

SPICe

The Information Centre
An t-Ionad Fiosrachaidh

Post-legislative scrutiny: Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017

Introduction

The Committee is undertaking post-legislative scrutiny of the Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017.

The Committee will hear from:

- Evan Beswick, Chief Officer, Argyll and Bute Health and Social Care Partnership
- Charlotte Cuddihy, Public Health consultant, West Lothian Partnership and Place team and child and maternal public health lead, NHS Lothian
- Peter Kelly, Chief Executive, Poverty Alliance
- Martin Booth, Executive Director, Glasgow City Council
- Sally Buchanan, Library Services and Fairer Falkirk Manager, Falkirk Council

This paper provides background and suggested themes for discussion.

Background

Ahead of the publication of statistics in March 2025 that will show whether the interim targets have been met, the Committee is looking back at the impact of having a statutory framework for reducing child poverty. The Committee has previously looked at two key areas of the current policy approach – the impact of the Scottish Child Payment and efforts to increase earnings from employment. This post-legislative scrutiny exercise adds to that work by considering the impact of having a legislative framework underpinning these policies.

This first session focuses on local approaches.

Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017

The Act set targets for four measures of poverty to be met by 2030-31. Amendments at stage 2 of the Bill added interim targets to be met by 2023-24.

The Act requires Scottish Ministers to consult on and then prepare three delivery plans, which must be laid in parliament. The first covered financial years 2018-19 to 2020-21, the second covers 2021-22 to 2025-6 and the third covers 2026-27 to 2030-31.

The Scottish Government must publish annual progress reports as soon as practicable after the end of the reporting year. They must describe the measures taken and the effect they have had on the targets. If any of the targets have not been met, the reports issued in the interim and in the final target years must explain why not.

Local authorities and health boards must report annually on measures taken towards meeting the targets.

Local Child Poverty Action Reports (LCPAR)

The reports must describe measures taken and proposed to be taken towards meeting the targets. In particular, they must cover:

- Income maximisation for pregnant women and families with children
- Measures for children where a member of the household has protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010.

The [Scottish Government published guidance](#) in 2022 on producing local reports. This described their purpose as being to:

- provide evidence of local progress on child poverty
- identify and share good practice
- identify potential areas for development/improvement
- inform development of future work/priorities at local and national level
- promote partnership working and awareness of child poverty strategy at local level.

LCPARs are [published on the Improvement Service's website](#). Almost all (30) local authorities have published their year 5 (2022-23) reports. At time of writing (12 November), 9 local authorities' 'year 6' (2023-24) reports were available on the Improvement Service website, including Argyll and Bute and Falkirk Councils.

Progress towards the targets

Data is published every March. In March 2025, data will be published for the interim target year of 2023-24. The table below shows the targets alongside data for 2022-23 with its margin of error.

Measure	2022-23 (margin of error)	Interim target 2023-24	Final target 2030
Relative poverty	26% (15% to 37%)	18%	10%
Absolute poverty	23% (12% to 34%)	14%	5%

Measure	2022-23 (margin of error)	Interim target 2023-24	Final target 2030
Low income and material deprivation	12% (1% to 22%)	12%	5%
Persistent poverty	14%	8%	5%

Definitions and sources:

Relative: equivalised incomes below 60% UK median in the current year.

Absolute: equivalised incomes below 60% UK median in 2010-11 adjusted for inflation.

Low income and material deprivation: equivalised income below 70% UK median and going without certain basic goods and services.

Persistent: relative poverty in at least three of the last four years.

Equivalisation adjusts household income to take account of family size and children's ages.

Persistent poverty is based on the Understanding Society Survey, the other measures are based on the Family Resources Survey.

Scottish Government [Child Poverty Update, March 2024](#).

Although the Act refers to single year poverty data, the Office for National Statistics recommends using a three-year rolling average at Scotland level. This survey-based data is not available at local authority level because of sample sizes.

[Local authority level statistics](#) are available from the UK Government, based on administrative statistics and presented on a 'before housing costs' basis.

[Loughborough University](#) adjust them to estimate 'after housing costs' figures. They note that:

"We further recommend that users of these Local Child Poverty Statistics focus on longer-term trends to understand how poverty has changed in an area rather than year-on-year changes which are prone to fluctuations. And avoid comparisons between nations and regions."

Both these sources of local statistics present a 'rolling average' rather than single year figures.

Therefore, at a local authority level (and to some extent at a Scotland level) these statistics are very useful for tracking long term trends, but not so useful for identifying annual changes.

Call for Views

A [summary of the written submissions to the Call for Views](#) is available on the inquiry page. A key theme on the local impact of the Act was that the statutory framework has made a positive difference, incentivising local collaboration and ensuring a focus on child poverty at senior levels.

Implementation was however considered uneven and there was some concern about reporting burdens as well as whether the focus should be poverty in general rather than particularly child poverty. Budget constraints were also often referred to particularly by local authorities.

Submissions from witnesses

Poverty Alliance

As members of the 'National Partners Group', the Poverty Alliance support local areas in their child poverty work. They describe how in many areas there is an increased focus on prevention and child poverty has become a strategic priority which is embedded across local strategies. However, there are 'varying levels of engagement', constrained resources and no enforcement. Financial constraints affect the type of action taken:

"With that lack of resource and capacity, local authorities fall back on tried and tested measures such as short-term income maximisation, rather than innovation."

Argyll and Bute

[Argyll and Bute Child Poverty Group](#) is a multi-agency group chaired by the Chief Officer of the Health and Social Care Partnership. The group is responsible for developing and publishing the local child poverty action report.

Prior to the Act, there was no specific group or lead on child poverty and joint working was limited. The support co-ordinated through the Improvement Service has been very helpful – particularly the working group for rural areas.

However, annual local reporting 'does take a considerable amount of time'. The submission asks whether a questionnaire or survey would suffice.

Additional funding, such as the [Child Poverty Practice Accelerator Fund](#) was welcomed but "progress has been limited". There is concern that a focus on child poverty diverts resources away from core services and that recruitment and retention, particularly in rural areas "is currently having a significant impact on child poverty work."

In addition, there is a concern that "major events, both global and national threaten the feasibility of the targets." Given the difficulty of reaching the targets, the submission suggests that:

"it may be that now would be a good time, with interim targets coming up, to reassess how we go forward."

NHS Lothian

The [submission from NHS Lothian](#) is a summary of views co-ordinated by the public health maternal and child health lead. The general view was that the statutory framework:

"supported strategic, system wide collaborative work between local authorities, NHS boards and non-statutory partners."

However, funding is short-term and not co-ordinated and "therefore difficult to mobilise into effective action." In addition, the lack of control over some factors that

influence child poverty “potentially undermines motivation and commitment to local action.”

Falkirk

The submission from Falkirk considers that addressing the complexity of child poverty “may be beyond the mechanism of statutory targets.” It notes that child poverty is caused by deep rooted structural factors and external factors can undermine progress, causing hopelessness. It would be better to focus on outcomes, for example ‘all children live in a warm, comfortable home.’

The submission points to a ‘lack of joined up thinking’, citing the impact of the council tax freeze on local authority funds and that poverty is best tackled ‘holistically across all groups’ rather than focusing on child poverty.

Falkirk also highlighted the lack of local data and difficulties of data-sharing.

There was no submission from **Glasgow City Council**.

Local Child Poverty Action Reports from witnesses

[Links to Local Child Poverty Action Reports](#) are collated on the Improvement Service website. The following highlights some examples from reports from today’s witnesses.

Argyll and Bute Council

In Argyll and Bute, 21.7% of children are in poverty. Their year 6 report, the [2023-24 Action Plan review](#), describes a wide range of actions, much of it broader than child poverty. Some examples include:

- Consultation with children on what matters to them
- Participation in the Poverty Alliance 3 year project ‘Taking Action on Rural Poverty’
- Combining datasets to gain insight on unmet financial need in households.
- Their Parental Transitions Fund provides financial assistance in the first three months of employment.
- Family Liaison and Health and Wellbeing Officers ‘are making a real difference to our most vulnerable pupils and their families through a wide range of support.’
- Housing - in July 2023 the council declared a housing emergency. In March 2024 there were 85 children in families on the homeless list.
- Fuel poverty. Allenergy (Argyll, Lomond and the Islands Energy Agency) provides energy efficiency and warmth advice. In 2023-24, a third of the households seeking help with energy had children in the home.

Falkirk

One in four children in [Falkirk](#) live in poverty. [Building a Fairer Falkirk 2024-29](#) is the overarching anti-poverty strategy, which forms the Community Planning Partnership’s child poverty plan. That plan focuses on income maximisation,

employment and transport. Work on child poverty will be reported on under that plan in future. The 2023-24 progress report highlighted two projects as case studies:

- The Household Support Fund includes a focus on infant health.
- Braes High School Maximising Income for Families project – maximising income and reducing the cost of the school day.

Glasgow

[Glasgow's 2023-24 report](#) highlights the work of the poverty pathfinder. This includes development of a collaborative No Wrong Door infrastructure, research on the cost of child poverty, identifying particular wards on which to focus action and the creation of a £22 million change fund “that reflects the need to underpin shared policy intent with improved funding flexibility.” The city uses Council Tax and Housing Benefit records to understand more about families in receipt of these benefits and detail the [level of local child poverty](#). The report, from the Centre for Civic Innovation, “is intended to support service providers [...] to help design better policies and services so we can meet the Scottish Government’s national targets.” A [child poverty dashboard](#) shows data at ward level, for priority groups and for different poverty measures.

Lothian

[Edinburgh Council](#) submitted its [2023 'End Poverty in Edinburgh annual progress report](#), rather than a specific report on child poverty.

East Lothian’s [2022-23 report](#) describes how tackling child poverty sits within broader work set out in their poverty plan. The Poverty Working Group within the Community Planning Partnership structure has oversight of child poverty. Actions reported do not always separate out the impact on child poverty.

[Midlothian Council's report for 2022-23](#) notes support from the Improvement Service to do a ‘Child Poverty Self-Assessment’. Key areas for development in 2023-24 included; improving data, consideration of lived experience and various income maximisation initiatives. Their Child Poverty Working Group reports to the ‘Midlothian will work towards reducing poverty’ thematic priority group of the Community Planning Partnership.

[West Lothian's report for 2022-23](#) sets out key areas for 2023-24 including: aligning the child poverty report with their five-year West Lothian Anti-Poverty Strategy, making better use of data, identifying improvements for supporting lone parents, mitigating the impact of Universal Credit, and focusing on skills and training for employment.

The annexe to this paper summarises further examples of local action and governance arrangements from the Committee’s survey of local authorities.

Themes for discussion

Theme 1: Reporting requirements

Submissions from local authorities and health boards described how reporting requirements support local collaboration. On the other hand, some referred to the burden of reporting. For example NHS Lanarkshire commented that:

“Reporting cycles are raised consistently at networking events, with the majority of local authorities and health boards feeling the annual reporting is too labour intensive and doesn’t give enough time to affect change. Two or three year plans with reporting on this timeline feels more appropriate.”

This theme is also raised by Argyll and Bute, whose submission noted that annual local reporting ‘does take a considerable amount of time’ and asked whether a questionnaire or survey would suffice, co-ordinated into a single report by the Improvement Service.

‘Cluttered’ reporting landscape

Another theme in submissions was the number of reports and plans that are required by different statutes. For example, Social Work Scotland and Scottish Association of Social Workers described how:

“Local authorities already have statutory duties in relation to the wellbeing of children and other vulnerable groups many of which bring with them reporting duties. Eg corporate parenting plans, children’s rights plans, reporting in relation to delayed discharge, mental health and wellbeing and educational attainment. The inclusion of reporting on poverty...creates a more complex landscape for leaders and removing vital resource away from front line efforts to tackle poverty.”

Similarly, Aberdeen Council discussed community planning requirements, commenting that:

“Better integration and alignment of various related plans is required to streamline efforts and reduce the reporting burden on local authorities and health boards. Without this alignment, scrutiny of the national targets becomes peripheral to activity and initiatives being driven by local authorities and health boards as part of formal Community Planning Partnerships and in delivery of Local Outcome Improvement Plans.”

Shetland Council described the increasing number of statutory reporting requirements saying that: “In a small authority area, such as Shetland, there is a danger that this can distract from delivery.”

More positively, the Poverty Alliance noted that in many areas, child poverty has become a strategic priority – embedded across local strategies.

Scottish Government guidance suggests that the child poverty reports could be ‘amalgamated with other reporting duties, such as Children’s Services Plans,

Children's Rights reporting and Local Outcome Improvements Plans. The latest report from Argyll and Bute states that it aligns with:

- Children and Young People's services plan
- Outcome Improvement Plan
- Community Justice Plan
- Corporate Parenting Plan
- Employability Partnership Delivery Plan
- Education Strategic Plan
- Local Housing Strategy
- Children's Rights Plan.

Inconsistent implementation and accountability

The Poverty Alliance highlight 'unevenness' in implementation in different local areas, linking this to the lack of enforcement:

"In the absence of negative consequences or enforcement, it becomes unclear the extent to which the statutory framework has impacted approaches to reducing child poverty, particularly in local areas least committed to this agenda."

They recommended further support to "ensure compliance" and additional resource for local authorities "to increase their capacity to fulfil this statutory duty."

This theme was also raised by others. For example, CRER (Coalition for Racial Equality and Rights) said that:

"Local authorities do not report in a consistent manner or with a standardised format. This makes comparison across local authorities difficult. While the Act demands a requirement for local authorities to describe measures taken in relation to priority groups, there is no accountability to ensure that local authorities take any action."

Similarly, Aberdeen Council said:

"There should also be a clear accountability framework in place, outlining the responsibilities of all partners and the consequences of failing to work towards meeting the targets set out in the Child Poverty (S) Act 2017. This will ensure that all parties remain committed to achieving the overarching goal of eradicating child poverty in Scotland."

Members may wish to discuss:

- 1. To what extent have you been able to integrate reporting under this Act with other statutory reporting requirements?**
- 2. To what extent is local action based on tackling poverty in general rather than child poverty in particular?**

3. What should the consequences be of failing to implement the Act at a local level?

Theme 2: Collaboration

Most submissions describe how the reporting duties have increased collaboration between local authorities, health boards and other stakeholders and ensured a focus on child poverty.

NHS Lothian commented that:

“the process of jointly preparing and publishing the report was felt to foster a parity of roles and responsibilities between local authority and NHS colleagues.”

It has:

“supported strategic, system wide collaborative work between local authorities, NHS boards and non-statutory partners.”

Other submissions made similar points. For example, North Ayrshire Council explained that:

“The statutory framework has resulted in closer partnership working between North Ayrshire Council and NHS Ayrshire and Arran. The requirement to articulate plans and report impact has ensured there is a shared understanding of approaches adopted by each organisation. This has informed local activity that will soon commence to progress further alignment of initiatives to maximise support for residents, who would benefit from support from both organisations.”

Argyll and Bute described how, prior to the Act, there was no specific group or lead on child poverty and joint working was limited.

Members may wish to discuss:

4. In what ways has the Act resulted in local collaborations that would not otherwise have happened? What impact has this had on child poverty in your local area?

Theme 3: How the Act has led to different policy choices

At a national level, many submissions referred to the Scottish Child Payment as an example of something that would have been unlikely to have happened without the focus created by the Child Poverty (Scotland) Act.

At a local level, some submissions suggested that much anti-poverty work would have happened anyway. For example, NHS Lanarkshire state:

“Having this Act enshrined in Law is useful for keeping it on more senior leaders’ agenda and prioritising work and partnership working. It is likely however that work around child poverty would be happening anyway, but perhaps not in such a co-ordinated way.”

Similarly the Joseph Rowntree Foundation stated:

“In practice there has been little evidence of a significant shift in priority or budgets to date that have resulted in a reduction of child poverty.”

Members may wish to discuss:

- 5. To what extent has the Act resulted in additional interventions at a local level to tackle child poverty that would not otherwise have happened?**

Theme 4: Recognising local context and scope for impact

The Act sets out national targets. Some submissions described how this can feel quite distant from their local reality. For example, the submission from NHS Lanarkshire stated:

“National targets don’t always feel so applicable to local work, especially given the wide variations across boards and local authority areas, maybe worth considering local targets, or softer targets?”

Shetland Council described how the poverty measures do not take into account the high cost of living in very rural areas. They said:

“It can feel like our circumstances are very different from those of national policy makers, and the more traditional measures of disadvantage.”

Argyll and Bute’s submission took a different view, noting how requiring local reports:

“has also been helpful in identifying that child poverty exists and is a concerning factor in remote, rural and island places and that ways of addressing it via the 3 drivers of poverty model looks very different to those in towns and cities.”

Their submission referred to support from the Improvement Service who led a working group for child poverty leads in rural areas and to financial support provided from:

“an additional £1 million in the current financial year to be delivered through the Islands Cost Crisis Emergency Fund to support islanders facing high fuel, food and energy costs in order to help meet cost of living pressures.”

Factors beyond the control of local partners can also be discouraging. Falkirk Council described how:

“Broad, national targets impacted by a multitude of factors (macroeconomics, pandemic, war, short political cycles) can make progress or regression difficult to measure on a year-to-year basis, and good work may be undermined by external factors, as observed during the COVID-19 pandemic. This can cause a sense of fatigue or hopelessness.”

Members may wish to discuss:

- 6. How relevant are the national targets to your local area? How should the statutory and policy framework take local circumstances into account?**

Theme 5: Data and other evidence

The End Child Poverty Coalition stated that the local reporting duty has 'helped focus minds and resources' but highlighted lack of local data. In their submission, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation noted that:

"It is concerning that Improvement Service comment in their analysis of the year 5 Local Child Poverty Action Reports that: "what the reports do not reflect clearly is whether data, intelligence and wider evidence is routinely being used to inform priorities, policy decision and/or service delivery"."

As set out above, the data on which the statutory targets are based is not available at a local authority level. [Local authority child poverty statistics](#), based on administrative data, are available from the Department of Work and Pensions and Loughborough University. Annual fluctuations in the data mean that a three year rolling average is needed to show robust trends.

The submission from Falkirk Council stated:

"Whilst the national targets ensure focus and scrutiny, the lack of up to date local and ward based data impacts on effective targeting at local level."

Glasgow City Council has developed detailed local poverty statistics. Their 2023-24 report notes that:

"we hold significant amounts of data and we are making good progress on accessing and co-ordinating this to inform services"

Members may wish to discuss:

- 7. Has the Act led to improvements in the availability of local data on child poverty?**
- 8. How have witnesses changed their local policies in response to insights from local data on child poverty?**

Theme 6: Support from national partners

The Scottish Government has published [guidance on completing Local Child Poverty Action Reports](#). Support for local partners is available from the National Partners group, made up of: COSLA, Improvement Service, Poverty Alliance, Child Poverty Action Group, Scottish Government, Scottish Poverty and Inequality Research Unit at Caledonian University and Public Health Scotland.

Other support networks include:

- National Peer Support Network
- Rural Child Poverty Network
- Remote, Rural and Island Child Poverty Network

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation commented that:

“the support that Health Boards and Local Authorities receive tends to revolve more around the production of plans, rather than capacity to more assertively reduce poverty.”

In their submission, the Child Poverty Action Group suggested that:

“more detailed guidance on the expected role of local partners, what should be included in the child poverty action reports and how success can be measured at local level could strengthen the impact of the legislative framework.”

More broadly, a common theme in submissions was lack of resources. This was a particularly strong theme in the submission from COSLA. Falkirk Council pointed to a lack of joined up thinking, giving the example of the council tax freeze:

“it can appear that there is a lack of joined-up thinking when it comes to understanding and analysing the impact of other decisions on those experiencing poverty. For example, the recent Council Tax freeze, on the face of it, helps all households by preventing an increase in their living costs. However, this negatively impacted funding available to councils to provide key frontline services, which are often relied on by those on the lowest incomes and are most vulnerable to the worst impacts of poverty and inequality.

The Poverty Alliance suggested that resource constraints are a barrier to innovation:

“Any strategy is only as good as the budget which sits behind it. This means that constraints on local budgets will significantly restrict the approaches that local authorities can take to reducing child poverty. With that lack of resource and capacity, local authorities fall back on tried and tested measures such as short-term income maximisation, rather than innovation that takes account of local need through local interventions.”

Members may wish to discuss:

- 9. What further support is required from the Scottish Government, Improvement Service and National Partners Group to assist local partners tackle child poverty?**

**Camilla Kidner
SPICe
13 November 2024**

Annexe 1: Submissions from local authorities on local variations

On 11 October 2024, the Committee sent a survey to all local authorities across Scotland. The survey aimed to gather further information on the extent of local variation on child poverty policies and governance structures at a senior level.

The Committee asked local authorities for:

1. An example of a child poverty reduction policy that goes beyond Scottish Government policy or statutory requirements.
2. An example of how a focus on child poverty is reflected in local governance arrangements at a senior level.

Key themes are summarised below. The full submissions are [published on the Committee's web page](#).

Dumfries and Galloway Almost £2 million in 2023-24 supporting 17 projects including topping up statutory provision such as Scottish Welfare Fund, school clothing and holiday food and play provision as well as additional schemes such as taxi-card transport scheme.

Inverclyde has more generous eligibility criteria for school clothing grants and free school meals.

Perth and Kinross Their approach “has not been about developing new/additional policies but rather integrating actions within key strategies to gain traction.”

Fife Additional action in Fife includes ‘holiday hunger’ programme, a higher income threshold for School Clothing Grants, school meal debt write-off since 2021 and various cost of living crisis measures.

North Ayrshire Examples include money/welfare/energy advice, employability support, wiping out school meal debt and a healthy mid-morning snack for all primary pupils.

Stirling Examples include writing off all school meal debt in 2022/23 and paying above the statutory minimum for School Clothing Grants.

Renfrewshire Examples include offering money and benefits advice to everyone applying for free school meals/school clothing grants and offering an additional £50 for winter clothing for each child entitlement to a school clothing grant.

East Renfrewshire Examples include; 14 properties for care experienced young people, dedicated Parental Employability Advisor (using Scottish Government funding), sign-posting people to money advice and developing a cost of living dashboard, using banking data to pinpoint areas where households struggle.

South Lanarkshire Examples include: four Family Support Hubs provide “early social work response to pregnant women, children and young people up to 18”, (funded by Scottish Government), a pathfinders project for children on the edge of care, neighbourhood planning involving the local community and focused on deprived areas.

Governance arrangements

Dumfries and Galloway The Executive Director of Education, Skills and Communities is the organisational lead for child poverty. Tackling child poverty is a key outcome in the Children’s Services Plan and Local Outcome Improvement Plan. The Poverty and Inequalities Partnership has a sub-group on child poverty and reports to the Community Planning Partnership.

Inverclyde Their Child Poverty Action Group is chaired by the Director of Education and Communities. The Partnership Plan for Inverclyde Alliance aligns the health board’s annual delivery plan with the children’s services plan.

Perth and Kinross The strategic lead on poverty chairs the ‘themed board’ on poverty and reports to the Chief Executive.

Fife Their Tackling Poverty and Preventing Crisis Board includes representatives from the Child Poverty Group, leads strategic planning on poverty and reports to the Fife Partnership Board. It also works with Children in Fife – the governance group for children’s services.

North Ayrshire Their Child Poverty and Cost of Living Board is chaired by the leader of the council, and includes senior officials, third sector representatives and NHS board. They are planning to mainstream poverty related issues as a workstream of the Community Planning Partnership.

Stirling Child poverty is integrated into different committees and is a key theme of the Community Planning Partnership. The child poverty action report goes to their Community Wellbeing and Housing Committee.

Renfrewshire Child Poverty work is taken forward under the Fairer Renfrewshire programme. The local child poverty action report is considered at the council’s Leadership Board.

East Renfrewshire The Community Planning Partnership is responsible for the Local Child Poverty Action Report. This is supported by a Child Poverty Oversight Group chaired by Director of Business Operations and Partnerships and the HSCP’s Chief Officer.

South Lanarkshire Governance of the child poverty action report is aligned with the Children’s Services Partnership.

Annexe 2: Practice Examples

The [Tackling Poverty Locally Directory](#) is managed by the Scottish Poverty and Inequality Research Unit at Glasgow Caledonian University provides a searchable database of local anti-poverty initiatives from communities across Scotland and beyond. Content is peer-reviewed. It has 60 projects listed of which ten are ‘fully validated’ and based in Scotland. These are listed below. They range from large scale, high-cost projects with a long track record – such as Glasgow’s ‘Healthier, wealthier children’ to low cost ‘awareness raising’ project on the cost of the school day in Edinburgh.

Project	cost	reach	description
Private rented sector hub, Glasgow	Not available	1400 families from 2019 to June 2023	support families affected by the benefit cap to sustain tenancies or move into sustainable housing option
High Cost			
Healthier, Wealthier Children, Glasgow	initially £1 million in 2010 for 15 months	Over 54,000 referrals 2010 to 2024. £30m financial gain for families over ten years.	Income maximisation and advice for pregnant women and families with young children in or at risk of poverty.
Start Project Renfrewshire	£200k	n/a	includes Men's Shed, befriending, community pantry, mental health support
PEEK project, Glasgow	£1.3 to £1.4million p.a	5,800 children and young people	includes: free meals, young peoples' training, art programme, holiday and after school programmes
Trusted Partner Model, Midlothian	£569k current budget	2,355 instances of support by end August 2023	dignified financial aid' for food and fuel
Maximise Angus	£200k over two years	generated £702k for 314 clients	income maximisation in school setting
Tayside Family Financial Wellbeing Project	£150k	90 family members	help with problematic debt
Medium Cost			
Fun and food, Dundee	£237k 2018-20	37,000 meals delivered summer 2022.	packed lunches in school holidays
Low Cost			
Dundee living wage	low	no specific info	increasing the number of living wage employers
1 in 5 (Edinburgh)	£10k in 2016, and no dedicated funding since	local authority wide	increasing awareness about how to reduce the cost of the school day.