



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

Published 22 May 2017
SP Paper 145
1st Report, 2017 (Session 5)

Social Security Committee
Comataidh Tèarainteachd Sòisealta

**Stage One Report on the Child Poverty
(Scotland) Bill**



Published in Scotland by the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body.

All documents are available on the Scottish Parliament website at:
<http://www.parliament.scot/abouttheparliament/91279.aspx>

For information on the Scottish Parliament contact Public Information on:
Telephone: 0131 348 5000
Textphone: 0800 092 7100
Email: sp.info@parliament.scot

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
Background	5
Levels of child poverty	5
Why legislate?	7
The statutory targets	9
How income will be calculated?	10
Interim targets	12
Delivery plans, progress reports and local reports	14
Content of delivery plans	14
Frequency of delivery plans	17
Progress reports and local action report	18
The Scottish Government child poverty measurement framework	21
Scrutiny and accountability	23
Delegated powers	25
Financial Memorandum	26
Finance and Constitution Committee consideration	26
Wider budgetary considerations	27
Conclusions	28
Annex A	29
Annex B	31
Bibliography	33

Social Security Committee

To consider and report on matters relating to social security falling within the responsibility of the Cabinet Secretary for Communities, Social Security and Equalities.



<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/CurrentCommittees/social-security-committee.aspx>



SocialSecurityCommittee@parliament.scot



0131 348 5228

Committee Membership



Convener
Sandra White
Scottish National Party



Deputy Convener
Pauline McNeill
Scottish Labour



George Adam
Scottish National Party



Mark Griffin
Scottish Labour



Gordon Lindhurst
Scottish Conservative
and Unionist Party



Alison Johnstone
Scottish Green Party



Ben Macpherson
Scottish National Party



Ruth Maguire
Scottish National Party



Adam Tomkins
Scottish Conservative
and Unionist Party


Executive Summary

The Committee's conclusions and recommendations are as follows:

1. **The Committee notes that setting targets will not, of itself, reduce child poverty. However we agree that legislation to reinstate statutory targets to tackle child poverty serves several important purposes. It sends a message about the importance the Scottish Government and this Parliament attaches to addressing child poverty. It serves to focus minds and resources and sets a clear vision of where, as a society, we want to be.**
2. **The Committee recognises that the four income-based targets are challenging; particularly on an after-housing-costs basis. Nevertheless, we agree that these targets are appropriate. In addition to the income-based targets, the Committee recommends that the Bill should include a challenging target to address persistent poverty. We invite the Scottish Government to bring forward an appropriate amendment at Stage 2.**
3. **The Committee invites the Scottish Ministers to look again at the way net income is to be calculated for the purposes of this Bill. In particular, the Committee draws attention to the evidence around the extent of poverty in households where someone has a disability. The Committee requests that further consideration be given to whether there are other deductions that should be made when calculating net household income.**
4. **The Committee is of the view that interim targets should be on the face of the Bill. Placing interim targets on a statutory footing will aid focus and create greater immediacy.**
5. **We recommend that the Scottish Government brings forward an amendment at Stage 2 to include the five areas suggested by End Child Poverty coalition as being a requirement for inclusion in delivery plans.**
6. **It is the view of the Committee that (1) the full use of Scottish social security powers, (2) the provision of information, advice and assistance to parents and carers in relation to welfare rights and income maximisation, (3) the provision of suitable and affordable housing, (4) the availability of childcare and (5) the facilitation of employment for parents and carers should be among the key components in each delivery plan and that their inclusion on the face of the Bill would not compromise flexibility. Further, we invite the Scottish Government to consider the evidence we received suggesting other issues to be covered in delivery plans.**
7. **The Committee believes that future delivery plans should be published to coincide with the start of new parliamentary sessions and that robust and comprehensive parliamentary scrutiny is essential. In the view of the Committee, there is a case for delivery plans to be three-yearly to ensure they can be updated or revised. The Committee would welcome further discussion of this point.**

8. **We welcome the establishment of a reference group to provide guidance to local authorities and health boards about their responsibilities under this Bill. We request more detail on the timescale for setting up the reference group, its remit and membership and when it is expected that guidance will become available. We request that the reference group considers how best practice and data around child poverty can be shared more usefully and what improvements can be made to available data.**
9. **We welcome the commitment given by the Cabinet Secretary to review the measurement framework and to include an updated version with the delivery plan to be published next year. We also welcome her agreement that it needs to be “a wider dashboard of indicators”. We recommend that delivery plans make specific reference to the measurement framework.**
10. **The Committee is concerned that, as the Bill currently stands, there is potential for the scrutiny arrangements around tackling child poverty to be weaker than those previously in place at UK level. Therefore, the Committee believes that the establishment of a commission, on a statutory footing, with a duty to scrutinise Scottish Ministers' delivery and progress plans is required. Having a commission, on a statutory footing, will ensure current and successive Scottish Ministers and Parliaments take account of the commission's views and that the Parliament has a say in the appointees.**
11. **We support the recommendation of the Delegated Powers and Law Reform Bill Committee that any regulations specifying a change to the base year for the absolute poverty target should be subject to the affirmative procedure. We invite the Scottish Government to bring forward the appropriate amendment at stage 2.**
12. **Although the FM states that the costs arising directly from this Bill will be £227, 000 per annum, this Bill is simply the framework for the wider policy initiatives required to meet the targets. It is clear that the policy actions required will have resource implications. We, therefore, recommend that the Scottish Ministers' budget plans make direct links with the child poverty delivery plans and progress reports.**
13. **The Committee acknowledges that the Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill is a framework bill. As such, it sends a message of intent and provides the foundations for ensuring focus at national and local level. A consistent and sustained effort at national and local level is required to tackle child poverty in Scotland and to bring about the necessary culture change across society. The Committee supports the general principles of the Bill.**

Introduction

14. The [Child Poverty \(Scotland\) Bill](#) was introduced to the Scottish Parliament by the Cabinet Secretary for Communities, Social Security and Equalities (the Cabinet Secretary) on 9 February 2017. The long title of the Bill states its purpose is to "set targets relating to the eradication of child poverty".
15. The Committee issued a call for evidence and received 41 written submissions. On 27 March, the Committee met formally in Glasgow to take evidence at a public meeting. We then met informally with a cross-section of representatives working in health, education and social care, housing, community regeneration and income maximisation in Glasgow. We chose Glasgow for our first meeting because research shows that child poverty is highest here. More than one in three children in the Glasgow City area are living in poverty; the highest ratio in Scotland.
16. On 20 April, we took further evidence at a public meeting in Edinburgh and on 27 April we concluded our evidence by hearing from the Cabinet Secretary. The Committee is extremely grateful to everyone who submitted evidence and took time to meet with us formally and informally to assist us in reaching our views on this Bill.
17. This report is on the general principles of the Bill and whether to agree them.
18. The Bill does two things. First, it sets four income-based targets against which child poverty in Scotland would be measured. Second, it puts in place reporting mechanisms, including a requirement on Scottish Ministers to publish delivery plans at set points detailing the action they would take and to publish annual progress reports. The Bill also requires local authorities and health boards to report jointly at the end of each financial year what actions they have taken to address child poverty.
19. The Bill was introduced in response to the UK Parliament's repeal of significant sections of the UK Child Poverty Act 2010 (the 2010 Act), including the income-based targets to address child poverty across the UK. The Scottish Government opposed the UK Government's change of approach and secured an opt-out.
20. This Scottish Government Bill mirrors certain provisions in the 2010 Act. The difference is that the targets measuring net income in this Bill are on an after-housing-costs (AHC) basis, whereas the previous UK approach had been before-housing-costs (BHC).
21. The Cabinet Secretary told this Committee—
 the Scottish Government is making a clear statement: first, that child poverty is neither acceptable nor inevitable—that is why our targets, which are set on an after-housing-cost basis, will be even more stretching than those in the original 2010 act; and secondly, that income, or a lack of income, is central to poverty

Source: Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], The Cabinet Secretary for Communities, Social Security and Equalities (Angela Constance), contrib. 5¹
22. The Bill does not specify any of the policy actions that will reduce levels of child poverty or detail what level of resources would be allocated to support the policy

actions. The purpose of this Bill is simply to set out targets and the requirement for delivery plans and provide a framework for reporting.

Background

23. The 2010 Act set out four income-based targets to be met in the financial year 2020-21 and a commitment to establish a Child Poverty Commission. The Child Poverty Commission was not set up and, following political changes at UK level, the Welfare Reform Act 2012 (the 2012 Act) replaced the proposed Child Poverty Commission with a Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission.
24. The Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016 (the 2016 Act) then replaced the four income-based targets with a duty to produce an annual report on levels of worklessness and educational attainment. The Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission's remit was changed and renamed the Social Mobility Commission and the 2010 Act was renamed the Life Chances Act 2010.
25. The Scottish Government voiced its “fundamental disagreement” with the removal of the four income-based targets from the 2010 Act. Through the 2016 Act, the Scottish Government secured an opt-out from the UK-wide provisions with the aim of bringing forward proposals for Scotland.
26. In 2012, the Scottish Government appointed a ministerial advisory group on child poverty. The ministerial advisory group played a key role in the development of the measurement framework which supports the Scottish Government's Child Poverty Strategy 2014-17. The measurement framework contains 37 indicators of child poverty under the three headings of pockets, prospects and places.
27. In August 2016, the Scottish Government published its consultation on a child poverty Bill for Scotland. An analysis of responses was published in December 2016 (ref) followed by introduction of this Bill in February 2017.
28. In October 2016, the Scottish Government published its Fairer Scotland Action Plan². This plan sets out the Scottish Government's five areas of focus until 2030: a fairer Scotland for all, ending child poverty, a strong start for all young people, fairer working lives and a thriving third age.

Levels of child poverty

29. In a recently published report, the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) forecasts a significant increase in the number of children living in poverty across the UK by 2021-22.

” Relative child poverty rises significantly in our projections, from 29% in 2014–15 to 36% in 2021–22. This is for two main reasons. First, low-income households with children receive a large share of their income from benefits – Belfield et al. (2016) show that households in the bottom quintile of the child income distribution received 61% of their income from benefits in 2014–15. This means that the working-age benefit freeze represents a substantial cut to the real incomes of poor households, as do the roll-out of universal credit and the phased introduction of the two-child limit in tax credits (which is mirrored in UC). Second, low-income households with children gain less from real earnings growth than households around the median, as a smaller share of their income comes from employment. Thus if real earnings rise as projected, median income will grow faster than the incomes of low-income households with children.³

30. Recently published figures on child poverty in Scotland in 2015-16 show⁴ —

- 19 per cent of children in Scotland, approximately 190,000, were living in relative poverty before housing costs (BHC) in 2015-16. This compares to 17 per cent the previous year.
- After housing costs (AHC), 26 per cent of children in Scotland were living in relative poverty, approximately 260,000. This compares to 22 per cent the previous year.
- Relative child poverty, both BHC and AHC, has fluctuated in recent years following a long term decrease between 1998-99 and 2011-12.
- In 2015-16, 10 per cent of children were living in combined low income BHC and material deprivation, unchanged from the previous year.
- In 2015-16, 100,000 children were living in material deprivation.
- After housing costs, 12 per cent of children were living in combined low income and material deprivation, unchanged from the previous year.
- In 2015-16, 110,000 children were living in material deprivation.

Why legislate?

31. Across the range of our evidence, there was strong support for reinstating statutory targets measuring household income for tackling child poverty. The reasons for supporting this Bill were similar to those made in response to the Scottish Government's consultation. For example, End Child Poverty (ECP) members welcomed the Bill saying—

” We particularly welcome the fact that the Bill proposes establishing four income based targets which will be measured after housing costs. Members of End Child Poverty work with children, young people and their families who face a range of different difficulties and challenges. What many of them have in common is that they face these challenges living on a very low income. Income very much matters to the quality of their day to day lives. ⁵

32. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) said it too warmly welcomed this Bill to provide a vision and a goal, to ensure progress, widen accountability and locate responsibility. Dr Jim McCormick (JRF) told the Committee—

” If we are to have that commitment as a society, having good, clear measurements and targets is important for scrutiny and ensuring that we are on track and that we can change course if we are not progressing at the rate at which we would like to progress.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr Jim McCormick (Joseph Rowntree Foundation), contrib. 2⁶

33. Naomi Eisenstadt, the Scottish Government's independent adviser on poverty and inequality, also voiced support for the Bill. She told the Committee she had been the civil servant in the UK Government who drafted the initial UK Bill and had been “heartbroken” at the dismantling of the 2010 Act. She added—

” I was very pleased about and warmly welcomed the Scottish Government's resistance to dismantling the Bill and putting back together some of the key components that I consider most important.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Naomi Eisenstadt, contrib. 3⁷

34. In a written submission, COSLA said it had supported the targets in the 2010 Act and accordingly supported the targets in this Bill, adding—

” Making income targets statutory would also provide a driver for change and improvement. This is arguably because embedding the targets in statute ensures that the issue remains at the forefront of the national consciousness and can be used to monitor progress. ⁸

35. There was recognition that work has already been taking place. For example, Robert McGregor (Fife Council) said most local authorities had been engaging with local partners to reduce child poverty but the picture was not a consistent one across the country. He, in common with others, felt the Bill would direct efforts. He reflected that—

” Anything that raises the profile of child poverty so that it becomes a “must do” rather than a “good to do” is a good thing.

Source: Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Robert McGregor (Fife Council), contrib. 6⁹

36. The Cabinet Secretary stated—

” As child poverty is on the increase and is predicted to increase further, it would be wholly unacceptable and a dereliction of duty to downgrade the importance of addressing it by not having statutory income targets.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], Angela Constance, contrib. 7¹⁰

37. **The Committee notes that setting targets will not, of itself, reduce child poverty. However we agree that legislation to reinstate statutory targets to tackle child poverty serves several important purposes. It sends a message about the importance the Scottish Government and this Parliament attaches to addressing child poverty. It serves to focus minds and resources and sets a clear vision of where, as a society, we want to be.**

The statutory targets

38. The Bill sets out four income-related targets to be met in the financial year beginning 1 April 2030; effectively by 31 March 2031. The targets are that—
- Less than 10 per cent of children live in households that are in relative poverty
 - Less than 5 per cent of children live in households that are in absolute poverty
 - Less than 5 per cent of children live in households that are in combined low income and material deprivation
 - Less than 5 per cent of children live in households that are in persistent poverty.
39. The Bill defines relative and absolute poverty. Both are calculated with reference to equivalised net income, i.e. income adjusted to take account of variations in household size and composition after deducting housing costs.
40. Our evidence showed strong support for the statutory targets to be income based. Child Poverty Action Group in Scotland (CPAG) explained why that was important—
- ” retaining a focus on income based targets in this legislation is the correct approach. Only by maximising the financial resources available to families in Scotland can real and lasting progress be made towards improving child wellbeing. ¹¹
41. The majority of written respondents were clearly in favour of the four targets currently on the face of the Bill. However several, including JRF, the Poverty Alliance, Citizens Advice Scotland (CAS) and Fife Partnership, argued that statutory child poverty targets should form part of a wider all age anti-poverty strategy.
42. For example, in its written submission, JRF made reference to the all-age strategy it had published in autumn 2016, reflecting the risks and costs faced by people at various points in their lives. JRF wrote—
- ” We would encourage the Scottish Government and Parliament to consider how far the Child Poverty Bill combined with the Fairer Scotland Action Plan and the emerging approach to Inclusive Growth will provide the basis for a comprehensive approach to solving poverty across the population. ¹²
43. A number of respondents welcomed the ambition of the targets, particularly when the targets are to be met on an after housing costs (AHC) basis. For example, the Scottish Human Rights Commission pointed out that "the Scottish Government is actually aiming for similar or even more ambitious targets than [those set by the UN Sustainable Development Goals in relation to poverty reduction]".
44. There were a few respondents who questioned whether the targets would be achievable. For example, Dr Morag Treanor (University of Edinburgh), while supportive of the introduction of these targets, explicitly asked whether they could be achieved. She wrote—

- ” The proposed targets are highly ambitious (unachievable?) on an after housing costs basis, particularly in light of the caveat that the Scottish Government does not hold all the levers to enable them to achieve these targets. ¹³
45. Similarly, the City of Edinburgh Council questioned whether such ambitious targets have ever been achieved by comparable nations on a similar timescale.
46. In contrast, CPAG, JRF and Shelter called for more ambitious targets to be considered, specifically for measuring the scale of persistent poverty. Shelter, for example, suggested that the persistent poverty measure should include those living in relative poverty in two out of four years—
- ” Given the importance of a child's development and education, we strongly believe that a two-year period more adequately reflects the devastating and long-term effects that poverty has on children than a three year period. ¹⁴
47. In his oral evidence, Dr Jim McCormick (JRF) said—
- ” It is important that we have a small core set of the right targets that are informed by a richer measurement or monitoring framework that gets more into the detail of the connections that drive the outcomes around those targets. The broad measures that are being proposed are very good, but a target that better captures the depth or severity of poverty is missing.
- Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr McCormick, contrib. 21¹⁵
48. The Cabinet Secretary acknowledged that meeting the targets would be challenging but added—
- ” It will be a challenge. The targets are achievable with the right focus, the right commitment and the right policies in place, as reflected in the delivery plan, but that will not be easy.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], Angela Constance, contrib. 7¹⁰

49. **The Committee recognises that the four income-based targets are challenging; particularly on an after-housing-costs basis. Nevertheless, we agree that these targets are appropriate. In addition to the income-based targets, the Committee recommends that the Bill should include a challenging target to address persistent poverty. We invite the Scottish Government to bring forward an appropriate amendment at Stage 2.**

How income will be calculated?

50. None of our evidence suggested that the calculation of net income should be on a BHC measure, some queried whether the current AHC measure adequately reflects disposable income. JRF suggested an alternative “after essential costs” approach to take account of other unavoidable expense such as heating, lighting or childcare.
51. Inclusion Scotland and JRF both suggested account should be taken of the additional costs faced by households where one or more persons are living with a

disability. Inclusion Scotland made a specific call for the main disability benefits to be discounted when measuring household income. Inclusion Scotland pointed out that disabled children and children in households containing a disabled adult are at higher risk of poverty, observing—

” The 4 proposed targets all, in one way or another, take account of the additional income from disability benefits but fail to measure the impact of additional costs. This has the effect of boosting household income and lifting many households containing disabled people out of “poverty” when the current measure of poverty is applied...¹⁶

52. Dr Jim McCormick (JRF) suggested that a minimum income standard would be a better measure of adequate standards of living. This was supported by Naomi Eisenstadt who highlighted the difference in the cost of living in Shetland compared to Glasgow and the limitations of looking at income on its own. She pointed out—

” Certainly, Scotland and Wales both have much more rural poverty than England has, so, for Scotland, looking at the minimum income standard in rural areas is very important.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Naomi Eisenstadt, contrib. 22¹⁷

53. From the written submissions, there was a range of other suggestions as to additional costs that could be considered as deductions calculating net income. Examples included mortgage capital payments (Shelter), household debt and other costs such as education (Scottish Youth Parliament) and childcare (Engender).

54. Andrew Hood (IFS) recognised the benefit of the approach taken in this Bill to measure income AHC but noted a caveat around the element of personal choice that exists. He gave the example of two households with exactly the same income where one household values the quality of the house they live in more than the quality of their food and the other household values the opposite. He commented—

” On the AHC measure, one of those households will be measured as being in poverty and the other will not. You might not want that to be the case, because the only difference is that they prefer one thing over another—it is nothing to do with essentials.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Andrew Hood, contrib. 23¹⁸

55. **Clearly, how the net household income is arrived at will be important when measuring levels of child poverty, assessing what actions to take and measuring performance against targets.**

56. **The Committee invites the Scottish Ministers to look again at the way net income is to be calculated for the purposes of this Bill. In particular, the Committee draws attention to the evidence around the extent of poverty in households where someone has a disability. The Committee requests that further consideration be given to whether there are other deductions that should be made when calculating net household income.**

Interim targets

57. The Bill requires that the four targets are met “in the financial year beginning with 1 April 2030”, 13 years away. The Bill makes no provision for interim targets.
58. In our call for evidence, we asked whether interim targets were needed. Most respondents said yes; however different interim dates were suggested. The most widely suggested was the halfway point (2024) or at the end of each delivery plan period (2021 and 2026 in line with the current provisions in the Bill).
59. Dr Jim McCormick (JRF) observed that as the timescale for this Bill is 13 years, a child starting school this year would be 18 by the time the target date is reached. He said—
- ” understanding what the pathway through a typical childhood looks like, with its various twists and turns, transition points and so on, is quite important. Having interim targets is a good idea.
- Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr McCormick, contrib. 7¹⁹
60. ECP agreed and drew parallels with other legislation—
- ” Again, interim targets would allow public and political scrutiny and provide a useful way of measuring progress towards the 2030 goals. There is useful legislative precedent in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 which requires annual reporting on targets – advised by an independent panel – an interim target and a final target.⁵
61. Not all written respondents were clear that interim targets should be included on the face of the Bill. However all of our witnesses, who offered a view, called for the Bill to be amended to include interim targets. Both CPAG and other members of the ECP coalition said that interim targets, for the mid-way point between now and 2030 should be explicit in the Bill—
- ” ...a good starting point would be an expectation that Scottish Ministers be “halfway” towards eradicating child poverty by 2024 (“halfway” towards the target year of 2030). Interim targets would allow public and political scrutiny and provide a useful way of measuring progress towards the 2030 goals.²⁰
62. Andrew Hood (IFS) supported adding interim targets to ensure accountability and check that the Government was on track. However he added that interim targets should sit alongside forecasting or a projection, based on current economic forecasts, of poverty levels in future years. He explained—
- ” If the Government is recording progress only against a set of interim targets, it will be very hard, once the timescale for the interim targets has been reached—or even a long way before then—to hold the relevant people to account unless the Government says, “This is what we expect the number to be.”
- Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Andrew Hood, contrib. 11²¹
63. The Cabinet Secretary said she was open to revisiting the issue of interim targets and coming back with proposals at Stage 2. However, she added—

” we would have to be careful about setting such targets in the Bill, given that the work that we need to do prior to the delivery plan, on understanding the projections and the trajectory of child poverty, is still being done.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], Angela Constance, contrib. 9²²

64. **The Committee supports the setting of interim targets and welcomes the Cabinet Secretary's openness to bringing forward proposals at Stage 2.**

65. **The Committee is of the view that interim targets should be on the face of the Bill. Placing interim targets on a statutory footing will aid focus and create greater immediacy.**

Delivery plans, progress reports and local reports

Content of delivery plans

66. The Bill puts in place certain mechanisms for reporting against the targets. The first is that the Scottish Ministers must lay and publish three delivery plans. The first delivery plan will cover the period April 2018 to March 2021, the second April 2021 to March 2026 and the third April 2026 to March 2031. The delivery plans will set the actions to be taken for the purpose of meeting the child poverty targets.
67. The Bill sets out whom the Scottish Ministers must consult when preparing the delivery plans and that plans “may include such other information about child poverty as the Scottish Ministers consider appropriate”. The Bill provides no further detail about what a delivery plan would look like or any of the indicative policy areas that must be covered.
68. All of our witnesses recognised that the Scottish Ministers’ delivery plans would be key to delivering this Bill’s aims. The Committee is therefore disappointed that there is no detail in this Bill about the shape and content of the delivery plans.
69. This absence of detail was noted by a number of respondents who called for the Bill to set out some of the policy areas that must be covered in the delivery plans. Barnardos and Children in Scotland (both part of the ECP coalition) suggested a list of the issues that Scottish Ministers should address in the plans:
- The full use of Scottish social security powers
 - The provision of information, advice and assistance to parents and carers in relation to welfare rights and income maximisation
 - The provision of suitable and affordable housing
 - The availability of childcare
 - The facilitation of employment for parents and carers. ²³
70. Many respondents and witnesses made reference to the Scottish Government’s new social security powers, the interaction between them, the powers retained by the UK Government and the relationship between social security and child poverty. CAS called for the Scottish Government to work with the UK Government to achieve the child poverty targets, saying—
- ” Eradicating child poverty by 2030 will require a sustained and focussed programme of activities across a number of areas, including reserved matters. Whilst a number of matters related to addressing child poverty – such as education, health and public transport are within the remit of the Scottish Parliament, other areas directly related to increasing family income, such as the National Minimum Wage, most ‘safety net’ social security benefits, and areas of taxation are reserved to the UK Parliament. ²⁴

71. CPAG called for the Bill to include a commitment that social security powers would be used to reduce child poverty alongside a duty to review annually the overall value of social security support for families. Supported by Engender, Inclusion Scotland and others, CPAG suggested—

” ...the legislation should include an initial commitment to use new social security powers to top-up child benefit by £5 a week per child (a policy, modelling suggests, would reduce child poverty by up to 14% - lifting around 30,000 children out of poverty)...Such a commitment would provide a clear statement of intent and demonstrate the Scottish Parliament's willingness to prioritise resources toward achieving the proposed targets. ²⁰

72. Naomi Eisenstadt did not agree with that suggestion. She explained—

” I am not in favour of the £5 extra child benefit. I simply do not think that that is the best way to spend the limited money that we have. If we give everyone a spoonful of rice, the people who are most in need will not get any fatter, but the fattest will get fatter. Therefore, I am not in favour of that approach.

There is a fundamental issue about the delivery of benefits and the benefits system, and that is to do with dignity and respect. We should stop using stigma as an excuse for universalism and start to treat people as decent human beings; we would then not have that problem.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Naomi Eisenstadt, contrib. 72²⁵

73. Engender also said that understanding and tackling women's poverty in Scotland would be central to the success of this Bill. It noted the link between women's poverty and child poverty and that women are more likely than men to be living in poverty. It also pointed to evidence that lone mothers are more likely to experience poverty and women are twice as likely as men to be dependent on social security. Engender called for the Bill to be “gendered” stating—

” failing to tackle gender inequality in poverty will jeopardize the Scottish Government's ambition to eradicate child poverty in Scotland. ²⁶

74. When asked whether the Bill should include a legal duty on Scottish Ministers to take steps to close the attainment gap, Naomi Eisenstadt replied—

” I would say no, because I think that if you wrap too much in the bill, you will not get the impact. Income is enormously important and the bill is about income.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Naomi Eisenstadt, contrib. 31²⁷

75. Dr Jim McCormick (JRF) agreed, but added—

” The place to make the link is in the delivery plan, where Government has to give an account of which powers and budgets it will use to contribute to achieving the targets, but what is really helpful is to have a richer framework around the bill.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr McCormick, contrib. 32²⁸

76. Other witnesses were asked whether the Bill should include a requirement for the delivery plans to address the attainment gap. John Dickie (CPAG) suggested that this Bill could be used to amend the Education (Scotland) Act 2017. He explained—

” I agree about the importance of tackling the educational attainment gap. Last year, during the passage of the Education (Scotland) Bill, we argued that that aspect should be beefed up, with a clear duty on Government to reduce the attainment gap as part of the legislation. That is where I see that aspect more comfortably fitting. The measure is one of attainment and the attainment gap; it is not, in itself, a measure of poverty or child poverty.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, John Dickie, contrib. 98²⁹

77. Peter Allan (Dundee City Council) said—

” I do not know whether it should be added to the bill, but I described earlier the logic modelling that we do, with which we think about what the biggest contributory factors are and how we can take early action to change them. Attainment issues will be one of those factors. Strong targets associated with those would be more meaningful than waiting for five or 10 years to see whether the income measures have changed.

Source: Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Peter Allan, contrib. 28³⁰

78. Bill Scott (Inclusion Scotland) said although he did not think attainment should necessarily be in the Bill, it was a huge issue. He explained—

” Disabled children are twice as likely as non-disabled children to leave school with no qualifications, regardless of the type of impairment that they have. There are disabled children with sensory impairments and physical impairments but no intellectual impairment whatsoever who are leaving school with no qualifications. That makes their chances nil in the current job market. Unless we change that, we will not change their future, and when they become parents they will be parents living in poverty, and their children will be living in poverty, so we have to change the cycle.

Source: Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Bill Scott, contrib. 110³¹

79. The Committee agrees that the delivery plans are a key element of the framework for meeting the child poverty targets. Importantly, they are the mechanism by which the Scottish Government will set out the measures they intend to focus on in order to reduce child poverty and meet the targets by 2030. For these reasons, the Committee believes there should be a sharper focus at Stage 2 on the elements to be included in each and every delivery plan.

80. The Committee would welcome more discussion with the Scottish Government about the function of the delivery plans to ensure there is clarity around the format the delivery plans and what they must contain. Whilst we agree plans should not be too prescriptive, they must provide sufficient information to inform the Parliament of plans going forward. This should include addressing the correlations between child poverty and gender, disability or race.

81. **The Cabinet Secretary said she was not averse to the Bill listing areas that delivery plans should cover. We welcome this.**

82. **We recommend that the Scottish Government brings forward an amendment at Stage 2 to include the five areas suggested by End Child Poverty coalition as being a requirement for inclusion in delivery plans.**
83. **It is the view of the Committee that (1) the full use of Scottish social security powers, (2) the provision of information, advice and assistance to parents and carers in relation to welfare rights and income maximisation, (3) the provision of suitable and affordable housing, (4) the availability of childcare and (5) the facilitation of employment for parents and carers should be among the key components in each delivery plan and that their inclusion on the face of the Bill would not compromise flexibility. Further, we invite the Scottish Government to consider the evidence we received suggesting other issues to be covered in delivery plans.**

Frequency of delivery plans

84. We received mixed views about whether the frequency of the delivery plans was right and, if not, what it should be. Children in Scotland, CAS and Inclusion Scotland suggested that the delivery plans should be prepared at three-yearly intervals rather than five.
85. Others, including JRF, suggested that delivery plans should be published early in a new parliamentary session—
- ” One government and parliament cannot bind the next – a fresh look at the start of each term would aid scrutiny and accountability.¹²
86. The Cabinet Secretary noted that the current child poverty strategy covers a three-year period and that a three-year cycle tends to fall in the middle of a parliamentary session. She added—
- ” I am quite relaxed about the timing of the delivery plans, but they need to cover a long-enough period to give the Government and its partners a run at it.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], Angela Constance, contrib. 57³²

87. **The Committee believes that future delivery plans should be published to coincide with the start of new parliamentary sessions and that robust and comprehensive parliamentary scrutiny is essential. In the view of the Committee, there is a case for delivery plans to be three-yearly to ensure they can be updated or revised. The Committee would welcome further discussion of this point.**

Progress reports and local action report

88. In addition to the delivery plans, at the end of each financial year within a period covered by a delivery plan, the Scottish Ministers must lay and publish a progress report. Progress reports must detail what has been achieved during that financial year towards meeting the targets and implementing the delivery plan.
89. In the final year of the period in which the targets should be met (April 2030 to March 2031), the Scottish Ministers' progress report must include a statement on the percentage of children still living in relative poverty, absolute poverty, combined low income and material deprivation and persistent poverty.
90. The Bill also requires local authorities and health boards to "as soon as reasonably practicable after the end of each reporting year" jointly prepare and publish an annual local child poverty action report. Each joint report must describe any measures taken during the reporting year by the local authority or the health board to contribute to meeting the child poverty targets.
91. The requirement is for local authorities and health boards to report, retrospectively, anything that has been done. The Bill does not require that any action is taken, only that, if action has been taken during that year, it is reported.
92. There was support for local reporting. Jackie Erdman, head of equalities at NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, said it was important for local areas to know about their own progress. She said—

” Given the inequality that we have in Glasgow, it is important to show that we can use our resources in different ways to target different areas.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Jackie Erdman, contrib. 146³³

93. Some local authority and NHS respondents questioned whether the duty to report should be placed on a broader range of organisations. Aberdeenshire Community Planning Partnership (CPP) suggested that CPPs should be added to the face of the Bill, describing the current provision as a "missed opportunity to ensure reporting of the fullest possible range of actions at a local level".³⁴ (reference) Several responses also suggested that consideration should be given to the potential role of local health and social care partnerships in producing reports.
94. Renfrewshire Council pointed out that most health boards work across more than one local authority area, highlighting that NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde will be involved in eight separate joint reports. This was one of a number of written responses that touched on the complexity of the reporting landscape at a local level.
95. Members of ECP and other respondents argued that the duty on local authorities and health boards to report progress is insufficient and said—

” the legislation should ensure there is a clear duty on local authorities and health boards to take a strategic approach to reducing child poverty in their area - as well as reporting annually on the steps they have taken to achieve this.³⁵

96. This was also the view of a number of other respondents, including some of those that would be subject to this duty, e.g. Renfrewshire Council, Fife Partnerships and NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde:

” If the duty was focussed on strategic planning around child poverty this would make more sense, as it encourages major local partners to present a strategic and co-ordinated approach to tackling poverty.³⁶

97. Robert McGregor (Fife Council) said there was a risk that local authorities and health boards continue to just do what they had always done, saying—

” It is not absolutely clear to me what we are being asked to do over and above what we currently do, or whether the Bill, when enacted, will eventually provide a great deal of scrutiny and support around sharing learning and so on.

Source: Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Robert McGregor, contrib. 13³⁷

98. Other evidence highlighted the importance of local areas sharing best practice. For example, Sandra McDermott (Glasgow City Council) called for—

” publicity or some way of reporting on things that a local authority, national health service board or community planning partnership has done that really work and have a fantastic impact, so that we are not all chasing around, trying to reinvent the wheel, but learn from each other about what works and what has a good impact.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Sandra McDermott, contrib. 152³⁸

99. On that same theme, Dr Hannah (NHS Fife) agreed—

” There is a lot of commonality across our areas and Dundee is just across the river from Fife, but we do not necessarily get a chance to learn much about the detail of what even a neighbouring local authority is doing. If we can find better ways to learn together about what works for us, we will be able to accelerate the pace at which we address the challenge.

Source: Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Dr Hannah, contrib. 52³⁹

100. Robert McGregor (Fife Council) said—

” through the administrative data that we hold on many different things, we understand a lot about families and children, but we do not as yet make enough of that kind of information or consider how we join everything up between the various partners.

Source: Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Robert McGregor, contrib. 31⁴⁰

101. Professor Andrew Russell (NHS Tayside) agreed, adding—

” There is an opportunity through the alignment of health and social care to bring the local authority and other partners into that conversation and into the discipline around the way in which we collectively use data, and we can see real opportunities against the background of that agenda.

Source: Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Professor Russell, contrib. 32⁴¹

102. It is clear there is an appetite at local level for closer working and more sharing of ideas. Aligned to that is a recognised need for better data and better data sharing.
103. The Cabinet Secretary said that the Scottish Government would shortly be consulting on a new overarching socio-economic duty. If enacted, the Child Poverty Bill would sit beneath that as part of a wider set of duties on ministers and local authorities arising from the Education (Scotland) Act 2016, the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 and the Children and Young People Act (Scotland) 2014. Alongside that, and with specific reference to this Bill, she is “working to establish a reference group to provide guidance to local authorities and health boards”.
104. We understand from the Cabinet Secretary that the new socio-economic duty will result in broader responsibilities than set out in this Bill and that this should have the effect of ensuring that a strategic approach is taken locally.

105. **We welcome the establishment of a reference group to provide guidance to local authorities and health boards about their responsibilities under this Bill. We request more detail on the timescale for setting up the reference group, its remit and membership and when it is expected that guidance will become available. We request that the reference group considers how best practice and data around child poverty can be shared more usefully and what improvements can be made to available data.**

The Scottish Government child poverty measurement framework

106. The Scottish Government's existing child poverty strategy includes a child poverty measurement framework (the framework) of 37 indicators under three themes: pockets, prospects and places. There was support for retaining the three themes but most of our respondents called for the indicators in the framework to be reviewed and several proposed a stronger link between the framework and the statutory targets in this Bill.
107. The majority of written respondents argued for an increase in the number of indicators. For example, suggestions for further measures under “pockets” included uptake of social security benefits, measures of irregular employment and in-work poverty levels. Under “prospects”, suggestions included proxies for maternal health, birth-weight or child obesity, development indicators at 27-30 months and “adverse childhood experiences”.
108. Dr Margaret Hannah (NHS Fife) suggested using a stronger focus on measuring inequality—

” A potential addition to the process could be an inequality measure such as the Gini coefficient, which could be used to look at the distribution of income across all income groups in society, rather than targeting the measurement only on levels of poverty in childhood.

Source: Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Dr Hannah, contrib. 24⁴²

109. There was some concern that the existing “places” measures do not adequately capture data on children who live in poverty but who do not live in a deprived area. Children 1st pointed out that, even in an affluent city such as Edinburgh, every single ward registers child poverty rates of over 10 per cent AFC.⁴³ JRF confirmed that the concentration of poor households in the poorest neighbourhoods varies widely across local authority areas.¹²
110. Others suggested that the framework could be improved in relation to particular groups where poverty levels are known to be higher, such as people with disabilities, women, ethnic minorities, refugees and asylum seekers.
111. Members of the ECP coalition suggested that the Bill should make explicit reference to the measurement framework. As John Dickie explained—
- ” it is clearly being seen as an important part of the overall picture for understanding what needs to be in place to make progress and how we measure whether progress has been made beneath the headline targets.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, John Dickie, contrib. 84⁴⁴

112. **We welcome the commitment given by the Cabinet Secretary to review the measurement framework and to include an updated version with the**

delivery plan to be published next year. We also welcome her agreement that it needs to be “a wider dashboard of indicators”. We recommend that delivery plans make specific reference to the measurement framework.

Scrutiny and accountability

113. Other than requiring that Scottish Ministers lay and publish the delivery plans and the annual progress reports, this Bill makes no provision for any independent scrutiny of the Scottish Government's actions.
114. The Law Society of Scotland was explicit in highlighting a lack of accountability in the Bill as it currently stands. It noted that laying delivery plans and progress reports would encourage progress, scrutiny and oversight but said—
- ” we are concerned that these measures alone will not secure the success of the Bill's aims. It is unclear to us what the consequences, if any, would be if the targets are not met. ⁴⁵
115. Peter Allan (Dundee City Council) raised the same issue asking—
- ” Who will look at all the reports that are produced, the delivery plan for the Government, or the local plan and say whether they are doing enough: going far enough and fast enough to seriously reduce inequality?
- Source: Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Peter Allan, contrib. 38⁴⁶
116. Both Inclusion Scotland and the Poverty Alliance suggested that scrutiny could be improved by reports being subject to parliamentary approval and scrutiny before publication. ⁴⁷ As already noted, JRF pointed out that having delivery plans coincide with the start of parliamentary terms would improve accountability. Dr Jim McCormick (JRF) and others pointed to the importance of linking delivery plans with the budget process too. He said—
- ” The more that we can drive resource allocation decisions that are based on evidence from what has and has not worked, the more it becomes a living, breathing, practical and useful plan, rather than something that sits to the side of what Government is doing.
- Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr McCormick, contrib. 17⁴⁸
117. ECP called for independent scrutiny by a body that could “speak freely and be critical of the government when necessary” and report annually on progress towards meeting the targets. ⁵ John Dickie (CPAG) supported calls for a statutory body but asked also what commitment the Parliament would give to scrutinising the delivery plans, progress reports and local reports.
118. In the Fairer Scotland Plan, published in October 2016, the Scottish Ministers said they would establish a poverty and inequality commission. There is no mention of the commission in this Bill or what role it might have in relation to child poverty or in scrutinising the Scottish Ministers.
119. In her evidence, the Cabinet Secretary said she intended that the poverty and inequality commission would assist with the development of Scottish Ministers' first delivery plan. It would also have an important role in relation to annual reports and more widely—

- ” a core part of the commission’s role is evaluating the Government’s current and new policies. The commission will also evaluate the UK-wide context and the wider impact of the economy and welfare reform.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], Angela Constance, contrib. 55⁴⁹

120. However, the Cabinet Secretary said there were no plans to place the commission on a statutory footing. She gave two main reasons for this: firstly that the UK body had been statutory but a new UK Government had, nonetheless, made significant changes to it. And secondly—

- ” if it were to be a statutory body, the timescales involved mean that it would not be established in time for the publication of the first delivery plan, which must be in April 2018.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], Angela Constance, contrib. 40⁵⁰

121. We understand that an announcement on the poverty and inequality commission will be made “in the near future”.

- 122. The Committee is concerned that, as the Bill currently stands, there is potential for the scrutiny arrangements around tackling child poverty to be weaker than those previously in place at UK level. Therefore, the Committee believes that the establishment of a commission, on a statutory footing, with a duty to scrutinise the Scottish Ministers' delivery and progress plans is required. Having a commission, on a statutory footing, will ensure current and successive Scottish Ministers and Parliaments take account of the commission's views and that the Parliament has a say in the appointees.**

Delegated powers

123. The Bill contains one subordinate legislation provision. Section 3 allows the Scottish Ministers to make regulations specifying a change to the base year for the absolute poverty target. The regulations are to be subject to the negative procedure.
124. The Delegated Powers and Law Reform Bill Committee (the DPLR Committee) considered and reported on this provision. The DPLR Committee disagreed with the view of Scottish Ministers that any change to the base year would be simply a methodological change. For this reason, the DPLR Committee recommended that any regulations made under section 3 should be subject to the affirmative procedure. In that way, any change to the base year made by the Scottish Ministers would be afforded a higher level of scrutiny by the Parliament.
125. **We support the recommendation of the Delegated Powers and Law Reform Bill Committee that any regulations specifying a change to the base year for the absolute poverty target should be subject to the affirmative procedure. We invite the Scottish Government to bring forward the appropriate amendment at stage 2.**

Financial Memorandum

126. The Financial Memorandum (FM) summarises costs for the Bill, as £227,000 per annumⁱ. This is broken down into costs for the Scottish Government (specifically for delivery plans and annual reports relating to action on child poverty)ⁱⁱ, and costs for both local authorities and health boards (also for production of the annual reports)ⁱⁱⁱ.
127. The Scottish Government states that the costs directly arising from the Bill“ are not expected to be significantly different to the status quo”[1], as this Bill effectively replaces the existing requirement to publish a Child Poverty Strategy every three years.
128. With regard to costs to local authorities and health boards, the Scottish Government states it does not expect annual reporting to create a significant additional burden to existing reporting activity.[1]

Finance and Constitution Committee consideration

129. The Finance and Constitution Committee issued a call for views on the FM in March 2017, and received responses from 9 local authorities, 2 health boards and Social Work Scotland.
130. The responses acknowledged that the FM estimates cost for production of annual child poverty action reports by local authorities and regional health boards. However, many respondents pointed out that this is additional reporting being asked for when budgets are already stretched. In their view, this will place an additional burden on local service providers in a climate of economic challenges such as rising child poverty levels and the consequences of exiting the EU (e.g. South Lanarkshire Council, West Lothian Council, Dumfries and Galloway Council).
131. Social Work Scotland proposed that the Scottish Government take the lead by collating local information and analysis of poverty throughout Scotland, to more effectively maximise resources at both a national and local level. Aberdeen City Council said that the extra burden should be recognised by increasing the Local Government Finance Settlement.
132. A number of respondents also pointed out that the costs estimated in the FM do not take account of the resources involved in partnership working; and it is often partnerships (involving more than just local authorities and health boards) that are involved in local level activity to tackle child poverty.
133. East Ayrshire Council, for example, pointed out that the activity of Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) is not factored into cost estimates (given that the FM

i This is a maximum annual cost for a year where there is both a delivery plan and annual reports.

ii £27,000 costs for each delivery plan and £11,000 per annual report.

iii £152,000 costs for local authorities and £37,000 for health boards annually.

states that the Scottish Government “would expect Community Planning Partnerships to be a useful vehicle by which to co-ordinate this work”) ⁵¹ .

134. The respondents all highlighted that the real costs of this Bill come with the need for various local partners to pursue new and revised activity to work toward meeting the statutory child poverty targets. For example, Dumfries & Galloway Council noted that, in the context of reduced budgets, supporting vulnerable children is increasingly difficult; with new approaches to meeting the sometimes complex needs of children in poverty requiring significant resource investment.
135. The Finance and Constitution Committee considered and noted the responses. It has not reported.

Wider budgetary considerations

136. More generally, Naomi Eisenstadt and Dr Jim McCormick (JRF) highlighted the importance of linking delivery plans and progress reports to the Scottish Government's budget process. This would provide one means of holding the Scottish Ministers to account for their decisions on tackling child poverty. Dr Jim McCormick proposed that there should be a duty on the Scottish Government to report annually on how it has made evidence based budgetary decisions that contribute to the Bill's targets. He said—

” I would support the Bill being tougher on the Scottish Government by giving it a duty, alongside local partners, to report annually and, as part of that, to give us an account of the evidence on which the Government has based its budget decisions that contribute or not—to be discussed—towards the targets. We need in Scotland to invest in better data and better modelling and projections so that we know what would happen if we did not take certain measures.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr McCormick, contrib. 46⁵²

Sonya Scott, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, agreed that setting out the budgetary response would strengthen the Bill.

” A few things could be added to the Bill to strengthen it. I was struck by a comment from either Naomi Eisenstadt or Jim McCormick about the Government having to set out the budgetary response in relation to the Bill. That would be really useful because, at the end of the day, this is about putting your money where your mouth is and allocating resource.

Source: Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Sonya Scott, contrib. 158⁵³

- 137. Although the FM states that the costs arising directly from this Bill will be £227, 000 per annum, this Bill is simply the framework for the wider policy initiatives required to meet the targets. It is clear that the policy actions required will have resource implications. We, therefore, recommend that the Scottish Ministers' budget plans make direct links with the child poverty delivery plans and progress reports.**

Conclusions

The Committee acknowledges that the Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill is a framework bill. As such, it sends a message of intent and provides the foundations for ensuring focus at national and local level. A consistent and sustained effort at national and local level is required to tackle child poverty in Scotland and to bring about the necessary culture change across society. The Committee supports the general principles of the Bill.

Annex A

Extracts from the Minutes of the Social Security Committee meetings and associated written evidence

3rd Meeting, 2017 (Session 5), Thursday 23 February 2017

Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill (in private): The Committee received a briefing from—

Gillian Cross, Policy Adviser, Social Justice Strategy Team and Bill Team Leader, Paul Tyrer, Head of Social Justice Strategy, Andrew White, Senior Assistant Statistician, Communities Analysis Division, Stuart Foubister, Divisional Solicitor, Scottish Government.

Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill (in private): The Committee considered its approach to the Bill. It agreed a call for evidence and who to invite to give evidence formally and informally. It also agreed to review evidence in private, to consider the draft Stage 1 report in private and to delegate to the Convener responsibility for arranging for the SPCB to pay, under Rule 12.4.3, any expenses of witnesses arising from the scrutiny of the Bill.

7th Meeting, 2017 (Session 5), Monday 27 March 2017

Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill: The Committee took evidence on the Bill at Stage 1 from—

Naomi Eisenstadt, Independent Advisor on Poverty and Inequality, Scottish Government;

Andrew Hood, Senior Research Economist, Institute for Fiscal Studies;

Dr Jim McCormick, Associate Director Scotland, Joseph Rowntree Foundation Scotland;

John Dickie, Director, Child Poverty Action Group in Scotland (CPAG);

Eddie Follan, Policy & Public Affairs Officer, Barnardo's Scotland;

Fiona Moss, Head of Health Improvement and Inequality, Glasgow City Health and Social Care Partnership;

Sandra McDermott, Head of Financial Inclusion and Improving the Cancer Journey, Glasgow City Council;

Jackie Erdman, Head of Equalities and Human Rights, and Sonya Scott,

Consultant in Public Health Medicine, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde.

Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill (in private): The Committee reviewed the evidence heard earlier in the meeting.

Written evidence

[Joseph Rowntree Foundation](#)

[Child Poverty Action Group in Scotland](#)

[Barnardo's Scotland](#)

[NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde](#)

8th Meeting, 2017 (Session 5), Thursday 20 April 2017

Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill: The Committee took evidence on the Bill at Stage 1 from—

Peter Allan, Community Planning Manager, Dundee City Council;

Professor Andrew Russell, Medical Director and Deputy Chief Executive, NHS Tayside;

Robert McGregor, Policy Manager, Fife Council;

Dr Margaret Hannah, Director of Public Health, NHS Fife;

Bill Scott, Director of Policy, Inclusion Scotland;

Emma Trottier, Policy Manager, Engender.

Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill (in private): The Committee reviewed the evidence heard earlier in the meeting.

Written evidence

[Dundee City Council](#)

[Fife Partnership](#)

[Inclusion Scotland](#)

[Engender](#)

9th Meeting, 2017 (Session 5), Thursday 27 April 2017

Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill: The Committee took evidence on the Bill at Stage 1 from—

Angela Constance, Cabinet Secretary for Communities, Social Security and Equalities, Scottish Government.

Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill (in private): The Committee reviewed the evidence heard earlier in the meeting.

10th Meeting, 2017 (Session 5), Thursday 11 May 2017

Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill (in private): The Committee considered a draft Stage 1 report and agreed to consider a revised draft at its next meeting.

11th Meeting, 2017 (Session 5), Thursday 18 May 2017

Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill (in private): The Committee considered a draft Stage 1 report. Various changes were agreed to, and the report was agreed for publication.

Annex B

Other written evidence

Aberdeenshire Council Community Planning Partnership

Big Lottery Fund

Carers Trust Scotland

Child Welfare Inequalities Project

Children in Scotland

Children 1st

Citizens Advice Scotland

City of Edinburgh Council: Schools and Lifelong Learning

Coalition for Racial Equality and Rights

COSLA

Dr Morag Treanor

East Ayrshire Council

End Child Poverty

Engender and Inclusion Scotland - supplementary

Glasgow City Council

Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector

Law Society of Scotland

Lloyds TSB Foundation for Scotland

NHS Ayrshire and Arran

NHS Health Scotland

North Ayrshire Council

Poverty Alliance

Professor Nick Bailey

Renfrewshire Council

Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health Scotland

Scott McDougall

Scottish Borders Child Protection Committee

Scottish Human Rights Commission

Scottish Refugee Council

Scottish Youth Parliament

Shelter Scotland

Steve Johnson

Unison

- [1] Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], The Cabinet Secretary for Communities, Social Security and Equalities (Angela Constance), contrib. 5, <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10913&c=1994666>
- [2] Scottish Government. (2016). Fairer Scotland Action Plan. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2016/10/9964>
- [3] Institute for Fiscal Studies. (2017). Living Standards, Poverty and Inequality in the UK: 2016–17 to 2021–22. Retrieved from <https://www.ifs.org.uk/uploads/publications/comms/R107.pdf>
- [4] Scottish Government. (2016). Poverty and Income Inequality in Scotland 2015-16.
- [5] End Child Poverty. (2017). Written Submission.
- [6] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr Jim McCormick (Joseph Rowntree Foundation), contrib. 2, <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987270>
- [7] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Naomi Eisenstadt, contrib. 3, <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987271>
- [8] COSLA. (2017). Written submission.
- [9] Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Robert McGregor (Fife Council), contrib. 6, <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10897&c=1992094>
- [10] Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], Angela Constance, contrib. 7, <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10913&c=1994668>
- [11] Child Poverty Action Group. (2017). Written Submission.
- [12] Joseph Rowntree Foundation. (2017). Written Submission.
- [13] Dr Morag Treanor. (2017). Written Submission.
- [14] Shelter Scotland. (2017). Written Submission.
- [15] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr McCormick, contrib. 21, <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987289>
- [16] Inclusion Scotland. (2017). Written Submission.
- [17] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Naomi Eisenstadt, contrib. 22, <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987290>
- [18] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Andrew Hood, contrib. 23, <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987291>
- [19] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr McCormick, contrib. 7, <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987275>
- [20] Child Poverty Action Group in Scotland. (2017). Written Submission.

- [21] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Andrew Hood, contrib. 11,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987279>
- [22] Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], Angela Constance, contrib. 9,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10913&c=1994670>
- [23] Barnardo's Scotland, End Child Poverty in Scotland. (2017). Written Submissions.
- [24] Citizens Advice Scotland. (2017). Written Submission.
- [25] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Naomi Eisenstadt, contrib. 72,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987340>
- [26] Engender. (2017). Written Submission.
- [27] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Naomi Eisenstadt, contrib. 31,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987299>
- [28] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr McCormick, contrib. 32,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987300>
- [29] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, John Dickie, contrib. 98,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987366>
- [30] Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Peter Allan, contrib. 28,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10897&c=1992116>
- [31] Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Bill Scott, contrib. 110,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10897&c=1992198>
- [32] Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], Angela Constance, contrib. 57,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10913&c=1994718>
- [33] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Jackie Erdman, contrib. 146,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987414>
- [34] Aberdeenshire Community Planning Partnership. (2017). Written Submission.
- [35] End Child Poverty in Scotland. (2017). Written Submission.
- [36] Renfrewshire Council. (2017). Written Submission.
- [37] Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Robert McGregor, contrib. 13,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10897&c=1992101>
- [38] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Sandra McDermott, contrib. 152,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987420>
- [39] Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Dr Hannah, contrib. 52,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10897&c=1992140>
- [40] Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Robert McGregor, contrib. 31,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10897&c=1992119>

- [41] Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Professor Russell, contrib. 32,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10897&c=1992120>
- [42] Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Dr Hannah, contrib. 24,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10897&c=1992112>
- [43] Children 1st. (2017). Written Submission.
- [44] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, John Dickie, contrib. 84,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987352>
- [45] Law Society of Scotland. (2017). Written Submission.
- [46] Social Security Committee 20 April 2017 [Draft], Peter Allan, contrib. 38,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10897&c=1992126>
- [47] Written Submissions. (2017).
- [48] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr McCormick, contrib. 17,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987285>
- [49] Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], Angela Constance, contrib. 55,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10913&c=1994716>
- [50] Social Security Committee 27 April 2017 [Draft], Angela Constance, contrib. 40,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10913&c=1994701>
- [51] Financial Memorandum, para.23. (2017).. (n.d.)
- [52] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Dr McCormick, contrib. 46,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987314>
- [53] Social Security Committee 27 March 2017, Sonya Scott, contrib. 158,
<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10870&c=1987426>

