



Torbay

Child Poverty Needs Assessment

*Identification of the factors driving and the impact
of Child Poverty in the most vulnerable
communities of Torbay*

UPDATE – APRIL 2012

DRAFT

CONTENTS

KEY FINDINGS.....	3
1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW	7
3. FIRST TIER OUTCOME: MEASURING POVERTY	10
4. SECOND TIER OUTCOMES: FACTORS THAT DIRECTLY INFLUENCE FAMILIES' INCOMES AND RESOURCES	14
5. THIRD TIER OUTCOMES: FACTORS THAT DIRECTLY INFLUENCE FAMILIES ABILITIES TO ENTER AND SUSTAIN WELL PAID EMPLOYMENT IN THE SHORT AND LONGER TERM	16
6. OTHER INDICATORS: IMPACT AND INDICATIVE OF CHILD POVERTY	20
Appendix One: Child Poverty Basket of Indicators	25
Appendix Two: JSNA Ward profile for Tormohun 2011.....	27
Appendix Three: JSNA Ward profile for Watcombe 2011.....	28
Appendix Four: JSNA Ward profile for Ellacombe 2011.....	38
Appendix Five: JSNA Ward profile for Roundham with Hyde 2011.....	39

DRAFT

KEY FINDINGS

Just under one quarter (24.3%) of children under the age of 16 live in poverty across Torbay, this is higher than the England average of 22.0%. However, across Torbay's most deprived communities the proportion of children living in poverty is much higher again.

- Factors driving child poverty locally include:
 - Limited, low wage economy
 - A downward trend in median weekly wage
 - Torbay is vulnerable to limited economic growth given the reliance on public sector jobs
 - The proportions of people claiming out of work benefits is higher in our deprived communities
 - The affordability of homes which can place further financial strain on families
- Locally the impact of poverty and inequality across Torbay is evidenced by:
 - The difference in life expectancy is as much as 7 years between our most deprived and most affluent wards.
 - In the Foundation Stage, despite increases in achievement children who live in areas of deprivation do not achieve as well as children living in affluent areas and are consistently more likely to fall in the lowest achieving 20%.
 - The gap in achievement between children living in Torbay's most deprived areas and the rest becomes more noticeable once they start secondary school. The difference is small at Key Stage 2, becomes more noticeable at Key Stage 3 and greater at GCSE.
 - Our most deprived communities have the highest rates of under 18 conceptions.
- In terms of 'Place' it is well documented locally that Tormohun, Ellacombe, Roundham with Hyde and Watcombe are our most deprived communities. However, within the wards of Blatchcombe and St. Mary's with Summercombe there are pockets of deprivation and high proportions of children living in poverty.

This needs assessment raises further questions about the impact on children of growing up in our most disadvantaged communities which need to be explored further. These issues can be picked up through the planned community consultation so that feedback and from communities is used to inform this assessment further. Intelligence from this needs

DRAFT

assessment together with feedback from the community will be used to identify the priority areas and actions for the Torbay Child Poverty strategy.

Further questions include:

- What is the perceived impact of living in our most disadvantaged areas for those people who live there – is this positive / negative?
- What are the financial implications / strains for families?
- What are the health and well being implications for families?
- What is the impact on children who grow up in our most disadvantaged areas?
- What are the opportunities for children who grow up in our most disadvantaged communities to achieve well at school and enter and sustain employment?
- What should the priorities be for a child poverty strategy?

1. INTRODUCTION

A child's life chances are largely determined by childhood experience. Children who grow up in low income families often grow up to be poor adults and poverty in childhood can have a great impact on a child's development and life chances¹. The Coalition Government are committed to eradicating child poverty by 2020 and the Child Poverty Act 2010 gives local authorities and their partners the legal force and duty to contribute to this aim. Under the Child Poverty Act, local authorities and their partners must develop a joint strategy which identifies the measures each agency will take with the purpose of reducing and mitigating the effects of child poverty. As part of these arrangements a local needs assessment must be undertaken and published, which identifies local factors which drive and impact on child poverty². The priorities identified within this assessment will inform the subsequent Child Poverty Strategy for Torbay.

The impacts of child poverty are well researched, children who grow up in poverty are less likely to achieve well in school and will leave school at the age of 16 with fewer qualifications. They are less likely to attend school and are more likely to engage in risky behaviours such as smoking and anti-social behaviour¹. They are more likely become teenage parents and have lower life expectancy. Inequalities in early childhood development and education follow a child through to employment, standard of living as they become adults. Persistent inequalities become a driving factor in health and wellbeing generally.³ Poverty becomes a cycle which can be difficult to break out of especially when it has been a long-standing characteristic of a community⁴.

Nationally, the proportion of children living in poverty has doubled in the past generation. In 2008/09, 2.8 million children were living in poverty and the UK has one of the worst rates of child poverty in the industrialised world. As well as the human cost to child poverty there is also a significant financial cost to the tax payer, estimated to be between £10 and £20 billion a year¹.

In 2011 the Coalition Government published a national strategy, 'A New Approach to Child Poverty'⁵, which is the first national Child poverty Strategy. At its heart are strengthening families, encouraging responsibility, promoting work, guaranteeing fairness & providing support to the most vulnerable. Local authorities and their partners, through the delivery of local services have a vital role to play in the commitment to end child poverty. By tackling child poverty, children's life chances will improve and the opportunities open to them become much wider.

Locally there are a number of existing programmes which are working towards reducing inequality, one of the most closely linked to the child poverty agenda is the *Closing the Gap* project in the Hele area of Torbay. The

¹ Field, F. (2010). The Foundation Years: Preventing Poor Children Becoming Poor Adults. The Report of the Independent Review on Poverty and Life Chances. HM Government.

² Child Poverty Act 2010. www.legislation.gov.uk

³ The Marmot Review (2010). Fair Society, Healthy Lives.

⁴ Joseph Rowntree Foundation

5 A New Approach to Child Poverty: Tackling the Causes of Disadvantage & Transforming Families Lives
<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/CM%208061>

Closing the Gap project presents a new way of looking at how public services are delivered in Hele and is working closely with residents to make a real difference to their lives.

This Child Poverty Need Assessment for Torbay draws upon what is known about our communities in the context of our own Torbay Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA). The JSNA is the overarching needs assessment for the Torbay strategic Partnership. Its purpose is to improve the health and well-being of the population by identifying need both over the short term (three to five years) and longer term (five to ten years). JSNA identifies “the big picture” in terms of health and well-being needs and inequalities locally and provides much of the evidence from which the Torbay Strategic Partnership and commissioners to commission services.

This Child Poverty Needs Assessment draws upon evidence within the JSNA as well as taking a more detailed look at some of the factors which are specifically related to child poverty specifically those which are included in the ‘basket of indicators’ as provided by the Child Poverty Unit. This assessment is structured around these indicators and the child poverty pyramid (outlined in appendix one).

In addition to the JSNA, the Child Poverty Needs Assessment and strategy should be considered in conjunction with the following assessments and strategies:


- Children and Young Person’s Plan.
- Local Economic Assessment
- Childcare Sufficiency
- Teenage Pregnancy Strategy

This Assessment considers the demographic overview of Torbay, along with the indicators which are specifically related to child poverty and enforce the inter-generational cycle of poverty. The evidence outlined in this assessment will inform the TSP’s strategy for reducing child poverty with the aim of preventing Torbay’s children becoming poor adults.

2 DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW


Torbay is home to approximately 135,400 people and is a popular tourist and retirement destination thanks to its position as a seaside community. Torbay is a small urban local authority area yet the three main towns of Brixham, Paignton and Torquay which make up Torbay are all very distinct. The map in Figure 1 below shows the Electoral Wards across Torbay.

Figure 1: Torbay Ward Boundary



Torbay's population is very much dominated by a higher proportion of older people; this is demonstrated in the population pyramid below. The solid bars represent Torbay's resident population and the hollow bars represent the population structure for England. The pyramid in figure 2 shows that the proportion of children and young people is noticeably lower than the England structure.

Figure 2: Torbay Population Pyramid 2010



Source: 2008 based Sub National Population Projections, ONS. Taken from JSNA Population Tool

Table 1: Proportion of Children by Ward

Ward	0 to 4		5 to 9		10 to 14		15 to 19	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Berry Head-with-Furzeham	396	4.0	359	3.6	440	4.5	510	5.2
Blatchcombe	746	6.8	689	6.3	799	7.3	764	6.9
Churston-with-Galmpton	179	2.7	239	3.6	303	4.5	326	4.9
Clifton-with-Maidenway	407	5.7	359	5.0	377	5.3	424	6.0
Cockington-with-Chelston	603	5.4	647	5.8	665	6.0	732	6.6
Ellacombe	489	6.6	373	5.1	432	5.8	545	7.4
Goodrington-with-Roselands	264	3.7	358	5.0	414	5.8	460	6.5
Preston	497	4.8	476	4.6	481	4.6	571	5.5
Roundham-with-Hyde	328	4.3	292	3.8	316	4.1	363	4.7
St Marychurch	636	5.5	545	4.7	641	5.5	713	6.1
St Mary's-with-Summercombe	348	4.7	365	4.9	424	5.7	481	6.5
Shiphay-with-the-Willows	719	7.4	619	6.4	606	6.2	571	5.9
Tormohun	739	6.1	521	4.3	568	4.7	792	6.6
Watcombe	404	5.5	432	5.9	484	6.6	554	7.5
Wellswood	220	2.9	193	2.5	183	2.4	263	3.4
Torbay Wide	6,975	5.2	6,467	4.8	7,133	5.3	8,069	6.0

Source: MidYear Population Estimates for 2010


The wards across Torbay which are considered to be our most disadvantaged have higher proportions of children and young people as demonstrated in table 1.

Across our most deprived wards of Tormohun, Ellacombe, Roundham with Hyde and Watcombe, there are approximately 8,200 children and young people aged 0 to 19 and 2,700 children in the early years age group of 0 to 4.

Although the proportion of children and young people (aged 0 to 19) in the population is set to decrease slightly between 2010 and 2033, the actual number of children and young people is still set to increase. In 2010 it was estimated that there were 28,800 children and young people (0 to 19) this is set to increase to 31,100 in 2033. Children and young people make up approximately one fifth of Torbay's population.

Despite Torbay's position as a seaside community and a popular tourist and retirement destination, there are pockets of severe deprivation, as can be seen by the areas highlighted in red on the map in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3: Indices of Deprivation 2010



In 2010, Torbay ranked 61st most deprived local authority nationally out of 326 authorities. Across Torbay, between 2004 and 2010 the overall levels of multiple deprivation increased. This was clear by the increase of 4 to 12 Super Output Areas (SOAs) ranking in the top 10% most deprived nationally.

Just over 18,800 (14%) residents live in the top 10% most deprived areas across Torbay compared to 15,500 in 2007 and just over 3,100 of these are children and young people aged 0 to 15.

The electoral wards in Torbay which have the highest levels of deprivation are (as in 2007):

- Tormohum
- Roundham with Hyde
- Ellacombe
- Watcombe

As Torbay's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment demonstrates, within Torbay there are multiple inequalities across the Bay, for example the gap in life expectancy between the more affluent and most deprived remains at over 7 years.

3. FIRST TEIR OUTCOME: MEASURING POVERTY

Within the National Indicator set the Child Poverty Unit identified a 'basket of indicators' which they felt most closely reflected the drivers of child poverty. These indicators also represent the 'drivers' of child poverty which agencies under the Torbay Strategic Partnership (TSP) can influence. These drivers are set out in the pyramid in appendix one.

3.1 Proportion of Children in Poverty

The introduction of the performance indicator NI116: Proportion of children living in poverty, provides the TSP with an overarching outcome measure for child poverty. This indicator is defined as 'the number of children who live in households whose equivalised income is below 60% of the contemporary national median'. This indicator forms part of the Public Service Agreement (PSA) 9, halve the number of children in poverty by 2010-11, on the way to eradicating child poverty by 2020 and is a relative measure of poverty as it sets the threshold 'poverty line' in line with real incomes reported in the year in question.

The latest data for this indicator was published in 2011 by HMRC and provides the detail for the year 2009. In Torbay just over 6,300 children live poverty. The table below shows the proportion of children living in poverty across Torbay by ward and compared to the England average. Although the percentage dipped in 2008, 2009 shows an increase and there are more children in poverty in 2009 compared to 2006. The proportion of children in poverty is still higher than England. In Torbay almost one in four children under the age of 16 lives in poverty.

The table also identifies that there are areas across Torbay in which poverty is clearly a bigger issue. In Watcombe just under 40% of children live in poverty and a third of children in Blatchcombe and Ellacombe live in poverty.


Table 2: % of Children Living in Poverty (NI116)

Wards	2007		2008		2009	
	Under 16	All Children	Under 16	All Children	Under 16	All Children
England	22.4%	21.6%	21.6%	20.9%	22.0%	21.4%
Torbay	24.7%	23.6%	24.3%	23.4%	24.3%	23.7%
Berry Head-with-Furzeham	19.3%	19.3%	20.1%	19.4%	19.4%	19.1%
Blatchcombe	34.2%	32.2%	34.4%	33.5%	32.0%	32.2%
Churston-with-Galmpton	10.1%	9.7%	8.7%	9.0%	11.6%	11.3%
Clifton-with-Maidenway	19.5%	18.6%	19.4%	19.5%	20.2%	20.6%
Cockington-with-Chelston	18.1%	17.8%	18.8%	18.5%	19.4%	19.0%
Ellacombe	29.9%	29.0%	31.5%	30.2%	33.3%	31.9%
Goodrington-with-Roselands	16.2%	15.7%	16.9%	15.6%	16.8%	15.9%
Preston	13.6%	13.4%	13.5%	12.8%	14.1%	13.3%
Roundham-with-Hyde	31.3%	29.8%	28.3%	27.5%	28.8%	27.5%
St Marychurch	21.5%	20.3%	20.4%	20.1%	21.1%	21.1%
St Mary's-with-Summercombe	24.9%	24.6%	23.0%	22.1%	26.5%	25.1%
Shiphay-with-the-Willows	22.9%	21.6%	19.8%	18.9%	19.3%	18.7%
Tormohun	38.2%	37.0%	35.1%	33.3%	32.0%	30.9%
Watcombe	37.0%	35.5%	39.9%	38.5%	39.4%	38.6%
Wellswood	18.4%	17.4%	18.0%	16.7%	17.7%	16.5%

Source: HMRC

The proportion of children living in poverty can also be considered at a lower geography than ward. The map below shows the spread of child poverty across Torbay by Lower Super Output Area (LSOA). A total of 18 LSOAs (out of 89) have more than 30% of children living in poverty. This map also highlights that within wards there are pockets where child poverty is more of a significant issue than the ward level data identifies. There are pockets of poverty in Blatchcombe, Tormohun, Ellacombe, Watcombe and Roundham with Hyde.

Figure 4: Proportion of all Children in Poverty 2009



3.2 Households Dependent on Workless Benefits

Across Torbay, just under one fifth of the working age population claim out of work benefits. However, the data at ward level shows that our more deprived areas have higher than average proportions of people claiming out of work benefits. The wards with the highest number of claimants include, Roundham with Hyde, Tormohun, Watcombe and Ellacombe. In these wards at least a quarter of the working age population are claiming out of work benefits.


Table 3: Working Age Population Receiving Out of Work Benefits 2010

Ward name	Number of working-age people in receipt of out-of-work benefits	Proportion of the working-age population who are in receipt of out-of-work benefits	Torbay Rank (1=highest)	UK Rank (1=highest)
TORBAY	14755	19.4	-	-
Roundham-with-Hyde	1310	30.4	1	335
Tormohun	2245	29.8	2	383
Watcombe	1020	24.8	3	947
Ellacombe	1165	24.8	4	957
Blatchcombe	1385	21.3	5	1594
St Mary's-with-Summercombe	1125	17.9	6	1982
Wellswood	805	19.1	7	2102
St Marychurch	755	13.4	8	2460
Berry Head-with-Furzeham	885	16.4	9	2940
Preston	845	15.2	10	3362
Clifton-with-Maidenway	620	15.1	11	3421
Cockington-with-Chelston	920	14.3	12	3730
Shiphay-with-the-Willows	785	19.6	13	4104
Goodrington-with-Roselands	540	13.4	14	4122
Churston-with-Galmpton	350	10.8	15	5431

Source: The Poverty Site

The latest data (August 2011) on claimants of key benefits show that Torbay's more deprived wards (Roundham with Hyde, Tormohun, Blatchcombe, Watcombe and Ellacombe) have a higher proportion of claimants than elsewhere and compared to the Torbay and England average (11% and 14% respectively).

Figure 5: Working Age Claimants of Key Benefits by Ward




Source: DWP

3.3 Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI)

The Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) was produced as part of the overall Indices of Multiple Deprivation (2007) and is a subset of the Income Deprivation Domain. IDACI shows the proportion of children (aged 0-15) in each SOA who live in families which are income deprived. Income Deprivation is classified as households in receipt of Income Support / income based Jobseekers Allowance / Pension Credit or those who are in receipt of Working Tax Credits / Child Tax Credit with an equivalised income of 60% of the national median before housing costs.

The number of people in Torbay who live in the 10% most deprived areas has increased by 254.5% from 3,065 in 2007 to 10,867 in 2010. 8.1% of Torbay's whole population and 10.3% of children aged 0 to 15 live in the 10% most deprived areas in England for IDAC. The number of children aged 0 to 15 living in the 10% most deprived areas for IDAC has increased from 681 to 2,301.

Figure 6: IDACI 2010




4. SECOND TIER OUTCOMES: FACTORS THAT DIRECTLY INFLUENCE FAMILIES' INCOMES AND RESOURCES

4.1 Household income

For those people in employment, median full time earnings across the South West are below the England average and across Torbay, median earnings are much lower again, this is demonstrated in Figure 7 below. In 2011 the gross weekly pay for someone working full time was £406.2 compared to £502.6 nationally.

Figure 7. Gross Weekly Pay



4.2 Free School Meals

Free School Meals eligibility is considered to be a proxy measure for economic disadvantage and children are eligible if their parents take up income related benefits such as Income Support, Income Based Job Seekers Allowance and Working Tax Credits where they are working less than 16 hours a week.

Take up and eligibility for free school meals (FSM) in maintained schools has increased over the last two years as demonstrated in table 4 below. Approximately 21% (2,686) of children across Torbay are eligible for FSM, although 16% (2,062) took a FSM. There are a higher proportion of children who attend Special Schools who are eligible for FSM, when compared to the rest of the school population. At a school level, those schools which serve our most deprived communities, Ellacombe, Kings Ash, Upton St. James, Barton and Watcombe Primary Schools all have high proportions of children who are eligible for FSM.

Table 4: Spring 2011 and 2012 Maintained Free School Meal Take Up and Eligibility

	Total NOR		FSM Taken on census day		Pupils eligible for FSM		% of pupils who took a FSM		% of pupils eligible for FSM	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
PRIMARY	7657	7699	1170	1308	1468	1614	15.3%	17.0%	19.2%	21.0%
SECONDARY	4794	4669	593	616	855	922	12.4%	13.2%	17.8%	19.8%
SPECIAL	327	346	121	138	132	150	37.0%	40.0%	40.4%	43.4%
TOTAL	12778	12714	1884	2062	2455	2686	14.7%	16.2%	19.2%	21.1%

School Name	% of pupils who had a FSM	% of pupils eligible for FSM
MAINTAINED PRIMARY SCHOOLS 2012		
Ellacombe	39.7%	50.2%
Barton	33.9%	44.3%
Kings Ash	35.1%	43.2%
Watcombe	29.3%	39.2%
Upton St James	25.0%	37.0%
Curledge Street	35.9%	36.1%
Cockington	22.7%	27.4%
St Marychurch	16.6%	23.0%
Priory	20.8%	21.1%
Queensway	12.1%	19.0%
Sacred Heart	12.3%	18.1%
Roselands	16.9%	17.6%
Homelands	17.3%	17.3%
Babbacombe	13.8%	16.8%
St Margaret Clitherow	7.4%	15.8%
Torre	11.3%	15.4%
Furzeham	10.5%	14.1%
Warberry	9.0%	10.5%
Collaton St Mary	9.9%	10.4%
Brixham Primary	7.7%	10.3%
Sherwell Valley	9.0%	10.1%
White Rock	7.9%	9.8%
Preston	7.0%	9.5%
Galmpton	6.4%	9.4%
Oldway	7.3%	9.3%

School Name	% of pupils who had a FSM	% of pupils eligible for FSM
MAINTAINED SECONDARY SCHOOLS -2012		
Torquay Community College	17.0%	26.5%
Westlands Technology College	13.2%	20.2%
Paignton Community & Sports College	13.5%	19.7%
St Cuthbert Mayne School	10.0%	14.1%
MAINTAINED SPECIAL SCHOOLS – 2012		
Combe Pafford School	36.8%	46.6%
Mayfield School	29.5%	33.6%
Torbay School	76.0%	56.0%

Source: Spring School Census 2012

5. THIRD TIER OUTCOMES: FACTORS THAT DIRECTLY INFLUENCE FAMILIES ABILITIES TO ENTER AND SUSTAIN WELL PAID EMPLOYMENT IN THE SHORT AND LONGER TERM

5.1 Achievement in the Early Years Foundation Stage

The recent review completed by Frank Field *The Foundation Years: Preventing Poor Children Becoming Poor Adults* (2010) highlights the importance of a child's early years experience and the impact this has on their development which in turn is fundamental improving life chances.

Field identifies that by the time a child is 3 years old, 80% of their brain has developed and for those children who are living in deprived communities the services that children receive in the first five years of life are key to supporting development.

At the end of Early Years Foundation Stage children are observed and given scores against their level of development across 13 areas of learning. Local authorities are currently measured against two national indicators for children's achievement in the Foundation Stage. The first indicator measures children's achievement overall, the proportion of children who score at least 78 points across the Foundation Stage Profile (FSP) with at least 6 in each of the personal, social and emotional development (PSED) and Communication, Language and Literacy (CLL) scales (NI72).

Table 5 below shows that children who live in Torbay's Wards as a proportion of all children who were assessed in the FSP for the Ward. Children in Torbay generally have lower levels of achievement than national counterparts, however locally children's achievement has increased in 2011. For those children who live in the 30% most deprived areas 4 out of 5 areas show an increase. Although children's achievement has generally increased from the 2007 baseline, the level of achievement for children who live in the most deprived wards is still lower than the rest including Blatchcombe which shows the lowest achievement in 2011.

Table 5: NI72: Children Achieving NI72 by Ward as proportion of total children in Ward

	2008	2009	2010	2011
ENGLAND	49.0%	52.0%	56.0%	59.0%
TORBAY	50.8%	45.9%	53.9%	57.2%
Berry Head-with-Furzeham	54.3%	48.5%	71.0%	62.1%
Blatchcombe	54.5%	41.6%	56.3%	37.8%
Churston-with-Galmpton	68.9%	65.2%	60.0%	74.4%
Clifton-with-Maidenway	55.4%	41.7%	49.3%	58.8%
Cockington-with-Chelston	44.8%	45.8%	69.4%	65.2%
Ellacombe	50.7%	36.2%	42.7%	53.7%
Goodrington-with-Roselands	58.1%	64.9%	56.3%	75.4%
Preston	48.1%	61.2%	70.3%	57.3%
Roundham-with-Hyde	56.2%	40.9%	41.0%	48.2%
Shiphay-with-the-Willows	45.6%	40.3%	49.2%	60.4%
St Marychurch	46.4%	43.2%	45.3%	55.7%
St Mary's-with-Summercombe	57.6%	50.0%	58.9%	56.9%
Tormohun	39.5%	42.9%	44.9%	54.7%
Watcombe	50.5%	32.4%	41.8%	41.0%
Wellswood	33.0%	45.0%	55.9%	80.0%

The second indicator which is used to measure children’s achievement in the Foundation Stage is based around an inequality gap. NI 92, The % gap in achievement in the Foundation Stage between the lowest achieving 20% and the rest, considers the how well the lowest achieving 20% have performed compared to their peers. Across Torbay the gap has narrowed steadily since the 2007 but in 2011 jumped nearly 2%. Table 6 shows that in 2011 over 60% of children in the lowest achieving 20% live in Torbay’s most deprived communities.

Table 6: Lowest Achieving 20% by Rank of Overall Deprivation (2007 IMD in 2008-10, IMD 2010 in 2011)

Rank of Overall Deprivation	2008		2009		2010		2011	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Top 10%	41	16.3%	50	19.5%	43	19.6%	61	24.6%
10% to 20%	23	9.1%	17	6.6%	27	12.3%	20	8.1%
20% to 30%	81	32.1%	74	28.8%	75	34.2%	70	28.2%
30% to 40%	42	16.7%	37	14.4%	46	21.0%	22	8.9%
40% to 50%	24	9.5%	29	11.3%	22	10.0%	39	15.7%
50% to 60%	21	8.3%	16	6.2%	36	16.4%	24	9.7%
60% to 70%	8	3.2%	<5	1.6%	9	4.1%	7	2.8%
70% to 80%	8	3.2%	<5	1.2%	<5	0.9%	<5	1.6%
80% to 90%	<5	0.4%	0	0.0%	<5	0.9%	<5	0.4%

5.2 Key Stage 2

Data on children’s achievement at Key Stage 2 (KS2) is a good indication of how well they are progressing. Data for 2010 is based on teacher assessments. Table 7 below shows that there is not a great deal of difference between achievement at KS2 locally and nationally although the English gap has widened in 2011.

Table 7: KS2 Achievement

	2009		2010*		2011	
	ENGLISH (Level 4+)	MATHS (Level 4+)	ENGLISH (Level 4+)	MATHS (Level 4+)	ENGLISH (Level 4+)	MATHS (Level 4+)
Torbay	79%	77%	79%	79%	77%	79%
National	80%	79%	81%	80%	82%	81%

Source: Department of Education

* Torbay 2010 Achievement based on Teacher Assessments

The relationship between absence and achievement is also clear at this key stage. Locally data suggests that children who did not achieve level 4 in English and Maths at Key Stage 2 tended to have a higher rate of absence at school. This was a common theme across those schools which serve the most deprived communities.

5.3 GCSE

Table 8 shows the distinct increase in GCSE achievement since 2009 although Torbay is still below the national average for the maintained sector.

Table 8: GCSE Achievement : 5+ A*-C inc English & Maths

	2009	2010	2011
Torbay	53.7%	54.0%	57.2%
National	49.8%	55.3%	58.4%

Source: Department of Education

5.4 School Absence

Absence from school does impact on a child's educational attainment and as a result their life chances and outcomes going forward. Torbay's Every School Day Matters strategy aims to improve levels of attendance across schools. While the numbers of children who are persistently absent from school are very low Torbay has a slightly higher rate than the national average. Those children who have unauthorised absence from school are more likely to also Free School Meals. This is demonstrate in Table 9 below. For children in Secondary School, they are also slightly more likely to have unauthorised absence compared to the whole cohort of children who have unauthorised absence.


Table 9: Local Authority Maintained School Absence Academic Year 2010/11

School	Contextual Breakdown	No of pupils	% authorised absence	% unauthorised absence	Total % Absence	Total % Attendance
Secondary Schools	Whole cohort	5414	6.0	1.3	7.3	92.7
	Free School Meals	966	7.7	2.5	10.2	89.8
	Ethnicity (BME)	232	5.5	1.3	6.8	93.2
	Children with Statements	186	6.2	2.0	8.2	91.8
	Children on SA & SA Plus	1526	6.6	2.1	8.7	91.3
Primary Schools	Whole cohort	6373	4.7	0.6	5.3	95.7
	Free School Meals	1290	5.6	1.4	7.0	93.0
	Ethnicity (BME)	389	5.5	0.8	6.3	93.7
	Children with Statements	172	6.3	0.6	6.9	93.1
	Children on SA & SA Plus	1345	5.3	1.0	6.3	93.7

5.6 Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET)

The number of young people aged 16 to 18 who are not in education, employment or training (NEET) has decreased recently and in 2009/10 fell well below the target set, figure 8 below. However, given very recent press regarding the numbers of young people who are unemployed, we could see the numbers of NEETs increase.

Figure 8: 16 to 18 year olds who are NEET



5.7 Teenage Conceptions

Young women who become mothers are more likely to suffer from poor outcomes and subsequently their children are more at risk of poor outcomes⁷. Research and data tell us that the majority of teenage conceptions are unplanned as over half end in abortion. It tends to be young women from poorer backgrounds and areas of high unemployment who are more likely to become teenage mothers. Teenage mothers suffer from poorer mental health in the 3 years after birth and the children of teenage mothers are more likely to be at risk of poor outcomes as they grow up. There is a higher risk of low educational attainment, higher risk of unemployment and a high risk that they themselves will become teenage parents⁵

In terms of the under 18 conception rate, Torbay has continued to see a rise in the rate of under 18 conceptions to 64.9 per 1000 15 to 17 year old girls in 2008. The target set by the Government to reduce the rate of teenage conceptions by 50% (from the 1998 baseline) is shown in table 10 Torbay is the only authority in our statistical neighbour group which has seen an increase (46.9%) in the rate of teenage conceptions since 1998.


Table 10: Under 18 Conception Rates Torbay

Torbay UA	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
u18 conception rate	52.7	48.9	40.6	49.6	41.2	50.0	48.6	51.1	57.4	64.9	55.0	47.0
% leading to abortion	45	46	57	50	45	49	53	49	56	54		51

The graph in figure 9 below, highlights the stark difference between the rate of teenage conceptions locally and nationally.

⁵ Teenage Pregnancy Unit (2004). *Long Term Consequences of Teenage Births for Parents and their Children*.

Figure 9: Rate of Teenage Conceptions National Comparison




6. OTHER INDICATORS: IMPACT AND INDICATIVE OF CHILD POVERTY

There are a number of other issues which become an impact of living in poverty. Life expectancy is a prime example in Torbay with the difference in male life expectancy of just over 7 years. This final section of the assessment considers the impact of poverty on health outcomes and crime and ASB.

6.1 Health


The effects of smoking on health are widely documented, smoking can lead to a number of cancers as well as other longer term and irreversible diseases such as Emphysema. Women who smoke throughout pregnancy are increasing the risk that their baby will not develop which can lead to low birth weight. In 2008/09, just over a fifth of women in Torbay were confirmed as smokers at the time their child was born. There are statistically more children born to mothers who smoke in Watcombe and Roundham with Hyde when compared to the Torbay average, see figure 10 below.

Figure 10: Mothers smoking at time of delivery



Across Torbay in 2009, the median birth weight of babies born in Roundham with Hyde and Watcombe were lower than the Torbay median, while the difference is not significant it is interesting to note that these are the same wards where there is a higher proportion of mothers confirmed as smokers at time of delivery.

Figure 11: Median Birth Weight



Mental health is a significant contributory factor and potential impact of living in poverty. Adults who are living in poorer areas are more likely to be at risk of developing a mental illness than those on average incomes⁶. Financial strain can lead to insecurity and be a source of stress, which, in turn, can become contributory factors to mental illness, the mental illness experienced can then compound financial hardship as those suffering can impact on a person's ability to retain a job⁷. It is estimated that there are 5.25 million people in England who have a common mental disorder, table 11 below shows that in Torbay 12,510 people are predicted to have a common mental disorder, this equates to 16.2% of the population.

Table 11: Adults 18 to 64 predicted to have a mental Health Disorder

	Number predicted to have a common mental disorder	Number predicted to have a borderline personality disorder	Number predicted to have an antisocial personality disorder	Number predicted to have psychotic disorder
2010	12,510	350	269	311
2015	12,399	347	268	308
2020	12,494	349	272	310
2025	12,544	350	274	312
2030	12,544	350	276	312

Source: PANSI Based on Adult psychiatric morbidity in England 2007: Results of a Household Survey

The misuse of alcohol and drugs can have an impact on a person's ability to retain employment, in addition to this can be a financial strain on families because of the dependency. There is also a risk that parents who are dependent on alcohol or drugs have a reduced parenting capacity which can lead to safeguarding issues. It is

⁶ The Poverty Site: Health Survey for England DH, 2010.

⁷ Gould, N (2006). Mental Health and Child Poverty. Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

estimated that 6% of the population in Torbay have a dependence on alcohol and 3.4% have a dependence on drugs.

Table 12: People Aged 18-64 Predicted to have a dependence on Alcohol or Drugs by Gender

	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total population 18-64 predicted to have alcohol dependence	3,332	8.7%	1,294	3.3%	4,626	6%
Total population 18-64 predicted to be dependent on drugs	1,724	2.2%	902	2.3%	2,625	3.4%

Source: PANSI: Adult psychiatric morbidity in England 2007: Results of a household survey

Tables 13 and 14 below show the rate of Alcohol and Drug episodes respectively. It is important to note that this represents people who have been assessed and accessed a service, it is not an rate of prevalence across the population. In both tables the wards which have higher rates than the Torbay wide rate have been highlighted. Although this gives us an indication that in these wards more people are accessing treatment services, it could also be because there are easier points of access to treatment services in these wards.

Table 13: Access to Alcohol Services 2009/10

Ward	Rate per 10,000
Berry Head-with-Furzeham	37.86
Blatchcombe	42.15
Churston-with-Galmpton	8.62
Clifton-with-Maidenway	27.88
Cockington-with-Chelston	29.63
Ellacombe	68.04
Goodrington-with-Roselands	22.39
Preston	30.29
Roundham-with-Hyde	83.22
Shiphay-with-the-Willows	26.6
St Marychurch	38.68
St Mary's-with-Summercombe	23.55
Tormohun	87.73
Watcombe	65.68
Wellswood	46.69
Grand Total	50.31

Source: Torbay Care Trust

Table 14: Access to Drug Services 2009/10

Ward	Rate per 10,000
Berry Head-with-Furzeham	30.76
Blatchcombe	57.8
Churston-with-Galmpton	5.17
Clifton-with-Maidenway	33.11
Cockington-with-Chelston	22.79
Ellacombe	94.21
Goodrington-with-Roselands	22.39
Preston	34.95
Roundham-with-Hyde	95.55
Shiphay-with-the-Willows	16.8
St Marychurch	56.94
St Mary's-with-Summercombe	37.01
Tormohun	158.35
Watcombe	67.46
Wellswood	33.95
Grand Total	58.27

Source: Torbay Care Trust

6.2 Crime and Anti-Social behaviour

Not surprisingly those experiencing child poverty are also likely to be growing up in areas with higher levels of crime, anti social behaviour and domestic abuse. These wards also have more young offenders and more First Time Entrants to the criminal justice system.

Main wards with crime and ASB were Tormohun and Roundham with Hyde. These wards contain the town centres of Torquay and Paignton which include the main shopping and night time economy areas.

Table 15: Crime and ASB by ward 2009/10

	Recorded Crime 2009/10	Crime per 1,000	ASB 2009/10	ASB per 1,000
Berry Head with Furzeham	645	64	613	61
Blatchcombe	656	60	913	83
Churston with Galmpton	153	23	174	26
Clifton with Maidenway	200	28	189	26
Cockington with Chelston	476	42	551	49
Ellacombe	584	78	537	72
Goodrington with Roselands	325	45	273	38
Preston	405	39	362	35
Roundham with Hyde	1062	138	971	126
Shiphay with the Willows	567	49	510	44
St Marychurch	931	99	651	69
St Mary's with Summercombe	276	37	357	48
Tormohun	2486	215	1935	168
Watcombe	454	62	652	89
Wellswood	658	84	395	50
Torbay	9878	74	10118	75

Table 16 below shows ward ranking for several indicators based on the rate per 1000 population in each ward. It is ordered by the rate of young offenders by ward. This data is based on the last post code of young offenders in the 2009/10 financial year. The top 4 wards are also those with high levels of child poverty.

Table 16: Ward ranking for rates of young offenders, first time entrants, crime and ASB


	Young offenders	FTEs	Crime	ASB
Ellacombe	1	1	5	5
Watcombe	2	3	7	3
Blatchcombe	3	2	8	4
Tormohun	4	4	1	1
Cockington with Chelston	5	5	11	9
St Marychurch	6	6	3	6
Roundham with Hyde	7	9	2	2
St Mary's with Summercombe	8	11	13	10
Clifton with Maidenway	9	10	14	14
Shiphay with the Willows	10	8	9	11
Goodrington with Roselands	11	7	10	12
Berry Head with Furzeham	12	14	6	7
Wellswood	13	12	4	8
Preston	14	13	12	13

The table below shows the wards with the most domestic abuse crimes per head of population. Again the wards with the most crimes also had highest levels of child poverty. The JSNA evidences that the wards which have significantly higher proportions of domestic violence crimes where children are present are Ellacombe, Roundham with Hyde and Watcombe.

Table 17: Domestic abuse crimes per 1000 population, ranking by ward

	Domestic abuse
Tormohun	1
Roundham with Hyde	2
Ellacombe	3
St Marychurch	4
Blatchcombe	5
Watcombe	6
St Mary's with Summercombe	7
Berry Head with Furzeham	8
Goodrington with Roselands	9
Clifton with Maidenway	10
Wellswood	11
Preston	12
Cockington with Chelston	13
Shiphay with the Willows	14
Churston with Galmpton	15

Appendix One: Child Poverty Basket of Indicators



Tier	Outcome	Related Indicators in Current NIS which would make up a Basket
High level outcome	All of the children living in poverty in the local area	NI116: Proportion of children in poverty.
Second tier of outcomes: factors that directly influence families' incomes and resources today	The number of parents in employment.	NI151: Overall employment rate
	The earnings of parents in employment.	NI166: Median income of employees in the area.
	The number of families taking up the benefits and tax credits that they are entitled to	N/A
	The timeliness and accurateness of payments administered by local partners.	NI181: Time taken to process HB/CTB new claims and change events.
	The proportion of families with children living in decent homes.	NI158: % non-decent council homes
		NI156: Number of households living in temporary accommodation.
	The proportion of families with children experiencing fuel poverty.	NI187: % people receiving income based benefits living in homes with a low energy rating.

Third tier: Factors that directly influence families' abilities to enter and sustain well paid employment in the short and longer term.	The skills levels of parents.	NI163: Proportion aged 19-64 for males and 19-59 for females qualified to L2 or higher.
	The levels of achievement and progression amongst children and young people, particularly those from low income families and other disadvantaged groups.	NI82: Inequality gap in the achievement of a level 2 qualification by the age of 19
		NI92: Narrowing the gap between the lowest achieving 20% in the EYFS and the rest
		NI101: LAC achieving 5A*-C GCSEs or equivalent at KS4 including English and Maths
		NI102: Achievement gap between pupils eligible for FSM and their peers at Key Stage 2 and 4.
		NI105: SEN/non-SEN gap achieving % A*-C GCSEs including English and maths.
		NI106: young people from low income backgrounds progressing to HE.
		NI108: KS4 attainment for BME groups.
	NI117: 16 to 18 year olds who are NEET	
	The sufficiency of suitable employment opportunities that offer sufficient pay and/or progression routes to move families out of poverty.	N/A
The sufficiency of suitable and affordable childcare for parents in employment and training.	NI118: Take up of formal childcare amongst low income families.	
The sufficiency of affordable transport, particularly between poorest communities and areas where there are employment opportunities.	NI176: Working age people with access to employment by public transport.	
Additional Indicators partners may wish to add to their basket	<p>In addition to the core basket set out above, partners may want to include other indicators that reflect pertinent issues in their area. Other relevant indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NI76: Reduction in number of schools where fewer than 65% of pupils achieve level 4 or above with English and Maths at KS2. ▪ NI78: Reduction in number of schools where fewer than 30% of pupils achieve 5 or more A*-C at GCSE including GCSEs in English and Maths. ▪ NI112: Under 18 conception rate ▪ NI146 Adults with learning disabilities in employment ▪ NI150: Adults in contact with mental health services in employment ▪ NI153: Working age people claiming out of work benefits in the worst performing neighbourhoods ▪ NI161: Number of level 1 qualifications in literacy achieved. ▪ NI162: Number of entry level qualifications in numeracy achieved. ▪ NI172: Percentage of small businesses in an area showing employment growth. 	

Appendix Two: JNSA Ward profile for Tormohun



TORBAY JOINT STRATEGIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT - WARD PROFILE TOOL - JAN 2011




SELECT WARD:

TORMOHUN POPULATION: 11,542

TORBAY POPULATION: 134,200

KEY:

- Ward is significantly different from Torbay mean
- Ward is not significantly different than Torbay mean



Domain	Indicator (Rate or Proportion in brackets)	Ward indicator Value	Ward indicator rate or proportion	Torbay mean	England mean	Lowest ward	Range	Highest Ward
Demography	1 RETIREMENT AGE POPULATION	2,140	18.5%	26.5%	18.9%	16.7%		39.9%
	2 AVERAGE AGE	n/a	40.5	44.2	39.6	38.8		52.1
	3 FEMALE LIFE EXPECTANCY*	n/a	83.0	85.3	82.0	79.7		87.8
	4 MALE LIFE EXPECTANCY*	n/a	79.0	78.9	77.9	74.5		82.4
Pride in the Bay	5 SATISFACTION WITH PLACE TO LIVE	117	76.0%	83.5%	79.7%	75.0%		93.2%
	6 ABILITY TO INFLUENCE DECISIONS	41	30.8%	23.3%	28.9%	13.3%		30.8%
	7 AVERAGE DOMESTIC ELECTRIC CONSUMPTION	15,540	3,597	3,608	3,800	3,331		3,910
Learning and skills for the future	8 FOUNDATION STAGE ACHIEVEMENT	74	69.2%	77.3%	77.0%	58.6%		88.4%
	9 KEY STAGE 2 ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT	69	71.9%	79.5%	81.0%	71.2%		88.2%
	10 KEY STAGE 2 MATHS ACHIEVEMENT	72	75.0%	79.7%	81.0%	72.7%		87.1%
	11 GCSE'S ACHIEVEMENT	42	48.3%	49.4%	50.0%	30.1%		73.7%
	12 PERSISTENT ABSENCE	69	5.8%	3.8%	3.3%	1.7%		6.8%
	13 FREE SCHOOL MEALS	311	22.3%	15.7%	16.2%	7.3%		28.4%
The New Economy	14 CHILD POVERTY	760	33.3%	23.4%	20.9%	9.0%		38.5%
	15 OUT OF WORK BENEFITS	2135	27.2%	16.8%	12.5%	8.3%		27.2%
	16 NEED TO IMPROVE JOB PROSPECTS	41	29.5%	23.3%	-	17.8%		33.3%
	17 HOUSEHOLD INCOME	n/a	£490	£530	-	£440		£630
	18 AVERAGE VALUE OF CCJ	439	£1,277	£2,058	£1,962	£1,203		£7,621
Stronger communities	19 TEENAGE PREGNANCY	17	77.3	49.0	42.4	23.0		77.3
	20 SMOKING IN PREGNANCY	54	29.9%	20.7%	14.0%	9.2%		39.1%
	21 DOMESTIC ABUSE INCIDENTS WITH CHILDREN PRESENT	179	155	98	-	27		184
	22 POLICE RECORDED ASB	1935	1,676	754	-	256		1,676
	23 ALCOHOL RELATED HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS*	302	2,204	1,622	1,743	1,165		2,283
	24 ALL AGE ALL CAUSE MORTALITY*	383	688	546	582	389		722

Appendix Three: JNSA Ward profile for Watcombe

TORBAY JOINT STRATEGIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT - WARD PROFILE TOOL - JAN 2011




SELECT WARD:

WATCOMBE POPULATION: 7,366
TORBAY POPULATION: 134,200

KEY:

- Ward is significantly different from Torbay mean
- Ward is not significantly different than Torbay mean



Domain	Indicator (Rate or Proportion in brackets)	Ward indicator Value	Ward indicator rate or proportion	Torbay mean	England mean	Lowest ward	Range	Highest Ward
Demography	1 RETIREMENT AGE POPULATION	1,744	23.7%	26.5%	18.9%	16.7%		39.9%
	2 AVERAGE AGE	n/a	41.2	44.2	39.6	38.8		52.1
	3 FEMALE LIFE EXPECTANCY*	n/a	79.7	85.3	82.0	79.7		87.8
	4 MALE LIFE EXPECTANCY*	n/a	74.5	78.9	77.9	74.5		82.4
Pride in the Bay	5 SATISFACTION WITH PLACE TO LIVE	89	82.4%	83.5%	79.7%	75.0%		93.2%
	6 ABILITY TO INFLUENCE DECISIONS	17	19.1%	23.3%	28.9%	13.3%		30.8%
	7 AVERAGE DOMESTICE ELECTRIC CONSUMPTION	10,791	3,644	3,608	3,800	3,331		3,910
Learning and skills for the future	8 FOUNDATION STAGE ACHIEVEMENT	58	58.6%	77.3%	77.0%	58.6%		88.4%
	9 KEY STAGE 2 ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT	89	85.6%	79.5%	81.0%	71.2%		88.2%
	10 KEY STAGE 2 MATHS ACHIEVEMENT	82	78.8%	79.7%	81.0%	72.7%		87.1%
	11 GCSE'S ACHIEVEMENT	42	42.0%	49.4%	50.0%	30.1%		73.7%
	12 PERSISTENT ABSENCE	71	6.8%	3.8%	3.3%	1.7%		6.8%
The New Economy	13 FREE SCHOOL MEALS	353	28.4%	15.7%	16.2%	7.3%		28.4%
	14 CHILD POVERTY	675	38.5%	23.4%	20.9%	9.0%		38.5%
	15 OUT OF WORK BENEFITS	925	21.1%	16.8%	12.5%	8.3%		27.2%
	16 NEED TO IMPROVE JOB PROSPECTS	24	25.0%	23.3%	-	17.8%		33.3%
Stronger communities	17 HOUSEHOLD INCOME	n/a	£540	£530	-	£440		£630
	18 AVERAGE VALUE OF CCJ	206	£1,474	£2,058	£1,962	£1,203		£7,621
	19 TEENAGE PREGNANCY	10	66.6	49.0	42.4	23.0		77.3
	20 SMOKING IN PREGNANCY	25	39.1%	20.7%	14.0%	9.2%		39.1%
	21 DOMESTIC ABUSE INCIDENTS WITH CHILDREN PRESENT	115	156	98	-	27		184
	22 POLICE RECORDED ASB	652	885	754	-	256		1,676
	23 ALCOHOL RELATED HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS*	163	1,778	1,622	1,743	1,165		2,283
	24 ALL AGE ALL CAUSE MORTALITY*	210	539	546	582	389		722


Appendix Four: JNSA Ward profile for Ellacombe

TORBAY JOINT STRATEGIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT - WARD PROFILE TOOL - JAN 2011



SELECT WARD:

ELLACOMBE POPULATION: 7,442
TORBAY POPULATION: 134,200



Domain	Indicator (Rate or Proportion in brackets)	Ward indicator Value	Ward indicator rate or proportion	Torbay mean	England mean	Lowest ward	Range	Highest Ward
Demography	1 RETIREMENT AGE POPULATION	1,246	16.7%	26.5%	18.9%	16.7%		39.9%
	2 AVERAGE AGE	n/a	38.8	44.2	39.6	38.8		52.1
	3 FEMALE LIFE EXPECTANCY*	n/a	81.0	85.3	82.0	79.7		87.8
	4 MALE LIFE EXPECTANCY*	n/a	78.4	78.9	77.9	74.5		82.4
Pride in the Bay	5 SATISFACTION WITH PLACE TO LIVE	74	75.5%	83.5%	79.7%	75.0%		93.2%
	6 ABILITY TO INFLUENCE DECISIONS	18	22.0%	23.3%	28.9%	13.3%		30.8%
	7 AVERAGE DOMESTIC ELECTRIC CONSUMPTION	10,037	3,637	3,608	3,800	3,331		3,910
Learning and skills for the future	8 FOUNDATION STAGE ACHIEVEMENT	58	65.2%	77.3%	77.0%	58.6%		88.4%
	9 KEY STAGE 2 ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT	68	75.6%	79.5%	81.0%	71.2%		88.2%
	10 KEY STAGE 2 MATHS ACHIEVEMENT	69	76.7%	79.7%	81.0%	72.7%		87.1%
	11 GCSE'S ACHIEVEMENT	28	30.1%	49.4%	50.0%	30.1%		73.7%
	12 PERSISTENT ABSENCE	46	4.6%	3.8%	3.3%	1.7%		6.8%
	13 FREE SCHOOL MEALS	262	23.4%	15.7%	16.2%	7.3%		28.4%
The New Economy	14 CHILD POVERTY	535	30.2%	23.4%	20.9%	9.0%		38.5%
	15 OUT OF WORK BENEFITS	1095	22.4%	16.8%	12.5%	8.3%		27.2%
	16 NEED TO IMPROVE JOB PROSPECTS	26	31.7%	23.3%	-	17.8%		33.3%
	17 HOUSEHOLD INCOME	n/a	£520	£530	-	£440		£630
	18 AVERAGE VALUE OF CCJ	236	£1,682	£2,058	£1,962	£1,203		£7,621
Stronger communities	19 TEENAGE PREGNANCY	10	63.7	49.0	42.4	23.0		77.3
	20 SMOKING IN PREGNANCY	30	26.5%	20.7%	14.0%	9.2%		39.1%
	21 DOMESTIC ABUSE INCIDENTS WITH CHILDREN PRESENT	137	184	98	-	27		184
	22 POLICE RECORDED ASB	537	722	754	-	256		1,676
	23 ALCOHOL RELATED HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS*	161	1,892	1,622	1,743	1,165		2,283
	24 ALL AGE ALL CAUSE MORTALITY*	212	607	546	582	389		722

Appendix Five: JNSA Ward profile for Roundham with Hyde




TORBAY JOINT STRATEGIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT - WARD PROFILE TOOL - JAN 2011



SELECT WARD:

ROUNDHAM-WITH-HYDE POPULATION: 7,697
 TORBAY POPULATION: 134,200



Domain	Indicator (Rate or Proportion in brackets)	Ward indicator Value	Ward indicator rate or proportion	Torbay mean	England mean	Lowest ward	Range	Highest Ward
Demography	1 RETIREMENT AGE POPULATION	2,339	30.4%	26.5%	18.9%	16.7%		39.9%
	2 AVERAGE AGE	n/a	46.8	44.2	39.6	38.8		52.1
	3 FEMALE LIFE EXPECTANCY*	n/a	81.0	85.3	82.0	79.7		87.8
	4 MALE LIFE EXPECTANCY*	n/a	74.9	78.9	77.9	74.5		82.4
Pride in the Bay	5 SATISFACTION WITH PLACE TO LIVE	95	80.5%	83.5%	79.7%	75.0%		93.2%
	6 ABILITY TO INFLUENCE DECISIONS	14	13.3%	23.3%	28.9%	13.3%		30.8%
	7 AVERAGE DOMESTICE ELECTRIC CONSUMPTION	9,963	3,331	3,608	3,800	3,331		3,910
Learning and skills for the future	8 FOUNDATION STAGE ACHIEVEMENT	51	85.0%	77.3%	77.0%	58.6%		88.4%
	9 KEY STAGE 2 ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT	47	71.2%	79.5%	81.0%	71.2%		88.2%
	10 KEY STAGE 2 MATHS ACHIEVEMENT	48	72.7%	79.7%	81.0%	72.7%		87.1%
	11 GCSE'S ACHIEVEMENT	26	47.3%	49.4%	50.0%	30.1%		73.7%
	12 PERSISTENT ABSENCE	19	2.8%	3.8%	3.3%	1.7%		6.8%
	13 FREE SCHOOL MEALS	167	21.4%	15.7%	16.2%	7.3%		28.4%
The New Economy	14 CHILD POVERTY	355	27.5%	23.4%	20.9%	9.0%		38.5%
	15 OUT OF WORK BENEFITS	1245	27.0%	16.8%	12.5%	8.3%		27.2%
	16 NEED TO IMPROVE JOB PROSECTS	26	24.1%	23.3%	-	17.8%		33.3%
	17 HOUSEHOLD INCOME	n/a	£440	£530	-	£440		£630
	18 AVERAGE VALUE OF CCJ	195	£1,405	£2,058	£1,962	£1,203		£7,621
Stronger communities	19 TEENAGE PREGNANCY	8	76.4	49.0	42.4	23.0		77.3
	20 SMOKING IN PREGNANCY	25	28.0%	20.7%	14.0%	9.2%		39.1%
	21 DOMESTIC ABUSE INCIDENTS WITH CHILDREN PRESENT	125	162	98	-	27		184
	22 POLICE RECORDED ASB	971	1,262	754	-	256		1,676
	23 ALCOHOL RELATED HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS*	250	2,283	1,622	1,743	1,165		2,283
	24 ALL AGE ALL CAUSE MORTALITY*	475	722	546	582	389		722
