In Attendance/Apologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Apology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phil Poirier</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Perfect (LP)</td>
<td>Derby City Council</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Clegg</td>
<td>Derby City Council</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Fletcher (RF)</td>
<td>Derbyshire County Council</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Walker (JW)</td>
<td>JCP/DWP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Skinner</td>
<td>Leicester City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Robinson (AR) Chair</td>
<td>Leicestershire County Council</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mags Walsh (MW)</td>
<td>Leicestershire County Council</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Gibson (LG)</td>
<td>Leicestershire SLF Programme</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Rainey (MR)</td>
<td>Lincolnshire County Council</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Holloway (AH)</td>
<td>Lincolnshire County Council</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicci Marzec (NM)</td>
<td>Northamptonshire CC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim O’Neill</td>
<td>Nottingham City Council</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicky Dawson</td>
<td>Nottingham City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Spencer (JS)</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire CC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helga Spry-Shute (HS-S)</td>
<td>Rutland County Council</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Williams (PW)</td>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Thomas (KT)</td>
<td>Working Links</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Grice (PG)</td>
<td>TFEA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Annetts (LA)</td>
<td>TFEA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Holtham (SH)</td>
<td>TFEA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item** | **Subject** | **Actions**
---|---|---
2. | Notes and Action Points of 25th June 2013 Meeting |  

*Actions Points:*

Action for Russ Aziz, DCLG – it was understood that claimants need to be over 18 in order for their payments to impact upon payments to other family members.

Actions for AR – AR had yet to speak with Louise Casey and DCLG’s TF Unit on the possibility of setting up a senior level national meeting of TF leads and also to ascertain whether embargoed data could be released a day early to relevant local authorities in order to prepare a possible media response.

Action for Kevin Tinsley, DCLG – Clarification was provided on the point of whether claims can be made for those that volunteer for the Work Programme as well as those that are mandated to enter it. Payment could be claimed in either case.

Other action points had been completed.

*Notes:*

The notes were then agreed.
3. Presentation from DWP Troubled Families Employment Co-ordinator Adviser secondees on their role

PG, LA and SH gave the Group some information on their roles. The key points included:

- Had generally been in post since the Spring/early summer
- All undertook (locally determined) differing roles
- Role may include ensuring that families are receiving the correct benefits (often genuine errors are found and less often possible fraud)
- Secondees may be based at JWP offices, within the local authorities or various community buildings or may move between sites

AR thanked PG, LA and SH for their presentation and the Group raised the following points:

- Agreed that the secondees had made a valuable contribution to the Programme and had achieved results in a short space of time
- All agreed that the TF Programme was beginning to show results and that people had begun to find sustainable employment opportunities
- The relationship between local authorities and DWP was felt to be strong and working well
- Other teams are also integrating well into the partnership approach to supporting families to find work and now understand themselves how work can help families improve their overall circumstances e.g. social care teams
- Concern was expressed that the statistics were not reflecting the true successes of the Programme as claims could not be made for achieving continuous employment if a claim had already been put in previously.

AR to raise with DCLG

4. Leicestershire’s SLF Programme’s Family Voice

AR welcomed LG to the meeting who showed her video “A Mother’s Love”, which had been produced to outline some of the struggles and challenges she and her family had faced and how they dealt with them.

MW explained that through the video and discussions with Lynn, many groups in Leicestershire and elsewhere have been able to get a greater understanding of some of the issues faced by Lynn and her family, and others in a similar position, than they would have otherwise. It also increased awareness of the multi-agency role.

Lynn explained that her and her family have made a lot of progress but still face challenges. Some of her previous mental health issues have resulted in others adopting an over cautious approach and assuming she is less capable of achieving things today than is the case. She stressed the importance of giving people the time and opportunity to develop themselves, and acknowledged that she often needs to over-compensate and work harder than would normally be expected just to meet (real or perceived) goals. However, she is also working to realise a better work/life balance.

Lynn explained the importance of a good support worker who was prepared to take ‘risks’ and see the potential in people. Being labeled as having a ‘tragic life’ from the outset was unhelpful to Lynn as she did not recognise this description of herself and could only lead to people into making unhelpful assumptions from the outset. Help with the day to day needs of a family, such as transportation to and from school, was often what was needed the most.

Lynn is available to meet other groups if required.
5. **Updates from Each Area, including July & October PBR claims**

*Nottingham City Council* – No update available.

*Nottinghamshire County Council* – Identified 900 families with approximately 1000 more to identify. Concern about the audit process where a lack of national guidance may be resulting in an over cautious approach within the authority.

*Lincolnshire County Council* – Identified 1000 of 1370 target families and working with 730. A third of these families have more complex needs. 4 PCSOs have now been recruited. No October claim was submitted due to resource constrains but will submit a claim in January. Lincolnshire has been identified as a level 2 authority in the national evaluation.

*Derby City Council* – Working with 71% of the 660 target number of families, 75% of which have a lead worker in place. Securing data is proving to be a key challenge. Derby has contracted 11 providers whose services can be called upon when required. Also have good working relationship with TFEA secondee. Derby City’s local evaluation may be conducted jointly with the County Council.

*Derbyshire County Council* – October PBR claim is with the audit department.

*Leicester City Council (email update)* - As of end September Leicester had identified 836 families, started work with 730 and claimed 170 PBR successes. Leicester has predicted 50 claims this October. The process of identifying and tracking families is running smoothly, and are in the process of consolidating work to date and as such are discussing with partners ‘phase 2’ of the Programme – i.e how the programme is embedded. There are lots of opportunities and challenges given the amount of organisational review/changes at the City Council and externally with partners.

*Leicestershire County Council* – Identified 75% of 810 target families and put in claims for about half of these, with the October claim for around 50 families. Leicestershire will be doing some work to analyse the wider needs of families and to develop progress measures. Leicestershire’s Children’s Service has been renamed Childrens and Families Service to reflect the need to deal with families as a whole.

*Rutland County Council* – Identified most of their target families and is currently working with about 50% of these. No dedicated staff are in place to work with families but have a bank of skills that can be called upon.

*Northamptonshire County Council* – Over 50% of families have been identified. Also concerned at over cautious approach to auditing leading to claims being delayed. One issue is the difficulty in getting data from the new academies. The County Council is working with the districts in developing specific projects and programmes.

**Working Links** – Referrals from Job Centre Plus continue to come through. Contract has been extended by 3 months to December 2014 and then able to work with new starters for a further 3 months. Debt management advice is often requested. Starting to see some longer term employed get back into work on a sustainable basis.

6. **Implications of the ‘Bedroom Tax’**

Item not discussed.

7. **Tracking Families across city and county borders**

Item not discussed.

8. **Benefits Realisation/Cost Benefit**

As far as the Group is aware DCLG have yet to release the cost/benefit analysis tool as had been expected. A series of events arranged for November might provide clarity.

If a tool is not released some authorities are preparing to make their own arrangements.

A number of authorities were or are about to consider how budget cuts might
impact upon the TF programme. In the majority of cases these decisions had yet to be taken. Other authorities had underspent on their TF allocations.

A widespread concern was expressed that progress and momentum would be lost if the TF Programme simply ends after 3 years without further support being made available to families, many of whom were now showing benefits from the Programme. It was felt that 3 years was an insufficient amount of time to make a lasting change to families.

The group agreed to share their experiences of auditing their claims.

The Group then agreed to set up a time-limited sub-group to discuss benefits realisation prior to the next full meeting of the Group.

9. Update from the TF East Midlands Analyst Group

The notes of the last meeting of the TF East Midlands Analyst Group held on 6 September 2013 had been circulated. The Analyst Group next meet on 14 November 2013.

10. Any Other Business

The Group discussed the use of EU Strategic Investment Funds (SIF) to support Troubled Families. In Leicestershire, for example, £14m was being made available over 7 years, £4m of which was being used to support vulnerable families. Enquiries about SIF should be made to the LEPs in the first instance.

The Group then discussed the operation of the Performance Framework which was designed to pick up some of the key issues but did not allow authorities to record any of the detail on an individual family basis.

11. Date of Next Meeting

Meeting: Troubled Families Leads Network Cost Benefit Sub-Group
Date: tbc
Time: tbc
Venue: tbc

Meeting: Troubled Families Leads Network
Date: tbc
Time: tbc
Venue: tbc