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Presentation Overview

This session will:

• Explore the complexities of capturing and measuring the costs of short breaks for disabled children and their families in the UK

• Explore the complexities of capturing and measuring outcomes achieved by disabled children and their families accessing short breaks in the UK

• Examine the effectiveness of ‘hub’ models of delivery

• Demonstrate how information on the costs and outcomes and be bought together to inform effective commissioning
Measuring Costs

as long as it takes
The costs and outcomes programme at CCFR

- Understanding the links between costs, needs and outcomes
  - Introducing transparency
  - Comparing like with like
  - Bottom up costing methodology
- Comprehensive costs
  - Combines costs of different types of services with the costs of worker ‘activity’
  - Understanding overheads
- Stream of work exploring the costs and outcomes of short break services for disabled children and their families
  - DfE funded study: bottom up costs of short breaks
  - Exploring the outcomes of Action for Children short break services
  - Comparing the costs of short break services
Previous research: Variations in the costs of short break services

- Variations according to:
  - The provider
  - The type of service
  - The type and number of staff required
  - The length of the activity
  - The number of children attending
  - The needs of the children attending
  - The locality of the service
  - The time the service was delivered
  - The type of social care activity associated with the service
## Costs of short breaks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service type</th>
<th>Average cost per child</th>
<th>Range (per child)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential overnight</td>
<td>£437.94 / $684.63</td>
<td>£427.66 - £782.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster family based overnights</td>
<td>£230.47 / $359.56</td>
<td>£139.39 - £309.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community: Groups</td>
<td>£40.15 / $62.77</td>
<td>£15.27 - £71.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Activities</td>
<td>£15.82 / $24.73</td>
<td>£1.28 - £44.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community: Access to Leisure</td>
<td>£23.42 / $23.42</td>
<td>£6.86 - £60.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school clubs</td>
<td>£20.55 / $32.13</td>
<td>£8.59 - £11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domiciliary</td>
<td>£26.42 / $41.30</td>
<td>£20.00 - £32.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overhead calculations

- Those costs associated with the overall functioning of the organisation eg. office running costs, buildings maintenance etc.
- 15% of salary widely used in social care
- Selwyn et al (2009) suggest that 15% underestimates overheads
- Average 36.6%
- Developed a framework for the calculation of overheads which introduces
  - Consistency
  - Transparency
- Useful for making cost comparisons
Drivers for costs

• The needs of the children
  – Staffing ratios
  – Equipment and training of staff
  – Can be highly variable
• Service type
  – Activity costs
• Staffing
  – Actual and relative costs
• Management costs
• The costs of commissioning
• Linking costs to Value
## Understanding Children’s Needs to Inform Staffing Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>No additional support required</th>
<th>Some Assistance required</th>
<th>Some assistance required</th>
<th>Moderate Assistance required</th>
<th>Significant Assistance required at all times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The method of a young person's communication. (Assistive technology, computer programmes, PECS, signing, widgets &amp; body language)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;15 min of staff time</td>
<td>&lt;30 minutes of staff time</td>
<td>&lt;60 minutes of staff time</td>
<td>&lt;90 minutes of staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If &gt; 90 minutes of staff time please enter value in minutes below and explain in notebox below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If > 90 minutes of staff time please enter value in minutes below and explain in notebox below
Cost and Value

• How is “value for money” defined?
  – Outcomes?
  – Experience and expertise of staff?
  – Training?
  – Ongoing support?

• Shorter term contracts

• Value for money or lowest cost?
Delivering a short break hub model

- Foster Care short breaks
- Pathway projects and inclusion
- Peer befriending
- Residential activity holidays
- Transition Support
- Domiciliary Care
- After school care
- Holiday and weekend activity groups
- Intensive Family Support
- Sibling support
- Parenting skills e.g. behaviour support; sleep management
# Hub services: An example of value for money?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost type</th>
<th>Proportion of expenditure</th>
<th>Hub Services</th>
<th>Other Action for Children Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Family Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee related</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hub Services</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.11</td>
<td>75.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client related</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency function</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>23.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shared learning: key information

• Data
  – Consistency in the data provided
  – Understanding full cost recovery
    – Foster Family overnight short breaks
    – Personal budgets
• Comparing like with like
  – Understanding the services
  – Understanding the children
• Understanding outputs
Measuring outcomes
Measuring outcomes: The complexity of the picture

• The issue: Variety
  – The needs and circumstances of children accessing short breaks
  – The types of short break provision on offer

• The solution: Gathering of baseline data
  – Categorisation of needs and impairments
    – Subcategories “Mild Moderate and Severe”
  – Identification of individual smart targets
    – Sub-categories within each outcome area
Examples of Outcomes

• The child/young person knows about risks to their safety and how to deal with them
• Improvement in emotional wellbeing
• Parents/Carers capacity to cope with difficulties is enhanced
• Engages safely in a leisure activity of their choice
• Views are sought, heard and contribute to decision making
• Social skills improve
• Communication skills improve
• There is an improvement in practical life skills
## Example: Use and analysis of SMART target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action for Children Outcomes Framework Outcome</th>
<th>SMART Target</th>
<th>Outcome subcategory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in practical life skills</td>
<td>I would like to do more for myself. Please help me to make snacks and look after my belongings</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eat meals independently</td>
<td>Eating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brushing own hair (three strokes)</td>
<td>Dressing/Personal care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please help me use my Big Mack switch to switch on appliances e.g. the bubble machine and food processor.</td>
<td>Big Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to pay for my own choice of sweet or snack at the local shop</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Use and analysis of SMART targets

- Not Known or No Change
- Achieved or Improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not Known or No Change</th>
<th>Achieved or Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Mack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measuring outcomes: Wider impact: taking small steps

• The Issue: The “Spoon Scenario”
  – “soft outcomes”
  – small or slow progress

• The solution: contextualisation
  – Baseline data and “distance travelled”
  – Understanding the impact of the outcome achieved
  – Survey and interview data
    – Routine analysis of the wider impact
Jack and Mary’s story

• 16 years old increasingly isolated: communication & interaction difficult

• Interest in art, drama and horse riding supported to do both weekly

• Support staff gradually withdrew as Jack’s confidence increased

• Social & communication skills increased & interest in script writing

• Went on to lead improvisation session at drama group

• Mary has a break and walks the dog, goes to café and a night class

• Mary’s emotional wellbeing improves & more optimistic about Jack’s future
Jack and Mary’s story

‘We [parents] went to his parents’ evening at school and they said, “oh, we’re really pleased because I don’t know what’s happened, but suddenly, he’s initiating conversations” which was always the problem, because of the shyness, people would say ‘hello’ [and] he’d turn his head away, back away.’
Using costs and outcomes to inform commissioning
Linking costs to needs and outcomes

• Variations in costs
  ~ according to needs
  ~ according to service type
  ~ based on local policies and procedures
• Do the most expensive interventions and services produce the best outcomes?
• Least positive outcomes and highest costs for children with complex needs
  ~ Could services have been provided earlier?
  ~ Have decisions been delayed
  ~ Do services need to continue for longer?
Financial Savings from Short Break Support: England

£174 million if short breaks were effectively delivered to all those eligible to receive them.

Based on the following data:

- Decreased cost of long-term residential care from reductions in the number of disabled children placed outside of the family home: £135 million
- Decreased cost to health services from reduction in parents’, families’ and carers’ stress: £18 million
- Decrease cost to schools of educating siblings with behavioural and emotional difficulties: £21 million

For the full report, which includes the methodology of this work, please see: www.actionforchildren.org.uk/valueofshortbreaks
The commissioning environment

• External providers offer:
  – Knowledge and expertise
  – Value for money

• Providers selected by:
  – Outcomes
  – Demonstrable quality and expertise
  – Value for money

• ‘Success’ measured by:
  – Outcomes
  – Value for money
## Selecting Short Break Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrable quality and expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost: value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to deliver required outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good references</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost: transparency in costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being known to the authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well written bid</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost: lowest cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes Based Commissioning

Children should have -

- the opportunity to mix with peers (and make friends)
- have new experiences
- be able to stay away from home
- the opportunity to develop team skills
- the chance to rate the activities they do
- gain a sense of achievement

http://www.shortbreaksnetwork.org.uk/policyandpractice/impact/casestudies/commissioning
Reporting Outputs and Outcomes

Action for Children’s Report Cards
Thank You

http://www.actionforchildren.org.uk/policy-research/research

www.ccfre.org.uk