# Care Leaver Payment Consultation: Analysis of Responses

Dawn Griesbach and Jennifer Waterton
Griesbach & Associates

**June 2024**

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

**Table of contents**

## Abbreviations

In the tables throughout this report, the column headings '**n**' and '**%**' are used to indicate, respectively, the **number** and **percentage** of respondents who answered a question in a particular way.

Other abbreviations that appear in this report are:

**CYCJ:** Children's and Young People's Centre for Justice

**STAF:** Scottish Throughcare and Aftercare Forum

**UNCRC:** the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child – a legally-binding international agreement setting out the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of every child, regardless of their race, religion or abilities.

## Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Alison Platts (Alison Platts Research Services) for her time in quality-assuring this report.

# Executive summary

1. Between 3 November 2023 and 26 January 2024, the Scottish Government carried out a public consultation on its proposals to establish a Care Leaver Payment for young people leaving care in Scotland.

2. Altogether, the consultation received 70 responses – 37 from organisations and 33 from individuals. Just over half of the organisational responses (20 out of 37) came from public sector organisations, and a third (12 out of 37) came from third sector organisations. The remaining 5 organisations did not fit into either of these two main categories. They comprised three academic / research organisations and two professional bodies representing social workers in Scotland.

3. In addition, as part of the consultation, six engagement sessions – four online, and two face-to-face – were carried out to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to discuss their views. A total of 62 individuals participated in these sessions.

4. The following summary of the main points raised in the consultation takes account of the views expressed by both respondents and participants in the engagement sessions.

**Main messages**

5. Respondents largely supported the proposal to establish a Care Leaver Payment and thought it would help (to some extent) to reduce some of the financial barriers that care leavers can face when moving on from care.

6. A range of respondents agreed with the proposed eligibility criteria and age requirements for applicants. These respondents thought it made sense to focus the payment on care leavers, and to align the age criteria for receipt of the payment with those which apply to the provision of Continuing Care and Aftercare. However, it was very common for respondents to suggest that the proposed eligibility criteria and age requirements were too restrictive or that consideration should be given to extending eligibility for the payment to other groups. In particular, respondents thought all young people who had been looked after at home and / or who had been looked after away from home for any length of time before their 16$^{th}$ birthday, should be eligible for the payment (or that further consideration should be given to extending eligibility to these groups).

7. Key recurring themes across all the consultation questions were the need for an inclusive and personalised approach to application and payment processes, the importance of providing support to applicants (before and after receipt of the payment) and ensuring that the payment does not affect the eligibility of care leavers for other benefits or financial support.

**Name and purpose of the payment**

8. Around half of respondents (49%) thought the proposed name of the payment (Care Leaver Payment) represented its purpose and intention, a similar proportion (43%) thought it **somewhat** did, and a small proportion (8%) thought it did **not**. Individuals were more

likely than organisations to say the name of the payment did **not** represent its purpose and intention.

9. Respondents who thought the proposed name represented its purpose and intention saw the name as ‘clear’, ‘self-explanatory’ and ‘precise’. Those who thought the name did **not** represent its purpose and intention, or that it only **somewhat** did so, described it as ‘vague’ and ‘potentially stigmatising’. Some also said that it gives the impression that a person is ‘being paid to leave care’ and there were concerns that it might be perceived as an ‘incentive’ to leave care in situations where Continuing Care should be prioritised.

10. Some respondents commented that earlier proposals for the payment appeared to cover **all** young people with care experience, whereas the current proposal appeared to focus more narrowly on care leavers. Respondents who raised this point often said that they thought the payment should be available to **all** ‘care experienced’ people.

11. Around half of respondents (48%) thought the payment will be able to help reduce some of the financial barriers young people face when moving on from care into more independent living, 14% thought it will **not**, and the remaining 38% of respondents were unsure. Organisations were more likely to say they were unsure than to agree, and individuals were more likely than organisations to say the payment **cannot** fulfil its purpose of reducing some of the financial barriers young people face when moving on from care.

12. Respondents thought the extent to which the payment is able to fulfil its purpose would depend on (i) providing guidance, support, and advice alongside any financial payment and (ii) providing a wider range of financial support to young people with care experience.

### Eligibility criteria

13. There were two main views in relation to the proposed eligibility criteria and age requirements for the Care Leaver Payment. One group of respondents (the smaller of the two) were generally satisfied that the eligibility criteria and age requirements set out in the consultation paper were **appropriate**. The second (larger) group thought the criteria set out in the consultation paper were **too restrictive** and consideration should be given to expanding the criteria to include a wider range of young people.

14. Suggestions from the latter group included making the payment available to (i) all young people with care experience, (ii) those who were looked after at home, (iii) those who were adopted, (iv) all those in informal kinship care (not just those with a Kinship Care Order), and (v) unaccompanied asylum-seeking children. There was also a widespread view that young people who had left care before the age of 16 should be eligible.

### Payment amount and processes

15. In general, respondents thought the proposed single lump sum payment of £2,000 was preferable to the original proposal of £200 annual payments over a period of 10 years. They also thought a one-off lump sum payment would be easier to administer. Less often, respondents expressed reservations about the revised approach, saying that a lump sum of £2,000 may not be spent appropriately by some young people and / or would put them at risk of financial exploitation. These respondents generally favoured the original proposal.

16. Regardless of whether they supported or disagreed with the proposal, respondents highlighted concerns that (i) some young people may find it difficult to manage such a large sum of money, (ii) some may be put at risk (due to addiction problems, or the potential for financial exploitation), and (iii) a large payment could have a negative impact on care leavers' eligibility for and access to other financial support.

17. Notwithstanding these concerns, the great majority of respondents thought the payment would be helpful – 37% thought it would be 'very helpful', 25% thought it would be 'helpful', and 30% thought it would be 'somewhat helpful'. Just 8% thought it would be 'not at all helpful'. Respondents argued that the extent to which the Care Leaver Payment is helpful would depend on a number of factors, including (i) clearly defined parameters for its use, (ii) support being provided to help young people budget and manage the money, (iii) the relationship between the Care Leaver Payment and other financial support given to care leavers, (iv) other existing financial entitlements not being reduced or withdrawn, and (v) the young person's circumstances at the point of moving on from care.

18. A large majority of respondents, 85%, thought it would be beneficial for care leavers to have a choice in how their payment is made, 6% thought it would **not** be beneficial, and 9% were unsure. A recurring view among those who thought it would be beneficial for care leavers to have a choice was that the payment should be made in a way that suits each young person's circumstances and needs. Some in this group referred to Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child which states that children have the right to express their views freely in all matters affecting them and that these views should be given due weight in decision-making. Respondents who did **not** think it would be beneficial to give young people a choice, or who were unsure, thought it could be too complicated administratively to do this.

19. In relation to the timing of the payment, around a third of respondents (34%) said it would be most helpful for care leavers to receive the payment in preparation of moving on, 11% thought it should be received at the point of moving on, and 10% thought it should be received within 12 or 18 months of moving on. However, 44% of respondents did not favour any of these timing options. The most common view among this group was that the payment should be given to young people at a time of their choosing.

**Application process and support**

20. A range of respondents did not agree that there should be an 'application process' of any kind for a Care Leaver Payment. Rather, they said that anyone who was eligible should simply receive the payment **automatically** at the point at which they were leaving care. It was thought that responsibility for identifying eligible recipients should lie with the local authority and, in particular, with social workers, key workers or other professionals who were involved with the young person.

21. Respondents emphasised the importance of involving young people in the design of the application process – particularly those with care experience and those most likely to face barriers in applying. Respondents thought any application process should be person-centred, straightforward and non-stigmatising.

22. There was virtually unanimous agreement that young people should have support to apply for a Care Leaver Payment. Respondents identified three main areas for which support would be required, namely (i) assistance with accessing (potentially) an online portal, (ii) assistance with navigating the system, and (iii) assistance with completing the form / application including identifying and accessing any supplementary information required to support an application.

### Applicant income and eligibility for other financial support

23. There was virtually unanimous support for the proposals that (i) an individual's income should have no impact on their eligibility for the Care Leaver Payment and (ii) the receipt of a Care Leaver Payment should not negatively impact entitlement to other support.

### Impacts of the payment

24. Respondents suggested that the Care Leaver Payment would potentially have positive impacts in relation to (i) securing and furnishing accommodation, (ii) meeting daily living expenses, (iii) undertaking education and training, (iv) preparing for employment, (v) improving wellbeing and establishing and maintaining social connections, and (vi) fulfilling any other aspirations that care leavers may have. More generally, some said that the Care Leaver Payment would help reduce the stigma associated with having care experience, enabling care leavers to live like their peers who are not care experienced.

25. Respondents also identified possible negative impacts. The two most common were that some young people (i) may spend their payments in 'unsafe' ways, putting themselves at risk of harm (for example, through drug or alcohol use or gambling), **or** (ii) may be financially exploited. There were also concerns that young people may spend the money 'recklessly' and 'have nothing to show for it' which could have a knock-on negative effect on their pride, sense of achievement and self-esteem.

### Support for payment recipients

26. Respondents described the **characteristics of the type of support** a young person might need once they have received a Care Leaver Payment. They thought the support available should be well-signposted, personalised, flexible, easy to access, consistent across all geographic areas, and available for as long as necessary. They also discussed the **content of the support** young people may need, including advice and guidance in relation to (i) budgeting, (ii) setting up and managing a bank account, (iii) identifying rights and entitlements in relation to benefits and other financial support, (iv) decision-making and prioritising, and (v) minimising the risk of being financially exploited.

27. There was a commonly expressed view that support for payment recipients should be provided in a way that best suited the specific individual.

### Awareness and publicity

28. Respondents offered a range of suggestions for ways of informing care leavers about their eligibility and entitlement for a Care Leaver Payment. Comments mainly focused on organisations that could assist with this – including local authorities, care providers, employment services, advice services, etc. – and methods of communication that might be

used, such as social media, podcasts, billboards, leaflets, TV, radio, etc. Respondents also thought it would be useful to learn from other successful initiatives.

**Other issues and the need for other financial assistance for care experienced people**

29. Three main additional issues in relation the development and delivery of the Care Leaver Payment were raised, namely (i) practical issues in relation to making the payment (e.g. many young people do not have bank accounts), (ii) the need to ensure adequate support and funding is in place for the organisation(s) responsible for administering the payment, and (iii) the importance of monitoring and evaluating the impact of the payment.

30. Respondents also identified other types of financial assistance young people with care experience may benefit from in the future. This included assistance with day-to-day living costs, employment-related costs, technology-related costs, housing costs and childcare costs. There were also suggestions that financial support should be provided to care leavers beyond the age of 26 and that the Care Leaver Payment should be made available retrospectively to all those who have left care since 2020 – when the commitment to the payment was first made by the Scottish Government.

# 1 Introduction

1.1 Between 3 November 2023 and 26 January 2024, the Scottish Government carried out a public consultation on its proposals to establish a Care Leaver Payment for young people leaving care in Scotland. This report presents findings from the analysis of responses to the consultation.

## Policy context

1.2 In February 2020, the Independent Care Review published a series of reports called The Promise which set out what needed to be done to make sure that all children and young people are loved, safe and respected so that they can reach their full potential. In March 2022, the Scottish Government published its Promise Implementation Plan to deliver on its commitment to 'Keep The Promise' for care experienced children, young people and their families by 2030.

1.3 One aspect of The Promise is that all children and young people with care experience should be given the support they need to help them transition from care and move on into adulthood and independent living. It is in this context that the Care Leaver Payment has been proposed.[1] This payment will be part of a broader package of support which includes, but is not limited to, the Care Experience Bursary and council tax exemption for care leavers.

1.4 Proposals for the Care Leaver Payment benefited from input and discussion with a range of stakeholders, including young people with care experience, and care leavers. The consultation sought to build on these discussions, and to develop and refine the proposals.

## The consultation

1.5 The consultation paper on proposals for the Care Leaver Payment was published on 3 November 2023. The consultation was open to the public but was specifically targeted at (i) children and young people with care experience, (ii) those who work with young people in care or support people with care experience – including kinship carers and foster carers, and (iii) organisations and people working in relevant areas across the public, private and third sectors.

1.6 The consultation questions addressed the following topics:

- Purpose of the proposed payment (Q1 and Q2)
- Payment amount and processes (Q3 to Q6)
- Impact of the proposed payment (Q7 and Q8)
- Eligibility criteria, including age and income requirements (Q9 to Q13)
- The application process (Q14)

[1] Note that this payment was previously referred to as the 'Care Experience Grant' in the SNP Manifesto 2021 (page 28), the Programme for Government 2021/22 (page 10) and the Programme for Government 2022/23 (page 15).

- The need for support (at the time of application and after payment) (Q15 to Q19)
- Awareness and publicity (Q20)
- Any other issues and / or other financial assistance for people with care experience (Q21 and Q22).

1.7 In addition to the online consultation, the Scottish Government carried out six 'engagement sessions', each of which attracted between 5 and 16 participants. Scottish Government officials produced a short report for each session, summarising the main discussion points.

1.8 The consultation closed on 26 January 2024.

## About the analysis

1.9 This report is based on a robust and systematic analysis of the responses to the consultation. The work undertaken involved both quantitative and qualitative analysis.

1.10 Frequency analysis was undertaken in relation to the responses to all closed (tick-box) questions and the findings are presented in tables throughout this report. Not all respondents answered all the closed questions, and therefore the total number shown in each table is the number of respondents who answered that question.

1.11 Very occasionally, respondents did not answer a closed question (i.e. they did not tick a box in response to the question), but their comments stated or strongly implied their response to the closed question. In such cases, the response to the closed question was imputed (i.e. added at the analysis stage). Thus, the tables throughout this report include a small number of these imputed responses.

1.12 Qualitative thematic analysis was undertaken in relation to respondents' comments. The aim of the qualitative analysis was to identify the main themes, as well as the full range of views submitted in response to each question (or group of questions), and to explore areas of agreement and disagreement in the views of different groups of respondents. A thematic analysis of the summaries of the engagement sessions was also undertaken.

### A caveat about the findings

1.13 As with all consultations it is important to bear in mind that the views of those who have responded may not be representative of the views of the wider population. Individuals (and organisations) who have a keen interest in a topic – and the capacity to respond – are more likely to participate in a consultation than those who do not. This self-selection means that the views of consultation participants cannot be generalised to the wider population.

1.14 For this reason, the approach to consultation analysis is primarily qualitative in nature. Its main purpose is not to identify how **many** people held particular views, but rather to understand the full range of views expressed and any concerns that respondents may have. The qualitative analysis also helps in understanding the responses to the closed questions and gaining insight into people's views.

## The report

1.15 The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- Chapter 2 presents information about the respondents to the consultation, and the six engagement sessions undertaken during the period of the consultation.
- Chapters 3 to 11 present an analysis of the written consultation responses. Note that the findings are not presented in the same order as the questions appeared in the consultation questionnaire. See the table of contents for details.
- Chapter 12 presents a thematic analysis of the key points from the discussions at the engagement sessions.

1.16 In addition, this report includes two annexes. Annex 1 contains a list of organisational respondents. Annex 2 sets out the response rates for each of the consultation questions, with a breakdown by respondent type.

# 2 Description of the responses and respondents

2.1 This chapter provides information about the respondents and the responses to the consultation. It also provides a brief description of the engagement sessions carried out as part of the consultation process.

## Respondents and responses

2.2 Altogether, the consultation received 70 responses. Of these, 56 were submitted online through the Scottish Government's consultation hub and 14 were sent by email. Responses were received from 37 organisations and 33 individuals (see Table 2.1).

**Table 2.1: Number and percentage of respondents**

| Respondent type | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Organisations | 37 | 53% |
| Individuals | 33 | 47% |
| **Total** | **70** | **100%** |

2.3 There were two main groups of organisational respondents (see Table 2.2).

- **Public sector organisations** comprised around half of the organisational respondents (20 out of 37, or 54%). This group included local authorities and NHS services, as well as other public bodies with remits relating to children and young people (and those with care experience, in particular).
- **Third sector organisations** comprised around a third of the organisational respondents (12 out of 37, or 32%). This group included organisations working with children and young people and their families and organisations providing financial education, advice or support to young people.

2.4 The remaining five organisations (14%) did not fit into either of the two main categories and are referred to throughout this report as 'other organisation types'. A complete list of organisational respondents is shown in Annex 1.

**Table 2.2: Breakdown of organisational responses, by type**

| Organisation type | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Public sector organisations | 20 | 54% |
| Third sector organisations | 12 | 32% |
| Other organisation types* | 5 | 14% |
| **Total organisations** | **37** | **100%** |

* Includes three academic / research organisations, and two professional bodies representing social workers.

2.5 In general, responses from individuals were very brief, whereas organisational respondents often submitted lengthier responses, in some cases citing research and including lists of references. In addition, some responses submitted by organisations contained the collated views of young people with care experience in relation to some or all of the consultation questions.

### Response rates for individual questions

2.6 The response rates for individual consultation questions ranged between 87% and 93% for closed questions, and between 63% and 96% for open questions.

2.7 Question 3 and Question 8 (both open questions) received the highest response rates overall – 96% of all respondents commented at these questions which asked, 'What are your views on the revised approach proposed by the Scottish Government?' (Q3) and 'Do you think this payment could have any negative impact on young people leaving care?' (Q8). Question 10 (an open question) received the lowest response rate – 63%. This question asked, 'Is there anything else you think the Scottish Government should take into consideration related to eligibility criteria for the Care Leaver Payment?'

2.8 Response rates for individual questions varied, depending on whether the question was closed or open, and on whether the respondent was an organisation or individual. Among individuals, the response rate for all the closed questions was 100% – i.e. **all** the individual respondents answered **all six** of the closed questions – while the response rates for the open questions ranged from 58% to 97%. Among organisations, response rates ranged from 76% to 86% for closed questions, and from 68% to 95% for the open questions.

2.9 See Annex 2 for full details of the question response rates.

## Participants in engagement sessions

2.10 As noted in Chapter 1, in addition to the public consultation the Scottish Government carried out six 'engagement sessions' which provided an opportunity to discuss and explore participants' views on the issues addressed in the consultation.

2.11 Four of the engagement sessions were held online. Invitations to participate were sent to a range of relevant stakeholders (including local authorities, NHS health boards, third sector and national organisations) to be shared with their networks. Altogether, 55 individuals who worked in a field relevant to children and young people and / or the care sector participated in these sessions (between 11 and 16 individuals in each session).

2.12 Two further engagement sessions, both organised through the Youth Justice Voices project, were held face-to-face.[2] One was facilitated by the group Inside Out at His Majesty's Young Offenders Institution Polmont (HMPYOI).[3] The other was facilitated by the group Youth Just Us.[4] Altogether, 9 young people with care experience and 6 professionals working in relevant organisations (Barnardo's, STAF and CYCJ) participated in these sessions.

[2] The Youth Justice Voices project is a joint collaboration between the Children's and Young People's Centre for Justice (CYCJ) and the Scottish Throughcare and Aftercare Forum (STAF). It was set up in April 2019 to amplify the voices of young people aged 16–25 with experience of the care and justice systems. The project is funded by the National Lottery Community Fund and The Promise Partnership Good Childhood Fund.

[3] Inside Out is a steering group for care experienced boys and young men in HMPYOI in collaboration with Barnardo's. The project focuses on driving change and promoting rights-based issues.

[4] Youth Just Us is the steering group for the Youth Justice Voices project.

# 3 Name and purpose of the payment (Q1 and Q2)

3.1 This chapter presents respondents' views regarding the first two consultation questions, which asked about the proposed **name** of the payment – i.e. Care Leaver Payment – and its **purpose**.

3.2 The consultation paper explained that the purpose of the Care Leaver Payment is to help reduce some of the financial barriers that young people face when moving on from care into adulthood and more independent living. Questions 1 and 2 invited views on (i) the extent to which the proposed name of the payment reflected its purpose and intention, and (ii) whether the payment can fulfil its intended purpose.

---

**Question 1:** How well do you think the name of the payment represents its purpose and intention? [Name of the payment represents the purpose and intention of the payment / Name of the payment somewhat represents the purpose and intention of the payment / Name of the payment does not represent the purpose and intention of the payment]

Please explain your answer and provide any names you think would be more suitable.

**Question 2:** Do you think the payment can fulfil the purpose set out above? [Yes / No / Unsure]

Please explain your answer.

---

## Extent to which the name represents its purpose and intention (Q1)

3.3 Question 1 asked how well the proposed name of the payment (Care Leaver Payment) represented its purpose and intention. Table 3.1 shows that, overall, 49% of respondents thought the name represented the purpose and intention of the payment, 43% thought it **somewhat** did so, and 8% thought it did **not** represent the purpose and intention of the payment.

3.4 Around half of both organisations (50%) and individuals (48%) thought the proposed name of the payment represented its purpose and intention. The remaining 50% of organisations thought the name **somewhat** represented its purpose and intention. Among individuals, however, just over a third (36%) thought the name **somewhat** represented its purpose and intention, while 15% thought that the name of the payment did **not** represent its purpose and intention (no organisation gave this view).

**Table 3.1: Q1 – How well do you think the name of the payment represents its purpose and intention?**

| Respondent type | Name represents purpose and intention | | Name SOMEWHAT represents purpose and intention | | Name does NOT represent purpose and intention | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Organisations | 14 | 50% | 14 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 28 | 100% |
| Individuals | 16 | 48% | 12 | 36% | 5 | 15% | 33 | 100% |
| **Total, all respondents** | **30** | **49%** | **26** | **43%** | **5** | **8%** | **61** | **100%** |

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

3.5 Respondents were asked to explain their answers and provide any names they thought would be more suitable. Altogether 47 respondents – 29 organisations and 18 individuals – provided comments and the views expressed are discussed here.

### The payment name represents its purpose and intention

3.6 Respondents who thought the proposed name of the payment represented its purpose and intention described it as 'self-explanatory', 'straightforward', 'clear', 'concise', 'precise', 'short and simple'. Some pointed out that the term 'care leaver' is defined in legislation and therefore makes clear who the payment is intended for. At the same time, however, some went on to offer suggestions for alternative names which they thought were better or – more often – to express caveats and / or concerns about (i) definitional issues (specifically in relation to the distinction between 'care experienced' and 'care leaver') and (ii) the use of the term 'care leaver' specifically. These issues are discussed below.

### The payment name does NOT or SOMEWHAT represents its purpose and intention

3.7 Those who thought the name of the payment did **not** represent its purpose and intention, or that it only **somewhat** did so, made several different points. Some described the name of the payment as 'vague' or 'potentially stigmatising', or said it gives a negative impression – 'as if you are being paid to leave care' – or that it might be perceived as an 'incentive' to leave care in cases where Continuing Care should be prioritised. Others in this group thought the proposed name made clear **who** the payment is intended for, but not its **purpose.** Respondents in this group often suggested alternative names (see paragraph 3.14 below) and / or they expressed similar concerns to the group above in relation to definitions and the inclusion of the term 'care leaver' in the name.

### Definition and terminology issues

3.8 A range of respondents (both organisations and individuals) commented on issues relating to definitions and terminology. Regardless of how they answered the closed question, respondents wanted the terminology used in relation to the payment to be clear and consistent to avoid confusion and challenge. Some commented that earlier proposals for the payment appeared to cover **all** people with care experience, whereas the current proposal focused more narrowly on care leavers. They pointed out that there is a legal definition of 'care leaver', but no legal definition of 'care experienced'. (From April 2015 any

young person who ceases to be looked after by a local authority on or after their 16th birthday is classified as a 'care leaver'.[5]) At the same time, respondents noted that the term 'care experienced' is sometimes used interchangeably with the term 'care leaver'.

3.9 Respondents emphasised that these two terms are **not** the same and stated that 'care experienced' covers a larger group of people than 'care leaver'.[6] Respondents who raised this point also often said that they thought the payment should be available to all 'care experienced' people.

3.10 Thus, in their view, the issue of definition was not only relevant to the **name** of the payment, but also to the question of **eligibility.** (Respondents' views on eligibility are discussed in detail in Chapter 4.) These respondents wanted to see clarity about definitions, with some calling for the development of a universally understood and accepted definition of 'care experience'.[7]

3.11 In addition, a range of respondents thought the term 'care leaver' should **not** be included in the name of the payment. Several different points were made about this terminology:

- First, there was a suggestion that this term does not reflect the current approach being taken in Scotland (as set out in 'Keep The Promise') to support and understand the needs of young people with care experience at a key stage in their lives. Some suggested that the term 'care leaver' implies that leaving care is like a 'cliff edge' – a point where there is no going back.
- Second, there were concerns that the proposed name might unintentionally encourage some young people to leave Continuing Care placements before they are ready to do so. Respondents who raised this issue thought that any communications about the payment should emphasise, and be supportive of, a gradual transition into adult life. Communications should also be clear that the payment does not preclude care leavers from receiving Continuing Care.

[5] See Scottish Government (2016) Guidance on Part 10 (Aftercare) of the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014, paragraphs 37 and 38. A 'care leaver' is a young person who meets the descriptions set out in section 29 and section 30 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995 (as amended by section 66 of the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014). From 1 April 2015 a care leaver is a young person who ceased to be looked after on, or at any time after, their sixteenth birthday. This replaces the previous definition of 'a young person who ceased to be looked after on or after the minimum school leaving age'.

[6] Different organisations define 'care experienced' in slightly different ways. The Care Inspectorate defines it as 'a child, young person or adult who is, or who has been, looked after [by the local authority] at some point in their childhood'. The Scottish Framework for Fair Access defines it as referring to 'anyone who has been or is currently in care/looked after background at any stage of their life, no matter the length of time. This includes adopted children who were previously looked after. This care may have been provided in one of many different settings, such as in residential care/ foster care/ kinship care or being looked after at home with a supervision requirement'.

[7] As part of the Keeping the Promise Implementation Plan (Chapter 7), the Scottish Government has made a commitment to develop a universal and inclusive definition of 'care experience'.

- Finally, some respondents pointed out that experiences of being in care vary greatly for young people, and not everyone wants other people to know that they have been in care. For these young people, 'care leaver' is a stigmatising label.

**Suggested alternative names**

3.12 Regardless of their answers to the closed question, respondents often suggested alternative names for the proposed Care Leaver Payment. In some cases, these suggestions were general in nature – for example, some thought the name should incorporate the concepts of 'independence', 'transition' or 'future' (rather than 'leaving care'). Other suggestions were that it should include 'young people' in the name, or that the name should make clear that it is a 'one-off' payment.

3.13 As discussed above, respondents often wanted to avoid the term 'care leaver' altogether. Others wanted the payment to be refocused on young people with care experience (e.g. those aged 15–26), rather than care leavers.

3.14 Specific suggestions were:

- Care Transition Payment
- Transitions Payment
- Transition Support Payment
- Support Grant
- Care Experienced Payment
- Care Experienced Young Person's Grant
- Care Leaver Payment for 16+
- Financial Assistance as You Move On to Independent Living
- Home Start-up Payment
- Independent Living Payment.

3.15 Finally, organisational respondents of all types urged the Scottish Government to consult children, young people, and young adults with care experience about the name to ensure it is suitable and sounds 'comfortable' for the intended recipients.

## Can the payment fulfil its purpose? (Q2)

3.16 Question 2 asked respondents if they thought the payment can fulfil the purpose for which it is intended – that is, to help reduce some of the financial barriers that young people face when moving on from care into adulthood and more independent living. Table 3.2 shows that, overall, 48% of respondents thought the payment can fulfil the purpose set out and 14% thought it cannot. The remaining 38% of respondents said they were unsure.

3.17 Around two-fifths of organisations (43%) and half of individuals (52%) thought the payment can fulfil the purpose set out. However, organisations were more likely to say they were 'unsure' than to answer 'yes' to this question. Compared to organisations, a relatively large proportion of individuals (1 in 5) thought the payment **cannot** fulfil its purpose.

**Table 3.2: Q2 – Do you think the payment can fulfil the purpose set out?**

| Respondent type | Yes | | No | | Unsure | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Organisations | 13 | 43% | 3 | 10% | 14 | 47% | 30 | 100% |
| Individuals | 17 | 52% | 6 | 18% | 10 | 30% | 33 | 100% |
| **Total, all respondents** | **30** | **48%** | **9** | **14%** | **24** | **38%** | **63** | **100%** |

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

3.18 Respondents were asked to explain their answers and altogether, 59 respondents – 34 organisations and 25 individuals – provided further comments.

### Respondents thought the payment CAN fulfil the purpose intended

3.19 Those who answered 'yes' at Question 2 generally thought that the payment would be welcomed by young people with care experience and that it would help reduce some of the financial barriers this group face when leaving care. However, respondents who answered 'yes' also often expressed caveats, saying the payment would only fulfil its purpose if a range of supports and other financial assistance were also made available.

### Respondents thought the payment CANNOT fulfil the purpose intended

3.20 Those who answered 'no' generally did so because they thought a payment of £2,000 was insufficient ('like putting a plaster on a broken leg'), or unlikely to have a significant positive effect on the lives of young people leaving care. Some individuals in this group suggested that young care leavers do not need money; rather, they need other types of support (such as 'therapeutic support' or 'mental health services'). Those who answered 'no' were also concerned that young people receiving this amount of money without supervision or support would be at risk of financial exploitation or other potential harms.

### Respondents were UNSURE if the payment can fulfil its purpose

3.21 Some of those who answered 'unsure' thought the payment would be a helpful contribution to the financial challenges care leavers face, but was unlikely to entirely fulfil its intended purpose. That is, it would not, by itself, address the longer-term financial barriers encountered by young people with care experience. Others thought that a one-off payment may not be the **best** way to reduce financial barriers. These respondents thought such a payment could, in fact, be detrimental if the right support was not provided to help young people make good use of it.

3.22 Some respondents also questioned who would define the specific purpose(s) of the payment and who would determine if the purpose(s) had been fulfilled after payments had been made.

### Caveats to respondents' views

3.23 Irrespective of how respondents answered the initial closed question, they often made similar points in their comments saying that the extent to which the payment is able to fulfil its purpose will depend on: (i) providing guidance, support, and advice alongside

any financial payment to young people with care experience, and (ii) providing a wider range of financial support to young people with care experience.

3.24 Both of these points are discussed in detail later in this report. (See Chapters 6 and 9 for a discussion of respondents' views on the support that should be made available to payment recipients, and Chapter 11 for a discussion about the wider financial support needed by young people with care experience.)

# 4 Eligibility criteria (Q9 to Q11)

4.1 This chapter presents respondents' views on who should be eligible for the Care Leaver Payment.

4.2 The consultation paper explained that the Scottish Government proposed that people leaving care from the age of 16 will be eligible to apply for the Care Leaver Payment if they are looked after by a local authority in Scotland at the point of moving on from care. Young people who have been looked after in the following care settings and placement types would be considered eligible to apply:

- Foster care
- Residential care
- Formal kinship care
- Informal kinship care where a Kinship Care Order is in place (as per Section 72 of the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014)
- Secure care
- Those in receipt of Continuing Care – this allows a young person born after 1 April 1999 who is looked after in foster, kinship or residential care to remain in their current placement until they turn 21.

4.3 The consultation paper went on to propose that 'young people moving on from care, aged 16 to 25' will be eligible to apply for and receive the payment.

4.4 The consultation paper contained three questions about the eligibility criteria for the payment.

---

**Question 9:** What are your views on the proposed eligibility criteria for applicants of the payment? Please explain your answer.

**Question 10:** Is there anything else you think the Scottish Government should take into consideration related to eligibility criteria for the Care Leaver Payment? Please share your views.

**Question 11:** What are your views on the proposed age requirements for applicants of the payment? Please explain your answer.

---

4.5 There was no clear separation between the responses offered to each of these three questions. Many respondents provided a full account of their views on eligibility at Question 9 – including their views on any other factors that should be taken into account. In other cases, respondents repeated their views at (each) question, or used the questions interchangeably to provide an account of their views. Therefore, the comments made across the three questions were analysed together and the views expressed are reported in the sections below.

4.6 Altogether, 67 respondents – 34 organisations and 33 individuals – provided comments on one or more of these questions. The views offered are discussed below in two sections which cover, first, views on the eligibility criteria proposed in the consultation paper and, second, other considerations relating to (i) eligibility in specific circumstances and scenarios and (ii) an alternative approach to defining eligibility.

4.7 It should be noted, as discussed earlier (see paragraphs 3.8–3.11), that respondents had concerns about the potential confusion between the use of the terms 'care leaver' (which has a legal definition) and 'care experienced' (which does not). It was noted that a previous iteration of the 'Care Leaver Payment' had referred to the 'Care Experience Grant'. This change of name – and implied change of target group(s) – for the payment introduced a degree of confusion for some respondents when responding to questions about eligibility for the payment.

## Views on eligibility requirements

4.8 Respondents to the questions about eligibility requirements fell into two main groups:

- The first group (the smaller of the two) comprised those individuals and organisations who were **generally satisfied** that the criteria set out in the consultation paper were appropriate.
- The second group (a much larger group) comprised those individuals and organisations who thought that the criteria set out in the consultation paper were **too restrictive** and should be extended in some way.

4.9 In addition:

- One organisational respondent said that the eligibility requirements should be **further restricted**; this respondent said those in informal kinship care where a kinship care order is in place should not be eligible.[8]
- A small number of respondents (and individuals in particular) said that decisions about eligibility should be made on a **'case-by-case'** or **'individual' basis**.

4.10 It should be noted that it was common for respondents (particularly individuals) to say at Question 9 that the suggested eligibility requirements were appropriate, but then to go on – at Question 10 and / or Question 11 – to suggest other groups to whom the payment could or should apply.

[8] It was noted by this respondent that Part 13 of the kinship care guidance (page 13, paragraph 37) states that young people in informal kinship care where a kinship care order is in place, are not looked after children, and that therefore the legislation and regulations governing the care of looked after children do not apply to this group. It was suggested that including these children within the scope of eligibility for the Care Leaver Payment was therefore contradictory to the kinship care guidance and would give rise to inequities and anomalies. The respondent also noted that the inclusion of this group would mean that the eligibility criteria for the Care Leaver Payment would not match the eligibility criteria for other financial support packages, and this could be a further source of confusion.

4.11 The views of each of the two main groups are discussed in turn below, including specific issues relating to the age requirements.

### Views of those who support the suggested eligibility requirements

4.12 Respondents who fully supported the eligibility requirements set out in the consultation paper made comments such as 'eligibility seems appropriate and fair', 'criteria appear to cover all who could benefit', 'seems sensible', or 'agree'. In the main, no further elaboration was offered by these respondents other than to affirm that it was helpful – and straightforward from an implementation / delivery point of view – for (i) the payment to be available to those who met the legal definition of a 'care leaver', and for (ii) the eligibility requirements to align with the requirements for statutory Aftercare and Continuing Care.

### Views of those who thought the eligibility requirements were too restrictive

4.13 It was very common for respondents to suggest that a wider range of individuals should be considered (or could be considered) eligible for the proposed payment when they leave care.[9] The main groups mentioned for inclusion were (i) all young people with experience of care, (ii) those who were looked after at home, (iii) those who were adopted, (iv) all those in informal kinship care (not just those with a kinship care order), and (v) unaccompanied asylum-seeker children. (Note that these groups overlap.) Less often, mention was also made of young people who have been in an abusive home situation, and vulnerable young people.

4.14 Both individual and organisational respondents said they thought there was a 'gap' in the eligibility criteria for **all young people with care experience whose orders ceased before they were 16**. Respondents considered that these young people (whom they sometimes described as being 'on the edges of care') were subject to similar circumstances to those who met the legal definition of a 'care leaver'.

4.15 It was suggested that if eligibility were to be extended to this group, then the criteria could mirror those developed for the Care Experienced Bursary. It was also acknowledged that such an extension would substantially increase the cost of funding all those who would be eligible. One organisation explicitly asserted that eligibility had been restricted to care leavers only for cost reasons.

4.16 There was widespread support from individuals and organisations for including those who had been **looked after at home**. It was noted that there was evidence that these young people often face the greatest barriers and levels of disadvantage.

4.17 There was also widespread support for the inclusion of those who had been **adopted**, who (respondents said) made up 7% of those who had (previous) experience of care.

[9] It should be noted that these suggestions were not always offered in a definitive manner (e.g. 'this group **must** be eligible for the payment'), but rather were put forward as suggestions for consideration (e.g. 'consideration should be given to extending eligibility to this group') or questions (e.g. 'should this group not also be eligible for the payment?')

4.18 Individual and organisational respondents were in favour of extending eligibility to **all those in informal kinship care** arrangements (i.e. those **with and without** kinship care orders). One respondent qualified this view by saying eligibility should apply in cases where the kinship carer was in receipt of benefits.[10]

4.19 One individual and a small number of organisations explicitly mentioned the importance of extending eligibility to **unaccompanied asylum-seeking children** (UASC) – at least to those whose asylum status is undetermined at the point when they leave care. One third sector organisation stated that this eligibility should apply despite possible complications relating to those with no recourse to public funds (NPRF) – in these cases it was suggested that the Care Leaver Payment should be proactively paid in full before they turn 18 or leave care, whichever comes first.

**Specific views on age requirements**

4.20 In general, the views expressed on the age requirements for eligibility flowed from the respondent's perspective on the eligibility criteria more generally. Thus, there were two main perspectives offered, namely that (i) the age requirements set out in the consultation paper were satisfactory, and (ii) the age requirements set out were too restrictive.

4.21 Respondents who were content with the eligibility criteria set out in Question 9 of the consultation paper also supported the age eligibility requirements. Some of these respondents simply said they 'agreed' with the criteria, or that the criteria were 'fine' or 'sensible'. In other cases, respondents in this group went on to elaborate that their agreement was based on the alignment between the age range offered (16–25) and the provision of Aftercare and Continuing Care as set out in the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014.

4.22 Respondents who thought the age requirements set out were too restrictive made the following main points to explain their views:

- Those young people with care experience, who had left care before the age of 16 would not be eligible for the payment. The age requirements should be extended to include all those who had experience of care.
- The age requirements are not in keeping with the aspiration set out within The Promise to provide lifelong (financial and other) support to those with experience of care.
- It might take some time for individuals who were eligible for a payment to (i) become aware of their eligibility and (ii) submit an application. The cut-off should therefore be extended to 26 (rather than 25) to allow more time for individuals to apply. This reason was raised particularly in relation to individuals who might be leaving secure care or a Young Offenders Institution.

[10] Note that one third sector organisation said young people with a kinship care order are currently excluded from Continuing Care and gave this as a reason for agreeing with the criteria proposed in the consultation paper.

- Young people with care experience require lifelong financial support due to the well documented and well evidenced difficulties that they have experienced. Arbitrary cut-offs are not helpful in this regard.
- Some flexibility to accommodate individual (and exceptional) circumstances beyond the suggested cut-off of age 25 would be important.

4.23 It should be noted that respondents often discussed the age the individual should be when the payment is **received**, rather than the age the individual should be in order to be **eligible** for the payment. In this context, respondents sometimes argued that 16 was too young to receive the payment (and / or too young for any individual to leave care) and sometimes suggested, relatedly, that the payment should only be available to those over 18, or over 21, or that the payment should be 'deferred'. (See also the discussion in Chapter 5 on this issue.)

## Other considerations regarding eligibility

4.24 Beyond the discussion of the proposed eligibility requirements as set out in the consultation paper, respondents identified two other areas which they thought required further consideration. These were (i) whether or not eligibility would apply in (a range of) specific scenarios and circumstances and (ii) whether there should be an alternative approach to defining eligibility. Each of these is discussed briefly below.

### Eligibility in specific circumstances

4.25 Respondents described a range of scenarios and circumstances where they were unsure whether eligibility (as described in the consultation paper proposals) would apply. These included situations in which young people:

- Have a supported carer placement when they are aged 16 or over
- Are in secure care on offence grounds, and / or where their appeal rights have been exhausted
- Are in 'less formal' care arrangements
- Have Additional Support Needs (ASN) including those who are boarding in specialised accommodation
- Have recently had a compulsory supervision order removed
- Are currently in receipt of Aftercare.

### An alternative approach to defining eligibility

4.26 Finally, one organisational respondent offered a different (and they thought, more straightforward) approach to defining eligibility for the payment. This respondent suggested that the payment should cover all individuals who (i) 'had been previously looked after away from home' and (ii) 'had left care on or after their 16th birthday'. Note, however, that this suggested approach would not include young people who had been looked after at home, or young people who had left care before their 16th birthday.

# 5 Payment amount and processes (Q3 to Q6)

5.1 This chapter discusses respondents' views on certain aspects of the implementation of the proposed Care Leaver Payment.

5.2 The consultation paper explained that the Scottish Government had previously proposed a Care Experience Grant involving an annual payment of £200 for 10 years. However, following consultation with stakeholders, the name of the grant was changed to Care Leaver Payment, and payment was now conceived of as a single lump sum of £2,000. This change takes account of the current cost of living, the likely limited impact of annual payments of £200, and the potential administrative challenges of delivering payments over a period of 10 years without a re-application process.

5.3 Four questions asked respondents for their views on the revised approach and aspects of its implementation, including how the payment is made, at what point the payment should be made, and whether care leavers would benefit from a choice in relation to the payment arrangements.

---

**Question 3:** What are your views on the revised approach proposed by the Scottish Government? Please share your views.

**Question 4:** How helpful would a payment of £2,000 be at the point of moving on from care? [Not at all helpful / Somewhat helpful / Helpful / Very helpful]

Please explain your answer.

**Question 5:** Would it be beneficial for applicants to have a choice in how their payment is made? For example, having the payment made in instalments of smaller amounts over a period of time rather than as a lump sum. [Yes / No / Unsure]

Please explain your answer and provide any suggestions you have.

**Question 6:** At what point would it be most helpful for care leavers to receive the payment? [In preparation of moving on from care / At the point of moving on from care / Within one year of moving on from care / Within 18 months of moving on from care / Other]

Please explain your answer and provide any other suggestions you have.

---

## Proposed approach (Q3)

5.4 Question 3 asked respondents for their views on the revised approach proposed by the Scottish Government (i.e. a single lump sum payment of £2,000, rather than instalments of £200 over 10 years). This was an open question and, altogether, 67 respondents – 35 organisations and 32 individuals – made comments. The discussion below focuses on: (i) views on the revised approach and (ii) concerns about potential unintended consequences and how these may be addressed.

### Views on the revised approach

5.5 In general, respondents thought the revised proposal of a single lump sum payment of £2,000 was better than the initial proposal of £200 annual payments over a period of 10 years. Respondents described the change as 'sensible', 'practical' 'more inclusive', 'more beneficial to young people', helping to promote 'dignity, fairness and respect', and offering 'better value for money'. They thought the original proposal of instalments over a 10-year period would have had limited impact and was unlikely to achieve the intended purpose of the payment (i.e. to reduce the financial barriers for young people leaving care). Some respondents said the revised approach demonstrated a high level of trust in young people – which was seen to be positive.

5.6 Some respondents also said the revised proposal of a one-off lump sum payment would be easier to administer, whereas the original proposal of payments in instalments over 10 years was described as 'impractical' with a heavy administrative burden.

5.7 Less often, respondents expressed reservations about the revised approach, saying that a £2,000 lump sum may not be spent appropriately by some young people and / or would put them at risk of financial exploitation. These respondents generally favoured the original proposal of annual payments of £200 over 10 years.

5.8 There was also a suggestion that the Scottish Government should publish any analysis or research on how the proposed level of payment (£2,000) had been arrived at. A question was also raised about whether any projections had been made for inflation-based increases to the payment over time.

### Potential unintended consequences and how these can be addressed

5.9 While most respondents supported the revised approach, they also repeatedly expressed concerns – raising similar points to those who had reservations. In particular, they suggested that:

- Some young people will find it difficult to manage such a large sum of money.
- Some young people might be put at risk by a large one-off payment.
- The payment could have a negative effect on access to other financial support.

5.10 All of these issues are covered in detail in Chapter 8 where respondents' views on the potential negative impacts of the Care Leaver Payment are discussed.

## Helpfulness of the payment (Q4)

5.11 Question 4 asked respondents for their views about how helpful a payment of £2,000 would be to a young person at the point of moving on from care. Table 5.1 shows that, overall, 37% of respondents thought such a payment would be 'very helpful', 25% thought it would be 'helpful', 30% thought it would be 'somewhat helpful', and 8% thought it would be 'not at all helpful'.

5.12 Individuals were more likely than organisations to think the payment would be 'very helpful' (52% of individuals, compared with 20% of organisations). Individuals were also

more likely than organisations to think it would be 'not at all helpful' (15% of individuals, compared with 0% of organisations). By contrast, organisations were much more likely than individuals to choose the intermediate options ('helpful' or 'somewhat helpful') – 4 out of 5 organisations (80%) chose one of these options compared to a third (33%) of individuals.

**Table 4.1: Q4 – How helpful would a payment of £2,000 be at the point of moving on from care?**

| | Very helpful | | Helpful | | Somewhat helpful | | Not at all helpful | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Respondent type** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| Organisations | 6 | 20% | 10 | 33% | 14 | 47% | 0 | 0% | 30 | 100% |
| Individuals | 17 | 52% | 6 | 18% | 5 | 15% | 5 | 15% | 33 | 100% |
| **Total, all respondents** | **23** | **37%** | **16** | **25%** | **19** | **30%** | **5** | **8%** | **63** | **100%** |

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

5.13 Respondents were asked to explain their answers and, altogether, 61 respondents – 32 organisations and 29 individuals – provided comments.

5.14 Very similar comments were made by those who answered 'very helpful', 'helpful' and 'somewhat helpful'. Thus, the views of these three groups are discussed together below, followed by a brief summary of the points made by those (5) individuals who thought the payment would be 'not at all helpful'.

### A payment of £2,000 would be very helpful, helpful or somewhat helpful

5.15 As mentioned above, similar views were expressed among respondents who thought a £2,000 payment would be very helpful, helpful or somewhat helpful. This group thought the payment had the **potential** to be helpful, but the extent to which it **is** helpful, in reality, would depend on a number of factors.

5.16 Some thought a payment at this level would help mitigate financial pressures for care leavers and give them a degree of security that they would not otherwise have. Others noted that local authorities already give young care leavers a grant to pay for basic essentials in furnishing a flat but said that the proposed Care Leaver Payment would give young people greater choice, allow them to buy better quality items, and give them the means to personalise their homes.

5.17 Respondents who thought a £2,000 payment would be helpful also frequently expressed caveats, saying that, to a large extent, the impact of the payment would depend on each individual's circumstances and their willingness (if needed) to accept advice and support. Some respondents, who thought the payment would be 'somewhat helpful', pointed out that, in the current economic climate, £2,000 would not go very far in covering the costs of rent, food and energy. These respondents repeatedly said that the extent to which the Care Leaver Payment is helpful would depend on:

- Clearly defined parameters for its use

- Support being provided to help young people budget and manage the money
- The relationship between this payment and other financial support given to care leavers
- Other existing financial entitlements not being reduced or withdrawn
- The young person's circumstances at the point of moving on from care.

5.18 Respondents thought that, to be most helpful, the Care Leaver Payment must be one part of a package of holistic support for young care leavers that includes ongoing relationship-based advice and guidance, sufficient social security benefits, supported employment opportunities and access to good accommodation.

**A payment of £2,000 would NOT be helpful**

5.19 Respondents (five individuals) who thought a payment of £2,000 would **not** be helpful largely echoed the caveats noted above in explaining their reservations and concerns. This group argued that young people leaving care would not be able to manage such a large sum of money appropriately, and that these young people needed more than 'a cheque and a pat on the head'. These respondents were concerned that young care leavers would spend the money and be left with 'nothing to show for it'.

## Applicant choice in how the payment is made (Q5)

5.20 Question 5 asked respondents if they thought it would be beneficial for applicants to have a choice in **how** their payment is made. The example was given of having the payment made in instalments over a period of time, rather than as a lump sum payment, as currently proposed by the Scottish Government.

5.21 Table 5.2 shows that, overall, 85% of respondents thought it would be beneficial for applicants to have a choice in how their payment is made, and 6% thought it would not. The remaining 9% of respondents were unsure.

5.22 Although large majorities of both organisations (91%) and individuals (79%) thought it would be beneficial for applicants to have a choice in how their payments were made, individuals (12%) were more likely than organisations (0%) to say it would not be beneficial.

**Table 5.2: Q5 – Would it be beneficial for applicants to have a choice in how their payment is made?**

| | Yes | | No | | Unsure | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Respondent type** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| Organisations | 29 | 91% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 9% | 32 | 100% |
| Individuals | 26 | 79% | 4 | 12% | 3 | 9% | 33 | 100% |
| **Total, all respondents** | **55** | **85%** | **4** | **6%** | **6** | **9%** | **65** | **100%** |

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

5.23 Respondents were invited to explain their answers and to provide any suggestions that they had and, altogether, 60 respondents – 32 organisations and 28 individuals – offered comments. The discussion here focuses first on the views of those who thought it would be beneficial for applicants to have a choice in how their payments were made. The views of those who said it would **not** be beneficial and the views of those who were not sure are presented afterwards. This is then followed by specific suggestions respondents made about how to deliver the payment in a way that would maximise the benefit for young care leavers.

**Choice in how their payment is made will be beneficial**

5.24 Many of the respondents who answered 'yes' at Question 5 did not explain their views in any detail. Instead, they simply reiterated that those who are the intended recipients of the payment should have a choice, and payments should be made in a way that suits the young person's circumstances and needs.

5.25 However, some referred to Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), saying that children have the right to express their views freely in all matters affecting them and that these views should be given due weight in decision-making. In addition, some respondents noted that giving young people a choice would align with the values and principles of Getting It Right for Every Child (GIRFEC). In addition, they pointed out that a core principle of The Promise is that children and young people are listened to and involved meaningfully and appropriately in decision-making about their care. Respondents saw this type of choice as a way of empowering young people and allowing them to take appropriate risks on their journey to independence.

5.26 A range of other points were also made by respondents who answered 'yes' at Question 5, including that:

- Some young people may be overwhelmed by such a large lump sum and prefer to receive smaller amounts spread out over a period of time.
- The needs and circumstances of young people are different; this should be reflected in the way the payment is made.
- Giving young people a choice about how and when the payment is made would enable conversations with staff about how the payment will be used, thus encouraging greater financial responsibility.
- Having the option to pay in instalments would help reduce the risks of exploitation associated with receiving a large lump sum payment.

5.27 There was also a view that, given the relatively low numbers of young people leaving care each year, it ought to be possible to have bespoke arrangements for each individual.

**Choice in how the payment is made will not (or may not necessarily) be beneficial**

5.28 Among respondents who answered 'no' or 'unsure' at Question 5, the main theme in the comments was that it would potentially be too complicated administratively to give young people a choice in how their payment is made. It was suggested that it could be

challenging for local authorities to provide this level of flexibility. One third sector organisation thought it would 'probably be impossible within current capacity'. The point was made that managing instalments would be complex and could be further complicated by the nature of the relationship between the individual and the local authority (which might also change over time).

5.29 Separately, it was also suggested that young people were unlikely to choose to have the payment made in instalments. Most young people, it was suggested, would prefer to have a lump sum payment.

**Suggestions regarding how the payment is made**

5.30 Respondents made a variety of suggestions for how flexibility could be built into the delivery of the payment. It was relatively common for respondents to suggest that young people should apply for the funds for specific purposes (possibly linked to the eight wellbeing indicators[11]), thus ensuring that they have a plan for the money before receiving it. Other suggestions included:

- Administering the funds using a model similar to that of Self-Directed Support.
- Offering 12 monthly instalments, two annual instalments, or 24 monthly instalments. (There was a view that any timescale longer than 24 months was unlikely to be helpful to care leavers.)
- Giving applicants until the age of 26 to claim up to £2,000, with any remaining balance paid to the young person on their 26th birthday.

## Timing of payment (Q6)

5.31 Question 6 asked respondents about the point it would be most helpful for care leavers to receive the payment. Four options were given: (i) in preparation of moving on from care, (ii) at the point of moving on from care, (iii) within one year of moving on from care, and (iv) within 18 months of moving on from care. Respondents could also tick 'other' if they wanted to suggest another point in time. To simplify the presentation of the results, options (iii) and (iv) above – each of which was chosen by a very small number of respondents – have been combined into a single category in Table 5.3.

5.32 Table 5.3 shows that, overall, around a third of respondents (34%) said it would be most helpful for care leavers to receive the payment in preparation of moving on, 11% thought it should be received at the point of moving on, and 10% thought it should be received within 12 to 18 months of moving on. However, the largest proportion of respondents (44%) answered 'other' in response to this question.

5.33 There were differences in the way organisations and individuals answered this question: most individuals (75% in total) selected one of the three timing options offered, while most organisations (about two-thirds, 68%) selected 'other'.

[11] The eight wellbeing indicators are: Safe, Healthy, Achieving, Nurtured, Active, Respected, Responsible and Included. These are often referred to using the acronym SHARNARRI.

**Table 5.3: Q6 – At what point would it be most helpful for care leavers to receive the payment?**

| | In preparation of moving on | | At point of moving on | | Within 12 to 18 months | | Other | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Respondent type** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| Organisations | 8 | 29% | 1 | 4% | 0 | 0% | 19 | 68% | 28 | 100% |
| Individuals | 13 | 39% | 6 | 18% | 6 | 18% | 8 | 24% | 33 | 100% |
| **Total, all respondents** | **21** | **34%** | **7** | **11%** | **6** | **10%** | **27** | **44%** | **61** | **100%** |

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

5.34 Respondents were asked to explain their answer and provide any other suggestions that they had. Altogether, 61 respondents – 32 organisations and 29 individuals – offered comments. These included several who did not answer the closed question but whose comments largely echoed those who selected 'other'.

5.35 The sections below provide a summary of these views of those who selected each of the options set out in the consultation question.

**The payment should be given in preparation of moving on**

5.36 The key point made by respondents who selected this option was that having the payment at this stage would provide an opportunity for, and enable conversations about, financial management with the young person while they are still in care. It would also allow the young person to plan and factor in the payment as they make decisions about future accommodation.

5.37 Some who selected this option said that they thought young people should have the choice of when the payment is received. However, in their view, the point at which it is likely to be most useful to the young person is when they are preparing to move on from care. There was a view among this group that an early payment (i.e. before leaving care) would also reduce the risk of any administrative delays in receiving the payment.

**The payment should be given at the point of moving on**

5.38 Most respondents who selected this option were individuals; there was just one organisation in this group. These respondents echoed some of the points made above. They noted that young people leaving care have many financial challenges, particularly if they are taking on their own tenancy for the first time. Thus, increased financial support at this point would be of most benefit, enabling young people to create a safe and stable home of their own.

5.39 While this group thought the Care Leaver Payment would be of most benefit to young people at the point of moving on from care, there was also a concern that some young people may decide to move on **before** they are really ready, knowing that there is a considerable sum of money available to them to do so.

5.40 Like the group discussed above, some respondents also said that they thought young people should be able to choose when to receive the payment. However, they also thought a later payment would be less likely to achieve the policy intention of reducing the financial barriers that young people face when they move on from care, resulting in more young people facing financial hardship for a longer period of time.

**The payment should be given within 12 or 18 months of moving on**

5.41 Just six individuals selected the option of having the Care Leaver Payment made within 12 or 18 months of moving on from care, and just four of these provided comments to explain their answers. This group made several different points and, in each case, the point was made by one or two people:

- Not all young people will be 'ready' to receive a large payment at the point at which they leave care. There was a concern that some would 'blow' the money and be left with nothing to show for it.
- Young people will be more mature 18 months after leaving care and will make better financial choices.
- Local authorities already provide financial support to young people at the point at which they move on from care to help them set up their own home. This support should continue to be provided. Any new additional funding will be more useful to young people around a year after leaving care.
- Having access to the payment 12 or 18 months after leaving care provides greater flexibility in spending the money.

**Other views about the timing of the payment**

5.42 The two main points made by respondents who selected 'other' at Question 6 were that (i) the payment should be given to young people at a time of their choosing, and (ii) the Scottish Government should consult young people on this matter.

5.43 As noted previously, some organisational respondents had engaged with young people in care and care leavers to inform their response to the consultation. These respondents reported that there was not a consensus on the preferred timing of the payment among the young people they consulted. Rather, young people suggested that the **best** time for the payment will be different for different individuals. Therefore, there should be flexibility in the timing of the payment, and a 'one-size-fits-all' approach should be avoided.

5.44 Occasionally, respondents who selected 'other' made specific suggestions about when the payment should be made available to young care leavers. In most cases, they suggested it should be made anytime up to age 26. However, there was also a view that the payment should be made at age 21, by which time (it was suggested) most young people will have matured and have better decision-making skills. A third view was that it should be given to them in instalments on their birthday over 10 years.

5.45 Two further points were made by this group:

- First, it was also suggested that consideration needs to be given to the timing of the Care Leaver Payment for children and young people who may be in secure care or in prison at the time of leaving care.
- Second, young people should be encouraged to remain in their placements (through Continuing Care arrangements) until the age of 21. Those who opt to do so should be able to claim their Care Leaver Payment after moving on from Continuing Care.

# 6 Application process and support (Q14 to Q17)

6.1 This chapter presents respondents' views regarding the application process and the requirements applicants might have for support during the process.

6.2 The consultation paper explained that the Scottish Government is considering which body or organisation could best deliver the proposed Care Leaver Payment. To help inform this decision, consideration is being given to how the application process and receipt of payment will be experienced by the applicants. The Scottish Government is also considering what type of support may be needed by young people at the point at which they apply for the payment. There were four questions on these topics.

**Question 14:** What should the experience of applying for and receiving the proposed Care Leaver Payment look and feel like for applicants? Please share your views.

**Question 15:** Do you think young people should have support to apply for the payment? [Yes / No / Unsure]

**Question 16:** What support might a young person need when applying for the payment? Please share your views.

**Question 17:** How should this support be provided? Please share your views.

## What should the application process look and feel like? (Q14)

6.3 Question 14 which asked what the experience of applying for and receiving the proposed Care Leaver Payment should look and feel like for applicants. This was an open question and altogether 63 respondents – 33 organisations and 30 individuals – provided comments. The views expressed are discussed below.

6.4 It should be noted that a range of respondents (both individuals and organisations) did not agree that there should be an 'application process' of any kind. Rather, they suggested that it was more appropriate that anyone who was eligible should simply **receive this payment automatically** at the point at which they were leaving care. It was thought that responsibility for identifying eligible recipients should lie with the local authority, and in particular with social workers, key workers or other professionals who were involved with the young person. Respondents suggested the Care Leaver Payment could be managed in a similar way to Section 29 payments and could form part of the pathway planning process which is undertaken for all young people leaving care.[12]

6.5 The other comments at this question covered (i) involving diverse groups of young people in the design of the application process, (ii) the importance of a personalised approach, (iii) the requirements for the application process to be straightforward, non-

[12] Section 29 of the 1995 Act outlines the type of support to be provided to care leavers eligible for Aftercare. This may include assistance 'in kind or in cash'.

stigmatising and based on a human rights approach, and (iv) learning from other schemes. Each of these aspects is described in further detail below.

6.6 Note that in their comments at Question 14, respondents also anticipated the questions which followed (Qs 15–17) which asked about the nature of any support required for those going through the application process. These comments are included in the analysis which follows (see paragraphs 6.13–6.28 below).

**Involve diverse groups of young people in designing the application process**

6.7 A range of respondents emphasised the importance of involving young people – particularly those with care experience and those who would be most likely to face barriers in applying (e.g. those in secure accommodation, those in conflict with the law, unaccompanied asylum-seeking children, etc.) – in the design of the application process.

**Adopt a personalised approach**

6.8 It was common for both individual and organisational respondents to state that it was vital that the application process should be 'person-centred' and take into account the specific needs of the individual. This would mean ensuring that any vulnerabilities of the individual applicant were accommodated within the application process. Such vulnerabilities might relate to cognitive ability and literacy levels, health needs, past experience and any trauma-related issues, as well as any practical requirements (e.g. access to the internet and / or a laptop, whether the young person has a bank account, their requirement for a cash payment, etc.).

**Establish a straightforward and non-stigmatising process**

6.9 Both individual and organisational respondents repeatedly emphasised the need for the application process to be (i) straightforward and (ii) non-stigmatising. This meant that the application process:

- Should not use jargon, confusing words, or technical language
- Should involve minimal paperwork (no more than two sides of A4 was suggested), and should be easy to complete
- Should be available to complete either in paper or online
- Should not require the applicant to supply any detailed personal or intrusive information relating to their past experience or current circumstances, so as not to trigger any adverse (and potentially trauma-related) reaction
- Should be designed using 'trauma-informed' approaches and should emphasise the (human rights) principles of dignity and respect
- Should allow the applicant to feel in control of the process – and assure applicants that this payment is an **entitlement**
- Should identify a clear communication pathway (i.e. the application process should clearly identify the (email or postal) address to which application should be submitted and should alert the applicant to the way(s) in which further information would be

sent / received throughout the application process, including information about receipt of the payment).

6.10 In addition, it should be made clear from the outset (i) how long it will take until the applicant will receive the payment, and (ii) how the payment will be made.

**Learn from other schemes**

6.11 Respondents noted a variety of other schemes which had been in operation for some time, which could provide learning in relation to the application process for the Care Leaver Payment. There was positive mention in this regard of the Care Experienced Bursary, and the basic income pilot in Wales. It was also suggested that lessons could be learned from the council tax exemption scheme for care leavers and from the Care Experienced Flexible Fund.[13]

6.12 A small number of respondents noted that many care leavers did not access the Aftercare or Continuing Care services to which they were entitled. It was suggested that there may be lessons from the roll out of these schemes which could inform the development of the Care Leaver Payment application process to encourage greater take-up.

## Should young people have support to apply? (Q15)

6.13 The consultation paper explained that the Scottish Government proposes that support is offered to those who need it when applying for the Care Leaver Payment. Question 15 asked respondents if they thought young people should have such support when applying. This was a closed question with no space for comments. However, two follow-up questions (Q16 and Q17) invited views about the type of support that should be made available, and how it should be provided.

6.14 Table 8.1 shows that there was virtually unanimous agreement that young people should have support to apply for the payment. Overall, 97% of respondents selected this option. Just two respondents (one organisation and one individual) said they were 'unsure' whether young people should be able to access such support.

**Table 8.1: Q15 – Do you think young people should have support to apply for the payment?**

| | Yes | | No | | Unsure | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Respondent type** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| Organisations | 31 | 97% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 3% | 32 | 100% |
| Individuals | 32 | 97% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 3% | 33 | 100% |
| **Total, all respondents** | **63** | **97%** | **0** | **0%** | **2** | **3%** | **65** | **100%** |

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

[13] The Care Experienced Flexible Fund for care leavers was launched by Stirling Council in 2022.

## What support would be needed and how should it be provided? (Q16 and Q17)

6.15 As indicated in the answers to Question 15, it was almost universally agreed that young people should have support to apply for the payment. The kind of support which would be needed, and the means by which it would be provided are discussed in turn below.

6.16 Altogether, 64 respondents – 33 organisations and 31 individuals – provided comments on one or other of these questions.

### What support would be needed?

6.17 Both individual and organisational respondents highlighted that the level of support needed would vary substantially – fairly limited support would be required for some individuals and intensive support for others.[14] Respondents said it was likely that more intensive support would be required by those who had specific needs including those with literacy issues, those who lacked capacity, those with learning difficulties, those who were neurodivergent, and those for whom English was not their first language.

6.18 Both individual and organisational respondents identified three main aspects of the process for which support would be required, namely (i) accessing (potentially) an online portal, (ii) navigating the system, and (iii) completing the form / application including identifying and accessing any supplementary information required to support an application. Each of these is described further below.

6.19 Respondents said it should not be assumed that young people who were eligible for the payment would have access to a computer, laptop or other device or equipment from which they could **access an online portal** (note that respondents generally assumed that there would be an online application process). Thus, arrangements for access to an online portal would have to be put in place in some cases.

6.20 Young people who were eligible for the payment might require assistance to **navigate an online system**. This would involve support to ensure that the individual was able to login to the system, that each section of the application process was completed in full, that any additional documents required could be uploaded, and that the application was submitted in line with requirements.[15]

6.21 Respondents repeatedly emphasised that support would be required in relation to the practicalities of **completing the online form / application and identifying, accessing, and submitting any supplementary documents or information** which might be required. Specific areas mentioned by respondents included support with (i) confirming their eligibility for the payment / confirming their status as a care leaver, (ii) providing ID details such as proof of address, or bank account details, (iii) providing any financial

[14] Note that one organisation said it was not possible to comment on what support would be needed without further specific details of the application process.

[15] Note that it was suggested that a useful feature for the application process would be the ability for an applicant to save their work as they went along, and to return to it at a later date.

information required, and (iv) understanding any technical or legal terminology used in the application process.

6.22 Note that respondents also discussed at this question (Q16) the importance of having support available (i) in advance of the application process to help the young person plan what they intended to spend the payment on, (ii) to help understand the timescales involved in making the application and receiving the payment, (iii) for any applicants who were deemed – following their application – to be ineligible for the payment, and (iv) for wider issues relating to leaving care. The latter point (around support for wider issues relating to leaving care) is dealt with more fully in relation to Question 18 (Chapter 9) below.

6.23 Finally, one organisation suggested that the payment should be accessed by a professional on behalf of the young person (rather than by the young person themselves). In addition, one individual suggested that the application form should be in two parts with the first part completed by the young person, and the second part completed by their key worker.

**How should support be provided?**

6.24 In a small number of cases, respondents provided prescriptive views about who should be involved in providing support saying, for example, 'support should be provided by the local authority' or 'government should not get involved in providing support'.

6.25 More commonly, however, respondents made more general statements, saying that support for those applying for the payment should be provided in the way which best suited the specific individual. Thus, in general, respondents focused on the importance of (i) choice for the individual applicant, (ii) flexibility in terms of the delivery of any support, and (iii) an individualised and person-centred approach to the provision of support. A small number of respondents said explicitly that all the support provided should be cost-free.

6.26 Given this focus on personalised support, respondents enumerated a wide range of individuals and organisations who might be involved in providing support in any individual case depending on the circumstances. These included:

- Individuals who are trusted by the young person, who offer 'relationship-based support', and who know and care about them, including key workers, advisors, support workers, mentors, pathways coordinators, family members, intandem coordinators, corporate parenting partners, foster carers, kinship carers, schoolteachers, etc.
- Designated groups and teams who have statutory responsibilities for looked after children and young people, including social work teams, welfare rights teams, poverty teams, corporate parents, Throughcare and Aftercare teams, etc.
- Local services including independent advocacy services, financial inclusion services, Citizens Advice Bureaux, Money Advice Scotland, banks, public libraries, schools, housing offices, job centres, youth organisations, community groups, etc.

- National agencies including Social Security Scotland and the Department of Work and Pensions
- The Care Leaver Payment administering / delivery body (as yet unknown).

6.27 Given the focus on flexibility and personalised support, respondents also mentioned a wide range of delivery options for support including:

- Written and verbal guidance and information delivered in an accessible format (i.e. easy to read, easy to understand, friendly, trauma-informed)
- Face-to-face (both one-to-one and workshops), telephone and online options (including chat box functions and a tailored app)
- Professional and educational materials.

6.28 Respondents emphasised that the delivery of the support should be undertaken within the context of a dedicated and fully resourced service, and that young people should be involved in decisions about how any support service is structured.

# 7 Applicant income and eligibility for other financial support (Q12 and Q13)

7.1 This chapter presents respondents' views regarding any impact an individual's income should have on their eligibility for a Care Leaver Payment and whether receipt of this payment should impact on any other financial support they receive.

7.2 The Scottish Government proposed that an individual's income should have no impact on their eligibility for the Care Leaver Payment, and that the payment should not affect their entitlement to other types of support – for example, support received through the benefits system. The consultation contained two questions inviting views on these issues.

**Question 12:** What are your views on an applicant's income impacting their eligibility for the payment? Please explain your answer.

**Question 13:** What are your views on this payment impacting an individual's entitlement to other support? Please explain your answer.

## Applicant income and effect on eligibility for payment (Q12)

7.3 Question 12 asked for views about whether an applicant's income should have an impact on their eligibility for a Care Leaver Payment. This was an open question and, altogether, 66 respondents – 33 organisations and 33 individuals – provided comments. The views expressed are discussed below.

7.4 There was virtually unanimous support for the proposal that an individual's income should have no impact on their eligibility for the Care Leaver Payment. Just three (3) individuals dissented from this view.

7.5 A range of respondents (both organisations and individuals) simply said they agreed with the proposal. The following main points were made by those who went on to elaborate their views:

- Means testing can lead to low uptake (as providing personal information can be perceived as intrusive and uncomfortable), social stigma, and unnecessary bureaucracy, and would affect individuals in the 'middle of the income spectrum' who could genuinely benefit from the payment. In relation to the point about the deterrent effect of bureaucracy, evidence was cited that young people with care experience are already missing out on financial support that they are entitled to because it can be too difficult to find out about what support is available and to submit a claim.
- Young people moving on from care may be in a precarious financial situation which means that (i) any assessment of their (true) financial situation would be difficult to do properly and might be misrepresented, and (ii) the administrative cost of undertaking such an assessment could be large (and by implication not worthwhile).

- It would be unfair and wrong to penalise individuals who had worked hard (at school and / or college / university) so that they could get a job with a good salary.
- It would be wrong to create an additional barrier for young people leaving care. The payment should come with no conditions; it should not be taxable or seen as income (either for the young person themselves, or for their carer).
- This proposal (i.e. that an individual's income should have no impact on their eligibility) simply mirrors the scenario for other young people – who receive financial support from their families as they move into independent living.

7.6 Two individuals who dissented from this view said (i) that the payment should be means tested, and (ii) that it should not be available if young people have an income such as a college bursary or other income (a threshold of £25k was suggested). A third individual said that young people leaving care should not receive the payment directly – rather it should be used on their behalf to 'set them up' for leaving care.

## Effect of payment on individual's entitlement to other support (Q13)

7.7 Question 13 asked for views about whether the payment should have an impact on an individual's entitlement to other (financial) support. This was an open question and, altogether, 65 respondents – 34 organisations and 31 individuals – provided comments. The views expressed are discussed below.

7.8 There was virtually unanimous support for the proposal that receipt of this payment should not negatively impact an individual's entitlement to other support. Only one individual dissented from this view.

7.9 A range of respondents (both organisations and individuals) simply said they agreed with the proposal, emphasising that the Care Leaver Payment should be seen as an additional, stand-alone payment which did not replace other support. The following main points were made by those who went on to elaborate their views:

- It would be important to communicate with both local and national organisations in advance of implementing the payment to ensure that their processes and procedures did not disadvantage recipients of the payment. Specific organisations mentioned in this regard included local authorities, Social Security Scotland, Student Awards Agency Scotland, Scottish Funding Council, and Department of Work and Pensions. (Note, however, that one individual expressed scepticism that other organisations would implement the guidance to treat this as a stand-alone, non-taxable payment – they thought it would be used as a reason to hold up any other benefits due.)
- The Care Leaver Payment should have no impact on the individual's entitlement to the following payments: local authority Section 29 payments as well as any other local authority benefits, grants or reductions; the package of support for care leavers offered via the corporate parenting responsibilities of colleges and universities (including the Care Experienced Bursary); Community Care Grants from the Scottish Welfare Fund; Child Benefit payments; Universal Credit; and employability support.

- The Care Leaver Payment should not be considered as part of an individual's taxable income.
- There could be an unintended impact for unaccompanied asylum-seeking children who receive a Care Leaver Payment – because the receipt of the full amount could put recipients over the threshold for legal aid, affecting their ability to make asylum claims. It was suggested that this unintended consequence could be avoided with appropriately drafted legislation.

7.10 The (one) individual who dissented from the majority view said that young people in care 'get a lot financially which leads to unattainable expectations later in life'.

# 8 Impacts of the payment (Q7 to Q8)

8.1 The chapter presents views about the potential impacts of the Care Leaver Payment. The consultation paper included two open questions inviting respondents to discuss both positive and negative impacts.

**Question 7:** What might this payment help young people achieve when they are moving on from care? Please share your views.

**Question 8:** Do you think this payment could have any negative impact on young people leaving care? Please share your views.

## Potential positive impacts of the payment (Q7)

8.2 Question 7 asked what the Care Leaver Payment might help young people to achieve when they are moving on from care. This was an open question and, altogether, 65 respondents – 32 organisations and 33 individuals – provided comments.

8.3 In general, comments focused on a relatively small number of specific areas. Respondents saw potentially positive impacts in relation to:

- **Securing and furnishing accommodation:** including funding deposits for tenancies; payment of rent; purchase of household goods, carpeting, bedding, furnishings, and paint for decoration; being able to 'make their house a home'; or saving for a house deposit
- **Paying for daily living expenses:** including for utilities and other household bills; food and clothing; or a car, bicycle or motorbike
- **Funding education and training:** including driving lessons
- **Supporting the transition into employment:** including helping with travel costs; costs of attending interviews and / or setting up a business; buying tools or equipment for work or a trade
- **Improving wellbeing and establishing and maintaining social connections:** including participating in sport and recreation; joining a gym; having meals out or trips to the cinema; attending gigs; beauty treatments; starting a hobby; buying a computer or other digital device(s); participating in community life; attending counselling; buying art materials; or owning a pet
- **Enabling any other aspirations:** including travelling; taking a gap year; paying for a passport; having a holiday with friends or family; experiencing something they have always wanted; and 'having the opportunity to access their own vision and dreams for themselves'.

8.4 Regarding the last two points, respondents argued that it was important that young people with care experience should be able to spend some of the money on things that will bring joy to their lives, as well as covering more basic needs. This, it was noted, was

consistent with Article 31 of the UNCRC which sets out the right of children to rest, leisure and play. Respondents cautioned against a view that young people with care experience – many of whom will come from deprived communities – may not spend the payment 'responsibly'. Instead, they emphasised that these young people should be treated with respect and given independence and financial freedom to make their own choices, with support from people they known and trust.

8.5 More generally, some respondents said that the Care Leaver Payment would help reduce the stigma associated with having care experience, enabling young care leavers to live like their peers who are not care experienced. It would also give young care leavers a sense of responsibility, independence and ownership in making their own decisions; skills in budgeting and managing money; and a sense of worth and motivation.

8.6 Finally, one individual noted a somewhat different potential impact from the payment, suggesting it could possibly be used as a tool to get young people who are hard to engage to work with services.

## Potential adverse impacts of the payment (Q8)

8.7 Question 8 asked respondents if they thought the payment could have any negative impact on young people leaving care. This was an open question and, altogether, 67 respondents – 34 organisations and 33 individuals – made comments.

8.8 The two most common concerns raised by respondents were that some young people (i) may spend their payments in 'unsafe' ways, putting themselves at risk of harm (for example, through drug or alcohol use or gambling), **or** (ii) may be financially exploited – i.e. tricked or forced into giving the money to others. There were concerns that young people may spend the money 'recklessly' and 'have nothing to show for it' which could have a knock-on negative effect on their pride, sense of achievement and self-esteem.

8.9 Respondents emphasised that the likelihood of these risks would depend on the individual young person and their circumstances: some would be able to manage the funds with minimal help; others would be more vulnerable. In general, respondents thought any risks could be mitigated by ensuring that young people have the skills necessary to budget and manage their finances, and ongoing guidance and support from someone they trust to plan how to spend the payment. Some respondents said they saw **no** potential adverse impacts arising for young people in receiving a Care Leaver Payment **so long as** support is provided to them in planning how to spend it.

8.10 Some respondents suggested that there should be a risk assessment carried out for each young person before the payment is made and that safeguarding measures should be put in place for those who are vulnerable. At the same time, there was also a recurring view that any vulnerabilities of potential negative impacts should not be used as a justification for restricting access to the payment, or to dictate how and when it is spent.

8.11 A third potential negative impact, mentioned frequently, related to the way in which this payment would relate to and interact with other payments and supports that young care leavers are entitled to – specifically welfare benefits, further and higher education

grants, housing support, etc. This issue, and the steps that could be taken to prevent this impact, have been discussed – both in the previous chapter (Chapter 7) and in Chapter 9.

8.12 Occasionally, respondents identified what they saw as other potential adverse impacts, saying that the payment might:

- Encourage young people to leave supported placements before they are ready
- Come at a time when a young person is not able to use it effectively to enhance their life and opportunities
- Give young people a sense that they do not need to earn money.

# 9 Support for payment recipients (Q18 and Q19)

9.1 This chapter presents respondents' views regarding the support young people should receive after they have received the payment.

9.2 The consultation explained that the Scottish Government is considering what further support young people will need – for example, financial management support – **after** they have received a payment. There were two questions inviting views on the kind of support needed, and how it should be provided.

---

**Question 18:** What support might a young person need once they have received the payment? Please share your views.

**Question 19:** How should this support be provided? Please share your views.

---

## Support after receiving the payment (Q18)

9.3 Question 18 asked respondents for their views on the type of support a young person might need after receiving a payment. This was an open question and, altogether, 64 respondents – 32 organisations and 32 individuals – provided comments. The views expressed are discussed below.

9.4 In answering Question 18, respondents described the **characteristics of the type of support** a young person might need once they have received the payment. They thought the support available should be well-signposted, personalised, flexible, easy to access, consistent across all geographic areas, and available for as long as necessary. (Note that the characteristics identified by respondents in relation to support following receipt of the payment closely mirrored the characteristics of the support required during the application process as set out in relation to Question 16 – see Chapter 6 – above. Indeed, respondents often answered this questions simply by saying 'as above', or 'see Question 16 above'.)

9.5 As far as the **content of any support** following receipt of the payment was concerned, the main issue identified was that young people should have access to 'financial education', 'financial planning advice' or 'financial literacy courses'. Respondents explained that this would include advice and guidance in relation to:

- Budgeting (for rent or mortgage costs, energy costs, council tax, student loans, other bills, food, living expenses, regular savings, etc.)
- Setting up and managing a bank account (including setting up direct debits, understanding overdraft and credit facilities, debt management, organising paperwork and receipts, etc.)
- Identifying rights and entitlements in relation to benefits and other financial support (including support for digital access and inclusion, disability living allowance, Care

Experience Bursary, council tax exemption, parental entitlement, etc.) in order to maximise income

- Decision-making on how to prioritise expenditure and achieve value for money, and ensure the money did not get 'blown away'
- Minimising the risk of being financially exploited or 'scammed'.

9.6 One individual stated that advice and support was not enough on its own if the amount of money available was not sufficient.

## How support should be provided (Q19)

9.7 Question 19 asked respondents for views on how support should be provided to young people once they have received a Care Leaver Payment. This was an open question and, altogether, 62 respondents – 30 organisations and 32 individuals – provided comments. The views expressed are discussed below. (Note that respondents often answered this question simply by saying 'as above', or 'see Question 17 above'. The analysis of Question 17 is set out in Chapter 6.)

9.8 A small number of respondents offered specific views on how this support should be provided – saying for example 'by Continuing Care or Aftercare teams' or 'by advocacy services'. However, respondents were more likely to say (as they did at Q17) that support should be provided in a way that best suited the specific individual. Moreover, the individuals and organisations that respondents suggested should be involved in providing this support, together with the range of possible delivery options proposed, largely mirrored the suggestions set out in Question 17 above – albeit with a greater emphasis on organisations with a specific focus on financial management (e.g. banks, Citizens Advice Bureaux, etc.).

9.9 Additional points made in response to Question 19 were that:

- A risk assessment should be undertaken by the local authority or relevant representative in advance of a young person receiving the Care Leaver Payment. If the young person was not confident to manage the payment themselves, if they were assessed to be vulnerable, or if a risk that could not be satisfactorily mitigated was identified, then appropriate safeguards and controls should be put in place. This might involve a key worker or agency having access to the funds on behalf of the young person.
- Training for all relevant staff would need to be put in place before the roll out of the Care Leaver Payment. The training should cover all relevant individuals (lead professionals, guidance staff, care workers, carers, etc.), as well as public, private and third sector organisations (including banks, benefits agencies and housing organisations) who might be interacting with a young person leaving care.
- Existing organisations in this field are known to be working under great pressure. Therefore, it is not clear that additional responsibilities can be taken on without further investment or funding.

- It should not be **necessary** for a young person to accept support in order to receive the Care Leaver Payment.
- All school-age children and young people in Scotland – not just care leavers – should receive financial education through Curriculum for Excellence. It is a basic life skill for everyone.

# 10 Awareness and publicity (Q20)

10.1 This chapter presents respondents' views regarding the communication channels which could be used to raise awareness about the Care Leaver Payment.

10.2 The Scottish Government wants to ensure that people who are eligible for a Care Leaver Payment know about it and know how to apply for it. The consultation paper noted that information about the payment will be promoted via public awareness campaigns, and widely shared through a variety of communication channels, including but not limited to:

- Social media
- Community hubs
- Healthcare practices
- Educational establishments
- Individuals whose professional role involves working with children, young people and their families.

10.3 The consultation invited views on other ways of raising awareness and publicising the Care Leaver Payment to those who are eligible for it.

**Question 20:** Are there any other communication channels you think we should consider which have not been set out above? Please share your views.

10.4 Question 20 asked about other potential communication channels for raising awareness of the Care Leaver Payment. This was an open question and, altogether, 49 respondents – 28 organisations and 21 individuals – provided comments. The views expressed are discussed below.

10.5 A substantial subgroup of the individual respondents who commented simply said that the suggested channels were sufficient, and that no further communication channels were required. The remaining respondents (both organisations and individuals) made a range of additional suggestions. These covered (i) organisations that could be helpful in informing care leavers of their entitlements, and (ii) methods of (or channels for) communication.

10.6 The organisations that respondents suggested could help in informing care leavers about their eligibility / entitlement for the payment included:

- Local Authorities, COSLA, Champions Boards, Corporate Parenting Boards, and specific professionals within local authorities (chief executives, chief social workers, GIRFEC teams, etc.)
- Care providers and care provider networks (residential providers, foster care providers, kinship carer networks)
- Employment services (job centres, employment support agencies)

- Advice services (advocacy services, Citizens Advice Bureaux, banks, money advice services, public libraries)
- Higher and further education institutions and organisations (colleges, Association of Directors of Education in Scotland)
- Criminal justice organisations (Scottish Children's Reporters Association centres, secure care establishments, restorative justice services, prisons)
- Membership organisations (e.g. Scottish Throughcare and Aftercare)
- Scottish Youth Parliament
- Third sector organisations in contact with young people (e.g. Young Scot).

10.7 The methods and approaches suggested by respondents included:

- Social media (YouTube, TikTok, Instagram)
- Podcasts
- Billboards
- Leaflets and written material
- TV and radio (adverts, drama).

10.8 Respondents made a range of other comments including that:

- The universal basic income pilot in Wales had generated a very high uptake rate of 97% – it would therefore be important to understand how this initiative had been advertised and communicated.
- It was important not to entrench the 'digital divide' and to recognise that not all potential recipients would be accessing social media.
- The approach to communication should be informed by the learning and resources from the Each and Every Child initiative.

# 11 Other issues and the need for other financial assistance (Q21 and Q22)

11.1 The consultation paper explained that legislation will be required to deliver the proposed Care Leaver Payment, and that this will be done through the Social Security (Amendment)(Scotland) Bill. It was noted that a further public consultation will be carried out in due course on the details of the payment and its administration prior to its implementation. The final two questions in the consultation invited views on any other issues related to the development and delivery of the payment, and the potential need for further financial assistance for young people with care experience.

**Question 21:** Is there anything else you think the Scottish Government should consider in the development and delivery of the payment? Please share your views.

**Question 22:** What other financial assistance might those with care experience benefit from in the future? Please share your views.

## Other comments on the Care Leaver Payment (Q21)

11.2 Question 21 asked respondents for any other thoughts in relation to the development and delivery of the Care Leaver Payment. This was an open question and, altogether, 47 respondents – 26 organisations and 21 individuals – provided comments.

11.3 Many of the issues raised by respondents at Question 21 repeated or reiterated points made previously, including those related to:

- The need to consult widely with young people with care experience in developing payment processes
- Eligibility (the payment should be available to adopted young people and unaccompanied asylum-seeking young people)
- The need to provide care leavers with support in planning for and managing the payment (including giving young people options for agencies they can contact for support)
- The application process (the payment should be automatic without a need to apply; support should be provided to young people for applying; reminders should be sent to young people to tell them when they can apply; etc.)
- The need to regularly review the level of the payment to ensure it reflects increases in the cost of living
- The need to ensure that the payment does not result in young people with care experience being penalised (in terms of tax or eligibility for other benefits they are entitled to)
- The need for ongoing, holistic support for young people with care experience.

11.4 The three main topics raised repeatedly at Question 21 (and not discussed in any detail at earlier questions) related to (i) practical issues in relation to making the payment, (ii) the importance of ensuring that the payment can be administered properly, and (iii) the need to monitor and evaluate the impact of the payment on care leavers. Each of these is briefly discussed here.

**Practicalities of making the payment**

11.5 Some respondents pointed out that many care leavers do not have bank accounts, and some may struggle to open an account if they do not have access to the necessary proof or address and identification required by financial institutions. These respondents thought young people may need help in setting up a bank account.

11.6 There were also suggestions that different modes of payment should be offered, including a cash payment, and that consideration should be given as to how the payment would be administered for a young person who had become homeless.

**Support for the administration of the payment**

11.7 Some respondents – mainly public sector organisations – highlighted the importance of ensuring that there was adequate support and funding in place for the organisation (or organisations) responsible for administering the payment. Some respondents wanted clarification about the source of funding for the payment and its administration, and whether local authorities or some other organisation(s) would be responsible for the administration.

11.8 There were arguments for and against local authority administration. Some noted that local authorities were well placed to take on this role because they already have contacts with looked after children and care leavers. However, it was suggested that dedicated funding should be provided to local authorities for this purpose. Others suggested that local authorities do not have the capacity to take on this additional work, and that, in any case, it would be less stigmatising if the payment were administered by an organisation independent of local authorities.

11.9 A separate, but related point was that, regardless of which organisation(s) had responsibility for administration of the payment, the timescales for its introduction should be carefully considered to align with other relevant policies and legislation, including those related to The Promise Bill.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

11.10 A recurring theme – for organisations in particular – was about the need for formal monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the payment on care leavers. Respondents thought it was important for the Scottish Government to assess whether the payment is fulfilling its intended purpose and to make any necessary improvements. There were suggestions that any evaluations should examine:

- How easy the payment is for care leavers to access

- Any gap between the (i) the annual number of young people leaving care and (ii) the number (applying for and) receiving a payment
- Reasons that young people may not be receiving, or taking up, the payment
- How young people are choosing to use the payment – and whether any adjustments need to be made in other support available to care leavers as a result
- Any unintended consequences of the payment.

11.11 There was a suggestion that any evaluation should be co-designed with young people with care experience.

## Possible other financial assistance for care experienced people (Q22)

11.12 Question 22 asked respondents for their views on other types of financial assistance young people with care experience might benefit from in the future. (Note that in contrast to the rest of the consultation questionnaire, this final question focused on all those with care experience – not only care leavers.) This was an open question and, altogether, 51 respondents – 28 organisations and 23 individuals – provided comments.

11.13 It should be noted that comments from respondents often suggested that the range of financial assistance currently available to care leavers was complicated, confusing and varied from one local authority to another.

11.14 In terms of specific suggestions for financial assistance for young people with care experience, responses to this question clustered around several topics. Respondents thought that people with care experience would benefit from access to financial assistance in relation to:

- Day-to-day living costs: e.g. energy costs, energy-efficient appliances, access to leisure facilities across Scotland, costs of dental care, etc.
- Employment-related costs: e.g. for tools, uniforms, transport, training schemes, and for driving lessons and purchase of a car – there was also a suggestion that the Young Persons' (under 22s) Free Bus Travel Scheme should be extended to age 26 for young people with care experience
- Technology-related costs: e.g. provision of laptops, phones, tablets and free access to wifi up until age 21 or 26
- Housing costs: e.g. guaranteed access to safe and secure accommodation, a first house deposit scheme
- Childcare costs and other parental responsibilities: it was noted that young people with care experience are less able to rely on support from family networks when they start their own families.

11.15 Reference was made to the Care Leavers Covenant, which emphasises the need for corporate parents to assume that all care leavers are entitled to services, support, and

opportunities up their 26th birthday – including access to bursaries and grants; access to employment or training support and provisions; housing and accommodation options; health services; leisure, cultural and recreational opportunities; and access to 'second chance' opportunities.

11.16 There were also suggestions that:

- Financial support should be provided to care leavers beyond the age of 26
- The Care Leaver Payment should be made available retrospectively to all those who have left care since 2020 – when the initial commitment was made.

11.17 It was also suggested that there was a need for reform of the social security system in terms of the way in which it interacts with care leavers. One organisation commented that care leavers are often unaware of their rights and entitlements to social security benefits. This organisation also noted that, compared to other users of the social security system, they are also more likely to be sanctioned.

11.18 More generally, respondents thought young people with care experience should be able to have access – in an ongoing way, and through different routes – to practical, emotional and financial support to help them grow and develop their skills in managing their lives and their finances. Some suggested this support would be particularly important at major transitions, such as marriage or starting a family, buying a house, changing jobs, etc.

11.19 Some third sector organisations and organisations in the 'other organisation type' category also called for the Scottish Government to consider a 'more ambitious package of financial support' for young people with care experience. Specific suggestions included (i) a Basic Income for Care Leavers Scheme – similar to that being piloted in Wales, (ii) further work on a Minimum Income Guarantee, and (iii) a ringfenced welfare fund. These types of scheme, it was argued, would guarantee the financial security that care experienced young people need, and help to create stability and certainty in their lives.

11.20 Finally, it was suggested that the Scottish Government should develop guidance for professionals, young people and families to (i) raise awareness of all entitlements for young people with care experience, and (ii) ensure they are implemented, accessed and received as intended. This was seen to be vital, given the evidence (based on administrative data) that only around half of young people eligible for Aftercare support in Scotland in 2021 received it.

# 12 Engagement sessions

12.1 As noted in Chapter 2 (see paragraphs 2.10–2.12), six engagement sessions were held during the period of the consultation. Four were online and two (facilitated by Inside Out and Youth Just Us) were face-to-face. The online sessions covered a slightly different set of topics than the face-to-face sessions. This chapter provides an overview of the views expressed, first discussing the online sessions, then the findings from the face-to-face discussions.

## Online engagement sessions

12.2 The issues discussed at the online sessions covered (i) eligibility criteria, (ii) the payment amount, (iii) requirement for support, and (iv) impacts of the payment. Each of these is discussed below. The section concludes with a summary of other points and queries raised during these sessions.

### Eligibility criteria

12.3 It was thought that providing a mechanism and clear criteria for assessing eligibility for the payment was a challenge. One participant likened this to the challenge of providing clear criteria for the provision of Throughcare and Aftercare and said that there was a widespread lack of understanding about the eligibility criteria for these services.

12.4 A range of queries about eligibility for the Care Leaver Payment were raised as follows:

- Who will decide whether the young person will be eligible for the payment? Will it be the social worker?
- Will children and young people held under Section 25 orders in residential schools be eligible for the payment?
- Would a young person from England but looked after by a Scottish local authority be eligible for the payment?
- Will the amount of time spent in care be taken into account when deciding on eligibility for the payment?

### Payment amount

12.5 Participants discussed the various leaving care grants that were currently available within their local areas. The amounts discussed varied between £1,800 and £3,500.

12.6 Although the Care Leaver Payment was welcomed, £2,000 as a lump sum one-off payment was not viewed as enough for a young person leaving care and moving into their own accommodation to make a cosy and comfortable home. This was particularly the case given the recent cost of living crisis, and the need to ensure that the payment amount increased in line with inflation.

12.7 It was noted that young people leaving care might need additional funds in the months and years following their move into independent living. One participant said they would be continuing to advocate for a (universal) basic income for care leavers.

### Requirement for support

12.8 Participants emphasised the importance of having a tailored and flexible approach to supporting young people who apply for / receive the payment. The support would have to be personalised and recognise that every individual has a unique set of experiences and needs. There was a wide age range to whom the payment could apply (16-25). It was particularly noted that intensive support might be required especially for those at the younger end of the age spectrum who would not have the skills to manage such a large payment.

### Impacts

12.9 Participants in the engagement sessions identified both positive and negative (potential) impacts of the payment.

12.10 Positive (potential) impacts included that the payment could provide financial stability, help care leavers to plan their future, ease the emotional stress, provide reassurance at a time of change, and assist care leavers to develop their independence. The payment would be helpful for care leavers who were setting up home on their own for the first time.

12.11 However, (potential) negative impacts were also identified. These related to (i) the stress of the application process (the individual would require support at this stage), (ii) the possible lack of emotional maturity of some of those receiving the payment (especially, the younger ones), (iii) the risks that the young people would not spend the money wisely, (iv) the possibility that young people could be exploited by others who knew they had received a lump sum, and (v) the possibility that the payment would act as an incentive for young people to leave care 'too soon'.

### Other issues

12.12 A range of other issues were raised by participants in the online engagement sessions including that:

- Local authorities are currently working under a lot of pressure and may not have the resources to support young people to the extent required.
- The payment should be made an entitlement – the young person should not be required to make an application.
- This Care Leaver Payment should not result in the reduction or withdrawal of other financial support which might be available to young people with care experience.
- It is not clear how care leavers will be able to find suitable housing when they leave care.
- More details are required about what governance arrangements will be put in place and how the delivery of the payment will be coordinated.

## Face-to-face sessions

12.13 The discussions facilitated by Inside Out and Youth Just Us – unlike the online sessions – did not focus on (potential) impacts of the payment. The other topics – eligibility,

payment amount, and requirement for support – were covered. In addition, these engagement sessions focused on (i) the name of the payment, (ii) who should deliver the payment, and (iii) what the money should be spent on. Each of these topics is covered briefly below. The section concludes with a summary of other points and queries raised during these sessions.

### Eligibility

12.14 The discussion in face-to-face sessions particularly focused on whether those who had left care before the age of 16 would be eligible for the payment. It was thought to be unfair for someone to be denied the payment when they have been looked after for most of their childhood, just because they left care before they were 16.

12.15 A question was raised about whether the payment would be available to those who are currently eligible – but who will not be eligible by the time the payment 'goes live'.

### Amount of payment

12.16 Similar to the online sessions, participants in the face-to-face sessions thought that the payment should be higher than suggested – a sum of £3,500–£4,000 was thought to be suitable. In addition, it was thought that those receiving the payment should be able to choose whether this was paid as a lump sum, or in (weekly or monthly) instalments.

### Requirement for support

12.17 The participants discussed the importance of having someone they trusted to support them throughout the process. This individual could advise the young person what they should spend the money on, and also on any other financial entitlements they might have. In addition, they would also ensure that the individual would not be disadvantaged given their inability to access the internet whilst in some institutions such as HMPYOI Polmont.

12.18 More generally, there was discussion about the requirement for advice and support following release from prison. There were thought to be inconsistencies in the advice provided in relation to financial entitlements on release for young people who were previously in care. There was also discussion about the need for support to find employment and housing.

### Name of the payment

12.19 The participants did not support the name 'Care Leaver Payment'. They thought this was stigmatising and could be seen as a 'pay-off' from care. Alternative suggestions for the name were 'Youth Fund', 'Moving On Grant', or 'Moving Free Grant'.

### Delivery of the payment

12.20 The participants suggested that Social Security Scotland (SSS), or Scottish Throughcare and Aftercare (STAF) would be good vehicles for delivering the payment. The argument made in favour of using SSS was that it was a national organisation, which would give confidence that everyone entitled to the payment would receive it. The argument

made in favour of using STAF was that this would allow recipients to feel that it was out of the hands of local authorities.

12.21 It was suggested that the payment could either be made into a personal bank account or into a credit union account. This would best be done as the young person was leaving or had left care (not beforehand).

**What should the payment be spent on?**

12.22 The participants thought that the payment should not be used for essentials which are already covered by existing support schemes. Rather, it should be spent on other items such as driving lessons, buying a car, travel, a holiday, clothes, or 'to buy nice things for your first home'.

12.23 One group said they were concerned that people receiving the payment might be required to submit receipts. This was not supported by the group, who thought this might pressure people into buying 'essential' goods which should be covered separately by the local authority.

**Other issues**

12.24 As with the participants in the online sessions, it was suggested by participants in the face-to-face sessions that (i) receipt of the payment should be automated – and there should therefore not be an application process, (ii) the payment should not affect in any way the other financial support which care leavers are entitled to, and (iii) those aged 16–18 were perhaps too young to be receiving the payment, and might not spend the money wisely.

# Annex 1: Organisational respondents

The consultation received responses from 37 organisations or groups.

**Public sector organisations (20)**

- Aberdeen City Council
- Aberdeenshire Council
- Children and Young People's Commissioner Scotland
- Children's Hearings Scotland
- City of Edinburgh Council - Throughcare and Aftercare
- COSLA
- Dumfries & Galloway Council, Young People's Transitions Team
- Edinburgh Champions Board and City of Edinburgh Council Corporate Parenting Board
- Falkirk Council's young people
- ILF Scotland
- NHS Borders School Nursing Team
- NHS Lanarkshire
- North Ayrshire Childrens Services Strategic Partnership
- North Ayrshire Council Education Service
- North Lanarkshire Council
- Perth and Kinross Council Throughcare and Aftercare Team
- Renfrewshire Council, Children Services
- South Lanarkshire Council
- Stirling Council
- West Lothian Council

**Third sector organisations (12)**

- Aberlour
- Association for Fostering, Kinship and Adoption Scotland (AFKA Scotland)
- Barnardo's Scotland
- Children in Scotland
- Health and Social Care Alliance Scotland (the ALLIANCE)
- includem
- Inspiring Scotland (intandem programme)
- MyBnk
- Rossie Young People’s Trust
- The Low Incomes Tax Reform Group
- The Promise Scotland
- Who Cares? Scotland

**Other organisation types (5)**

- CELCIS
- Children and Young People's Centre for Justice (CYCJ)
- Colleges Scotland
- Scottish Association for Social Work and Social Workers (SASW, part of BASW UK)
- Social Work Scotland

# Annex 2: Question response rates

| Respondent type | Organisations | | Individuals | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Question** | **n** | **% of 37** | **n** | **% of 33** | **n** | **% of 70** |
| Q1 (closed): How well do you think the name of the payment represents its purpose and intention? | 28 | 76% | 33 | 100% | 61 | 87% |
| Q1 (open): Please explain your answer and provide any names you think would be more suitable. | 28 | 76% | 19 | 58% | 47 | 67% |
| Q2 (closed): Do you think the payment can fulfil the purpose set out above? | 30 | 81% | 33 | 100% | 63 | 90% |
| Q2 (open): Please explain your answer. | 34 | 92% | 25 | 76% | 59 | 84% |
| Q3 (open): What are your views on the revised approach proposed by the Scottish Government? Please share your views. | 35 | 95% | 32 | 97% | 67 | 96% |
| Q4 (closed): How helpful would a payment of £2,000 be at the point of moving on from care? | 31 | 84% | 33 | 100% | 64 | 91% |
| Q4 (open): Please explain your answer. | 32 | 86% | 29 | 88% | 61 | 87% |
| Q5 (closed): Would it be beneficial for applicants to have a choice in how their payment is made? | 32 | 86% | 33 | 100% | 65 | 93% |
| Q5 (open): Please explain your answer and provide any suggestions you have. | 32 | 86% | 28 | 85% | 60 | 86% |
| Q6 (closed): At what point would it be most helpful for care leavers to receive the payment? | 28 | 76% | 33 | 100% | 61 | 87% |
| Q6 (open): Please explain your answer and provide any other suggestions you have. | 32 | 86% | 29 | 88% | 61 | 87% |
| Q7 (open): What might this payment help young people achieve when they are moving on from care? Please share your views. | 32 | 86% | 33 | 100% | 65 | 93% |
| Q8 (open): Do you think this payment could have any negative impact on young people leaving care? Please share your views. | 34 | 92% | 33 | 100% | 67 | 96% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q9 (open): What are your views on the proposed eligibility criteria for applicants of the payment? Please explain your answer. | 33 | 89% | 31 | 94% | 64 | 91% |
| Q10 (open): Is there anything else you think the Scottish Government should take into consideration related to eligibility criteria for the Care Leaver Payment? Please share your views. | 25 | 68% | 19 | 58% | 44 | 63% |
| Q11 (open): What are your views on the proposed age requirements for applicants of the payment? Please explain your answer. | 31 | 84% | 32 | 97% | 63 | 90% |
| Q12 (open): What are your views on an applicant's income impacting their eligibility for the payment? Please explain your answer. | 33 | 89% | 33 | 100% | 66 | 94% |
| Q13 (open): What are your views on this payment impacting an individual's entitlement to other support? Please explain your answer. | 34 | 92% | 31 | 94% | 65 | 93% |
| Q14 (open): What should the experience of applying for and receiving the proposed Care Leaver Payment look and feel like for applicants? Please share your views. | 33 | 89% | 30 | 91% | 63 | 90% |
| Q15 (closed): Do you think young people should have support to apply for the payment? | 32 | 86% | 33 | 100% | 65 | 93% |
| Q16 (open): What support might a young person need when applying for the payment? Please share your views. | 34 | 92% | 31 | 94% | 65 | 93% |
| Q17 (open): How should this support be provided? Please share your views. | 31 | 84% | 30 | 91% | 61 | 87% |
| Q18 (open): What support might a young person need once they have received the payment? Please share your views. | 32 | 86% | 32 | 97% | 64 | 91% |
| Q19 (open): How should this support be provided? Please share your views. | 30 | 81% | 32 | 97% | 62 | 89% |
| Q20 (open): Are there any other communication channels you think | 29 | 78% | 20 | 61% | 49 | 70% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| we should consider which have not been set out above? Please share your views. | | | | | | |
| Q21 (open): Is there anything else you think the Scottish Government should consider in the development and delivery of the payment? Please share your views. | 26 | 70% | 21 | 64% | 47 | 67% |
| Q22 (open): What other financial assistance might those with care experience benefit from in the future? Please share your views. | 28 | 76% | 23 | 70% | 51 | 73% |

© Crown copyright 2024

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit **nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3** or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: **psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk**.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at **www.gov.scot**

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at

The Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

ISBN: 978-1-83601-380-8 (web only)

Published by The Scottish Government, June 2024

Produced for The Scottish Government by APS Group Scotland, 21 Tennant Street, Edinburgh EH6 5NA
PPDAS1467539 (06/24)

w w w . g o v . s c o t