

RESEARCH INTO BEACON COUNCIL SCHEME APPLICATIONS

Objective 1 final report – Identifying trends in applications and in selection

1. Introduction

The Local Government Centre (LGC), Warwick Business School was invited by the IDeA and the DTLR to build on their earlier work and reports (Rashman, L. Hartley, J. and Gulati, A. (2000). *Leading and learning: perceptions and attitudes toward the Beacon Council Scheme and motivations for attending events*, Hartley, J., Rashman, L., Downe, J. and Storbeck, J. (2001) *Report of the Process Outcomes Evaluation*) by focusing on local authority applications for Beacon status.

The research on Beacon applications has a number of elements related to the three basic objectives of the project. The aim of this objective is to identify trends in applications over the three rounds of the scheme. Whether the patterns are a concern or not will partly depend on the findings from Objective 2 (Determining why local authorities do or do not apply and understanding the reasons why applications are falling) and Objective 3 (Determining whether the best local authorities apply) which are currently being undertaken. The LGC is reporting on these objectives in April 2002.

A database has been constructed of all English local authorities, which includes details on their application history in the three rounds of the scheme. Round 1 Beacons were announced in December 1999. Round 2 Beacons were announced in February 2001 and the round 3 Beacons will be announced in April 2002. The number of authority applications is examined for patterns based on:

- Type of authority (e.g. district, county etc.).
- The impact of previous applications on future applications (both successful and unsuccessful applications in rounds 1 and 2).
- Multiple applications.
- The choice of Beacon themes.

Some comparative analysis is also undertaken on similar or relevant quality schemes in public services in order to explore trends in applications over time.

2. Involvement in the Beacon Council Scheme

Round 1: applications, short-listings and awards

203 (53%) local authorities applied.

Of the authorities who applied, 68 (33%) were initially short-listed.

Of the authorities who were short-listed, 42 (62%) Beacon Councils were selected.

No application	181	(47%)
Applied	135	(35%)
Short-listed	26	(7%)
Beacon	42	(11%)

The chance of becoming a Beacon if an authority has made an application is 21%

Round 2: applications, short-listings and awards

124 (32%) local authorities applied.

Of the authorities who applied, 59 (48%) were initially short-listed.

Of the authorities who were short-listed, 39 (66%) Beacon Councils were selected.

No application	260	(68%)
Applied	65	(17%)
Short-listed	20	(5%)
Beacon	39	(10%)

The chance of becoming a Beacon if an authority has made an application is 31%.

Round 3: applications, short-listings and awards

92 (24%) local authorities applied.

Of the authorities who applied, 63 (68%) were short-listed.

No application	292	(76%)
Applied	29	(8%)
Short-listed	63	(16%)

Table 1: Involvement in the Beacon Council Scheme

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
	(%)	(%)	(%)
No application	47	68	76
Applied	35	17	8
Short-listed	7	5	16
Beacon	11	10	Not yet announced

Table 2: Involvement in the Beacon Council Scheme by local authority type: applications

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
	(%)	(%)	(%)
Metropolitan Boroughs	78	69	56
London Boroughs	76	51	45
Unitaries	76	48	56
County Councils	56	76	35
District Councils	40	14	11

Conclusions

- There is a clear trend downwards in the involvement of local authorities in the scheme - from 203 (53%) in the first round of the scheme, 124 (32%) in the second round and 92 (24%) in round three.
- Once an application has been made, more authorities as a proportion of the population are being short-listed as the scheme continues (33% in round one, 48% in round 2 and 68% in round 3).
- The chance of becoming a Beacon once an authority has made an application is increasing (from 21% in round one to 31% in round 2. Figures are not yet available for round 3).
- Round 1 – There was a reasonable spread of applications across the different types of authorities, however, only 40% of district councils applied.
- Round 2 – There was an increase in the proportion of county councils applying and a fall in all the other types of authority. The most significant fall is in the number of district councils applying (from 40% to 14%).

- Round 3 – There was an increase in the proportion of unitaries applying for Beacon status (from 48% in round 2 to 56%), but applications from all other types of authority fell. The proportion of counties applying fell the most (from 76% to 35%).

3. Authorities that have never applied for Beacon status

We are interested in discovering which local authorities have never applied in the history of the scheme. When this information is combined with findings from Objective's 2 and 3, this will help the DTLR/IDeA to target particular types of local authority in their publicity/choice of themes etc.

126 local authorities (33%) have never applied for Beacon status in any round (i.e. rounds 1-3). This total consists of:

- 113 District Councils,
- 5 London Boroughs (Bromley, Hackney, Islington, Tower Hamlets, Wandsworth),
- 5 Unitaries (Isle of Wight, North East Lincolnshire, North Somerset, Redcar and Cleveland, Southend on Sea),
- 2 Metropolitan Boroughs (Solihull, Wolverhampton),
- 1 County Council (North Yorkshire).

This is shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Authorities that have never applied for Beacon status

Type	Never applied	Total	% of total, never applied
District Councils	113	238	47
London Boroughs	5	32	16
Unitaries	5	46	11
Metropolitan Boroughs	2	36	6
County Councils	1	34	3

- The spread of non-applying authorities varied widely by government office. Only 16% of authorities in the Government of London region (GOL) have never applied, while 45% of councils in the Government of East Midlands region (GOEM) have never applied.

Table 4: Authorities that have never applied for Beacon status by government region

Government office	Never applied	Total	% of total, never applied
East Midlands	19	42	45
West Midlands	16	39	41
North East Region	9	24	38
Eastern	20	54	37
Yorkshire and Humberside	8	24	33
South East	23	73	32
South West	15	50	30
North West Region	11	46	24
London	5	32	16

4. New bidders for Beacon status in Rounds 2 and 3

Round 2

- 36 local authorities applied for Beacon status for the first time in round 2.
- 39% of these new bidders were district councils and 33% from county councils. This latter figure is the result of a number of themes in round 2 focusing on the services provided by county councils.
- These 36 local authorities were not as successful at being short-listed as the whole population. 14 authorities of this total were short-listed (39%) while 47% of all authority applied were short-listed. 12 out of the 14 short-listed became Beacons. Overall, 12 out of 36 applications became Beacons (33%). This compares to 32% of the whole population (39/121). It seems that authorities that had not previously bid were not at a disadvantage to those who had applied in round 1.

Round 3

- 19 local authorities applied for Beacon status for the first time in round 3.
- 12 of these new bidders were district councils (63%). There were two authorities each from the counties, unitaries, metropolitan boroughs and one London borough.
- As in round 2, these new bidders were not as successful at being short-listed as the whole population. 9 authorities (47%) have had their application short-listed. In round 3 as a whole, 68% of application were short-listed, so new bidders have not performed as well as other councils who have previously applied. It may be that previous bidders have now built up significant experience of applying over two rounds, which is advantageous to their chance of success.

5. Multiple applications

In round 1 of the scheme, 61 local authorities made multiple applications. Around two-thirds (41) made two applications with the remaining third (20) making three applications. The total consisted of:

- 18 Unitaries,
- 15 District Councils,
- 13 London Boroughs,
- 11 Metropolitan Boroughs,
- 4 County Councils.

In round 2 of the scheme, there was a fall in the number of local authorities making multiple applications to 50. 42 local authorities made two applications with the remainder (8) making three applications. The total consisted of:

- 12 Metropolitan Boroughs,
- 11 County Councils,
- 10 London Boroughs,
- 9 District Councils,
- 8 Unitaries.

In round 3 of the scheme, 33 local authorities made multiple applications. Two-thirds made two applications (22) with the remaining third (11) making three applications. The total includes Stroud which made a single application and also a joint application – it was the only authority to do this. The total consisted of:

- 11 Unitaries,
- 7 London Boroughs,
- 7 Metropolitan Boroughs,
- 4 County Councils,
- 4 District Councils.

The total of 22 local authorities that applied in two theme areas in round 3 consisted of:

- 7 Unitaries (Bracknell, Derby, East Riding, Halton, Leicester, Medway, Reading),
- 6 Metropolitan Boroughs (Bolton, Manchester, Middlesbrough, Rotherham, Walsall, Wirral),
- 3 London Boroughs (Camden, Greenwich, Sutton),
- 3 Counties (Dorset, Northamptonshire, Suffolk),
- 3 District Councils (Cheltenham, Stevenage, Stroud).

Application history of those authorities which applied for two themes in round 3

Bolton - applied round 1 and round 2.

Bracknell - applied round 1, beacon status round 2 (Maintaining a quality environment).

Camden - beacon status round 1 (Education and Modern service delivery), beacon status round 2 (Independent living for older people).

Cheltenham – beacon status round 2 (Maintaining a quality environment).

Derby - applied round 1.

Dorset - beacon status round 2 (Tackling youth drug misuse).

East Riding - applied round 1, beacon status round 2 (Tackling youth drug misuse).

Greenwich - applied round 1 and round 2.

Halton - beacon status round 1 (Planning), applied round 2.

Leicester - beacon status round 1 (Housing maintenance), beacon status round 2 (Maintaining a quality environment).

Manchester - beacon status round 1 (Housing maintenance), beacon status round 2 (Independent living for older people).

Medway - beacon status round 1 (Community safety).

Middlesbrough - applied round 1 and round 2.

Northamptonshire - applied round 1 and round 2.

Reading – applied round 1, beacon status round 2 (Town centre regeneration).

Rotherham – none.

Stevenage - beacon status round 1 (Community safety).

Stroud - applied round 1.

Suffolk – beacon status round 1 (Social services and Education), beacon status round 2 (Local health strategies).

Sutton – applied round 1, beacon status round 2 (Competiveness and enterprise).

Walsall - applied round 1 and round 2.

Wirral – applied round 1.

- 13 out of the 22 authorities (59%) had already achieved Beacon status in either round of the scheme.
- Only one authority (Rotherham) had not previously made any application.

- 11 local authorities applied in three theme areas in round 3. This total consists of:
- 4 London Boroughs (Barnet, Bexley, Brent, Croydon),
 - 4 Unitaries (Blackburn, Kingston-upon-Hull, Luton, Stockton-on-Tees),
 - 1 Metropolitan Borough (Liverpool),
 - 1 County (Nottinghamshire),
 - 1 District Council (Oswestry).

Application history of those authorities which applied for three themes in round 3

Barnet - applied round 1 and round 2.

Bexley - beacon status round 1 (Waste), beacon status round 2 (Foster care).

Blackburn - beacon status round 1 (Raising attainment in education).

Brent - applied round 1 and round 2.

Croydon - applied round 1, beacon status round 2 (Local health strategies and Town centre regeneration).

Kingston-upon-Hull - applied round 1, beacon status round 2 (Tackling youth drug misuse).

Liverpool – applied round 2.

Luton – none.

Nottinghamshire – applied round 1 and round 2.

Oswestry – none.

Stockton-on-Tees - applied round 1, beacon status round 2 (Local health strategies).

- 5 out of the 11 authorities (45%) had already achieved Beacon status in either round of the scheme.
- Two authorities (Luton and Oswestry) had not previously made any application.

Conclusions

- The number of authorities making multiple applications has fallen in each round of the scheme (61 in round 1, 50 in round 2 and 33 in round 3).
- These data would seem to suggest that it is easier for single-tier authorities to make applications in more than one theme area. In the three rounds of the scheme, only fifteen district councils in round 1, nine in round 2 and four in round 3 made multiple applications. This is likely to be the result of single-tier authorities having more capacity in terms of staff and resources to devote to multiple applications. Another potential factor may be that the themes were

less applicable to district councils than the single-tier authorities. We will explore these issues in Objective 2 of the research.

- 55% of authorities in round 3 making multiple applications had achieved Beacon status in a previous round of the scheme. This shows that where local authorities are successful, they are more likely than other councils to put in multiple applications. Start-up costs have already been applied, so it is easier and less costly to apply again, and perhaps the authority can also more clearly see the benefits of the scheme.

6. Impact of gaining Beacon status upon future applications

Round 1

Of the 42 authorities who achieved Beacon status in round 1:

23 (55%) did not apply in round 2.

10 (24%) became a Beacon in round 2 as well.

9 (22%) applied but were not successful (*Of these, 5 (12%) applied but were not short-listed and 4 (10%) were short-listed.*

24 (57%) did not apply in round 3.

18 (43%) applied in round 3.

- Of the nineteen applications in round 2 from round 1 Beacon Councils, ten were successful (53%). The chance of becoming a Beacon if an authority has made an application for the population as a whole in round 2 was 31%. It seems therefore that being a Beacon in round 1 is associated with an increase in the chance of success in round 2.
- There is a seemingly high percentage of Beacon Councils not applying in round 2 (55%) and round 3 (57%). This compares however to the non-application figure for local government of 68% in round 2 and 73% in round 3. These figures suggest that gaining Beacon status has a positive effect on making an application in round 2. We will explore this issue further in Objective 2.

Round 2

Of the 39 authorities who achieved Beacon status in round 2:

12 (31%) had not applied in round 1.

17 (43%) applied but were not successful (*Of these, 13 (33%) applied but were not short-listed and 4 (10%) were short-listed.*

10 (26%) were Beacons in round 1 as well.

10 (25%) did not apply in round 3.

29 (75%) applied in round 3.

- High percentage of authorities applying in round 3 (75%) – overall figure of 24%. Being a Beacon in round 2 seemed to have a positive impact on the chance of an authority making an application in round 3.

Round 1 and 2

Of the 10 authorities who achieved Beacon status in both round 1 and round 2:

1 (10%) did not apply in round 3 - Kirklees.

9 (90%) applied in round 3 and 8 of these applications (80%) have been short-listed.

Of the 81 authorities who achieved either Beacon status in round 1 or round 2 or in both rounds:

33 (41%) did not apply in round 3.

48 (59%) applied in round 3.

7. Impact of rejection

Round 1 rejection

a): Of the 135 authorities who applied in round 1 but were rejected:

32 (24%) also applied in round 2 and were rejected.

13 (10%) also applied in round 2 and were short-listed.

13 (10%) achieved Beacon status in round 2.

77 (57%) did not apply in round 2.

- 68% of all authorities did not apply in round 2, compared to 57% of authorities who did not apply in round 2 after failure in round 1. The failure in round 1 does not seem to have a negative impact of applying in round 2.

11 (8%) also applied in round 3 and were rejected.

22 (16%) also applied in round 3 and were short-listed.

33 (24%) *applied in round 3.*

102 (75%) did not apply in round 3.

- 76% of all authorities did not apply in round 3, so failure in round 1 does not seem to have a negative impact of applying in round 3.

b): Of the 26 authorities who applied in round 1 and were short-listed:

1 (4%) was also short-listed in round 2.

6 (23%) applied but were rejected in round 2.

4 (15%) became Beacon Councils.

15 (58%) did not apply.

- As above for those council's who applied in round 1 and were rejected, the failure in round 1 does not seem to have a negative impact of applying in round 2.

7 (27%) were also short-listed in round 3.

3 (12%) applied but were rejected.

16 (62%) did not apply.

Putting together the two options above –
a): those who applied and were rejected and
b): those who were short-listed but ultimately rejected

Of the 161 authorities who applied in round 1 but did not gain Beacon status:

52 (33%) applied in round 2 but were not successful.

17 (11%) applied and became Beacon Councils in round 2.

92 (57%) did not apply in round 2.

- More likely to apply in round 2 having been rejected in round 1 than the population as a whole (44% vs. 32%). This may seem a surprising result but could indicate that once the effort has been made to apply once (regardless of the result), it is easier to apply again.

43 (26%) did apply in round 3.

118 (73%) did not apply in round 3.

- Failure to gain Beacon status in round 1 had no impact on applying in round 3.

Round 2 rejection

a): Of the 65 authorities who applied in round 2 but were rejected:

18 (28%) applied in round 3 (*Of these, 6 (9%) also applied in round 3 and were rejected and 12 (19%) also applied in round 3 and were short-listed*).
47 (72%) did not apply in round 3.

- 73% of all authorities did not apply in round 3, compared to 72% of authorities who did not apply in round 3 after failure in round 2 – no real difference.

b): Of the 20 authorities who applied in round 2 and were short-listed:

6 (30%) were also short-listed in round 3.

2 (10%) applied but were rejected.

12 (60%) did not apply.

Putting together the two options above –

a): those who applied and were rejected and

b): those who were short-listed but ultimately rejected

Of the 85 authorities who applied in round 2 but did not gain Beacon status:

27 (32%) did apply in round 3.

58 (68%) did not apply in round 3.

- As above for those council's who applied in round 2 and were rejected, the failure in round 2 has a small positive impact of applying in round 3.

Round 1 and 2 rejection

52 authorities have applied in both rounds of the scheme but have not become a Beacon ('Applied and/or 'Short-listed). In round 3:

36 (69%) did not apply.

10 (19%) have been short-listed.

6 (11%) have been rejected again.

- These six authorities (Bolton, Cambridgeshire CC, Sandwell, Sheffield, St Helens, Walsall) have therefore applied for Beacon status in all three rounds without any success. Five are metropolitan boroughs with one county council. This result shows that only large authorities are deciding to continue to apply for Beacon status without reward, possibly because they have the organisational capacity to keep applying.

8. Analysis of applications by Beacon theme

The DTLR database shows that there were 281 applications in round 1, 184 applications in round 2, and 137 applications in round 3 (this includes all those who are part of a joint bid).

Round 1

Table 5: Analysis of applications by Beacon theme in round 1

Beacon theme	No. of applications	% of total applications
Community safety	87	31
Waste	50	18
Education	45	16
Modern service delivery	29	10
Housing maintenance	26	9
Planning	24	9
Social services	20	7

- An average of 40 applications per theme, but with a range from 20 to 87.
- Community safety was the most popular theme. This theme is open to all local authorities to apply. Crime is one of central government's top priorities along with Education, Health, and Transport. All local authorities have statutory Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and produce strategies to improve performance in this area. The area of community safety forms part of authorities' work in reducing crime and disorder, so there is no ambiguity over the title of the theme (see round 3).
- The social service theme had the least number of applications. This theme is only available to single-tier (and county) authorities and the focus is on a specific area of social services. These factors may have acted to reduce the number of applications.

Round 2

Table 6: Analysis of applications by Beacon theme in round 2

Beacon theme	No. of applications	% of total applications
Town centre regeneration	33	18
Accessible services	22	12
Local health strategies	22	12
Raising attainment in education	19	10
Competitiveness and enterprise	18	10
Independent living for older people	18	10
Regenerating through culture, sport and tourism	15	8
Maintaining a quality environment	11	6
Tackling youth drugs misuse	11	6
Foster care	10	5
Tackling vehicle crime	5	3

- In round 2 there was a larger number of themes (11 rather than 7). An average of 17 applications per theme, range from 5 to 33.
- There was generally a very good spread across themes in this round.
- The town centre regeneration theme had the most number of applications. Like community safety, this is currently an important concern for both central and local government and the title of the theme is clear.
- The reducing and preventing vehicle crime had the least number of applications. Perhaps this theme suffered by focusing upon such a specific area of crime reduction. Reducing vehicle crime is a relatively new area of concern compared to the other themes. As a result, it may be that local authorities are not aware that their methods in this theme are 'good practice'?

Round 3

Table 7: Analysis of applications by Beacon theme in round 3

Beacon theme	No. of applications	% of total applications
Community legal services	21	15
Libraries as a community resource	19	14
Tackling fuel poverty	17	12
Neighbourhood renewal	17	12
Fostering business growth	15	11
Improving urban green spaces	14	10
Adoption	12	9
Crime reduction in rural areas	7	5
Transition in education	7	5
Promoting racial equality	5	4
Better access and mobility	3	2

- Like round 2, there were 11 themes. An average of 12 applications per theme, range from 3 to 21.
- The better access and mobility theme had the least number of applications. It is possible that this is partly the result of the ambiguous title.

9. Have local authorities followed through in theme areas over the three rounds of the scheme?

We examine here the 3 theme areas that have continued across the 3 rounds of the scheme (Education, Crime and Social Services), to see whether the same authorities are applying in each round. We also want to investigate whether success in one round in the theme leads to an application in the same theme area in future rounds.

Education

The fall in the number of authorities applying for Beacon status in the education theme is worrying – from 45 in round 1, to 19 in round 2 and then to only 7 in round 3. There has been an 84% fall in the applications in this theme between round 1 and round 3. The number of applications to the scheme as a whole has fallen by 51% in the same time-span.

Of the 45 authorities who applied in round 1 in education, only 6 of these applied for the education theme in round 2 (Birmingham, Durham, Lancashire CC, Stockton, Camden and York).

Of the 4 Beacons in education in round 1 (Blackburn, Camden, North Tyneside, and Suffolk CC), only Camden and Suffolk have applied for Beacon status in an education theme in later rounds. Camden was a Beacon in round 2 in education and Suffolk applied for Beacon status in education in round 3.

Of the 19 authorities who applied in round 2 in education, only 2 of these applied for the education theme in round 3 (North Lincolnshire and Oxfordshire CC). North Lincolnshire was the only Beacon authority in education in round 2 that applied for education in round 3.

Crime

There were 87 applications for community safety in round 1. The tackling vehicle crime theme had five applications in round 2. In round 3, the Crime reduction in rural areas theme received seven applications.

Of the 87 authorities who applied in round 1, only 2 of these applied in round 2 (North Tyneside and Watford). North Tyneside applied in round 1 and became a Beacon in this area in round 2 as well. Watford applied in round 1 and was short-listed in round 2.

Of the 6 Beacons in community safety in round 1 (Bradford, Coventry, Eastleigh, Medway, Stevenage, and Tameside), none of them applied in any community safety theme in rounds 2 and 3.

Of the seven applications in round 3, all local authorities were district councils and apart from Stroud were new bidders to the scheme (Forest of Dean, Hambleton, Kings Lynn, Oswestry, Penwith, and Tewkesbury).

Social services

There has been a theme under the banner of social services in every round of the scheme. In round one, there were 20 applications for the helping care leavers theme. 10 applications were made in the foster care theme in round 2 and the adoption theme received 12 applications in round 3.

Of the 20 authorities who applied in the helping care leavers theme, only three of these applied for a theme related to social services in later rounds of the scheme. Southwark was short-listed in both round 1 and round 2 while Gateshead and Reading applied in round one without success and have been short-listed in round three for adoption.

Of the 4 Beacons in social services in round 1 (Kensington and Chelsea, Suffolk, Wakefield and Westminster), none of them applied in any social services theme in rounds 2 and 3. Wakefield and Westminster did not make any applications at all in round 2 and round 3.

Of the ten authorities that applied in round 2 in the foster care theme, two applied in the adoption theme in round three (Essex and Middlesbrough). The two Beacon Councils in this theme (Bexley and Cheshire) both applied for Beacon status in round three but in different theme areas.

10. Other Beacon Schemes

The government has already introduced Beacon schemes to spread best practice in other public services, notably in health, where the NHS Beacon programme was launched in 1999 and in education, where the Beacon School initiative forms part of the Department for Education and Employment's (DfEE) school improvement agenda.

Whilst these schemes share similar aims and underlying principles, they have been promoted and have evolved differently from Beacons in local government (National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER), 1999; King and Ollerearnshaw, 2000).

NHS Beacons

1999-2001

- 287 Beacons across six priority areas (Cancer Care, Health Improvement, Human Resources, Mental Health, Primary Care and Waiting Lists and Times) (NHS Beacons Learning Handbook, 2000-2001).
- Beacon status lasts for two years.
- All Beacons were given the chance to extend their status by a year. Approximately 100 out of 287 re-applied (35%) and 81 of these were successful.
- Possible reasons given for low re-application – lots of work, had to re-apply, work in area had moved on or was no longer innovative.

2000-2002

- 29 new Beacons added to some of the areas identified above plus an additional 43 new Beacons (making a total of 72) in the new theme areas of Palliative Care, Coronary Heart Disease, Outpatients, Stroke, Personality Disorder and Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (NHS Beacons Learning Handbook, 2001-2002).
- There are currently a total of 153 Beacons (81 plus 72).
- An evaluation of the NHS Beacons has just been carried out. There is currently a moratorium on the scheme. No new Beacons have been recruited, but there are 630 organisations who have applied for information about becoming a Beacon.

Beacon schools

- The first Beacon schools were invited to become Beacons. Now, some LEA's suggest which schools should be put forward for Beacon status in addition to the DfEE inviting some schools. The recent White Paper 'Schools achieving success' announced that the national network of Beacon schools now consists of more than 1,000 schools.

Table 8: Number of schools joining the Beacon initiative at different phases

Date joined initiative	Phase	Total
September 1998	First	75
September 1999	Second	125
January 2000	Third	50
September 2000	Fourth	300
January 2001	Fifth	37
September 2002	Sixth	425
Total		1,012

Source: NFER (2001)

Central Government Beacon Scheme

2000-2

- The scheme started in 2000 with a total of 33 applicants.
- 23 organisations were awarded Beacon status in year 1 of the scheme (November 2000) (7 rejected after sift, 1 rejected after assessment, 2 withdrawn).
- These organisations retain their status for two years, when they can reapply.

2001-3

- In 2001, there were 29 applications.
- An additional 16 organisations were awarded Beacon status in year 2 of the scheme (October 2001) (5 rejected after sift, 5 rejected after assessment, 2 ineligible, 1 withdrew).

11. Other awards

Charter Mark

Table 9: Applications and winners of the Charter Mark 1999-2001

	1999	2000	2001
Applicants	1179	984	824
Winners	803	753	697
% chance of success	68	77	85

1999-2000 24% fall in applications.

2000-2001 16% fall in applications.

LGC Council of the Year awards

- No database exists of applicants/winners in previous years.
- In 2001, Camden, Manchester, Nottingham, Sheffield and Suffolk were short-listed with Suffolk winning the award.

Table 10: Application history of LGC Council of the Year finalists 2001

Authority	Beacon application history round 1	Beacon application history round 2	Beacon application history round 3
Camden	3 themes, 2 awarded Beacon	2 Beacons	2 short-listed
Manchester	2 themes, 1 awarded Beacon	2 themes, 1 awarded Beacon	1 short-listed
Nottingham	2 themes	2 Beacons	1 short-listed
Sheffield	1 theme	1 theme	1 theme
Suffolk	2 Beacons	3 themes, 1 awarded Beacon	2 short-listed

- In 2002, Blackburn, Camden, Chichester, Stockton-on-Tees, and Sunderland have been short-listed. Two authorities were jointly named 'council of the year' – Blackburn and Camden.

Table 11: Application history of LGC Council of the Year finalists 2002

Authority	Beacon application history round 1	Beacon application history round 2	Beacon application history round 3
Blackburn	1 Beacon		3 themes, 2 short-listed
Camden	3 themes, 2 awarded Beacon	2 Beacons	2 short-listed
Chichester			
Stockton-on-Tees	2 themes	2 themes, 1 awarded Beacon	2 short-listed
Sunderland	3 themes	2 themes, 1 awarded Beacon	1 short-listed

12. Local PSA's

2000-1

There are a total of 20 local PSA pilots. Table 12 shows the Beacon application history of each pilot authority. We wanted to explore the level of involvement of these authorities in the scheme and also if there has been a fall off in the number of applications for Beacon status as a result of the introduction of PSA's.

In round 1 all authorities except Newcastle made an application for Beacon status. A total of 4 authorities were successful in becoming Beacon Councils. In round 2, 5 out of 20 authorities did not make an application. Of the 15 authorities who applied, 5 became Beacons. In round 3, there was a significant drop in the number of applications. Only 11 authorities applied in round 3. There is evidence from earlier Warwick research (Hartley, J., Rashman, L., Downe, J. and Storbeck, J. (2001) *Report of the Process Outcomes Evaluation Report to IDeA and DTLR*) that PSA's are becoming more attractive than the Beacon Council Scheme and these figures provide tentative support for this argument. We will investigate this issue in greater detail in Objective 2, which aims to determine why local authorities do or do not apply.

Table 12: Application history of the local PSA pilots 2000-1

Authority	Beacon application history round 1	Beacon application history round 2	Beacon application history round 3
Birmingham	2 themes	2 themes, 1 awarded Beacon	
Blackburn	1 Beacon		3 themes, 2 short-listed
Cambridgeshire	1 theme	1 theme	1 theme
Camden	3 themes, 2 awarded Beacon	2 Beacons	2 short-listed
Coventry	1 Beacon	1 theme	
Derbyshire	1 theme		
Kent	1 theme	2 themes	
Lewisham	2 themes	1 Beacon	1 short-listed
Middlesbrough	1 theme	1 theme	2 themes, 1 short-listed
Milton Keynes	1 theme		
Newcastle			1 short-listed
Newham	1 theme	1 theme	
Norfolk	2 themes	2 themes	
Richmond	1 theme		
Sheffield	1 theme	1 theme	1 theme
Stockton-on-Tees	2 themes	2 themes, 1 awarded Beacon	2 short-listed
Sunderland	3 themes	2 themes, 1 awarded Beacon	1 short-listed
Surrey	1 theme	1 theme	1 theme
Tameside	1 Beacon	2 Beacons	1 short-listed
Warwickshire	1 theme	2 themes	