

## Framework for feedback on Local Child Poverty Action Reports

This framework has been developed by the National Partners, in conjunction with Local Child Poverty Leads (LCPLs). Its purpose is to provide a basis for feedback on Local Child Poverty Action Reports (LCPARs) and draws directly from the Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017 and the Local Child Poverty Action Report Guidance (2018). It is intended as a tool to help identify examples of good practice as well as areas for improvement that local areas may wish to consider.

It was updated in July 2021 to reflect the importance of action on child poverty being informed by the impact of COVID 19.

	Unclear	Quite clear	Extremely clear	Identified areas for improvement
<b>Evidence of step change</b>				
<b>1. The LCPAR identifies action that might constitute a <u>step change</u> in action to tackle child poverty locally.</b>	<p>No evidence to suggest actions described in LCPAR will have an impact on child poverty over and above pre-existing activity/business as usual.</p> <p>No re-direction or investment of resources to tackle child poverty described.</p>	<p>Actions described in LCPAR have potential to bring about significant improvements in action to tackle child poverty but may not be of the scale required to have a significant, long-term impact on key drivers of child poverty.</p> <p>LCPAR describes some commitment to investment/redirection of resources.</p>	<p>Ongoing work, improvements and new initiatives described in the LCPAR are of a scale and quality likely to have a significant, long-term and sustainable impact on key drivers of child poverty.</p> <p>LCPAR describes clear commitment to invest/redirect resources to tackle child poverty.</p>	
<b>2. The LCPAR identifies ways of working that might facilitate a <u>step change</u> in action to tackle child poverty</b>	<p>Minimal evidence of action to raise awareness and understanding of the need to tackle child poverty amongst staff, elected members etc.</p> <p>Minimal evidence of strong leadership in relation to child poverty,</p>	<p>Describes actions and/or mechanisms to raise awareness of the need to tackle child poverty but amongst a limited number of staff, elected members etc.</p> <p>Some evidence of strong leadership and a</p>	<p>Describes action and/or mechanisms to ensure staff at all levels (incl frontline staff, senior management and elected members) are aware of the need to prioritise action to reduce child poverty.</p>	

	Minimal evidence those in a position to influence change at strategic level have been involved in LCPAR development and/or implementation.	commitment to step change to tackle child poverty amongst senior officers and elected members.  Those involved in the development and/or implementation are working to influence change and commitment at strategic level.	Strong leadership and commitment to step change amongst senior officers across the local authority, health board and key partner organisations.  Those developing / implementing LCPAR are in a position to influence or bring about strategic commitment and change.	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

### Evidence of effective collaboration

<b>3. The LCPAR has been jointly prepared by the local authority and territorial health board</b>	Evidence LCPAR approved by both partners.  All or vast majority of actions are led by one partner only.  No evidence of joint production of the report.	Evidence LCPAR approved by both partners.  Evidence that the LCPAR was developed jointly to some extent.  Actions and responsibilities clearly attributed to both partners.	Evidence LCPAR approved by both partners.  Strong evidence of meaningful coproduction (such as actions developed or delivered in partnership, mechanisms in place to allow for shared planning and learning).  Actions clearly and proportionately attributed to both partners.	
<b>4. There is evidence of a collaborative approach (internally and with local partners).</b>	Minimal evidence of engagement with agencies beyond	Some evidence of engagement of wider community planning partners in development of	Evidence that actions described in the LCPAR have been developed with the involvement and	

	<p>territorial health board and local authority.</p> <p>Lack of evidence of meaningful internal engagement across departments.</p>	<p>the plan.</p> <p>Some evidence that local authorities and NHS Boards have engaged internally on a strategic basis across key areas (such as economic development, advice services and housing)</p>	<p>commitment of community planning partners beyond the local authority and health board (including third sector partners)</p> <p>Strong internal involvement and commitment across wide range of key policy areas.</p>	
<p><b>5. There is a wider collaborative approach (involvement of communities with lived experience of poverty)</b></p>	<p>No or minimal evidence of engagement with those with lived experience of poverty.</p> <p>No articulation of how engagement has influenced local action to tackle child poverty.</p> <p>No or minimal engagement with third sector organisations working with or representing families at risk of poverty.</p>	<p>Evidence of some engagement with communities.</p> <p>Minimal suggestion that engagement has influenced local action to tackle child poverty and/or whether engagement will be ongoing.</p> <p>Evidence of some engagement with third sector organisation.</p>	<p>The LCPAR draws on mechanisms for input and feedback from families experiencing poverty locally, including those in priority groups and with protected characteristics.</p> <p>There is evidence of a commitment to ongoing engagement to inform the content of future plans.</p> <p>It is clear that the views and experiences gathered through engagement have a direct impact on strategic policy and planning decisions.</p>	
<p><b>6. Consideration given to wider policy context</b></p>	<p>Minimal reference to relevant local and national commitments such as Children and Young People (Scotland) Act, Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act, the Fairer Scotland</p>	<p>Relevant legislation has been referenced and some links drawn, but practical implications may not be explicit.</p>	<p>Demonstrates clear understanding of how relevant legislation (and the local strategy it informs) can contribute to development and delivery of actions to tackle child</p>	

	<p>duty and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child</p>		<p>poverty locally (and vice versa).</p> <p>LCPAR clearly builds on and adds value to commitments already made in Children's Services Plan, Local Outcome Improvement Plan, Locality Plans, etc.</p>	
<p><b>7. Recovery and Renewal from COVID-19</b></p>	<p>Minimal or no mention of the medium or long term impact of COVID-19 on low income families with children</p> <p>Reference to COVID-19 largely relate to short term, crisis level interventions</p> <p>No reference to recovery and renewal plans</p>	<p>Some reference to the short, medium and long term impact of COVID-19 on low income households with children.</p> <p>Reference to local plans and strategies relating to recovery and renewal from COVID-19 - but the extent to which they will seek to address the impact on families with children is unclear.</p>	<p>Clear consideration of the short, medium and long term economic impact of COVID-19 locally, with particular reference to low income families with children, including priority groups.</p> <p>Clear strategy to ensure strategic plans for recovery and renewal address the particular impact on low income families with children, including priority groups.</p>	

**Evidence of robust needs assessment**

<p>8. The LCP draws upon a clear understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the needs of families experiencing poverty, including both an understanding of the levels and distribution of child poverty and it's key drivers,</li> </ul>	<p>Some mapping of distribution of child poverty in the local authority area.</p> <p>Limited use of existing data.</p> <p>No or limited consideration of high risk geographic areas / priority groups / protected characteristics.</p>	<p>The report is informed by an evidence based understanding of the needs and circumstances of families experiencing poverty.</p> <p>The implications of future projections have been taken into account.</p> <p>There is evidence that the LCPAR is proportionately informed by a range of data sources and evidence.</p> <p>Minimal consideration of priority groups/protected characteristics/high risk geographies.</p>	<p>The report and actions are informed by a clear and in-depth understanding of child poverty, including future projections/trends and drawing on a range of evidence.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the needs of families experiencing poverty, with consideration of geographical communities, priority group and those with protected characteristics.</p>	
<p>9. The LCPAR draws upon a clear understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the reach and impact of current services and policies and how far these go toward i) reducing/preventing child poverty and ii) meeting the needs of families experiencing poverty</li> </ul>	<p>Some description of existing services and their impact on child poverty, but minimal consideration of extent to which they are accessible to and accessed by families at risk of poverty (particularly priority groups and those with protected characteristics)</p>	<p>Some evidence that reach/impact of existing services have been considered.</p> <p>Some consideration given to potential obstacles for priority groups/those with protected characteristics</p> <p>Minimal use of information from services or community engagement to inform considerations.</p>	<p>The report builds on an understanding of the reach and impact of relevant services. This includes amongst priority groups/ those with protected characteristics.</p> <p>Evidence that community engagement and engagement with frontline services has been used to understand obstacles to existing services.</p>	

## Evidence of mapping existing activities and identifying improvements / new activities

<p><b>10. The report covers activity undertaken in the reporting period well as proposed future action.</b></p>	<p>Lack of clarity as to timeframe of listed activities and whether they are ongoing or planned.</p>	<p>Distinction between ongoing and planned work.</p> <p>Lack of clarity as to precise planned timeframes.</p>	<p>Clear distinction drawn between ongoing work, work initiated in the relevant period and work that will be taken forward in the future. Clear timeframe against each activity.</p>	
<p><b>10. There is evidence that partners are thinking creatively and acting at strategic level to utilise a wide range of policy levers to tackle child poverty</b></p>	<p>The LCPAR describes actions restricted to a narrow range of traditional policy levers (e.g. children’s services and advice).</p> <p>It delivers on the statutory requirements in relation to specified policy areas, e.g. describes any income maximisation measures taken in the area of the local authority to provide pregnant women and families with children with—</p> <p>(a) information, advice and assistance about eligibility for financial support, and</p> <p>(b) assistance to apply for financial support.</p>	<p>The LCPAR describes actions which utilise a wider range of policy levers available locally to address child poverty.</p> <p>Suggests that significant relevant policy levers are not yet contributing to actions to tackle child poverty locally.</p>	<p>The LCPAR demonstrates that all or almost all major policy levers available locally have been considered in relation to child poverty.</p> <p>Key actions, clearly linked to the key drivers of child poverty have been identified in relation to a wide range of policy levers.</p> <p>There is evidence of a widespread, corporate commitment to addressing child poverty</p>	

<p><b>11. There is evidence that a clear distinction has been drawn between actions which</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. reduce poverty between now and 2030</li> <li>b. not reduce poverty before 2030 but has a potentially longer term preventative outcome</li> <li>c. not reduce poverty before 2030 but will improve wellbeing of families experiencing poverty now.</li> </ul>	<p>No distinction drawn between activities which alleviate, prevent or mitigate child poverty.</p> <p>Lack of prioritisation of activities influencing key drivers of poverty by 2030.</p>	<p>A distinction is drawn between categories of action though may be unclear in places.</p> <p>Evidence of some prioritisation of activities which will alleviate poverty before 2030.</p>	<p>Clear distinction is drawn between categories of action.</p> <p>There is particular focus and prioritisation of actions and approaches that will contribute towards the targets by influencing one or more of the key drivers of child poverty.</p> <p>The rationale for inclusion of each activity and the intended reach of these activities is clear.</p>	
<p><b>12. The particular impact of each activity on those with protected characteristics (statutory) and priority groups has been well-considered and clearly articulated (where relevant).</b></p>	<p>There is mention of protected and priority groups though minimal consideration of impact or how it might be measured.</p>	<p>Impact on priority and protected groups has been considered, although more detail would be helpful.</p> <p>Some evidence that steps have been taken to demonstrate impact.</p>	<p>Available evidence has been used to demonstrate the impact of each activity on the drivers of poverty (with particular consideration of priority and protected groups).</p> <p>In absence of robust evidence, there is a clear rationale for inclusion of each action and consideration of how evidence might be collected in future.</p>	
<p><b>13. The plan clearly indicates how existing activities will be improved, extended or modified to maximise impact on the key drivers of child poverty, particularly amongst priority</b></p>	<p>No or few commitments to modify existing activity or introduce new activities.</p>	<p>The plan either (i) clearly indicates how existing activities will be improved, extended or modified to maximise impact on the key drivers of child poverty,</p>	<p>As well as a commitment to extend or modify effective ongoing activities (or to continue with existing activities that are operating with</p>	

groups.		<p>particularly amongst priority groups, or (ii) explains why existing activity is operating with optimum impact</p> <p>Some consideration has been given to which activities might be deprioritised to allow for focus on actions impacting the key drivers amongst priority groups.</p>	<p>optimum impact), the plan clearly indicates that new or enhanced activities will be initiated in the coming year to maximise impact on the key drivers of child poverty, with consideration given to the priority groups.</p> <p>Clear consideration has been given to which activities might be deprioritised to allow for focus on actions impacting the key drivers amongst priority groups.</p>	
---------	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

**Evidence of proportionate, useful monitoring and evaluation**

<p><b>15. Where relevant and proportionate – the LCPAR identifies baseline data and meaningful short- and intermediate-term outcomes to measure impact in relation to the key drivers.</b></p>	<p>Some reference may be made to long term outcomes.</p> <p>Minimal consideration of relevant baseline and/or indicators of how progress will be assessed.</p>	<p>Short and medium term outcomes have been identified and are appropriate.</p> <p>Indicators identified are broadly relevant but could be clarified or better aligned with outcomes.</p> <p>Minimal consideration of disaggregation in relation to priority groups/protected characteristics.</p>	<p>Where relevant and proportionate, appropriate long, medium and short term outcomes have been identified.</p> <p>Relevant indicators are identified for monitoring impact on these outcomes, with a particular focus on the impact on priority groups/protected characteristics.</p>	
<p><b>16. The LCPAR indicates that proportionate mechanisms have been developed to evaluate new policies and/or monitor the impact of existing policies– with consideration of the</b></p>	<p>Minimal reference to how the impact of new or ongoing interventions will be measured / progress reported and assessed.</p>	<p>Commitment to monitor or evaluate some interventions.</p> <p>Minimal consideration of feasibility of differentiating</p>	<p>Consideration has been given to monitoring /evaluating all interventions and measures put in place</p>	



<p><b>impact on priority groups.</b></p>	<p>No system in place for reporting on or scrutinising progress under the LCPAR.</p>	<p>impact on priority/protected groups.</p> <p>Some consideration has been given to the need for reporting and scrutiny.</p>	<p>where feasible and proportionate.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to how impact on priority/protected groups will be understood and tracked.</p> <p>An overall system is in place for reporting and considering progress – and agreeing corrective action, where required. This may include elected members scrutiny and proportionate arrangements for public reporting.</p>	
------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

**General**

<p><b>17. The LCPAR is clear and accessible.</b></p>	<p>LCPAR may be poorly structured and difficult to read.</p> <p>Language used and figures presented may make LCPAR inaccessible to those without understanding of internal structures and relevant expertise.</p>	<p>LCPAR is clearly presented.</p> <p>Language used and way information is presented may make parts of the report challenging to read and understand for some staff and/or members of the public.</p>	<p>LCPAR reads well and gives a clear understanding of current and planned action to address child poverty.</p> <p>Clear information on local action to tackle child poverty is accessible to members of the public.</p>	
------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Local Child Poverty Action Reports might also describe local actions that relate directly to the commitments made in the Scottish Government’s Child Poverty Delivery Plan 2018-22 (Every Child, Every Chance). Examples might include local implementation of the

- minimum School Clothing Grant,
- introduction of devolved benefits including the Best Start Grant, Best Start Food, Scottish Child Payment and Scottish Disabled Child Payment and
- roll-out of the Financial Health Check for Families (MoneyTalk Service)
- the Parental Employability Support Fund and Disabled Parental Employability Support Fund
- Provision and uptake of funded 1140 hours of Early Learning and Childcare (including uptake amongst eligible two year olds)

DRAFT