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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

1. As part of the Scottish Executive’s strategy for eliminating child poverty within a generation, in mid-2003 funding was given to Dumfries and Galloway and Glasgow Councils to set up pilot Working for Families projects. In total 11 projects were funded for one year: 8 in Dumfries and Galloway and 3 in Glasgow.

2. The objectives of the projects were to help parents and carers facing barriers to employment, to move closer to employability or training. The mechanism for doing this was the provision of child care in a variety of ways tailored to the circumstances of the clients. To ensure that the funding was additional it was to be targeted at clients whose needs were not being met by other agencies.

3. The intention was that the experiences of the pilots would be used to inform the development of the main Working for Families programme which starts in April 2004.

4. Accordingly, GEN Consulting was commissioned by the Scottish Executive to undertake an ongoing (formative) evaluation of the pilot projects. This involved regular contact with them over the period June to October 2003, feedback on such things as monitoring frameworks, and a half-day workshop at which the consultants and the projects shared their experiences. A further report which will cover the extended pilot evaluation period until the end of March 2004 is due in summer 2004.

THE PILOT PROJECTS

5. The pilot projects received between £18,000 and £231,000 from the Scottish Executive. Most were being run by intermediary organisations. Generally funding went to the Council and then to the projects, with the relationship being defined through some form of Service Level Agreement. In one instance the Scottish Executive was directly funding a Glasgow-based community project, Rosemount Lifelong Learning.

6. The projects were to be involved in a variety of activities. In Dumfries and Galloway they included:

- Providing childcare in the homes of parents and carers;
- Offering childcare outwith the hours of 9 to 5;
- Offering childcare in the evenings so that parents could attend classes at a local learning resources centre;
- A roving crèche that would link childcare to a mobile learning facility to provide childcare training, the intention being that parents and carers could become registered as childminders;
- Providing childcare whilst parents were being taught to drive so that they could then access job opportunities; and
- A community transport initiative that would take children to childcare services thereby allowing their parents to gain a job.
7. In Glasgow the 3 projects were involved in the following activities:

- Two projects were similar in that they run childcare subsidy schemes which allow parents to purchase suitable childcare according to their needs. In conjunction with this a guidance worker offers support to help them move towards work or training; and
- The third, run by a community based organisation, offers advice and support to parents and carers to enable them to make the ‘transition’ to work.

8. The extent to which the projects were operational over the time of the evaluation varied. Two were working with clients. Another 5 had appointed staff and were starting to operate. The remaining 4 had made little progress. Accordingly, the extent to which it was possible to identify general lessons from the evaluation, especially about project implementation, varied.

GOOD PRACTICES

9. The formative evaluation identified a number of issues related to project development and, to a lesser extent, implementation. Using these it was possible to formulate good practice lessons that could influence the effectiveness of the main programme as well as the pilots.

10. In terms of project development, setting up a steering group was important. This would bring together people from a variety of local authority departments and external agencies so that linkages can be developed. It was seen as particularly important that links be developed between economic development and childcare departments. The group can also link into wider strategic and policy networks. This will give the project credibility as well as ensuring that any conflicts with existing projects are avoided.

11. Development needs should be underpinned by local research to ensure that the project is meeting a need and can provide the type of support that will enable parents or carers to access available jobs.

12. As part of the development process consultation is important, especially with local elected members and bodies such as the Care Commission, as is drawing on the experiences of other projects.

13. As development takes time, it is important that a member of the council’s staff be allocated time to co-ordinate and manage the development process. Trying to do this on top of an existing work load is likely to be less than effective.

14. Clients are likely to face a variety of barriers to employment in addition to childcare. To help overcome these, networking with other specialist staff and agencies is crucial. In particular, links need to be developed with economic development and childcare agencies and specialist providers who can offer support with such things as substance abuse, literacy and numeracy and finance.

15. Delivery seems best done through existing intermediary organisations. However, councils need to be convinced that such organisations have the capacity to take on additional
responsibilities. Service Level Agreements should be drawn up to outline what is to be delivered and how this is to be monitored.

16. The projects had recruited staff in a number of ways, for example using secondees and offering permanent contracts. Each has advantages and disadvantages. Regardless of the method used staff should, ideally, be familiar with the needs of parents in the local area and should be provided with an unambiguous job description.

17. To meet the Scottish Executive’s objectives it is important that clients are motivated to move towards employment. Accordingly, clients need to be assessed to see if they are committed and to clarify the barriers to labour market access that need to be overcome. Once these are identified then clients can be referred to the appropriate specialist providers.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

18. In the course of the evaluation GEN Consulting stressed to the projects that the objective of the funding was to move parents and carers into, or closer to, work or training. Childcare was a means to this end, not the end in itself.

19. When the targets and outcomes set by the pilots were examined it became clear that there were differences in understanding. For example:

- Not all of the projects had quantitative targets;
- Some of the outcome measures were qualitative, making attainment difficult to judge; and
- Some projects had confused outcomes with outputs. For example, they saw the outcome as being the number of families who benefited from the service, rather than the number of parents who were able to gain a job.

20. It was surprising that few projects had identified the need to try to measure ‘soft’ outcomes, that is such things as changes in attitudes and increased confidence levels. The projects recognised that the client group was unlikely to be able to move easily into a job. Accordingly, GEN Consulting felt it important that attempts be made to measure such things. This would enable the true project impacts to be captured.

21. Based on the analysis of the projects, and the progress that some had made in setting up monitoring and evaluation systems, GEN Consulting recommended that a monitoring and evaluation framework be developed that had 3 parts:

- The collection of client profile information, which would, amongst other things, ensure that the target client group was being reached;
- The collection of ‘Hard’ indicators relating explicitly to the Scottish Executive’s objectives. These would cover among others the numbers of clients who obtained jobs or places on education or training courses; and
- The use of ‘Soft’ indicators to measure changes in attitudes and expectations.

22. A detailed set of pro formas were developed to capture baseline data, attitudes and expectations and distance travelled once clients had left the project. These are included as Appendices to this Report.
LESSONS FOR THE MAIN PROGRAMME

23. One of the aims of the evaluation was to provide guidance for the Scottish Executive to inform the development of the main programme. The key recommendations were:

- That the funding be channelled through local authority economic development departments so that there would be a strong emphasis upon getting clients into work, with childcare being seen as the means to this end;
- There be recognition of the time taken to develop projects and that the funding programme be implemented with this in mind;
- All projects be required to assess clients to ensure that they are motivated towards gaining a job or a place on a training course;
- The objectives of the main programme be added to, to include moving clients into volunteering, which can be seen as a half-way house between economic inactivity and employment;
- All projects be required to make use of a standard monitoring and evaluation framework;
- There be explicit criteria outlined for project approval by the Scottish Executive; and
- Structures are set up to disseminate good practice from the main programme, given its innovative nature.
Chapter One  Introduction

1.1 This is the First Report of the Working for Families pilot evaluation study, commissioned by the Scottish Executive from GEN Consulting. The Report covers 6 main elements, it:

- Gives the background to the Study, looks at the extent to which the original brief has been conformed to and outlines the Study methodology (Chapter 1);
- Gives a progress report on the pilot projects (Chapter 2);
- Looks at the findings and issues (Chapter 3);
- Looks in some detail at project monitoring and evaluation (Chapter 4);
- Looks at the good practices, mainly in project development, that have been identified (Chapter 5); and
- Provides guidance to the Scottish Executive on the main funding programme (Chapter 6).

The Study Background

1.2 As part of the Scottish Executive’s strategy for eliminating child poverty within a generation, in mid-2003 funding was given to 2 councils (Dumfries and Galloway and Glasgow) to set up pilot Working for Families projects. The projects were to provide childcare support in a variety of ways with the objective of helping those parents and carers who faced barriers to employment to move closer to employability.

1.3 The funding was to target clients whose needs were not being met by other providers but who had some motivation towards moving into employment, education or training. Thus it was aimed at lone parents, those on low incomes and households facing particular stresses, such as substance abuse, health problems and containing children with disabilities. The money was to be used to provide financial support for childcare, targeted at these groups in a way that would meet their specific needs. Additional support was to be accessed through specialist providers as needed.

1.4 A total of 11 projects were funded: 3 in Glasgow, albeit that most of these had a number of components, and 8 in Dumfries and Galloway. Although the original intention was that the money would be routed through local councils, one in Glasgow, (the Rosemount Transitions Project), that is run by a voluntary group, is being funded directly by the Scottish Executive. In total the 11 projects are to receive over £1 million for the 12 month pilots.

1.5 The main goal of this Study was to undertake a formative evaluation of the pilot projects in order to inform the development and subsequent evaluation of the main programme. This is to start in 2004/05 and has had £20 million allocated to be spent in the 2 years to March 2006. To inform the main programme the detailed Study objectives were, to:

- Work with the initiatives in the pilot local authority areas to provide them with advice and support on the development of their delivery plans and monitoring and evaluation frameworks;
• Work with the initiatives to evaluate their impact in meeting the needs of the target client group and moving them towards employability;
• Identify and disseminate good practices between the initiatives;
• Provide the Scottish Executive with detailed guidance on the implementation of the main programme from 2004-05. This was to cover such things as spatial targeting, use of local outcome agreements and mechanisms for good practice dissemination; and
• Develop outline guidance for monitoring and evaluation of the main programme, both at a strategic and a project level. This was to include consideration of such issues as cost effectiveness and tracking of progress.

1.6 The assumption, of both GEN Consulting and the Scottish Executive, was that the pilot projects would be well developed by the time the Study started. It would therefore be possible to look at issues such as effectiveness in reaching the target groups and value for money. In the event this has not been possible. When work started in June 2003 on the Study it soon became clear that development was in its early stages. Even at the time of writing (October 2003) some of the projects have still to start. Accordingly it has not always been possible to do exactly what was outlined in the Study brief or in the GEN tender.

CHANGES TO THE STUDY

1.7 The main deviations from the methodology originally submitted to the Scottish Executive are as follows:

• In Stage 3 we indicated that we would work with the projects to help them develop their monitoring and evaluation frameworks (Paragraph 4.13)\(^1\). This has not worked in the way we originally envisaged for 2 main reasons:
• 2 of the projects were developments of existing initiatives that already had sophisticated monitoring and evaluation systems in place; and
• Some of the projects were at too early a development stage with, in some instances, there being no delivery staff in place.

Accordingly we have, with the Scottish Executive’s permission, discussed monitoring and evaluation with the 2 authorities and distributed to them the initial ideas of what a framework should include, as contained in the Mid-term Report. In the case of Dumfries and Galloway we were invited to attend a meeting of the Monitoring and Evaluation Sub-Group (set up to oversee monitoring of the pilots) where we distributed a paper outlining the likely monitoring requirements. In Glasgow these were discussed with the staff concerned and the same paper distributed. As well as making the projects aware of the Scottish Executive’s likely requirements this process also raised the profile of monitoring with staff and consolidated the point that the objective of the pilots was to move parents and carers nearer to the labour market, with childcare being the means to doing this, not the end;
• In Stage 3 (Paragraph 4.16) we envisaged the projects completing short questionnaires containing details of clients. We would then use this to assess the

\(^1\) The paragraph numbers in this Paragraph refer to those in the original tender "Working for Families Funding” 11th June 2003 submitted by GEN to the Scottish Executive.
extent to which the projects were recruiting from the identified client group. As there are currently very few clients this has not been done;

- In Stage 3 we intended to collect financial data from the projects in order to assess cost effectiveness. This has not been done as the projects are still mainly in the development stages;

- In Stage 3 we intended to undertake a mapping of linkages (Paragraph 4.18). This has been undertaken in an impressionistic, rather than a systematic, way, as the projects are not yet fully operational. We have therefore explored with the projects the type of agencies they envisage developing networks with, rather than asking them to map this;

- Stage 4 was to involve holding 2 Employment and Childcare Fora. In the event only one was held. The reason is the same as earlier: the projects are not sufficiently advanced to make 2 events worthwhile;

- Stage 5 (Analysis and Final Report) was written on the assumption that the projects would have been running whilst the formative evaluation work was underway. As this has not been the case some of the things that we expected to cover have not been done. For example:
  - It is not possible to say anything about the projects’ effectiveness in reaching the target group nor about their impact upon employability; and
  - As the projects are not, in the main, working with clients, it is difficult to say much about good practices for project delivery. However we can say a reasonable amount about good practices in project development, as this is something that we have tracked throughout the life of the evaluation.

THE STUDY PROCESS

1.8 The Study process involved 4 main elements:

- Interviews with the 2 staff responsible for project co-ordination and liaison with the Scottish Executive in the 2 authorities;
- Interviews with staff involved in wider economic development issues;
- Ongoing contact with the staff responsible for running the pilot projects or, in the cases where the pilots had not been set up, with the staff who were responsible for establishing them. This was a mixture of face-to-face interviews and telephone follow-ups when it seemed as if there had been limited progress since the last meeting; and
- Attendance at the 3 meetings of Dumfries and Galloway’s Childcare, Employment and Training Working Group, set up to oversee the development of the various projects. We also attended the first meeting of the Monitoring and Evaluation sub-group, which was established to ensure that the projects developed a systematic approach to data collection.

The interviewees are listed in Appendix 1.

1.9 Each interview followed a semi-structured format. In addition to gathering information about the projects, a variety of background documentary material was collected. This is referred to as appropriate.
FORMATIVE EVALUATION

1.10 The Study was essentially a formative evaluation of the pilot projects: that is it involved working with the projects and providing whatever advice and guidance we could, derived from our experience and knowledge of the other pilots, of monitoring and evaluation and of economic development generally. The degree to which this could be effective clearly depended upon the progress that the pilots had made. Given this, the extent to which we have been able to provide support has been more limited than was originally envisaged.

1.11 However we have been able to make some progress, for example putting Rosemount in contact with a project based in Stirling which has a well developed computer based monitoring system. We have also raised with Rosemount the possibility of it being represented on the Steering Group set up by the City Council to oversee the Easterhouse and Castlemilk projects. To some extent this would be formalising the links that already exist with the City. However this would enable the project to develop, not only links with the other Glasgow pilots, but also with senior officials whose departmental policies impact upon Rosemount’s activities.

1.12 At a more general level we have been eager to stress to all interviewees the importance of being able to show that the pilots are both reaching the Scottish Executive’s target group and are enabling them to move either into, or towards, work education or training. Originally we had some concerns that not all of the projects recognised the importance of being able to produce evidence to demonstrate progress in these areas. Accordingly this is something that we have devoted some time to. For example, with the Scottish Executive’s permission, we distributed a note about monitoring and evaluation to the projects (Paragraph 1.7). Hopefully this has influenced the approach that will be taken to collecting monitoring information. The fact that Dumfries and Galloway, for example, has set up a sub-group specifically to look at monitoring the pilots would seem to indicate that this has had some impact.

THE REPORT’S STRUCTURE

1.13 The Report is structured as follows:

- Chapter 2 gives an overview of the pilot projects;
- Chapter 3 looks at the findings and issues that have emerged in the course of the Study;
- Chapter 4 looks at project monitoring and evaluation;
- Chapter 5 identifies elements of good practice for setting up and running the pilot projects; and
- Chapter 6 draws upon this, and the earlier issues, to make a number of suggestions that could be incorporated into the guidance prepared by the Scottish Executive for the main programme when it starts in April 2004.

The 4 Appendices include a list of interviewees (Appendix 1), and proposed forms for monitoring (Appendices 2, 3 and 4).
CHAPTER TWO  THE PILOT PROJECTS

INTRODUCTION

2.1 The pilot projects are being developed in 2 contrasting areas: Dumfries and Galloway and Glasgow. In total there are 11 projects, although some of these are made up of a number of discrete elements. In addition the Scottish Executive is funding Glasgow City to undertake research into the type of childcare services that parents and carers would like to see. This Chapter gives an overview of their development state at October 2003.

2.2 In Dumfries and Galloway there are 8 projects. Although funded through the Council, the intention was that most would be delivered by other organisations. To facilitate this, Service Level Agreements are being drawn up between the Council and the deliverer. The first of these, with the Accessible Transport Forum that is to deliver the Access to Work project, has been drafted. However, delivery arrangements for a number of the projects have still to be resolved (see Paragraph 2.8).

2.3 Three of the projects are within Glasgow. Of these 2 are being delivered by intermediary organisations with funding coming through the City Council whilst the third is being delivered by a voluntary organisation (Rosemount) that is being funded directly by the Scottish Executive. The 2 that are being delivered by intermediaries will have their relationships with the Council outlined in Service Level Agreements.

PROJECT FUNDING

2.4 Table 2.1 summarises the funding that has been allocated to the projects. It will be seen that:

- £1,013,390 has been allocated by the Scottish Executive to the projects, an average of £92,000 per project, although the actual amounts range from £18,000 to £231,000;
- In addition to the Scottish Executive’s funding, 3 of the projects intend to lever funds from other sources. This totals £99,452, giving total project funding of £1,111,842; and
- The leverage accounts for some 10% of total project costs.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT STAGES – DUMFRIES AND GALLOWAY

2.5 The development stages of the various pilot projects differ considerably both within and between the pilot authorities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Scottish Executive Funding to Glasgow</th>
<th>Other financial support¹</th>
<th>Scottish Executive Funding to Dumfries and Galloway</th>
<th>Other financial support¹</th>
<th>Total Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries &amp; Galloway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sitter Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>105,797</td>
<td>105,797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Out of hours childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,654</td>
<td>31,654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evening Childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,685</td>
<td>39,685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Roving Crèche</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,718</td>
<td>17,718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expansion of Childminding service</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,290</td>
<td>32,290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Childminding Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td>63,848</td>
<td>63,848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Access to Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,543</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>75,543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,981</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>129,981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-wide activities:</td>
<td>a) Evaluation;</td>
<td>10,538</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Project co-ordinator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DUMFRIES and GALLOWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td>453,984</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>529,984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemount</td>
<td>133,197</td>
<td>23,452</td>
<td></td>
<td>156,649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easterhouse</td>
<td>194,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>194,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlemilk</td>
<td>230,709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230,709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GLASGOW</td>
<td>558,406</td>
<td>23,452</td>
<td></td>
<td>581,858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COSTS ALL PILOTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,111,842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Other financial support has come from Dumfries and Galloway Council Area Committees, Scottish Enterprise Dumfries and Galloway, the Rural Challenge Fund and, indirectly (for Rosemount), the European Regional Development Fund.
2.6 In Dumfries and Galloway project development is being overseen by a sub-group of the Council’s Inclusive Communities Forum, entitled the Childcare, Employment and Training Working Group. This brings together the key partners, for example Council staff, the Surestart Service manager, the Accessible Transport Forum, Jobcentre Plus and the Scottish Childminding Association. Some of the members have responsibility for project delivery (for example the Transport Forum) whilst others can potentially provide relevant advice and support, such as Dumfries and Galloway College’s Lifelong Learning Partnership Co-ordinator. Policy support, and liaison with the Scottish Executive, comes through a designated Council officer. In addition the Sub-Group has set up a Monitoring and Evaluation Group, which had its first meeting in early September. This is looking at how the pilots will be monitored and is developing proposals for using a common reporting template.

2.7 Attempts are also being made to keep local elected members informed about progress. This is being done by making presentations to the various Area Committees that have been set up throughout the Council area. There is no parallel in Glasgow, with the nearest being the Steering Group that is overseeing development and is chaired by a senior councillor. However, this has far more of a strategic role (see Paragraph 2.10).

2.8 At the time of writing in October 2003, the individual projects are at varying stages of development:

- There has been no progress on the Sitter Service (Project 1), which is to provide childcare within parents/carers homes. The intention is that the service will be run by an intermediary organisation. A brief is to be drawn up and it is hoped to commission someone to implement this shortly thereafter;
- A start has been made on Project 2, Out-of-Hours Childcare. This aims to provide subsidised childcare outwith the hours of 9 to 5. This is to be part of the remit of 4 childcare development workers who have recently been appointed by the Council;
- Project 3, Evening Childcare was the idea of a parent-led community group in North West Dumfries. The project is to provide childcare in the evening to enable parents/carers to attend classes at a learning resource centre. Unfortunately the Care Commission has expressed reservations about the group’s ability to take on board additional responsibilities. At the moment it is unclear how the project will be implemented, although it is recognised that there is still a need. One possibility is for delivery to be undertaken by one of the other Pilots, possibly Project 5 (Expansion of Existing Childminding Services). However this would need to be agreed with the Scottish Executive;
- Project 4 (the Roving Crèche) is currently available throughout the region. The intention is to expand provision in the more remote rural areas and link it to outreach learning centres and eventually to a mobile learning facility. It is also to be used to pilot a computer based training package for potential childminders. This is intended to take trainees through the process from pre-registration to becoming established childminders. It is to be based in Annandale, Eskdale and Upper Nithsdale. Originally it was to be run by a community group, Little Stars. However the Care Commission has expressed concerns about its capacity. What seems now likely to happen is that it will be taken forward by the Council, using the same staff. The long term aim will be that the group should eventually take over responsibility for the project once its management capacity has developed;

---

*The project numbers refer to the numbers in Table 2.1*
• Project 5, the Expansion of the Childminding Service, is being delivered by the Scottish Childminding Association (SCMA). It aims to target those on low incomes who wish to enter employment as childminders. Two part-time co-ordinators have been recruited covering, respectively, the West of the area and the East. In parallel with this, publicity material is being prepared (which will also be used for Project 6) and a monitoring pro-forma has been drafted. This has been helped by the fact that the SCMA is accustomed to running projects funded by Europe that have monitoring requirements;

• There has been limited development of the Childminding Subsidy (Project 6) which is again to be delivered by SCMA. The project is based on feedback from SCMA’s helpline and surveys which identified a need for evening support so that parents could gain work. The aim is to make childminding more affordable by providing the minder with a subsidy to cover the extra costs of evening childcare. There is also to be support during the transitional period when the parent or carer moves into a job and is waiting for Working Tax Credit to be processed. It is hoped to recruit a co-ordinator but as yet no one is in post. However there has been progress on preparation of publicity material (see Project 5) and it is expected that there will be rapid progress once staff are in post;

• Project 7, The Access to Work pilot (which provides childcare whilst parents are being taught to drive) has appointed a co-ordinator who took up post on the 1st August. The local press is being used to recruit clients and the eligibility questionnaires have been prepared. In part the reason for this relatively rapid progress is that the project has already run in a similar form for one year, albeit covering a smaller area. As a result it was relatively easy to roll it out across new areas (South Machars);

• Progress has also been made with the Community Transport, Project 8. This aims to use community transport to take children to childcare services thereby enabling their parents to access employment or training. This is to be managed by a local group. The Accessible Transport Forum co-ordinator has spent time working with local people to get them to the stage at which they feel confident about taking on management responsibilities. Time has also been spent looking at suitable transport, with various providers being invited to bring people carriers and minibuses down to Whithorn to be examined by the group; and

• The Council received a contract in August from the Scottish Executive for delivering the 8 projects and associated outputs and outcomes.

2.9 The Council’s intention is to appoint a co-ordinator whose remit will be to oversee all 8 projects and ensure that they meet the Scottish Executive’s objectives. The co-ordinator will also help the projects to develop their marketing strategies thereby ensuring that the target client group is reached. There has been discussion about the job specification, which at one time was to include project development. This might have resulted in the job being impossible for a single person to fill. However, the description has now been narrowed down and made more strategic, and therefore manageable, for whoever is appointed. The expectation is that the post will be filled by a secondee who has been involved in project development. Yet progress has been slow and to date no appointment has been made. There is clearly a danger that, by the time the appointment is made, the projects will be well into their one year life so that the opportunity to influence their development may be limited.
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT STAGES – GLASGOW

2.10 Within Glasgow a Steering Group has been set up to oversee development of the 2 projects being funded by the Council. In contrast to Dumfries and Galloway the majority of the members are senior officers from relevant departments (for example Education and Social Work) and the chair is a senior councillor. As such its role is more strategic than operational. Unlike Dumfries and Galloway there is no intention of appointing a co-ordinator. However, this role is effectively being filled by a staff member from Development and Regeneration Services who acts as the liaison person between the projects and the Steering Group and also liaises with the Scottish Executive.

2.11 Progress in developing the 2 Glasgow City projects is as follows:

• The Castlemilk project (Castlemilk Employment, Education and Childcare Support), after a slow start, has developed rapidly in the last month (October 2003). It has 2 elements and in many respects is similar to the Easterhouse pilot. The elements are:
  • A childcare subsidy scheme to allow parents or carers to purchase suitable childcare to meet their needs; and
  • A dedicated guidance worker who will provide advice and support to individuals to help them make the transition to work.

The guidance worker, a secondee from the local economic development company (Castlemilk Economic Development Agency (CEDA)), has been appointed and took up post at the end of September. Accordingly the project will run from October 2003 to September 2004. The worker’s immediate priority is developing marketing and publicity material. Presentations are also to be made to local agencies. Priority is being given to developing links with the Community Care Manager and the Social Work Team as it is thought that they will make the majority of referrals to the project. The guidance worker also intends to work closely with “Moneymatters” (a local financial advice agency). It will give advice on benefits, how to maximise uptake and how to manage once the 6 to 12 month period of childcare subsidy comes to an end; and

• The Easterhouse project is to be run by Childcare Greater Easterhouse and, like Castlemilk, will run from October 2003 to September 2004. Originally it had 4 discrete elements. These were:
  • A mentor whose role was to work with parents, employers and agencies to identify the childcare support that needed to be provided to allow entry to the job market or to education/training;
  • A childcare subsidy that was to help people who had problems paying for childcare during the first 6 months that they were in work or on a course;
  • Paying for additional 0-3 year old childcare provision in the area; and
  • Providing school holiday and wraparound childcare provision.

These 4 elements have now been combined into 2: mentoring and childcare subsidy, with the latter incorporating the 2 other elements: a wrap-around and holiday childcare service and additional provision for 0 to 3 year olds. The mentor has been appointed and takes up post in mid-October. It had initially been hoped that a local agency Family Action in Rogerfield and Easterhouse (FARE) would provide a secondee. In the event this proved to be impractical. Instead the person targeted for the secondment has been appointed on a one year’s contract. It was felt to be important to recruit a local person who was aware of local childcare
issues and agencies. There would, therefore, be no need to spend time developing networks so that the appointee would be able to make the most effective use of time. The mentor will manage the subsidy scheme. The benefits of Easterhouse’s well developed inter-agency links, through such groups as the Greater Easterhouse Partnership and the Childcare Greater Easterhouse Strategy Group are already apparent. For example Community Connections (a local training agency) is keen to work with the project and to make its clients aware of the assistance that it can provide to help them move into employment. Likewise links have been made with Greater Easterhouse Money Advice. It will conduct quarterly financial checks with those who have received a subsidy and provide a wider financial advice and support service.

2.12 The Rosemount Transitions Project, although in Glasgow, is slightly different in that it is being funded directly by the Scottish Executive. It aims to provide advice, support and guidance to parents to enable them to make the “transition” to work. As part of this process childcare support is to be provided, as well as a crisis fund that provides small amounts of money to be paid out to clients to help them overcome unforeseen circumstances such as emergency childcare. One of the outcomes that the project hopes to achieve is involvement in voluntary activity, which is seen as a halfway house between being economically inactive and entering the labour market. This is not something that is explicitly mentioned by the Scottish Executive. It may, however, be an intermediate outcome that other projects could usefully pursue and which needs to be measured. This is considered again in Chapters 3 and 4.

2.13 The current situation in the Transitions project (which is to run from October 2003 to September 2004) is that:

- The senior guidance worker took up post at the start of July. This was possible because, as with Dumfries and Galloway’s Access to Work project, the Transitions Project is an extension and intensification of an existing initiative that had run for 18 months. Once this funding stream ended it proved possible to support the same worker through the pilot monies;
- The other 2 posts that are being funded through the pilot (an information and support officer and an administrator) have been advertised and filled. As Rosemount decided to make permanent appointments, rather than go for a temporary post or a secondment, the application and appointment process was very time consuming due to the number of applicants;
- The crisis funding part of the pilot (£5,000 to cover a variety of crises, for example the need to provide emergency childcare or cover loss of earnings due to childcare problems) is almost finalised. Discussions have been held with various agencies to ensure that the Fund will not duplicate the support that they offer. In order to avoid conflicts of interest the Fund is to be managed by Rosemount’s financial controller rather than the guidance worker. The controller’s post is, however, currently vacant, although it is due to be filled by the end of October;
- Part of the pilot was funding for 6 additional childcare places that were to be purchased from a local community-based childcare provider (St Roch’s) and provided in its facilities. At our first meeting with the project there was uncertainty as to how these would be used. For example, one option was that they would be used by the parents who were being supported by the guidance worker. In the event this is not the option that the project has decided to adopt. The St Roch’s places will be used by a group of parents who will enrol on a European
Social Fund training course. This will mean that there are then 6 childcare places in Rosemount that will be filled by the children of parents who will make use of the Transitions project. It has also been decided, since our first meeting, that 3 of the places will be for parents who are involved in voluntary work: this being seen as a half-way house to paid employment. As such a volunteer co-ordinator is part of the Transitions staff complement, albeit that salary costs are being covered from other sources;

- There are on-going discussions about eligibility criteria for accessing the childcare places. The key factor has to be that any recipient of support would not be eligible for assistance through some other channel. This might, for example, mean that those on education courses would not be eligible as there is usually some form of childcare support for students;
- Part of the pilot funding (£6,000) is to be used for developing more effective monitoring and evaluation systems. At the moment the project is in the process (using an external consultant) of revising its existing monitoring and evaluation forms; and
- The project’s geographical area has also been slightly changed. As well as covering the area of the Glasgow North Social Inclusion Partnership (SIP) it will also take in Townhead which, although not within the SIP, contains areas of recognised need.

2.14 In addition to the pilot projects the Scottish Executive is also funding the City to undertake market research that is being done on its behalf by FMR Research. The original intention was that this would be undertaken sequentially, with the research findings shaping the pilot projects. In the event the work is being undertaken in parallel and it remains to be seen if it has the ability to shape the pilots, given their development stages.

2.15 The first stage of the research was published in August (FMR Research 2003) and involved 60 face-to-face interviews conducted in Castlemilk and Easterhouse. To some extent the profile of the interviewees matches the profile of the intended recipients of the Working for Families support, with almost half being single parents and two thirds receiving Income Support. However, in other ways the survey has deficiencies. There were no ethnic minority respondents (partly a reflection of the areas in which the survey was carried out) and some of the questions seem to omit useful dimensions. For example the question that asks for views on the type of childcare services makes no mention of childminding.

2.16 The research does, however, provide some justification for some of the pilots. For example, in terms of the childcare support that would help respondents move into employment or onto a course:

- 58% cited school holiday childcare;
- 57% financial assistance; and
- 45% childcare outwith 9 to 5.

2.17 In other respects the research presents challenges to the assumptions underpinning the Working for Families funding, or at least indicates that results may not be rapid. This comes about when the interviewees were asked about the timing of their intentions to move into work or education/training. Very few saw this as an immediate intention, with the majority seeing it as a long term goal (longer than 12 months). Given this type of timescale, there must be some doubt if this is a realistic intention at all. At the very least it does indicate that
“success”, in terms of achieving such a hard outcome as a job, may be a long time coming if left to the parents/carers alone. It also emphasises the importance of having some monitoring system that can measure changes in attitudes as well as simply hard outcomes. This is considered in greater detail in Chapter 4.

2.18 There may also be a danger that, if the findings of the research about the timing of a move into work, are generally applicable, then the Working for Families funding may result in displacement. This may come about as those who want to work, or are already in a job (and currently make use of informal childcare) take advantage of the additional provision. This then displaces their informal arrangements. They may be helped in this by the desire of the projects to illustrate success. The outcome could be that those who are furthest from the labour market are not helped, in part as they do not want to move into work in the near future. Some evidence for this is found in the research which identified a view that additional childcare places would take the pressure off informal provision (FMR Research, 2003, p. 14).

SUMMARY

2.19 In summary, of the 11 projects, 2 were effectively operational by October 2003 (Rosemount’s Transitions and Dumfries and Galloway’s Access to Work). It is significant that both of these are developments of existing projects that have run, albeit in slightly different or less intensive forms, prior to Scottish Executive support being obtained. There has been little development for 4 of the others. The remaining 5 are in the process of starting to deliver, with staff having been appointed, although as yet developments on the ground are limited.

2.20 Having produced an overview of the 11 pilot projects we will now consider the issues that have emerged over the time of the formative evaluation.
CHAPTER THREE       THE FINDINGS AND ISSUES

INTRODUCTION

3.1 During the course of the Study a number of issues were identified. Some of these were specific to individual projects. However many were of wider relevance, both to the pilot projects and to the main Working for Families programme. The starting point is to consider the strategic context within which the pilot projects operate.

A STRATEGIC CONTEXT

3.2 At a general level all projects fit into the Scottish Executive’s and Westminster’s goal of increasing participation in the labour market from those who are currently economically inactive. One of the reasons for doing this is to tackle child poverty, as gaining paid work, when complemented by various in-work benefits, is seen as making a significant contribution to economic wellbeing. To this end, for example, Westminster aims to increase the proportion of lone parents in work to 70% by 2010 (Thurley, 2003).

3.3 The Scottish Executive’s childcare strategy (The Secretary of State for Scotland, 1998) clearly makes the link between childcare and economic development, with one of the indicators of success being that more parents will be able to move into work, education or training. However local councils’ children’s services plans tend to dilute this message and approach childcare more from the perspective of the child rather than from the economic development benefits that it may bring. As such there seems to be a lack of a detailed local strategic context which relates explicitly to the Working for Families Funding.

3.4 At the smaller area level there is, however, often a degree of strategic underpinning for the Scottish Executive’s aims. In part this comes about through childcare partnerships and local initiatives such as Glasgow’s network of childcare forums and their links into wider regeneration networks. These links are particularly well developed in Glasgow where the various area based regeneration initiatives have developed holistic strategies, all of which recognise the importance of childcare and which, in some cases, link this to the development, or employment, of parents and carers. For example, in the 2003-2005 Castlemilk Partnership Development Strategy (Castlemilk Partnership 2002) continuation funding is sought from the SIP to provide assisted child care places for low income parents/carers who are in work or training.

3.5 Similarly in Easterhouse the Partnership has been promoting the provision of a mentoring system, through the Stepping Stones project, which provides advice and support to those on low incomes and suffering from other barriers to labour market access. This aims to help people move “from benefit dependency through to employment” (Greater Easterhouse Partnership, 2002). It is therefore very similar to the aims of the Easterhouse pilot.

3.6 This local strategic context tends to be far more developed in Glasgow, simply because of the dense network of initiatives and related networking structures, than in Dumfries and Galloway. However, given the importance of developing initiatives that cross departmental boundaries (in this case between childcare and economic development) it would
seem to be worth considering making more explicit mention of these links in both childcare and the employment and employability elements of economic development strategies.

3.7 Relating a project to a wider strategy seems good practice. It should help to eliminate any project overlap or duplication as well as facilitating the development of networks (see Paragraph 2.11). Where the strategic networks are less well established then project development by working in partnership with employment and childcare agencies should be pursued. Indeed this is the strategy that was used, perhaps for other reasons, in Dumfries and Galloway.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

3.8 Related to this strategic context is the extent to which the pilots were underpinned by research which justified provision. Generally there was such an underpinning. This had come about in a number of ways:

- For those projects (for example Access to Work and Rosemount) that had a track record there was experience of what worked and what had not worked. This could then be built upon when developing the pilots. In Rosemount’s case the project has also commissioned in-depth research looking at the barriers women face in making the transition from being economically inactive to becoming employed. This has played an important role in shaping the Rosemount pilot;
- Elsewhere feedback from users had been used to justify the pilots. For example in Easterhouse a childcare line is run which is seen as being a good source of information on childcare requirements; and
- In Dumfries and Galloway, prior to the Scottish Executive pilots being announced, a seminar had been held at which various agencies had discussed childcare problems and needs. From this, transport problems and a desire for children to be looked after in their own homes emerged as issues. These then had an influence upon the development of the pilots.

3.9 The final form of the pilots had, to some extent, been shaped by wider consultation. However, often this had been constrained by the available time and was, as in Dumfries and Galloway, with agencies rather than service users. There was often a view that wider consultation would have been desirable. To some extent this was easier in Glasgow, especially in Easterhouse, where the existence of the Childcare Greater Easterhouse meant that it was possible to develop projects in consultation with a wide range of bodies, in particular the Local Childcare Forum.

3.10 It was also the case, in a number of instances, that the pilots drew upon the experiences of initiatives elsewhere. For example, the Easterhouse childcare subsidy was based, in part, on a similar initiative that had operated in Drumchapel. Likewise the costings for the holiday and wraparound part of the pilot were based on costs incurred by a similar project operating in Glasgow’s East End.

3.11 It therefore would seem to be general good practice if projects are based upon local research to identify need. It would also seem sensible to undertake consultation so that ownership is spread, although it is accepted that timing can make this difficult. Likewise
drawing on the experiences of others might be beneficial, if only to help develop realistic costings.

LABOUR MARKET INFORMATION

3.12 Providing childcare support to enable parents or carers to re-enter the labour market may have limited impact if there are not job opportunities available. Although research had generally been undertaken to see if there was a need for childcare, in neither of the 2 pilot areas had any systematic attempt been made to look at labour demand. This was a concern to some interviewees. Views on job availability tended to be anecdotal, albeit often informed by considerable experience of the local economy. For example, in some areas major developments (such as construction projects) were mentioned that might provide job opportunities. However, the general view was that most parents or carers would be looking to move into entry level jobs where technical skills were limited and attitude and aptitude were more important.

3.13 The work commissioned by Glasgow City (FMR Research, 2003) has identified some information about interest in obtaining a job. For example, of the 60 interviewees 33% were interested in a full-time job. However no information was collected on the type of work they were interested in.

3.14 Some of the pilots, especially those that were developments of existing schemes, had links with Jobcentre Plus, albeit that these often tended to be more about benefit eligibility than to help find suitable vacancies. Generally networking and partnership working with employment agencies and projects was limited, although this may change as implementation gets underway.

3.15 There were however exceptions to this. Diagram 3.1 looks at the process used by Access to Work in Dumfries and Galloway to ensure that clients are able to attain a positive outcome. This involves links with a variety of agencies such as Business Gateway and the Prince’s Scottish Youth Business Trust. In the project’s first year (2002 to 2003), 4 of the 20 clients gained a full-time job and one was referred to Business Gateway. Although the first year was not specifically about helping those with childcare problems, the project does seem to have had a degree of success.

3.16 Given this, it would seem sensible for all projects to make use of available agencies and sources of information to access labour market intelligence and thereby improve the chances of getting their clients into work or some other positive outcome. We would suggest the following, that projects:

- Liaise with their local Jobcentre Plus office in order to access information on job vacancies and to gain access to other employment specific services (such as programme centres) that may be of help in providing the skills and support needed to gain employment;
- Assess information from such databases as the National Online Manpower Information System (NOMIS) in order to identify hard-to-fill vacancies and general labour market information. This should be possible through Jobcentre Plus and the relevant local enterprise company (LEC);
Diagram 3.1  The Access to Work Process
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• Work with other locally based initiatives that might have detailed information on local vacancies. If such initiatives do not exist then it might be worthwhile for the local authority and the LEC to think about setting something up. A model might be the Joblink service that operates as a jobs broker between employers and the unemployed in Dunbartonshire. This seems to be highly effective in placing clients into work, in part because it adopts a pro-active stance in developing links with employers and providing employees with ongoing support once they move into work.

THE PROJECT’S STRATEGIC “FIT”

3.17 All of the pilot projects have been approved by the Scottish Executive and therefore would seem, almost by definition, to “fit” with the aims of the Working for Families Funding package. However we do have reservations about the extent to which some, if implemented as currently described, would result in the Scottish Executive’s objectives being attained. There would seem to be evidence that the funding package has been used by some projects to implement plans that had already been drawn up. These have been only slightly modified to include a childcare component.

3.18 It is unfair, at this stage in the development of the pilots, to highlight those that seem to have only marginal relevance. However the lesson for guidance on the main programme would seem to be that the link with employment and childcare needs to be explicit and that the attainment of other goals, however desirable, is very much a secondary consideration.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND DURATION

3.19 Project development has been slow, as Chapter 2 has highlighted. Six months into the financial year some of the projects have still to be established. There are a number of reasons for this. However, the lesson is that development takes time and projects, even if they are developments of existing ones, cannot be set up rapidly. This is even more the case if they are new.

3.20 So why has project development taken so long? A number of reasons can be identified:

• In both pilot areas the preparation of the bids to the Scottish Executive, and their subsequent refinement, has been the responsibility of staff who already had an existing workload. This and the need, in some instances, to bring together a range of partners slowed down progress;

• In Glasgow development in Castlemilk was slow as there was a lack of strategic infrastructure to facilitate project development. This meant that the City Council co-ordinator had to draw up the bid. Given her other responsibilities, this inevitably delayed progress, as did the need to find a locally based organisation that would be willing to host the initiative. This can be contrasted with the situation in Easterhouse where the Greater Easterhouse Childcare Partnership brings together local agencies concerned with childcare and economic development. This meant that it was possible to approach one organisation which then took over responsibility for preparing the bid in partnership with others;
• For 2 of the projects the original intention had been that they would be delivered by locally based community groups. In the event the Care Commission felt that they lacked the management capacity to take on other responsibilities. Accordingly progress has been delayed whilst alternative delivery plans are explored; and
• There also seem to be some instances where insufficient thought had been given to delivery. In these projects there was a lack of clarity as to who was to be responsible, whether the local authority or a third party.

3.21 Several interviewees, at various times, also commented upon the fact that the Care Commission tended to be rather slow in making decisions. This could easily delay project development. This may be inevitable and would, therefore, seem to be something that projects have to factor into their development time.

3.22 Underpinning all of these reasons is, however, the speed with which the bids had to be put together and the projects rolled out. This has proved impossible to do quickly, other than for the projects that are developments of existing initiatives. Whilst it could be argued that more time should have been spent on development before the bids were submitted to the Scottish Executive, this is probably unrealistic when the funding outcome is uncertain. There, therefore, needs to be recognition that, even after project approval, time will have to be spent on development and refinement before the projects can start.

3.23 In part this slow development reflected the fact that the pilots were being set up by people who were trying to fit this work around their existing workloads (Paragraph 3.20). There is a feeling that a lot of effort had gone into setting something up that would only have a one year life. Given this, it is not surprising that a consistent thread running through many of the interviews was the need for a degree of funding continuity, if all of this effort was to be worthwhile.

3.24 The slow start, when combined with the likely difficulties of being able to show rapid progress in getting the target group into work or onto a course, means that a year may be too short a time to be able to demonstrate definitive progress in attaining the Scottish Executive’s objectives.

3.25 All of these factors mean that the lessons for the main programme are that:

• Taking a project from even a detailed description to implementation will take time. This needs to be recognised by the projects when making their bids and by the Scottish Executive when allocating and monitoring funding;
• Providing funding for only a year may be counterproductive in terms of being able to demonstrate what works and what does not work and in terms of sustaining staff commitment; and
• If projects are successful in recruiting from the identified target group then the many other barriers that they may face, in addition to childcare, may mean that it is difficult to demonstrate any “hard” outcomes (such as a job or entry to an education course) over a year. This is reinforced by the findings of the FMR research, cited earlier (Paragraph 2.17) on the timing of interviewees’ entry to the labour market. One consequence of this is that there is a need to measure “distance travelled” as well as “hard” outcomes. This is considered in greater detail in Chapter 4.
3.26 In the light of these factors we would suggest that funds be allocated for a minimum of 2 years. At the end of that period it should be possible to see if the project is attaining its objectives and decide if further support is justified. Any such judgements at the end of 12 months seem likely to be premature.

MARKETING

3.27 Two of the pilots (Access to Work and Rosemount) have marketing strategies in place. These involve such things as:

- Using the local press, both editorials and advertisements;
- Placing posters and fliers in venues where it is felt the target group will see them. This has been in such places as jobcentres and Business Gateway offices;
- Using existing networks to disseminate information about the project around agencies and individuals, which is also being done by other projects, such as Easterhouse; and
- Using waiting lists to contact people who have already expressed an interest in coming onto the project, as Access to Work has been able to do.

3.28 Given that these 2 pilots are based upon existing successful initiatives it seems reasonable to assume that this type of marketing is effective and would be equally successful when used by other projects. However, marketing needs to reach the Scottish Executive’s target groups, as well as raising the general profile of a project. This is considered next.

REACHING THE APPROPRIATE TARGET GROUP

3.29 The target group is, at one level, defined by the Scottish Executive in so far as the aim is to target parents and carers who are furthest from labour market participation (possibly as they have a variety of other non-childcare related problems such as substance abuse). Recruiting clients with these characteristics is something that the projects need to ensure that they do. As such it is looked at in greater detail in Chapter 4.

3.30 However the aim of the funding is primarily to provide appropriate childcare support, rather than help to overcome these other problems per se. As such the projects clearly need to develop appropriate networks, with other specialist agencies, so that they can be called upon as needed to give support that, by complementing childcare, will result in the Scottish Executive’s objectives being attained.

3.31 The literature dealing with the problems that lone parents and those with childcare responsibilities face highlights childcare as being a key barrier. For example, an evaluation of New Deal for Lone Parents found that 54% of respondents were reluctant to leave their child with someone else whilst they worked, whilst 51% highlighted a lack of suitable childcare as being a problem in their area (Lessof, et al, 2002). Research has also found that this group expresses a “strong orientation towards paid work” (Thurley, 2003). However the research, undertaken for Glasgow City has found that, of those interviewees who expressed an interest in moving into employment or education/training relatively few had this as an immediate goal (FMR Research, 2003) (Paragraph 2.17). For example 47% of respondents saw moving
into full-time employment as being something that they would contemplate “in the longer term”, that is in over 12 months time.

3.32 Accordingly guidance for the main programme should emphasise that, although the target group is those who are not near being “job ready”, they need to be motivated towards gaining a job or education or training place. Access to the main programme should, therefore, not be open to all but should only be allowed when there is some evidence of a degree of commitment. This is not to suggest that immediate results are looked for. The nature of the target group seems likely to make this difficult. However, if the programme is to be able to attain its objectives, and to be spent effectively, then recruiting clients who have some motivation is essential.

3.33 To an extent some of the pilots already do this. For example, Access to Work interviews all applicants and makes an assessment of the extent to which the applicant would benefit from being taught to drive and, amongst other things, is actively seeking employment (Diagram 3.1). Similarly Rosemount makes an initial assessment of each applicant before making a decision on admission. If Rosemount is felt not to be able to offer the support that the applicant needs they may be referred elsewhere to more specialist providers.

3.34 The need to target those who are committed needs to be something that guidance in the main programme should emphasise. The danger with this is, however, that only those who are near to being job ready are targeted so that the really hard-to-reach groups are ignored. This needs to be avoided if the programme’s aims are to be met. One way of doing this might be to stress to projects that they need to develop an appropriate delivery model.

DEVELOPING AN APPROPRIATE DELIVERY MODEL

3.35 One of the differences between the pilot projects in Dumfries and Galloway and Glasgow is that all of the Glasgow projects have incorporated into them staff whose role is to provide support and guidance and facilitate networking with specialist providers to meet the varied needs that projects’ clients may have. This is largely not the case in the Dumfries pilots. There the focus in many is upon childcare and guidance networks are something that have still to be developed. There are exceptions to this, in particular Access to Work which has its own established networks. It is also likely that some of the project development staff will be able to provide support. However, generally this is not a planned part of provision. It might be wise to ensure that this is the case in the main programme.

3.36 The purpose of the pilots is to move parents and carers nearer to the labour market. Childcare is but one of a number of barriers that they face to labour market participation, albeit that it is, perhaps, the one that is most easily overcome by spending public resources. However, to overcome the others requires the use of specialist agencies that can provide support for such problems as health, substance abuse and literacy and numeracy. The model that some projects seem to be promoting is shown in Diagram 3.2. It is based on the assumption that clients will be able to enter the labour market with the help (as appropriate) of specialist provision once they receive the childcare support.

3.37 The problem with this model is that the client group that the Scottish Executive wants to reach may not be able to enter employment without long-term support and guidance. To
provide childcare support in parallel with this may mean that the childcare resources are spent for limited short, or even medium, term impacts.

Diagram 3.2 The Employment and Childcare Funding Model
3.38 Given this we would propose that guidance stresses to projects the model shown in Diagram 3.3. Under this all clients undergo an initial assessment which determines motivation. Those who are motivated towards moving nearer to the labour market are then further assessed to identify the barriers they face. If these are solely childcare then they can move onto the programme. If they face other barriers they will be referred to the appropriate specialist providers. In this case childcare may be provided in order that they can make use of these specialist services.

3.39 This is not to suggest that those whose main barrier is childcare receive no specialist support. What is proposed is that such provision is only made available, along with the childcare support, for a limited period of time. This model would seem to be a more effective use of the Working for Families funding than that shown in Diagram 3.2. It would also seem to be a more effective use of specialist provision.

**STAFFING**

3.40 A number of the pilot projects are being run by staff who have experience of delivering similar initiatives, as the pilots are developments of existing projects. However new staff are also being recruited. Recruitment is being done in 2 ways: through secondments and by open recruitment.

3.41 In general terms secondments are seen as advantageous in that it is possible to persuade someone to come and run a project that has a time limited life. As they know that they have a job to return to, they are able to devote their energies to running the project. It is also hoped, in a number of instances, that the secondees will have been involved in the development of the pilots and will, therefore, be able to make rapid progress once in post. However, a view was also expressed that secondees may be unwilling, or unable, to adapt to a new situation (however temporary) and therefore continue to act as if they were employed by their parent organisation.

3.42 The obvious alternative to using a secondee is to recruit someone on the open market on a fixed term contract. Whilst this might be inevitable in some instances, it is felt that this is rarely an effective way to staff a project. The main reason for this view is the limited effective time that is spent on project development and delivery, given the time needed to settle in and the inevitable period of uncertainty, and time spent on job search, as the contract end nears.

3.43 There is however, another way of overcoming the problems affecting both secondees and fixed term contracts. This is to recruit staff on a permanent contract, as Rosemount has done. However this may only be an option available to larger projects with a variety of funding streams. There is, therefore, a reasonable degree of certainty that once one stream ends then it will be possible to pay staff from another. Going down this route can also, as Rosemount has found, be very time consuming due to the volume of applicants (Paragraph 2.13).
Diagram 3.3 An Alternative Employment and Childcare Model
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3.44 Regardless of which route projects go down there is a need to be clear about the roles of staff. Observations of the discussions held in Dumfries and Galloway found that there were both differences of opinion, and some unrealistic expectations, as to what a co-ordinator could be expected to do. Perhaps naturally, there was a tendency to see the co-ordinator as picking up all of the tasks that currently had not been allocated. The outcome was that the job description was becoming unrealistic. Following discussion it was narrowed down to a more strategic, overview role. Such clarity seems vital if the post holder is to be able to perform adequately to a tight timetable.

VOLUNTEERING

3.45 The point has already been made that one of the outcomes that Rosemount is aiming at is for clients to become active as volunteers, which is seen as being a staging post to moving into paid work (Paragraph 2.13). As an option this did not figure explicitly in the original Scottish Executive brief as an outcome. We do however feel that it should be considered as a valid interim outcome of the Working for Families support. As such it has been incorporated into the proposed monitoring framework (see Chapter 4).

PROJECT DELIVERY

3.46 Delivery of most of the projects is through an intermediary organisation, rather than the local authority directly. For example SCMA and the Accessible Transport Forum are to deliver projects in Dumfries and Galloway, whilst in Glasgow local groups such as COJAC have this responsibility.

3.47 Using intermediaries has advantages. For example:

- They know the local area and have credibility with local organisations and the wider community. It might, therefore be easier, or quicker, to establish a project than if a totally new body was to be set up;
- An existing project is likely to have its own local networks, both formal and informal. This means that marketing campaigns, even by word of mouth, can be set up very rapidly. Proof of this can be seen from the fact that even before the Easterhouse project had been launched requests for childcare subsidy had been received from 2 local parents;
- Groups will have their own structures and systems which do not have to be set up, as would be the case were a new delivery organisation to be created; and
- They will be experts in their field, be this childcare or transport, and will therefore know what works and what doesn’t. This should make the formulation of objectives and targets easier.

3.48 However there may be a down side to working through existing organisations. In particular:

- As has already been pointed out, existing organisations may lack the capacity to deliver additional projects. There is, therefore, clearly a need to ensure that projects have management capacity to take on additional tasks before giving them a delivery role; and
Organisations are experts in their own field. Such expertise may, however, mean that they want to continue to deliver what ever they are comfortable with, rather than move into new areas of work. It is too early to say if this will be a problem with the pilot projects. However, some of the initial observations (for example in Dumfries and Galloway) tended to indicate that there were tensions between those coming from a childcare background and those with an economic development remit. The danger is that these tensions are not resolved and that, given that most of the projects are being run by those from a childcare background, childcare is given priority over wider economic development objectives. This is something that needs to be monitored.

Although there may be problems with using local groups, on balance this would seem to be the appropriate way to deliver the Working for Families projects, subject to:

- The local authority being certain that the group has the capacity to deliver what is being asked of it;
- This being agreed in advance with the Care Commission, if necessary; and
- Exactly what the group is to deliver, and other requirements, being set out clearly in service level agreements.

This possible tension between childcare and economic development objectives is, however, of considerable importance. If it is not resolved then it may be difficult for the programme to deliver its objectives. Accordingly this is explored in greater detail in the next section.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LINKAGES

The objective of the pilot funding is to provide childcare as a means of enabling parents and carers to move into, or nearer to, the job market. Childcare is therefore a means to an end, not the end in itself. Given this it is, perhaps, surprising that of the 11 projects only 2 (Access to Work and Rosemount) are coming from what could be described as an economic development background. Another, Dumfries and Galloway’s Expansion of the Childminding Service, has the aim of promoting self employment, albeit in a narrow field, where the track record of sustainability is, as the Scottish Executive’s figures show (Scottish Executive, 2003), not very good. The others either have childcare origins or come from other backgrounds, for example community transport.

To attain the Scottish Executive’s objectives there will be a need to develop close links with economic development agencies and organisations for those pilots that lack such networks. For some projects this might be easy. For example the Castlemilk project is to be run by a secondee from CEDA, the local economic development company. However, several of the other projects seem likely to have to develop such linkages from a background of limited understanding and awareness of economic development structures and programmes.

Developing such an understanding is clearly not impossible, although it may be difficult in the short time scale over which the pilots will run. However, a more efficient way of delivering the Scottish Executive’s objectives might be for projects to be run by economic development organisations that have expertise in helping those who are a long way from the
labour market move into jobs. They could then, as has Rosemount, contract with childcare providers to deliver whatever childcare is needed.

3.54  The danger with many of the pilots is that, because of the type of organisations that are delivering them, the emphasis, and the effort, is initially going into childcare rather than economic development. It might be preferable to ensure that, when the main programme is rolled out, greater efforts are made to have more economic development organisations delivering projects than is currently the case. Whilst childcare may not always be easy to provide, for example because of the need to cater for children with behavioural difficulties or the lack of infrastructure, there would generally seem to be more certainty about providing it than with getting parents and carers into employment. Yet the expertise in most of the pilots lies in childcare, not in economic development.

3.55  There are examples of economic development organisations that are major childcare providers. For example the East End Partnership, one of Glasgow’s local economic development companies, runs a number of childcare projects (providing a total of 140 places), a mobile play team and a variety of related initiatives such as Child Safety and a Childminding Initiative. It also delivers an Intermediate Labour Market initiative “Childcare Works” which aims to help 15 local residents to move into work. Such organisations might be better placed to meet the Scottish Executive’s objectives in the short to medium term than ones having a child care remit alone.

3.56  To some extent Glasgow is exceptional in the extent to which it has developed a local economic development framework through its network of 8 local economic development companies. As has been commented upon earlier, one of these (CEDA in Castlemilk) is involved in the pilots through the provision of a secondee. However other council areas have their own networks and local development projects. Local authority economic development departments, or their equivalent, and LECs should be aware of what exists locally.

3.57  To ensure that the funding meets its objective, that is to move parents nearer to employability, we therefore suggest that consideration be given to steering the money for the main programme through local government’s economic development, rather than the childcare, infrastructure. An alternative option might be to use the Childcare Partnerships. However, analysis of the strategies for Glasgow and Dumfries and Galloway has found that the childcare-employment link is not always very strong. Accordingly, if the money was to be channelled through the partnerships there must be a fear that, as with most of the pilots, the main focus would be upon childcare rather than economic development.

TARGETING

3.58  There is invariably a conflict between targeting geographical areas and targeting individuals. Geographical targeting can be a crude mechanism in so far as there are invariably many people with the identified targeted characteristics outwith the targeted areas as there are within them. However, it is administratively very efficient as it enables services to be delivered to a large group of people even though not all of them may possess the characteristics being targeted. Targeting individuals may be more effective in that there is certainty that those receiving the policy intervention have the characteristics that the policy makers want to impact upon. However, such targeting can be relatively inefficient as there is a need to ensure (through some sort of assessment) that the individuals receiving the support
have the necessary characteristics. Delivery, especially for services that need a physical base or some threshold level of users, can also be difficult, especially in rural areas where the target group may be widely distributed.

3.59 To some extent the pilot projects have elements of both geographical and individual targeting. They are focused upon areas that have above average levels of exclusion. Within these areas the emphasis is upon targeting those who have specific characteristics: parents or carers who want to move into employment, training or education but are unable to do so as they face a number of barriers, one of which is childcare.

3.60 Although Dumfries and Galloway had been selected as one of the pilots there was a general view from interviewees in the area that spatial targeting was unfair in so far as it was often done at such a scale as to mean that pockets of exclusion were overlooked. To some extent this would support targeting individuals rather than areas.

3.61 Some interviewees also expressed the opinion that continued spatial targeting might eventually result in the targeted areas being unable to absorb the additional resources. This might have a number of consequences, for example:

- There may not be sufficient qualified staff to run whatever facilities were to be set up. This is predicted to be a problem in Easterhouse when the currently planned facilities for 0 to 3 year olds come on stream; and
- There may be a problem in identifying sufficient clients with the required characteristics. This might be even more of a problem if, as earlier suggested, (Paragraphs 3.29 to 3.34) there were to be some initial assessment before clients were admitted to a project.

3.62 Spatial targeting, based on the Scottish Executive’s Indices of Deprivation, has political consequences were resources to be allocated in line with the severity of deprivation. Table 3.1 looks at the distribution of the 100 most deprived wards in Scotland as identified in the 2003 Indices of Deprivation. It can be seen that, were resources to be allocated on the basis of this measure of need, then Glasgow would receive the largest share, followed by Dundee. Although councils such as East Ayrshire contain rural areas, the deprived wards tend to be the small former mining and iron working communities. Highland has 1 ward in the 100 most deprived and this is ranked 8th. Likewise Dumfries and Galloway has one ward: ranked 70th.
Table 3.1 Number of the 100 Most Deprived Wards in Selected Local Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Number of Wards in most Deprived 100†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ayrshire</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ayrshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lanarkshire</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackmannanshire</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>1 (ranked 8th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkirk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>1 (ranked 70th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note:
1. There are 1,222 wards in Scotland.

3.63 Had the Working for Families funding been allocated solely on the basis of need, then the 2 pilot areas would have probably been Glasgow and Dundee. Using the Indices in this rather mechanistic way would, however, be unlikely to be politically acceptable. Yet the Indices exist and it would seem unwise for the Working for Families programme to ignore them. Consideration could therefore be given to allocating funds to those authorities with the greatest concentrations of deprivation, as measured by the Indices. However if this is done then the spatial consequences need to be borne in mind.

3.64 It could also be argued that the 2003 Indices do not fully represent rural dimensions such as accessibility. Although geographical access to services figures in the Indices it is solely to services such as doctors, shops and banks. There is no measure of distance to key employment nodes or to further education centres. Other available indicators that might favour rural areas were not included: for example access to private and public transport. Such omissions could easily be used by rural authorities to argue a case for project support.

URBAN/RURAL DIFFERENCES

3.65 It is easy to exaggerate the differences between urban and rural areas with regard to such things as access to job opportunities and attitudes to specific types of childcare such as childminding.

3.66 Although the distances to be travelled in rural areas to any facility, such as a training centre or a work place, are likely to be geographically greater, many of those living in, for
example Glasgow’s outer housing estates, find it very difficult to access jobs, other than those located in the city centre. This reflects the tendency for public transport to be concentrated upon radial routes. There are well documented experiences in Glasgow of the inability of those without a car, living in Castlemilk and Easterhouse, to be able to access jobs in, respectively East Kilbride and North Lanarkshire.

3.67 Likewise attitudes to childminding in many of the Pilots’ target communities may differ little between the 2 types of area. For example, one of the Dumfries and Galloway bids is justified, in part, on the basis that parents are unwilling to allow their children to be looked after by childminders. Apparently the market research underway in Glasgow has uncovered identical attitudes, with childminders being demonised by parents who have little, or no, experience of them.

3.68 However, what might be a more of a problem in rural areas is the development of effective networks. These are needed so that those looking to return to the labour market can be referred to specialist agencies to help them overcome whatever labour market access barriers they have. Not only do urban areas have a greater density of such agencies (in part a reflection of the greater severity of exclusion problems) but geography makes accessing them easier. This does not, however, mean that it is impossible to establish such networks in rural areas, as the Access to Work project has shown.

3.69 Rural areas also do not have the density of initiatives and networks that are found in cities such as Glasgow. This, as Paragraph 3.6 pointed out, may mean that there is a restricted strategic and policy framework to relate projects to. However this can be overcome by ensuring that project development involves all of the players who have an interest in economic development and childcare, as has been done in Dumfries and Galloway.

3.70 Given that there are both differences and similarities between urban and rural areas with regard to such things as accessibility how should the Scottish Executive’s Working for Families programme respond? There is a need to recognise that there will generally be further to travel in rural areas to facilities and employment. As such the need for transport to childcare provision and transport for child carers needs to be recognised, as indeed it has been in some of the pilot projects. It may also be necessary to accept that transport difficulties may make securing “hard” outcomes, such as jobs, more difficult in rural areas. Beyond this, given the projects’ development stages, it is not possible to be more prescriptive at this time.

SUMMARY

3.71 This Chapter has identified a number of issues that could impact upon the main Working for Families programme. Before looking at how these could be used to help the Scottish Executive develop good practice and criteria for allocating the main programme the crucial issue of monitoring and evaluation will be considered.
CHAPTER FOUR DEVELOPING A MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

4.1 Being able to demonstrate that the projects are reaching the target groups and moving them closer to being economically active is crucial. Accordingly this Chapter looks at the projects’ targets and outcomes and progress in developing monitoring systems. It finishes by making a number of suggestions for the type of framework that needs to be put in place if data is to be captured that will demonstrate that the Scottish Executive’s objectives are being met.

4.2 The Mid-Term Report, submitted to the Scottish Executive in July 2003, outlined the type of information that it would be useful to collect if the pilots were to be able to show that they were both reaching their target groups and moving them towards employability. Feedback received on this Report, along with comments made at the meeting of the first Advisory Group, has been incorporated into the Framework that is outlined here.

PROJECT TARGETS AND OUTCOMES

4.3 The various targets and outcomes for the pilot projects are summarised in Tables 4.1 and 4.2. These have been derived from the submissions made by the projects to the Scottish Executive. A number of conclusions can be drawn:

- Not all of the projects have quantitative targets. Their lack could make it difficult to assess project effectiveness or efficiency. Targets would seem to be a basic management tool. Their absence may indicate that there has been insufficient project planning. Alternatively a project may be so experimental that it may be very difficult, if not impossible, to derive targets that are anything more than guesses. However, the nature of the projects that lack targets makes the former interpretation more likely. It may also be the case that targets have not been given as there is a fear that failure to attain them may result in sanctions by the Scottish Executive; and
- There are greater concerns about the project outcomes. These fall into 3 groups:
  - Those projects that have quantitative outcomes that clearly relate to the Scottish Executive’s objectives for the pilot projects, that is getting parents or carers either into, or nearer to accessing work, education or training. Of the 10 projects in the Tables only 3 fall into this category. There are, however, others that phrase their outcomes in terms of the numbers of people attaining the Scottish Executive’s objectives but which fail to specify these numbers. The implication would seem to be that whatever numbers the project eventually achieves becomes the de facto outcome measure. This does not seem to be a very objective way of measuring progress;
Table 4.1  Glasgow Pilot Project Targets and Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosemount - Transitions Project</td>
<td>Caseload for Transitions staff: 1) 80 women take up classes; 2) 60 women move into employment or education (half recent graduates, half completing course pre-2003); 3) 30 low paid women in entry level jobs; and 4) 6 care leavers who are lone parents (women with addictions).</td>
<td>First 12 months: 1) 40 women into voluntary work; 2) 20 into further education; 3) 40 into work; and 4) 40 sustain jobs or secure better jobs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Easterhouse – Childcare Extra
1) 48 families supported through the Childcare Mentor; and 2) 24 Holiday/Wraparound Childcare places.

1) Enhanced uptake of Childcare Tax Credit; 2) Increased household income for families; 3) Additional revenue for local Childminding services; 4) Increased usage of Childminding services; 5) Increased use of money advice services and credit unions; 6) Increased ability of parents to take advantage of training, employment and educational opportunities; and 7) Increased access to childcare services for 0-3 year olds.

Note:
1. At the time of writing (October 2003) targets and outcomes were not available for the Castlemilk project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Out of hours childcare</td>
<td>5 workers in the first year.</td>
<td>5 parents in work supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evening Childcare</td>
<td>None as yet.</td>
<td>Enabling parents to access training at the Learning and Resource Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Roving Crèche/Childcare Training</td>
<td>1) 150 users in Year 1; and 2) 300 hours of</td>
<td>Enabling parents to attend training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>childcare.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expansion of Childminding service</td>
<td>100 marketing events.</td>
<td>1) 20 new self employed businesses; and 2) 30 people to return or enter employment or training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Childminding Subsidy</td>
<td>23,460 hours of subsidised childcare (over 26 weeks).</td>
<td>Over 26 weeks at least: 1) 15 families benefit from full-time childcare subsidy; and 2) 40 families benefit from part-time childcare subsidy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Access to Work</td>
<td>10 parents gain places on course to learn to drive.</td>
<td>Number of parents entering training or employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community transport</td>
<td>None detailed.</td>
<td>Enable parents to access childcare services and support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects that have qualitative outcomes some, or all, of which relate to the Scottish Executive’s objectives; and

Projects that have outcomes that are essentially outputs, for example the numbers of families who benefit from support or enabling families to access services.

4.4 Rosemount is the pilot that has most clearly focused its targets and outcomes, in terms of their being measurable and closely linked to the objectives of the Scottish Executive. This no doubt reflects its awareness of monitoring and evaluation procedures, as a consequence of its activities having been subject to previous external evaluations.

4.5 What is surprising about the Outcomes is that none of the pilots refers explicitly to soft indicators, albeit that the Easterhouse pilot comes closest with its reference to the “increased ability of parents to take advantage of training, employment and educational opportunities”. The reason for expressing surprise is that, both in the academic literature, some of the project descriptions and in interviews, the difficulty of demonstrating progress over 12 months in terms of hard outcomes, (such as securing a job) was commented upon. In part this reflects the variety of problems that the target group often faces, with childcare being only one of a number of barriers to becoming economically active. As such, progress to work may be slow. Given this, it would seem sensible for the pilots to begin to think of how they can demonstrate progress in a way that will show that the Scottish Executive’s objectives are being met, if only partially, in the short term. This is something that has been raised with the projects in discussion and hopefully has been taken on board.

4.6 Examination of the project descriptions also indicates that some pilots need to tailor their activities more closely to the Scottish Executive’s objectives (see Paragraphs 3.17 to 3.18). For example, part of the Dumfries Community Transport Project description implies that its objectives are to allow childcare to be accessed rather than to access this for economic development ends. Even if this is reading too much into the description, this project, and others, would seem to require quite sophisticated monitoring systems if only to ensure that the appropriate target group is accessing the services. In turn this has implications for marketing and for the sensitive application of eligibility criteria when making decisions about who should be allowed to use a service.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

4.7 Given that not all of the projects have been set up, and those that have are mainly in their early developmental stages, it is unsurprising that progress on developing monitoring and evaluation systems is limited. However, given the short timescale and the need to show that objectives are being attained (if continuing funding is to be secured) setting up such systems should be a priority.

4.8 It seems that only 2 of the 11 projects have monitoring and evaluation systems. Not surprisingly these are the 2 established ones: Rosemount and Access to Work. However some of the others, for example Dumfries and Galloway’s Project 5 (Expansion of Childminding Service), have drafted monitoring pro formas.

4.9 The Rosemount system has 4 elements:
• Profile information that is completed for each student. This covers things such as number of dependents, qualifications, employment status and benefits being received;
• A Student Referral Form, covering how the student heard about Rosemount, courses they are interested in, childcare needs and ability to communicate in English. Interestingly, in the light of the earlier comments about soft indicators (Paragraph 4.5), there is also a section on expectations covering such things as “Gain Skills”, “Access Further Education” and “Gain Confidence”. This is, however, simply a series of tick boxes, rather than a graded system which would allow measuring and tracking of progress;
• An Aftercare Guidance Form which summarises the student’s needs and the action taken; and
• A Discharge Form which summarises why the student left, any referrals to other agencies and whether there is a need for follow-up.

4.10 At the moment the system is paper based and much of the information is collected in the form of open ended questions/statements. This would make analysis difficult as there would be an initial need to classify the responses. However, some of the pilot funding is to computerise this system. As part of this process Rosemount is currently revising its monitoring forms with the help of an external consultant and is trying to identify suitable software packages.

4.11 The Access to Work monitoring system is similarly comprehensive. Although some of the material collected is part of an interview process, designed to assess suitability for project entry, it could be used for monitoring purposes. The process starts with an interview which involves the Project Co-ordinator, members of the Accessible Transport Forum and local people asking the interviewee a number of questions covering such things as:

• The ways in which having a driving licence would be of benefit;
• Reasons why the interviewee feels that he/she should be given a place on the project; and
• The extent to which transport and childcare barriers restrict ability to take up employment.

This information is then fed into a scoring system which is used to make a decision on suitability for entry to the project. This is essentially a series of Yes/No answers to such questions as “Is the applicant actively seeking work?” and “Is childcare a barrier to labour market entry?”

4.12 Once recruited, clients go through an induction interview. Use is then made of the Rickter Scale, an evaluation tool, essentially a plastic board with sliders which allows clients to record their responses. The initial use asks for responses to the “Preparation for Work” Life Board. This asks a variety of questions covering such things as readiness for work, income needs from work, progress towards getting a job and the extent of job preparation. Use is also made of other boards as appropriate, for example that covering Drugs and Alcohol. This information then forms a baseline against which “Distance Travelled” can be measured when the questions are repeated at a later stage.

4.13 SCMA, that is responsible for delivering the Expansion of the Childminding Service (Dumfries and Galloway’s Project 5), has produced a draft monitoring form that has been
distributed to members of the Council’s Working Group and feedback asked for. The
intention is that information from individual advice sessions will be collated on a monthly
basis. This will then be forwarded to the co-ordinator. The information to be collected
includes:

- Numbers of attendees who were interested in becoming childminders;
- Their characteristics, such as being a member of an ethnic minority or a lone
  parent;
- Numbers receiving specific types of benefit; and
- Barriers to entering the labour market.

4.14 The other projects have made limited progress in developing monitoring systems. In
Dumfries and Galloway the expectation seems to be that this will be the responsibility of the
yet to be appointed co-ordinator, who is to oversee all 8 projects. In Castlemilk it is similarly
expected that the secondee co-ordinator will have experience of monitoring and evaluation
that will be used to develop a system for the pilot project.

4.15 Whilst this limited progress may be inevitable, given the development state of most
projects, it does need to be urgently addressed. One reason for stressing this is that the
discipline of developing these systems will emphasise to project staff the need to ensure that
the pilots target the appropriate client group and are helping to move them towards work or
training/education, rather than simply providing childcare support as an end in itself. In its
turn this realisation should impact upon such things as marketing, eligibility criteria and
measuring progress.

DEVELOPING A MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

4.16 On the basis of the examination of the stated targets and outcomes, and our
understanding of the Scottish Executive’s aims for the pilot projects, we would suggest that
the projects need to -

- Revisit their targets and outcomes and develop quantitative measures, especially
  for the targets;
- Ensure that outcomes relate explicitly to the Scottish Executive’s objectives. For
  some projects this might mean that they modify their activities;
- Give greater thought to the use of qualitative, soft, indicators to complement the
  hard measures in order to measure distance travelled as a result of project
  participation; and
- Develop monitoring systems that demonstrate that the target client group is being
  reached and show how this group has progressed towards employment or
  education/training.

These criteria should also apply to the main programme when it starts in 2004 and could
usefully be specified in the Scottish Executive’s guidance.
4.17 Whilst the projects are varied, in terms of the type of support they offer, they should all have 2 common characteristics:

- Be targeting a similar client group; and
- Be providing support to move this group towards work, education or training.

4.18 Given this, there should be a degree of similarity in the monitoring frameworks used, not only across the pilots but also across the projects that will form part of the main programme when it is launched in 2004. Our suggestion, therefore, is that any monitoring and evaluation framework fall into 3 parts:

- **Client Profile** information so that it is possible to ensure that the target client group is being reached;
- **Hard Indicators** relating explicitly to the Scottish Executive’s objectives. These would relate to clients obtaining jobs and places on training and education courses. Voluntary activity should also be measured, as this may be a half-way house towards obtaining work, something that Rosemount stresses (Paragraph 3.45); and
- **Soft Indicators** that measure such things as changes in attitudes and expectations as a result of participation in a project. Given the potential problems in showing progress on hard indicators over a short time such information would seem to be important if progress is to be measured.

4.19 In addition to this information we assume that the normal financial monitoring and auditing will be undertaken to ensure that the money is being spent as agreed with the Scottish Executive. As such this does feature in our draft frameworks.

4.20 It is also likely that, as the 3 examples described above indicate (Paragraphs 4.9 to 4.13) the projects will all want to collect information that is specific to their own project. Given that this may be unique this is again not something that features in our draft framework.

4.21 The point was made in the Mid-Term Report that, in developing frameworks, there is a need to strike a balance between the theoretical ideal (which invariably tends towards the long and complex) and having something that can be used with minimal additional effort. Following feedback from the Scottish Executive the suggested monitoring framework was revised. However, these revisions were not to the overall approach, which was accepted, but to the detail. One consequence of this is that the content has increased. Its completion may, therefore, require additional work. However, if these requirements are made clear at the start of the funding period then projects should be able to incorporate them into their systems with limited additional effort.

4.22 As far as possible the contents of the pro formas consist of closed questions, although some open ones are inevitable in order to keep the length to manageable sizes. It would also be useful if they can be set up and distributed by the Scottish Executive electronically using an Excel spreadsheet. This should allow analysis of the closed questions to be undertaken automatically. However this would require that all projects be linked to the Internet. Whilst this would be no problem for local authorities and the larger projects, it might be for some of the smaller ones that may be involved in delivery. This could be overcome by making the provision of monitoring information electronically a grant condition.
4.23 In terms of the framework’s content, for the Profile information, the following would seem to be required:

- Client’s name and address;
- Gender;
- Age;
- Main language;
- Residency status which may be an important factor in certain areas, for example Glasgow, where there are large numbers of asylum seekers in some localities;
- Family status;
- Disabilities;
- Household composition;
- Non-child dependents;
- Qualifications held;
- Current economic status;
- If working, information about the job held;
- If not working, date last worked and information about this job;
- Benefits received;
- Dependent children (numbers and ages); and
- Other barriers to accessing work, education or training.

The detailed content of some of these questions was discussed with the Scottish Executive and some suggestions for additional information made. Most of these have been incorporated into the revisions. Some have, however, not been included as it was felt that they were too complex and would provide limited useful information. The main ones related to questions about the categorisation of jobs and industries. These have been left as open questions which may have implications for analysis.

4.24 The Hard indicators relate to the intended eventual outcomes of the Working for Families Funding, that is jobs, places on education and training courses or voluntary involvement. Our suggestions are that the following indicators be collected:

- Job secured, with information on its characteristics (full or part-time, temporary or permanent, level of skill, and gross weekly wage);
- Education course entered, with details of its title, provider, duration, time of attendance (Full-time, part-time, (morning, afternoon evening, weekend)), and qualification aimed at;
- Training course attended again collecting the same details as for education; and
- Voluntary work involvement, covering type of organisation being worked in, role and hours worked.

4.25 The main omission from the Hard indicators are any measures relating to support to enable people to sustain employment and develop a career path, something that Rosemount, for example, intends to do by working with low paid employees in entry level jobs. Although this is not one of the Scottish Executive’s explicit target groups it may be that the indicators could be supplemented to cover this group.

4.26 Soft indicators are seen as important in order to try to capture project impacts that may not immediately result in a Hard outcome. We suggest that the focus be upon measuring
Distance Travelled, that is changes in expectations and attitudes following the childcare support. This could be done in 2 main ways:

- By asking parents/carers to assess such things as their motivations and confidence at the start and end of support. However we recognise that this can be difficult, especially at the start of an initiative when clients may be very uncertain about participation and their expectations; or
- Towards the end of support when people are asked retrospectively to assess changes in motivation or confidence. The problem with this is that there may be an inbuilt tendency to overestimate project impacts, especially if participation has been a positive experience.

4.27 It may be that the most effective approach is to capture attitudes a short period into a project, when participants are clearer about what the project is offering. There would then be a follow-up at the end of the period of support that is 3, 6 and possibly 12 months after. This would allow Distance Travelled to be measured when the results are compared.

4.28 Most Distance Travelled methodologies, used in employment projects, capture information on some, or all, of 4 types of core outcomes: skills related to work; attitudes; personal factors; and practical abilities. Working for Families funded pilots are not generally being used to provide training (although there are exceptions, for example Childcare Training is part of the Roving Crèche project in Dumfries and Galloway). The projects are essentially about improving access by removing, or lessening, one barrier to labour force participation. As such, measuring core skills relating to work and practical abilities, and possibly even personal skills, may not be relevant. Accordingly the type of information that we suggest should be captured would cover:

- Motivation;
- Confidence; and
- Self-esteem.

Each of these dimensions would be measured on a progressive scale, with respondents being asked to give responses to set questions.

4.29 In terms of the timing of the implementation of the frameworks we would suggest that:

- Shortly after a client is recruited onto a project, and once they are aware of what support they are to receive, they be asked to provide the Profile and the Baseline Soft Indicator information by completing the appropriate pro formas. Examples of these are given in Appendix 2;
- Upon completion of their time on the project clients provide information that enables any Outcomes and distance travelled to be assessed. An example pro forma is shown in Appendix 3;
- This information is then collected again after 3 and possibly 6 and 12 months (Appendix 4). We are, however, aware that there are resource implications involved in tracking clients. If this is thought necessary, the Scottish Executive needs to make this a contractual requirement when funding is approved. To try to track beyond 12 months may be difficult if only because contact addresses and telephone numbers change. It may also be expecting too much of the intervention
that, given all the other changes in the wider environment, it would still be possible to isolate its impact after a year.

4.30 In addition to completing these pro formas we would suggest that the process involve:

- An initial assessment to ensure that the potential client is committed to trying to secure a job or course place in the short term and to identify the barriers (other than childcare) that restrict access to labour market participation (Paragraphs 3.35 to 3.39); and
- Some form of Early Exit Assessment for those clients who leave the project before completion.

The process is shown in Diagram 4.1.

4.31 The intention would be that the Profile, Baseline and the Completion information pro formas be completed by the client with advice and support, as appropriate, from project staff. The tracking information will be more difficult to collect. Initial contact needs to be made by telephone when information on such things as current status can be gathered. Collecting the distance travelled information will require either (in descending order of preference) that:

- Clients be invited back to the project to complete the pro-forma;
- The pro forma be sent out for them to complete and return by post; or
- It is completed over the telephone.

The exact procedure to be used should be left to the projects, although the requirement to produce this information should be made a grant condition.

4.32 There are different methodologies for collecting soft indicators. It might be appropriate if further consideration were given to this before the main programme is rolled out. In particular the merit of using some “off-the-shelf” approach such as the Rickter Scale needs to be considered. Further information can be found at the following web sites:

- [www.rickterscale.com](http://www.rickterscale.com)
- [www.getting-on.co.uk/toolkit/index.html](http://www.getting-on.co.uk/toolkit/index.html)

**SUMMARY**

4.33 Effective systems for monitoring the pilots, and the main programme, seem essential. Increasingly there is recognition of the need for such systems and progress is being made in setting them up. The proposals contained in this Chapter would, if implemented, ensure that a standardised approach was put in place across all of the projects when implementation of the main programme starts. This will allow comparisons to be made and will make the eventual evaluation of the Working for Families Fund far easier and more economical. Accordingly we would suggest that this is something the Scottish Executive implement.
Diagram 4.1  The Assessment and Monitoring Processes
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CHAPTER FIVE GOOD PRACTICE IDENTIFICATION

5.1 The point has been made on several occasions that project development has been slow so that there has been limited progress in implementation. As such it is impossible to make any judgements on project effectiveness or value for money. However, on the basis of the work undertaken both good and bad practices have been identified, especially ones related to project development. These are drawn upon here to outline a number of good practice lessons that might usefully influence the main programme.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

5.2 When developing a project good practice is that:

- **A steering group** is set up to oversee development. This will enable crucial partnership linkages to be forged, conflicts with existing projects to be identified and cross departmental links to be developed within the local authority, especially between economic development and childcare departments. Such groups, especially if they involve senior staff, can also be very effective in resolving conflicts rapidly. Ideally 2 groups would be established:
  - One consisting of **senior staff**, and perhaps local elected members, that will have a strategic role and is likely to be made up mainly of local authority staff and members; and
  - A group that has an **operational remit**, being drawn from those involved in delivery and policy formulation. Ideally this should involve all the organisations and agencies in the area that have economic development and childcare responsibilities;

- Link the project into whatever **strategic and policy networks** exist. This will provide project justification and credibility and also ensure that there are no conflicts with existing initiatives and wider policies;

- If the strategic and policy networks are sparse then they can be replicated through **steering groups**, especially ones that bring together operational staff;

- **Research** be undertaken to:
  - Identify the **need for the childcare support** that it is proposed to provide so that there is a degree of certainty that it will be taken up; and
  - Look at the characteristics of the **local labour market** in order to gain some idea of the type of jobs that are available;

- When a project is reasonably far down the development route, **consult** as widely as possible about it. This will ensure that others buy into it, begin the marketing process and ensure that what is being proposed is feasible;

- **Drawing on the experiences of other projects** can be useful in identifying what does and does not work. This can also help in putting budgets together and in devising realistic targets; and

- As far as possible keep **local elected members informed** of what is being done. Links with senior members may ensure that the project has a profile and also support.
5.3 Projects, and others, need to learn from the experiences of the pilots and realise that development will be time consuming. Good practice would imply that:

- A member of the council’s staff be allocated time to co-ordinate the development process. Fitting this work in, on top of an existing workload, may not be very effective;
- There needs to be careful planning and agreement, especially over such things as the delivery organisations and timescales; and
- Planning needs to take account of such things as the need to get agreement from external agencies, such as the Care Commission, which may be time consuming.

NETWORKING

5.4 To be effective in moving the target client groups nearer to the labour market networking is crucial. Projects need to:

- Develop links with staff and agencies involved in economic development and childcare; and
- Develop links with specialist providers that can offer clients support to deal with such problems as substance abuse, literacy and numeracy and finance.

5.5 Networking is so crucial to the success of this type of inter-disciplinary project that projects should consider employing a member of staff who can provide guidance and signposting services to clients.

FUNDING

5.6 Drawing in more than one funding stream to support a project may bring benefits in terms of:

- Giving a project a greater degree of flexibility;
- Help promote partnership as the various funders come together to develop the project; and
- Enabling additional services to be provided that can be of benefit to the client group.

5.7 However, if several funding streams are to be used then projects need to ensure that:

- All the funds are in place at the start of the project; and
- The various funders are happy to be contributing to a financial cocktail.

Project Delivery

5.8 Project delivery is probably best done through an existing intermediary organisation. Such organisations will usually:
• Be familiar with the local area so that they know local agencies and networks;
• Have an awareness of the issues that are being dealt with;
• Have their own systems and structures that can be used to manage and audit the new initiative; and
• Be experts in their own field. HOWEVER there is a need to guard against this expertise being used to drive the project down the route that the organisation is familiar with, so that, for example, the project becomes simply a childcare initiative.

5.9 When using intermediaries the local authority needs to ensure that:

• They have the capacity, and not just the willingness, to deliver a new project;
• The Care Commission is agreeable to new responsibilities being taken on, if their involvement is appropriate. This may take time so this needs to be factored into the project development period; and
• A service level agreement is drawn up which unambiguously states what services the organisation is expected to deliver and also specifies such things as monitoring and reporting requirements.

PROJECT STAFFING

5.10 Staff have been recruited in a number of ways. Based on their previous experiences, interviewees were able to identify the potential advantages and disadvantages of each:

• Using a secondee means that the person is likely to be familiar with the areas being dealt with and therefore becomes effective in a very short time. Obtaining a secondee may be done very rapidly. HOWEVER, secondees may retain their loyalty to their parent organisation and therefore not really develop any loyalty to the project. They may also find it difficult to get to grips with a project that has elements of both economic development and childcare and may therefore promote one more than the other;
• Recruiting on a short term contract may mean that it is possible to employ someone who will grow with the project and will therefore develop loyalty to it. HOWEVER, the nature of short term contract means that people may only be effective for a relatively short period of time, given that they need to settle in and will then spend time looking for another job as the contract nears an end; and
• Recruiting someone to a permanent job will overcome the potential problems of loyalty and time spent looking for another post. HOWEVER, projects need to be certain that they have guaranteed funding streams to provide employment continuity. Open recruitment can also pose considerable burdens on a small organisation that can become overwhelmed by the volume of responses. Similar problems will be experienced when recruiting for short term contracts.

It needs to be stressed that the above comments are generalisations, based on the experiences of the interviewees. As such they may not necessarily be reflected by the projects once they get underway.
5.11 Regardless of how staff are recruited, there may be **advantages in employing someone who is familiar with the local area** and its organisations and networks. This will enable the project to develop faster than if someone from outside of the area was to be recruited.

5.12 Whichever route is gone down to run the projects there is a need to:

- Be clear about the roles of each staff member and set these out in clear and unambiguous job descriptions.

**CLIENT ASSESSMENT**

5.13 If targets are to be met then there is a need to undertake some assessment of clients before they are recruited to a project. Good practice is that:

- Clients be assessed to ensure that they have some **commitment** to moving nearer to employability or education or training;
- Assessment should also **clarify the barriers to labour market access** that clients have. They can then be referred to specialist providers to help overcome their problems; and
- Assessment should also clarify if clients are **eligible to receive other childcare support**. To ensure that the Scottish Executive’s funding is additional such people should not be supported through the programme;

**MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

5.14 Monitoring and evaluation is important if projects are to be able to prove to the Scottish Executive that they are reaching the target client group and are effective in moving them towards employment or an education or training course. Good practice in setting up monitoring and evaluation systems requires that:

- Projects have a clear understanding of the **differences between project outputs and outcomes**. Outputs are a mean to an end. Outcomes (moving parents/carers nearer to the labour market) are what the Scottish Executive is interested in;
- Projects need to have **clear, unambiguous quantitative targets** that relate to outcomes;
- The monitoring and evaluation system needs to collect 3 types of information:-
  - **Profile information** relating to project clients so that there can be certainty that the Scottish Executive’s target groups are being recruited;
  - Information on the clients who achieve **“hard” outcomes** such as a job, entry to an education or training course or becoming active as a volunteer; and
  - Qualitative information that measures **distance travelled**. These “soft” indicators are crucial, given the time it may take to achieve a “hard” outcome with some of the client group. This information will enable the project to show that clients are progressing towards employability.
SUMMARY

5.15 This Chapter has highlighted some of the good practices that have come out of the formative evaluation of the childcare pilots. Whilst these are mainly addressed to the projects, some may be of relevance to the Scottish Executive in guiding the development of the main programme. This is, however, now considered in greater detail in the final Chapter.
CHAPTER SIX  GUIDANCE FOR THE SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE’S MAIN FUNDING PROGRAMME

INTRODUCTION

6.1 One of the aims of the Study was to provide guidance to the Scottish Executive that would inform the development of the main funding programme. The earlier Chapters have included a variety of information that the Scottish Executive may find of value, especially Chapter 5 looking at Good Practice. The purpose of this Chapter is to focus on those aspects of the earlier work that we feel are specifically relevant to the Scottish Executive, rather than those who may be running projects. In making a variety of recommendations we have not provided detailed justifications. This generally is covered in the earlier Chapters. Accordingly we have given cross references as appropriate.

ALLOCATING FUNDING

6.2 The Scottish Executive has, through the pilots, allocated funding both to local authorities and directly to a voluntary group.

6.3 We would suggest that this be the model used to determine allocations for the main programme. However, voluntary groups need to be of sufficient size to be able to run a project without external support. They also need to demonstrate that they have the experience and capability to meet the programme’s objectives. This needs to be set out in the funding application (Paragraph 6.30).

6.4 As has been argued earlier (Paragraphs 3.51 to 3.57) the difficulty of placing the target client group into work, when compared to the relative ease with which childcare can be provided, would imply that the programme might be more effective if it were targeted at economic development organisations, rather than those with experience of childcare. Accordingly we would suggest that:

- Funding be mainly channelled through local authority economic development departments rather than those that have a childcare remit; and
- Voluntary sector economic development agencies (for example Glasgow’s network of economic development companies) are invited to apply directly.

FUNDING

6.5 The funds allocated to the pilots range from £18,000 to over £200,000 (Table 2.1). The larger projects contain a number of elements. The costs involved in developing small projects, assessing them, monitoring and auditing are likely to be, proportionally, high. Accordingly applicants should be encouraged to develop larger projects containing a number of complementary elements. This is what the Glasgow projects have done so that clients can receive a package of support, rather than having to access a series of individual initiatives. However, it is recognised that in some smaller authorities, and those where population density means that absolute numbers of the client group are limited, this approach may not be appropriate.
6.6 We would also suggest that the maximum amount allocated to any single project be £250,000. This would allow a diversity of projects and a geographical spread. It also minimises the risks should any one fail to perform.

6.7 The lengthy time taken to set up the pilots (Paragraphs 3.19 to 3.26), and the time that it will take to move the target group towards employability, means that progress is likely to be slow. There is also a need to demonstrate commitment to those who spend time and effort developing projects by providing a degree of long term support.

6.8 Accordingly we would suggest that funding be initially committed for 2 years. At the end of that period it should be possible for the Scottish Executive to come to an informed judgement as to what works and does not work and therefore to make decisions on future financial support.

PROJECT START DATES

6.9 Delays in setting up projects, despite project funding having been approved, mean that the effective start date for some projects is now October 2003, almost 6 months into the financial year.

6.10 This seems to be the reality of project development. Accordingly we recommend that the Scottish Executive recognises this and does not try to fund projects from administratively convenient dates, such as the beginning of the financial year. Funding should be only drawn down when the project can start operating. This means that staff, any funding package, premises and networks are in place.

THE PROGRAMME’S TARGET GROUP

6.11 We see no reason to suggest that the target groups for the programme be any different to those outlined in the Study brief. Indeed there is, as yet, no evidence from the pilots to suggest that these groups are inappropriate.

6.12 However the evidence from the FMR market research (Paragraph 2.17) indicates that intentions towards moving into the job market may not be immediate. Accordingly there is a need to stop expenditure through the programme being spent upon those who have little intention, or motivation, of moving into work. We would therefore recommend that the Scottish Executive require all projects to undertake an initial assessment of potential clients to see if they want to move into work (or education or training). If this is not the case then such people should not be allowed entry to the programme.

GEOGRAPHICAL TARGETING

6.13 The Working for Families programme needs to consider the Indices of Deprivation as a targeting mechanism (Paragraph 3.62 to 3.63). In particular consideration could be given to allocating the funding to a limited number of authorities that were pre-selected on the basis of their levels of deprivation. However, was this to be used as the main allocation criterion then
the implications for the spatial distribution of funding need to be considered, particularly the
impact upon rural areas.

6.14 The Scottish Executive also needs to consider the fact that the Indices do not
incorporate some dimensions that are particularly significant in rural areas, for example
access to private and public transport (Paragraph 3.64).

SERVICES OFFERED

6.15 The pilots’ early developmental stages means that it is not possible to give any
indication of which of the many varied approaches is the most effective in moving clients
towards employability.

6.16 However, on the basis of such evidence as the FMR research and the likely financial
consequences of using the programme to support those who are a long way from being job
ready, we would suggest that all funded projects be required to:

- Undertake an initial assessment of potential clients to determine:
  - If they are motivated to moving into the labour market; and
  - The barriers they face to labour market access; and
- Those who are not motivated should not be admitted to the programme. Those
  with multiple barriers, other than childcare, should be referred to the appropriate
  specialists. Childcare may, however, be provided to enable clients to access the
  services of the specialist providers.

6.17 If the projects are to be successful then they need to establish networks with other
agencies that can provide whatever specialist support is needed, be this for childcare, help
entering the labour market or help to overcome other barriers to employment such as literacy
or health problems. Progress in attaining targets is likely to be slow if these networks are not
established. Accordingly we would recommend that the Scottish Executive require projects
that are applying for funding to provide evidence that they have such networks in place.

6.18 The programme aims to bring together childcare and economic development skills.
Accordingly we would recommend that if a project is:

- Providing childcare only then there needs to be a clear statement as to how it
  intends to meet the economic development aims of the programme;
- Likewise if a project is essentially economic development there needs to be a clear
  statement as to how it aims to overcome the barrier to employability of childcare;
  and
- If projects are providing neither of these services (for example community
  transport) then there needs to be a statement explaining how they will meet both
  the childcare and economic development aims of the programme.
STAFFING

6.19 The skills that project staff have will be determined, in part, by the activities that the project is involved in. However, there is a need to network and signpost clients to what might be a wide diversity of agencies. This implies that appointing someone as a guidance worker or mentor for clients is likely to increase the chances of attaining the outcomes that the Scottish Executive wants.

6.20 Accordingly we would recommend that the Scottish Executive suggest that project effectiveness is likely to be increased if one of the staff has a guidance and mentoring role.

OUTCOMES

6.21 We feel that the programme’s main outcomes should be revised to include volunteering, which can be seen as a halfway house between economic activity and employment (Paragraph 3.45). However, it needs to be stressed that the programme is not aiming to promote volunteering other than as a step towards employment.

6.22 Accordingly the number of people who go from any supported project to volunteer positions should be limited. The project should also assess these clients to ensure that their medium term intention is to move into work.

6.23 We would suggest that the project guideline be that a maximum of 10% of clients move into volunteering in a year. More than this and there is a danger that the aims of the programme become confused and subverted.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

6.24 Chapter 4 considered monitoring and evaluation at some detail. We would recommend that the Scottish Executive require all projects funded through the programme to:

- Collect monitoring information covering client profile information, “hard” outcomes and “soft” indicators covering distance travelled. The pro formas contained in Appendices 2, 3 and 4 could be used for these purposes;
- Collate this information and submit it electronically using an Excel spread sheet (or a similar package specified by the Scottish Executive) to the Scottish Executive on a 3 monthly basis; and
- Use the pro formas to track those who have left the project at 3, 6 and possibly 12 monthly intervals. Tracking beyond this time might be difficult but could be considered.

6.25 If the Scottish Executive is agreeable to this then the monitoring pro formas need to be placed into Excel format and distributed electronically to all funded projects.

6.26 We assume that, in addition to this outcome monitoring, all projects will have financial control and audit systems. We would also encourage projects to collect their own monitoring information that is project specific and which may relate to outputs, rather than outcomes.
LOCAL OUTCOME AGREEMENTS

6.27 Using local outcome agreements did not emerge as an issue in the Study. Accordingly these seem to be an appropriate way to allocate funds, either to local authorities or other agencies.

6.28 However, if they are to be used then we would recommend that they commit projects to:

- Trying to attain clear and unambiguous quantitative targets that relate to outcomes not outputs, that is moving clients nearer, or into, employability;
- Using the Scottish Executive’s monitoring and evaluation framework;
- Supplying information to the Scottish Executive on a 3 monthly basis using this framework;
- Supplying the information electronically on an Excel spreadsheet or some similar easily manipulated data base; and
- Participation in the 6 monthly dissemination fora and providing the Scottish Executive with the required Learning Review (Paragraphs 6.32 to 6.35).

6.29 These requirements need to be monitored and guidance should state that failure to conform to them could jeopardise project funding.

PROJECT APPROVAL CRITERIA

6.30 When approving projects we would suggest that the guidance from the Scottish Executive indicates that decisions will be made on the basis of the following criteria, which will be set out in any application form:

- The extent to which what is being proposed is based on research that has identified a need that meets the programme’s objectives;
- The extent of deprivation within the project’s target area, based on the 2003 Indices;
- The estimated numbers of the target group within the project’s target area;
- Justification of the proposal in both economic development and childcare terms;
- A detailed description that explains how the project will meet the programme’s aims;
- Evidence of the capability of the applicant to deliver the proposed project;
- Evidence that the type of supportive networks that are likely to be needed to attain targets are in place; and
- Having clear and unambiguous quantitative outcome targets. If possible these should be justified in terms of such things as the performance of similar projects elsewhere.

6.31 We would also suggest that the Scottish Executive stresses that targets, especially for innovative projects, will initially be treated as indicative. Failure to attain them may not result in any sanctions being applied. However the Scottish Executive will look for an explanation and will expect that targets be revised in the light of experience. This is to be done at the end of year one. As a consequence of target changes funding allocations may be altered.
GOOD PRACTICE DISSEMINATION

6.32 The programme is innovative in the way that it tries to bring economic development and child care together in a practical way in order to improve employability. As such it may be that there will be lessons that could usefully be learnt.

6.33 To ensure these lessons are highlighted, and disseminated, we suggest that, as a grant condition, projects are required to:

- Attend a regional forum that would be held on a 6 monthly basis;
- Produce for this a short “Learning Review” that highlights the lessons learnt and the good practices that the project is felt to exemplify. These would form the basis of a number of short presentations at the forum, followed by discussion; and
- The Learning Reviews should be submitted to the Scottish Executive.

6.34 The Learning Reviews, along with the monitoring information (see Paragraph 6.24), will mean that evaluating the impact of the programme should be relatively easy and very cost effective.

6.35 A local authority in each region (the West, East, Centre and North of Scotland) should be designated as the forum leader. Modest funding should be included in the grant aid to pay for the costs of facilitating this.
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APPENDIX TWO
PROFILE, BASELINE AND SOFT INDICATOR
MONITORING INFORMATION

Working for Families Funding

Monitoring and Evaluation Pro-forma

To be completed when the client first enters the programme.

Profile Information

1. Name: _____________________________________________________________

2. Address: ___________________________________________________________

   Postcode: ____________________________________________________________

3. Gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Main language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Residency status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU Citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Visa Holder</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seeker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee (Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR))</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee (Humanitarian Protection (HP))</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee (Discretionary Leave (DL))</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner/husband</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do you suffer from any disability?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. If YES is this (please tick all that are applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How many dependent children do you have?

(please indicate numbers in appropriate boxes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Do any of your children have disabilities?

   Yes  1
   No   2

12. Are you caring for any other non-child dependents?

   Yes  1
   No   2

13. If YES please give details.

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

14. Qualifications held: (please tick all that are appropriate):

   No qualifications  1
   Access/Foundation Standard Grade  2
   General Standard Grade/Intermediate 1 (equivalent to SVQ level 1)  3
   Credit Standard Grade/Intermediate 2 (equivalent to SVQ level 2)  4
   Higher (equivalent to SVQ level 3)  5
   A Levels and SYS or Advanced Highers  6
   HND, Degree or Professional Qualification  7

15. Current economic status (please tick one):

   Working full-time  1
   Working part-time  2
   Unemployed and receiving Job Seekers Allowance  3
   Unemployed but NOT receiving Job Seekers Allowance  4

16. If currently WORKING please give the following information:

   Job title: ___________________________________________________
   What is your employer’s business (for example hotel, shop, or manufacturing)?
   ____________________________________________________________

   Date employment started: Year: __________
   Month __________
   Weekly hours worked: _________________________________________
   Gross weekly wage: _________________________________________
17. If NOT currently WORKING have you ever worked?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. If YES please give details of your last job

Job title: ____________________________________________

What was your employer’s business (for example hotel, shop or manufacturing)?

| Date employment started: Year: ________ Month: ________ |  
| Date employment finished: Year: ________ Month: ________ |  
| Weekly hours worked: _______________________________ |  
| Gross weekly wage: ________________________________ |  
| Why did you leave? __________________________________ |  

19. What benefits are you currently receiving (please tick all that apply)? :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Seekers Allowance</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Support</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incapacity Benefit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Tax Credit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Tax Credit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Benefit</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Benefit</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Benefit</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Which of the following do you see as barriers to your ability to gain a job or enter a training or education course (please tick as appropriate)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inability to drive</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of private transport</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for child dependents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for non-child dependents</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor health</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of guidance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of skills/qualifications</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudes

Please tick one box for each statement to show how much you agree or disagree with it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. I am very interested in obtaining a job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I am very interested in obtaining a place on a training or education course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I am confident that if I want a job I can get one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. If I want a job I know how to go about looking for one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. If I want a place on a training or education course I know how to obtain one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. If I want support to help me obtain a job I know who to approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I feel that I have the skills that employers are looking for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I feel that I have the abilities that employers are looking for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I feel that I could successfully complete a training course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX THREE   PROJECT COMPLETION, OUTCOMES AND DISTANCE TRAVELLED MONITORING INFORMATION

Working for Families Funding

Monitoring and Evaluation Pro-forma

To be completed when the client leaves the programme.

1. Name: ________________________________________________________________

2. Address: ____________________________________________________________________
   Postcode: __________________________________________________________________

Intervention Outcomes

3. What is your current economic status (please tick one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed and receiving Job Seekers Allowance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed but NOT receiving Job Seekers Allowance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Has your economic situation changed since receiving childcare support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If YES what changes have occurred (please tick all that are applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved from unemployment to a full-time job</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from unemployment to a part-time job</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from a part-time to a full-time job</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from full-time to a part-time job</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from being employed to being unemployed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased gross weekly wage</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased job responsibility</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State benefits increased</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State benefits decreased</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you were **unemployed** before and are now working please provide the following information:

Job title: ____________________________________________________________

What is your employer’s business (for example hotel, shop, manufacturing)?
_____________________________________________________________________

Date employment started: Year: ___________ Month: ________________
Weekly hours worked: ________________________________________________
Gross weekly wage: ________________________________________________

If you have started attending an **education course** following childcare support please provide the following information:

Course title: _________________________________________________________
Provider: _____________________________________________________________
Duration ____________________________________________________________ weeks

Mode of attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of attendance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualification to be gained: ____________________________________________

If you have started attending a **vocational training course** following childcare support please provide the following information:

Course title: _________________________________________________________
Provider: _____________________________________________________________
Duration ____________________________________________________________ weeks

Mode of attendances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of attendances</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualification to be gained: ____________________________________________
9. If you have become involved in voluntary activity following childcare support please provide the following information:

Organisation worked for: ______________________________________________________
Your role ________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
Hours active per week _______________________________________________________

Attitudes

Please tick one box for each statement to show how much you agree or disagree with it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I am very interested in obtaining a job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I am very interested in obtaining a place on a training or education course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I am confident that if I want a job I can get one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>If I want a job I know how to go about looking for one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>If I want a place on a training or education course I know how to obtain one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>If I want support to help me obtain a job I know who to approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I feel that I have the skills that employers are looking for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I feel that I have the abilities that employers are looking for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I feel that I could successfully complete a training course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX FOUR  PROJECT COMPLETION, OUTCOMES AND DISTANCE TRAVELLED MONITORING INFORMATION (3, 6 AND 12 MONTHS)

Working for Families Funding

Monitoring and Evaluation Pro-forma

To be completed 3, 6 and 12 months after the client leaves the programme.

1. Name: ____________________________________________________________

2. Address: __________________________________________________________

Postcode: ___________________________________________________________

Intervention Outcomes

3. What is your current economic status (please tick ones applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed and receiving work related benefit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed but NOT receiving work related benefit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Has your economic status changed since receiving childcare support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If YES what changes have occurred (please tick all that are applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved from unemployment to a full-time job</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from unemployment to a part-time job</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from a part-time to a full-time job</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from full-time to a part-time job</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from being employed to being unemployed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased gross weekly wage</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased job responsibility</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State benefits increased</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State benefits decreased</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. If you were **unemployed** before and are now working please provide the following information:

   Job title: ______________________________________________________________
   What is your employer’s business (for example hotel, shop, manufacturing)?
   ______________________________________________________________________

   Date employment started:           Year:            Month:            
   Weekly hours worked:              ____________________________
   Gross weekly wage:                ______________________________________

7. If you have started attending an **education course** following childcare support please provide the following information:

   Course title: _________________________________________________________
   Provider: ____________________________________________________________
   Duration _____________________________________________________________weeks

   Mode of attendance:
   | Full-time | 1 |
   | Part-time | 2 |
   | Evening   | 3 |
   | Weekend   | 4 |

   Qualification to be gained _____________________________________________

8. If you have started attending a **vocational training course** following childcare support please provide the following information:

   Course title: _________________________________________________________
   Provider: ____________________________________________________________
   Duration _____________________________________________________________weeks

   Mode of attendances:
   | Full-time | 1 |
   | Part-time | 2 |
   | Evening   | 3 |
   | Weekend   | 4 |

   Qualification to be gained _____________________________________________
9. If you have become involved in **voluntary activity** following childcare support please provide the following information:

Organisation worked for: ________________________________

Your role ________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

Hours active per week ________________________________

**Attitudes**

Please tick one box for each statement to show how much you agree or disagree with it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. I am very interested in obtaining a job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am very interested in obtaining a place on a training or education course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am confident that if I want a job I can get one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If I want a job I know how to go about looking for one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. If I want a place on a training or education course I know how to obtain one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If I want support to help me obtain a job I know who to approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel that I have the skills that employers are looking for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel that I have the abilities that employers are looking for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I feel that I could successfully complete a training course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>