Children and Young People & Financial Capability: Provision Analysis

September 2018

Ann Griffiths & Nona Buckley-Irvine

the Money Advice Service

Foreword

The things we see and learn about money in childhood and adolescence can have long-lasting consequences. Money habits that can last for life begin to form between the ages of 3 and 7, and are shaped by our experiences in school, at home, and in communities. There are opportunities through all these routes to make a significant, positive difference to future generations' ability to manage their money well.

The Money Advice Service wants to ensure every child gets a meaningful financial education, no matter what their needs or circumstances.

In late 2018 MAS will finalise its first ever Children and Young People's Financial Capability Commissioning Plan, which will set out how we plan to work towards achieving this goal in the years 2019-22.

We published the first step on our way to this plan, our analysis of CYP Financial Capability Needs, in April 2018. This set out topics on which CYP may need more financial education support, and which CYP may be in greater need than others. The Provision Analysis, Evidence Analysis, and Policy Landscape Analysis we are now publishing are the next steps. They are the first reports of their kind in the UK, and draw together everything we know about how financial education is currently delivered, what is effective in helping children develop financial capability, and the risks and opportunities of the policy context in each UK nation.

In Sept-Oct 2018 MAS will consult on draft recommendations for how we plan to put all this evidence into action over coming years, before finalising our commissioning plan in the months that follow. Our intention is that this will inform the financial capability strategy for the UK for future years, including funding, delivery, influencing, and research activity.

We also hope these reports will be of use to anyone seeking to understand how financial education is currently delivered in the UK, and where the gaps and opportunities for change for the better lie. We will keep them updated and welcome feedback to inform future versions.

I am delighted to introduce these documents and look forward to hearing your contributions and reflections as we work towards our Commissioning Plan over the coming months.

Sarah Porretta
Director of Financial Capability

Contents

Executive summary

Background and context

The Money Advice Service has a strategic aim to improve and widen financial education. The Financial Capability Strategy for the UK, which the Money Advice Service coordinates, aims to ensure that every child and young person gets meaningful financial education by 2025.

We work to achieve these goals by:

- generating and analysing evidence about the best ways to help children and young people develop financial capability;
- improving strategic coordination of financial education; and
- sharing evidence and insights to influence funding, commissioning, delivery, and policy.

In 2018, we will complete our first children and young people commissioning plan, setting out how resources can best be targeted to meet needs. The plan will be based on evidence of needs and what is effective, as well as analysis of existing resources and the wider policy landscape.

Our financial education mapping exercise

To be able to deliver our plan, we need to understand what financial education is taking place, where, for whom, and by whom. In late 2017/early 2018, we conducted a mapping exercise of financial education provision for children and young people across the UK.

We received more than 130 responses and we are confident we have captured the details of most major financial education provision across the UK. The exercise does not cover the day-to-day delivery of financial education by teachers as part of the statutory school curriculum. As this is the first time we have conducted this mapping exercise, there are some limitations and there may be a lot of local provision not yet captured.

This report presents an analysis of our findings, and explains:

- what financial education interventions are happening where;
- how many children and young people do they reach, with what needs, at what ages;
- who funds provision;
- who delivers provision;
- what methods are used; and
- how interventions are evaluated.

Our findings

The mapping exercise identified 131 financial education interventions in the UK. They range from local interventions for just 20 children, to UK-wide provision that reaches up to a million young people each year.

The total reported reach of interventions is more than 3.3 million children and young people. The majority of this reach is through education with a face-to-face element; only around 1.43 million is via online interventions or learning resources.

Direct delivery to children and young people was by far the most frequently reported type of financial education. Only a very small number of interventions focus on intermediaries, such as parents.

The picture around the UK

We captured information about 36 interventions that deliver across the UK; 39 in England only; 14 in Wales only; 25 in Scotland only; and three in Northern Ireland only. A small number deliver in two or three nations.

The UK-wide interventions reach around 2.7 million children and young people, though these are more likely to be learning resources than provision in individual nations, so the reach might be expected to be larger. The reach of interventions available ineach nation is as follows:

- 379,000 in England;
- 145,000 in Wales;
- 114,000 in Northern Ireland;
- 75,400 in Scotland.[1]

1 Figures include a level of double counting as some interventions cover multiple nations.

While more interventions were reported in Scotland than in Northern Ireland or Wales, Scottish projects tend to operate at a more local level with smaller reach.

Provision for different age groups

The interventions tend to target the older age groups. Ages 14-16 and 16-18 are most frequently targeted, while age 0-5 is the least frequently targeted group. The highest reported reach is in the 14-16 age group, followed by ages 11-14 and 16-18.

Targeting of people with specific needs

Fewer than two in five interventions focus on specific needs, and the reach of these projects is less than 4% of the total reported reach. The vast majority of these projects include a focus on the 16-18 age group. The most frequently targeted groups are young people transitioning to financial independence or independent living; and those who are excluded or at risk of exclusion, homeless or at risk of homelessness, or not in education, employment or training (NEET).

Who funds financial education projects

We received funding information from just over half the interventions in our mapping exercise. The total reported funding is more than £13m. Using rough estimates of potential funding going into projects unable to provide funding information, we believe the total funding going into financial education mapped may be around £18m.

Financial services are the biggest funder. Financial services firms are involved, sometimes with other funders such as government, in funding projects receiving almost £6m. Within this, they are the sole funders of £3.7m of projects. Government agencies also play a large part, a contributor (with others) to almost £4m, and the sole funder of £1.5m of financial education in the UK. Other major funding sources included the Money Advice Service and investment from businesses that deliver financial education.

Who delivers financial education

More than 100 organisations are responsible for delivering the different interventions. Charities and social enterprises are the largest sector in terms of the numbers of interventions: they deliver 79 interventions with a total reach of <570,000. Financial services, including credit unions, deliver 30 interventions, but the reported reach of these is much higher, at >1.4m. Other delivery organisations included housing associations, local authorities, and educational institutions.

Where and how financial education is delivered

The most common delivery setting was schools: more than half of financial education interventions delivered in secondary schools and more than two-fifths in primary schools. Around a fifth of interventions reported delivery in each of youth and community groups, and further education colleges.

The most frequently reported methods used were resources, case studies/role play, games, and workshops. Interventions were largely delivered by teachers/tutors/educators, paid facilitators, volunteers, and by practitioners who already work with children and young people. Few were delivered by support workers or social workers, and only around one in nine interventions were delivered by parents/carers/family members.

The content of financial education

The most frequently reported topics were budgeting, keeping track, and planning ahead; making spending and saving choices; needs vs wants; and understanding ways to save. The least frequently covered topics were choosing and using mortgages, pensions, investments, and insurance. This remained the case even for the oldest age groups. Topics such as fraud and exploitation, and gambling, were also covered relatively infrequently.

The use of evidence and evaluation

Most interventions report use of evidence to inform their development. Feedback from children and young people and practitioners, previous evaluations and surveys were frequently mentioned. However, very few respondents said they used evidence of gaps or evidence of children and young people’s need.

Executive summary continued

Almost nine in ten interventions conduct some sort of evaluation. The most common method was informal feedback from the target group, used in 68 interventions. Measurement of output, for example number of children reached, or sessions held, was used in 60 interventions. Analysis of before and after outcomes using quantitative measures directly with children and young people was used by 53 interventions – a positive sign of the use of more robust evaluation methods.

Only 34 interventions used a theory of change. These interventions were delivered by 20 organisations, 11 of whom were signatories to the Money Advice Service's IMPACT principles. In total, 38 interventions were being delivered by IMPACT principles signatories (14 organisations). Only nine interventions, from five providers, reported that their evaluations were held on the Financial Capability Evidence Hub, though this is likely to increase as evidence from What Works Fund projects is increasingly added to the hub. 27 interventions reported the resources they used have the Financial Education Quality Mark. These findings indicate progress in awareness and use of evidence, but ongoing room for improved evaluation practice.

Next steps

This analysis of provision, alongside our needs analysis, evidence analysis, and wider consideration of the financial education policy landscape, will inform a gap analysis, and the children and young people's commissioning plan, to be produced by late autumn 2018.

Our online mapping form will remain live so that we can collect information about new provision. We intend to produce an annual update about interventions, and to put out a new call for information every three years, ahead of new commissioning plans.

We also intend to make a map of financial education in the UK available on the www.fincap.org.uk website by autumn 2018.

Introduction and background

Who we are and what we do in relation to children and young people

The Money Advice Service is a UK-wide, independent service set up by the government to help people manage their money. We are paid for by a statutory levy on the financial services industry, raised through the Financial Conduct Authority. We have three statutory aims:

- To enhance the understanding of members of the public about financial matters.
- To enhance the ability of members of the public to manage their own money.
- To improve the availability, quality and consistency of debt advice across the UK.

Our role is important because far too many people are struggling with their finances. 8.3 million adults in the UK are over indebted, including one in five young adults aged 18–24;[2] 11.9 million adults would have to borrow or could not pay an unexpected bill of £300;[3] 44% of working-age adults in the UK have less than £100 in a formal savings account[4]. In research we conducted with young adults in their twenties, nearly three-quarters admitted making money mistakes in their early years of financial independence which they later regretted, and almost half said they felt 'depressed' as a result[5]. Over half of the debt advice clients we see have previously been diagnosed with a mental health condition[6].

Our work aims to address these issues. In October 2015, we launched the 10-year Financial Capability Strategy for the UK. This sets out how the Money Advice Service, together with the wide range of organisations working to help people manage their money better[7], will work to improve financial capability in the UK. Part of this work involves testing and measuring what approaches work to improve financial capability.

A key theme of this strategy, and the Money Advice Service Business Plan, is improving the ability of children and young people to manage money well and make good financial decisions. We do this through building the evidence base, improving coordination of financial education, and sharing evidence and insights to influence funding, commissioning, delivery, and policy.

We believe adult financial capability is a direct consequence of what is learned and experienced in childhood and adolescence. Skills, knowledge, mindset, attitudes and behaviours all matter to people's financial capability and the outcomes they achieve in life. Childhood and adolescence are vitally important times to influence all these elements.

About this provision analysis

This provision analysis sets out the findings from a mapping exercise carried out at the end of 2017 to identify, as robustly as possible, the nature and extent of existing provision of financial education and financial capability support for children and young people across the UK. It is intended to give as full a picture as is possible at this time of the sorts of financial education taking place; the content and approaches used; the children and young people targeted; the location of delivery; who provides and funds the education; and the extent to which provision is evaluated.

This information is vital to enable us to compare existing provision with need; to understand where gaps are, what potential resources are available, who providers are and what they do; and, ultimately, to inform our thinking about how resources may best be targeted in future. We hope our analysis will also make the case for the importance of continued efforts to expand financial education, and identify where additional effort may be required.

2 Available at: http://overindebtednessmap.org/
3 *The Savings Challenge - Is the UK prepared for a rainy day?* (MAS, September 2016), available at: www.moneyadviceservice.org.uk/en/corporate/research
4 Ibid.
5 *It's time to talk: young people and money regrets* (MAS, September 2014), available at: www.moneyadviceservice.org.uk/en/corporate/research
6 2016 outcome evaluation of debt advice funded by Money Advice Service (MAS, October 2017), available at: www.moneyadviceservice.org.uk/en/corporate/research
7 Such as financial education providers, financial services firms, advice providers, charities, research agencies, trusts and foundations, and government agencies.

Introduction and background continued

The mapping exercise also allows us to measure change over time, including, for example, the scale and reach of financial education, and how much funding is going into financial education that has an evidence base and/or is evaluated. It will also support coordination of activity in the sector, enabling the Money Advice Service to make links between organisations working towards similar objectives and to identify providers who are not yet involved with the IMPACT principles or the Financial Education Quality Mark.

Ultimately, we hope to support the organisations which are funding and delivering financial education by making basic, publicly available information about provision available in a single place on the web. This is likely to take the form of an interactive map on the Financial Capability website (www.fincap.org.uk), showing the names, target ages, and websites for the provision we have identified. This is part of planned future activity, covered in the 'Next steps' section at the end of this document. It will be discussed with all those who have submitted information to the mapping exercise before action is taken.

This provision analysis is the second in a series of reports that will inform our children and young people commissioning plan, to be published in late autumn 2018. It follows the needs analysis, published in April 2018, which summarises children and young people's current levels of financial capability and identifies which children and young people may have greater or different needs and what we know about the nature of those needs. It sits alongside an evidence analysis, which sets out what we know about which approaches are likely to be most effective at delivering outcomes for different groups; and a landscape analysis, which will provide an overview of risks and opportunities in the policy landscape, in the context of wider external drivers of change.

These reports will feed into a gap analysis, which will compare needs to existing provision and evidence, in the context of wider risks and opportunities, and will make recommendations about future commissioning intentions based on a balance of all the evidence available. The commissioning plan will then set out how we believe resources across the financial education sector can best be targeted to meet need and to ensure all children and young people get the financial education they need to manage money well as adults. A diagram showing how these reports feed into the commissioning plan is set out at Appendix A.

The scope of this provision analysis report extends only to setting out what we know about current provision and where gaps appear to be, based on this analysis alone. The gap analysis and commissioning plan which follow will draw conclusions by comparing the provision, needs, evidence, and landscape analyses, and recommending what should be done as a result.

We intend to keep our provision mapping up to date by asking everyone who has contributed to update information about their provision annually, by ensuring we have a form online at all times to collect information about new provision, and by doing a further call for information every three years. Our analysis will be updated in future to reflect these updates. The commissioning plan will be iterated accordingly over time, as component analyses are updated on an annual basis.

Scope and definitions

The scope of our mapping covers any intervention offered to children and young people, or those people who support them (parents, carers, educators or wider practitioners), which aims to have a preventative, preparatory education role for any child or young person in helping them develop financial capability. It does not include real-time money advice or guidance for young people who are already economically active.

We have not set a single cut-off age, as some interventions are offered to age groups spanning older childhood through to young adulthood. Where these interventions are educational, we have included them, even where the upper limit goes beyond 18. In all cases, however, the children and young people targeted will lie somewhere in the age range 0-25.

We define 'intervention' as a form of direct delivery (for example, coaching, classroom lessons and workshops), resource (such as teaching materials, games, websites, apps), educational product (for example, a savings app that specifically targets educational objectives), or training or qualification (for young people or the educators and practitioners who work with them), which aims to support any element of children and young people's financial capability.

To be within scope, an intervention must focus on financial capability as a key part of its objectives. Interventions with a primary focus on a related subject, such as numeracy, literacy, enterprise or employability, are included as long as financial capability is an explicit additional goal. Interventions that operate at local, regional, and national levels are included, across all areas of the UK.

Schools play a key part in the delivery of financial education. Our mapping includes interventions that are delivered in schools (such as resources used by teachers, workshops delivered by charities, and school bank initiatives by financial services organisations), but does not include the teaching that takes place as part of day-to-day delivery of the curriculum in any nation of the UK. This is partly because this would have required contacting schools directly, with a different sort of survey, tailored to each nation. We are beginning work to understand more about delivery in schools through other research and will cover what we understand about financial education delivery through curricula in our landscape analysis.

Methodology

We set out with the aim of achieving the most robust mapping of financial education provision in the UK to date. Our approach included:

Desk research

In 2016, we carried out an extensive desk research exercise identifying 120+ potential providers of financial education, through web and social media searches. This was collated into a spreadsheet and formed the starting point for this mapping exercise.

Accuracy checking

At the outset of this project, the information collected through desk research was sent to identified providers to verify and update as required.

Public call for information

In November to December 2017, we published an online form to capture information about interventions not yet captured through our desk research and individual contact with providers. This was publicised through Money Advice Service newsletters, the newsletters and email distribution lists of other agencies, presentations at events including during Financial Capability Week, and through social media. A copy of the questions in the form is included in Appendix B.

To gather as much information as possible about the nature, location, and focus of existing provision, the mapping exercise covered a wide range of topics, including:

- Intervention overview – including who delivers and funds the intervention, the scale of the intervention, the funding amount, and the target population.
- Delivery – where the intervention takes place, who delivers it, and how, including detailed information about topics covered.
- Evidence and evaluation – how evidence is used to inform the intervention, and whether the intervention is evaluated and how.

Open form on website

An online form remains available on the financial capability website to ensure we can continue to collect information about new provision, and so that information we hold can be updated[8]. We intend to update information on the interventions held in our database annually, and to do a full call for information every three years to inform future commissioning plans.

8 https://www.fincap.org.uk/document/WgwBvykAACcGyipg/call-for-information-new-call-for-information-issued-for-providers-of-children-and-young-peoples-financial-education

Introduction and background continued

Data entry

We entered information from the online form into an Excel spreadsheet. This involved cleaning of data to ensure consistent recording of answers, removal of duplication[9], and coding and filtering of answers to enable analysis. We are conscious this is a fairly basic and manual approach to analysis. Before the project began, a range of options for conducting and analysing returns was considered, including more sophisticated technological solutions, but it was agreed that this approach would be fit for purpose for the scale and nature of financial education mapping in the short term. We remain open to considering ways to improve the robustness of collection and analysis of information in future, and are currently working to update the online form, code answers, and build a more sophisticated spreadsheet to increase efficiency of future analysis

Limitations

We received more than 130 validated submissions. We believe this is a good response and are confident we have captured information about most major financial education provision across the UK. However, we are aware there may be a lot of local provision that is not captured. A small number of submissions from local providers, including individual Citizens Advice offices and credit unions, suggest there may be many more of these that we did not pick up. We're also conscious that organisations such as local authorities and housing associations are likely to deliver financial education to some vulnerable children, young people and families, and our reach into these organisations has not yet been extensive or consistent.

We worked to promote the exercise through as many routes and networks as we could, including social media, newsletters, and presentations at events. We are very grateful to organisations including Tax Incentivised Savings Association (TISA), the Local Government Association, the Welsh government, Young Money, The Improvement Service (Scotland), Citizens Advice, and the Association of British Credit Unions Limited for including information in newsletters or promoting through mailing lists. However, promotion of our call for information was limited by time and resource constraints, and was reliant on the goodwill of existing networks, so it would have been possible for some financial education providers or funders to miss the fact it was happening. For example, our reach in Northern Ireland may not have been as strong as other nations, as we are still working to establish stronger financial education contacts there. When we repeat the exercise in future, we will seek to have a longer window of time to publicise the call for information, so that a consistent and repeated message can go out through as many routes as possible. We are also working to promote the online form continuously when new provision is identified.

We were unable to get responses from around 40 interventions identified through desk research or through other projects, including the Financial Education Quality Mark. In some cases, this may have been because contact details on websites were out of date, or the intervention is not running anymore; in others, the request for information may have simply come at a busy time and not been seen as a priority.

The analysis in this report is based only on mapping returns directly from, or validated by, the funder or provider of the intervention. We hold information in a separate database about provision identified by desk research but not validated, and will attempt to make contact again when mapping information is updated in future.

At this early stage, there was little we could offer to those who completed the mapping form other than the knowledge they would be recognised in our report and have the opportunity for information about their provision to be held on a website that signposts to financial education providers in future. In this context, we are especially grateful to all those funders and providers who took the time to contribute to this work. They are listed in Appendix C.

9 In a small number of cases, responses were submitted by both the funder and the provider of a programme, or by local agencies delivering a national programme. Duplications were removed for analysis purposes but we have kept records of those involved for future updates.

Finally, there are limitations because of the nature of any provision mapping exercise. The information set out in this report is a snapshot of one period in time, and is likely to change within months as some funded projects come to an end and new ones begin. Our annual updates will aim to overcome this as far as possible and to ensure that information is kept reasonably up to date.

There may also be variations in how organisations have interpreted questions, or in how they collect information themselves. For example, the reach of an intervention may be counted very differently across different organisations, and it may be easier to calculate precisely for those interventions that work directly with children and young people (rather than through intermediaries or online resources, for example). The analysis is also vulnerable to distortion based on any human error in the form completion – if a respondent accidentally added a '0' to a figure for example. We have not been able to independently verify quantitative data reported, so analysis should be taken as based on funder- and provider-reported data only.

This is the first time we have undertaken a provision mapping exercise and, while there are limitations, we believe we are able to give the most definitive picture to date of what financial education is happening, where, for whom, and how. We will continue to develop our approach in the coming months and years to make the most of this information to inform our understanding of gaps for commissioning, to measure change in the sector, and to 3 signpost others to support and education available. We will also seek to improve the robustness of our approach and analysis continuously[10].

There is a good deal of more detailed and nuanced analysis of the data that we have not included in this report for reasons of resource, time, and prioritisation of space. For example, it would be possible to look at the age breakdown of interventions targeting teachers and children in any one nation, or how many of the interventions using workshops are being evaluated, or how content varies by type of funding organisation, or any other combination of information we have collected. We do not intend to publish detailed analysis looking in this depth across different categories of information, but if providers or funders are interested in more detail on specific topics, types of financial education, locations, ages or any other focus, we will do our best to respond to requests for additional analysis.

10 We recognise this will need to be taken into account in future analysis of change over time. If our mapping becomes more effective at reaching and capturing information about a wider range of financial education, it could appear that interventions are taking place, when in fact it is just our mapping becoming more effective. We'll address this by making sure information about lifespan of interventions continues to be captured, so we can see where something was happening but was not captured in previous mapping.

The wider context: other research on financial education provision

We are not aware of any other work that has attempted to map systematically the financial education and financial capability support being offered to children and young people across the UK. This means the snapshot we have created through this exercise should be taken as a baseline, as it is difficult to compare it to any previous analysis of financial education.

There are, however, a number of studies that have looked at aspects of the financial education provision system. Most of these have looked at schools only, have focused on views of good practice and barriers, and some are from a decade or more ago. However, they are worth bearing in mind as context for understanding the delivery landscape for financial education. Relevant studies include:

- **Financial education: a review of existing provision in the UK[11].** This 2005 study by the Department for Work and Pensions, based on a literature review and interviews with 20 stakeholder organisations, did not set out to audit financial education. It concluded that the majority of financial education at the time was through statutory curriculum delivery in schools across all nations, though at the time inclusion was voluntary, and there was little evidence of effectiveness.
- **Financial education in schools two years on: job done?[12]** This report from the All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Financial Education in 2016 looked at progress since financial education was introduced into the curriculum in England (and recognising its position in the curricula of other UK nations). It found wide recognition of the importance of financial education in schools and beyond, but many barriers to the consistency and quality of delivery. It identified the importance of starting young and of embedded financial education across subjects, as well as the need to improve teacher skills and confidence, to better coordinate what is happening, and to measure long-term impact.
- **Financial education for vulnerable young people[13]**
  This report from the APPG on Financial Education from 2013 found that there were many innovative examples of support targeted at more vulnerable children and young people, but that these were patchy and uncoordinated, and staff were often lacking confidence and skills to support young people effectively. Focus tended to be on those young people who were approaching or just entering independence.
- **Building societies and financial education[14]**
  This 2016 report by MyBnk and the Building Societies Association found that just over half of responding building societies said they were delivering financial education, and estimated an overall contribution of around £750k from building societies to financial education annually. It also identified areas building societies wanted more support on, including access to consistent high quality resources, evaluation support, and training for staff.
- **Financial education in schools: how to fix two lost years[15].** This report from the Money Charity in 2016, based on a survey and interviews with teachers, looked at the impact of financial education on the curriculum in England. It concluded that, although most schools report they deliver some financial education, most reported little change as a result of financial education being part of the curriculum, and there is mixed quality in delivery. Time, resources, leadership and prioritisation were seen as key barriers.

11 http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/7210/1/rrep275.pdf
12 https://www.young-money.org.uk/sites/default/files/APPG%20on%20Financial%20Education%20for%20Young%20People%20-Final%20Report%20-%20May%202016.pdf The Money Advice Service partly funded this inquiry and submitted a response which informed the recommendations.
13 https://www.young-money.org.uk/sites/default/files/Doc_downloads/APPG/Financial%20Education%20for%20Vulnerable%20Young%20People.pdf
14 https://www.bsa.org.uk/BSA/files/1e/1e5b8666-6109-4a04-9a9c-fd4f0de1896a.pdf
15 http://themoneycharity.org.uk/financial_education_schools/

- **Managing money: financial education in primary and secondary schools in Wales[16].** Estyn's 2017 report drew on inspection findings and responses from a survey to teachers. It found that inclusion of financial education in the curriculum in Wales meant most schools included elements of financial education in mathematics and, in some cases, in personal and social education. However, it found that the majority of secondary school pupils did not have enough opportunities to develop and apply their skills and abilities as they moved through school, that few schools monitor and evaluate standards in financial education specifically, that many teachers lack confidence and skills, and that access to appropriate resources varies between schools. It identified a few good practice examples where parents were engaged in financial education activities, but this was a small number. A minority of schools were found to benefit from partnerships with financial services organisations, but many were not aware of these opportunities.
- **Evaluation of financial education in Scottish primary and secondary schools[17].** This 2009 Scottish government report used a literature review, schools survey and interviews to understand the range, effectiveness, and quality of financial education in Scotland. It found most schools said they delivered financial education but that it was largely delivered via standalone activities rather than integrated into the curriculum. The study found that financial education was stronger in primary schools than secondary; that focus depended on leadership within individual schools so delivery was patchy and inconsistent; and, again, that improved training and support for teachers was important.
- **Getting ready for work[18].** This 2016 Ofsted report included a review of financial capability as taught through enterprise education in schools in England. It found delivery was piecemeal, inconsistent, and dependent on leadership in individual educational establishments. Evidence from pupils suggested that financial capability was the weakest area of provision. In many schools, delivery was not taking into account relevance to children and young people's real lives. For example, little provision focused on financial education relevant to the experiences of pupils from the most disadvantaged backgrounds, or from different faiths.

These reports will be useful in understanding the full context of provision of financial education as we develop our commissioning plan.

However, we believe our provision mapping exercise increases considerably our understanding of the nature extent of, and gaps in, financial education across the breadth of delivery methods across the UK. The report that follows sets out our key findings and initial thoughts on possible gaps.

16 https://www.estyn.gov.wales/sites/default/files/documents/Managing%20money.pdf
17 http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/259782/0077311.pdf
18 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/enterprise-education-how-secondary-schools-prepare-young-people-for-work

What financial education interventions are happening where

Our mapping identified 131 relevant interventions delivering financial education to children and young people across the UK. Of these, 98 (75%) reported that they focused on financial capability as a primary focus, while the remaining 33 (25%) have financial capability as a secondary focus. The most commonly cited main focus for interventions that did not focus primarily on financial capability was life skills (11 interventions), followed by business/enterprise (six), employability and housing/tenancy skills (five each), and numeracy (four).

There are seven projects which ran or are running through the What Works Fund for a finite time, at least eight quality-marked resources, and 16 other direct delivery interventions, 14 resources, and one financial product which were identified through previous desk research but which did not provide verified data through our mapping form. We have not included these in the quantitative analysis that follows because of a lack of detailed information, but we will seek to gather full information about them to add to our database and analysis in future years.

The oldest intervention mapped began in 1980, another began in 1986, one in 1994, and one in 1999. A further 23 interventions began between 2000-2009, 45 between 2010-14, and 51 between 2015-17.

76 of the interventions stated their intervention as continuous, ongoing, or otherwise without end date. 38 stated an end date, 24 of which were this year (2018). 11 of the interventions that stated an end date had a duration of one year only; a further nine were for two years, and six interventions were for three years. The remainder varied between four and 16 years in length.

Types of interventions

We categorise interventions into five groups:

- direct delivery (face-to-face, such as workshops, one-to-one coaching, facilitated games or lessons);
- financial product (we include only those products with an educational element, such as pocket money apps);
- learning resource (such as a book, website, or game);
- qualification for children and young people; and
- training/qualification for practitioners.

Some interventions do several of these things at once. More than 6 in 10 of the interventions reported delivery in only one of these categories. A further 1 in 6 interventions reported doing two of these things, and more than 1 in 8 deliver through three types.

The most commonly reported types of intervention were:

- direct delivery only (30%);
- learning resources (13%); and
- direct delivery and learning resources (7.6%).

Only six interventions were reported as standalone financial products, though 18 had some element of financial product as part of the intervention.

Qualifications/training for practitioners was the standalone purpose of seven interventions, and is a component of 22 interventions overall (ncluding the seven where it is the sole method). Four interventions focus solely on qualifications for young people themselves, and training/qualifications for young people is a part of 34 interventions in total.

Where the different types of interventions are taking place

Across the UK

Interventions that cover the whole United Kingdom were reported 36 times. At UK level, learning resources are the most frequently mentioned type of intervention, featuring in nearly six in ten interventions[19]. Direct delivery is the next most common type of intervention, featuring in just over half the UK-wide interventions.

England

39 interventions cover England only. 27 of these England-only interventions use direct delivery; 13 use learning resources; and 11 interventions focus on training/qualifications for young people, including three of the four interventions that focus on this as their only form of delivery (the other is available in England and Wales). Seven England-only interventions include a focus on training/qualifications for practitioners, including two where this is the only form of delivery. Five interventions include a financial product.

When looking at all interventions available in England (including those available in one or two other nations as well), the proportions of different types of delivery remain fairly similar: more than seven in ten (37) include direct delivery, two-fifths include resources, two-fifths include training/qualifications for young people, a fifth include training/qualification for practitioners, and just over 1 in 10 include a financial product.

Wales

14 interventions cover Wales only. Nine Wales-only interventions include direct delivery; only one intervention for Wales had learning resources as its sole focus; and two were financial products. One intervention focused on training/qualifications for both practitioners and young people. Three interventions have direct delivery as a primary focus, but also include training/qualifications for young people and/or practitioners who work with young people[20].

When looking more widely at all interventions being delivered in Wales (not just Wales-only), nearly three-quarters involve direct delivery; one-fifth include financial products, just under a half use learning resources, two-fifths involve training/qualifications for young people, and a quarter involve training/qualifications for practitioners.

Scotland

25 interventions cover Scotland only. 19 of these use direct delivery and 12 include the use of learning resources. Two interventions include training/qualifications for practitioners who work with young people, five interventions include training/qualifications for young people, and three include financial products.

When looking at all interventions delivered in Scotland, more than three-quarters involve direct delivery, half use learning resources, a fifth involve training/qualifications for young people, just over 1 in 10 involve training/qualification for practitioners, and fewer than 1 in 10 involve financial products.

Northern Ireland

Three interventions cover Northern Ireland only[21]. Our results for Northern Ireland are therefore limited, and we understand that more interventions may exist. However, we found all three interventions combined multiple types of delivery. Two include direct delivery, financial product, learning resources, training/qualifications for practitioners who work with young people, and training/qualifications for young people; and the third includes direct delivery, learning resources, and training/qualifications for young people. All these interventions have a face-to-face element, including school assemblies, workshops, and one-to-one coaching.

19 All figures refer to interventions that include this type of method either on its own or in conjunction with other types.
20 It is possible that individuals completing it found it difficult to typify the intervention.
21 The methods through which we publicised our call for information varied in different nations, because of the devolved nature of all arrangements relating to financial education and differing networks and approaches to delivery. However, we believe our financial education reach in Northern Ireland is less strong than in other UK nations, so the small number of results for Northern Ireland may be partially because of this.

What financial education interventions are happening where continued

Multi-nation interventions
A small number of interventions are delivered in two or three UK nations. Five are delivered in England and Wales; one in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland; two in England, Wales, and Scotland; and four in England and Scotland. A small number did not give details of countries of operation.

Many of the interventions mapped are available more widely than where they are currently delivered, either because they operate on the basis of requests from schools or funders to deliver in any area, or because they offer a project that they would be happy to expand on request.

Local areas of delivery
We also asked for information about the regions and, where possible, local authorities in which interventions are being delivered. 58 interventions specified a geographical area (smaller than nation) in which they are operating. These varied between region, county level, local authority level, and individual cities/towns. Many interventions are operating in multiple areas so it is not possible to specify the reach figures in each area. Others stated they delivered across whole countries and that they had targeting criteria, such as areas of high deprivation, without specifying exact locations. Many areas will receive delivery that is available nationwide, so the following figures should not be seen as a definitive list of the only areas receiving financial education. However, they give an indication of where geographically targeted interventions are happening.

The specific areas in which financial education was reported as being delivered were as follows (numbers of interventions in brackets where there are more than one).

England: Greater London and South East
London (four), as well as specific boroughs: Barking and Dagenham, Brent, Camden, Greenwich, Hackney, Hillingdon, Islington, Newham, Southwark (two), Tower Hamlets (three), Westminster.

Berkshire, Brighton, Eastbourne, Essex, Hove, Leatherhead, Reading, Reigate, Thurrock.

England: East
Ipswich.

England: South West
Cornwall, Bristol, Gloucester.

England: East & West Midlands
Birmingham (three), Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Solihull, Staffordshire (two), West Midlands, Wolverhampton.

England: North East
Darlington (two), Newcastle-upon-Tyne (two), Northumberland, Tyne and Wear.

England: Yorkshire & the Humber
Bradford (two), Leeds (four), West Yorkshire.

England: North West
Blackburn and Darwen, Bolton, Carlisle City, Cheshire (two), Cumbria, Greater Manchester, Halton, Lancashire, Liverpool, Manchester City, Oldham, Salford, Warrington, Wigan, Wirral.

Wales
Bridgend, Cardiff (two), Conwy & Denbighshire (two), Flintshire, Newport, Merthyr Tydfil, Pembrokeshire, Torfaen, Vale of Glamorgan, Ynys Mon.

Scotland
Dumfries and Galloway; Dundee; East Ayrshire (two); East Lothian; East Renfrewshire (two); Falkirk; Fife (four); Forres Area; Glasgow (eight); Grampian; Moray and Nairn; North and South Lanarkshire; Stirling (three); West Dunbartonshire (two); West Lothian (two).

Northern Ireland
Belfast.

The large number of interventions reported for some areas, for example, Glasgow, may reflect excellent sharing of the mapping form through networks within those areas, as well as a large number of interventions happening there. In future years we will work to increase the reach of our mapping call for information through wider networks across the UK, and will be able to report, based on the reported start and end date of interventions, the extent to which we are picking up new interventions, or simply ones that were occurring but had not been captured by our mapping in this initial round.

Reach & targeting: number, ages, and needs of CYP targeted

This section explores the reach of financial education interventions in the UK, the target recipient (for example, whether the intervention is aimed at children and young people themselves or at an intermediary), and the types of needs and ages targeted.

These figures give an idea of the scale of current financial education, and provide a baseline for us to understand, alongside other measures, how financial education changes over time. However, they should be treated with some caution, as we cannot know whether multiple interventions may have reached the same child, creating duplication – for example, if resources from one funder or provider have been used by another as part of delivery.

We also found that some organisations do not measure reach, meaning there are some gaps in data, so our calculations are based on only a proportion of those who responded. Organisations will also measure reach in different ways. Online resources may count website hits or downloads as an individual child receiving financial education, and the figures therefore become very large. We have therefore reported figures both including and excluding online interventions, to give an indication of the scale at which more intensive financial education is happening, as well as the overall view.

We consider these figures to be estimates of the numbers of interactions children have had with financial education, or reported total reach of all interventions, rather than definitive figures of the precise number of children who have received financial education. Nevertheless, they give us a fuller picture than has ever previously been available about who is receiving financial education and where.

Number of interactions with financial education

The total reach reported by all interventions mapped is >3.3m children and young people. Around 1.2m of this reach is reported by online-only interventions, which are an important part of financial education but which are likely to record reach in different ways[22], and 230,000 children and young people are reported as being reached by interventions that are learning resources only.

Two interventions report a reach of >750,000 children and young people. A further two report a reach of between 100,000-500,000 children and young people, and another three between 50,000-100,000 children and young people. 12 interventions report a reach of between 10,000-25,000; 10 between 5,000-10,000; six between 2,000-5,000; and 16 between 1000-2000. 45 interventions reported a reach of less than 1,000 children and young people, and in all but one of these cases, the reach was 500 children and young people or fewer. 29 of these reported a reach of 250 children and young people or fewer, and 17 reported a reach of 100 or fewer.

Broken down by nation, the reported reach of interventions[23] is:

Table 1: Reported Reach of Financial Education interventions, by country

COUNTRY	TOTAL REPORTED REACH
Available across United Kingdom	2,700,000
Available in England	379,000
England only	292,000
Available in Wales	145,000
Wales only	74,600
Available in Scotland	75,400
Scotland only	52,100
Available in Northern Ireland	114,000
Northern Ireland only	92,000

While a greater number of interventions were included in the mapping in Scotland, than for Wales and Northern Ireland, these tended to operate at a smaller and often more local scale than those mapped in other UK nations.

22 This is based on figures given by 101 organisations. The remainder either did not provide figures or counted reach in a different way, such as hours of lessons delivered annually.
23 Rounded to 3 significant figures

Reach & targeting: number, ages, and needs of CYP targeted continued

When we look at the reach of interventions delivered directly to young people (rather than purely resources or products), we find the majority of reach in Northern Ireland, Wales, and Scotland is by interventions that include direct delivery. Only very small numbers (<250 in each nation) were reached by interventions that are not face-to-face. Perhaps unsurprisingly, interventions operating across the whole of the UK are more likely to be learning resources or financial products.

The initial recipients of financial education

Some interventions target teachers, practitioners (for example, youth workers, social workers, family keyworkers, community group leaders, or youth justice professionals), or parents as a means of reaching children and young people. Others target children and young people directly.

Table 2: Type of target recipient of interventions, by country

TARGET RECIPIENT	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS REPORTING TARGETING THESE RECIPIENTS	% INTERVENTIONS	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS TARGETING THESE RECIPIENTS IN EACH NATION				
			UK	ENGLAND	WALES	SCOTLAND	NI
Children and young people (CYP) only	76	58	22	32	6	19	2
CYP + teachers	16	12	2	7	8	3	1
CYP + parents	9	6.9	2	0	3	4	0
CYP + parents + teachers	7	5.3	4	3	0	0	0
CYP + parents + practitioners	5	3.8	1	0	1	2	1
CYP + parents + teachers + practitioners	4	3.1	3	0	1	0	0
Teachers or practitioners only	4	3.1	2	2	1	0	0
Parents/carers + teachers + practitioners	3	2.3	2	1	1	0	0
Parents only	2	1.5	0	2	0	0	0

When reach is taken into account, children and young people (CYP) only remains the most frequently targeted group. Interventions targeting CYP as the recipient report a reach of some 2.35m. The reach of interventions aiming to reach CYP and parents; CYP and teachers; and CYP, parents, and teachers is between 200,000-300,000 in each category.

While fewer interventions aim to reach CYP, parents, teachers, and practitioners (other than teachers), the total reach of these is >420,000, mainly because of one large resource-based intervention, which reaches >350,000 on its own.

Just less than 66,000 children and young people are reached by interventions targeting CYP, parent/carers, and practitioners.

Around 7,500 CYP are reached through interventions aiming to train practitioners (those who work with children and young people beyond teachers) alone. About 300 CYP are reached through interventions delivered to parents alone.

Only six interventions included foster carers in their target recipients, with a total reported reach of <500. It could be that many interventions targeting parents include foster carers within their recipients, but it is notable that no interventions were reported to be specifically targeting or tailored to the needs of foster carers alone.

Ages targeted

In our mapping form, we broke ages down according to school key stages/phases and aligned with our CYP outcomes framework[24]. We included the 18+ age group to capture those interventions spanning a wider age range than pre-18 (for example, those that work with 16-25 year olds), and because some young people over 18 may still fall within the responsibility of statutory children's services, and/or be receiving preparatory educational support (for example, those with special educational needs and disabilities).

Where interventions were engaging with teachers, parents, or practitioners as intermediaries, we asked for information about the age group of CYP they were intending to reach through these adults. A small number of providers did not give this information, but we are able to analyse age data for more than 120 interventions.

Age groups 14-16 and 16-18 have the greatest number of interventions targeted at them. Over half of the financial education interventions mapped targeted 14-16 year olds; nearly 6 in 10 targeted 16-18 year olds. Age 0-5 is the least-often included age group, targeted in less than one in five interventions.Ages 5-7 and 7-9 are targeted by around a third of interventions each.

When reach is taken into account, the pattern changes slightly. The greatest number of children and young people reported to be reached by financial education are in the 14-16 age group, followed by 11-14, then 16-18. This reported reach includes online and resource-only interventions but, given the significantly smaller number of interventions reported for age 11-14, suggests these tend to be operating at a larger scale than those for older young people, or those in the 9-11 age group. The number of interventions targeting the 9-11 age group is is very similar to the number targeting the 11-14 group, but the reach for the 9-11 group is much lower.

24 Though separating 7-9 and 9-11 to reflect different stages of learning in school http://www.fincap.org.uk/outcomes_children_and_young_people

Reach and targeting: how many children and young people are reached and what ages and needs are targeted continued

Table 3: Ages targeted by interventions, by country[25]

AGE BRACKET	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS TARGETING AGE GROUP	% OF ALL INTERVENTIONS TARGETING AGE GROUP	TOTAL REACH OF INTERVENTIONS TARGETING THIS AGE GROUP	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS TARGETING THIS AGE GROUP, BY NATION				
				UK (TOTAL = 36)	ENGLAND (TOTAL = 52)	WALES (TOTAL = 23)	SCOTLAND (TOTAL = 31)	NI (TOTAL = 4)
0-5	24	18	343k	7	4	6	9	0
5-7	42	32	832k	12	14	11	11	2
7-9	46	35	1.91m	15	14	12	11	2
9-11	54	41	1.90m	16	18	13	15	2
11-14	56	43	2.87m	16	21	14	13	3
14-16	72	55	2.93m	18	25	17	19	3
16-18	76	58	2.74m	18	30	15	18	4
18+	47	36	1.19m	11	20	11	9	2

The pattern seems to be relatively consistent across nations, though more pronounced in England-focused financial education than any other nation or the UK as a whole. In Wales and Scotland, the number of interventions targeting the 14-16 age group just exceeds the number focusing on 16-18. In the UK, the numbers of interventions targeting the 14-16 and 16-18 age groups are equal, and there seems to be a little more balance, with almost as many interventions targeting ages 9-11 and 11-14, too. There appears to be a very slightly increased focus on age 9-11 in Scotland, and Scotland also seems to have a disproportionately high number of the 0-5 interventions, including the only intervention in the UK targeted specifically at 0-5 alone.

Only 23 interventions focus on one age group alone – one for each of ages 0-5, 5-7, and 7-9; four for 9-11; two for 11-14; six for 14-16; and eight for 16-18. The total reach of interventions targeted at just one age group tend to be small or relatively small. For example, the reported number of children reached by the intervention for the 0-5 age group is less than 100; the largest reach of any intervention targeting only one age group is less than a quarter of a million (and this is a learning resource); and the largest reach of a face-to-face intervention targeting just one age group is 20,000 or less.

Needs targeted

We found 49 (37%) interventions that target groups with specific needs, beyond age range. All but three of these include face-to-face delivery, either through direct delivery with the children and young people or, in a small minority of cases, through qualifications or training for CYP or practitioners. The remaining three are learning resources only.

Importantly however, the total reach reported for these interventions is only just over 128,000 – less than 4% of the total reported reach of all interventions.

25 This uses figures for interventions reporting delivery in specific nations or combinations of nations – for example, reported figures for Scotland are based on those delivering only in Scotland, or those delivering in England and Scotland; or England and Scotland and Wales. This means that some interventions are counted in more than one column, on the basis that they are relevant to the picture of provision in more than one country. UK-wide financial education is covered only in the UK column, however, as it would be difficult to divide appropriately across nations.

Those with a face-to-face element have a total reported reach of just over 106,000, or around 7.4% of the total reach reported by all face-to-face interventions.

The number of interventions focusing on particular groups is set out in the table below, alongside information about the presence or otherwise of interventions focusing on specific needs across different nations.

Data on Northern Ireland is limited by the very small number of interventions reported here. It is also important to note that 28 of these interventions were operating at an area below country level – often as local as a local authority area or city – so the need should not always be seen as being targeted by interventions available across the whole country.

Table 4: Needs targeted by interventions, by country

PARTICULAR GROUP OF PEOPLE	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS INCLUDING FOCUS ON THIS GROUP	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS TARGETING ONLY ON THIS GROUP/COMBINED WITH ONLY ONE OTHER CATEGORY	COUNTRIES IN WHICH INTERVENTIONS ADDRESSING THIS NEED ARE AVAILABLE				
			UK	ENGLAND	WALES	SCOTLAND	NI
Moving into independent living/in supported accommodation	18	2 (plus 2 that also target risk of/ homelessness; and 1 also targeting those about to start university)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Young people excluded/at risk of exclusion	18	1 (plus 1 also targeting those about to start university; and 1 targeting this group + young offenders)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Homeless/at risk of homelessness	16	1 (plus 2 others targeting this group + moving into independent accommodation)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
About to start university	16	5 (plus 5 others targeting this + one of: NEETs, school leavers, at risk of exclusion, moving into independent living)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Not in education, employment or training (NEET)	15	0 (1 intervention targets this + about to start university)		✓	✓	✓	

Reach and targeting: how many children and young people are reached and what ages and needs are targeted continued

PARTICULAR GROUP OF PEOPLE	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS INCLUDING FOCUS ON THIS GROUP	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS TARGETING ONLY ON THIS GROUP/COMBINED WITH ONLY ONE OTHER CATEGORY	COUNTRIES IN WHICH INTERVENTIONS ADDRESSING THIS NEED ARE AVAILABLE				
			UK	ENGLAND	WALES	SCOTLAND	NI
Children receiving free school meals/ low income/ deprived area	13	2 (all interventions targeting this group target at least 2 other categories too)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Young parents	13	0 (most interventions have this as one of >3 categories. The most specific targeting are 2 interventions that target this group in addition to NEETs/at risk of exclusion)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Care leavers	11	0 (1 targets this group + children in care)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Young offenders/gang experienced young people/at risk of offending	8	0 (1 targets this group + at risk of exclusion)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Children in care	7	0 (as above, 1 targets this group + care leavers)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
English as a second language (ESOL) speakers	6	0 (one targets this group + SEND)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Children and young people affected by substance misuse	6	0 (all interventions targeting this group target at least 5 other groups too)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
At risk of, or experiencing abuse/ exploitation (including domestic abuse)	5	0 (all interventions targeting this group target at least 7 other groups too)		✓	✓		

PARTICULAR GROUP OF PEOPLE	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS INCLUDING FOCUS ON THIS GROUP	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS TARGETING ONLY ON THIS GROUP/COMBINED WITH ONLY ONE OTHER CATEGORY	COUNTRIES IN WHICH INTERVENTIONS ADDRESSING THIS NEED ARE AVAILABLE				
			UK	ENGLAND	WALES	SCOTLAND	NI
Children and young people with mental health difficulties	5	0 (all interventions targeting this group target at least 6 other groups too)	✓	✓	✓		
Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) communities	4	0 (all interventions targeting this group target at least 3 other groups too)		✓		✓	
Young carers	4	0 (all interventions targeting this group target at least 4 other groups too)		✓		✓	
Asylum seekers/ refugees	3	0 (all interventions targeting this group target at least 3 other groups too)		✓	✓	✓	
Children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND)	3	0 (1 focusing on this + ESOL speakers)	✓	✓	✓		
Children and young people with physical impairments	2	1		✓	✓		
Children from Gypsy/Roma/ traveller communities	0	0					
Military families	0	0					

Reach and targeting: how many children and young people are reached and what ages and needs are targeted continued

Perhaps not surprisingly, the greatest number of interventions exist for young people about to transition into independence, where 'need' is based on stage of development rather than individual characteristics or behaviours, and/or where young people have needs that link to other pressing policy issues such as reducing homelessness, encouraging employment and participation in education.

Our mapping did not identify any interventions targeting children from Gypsy, Roma, or traveller communities[26], or military families, and found fewer than five targeting each of: children with physical impairments; CYP with SEND; young carers; asylum seekers/refugees; and children from BAME communities.

Only eight of the interventions that target additional needs have a focus that includes children age seven or under; 11 have a focus that includes children aged 11 or under[27]; 17 have a focus that includes under 14s; and 30 have a focus that includes under 16s. 39 interventions include a focus on the 16-18 age group, and 17 focus on this group alone (often with 18+ as well). 28 interventions focus only on age 14+.

The vast majority of interventions that target specific groups focus on multiple categories of need. This may reflect the fact that categories of need are not mutually exclusive; any child or young person will have a broad range of needs and strengths and may be able to be counted in multiple groups. For example, young people excluded from school may also be NEET; care leavers may also be moving into independent accommodation; and a young person about to start university could have any number of different characteristics and circumstances affecting them.

It may also reflect, however, that existing targeting of financial education for children and young people tends to be quite broad. Just over half (27) of the interventions targeting specific groups focused on three or fewer categories of need. In some cases, such as children with mental health difficulties, at risk of or experiencing abuse or exploitation, or affected by substance misuse, the category of need was always found in a long list of potential 'vulnerabilities'. This suggests that, while interventions exist aiming to serve these young people, there may still be little work targeted or tailored to understanding and addressing their specific unique needs.

Some respondents added 'other' categories of need beyond the list we specified. These included 'workless households who have a teenager at risk of not reaching a positive destination', 'lone parents', and 'lacking positive role models around money management'. In future years, we will hone our list of needs to reflect these areas and align consistently with categories identified through research in our needs analysis.

We are also able to look at who funds and delivers interventions targeted at specific needs. The vast majority of providers in this space are not-for-profit organisations – only five interventions targeted at specific needs are delivered by financial services organisations (including three credit unions and one building society). More than 30 of the interventions are delivered by charities or social enterprises, with the remainder made up of some local authorities, educational establishments, and housing providers.

Interestingly, only 10 of the interventions that address specific needs are funded from sources that include financial services organisations or corporates (and when they are, this is often in partnership with others, such as foundations or housing associations). The funding going into these interventions from financial services totals just over £800k. Government funding, including from local authorities, devolved administrations and UK government departments such as the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS), and money from foundations and lottery funds, play a more significant role here, with funding from the not-for-profit sector totalling more than £1.65m.

26 We received one submission from an organisation that was implementing part of a national programme, which stated they targeted this community in their implementation of the project in one local authority area in Wales.
27 Including those with a focus on under-sevens.

Funding: who funds financial education and to what value

Responses to our mapping exercise indicate that at least £13 million is being spent on financial education per year. The actual figure is very likely to be higher, as funding information was provided for only just over half of interventions mapped.

Several organisations, including some major financial services funders, were not able to share information about funding. In other cases, funding information was not able to be given because provision was funded through charging for services. Funding often comes from more than one provider, which makes it difficult to identify exactly how much comes from different funders. In some cases, providers have had to estimate funding, for example, based on proportions of pupil premium or grant funding spent on financial education, or what proportion of their organisation's time was spent on this, compared with, for example, supporting adults.

However, the mapping gives us a fuller picture than has been available previously of where funding is coming from and where it is directed, and we will be able to review change in future years, especially for the 70+ interventions that reported funding information.

The funding figures that follow are all given per annum.

Financial services are the biggest funder, with total funding in which they pay a part (often in collaboration with other funders, meaning it is hard to determine how much is funded by which organisation) exceeding £6.3m. Within this, £3.7m of projects are funded purely by financial services firms.

Government agencies across the UK also play a significant role. Funding in which they play a part totals almost £4m, and within this they are the sole funders of almost £1.5m of financial education. This includes funding from devolved administrations, including for Supporting People and Communities First projects in Wales; Scottish government projects in schools and nurseries; funding from the Department for Education and DCMS in England (including use of pupil premium funding); funding from the European Commission and European Social Fund; and a small number of local authorities across England, Wales, and Scotland.

Those projects in the mapping exercise that are funded by the Money Advice Service alone contributed just under £1m. The Money Advice Service was also named as a contributing partner to projects whose funding totals another £980k. A considerable proportion of the Money Advice Service funding comes from the What Works Fund[28].

Other (non-financial services) corporates are named as sole funders of around £100k of projects, and contributors to projects whose funding totals just over £1.7m.

More than £1.7m was funded by projects delivering financial education as a for-profit business. Projects funded by philanthropists, or self-funded, totalled just over £400k; Lottery, foundations, and large charities are named as funders of projects whose funding totals £460k.

The table below shows reported funding for interventions across the UK[29]. Note again the caveat that information is available for only around half of all interventions and, in Wales and Scotland in particular, agencies often reported that they were delivering as part of a wider funded government programme, and were unable to identify separate specific funding for financial education.

28 https://www.fincap.org.uk/what-works-fund
29 Rounded to three significant figures

Funding: who funds financial education and to what value continued

Table 5: Funding reported for interventions, by country

COUNTRY	REPORTED FUNDING
Available UK-wide	£6,023,000
Available in England	£4,800,000
England only	£3,760,000
Available in Wales	£1,180,000
Wales only	£331,000
Available in Scotland	£779,000
Scotland only	£559,000
Available in Northern Ireland	£1,170,000
Northern Ireland only	£965,000

It is difficult to judge accurately what level of funding might be going into the interventions that were unable to provide funding information, because of the wide range of reasons for this. For example, estimating the level of funding brought in by charging for a service in a given year is quite different from calculating the possible proportion of local authority youth service funding going into the financial education element of a wider project on life skills.

However, using very rough estimates based on the reported reach of interventions that were unable to report funding information, their methods of delivery, and funding figures from similar interventions, we suggest it may be the case that at least an additional £5m is going into financial education that has not been reported, bringing the potential total to more than £18m.

This figure is based on a significant number of assumptions, however, and does not incorporate potential funding for interventions with a reach of <100 funded through an organisation's core funding, nor the very few interventions for which no reach figures or funding information were given. We will aim to increase the completeness, and therefore accuracy, of funding figures in future years and, by comparing the data held year to year, will be able to comment on the extent to which any reported change in funding amounts is because of increased accuracy, versus a genuine increase or decrease in funding.

Delivery: settings, practitioners, and methods used

Who delivers financial education, to whom?

More than 100 organisations are delivering the financial education recorded in our mapping exercise. Charities and social enterprises (not-for-profit businesses) are the largest sector in delivery of financial education in terms of numbers of interventions they are involved in – 79 interventions are delivered either by charities alone or in partnership with other agencies. The total reach of these is <570,000, and all but eight of these interventions involve face-to-face delivery.

Financial services, including credit unions, are involved in delivering 30 interventions, but the reported reach of these is >1.4m. All but five of these interventions include face-to-face delivery of some form.

The remainder of delivery is made up of other local agencies such as local authorities, educational institutions, housing associations; other for-profit businesses including sole traders; and government agencies in Scotland and Wales.

Nearly 9 in 10 of all interventions are being delivered by a single organisation. Where delivery is by more than one organisation, the partnerships include collaboration between more than one charity, between local authorities and education organisations, between charities and the financial services, and between charities and local authorities.

Interestingly, within interventions that are delivered by the financial services sector, we see a slightly greater focus on primary school age than in the profile of interventions overall. 22 of these interventions include a focus on at least some primary school children and the vast majority of these include under-sevens. This is likely because of savings clubs run by credit unions, which tend to be targeted at primary schools.

In interventions delivered by charities, targeting is skewed towards older young people, with more than three-fifths of interventions delivered by charities including a focus on ages 16-18, fewer than one in ten including a focus on ages 0-5, and less than a quarter focusing on ages 5-7 and 7-9.

Delivery settings

We asked respondents to indicate where their interventions are delivered. The answers are set out in the table below.

Table 6: Delivery setting for financial education, by country

DELIVERY SETTING	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS REPORTING DELIVERY IN THIS SETTING	% INTERVENTIONS OVERALL	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS AVAILABLE IN EACH UK NATION REPORTING DELIVERY IN THESE SETTINGS[30]				
			UK	ENGLAND	WALES	SCOTLAND	NI
Secondary school	74	56.4	13	28	18	19	3
Primary school	57	43.5	13	20	13	18	1
Youth groups	29	22.1	8	10	8	5	2
Further education colleges	29	22.1	6	15	8	3	1
Sixth form	25	19.1	5	10	8	2	2
Community groups	24	18.3	5	9	5	8	1

30 The count of interventions for each nation includes those delivered in that nation only and those delivered in that nation as part of delivery in two or three parts of the UK.

Delivery: settings, practitioners, and methods used continued

DELIVERY SETTING	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS REPORTING DELIVERY IN THIS SETTING	% INTERVENTIONS OVERALL	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS AVAILABLE IN EACH UK NATION REPORTING DELIVERY IN THESE SETTINGS[30]				
			UK	ENGLAND	WALES	SCOTLAND	NI
Online	21	16	15	0	3	1	1
Non-mainstream education settings	20	15.3	7	8	6	2	0
Businesses' offices	18	13.7	3	7	5	2	0
Children's centres/ family hubs	16	12.2	3	6	7	6	1
Training centres (for practitioners)	13	9.9	2	4	3	5	0
Higher education institutions	11	8.4	3	5	2	1	1
Supported accommodation	11	8.4	3	5	5	1	0
In the child or young person's home	10	7.6	6	1	2	1	0
CABs/local advice centres	10	7.6	2	5	4	1	0
Faith organisations	8	6.1	4	2	1	1	0
Libraries	6	4.6	2	2	2	0	0
Young offenders institutions	6	4.6	3	3	1	0	0
Residential care	5	3.8	2	2	2	1	1

Unsurprisingly, schools are by far the most commonly used setting for delivery of financial education. Youth groups, community groups, further education (FE) colleges and sixth forms, and children's centres/family hubs were all used for 20 or more interventions, while young offenders' institutions and residential care were among the least commonly used delivery settings.

The pattern of delivery settings is relatively similar across different nations, though delivery in primary schools and community groups seems to be relatively more common in Scotland; delivery in children's centres or family hubs is proportionately slightly higher in Scotland and Wales than elsewhere; and delivery in FE colleges seems to be slightly more popular in England.

Who delivers financial education

We asked interventions to identify who is involved in delivery of the financial education provided. The responses are set out below:

Table 7: Individuals delivering financial education, by country

INDIVIDUALS DELIVERING FINANCIAL EDUCATION	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS USING THESE INDIVIDUALS TO DELIVER	% INTERVENTIONS OVERALL	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS DELIVERING THROUGH THESE INDIVIDUALS IN DIFFERENT NATIONS				
			UK	ENGLAND	WALES	SCOTLAND	NI
Teachers/tutors/ educators	39	29.8	12	12	6	13	1
Paid facilitators	39	29.8	6	20	9	5	2
Volunteers	34	26	8	14	8	5	1
Practitioners already working with CYP	28	21.4	6	4	4	10	0
Staff from the funding organisation	21	16	5	12	4	7	1
Practitioners specialising in financial education	19	14.5	2	5	3	9	0
CYP (as peer educators)	18	13.7	4	4	2	8	1
Parents/carers/ family members	15	11.5	11	1	0	3	0
Support workers	14	10.7	6	3	3	4	0

Interventions largely deliver through teachers/tutors/ educators and paid facilitators, as well as volunteers, and practitioners (other than teachers) who already work with children and young people.

Relatively few interventions were delivered through support workers, and only three interventions (two UK-wide and one in Scotland) mentioned delivery through social workers (this is not included in the table because of the low number of reports).

Parents/carers/family members were reported as a route for delivery in only about 1 in 9 interventions. Where this was the case, it was often because the financial education was a resource or set of resources designed to be used at home as well as in school or other settings.

Understandably, most interventions delivered online only (largely through apps or websites) did not specify an individual or group of individuals delivering the intervention. One identified children and young people

Delivery: settings, practitioners, and methods used continued

(as peer educators), two identified parents/carers/family members as delivering the intervention, and another identified practitioners who specialise in financial education.

A very small number of interventions added other categories. These included business advisers, consultants, economic development staff (from a local authority), project coordinators from a housing association, and 'self-delivery'.

Looking at the variation between nations of the UK, the use of paid facilitators and volunteers seems to be highest in England and Wales, while Scotland seems to have a higher proportion of interventions delivered through teachers, practitioners (other than teachers) who already work with CYP, and practitioners specialising in financial education. Scotland also seems to have a greater number of interventions involving children and young people as peer educators. Staff from funding organisations are relatively more frequently used in England.

For interventions delivering across the whole UK, teachers are perhaps unsurprisingly the most often mentioned individuals involved in delivery, though parents/carers/family members was the secon most cited group – largely because of the number of online and resource-based financial education interventions designed for use at home as well as in education settings.

We can also look at how the individuals involved in delivery vary across age groups.

How the individuals delivering interventions vary across ages

Table 8: Individuals delivering financial education, by age

INDIVIDUALS DELIVERING FINANCIAL EDUCATION	TOTAL NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS USING THESE INDIVIDUALS TO DELIVER	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS REPORTING DELIVERY THROUGH/WITH THESE INDIVIDUALS							
		0-5	5-7	7-9	9-11	11-14	14-16	16-18	18+
Teachers/tutors/educators	39	12	19	19	24	19	24	20	10
Paid facilitators	39	9	14	16	16	17	21	24	15
Volunteers	34	9	17	19	20	16	20	17	8
Practitioners already working with children and young people	28	9	9	9	12	11	17	17	12
Staff from the funding organisation	21	3	7	7	10	10	12	9	6
Practitioners specialising in financial education	19	3	4	4	6	6	11	15	7
CYP (as peer educators)	18	8	12	11	11	7	8	8	5
Parents/carers/family members	15	6	10	10	11	8	8	6	2
Support workers	14	2	3	3	4	3	8	12	8

Once again, overall, we would expect to see higher numbers reported in the older age groups where greater numbers of interventions overall were reported.

In future updates to our mapping, we will seek to hone our collection of data about the individuals involved in delivery to ensure that we reduce double-counting resulting from reporting of the same individuals under more than one category – for example, 'paid facilitator' and 'practitioner specialising in financial education', or 'support worker' and 'practitioner already working with CYP'.

We can see some patterns in the data collected. Delivery through teachers/educators and volunteers is high across the age groups. Delivery through paid facilitators is also relatively high throughout, though use of this group increases slightly more obviously as age increases. Practitioners (other than teachers) who already work with children and young people, and practitioners who specialise in financial education seem to be most often used for interventions with ages 14+. The use of support workers is greater in the 14+ age group; not surprisingly as these individuals tend to be involved with supporting transition into independent living, housing, or employment.

Financial education delivered by staff from the funding organisation seems to be most often found across the ages 9-16. Financial education intended to be delivered by parents or carers seems to be targeted relatively more frequently at the 5-11 age group.

Interestingly, the use of children and young people as peer educators is also skewed to the younger ages. This is likely to be because of a high number of primary school banks, saving schemes, and other whole-school or class-based challenges in this category.

Methods of delivery

The methods of delivery used in the financial education interventions are set out in the table below.

Table 9: Methods of delivery, by country

METHOD	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS REPORTING USING THIS METHOD[31]	% OF INTERVENTIONS USING THESE METHODS	UK	ENGLAND	WALES	SCOTLAND	NI
Resources for CYP (booklet, activity packs, etc)	52	39.7	13	21	13	13	2
Case studies/role play	48	36.6	12	18	12	10	2
Games	47	35.9	9	21	11	15	1
Workshops	46	35.1	8	22	13	12	3
Teacher resources	36	27.5	10	19	9	6	1
Immersion in real-life scenarios	34	26	11	13	7	5	2
Experience in handling money	32	24.4	7	12	8	6	2

31 Either on its own or in conjunction with other methods

Delivery: settings, practitioners, and methods used continued

METHOD	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS REPORTING USING THIS METHOD[31]	% OF INTERVENTIONS USING THESE METHODS	UK	ENGLAND	WALES	SCOTLAND	NI
Training	31	23.7	6	17	9	6	1
One-to-one coaching	27	20.6	7	11	6	5	1
Online intervention	25	19.1	16	6	2	2	1
School assembly	25	19.1	4	13	5	5	1
Short course (1-5 days)	17	13	5	4	7	5	1
CYP/parent groups	10	7.6	3	5	1	2	0

The most frequently used methods are resources for children and young people, case studies/role play, games, and workshops. Perhaps unsurprisingly, UK-wide interventions were more likely to be online than to use any other method, and few interventions focused in one to three nations used online as part of their offer. School assemblies, training, and teacher resources seem to be slightly more popular in England than other nations, and in Scotland the use of games comes out as the most frequently used method while it is at most the 3rd or 4th most commonly used method in other nations. Short courses are reported more frequently in Wales than in any other nation (though they still feature in less than a third of interventions in Wales).

Relatively few interventions focus on one-to-one coaching, which is perhaps reflective of the fact that most financial education is universal and is more often directed at larger groups and classes than at individuals. However, this is worth noting in considering the difference in the nature of 'face-to-face' delivery for children and young people vs adults; with adults, a large amount of advice or guidance is likely to be delivered through more individual approaches.

Very few interventions included groups for children and young people and parents together, reflecting the small number of interventions targeting parents' support for developing children's financial capability. Similarly, only a small number of interventions reported the use of short courses, perhaps indicating the likely focus of most financial education on interventions that last a day or less.

Nine interventions (two available across the UK and seven in England only), mentioned 'group work' as an additional method used. A very small number of interventions reported other methods of delivery, including theatre performances and homework challenges.

We collected free-text information about the duration, number and timing of sessions, which will be analysed in more depth to enable us to collect more robust information in future updates about the timescale and structure over which financial education is delivered. We will then be able to give a fuller overview of the average duration and timing of financial education interventions.

We can also look at how the methods used vary over different age groups, as set out in the table below.

How method used varies across age groups

Table 10: Methods of delivery, by age group

METHODS USED	TOTAL INTERVENTIONS REPORTING USE OF THIS METHOD	NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS REPORTING DELIVERY THROUGH THESE METHODS AT DIFFERENT AGES							
		0-5	5-7	7-9	9-11	11-14	14-16	16-18	18+
Resources for CYP (booklet, activity packs etc)	52	9	20	19	23	24	34	35	18
Case studies/role play	48	7	14	15	20	21	31	36	20
Games	47	8	16	16	22	21	27	29	16
Workshops	46	5	12	14	18	24	29	33	19
Teacher resources	36	10	17	17	21	23	25	23	12
Immersion in real-life scenarios	34	7	12	13	16	16	22	23	13
Experience in handling money	32	8	15	17	19	18	19	21	9
Training	31	5	10	10	15	15	17	16	11
One-to-one coaching	27	4	6	7	8	9	16	23	16
Online intervention	25	4	9	11	14	13	13	17	8
School assembly	25	12	19	18	19	12	11	10	6
Short course (1-5 days)	17	2	6	7	9	13	14	16	10
CYP/parent groups	10	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	6

More interventions were targeted at older age groups, so we would expect to see a bigger count of methods overall in the 11+ groups. Many interventions also reported using a large number of methods simultaneously, often across a broad range of ages, and it is not always clear whether they use all methods for all ages, nor whether they are sometimes referring to a single method under several categories (such as 'training' and 'short course'). This is therefore a question we will seek to make more precise and specific in future mapping updates.

The age breakdown does reveal some patterns, however. The use of resources, games, case studies/role play, and workshops is relatively high throughout, increasing with age. With teacher resources, and experience in handling money, we see a more balanced profile across age ranges, while school assemblies are a much more frequently reported method for primary school children. Unsurprisingly, one-to-one coaching is heavily skewed towards the 14+ age group. The use of CYP/parent groups is low throughout.

Content: topics covered in financial education

This section sets out our findings about the content of current financial education. We asked about content in the following categories, aligned to our CYP outcomes framework:

- **Ability (financial knowledge and skills)** – such as choosing the correct coins to pay for things, understanding different financial terms, being able to read a bank statement or payslip.
- **Mindset (values and attitudes towards money)** – such as whether a child feels anxious about money, is confident managing money, prefers not to borrow, recognises the difference between needs and wants, chooses to save or spend.
- **Behaviour (actions with money)** – such as frequency and regularity of saving, planning what to do with money, keeping track.
- Connection (engagement and access to financial products/services) – such as using a bank account, talking about money with appropriate people, using online banking.

Recognising that not everybody filling in the form would be familiar with the Money Advice Service outcomes frameworks, we gave multiple-choice answers with sub-categories reflecting content we wanted to understand more about. Not all respondents answered these questions, and the response rates varied across questions. A few interventions focused solely on one sub-category of content. We have based the analysis below on the frequency with which each topic was mentioned as being included in the interventions.

Looking across all areas of the outcomes framework, the topics covered most in the interventions are:

1. Budgeting, keeping track, and planning ahead
2. Making spending and saving choices
3. Needs vs wants
4. Understanding ways to save
5. Earning money/making choices about the future – jobs, aspiration
6. What borrowing means
7. Attitudes to borrowing
8. Financial numeracy skills
9. Talking about money/accessing help or advice
10. Financial problem solving

'Mindset' and 'ability' topics are overall the most widely covered of the areas of the outcomes framework.

The least common areas of focus are (from least-often covered, ascending):

1. Choosing and using: mortgages
2. Choosing and using: pensions
3. Using money abroad/exchange rates/currencies
4. Charities and giving
5. Choosing and using: insurance
6. Choosing and using: investments
7. Types of investment
8. Advertising
9. Credit reports
10. Taking risks/gambling

The interventions tend to focus on the practicalities of day-to-day money management, and much more rarely address longer-term elements that young people may need to consider. This may be because providers feel these are less relevant to children and young people.

However, a quarter or less of interventions included subjects that might be directly relevant to children and young people's lives – advertising, taking risks and gambling. Only a third covered fraud, exploitation and keeping money safe in this context; and two-fifths or less covered using money online, choosing and using credit, and choosing and using current accounts.

The frequency with which different topics were mentioned under each category of the outcomes frameworks are set out in the tables below.

Ability (knowledge and skills)

In this category, there is a greater emphasis on practical skills than knowledge, perhaps with a view to application to real life.

Table 11a: 'Ability' topics covered in financial education

TOPIC	FREQUENCY	% INTERVENTIONS COVERING THIS TOPIC
Understanding ways to save	95	72.5
What borrowing means	84	64.1
Financial numeracy skills (e.g. calculating interest rates, working out price reductions)	81	61.8
Financial problem solving	80	61.1
Understanding financial documents (e.g. reading bank statements, payslips)	75	57.3
Understanding risk	54	41.2
Using money online	53	40.5
Tax, government spending, the economy	42	32.1
Benefits and allowances	39	29.8
History of money	35	26.7
Types of investment	24	18.3
Charities and giving	21	16
Using money abroad/exchange rates/currencies	20	15.3
Other	10	7.6
Blank	7	5.1
N/A	1	0.76

Mindset

Responses suggested that there is a strong focus on most of the topics we specified that relate to attitudes and mindset, with the exception of advertising.

Table 11b: 'Mindset' topics covered in financial education

TOPIC	FREQUENCY	% INTERVENTIONS COVERING THIS TOPIC
Making spending and saving choices	101	77.1
Needs vs wants	97	74
Earning money/ making choices about the future – jobs, aspirations	86	65.6
Attitudes to borrowing	82	62.6
Money values	79	60.3
Advertising	30	22.9
Blank	6	4.6
Other	5	3.8
N/A	3	2.3

Content: topics covered in financial education continued

Behaviour

This category contained the most frequently covered topic – budgeting, keeping track, and planning ahead. The relatively small proportion of interventions covering topics to do with risk, gambling, and fraud is worthy of note.

Table 11c: 'Behaviour' topics covered in financial education

	FREQUENCY	% INTERVENTIONS COVERING THIS TOPIC
Budgeting, keeping track, and planning ahead	105	80.1
Talking about money/accessing help or advice	81	61.8
Shopping around/ value for money	73	55.7
Making choices around borrowing	70	53.4
Living independently - e.g. managing household bills, costs of parenting, housing	66	50.4
Fraud, exploitation, keeping money safe	45	34.4
Taking risks, gambling	33	25.2
Blank	8	6.1
Other	8	6.1
N/A	6	4.6

Connection

This area received slightly fewer responses than other aspects of financial capability. This may be because this section came last, or possibly because respondents felt they had covered aspects of connection under other topic areas. Connection topics were also reported as being covered less frequently than other areas of the outcomes framework, with a higher number of respondents responding 'n/a', perhaps because these areas are considered of less direct relevance to children and young people, or because of challenges in providing active opportunities for children to connect with money at ages when parental consent is still required.

Table 11d: 'Connection' topics covered in financial education

SUB-CATEGORY: CONNECTION	FREQUENCY	% INTERVENTIONS COVERING THIS TOPIC
Choosing and using: savings accounts	58	44.3
Methods of payments	57	43.5
When and how to seek guidance	54	41.2
Choosing and using: credit	53	40.5
Choosing and using: current accounts	49	37.4
Consumer issues	39	29.8
Credit reports	31	23.7
Choosing and using: insurance	22	16.8
Choosing and using: investments	22	16.8
Choosing and using: pensions	19	14.5
Choosing and using: mortgages	18	13.7

SUB-CATEGORY: CONNECTION	FREQUENCY	% INTERVENTIONS COVERING THIS TOPIC
N/A	25	19.1
Blank	13	9.9
Other	5	3.8

How does content differ across age groups?

We find the topics covered in financial education vary somewhat between the different age groups. As so few interventions focus on only one age range, the information that follows is based on counting the number of mentions of different content topics in interventions that include the specified age range. Because the number of interventions focusing on different ages varies, we then compare the percentage of interventions covering topics at different ages (rather than just the count)

On ability, 'financial problem solving' is the most frequently covered topic for financial education covering ages 0-5; and 'understanding ways to save' is the most popular for ages 5-11. For all primary school ages, the top three areas of content covered here are: understanding ways to save, financial problem solving, and financial numeracy skills. At ages 11-16, 'what borrowing means' becomes the most frequently covered topic, followed by 'understanding ways to save'. By age 14-16, 'understanding financial documents' also appears in the top three topics covered. At ages 16-18+ the most frequently covered topic goes back to 'understanding ways to save', although this is closely followed by 'what borrowing means', then 'understanding financial documents'.

The most frequently featured content on mindset is 'making spending and saving choices' across all age ranges. This subject is covered in around 9 in 10 interventions focusing on primary school age children. 'Needs and wants' is covered in about 8 in 10 interventions for those age 11 or under. At ages 11-16, the gaps between 'making spending and saving choices', 'needs vs wants', 'earning money/making choices about the future – jobs, aspirations' and 'attitudes to borrowing' narrow, with all these featuring in more than 7 in 10 interventions targeting these age groups. By 16-18, these four most commonly found topics feature in at least 8 in 10 interventions.

In the behaviour category, 'budgeting, keeping track, and planning ahead' is the most featured topic across all ages. It is included in more than three-quarters of all interventions and this increases to almost 9 in 10 of interventions that target children age 14+. 'Talking about money' and 'shopping around' are the second and third most commonly included topics in interventions targeting primary school age children. For ages 11-16, 'making choices about borrowing' is the second most frequently covered topic, 'shopping around' is the third most common for the 11-14 group, and 'living independently' is the third most common for the 14-16 group. By 16-18, 'living independently' is the second most covered topic, with 'talking about money' the third.

Importantly, 'fraud, exploitation and keeping money safe' is covered in less than half, and 'taking risks and gambling' in less than two-fifths, of interventions targeting 11-18s, and this figure does not increase with age.

On connection topics, 'choosing and using savings accounts' is the most frequently featured topic in interventions focusing on all age groups under 14. For ages 14-16 this comes second, with 'choosing and using credit' top. For ages 16-18, 'when and how to seek guidance' was the most frequently featured topic, with 'choosing and using credit' and 'methods of payment' next most commonly featured, and 'choosing and using saving accounts' fourth.

Again, we do not see a noticeable increase across ages in the proportion of interventions focusing on the relatively infrequently covered topics of choosing and using mortgages, insurance, investments, or pensions – each of these tends to be covered by around a quarter or fewer of interventions across the whole 11-18 age range. The proportion of interventions covering the topic of credit reports is understandably highest for interventions that work with ages 16-18, though even at this age only around a third of interventions cover this subject.

Content: topics covered in financial education continued

How does content differ across nations?

There is some variation in aspects of content included in financial education in the different nations of the UK. The information that follows is based on counting the number of times different topics are covered in all interventions that are delivered in a particular nation (including those targeting two or three nations) and calculating the percentage of interventions featuring the topics in each nation. They should be treated with some caution because of the differing numbers of interventions reported across nations, but they do give some indication of the variations in focus.

'Understanding ways to save' is the most frequently reported ability topic across all nations and the UK. Financial problem solving, financial numeracy skills, understanding financial documents, and what borrowing means, were found in a higher proportion of interventions delivered in Wales, Scotland, and NI, than in interventions in England or the UK. The least-often covered topics were consistently 'using money abroad', 'types of investment', and 'charities and giving', with the history of money also a gap in interventions identified in Northern Ireland.

Among the mindset content, 'making spending and saving choices' was the overall most frequently mentioned topic. It came out top in Scotland; in England, jointly with 'earning money/making choices about the future'; and in UK-wide interventions, jointly with 'money values.' In Wales and Northern Ireland, it featured strongly, but the most frequently covered topic in Wales was 'needs vs wants'. In Northern Ireland, 'needs vs wants', 'attitudes to borrowing', and 'earning money/making choices about the future' were present in all four interventions mapped. 'Advertising' is the content least frequently reported across all nations and the UK as a whole.

'Budgeting, keeping track, and planning ahead' is the behaviour topic most frequently covered by interventions in every nation of the UK, and in the UK as a whole. In Northern Ireland, all four interventions also included a focus on 'making choices about borrowing'. In Wales, the second and third most frequently covered topics were 'living independently' and 'talking about money', with 'shopping around', and 'making choices about borrowing' also featuring in 7 in 10 or more interventions. In Scotland, 'shopping around', and 'making choices about borrowing' are the second and third most frequently covered topics, followed by 'talking about money' and 'living independently', although these feature in less than 6 in 10 interventions. In England, 'making choices about borrowing' was the second most frequently covered topic in this category, followed by 'talking about money' and 'shopping around', but again these were included in less than 6 in 10 interventions.
In UK-wide interventions, 'talking about money' was the second most commonly included topic, but only featured in around half of interventions.

'Taking risks/gambling', and 'fraud, exploitation and keeping money safe' were the least frequently reported topics, with generally only around a third or less of interventions in each nation covering these. The notable exception for 'fraud, exploitation and keeping money safe' is Wales; just under half of all interventions delivering in Wales reported covering this topic.

'Choosing and using savings accounts' was overall the most commonly covered connection topic, and it came out top for interventions focusing on England or the UK as a whole. In Northern Ireland, it was featured in two of the four interventions, along with choosing and using current accounts, credit, and mortgages. It comes second in Wales, where the most commonly featured connection topic is 'methods of payment'; and in Scotland, where the most commonly featured topic is 'when and how to seek guidance'.

Across all four nations and the UK, the least commonly mentioned topics were choosing and using mortgages, insurance, pensions, and investments. There is some variation in the proportion of interventions reporting inclusion of these topics across countries, however – notably in Scotland, where fewer than 1 in 20 interventions include content on choosing and using mortgages (this figure is between 1 in 10 and 1 in 4 for England, Wales, and the UK, and 2 of 4 interventions in Northern Ireland include it).

Evidence and evaluation: who is evaluating their work, through what methods

We asked several questions relating to the evidence used to inform interventions, and the evaluation carried out.

Evidence used to inform interventions

Responses about 103 interventions gave information about the evidence used to inform the intervention. This question was asked with open text answers, as we didn't have a clear idea about the responses to expect. As a result, there is a very wide breadth in answers that makes them difficult to analyse quantitatively. As we develop our mapping approach over the coming year, we will seek to code these responses, so the form can be updated with closed answers, enabling more robust analysis in future updates.

However, frequent responses included 'feedback' (mentioned in 48 responses, often referring to input from both children and young people and teachers/practitioners); 'evaluation' (34 mentions, sometimes referring to previous programmes, sometimes to in-intervention development, including 10 responses that mentioned 'pilots'); and 'surveys' (mentioned in 24 responses, again often referring to both children and young people and teachers/practitioners). 'Research' was mentioned in 11 responses, though this ranged from large-scale market research, to using evidence from academic papers, to unspecified 'desk research'. 'Focus groups' were mentioned nine times, often in conjunction with feedback or surveys.

Experience or expert views – for example, interventions being developed by practitioners who are experts in specific CYP needs, or interventions created by young people themselves – were mentioned in 11 of the responses, three of which referred to interventions targeting specific needs. Positively, only three of the responses that listed experience as a source of evidence did not list other sources in addition to this.

Other responses included visits to observe other interventions, use of government guidance (in Wales and Scotland), and analysis of assessments conducted by local authorities.

Interestingly, only five responses made reference to using evidence about what was available in the market already, or identifying needs not currently being met. This may be because respondents were not thinking about this as 'evidence'. We will seek to include specific options on this in future forms to get a better idea of the extent to which this is genuinely not being considered. The possible lack of use of evidence about unmet need and provision gaps may also be because there has not to date been a single source of this information to refer to. This report, and the needs analysis, evidence analysis, and subsequent gap analysis informing our commissioning plan are intended to address this issue. We hope to see increasing use of nationally collated sources of evidence about need, provision, and what works to inform funding and delivery of interventions in future years.

Evaluation of interventions

We asked respondents to tell us about the ways they evaluate their interventions. A theory of change (ToC) was noted as present for 34 interventions, delivered by 20 organisations, 11 of whom are IMPACT principles signatories, and 17 of whom are charities or other not-for-profit organisations.

While a relatively small number of interventions had a ToC, this number does, however, include some of the interventions with the largest reach and funding (as well as a number of smaller ones). The total reach of interventions with a ToC is almost 1,565,000 children and young people, and the total funding reported for these interventions is nearly £7.2m (with some funding information for large interventions not available).

We collected meaningful responses on the kinds of evaluation conducted for all but 16 interventions. These 16 either left this section of the form blank or stated they do not evaluate the intervention.

Evidence and evaluation: who is evaluating their work, through what methods continued

26 interventions reported being evaluated using a single method. Within these, 'informal feedback from CYP/target group' was the most common method reported (eight interventions); five use process evaluation only; and four use analysis of before and after outcomes using quantitative measures (like surveys) direct with CYP only.

Looking across all interventions that reported evaluation activity, the most commonly mentioned evaluation method was 'informal feedback from CYP/target group', used in 68 interventions. 'Measurement of output' was reported for 60 interventions, and 'analysis of before and after outcomes using quantitative measures (like surveys) direct with CYP' for 53 interventions.

Process evaluation was reported for 38 interventions. Analysis of quantitative measures through others (such as practitioners) was also included in evaluations for 38 interventions, and 'analysis of before and after outcomes using qualitative measures (for example, interviews) through others' (such as parents, or practitioners) in 34.

Monitoring of KPIs was mentioned in 33 interventions, and 'analysis of before and after outcomes using qualitative measures direct with CYP' was used in 31 interventions, almost always alongside other methods of evaluations, suggesting possible use to contextualise quantitative data.

It is positive that a large number of interventions report conducting evaluations, and there is a relatively large number of evaluations that include 'pre' and 'post' measures, as well as a range of other approaches. The fact that informal feedback and measurement of output remain the most used methods of evaluation, however, suggests there is some way to go in improving rigour, and that ongoing work to support more robust and high-quality evaluation continues to be important.

IMPACT principles signatories and the Evidence Hub

38 interventions are delivered by providers signed up to the IMPACT principles[32]. 28 responses indicated that they were 'unsure' of whether the delivery organisation was signed up to the principles. While many of the largest and highest-funded interventions in the UK are signed up to the principles, these results suggest that there remain opportunities to increase awareness and use of the principles by funders and providers of financial education, supporting our ongoing work to improve use of evaluation and evidence.

Only nine interventions, from five providers, reported that evaluation of their interventions was held on the Financial Capability Evidence Hub[33]. 24 further said they were 'unsure' whether information about their interventions was on the hub or not. The number included in the Evidence Hub is likely to increase as What Works Fund project evaluations are added. However, the small number of financial education interventions currently featured in the hub suggests there are opportunities to work to increase representation as evaluation strengthens across the sector.

Financial Education Quality Mark

The Money Advice Service funds the Financial Education Quality Mark[34], a mark awarded to financial education resources assessed as high quality through an independent assessment process coordinated by Young Money. We also support the development of theories of change and evaluation plans as part of this process.

27 of the interventions reported that resources used within their intervention have the Financial Education Quality Mark. A further 24 said they were 'unsure'. The large number of resources identified that do not currently have the Financial Education Quality Mark highlights another opportunity to raise awareness and increase use of the mark, as part of our work to improve evaluation capability and delivery in financial education provision.

32 https://www.fincap.org.uk/impact-principles
33 https://www.fincap.org.uk/evidence_hub
34 https://www.young-money.org.uk/services/financial-education-quality-mark-%E2%80%93-guidance-resource-producers

Conclusion and next steps

The findings about financial education provision currently available in the UK identified in this analysis will be reviewed alongside our needs analysis, evidence analysis, and wider consideration of the policy landscape, in the gap analysis and commissioning intentions we will develop by Sept 2018. After consultation, these will form the basis of our first CYP Commissioning Plan, to be completed by Nov 2018.. The gap analysis will consider areas of potential interest revealed by this analysis, in terms of location, age, need, method, and content. It will also consider areas and target cohorts where interventions are happening but at a very small scale, with a view to considering the potential for increasing reach. Finally, it will consider ongoing opportunities to improve evaluation and use of evidence to inform intervention design and evolution.

We will continue to update our mapping database and hone our data collection methods, using lessons learned from this initial exercise. Our mapping form will remain live on the www.fincap.org.uk website so that we can collect information about new provision continuously. We intend to produce an annual update about those interventions held in our database, and to put out a new call for information every three years, ahead of production of new commissioning plans.

We are also looking at opportunities to use the information collected to better signpost people who are seeking financial education to the provision available. The vast majority[35] of interventions mapped indicated they would be happy for basic public information about their work to be included on an online map of provision, and we intend to make a map of financial education in the UK, hopefully overlaid with some information about need, available on the fincap.org.uk website by autumn 2018.

35 100 interventions answered 'yes' to the question 'Would you be happy for your data to be included in our online map'. Only one answered 'no'. 23 stated 'I need more information', and the remainder were blanks.

Appendix A: How these Analysis reports will inform the CYP Financial Capability Commissioning Plan

COMMISSIONING PLAN

Conclusions from consultation on gap analysis and commissioning iintentions

Plan for what we will seek to fund, deliver, or influence in the years 2019-22

Will include baseline of measures of success

GAP ANALYSIS AND COMMISSIONING INTENTIONS

Consideration of all the evidence available and recommendations based on this, for how we believe resource can best be targeted to ensure all CYP get a meaningful financial education that meets their needs

NEEDS ANALYSIS

Evidence on the fin cap needs of CYP in the UK, including identification of those with unique or greater need

PROVISION ANALYSIS

Findings from mapping of financial education provision; what is happening, where, for whom and by whom

EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

What we know from international research, 'what works' projects and other evaluations about what effective fined is likely to involve

POLICY LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS

Summary of the opportunities and risks in the wider policy landscape, and external drivers of change

MEASURES OF SUCCESS

20 indicators of short, medium and long term change, which we'll track to measure progress and areas for improvement

Appendix B: Questions used in mapping form

Money Advice Service Children and Young People Financial Education Provision Mapping Form

1. Overview

Can you help build a full and up-to-date picture of financial capability/financial education provision for children and young people (CYP) in the UK?

The Money Advice Service is mapping the interventions happening in the UK to help children and young people's financial capability. We're putting together the most comprehensive, up-to-date and accurate view of existing financial capability provision for children and young people to date.

This will inform our commissioning plan, which will enable us to identify gaps in financial education provision, and support the sector in outlining exactly what the provision landscape looks like. In return for your participation, we'll also highlight interventions in an interactive online map that is publicly accessible.

In case you are unsure, we define financial capability as the financial skills, knowledge, motivation and attitudes required to make good financial decisions and to achieve good financial well-being. The foundations for these are developed and can be observed in childhood and adolescence.

We need your help! We are looking for all interventions which have a key focus on financial capability, although they can have other focuses as well. If you're doing something in this space, we'd love to hear from you. We recognise that not all questions will apply to your organisation. Please respond to the questions where it does apply, and enter n/a where it does not. If you deliver more than one service/project/intervention, please use multiple forms to fill out the required information.

The form should take no longer than 15 minutes to complete. It does require specific information on the project, so please make sure you have information to hand. No information will be shared without your permission. We do ask for contact details so we can keep the data on your services up to date and accurate. If you have further questions, please refer to our FAQs.

1. Name*
2. Email address*
3. Telephone number*
4. Job title*
5. Organisation*

Appendix B: Questions used in mapping form continued

2. Programme overview

6. Name of intervention*
7. Type of intervention (select all that apply)* Direct delivery Financial product Learning resources Training/qualification for practitioners who work with young people Training/qualification for young people Other (please specify):
8. Which organisation(s) deliver the intervention/project?*
9. Who funds the project/service/intervention? (If more than one agency is involved please include all - both funders and commissioners)*
10. Current funding (£ pa) (how much funding goes into the project/service/intervention delivery every year? If you receive funding for evaluation as well as delivery, please provide details of both)*
11. Primary focus of intervention (select one)* Business/enterprise Employability Financial capability History Housing/tenancy skills Life skills Literacy Numeracy Parenting PSHE/emotional wellbeing/PSE Other (please specify):

12. Additional focus (select all that apply)*
    - Business/enterprise
    - Employability
    - Financial capability
    - History
    - Housing/tenancy skills
    - Life skills
    - Literacy
    - Numeracy
    - Parenting
    - PSHE/emotional wellbeing/PSE
    - Other (please specify):
13. Who is the intervention targeting? (Select all that apply)*
    - Children and young people
    - Foster carer
    - Parents
    - Practitioners (e.g. youth workers, social workers, family keyworkers, community group leaders, youth justice professionals)
    - Teachers
    - Other (please specify):
14. Which age range(s) does the intervention target? (If the intervention targets a non-CYP group such as parents or teachers, please respond for the CYP age group(s) they work with)*
    - 0-5
    - 5-7
    - 7-9
    - 9-11
    - 11-14
    - 14-16
    - 16-18
    - 18+
    - Other (please specify):

Appendix B: Questions used in mapping form continued

15. Does the intervention focus on any particular area of need? Please select all that apply.*
About to start university
Asylum seekers/refugees
At risk of, or experiencing abuse/exploitation (including domestic abuse)
Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic communities
Care leavers
Children in care
Children and young people affected by substance misuse
Children and young people with mental health difficulties
Children and young people with physical impairments
Children from traveller communities
Children receiving free school meals
English as a second language speakers
Homeless/At risk of homelessness
Military families
Moving into independent living/in supported accommodation
NEETs
SEND
Young carers
Young offenders/gang experienced young people/at risk of offending
Young parents
Young people excluded/at risk of exclusion
N/A
Other (please specify):
16. Number of CYP reached per annum (please give a rough estimate of how many CYP your project/ service/intervention reaches or will reach each year)*
17. Dates – when did you begin to deliver the intervention? (Year)*
18. Dates – when will the delivery of the intervention end? (Year)*

3. Delivery

19. In what venues/agencies is it delivered?*

- Businesses offices
- CABs/local advice centres
- Children's centres/family hubs
- Community groups
- Faith organisations
- Further education colleges
- Higher education institutions
- In the child or young person's home
- Libraries
- Non-mainstream education settings
- Online (app, website, games)
- Primary school
- Residential care settings
- Secondary school
- Sixth form
- Supported accommodation
- Training centres (for practitioners)
- Young offenders institutions
- Youth groups
- Other (please specify):

Appendix B: Questions used in mapping form continued

20. Who delivers the intervention?*

- Children and young people (as peer educators)
- Paid facilitators
- Parents/carers/family members
- Practitioners who already work with the children and young people, doing financial education as part of this
- Practitioners who specialise in financial education
- Social workers
- Support workers
- Staff from funding organisation
- Teachers/tutors/educators
- Volunteers
- Other (please specify):

4. Content

This next section is looking at what areas of financial capability the intervention aims to develop. The first section examines knowledge and skills associated with financial capability. The second section looks at attitudes towards money. The third section looks at behaviours towards money, and the final section looks at ways children and young people might engage with financial products and services.

21. Knowledge and skills: which of the following does your intervention cover?*

- Benefits and allowances
- Charities and giving
- Financial numeracy skills (e.g. calculating interest rates, working out price reductions)
- Financial problem solving
- History of money
- Types of investment
- Understanding financial documents (e.g. reading bank statements, payslips)
- Understanding risk
- Understanding ways to save
- Using money abroad/exchange rates/currencies
- Using money online
- What borrowing means, different types of debt
- Tax, government spending, the economy
- N/A
- Other (please specify):

22. Attitudes & mindset: which of the following does your programme cover?*

- Advertising
- Attitudes to borrowing
- Earning money/making choices about the future - jobs, aspirations
- Making spending and saving choices
- Money values
- Needs vs wants
- N/A
- Other (please specify):

23. Behaviour: Which of the following does your programme cover?*

- Budgeting, keeping track, and planning ahead
- Fraud, exploitation, keeping money safe
- Living independently - e.g. managing household bills, costs of parenting, housing
- Making choices around borrowing
- Shopping around/value for money
- Taking risks, gambling
- Talking about money/accessing help or advice
- N/A
- Other (please specify):

24. Connection: Which of the following does your programme cover?*

- Choosing and using: current accounts
- Choosing and using: savings accounts
- Choosing and using: credit
- Choosing and using: mortgages
- Choosing and using: insurance
- Choosing and using: pensions
- Choosing and using: investments
- Credit reports
- Methods of payments
- Consumer issues
- When and how to seek guidance
- N/A
- Other (please specify):

Appendix B: Questions used in mapping form continued

25. What methods and approaches are used?*
    - Case studies/role play
    - CYP/parent groups
    - Experience in handling money
    - Games
    - Immersion in real life scenarios
    - One-to-one coaching
    - Online intervention
    - Resources for CYP (booklet, activity packs etc)
    - School assembly
    - Short course (1-5 days)
    - Teacher resources
    - Training
    - Workshops
    - Other (please specify):
26. What online content is included? Please only include 'core content' of the course.*
    - App
    - Factsheets
    - Games
    - Website
    - N/A
    - Other (please specify):
27. Do any of the resources used carry the 'Financial Education Quality Mark'?*
    - Yes
    - No
    - Unsure
28. Charge for service use (what is the charge for your service/delivery of your project or resource - if any?)*
29. Please outline the number, duration, and timing of sessions (if relevant - e.g. this project is delivered through 4 half-day sessions, one per term in a school year)*

30. Where is it delivered?* England Northern Ireland Scotland United Kingdom Wales
31. In what Local Authority areas/principle areas/government district/local council areas is your intervention delivered (if relevant)?

5. Evidence and evaluation

This section will focus on how the intervention is evidenced and evaluated. We recognise that not all providers will have all evaluation methods: please answer where it applies to your organisation.

32. Is the provider signed up to the 'IMPACT Principles'?* Yes No Unsure
33. What evidence was used to inform design of the programme/intervention? (e.g. surveys of young people, teacher feedback, evaluations of other programmes)
34. What are the intended outcomes? (please state the headline goals your project aims to achieve, referring to outcomes from the MAS outcomes framework if relevant)
35. A Theory of Change is an evaluation tool that identifies key outcomes and the steps needed to reach these outcomes. Similar tools include CES Outcomes Triangle or BLF evaluation toolkit. If you use a ToC or similar, please could you outline the approach and include a link (if applicable)

Appendix B:
Questions used in mapping form continued

36. How do you evaluate the project/service/intervention?*

Analysis of before and after outcomes using quantitative measures (like surveys) direct with CYP

Analysis of before and after outcomes using quantitative measures (like surveys) through others, such as staff or parents

Analysis of before and after outcomes using qualitative measures (e.g. interviews) direct with CYP

Analysis of before and after outcomes using qualitative measures (e.g. interviews) through others e.g. staff delivering project

Cost-benefits or cost-effectiveness analysis, or Social Return on Investment (SROI) or other financial evaluation method

Informal feedback from CYP/target group

Measurement of output e.g. number of sessions delivered, number of CYP reached

Monitoring of KPIs

Process evaluation (developing a detailed understanding of programme operations; understanding what is working more/less well; assessing whether the intervention was implemented as planned)

We don't currently evaluate the intervention

Other (please specify):

37. Is it included on the FinCap Evidence Hub?*

Yes

No

Unsure

6. Final question!

We would like to include basic information about interventions - name of programme, intended audience, website link - to be included in an online public 'map' of financial education.

38. Would you be happy for your data to be included in our online map? (More information available in our FAQs)*

Yes

No

Unsure

Comments:

Appendix C: Organisations responding to the call for information

We are extremely grateful to the following organisations for telling us about the financial education they are involved in delivering or funding[36]:

Achieve More Scotland	Dundee City Council and Action for Children Dundee
ASDAN	Education Scotland
Bank of Ireland UK	Experian
Barclays	European Union PROFIT consortium
Birmingham Settlement	Fife Council Economic Development & Education Services
BITC	Finance 4 Kids
BITC Cymru and Careers Wales	Fincap Training Solutions
bMoney-Wize Ltd	Find Your Way project at Young People Cornwall
Bridgend Lifesavers Credit Union	Forres Area Credit Union
Business Wales/Big Ideas Wales	goHenry
Canolfan Cynghori Ynys Mon Citizens Advice	Grwp Cynefin/ The Going it Alone Project
Cardiff & Vale Credit Union	Gwalia
Centrepoint	Halton Credit Union
Ceredigion Youth Service	Hillingdon Credit Union Ltd
Chartered Banker Institute	HSBC
Christians Against Poverty	Just Finance Foundation, Lifesavers
Citizens Advice & Rights Fife, Fife Gingerbread, Kingdom Credit Union, Fife Council	KickStart Money Partnership
Citizens Advice Merthyr Tydfil	Kith & Kin Financial Wellbeing
Crisis	Lanarkshire Credit Union
CYBG Plc (Clydesdale Bank, Yorkshire Bank)	Legal & General
Darlington Credit Union	Lloyds Banking Group
Debt Advice Foundation	London Institute of Banking and Finance
Depaul UK	MBNA

36 This is not an exhaustive list of funders and providers reported in our mapping, but rather represents those agencies who directly submitted responses to our call for information. Other agencies may have been listed in association with these, especially as funders where delivery organisations have responded, but did not submit a response directly. If your organisation is involved in financial education, is not on this list, and you would like it to be, please contact cyp@moneyadviceservice.org.uk. If your organisation is included on this list and you would like it to be removed please let us know.

Appendix C: Organisations responding to the call for information continued

Money A+E UK	Sovereign Credit Union
Money Advice Scotland	Stewart Ivory Financial Education Trust
Musselburgh Citizens Advice Bureau	St. Maria Goretti Primary School
MyBnk	Streetwise
Nationwide	The Mix
Newcastle Citizen's Advice	The Money Charity
Newport Credit Union	The National Youth Agency
OnSide Youth Zones Network	The Share Centre, The Share Foundation, Share Premium Ltd
ParentPay/nimbl	Toonspeak and GEMAP Scotland
Pioneer Mutual Credit Union Ltd	Tower Hamlets Education Business Partnership
Prudential UK	Trading Standards Illegal MoneyLending team (Birmingham City Council)
Quaker Social Action	UK Youth
RBS (including NatWest, Royal Bank of Scotland, Ulster Bank)	Virgin Money
RedStart, Redington	Wales Illegal Moneylending Unit
RoosterMoney	West Dunbartonshire Council & West College Scotland
Royal Association for Deaf People (RAD)	Westercraigs Nursery School & Glasgow City Council
Royal Society for Blind Children (RSBC)	Working 4 U
Sale Sharks Community Trust	Yorkshire Building Society Group
SARN Associates	Young Enterprise/Young Money
Shelter Cymru	Young Enterprise Northern Ireland
Southwest Arts and Music Project (SWAMP)	Young Enterprise Scotland

Money Advice Service
Holborn Centre
120 Holborn
London EC1N 2TD
© Money Advice Service
September 2018

For more information about this resource please contact

pressoffice@moneyadviceservice.org.uk

moneyadviceservice.org.uk

the Money Advice Service