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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

London has the highest rate of child poverty of any English region with as many poor children in London as in all of Scotland and Wales.¹ 592,000 or 37 per cent of all children in London live below the poverty line.²

The 2010 Child Poverty Act places a duty on Local Authorities to prepare a ‘local child poverty needs assessment’ setting out the needs of children living in poverty in the area, and to prepare a child poverty strategy to “set out the measures that the responsible local authority and each partner authority propose to take for the purpose of reducing, and mitigating the effects of, child poverty in the responsible local authority’s area”.³

The report is based on in depth telephone interviews with 17 of London’s Local Authorities, written communication with representatives from 27 Local Authorities⁴ and reading and assessing every Local Authority’s Child poverty needs Assessment and Child Poverty Strategy/ Children and young People’s Plan.

Each of the 17 Local Authorities we spoke to indicated that the Child Poverty Act had been useful in directing energy and resources directly towards child poverty. It had encouraged services to focus on child poverty, and raised the profile and understanding of the issue. It has also been found to be a powerful tool for drawing people working on similar goals to share resources.

Boroughs which had developed particularly strong child poverty strategies were characterised by a high level strategic understanding and commitment to tackling child poverty: a child poverty partnership which is governed by or is a sub group of an existing executive body within the Authority; strong support from elected members with cabinet representatives directly involved in the child poverty partnerships work and a view of child poverty as a cross-cutting theme across the Local Authority.

In Local Authorities that had high levels of child poverty and deprivation, we found that child poverty was a priority prior to the 2010 Act and these Local Authorities had put cross council structures in place so that every service ‘child poverty proofed’ its strategic plans. Yet even where there was little or no focus on child poverty before 2010, the Local Authorities that were most heavily invested in the issue of Child Poverty tended to be ones where the agenda had been taken up across the authority and there was significant high level “buy in”.

---

¹ Households Below Average Income Statistics for 2009/10.
² Figures for 2010/11: defined as living below 60 per cent of equivalised median income After Housing Costs. The figures before Housing Costs are 304,000 children, or 19 per cent.
³ Child Poverty Act 2010, Clause 23 (2).
⁴ We spoke to representatives in all London local authorities other than the City of London, Hammersmith and Fulham, Southwark, Wandsworth and Westminster.
We found few Local Authorities that did not view child poverty as a relevant issue for their area. Other than the City of London which felt that they were too small to spend resources looking into and addressing the issue, these tended to be more affluent outer London boroughs that did not perceive child poverty to be an important issue. Interviewees said that large levels of affluence in these boroughs obscured inner deprivation which made it hard to have poverty on the agenda as it was “often over ridden by the views of the prosperous”.

Some Local Authorities, particularly those who had responsibility for the child poverty agenda confined to one department of service (typically Children and Young people or Children and Families) found that they struggled to keep child poverty on the agenda. Many interviewees suggested that despite themselves having put time and energy into the issue and creating a framework for understanding and addressing it, this was not always taken up across the authority.

In general however, the response to the child poverty agenda across London Local Authorities was positive. Only three authorities had no strategy or up to date document addressing child poverty. Almost an equal number of local authorities chose to create a stand-alone strategy as chose to incorporate child poverty into the children and young people’s plan.

Our report also found a variation across Needs Assessments with regard to depth and detail. The most comprehensive Needs assessments included a detailed profile of the borough as well as outlining and explaining the drivers and effects of child poverty in their borough. Many Local Authorities felt that accessing up to date data and detailed localised data was a challenge. There is a clear correlation between the standard of the Needs Assessment and the standard of the strategy and all Local Authorities found the creation of a Needs Assessment a vital starting point for addressing child poverty in their borough.

**COMMON FEATURES OF CHILD POVERTY STRATEGIES**

The majority of child poverty strategies share the goal of improving life chances of children and ensuring that poor children do not grow up to become poor adults.

Two common themes across all child poverty strategies, both in terms of measures of child poverty and areas to address were children’s education and parental employment. Fewer Local Authorities highlighted the importance of directly increasing family income, perhaps because Local Authorities have fewer direct levers over tax and benefit policy, although a few interviewees (from Local Authorities with high levels of child poverty and deprivation) recognised the importance of this, and a number of strategies looked towards increasing benefit education and uptake as a goal.

Many Local Authorities consulted with Children and Young People, to varying extents and levels of effectiveness. Most felt that with sufficient resources and time that even if they had not done so previously, consulting and involving children was important.

The voluntary sector was also involved with most Local Authorities; with some organisations providing information and helping to shape the plan and others involved in delivery. The Local Authorities that had used the Voluntary Sector effectively felt that it was vital and others said that they would like to involve them more.
Action plans varied strongly with some Local Authorities focusing entirely on early and targeted intervention and others focusing on universal service provision. Most strategies contained elements of both, with the targeted approach adopted by more affluent boroughs characterized by pockets of poverty, and universal provision adopted by local authorities that have poverty across the borough.

**COMMON CHALLENGES AND CONCERNS**

Defining child poverty was difficult for some Local Authorities, due both to a lack of local data, and a concern that Government’s intention to consult on changing the way in which child poverty is measured would leave any measurement subject to rapid revision.

Almost all interviewees cited the cuts to Local Authority budgets as a cause for concern. Many felt that whilst they had survived the first round of cuts without making significant changes to services that affect the poorest; “as more austerity is imposed, it is inevitable that the standard of living for the poorest would decrease” and the best Local Authorities could aim to do was mitigate the effects of child poverty or reduce it to a manageable figure.

No Local Authority felt that it was well placed to meet the Government’s target of tackling child poverty by 2020. One even suggested that the only way this could be done was to “relocate the poorest” to another Local Authority. Many interviewees expressed a concern that not only were they going to be unable to meet targets but that it could no longer be a priority due to increased pressure in areas of welfare. The target was described as an “unachievable goal”.

There was an overwhelming sense that if poor people need money and services then a reduction in these resources for families following both Local Authority and welfare cuts would inevitably lead to greater levels of poverty. Furthermore, family income for many has decreased due to unemployment or rising costs of living and therefore families who were previously on the poverty line are now being pushed below it.

The benefit cap was a key concern for all Local Authorities: concern about the impact of reduced income for families, in particular large families who are already at greater risk of poverty, was seen as likely to lead to more poverty. The more affluent authorities feared that residents accessing the private rented sector in housing would be priced out whilst poorer boroughs already had too high a demand for social housing than could be met and feared that those who had been priced out of more affluent areas would try to access privately rented accommodation in their area, making availability and affordability of housing a crucial issue.

However, some interviewees felt that they were well placed to address child poverty because of the universal commitment and energy that the Local Authority was putting behind the issue.
CHILD POVERTY IN THE FUTURE

Key features of effective child poverty strategies included:

- High level political commitment, backed up by a board within the local authority taking clear responsibility for developing the strategy.

- A strategy that built on the assessment of drivers of child poverty identified within the child poverty needs assessment, including parental worklessness, levels of education within the borough and housing need.

- A strategy that built on consultation with children, young people and parents.

Most authorities were too early in the process of developing a child poverty strategy to assess the extent to which it had driven progress within their area. CPAG and 4in10 are keen to work with authorities in developing a framework for evaluating the success of their strategies, and for sharing effective practice across boroughs.

Although Local Authorities face a challenging context for delivering strategies to tackle child poverty, action at the local level is more vital than ever. Local Authorities are responsible for delivering large parts of the welfare reform agenda with the localisation of Council Tax Benefit and the Social Fund. They also have significant control over how money for childcare and early intervention is delivered. Ensuring that policies in these areas contribute to the goal of ending child poverty is a vital role for Local Authority child poverty strategies, which should provide a benchmark for all Local Authority policies.
1. INTRODUCTION

London has the highest rate of child poverty of any English region with as many poor children in London as in all of Scotland and Wales.\(^5\) 592,000 or 37 per cent of all children in London live below the poverty line.\(^6\)

The 2010 Child Poverty Act places a duty on Local Authorities to prepare a ‘local child poverty needs assessment’ setting out the needs of children living in poverty in the area, and to prepare a child poverty strategy to “set out the measures that the responsible local authority and each partner authority propose to take for the purpose of reducing, and mitigating the effects of, child poverty in the responsible local authority’s area”.\(^7\)

This report provides an overview of child poverty strategies in the 33 London Boroughs, with the aim of highlighting good practice, and providing a tool for Local Authorities seeking to develop and expand on their own strategies. The report is based on in depth telephone interviews with 17 of London’s Local Authorities, written communication with representatives from 27 Local Authorities and reading and assessing every Local Authority’s Child poverty needs Assessment and Child Poverty Strategy/ Children and Young People’s Plan.

CURRENT CONTEXT

Local Authorities are currently developing their Child Poverty Strategies at a time of considerable change. A 26 per cent cut to local government funding was imposed in the Comprehensive Spending Review, \(^8\) and a wide range of welfare reforms, many of which will see Local Authorities being made responsible for imposing reductions in residents’ Housing Benefit and support with Council Tax payments (a list of these changes is provided in Appendix 1). The Government is also currently preparing to consult on a new way of measuring child poverty, leaving Local Authorities with some uncertainty over how they themselves should be defining child poverty within their own strategies.


\(^6\) Figures for 2010/11: defined as living below 60 per cent of equalised median income After Housing Costs. The figures before Housing Costs are 304,000 children, or 19 per cent.

\(^7\) Child Poverty Act 2010, Clause 23 (2).

In addition, the strong push from the Government around the ‘troubled families’ agenda, and the introduction of a payment by results scheme for Local Authorities working with these families is providing an additional focus for Local Authorities’ work with children and families.

Yet despite these challenges and the changed context in which Local Authorities are operating, we found that most were committed to tackling child poverty, and recognised it as a priority for their local area. The development of a child poverty strategy and needs assessment was in most cases providing a valuable way to bring together work across Local Authority departments, as well as an opportunity to work collaboratively with the voluntary sector, and with parents and children themselves.

The Government has stated its commitment to retaining the target to end child poverty by 2020. Action by local authorities will be vital to achieving this goal, and is vital to bringing down London’s shockingly child poverty rates. We hope that this report provides a useful contribution towards that goal.

9 ‘Troubled families’ are defined by the Government as those involved in crime and anti-social behaviour, with children out of school, including an adult on out of work benefits and ‘causing high costs to the public purse’ see: http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/2117840.pdf

2. CHALLENGES IN DEVELOPING A CHILD POVERTY STRATEGY

There were a number of challenges faced by Local Authorities both at the stage of creating the Needs Assessments and Strategy and in terms of moving from strategy to delivery.

MEASURING CHILD POVERTY

The Government is currently considering how best to measure child poverty, and is expected to issue a consultation on this issue in November 2012. Local Authorities in London indicated some anxiety about the current, headline, ‘60 per cent below median income’ measure in case this was downgraded in importance.

Further, data on this headline measure is not currently available at a local level. Local Authorities were therefore using a range of proxies (discussed further in the Good Practice section).

GATHERING INFORMATION

Local Authorities face a number of challenges when it came to collecting data both at a local and national level.

At local level specific data needs included:

- Mapping the services already out there was found to be a sizeable, time consuming and difficult task. Many Local Authorities have hundreds of separate services that provide similar or overlapping services. Collecting local data on specific groups including adults and children with disabilities, gypsy and traveller children, Roma children and asylum seekers proved difficult.

- Qualitative data on the specific experiences of families in diverse boroughs, especially from newly emerging communities (A10 and other ethnic minority groups) was hard to find.

- Data on the earnings/incomes of single earner households.

- Robust cost benefit analysis of policy options.

- Pupil performance data for young people aged 16-18 who travel outside the borough for their education.

- Ward/locality level data was not available for: children living in households that claim housing benefit and may be suffering from fuel poverty; children living in households that claim council tax benefit; children living in temporary accommodation; non-decent council homes, and out of work benefit claimants with dependent children.
• There is a lack of reliable data on overcrowding in the housing stock in the private rented sector.

• More data is needed to identify the number and geographical spread of those with caring responsibilities to ascertain the effect on child poverty.

  At a National Level interviewees commented that the economic climate created uncertainty around setting child poverty targets, especially in the short term, given the upcoming consultation on the definition of child poverty. They also identified gaps in information including:

• Reliable data on the number of asylum seekers in a borough is not currently available. As this group is often overlooked in official statistics more data is needed to ascertain the number of children in poverty.

• Data is needed on the potential risk of severe child poverty (<50% below median income).

CHALLENGES IN MOVING FROM STRATEGY TO ACTION

WELFARE REFORMS

The problems in dealing with fast paced and large scale welfare reforms was being compounded by what interviewees saw as a lack of detail about the policies. This meant that it was difficult for authorities to fully assess and plan for the impact of these changes.

Interviewees agreed that keeping child poverty on the agenda at a time of austerity and significant budget cuts was not easy.

HOUSING

The availability of affordable housing and housing that is suitable for families is a serious issue. Demand for social housing in many Local Authorities is already extremely high and is likely to continue to exceed supply. This problem is most acute in the less affluent parts of London where social housing is heavily relied upon; in addition, interviewees were concerned that there may be an influx of families from other Local Authorities who have been priced out and so are moving to the poorer, less expensive Local Authorities.
VCS organisations are currently facing funding pressures, meaning that they may have fewer staff and resources to engage in the process of working with Local Authorities.

Some interviewees felt that commissioning and tendering processes disadvantage small local VCS organisations and favour large national ones. Small organisations may not have adequate time, skills and resources to write a successful bid, or they may provide services that are not tendered for.

The high cost of rent was also threatening the survival of some VCS organisations.
4. Effective Needs Assessments

This chapter examines the 14 needs assessments that were produced as a precursor to the development of a child poverty strategy. We found that these assessments were vital to the development of an effective strategy. They provide a firm evidence base from which to build support and understanding of the issue of child poverty. Even Local Authorities that already had child poverty as a priority in their work found the needs assessment useful to provide a strong evidence base for future work, and to draw attention to specific groups or issues.

Overview

Effective needs assessments focused on the extent, drivers and impacts of child poverty specific to the Local Authority. This was often done by first outlining the problem of Child Poverty nationally followed by a profile of the borough and data relating to the drivers and risk factors of Child Poverty in the borough with explanations of these.

Hard facts, visual data and interpretations of the data combined made for successful needs Assessments, and we noted that Local Authorities that had a mix of all of these tended to go on to produce the most effective Child Poverty Strategies. The data that was used in these forms included:

- An explanation of why child poverty is an issue and how it can be defined
- Short explanation of child poverty in the UK/ National Context
- Short explanation of child poverty in London/ Regional context
- Associated Risk Factors of child poverty (lone parents, ethnicity, work barriers and worklessness, low income families, teenage parents, families with disabled children or disabled parents, large families, children in and leaving care, children growing up in social housing, temporary accommodation, traveller and gypsy children, asylum seekers, transience, NEET status)
- Drivers of child poverty (Unemployment, Adequacy of Childcare)
- The role of additional key services in mitigating the effects of child poverty.

A Profile of the Local Authority:

- **Housing** provision (stock, tenure, cost/ affordability, size, quality, ratio of house prices to earnings) and information on housing in the Local Authority relating to child poverty (the percentage of households in housing need with dependent children, Youth homelessness,
Ethnic minority homelessness, the percentage of care leavers housed in suitable accommodation.

- **Local demographics**: size and age of the population and any changes to this (projected or over time)
- **Levels of skills of workforce**: proportion of workforce with qualifications and at what level.
- **Employment**: Levels of employment deprivation, employment migration, key sectors for employment of borough residents and average wages
- **Ethnicity** of population: levels of diversity.
- **Health** of the population especially including data for the number and type of residents with long term illness or **disability**
- **Number and background of school children**
- **Educational attainment** and the gap between those claiming and those entitled to free school meals (FSMs)
- **Number of Young Carers**
- **Which services** are most central to community life (children’s centres, libraries)

**Haringey’s Needs Assessment** assessed the extent of Child Poverty by:

- ward,
- family composition (lone parent/ two parent families)
- Family size- 1,2,3,4 or more children,
- take up of FSMs,
- take up of out of work benefits,
- take up of housing benefit and council tax benefit,
- Take up of tax credits.

The Borough was then compared to the rest of the country through the use of three national indicator sets:

- Indices of Deprivation,
- Income deprivation affecting children
- The Index of Child Well Being Index

**Measuring Child Poverty in the Borough**

- The percentage and number of children living in poverty according to **NI 116** official statistics on child poverty
- Recent trends in Child Poverty (by Free School Meal eligibility, out of work benefits claimants)
- Number and percentage of children receiving working tax credits (WTC) and child tax credits (CTC) and are in a household with an income of less than 60 per cent of the median income
- The percentage of children entitled to Free School Meals (FSMs)
- The percentage of families living on annual income of less than £20,000
- Number and location of people claiming Disability Living Allowance (DLA)
- Number of families with a member on incapacity benefit or Employment and Support Allowance
- Ranking on Child Well Being Index
- Level of deprivation according to most recent Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)
- Areas of social housing with high percentage of children in poverty
- Proportion of children in Poverty by Lower Super Output Area (LSOA)
- Family type for the majority of households on income benefits and council tax or housing benefits
- Ethnic diversity within the borough
- Statistical Neighbours were effectively used by some boroughs to make useful comparisons

**Assessment of the Drivers of Child Poverty**

- Levels of accessible and affordable childcare.
- Teenage pregnancy levels in the borough
- Percentage of population with English not as a first language
- The proportion of young people not in education or employment (NEET)
- Employment levels among parents
- Percentage of school leavers progressing to higher education
- Fluency in English of parents/ carers
- Children in care
- Proportion of households who have access to a computer/ the internet
- Finance: **Provision of affordable credit** and proportion of residents with access to basic bank accounts

---

**Redbridge - Mapping**

Redbridge are bringing together existing mapping exercises (including those from Families Information Direct (FiND), Redbridge Community and Voluntary Services (RCVS), the children and Young people’s plan (CYPP), and the Employment, Skills and Enterprise Plan, and the work Redbridge network) to try to paint a complete picture of the services that exist to support children living in poverty and their families. They are also looking at working with partners to look at best practices to improve joined up working, such as better utilising schools and Children’s Centres as ‘hubs’ for service provision.

---

**Kingston’s table of Child Poverty indicators against 2009 data.**
5. EFFECTIVE CHILD POVERTY STRATEGIES – KEY THEMES

Local Authorities across London are working in different ways to address child poverty. However, we found that the most effective child poverty strategies were characterised by a mix of a strong evidence base from the needs assessment, narrative and explanation and a clear plan of action. This was most effectively presented where Local Authorities had identified the risk factors for, and drivers of poverty, and had considered actions specifically to address these.

This chapter highlights effective practice from across the 27 strategies that we reviewed. It first looks at how strategies identified and defined child poverty. It then looks at targets and actions across four main areas; addressing low income and material deprivation; tackling homelessness and improving housing; addressing parental worklessness, and addressing children and young people’s education and employability. We then focus specifically on the role of Children’s Centres, which were central to many Local Authorities’ plans.

IDENTIFYING AND DEFINING CHILD POVERTY

GETTING CONSENSUS:

A number of Local Authorities, particularly those with lower levels of child poverty, struggled to get consensus and support around the issue of child poverty. Some Councillors and services felt that child poverty was not an issue for their borough. To address this, some interviewees working on child poverty explained that they used the term ‘Family poverty’ to ensure political consensus and cross-department ‘buy in’. They found this helped elevate the issue clearly beyond Children and Young People’s Services so that all services and departments across the borough took some responsibility for addressing it. The term has been used by other Local Authorities to make sure that the strategy is endorsed, embraced and adopted by as wide a body of partners as possible. Some of the Local Authority representatives suggested that this lack of political consensus had led to Child Poverty strategies being incorporated into Children and Young People’s plans, rather than existing as a stand-alone document.

The level at which strategies were produced depended very much on commitment from members. A representative from one of the most affluent boroughs to produce an independent Child Poverty Needs Assessment and a Strategy confirmed that despite having low overall rates of child poverty there was a desire from the members of the children and young people’s trust board to undertake the work at some point to get a clearer picture of child poverty in the borough. Whilst the Needs Assessment and strategy...
essentially confirmed what they already knew, it was considered a “useful exercise that enabled the Local Authority to identify some additional actions that we need to undertake that could have a positive impact on child poverty levels and the needs assessment itself has been extremely useful as an evidence base when planning or reviewing services—both for the Council and for key partners.”

Local Authorities with the strongest child poverty strategies had child poverty and related issues as a clear priority. They are typically characterised by high level political support and a deep understanding of the issues across services.

**Indicators of Child Poverty**

Defining and measuring child poverty was difficult for Local Authorities as those constructing new Strategies or revising plans did not want to set down targets and proxies for them to be revoked by the current government, which is widely expected to consult on a new definition of child poverty in the autumn.

A number of Local Authorities used the 60 per cent of the median income definition as a measure of child poverty but identified other important areas to focus on in order to achieve this. Haringey for example used improved live chances, financial support to families, employment and providing decent housing as key measures for their strategy.

Other widely used indicators that were used to measure current levels of child poverty were: tax credits, free school meals, the child well-being index; children living in overcrowded households, children living in temporary accommodation; health deprivation and disability; and attainment gap between pupils eligible for FSMs and their peers and levels of attainment at GCSE (5+A*-C).

**Setting a Vision**

A number of Local Authorities had set out an overall vision for what they wanted to achieve with their child poverty strategy. These included:

- Reduce the number of children living in workless households.
- Give children the best opportunities and maximising their life chances.
- Reduce housing related poverty.
- Maximise family income.
- Enable children and young people to lead healthy life styles.
- Ensure partnership around the family.
- Raise aspirations of the next generation.
KEY THEMES IN CHILD POVERTY STRATEGIES

The key themes and areas for action to emerge in London’s child poverty strategies are addressing low income and material deprivation; tackling homelessness and improving housing; addressing parental worklessness; and addressing children and young people’s education and employability. For each, we discuss the targets that were developed, whether these were for outcomes in terms of change on the ground, or outputs in terms of Local Authority delivery, and the actions that the Local Authority planned to take to achieve this.

Those strategies which appeared most effective made clear links between the drivers of child poverty identified in their needs assessment, and the actions that would be taken to address them.

LOW INCOME AND MATERIAL DEPRIVATION

TARGETS

Commonly used outcome targets in this area were:

- Reduce the percentage of children living in poverty (as defined by 60% median income)
- Reductions in fuel poverty.
- Tackle Financial exclusion including debt management, financial literacy, affordable credit and maximising benefit take up.
- Reducing the incidence of in work poverty.

A number of Local Authorities are running Income maximisation sessions at Carers’ Centres or Children’s Centres.
• **Sutton**: plans to have Benefits workshops delivered in All Children’s Centres by Job Centre Plus, tailored for the client group attending each centre. They are also going to hold public outreach surgeries and work with CAB and Sutton Housing Partnership to maximise benefit take-up.

• **Wandsworth**: is expanding the commissioning of the CAB to run an advice service on debt once each month in each Children’s Centre following a successful pilot.

• **Tower Hamlets**: developed a guide for parents, in partnership with the Financial Services Authority, explaining benefits take-up which is now being promoted through Children’s Centres and the Parents Advice Centres.

Local Authorities have also set up their own schemes to tackle those in the most need through providing extra services or targeted measures.

• Credit Unions provide an opportunity for residents on low incomes to make savings and borrow money when needed. Many Local Authorities have already set these up and others are considering doing so.

• Tower Hamlets has a ‘choice and opportunities On-Line’ (CO-OL) scheme which provides 6,000 of the most deprived and vulnerable Young People with £40 to spend per month through swipe cards on a range of recreational, sporting, cultural and leisure activities.

**Homelessness and Housing**

As described above in chapter 2, the availability of affordable housing and housing that is suitable for families was a serious issue for many Local Authorities. Few had set explicit targets around housing as part of their strategy, although Waltham Forest specifically set the goal of ‘reducing housing related poverty’, linking this to building new homes.

However, several Local Authorities highlighted the actions they were taking around homelessness as part of their strategy.

---

**Croydon: Rent in Advance Scheme**

CRIAS gives financial support and advice to people who are 18 or over and ready to move into independent living. The Council helps with the deposit for privately rented property by paying the rent in advance and giving a bond guarantee to the landlord. The rent in advance scheme has been expanded to tackle homelessness.

**Tower Hamlets: Addressing Housing and Homelessness**

Tower Hamlets have developed a peer education programme on homelessness, targeting 14-15 year olds to highlight the realities of independent living and to ensure if they are ready to make a homeless application it is in a planned way.

Tower Hamlets have put in place a range of initiatives to help families living in overcrowded conditions, including knock throughs, cash incentive schemes to encourage under-occupiers to downsize into smaller accommodation and the development of larger family homes.
**Parental Employment**

**Targets**

Given the strong association between parental employment and children escaping poverty, it was not surprising that this was a focus of many Local Authorities’ Child Poverty Strategies.

Targets included:

- Reduce the number of children living in workless households.
- An increased percentage of parents entering sustained employment.
- Increase the number of free Early Years Childcare places available for 2 year olds from the most disadvantaged communities.
- Remove barriers to work including lack of spoken English, literacy and numeracy.
- Support parents into work by delivering employment advice and targeted training to parents and carers through outreach services in relevant accessible locations including Children’s Centres.

**Actions**

Examples of programmes being undertaken to promote parental employment included those encompassing childcare services, adult learning provision and transport costs:

- **Sutton** has a Tot’s and teens programme supporting teenage Mum’s and Dads to gain level 2 qualifications.
- Provision of targeted advice on childcare to families with disabled children.
- Transport: Expense is often quoted as a barrier to accessing services and free or subsidised transport arose as a possible area for action.
- Crèche provision at Adult Learning Centres is being provided by some Local Authorities.
- Some authorities highlighted the provision of ICT classes for parents to help improve access to jobs and employability.
- One relatively common approach was to provide outreach advice and employment services within health centres/GP practices.

---

**Wandsworth and Housing Conditionality**

Wandsworth are exploring the potential for housing to link housing offers with training and employment for e.g.: for older siblings in houses which are suffering from overcrowding.

They are also looking at linking the priority for re-housing to the length of time that employment has been maintained.
WorkNet is a partnership programme which helps residents with jobs, skills and benefits advice. The service is delivered through single points of access around the boroughs Children’s Centres, Registered Social Landlord (RSL) receptions, Waltham Forest College and Jobcentre Plus offices. Services include: One-to-one Information, Advice and Guidance on returning to and remaining in work; Benefits advice; Voluntary work placements to gain recent experience, new skills and a reference; Access to other Council frontline services; Vocational training courses including Railway engineering (PTS), Truck Induction, catering, retail, and safety at work training courses; In-work support and careers advice for up to 12 months This partnership programme covers WF council, JCP, the community based housing association and the learning and skills council. The service is a fully integrated entry to work ‘offer’.

WorkNet is helping with improving the co-ordination of services and developing targeted outreach to engage hard to reach families. It will deliver services from venues that are easier to access such as Children’s Centres, and extended schools. It will also deliver and expand the English for Speakers of Other Language (ESOL) training and support to parents and post qualification support.
Most strategies had a strong focus on children and young people’s education, including on both their future employment prospects, and employment prospects for those young people who had already left school. There was a consensus that giving children a good education so they can go on to employment or higher education is an important way to help prevent poor children becoming poor adults.

**TARGETS**

- Attainment levels at each Key Stage, GCSE and A-level- including by FSM eligibility, SEN, and ethnicity.
- Closing Attainment gaps- including by FSM eligibility, ward and ethnicity.
- Increasing the proportion of young people accepted into higher education.
- Reduce school absence/ exclusions.
- Reducing the number of young people Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETS).
- Increase the number of care leavers in Education, Employment and training.

**ACTIONS**

Interventions highlighted within the early years included:

- Early Years Foundation Stage Profiles to assess a child’s physical, intellectual, emotional and social development.
- Identifying a child’s level of attainment at age three and providing extra support at this stage.
- Implementing a Foundation Years Programmes (conception to five years) to improve parental nurturing of children.

For school age students programmes included:

- Extended schools: many Local Authorities are providing extended services to the most economically disadvantaged free of charge. Services and activities include: childcare, adult education, parenting support programmes, and community based health and social care services, multi-agency behaviour support teams and after-school activities.
- Wandsworth are offering a university visit to all year 7 pupils in the borough.
- Tower Hamlets has rolled out a laptop initiative to all year 7 pupils, providing technology and internet access to the families of these young people.

Local authorities also targeted some interventions at 16-18 year olds:

- Careers Academy programmes are run with at some local secondary schools to explore career opportunities in 6th Form.
- In Bexley, all young people aged 16-18 who are NEET are provided with an individualised and personal programme of support and activities.
Some authorities also targeted interventions more broadly at child well-being:

- This included introducing increasing or better targeting parenting courses to support parents with children.
- Many Local Authorities also offered sports, arts or personal development activities for young people.

**Targeted Approach: Waltham Forest**

Waltham Forest piloted a family centred, multi-disciplinary joint visiting team of a benefits officer and specialist family support officer to families of 3, 4 and 5 year olds due to being joining the 5 primary schools in the highest FSM and low educational attainment categories.

The plan lays out action to deliver intensive support and personalised packages to 100 families at greater risk due to a combination of poverty related factors with a focus on parental engagement in early learning.

The plan also commits to holding three consultation focus groups with children in care, including unaccompanied asylum seekers who are not in Further Education and are coming to an end of their time being supported by social services; care leavers- British born, 18 and over; accommodated 13-14 year olds.

**Newham: Universal services**

Free School Meals are offered to all primary school children, free swimming and largest range of free sports and trips and activities in London, to offer the same access to positive activities regardless of income. Free tuition in playing a musical instrument in Year 5 in all Newham schools for 2 years, through the mayors every child a musician project.

To help with parental engagement local authorities are:

- Providing more education opportunities for parents so they can understand and support young people’s learning.
- Providing translation services for children whose parents do not speak English.
The Role of Children’s Centres

Children’s Centres are central to the delivery of many Local Authority strategies. They are widely used to provide an accessible, non-stigmatizing service to people and have been central to removing barriers to work in many Local Authorities. They are also well placed to identify and contact families in poverty or at risk of poverty. Across Local Authorities in London children’s centres are providing a range of services. Success in provision of these services has come from Local Authorities that are able to work closely with community based partners.

Tower Hamlets’ Lincoln and Burdett Children’s Centre works with the training and employment team at Poplar Harca, Job Centre Plus, Working Links, the Voluntary Sector Tower Hamlets and the Bromley by Bow centre. The success of the pilot services provided at this centre led to the expansion of employment and training services across all 21 Children’s centres.

Other services that have been successfully provided at Children’s Centre’s include:

- Access to child and family health services.
- Family support services and parental outreach.
- Support for children and parents with special needs.
- Support for parents considering training or employment: bespoke advice provision, referral to relevant training, job brokerage, money matters training, motivational training, CV building and better off calculations.
- Jobcentre Plus operating at children’s centres to enable residents to search for jobs and also providing the mandatory “work focussed interviews” for lone parents in a child friendly centre.
- “Options and Choices” sessions directed at Lone Parents who need advice on benefit changes and childcare.
- Citizens Advice Bureau delivering benefits advice and debt management services
- ESOL and pre-ESOL classes.
- Housing Advice is being delivered by the relevant advice providers within children’s centres.
- **Tower Hamlets** developed a ‘50-up’ programme where each children’s centre identifies 50 parents to be supported into work through the Community Hub networks.
- **Haringey** has used their children’s centres to provide a ‘Haringey Guarantee’ scheme. The borough has outreach workers whose role is to engage with residents and inform them of the support available to them regarding looking for employment and training options. A Family Learning is a scheme and employability workshops targeted at parents with children aged 0-5 have also been delivered in children’s centres.
- **Richmond** Children’s centres, offer a range of services for families who may be in poverty including: adult education and family learning; child and family health services; CAB drop-in sessions; early years provision; family support and parental outreach; Job Centre Plus drop-in sessions; job skills sessions; literacy classes for parents; midwifery and health visiting.

*Children’s Centres have been used to distribute surveys and conduct consultations in order to encourage participation in the creation of child poverty strategies.*
services; parents returning to work sessions; specialist services such as speech and language therapy and child and adolescent mental health support; and targeted support and outreach services to parents and carers and children who have been identified as most in need.
6. EFFECTIVE CHILD POVERTY STRATEGIES: PARTNERSHIP WORKING

Whilst the issue of child poverty in many Local Authorities was the responsibility of a single service or department; most Authorities had child poverty partnerships that worked on and delivered the plans. These included representatives from a range of Local Authority services including: children’s services, adult services, social care and health, transport, housing and representatives from public health, Job Centre Plus and the (to varying degrees) the voluntary and community sector. A couple of authorities had children represented and another few had some private sector employers involved in the partnership. This chapter looks at partnership approaches between boroughs, at approaches to involving the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS), the private sector, and finally between Local Authorities and children, young people and families themselves.

INTER BOROUGH WORKING

- Croydon is working with four other London boroughs to address the problems around territorial gangs
- Richmond worked with neighbouring borough Kingston that was ahead in the process of creating a needs assessment and strategy to understand how they went about addressing the Child Poverty Agenda.

Tri Borough Working

Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham and Kensington since 2011 have been working together combining services and management costs in a move to save frontline services. This is set to create £40m savings a year by 2015/16. Each local authority remains a sovereign local authority with its own statutory responsibilities, local decision making and accountability.

A representative was positive about the ability the arrangement had provided for sharing best practice and also the increased purchase power the Authorities now have. However, technical problems of managing 3 different IT systems and back office staff etc. had been experienced.
WORKING WITH THE VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR

The Voluntary and Community sectors have been closely involved in both the planning and implementation of Local Authorities’ strategies. They have first-hand understanding of the issues and are also in a good position to be able to identify vulnerable groups or individuals. As one Local Authority said “they have their ear on the ground” and therefore “have a massive role to play”. Authorities who consulted and worked with the Voluntary and Community Sector were reliant on this support.

- **Richmond** worked with the children’s charity Barnados at the early stages who helped provide information and shape the direction of the strategy.

- **Brent** has both a VCS Lead from within the Voluntary and Community Sector and has a newly appointed Chief Executive of Voluntary and Community groups. Through this they have been able to identify key organisations such as a Somali Organisation, which helped the council engage with Somali women and lead to understanding of their desire for employment and concerns around childcare.

- **Kingston** Voluntary Action has a web based discussion Forum on child poverty where experience and expertise is shared.

- **Waltham Forest** is working with EAGA, the residential energy efficiency solutions group to increase uptake of home energy efficiency grants and to reduce fuel poverty.

---

**Tower Hamlets: St Paul’s Way case study**

The St Paul’s way transformation project is an example of a multi-agency approach to local regeneration and partnership working to mitigate the effects of poverty.

The project bought together the PCT, Polar Harca (Housing and Regeneration Community Association), the Local Authority, local third sector organisations and local schools to collaborate around the physical and human transformation of the St Paul’s Way area. This comprises three major capital programmes, the creation of new local employment and learning opportunities, investment in arts and cultural facilities and activities and complete development of local health services.

---

**Kingston Superhighways Project:**

This involved setting up a wireless broadband network on the Cambridge Road estate, giving residents who registered free access to the internet. The project also refurbishes donated PCs to give to residents, provides training and maintains the wireless network. Local Community Groups have benefitted from ICT infrastructure to increase community learning activity.
WORKING WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR

A number of Local Authorities expressed a desire to have greater involvement with the private sector in order to improve employment security and flexibility. This was seen by most as difficult due to lack of Local authority control over private sector practices and economic pressures driving down employment security. We did find some examples of good practice that support partnership working in this area:

- **Newham** has created a Skills Academy with Westfield. This enables people to train for jobs and for higher level jobs than the ones they are already at.
- One Local Authority is doing work around ways of enforcing the National Minimum Wage after findings that a significant number of employed residents are not getting paid the minimum wage. (It is worth noting that Southwark, Lewisham, Islington and Tower Hamlet are all committed to providing the funding to ensure that they are Living Wage employers, and Hounslow, Ealing, Camden and City of London have made a public commitment to move to this status).
- **Kingston** council worked with Chessington World of Adventures to get them to agree to recruit via Jobcentre plus. This was successful in getting residents from the immediate local area employed at the park.

CONSULTATIONS WITH CHILDREN AND RESIDENTS

Many local authorities had sought to consult with children, young people and parents, in the course of the development of their child poverty strategy or children and young people’s plan.

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

- **Newham** has a directly elected young Mayor who consults with Young People and represents their views on the children’s trust. Lambeth also have a Young mayor who was involved in the consultation process.
• Having a Youth Council Representative on Child Poverty Steering Group has been suggested by a number of councils as a way to most effectively engage the youth council that can in turn engage other Young People. Croydon’s local youth council is part of the partnership. They come to meetings and are aligned in sub groups in the same way as the main council.

• Tower Hamlets identified families through services such as Children’s centres and talked to families on the issue of poverty. This process brought up important issues that they faced such as financial capability, financial inclusion and feelings of isolation among those with children and living in council housing with just small communal play spaces.

• Social media, specifically Facebook has been used by some Local Authorities and can be an effective way to get young people engaged in discussion about issues affecting them. Croydon are developing a ‘Youth Tube’ which will be an interactive resource for Young people to express their views on local issues. Using social media in this way has also been found to be more effective than using the Local Authority websites as councils that had surveys on those had a low take up.

Hounslow: Engaging Children and Young People and the Community and Voluntary Services

• Met with children, Young People, parents and carers focus groups and existing forums to gather views

• A children and Young Persons online survey launched through the London Borough of Hounslow website

• A parents and carers on-line survey (hard copies distributed to children’s centres, libraries and other community venues)

• Carried out local community focus group consultation on the emerging priorities for the plan

• Asked the views of a group of voluntary agencies

• Professional groups held thematic stakeholder meetings to seek the views of people working with children and YP, refining outcomes and setting a range of challenging actions and targets to achieve over the year.

• Bromley conducted a Young People’s consultation which brought up key issues around homelessness that had not been identified previously. They also worked with the children in care council who provided information and produced a DVD on living in care and the transition afterwards.
• One LA used a survey to capture the thoughts of young people. However, they recognised that although this was useful, the nature of multiple choice also meant that it was limited in the scope of information. Focus groups allowed for a more thorough discursive approach to key issues. The authority representative that we spoke to also thought that getting the children involved in the design of the survey would be a useful strategy. In the next survey they do, parents and carers are going to be included through circulation at Job Centre Plus, GP’s, libraries and other relevant services.

• Richmond conducted Child Poverty Consultations with families (a total of 41 individuals) drawn mainly from the most deprived areas of the borough (see Richmond CP Consultation Report). The parents and carers were asked to identify the specific issues that exist within Richmond Borough that are having a negative impact on the life chances of their children, and to come up with any actions that could be undertaken to alleviate those issues.
**Sutton – Consulting with Children**

Children, young people and carers were consulted at the early stages of development of the Sutton CYPP. The first phase included a survey which was sent to a range of clubs and groups, including those working with children with disabilities, ethnic minorities and looked after children. Responses were received from children, young people, parents and carers via a wide range of groups including: Sutton Carers Centre; Sutton Youth Parliament; Sutton Young Advisers; Sutton Ramp Events; MAPS (mentoring and peer support); Decision Busters; Home Start; and Parents’ Voice.

The Time Out Youth Project works with young people across the northern wards of the borough with a membership of over 75 young people, predominantly aged 13 to 19 years. They commented on the issues in the consultation and a discussion wall was set up on Facebook in which 21 young people participated.

The Pupils Voice Conference, which took place in February 2010, was attended by over thirty pupils from ten of Sutton’s secondary schools, one of which was a special school, four were non-selective and five were selective schools. Pupils also took part in a scenarios based workshop where the questions in the CYPP consultation were brought alive with true to life stories. This was felt to be an important event in that it brought pupils from different schools together leading to a cross-fertilisation of ideas and a lively debate.

Sutton’s Young Advisors Network came into being early in 2010 and they have contributed ideas for the Children and Young People’s Plan, amongst other things. The network aims to provide a platform for young people of secondary school age to become involved in issues that affect them locally. It seeks to raise awareness, involve them in the design and delivery of services, allow them to influence and give feedback on consultations, devise youth friendly documents and literature and work with adults to engage with young people. They have two places on the Children’s Trust Board.

Under the Youth4U – Young Inspectors programme, Jigsaw4u has been working with the council to recruit, train and support young people to investigate and assess local services and recommend improvements. Inspections that have taken place to date include Sutton Police Station; the Leaving Care team; Sutton Youth Court; and Sutton Mencap. The findings contained in the inspection reports have been taken into account, alongside the other feedback mentioned above, in the development of the plan.

All of the responses received in this first phase of consultation were written up for the Children’s Trust Board meeting in March 2010. These along with the findings from the needs analysis were taken into consideration together with the results of recent surveys and other engagement activity including the Safer Neighbourhoods youth survey, a Youth Parliament report on sex and relationships education; an engagement event with young people in Sutton High Street; plus the MORI borough wide survey and TellUs survey.
Keeping Child Poverty on the Agenda

At a time of economic uncertainty and welfare changes, some authorities have found it difficult to keep child poverty as a priority. However, there are some strategies that some Local Authorities have taken to ensure that child poverty remains on the agenda. These include:

- Conducting an Annual review of the Strategy or Partnership Plan
- Having a Multi Agency Child Poverty Working Group that meets quarterly
- Monitoring and self evaluation
- Waltham Forest Have appointed a ‘champion’ for Child Poverty to drive forward the delivery of the strategy.
- Tower Hamlets have introduced child poverty analysis to their service planning and commissioning arrangements.
- Measure the impact of actions and measures annually to help understanding of what activities are making the most difference and where it is necessary to prioritise resource.
7. Conclusion

Across London, both the people within Local Authorities that we spoke to and our analysis of Child Poverty Strategies and Action Plans shows that the issue of addressing child poverty is difficult. However, across the majority of boroughs there was a significant amount of optimism. People felt that with joined up partnership working and a high level political and strategic commitment, child poverty was an area where real progress can be made.

There are many positive lessons to draw from the practice across London: the importance of Child Poverty Needs Assessments in setting the framework for an effective Child Poverty Strategy; the value that Local Authorities place on engagement with stakeholders, particularly children, young people, their families and the voluntary and community sector as well as the opportunities for innovative partnership working across the various services within Local Authorities.

Many interviewees were proud of the measures their Borough has taken towards mitigating, preventing and targeting child poverty. We hope that this report has highlights some key areas in which actions are being taken and hopefully goes some way to sharing these actions and ideas so that children across London can benefit from the experience and ideas of councils beyond their own.

Key features of effective child poverty strategies included:

- High level political commitment, backed up by a board within the local authority taking clear responsibility for developing the strategy.

- A strategy that built on the assessment of drivers of child poverty identified within the child poverty needs assessment, including parental worklessness, levels of education within the borough and housing need.

- A strategy that built on consultation with children, young people and parents.

Most authorities were too early in the process of developing a child poverty strategy to assess the extent to which it had driven progress within their area. CPAG and 4in10 are keen to work with authorities in developing a framework for evaluating the success of their strategies, and for sharing effective practice across boroughs.

Although local authorities face a challenging context for delivering strategies to tackle child poverty, action at the local level is more vital than ever. Local authorities are responsible for delivering large parts of the welfare reform agenda with the localisation of Council Tax Benefit and the Social Fund. They also have significant control over how spending on childcare and early intervention is prioritised. Ensuring that policies in these
areas contribute to the goal of ending child poverty is a vital role for local authority child poverty strategies, which should provide a benchmark for all local authority policies.
# Appendix 1: Changes to the benefit system between 2011 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Who will it affect</th>
<th>Who will implement this change</th>
<th>Date of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration from incapacity benefit to employment and support allowance</td>
<td>Incapacity benefit claimants</td>
<td>Jobcentre Plus</td>
<td>2010–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National caps on local housing allowance (LHA) depending on property size</td>
<td>All LHA claimants</td>
<td>Local authorities administering HB, until the introduction of universal credit</td>
<td>From April 2011 for new claimants. For existing claimants, on the anniversary of their claim. Nine months transitional protection is available to most claimants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in non-dependant deductions</td>
<td>All LHA claimants with non-dependants living with them</td>
<td>Local authorities administering HB, until the introduction of universal credit</td>
<td>In April 2011, and again in April 2012 and 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing the £15 excess that LHA claimants could keep if their rent was below LHA rates</td>
<td>All LHA claimants</td>
<td>Local authorities administering HB, until the introduction of universal credit</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting LHA rates at the 30th percentile of rents in each broad rental market area rather than the median</td>
<td>All LHA claimants</td>
<td>Local authorities administering HB, until the introduction of universal credit</td>
<td>From April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared accommodation rate applies to single tenants without dependent children up to 35 years old (rather than as previously those up to 25 years)</td>
<td>All LHA claimants</td>
<td>Local authorities administering HB, until the introduction of universal credit</td>
<td>From January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working tax credits can only be claimed by couples when they work over 24 hours</td>
<td>Low income working families claiming tax credits</td>
<td>HMRC</td>
<td>From April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>Responsible Body</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uprating LHA by the Consumer Price Index rather than by increases in rents</td>
<td>All LA claimants</td>
<td>Local authorities administering HB, until the introduction of universal credit</td>
<td>From April 2013 (rents frozen from April 2012 in preparation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of ‘under-occupation’ penalties in the social rented sector (‘bedroom tax’)</td>
<td>HB claimants in the social rented sector</td>
<td>Local authorities administering HB, until the introduction of universal credit</td>
<td>From April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localisation of the discretionary social fund</td>
<td>All local residents</td>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localisation of council tax benefit (CTB)</td>
<td>All local residents</td>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The benefit cap</td>
<td>All benefit claimants</td>
<td>Local authorities administering HB, until the introduction of universal credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of personal independence payment (replacing disability living allowance)</td>
<td>Working age disabled people receiving disability living allowance</td>
<td>Jobcentre Plus</td>
<td>April 2013 until 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of universal credit (replacing most other means tested benefits)</td>
<td>Benefit and tax credit claimants</td>
<td>Department for Work and Pensions, working with local authorities</td>
<td>October 2013 until 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: SOURCES OF DATA FOR DEVELOPING A CHILD POVERTY STRATEGY

Some interviewees found accessing data in order to create a comprehensive Needs Assessment challenging. Problems included: lack of statutory direction, time lags as the national data published tends to be a year or so out of date and difficulties accessing detailed local data.

Some authorities already had mechanisms by which data is collected at local level and shared across services. Others found that it can be difficult to collect data for Super Output Area, or drill down the data for wards to understand the characteristics of the groups behind data. For example data may be available on poverty by ward but it is not clear the proportion of those who are disabled, lone parents etc.

This section lists at where data can be found and useful data to include.

Barnardo’s:  Barnardo’s child poverty programme.
http://www.barnardos.org.uk/what_we_do/our_projects/child_poverty.htm

Centre for Excellence and Outcomes (C4EO): C4EO resource includes information on the development and delivery of effective area-wide child poverty strategies. http://tinyurl.com/yj6hsxw

Child Poverty Act 2010: A detailed information on the Act which sets targets relating to the eradication of child poverty.


Child Poverty Knowledge Hub: An interactive network for online problem-solving, peer-support and information sharing for those working to prevent and tackle child poverty.
https://knowledgehub.local.gov.uk/group/childpovertycop

Child Wellbeing Index

Children in care
**Department for Education (DfE):** Child poverty strategy information, access to research, and details of pilot evidence.  
http://www.education.gov.uk/childrenandyoungpeople/families/childpoverty

*Estimating the costs of child poverty*, JRF (October 2008):  
http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/estimating-costs-child-poverty

**GLA Intelligence**  
https://www.london.gov.uk/gla-intelligence

**HMRC – child poverty statistics**  
http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/personal-tax-credits/child_poverty.htm

---

**Households below Average Income (HBAI)** data produced by the Department for Work and Pensions (June 2012) into the standard of living of the household population in the United Kingdom.  

**Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI)** The Index of combines a number of indicators, chosen to cover a range of economic, social and housing issues, into a single deprivation score for each small area in England. This allows each area to be ranked relative to one another according to their level of deprivation.  
http://www.communities.gov.uk/communities/research/indicesdeprivation/deprivation10/

**Joseph Rowntree Foundation** The Joseph Rowntree Foundation's child poverty programme.  
http://www.jrf.org.uk/work/workarea/child-poverty

http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/monitoring-poverty-2010

**London Councils Child Poverty Information**  
http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/policylobbying/children/childpoverty/

**NI116** Proportion of children in poverty in each LA (to be revised*)  

**Nomis** Labour market statistics  
http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/contents.aspx

**Child Poverty Basket of Indicators:** The DfE web pages covering the proxy child poverty measure also contain child poverty data sheets produced by

---

*Revised child poverty measure* Data on the proportion of children in poverty at national, regional and local levels.  
http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/personal-tax-credits/child_poverty.htm

The revised child poverty measure for 2010 (previously known as the NI116 child poverty measure) is due to be published in autumn 2012 and will be available on the HMRC website at the address above.
the Child Poverty Unit which identify the main drivers of poverty that can be influenced by local authorities. 
http://www.education.gov.uk/childrenandyoungpeople/families/childpoverty/b0066347/child-poverty-data

Further Sources of local data (National and local)

**Joint Strategic Needs Assessment**: Joint strategic needs assessments (JSNAs) analyse the health needs of populations to inform and guide commissioning of health, well-being and social care services within local authority areas. [http://www.nhsconfed.org/Publications/briefings/Pages/joint-strategic-needs-assessment.aspx](http://www.nhsconfed.org/Publications/briefings/Pages/joint-strategic-needs-assessment.aspx)


**Tellus Surveys**: National Survey of Children and Young people attending local schools. It is a voluntary survey to which schools choose to contribute. Pupils in years 6, 8 and 10 contributed to the survey in autumn 2009. The Government scrapped this survey in 2010 [https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationdetail/page1/DCSF-RR218](https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationdetail/page1/DCSF-RR218)


**Housing Local Authority data**: live data on housing by local authorities held by the Department for Communities and Local Government [http://www.communities.gov.uk/housing/housingresearch/housingstatistics/housingstatisticsby/locallevelstatistics/](http://www.communities.gov.uk/housing/housingresearch/housingstatistics/housingstatisticsby/locallevelstatistics/)

**Childcare Sufficiency Assessments and Other related plans**: (Children and Young People, Economy etc.) held by each Local Authority


**School Census (DFE)**: The School Census (SC) collects key data on around 8 million pupils and around 25,000 schools, and pupil level data have been collected since 2002. [http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/schoolcensus.shtml](http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/schoolcensus.shtml)

**Office for National Statistics (ONS)**: is the UK’s largest independent producer of official statistics and the recognised national statistical institute of the UK. [http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/index.html](http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/index.html)

**Land registry**: Land Registry is a government department created to register the ownership of land and property in England and Wales [http://www.landregistry.gov.uk/home](http://www.landregistry.gov.uk/home)
Many local authorities had used innovative approaches within their strategies to presenting data. We highlight a few positive examples here.

**Delivery Frameworks**

The table below is a snapshot of the type of Action Plan framework some Local Authorities included.

These were effective clear mechanisms for joining the findings of the needs assessment and explanation of a strategy together. They also help the Local Authority establish accountability and enable monitoring of the Child Poverty Agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Children Living in poverty – 2010 mid year estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfont</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentford</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick Homefields</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick Riverside</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltham North</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltham West</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanworth</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanworth Park</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heston Central</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heston East</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heston West</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Central</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Heath</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow South</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow West</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleworth</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osterley and Spring Grove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syon</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnham Green</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hounslow</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hounslow created this table of income related poverty at ward level.
### Funding allocations

As an initial statement, the following funds are allocated to services for 2010/11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Spending Blocks, 2010/11 Estimates in £'000</th>
<th>Gross Expenditure</th>
<th>Grants and Income</th>
<th>Delegated Service</th>
<th>Net Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Management</td>
<td>£15,943</td>
<td>-£9,045</td>
<td>£113,618</td>
<td>£120,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement</td>
<td>£14,885</td>
<td>-£11,544</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent, Pupil and Student Services</td>
<td>£22,695</td>
<td>-£2,704</td>
<td></td>
<td>£19,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Engagement</td>
<td>£3,463</td>
<td>-£2,311</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Services and Early Years</td>
<td>£10,057</td>
<td>-£7,398</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Schools Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td>-£132,311</td>
<td></td>
<td>-£132,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Total</strong></td>
<td>£67,043</td>
<td>-£165,313</td>
<td>£113,618</td>
<td>£15,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included in the above is Special Educational Needs (£'000)</td>
<td>£40,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Families</td>
<td>£22,309</td>
<td>-£4,977</td>
<td></td>
<td>£17,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sutton’s Clear Outline of Funding Allocations

### Hackney Housing Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overcrowded</th>
<th>(neither)</th>
<th>Under-occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single pensioner</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ pensioners</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single non-pensioner</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple adult</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple, no children</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent family</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ adults, 1 child</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ adults, 2+ children</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hackney Housing Assessment, providing useful data on overcrowding.
Figure 6.2 Child Poverty Pyramid

Factors that directly influence families’ resources and incomes today:
- Financial Support (e.g., benefits & child maintenance)
- Parental employment & earnings
- Costs (e.g., housing, utilities)

Factors that directly influence families’ abilities to enter and sustain well paid employment in the short and longer term:
- Education
- Adult skills
- Childcare
- Transport
- Job availability

Factors that indirectly influence families’ abilities to enter and sustain well paid employment and escape poverty now and in the future:
- Children’s outcomes
- Financial inclusion
- Access to services and facilities
- Health
- teenage pregnancy
- Relationship breakdown
- Crime, drug & alcohol use

Source: Child Poverty Unit

Redbridge included this child poverty pyramid

Gross expenditure by service area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Amount (£ million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>98.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools service</td>
<td>45.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and young people</td>
<td>49.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>194.51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Westminster used pie charts to show resource allocation.

Bexley divided the LA into clusters.
1.3 The Reality of Poverty

"I do without my dinner quite a lot, in fact I would say about 4 days a week, I pretend that I have had my dinner, I would rather give the kids their dinner." Extract Benedicto

"'I'm sometimes sad, like other people get stuff and I wish I had that. Sometimes I feel like I am acting selfishly, I should be happy with what I've got.' Walker et al 2008

'I get sick often, I get a lot of flu... I get sick so much, then I miss my school work, but I don't stay at home that much. Maybe I catch it from other people or maybe I get it from this home... [The Landlord] never repairs anything... Everything breaks.' Rice, 2006

"'I have a box under the bed, I fill it up with extra food for them when I can afford it. But I don't tell the children about it.' Gill & Sharma 2004

"'I am a single mum of two living on benefits. My daughter starts secondary school in September and I am panicking about the cost of the uniform as it is so expensive. I just know I won't be able to manage. Not only will I have to buy uniform for her there is also my son to consider. He will need a new uniform too. I just don't know how I will cope.' CAB services, 2008b

"'If you don't have the same clothes as other people they say that you've got rags... they will tosso you until you have the right clothes... when you don't have any clothes and you don't have any shoes people bully and people laugh at you when you go somewhere.' Extract DWP Research Report 594

"'It's freezing in the winter, you have to wear hats and scarves... Even though you wear too much clothes you still feel cold. It's bad when you sleep.' Rice, 2006

"'I've always been broke. I only get money at birthdays and Christmas, maybe Easter. Nothing else. I feel really poor. I just think why did my dad left [sic] ' Walker et al 2008

Tower Hamlets page with quotes on what it is like to live in poverty.
Child Poverty Action Group is the leading national charity working to end poverty among children, young people and families in the UK.

Our vision is of a society free of child poverty where all children can enjoy their childhoods and have fair chances in life to reach their full potential.

www.cpag.org.uk

4in10 is a network of organisations and individuals in London who want to tackle the issue of child poverty in the capital. We build capacity of the VCS and statutory sector and support to organisations to campaign on child poverty issues in London.

www.4in10.org.uk