

Can I afford to? Can I afford not to?

What the evidence tells us about best practice and where we will get the best returns for our investment.



Can I afford to? Can I afford not to?

What the evidence tells us about best practice and where we will get the best returns for our investment.

“Governments should continuously experiment with policies and programmes for children, rigorously evaluate them to see whether they enhance child well-being, and reallocate money from programmes that don’t work to those that do”. (*Doing Better for Children: the Way Forward*, OECD 2009)

Excellent services for all children, young people and their families are an entitlement. The key questions are:

- What are the most effective ways to deliver this entitlement for all our children and young people and, in particular, for our most vulnerable and disadvantaged children or their families?
- How can we secure this entitlement as efficiently as possible, in the context of reducing resources?

C4EO has strong evidence that can be used to help answer these questions. It is evidence based on validated effective local practice. For this report, C4EO drew on 49 validated intervention programmes across 35 local authorities and three charities. These are examples of developed and developing practice from across the country that can be replicated to suit local need and circumstance and demonstrate significantly improved outcomes for children and young people. They also provide evidence that improved practice can deliver savings not only to the agencies that run or commission them but also across public services more broadly.

C4EO has started to consider this wider view of efficiency and saving. In many of the examples below analysis has included an estimate of the future costs that have been avoided as a result of particular interventions. These avoided costs have been captured in the Social Return on Investment template. This template is an analytical tool that helps the user to estimate a monetary value of the broader social and environmental benefits from investment. It incorporates, for example, the longer term benefits to health and social cohesion and the extent to which it is likely that the intervention will allow the young person or family to contribute positively to the economy. Avoided costs are only one part of the SROI calculation and those reported here have been limited to a conservative estimate of the savings available to local areas within a two year period.

The approach adopted by C4EO takes a long-term view of savings not a short-term fix. The examples of local practice included here can contribute to long-term savings across a number of partners and public sector agencies, although these wider savings have not been estimated.

How can C4EO help?

C4EO is committed to working with all providers and commissioners to help ensure that local services are delivered in the right place at the right time and at the right price to produce the best outcomes for all children and young people. C4EO is not an academic research unit although it does draw on top quality academic research. It is interested only in serving the children and young people's sector by identifying 'what works' and why. It offers evidence and examples to inform planning to meet local needs and also offers practical support to local areas, at their request. This includes:

- access to a bank of effective local practice, with an analysis of impact and costs;
- a cost and outcomes web-based template, along with a user guide, to support local authorities, organisations or services to calculate the unit cost of interventions or universal services in their areas;
- a tool guide to begin to calculate the Social Return on Investment;
- support from a team of accredited financial specialists to help local areas use the web-based tools and calculate the unit cost of their universal and targeted services;
- support from financial specialists to model the cost of replicating effective local practice in individual areas (conceptual modelling) to aid service redesign.

What are the key financial messages from C4EO's work?

- Effective delivery of all services can financially benefit local government, government departments and other public sector bodies.
- Well designed high quality universal services (particularly health services, children's centres and schools) and targeted intervention can have a long-term impact on areas where investment is high and where public and political interest is intense including: crime and anti-social behaviour, teenage pregnancy and risk-taking behaviour, educational performance, health and healthy life-styles, the family and the role of parents, employment and social benefits.
- The effective operation of universal services working in partnership with targeted and specialist services, including the voluntary and community sector, yields not only better outcomes but more efficient use of potentially expensive resources.
- Schools doing their core business of educating all children to a high standard play a critical role in prevention. School improvement at national and local level makes a key contribution to reducing the cost of targeted or specialist services that are often required for children who fall behind in education.
- Solving or limiting problems early can save very expensive spending later. However, the estimates made in the body of this report are deliberately conservative and focus on the potential costs avoided by local authorities and partners over a two year period.
- The earlier the intervention the greater the potential saving. Early here applies not just in terms of age but also in terms of the emerging problems.

- Conversely, it is never too late to look for effective intervention. Even when children are in care or custody, interventions can be made that will yield significant long-term savings.
- Investing in well-planned work with parents and families gives a better return on investment in many cases than simply investing in the child.
- If savings are to be maximised, national government, local authorities and other public services will need to take a joint approach. For example, where it can be demonstrated that more than one body will gain in terms of savings, pooled budget arrangements should be seriously considered.

A concise summary of the evidence of ‘what works’ with examples of improved outcomes, the unit costs of delivery and, where possible, the ‘Social Return on Investment’ follows, to illustrate C4EO’s Key Messages. This summary is supported by:

Annex 1 illustrating 12 examples of effective practice, combined with estimated savings to wider public services.

Annex 2 illustrating a further 38 examples of costed effective local practice. Full detail of both the practice and costings can be accessed through the web link for each example.

High Quality Universal service delivery:

The evidence says:

- The core business of schools, the successful education of all children regardless of background, is the key to success for the great majority of children and impacts on all areas of their lives. Success in education massively reduces the likely need for expensive intervention. Conversely, educational failure carries with it a high risk of poor employment, criminal or anti-social behaviour, involvement in harmful risk-taking behaviour, early and unplanned pregnancy and poor mental and physical health and well-being.
- The vulnerable also include those children at risk of educational under-achievement, in particular those children from socially deprived backgrounds.
- Universal services, particularly schools, children's centres and health services have a key role to play in prevention and can reduce the need for costly intervention.
- Support delivered early in a child's life is effective in terms of improved outcomes and more efficient use of resources.
- Services should be designed to meet local need. Local authorities and others responsible for local communities understand the characteristics and need of their local area, and commission services effectively. Using data intelligently underpins effective and cost effective services.

Examples below provide the following financial returns:

The return on investment reported here includes the avoided costs to local authorities and partner organisations over a two year period following a particular intervention. It does not include wider potential benefits that may result from a particular intervention, such as longer-term health benefits or improved educational outcomes.

1. In response to sustained poor educational achievement in an area of high deprivation a local authority encouraged the soft federation of two primary schools. This created greatly increased leadership capacity and a sense of drive and purpose. A talented head led development for staff and ensured an enriched curriculum. The impact on achievement was such that one school has been recognised as the most improved school in the country. Cost of the intervention alone to replicate £70,000 and an estimated return on the investment of £1.84 per £1.
2. With the aim of increasing breastfeeding a partnership between the children's centres and primary care trust (PCT) was established to reach out to young mothers from disadvantaged areas who are less likely to breastfeed. 903 vulnerable young mothers received targeted support at a cost of £29,811 or £33 per mother per year. The programme found a return on the investment of £1.56 for every £1 invested, and estimated savings to local health services of £57,500 over a two-year period.

Early intervention and prevention

The Evidence says: (For detail see *Grasping the Nettle*) that there are five “Golden Threads” that run through the most effective practice. These threads work best when applied together. The golden threads are:

- Ensuring the best start in life - effective intervention early in a child's life yields the greatest results and saves a great deal of costly investment later on.
- Language for life – there is a strong correlation between communication problems and low attainment, mental health problems, poor employment and youth crime.
- Engaging parents – parents exercise the single greatest influence over their children.
- Smarter working, better services – the need is for energetic and visionary leadership, a continuum of services, robust commissioning, multi-disciplinary working with children and families at the centre.
- Knowledge is power – effective intervention strategies are evidence based with excellent use of data.

Examples below provide the following financial returns:

1. Parents as First Teachers (PAFT) is a parenting programme for children under 3 years old. It is offered universally but is tailored to the specific needs of each family. Work is carried out in the home. PAFT aims to ensure that problems do not escalate and aims to integrate families into their communities. 60 children benefited from this initiative at a cost of £17,550 2009-2010. This equates to £292 per child per year.
2. An improving behaviour programme involving a group of 42 children aged 3 to 5 in nine Early Years settings made effective use of workshops to enhance the skills of parents and staff in managing and improving behaviour. The programme improved children's readiness to learn and their social skills. This programme has now been transferred to 26 local authorities and 41 schools. Cost of intervention to replicate £10,200 or £242 per child per year.
3. Parents as Partners in Early Learning (PPEL) works in partnership with parents to raise children's linguistic skills and to improve attainment. It focuses on a range of play based activities to support social and linguistic development. 15 early years settings benefit from this initiative at a cost of £169,000 (reduced through grant funding). This equated to 50 families at £70.41 per family per week. The estimated saving for Education is £171,000 and 'adult social care £272,000. This equates to a return of £1.31 per £1 invested.

Targeted support

The evidence says:

- The effective realignment of targeted support will be a critical element in achieving better outcomes, more coherent joint working practices and less costly service delivery models.
- Parents of children with disabilities face enormous pressure. Work to support them can lead to higher levels of successful integration into mainstream education with a subsequent improvement in achievement and savings in cost.
- Intervention is often associated with early years. However, early intervention can also be applied successfully to young people who have been identified as being at risk.
- Intervention and prevention strategies need to include children and young people on the edge of the care system or those already in care. This is potentially the greatest area of saving. More effective strategies for those in care or at risk of going into care could yield enormous dividends in outcomes and efficiency of service delivery.

Examples below provide the following financial returns:

1. Parents of children on the autistic spectrum have often felt that they are isolated and unsupported. The Early Communication and Autism Partnership (ECAP) is a project for children under 8 years old with autistic spectrum disorder (ASD). Cost of the intervention to replicate: Gross cost: £375,862 in 2009/2010. This equates to £244.70 per family per week.
2. Another programme targeted the well being of 37 disabled children up to age 8. The intention was to ensure the highest level of successful engagement with mainstream school and to improve communication and language skills. 32 children improved their use and understanding of language with 28 making a marked improvement. Cost of the intervention to replicate: £46,300k per annum per project). Return on investment estimated at 1.37 per £1 invested.
3. The Teens and Toddlers programme was designed to reduce the likelihood of conception among a group of girls identified as being at high risk. Cost of replication is £135,850 over a two year period. There is a considerable cross departmental saving with this programme with a return on investment of £1.71 in the first year but £6.60 per £1 over 5 years. It is estimated that the savings to the 'housing services' and NEET provision would be £135,850 and the DWP and local government £20,520 over a two year period.
4. Criminal behaviour by young people is not only costly in terms of money it is also a major concern for the public. A programme targeted at 120 families designed to reduce the risk of re-offending. The cost of replication for 1 year for 120 families is £2,264 per family with estimated savings over two years to the Justice leads of £427,750, to the DWP/Local Authority of £70,000 and to the health of £97,315. The return on investment is estimated at £1.31 per £1.

Potential savings to local partners

High Quality Universal Services

1. Beneficiary partners: Health

Programme: Breastfeeding Initiative and Support.

Figures: 903 young women were helped to adopt breastfeeding throughout 12 Children's Centres at a cost of £29,811. This equated to a cost of £33.00 per mother per year.

Estimated savings to health services over two years **£57,500**

Return on investment is £1.56 per £1.00 invested.

2. Beneficiary partners: Education, Adult Social Care

Programme: Parents as Partners in Early Learning (PPEL).

Figures: 15 early years settings benefit from this initiative at a cost of £169,000 (reduced through grant funding). This equated to 50 families at £70.41 per family per week.

Estimated savings to education services: **£171,000**

Estimated savings to adult social care: **£272,000.**

This equates to a return of £1.31 per £1 invested.

Early Intervention and Prevention

3. Beneficiary partners : Health, Housing (benefits), Health

Programme: Building Bridges. Meeting the needs of children and families where parents have severe and enduring health problems.

Figures: Forty families were supported over the course of 1 year at a cost of £3500.00 per family (2009-2010). Cost per week per family is £73. The return on investment is £1.37 for every £1.00 invested.

Estimated savings to education services over two years: **£114,000.**

Estimated savings from reduction in benefit claims over two years: **£158,000.**

Estimated savings to the health services over two years: **£67,200.**

The return on investment is £1.18 for every £1.00 invested.

4. Beneficiary partners: 14-19 Partnership, Education, Health, Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP). Police

Programme: [The Family Recovery Project. Think Family Pathfinder multi-agency intervention to families at risk of social exclusion.](#)

Figures: Fifty families can be supported over the course of 1 year at a cost of £19,500.00 per family (2009-2010).

Estimated savings to temporary accommodation, arrears, housing in year 1: £135,850.

Estimated savings to the local authority 14-19 partnership (NEET) and education services in 1st year 1: **£144,936**.

Estimated savings to local police services in year 1: **£419,617**.

Estimated savings to health services in year 1: **£567,712**.

Estimated savings to local CDRP in year 1: **£351,598**.

The return on investment is £2.03 for every £1.00 invested.

5. Beneficiary partners: Education, Health, Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP).

Programme: [The Adolescent Multi-Agency Support service \(AMASS\).](#)

Figures: 22 families with a young person exhibiting challenging behaviour benefited from the service (2009-2010) at a cost of £780,000. This equates to £739.00 per family per week.

Estimated savings to education services over two years: **£336,932**.

Estimated savings to local health services: **£161,356**.

Estimated savings to local CDRP: **£624,000**.

The return on investment is £1.46 for every £1.00 invested.

Targeted Services

6. Beneficiary partners: Social Care, Health

Programme: [Childminding Network for Vulnerable Children.](#)

Figures: 179 vulnerable and disabled children from 159 families benefited from a stable and efficient childminding network providing respite care at a cost of £194,000 (£20.85 per child per week), providing a return on investment of £1.35 per £1.00 invested.

Estimated savings to social care: **£269,000** over 2 years.

Estimated savings to health services : **£2500** per year.

7. Beneficiary partners: 14-19, Communities and Local Government

Programme: [Teens and Toddlers](#) – To support young people at risk of early conception to develop social skills, aspirations and positive life goals.

Thirty one teenagers take part in a mentoring, coaching and life skills course.

Figures: The programme advises teens the responsibilities of caring for a child whilst developing skills, aspirations etc to help the teen to prevent early pregnancy and not fall into the NEET category at a cost of £1,500 per teen.

Estimated savings to reduced crime, increased chance of employment/less benefits, Health part – reduced STI's/Health, reduced pregnancies employment over two years **£135,850**.

Estimated savings to local youth services' over two years **£20,520**.

Return on investment is £1.71 per £1.00 invested.

8. Beneficiary partners: Education

Programme: Well-being of disabled children up to age 8

Figures: 92% of the 40 children with complex language needs supported were able to attend their local primary school with no access to a specialist language provision at a project cost of £46,300 (£1157 per child).

Estimated savings to education over 1 year: **£130,980**.

Return on investment is £1.37 per £1.00 invested.

9. Beneficiary departments: Education

Programme: Well-being of disabled children up to age 8.

Figures: 39 children with complex language needs enabled to attend mainstream primary school at a cost of £32,500 per project and £756 per child.

Estimated savings to education over two years **£134,520**.

Return on investment is £2.00 per £1.00 invested.

10. Beneficiary partners: Education

Programme: [Soft Federation of two primary schools.](#)

Figures: A local area formed a soft federation to: narrow the gap in educational achievement between children in this school and those in other parts of the borough and; improve the quality of life for children in the school. Due the impact of an exemplary head teacher, a previously failing school improved the quality of life of 432 children and families, through increased academic attainment, improved staff confidence and community regeneration. This was achieved at a cost of £1,680,000 which equated at a cost of £74.78 per child per week.

Anticipated lifetime costs to education services is **£3,092,105**.

The return on investment indicated for every £1 invested, £1.84 was returned.

11. Beneficiary partners: Housing, Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP), Health

Programme: [Children and Family Service. Reducing the re-offending pathway to children and families by maintaining a stable family life.](#)

Figures: 120 families can be supported over the course of 1 year at a cost of £2264 per family (2008-2009).

Estimated savings to Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP). over 2 years: **£427,750**.

Estimated savings through reduced benefits(housing & job seekers allowances due likelihood of employment)over 2 years: **£70,000**.

Estimated savings to health over 2 years: **£97,315**.

The return on investment for every £1 invested, £ 1.31 was returned

Children in the care system

12. Beneficiary partners: Adult Social Care, Health

Programme: Foster Care. A local authority combined with a charity to assist to relive the pressure on the local authority's foster care service.

Figures: Consequently, 182 looked after children enter a specific programme at a cost of £122,476 for the year. This equates to a cost of £673 per child per year. The social return on investment indicates a return of £1.68 per £1 invested.

Estimated savings to adult social care services over 1 year: **£204,504**.

Estimated savings for the health over a period of 1 year: **£1547**.

The return on investment indicates a return of £1.68 per £1 invested.

High Quality Universal Services

Programme: [Consultation with young children and young people with complex communication needs.](#)

Figures: By improving extended services, the local authority were able to improve the well-being of 50 disabled children and young people, encouraging them to be able to participate in universal youth services, leisure, sports and arts and in making their own decisions.

The cost of this intervention was £11,520 per annum which equated to £4.80 per child per week.

Programme: [Child Development Programme - Home Learning.](#)

Figures: In its first year, 50 children (aged 3-5) benefited from this initiative at a cost of £6,120. This equates to £122.40 per child. By the fourth year 400 children benefited from the initiative at a cost of £8550 (£21.38 per child).

Programme: [Parents as First Teachers \(PAFT\).](#)

Figures: 60 children benefited from this initiative at a cost of £17,550 in 2009-2010. This equates to £292 per child per year.

Programme: **Buddying programme - leadership project.**

Figures: The buddying programme is a government funded programme aimed at strengthening leadership and improving the quality and capacity of the workforce, by encouraging collaboration between professionals and parents across schools and Early Years settings. 30 children were supported at a cost of £24.31 per week.

Total cost of project was £35,000 for one year.

Programme: **Early notification of pregnancy.**

Figures: A local authority implemented a practice by linking midwives to Children's Centres to respond to and follow up on the early notification of pregnancy in young females. This resulted in an improvement of wellbeing of young mothers and their families. 430 young mothers went through the programme across 21 Children's Centres at a cost of £5,401 for the year. This equated to a cost of £12.56 per young mother per year (2009).

Programme: **Give Me Room to Breathe. Sudden unexpected death in infancy.**

Figures: Give me room to breathe is an award winning campaign to raise the awareness of the risk factors associated with sudden infant death and the preventative measures that parents and carers can take to reduce those risks. The costs of this intervention were not available but the local authority charges other authorities £10,000 for a campaign pack.

Programme: **Maths in Early Years.**

Figures: 2900 children went through an early years maths programme which improved their numeracy abilities. This programme cost £28,504 (for 68 days) which equates to £0.14 per child per day.

Programme: **Health Hut.**

Students from an inner city comprehensive helped design, develop and then create a young person centered space where universal and targeted multi agency support can be accessed.

Figures: First year (2007-2008) cost of £36,500, services accessed by 914 students at a cost of £40 per student.

Early Intervention and Prevention

Programme: [Improving behaviour in 3-5 year olds.](#)

Figures: 42 children improved their behaviour in nine early years' settings at a cost of £10,200 (£242 per child per annum).

Programme: **Childcare and Community Inclusion Project (CCIP).**

Figures: 214 families were helped during the period (2007-2008) through registration at a Children's Centre with a Community Inclusion Worker as part of the CCIP. The cost of the project over this year was £708,993 (Total cost of the project over three-year period was £3,779,465). Those 214 families were helped at a cost of £3,101 per year.

Programme: [All Aboard. Early years and early intervention project aimed at ensuring that all children have the best start in school.](#)

Figures: 6 children benefited from the 12 week programme at a cost of £1,734. This equates to £289 per child per project at a cost of £24 per child per week.

Programme: [Family Support Model \(FSM\).](#)

Figures: FSM was delivered to 529 families (2008-2009) at a total cost of £158,000. During this period, 57% of families supported showed a reduction in the level of need. Net cost per family was £6.00 per week.

Programme: [Promoting parental access, capacity and engagement to strengthen families and communities.](#)

This is a parent and community strengthening model.

Figures: 40 families engaged in an 8 week multi-family session at a cost of £18,600 or £465 per family programme.

Targeted Services

Programme: **Early Years Excellence Partnership with Job Centre plus.**

Figures: 300 families supported via Children's Centres to access the integrated services through job centre plus at a cost of £1,295 per annum. This equated to £4.32 per family per annum.

Programme: **Raise achievement of the lowest performing 20% with movement difficulties.**

Figures: 75% (20) children demonstrated improved outcomes for a cost of £71 per institution

Programme: **[Family-based support for early learning](#)**

Figures: 59 children improved their attainment and well being through parents as partners in the children's education. Cost of £16,024 or £271.59 per child per week

Programme: **[Early support for families of children with disability.](#)**

Figures: 142 children with disability receive a timely family support plan within 4 weeks at a cost of £15 per child.

Programme: **[The 'Voice of a Child' project for pre-school children with autistic spectrum conditions.](#)**

Figures: A one child, pre-school project to improve the child's communication and to understand better his needs and requirements. The cost of this intervention was £70 per year.

Programme: **Providing benefits awareness to families with children with special needs.**

Figures: A local authority in partnership with the local Citizens Advice Bureau made sure that families with disabled children were able to claim benefits and tax credits that they were entitled to. 637 families went through the programme at a cost of £106,217 per year which equated to £166.75 per family per week.

Programme: **[The Early Communication and Autism Partnership \(ECAP\).](#)**

Figures: 70 families who have a child under the age of 8 with Autistic Spectrum Disorder benefited from this initiative at a cost of £375,862 (2009-2010). This equated to £138 per week, per child.

Programme: **Consultation with young children and young people with complex communication needs.**

Figures: By improving extended services, the local authority were able to improve the well being for 50 disabled children and young people, encouraging them to be able to participate universal youth services, leisure, sports and arts and in making their own decisions. The cost of this intervention was £11,520 per annum which equated to £4.80 per child per week.

Programme: **Risk management group (RMG) managing risks for vulnerable young people.**

Figures: The risk management group was a weekly management meeting that amount to 1.5 hours per week to assess children and young people who pose a high or very high risk to themselves. The group was attended by all relevant agencies that worked with the regions young people. It was considered that there were very little or no costs attributed to the programme.

Programme: **Family Group Conference.**

Figures: 49 families attended a family group conference to improve the wellbeing of the family as a whole. This led both to improved health and education attainment. This was achieved at a cost of £535 per conference.

Programme: [Cultural Parenting Groups](#)

Figures: 51 BME families with at least one disabled child benefit from this initiative at a cost of £29,100 (2008-2009) and £36,000 (2009-2010). This equates to £23 per family per week.

Programme: [Childminding Network for Vulnerable Children.](#)

Figures: 179 vulnerable and disabled children from 159 families benefited from a stable and efficient childminding network providing respite care at a cost of £194,000 (£20.85 per child per week), providing a social return on investment of £1.35 per £1.00 invested. Estimated savings to 'employment services' are £269,000 over 2 years. Estimated savings to health services are £2500 per year.

Programme: [Specialist Speech and Language Teaching Assistant Pilot Project.](#)

Figures: Thirty young children with speech, language and communication needs are given intensive support, through a specialist teaching assistant over one year at a cost of £21.00 per week (2008-2010).

Programme: [Befriending scheme – recruiting and training volunteers to support children and young people with disabilities to access mainstream activities.](#)

Figures: 11 volunteers were trained to support and befriend disabled children and young people to access activities where they had a similar interest. This support enabled the children and young people of the locality to enjoy and achieve access to mainstream activities. The cost of the training programme amounted to £16,120 which equated to £30.53 per volunteer per week.

Programme: **Speech Therapy service in Children's Centres.**

140 children went through an integrated service programme that incorporated local parents, health, education, employment and social services partners, along with non-government agencies, which improved development outcomes for children through effective practice.

Figures: The cost of this intervention amounted to £559,342 for the year, which equated to £92.91 per child per week.

Programme: [Outreach Intervention for Travellers.](#)

This project was instigated to provide a programme that supported Travellers families to improve their wellbeing and encourage a better integration with the local community.

Figures: 146 children benefit from this initiative at a cost of £273,064 (reduced through grant funding to £98,448 for four travellers sites which equated to £24,612 per site cost). This equates to £13.00 per child per week.

Programme: **Buddying programme – raising boys attainment.**

This was a university based course to improve practitioners skills in order that they could support and raise boys attainment in communication, language and literacy.

Figures: 30 practitioners went through the training programme at a cost of £24.31 per week.

Programme: [Child poverty prevention of family debt.](#)

Figures: Moneywise advised 556 clients and helped 228 manage debt or boost their income. More than 120 parents went through financial literacy training at a cost of £5 per adult.

Programme: [Weaning intervention to South Asian families.](#)

Research indicated a high incidence to iron-deficiency anaemia within South Asian pre-school children. In order to address this problem, the families were encouraged to undertake a weaning programme for children between three months and one year.

Figures: 360 South Asian families a year benefit from this initiative at a cost of £141,984 (2009-2010). This equates to £394.00 per family per year.

Programme: **Development of inclusive holiday play provision.**

Figures: 31 disabled young people benefited from the project at a cost of £87,194 (2009-2010). This equates to £1,264 per young person.

Programme: **Dragonflies (assessment and intervention provision).**

Figures: 16 pre-school children with complex communication needs benefited from Dragonflies at a total cost of £124,365. This equates to £162.00 per child.

Programme: **Youth alcohol partnership intervention – children and young people make healthy lifestyle choices by reducing their alcohol consumption.**

Figures: 169 young people referred to specialist alcohol worker following attendance at A&E or stopped by police following excessive alcohol consumption at a cost of £48 per referral.

Children in Care

Programme: **Foster Care. A local authority combined with a charity to assist to relive the pressure on the local authorities foster care service.**

Figures: Consequently, 182 looked after children enter a specific programme at a cost of £122,476 for the year. This equates to a cost of £673 per child per year. The social return on investment indicates a return of £1.68 per £1 invested. Estimated savings to 'local employment services over 1 year is £204,504. Estimated savings for health services over a period of 1 year is £1547.

Programme: **The RBKC Virtual School. Improving the educational outcomes for children and young people through the virtual school.**

A local authority improved the educational outcomes for 160 vulnerable (looked after) children through creation of a virtual school.

Figures: The cost of the programme was £412,164 which equated to £553.67 per child week.

Programme: **Blueprint project. The blueprint improved the participation of 150 looked after children, young people and stakeholders in their statutory review.**

Figures: This enabled a culture change in order to improve the children's and young people's wellbeing at a cost of £2.56 per child per week. The total cost over an 18 month period was £30,000.