to cope in these new circumstances. In the first instance, a number of interventions were put in place by the children's social worker, including a sitting service through a local third sector provider, overnights provided by a local authority short break foster carer, and a sponsored childminder, subsidised by Gateshead's Aiming High for Disabled Children programme. These temporary interventions provided necessary support, but it meant the family were dealing with a wide range of providers that had been selected by the local authority.</p> <p>Jill and John joined the Individual Budgets pilot, with a view to giving the family the opportunity to choose how they would like to meet their needs. The family were given an up front indicative allocation of money to do this, and a joint person centred plan was facilitated, holistically building a picture of what was important to both children, as well as considering their grandmother's needs as a carer. This plan incorporated details of how they would spend their combined Individual Budget, and how this would meet the identified needs of both children.</p> <p>The family chose to consolidate their support and to manage their own services.</p>	

The family receive a direct payment, which they use to pay a childminder before and after school. The childminder is registered with the local authority's sponsored childminding scheme and has benefitted from additional training in meeting the needs of disabled children as part of Gateshead's AHDC workforce development workstream. As the childminder is self-employed, the family do not have the responsibility of becoming employers, and easily make small changes to the scale and scope of their weekly support as necessary. The same childminder also provides a weekend break for the children once a month, for a two-night stay. The cost of the residential weekends were negotiated and agreed between the family and the childminder, and provide excellent value for money.

**COST OF SHORT BREAK**

The annual cost of the individual budget for the childminder and the overnights provided for both children is £16,440.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD**

The likely alternative would have been a placement with a specialist Independent Fostering Agency. The estimated annual cost to the local authority would have been £75,347.

**IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON**

- Jill and John needed a consistent routine and some stability in their lives, and opportunities to develop independent skills
- The agreed services were reviewed at an early stage, to ascertain whether the Individual Budget was effective and manageable for the family. The children had settled into a regular routine, and had contact with fewer agencies, and their grandmother felt that she had the support she needed to continue caring for the children.

**IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS**

The children's grandmother was delighted to be given the opportunity to be involved in choosing and managing the support.

7.

<b>LOCAL AREA – GLOUCESTERSHIRE</b>	<b>STRAND 2,3</b>
<b>RICHARD'S STORY</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<p>Richard is an 11-year-old boy who has severe learning difficulties, Severe Myoclonic Epilepsy in Infancy (SMEI), severe global developmental delay. He also has an older brother aged 13 L. His father is in the army and is therefore away from home leaving his mother with the main caring responsibility. Richards's epilepsy meant that he had frequent and long seizures during the night, which may require oxygen and medication. This meant that his mother did not get regular sleep and was awake for varying times very night to care for Richard. Parents had indicated that their marriage was at risk due to the strain of caring for Richard as his mother was exhausted .His father had guilt feelings because of the time he had to spend away from home. Richards's behaviour and needs were also having a negative impact on his 13-year-old brother.</p>	
<b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b>	
<p>The family were already receiving 40 hours outreach to be used during school holidays and 60 overnight stays in residential settings per year. This was not enough to meet their needs</p> <p>The package put in place to maintain Richard within his family is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After school club once a week in term time with taxi agreed to transport (nil cost)</li> <li>• 6 hours 2:1 support funded by a direct payment for weekends (£7500 per year)</li> <li>• 6 hours 2:1 support funded by direct payments during holidays (£2010 per year)</li> <li>• One hour 2:1 support term time (£1,170 per year)</li> <li>• 6 hours 2:1 support x2 days, funded by a direct payment for Richard's long weekend stay at overnight residential setting each month</li> <li>• 60 overnight stays per year pre Aiming High</li> <li>• Additional one night per month plus 6 nights per year for parents and L to go away on holiday (£7,500 per year)</li> <li>• Door and Lock fitted to L's bedroom. (£360 one off)</li> <li>• Air Hockey table (£198.one off)</li> <li>• Payment for mother to have a spa day and a meal out for parents (£200)</li> </ul>	
<b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b>	
<p>Total cost of package <b>£18,938</b> per year</p>	

## ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD

Out of borough placement = **£200,000** per year estimated

## IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON

- Richard would not have had opportunities for new experiences whilst getting the right amount of support
- Richard would have continued to present more challenging behaviours as he would have been more socially isolated and less stimulated
- He would not have had opportunities to mix with other people and learn socially acceptable behaviours resulting in more extreme behaviour when he did not go out anywhere
- His brother, L, would have continued to isolate himself from the rest of the family and his resentment toward his brother would have grown as Richard continued to go in L's bedroom and break his possessions.

## IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS

- There was a real risk that the family would not have been able to care for R in his home and would have no option but to request that he enter into the care system.
- Mum's emotional and mental health would have suffered even further and her physical exhaustion would have continued to the point where she was no longer able to cope.
- Dad was being torn between his commitment to his family and his commitments to work (Army). He may have had to leave his job or damage his promotion prospects by requesting that he did not take up the posting due to family issues.
- Without intervention there is a real risk that the marriage would have broke down irretrievably (both parents have stated this to Lead Professional).

*"We would be very grateful if you could pass on 'officially', our gratitude to J (Lead Professional), I would not like to think where we would now be this Christmas without her intervention and support. Richard and we as parents are receiving the support that we need. Thanks."*

8.

<b>LOCAL AREA - KNOWSLEY</b>	<b>STRAND 3</b>
<b>PARENT GROUP's STORY (S.P.E.A.K)</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<p>Note not all of these children were LAC, Knowsley LA believes there is a preventative aspect to this type of activity.</p> <p>A number of parents identified that summer holidays were a particularly stressful time for them. They wanted to go on holiday with their disabled children rather than accommodate them in residential overnight stays. However family holidays by themselves were not a break because of the extra pressure put on them by other holidaymakers who were critical of them (saw them as bad parents who could not control their children) and intolerant of some of the challenging behaviour presented by their disabled children. Siblings were also stressed by being embarrassed by the reaction of other holidaymakers. They wanted a group holiday with other families with disabled children.</p> <p>Social workers had also noticed an increase in referrals after the summer holidays because families were exhausted due to the long time that they and their children were together without a break</p>	
<b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b>	
<p>Knowsley MBC responded to a parents support group- S.P.E.A.K (Supporting Parents Events and Advice in Knowsley) request to apply for funding to take a group of disabled children and their families on holiday to Center Parcs at Whinfall Forest. Siblings were included.</p> <p>The families were identified and selected by S.P.E.A.K as fairly as possible, ensuring that families from across the Borough with children of wide ranging disabilities who attended mainstream, special schools and support units were represented. One place was offered to the Children's Disability Team to identify one family who they felt would benefit from coming on a residential break. Families were also given free activity vouchers to be able to purchase some of the wide range of activities that were available at Center Parcs. This gave young people an experience they had not had before.</p>	
<b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b>	
<p>In total 24 adults and 29 children attended the summer vacation. The total cost of this was £8508 (£400 per family).</p>	

## **IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON**

*The holiday was boss and I mean that, I liked everything.” –aged 16*

*“Forget the sun and the beach; this is my type of holiday. Everything was great. I loved the quad-bikes.”*

*“The project has had a big impact on siblings, as they have been able to enjoy themselves and not be embarrassed by the behaviour of their siblings. This has reduced stress on the whole family. Friendships have also developed with other siblings .Friendships have also developed between parents”*

*“Face book is being used as a means of communication for parents of disabled young people and their siblings.”*

*“It is the first time my child has met somebody with the same condition as him”  
(Mother)*

## **IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS**

*“Fabulous to see the happiness and enthusiasm of all the families. The children were all having so much fun. Parents felt comfortable that their disabled children could approach the other families who would understand their problems and be warm and friendly, unlike what they are used to, where strangers may judge their children unfavourably, not being able to understand their unique complexities. They were able to delight in their children and not be embarrassed. It was particularly heart-warming to see older siblings being so friendly and helpful to each other.” Organiser*

- Other families who are paying for themselves have indicated that they will go to Center Parcs at the same time as those who are funded through Aiming High
- There has been a reduction in referrals to Children’s Social Care Disability Team. Before Aiming High it was noted that there was an increase in referrals during the summer holidays.

9.

<p><b>LOCAL AREA – NORTH TYNESIDE STRAND 1,2</b></p>
<p><b>Liam’s Story</b></p>
<p><b>BACKGROUND</b></p> <p>Liam is a 13-year-old young man with autism and ADHD who was placed in the short stay unit as an emergency. His mother is a single working parent. His grandmother provides wrap around care for him to enable his mother to work.</p> <p>At the point of admission Liam was becoming increasingly hyperactive, challenging, doubly incontinent and started exhibiting uninhibited behaviour. His grandmother was struggling with his behaviour, particularly as he was also maturing and growing in size. This reached a crisis point when his grandmother sustained an injury. His mother approached the Disabled Children’s Service because she could not cope.</p>
<p><b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b></p> <p>Liam was already receiving a level of short breaks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The local area responded by providing him with an emergency bed at Heather field Mews (short break unit).</li> <li>• An assessment of need followed this. This highlighted that in order to maintain him within his family he would need more short breaks at the unit, specialist holiday activities and direct payments.</li> <li>• Staff were also able to advise and support his mother and grandmother on managing his challenging behaviour.</li> <li>• Liam is still engaged with the support package and further crises have been avoided. (June –September).</li> </ul>
<p><b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b></p> <p>Unit cost of services</p> <p>Residential short break £350 per night,  School Holiday Play Scheme £271 per day  Direct Payment £11.90</p> <p>Detailed costings of package not available within the timescale of the research</p>
<p><b>ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD</b></p> <p>In house Residential unit at £117,000 per annum or family placement at £55,000 per annum</p>

### **IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON**

- Short breaks met his needs, as he was able to remain with his family and in the community
- He was a young man who lacked internal control. The ability and expertise of staff to manage his behaviour had an impact on his emotional and mental well being and reduced the need for physical intervention
- The package of support offered to him included a range of options and opportunities for him to participate in positive activities not previously accessible to him. These would have had an impact on his self-confidence and his social well being
- His views and those of other children are ascertained in a variety of ways including the use of symbols and photographs to include children with “communication difficulties”.

### **IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS**

- Liam’s mother and grandmother were at breaking point because they were unable to manage Liam’s behaviour, which was getting increasingly out of control.
- The short break and the practical and emotional support and skill development on managing Liam’s behaviour had an impact on their stress level at the point of crisis and at the present time

10.

<b>LOCAL AREA – NORTH YORKSHIRE</b>	<b>STRAND 1,2,3</b>
<b>MARY’ STORY</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<p>Mary is 11 years old. She lives at home with her mother and 14-year-old brother. Mary has Cornelia de Lange Syndrome. For Mary this presents as having a severe learning difficulty and developmental delay in all areas. Although Mary appears to understand lots of things around her, she actually has great difficulties in understanding and processing information. Mary presents with challenging behaviour, which can be unpredictable. She targets others including children by hitting, hair pulling and biting. One example of these behaviours was when she slipped away from high staffing ratios in one setting, locked herself in an office and began to cut electrical/computer cables with scissors. She has also escaped from buggy straps and run onto the road and has absconded from school. She therefore requires two-to-one supervision.</p> <p>Mary her mother and other professionals require and receive specialist input from learning disability services and from school staff to provide support and advice on how to manage Mary and her challenging behaviours and to minimise risks to Mary and others around her.</p> <p>She is not currently prescribed any regular medication and has a difficult sleep pattern. Medications prescribed to help with this promoted hyperactivity in Mary and were therefore stopped.</p> <p>Her mother does have some limited support from her own mother, however, as she gets older and more difficult to manage this support is becoming more restricted. Mary’s mother has demonstrated a high level of skill and commitment to supporting M at her family home. However, she requires a high level of support to continue to manage this and M would be at risk of entering the Looked After System if this was not available.</p>	
<b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b>	
<p>Prior to the Short Breaks, Mary used to receive 48 overnights per year plus 2 hour per week regular day care. She also had 1 five hour session per week of day care during the school holidays.</p> <p><b>Since the inception of Aiming High the following support package has been put into place:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An extra 19 overnights (total of 67 overnights per year) at a residential short breaks unit managed by Action for Children (£418 per bed per night total = £11,286)</li> </ul>	

- Mary requires two-to-one support and the provision have had to reduce the number of young people using this service when Mary is present to minimise risks at the residential unit. The additional staffing costs for Mary@ £14.40per hour are £4665.60 per year
- 20 hours 2:1 support per month regular day care after school (£3691.20 per year)
- 6 hours 2:1 support alternate Saturdays for community based activities (£4798.56 per year)
- 2 x 5hour sessions 2:1 support per week during all school holidays (£4921.60)  
*1:1 support based on £15.38 an hour*

**COST OF SHORT BREAK**

Total cost of package funded by Aiming High = **£29,362.96** per year

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD**

Specialist out of borough placement = **£159.900-250,000** per year

**IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON**

- It has allowed Mary to remain at home and within the community.
- It has provided continuity of care through the workers involved to support her.
- She goes to a local school who provide additional support and advice to mother and other professionals on the management of Mary’s behaviour

**IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS**

- Reduction of stress
- Able to sleep
- Time to spend with Mary’s sibling

11.

<b>LOCAL AREA – A County Council</b>	<b>STRAND 1,2,3</b>
<b>TOBY, NICOLA AND CASSIE'S STORIES</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<p>A County Council commissioned a voluntary sector provider to provide a residential holiday for disabled children with challenging behaviour, whose families were also vulnerable. Prior to this holiday three of the families were asking for their children to be accommodated because they could not manage the intensity of their caring needs. After the holiday all three single carers re-considered the decision to give their children to the care system and two years later all are successfully being cared for at home.</p> <p>Profiles of the young people.</p> <p><b>Toby</b> -16 year old whose behaviour led to short term exclusions from school and regular police involvement.</p> <p><b>Cassie</b>- 13-year-old girl, whose mother had needed to involve the police, because she could not cope with her daughter's behaviour, but was reluctant to engage her in activities outside of the home because she was concerned about how she could keep her safe</p> <p><b>Nicola</b>- 12-year-old girl whose screaming and grabbing was causing problems within the home and community.</p>	
<b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nine children took part in residential activity holiday which cost £9000 funded by short break grant.</li> <li>• Parents of three of these children were asking for them to be looked after.</li> <li>• Further support needs to keep the young people out of the Looked After System were identified at the holiday and short break support packages were developed as a consequence.</li> </ul>	
<b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b>	
<p>Nine children took part in residential activity holiday, which cost £9000 (£1000 per child).</p> <p>Detailed cost breakdown of the individual support packages set up for Toby, Cassie and Nicola after the holiday were not analysed within the timescale. Some of the services providing support were block contract commissioned services providing a service to a number of children</p>	

## ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD

**Toby**- Residential out of borough placement =£200,000

**Nicola** - In house residential unit = £105,000

**Cassie** - Specialist foster carer= £52,000

## IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON

Toby has gone on to support PMLD peers as an advocate and has given an impressive presentation on this at conferences. He has much greater insight in to the impact of his own behaviour. The local authority has also employed him to assist them with recruitment and mentoring of other young people. He would have needed an out of borough placement.

Cassie's mother was resistant to her going in to activities has highlighted the following impact: *"we can see that she has a lot more confidence in herself since she came home. I am also more confident to let her do things now and seeing the photos of her doing the different things, has made me realise she can do so much."*

## IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS

Nicola's Father said; *"I am moved to see how these behaviours changed when she was occupied and interested."*

12.

<p><b>LOCAL AREA – A Small LA in the South East      STRAND 1</b></p>
<p><b>SMITH FAMILY AND BEN'S STORY</b></p>
<p><b>BACKGROUND</b></p> <p><b>Smith Family</b> – four children three of whom have complex disabilities. Jack aged 11, <b>Peter</b> aged 4 who has Cerebral Palsy and a learning difficulty, <b>Lauryn</b> aged 3 with global developmental delay with significant speech, language and behavioural difficulties and <b>Jane</b>, aged 1 who has developmental delay and has been referred to the Consultant Paediatrician at the Child Development Centre for a full assessment. After a cognitive assessment it was concluded that the mother was borderline for a learning disability so the family are under investigations for other syndromes and the father has a degenerative disorder. Short Breaks was used to avoid taking children into the Looked After System. Although this may still happen in the future the extended time period will have assisted the Council in making the right decision</p> <p><b>Ben</b> aged 16 has severe autism, being non verbal and reliant on carers for every aspect of his care. Depending on his environment and medication he can be aggressive and unpredictable and requires 2–1 support when he goes out as he can be difficult to manage. Physically he is very able with an athletic build so can be quite overpowering for carers particularly if they are unsure of him. His father is the main carer for Ben and the mother has a learning disability. Because of his mother's difficulties and her ability to keep him safe Ben cannot be left in her sole care.</p> <p>Parents have refused to consider child becoming looked after under section 20 so the short break provision has played a vital role in keeping this case out of the court arena.</p>
<p><b>Smith Family</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short breaks has contributed to a large care package the LA set in place to enable the children to remain with parents whilst a number of expert assessments are undertaken as directed by the Court in line with Care Proceedings.</li> <li>• The Short breaks included access to universal settings through their local Children's Centre during the day with specialist 1-1 assistance as required in view of the children's disabilities.</li> <li>• Outings and play activities both in and out of the home, which provided fun and stimulation. The children were able to have fun, try out new activities, be with other children, learn and were safe.</li> </ul> <p><b>Ben</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short breaks have included access to specialist group activities through voluntary organisations with a high level of staff input and support to access</li> </ul>

<p>activities in the community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every weekend Ben receives twelve hours of 2-1 support on a Saturday and Sunday where he is taken to secure, specialist adventure playgrounds or the local park and will now spend time in a local town centre café</li> <li>• He also accesses 40 hours 2-1 support specialist holiday activities such as day trips or activity centres</li> <li>• Other short break options</li> </ul>
<p><b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b></p> <p><b>Smith family (3 children)</b> £72, 718</p> <p><b>Ben</b> £53,694</p>
<p><b>ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD</b></p> <p><b>Smith family</b></p> <p>£119,112 in specialist family placements</p> <p><b>Ben</b> £180,000 for out of borough residential placement</p>
<p><b>IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON</b></p> <p><b>Smith family</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevented family breakdown.</li> <li>• Formed part of a Child Protection Plan.</li> <li>• Contributed to Safeguarding.</li> <li>• Contributed to the children’s development wellbeing inclusion and social interaction</li> <li>• Children had fun, enjoyed their activities and made progress.</li> </ul> <p><b>Ben</b> Ben has enjoyed these activities and had fun</p>
<p><b>IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ben’s father has had the chance to have a break.</li> </ul>

13.

<b>LOCAL AREA – SUNDERLAND</b>	<b>STRAND 1,2,3</b>
<b>PREVENTATIVE STRATEGY and QUEST SERVICE</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<p>A review of services to children carried out by Sunderland Council (5 years ago) highlighted that the main reason for children becoming looked after was due to family breakdown through lack of support. This particularly affected teenage boys with challenging behaviour. Sunderland responded to this by building up family support services, targeting them on children with the most complex needs. This resulted in very few children being taken into the Looked After system as a result of family breakdown. The main reason for children now entering the Looked After system is because of safeguarding concerns.</p> <p>As a consequence Sunderland closed down three long-term children’s homes for disabled children (9 beds). Funding was diverted into the development of an in-house Fostering and Family Support Service and the development of the youth sector.</p> <p>Aiming High has contributed to this success as it has provided further resources to enable the local area to provide sufficient tailored, flexible family support to meet the complex needs of disabled children at home.</p>	
<b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b>	
<p>This approach has also led to the development of a partnership service, joint funded by Social Care, Health and Aiming High. QUEST is an outreach service, led by the Psychology Service which works with young people with challenging behaviour and severe learning difficulty. They conduct an assessment and develop a behaviour management plan for families and professionals to implement with an offer of ongoing supervision. The plan focuses on recognising triggers, de-escalating situations and the reduction on physical restraints.</p> <p>The assessment also considers the young person’s overall needs and how imaginative short break packages can support these. This work often enables these young people to ultimately access short break services that they would otherwise not have been able to access. This occurs through QUEST staff supporting staff in short break services, delivering training, and facilitating introductions to the service, as well as providing ongoing support if difficulties arise.</p>	
<b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b>	
<p>Aiming High contributes £25,813 to the QUEST service which funds a 37hr/week support worker post.</p>	

### **IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON**

- The flexible support packages offered has resulted in young people being maintained within the community and being able to access an increased range of activities which were previously not open to them because of their challenging behaviour
- The behaviour management plan and the de-escalation techniques have resulted in decreasing the stress on the young person who may not have the capacity to exercise internal controls. The external controls exercised by the adults around him will have improved his mental health and emotional wellbeing.

### **IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS**

- The stress levels on families have been reduced.
- Anecdotal evidence from Social Workers has highlighted that in the last two summer holidays they have had almost no calls from families in crisis and they attribute this to the extra provision available through Aiming High.
- The training and support on offer to staff and parents through QUEST has had a reduction on the number of children in the Looked After System

14.

<b>LOCAL AREA – A Local Area in the South</b>	<b>STRAND 1,2,3</b>
<b>FIONA’S STORY</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<p>Fiona is an 11-year-old girl who has been known to the Disabled Children’s Services Team for a number of years. She has severe learning and physical disabilities with very little verbal communication.</p> <p>She lives with her brother and her single parent father who himself has learning difficulties. Social services supported him to apply for a residence order on Fiona as her mother had mental health problems. Her father is very vulnerable to inappropriate relationships. One such relationship was with a woman who also had mental health problems which manifested in stalking and harassment. Fiona’s s father did not deal with this situation very well which resulted in Fiona being exposed to emotional abuse. This may have resulted in her entering the Looked After system under Safeguarding requirements.</p>	
<b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b>	
<p>Fiona was provided with the following package:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short Breaks in a residential hospital in a unit attached to the Childhood Development Centre. This facility does not meet her social requirements as the focus is on her medical needs. It is envisaged that the Short Breaks residential provision will be provided by contract family placement carers.</li> <li>• Day care - during school holidays</li> <li>• Saturday Club</li> <li>• Direct payments offering flexible support</li> <li>• Her father was supported to address his relationship issues, which included support and advice to institute legal proceedings against the stalker.</li> </ul>	
<b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b>	
Total cost of package = £15,000 per year	
<b>ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD</b>	
<p>If Fiona needed accommodation the options available to her are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential school Out of Borough, (£150,000-£210,000 per annum)</li> <li>• Residential children’s home Out of Borough £180,000 per year.</li> <li>• Specialist family placement through a voluntary agency (£1,000 per week or £52,000 per year plus capital investment to adapt a carers home due to her physical disabilities)</li> </ul>	

**IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON**

- Fiona has remained within the community with her father who she clearly cares about.
- She loves going to the services and has developed relationship and local friendships.
- Although Fiona has communication difficulties (no verbal communication) it is obvious that she is happy and is enjoying the services on offer.

**IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS**

- The involvement of the Disabled Children's Services and the support provided by them to Fiona's father with regard to managing problems in his relationship and the Short Breaks support offered has resulted in a significant reduction in his stress levels

15.

<b>LOCAL AREA – WARWICKSHIRE</b>	<b>STRAND 1,2,3</b>
<b>ADAM'S STORY</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<p>In October 2009 a social care referral was received in relation to Adam. At this time Adam was 14 years old and had a diagnosis of ASD/MLD. Adam's Mother was heavily pregnant. Adam's behaviour was becoming increasingly problematic - he was regularly absconding, his school had significant concerns and Adam was displaying increasing anxiety in relation to the imminent arrival of the new baby.</p> <p>The family were at crisis point with the parents struggling to manage Adam's behaviour. There was a significant risk that if the situation escalated, accommodation would be sought.</p>	
<b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adam was allocated a 1:1 Short Break Worker who provides 4 hours of support per month. The Short Break Worker has encouraged Adam to access local leisure facilities and he is now playing basketball on a regular basis</li> <li>• The family were also offered overnight short breaks with a Family Link Contract Worker. Adam engaged positively with this and receives one to two nights of overnight respite care per month.</li> </ul>	
<b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b>	
<p>£ 4128 per annum estimated based on an hourly rate of £15.00 per hour for a short break worker and £ 300 per weekend overnight care.</p>	
<b>ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD</b>	
<p>Specialist family Placement £ 52,000 per annum (national average)</p>	
<b>IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON</b>	
<p>Adam has accepted his new sibling and the family are now in a much better position</p>	
<b>IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS</b>	
<p>The short break interventions were received very positively by Adam and his family. Stress levels were significantly reduced and the arrival of the new baby went smoothly.</p>	

16.

<b>LOCAL AREA – WIGAN</b>	<b>STRAND 2</b>
<b>DARREN'S STORY</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<p>Darren is a 17-year-old male with a learning disability and ASD who is considered extremely vulnerable. He finds it difficult to cope with stress and often reacts in a verbally or physically aggressive way. He has a tendency to be easily led and tends to get attached to one person. This in the past has tended to be people who have led him into anti-social directions such as drug-taking, drinking and generally anti-social behaviour including assault on another young person. He has been involved with Youth Offending Team, Connexions and the Young Peoples DAT.</p> <p>His mother is a single parent and he has younger siblings. His mother was concerned about the impact that his behaviour was having on younger siblings. She requested that he be placed in local authority care. This was facilitated and he was placed in an emergency placement. However, the placement could not manage his behaviour and he was given notice to leave. His mother agreed to have Darren back as long as some support was put in place.</p>	
<b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b>	
<p>Following a Change for Children meeting a package of support was put in place in the community. This included The Youth Offending team with regard to his offending behaviour and Connexions regard to his transition and employment opportunities</p> <p>Support funded from Aiming High</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Six hours of one-to-one support offered by Crossroads. Assessment by Crossroads staff identified that he was a pleasant young man who had difficulty in engaging with peers and adults. However, he had an interest in going to the gym. Crossroads therefore facilitated this.</li> <li>• The package was facilitated in March and was still in place in September.</li> </ul>	
<b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b>	
<p>The cost of this service is £75.00 per week £3900 per annum.</p>	
<b>ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD</b>	
<p>The cost of Darren entering the Looked After System would have been as high</p>	

as £200,000 external residential placement as he had already been excluded from an internal residential resource.

#### **IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON**

- He remains within the safety of his home and within his community – six months after the package was developed.
- Darren responded to the consistency, routine and positive role model provided by the Befriender
- The focussed support to identify his interests and the addition of extra capacity has resulted in his behaviour being diverted.
- His learning disability and autism made him very vulnerable in a Looked After group of children who were more street-wise than him. Placement with this group of young people therefore did not meet his needs.
- Transition to adult services will be smoother because he is still within the community and is working with Connexions.

#### **IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS**

- Family stress had been reduced, as his mother is able to provide a home with a support package.

The development of a positive role model and identification and support of his interest resulted in improvement of his mother's mental health as she was reassured that when he was with his befriender he was involved in a positive activity rather than with his peer group who were leading him astray.

17.

<p><b>LOCAL AREA WORCESTERSHIRE STRAND 3</b></p>
<p><b>OSBORNE COURT</b></p>
<p><b>BACKGROUND</b></p> <p>Osborne Court is a partnership scheme between NHS Worcestershire, Worcestershire County Council and Mental Health Trust (provider) for a Children and Young People emergency assessment and outreach service.</p> <p>A children's emergency assessment, support and outreach service has been developed at Osborne Court to enable children and young people with severe learning disabilities to be cared for in a safe and appropriate environment. By developing and providing a residential emergency assessment and support, and outreach service, or a combination of the two, the aim is to assist learning and autistic disabled children and young people to remain in their current home – i.e. to assess, support and return home, or to assist in the positive 'move on' to a new placement.</p> <p>The package of support is planned on an individual basis following assessment around the child and family's need. There are clearly defined purpose, timescale and a minimum of weekly reviews to assess progress and effectiveness.</p>
<p><b>WHAT DOES SHORT BREAK FUNDING PROVIDE?</b></p> <p>The elements of the service include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 in-patient beds to avoid children being placed out-of-county when placements break down</li> <li>• A local support and outreach service to support children and families and avoid placements breaking down, thereby reducing in-patient admissions more extended short break stays which were not previously appropriately managed within other short breaks units by enhancing support to families and filling an important gap in Worcestershire within the range of services for severe learning disabilities and challenging behaviour and complex health needs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>COST OF SHORT BREAK</b></p> <p>Contribution of £80,000 for 2010/11 from the LA's short breaks budget- a total of 6 children received this service in August 10 Their ages ranged from 8-12.</p>

### **ALTERNATIVES FOR CHILD**

Without the focused assessment and package of support some of the six children may have needed a Looked After placement

### **IMPACT ON CHILD /YOUNG PERSON**

- Allows him to remain at home with his /her family
- Provided space from an escalating problems at home
- Children referred may have lacked internal control. The ability and expertise of staff to manage his/her behaviour would have an impact on his emotional and mental well being
- The package of support includes a range of options and opportunities to participate in positive activities not previously accessible to them. These would have had an impact on self-confidence and social well-being.

### **IMPACT ON PARENTS /CARERS**

- Provide them with support in an emergency when this was needed
- The focused assessment and the planned package of support resulted in their individual needs being met – thus reducing stress and requests for emergency placements
- The support on management techniques and the outreach support developed skills of parents and carers and empowered them to be more in control of escalating situations thus reducing risk of emergency placements in the short term and children needing to enter the Looked After System in the longer term

### Appendix 3 Cost of Short Break Compared to Alternative Option

Local Area	Name of child/ren/ Initiative	Cost of short break per annum	Cost if Short Break not Available per annum	Cost Saving per annum	% cost compared to alternative	Estimated Cost of placement until child is 18
Barnet	Ella 14	19,624	£69,012	49,388	28%	£207,000
A shire county in the north	Anthony 17		200,000			200,000
Ealing	4 children	£40.51	534,491	493,982	8%	1.7 million
Enfield	Jonathan 14	16,512	100,000	83,988	16.51%	400,000
Gateshead	Jil (8) and John (7)	£16,440 per annum	£75,457 per annum	£59,017 per annum	21%	£750,457
Gloucestershire	Richard - 11	£18,938 per annum	£200,000 estimated	£181,062 per annum	9.40%	£1,800,000
North Tyneside	Anthony 13		£116.00			£580,000
North Yorkshire	Mary (11)	£29,362 per annum	£159,900	£130,538	18%	£1,119,300
A county Council	Toby (16)		200,000			400,000
A county Council	Cassie 13		105,000			525000
A county Council	Nicola 12		52			312,000
A small LA in the SE	Ben 16	53, 694	180,000	126,306	30%	360,000
A small LA in the SE	Smith family (11,4,3)	72,718	119,112	46,394	61%	
A LA in the South	Fiona -11	£15.000 per annum	£180.00	£165,000	8%	£1260, 000
Warwickshire	Adam 14	£4,128	52,000	47.872	8%	£208,000
Wigan	Darren 17	£4680 annum	200,000	195,320	5%	200,000

## Appendix 4 Cost Benefit of Prevention of Disabled Children Entering Looked After System

Local Area	No of requests for emergency placements in 09/10	No of requests for looked after placements prevented 09/10	Estimated cost saving per year <sup>1</sup>	Estimated cost saving per year <sup>2</sup>	Short break funding allocation 09/10	Number of children reached in 09/10
Barnet		8	416,000	1,600,000	£407,200	440
A shire county in the north	5	5	260,000	1,000,000	£2579058	817
Durham		See appendix 6			£549,500	1667
Ealing		4	208,000	800,000	£335,500	1129
Enfield		4	208,000	800,000	£1015333	770
Gateshead					£640,300	721
Gloucestershire					£1580,342	1118
Knowsley	2	4	208,000	800,000	£246,000	1140
North Tyneside	0	4	208,000	800,000	£597,100	300
North Yorkshire	0				£1743100	545
A county Council		6	312,000	12,000,000	£646,500	676
A small LA in the South East					£139,000	475
Sunderland					£966,700	519
A LA in the South	0				£124,500	242
Warwickshire					£550,986	1202
Wigan					£386,600	220
Worcestershire					£611,900	770

<sup>1</sup> Minimum based on £52,000 for family placement

<sup>2</sup> Maximum based on £200,000 for residential school placement

## Appendix 5 Trend Data

### A SHIRE COUNTY IN THE NORTH

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08	7	17	5	24
08/09	6	21	6	27
09/10	9	18	10	27
10/11	5	20	5	27

### DURHAM

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08		0		
08/09	24	0	24	24
09/10	28	0	28	28
10/11	30	0	30	32

## ENFIELD

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08	25	10	22	35
08/09	18	7	16	25
09/10	15	8	15	23
10/11	13	7	8	20

## GATESHEAD

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08	7	6	4	13
08/09	7	6	4	13
09/10	4	6	1	10
10/11	4	6	1	10

## GLOUCESTERSHIRE

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08	25	10	22	35
08/09	18	7	16	25
09/10	15	8	15	23
10/11	13	7	8	20

## KNOWSLEY

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08				
08/09	1	4	1	5
09/10	1	4	1	6
10/11	1	4	1	7

## NORTH TYNESIDE

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08	5	0	0	5
08/09	6	1	0	6
09/10	5	0	0	5
10/11	5	0	0	5

## NORTH YORKSHIRE

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08	23		23	
08/09	17	10	24	27
09/10	16	19	20	36
10/11	17	10	16	27

## A COUNTY COUNCIL

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08				
08/09	15	15	18	30
09/10	15	15	18	30
10/11	15	15	18	30

## A SMALL LA IN THE SOUTH EAST

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08				
08/09	27	2	29	29
09/10	16	7	17	26
10/11	14	4	15	24

## SUNDERLAND

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08				
08/09	4	15	1	19
09/10	5	15	2	20
10/11	4	13	2	17

## A LA IN THE SOUTH

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08				
08/09	7	3	0	10
09/10	4	2	0	6
10/11	3	2	0	5

## WARWICKSHIRE

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08				
08/09	9	34	9	43
09/10	6	33	6	39
10/11	6	33	6	39

## WIGAN

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08				
08/09	12	3	7	15
09/10	9	1	6	10
10/11	13	2	7	16

## WORCESTERSHIRE

<b>Year</b>	<b>No of disabled children in looked after in residential homes</b>	<b>No of disabled children looked after in family-based placements</b>	<b>No of disabled children accommodated more than 20 miles from home</b>	<b>Overall number of disabled children looked after</b>
07/08				
08/09	28	14	35	42
09/10	28	16	35	43
10/11	25	12	28	43

## Appendix 6 County Durham's Formula

Currently **£2,255,402** is spent on specialist provision at Thornhill Park.

Nine of these places are full 52-week residential places, which cost a total of **£1,807,729** an average of **£200,858** per place.

If we consider the financial breakdown in more depth (52 week placements) we can explore both the potential savings to be made and the variable should the need for provision increase.

Percentage change+/-	Saving or additional cost	Reduction or increase in places
5%	90,386	0.45
10%	180,772	0.9
15%	271,159	1.35
20%	361,545	1.8
25%	451,932	2.25

If we now consider the overall spend at Thornhill Park we can see where substantial savings could be made.

Percentage change+/-	Saving or additional cost	Reduction or increase in places
5%	112,770	1.1
10%	225,540	2.2
15%	338,310	3.3
20%	451,080	4.4
25%	563,850	5.5

By decreasing the number of 52 week placements by 2.25 a saving based on these figures would return **£451,932**.

By reducing just one 52-week place would see a saving of £180,772.