

COUNCIL SEMINAR 26th January, 2016

Present:- Councillor Roche (in the Chair); Councillors Alam, Atkin, Buckley, Burton, Elliot, Ellis, Evans, Godfrey, Gosling, Mallinder, McNeely, Pickering, Pitchley, Price, Russell, Sims, Wallis, Whelbourn, Wyatt and Yasseen.

INDICES OF DEPRIVATION 2015

Councillor Roche, Chair, introduced Miles Crompton, Policy and Partnerships, who gave the following presentation:-

Indices of Deprivation 2015

- Government measure produced by Oxford University
- Updates the previous ID2010
- 7 domains (37 Indicators) = Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) with 2013/14 baseline
- SOA Geography (167 in Rotherham and 32,844 in England)
- Average of SOA Scores measure – Rotherham increased from 53rd most deprived district in 2010 to 52nd in 2015 (326 districts)
- Minor changes to methodology

Rotherham Deprivation relative to England

% of Rotherham population within English IMD deciles	IMD 2004	IMD 2007	IMD 2010	IMD 2015
Most deprived 10%	12%	12%	18%	19.5%
Most deprived 20%	33%	32%	33%	31.5%
Most deprived 30%	49%	46%	46%	45%
Less deprived than national average	29%	35%	32%	37%

23.1% of children 0-15 live in 10% most deprived areas nationally (15.6% in 2007)

Rotherham's most deprived SOAs All in top 2% of 32,844 English SOAs

SOA	Rank in 2010	Rank in 2015
Ferham	851	242 (+609)
East Herringthorpe North	230	257 (-27)
Eastwood Village	2,207	302 (+1,905)
Canklow North	434	315 (+119)
Eastwood East	641	323 (+318)
East Herringthorpe South	920	480 (+440)
Eastwood Central	1,089	500 (+589)
Maltby Birks Holt	1,207	597 (+610)
East Dene East	707	623 (+84)
Masbrough	847	634 (+213)

Estimated Ward Indices of Multiple Deprivation Scores

Ward	2004	2007	2010	2015	2004-2015	2010-2015
1. Rotherham East	52	51	52	58	-6	+6
2. Valley	42	42	44	45	+3	+1
3. Rotherham West	38	38	40	42	+4	+2
4. Wingfield	35	33	35	40	+5	+5
5. Boston Castle	35	35	37	37	+2	-
6. Maltby	35	33	37	37	+2	-
20. Hellaby	16	14	14	13	-3	-1
21. Sitwell	15	13	14	12	-3	-2

Deprivation by Domain

Domain	Top 10%	Change 2010-15	Top 20%	Top 50%
Education & Skills	24%	0	39%	69%
Employment	24%	+2%	42%	75%
Health & Disability	21%	-12%	40%	85%
Income	17%	+3%	33%	64%
Crime	15%	+4%	25%	65%
Living Environment	2%	-1%	4%	10%
"Barriers"	0%	0	2%	15%

40% of Rotherham is in the most deprived 20% nationally but none is in the least deprived 20%

Indices of Deprivation

Change in Health Indicators

Indicator	ID 2010	ID 2015	Change
Years of potential life lost	74.3	64.8	-9.5
Comparative illness & disability ratio (sickness & disability benefits)	147.1	142.5	-4.6
Acute morbidity (emergency admissions) 2006-8/2011-13	199.5	125.8	-73.7
Mood & anxiety disorders (Mental Health) 2006-8/2012-13	0.33	0.51	+0.18
Overall Health & Disability Score	0.84	0.64	-0.20

Average SOA scores (above) show improvement

Mental Health is worse – GP prescribing, hospital episodes, disability benefits and suicides

Income Deprivation affecting Children Index 2015

- 24.3% of children 0-15 are affected by low income
- Children 0-15 are 19% of population but 25% of those affected by low income
- 35% of children in low income families live in 10% most deprived nationally

Children and Young People's Attainment
Education Sub-Domain 2015

- 27% of children and young people live in 10% most deprived areas nationally
- 16% live in 5% most deprived areas

Comparison of Life Chances: Children

20 Contrasting Neighbourhoods	10 most deprived areas	10 least deprived areas
Total population (2013)	17,486	15,822
Children (aged 0-17)	5,870 (33.6%)	2,655 (16.8%)
Live in a family with 3+ dependent children	2,975 (50.7%)	470 (17.7%)
Good level of development at Foundation (2013)	117 (36.7%)	115 (73.2%)
Achieve Level 4 at Key Stage 2 (2011-13)	143 (56.7%)	135 (88.0%)
Achieve 5+ GCSEs A*-C inc English & maths (2011-13)	80 (32.7%)	141 (82.6%)
Be a Child in Need (Children Act 1989) (2014)	236 (4.0%)	21 (0.8%)
Be in contact with or supported by the CSE Team aged 13-16 (2012-14)	202 (20%)	31 (4.6%)

Comparison of Life Chances: Adults & General

20 Contrasting Neighbourhoods	10 most deprived areas	10 least deprived areas
Total population (2013)	17,486	15,822
Working Age Adults 18-64	9,732 (55.7%)	9,691 (61.3%)
Be unemployed, long term sick or FT carer	3,226 (33.1%)	505 (5.2%)
Be a disabled adult claiming DLA (2015)	1,460 (12.6%)	545 (4.1%)
Live in an overcrowded home (all households)	880 (12.6%)	114 (1.8%)
Recorded violent offences, burglary, theft and criminal damage (per 1,000 pop)	1,791 (102.4)	315 (19.9)
Older people aged 65+	1,884 (10.8%)	3,476 (22%)
Live in poverty as a pensioner	765 (40.6%)	222 (6.4%)
Male life expectancy	73.4	83
Female life expectancy	77.4	86.9

Key Messages

- Deprivation still top 20% nationally
- Employment and education deprivation most severe
- Improvements in health, crime and environment

- Most deprived areas getting worse
- Areas with average or low deprivation doing better
- Mental health getting worse
- Rising barriers to housing – affordability
- Polarisation on all domains except living environment
- 18.7% deprived of income
- 24.3% children v 16.5% working age adults
- Children more likely to be affected by deprivation

Policy Challenges

- Targeting the most deprived areas
 - Are we closing the gap? – no it is getting wider
 - Previous initiatives made little lasting impact
 - Welfare Reform exacerbating deprivation
 - Identify what works: evaluation and best practice
 - Joining-up services and targeting resources
- Improving education and skills in our most deprived areas
 - Raising school attainment and participation post-18
 - Higher adult qualifications and skills
 - Work readiness: basic life skills, welfare to work
 - Cultural shift towards learning and working

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/highlighted:-

- The information contained within the Indices were used for the submission of funding bids by the Council and other groups
- Importance of a neighbourhood approach when attempting to tackle the most deprived neighbourhoods
- Ability to drill down the information into Wards
- Need to convey the message to schools that it was not just about attaining GCSEs but also higher/further education
- For the period 2000-07 Rotherham had been 1 of the best performers in the area for job growth due mainly to the regeneration of the Manvers area; since 2007 it had been a reverse direction
- Disability Benefits were included in Indices as part of the Employment domain
- Rotherham did not compare well with similar authorities
- Long term problems not resolved by short term funding
- Partnership working required as resources diminished