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1: About this report

1.1 *Turning Points* is an economic impact assessment that demonstrates the rationale for Buttle UK’s *Chances for Children* appeal, which aims to raise £20 million over the next five years to fund an increase in the number and size of Buttle UK’s grants. The study assesses the impact this increased grant giving programme will have on three of society’s most vulnerable groups.

- **Struggling families.** These are families living on low incomes and experiencing a range of other challenging circumstances. They may have faced a period of recent homelessness; some members may have physical or mental health issues or there may be drug or alcohol problems in the family. The children may be struggling at school. Many lack a strong social support network to help them through these issues. These are issues that many families face at one time or another but the lack of an adequate income makes them much more difficult to cope with.

- **Families escaping domestic abuse.** These families will have many of the same characteristics as the above but specifically the overriding issue they are facing is domestic abuse. In particular they are at a point in their journey to recovery from an abusive relationship where they are moving into their first independent accommodation, or have been in it for a short time. In these situations the needs of the children can often be overlooked, and support focused on the parent who has suffered the abuse.

- **Estranged young people.** The years between 16 and 20 years old are ones of particular vulnerability, but for those from disadvantaged backgrounds they present even greater challenges. Those without support of parents/carers are among the most vulnerable of all. This group is sometimes referred to as being ‘estranged’. With increasing financial pressure on families living on the lowest incomes, the circumstances that cause many young peoples’ relationships with their parents to break down are exacerbated. As a result they try to live independently, and are therefore often homeless. Most young people who are estranged have left chaotic, disrupted home lives. Many have suffered abuse. However, by ‘estrangement’ we do not necessarily mean “has no contact with family”. Our understanding of estrangement is those young people who no longer live with their parents/carers and who lack the family-based financial and emotional support that most people rely on in their late teens. This includes young parents.

1.2 We have focused on these groups as they currently receive the biggest proportion of Buttle UK’s current grant programme.

1.3 Buttle UK grants are made through a wide range of referring organisations who are already working with these families and young people. These organisations include children’s services departments, housing associations and other charities. Grant applications are made on behalf of these organisations’ clients. The grants are designed to pay for small capital expenditures which help a family or young person address immediate crisis, and then support them over the longer term to pay for items and other costs that they would otherwise be unable to meet, and which act as a barrier to them creating a change in their circumstances with the other local support available.
1.4 The report takes a medium-to-long term view of potential effects, with the focus being on potential savings in public expenditure brought about by effective timely intervention addressing the problems of families and vulnerable young people who are at a crisis point. Buttle UK funding is designed to support the work of other agencies in delivering better outcomes for these families and young people, and so the analysis takes into account the proportion of benefits or effects that would have occurred even without the grant (calculated as 50% of the expected gross effects). We have used a 15-year timeframe to consider both the immediate and medium term consequences of preventing additional calls on public expenditure, covering each of the following areas:

- Absence and exclusion from compulsory years children’s education
- Child protection and safeguarding
- Children’s physical and mental health and well-being
- Substance misuse by vulnerable children and young people
- Crime and anti-social behaviour on the part of vulnerable children and young people
- Costs associated with homelessness
- Costs associated with economic inactivity and unemployment on the part of young people (aged 18-20 years) and parents/guardians of vulnerable children

1.5 The study has also considered the potential for additional tax revenues, raised when a proportion of grant beneficiaries are able to resume or begin permanent employment due to a stabilisation of their circumstances.

1.6 To produce this report, we have included in our evidence base:

- A review of literature and data including evidence on unit costs for public expenditure needed to support families and young people suffering extreme poverty and very difficult home circumstances;
- A review of evaluation reports and documents produced by and for Buttle UK that have examined the effects of the types of grants envisaged to be made available nationally under an expanded Buttle UK grant giving programme; and
- The results of a survey of families and estranged young people who have previously benefited from the types of grants that it is envisaged would be made under a national programme.

1.7 This is the full version of the Turning Points report. An abridged summary version can be found online at: www.buttleuk.org.

1.8 Buttle UK would like to thank Pears Foundation for their unrestricted grant which made this research possible.
2: Foreword

The number of children living in poverty has risen by 200,000 in the past year, according to the latest government data, with 3.9 million children across the UK now living below the breadline. This is the first increase in levels of child poverty since 2011-12.\(^1\)

Through our work as the largest grant-giving charity in the UK that gives funds directly to children and young people, we know that there are families and children in almost every community living in crisis. For sixty years, Buttle UK has given small, targeted and timely grants to these families and children for basic, essential items that can have a disproportionately positive impact on a child’s outcomes.

Last year, we gave £3.7 million in individual grants to nearly 30,000 children and young people preventing them from falling further into crisis and helping them to transform their lives. Whether Buttle UK gives a bed to a child who has become used to sleeping on the floor, counselling to a young boy who has fled an abusive home with his mother or a laptop to support a homeless teenager begin their first college course, our direct, efficient and intelligent grants are always focused on the needs of the child.

We see every day that by making a targeted intervention at the right time for a family or child, providing a small grant for something that many of us may take for granted, it can set a child’s life on a completely different trajectory. We wanted to explore this concept and what it means on a much bigger scale.

In April, we launched our inaugural Crisis Points report, revealing both the geographic distribution of the most vulnerable children and families in the UK, highlighting regions that may have previously gone unnoticed as areas where children, young people and their families are facing hidden deprivation. In this follow-up report, Turning Points we set out to highlight a potential solution to alleviating the effects of this deprivation and the complex social issues that often go alongside it.

Working with Development Economics, we have conducted an analysis to show how giving timely, intelligent interventions to families and children living in difficult conditions, through grants that carry a relatively small cost, could over the medium-to-long term make a huge impact on vulnerable children’s lives, as well as significant savings to the State.

We have done this as we believe greater attention, support and funding needs to be considered for this model of giving. Buttle UK wants to expand its small grants programme over the next five years, with our Chances for Children appeal aiming to raise just over £20m to lift 13,700 more children, young people and their families out of crisis.

In this report we have shown what this money could achieve for our society in the coming years.

Gerri McAndrew, Chief Executive, Buttle UK

---

3: Executive Summary

3.1 This economic impact assessment has found a benefit-to-cost ratio of approximately 6:1 for investing in targeted, timely intervention grants. This means that for every £1 raised and spent on these grants, over £6 of public expenditure savings and additional public revenues could be achieved.

3.2 Savings are not just confined to public expenditure. The analysis shows that £20.5 million of investment in targeted, timely intervention grants could mean that the three groups studied could be better off by £37 million over the course of 15 years. This breaks down to an aggregate increase in household spending of £21 million for struggling families, £10 million for families escaping domestic violence and £7 million for estranged young people.

3.3 For many families living in very difficult circumstances the cumulative effect of living in highly deprived conditions has a profound effect on everyone in the family, but in particular the children. Families living on benefits or low income simply cannot afford even small capital spends.

3.4 Alleviating that difficulty by astute use of a relatively small amount of money can have benefits far beyond the practical or monetary value of the award. At a level of around £1500, a grant directed in this way has the potential to support the outcomes of other service providers, and move a family beyond a crisis point and towards a turning point in their lives.

3.5 The analysis shows that this single £1,500 grant to a struggling family could make an average public expenditure saving of £8,923 over 15 years. The same grant to a family escaping domestic violence could result in an average saving of £7,650 and for an estranged young person, £6,739.

3.6 Buttle UK has recently launched its Chances for Children appeal, with the aim of raising £20m over the next 5 years. If Buttle UK’s grants programme can to be extended by reaching this target, then this analysis predicts, in gross terms, over £110 million in savings over a 15 year period on education, health, policing and social welfare spending.

3.7 In addition, there is also potential for additional government tax revenues associated with PAYE (pay-as-you-earn tax), National Insurance and indirect taxes on employee expenditure resulting from Buttle UK beneficiaries entering or returning to the workplace. This is estimated to amount to an additional £22 million over the 15 year period.

3.8 Taking both figures together, the overall benefit to the public purse as a result of Buttle UK’s timely intervention grants programme can be expected to amount to up to approximately £133 million over the stated period.

3.9 The biggest public expenditure savings could be made in struggling families, who receive 57% of Buttle’s grants, of £63 million. Families escaping domestic violence make up 23% of grant beneficiaries and savings to the state of £26 million could be made in this area. For estranged young people (20% of total grant recipients) £22 million could be saved.
3.10 The areas of public expenditure that could most benefit from targeted, timely intervention grants include adult economic activity – giving grant beneficiaries the opportunity to gain or return to employment (£29 million in savings); looked after children – preventing children from having to enter the care system (£22 million); preventing homelessness in beneficiaries (£20 million) and children’s mental health treatment (£14 million).
4: Introduction

Scope

4.1 This report appraises the potential impacts of implementing an expanded timely intervention grant support programme targeting vulnerable children, families and young people. This grant programme would be implemented nationally by the charitable organisation Buttle UK.

4.2 The proposed programme of financial support would provide financial grants averaging around £1,500 per award to help families or young people facing difficult circumstances. The purpose of the grants would be to provide resources to enable applicants to fund bespoke pathways out of their current set of difficulties based on the particular set of circumstances and challenges being faced by each applicant.

4.3 Buttle UK have been investigating whether providing grants in the order of £1,500 can have a disproportionately positive impact on the lives of vulnerable children and their families and estranged young people, if it is used to meet urgent needs and in combination with accessing existing services. For many families living in very difficult circumstances the cumulative effect of living in highly deprived conditions has a profound effect on everyone in the family, but in particular the children. Families living on benefits or low income simply cannot afford even small capital spends. Alleviating that difficulty by astute use of a relatively small amount of money can have benefits far beyond the practical or monetary value of the award. At a level of around £1,500, a grant directed in this way has the potential to support the outcomes of other service providers, and move a family beyond a crisis point and towards a turning point in their lives.

4.4 The proposed grant giving programme envisaged by Buttle UK would involve fundraising, via the Chances for Children appeal, and subsequent expenditure on grants of approximately £20.5 million (in 2016 prices) over a 9-year period starting in 2016/17. Although it is envisaged that the grants would be available across the UK, it is likely that grant awards would be concentrated in areas where the need is the greatest. These areas were highlighted in Buttle UK’s Crisis Points report published earlier this year.

4.5 This report identifies and quantifies (in monetary terms) the potential longer term savings in public expenditure that would be expected to occur if vulnerable families and young people estranged from their families are helped through the provision of financial support via a Buttle UK grant.

4.6 The range of public expenditure areas that are ‘in scope’ as far as this appraisal is concerned are as follows:

- Absence and exclusion from compulsory years children’s education
- Child protection and safeguarding
- Children’s physical and mental health and well-being
- Substance misuse by vulnerable children and young people
- Crime and anti-social behaviour on the part of vulnerable children and young people
• Costs associated with homelessness
• Costs associated with economic inactivity and unemployment on the part of young people (18-24) and parents/guardians of vulnerable children

4.7 The approach taken to identifying and quantifying the potential for future public expenditure savings in this appraisal is consistent with the requirements of HM Treasury’s Green Book. All expenditure, costs and benefits that are included utilise a 2016 price base. Future years’ costs and benefits have been converted into present values in the conventional way by using a discount rate of 3.5%.

4.8 The appraisal assumes that expenditure on the programme would start in 2016/17 and expenditure would continue at varying levels until 2024/25. However, the duration of the appraisal extends to 2030/31, reflecting an expectation that a proportion of the potential future public expenditure savings would, in the majority of instances, continue to persist to some degree for a period of up to 6 years after the programme is assumed to conclude.

Background to Turning Points

4.9 The proposed expanded grant giving programme is based on the findings of a series of pilot programmes. The first to be evaluated – called the Connect Project – was trialled in two local authority areas in Scotland (Renfrewshire and East Renfrewshire) between June 2014 and July 2015. This pilot generated a strong set of evidence indicating that provision of grants in the order of £1,500 per applicant would, in many cases, enable families facing very difficult circumstances to move beyond an immediate crisis point and turn a corner in their lives. Before the Connect Project, the main focus of Buttle UK’s activities had been the provision of smaller grants (typically around £300) that were designed to deal with immediate emergencies. Although these small grants created positive results, it is considered that they were seldom sufficient to address more fundamental issues and challenges faced by vulnerable families, children and young people estranged from their families and support networks.

4.10 The focus of the proposed expanded grant giving intervention is to roll out nationally the learning gained through the Renfrewshire/East Renfrewshire pilot project, and ensure that in future the targeted beneficiaries (whether a family with vulnerable children, or an estranged young person) have sufficient resources to avoid serious distress and to invest in pathways out of current difficult circumstances that they face.

4.11 Having tested and confirmed the success of the approach of providing target groups with sufficient financial resources to achieve a ‘turn around’ in their circumstances, Buttle UK is intending to launch a fundraising campaign – the Chances for Children appeal – circa £20.5 million to enable a 9-year programme of grant providing expenditure capable of helping around 13,700 beneficiaries (families and estranged young people) over this timeframe.

4.12 An indicative, year-by-year financial profile has been provided by Buttle UK to enable the modelling of potential impacts over a 9-year timeframe for programme expenditure, and a 15-year appraisal period in total.
4.13 Buttle have also provided information that provides a basis upon which the population of intended beneficiaries can be broken down in terms of three target sub-groups:

- Families that have suffered from domestic violence.
- Families that are facing other very difficult circumstances.
- Young people estranged from their families.

Methodology

Overview

4.14 The approach taken to the appraisal involves a three-step methodology, summarised in brief in the following.

4.15 First, a review was undertaken of relevant literature and data. The review included background documents, research reports, data and other materials developed by or commissioned for Buttle UK. It also included a wider review of literature produced by other organisations and academic institutions in the UK, with a particular emphasis on research focusing on the public expenditure implications of addressing child poverty and challenges faced by disadvantaged young people.

4.16 Second, a bespoke survey of its recent grant beneficiaries was organised by Buttle UK, using a questionnaire designed by Buttle UK but with inputs from Development Economics Ltd. A total of 53 responses were received, with Development Economics taking the lead in analysing the results.

4.17 Third, all this evidence was brought together and used in the development of a spreadsheet-based discounted cash flow model of anticipated programme expenditure and expected downstream implications for public expenditure and tax revenues.\(^2\) Assumptions regarding future public expenditure were developed using best available public information obtained from the document and data review.

Approach to the quantification of effects

4.18 The report focuses on potential public expenditure savings across the following six themes:

- Children’s and youth education
- Child protection and safeguarding
- Physical and mental health and well-being
- Crime and anti-social behaviour

\(^2\) Discounting is a method widely used in economic appraisals where future costs or benefits are converted to a present value using a discount rate. The discount rate is the annual percentage rate at which the present value of a pound or other unit of value is assumed to fall away over time. The standard discount rate used in UK Government appraisals is 3.5% p.a. and that is the rate used in this assessment.
Housing and homelessness

Adult and youth economic inactivity and unemployment

For each of these themes, a comprehensive review of relevant research documents and data – including academic studies and research undertaken by government or third-sector organisations – was undertaken, with the focus being to establish a robust evidence base for each of the following:

- Average unit costs for individuals or households receiving public expenditure support (for example, the average public expenditure incurred for each young person that is excluded from attending school). Where alternative cost estimates were found, the approach taken was to utilise the most recent and/or comprehensive evidence available. Where a range of values were provided, a low-end or mid-point value was used.

- The tendency of families (or young people) in target groups to be “at risk” of requiring support in each of the six thematic areas (or those which are relevant to their circumstances). For example, the document review identified data on the propensity of children from very low income families to suffer from regular problems in attending school and exclusion from school. Again, where a range of values were available, a low-end or mid-point value was used.

- In situations where the provision of a grant leads to the potential for public expenditure savings (e.g. a school exclusion prevented), it is also necessary to make assumptions about the duration of these effects. Evidence on the durability and persistence of positive effects was also captured during the document review stage. In all cases the most conservative assumption about duration and persistence of effects was used.

The available evidence from academic and other research was also supplemented with primary evidence obtained from the survey of recent beneficiaries of Buttle UK grants. For example, the survey of families asked questions about the effects that receiving a grant had on their child’s education and behaviour, and on family stability. Beneficiary responses (in percentage terms) to relevant questions were utilised in the modelling assumptions.

Ultimately, the modelling of potential impacts involves the use of judgements based on the best available primary and secondary research evidence. In all cases the judgements and assumptions used are the responsibility of Development Economics Ltd.

Modelling framework used

The elements included in the model (future spending, benefits and public revenues) have been appraised according to the principles set out in HM Treasury’s Green Book (2003 edition). All costs and benefits have been assessed in a discounted cash flow framework, with costs and benefits expected to occur in future years converted to a present value discounted at 3.5% per annum in line with standard Green Book guidance.

5: Increasing the Size of a Buttle UK Grant

5.1 This Chapter describes in more detail the theory of change logic that underpins the model used to assess and quantify the potential effects of an expanded national Buttle UK fundraising and expenditure programme.

5.2 As a registered charity Buttle UK has been providing financial support for vulnerable children and families for over 60 years. In recent years Buttle UK has been helping families by providing small grants (typically around £300) to assist struggling families with purchases of household goods such as cookers, washing machines and beds. Many of the families that receive support are trying to set up home after a period of homelessness or having fled from domestic abuse. The focus of these small grants has been to help address immediate problems, such as creating the ability to prepare healthy home cooked meals and to ensure that families can wash and dry their clothing and bedding.

5.3 The families and estranged young people that Buttle UK assist are on very low incomes and generally lack access to wider support networks. Very often they are in debt. These families and young people are barely able to cover the everyday costs of rent, food, heating and other bills. It is difficult or impossible for them to buy larger items such as furniture or white goods. The situation before grants are awarded can be children living in cold and sparsely furnished houses and families living in social isolation. Children and young people living in such extreme poverty often find it difficult to do well at school, with life-long consequences for workforce participation and earnings potential. Such circumstances also make it very difficult for adult members of the family to search for or hold down a job.

5.4 Children living in poverty do not only suffer material deprivation but are also socially deprived. Their families are unable to afford even a limited range of the social activities enjoyed by most children, which can both hamper their social and behavioural development and lead to them being socially isolated. The use of funding to support access into ‘extra-curricular’ activities can be a highly cost effective intervention for children who are experiencing developmental issues, especially when coupled with support to improve the home environment.

5.5 The idea driving an expanded grant giving programme is to provide a larger amount of support to create a clear, realistic and bespoke pathway out of each vulnerable family’s (or estranged young person’s) own specific set of problems and challenges. Initial evidence for the idea was generated via two preceding projects:

- a pilot located in Renfrewshire and East Renfrewshire during 2014 and 2015 focusing on vulnerable families; and

- through a project during 2010-2013 which tested the idea of making larger, personalised grants to vulnerable young people not in education employment or training which displayed impressive results of getting those people back into education and/or work.

5.6 The philosophy that underpins the proposed expanded national grant giving programme is to provide timely, precisely targeted intervention of sufficient scale to enable:
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- a recipient family to access the resources needed to address immediate needs and to invest in their children's development; and/or
- a recipient young person estranged who is from their family to stabilise their situation and return to education, training or employment.

5.7 Buttle UK has developed a “theory of change” model that underpins the proposed expanded grant giving programme. The model is based on many years’ experience of grant giving, and in particular has been informed by the experience with the Connect Project pilot project in 2014-2015.4

5.8 The focus of the intervention is to ensure that the targeted beneficiary (whether a family with vulnerable children, or an estranged young person) has sufficient resources to avoid serious distress and to invest in an effective route out of the current very difficult circumstances that they face. The intended outcomes are then:

- To ensure that a benefiting child is growing up in a safe, healthy, adequately equipped home that meets their development needs.
- (And in the case of an estranged young person, to ensure that they are living in a safe, adequately equipped home that gives them a better chance of returning to education, training or employment).
- To ensure that the child/young person is not excluded by financial barriers from education (or, for young people, from training of work experience opportunities).
- To ensure that the child/young person is not excluded by financial barriers from social and/or other activities that support their development needs.

5.9 The main impact driver is that through targeted financial support the child or young person ultimately has a much greater likelihood of achieving good levels of educational attainment and (for young people) improved access to training, skills acquisition and employment opportunities.

5.10 Buttle UK is intending to launch a fundraising campaign to raise sufficient resources to implement a programme at scale. The ambition is to raise circa £20.5 million, via the Chances for Children appeal, for a nine year programme capable of helping around 13,700 beneficiaries (families or estranged young people) over this timeframe.

5.11 The chart overleaf illustrates an indicative financial profile for the proposed programme. (Obviously, this profile assumes that the fundraising campaign is successful).

5.12 The anticipated (i.e. hoped-for) annual levels of fundraising and expenditure can be converted into intended numbers of beneficiaries if it is assumed that the average level of grant will be £1,500. The figure of £1,500 is based on the Evaluation Report (2016) for the Connect Project pilot undertaken in parts of Scotland in 2014/2015.

4 The description of the theory of change model is based on an explanation found in the Evaluation of the Connect Project (January 2016)
For the purposes of the appraisal it is also necessary to identify a plausible indicative breakdown of beneficiaries by the three sub-groups that are intended to benefit from the programme. The basis of this assumption is information provided by Buttle UK. 

Taking all of this information on board, the table below provides a disaggregated total for the number of family and estranged young people (EYP) beneficiaries that could be helped with grants if the fundraising programme succeeds and is implemented as is currently intended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV families</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Families</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>7,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYP</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>3,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>13,705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, over a 9 year period the £20.5 million Buttle UK hope to raise to fund the expanded grant giving programme could provide support averaging £1,500 to around 13,700 families and estranged young people.

The next chapter of the report sets out more details as to the approach taken to the assessment and the specific assumptions used to assess potential savings in each area of public expenditure that is relevant to the analysis. The next chapter also sets out the results of the assessment, both in terms of public expenditure saved and the potential for net additional tax revenues as a result of increased economic participation by beneficiaries.
6: Economic impact assessment

6.1 This Chapter quantifies the potential impact of the proposed expanded grant giving programme on future public expenditure. A total of eight public expenditure areas are considered in turn, namely:

- Absence and exclusion from compulsory years children’s education
- Child protection and safeguarding
- Children’s physical and mental health and well-being
- Substance misuse by vulnerable children and young people
- Crime and anti-social behaviour on the part of vulnerable children and young people
- Costs associated with homelessness
- Costs associated with economic inactivity and unemployment on the part of young people (18-24) and parents/guardians of vulnerable children

6.2 The final section of the Chapter also addresses the issue of potential additional tax receipts that would be expected to accrue if a proportion of parents/guardian of benefiting families – as well as estranged young people who also benefit from grants – find a pathway back to paid employment as a result of receiving a larger Buttle UK grant.

6.3 *Ex ante* appraisal necessarily involves the making of judgements about what might happen in future if the proposed intervention is implemented as intended. The estimates in this Chapter are based on the following key areas of judgement and evidence:

- The overall number of beneficiaries (c.13,700), which is based on information regarding the anticipated scale and duration of the programme supplied by Buttle UK.
- A disaggregation of overall beneficiaries by time (i.e. the expected number of families or young people benefiting each year) and by type, also based on information supplied by Buttle UK.
- Evidence from a survey of 53 beneficiaries of pilot programmes for the expanded grant giving initiative.
- Estimates of average costs based on public research evidence and other data.

6.4 The timeframe for the assessment is the period 2016/17 to 2030/2031. This takes into account:

- A 9 year programme of expenditure
- A further six year period that takes account of residual benefits of grants made in the final years of the programme.

6.5 Any assessment of effects must take into account additionality factors, such as deadweight, which is the proportion of benefits or effects that would have occurred even had the intervention not taken place.
6.6 For the types of effects considered in this report, the overall level of attribution of effects to the Buttle UK grant is assumed to be 50%. In other words, it is assumed that 50% of expected gross effects would occur even if the grant had not been made. This is considered to be a conservative assumption.

6.7 Another key assumption that needs to be made concerns the degree of persistence of positive improvements that are considered to be attributable to the grant intervention. In most cases the persistence of effects that are expected to occur is expected to decay at a rate of around 15% p.a. This implies that attributable effects will reduce to zero after 6 years. Again, this is considered to be a conservative assumption (however, in the case of a few types of effect the decay would be expected to occur more quickly, and exceptions to the usual benefit persistence assumptions are noted in the text).

School absence and exclusion

6.8 One of the key goals of Buttle UK’s expanded grant giving programme is to increase levels of educational achievement for children in struggling families that receive grants. The ambition is to create a more stable home environment, equipped to ensure that children can be provided with regular healthy meals and clean clothes, and that other basic needs can be met.

6.9 The grants can also be used to access structured social activities (such as swimming lessons, football, dance classes, etc.) that can be used to help children with behavioural, self-esteem, coordination and confidence issues that can be a barrier to educational attendance, participation and achievement.

6.10 Evidence for positive effects from these types of grants can be found from the survey of beneficiaries undertaken for this report. Survey respondents were asked about the level of impact that Buttle UK grants had on their children’s education, social life and behaviour. Very high levels of positive response were received, as indicated below:

- **Question: What effect, if any, do you think the grant has had on your children’s education?**
  - Proportion responding “very positive”: 40%
  - Proportion responding “positive”: 40%
  - Proportion responding “little or no effect”: 20%.

- **Question: What effect, if any, do you think the grant has had on your children’s social life?**
  - Proportion responding “very positive”: 51%
  - Proportion responding “positive”: 34%
  - Proportion responding “little or no effect”: 14%.

- **Question: What effect, if any, do you think the grant has had on your children’s behaviour?**
  - Proportion responding “very positive”: 51%
  - Proportion responding “positive”: 40%
  - Proportion responding “little or no effect”: 9%.
6.11 Based on Buttle UK’s theory of change model established for the expanded grant giving programme, it should be expected that families facing challenges in getting their children to attend and improve attainment levels in education should see some improvement with each. The improvement in attendance, behaviour and attainment can in turn be expected to save public costs associated with both persistent absenteeism and permanent exclusions from education.

*Costs of Persistent Absenteeism from education*

6.12 In the appraisal it is assumed that the average cost to the public sector of a persistent child absentee from full time education is £1,319 per annum. This figure is based on findings of a report entitled *The Immediate Fiscal Cost of Late Intervention for Children and Young People* published by the Early Intervention Foundation (EIF) in 2015.5 The EIF estimates are based on costs borne by local government (education authorities), police and justice authorities.

6.13 This EIF report is used to provide a basis for the unit cost assumptions for many of the public expenditure themes appraised in this Chapter of the report. The reasons why the EIF is relied on for the majority of the assumptions about unit costs are as follows:

- The report was published recently (2015) which means that it takes into account the various changes to the benefit system that have been introduced in recent years as well as other adjustments to the overall pattern of public expenditure in relevant areas.
- The report is comprehensive, in that it takes on board the majority of the expenditure areas that are relevant to this report.
- But more to the point, the EIF report has adopted a rigorous approach to ensuring that potential overlaps between public expenditure themes are taken into account as far as it is practicable to do so. This means that potential double counting between various expenditure themes – such as health, education, crime and justice, and social welfare – have been taken into account in the derivation of unit cost estimates.

6.14 Therefore, on this basis, the EIF report is considered a robust and reliable basis upon which to make estimates of potential future public expenditure savings that may be brought about through the implementation of a new (or expanded) intervention such as that proposed for the expanded grant giving programme.

6.15 It should be noted that the cost estimates provided in the EIF report are in terms of a 2014/15 price base. These have been converted to a 2016 price base using the GDP deflator series published by HM Treasury.6

---


6.16 It is assumed – conservatively – that 15% of the families receiving Buttle UK grants encounter problems in maintaining good levels of school attendance for their children. Of these, it is assumed that 50% will experience effective improvements in performance that are attributable to the grant (this proportion takes into account a failure rate among some families, but also an element of deadweight: i.e. some families may have recovered the situation even in the absence of the Buttle UK grant).

6.17 These rates are applied to both categories of families that are expected to receive Buttle UK grants. Note: grants to Estranged Young People (EYP) are not included in this part of the analysis.

6.18 It is also assumed that there is an erosion rate in the level of effect that can be attributed to the grant. This erosion rate is assumed to be 0% in year 1, but increasing to 15% in year 2, 30% in year 3 etc.

6.19 Based on all these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved on prevented school absenteeism as a result of help provided to families from the Buttle UK grants is expected to be £3.98 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.20 This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 106 secondary school teachers (or 115 primary school teachers) for 12 months.\(^7\)

6.21 In present value terms (i.e. when a discount rate of 3.5% p.a. is applied) the amount of public expenditure saved on school absenteeism is expected to amount to £3.14 million over the lifetime of the appraisal (2016/17 to 2030/31).

**Costs of permanent school exclusions**

6.22 A similar set of assumptions was used to estimate the potential public expenditure savings associated with prevented school exclusions. That is, it is assumed that there will be a future level of school exclusions that do not occur because of improvements in behaviour brought about by timely interventions via the expanded grant giving programme.

6.23 In the case of exclusions:

- The average annual public cost is assumed to be £1,242 (based on the findings of the EIF report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed (conservatively) to be 2% of families that receive grants and also 2% of estranged young people aged 16-18.

6.24 Based on these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved on school exclusions as a result of help provided to families from the Buttle UK grants is expected to amount to £0.66 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

---

\(^7\) Based on the annual gross earnings of secondary and primary education teaching professionals in the UK. The data was sourced from the 2015 ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, published November 2015.
6.25 This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 18 secondary school teachers (or 19 primary school teachers) for 12 months.\(^8\)

6.26 In present value terms (i.e. when a discount rate of 3.5% p.a. is applied) the amount of public expenditure saved on permanent school exclusions is expected to amount to £0.52 million over the lifetime of the appraisal (2016/17 to 2030/31).

**Child protection and safeguarding**

6.27 A key goal of the expanded grant giving programme is to provide safe and secure home environments for vulnerable children in families suffering poverty and under strain. The goal is to provide sufficient financial support so that these families can take control of their circumstances and stabilise their situation and home environment. Another important goal is to increase levels of social involvement outside the home and to thereby counter the danger that these vulnerable families will become socially isolated.

6.28 Helping to address the pressures and strain experienced by these vulnerable families and provide a pathway out of the current problems that they face should mean a reduced number of children in the future that require state intervention in the form of child protection and safeguarding. Three aspects of this are taken into account in the appraisal:

- Children who are looked after by public authorities
- Children who are the subject of a Child Protection Plan
- The number of Children in Need, where the need is caused by abuse, neglect, behaviour issues and parental functioning (that is, excluding children whose needs are defined by a physical disability).

6.29 Evidence for the stabilising effect producing by the awarding of these types of grants can be found from the survey of beneficiaries undertaken for this report. For example:

- 77% of families interviewed said that the Buttle UK grant had produced a positive or very positive effect on their financial situation; and
- 83% said that the grant had produced a positive or very positive effect on family stability.

6.30 Assumptions used and the results of the modelling for each of these sub-categories are described below. It should be noted that grant beneficiaries in the category Estranged Young People are not included in this part of the appraisal.

---

\(^8\) Based on data sourced from the 2015 ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings.
Children looked after by public authorities

6.31 A child that is being looked after by a public authority (also known as a child in care) could be living with foster parents, could be living at home but under the supervision of social services, or could be living in a residential children’s home or in some other residential setting such as school or secure unit.9

6.32 In the case of this category of children:

- The average annual public expenditure implication of a looked after child is assumed to be £66,118 (based on the findings of the EIF report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed to be 1% of families who are eligible to receive the grants, which is considered to be a very conservative assumption. Note: this percentage takes into account the variable number of children per affected family.

6.33 Based on all these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved by reducing the number of children that are looked after by public authorities is expected to amount to £22.29 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.34 This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 886 youth and community workers for 12 months.10

6.35 In present value terms, the amount of public expenditure saved on preventing children from needing to be looked after by local authorities is expected to amount to £17.60 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

Child Protection Plans

6.36 A child perceived by public agencies to be at significant risk of harm, abuse or neglect can be made the subject of a Child Protection Plan. In such cases the Child Protection Plan would be drawn up by the relevant agencies and reviewed on a regular basis until it is decided that the risk no longer exists, or the child turns 18.

6.37 In the case of Child Protection Plans:

- The average annual public cost is assumed to be £5,528 (based on the findings of the EIF report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed to be 2% of families. Note: this percentage takes into account the variable number of children per affected family.

---

9 Based on a definition published by the NSPCC.
10 Based on data sourced from the 2015 ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings.
6.38 Based on all these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved on the number of children that are not required to have a Child Protection Plan in place as a result of help provided to families from the Buttle UK grants is expected to amount to £2.22 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.39 This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 87 youth and community workers for 12 months.\(^{11}\)

6.40 In present value terms the amount of public expenditure saved on preventing children from needing a Protection Plan is expected to amount to £1.75 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

**Children in Need**

6.41 A child in need is defined under the Children Act 1989 as a child who is unlikely to reach or maintain a satisfactory level of health or development, or their health or development will be significantly impaired, without the provision of services, or if the child is disabled. In such cases, an assessment is carried out by a social worker to determine the child’s developmental needs and the parents’ capacity to meet these needs, and decisions are then made about the help needed by the child.

6.42 In the case of Children in Need (excluding cases where the need is caused by physical disability):

- The average annual public cost is assumed to be £1,611 (based on the findings of the EIF report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed to be 2% of families. Note: this percentage takes into account the variable number of children per affected family.

6.43 Based on all these assumptions, the total amount of future public expenditure that is expected to be saved on children in need is expected to amount to £0.65 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.44 This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 20 youth and community workers for 12 months.\(^{12}\)

6.45 In present value terms the amount of public expenditure saved is expected to amount to £0.51 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

**Child injuries and mental health**

6.46 Helping to provide safe and healthy home environments and helping to alleviate the strains experienced by vulnerable children would be expected to result in reduced numbers of children suffering physical injuries and mental health problems. Two health-related aspects that are relevant to children are taken into account in the assessment (Note: Estranged Young People are not included in this part of the appraisal).

---

\(^{11}\) Based on data sourced from the 2015 ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings.

\(^{12}\) Based on data sourced from the 2015 ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings.
Children who suffer injuries that require hospital treatment

Children who require NHS treatment for mental health conditions

6.47 The survey of previous grant beneficiaries (families only) identified that 40% of respondents considered that the Buttle UK grant had had a very positive effect on their children’s safety, while a further 43% said that the effect had been positive. In other words, only 17% reported no positive effect on their children’s safety.

6.48 The assumptions that have been used and the results of the modelling for each of these sub-categories are described below.

Children who suffer injuries that require hospital treatment

6.49 In the modelling of the potential prevention of cases of children suffering injuries requiring hospital treatment:

- The average annual public cost per hospital admission is assumed to be £1,385 (based on the findings of the EIF report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed to be 5% of families. Note: this percentage takes into account the variable number of children per affected family.

6.50 Based on all these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved by preventing children needing to attend hospital for treatment of physical injuries is expected to amount to £1.39 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.51 This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 44 nurses for 12 months.13

6.52 In present value terms the amount of public expenditure saved on preventing children from hospital admission preventions is expected to amount to £1.10 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

Children and young people who require NHS treatment for mental health conditions

6.53 In the modelling of the potential prevention of cases of children and young people suffering from mental health problems requiring NHS treatment:

- The average annual public cost per individual is assumed to be £41,072 (based on the findings of the EIF report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed to be 1% of families and 2% of estranged young people.

---

13 Based on the annual gross earnings of nursing professionals in the UK (2015). Data was sourced from the ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, published November 2015.
Based on all these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved by preventing the need for NHS treatment for mental health problems is expected to amount to £13.62 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 432 nurses for 12 months.\textsuperscript{14}

In present value terms the amount of public expenditure saved on preventing mental health conditions emerging among children is expected to amount to £10.75 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

Substance and alcohol misuse among children and young people

So far the analysis has tended to focus on categories of anticipated effects that are relevant to vulnerable families and their children. The other group that the expanded grant giving programme is intended to benefit are young people that are estranged from their families, either because of histories of abuse or neglect in their childhoods, or because of other difficulties that have occurred in their young adulthoods. Up until this point in this chapter, the categories that have included estimates for impacts (in terms of saved public expenditure) that are relevant to the EYP group has been limited to permanent exclusions (16-18 years only) and costs of mental health treatment.

Another category of public expenditure that is relevant to this group is substance and alcohol misuse. The logic chain here is that by helping to provide stable home environments for young people – and pathways back to education, training and/or employment – grants provided by Buttle UK can help prevent a proportion of young people becoming involved in substance and alcohol misuse.

Similarly, by providing more stable home environments for struggling families and families that have suffered from domestic abuse, a number of children from these families may be prevented from getting involved in substance and alcohol misuse.

Survey evidence collected for this report indicates that the receiving of a Buttle UK grant can have a very positive effect on a young person. For example, 61% said that the grant had made them feel safer and settled in their current accommodation, and 83% said that the grant had had a positive or very positive effect on their well-being.

Three alcohol and substance misuse related aspects are taken into account in the assessment:

- Young people requiring NHS treatment for alcohol misuse
- Children requiring NHS treatment due to alcohol use
- Young people and children requiring access to specialist substance misuse treatment services

The assumptions that have been used and the results of the modelling for each of these sub-categories are described below.

\textsuperscript{14} Data also sourced from the 2015 ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings.
Young People requiring NHS treatment for alcohol misuse

6.63 In the modelling of the potential prevention of cases of young people requiring medical treatment for alcohol misuse, the following assumptions are used:

- The average annual public cost per individual is assumed to be £458 (based on the findings of the EIF report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed to be 10% of estranged young people

6.64 Based on all these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved by preventing alcohol misuse among estranged young people benefiting from Buttle UK grants is expected to amount to £0.29 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.65 This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 11 nurses for 12 months.¹⁵

6.66 In present value terms the amount of public expenditure saved on preventing alcohol misuse among estranged young people is expected to amount to £0.23 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

Children requiring NHS treatment for alcohol misuse

6.67 In the modelling of the potential prevention of cases of vulnerable children requiring medical treatment for alcohol misuse, the following assumptions are used:

- The average annual public cost per individual is assumed to be £1,752 (based on the findings of the EIF report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed to be 5.0% of vulnerable children

6.68 Based on all these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved by preventing the need for children to require medical treatment for alcohol misuse is expected to amount to £2.86 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.69 This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 108 nurses for 12 months.¹⁶

6.70 In present value terms the amount of public expenditure saved on preventing alcohol and substance misuse among estranged young people is expected to amount to £2.26 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

¹⁵ Data sourced from the 2015 ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings.
¹⁶ Data sourced from the 2015 ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings.
6.71 In the modelling of the potential prevention of cases of vulnerable children and estranged young people from requiring specialist medical treatment for substance misuse, the following assumptions are used:

- The average annual public cost per individual is assumed to be £19,059 (based on the findings of the EIF report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed to be 0.5% for vulnerable children and 2% for estranged young people

6.72 Based on all these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved by preventing the need for children and young people to require specialist medical treatment for substance misuse is expected to amount to £4.31 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.73 This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 163 nurses for 12 months. 17

6.74 In present value terms the saving is expected to amount to £3.40 million.

Crime and Anti-social behaviour

6.75 Providing financial support to enable the creation of safe home environments and helping to alleviate stresses and strains experienced by families facing crisis points would be expected to result in reduced numbers of children committing crime and anti-social behaviour. This in turn can be expected to result in public expenditure savings, including savings on costs of policing, the justice system and for local government.

6.76 Furthermore, these Buttle UK grants provided to Estranged Young People would also be expected to reduce the rates at which young people in difficult circumstances become involved in offending and in anti-social behaviours. This would also very likely result public expenditure savings, policing, courts, legal aid and for local government.

6.77 The two categories of cost savings included in this part of the appraisal are therefore:

- Young people in the Youth Justice System, which is relevant to all three categories of potential Buttle UK grant recipients
- Anti-social behaviour on the part of children and young people – again relevant to all three categories of recipient

6.78 The assumptions that have been used and the results of the modelling for each of these sub-categories are described below.

---

17 Data sourced from the 2015 ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings.
Young people in the youth justice system

6.79 In the modelling of the potential prevention of young people becoming cases in the youth justice system, the following assumptions are used:

- The average annual public cost per case is assumed to be £8,944 (based on the findings of the EIF report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed to be 2.0% both for vulnerable children and for estranged young people

6.80 Based on all these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved by preventing entry of children and young people into the youth justice system as a result of receiving Buttle UK grants is expected to amount to £4.72 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.81 This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 118 police offices for 12 months.\(^\text{18}\)

6.82 In present value terms the saving is expected to amount to £3.73 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

Anti-social behaviour

6.83 In the modelling of the potential prevention of children and young people becoming involved in anti-social behaviour, the following assumptions are used:

- The average annual public cost per individual is assumed to be £353 (based on the findings of the EIF report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed to be 5.0% both for vulnerable children and for estranged young people

6.84 Based on all these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved by preventing children and young people becoming involved in anti-social behaviour as a result of receiving Buttle UK grants is expected to amount to £0.47 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.85 This level of savings would be sufficient to pay the gross salary costs of 12 police offices for 12 months.\(^\text{19}\)

6.86 In present value terms the saving is expected to amount to £0.37 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

\(^\text{18}\) Data sourced from the 2015 ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings. The median salary costs are based on police officers ranked at sergeant rank or lower.

\(^\text{19}\) Data sourced from the 2015 ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings. The median salary costs are based on police officers ranked at sergeant rank or lower.
Preventing homelessness

6.87 Providing financial support to enable the creation of safe home environments and helping to alleviate distress and strain experienced by families and estranged young people that are at a crisis point in their lives can be expected to result in reduced numbers of families and estranged young people subsequently becoming homeless.

6.88 Preventing homelessness would, in turn, be expected to produce significant downstream public expenditure savings, in the form of public expenditure on temporary accommodation, on additional welfare payments and on the additional educational and healthcare costs associated with homelessness among children and young people.

6.89 Research published by the national housing charity Shelter provides strong evidence that preventing homelessness is far more cost effective than dealing with the consequences of homelessness once it occurs. Research published by Shelter in 2010 estimates that the minimum cost saving of preventing homelessness compared to the occurrence of homelessness is around £4,500 per annum (2010 prices).

6.90 In the modelling of the potential public sector savings associated with preventing homelessness, the following assumptions are used:

- The average annual public cost per individual is assumed to be £4,862 (based on the findings of the 2010 Shelter report, updated to a 2016 price base)
- The propensity of the problem to occur (in the absence of the Buttle UK grant) is assumed to be 12.5% for families and 25.0% for estranged young people

6.91 Based on these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved by preventing cases of homelessness among vulnerable families and estranged young people by providing Buttle UK grants is expected to amount to £19.85 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.92 Data published by UK Government reveals that the average Housing Benefit case in 2014/15 was provided with support to the value of £4,811. On this basis, an alternative use for the £19.35m of public expenditure that is saved could be to support 4,126 low income households with their housing costs for 12 months.

6.93 In present value terms the saving is expected to amount to £15.67 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

Participation in Education, Training and Employment

6.94 The final public expenditure theme to consider is the potential economies in future public expenditure that relate to future levels of economic activity among grant beneficiaries. There are two types of future public expenditure saving included in the appraisal:

---

20 Shelter: Value for Money in Housing Options and Homelessness Services (2010)
• Public expenditure savings – in terms of social welfare payments – that relate to older children (16-17 years) and young people (18-20) who are not in employment, education or training. The estimated amounts of social welfare payments made to the latter group are much larger than the former, and the potential savings for each age group are set out separately in the reporting that follows.

• Public expenditure savings associated with addressing economic inactivity among a proportion of the parents in struggling families and families that have suffered domestic abuse.

6.95 Each of these aspects is considered in turn below. Another aspect that is also relevant to the analysis is the potential for additional tax revenues associated with additional earnings made by young people and parents who re-enter the workplace. However, this part of the analysis is treated separately later in this Chapter under a different heading.

Older children (16-17) and Young People (18-20) who are NEET

6.96 As was described with respect to the Education exclusions/absenteeism theme, one of the key goals of the expanded grant giving programme is to increase levels of educational achievement for children in struggling families that receive grants. The analysis presented under the education theme focused on public costs associated with educational achievement (which mainly fall to local government) as well as some police and justice system related expenditures.

6.97 However, it is also relevant to consider the effects that not being in education, employment or training (NEET) has on national social welfare budgets (i.e. expenditure that relates to the responsibilities of the Department for Work and Pensions).

6.98 There are two aspects to consider:

• expenditure linked to older children (16-17 years) who are NEET; and

• expenditure linked to young people (18-20 years) who are NEET

6.99 These two groups are differentiated for several reasons. First, they relate to different target sub-groups in terms of Buttle UK’s expanded grant giving programme. But more importantly, the propensities to be NEET are different for both groups, and the cost consequences of being NEET also vary very substantially between the two groups.

6.100 With respect to the first group (16-17), research published by the EIF suggests that the average annual public expenditure cost associated with this group – when updated to a 2016 price base – is £575 p.a. whereas the average unit cost public expenditure associated with the older group (18-20) is estimated to be much larger, at £4,601 p.a.

6.101 In this appraisal it is assumed that a total of 5% of families would be prevented from having an average of one 16-17 year old child that is NEET if they were in receipt of a Buttle UK grant. The attribution rate (taking into account deadweight and displacement) is assumed to be 50%. Note: the assumed timeframe for the duration of these effects is assumed to be two years only (which is a much shorter timeframe than is assumed for most of the effects considered in this report).
6.102 With respect to the 18-20 years group, it is assumed that 25% of Estranged Young People would be prevented from being not in education, employment or training if they were in receipt of a Buttle UK grant. The attribution rate (taking into account deadweight and displacement) is assumed to be 50%. The duration of these effects is assumed to be two years.

6.103 Based on these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved by preventing cases of NEET for 16-17 children among vulnerable families as a result of receiving Buttle UK grants is expected to amount to £0.49 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.104 In present value terms the amount of public expenditure saved on preventing cases of 16-17 year olds that are NEET is expected to amount to £0.40 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

6.105 With respect to the 18-20 years group, the expected savings are significantly larger:

- In undiscounted terms, the savings associated with the 18-20 group is expected to amount to £3.75 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31
- When discounted using conventional rates (3.5% p.a.), this is equivalent to savings of £3.10 million over the same period

**Return to employment by parents**

6.106 It is also expected that a proportion of adult members of families that are supported by Buttle UK grants could be expected to return to employment, either in the short to medium term or after a period of training or retraining. For example, where parents have been previously unable to work because of stress or anxiety about their home situation, the stabilising effect of the grant can at some point mean that a return to work is viable. In other situations, the grant may be used in a way that means that a younger child can ultimately return to school, thereby enabling a parent or guardian to be available for work. In other situations, a part of the Buttle UK grant may be used to address directly a barrier or obstacle that is otherwise preventing a parent or guardian from being available for work.

6.107 The focus in this part of the analysis is on the public expenditure savings associated with a return to work for parents and guardians who previously have been unable to participate in the workforce. With respect to this group, the average annual public cost per individual is assumed to be £5,835. This figure is based on a figure of £5,400 reported in a 2010 report published by the Princes Trust (The Cost of Exclusion: Counting the cost of disadvantage in the UK) which has been updated to a 2016 price base using HM Treasury’s GDP price deflator series.

6.108 In the survey of previous grant beneficiaries conducted for this research, a total of 29% of parents/guardians of vulnerable families said that they felt that they had a much better chance of getting or sustaining a job as a result of receiving the financial assistance from Buttle UK. A further 34% said that their employment prospects had improved to an extent. Therefore, the total proportion reporting a greater level of confidence in their future employment prospects was 63%.
Based on these findings, it has been assumed that 25% of parents/guardians of vulnerable families experience a return to the workplace within 12 months of receiving the grant. Given the survey findings reported above, this is considered to be a conservative assumption. In terms of attribution, it is assumed that 50% of these returnees would have resumed work even without the grant (i.e. deadweight and displacement is assumed to be 50%). Again, this is a conservative assumption.

Based on these assumptions, the total amount of public expenditure that is expected to be saved by addressing preventable economic inactivity among parents and guardians of vulnerable families as a result of receiving Buttle UK grants is expected to amount to £29.33 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

When discounted at 3.5%, the present value of the public spending savings made by addressing preventable economic inactivity among parents and guardians of vulnerable families is expected to amount to £23.15 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.

Public revenue benefits from youth and adult economic activity

It is also relevant to consider the potential for additional public revenue generation that would result if adults and young people who benefit from Buttle UK grants consequently enter the workplace at some point after the grant has been received. The logic chain underpinning this expected occurrence is similar to that already described for return to work by parents or guardians of vulnerable children, but here the estimation effects are also extended to a proportion of Estranged Young People grant beneficiaries.

In brief, the logic for the inclusion of a proportion of parents/guardian grant recipients is that the grant can, for example, remove an obstacle to economic inactivity that is caused by an unstable home environment or, as another example, the grant itself may be directed at expenditure that leads to the adult embarking on a course of re-training, or assistance with equipment or other items that help with job search.

The extension of this part of the assessment to young people is justified because of the findings of the beneficiary survey conducted in support of this research. The survey of the EYP group found that:

- about 67% of grant recipients reported that the grant from Buttle UK had helped the young person start a new course of training;
- about 61% of grant recipients reported that the grant from Buttle UK had helped them sustain or complete a course of training;
- about 44% felt that the grant had resulted in an improved chance of them getting a job.

A number of assumptions have been made to assess the potential public revenue implications of new employment that is attributable to the receipt of the Buttle UK grant.

First, the types of revenues that are assessed to be in scope of the appraisal are:

- Pay as you earn (PAYE) tax
- Employee’s National Insurance contributions
• Employer’s National Insurance contributions

• Indirect taxes (e.g. VAT, excise duties) that are generated as a result of increased household expenditure related to employment earnings

6.117 It has been assumed that grant beneficiaries that return to employment enter the labour force in jobs where their earnings correspond to the minimum wage. This is a conservative assumption: in some cases the levels of skills and qualifications possessed by the grant recipient may mean that higher levels of earnings can be achieved.

6.118 The current (2016) levels of minimum wage for 18-20 year olds (for estranged young people) and those aged 25+ (for parents and guardians of children) have been used in the calculations.

6.119 In addition, assumptions about current rates of PAYE, national insurance and other taxes have been obtained from HMRC for use in the appraisal.

6.120 In terms of indirect taxes paid on increased household expenditure associated with increased family income from working, these have been calculated based on estimates of additional household disposable income associated with a transition from 100% dependency on benefits to a situation where household income is comprised of a mix of earned income and benefit/tax credit income. The assumed average rate of additional VAT/excise duty paid on additional household expenditure is assumed to be 10%, a rate which takes into account the fact that many basic household items (including food items and children’s clothing) are zero rated for VAT purposes.

6.121 Overall, for 18-20 year olds who re-enter the workforce because of the Buttle UK intervention, it is assumed that the net additional revenue implication for the Exchequer would be an average of £1,087 p.a. per beneficiary (2016 prices).

6.122 For parents and guardians of children, the equivalent figure is estimated to be £3,785 per annum.

6.123 The response rates that have been assumed – and which take into account additionality factors of deadweight and displacement – are as follows:

• For those aged 18-20 we have assumed an average response rate of 25% which is considered to be conservative based on the findings of the EYP survey

• For parents and guardians a response rate of 12.5% has been assumed, which is also considered to be cautious

6.124 Based on these assumptions, the total amount of additional public revenue that is expected to be generated as a result of the expanded grant giving programme would amount to £22.44 million over the period 2016/17 to 2030/31.

6.125 In present value terms the figure is £17.71 million over the lifetime of the appraisal.
Summary of results

6.126 The table overleaf sets out the summary results for each element that has been included in the appraisal. Overall, if only considering the potential for public expenditure savings, the overall amount that is expected to be saved as a result of the expanded grant giving programme is £110.87 million in 2016 prices (undiscounted).

6.127 When discounting is applied, this figure for saved public spending amounts to £87.69 million.

6.128 In addition, there is also the potential for additional government tax revenues associated with PAYE, National Insurance and indirect taxes on employee expenditure that come about as a result of boosted participation in the workplace on the part of Buttle UK grant beneficiaries. This additional Government revenue is estimated to amount to £22.44 million over the 2016/17-2030/31 period (undiscounted).

6.129 When discounted, this figure amounts to £17.71 million.

6.130 Taking both figures together, the overall benefit to the public purse as a result of the expanded grant giving programme is expected to amount to £133.31 million in undiscounted terms, and £105.40 million when usual rates of discount (3.5% p.a.) are applied.

Table 6-1: Overall expected future public expenditure savings and revenues attributable to Buttle UK’s expanded grant giving programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persistent absentees from education</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent exclusions from education</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked after children</td>
<td>22.29</td>
<td>17.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection Plans</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Need</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s injuries requiring hospital treatment</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s mental health treatment</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people’s substance misuse treatment</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol misuse treatment</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist substance misuse facilities</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people in the youth justice system</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing homelessness</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17 NEET</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 NEET</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult economic activity</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>23.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure savings</strong></td>
<td><strong>110.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.69</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional direct and indirect tax revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.71</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total net additional public spending savings &amp;revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>133.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>105.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.131 In terms of the public expenditure savings expected to be made over the lifetime of the appraisal (i.e. excluding the additional direct and indirect tax revenues), the contribution made by each of the target groups is expected to be as follows:

- Families escaping domestic violence: £25.79 million (23.3% of the total of £110.87 million)
- Other families: £63.10 million (56.9%); and
• Estranged young people: £21.98 million (19.9%).

6.132 When combined with the numbers of grant awards expected to be made in favour of each beneficiary category, these estimates for future expenditure savings can be used to derive an estimate for the average amount of savings expected to be made per grant award. These estimates are as follows (all figures are undiscounted):

• Families escaping domestic violence: average public expenditure saving – £7,650 per grant awarded.
• Other families: average public expenditure saving – £8,923 per grant awarded.
• Estranged young people: average public expenditure saving – £6,739 per grant awarded
• All grants: average public expenditure saving – £8,090 per grant awarded

6.133 The benefit cost ratio expected to be produced by the proposed expanded grant giving programme can be presented in both an undiscounted and a discounted format.

• In undiscounted terms, the proposed expenditure of £20.5 million would be expected to produce public expenditure savings and additional public revenues amounting to £133.31 million over a 15-year period. This produces a benefit-to-cost ratio of 6.48:1.00.
• The proposed expenditure of £20.5 million over the period 2016/17 to 2024/25 is worth £17.30 in present value terms. The expected future public expenditure savings and additional tax revenues are worth £105.40 million in present value terms. The associated would be expected to produce public expenditure savings and additional public revenues amounting to £133.31 million over a 15-year period. The associated benefit-to-cost ratio is 6.09:1.00.

6.134 It is also relevant and useful to consider the additional benefit to households in terms of increased spending power that derives from more active involvement in the workforce. In terms of the three beneficiary groups that are the focus of this report:

• Families escaping domestic violence: we would expect to see an aggregate increase in household spending of £9.92 million for this group over the period of the assessment
• Other families: we would expect to see an aggregate increase in household spending of £20.81 million over the period of the assessment
• Estranged young people: we would expect to see an aggregate increase in household spending of £6.57 million over the period of the assessment

6.135 Overall, we would expect to see an increase in household spending amounting to £37.31 million over the assessment period.
7: How expanded Buttle UK grants can make a difference

7.1 This chapter presents case study examples of how an expanded Buttle UK grant can make a real difference to families, and especially to children and young people. Three case studies are presented, each based on support provided through the pilot project, and each reflecting the types of support that would be delivered if the expanded grant giving programme initiative were to be extended as intended by Buttle UK.

Case Study 1: Family recovering from Domestic violence

7.2 Overview:

This case study concerns a single mother with an eight year-old son. After leaving the mother’s abusive partner, concerns were raised for the child’s emotional wellbeing, as he would often become tearful or angry very suddenly. Teachers reported behavioural issues in the classroom and that he was showing increasingly disruptive, bullying behaviour. The mother was struggling to maintain routines and boundaries as she was under a lot of pressure since returning to work.

7.3 Intervention:

Buttle UK awarded a grant of £1,140 to the family for play therapy, which was used to help improve the child’s behaviour both at home and school. Since then the child’s behaviour has improved at school, he is doing well academically and has much more positive social relationships both in and outside of school.

7.4 Outcome:

The long term benefits to this family are principally measured in terms of safeguarding the mother’s future earnings potential. Savings on public expenditure can also be expected through a reduced risk of physical and mental health problems for both mother and child, reduced risk of additional support and other interventions at school. In the longer term there is also a reduced risk of the child being excluded from education or training (when he reaches the age of 16), and a reduced risk of alcohol and substance misuse, particularly when he reaches adolescence.

These potential medium to long term savings are estimated to be worth around £5,500 in terms of State support for this family. Given that the grant provided was £1,040, this implies a benefit cost ratio of 5.29:1.00 (undiscounted).
Case Study 2: Struggling Family

7.5 Overview:
This case study concerns a two parent family living with two children, with a third child soon to be born. The father of the family worked full time but money was very tight. However, the size of the family increased overnight when the father’s two young daughters from a previous marriage were removed by social services from his former partner’s care and moved in with him and his new family. The father continued to work full time but with extra children to support it became difficult for the family to manage on his income. He earned just enough to miss entitlement for benefits, so the family paid rent and council tax in full and received no support in terms of free school meals and family tax credits.

7.6 Intervention:
With money being so tight the family’s flat was inadequately furnished. There were no floor coverings, the children’s beds were old and needed replacing, and the fridge freezer was broken beyond repair. Buttle UK awarded the family £1,100 to buy the children new clothes, secure new flooring and fund the children’s leisure activities. Having received support from Buttle UK, the family is now more open to accepting some support and has managed to source essential baby equipment as well as other necessary items cheaply through various agencies.

7.7 Outcome:
The long term benefits to this family are principally measured in terms of safeguarding the father’s status as a full time worker and to prevent the family from becoming reliant on social welfare payments. In particular, the ability for this family to continue to care for the two children from a previous relationship means that there is a significantly reduced risk of those older children needing to be taken into care or otherwise needing a high level of financial support from the State. Future savings on public spending can also be expected through minimised risks of future health and educational problems for the children.

These potential medium to long term savings are estimated to be worth around £8,300 in terms of State support for this family. Given that the grant provided was £1,100, this implies a benefit cost ratio of 7.55:1.00 (undiscounted).

Case Study 3: Estranged Young Person

7.8 Overview:
Jack (not his real name) had a tough upbringing. His birth father had severe problems with his mental health, and his parents separated when he was very young. He and his sister were brought up by his mother on her own, until she remarried when he was a teenager. Jack got in with the wrong crowd on the estate where they lived and did things he later regretted. His behaviour, in combination with a difficult relationship with his new stepfather, eventually caused relationships in the family to breakdown. Jack ended up living in a hostel until he was rehoused in April 2015. He is now determined to get his life back on track and is currently studying for a BTEC in Engineering. He has just finished his second year.
7.9 Intervention:

When he moved into his flat it was completely unfurnished. His college helped with a microwave and crockery. Buttle UK awarded Jack a grant of £800, along with a laptop, an electric cooker and a washing machine. The total value of the support amounted to £1,540. Without the support received, Jack would have not being able to attend college and successfully progress into education as well as being ready and equipped to start his career.

7.10 Outcome:

The long term benefits to Jack can be assessed in terms of the potential risk of being unable to continue with education and instead becoming reliant on the welfare system. The potential medium to long term savings are estimated to be worth around £5,800 in terms of the State support that would otherwise be required to support this estranged young person. Given that the grant provided was £1,540, this implies a benefit cost ratio of 3.77:1.00 (undiscounted).
8: Review of results

8.1 This report has appraised the potential effects of the proposed expansion of Buttle UK’s timely intervention grant support programme. The expanded grant giving programme would aim to provide financial support to vulnerable families, and to young people who are estranged from their families and other support networks. The grant programme would be implemented nationally by Buttle UK.

8.2 The results of the appraisal indicate that the envisaged expanded grant giving programme involving expenditure of £20.5 million over 9 years and reaching 13,700 or so beneficiaries could achieve:

- savings on education, health, policing, social welfare and other areas of public spending worth, in gross terms, £110.87 million (2016 prices) over the period 2016/17 to 2031/31 in 2016 prices (undiscounted).

- when discounting is applied at the conventional rate (3.5% p.a.), the present value figure for potential savings in future public spending could be worth £87.69 million.

8.3 In addition, there is also the potential for additional government tax revenues associated with PAYE, National Insurance and indirect taxes on employee expenditure that would come about as a result of boosted participation in the workplace on the part of a proportion of Buttle UK grant beneficiaries. The potential for extra Government revenue is estimated to amount to an additional £22.44 million over the 2016/17-2030/31 period (undiscounted) compared to a scenario where the envisaged expanded grant giving programme is not implemented. When discounting is applied, the present value would amount to £17.71 million.

8.4 Taking both figures together, the overall benefit to the public purse as a result of the expanded grant giving programme can be expected to amount to £133.31 million in undiscounted terms, and £105.40 million when conventional rates of discounting are applied.

8.5 In terms of the public expenditure savings expected to be made over the lifetime of the appraisal (i.e. excluding the additional direct and indirect tax revenues), the contribution made by each of the target groups is expected to be as follows:

- Families escaping domestic violence: £25.79 million (23.3% of the total of £110.87 million)
- Other families: £63.10 million (56.9%); and
- Estranged young people: £21.98 million (19.9%).

8.6 The benefit cost ratio expected to be produced by the proposed expanded grant giving programme can be presented in both an undiscounted and a discounted format.

- In undiscounted terms, the proposed expenditure of £20.5 million would be expected to produce public expenditure savings and additional public revenues amounting to £133.31 million over a 15-year period. This produces a benefit-to-cost ratio of 6.48:1.00.
• The proposed expenditure of £20.5 million over the period 2016/17 to 2024/25 is worth £17.30 in present value terms. The expected future public expenditure savings and additional tax revenues are worth £105.40 million in present value terms. The associated would be expected to produce public expenditure savings and additional public revenues amounting to £133.31 million over a 15-year period. The associated benefit-to-cost ratio is 6.09:1.00.
9: Conclusion

9.1 Last year Buttle UK provided £3.7m in grants to nearly 30,000 children and young people, preventing them from falling into crisis and helping them to achieve their ambitions and potential.

9.2 *Turning Points* shows that Buttle UK’s £20.5 million *Chances for Children* appeal could deliver a step change in the support the charity currently delivers, generating significant economic benefits for the individual beneficiaries, as well as the State. At a 6:1 ratio of benefit to cost, over a 15 year period the programme could save a crucial £110.87 million on education, health, policing, social welfare and other areas of public spending, and add £22.44 million to the exchequer via tax revenues.

9.3 For the past six years public services in the UK have faced unprecedented funding pressures from austerity measures. It is thought too that the uncertainty caused from leaving the European Union will place further pressure on public finances in the short to medium term at least. Within this context we cannot afford to ignore the clear benefits that this model of giving could deliver.

9.4 Buttle UK has this year launched the *Chances for Children* appeal that aims to raise the £20.5 million needed to enact this increased grant giving programme. The charity’s recent Crisis Points (2016) report revealed new insights into the levels of need of families and children around the country. *Turning Points* shines a light on the true impact of timely, targeted and efficient interventions and demonstrates how a relatively small amount of money can have a transformative effect on the life chances of disadvantaged young people in the UK.
10: Buttle UK Recommendations

10.1 *Turning Points* demonstrates the positive impact that targeted timely intervention grants, delivered to meet the needs of the individual, can have by improving the life chances of children in crisis as well as delivering savings to public spending. We are calling on the UK Government and other policy makers to engage with us and explore further the impact of small amounts of tailored, targeted and timely funding in lifting the most vulnerable in society out of crisis and helping them transform their lives.

10.2 We also hope that support agencies, whether statutory or voluntary, will consider these findings in how they approach their own practice. Recognising that these are times of extremely tight budgets, we propose looking at the creative use of existing resources and exploring whether the adoption of this approach could be developed in conjunction with other forms of service delivery.

10.3 Our *Chances for Children* appeal, which aims to raise £20 million over the next five years, is an opportunity for the public, businesses and civil society to help us give children and young people in crisis the help they need, not just to survive but thrive. To find out how you can support our work, visit www.buttleuk.org.
11: About Buttle UK

11.1 Buttle UK is a charity dedicated to helping children and young people who are in crisis reach their potential by providing small but targeted and effective interventions.

11.2 The charity provided £3.7 million in individual grants to nearly 30,000 children and young people last year, preventing them from falling further into crisis and helping them to transform their lives. They are the largest grant-awarding charity to provide financial support direct to individual children and young people in the UK.

11.3 Whether Buttle UK gives a bed to a child who has become used to sleeping on the floor, counselling to a young boy who has fled an abusive home with his mother or a laptop to support a homeless teenager begin their first college course, their direct, efficient and intelligent grants are always focused on the needs of the individual.

11.4 Buttle UK was established in 1953 following the death of Frank Buttle, an East End clergyman, who raised nearly £1m to help launch children out of poverty. Since then, the money has been re-invested and multiplied countless times and ways. As the charity has grown, so has its capacity to make positive change.

11.5 You can find out more about Buttle UK and its work by visiting www.buttleuk.org.
## Appendix 1: Table of Estimated Public Expenditure Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absentees from pre-16 education</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent exclusions</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked after children</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>22.29</td>
<td>17.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection Plans</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Need</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP injuries</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP mental health</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYP hospital substance misuse</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance misuse specialist facilities</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol treatment</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17 NEET</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 NEET</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Justice System</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing homelessness</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment and inactivity</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>23.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.93</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.90</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>110.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>