

**Children's Services Committee: 16 August 2006**

### **3. Early Outcome Indicators**

- 3.1.** Evaluation of the implementation and outcome measurement of the 7 pilot authorities is being carried out on behalf of the Scottish Executive by an independent firm of consultants. The full evaluation of the 2-year pilot will not be known until about June 2007.

At present, though, our own evaluation of the programme is beginning to show some very positive indicators in the following areas.

- 3.2.** Offending Behaviour – overall there have been massive reductions in the offending behaviours of all the young people on the programme, but also there have been some stark individual examples, one young person went from 160 offences in the 9 months prior to ISMS to 1 offence in his year with ISMS.

Resilience – for those young women who have been supported by the ISMS programme, a major risk factor in their life has been the possible dangers of sexual exploitation. The intensive supports given to them has seen major improvements in building their resilience. This has led to a considerable reduction in their risk taking behaviours.

Working with Parents – Consultation with parents has given us very positive feedback about the quality, intensity and availability of the supports given to them. This has resulted in a significant decrease in request from parents to have their child accommodated by the Council.

- 3.3.** We are also seeing a significant reduction in the use of expensive residential resources, as can be seen in Appendix 1.

### **4. Personnel Issues**

At this moment in time there are no personnel issues.

### **5. Financial Implications**

At present there are no financial implications.

### **6. Conclusions**

- 6.1.** Whilst the full evaluation of the ISMS programme is still ongoing and will not be concluded until the Summer of 2007, early outcome measures are showing very positive results.

The key conclusion that can be drawn from the experience so far is that as a model of intervention the ISMS programme has shown that it is possible to deal with some of our more troubled young people within community settings without resorting to more expensive residential resources.

## **7. Recommendation**

**7.1.** Members of the committee are asked to note the contents of this report.

---

William W Clark  
Acting Director of Social Work

---

**Person to Contact:** Jim Watson, Section Head (Child Care), Department of Social Work Services, 7 Bruce Street, Clydebank G81 1TT. Telephone Number: 0141 951 6195. E-Mail: [jim.watson@west-dunbarton.gov.uk](mailto:jim.watson@west-dunbarton.gov.uk)

**Background Papers:**

**Wards Affected:** **All**

## **Appendix 1**

### **Referrals to Intensive Support and Monitoring Services**

From August 2005 until July 2006 24 young people referred to the ISMS programme.

17 young people subject to a formal assessment as a result of a decision from a Children's Hearing.

7 young people subject to an informal assessment as a result of a Looked after Child Review. These young people were assessed as not requiring a Movement Restriction Condition, but needed intensive support.

8 young people were placed on a Movement Restriction Condition (Electronic Tag).

---

### **Present Situation**

10 young people on the ISMS programme. (7 males and 3 females)

5 young people presently on a Movement Restriction Condition (4 males and 1 female)

1 young person on aftercare support following a Movement Restriction Condition (female)

2 young people on assessment (2 males)

2 young people on Intensive Supports without a Movement Restriction Order (1 male and 1 female)

---

## **Outcomes**

The following are early indicative figures of what has been achieved over the past year through the involvement of the ISMS programme.

9 young people have returned home from residential school earlier than would have been possible, due to intensive supports.

3 young people have returned from Secure Accommodation earlier.

6 young people were prevented from being placed in Secure Accommodation.

2 Young people had their placement in Secure Accommodation significantly delayed.

3 young people (under 16) avoided being placed in adult custody.

6 young people were prevented from being accommodated by the Council.

4 young people were prevented from being moved from their present residential unit to a residential school.