

An Evaluation of the Early Intervention Support Service in Northern Ireland

Karen Winter, Laura Neeson, Daryl Sweet, Paul Connolly Queen's University Belfast

A brief introduction ...

- Early Intervention Support Service (EISS) established as part of the Early Intervention Transformation Programme (EITP) in Northern Ireland
- EITP is a cross departmental government and philanthropic funded programme
- Focus is on improving outcomes for children and young people in Northern Ireland through establishing a range of early intervention approaches.



A brief introduction ...

- EISS aims to support and empower families with emerging vulnerabilities or needs by intervening early with evidence-informed services before difficulties become intractable, and before there is a need for statutory involvement
- 5 services, one in each Health and Social Care Trust
- EISS includes a service manager, 2.5 therapeutic workers, 1 full-time practical support worker and administrative support.



A brief introduction ...

- Contact within ten days of receiving a referral
- Waiting list no longer than four weeks before receiving an initial visit
- Workers trained in, and use, evidence-based therapeutic interventions: Solihull Approach, Solution-Focused Brief Intervention Therapy and Motivational Interviewing
- The Outcomes Star[™] used to assess, plan and evaluate the intervention within families
- In addition, 5% of families could avail of Family Group Conferencing; Incredible Years and Strengthening Families parenting programmes



EISS Evaluation Logic Wodel





We expect to see significantly better scores at post-test for families who have gone through the BSS intervention, compared to the control group, on each of the outcomes listed above

Research questions

- How effective is the EISS in improving outcomes for children and their families?
- What is the experience of delivering and taking part in EISS?
- What aspects of the EISS programme may need modification before a scaled roll-out is attempted?





Total number passed to QUB n=216

- Pre test intervention n=58
- Pre test control n= 51 TOTAL 109 parents/households
- Post test intervention n=47
- Post test control n=33 TOTAL 80 parents/households





- The family functioning scale (Roncone, 2007)
- Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Goodman, 2001)
- Tool to Measure Parental Efficacy (TOPSE) (Kendall and Bloomfield, 2005)
- Parenting Stress Index (PSI) Short Form (36 questions) (Abidin and Burke, 1978)



Methodological approach

- A non-randomised wait-list control group design.
- Each EISS used a four-week waiting-list to manage the number of referrals and caseloads of the support workers. This wait-list was the control group
- Pre-and post-test measures with families who were in contact with EISS;
- A qualitative process evaluation and;
- Descriptive and psychometric analysis of the outcomes star.



Non randomized wait list design

Northern Referrals t service n=1	0	South-Eastern Referrals to service n=132		hern rals to e n=137	Western Referrals to service n=182
Northern n=45 Intervention= Control=11	=34	South-Eastern n=54 Intervention=30 Control=24	Souti n= Interven Contr	58 tion=21	Western n=59 Intervention=39 Control=20
		Total number parents passed to n= 216	O QUB	respond t n=107. In Control=4 Parents u follow-up	nreachable for) post-test n=29. ect area was not
Р	re-test Intervent	ion n=58	Pre-test Contro	ol n=51	
No follow-up contact made n =11				No fo	llow-up contact made n = 18

Post-test Intervention n=47

Post-test Control n=33



CENTRE FOR EVIDENCE AND SOCIAL INNOVATION

Data collection

- An online survey designed and located on a server (LIME), hosted at QUB, and accessed via the internet.
- Desktop computers and an iPad were used to collect data, or a paper questionnaire where internet access was not available.
- Scales were computed from the raw data for 22 outcomes. Series of regression models to compare the mean scores for the intervention and control groups for each of the outcome measures at post-test, controlling for pre-test differences.
- The pre-test differences controlled for in the models were: pre-test scores on the outcome variable, age, gender, length of time between testing and trust area.



Comparison of scores on outcome measures at baseline by group

FFS_Communication	26.43 (2.1)	26.58 (2.2)	.763
FFS_Personal_Goals	19.66 (3.5)	19.06 (3.4)	.447
SDQ_Emotional	5.85 (3.0)	6.21 (2.6)	.571
SDQ_Conduct	4.38 (2.7)	4.94 (2.6)	.359
SDQ_Hyperactivity	7.15 (2.9)	6.58 (2.6)	.355
SDQ_Peer_Problems	3.43 (2.7)	3.36 (2.3)	.911
SDQ_Prosocial	7.02 (2.5)	6.73 (2.7)	.618
SDQ_Difficulties	20.81 (6.6)	21.09 (6.8)	.854
TOPSE_Empathy	48.15 (8.4)	46.58 (8.3)	.410
TOPSE_Play	50.77 (9.3)	47.36 (11.2)	.159
TOPSE_Emotions	52.06 (8.0)	52.18 (8.0)	.948
TOPSE_Control	37.53 (12.9)	34.12 (11.1)	.211
TOPSE_Discipline	41.19 (11.7)	38.76 (13.5)	.407
TOPSE_Pressures	34.19 (7.0)	35.39 (8.0)	.488
TOPSE_Self_Accept	48.91 (10.0)	49.12 ()11.7	.935
TOPSE_Learning	53.38 (9.7)	52.33 (9.0)	.619
PSI_Distress	39.60 (9.0)	40.42 (10.1)	.707
PSI_Dysfunctional	42.70 (7.0)	39.48 (6.7)	.042
PSI_Difficult_Child	32.49 (7.6)	31.48 (6.6)	.532
PSI_Total_Stress	114.79 (18.1)	111.39 (19.4)	.432



CENTRE FOR EVIDENCE AND SOCIAL INNOVATION

Main effects

Outcome	Adjusted Post-Test Mean Scores			Sig	Effect Size (Hedges' g)	
	Intervention		Control			
	Mean (SD)	n	Mean (SD)	n		
FFS Score	70.7 (8.7)	47	70.0 (9.2)	33	.724	.09 [36, .53]
FFS_Problem_Solving	23.3 (5.6)	47	22.6 (4.7)	33	.599	45 [90, .00]
FFS_Communication	26.5 (2.0)	47	26.9 (2.4)	33	.598	16 [60, .29]
FFS_Personal_Goals	20.7 (3.9)	47	20.4 (3.5)	33	.710	.09 [35, .54]
SDQ_Emotional	4.8 (3.0)	47	5.9 (2.5)	33	.130	37 [82, .08]
SDQ_Conduct	3.9 (2.5)	47	4.2 (2.6)	33	.563	12 [56, .33]
SDQ_Hyperactivity	6.2 (3.2)	47	6.1 (2.7)	33	.885	.03 [42, .47]
SDQ_Peer_Problems	3.4 (2.7)	47	3.4 (2.1)	33	.867	.03 [41, .48]
SDQ_Prosocial	7.1 (2.5)	47	7.6 (2.4)	33	.409	19 [63, .26]
SDQ_Difficulties	18.6 (7.9)	47	19.7 (6.8)	33	.501	15 [60, .29]
TOPSE_Empathy	52.3 (6.6)	47	47.6 (6.9)	33	.014	.67 [22, 1.13]
TOPSE_Play	53.2 (6.5)	47	48.8 (10.2)	33	.039	.56 [10, 1.01]
TOPSE_Emotions	46.3 (4.5)	47	44.7 (5.2)	33	.258	.33 [12, .78]
TOPSE_Control	40.0 (7.9)	47	38.3 (8.1)	33	.550	.16 [29, .60]
TOPSE_Discipline	45.2 (11.0)	47	40.8 (12.0)	33	.150	.38 [07, .83]
TOPSE_Pressures	47.4 (11.6)	47	44.8 (14.3)	33	.540	.20 [24, .65]
TOPSE_Self_Accept	46.7 (6.2)	47	43.4 (5.6)	33	.084	.49 [03, .94]
TOPSE_Learning	54.4 (7.1)	47	52.7 (8.3)	33	.474	.21 [23, .66]
PSI_Distress	41.3 (8.7)	47	42.3 (10.3)	33	.568	11 [-55, .34]
PSI_Dysfunctional	42.6 (6.5)	47	44.5 (7.4)	33	.258	27 [72, .18]
PSI_Difficult_Child	32.5 (8.6)	47	34.3 (7.1)	33	.408	23 [67, .22]
PSI_Total_Stress	116.2 (18.4)	47	121.4 (21.1)	33	.241	27 [71, .18]

AST EVIDENCE AND SOCIAL INNOVATION

Summary of Quantitative Findings

- Only two of the 22 outcomes were associated with statistically significant effects (p<.05): TOPSE Empathy and TOPSE Play. Taken in isolation, misleading to emphasise these as providing evidence of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the intervention.
- With 22 outcomes, it is expected that at least one of these could show a statistically significant effect just due to random variation. Given this, and given the lack of corroborating evidence in relation to the other outcomes, it is quite plausible that both simply reflect random fluctuations in the data rather than indicating any real effects of the intervention.



Outcomes Star



FOR CE AND INNOVATION

My Star[™] © Triangle Consulting Social Enterprise Ltd | www.outcomesstar.org.uk The Star Chart must be used with the Scales and workers trained by a licensed Star trainer

Family Star Plus

- Physical health
- Your well-being
- Meeting emotional needs
- Keeping your children safe
- Social networks
- Education and learning
- Boundaries and behaviour
- Family routine
- Home and money
- Progress to work



Family Star Plus

- A score of 1-2 indicates the parent feels **stuck**. They are not able to deal with the problem or accept help.
- A score of 3-4 indicates the parent is accepting help. They are aware of their problems and look to other people for help sorting it out.
- A score of 5-6 indicates the parent is **trying** to make a difference or change to their parenting but find it hard.
- A score of 7-8 indicates the parent is finding what works in managing their children's needs but will still need a degree of support.
- A score of 9-10 indicates the parent is, or is moving towards, **effective parenting** and does not need support in this area.



Family Star Plus in this study

Domain (n. of cases)	Decreased (%)	Stayed the same (%)	Increased (%)
Physical health (313)	2.6	55.9	41.5
Your well-being (736)	3.5	25.1	71.4
Meeting emotional needs (738)	2.7	18.8	78.5
Keeping your children safe (359)	0.8	45.7	53.5
Social networks (514)	1.4	35.0	63.6
Education and learning (606)	2.8	33.2	64.0
Boundaries and behaviour (858)	2.6	16.4	81.0
Family routine (633)	2.5	28.6	68.9
Home and money (323)	3.1	48.0	48.9
Progress to work (156)	4.5	57.1	38.4



CENTRE FOR EVIDENCE AND SOCIAL INNOVATION

Qualitative Findings

- Service well received by parents and children in particular the workers:
 - Their status (non social worker)
 - Their flexibility
 - Their emphasis on listening, practical help delivered in a responsive, timely and non judgemental way
 - Interventions were time limited



Discussion

- Service design
- Evaluation design
- Measures and outcomes
- Expectations
- Future directions



Full report and references

https://pure.qub.ac.uk/portal/files/155982564/FINAL_EISS_Report_110618.pdf

Any questions?

