



Department  
for Education

# **Review of the Family Fund Trust**

## **Appendix A – Methodology and Research Tools**

### **Research Report**

**April 2013**

**Richard Selwyn & Shelley Dorrans**

**Moorhouse Consortium**

# Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table of figures  | 3  |
| Review of the Family Fund Trust                               | 4  |
| A. Analysis of Family Fund Documentation                      | 6  |
| B. Stakeholder Interviews                                     | 7  |
| C. Survey of Families   | 9  |
| D. Case Study Visits to Families                              | 11 |
| E. Interviews with Unsuccessful Applicants                    | 12 |
| F. Evidence from Voluntary and Community Sector Organisations | 13 |
| G. Desk Research  | 14 |
| H. Options Appraisal  | 15 |
| I. Data Analysis  | 20 |
| Qualitative Data  | 20 |
| Quantitative Survey Data                                      | 20 |
| J. Research Tools   | 23 |
| Stakeholder Interview Guide                                   | 23 |
| Background  | 23 |
| Objectives, Functions, Position of the Family Fund            | 23 |
| Evolution of Family Fund since Last Review (2005)             | 24 |
| Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Family Fund model         | 24 |
| Increasing the Capacity of the Family Fund                    | 25 |
| Case Study Research: Topic Guide                              | 26 |
| Background  | 26 |
| Applying to the Fund  | 26 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Home visit ( <i>if applicable</i> )                        | 26 |
| Impact   | 27 |
| Other Kinds of Support                                     | 28 |
| The Future   | 28 |
| Phone Interviews with Unsuccessful Applicants: Topic Guide | 29 |
| Survey Questions   | 32 |
| Section 1: Background Information                          | 32 |
| Section 2: Applying for a Family Fund Grant                | 35 |
| Section 3: Impact of the Grant upon Recipient and Family   | 41 |
| Section 4: Additional Comments                             | 43 |

## **Table of figures**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Figure 1 Target sample   | 9 |
| Figure 2 Achieved sample | 9 |

## 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

This document provides a detailed description of our methodology. The table at the end provides an 'at a glance' summary of how we designed the review to meet the research objectives, and copies of the research tools are also provided.

## A. Analysis of Family Fund Documentation

We reviewed strategic documents, activity reports and research reports produced by the Family Fund to deepen our understanding its strategic objectives, governance arrangements, staffing structure, model for allocating and distributing grants, and contractual agreements with the four UK governments. This information fed into the development of our fieldwork tools and helped shape our sampling frame for the survey of families. The documents we reviewed included:

- Family Fund Trust activity reports by country for 2011/12 and 2010/11
- Family Fund Trust Annual Report 2010/11
- Family Fund Trust Annual Accounts 2010/11
- Income Criteria and Tax Credits , Family Fund Trust 2012/13
- 2012/13 grants agreements for England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales
- Internal paper by Cheryl Ward, Development Director, 2011, outlining the aims and objectives of the Family Fund, why it is effective, and aspirations for the future
- Example contract between the Family Fund and a white goods supplier
- Reaching Families in Wales: Mapping Families with Disabled Children. Contact a Family Wales and the Family Fund Trust, 2012
- A Review of the Family Fund, a report by PriceWaterhouseCoopers for the Department for Education and Schools, 2005
- We also reviewed the following resources on the Family Fund website:
- How to Apply to the Family Fund video
- Family Fund – Facebook pages
- Spring 2012 Family Newsletter and Stakeholder Newsletter

## B. Stakeholder Interviews

We undertook semi-structured interviews with 22 key representatives from the Family Fund and the four UK governments using a topic guide. Interviewees were identified through discussion with the review Steering Group and the then Chief Executive of the Family Fund Trust. We undertook a mix of telephone and face-to-face interviews, tailoring our questions to each interviewee. The interviews lasted up to one hour. Each interview was recorded using a Dictaphone and written up into notes at a later point (although not fully transcribed).

A list of interviewees' job titles and organisation is set out below:

- Policy Lead, Department for Education
- Director, Department for Education
- Policy Lead, Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety, Northern Ireland Assembly
- Director, Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety, Northern Ireland Assembly
- Policy Lead, Disabled Children and Young People, Scottish Executive
- Policy Lead, Department of Health, Social Services and Children, Welsh Assembly
- Policy Lead, Department of Health, Social Services and Children, Welsh Assembly
- Policy Advisor, Communities and Local Government
- National Network of Parent Carer Forums
- Chief Executive (outgoing), Family Fund (2 interviews)
- Acting Chief Executive / Business Development Director Family Fund (2 interviews)
- Operations Director, Family Fund (2 interviews)
- Human Resources Manager, Family Fund
- Grants Manager, Family Fund
- ICT Manager, Family Fund
- Policy Development Co-ordinator, Family Fund
- Procurement Lead, Family Fund
- Network Development Manager, Family Fund
- Family Fund Advisor, Family Fund
- Family Fund Advisor, Family Fund

- Trustee, Family Fund
- Chair of Trustees, Family Fund

A copy of the interview guide is provided in Section J of this document. An overview of the families who participated is provided in the Case Study Summary Report in Appendix B.



## C. Survey of Families

We designed an online questionnaire aimed at families who successfully received a grant in the last 18 months. The survey was designed to capture data on the impact of the grant as well as respondents' experiences and views of the application process, and whether they have been able to access additional sources of financial or other support as a result of the home visit/grant. Our survey drew on questions asked in the Family Fund's 2010 Customer Satisfaction Survey and the PricewaterhouseCoopers's (PwC) 2005 report on the Family Fund Trust to facilitate longitudinal comparison across the studies. A copy of the questionnaire is provided at the end of this section.

The sampling frame was based on our segmentation of families that received grants in 2010/11 to help ensure we captured a largely representative mix of families in terms of: i) country of residence, and ii) whether they were first time applicants or had applied multiple times. We aimed for a minimum response rate of 2,835 questionnaires, representing 5% of grant recipients in 2010/11, and in the end were able to generate 2,848 responses, slightly more than our target number. Our target and achieved samples are set out below.

**Figure 1 Target sample**

|                  | Type of applicant (no. of respondents) |          |  | Total        |
|------------------|--|----------|--|--------------|
|                  | 1 <sup>st</sup> time                   | Multiple |  |              |
| England          | 470                                    | 1,767    |  | 2,237        |
| Scotland         | 48                                     | 180      |  | 228          |
| Wales            | 48                                     | 180      |  | 228          |
| Northern Ireland | 30                                     | 112      |  | 142          |
|                  |  |          |  | <b>2,835</b> |

**Figure 2 Achieved sample**

|                  | Type of applicant (no. of respondents) |          |            | Total        |
|------------------|--|----------|------------|--------------|
|                  | 1 <sup>st</sup> time                   | Multiple | Not stated |              |
| England          | 682                                    | 1368     | 185        | 2,235        |
| Scotland         | 91                                     | 173      | 23         | 287          |
| Wales            | 54                                     | 105      | 23         | 182          |
| Northern Ireland | 39                                     | 90       | 15         | 144          |
|                  |  |          |            | <b>2,848</b> |

We worked with Family Fund to email the survey to 16,695 families who had successfully applied to the Family Fund in the last 18 months. Two reminder emails were circulated to non-responders to encourage their participation.

Respondents were encouraged to complete an electronic version of the questionnaire, however hard copies were available if requested. Respondents in Wales were offered the opportunity to complete the questionnaire in Welsh. None chose to do so.

Where possible, we compared the findings of our survey with the findings of the Family Fund's 2010 Customer Satisfaction survey and the PWC's 2005 survey as part of its Review of the Family Fund. However given the small number of respondents to the PWC report, any comparisons should be considered indicative and treated with caution.

---

| <b>Source</b>                    | <b>Sample size</b> |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| 2012 OPM survey                  | 2,848              |
| 2010 Family Fund Customer Survey | 1,001              |
| 2005 PwC Customer Survey         | 152                |

An overview of the families who participated is provided in the Survey Summary Report in Section B of this report.

## **D. Case Study Visits to Families**

Respondents to the survey were asked to provide their contact details if they would be willing to participate in a home visit with one of the research team to explore in more detail their views and experiences of the Family Fund, and in particular the added value of home visits, families' views on degree of choice and control they have over the grant, and the level of contact they have with other statutory or VCS services. To view the interview guide go to Section J. Each interview was recorded using a Dictaphone and written up into notes at a later point (although not fully transcribed).

We undertook 20 home visits across the UK, drawn from those who volunteered to participate. We recruited a diverse sample of families to ensure variation in: country of residence; nature of disabilities of the child; ethnicity; and history of applying to the Family Fund. We also ensured that families had had a home visit. Our research with each family lasted approximately 1.5 hours.

An overview of the families who participated is provided in this strand of research is provided in the Case Study Summary Report in Section B of this document. Short reports on each of the case study visits are provided in Appendix C.

## **E. Interviews with Unsuccessful Applicants**

Families whose application to the Family Fund had been turned down within the last 12 months were contacted by the Family Fund by email to invite them to contact the Moorhouse Consortium if they were willing take part in a short telephone interview about their views and experiences of the Family Fund. These interviews explored the reasons for their application; reason for rejection and how this was conveyed; the impact that this had on their family; and any alternative sources of grants or local / national support they were able to access. To see the interview guide go to Section J.

Telephone interviews were conducted with the first twenty parents/carers who responded to the invitation and were available to participate within the timeframe for the study.

An overview of the families who participated is provided in this strand of research is provided in the Telephone Interview Summary Report in Section B of this document.

## F. Evidence from Voluntary and Community Sector Organisations

Members of the review Steering Group identified relevant voluntary and community sector (VCS) organisations operating in the field of children's disabilities across the UK as possible members of a virtual Expert Reference Group. We emailed these organisations to invite them to participate in the group. Twelve individuals in 8 VCS organisations chose to do so and signed up to the Terms of Reference we designed for the group. Participation in the group was voluntary and members could exit from the group at any point.

The group was asked to provide insights and commentary on: the main challenges facing low income families with disabled children; how the Family Fund is placed to respond; effective models for supporting these families; improving links with the VCS sector; and the Family Fund's strategic direction, given the future public policy landscape. We received responses from: Children in Northern Ireland; Council for Disabled Children/National Children's Bureau; Contact a Family Northern Ireland; Children in Wales; Sense Scotland; Barnardos Cymru; and National Network of Parent Carer Forums.

The ERG helped us shape a wider 'call for evidence' from the VCS sector, exploring similar issues to those identified above. They circulated this to their contacts. We received submissions from: Carers Northern Ireland; RNIB Northern Ireland; Disability Action Northern Ireland; and Access for Black and Minority Ethnic children with disabilities and/or chronic illnesses (ABCD).

The findings from our consultation with the VCS sector are set out in our VCS Consultation Summary Report in Section B of this document.

## G. Desk Research

We undertook internet searches in order to gather information on possible alternative models examining the UK, EU and overseas contexts<sup>1</sup>. We were particularly interested in central grant models, in particular the Community Grant, as these were identified in the Invitation to Tender as being of interest. We also identified the following models as possible comparators based on our knowledge of the current policy context: Disabled Facilities Grant; Personal/individual budgets; and The CAN scheme

We searched online for documents and reports which described these models, and contained relevant information on target groups, eligibility criteria, efficiency and effectiveness.

We also identified a large number of other grant schemes available to families with disabled children through our stakeholder interviews, consultation with VCS providers, and searches online. We've described these in brief in the Comparators and Alternative Models summary report in Appendix D, but did not undertake detailed searches for comparative data on efficiency and effectiveness.

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to data reviewed as part of the desk research are contained in Section D.

## H. Options Appraisal

We made a comparative assessment between the Family Fund, and options 1) individual budgets, 2) voucher scheme, 3) parent carer forum, and 4) procurement exercise. Due to the nature of comparing very different markets, supply chain and end solutions the rationale for scoring each option is given below, and it should be noted that this is intended as an **indicative assessment**. Accuracy is improved by using multiple metrics for assessment.

|                             | Metric                                | Score | Rationale   |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|---|
| 0. Family Fund <sup>2</sup> | Time to set up market / supply chain  | 10    | No time to set up. Sets benchmark for this score.   |
|                             | Cost of implementation                | 10    | No cost of implementation. Sets benchmark for this score.   |
|                             | Overhead costs / unit price           | 7     | Overheads are low in comparison with other models such as DWP Budgeting loan and Community Care grant as discussed in this report <sup>3</sup> , however a voucher scheme on use of volunteers in the Parent Carer forum would be more cost efficient                       |
|                             | Family experience of service          | 9     | Issues with managing expectations, and constraints of vouchers, but survey of parents showed otherwise excellent user experience  |
|                             | Accuracy of targeting                 | 8     | Targeting will be effective through using Advisors and a social model of assessment, and review of social impact on outcomes, there remain some issues around reaching particular families (through increasing demand) and ensuring consistency of the Advisor assessments. |
|                             | Social impact on outcomes             | 9     | Combination of social impact from the direct grant, and greater impact from additional Advisor support gives an excellent level of impact   |
|                             | Safeguards against fraud and error    | 8     | Advisor assessment is effective in reducing fraud, although there are anecdotal reports of some recipients selling vouchers on the internet, and 25% of grants are not covered by vouchers  |
|                             | Risk of implementation inc reputation | 10    | Little risk – carrying on current model. Sets benchmark for this score.   |

<sup>2</sup> This section includes data taken from all of our interviews including that from interviewees from the Family Fund trust, government departments and from the expert reference group.

<sup>3</sup> See Section D for an overview of different models including DWP Budgeting loan, the Community Care grant and Vouchers.

|                                    | Metric                                | Score | Rationale  |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|--|
| 1. Individual Budgets <sup>4</sup> | Time to set up market / supply chain  | 3     | Mechanisms for distributing individual budgets are mostly in place (predominantly through Adult Services), but expanding the reach to families currently targeted by the Family Fund would require a significant period of transition, estimated to be 2 years |
|                                    | Cost of implementation                | 9     | Building on current process and tools – costs are mainly in expanding the user base, defining eligibility and securing local authority staff capacity (option to TUPE <sup>5</sup> staff from Family Fund to local authorities)                                |
|                                    | Overhead costs / unit price           | 8     | Lower cost to administer than the Family Fund, although remains a requirement to administer in the Local Authorities and to set up brokerage for particular services (e.g. family breaks and specialist equipment)   |
|                                    | Family experience of service          | 10    | Excellent – families will choose what to spend the money on without constraints. Sets benchmark for this score.  |
|                                    | Accuracy of targeting                 | 4     | Poor targeting as needs assessment will be through medical model of need and level of benefits currently received  |
|                                    | Social impact on outcomes             | 5     | Average impact on outcomes – parental choice will improve the application of grant money, but there is no option to negotiate discounts, and no other support is provided such as Advisor coaching or signposting / support packs                              |
|                                    | Safeguards against fraud and error    | 3     | Poor protection against fraud – reliant on DWP fraud prevention <sup>6</sup> , and no safeguards on what the grant money is spent on   |
|                                    | Risk of implementation inc reputation | 7     | Majority of the system is already set up (DWP assessment, LA distribution). However, this change could be perceived as a reduction in support for disabled children, and there is a risk that the transition period will lead to a reduction in coverage.      |

<sup>4</sup> The data on Individual Budgets was drawn from the desk research set out in Section D.

<sup>5</sup> Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment)

<sup>6</sup> See <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/publications/specialist-guides/fraud-guide/>



|                          | Metric                                | Score | Rationale   |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|---|
| 2. Vouchers <sup>7</sup> | Time to set up market / supply chain  | 8     | Similar scheme (Classes and Advice Network CAN Parent) is already in pilot stage – so drawing on the learning would be quick, improving the speed of implementation               |
|                          | Cost of implementation                | 5     | Expansion of the voucher scheme from pilot to full roll-out across the UK would be costly, including a new advertising campaign and redundancy costs for staff in the Family Fund |
|                          | Overhead costs / unit price           | 10    | Excellent – very low administration costs as vouchers are requested by families and handed out by local businesses / statutory services. Sets benchmark for this score.           |
|                          | Family experience of service          | 10    | Excellent – limited constraints on what the grant is spent on, easy access to funding. Sets benchmark for this score.   |
|                          | Accuracy of targeting                 | 1     | Very poor targeting – no needs assessment and families that apply for vouchers are likely to be those least in need   |
|                          | Social impact on outcomes             | 2     | Due to targeting the social impact will be poor, because there are no controls on who applies for a voucher, or what it is spent on   |
|                          | Safeguards against fraud and error    | 1     | Very poor as there are few or no controls over who applies and how the grant is spent   |
|                          | Risk of implementation inc reputation | 5     | Significant risk of implementation as the Family Fund would be shut down, and the voucher scheme may not be received positively   |

<sup>7</sup> The data on the Vouchers scheme was drawn from the desk research set out in Section D.

|  | Metric                                | Score | Rationale  |
|--|---------------------------------------|-------|--|
| <b>3. Parent Carer Forum<sup>8</sup></b> | Time to set up market / supply chain  | 1     | Likely to be 5 to 10 years before parent career forums are mature enough across the country to administer the Family Fund whilst maintaining probity   |
|  | Cost of implementation                | 8     | Due to the use of volunteers, implementation costs are likely to be low, although redundancy costs will need to be found for the majority of current staff in the Family Fund  |
|  | Overhead costs / unit price           | 10    | Parent Carer Forums may need to pay for capacity to administer the grant, however the use of volunteers will off-set this and lead to a much more efficient administration than the Family Fund  |
|  | Family experience of service          | 10    | Excellent experience as the grant is given directly to parents, with a network of support to help families get the best from the grant. Sets the benchmark for this score.   |
|  | Accuracy of targeting                 | 3     | Lack of structured needs assessment process or systematic reach to families that are not engaging with the Parent Carer Forum would limit ability to target families in most need  |
|  | Social impact on outcomes             | 7     | Good impact on outcomes as the grant would be accompanied by a support network from other Parents / Carers. However, issues with measurement and evaluation of impact, and grants may be spent on items that are not supporting families as much as alternative goods / services |
|  | Safeguards against fraud and error    | 1     | Very poor probity against fraud or error – particularly in light of the experience of one Government where grants to the voluntary sector was mis-directed to friends / family members   |
|  | Risk of implementation inc reputation | 2     | Significant risks due to the timescales for implementation, variability of use across the country, fraud and error   |

<sup>8</sup> Data in this section relates to interviews with representatives from, and others aware of the work of, Parent Carer forums

|                         | Metric                                | Score | Rationale  |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|--|
| 4. Procurement Exercise | Time to set up market / supply chain  | 3     | Six months to run the procurement exercise, and we expect a further six months from contract award to launch <sup>9</sup>  |
|                         | Cost of implementation                | 4     | High cost of implementation in running the procurement exercise, and in TUPE costs   |
|                         | Overhead costs / unit price           | 7     | Difficult to estimate without going through a tender process – assume provider will give a similar level of efficiency as the Family Fund  |
|                         | Family experience of service          | 9     | Difficult to estimate without going through a tender process – assume provider will give a similar level of experience for users as the Family Fund  |
|                         | Accuracy of targeting                 | 8     | Difficult to estimate without going through a tender process – assume provider will be as accurate in targeting as the Family Fund if they use a similar model of assessment   |
|                         | Social impact on outcomes             | 9     | Difficult to estimate without going through a tender process – assume provider will be as effective as the Family Fund   |
|                         | Safeguards against fraud and error    | 8     | Difficult to estimate without going through a tender process – assume provider will be as effective as the Family Fund   |
|                         | Risk of implementation inc reputation | 2     | High level of risk, depending on the provider selected. Experience of cutting funding by 11% in Northern Ireland suggested a strong reaction by parents of disabled children. There is also a significant risk that the need for certain providers to deliver a profit will lead to less efficiency or poorer user experience. |

<sup>9</sup> EU procurement guidelines stipulate that exercises will take 6 months to run a procurement exercise [http://europa.eu/business/public-contracts/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/business/public-contracts/index_en.htm)

# I. Data Analysis

## Qualitative Data

Data from our review of Family Fund documents, case study research, telephone interviews with families and stakeholder interviews was extracted and analysed via thematic content analysis procedures. We designed an analytical framework based on the research objectives and mapped the qualitative data onto this framework. As we undertook our analysis, we extended the framework as additional themes emerged from the data.

## Quantitative Survey Data

Quantitative survey data was imported into Excel. The data was presented as descriptive statistics (e.g. frequencies, trends, patterns), and positioned on the analysis framework. We produced separate data sets for each of the four UK countries, our sample of first time applicants and our sample of families who had applied multiple times.

We looked for differences across sub groups and reported any differences greater than 10%-15% as appropriate to the particular question. 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, when these differences are reported they should only be treated as indicative findings, rather than statistically significant.

It should also be noted that we interpreted our findings in light of data gathered from other research methods.

| Objectives  | Requirements  | Methods                                 |   |               |   |  |                                |
|---|---|---|---|---------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
|   |   | Expert ref. group and call for evidence | Stakeholder interviews (Family Fund & UK governments) | Desk research | Review of all relevant FTT documents, MI and data | Comparative analysis of effectiveness and efficiency | Research with CYP and families |
| Compare efficiency and cost effectiveness of current Family Fund model with alternative delivery models       | Describe current Family Fund delivery model and assess extent to which its objectives are being met   |   | X   |               | X   |  | X                              |
|   | Assess the capacity of Family Fund to be increased to support more families, generate more income, improve links to VCS and improve links with purchasing organisations | X                                       | X   |               | X   |  |                                |
|   | Undertake a comparative analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Family Fund delivery model with other models  |   |   | X             |   | X  |                                |
| Assess process of awareness raising with families, and allocation and distribution of funds                   | Analyse who knows about the fund, who applies and who receives awards, and assess whether the 'right' families are receiving funds                                      | X                                       |   |               | X   |  | X                              |
|   | Assess whether the assessment of need is fit for purpose, and whether there is timely use and distribution of funds   |   |   | X             | X   |  | X                              |
|   | Explore if there are unmet needs and the impact on families   |   | X   | X             |   |  | X                              |
| Identify the short and long term impact of initial and repeat funding on families                             | Assess the impact on disabled children, families and carers in terms of quality of life, economic outcomes and other relevant outcomes                                  |   |   |               |   |  | X                              |
|   | Prepare a small number of case studies related to the impact of grants, to include funded applications and potentially rejected applications                            |   |   |               |   |  | X                              |
| Measure qual impact of home visits and compare approach with other orgs providing info and advice to families | Assess the added value of home visits as opposed to other forms of providing advice and information to families   |   |   |               |   | X  | X                              |
|   | Assess the efficiency of using regional staff and local advisors  |   | X   |               | X   |  |                                |
| Review the appropriateness of the role of UK Government as direct grant providers                             | Explore whether it is appropriate for grant management to remain with DfE or whether there is a more suitable department  | X                                       | X   | X             |   |  |                                |
|   | Comment on how this approach to public funding fits with the current and future landscape in public policy funding across the four UK administrations                   | X                                       | X   |               |   |  |                                |
|   | Identify whether comparable support is provided to families in other parts of the UK, EU and overseas   |   |   |               | X   |  |                                |

| Objectives | Requirements  | Methods                                 |   |               |   |  |                                |
|------------|---|---|---|---------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
|            |   | Expert ref. group and call for evidence | Stakeholder interviews (Family Fund & UK governments) | Desk research | Review of all relevant FTT documents, MI and data | Comparative analysis of effectiveness and efficiency | Research with CYP and families |
|            | Identify the current supplier market conditions and how this should inform the Government's future approach to procuring this service | X                                       |   |               |   |  |                                |

## J. Research Tools

The research tools appear in the following order:

- Stakeholder interview guide
- Case study research with families topic guide
- Telephone interviews with unsuccessful applicants topic guide
- Survey questions

### Stakeholder Interview Guide

#### Background

1. Confirm interviewee's job title, contact details and role in relation to the Family Fund
2. Motivation for / how got involved with Family Fund
3. (Trustees) Amount of time spent on Family Fund activities and other roles in their working life

#### Objectives, Functions, Position of the Family Fund

4. Main objectives, functions and priorities of the Family Fund
  - a. If and why these have altered, or received different emphasis, in recent years
  - b. How they relate to the changing landscape of public policy funding
  - c. Extent to which there is overlap with the priorities of the UK government and devolved administrations as grant givers
5. Current performance in relation to these objectives, functions, priorities
  - a. What's working well and why
  - b. What's working less well and why
6. Outcomes that you perceive the Family Fund meeting (for the child / young person, and family)
7. Position of the Family Fund within the wider landscape of support for disabled children / families
  - a. If and why this has changed over recent years
  - b. Extent to which the Family Fund works alongside or with the VCS and statutory sectors, and how this plays out in practice
8. Strategic challenges facing the Family Fund within the current climate, and implications of these

## **Evolution of Family Fund since Last Review (2005)**

- 9.** Key changes in relation to:
  - a. Strategic direction/priorities
  - b. Governance
  - c. Organisational structure and management
  - d. Internal systems and processes
  - e. Distribution and value of grants
  - f. Financial management
  - g. Funding arrangements with the UK government and devolved administrations
  - h. Volume and type of applications
  - i. Additional income streams
  - j. Other areas

**10.** Rationale for any changes

**11.** Impact of any changes

## **Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Family Fund model**

**12.** Views on the efficiency and effectiveness of the current model

**13.** The kind of evidence that could be used to assess the efficiency of the current Family Fund model

- a. Opportunities for increasing efficiency
- b. Views on home visits as part of the delivery model
- c. Opportunities for revenue generation?

**14.** The kind of evidence or data that could be used to assess the effectiveness of the current Family Fund model in terms of delivering its intended outcomes

**15.** Evidence of effectiveness of current model

- a. Opportunities for increasing effectiveness of improving outcomes for either families or for children / young people?
- b. Appropriateness of current Family Fund needs assessment

**16.** Social Return on Investment (SROI) from grants



**17.** The Family Fund has a fixed budget each year from which it gives grants each year, therefore there is a balance between the number of grants given and the amount of each grant. Is this balance correct?

## **Increasing the Capacity of the Family Fund**

**18.** Ambitions for the Family Fund's future

**19.** Opportunities for increasing the Family Fund capacity

- a. Increasing links with VCS and statutory sectors
- b. Running additional funding programmes
- c. Replicating bulk buying arrangements
- d. Other

**20.** Opportunities to aggregate or integrate the role / activity of the Family Fund with other providers of support to families

# Case Study Research: Topic Guide

## Background

- Interviewer to note family members present
- Please tell me a bit about your family :
  - how many children are in your family?
  - how many of your children have disabilities? What is the nature of their disabilities?
  - who are the main care givers?
  - do any of the main care givers work? *If so, please ask for details.*
- What are the main pressures that your family faces? *Probe for detailed response.*

## Applying to the Fund

- Please tell me about your history of applying the Family Fund
- Prompt:
  - When did you make your first application?
  - How many times have you applied?
  - What kind of purchases have you made with the grants?
  - Have any of your applications ever been unsuccessful? *If so, what was the reason/s?*
- Please tell me what's involved in applying for a grant.
  - how easy did you find it to complete the application form?
  - did you receive any help with the application form? *If so, who provided this help and what did it involve?*
  - how long did it take between your most recent application and receipt of the grant? *Was this shorter or longer than you expected? Probe for details.*
  - *If longer than expected, what was the impact, if any, of this delay on your family?*
- How did you receive your grant (eg cheque, bank transfer, a voucher for a particular shop etc)?
- Were you given a choice about how, where and when you spent your grant? Probe to see whether Family Fund influenced what was purchased, where it was purchased and when it was purchased, as well as the parents'/carers' feelings about this

## Home visit (*if applicable*)

- Please tell me about the home visit you received from the Family Fund
- Prompts:
  - At what point in the application process did you have your home visit?

- How did you initially feel about having a home visit?
- What was the purpose of the home visit?
- What happened during the home visit?
- What kind of things did the Family Fund Trust worker talk to you about?
- Who was there from your family?
- How long did the visit last?
- How did you feel after the home visit had finished?
- What did you like and dislike about having a home visit?
- What, if anything, do you feel you gained from the home visit, other than the grant you received? This question, and the following question, are aimed at understanding the 'additionality' of a home visit
- Do you feel you would have 'missed out' if you hadn't had a home visit? *Probe for detailed response about why/why not.*
- Did the Family Fund worker point you in the direction of other kinds of support, financial or otherwise, which you could apply for? *If so, please ask for details.*
- Did you apply for or access any of this support? *If so, please tell me about this.*
- If you were in charge of the Family Fund Trust, would you offer home visits to families applying for the first time? *Probe for reasons why/why not.*

## Impact

*The following questions should be asked directly to the different stakeholder groups present, using age-appropriate language in the case of children/young people. We are seeking responses from: parents/other carers; disabled child/children; any siblings.*

- Please tell me how (list the Family Fund purchases) have made a difference to you?
- What has made the **most difference to you**? Why do you say that?
- What has made the **most difference to your family**? Why do you say that?

*The following questions should be directed to parents/carers:*

- Have there been any positive benefits for your wider network of family and friends? *If so, please tell me about these.*
- Has the grant/s you've received from the Family Fund been sufficient to meet the needs for which you applied to it? *Probe for detailed response.*
- Do you feel that you had enough choice about how you spent the voucher?
- How would you have met your families' needs if your application/s to the Family Fund Trust had been unsuccessful?
- Prompts:
  - Would you have looked for other sources of funding, for example, from your local authority, another charity etc?

- Would you have borrowed the money? *If so, from whom?*
- Would you have gone without the item?
- Would you have gone without other things to be able to afford the item?
- What would have been the impact on your family had your application/s been unsuccessful?

## Other Kinds of Support

- Do you or your child have a personal budget, direct payment or individual budget from your local authority or local NHS provider? *Please provide explanation of what these terms mean.*
- Are you or your child in regular contact with a professional in relation to their disability for example a social worker, family health worker, etc?
- Have you applied to other organisations for financial support for your family or disabled child/children, for example from another charity, your local authority or local NHS provider?
- Prompts:
  - Please tell me about your experiences of applying to these other organisations.
  - Did any of these applications involve a home visit from a professional? *Probe for details.*
  - How would you compare your experience of the Family Fund Trust with these other organisations? *Probe for detailed response about what's better/worse.*

## The Future

- Do you intend to apply to the Family Fund Trust again in the future?
- Prompts:
  - *If yes, what would you wish to purchase with any future grants?*
  - *If no, why not?*
- Do you have any final things to tell me about your experience of the Family Fund Trust?

## Phone Interviews with Unsuccessful Applicants: Topic Guide

### 1. Please tell me how you first heard about the Family Fund.

(prompt if needed: internet/friend/poster or leaflet/Family Fund event/School/local services eg GP, social work, health visitor/ national government department/ another charity)

### 2. Was this your first application to the Family Fund?

No (go to Q3)

Yes (go to Q5)

#### ***If this was not a first time application***

### 3. How many times have you applied to the Fund?

..... times

### 4. Were any of your previous applications successful?

Yes

No

### 5. What items did you wish to purchase with the grant and why?

Item:

Why needed item:

#### ***ASK ALL***

### 6. Did you speak to anyone at the Family Fund by telephone or email *before* submitting your application?

Yes (Ask Q7)

No (Go to Q8)

#### ***If spoke to Family Fund***

### 7. What did you speak about, and how helpful was this?

#### ***ASK ALL***

**8. Did you receive a home visit from the Family Fund *after* submitting your application?**

Yes (go to Q9)

No (go to Q10)

**9. What did the home visit involve, and how helpful did you find it?**

**ASK ALL**

**10. What was the reason/s for your application being unsuccessful?**

**11. How did the Family Fund communicate its decision with you?**

(by phone, email, letter?)

**12. What are your views on the way that the Family Fund communicated its decision with you?**

(prompt around: timeliness of the decision, whether the 'right' communication method used, and whether the Family Fund provided a satisfactory reason for their decision)

**13. Did the Family Fund direct you to any other sources of support, financial or otherwise, that might be available to your family or child?**

Yes (Answer Q14)

No (Go to Q16)

**If Yes at Q13**

**14. What were these other sources of support?**

**15. Did you access or apply for any of these other sources of support? *If so*, please tell me about this.**

Yes: Which did you access? Which did you apply for?

No

**ASK ALL**

**16. Have you been able to meet your family's/child's need in the absence of a Family Fund grant for example, by applying for other kinds of financial support, borrowing the money, or using credit?**

Yes: How?

No

**17. If your circumstances change in the future, would you consider applying to the Family Fund again? Please explain your answer.**

**18. Do you have any final comments to make about your experience of the Family Fund?**

# Survey Questions

## Section 1: Background Information

1.1. In what country were you living when you made your most recent Family Fund grant application?

- England
- Northern Ireland
- Scotland
- Wales

1.2. How many disabled children do you have in your care?

- None – I applied for the grant on behalf of myself
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more

1.3. What is the nature of your child's or children's disability?

- Autistic spectrum disorders
- Learning disabilities
- Behaviour disorders
- Sensory impairments
- Speech and language difficulties
- Cerebral palsy
- Downs syndrome
- Heart disease
- Epilepsy or convulsions
- Named syndrome
- Asthma
- Other

*If Other, please specify in the box below*



1.4. What is your monthly family income *before tax*? Please include benefits, salary (if applicable), grants and any other sources of income you have. You can select an option from the drop down list below.

- Less than £590
- £591 - 770
- £771 - 910
- £911 - 1,000
- £1,001 - 1,200
- £1,201 - 1,300
- £1,301 - 1,500
- £1,501 - 1,700
- £1,701 - 1,900
- £1,901 - 2,200
- £2,201 - 2,400
- £2,401 - 2,700
- £2,701 - 3,000
- £3,001 - 3,300
- £3,301 - 3,700
- £3,701 - 4,200
- More than £4,200
- Don't know

1.5. Ethnicity of survey respondent

1.6 In your own words, what are the greatest pressures and needs that your family is facing?

1.7. Do you or your child / children have a personal budget, direct payment, individual budget or personal health budget from your local authority or local NHS? Definitions of these budgets are included in the table below.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

### **Definitions of different personal budgets**

**Direct Payments** are paid to parent carers of disabled children where they commission delivery of a social care service in place of support from the local authority. Disabled 16 and 17 year olds may receive this in their own right.

**Personal budgets** allow individuals entitled to social care funding to choose whether they take their budget as a Direct Payment or prefer a local authority officer to commission services for them, whilst choosing how and by whom their needs are met.

An **Individual budget** is an arrangement where the family has direct control over the funding allocated to them from a number of income streams held by local statutory bodies, (social care, health and non-school based education services).

A **personal health budget** is an amount of money that is allocated upfront to an individual to allow them to plan to meet their health and wellbeing needs in a way that best suits them. The aim of a personal health budget is to improve outcomes and patient satisfaction by giving people and families more choice and control over the care they receive.

1.7. Are you part of a local Parent Carer Forum, or other similar support group, with links to your local authority? Tick one of the following:

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

*If yes, please specify in the box below*

## Section 2: Applying for a Family Fund Grant

### *Your recent grant history*

2.1. In which calendar year was your most recent grant application? from the drop down list:

- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- Can't remember

2.2. How many times in total, have you applied for Family Fund grants?

- This is my first application to the family fund
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 or more
- Can't remember

2.3. How many of these applications (including your most recent application) were successful and led to a Family Fund grant being awarded?

- Not had any successful applications
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 or more
- Can't remember

2.4. Did you experience any specific challenges when applying for a Family Fund grant?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

2.5. How would you improve the Family Fund application process?

### ***The application process***

2.6. How did you first find out about the Family Fund?

- On the internet
- Through a friend / family member
- Poster / leaflet / advertisement
- At an event organised by Family Fund
- School / college
- From local services (e.g. social care worker, health visitor, Local authority, school, citizens advice)
- From a national government department
- Through another charity
- Other (*please state*)

2.7. How did you obtain your last application form from the Family Fund?

- Over the internet
- Requested it directly from Family Fund by telephone or letter
- From a third party professional (e.g. a social worker)
- Other (*please state*)

2.8. How long after submitting your last application did it take to receive your grant?

- Less than 2 weeks after submitting the application
- Between 2 and 4 weeks
- Between 1 and 2 months
- Between 2 and 3 months
- Between 3 and 4 months
- Between 5 and 6 months

- Longer than 6 months

2.9. If you have applied for a Family Fund grant more than once, have you found the application process:

- Improved through time
- Worsened through time
- Stayed the same
- I've only applied once

*If Stayed the same and / or I've only applied once please go to 2.10*

2.10. What, in your opinion, brought about this change?

- New ways of applying (e.g. online)
- Time taken to be informed of decision
- Familiarity of application process
- Improvement in the application process
- Other (please state)

### ***Purpose of your most recent application for the grant***

2.11. Why did you make your most recent application to the Family Fund? (*Please tick all that apply*)

- To relieve stress
- To replace household equipment which is very old or broken
- To help with extra household tasks such as washing
- To help cope with my child / children's challenging behaviour
- To help with mobility difficulties
- To help with shopping difficulties
- Other, please specify

2.12. Thinking about your most recent application to the Family Fund, what was the approximate financial value of the grant you received?

- Less than £250
- From £250 to £499
- From £500 to £749
- From £750 to £999

- Over £1000
- Unknown

2.13. Thinking about your most recent application to the Family Fund, what items did you require from the grant? *(Please tick all that apply)*

- Day trip
- Holiday including overnight stay(s)
- Recreation activity
- Fridge
- Tumble dryer
- Computer
- Bedding
- Hospital visiting expenses
- Freezer
- Washing Machine
- Driving lessons
- Clothing
- Other (please state)

#### ***Outcome of your most recent application to the Family Fund grant***

2.14. What was the outcome of your last application to the Family Fund?

- Received all that I requested
- Received some of that I requested
- Received items that were not what I expected
- My application was rejected
- Still waiting for the outcome of my last application
- Can't remember

#### ***Support from an adviser***

2.15. Did you receive a visit or telephone call from a Family Fund adviser on your first application? *(Please tick all that apply)*

- Received a home visit from an adviser
- Received a telephone assessment from an adviser

- Can't remember
- Am still waiting for a decision on my last application
- No

*If No, please go to section 3*

2.16. Did the Family Fund adviser do any of the following? *(Please tick all that apply)*

- Supported me to complete the grant application
- Provided information on short breaks, holidays, recreation activities
- Provided information about extra financial help, for example the Disability Living Allowance, other benefits or grants
- Provided information about different types of support and advice, for example websites, other charities, local groups or services
- Don't know
- No
- Other *(please specify)*

### ***Comparing the experience with other organisations***

2.18. Have you applied for similar grants from other organisations, for example your local authority, local NHS, the Social Fund or another charity?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

*If No or Don't know please go to section 3*

2.19. Were any of these applications successful?

- Yes
- No
- Partially successful
- Don't know

2.20. How would you compare the experience of applying for a Family Fund grant with the experience of applying for grants from other organisations?

- Better than experiences of other organisations

- Similar to experiences of other organisations
- Worse than experiences of other organisations
- No difference to other organisations

*If No difference, please go section 3*

2.21. Please describe the key differences between applying to the Family Fund and other organisations?



### Section 3: Impact of the Grant upon Recipient and Family

3.1. Please select one of the following statements which best describes the impact of the grant upon your child.

- The grant has made a *big difference* to my child
- The grant has made *some difference* to my child
- The grant has made *no difference* at all my child
- Not applicable – I applied for the grant on behalf of myself

3.2. Please select one of the following statements which best describes the impact of the grant upon you.

- The grant has made a *big difference* to me
- The grant has made *some difference* to me
- The grant has made *no difference* at all to me

3.3. Please select one of the following statements which best describes the impact of the grant upon your wider family.

- The grant has made a *big difference* to my wider family
- The grant has made *some difference* to my wider family
- The grant has made *no difference* at all my wider family

3.3. Which is the biggest impact that the grant has had on you, your child and your family?

3.4. Which of the grant items contributed most to making a difference to you, your child and family?

3.5. Have you experienced any of the following impacts as a result of applying for a Family Fund grant? (*Please tick all that apply*)

- Received an additional three or five year warranty for grant items
- Received additional savings from a number of retailers
- Received other kinds of financial support such as benefits or grants from other organisations

- Not applicable

3.6. If you had *not* received a grant from Family Fund, which of the following statements best describes how you would have met this need?

- We would have done without the item
- We would have asked for help from families or friends
- We would have applied to other charities
- We would have borrowed the money
- We would have bought the item using credit
- Don't know
- Other (please state)

## Section 4: Additional Comments

4.1. Looking at the following statements, which best describes the ways in which you feel the Family Fund could extend the support that it offers? *(Please tick all that apply)*

The Family Fund could:

- Offer play schemes
- Offer summer holiday schemes
- Offer home decoration and adaptation
- Facilitate peer support from other families in the area
- Facilitate support from other local or national services
- Increase the age threshold for applications
- Increase the income threshold for applications
- Reduce time taken to process grants
- I am satisfied with the Family Fund as it is
- Other (please specify ...)

4.2. Do you think you would apply to the Family Fund for another grant in the future?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

4.3. If you had the chance, how would you change the Family Fund to meet the needs of your family better?

4.4. If you had the chance, how would you change other services to meet the needs of your family better?



Department  
for Education

© Moorhouse Consortium [April 2013]

**Ref: DFE- RR293B**

**ISBN: 978-1-78105-235-8**

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at Catherine Bradshaw, Ground Level, Sanctuary Buildings, Great Smith Street, London, SW1P 3BT

Email: [catherine.bradshaw@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:catherine.bradshaw@education.gsi.gov.uk)

This document is also available from our website at:

<http://www.education.gov.uk/researchandstatistics/research>