349. Strongly linked to the previous ‘partnership working’ theme, this theme of our inquiry considers what training and capacity building could be provided to communities. In addition, the theme considers what role CPPs need to play, in supporting and empowering communities to participate in the commissioning, planning and delivery of regeneration activity to ‘do regeneration themselves’. Finally, we were interested in how outcomes of regeneration activity are being and can be both measured and demonstrated, to enable progress and success to be identified, allowing best practice to be shared.

350. Four related questions were set out under this theme in our call for evidence—

- What actions could the Scottish Government’s forthcoming community capacity building programme include to best support communities to ‘do regeneration’ themselves?
- What role should CPPs play in supporting the community in regenerating their communities?
- How can CPPs best empower local communities to deliver regeneration? Please provide any examples of best practice or limitations experienced that you think the Committee would find useful in its scrutiny.
- How can the outcomes of regeneration truly be captured and measured? What are the barriers to capturing outcomes and how should the success of regeneration investment be determined?

351. Our findings in this area, incorporating those questions, are presented below.

**Community capacity building**

*What do we mean by community capacity?*

352. Before we could establish how best the Scottish Government and partners could support community capacity building, we gave consideration to what was meant by the term. Stuart Hashagen from the SCDC and Health Exchange offered a comprehensive definition of community capacity—

> “We say that there are four broad headings. First, communities need the understanding, knowledge, skills and confidence—the learning or education side of things—to be able to act in the first place in the situations that they deal with. Secondly, they need a level of organisation, whether that consists of informal networks, bigger organisations or entities as large as community-based housing associations. Thirdly, they need some political influence so

---

that what they want to see happen can be explained and justified to decision makers. Finally, equalities are very important, so that we are not just advantaging people who already have power at the expense of others. The equalities debate underpins all this”.

353. Capacity is not an abstract quality; rather, it develops in response to its exercise. Judith Robertson of OXFAM commented on some of the significant and major gaps for community organisations trying to relate to, or influence, community planning—

“From our perspective, it seems that we are expecting community organisations to tackle problems that as professionals we often fail to tackle, and to engage in community planning processes when they have no individual resources to do that. Community organisations often have very few staff and work with volunteers, who often do not have much time, as the committee heard from the woman from Kirkcaldy. In my experience, that is a very common instance. We expect some of the most vulnerable people in our communities to take care of some of the most vulnerable people, which is not okay”.

Methods of community engagement
354. A barrier to building community involvement in regeneration is a lack of knowledge of how to get involved. This can, in part, be overcome through successful community consultation exercises by all regeneration partners. However, it is not only public bodies that need to consult. BIG explained that it looks to community groups to explain how they have consulted.237

355. It is important that the results from such consultation processes truly represent community views. However, community representatives explained the difficulty in engaging people in successful community consultations, with a general apathy felt by the community towards such processes. For example, Von Jackson stated—

“There is a community consultation going on in New Cumnock about our goals for 2020. We have had to offer an incentive to people to get the papers back to us—the local hotel owner is offering a night’s stay. People are even going door to door to collect the papers.

I did a survey myself a couple of years ago for the liaison group at our fun day. People were just not interested. There was apathy. East Ayrshire Council gets the blame for the be-all and end-all, whether it is the council’s problem or not, and people are just not interested in filling in forms. I hope that the incentive of the hotel break will make all the difference this time, but that is yet to be seen.”238

356. Karen McGregor, from Kirkcaldy East Regeneration Forum, highlighted the inaccessibility of some consultation exercises—

“A lot of people in the community are the third generation in families in which no one has ever worked...Most of the people have low self-esteem. Nobody has ever come to their door and spoken to them or done a community consultation to ask, “What would you like done?” It is all right to send out questionnaires, but does everybody know how to read and write? It is all right if a questionnaire is online, but does everybody have a computer? We live in a different world now.”

357. We investigated whether community consultations could become more accessible, and therefore representative and reliable, if they were led by the community. Robert Young, of Community Links South Lanarkshire, explained that his organisation has a service delivery agreement with South Lanarkshire Council and does consultation work in its area. He stated—

“The work is door to door, as that is the only way to do it. You have to keep going round and round until you get all the answers...It is the only way that you get a true picture of an area.”

358. Brendan Rooney agreed there were benefits to community led groups running consultation exercises, including their ability to better reflect the language used in the community planning environment. We raised that issue in theme two of this report—

“Community-led groups have become adept at translation. For example, if the council wants to know something, community-led groups can adapt the council’s lingo into language that local people can understand. The community-led group can say to the council, the NHS or the statutory agency, “That approach will not work in this area. Here is a better methodology”—such as the door-to-door approach—“Why don’t you do it this way?” They have the local knowledge and the local language.”

359. As part of our scrutiny of the Scottish Government’s third draft National Planning Framework on 29 January 2014, we heard from Planning Aid Scotland about the Charetteplus model of community engagement they have developed to assist planning authorities when drawing up local development plans. This is a more holistic community engagement exercise, based on the Charette model of engaging with respect to place-making and development plans. However Charetteplus extends this model to include community planning more widely. Planning Aid Scotland pointed to its recent Charetteplus pilot exercise undertaken in Levenmouth in Fife in May 2013. This was carried out in co-operation with Fife
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Council and supported by COSLA and the Scottish Government. This is another example of innovation in terms of community engagement in decision making.

360. Participatory budgeting is another tool used to engage communities in decision making, highlighted by organisations such as North Lanarkshire Council and Oxfam—

“Participatory Budgeting…is very effective as an engagement tool and directly involves local people in making decisions on the spending and priorities for a defined public budget in their area. This also promotes wellbeing, empowerment and a sense of ownership.”

“If we are to engage people that will involve a transfer of power, which can be done in all sorts of ways. One way that we advocate in our submission is participatory budgeting, which is well used in Brazil, although clearly not to the extent that people got to say whether they wanted to host the world cup. In many cities and at high levels, chunks of the budget are allocated to participatory budgeting. There is a large community engagement process and the community says, “This is how we want the money to be spent.” How the money is spent is determined not by a finance committee, the Parliament or a local authority committee but by the people.”

361. Oxfam’s written evidence highlighted Govanhill as an example of best practice with regard to participatory budgeting—

“In addition to facing a range of social, economic and health inequalities, Govanhill in Glasgow is a diverse neighbourhood where over 50 languages are spoken. In 2010 the Govanhill Community Action group (GoCA) – comprising representatives from local community groups – was allocated £200,000 from the Scottish Government and tasked with deciding how it should be spent locally. Oxfam supported the group and facilitated the participatory budgeting process. GoCA embraced the responsibility – they discussed strategic priorities and then invited wider community groups to participate. Funded projects were innovative, diverse and ambitious, emphasising people, rather than place: the Govanhill Family Support Group; Govanhill Community Justice Partnership; and the Govanhill Baths Trust. This selection demonstrates a strong understanding of local issues. The process was a positive and beneficial experience for all concerned; it enabled structured and purposeful dialogue between community members as well as the public and third sectors. It also reflects a welcome cultural shift towards devolving decision making power to the Govanhill community and, as a result, trust and respect has increased. The community demonstrated strategic prioritisation of wider community interests – they


knew the issues and directed money in the direction of practical, efficient and effective solutions”.\(^{247}\)

362. We also heard an example of participatory budgeting from the Linwood Community Development Trust,\(^{248}\) which undertook a wide ranging consultation throughout the community that included all organisations that operated there. Its record of people’s priorities from this consultation was distilled into categories that then fed into creation of the Linwood community plan. Linwood now aims to take an asset based approach to regeneration and is looking to utilise powers that are expected to be given in the Community Empowerment Bill to ensure local ownership of community assets.

363. A continuing theme was the need to share best practice and show how other community groups have successfully developed local regeneration projects, in order to improve knowledge and information sharing.\(^{249}\) Here we note specifically the annual ‘SURF awards’ as a method of sharing best practice amongst practitioners and the community—

“With regard to specific examples of strong projects that are focused on multiple aspects, SURF can draw on a substantial body of independently assessed successful initiatives. Each year, SURF organises an annual awards scheme to highlight best practice in community regeneration. The annual SURF Awards are delivered in partnership with the Scottish Government and independently assessed by judging teams composed of national regeneration agency professionals and experienced community activists. Since 2006, SURF has been annually producing an accessible and widely distributed publication summarising up to 20 shortlisted SURF Awards regeneration initiatives from across Scotland. These publications are freely available from the SURF website and provide a valuable resource to regeneration practitioners, policy advisers and academics.”\(^{250}\)

364. Sharing of best practice is an important role for community based organisations, as SFHA pointed out—

“Organisations such as Link Group and NG Homes are doing exceptional work and engaging in innovative approaches that could be passed on for other organisations to learn from and use in their own ways for their own areas.”\(^{251}\) “Of course replicating successful community led and managed projects elsewhere requires funding to support the transfer process and to provide kick start funding for the project.”\(^{252}\)

365. North Lanarkshire Council suggested that the creation of a forum to share best practice and knowledge of regeneration projects would be an improvement.

\(^{247}\) Oxfam Scotland. Written submission, page 10.
\(^{248}\) Linwood Community Development Trust. Written submission.
\(^{250}\) SURF. Written submission, page 3-4.
\(^{252}\) Ibid.
366. We asked the Scottish Government what actions it was taking to support sharing of best practice in community led regeneration. In response, the Minister for Housing and Regeneration wrote to us stating—

“The Scottish Government recognises the need to share best practice on successful community regeneration across Scotland. I chair the Regeneration High Level Working Group that is focussed on improving collaborative working in order to support the delivery of regeneration outcomes. By working in partnership with a range of stakeholders from across the public, private and community sectors we are able to share best practice on successful regeneration initiatives”.

367. We note here also the Scottish Government’s ‘Achieving change’ programme, which we understand is designed to support the sharing of best practice in relation to tackling multiple disadvantage.

368. We note here the work of 17 staff of the Scottish Community Development Centre and Health Exchange (SCDC) in that regard. Stuart Hashagen, of the SCDC, explained that the role is to promote and support community development through a number of activities—

“We have been established for about 20 years in two different organisational forms. We are here to promote and support community development across Scotland, and we see that as involving advising on policy areas, practice development and working directly with communities up and down Scotland.

The things with which we have been associated include the training programme for the social inclusion partnerships, when we had them. We worked to co-ordinate the development of the national standards for community engagement and the VOICE—visioning outcomes in community engagement—programme, which is an online version of much the same thing. The community health exchange, which supports the network of community health organisations across Scotland, is based with us, as is the Scottish co-production network, which tries to encourage co-produced solutions to community problems with the national health service and other bodies.

We also run two or three programmes directly in communities, one of which, health issues in the community, is a training programme for local community activists. Another programme, which is funded by the Big Lottery Fund, is called ACE—achieving community empowerment—and is a capacity building programme for a number of smaller community organisations. The other thing that I should mention is that we developed and have spent a lot of time with LEAP—learning, evaluation and planning—which is an outcome-focused planning and evaluation framework for all forms of participatory community activities.”

253 Minister for Housing and Welfare. Written submission, 24 January 2013.
369. When discussing different approaches local authorities take to engage the community, SLAED stated—

“Diverse approaches are adopted. The tools are all there in the box for regeneration, for community engagement, for the delivery of physical projects and employability and for community benefits, which I mentioned. People know how to do those things. Our officers are equipped to use the tools and they use them. There are many examples across the country of economic development officers being engaged and bringing forward projects, whether that is in cities or towns or out in rural areas...we recognise that the tools are there. The resources that allow us to use them are pretty stretched, and officers have to make judgments on what it is appropriate to use in which circumstances. Ultimately, how the resources are secured concerns our political processes.”

Resources for community engagement and capacity building

370. Oxfam recommended giving the community skills, resources and support from experts to engage in community planning and suggested ‘top-slicing’ CPP funding for community groups to implement their own ideas - which many stakeholders indicated may generate revenue towards community future needs and ownership.256

371. HIE and RICS made similar suggestions, recommending the need for good leadership, specialist advice, guidance and capacity building support to manage projects and unlock the talent and aspirations of communities. Carnegie’s research indicated that inspirational community leaders are needed and public agencies have a partnership role to play in capacity building. Furthermore, community led initiatives need broad community level support, projects should not be expected to achieve too much and should be flexible in nature.

372. Community representatives made similar comments, recommending not only that community capacity building was needed, but that the funding should be ring-fenced. DTAS and the SCA called for funding to be invested directly in community organisations so

“capacity can be built from within communities.”

---

258 Ibid.
373. We heard different examples of funding capacity building for community ownership directed at community groups, such as that provided by the Heritage Lottery Fund—

“Start-up grants will be available to support changes in stewardship of heritage - helping communities take on the management of heritage assets and undertake initial options appraisals. Transition funding will help those previously supported by HLF to develop their business plans. A Catalyst capacity building grants programme will help organisations acquire the skills they need to fund raise and attract private investment and donations. A further round of HLF’s Skills for the Future programme will build on the success of our first scheme, offering work-based training opportunities across the sector.”

374. In this regard, all CPP partners need to be willing to trust and avoid any risk-averse attitude towards investing support in community capacity and enabling truly community-led projects. It is important that, at least initially, they do not expect too much and thus can ensure or at least recognise less tangible, but equally important benefits from such investment; benefits such as building community confidence and cohesion.

375. Brendan Rooney, from the Happy ‘n’ Healthy Community Development Trust explained that there is often a lack of trust displayed in community organisations—

“Community planning partnerships seem to have a fundamental lack of trust in community groups and organisations having the skills, commitment and capacity to manage resources and make effective decisions. The good experience that I cited took a lot of brokering, discussion and reassurance from us. Over the past 10 years, we have, thankfully, managed to develop a reputation as an organisation that can take on resource, spend it wisely and make a difference to people’s lives. Ultimately, that is what regeneration is all about. It is a complex situation, but there is a cultural issue in the fundamental lack of trust among community planning partners generally throughout Scotland.”

376. We heard that regulation and audit impacts on people’s willingness to take risk with investment. When we investigated risk and attitude to potential failure and the impact this may have on community capacity building, Eric Samuel from BIG stated—

“Years ago, a boss in my department said that if we do not fund some failures, we have failed, because it is all about trying new stuff [emphasis added]. I would imagine that Colin McLean - of HLF - thinks the same. We are so tightly controlled by our financial regulations and by audit

---


nowadays that we have to be very careful about what we put money into, so we operate a risk-based approach.”

377. Funding decisions may be more challenging during tough economic times, but a ‘never fail’ attitude stifles investment in community capacity building and innovative ways of communities delivering projects. The Transition University of St Andrews and Dr Rehema Whitey suggested that a culture change is required in local authorities as enablers of community resilience, a message we have heard repeatedly over the course of this inquiry and our inquiry into public services reform.

378. Both SURF and South Lanarkshire Council agreed with other stakeholders that the Government needs to fund community capacity building appropriately for ‘community led regeneration’, pointing out it will be crucial to delivering the key expected components of the forthcoming Community Empowerment Bill.

379. The Minister for Housing and Welfare wrote to us with further information in January of this year, outlining the actions the Scottish Government was taking to support community capacity building. Much of the information re-iterated various existing Scottish Government funds related to regeneration, such as the PCF and Regeneration Capital Grant Fund.

380. However, the Minister highlighted a new programme for community capacity building—

“We have recently developed a Strengthening Communities Programme to help expedite community anchor organisations to achieve greater sustainability and longer term resilience.

This community capacity building programme aims to develop more resilient and sustainable community anchor organisations, committed to community regeneration objectives. It will also deliver a pipeline of organisations with their capacity enhanced and ready to advance into more ambitious initiatives.”

381. It is our understanding this programme is being funded as part of the existing People and Communities Fund.

The role of CPPs

382. Returning to the SCDCs four key elements of community capacity building, we consider CPPs have a duty to support community capacity building by—

---
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• ensuring appropriate co-ordination and prioritisation of CPP resource to build community capacity, with funding following the objectives of building the knowledge, skills and confidence of communities. This includes funding communities to organise themselves and establish appropriate infrastructures and networks;

• enabling broad community engagement activity in the community planning process, using varied methods to interact with different groups;

• ensuring appropriate strategic co-ordination and prioritisation of CPP activity to support outcomes of reductions in poverty, equality and deprivation; and

• ensuring appropriate linkages in local structures and partnerships are in place, so that it is clear to communities and all other partners, how they truly contribute to and influence the strategic community planning process.

Communities and CPPs
383. There was significant consensus among those whom we took evidence from that CPPS need to be focused on people; with communities being key players in decision making processes and regeneration activity.267

384. In line with the findings from our public services reform inquiry268 and our findings in theme 1 on ‘true community-led regeneration’, evidence on the performance of CPPs engaging and empowering local communities in decision making is mixed. We heard mixed messages about whether CPPs involve the right partnerships at the right level. Some representatives suggested the strategic level at which CPPs operate often excludes the community.

385. The recent Audit Scotland report and recommendations on CPPs269 were commended by Judith Robertson from Oxfam Scotland, who suggested that CPPs are not doing enough to pro-actively engage communities in the right ways—

“Audit Scotland has done a fairly thorough report and made some quite good recommendations. Participation is a juggling act. Some CPPs do not have the word “community” in their name, and they become planning partnerships for public sector delivery. We are honest about that; that is what they achieve, and there are other complementary processes to engage the community, which we resource…We have to go and talk to people, we have to resource that and we have to do that in such a way that


people are prepared to engage with us, so we have to go to where they are. We cannot expect people to come to us. When the committee went to Govan, that was great. I know that lots of people do that all the time, and that is positive. Bringing people from communities into the Parliament is obviously good, but it is much better to go to where they are to get engagement, and that is resource intensive. It is clear from the Audit Scotland report that community planning partnerships are not predominantly doing that, so practice has to change.²⁷⁰

386. The view that there is a lack of community engagement and empowerment by CPPs was also backed by Dr Peter Matthews, of Heriot Watt University, Professor Carol Tannahill, from GoWell (Glasgow University) and Annette Hastings, of Glasgow University—

“The intention was that CPPs at a local authority level would have a strong focus on neighbourhood change. However, in practice many CPPs have struggled to balance their strategic role with the local focus, with local communities often feeling excluded from participatory arrangements, especially when they were involved in previous regeneration partnerships.”²⁷¹

“If community planning partnerships did not exist, we would all want to invent something like them. The principle is therefore very good, but there have been concerns and tensions about the two different roles that community planning partnerships often look to fulfil. The first role is about co-ordinating the resources, strategies and services of players at the level of the local authority. The second role is about the community bit of community planning: community involvement and reflecting the needs and priorities of the different communities that sit within a local authority area.”

“With regard to today’s discussion, we need to recognise that community planning partnerships are often not in a position to have the detailed local knowledge that is required to inform local regeneration decisions. I like to think of it as a chain, with community planning partnerships being one part of that chain and also having a role in keeping the chain well oiled. They have a responsibility for ensuring that there is the necessary community infrastructure for local decisions, but they often do not have that localised knowledge of what is needed in some areas.”²⁷²

“At a city-wide or local authority-wide level, and at a more local level, community planning is a useful instrument for understanding the different levels of need for particular services. As a strategic body, the community planning partnership can bring services together, think about the multidimensionality of needs, and assess whether there are different levels of need in different parts of an area for particular services. They are useful

²⁷¹ Dr Peter Matthews. Written submission, page 4.
as a strategic instrument, and that is at the heart of my submission. They are also a good instrument for tailoring provision appropriately to meet those needs.”

“The other aspect of community planning—keeping communities at the heart of community planning—is harder to deliver, but in an era when we are thinking about more community-led regeneration, it is helpful to have more detailed intelligence about the potential for communities to take the lead and do things for themselves in particular areas.”

387. Jackie Brock described the role of CPPs engaging with schools, suggesting much more could be done in that regard—

“Children in Scotland’s experience, just a handful of head teachers or other school leaders understand the role of CPPs and their contribution to single outcome agreements and know how to influence discussions on CPP investment decisions. I suspect that the vast majority of the school community has even less understanding.

I suppose that the upside of that is that it is a great opportunity for CPPs to describe the line of sight between what a school community is saying, influencing and wants to change and how that links in with the CPP’s investment decisions and outcomes. Those opportunities are certainly not being exploited and there is considerable scope, to put it mildly, to raise the profile of the benefits.”

388. Community support groups such as DTAS questioned the term CPP and whether CPPs as constructed can provide the interface needed to empower communities. The SCA went further suggesting that CPPs have failed to engage successfully with communities and that they have in fact encroached on the ‘space’ where locally led regeneration might flourish.

389. Brendan Rooney, from the Healthy ‘n’ Happy Community Development Trust stated—

“I urge members of the Scottish Parliament to rename the process. …community planning does not involve the community. There is an urgent need for agencies to plan together, which is what community planning is. There is no community involvement in community planning at the moment, so I urge members to acknowledge that by changing the name. We need to look to incorporate community involvement in the planning process, but communities are currently not involved.”

---
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390. However, we heard numerous examples of good partnership working between local authorities and community groups, with communities playing an active role in partnerships and decision making. We heard good examples of CPPs working and transforming local areas. For example, when we visited Whitfield in Dundee, the approach adopted by Dundee Council was praised by community representatives. We heard how the city council divides £750,000 of funding each year among six local regeneration forum areas that cover the city. Each area is given £125,000 to determine how it is spent. £50,000 must be spent on environmental projects and £50,000 must be spent on youth diversionary schemes, leaving £25,000 for provision as a discretionary grants fund. This approach was well received by the communities who attended our event.

391. In Dundee, local area regeneration committees have been established and have representatives on the CPP, providing direct and accountable involvement. A similar approach has been adopted by Glasgow City Council, who use community councils and local area partnerships to gain community views.

392. Irvine Bay URC felt that the CPP in North Ayrshire is crucial to focusing on key deliverables in partnership. Inverclyde Council made similar points about the CPP model, stating that it is an effective delivery mechanism for co-ordinating the funding that supports regeneration and a multi-disciplinary approach. South Lanarkshire Council stated that CPPs have a role in identifying appropriate community anchor organisations and building capacity.

393. Robert Young, from Community Links, South Lanarkshire, explained that all the board members of his organisation (who are members of the community) sit on committees that are run by South Lanarkshire Council, and as a result, they have their say. He praised the support that is provided by the local authority to organisations in South Lanarkshire and stated—

“In areas where we have done consultations, the planning partnership has put in place things that have completely changed those areas. One of the areas that I worked in when I started 10 years ago is completely different now. It has worked, and there are other areas in which you can see huge differences.”

394. Councillor Mairi Evans, from Angus Council, stated—

“The work of the local partnership, the community council and the retailers group, with support from local community planning, has completely changed
Brechin. We hope to build on the experience and spread the approach across Angus.\footnote{Scottish Parliament Local Government and Regeneration Committee. Official Report, 11 September 2013, Col 2556.}

395. Stuart Hashagen explained that the National Standards for Community Engagement (NSCE) had been prepared, with the support of the Scottish Government, to provide the approach for CPPs to engage communities in a partnership manner.\footnote{Scottish Parliament Local Government and Regeneration Committee. Official Report, 26 June 2013, Col 2446.}

396. A critical role for CPPs was identified by Dr Peter Mathews in ensuring that, as discussed in theme 1 of our findings, mainstream services are targeted and tailored for more deprived neighbourhoods. That approach was backed up by the evidence from Dr Annette Hastings, of the University of Glasgow,\footnote{Dr Annette Hastings. Written submission, page 1.} and SURF.

397. We investigated that matter with the Minister for Housing and Welfare. A Scottish Government official confirmed that—

"it is up to community planning partnerships to decide, but certainly all the messaging is that community planning partnerships should be taking steps to improve areas of multiple deprivation.\footnote{Scottish Parliament Local Government and Regeneration Committee. Official Report, 25 September 2013, Col 2675.}"

\textit{Housing associations and CPPs}

398. Many who gave evidence described housing associations, particularly locally-based housing associations, as key partners in delivering regeneration. We emphasise in theme 2 of our findings the powerful partnership role that housing associations, well-resourced in both staff and funds, can play in community engagement and community led regeneration.

399. Representatives from housing associations made similar suggestions to other stakeholders about CPPs and how they engage with local communities. For example, Craig Sanderson of Link Group LTD stated—

"We work across about 24 local authority areas. The performance of CPPs is mixed around the country, but we always get comments and feedback from local community members who do not feel that they are a strong enough part of the partnerships. The CPPs seem to be dominated by local authorities and by the other agencies; health agencies and the police tend to have a right to be on CPPs, but there appears to be scope for others to have a place at the top table.\footnote{Scottish Parliament Local Government and Regeneration Committee. Official Report, 12 June 2013, Col 2294.}"

400. Concern was expressed at the lack of senior formal engagement of housing associations in CPPs. Pauline Barbour, from the Scottish Federation of Housing Associations (SFHA) stated—

\textit{Footnotes}:
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“we have found that the community planning partnerships do not often include housing as standard in their membership, and we would really like to see housing at the table because of our involvement with health and social work. Everything has to be there, and housing is an integral part of community planning.”

401. Craig Sanderson, of the Link Group LTD and Dr Colleen Rowan of the GWSFHA, agreed—

“Since the demise of Communities Scotland, there has not been a high enough representation of housing interests at community planning partnership level. Communities Scotland used to have a place on all the partnerships, but the housing contribution to the debate is now sometimes missing…housing has to be seen to have a place at the top table, as it is strategically important. There must also be community representation at that level”.

“I echo the previous comments. The issue of representation and having a seat at the table has been a problem for our members. However, the community planning partnership structure in Glasgow is in the process of changing, and we hope to get a seat above the sub-group level. Our members want that representation, and we feel that it is an arena where we need to be represented.”

402. We asked the Minister whether she thought housing associations should have a statutory role in CPPs. She responded that—

“My instinct at the moment would be to say that I do not think that housing associations should have a statutory role because it would force housing associations and charities to be involved in something that they may not feel a need for within their strategy.

However, I would be concerned if a member told me that a housing association that wanted to participate fully in community planning partnership had been excluded. If they want to be involved, they should be, and there is a role for them. I believe that that is appropriate.”

403. This captures some of the difficulty. HAs vary considerably, but it should be possible for HAs within an area and CPPs to establish formal strategic relationships to ensure the full benefit of HAs can be brought to play in community regeneration. An approach clearly supported by the Minister.

---

Links between CPPs and neighbourhood planning

404. On CPPs’ engagement with local area and communities several witnesses indicated that there was often a gap between strategic and localised planning—

“I also reiterate the point about the geographical level at which CPPs operate. Decisions taken at that level often bear no relationship to what people at the micro or neighbourhood level want or feel is needed in their local communities.”

“At neighbourhood level, there is a big gap between what people regard as neighbourhoods and how neighbourhoods typically are characterised in partnerships. I am thinking about where I stay in Edinburgh. In the community planning partnership that I am part of, there are at least 10 or 11 communities at neighbourhood level. That begs the question of how we reinforce the ability of those neighbourhoods, as people understand them, to play a meaningful part in community planning partnerships. We are a long way from getting that right yet.”

“I think that we have a way to go to crack neighbourhood engagement and to connect better with that strategic way of working across the city. I mentioned that in the context of community planning and the strategic structures, below city level but still involving large geographies, in which senior officers often operate. It is about finding a way of engaging at a neighbourhood level.”

405. West Lothian Council recommended better links between strategic community planning and local teams who deliver services—

“Community Planning Partnerships must support local structures, and ensure that local regeneration work is valued and encouraged.”

Community Empowerment (Scotland) Bill

406. We received evidence from COSLA which urged that the role of CPP partners be put on a statutory basis—

“It is important that CPPs are empowered to focus on these activities, planning and resourcing strategic priorities facing communities, including a statutory requirement being placed across all relevant agencies, and not simply local government. CPPs also need to be able to rely on effective relationships and participation across a range of local partners. Although there is some excellent work going on, this is not always clearly linked to

---

overall community planning priorities, and there is a need to ensure that all partners understand their role and remits in relation to regeneration”.

407. In evidence to us the Minister indicated—

“The forthcoming community empowerment and renewal bill gives us an opportunity to consider how community planning partnerships can be upscaled and whether statutory obligations should be placed on them.”

Regeneration outcomes

408. From the evidence we received, it appears monitoring the success of a community led regeneration strategy is a complex process and there are different benefits from using different measurements. Due to the holistic nature of regeneration activity, some outcomes frameworks and indicators may be of more importance and relevance to some communities and partners than others.

409. There was consensus among different stakeholders that the outcomes of regeneration work can be long term, especially with regard to physical investment, although investment in people produced much quicker returns.

410. North Lanarkshire Council pointed to the need for robust monitoring and evaluation of outcomes. However some stakeholders, such as West Lothian Council, highlighted the challenges in measuring outcomes around community engagement, capacity, regeneration and social capital. Aberdeenshire Council highlighted its use of social accounting and use of performance indicators. It commented—

“Positive attitudes and strong cohesion are difficult to measure but are key indicators of success.”

411. Gavin Corbett, from Shelter, stated that there is often a difference of opinion on outcomes between those paying for the project and those in the community.

412. Several suggestions were made on the most appropriate way to define outcome measurements for successful community and social regeneration—

- The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS) used by the GoWell project.

---
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• Boots cited those used by the Welsh Government; these are already used in Scotland.307

• Oxfam’s humankind index is impressive in its range and appears to have considerable merit.308

413. HLF has an outcome framework for its grant programmes; BIG also evaluates at programme level.309 It encourages a model of self-evaluation by communities, an approach to outcomes endorsed by the Minister for Housing and Regeneration. Eric Samuel, from BIG, explained—

“We expect projects to self-evaluate, and we will include money in the grant that we give to them to pay the costs of that, but we also provide them with support from a contractor to learn how to evaluate, because we think that it is important for projects to know whether they are succeeding and to have evidence with which they can prove that the project has been successful when it comes to looking for future funding and making a case for it.”310

The Scottish Government’s regeneration strategy - outcomes framework

414. We wrote to the Minister for Housing and Welfare to request further information on how the Scottish Government was planning to monitor outcomes related to its community-led regeneration strategy in order to determine whether the strategy is achieving its vision.

415. In August 2013, we received a letter from the Minister for Housing and Welfare, which included an options paper for measuring the outcomes associated with regeneration. The Minister confirmed with us that “all strategies are looking for social outcomes.”311

416. The options paper outlines three levels of performance measurement for the regeneration strategy at a national, local and strategy specific level. The regeneration strategy is related to many of the Scottish Government’s 16 national outcomes included in ‘Scotland Performs’.312

417. Housing also plays a significant role in feeding into these national outcomes, and this is monitored by the Scottish Government through its outcomes framework for housing and regeneration313 which is aligned with national outcomes. Within this framework, one of the outcomes is ‘sustainable communities’ and there are a number of related indicators for physically, economically and socially sustainable communities that can be monitored
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418. The options paper suggests the Scottish Government’s analytical services could monitor these outcomes and indicators from the regeneration strategy, using the various indicators and that it could identify areas where there have been ‘reductions in performance’.

419. Further correspondence from the Minister has confirmed that the outcomes framework and monitoring arrangements included in the options paper are now being implemented—

“We are currently developing a monitoring report looking at the indicators most relevant to the Regeneration Strategy. This will enable us to track national and local trends in data relevant to regeneration over a period of time. It is important to note that regeneration programmes, such as the people and communities fund and regeneration capital grant fund are relatively new funds with recent investments being made. Outcomes associated with this investment are currently being embedded and will be monitored once projects are further established.”

SOAs—the link to local delivery of the strategy

420. Ultimately, the delivery of the regeneration strategy locally is delivered mainly through CPPs, and the key monitoring tool for outcomes through the CPP delivery mechanism is Single Outcome Agreements.

421. In considering outcomes it is necessary first to consider how objectives and targets are set. Not surprisingly, many witnesses considered that communities should have a major role in setting and developing priorities for SOAs and that capacity should be built for communities to take on more responsibility and ownership of outcomes.

422. Judith Robertson, from Oxfam Scotland, explained that for true community empowerment, communities should determine the agenda in community planning processes—

“SOAs provide an opportunity for genuine participation and for asking what a local authority’s objectives should be, but they are not used in that way.”

423. This view was supported by GWSFHA, which considered that communities should be involved in determining outcomes of regeneration and their evaluation.

424. The Scottish Government’s regeneration outcomes framework highlights a number of local and national indicators and data that can be analysed and monitored at local authority level. Examples include Scottish Government Neighbourhood Statistics, the Scottish Household Survey, the Scottish Crime and

314 Minister for Housing and Welfare. Written submission, 28 September 2013.


317 Glasgow West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations. Written submission, page 31.
Justice Survey and the Scottish Health Survey. In addition to these national statistics, local authorities will also use their own data collections, such as neighbourhood satisfaction surveys, citizens surveys and local panels to evidence progress towards SOAs.\(^{318}\)

425. The Minister stated it was for CPPs to determine the most appropriate indicators to monitor their performance, but commented—

“If community planning partnerships are strong and working well, they should be looking very closely at what indicators they want to use to ensure that people are actually benefiting.”\(^{319}\)

426. To improve their engagement with communities and to share best practice it was suggested that in monitoring outcomes and performance—

“CPPs should describe the amount of community participation and engagement that is taking place and what the impact has been.”\(^{320}\)

**CE Bill – Outcome Improvement Processes**

427. Part 2 of the consultation on the proposed CE Bill\(^{321}\) contains detail of a community body’s right to request to participate in processes to improve outcomes of service delivery. This part would allow such bodies to request to participate in an outcome improvement process.

428. An “outcome improvement process”, “in relation to a public service authority, means a process established or to be established by the authority with a view to improving an outcome that results from, or is contributed to by virtue of, the provision of a public service.” (section 13(5) draft bill) Bodies covered include local authorities, health boards and others set out in schedule 2.

429. Where a body requests involvement and meets the requirements of the Bill, the public service body has a duty to establish and maintain an improvement process. In other words to involve the community body.

430. We also note here that the draft CE Bill and consultation seeks views on including provision within the Bill that places a duty on Scottish Ministers to develop, consult on and publish a set of outcomes that describe the government’s long term, strategic objectives for Scotland, as well as a complementary duty to report regularly and publicly progress towards these outcomes. This would be in support of improving the link between local outcomes defined in each CPP’s SOA and national outcomes defined by a national outcome framework.

---


Governance and accountability

431. Our interest in governance arrangements surrounding regeneration activity was sparked for two main reasons—

- Interest in the role, if any, that communities and community representatives have at board level, in order to play a key role in determining priorities and outcomes; and

- Concern arising as a result of the summary report we received of the “Review of Riverside Inverclyde and Delivery of Regeneration Services within Inverclyde”.

Community involvement at board level

432. We sought evidence on this aspect at every opportunity but received little evidence of real involvement from those at community level. This was contradicted at council level, with many local authorities indicating they had processes in place to hear views from the community. Inverclyde Council gave us substantial evidence of involvement “on a range of fronts in terms of community planning”. Involvement runs through into the main CPP board with community councils having two representatives and the voluntary sector one.

433. Similarly Glasgow City provided evidence referring to its “21 multimember wards” and the role that they play, although not, as far as we are aware, at board level. South Lanarkshire has a voluntary sector representative at board level and a community representative.

434. At the strategic level in local authorities we heard that governance sits at board level within CPPs with scrutiny increasingly linked to the terms of single outcome agreements, as discussed above. At times, this sees through-flow of information from council plans and engagement on the ground.

435. There was general agreement from all evidence that CPPs “should be working alongside communities as critical partners in delivery of the priority outcomes for the area and be providing leadership.” Some emphasised the representative role and thus local accountability played by councillor members of boards. We of course recognise and accept that, provided this is not the exclusive route in for the community.

---
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436. The Minister said “I fundamentally agree that people are at the heart of regeneration"327 and, as we have highlighted, agreed with the important statement that—

“In the future, power will be as close as possible to those who will be affected by the decisions”328

437. The chief executive of Clyde Gateway reminded us about a key purpose of regeneration when attempting to put governance into perspective—

“All future regeneration policy, with reference to communities, must go beyond the issues around empowerment, leadership and governance and identify what practical steps can be taken to ensure that jobs are targeted at those living in the communities where the regeneration activity is underway.”329

**Governance, targets and outcomes of URC’s**

The voice of the people is integral to good governance.

438. Under theme 2 we looked at the background to URCs and considered how they can be used as a tool or mechanism for delivering regeneration. In this section, we will look specifically at their governance arrangements.

439. In September 2013 an independent mid-term review of, one of the URCs, Riverside Inverclyde, and the delivery of regeneration services within Inverclyde prepared for Inverclyde Council and Scottish Enterprise by New Skills Consulting was published.330 Prior to publication aspects of the report were leaked through the press, and to facilitate evidence we were provided with a then confidential summary report.

440. On governance, the summary report331 stated—

“The review has found that there are a range of strategies and plans in place in Inverclyde impacting on regeneration and economic development. While there is an overarching economic regeneration strategy, there is no single operating plan which would enable all partners to work together towards common delivery outcomes. Other areas, such as North Ayrshire and Lancashire have adopted a single regeneration plan, and a similar approach in Inverclyde could help to create a clearer focus on shared goals, improve partnership working between RI and the Council, avoid duplication

---
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in service delivery, and enable more efficient allocation of scarce resources.\textsuperscript{332}

441. On 11 September 2013, we took evidence from Inverclyde Council and Scottish Enterprise and, on 25 September, evidence from other URCs. On 11 September we inquired whether, in light of the report, witnesses felt governance arrangements within Riverside Inverclyde were satisfactory. We were advised that apart from a lack of regular board meetings they were. We note changes to board membership quickly followed for various reasons.

442. Other governance aspects of interest at the meeting related to the scrutiny of operations by partners, as well as business planning, including in particular target setting. We were surprised to learn that targets for the company had neither been revised in light of the economic downturn nor had there been any changes to funding arrangements from Scottish Enterprise. We were advised that revisions were now under consideration.

443. It was clear to us that governance was lax and arrangements would benefit from improvement. Furthermore, those funding Riverside Inverclyde were not scrutinising adequately its targets and work. We were reassured when told that action was being taken in this regard.

444. On 25 September we considered governance and accountability aspects more generally in relation to the other URCs, supported by supplementary written submissions. Three of the four west coast URCs – Clyde Gateway, Clydebank Rebuilt, Irvine Bay Regeneration Company and Riverside Inverclyde – have community board members, which gives direct input to local people on governance and decision making.\textsuperscript{333} On its governance and approach to community involvement, Raploch URC indicated that—

“Community involvement has been key to the regeneration of the Raploch area and over the years there have been many consultation exercises and public meetings, working in partnership with Stirling Council, the Community Council, the Raploch Community Partnership and other public sector agencies and local businesses.”\textsuperscript{334}

445. That was achieved with the following governance approach—

“The URC Company was initially set up with a number of directors from a range of public sector bodies. This reflected the breadth of the organisation that it was hoped would be able to engage in the project and encompassed the Local Authority, Health Service, Scottish Enterprise, and the Raploch Community Partnership. Forth Valley College were also represented on the Board at a later date and a variety of individuals have sat on the Board in recent times...the number of bodies represented on the board has
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diminished, with the Board now consisting of three directors, two of whom are Stirling Councillors.  

446. Clyde Gateway advised us that its Boards has—

“12 directors comprising 11 non-executives and the Chief Executive. The 11 non-executive posts are made up as follows—

1 independent chair;
6 “partner” directors (2 appointed by each of the three members);
4 “co-opted” directors;
2 business representatives from Glasgow and South Lanarkshire; and
2 community representatives from Glasgow and South Lanarkshire.”

447. We asked about targets for the companies and whether they had been adjusted to take account of the recession. Although the need for targets and evaluation of outcomes was accepted by all, the manner in which that should be done, and views on what were considered appropriate forms of measurement, varied enormously.

448. Clydebank Rebuilt and Irvine Bay regeneration had adjusted targets while PARC Craigmillar and Clyde Gateway had not, the latter observing the 20 year timescale in which they were operating.

449. We acknowledge that understandably, URCs have had different objectives and undertake different activity, and that they are not directly comparable due to differing geographies, populations, land issues and market failures. Targets and outcomes by URC will therefore differ, targets and measurements have in some cases changed over the period of their existence. This, due to the economic circumstances in which they operate, is to be expected to a degree. However, we are disappointed that although the purpose of regeneration is social improvement there was little in the targets to show how this would be achieved.

450. More generally, we would have expected any prudent organisation to react and adapt to the changing economic environment and change tack and approach accordingly. The indicators and outcomes that are available, including job creation and value for money, suggest that this either has not happened or happened much later than expected.

451. We considered how outcomes from URC regeneration activity could be monitored, and found the expected outcomes from public sector investment in URCs unclear. Furthermore we heard mixed messages about the success of these investments. When discussing the performance of URCs Scottish

---
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Enterprise explained that “it is a long-term process and we must give considerable time for the outcomes”. We agree this is obviously the case. However, our concern is that these long term objectives and outcomes appear not to have been established and monitored properly at the outset.

452. The approach to appraising and monitoring URC spend and activity level also appears inconsistent and perhaps has not been monitored as closely as it should have been. We examined with the URCs and the Minister whether common definitions and the collective setting of targets and indicators should be applied to URCs, and whether they benchmark against each other. Clyde Gateway stated it would be happy to have additional scrutiny, and update indicators as appropriate and gave the example of benchmarking against English Urban Development Companies and regeneration activity in East London. It explained that it reports against nine key performance indicators (KPIs) to its various stakeholders.

453. In their joint written submission the west of Scotland URCs wrote—

“Each of the URCs was established with specific Business Plan targets (around land remediation, job creation, commercial floor space, houses, etc) that we measure and report annually to Scottish Government. We are therefore clearly capturing the outcomes of our regeneration activities.

Our individual KPIs are aligned with our specific URC’s objectives and project activity and are not therefore always common across all URCs. While we believe that this is the correct approach (measuring things that we are accountable for) we would also welcome the introduction of a small number of common targets for URCs and other regeneration bodies that would allow a coherent national approach to impact assessment and evidence based decision making.

We believe that the measurement and accountability culture in Scotland is well established and we are able to isolate those KPIs that we have a direct influence on and that we can attribute direct outcomes from our activities.

We believe that it is important to recognise that while physical outcomes can be relatively easily measured, social and economic outcomes will manifest over a longer period and that it is therefore important to adopt a long-term approach and not to measure too soon. We also recognise the importance of not trying to measure everything and of including some qualitative perception indicators. For example, taking SIMD data zones, while some places have continued to feature toward the bottom of the rankings, this does not mean that there has been no improvement for local people and communities.”
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454. It should also be noted here that URCs have charitable status. We discussed with the URCs how their assets will ultimately be transferred when their work is complete. Ian Manson from Clyde Gateway suggested that there needs to be a community benefit from the assets that URCs currently own and manage, and that consideration needed to be given to how these assets will be transferred to the community. He gave as an example of best practice for community ownership and transfer of URC assets, the Dalmarnock community hub—

“When I talk about community ownership, I mean the real thing. The best example that I can give is the Dalmarnock community hub, which is in our operating plan to be funded. It is undergoing scrutiny by a number of bodies and will, we hope, get additional funding from the European regional development fund and regeneration funding. That asset will be owned and managed by the People’s Development Trust. I am clear that, when I talk about community ownership of assets, it is the real deal.”
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PRACTICAL ISSUES: OUR CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

455. This section sets out our conclusions and recommendations on the practical issues covered under this theme of the inquiry.

Conclusions

456. We received much evidence of successful, often very successful, projects run by community groups but no real strategic approach to sharing best practice on community led regeneration. We would have found it helpful to receive any examples of the work the Regeneration high level working group has done to improve the sharing and implementation of best practice amongst communities, or indeed any records of its meetings. We are unconvinced that the aim of the group is not duplicating the role of the National Community Planning Group, and this is reflected in our earlier findings.

457. We recognise the direct support and resource needed to build community capacity, particularly in communities facing poverty, inequality and deprivation. We believe direct support is a hugely beneficial preventative action and we welcome any strengthening of financial support for community capacity building.

458. We believe community capacity building is a concept that is yet to be ‘mainstreamed’ throughout delivery of public policy. This is required in order to truly empower the community to participate in decision making processes and delivery across economic, physical and community/social activity, supporting the public services reform agenda and delivering a more sustainable model of regeneration.

459. As the successful delivery of regeneration depends upon a holistic response successful partnership working is essential. That partnership working needs to be in support of communities if regeneration is to be community led. The main vehicle for providing that support is the CPPs.

---

460. We commend CPPs as the main vehicle for delivering regeneration and recognise the significant moves being made by public partners to deliver the public services reform required for sustainable positive outcomes for all. However, we note the need for further improvement in CPP performance and we believe this improvement can be supported by a stronger legislative framework for all CPP partners.

461. We note that if regeneration is to be community led then local authorities, CPPs and others need to give their confidence and resources to community groups, support risk taking and accept its sometimes concomitant failure.

462. All partners in regeneration are interested not only in financial activity but in wider economic and social benefit. Evidence indicates that although figures purporting to represent this were widely presented there are no established standards of collection, analysis and presentation as there are with financial accounts. It is not good enough for the measurement of outcomes to be haphazard. Nor should it be inconsistent if progress is to be measured and councils (and CPPs) are to learn from each other.

463. We welcome the introduction of the Scottish Government’s regeneration outcomes framework and we acknowledge the monitoring arrangements outlined by the Minister. However, we are not convinced that the framework is fully embedded at a local level.

464. Regeneration delivered by CPPs is demonstrated through single outcome agreements and evidence was received that indicated that there could be measurable and damaging disparities in the delivery of local government services to communities in disadvantaged areas. As it is a community led regeneration strategy, we believe more could be done to link the Scottish Government outcomes framework to SOAs, to build a wider understanding and clearer linkage of how different mainstream activities contribute to the national regeneration outcomes of reducing inequality, deprivation and poverty across Scotland. In this regard, we support the general proposal in the draft CE Bill to embed a national outcomes framework in legislation.

465. We remain unclear how URCs share best practice effectively and learn from each other, as they are working towards common national goals even if the activities they undertake to achieve these goals rightly differ. Given the amount of public money that has been invested in these companies we consider it essential that a degree of consistent central monitoring takes place.

466. In this regard, we welcome the suggestion made by the west coast URCs to introduce common indicators for national assessment. Such indicators should allow outcome measurement for physical and social regeneration as is the case in other areas of regeneration work.

467. We agree with the ultimate holistic aims of URCs to create jobs and build a better physical and economic environment for the community, seeking to attract private investment and correct market failure. We also commend the URCs.
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involvement in community/social development activities. However, we are not convinced that they have fully embedded this community led approach in their own governance arrangements, or targets set.

468. We neither heard nor received any evidence which suggests that the governance issues relating to Riverside Inverclyde could not or do not arise with other URCs.

469. We acknowledge that a number of the URCs have community representation on their boards, but we believe more could be done by the URCs to embed the community in their decision making structures, improving the accountability of such large public investment.

470. More generally, we note that at both national and local levels, there have been consistent rearrangements of governance, and we consider that such changes are not helpful at any level. A sustained period of stability, particularly for community organisations, is essential.

471. We are clear that it does not matter whether the reality on the ground is as described to us by communities, or local authorities and other partners. Regardless of what public partners might suggest, the message at community level is that they do not feel truly part of the decision making process, and that regeneration is ‘done to them’.

472. We believe the strategic governance arrangements for CPPs and public services cannot fully embed a community led approach without communities understanding how those arrangements work, how they can participate and how they can hold public delivery partners to account. Communities must be given opportunities and crucially feel fully involved at all aspects of regeneration activity from initial ideas, identification of priorities and projects, through to implementation and completion and must feel they have a voice which is listened to at all times.

473. We note that while the consultation on the CE Bill\(^{343}\) does not contain draft provision on CPPs, it does seek views on the creation of a legislative framework for effective community planning to—

- Put CPPs and their key roles and responsibilities on a statutory basis;
- Place new duties on partner bodies so that the CPP can fulfil its responsibilities, and so that each partner’s role in community planning is fully reflected in its own governance and accountability arrangements.

474. The CE Bill consultation considers that to make progress towards meeting the key tasks for CPPs set out in the Statement of Ambition\(^{344}\) will require CPPs to


be put on a statutory basis and for their core duties in planning and delivery of outcomes to be defined more clearly.\textsuperscript{345}

**Recommendations**

475. We welcome the introduction of the ‘Strengthening Communities’ Programme by the Scottish Government, although it is our understanding this programme is being funded from the existing People and Communities Fund. We look forward to details of the programme and will seek to revisit the progress made.

476. We would welcome an update from the Minister on the progress and implementation of the Scottish Governments ‘Achieving change’ programme, as detailed in the regeneration strategy.

477. We recommend that the NCPG take the lead to require the establishment of processes to mainline and roll out the best practice of successful community-led projects to similar communities, so that success is spread across the country.

478. We welcome the National Standards for Community Engagement and expect local authorities and CPPs to embed these standards in their decision making structures and processes. We believe the NCPG could play a leadership role in this regard.

479. We recommend that the Scottish Government, reports bi-annually on its regeneration outcomes framework in respect of progress in delivering its regeneration strategy.

480. We recommend that the National Community Planning Group (NCPG) is the appropriate body to provide leadership and support to CPPs in setting objectives and overseeing progress on implementation of the regeneration strategy. We expect annual collecting and collating of the results of local authorities’ and CPPs actions, through their SOAs, in line with the Scottish Government’s regeneration outcomes framework.

481. We recommend that the Scottish Government and NCPG work with the Accounts Commission and Audit Scotland to ensure that appropriate levels of scrutiny and accountability are in place for CPPs, in monitoring their cumulative and individual contribution to the outcomes of the Scottish Government’s regeneration strategy.

482. We find the suggestion made by URCs, to introduce some common indicators for national assessment, helpful. We encourage the Scottish Government, notwithstanding its comment on the status of the URCs, to consider the introduction of common targets so that progress can be monitored and benchmarking can take place. URCs input to the outcomes framework for the regeneration strategy should also be clearly linked

483. **We recommend that the Scottish Government reviews URCs’ progress to date, including their governance arrangements, and reviews the aims of the URCs in light of the economic climate to ensure that they are appropriately placed to deliver on their objectives. The review should re-establish a strategy and funding appropriate for the tasks in the current (now improving) economic climate, to ensure full benefit from the public investment.**

484. **Although there is considerable time until URCs work is successfully completed, consideration needs to be given to the ultimate beneficial owners of their assets. This should be built into the reviews referred to above, particularly in respect of asset transfers to community groups.**

485. **It is our intention towards the end of 2014 to revisit in depth the performance of the URCs and whether they are both adding value and delivering value for money. We explicitly expect to see strong community representation and participation on the boards of URCs, along with appropriate targets and ways in which progress is being measured and monitored.**

486. **We support the general thrust of the aims of the draft CE Bill. We agree with the principle that a legislative framework for CPPs is required and believe duties placed on all CPP statutory partners is absolutely essential to ensure roles and responsibilities of the partners in Community planning partnerships are clear. We also note the proposals in the Draft CE Bill consultation to embed the Scottish Government’s National Performance Framework in legislation to strengthen the accountability of public services.**

487. **However, we are unclear about how governance and accountability arrangements of CPPs will work in practice – and how partners hold each other to account.**

488. **In support of better community participation and empowerment in the governance and accountability of public services, we note the draft section in the Draft CE Bill of giving communities ‘a right to request to participate in outcome improvement processes’, designed to give the community a voice.**

489. **We look forward to considering the finer points when the Bill is introduced later this year. We support the general intention, but will consider further whether true community participation in decision making processes would be better served by requiring local authorities/CPPs to involve or seek to involve such community bodies, rather than the onus placed on communities to have to apply. We are minded to support an ‘opt-out’ rather than ‘opt-in’ approach. It will be for the Scottish Government to consider the practicalities of such an approach before introducing the Bill.**

490. **We believe there is merit in the suggestion that as part of statutory duties, CPPs should demonstrate the amount of community participation and engagement that is taking place and what the impact has been.**
491. We also recommend that the Scottish Government place a specific responsibility on CPPs to co-ordinate their resources in support of community-led regeneration.

492. We agree with the Minister that due to the diverse nature of housing associations, they should not be made statutory CPP partners. However, as we have already outlined in our findings for theme 2, we recommend that the Scottish Government investigate with housing associations what can be done to enhance and strengthen their role in supporting the delivery of regeneration.