



Department
for Education

Review of the Family Fund Trust

Appendix B – Summary Reports from the Main Strands of the Research

Research Report

April 2013

Richard Selwyn & Shelley Dorrans

Moorhouse Consortium

Contents

Table of figures	3
Review of the Family Fund Trust	4
A. Survey of families: Summary Report	5
1. Background Information	6
2. Applying for a Family Fund Grant	12
2.1 Recent Grant History	12
2.2 The Application Process	14
2.3 Purpose of Your Most Recent Application for the Grant	17
2.4 Outcome of Most Recent Application	19
2.5 Support from an Adviser	19
2.6 Comparing the experience with other organisations	20
3. Impact of the Grant	22
4. Additional Comments	25
5. Comparison to PWC Review (2005) and Customer Satisfaction Survey (2010)	28
B. Procurement Analysis and Issues: Summary Report	36
C. Case Studies with Families: Summary Report	39
D. Phone Interviews with Unsuccessful Applicants: Summary Report	46
E. Consultation with Voluntary Sector Providers: Summary Report	53

Table of figures

Table A1 Nature of children's disabilities	7
Graph A1 Monthly family income before tax	8
Graph A2 Ethnic background	9
Graph A3 Ethnic background by country	10
Table A2 Number of Family Fund grant applications made	12
Table A3 Number of applications leading to grant being awarded	13
Graph A4 Finding out about Family Fund	15
Graph A5 Time to receive grant after submitting application	16
Table A4 Reasons for making most recent application to Family Fund	17
Graph A6 Reasons for making most recent application to Family Fund	18
Graph A7 Items requested through grant	18
Graph A8 Support received from Family Fund adviser	20
Graph A9 Alternative to Family Fund grant	24
Table A5 Proposed extended support of Family Fund	25
Table A7 Financial value of grants received	31

Review of the Family Fund Trust

In April 2012, the Department for Education commissioned the Moorhouse Consortium (including Cognizant and OPM) to undertake a rapid review of the Family Fund Trust (FFT). The review, carried out between April 2012 and July 2012, had five main objectives:

1. To compare the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the current Family Fund model with alternative delivery models
2. To assess the process of awareness raising with families and allocation and distribution of funds
3. To identify the short and long term impact of initial and repeat funding on families
4. To measure the qualitative impact of home visits
5. To review the appropriateness of the role of UK Government as a direct grant provider.

Alongside the main report there is a research brief and five supporting appendices. These are:

- Appendix A: Detailed Methodology and Research Tools
- Appendix B: Summary reports from the main strands of research
- Appendix C: Individual Family Case Study Reports
- Appendix D: Alternative models
- Appendix E: Raw survey data by country, first time applicants and multiple applicants

A. Survey of families: Summary Report

Our Sample

In total, 2,848 families submitted responses to the online survey to capture views and experiences of the Family Fund Trust. The survey was intended to target families from the four countries in the UK, and to include first time applicants and families who have applied multiple times. Our achieved sample is set out below:

	Type of applicant (no. of respondents)			Total
	1 st time	Multiple	Not stated	
England	682	1368	185	2235
Scotland	91	173	23	287
Wales	54	105	23	182
Northern Ireland	39	90	15	144
				2848

Reading this Report

Unless specified, all findings are represented as a percentage of the 2,848 responses received. For some questions, less than 2,848 responses were received and so the number of responses received has been stated. Some questions allowed respondents to select multiple answers, so in these cases the total of all responses may exceed 100%. All figures and percentages are rounded to whole numbers.

The findings relate to *all* respondents unless stated. Analyses were conducted by country and by type of applicant (first-time or multiple) however with the former there were no substantial variations to report. Differences in the findings by type of applicant have been reported where relevant and response rates are given as a proportion of the type of respondent (for multiple applicants (1,736 responses) and for first-time applicants (866 respondents)).

We looked for differences across groups and reported any differences greater than 10%-15% as appropriate to the particular question¹. Because the sub-group analysis is based on quite small 'cell' counts, confidence tests were not appropriate as the margin of error would be far too great. For this reason, any sub group differences that are reported are only indicative rather than statistically significant.

Further analyses comparing these survey findings with those from the PWC Review of the Family Fund Survey (2005) and the Family Fund Trust Customer Satisfaction Survey (2010) are provided in section 5 of this chapter.

¹ In most instances the differences reported on are between first-time applicants and multiple applicants.

1. Background Information

Profile of Respondents

Country of Residence

An analysis of the survey respondents by country of residence indicates that:

- 79% live in England (n=2,235)
- 10% live in Scotland (n=287)
- 6% live in Wales (n=182) and;
- 5% in Northern Ireland (n=144)

Caring Responsibilities

When asked about how many disabled children they have in their care:

- The majority of parents/carers (85%) reported that they provide care for one disabled child (n=2,420)
- 13% reported that they care for two disabled children (n=361)
- Less than 3% reported that they care for three or more disabled children (n=66)

Nature of Child's or Children's Disability

Respondents were asked about the nature of the disability of the child/children they care for, and were invited to select multiple responses (many respondents have children with more than one disability).

Disabilities ranged from autistic spectrum disorders, which were the most commonly reported form of disability (55%, n=1,580), to heart disease, the least commonly reported disability (3%, n=84).

Table A1 shows the full list of disabilities that respondent's reported. *Note: as respondents selected multiple answers the number of responses does not add up to the number of respondents (n=7,823 responses).*

Table A1 Nature of children's disabilities

Disability	Percentage	Number of responses
Autistic spectrum disorders	55%	1580
Learning disabilities	51%	1463
Speech and language difficulties	38%	1084
Behaviour disorders	36%	1036
Other (e.g. diabetes, cancer, ADHD, other physical disorders (such as arthritis, CF), mental health problems)	25%	718
Sensory impairments	21%	591
Epilepsy or convulsions	11%	314
Asthma	11%	313
Cerebral palsy	9%	266
Named syndrome	8%	230
Downs syndrome	5%	144
Heart disease	3%	84

Base: 2848


Family Income

Respondents provided information about their monthly family income before tax (to include all sources of income).

- The largest proportion of survey respondents (20%) reported a household income of £1,001 – £1,300 (n=562)
- 18% reported an income of £771 – £1,000 (n=509)
- 15% of respondents reported an income of £1,301 – £1,700 (n=423)
- 12% of respondents reported an income of less than £770 (n=330)
- 12% of respondents reported an income of £1,701 – £2,200 (n=337).

Graph A1 below shows the proportion of respondents within these income bands. Whilst the larger proportions of respondents are on lower incomes (below £1700), it is notable that a high proportion reported that their monthly family income before tax was more than £4200. It is not possible to understand why this may be, although it may be linked to family size or other factors that the survey findings do not capture.

Graph A1 Monthly family income before tax




Ethnic Background

An analysis of respondents' ethnic backgrounds shows that:

- The majority of all respondents (87%) reported their ethnic background to be White (British, Irish or Other) (n=2,471)
- 6% of respondents reported their ethnic background to be Black or Black British (n=177)
- 3% of respondents reported their ethnic background to be Asian or Asian British (n=81)
- 2% of respondents selected 'other' to describe their ethnic backgrounds (n=63)
- Less than 1% of respondents reported their ethnic background to be Chinese or other South-East Asian (n=10)
- Less than 2% of respondents preferred not to state their ethnic background (n=46).

Graph A2 provides an overview of the ethnic backgrounds reported by respondents.

Graph A2 Ethnic background




Analysis by country shows that:

- 84% of respondents from England reported their ethnic background to be White British, Irish or Other, 14% of respondents reported a BME background, and 2% did not say.
- 96% of respondents from Scotland reported their ethnic background to be White British, Irish or Other, 2% of respondents reported a BME background, and 2% did not say
- 97% of respondents from Wales reported their ethnic background to be White British, Irish or Other, 2% of respondents reported a BME background, and 1% did not say.
- 99% of respondents from Northern Ireland reported their ethnic background to be White British, Irish or Other, and 1% of respondents reported a BME background

Graph A3 shows how these proportions compare to national figures on the BME population in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. It shows that:

- A higher proportion of respondents from England (14% of all respondents) reported a BME background compared to the national BME population (9%)
- The same proportion of survey respondents from Scotland and Wales (2% respectively) reported a BME background compared to the national BME populations (also 2% respectively)
- The same proportion of survey respondents from Northern Ireland (1%) reported a BME background compared to the national BME population (1%)

Graph A3 Ethnic background by country



Pressure and Needs Facing Families

Respondents were asked about the greatest pressures and needs that their families are facing in an open question. 94% of all respondents provided an answer (n=2,670), and the key issues highlighted were:

- **Financial pressures:** lack of income; decrease of income due to cutting work hours to care; cuts to welfare benefits; cuts to specialist services; cost of specialist equipment / help, e.g. to aid mobility, sensory abilities, learning abilities
- **Emotional pressures/stress:** single parenting; lack of shared caring; balancing needs of disabled and non-disabled children; finding time to be together as a family; finding time to spend with non-disabled siblings, and with partner; loneliness and isolation
- **Housing needs:** lack of equipment, unsuitable accommodation, lack of space
- **Transport needs:** cost and access to suitably sized vehicles; expense and time linked to maintenance of family car
- **Education needs:** lack of access to schooling; exclusion; teachers lack of understanding/knowledge of how to deal with conditions
- **Bullying and discrimination:** lack of wider understanding about disabilities
- **Caring:** keeping disabled children motivated, e.g. to attend school; keeping disabled children healthy; dealing with challenging physical behaviour, e.g. violence; dealing with challenging emotional behaviour, e.g. anger, frustration, anxiety; limited time to go out on day trips / holidays as a family; lack of access to respite care; providing stimulating, safe and appropriate activities for all children dependent on their needs; time and access to

attend specialist/hospital appointments; lack of support and information from services e.g. doctors

Personal Budgets

The majority of respondents (72%), reported that they/their child or children **do not** have a personal budget, direct payment, individual payment or personal health budget from their local authority or local NHS for their disabled children (n=2,047).

18% of respondents reported that they do receive one of these budgets, and 10% reported that they did not know (n=285).

It is possible that the high proportion of respondents that are not in receipt of a form of budget could include people that are waiting to receive one but were not at the time of the survey, and include respondents that opted out of direct payments.

Membership of Forums

When asked whether they were part of a local Parent Carer Forum or similar support group with links to their local authority the majority of respondents (76%) reported that they were not (n=2,171). 18% of respondents reported that they were part of such groups (n=518) and 6% did not know (n=159).

Of those respondents that reported being a member of a support group, the majority (97%) specified what type of group (n=505). Responses included:

- Local or national charity support groups, e.g. National Autistic Society, Contact a Family, Carers UK, Rethink, Mencap, Kaleidoscope,
- Local support groups for specific conditions/disabilities, e.g. autism, ADHD, Down's syndrome

An analysis of respondents by membership of Parent Carer Forum or support group by income does not show any trends. It is plausible that those respondents that are involved in groups may find that the support helps to alleviate pressures or meet social needs, but the survey findings do not provide insight into this.

2. Applying for a Family Fund Grant

2.1 Recent Grant History

Respondents were asked in which calendar year they made their most recent grant applications and the findings show that:

- The majority of respondents (60%) reported they made their most recent application in 2011 (n=1,712)
- 34% of respondents reported they made their application in 2012 (n=980)
- 4% of respondents reported they made their application in 2010 (n=118)
- 1% of respondents reported that they could not remember when they made their most recent application (n=38)

When asked about the number of times they have applied for Family Fund grants, the largest proportion of respondents said that they had applied just once (30%, n=866).

Table A2 shows a breakdown of the number of applications for Family Fund grants made by respondents.

Table A2 Number of Family Fund grant applications made

Number of applications	Percentage	Number of respondents
One application	30%	866
Two applications	23%	653
Three applications	16%	463
Four applications	9%	267
Five applications	5%	144
Six applications	3%	74
Seven or more applications	7%	209
Can't remember	6%	172

Base: 2848

When asked how many of their applications had led to a Family Fund grant being awarded, the largest proportion of respondents reported that they had one successful application (31%, n=892). This reflects the large proportion of respondents that had only applied for a grant once.

Table A3 below shows the proportions of respondents by the number of applications that successfully led to a Family Fund grant being awarded.

