

## Vulnerability Index Results for 2012

### The Vulnerability Index

The Vulnerability Index was developed in response to the challenge of measuring the impact of the recession on local authority areas. Traditional measures of need such as the Index of Multiple Deprivation concentrate on current circumstances. In view of the deep seated and long term changes, which are likely to change the current configuration of long term prosperity and sustainability in English Communities, the RSN identified the need to develop an index of vulnerability to change, to sit alongside more traditional measures of need.

The index identified vulnerability by looking at:

Wage levels, the current stock of public sector jobs, the number of JSA claimants and the percentage of the population which is working age. You can access a more detailed note explaining why these indicators were chosen and the data sources used.

Our index is simple and easily understood. The spreadsheet which accompanies this narrative allows you to compare your authority against all other authorities and benchmark its relative vulnerability within key categories of authorities – such for example as other districts in a given county and all other predominantly rural authorities. You simply need to click on the drop down menu at the side of the local authority name displayed in the spreadsheet and choose your authority to generate a listing of your relative vulnerability.

### **2013 Results**

This is the third year of our development of the index and comparing the relative position of authorities between the two indexes provides some interesting context for authorities thinking about the impact of the recession in their area.

At first tier level the top 10 most vulnerable authorities in 2011, 2012 and 2013 were as set out in the table below:

Ranking 2011	Ranking 2012	Ranking 2013
Blackpool	Blackpool	Blackpool
Sefton	Torbay	Dudley
Torbay	Sefton	South Tyneside
Wolverhampton	Wolverhampton	Sefton
NE Lincs	Darlington	Northumberland
Southend	Middlesborough	Wirral
Darlington	Wirral	Torbay
Wirral	Blackburn	Redcar and Cleveland
Middlesborough	Dudley	Bury
Doncaster	Stoke	East Riding of Yorkshire

The most vulnerable RSN member authority in all 3 years was Northumberland which was 21<sup>st</sup> in the index in 2011, 16<sup>th</sup> in 2012 and 5<sup>th</sup> in 2013. It has low wages a poor working age population and a high dependency on public sector jobs.

East Riding enters the top 10 for the first time having dropped over the last 3 years from 56<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> most vulnerable, its proportion of public sector workers and its working age population have got proportionately worse compared to other authorities over the last 3 years.

A number of these authorities, whilst not RSN members have key service centre roles for rural communities – particularly Torbay, Redcar and Cleveland and Bury.

At district level a number of RSN member authorities are in the top 10 of the most vulnerable authorities:

Ranking 2011	Ranking 2012	Ranking 2013
Thanet	Thanet	Thanet
Hastings	Boston*	Wyre
Boston*	Eastbourne	Wyre Forest*
Scarborough*	North Devon*	West Somerset*
Shepway*	Hastings	Tendring*
Eastbourne	Waveney*	Oadby and Wigston
Great Yarmouth	Tendring*	West Lindsey*
Weymouth and Portland	Weymouth and Portland	Teignbridge*
Tendring*	Wyre	Rossendale*
Worthing	Shepway*	Allerdale*

Interestingly 4 of the most vulnerable authorities within the top 10 were RSN members in 2011 and in 2012 the figure rose to 5 and in 2013 reached 7.

New authorities for 2013 include: Wyre Forest, West Somerset, West Lindsey, Teignbridge, Rossendale and Allerdale – the coastal theme continues for many of these authorities: West Somerset, Tendring, Teignbridge and Allerdale.

At first tier level the relative position of RSN member authorities was as follows:

Authority	Ranking 2011	Ranking 2012	Ranking 2013	Change Overall
Cambridgeshire	144	115	109	-35
Cheshire East	83	90	92	+9
Cheshire West and Chester	79	60	89	+10
County Durham	51	52	12	-39
Cornwall	37	26	42	+5
Cumbria	74	47	82	+8
Devon	42	33	17	-25
Dorset	40	34	69	+29
East Riding	56	43	10	-46
Hampshire	120	120	86	-34
Herefordshire	44	39	67	+23
Isle of Wight	14	18	30	+16
Lincolnshire	32	26	35	+3
Norfolk	45	47	57	+12
North Lincolnshire	56	77	78	+22
North Somerset	97	108	72	-25
North Yorkshire	74	79	27	-47
Northumberland	21	16	5	-16
Oxfordshire	119	118	111	-8
Rutland	85	50	74	-11
Shropshire	27	25	60	+33
Somerset	39	45	61	+22
Suffolk	58	63	57	-1
Wiltshire	70	80	48	-22

In 2011 5 RSN authorities were in the worst 25% of authorities on the list: Cornwall, Isle of Wight, Lincolnshire and Northumberland and Shropshire. In 2012 this had risen to 7: Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Isle of Wight, Lincolnshire, Northumberland and Shropshire. In 2013 this figure stayed at 7 with Devon, Isle of Wight, Lincolnshire and Northumberland staying in the list to be joined by Durham, East Riding and North Yorkshire.



Overall (from 2011) 12 authorities became relatively more vulnerable whilst 11 became relatively less vulnerable.

Significant increases in relative vulnerability (20 places or more) occurred in: Cambridgeshire, Durham, Devon, East Riding, Hampshire, North Somerset, North Yorkshire and Wiltshire. Overall the level of relative decline for first tier RSN authorities which slipped down the list were higher than the levels of relative improvement for first tier RSN authorities which rose up the list.

Northumberland has now become the most vulnerable member in the list and Oxfordshire the least.