1. Introduction

1.1 Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector (GCVS) is pleased to have the opportunity to respond to the Committee’s draft budget inquiry. We also look forward to welcoming Committee members and clerks to a joint session on this inquiry with charities and voluntary groups on 16/9/19.

GCVS is the third sector’s representative body in the City. Working with the 3000 plus third sector organisations in the City, extensive networks and our partners in Glasgow Third Sector Interface, we provide technical and practical support to charities and community groups of all sizes, reaching into every community across the City.

Alongside this core work, we have other projects which bring us into close contact with the third sector. These include:

1.2 Community Connectors\(^1\) - This partnership project with Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations is building strong links with local community and voluntary agencies and with public bodies. We are also developing a deeper understanding of why people are isolated or struggling to access key rights. The project works primarily with older people especially in the 76-95 age groups and with those who have complex disabilities and enduring mental health needs. The approaches taken are grounded in human rights and seek to enable people to live the best lives that they can. As part of this, project workers support people in deep crisis.\(^2\)

1.3 Everyone’s Children - This project supports third sector organisations in Glasgow which provide services to children, young people and families. The project is funded by the Scottish Government and works in partnership with statutory partners and the third sector. The project was primarily set up to promote and support Getting It Right for Every Child (GIRFEC) policy, and to deliver training and support to third sector organisations. It also represents 700+ children and families groups and charities in Glasgow through the Citywide Forum\(^3\).

Everyone’s Children has been at the heart of shaping responses to holiday hunger for school children. It has also carried out extensive work on promoting children’s rights to third sector organisations, promoting GIRFEC and providing training and briefing sessions on the UNCRC. It recently responded to the consultation on incorporation on the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and we refer to this later on.

\(^1\) http://communityconnectors.org/
\(^2\) http://www.gcvs.org.uk/community-connectors/case-study-mental-health-tonys-story/
\(^3\) GCVS Everyone’s Children – Incorporating the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child into Scots Law: consultation response, August 2019
Through hundreds of policy, training and information events, our social media engagement and the services outlined above, GCVS is uniquely positioned to gain “on the ground” information on issues around poverty, rights and access to key services. We hear daily the challenges facing the third sector in Glasgow and how it continues to help Glasgow’s citizens and communities to fight for and secure key rights, challenging the barriers which can prevent them from achieving greater equality and parity with other groups.

Our most recent Annual Report highlights our work in more detail.

2. The third sector in Glasgow – What We Know

2.1 Appendix 1 brings together a range of data sources on the scale, reach, scope and economic impact of Glasgow’s third sector. Glasgow’s third sector reaches into every community across the City, and provides many jobs and volunteering opportunities. In doing so, it directly enables people to access services and support which can help them achieve key human rights.

2.2 The Third Sector Interface and Glasgow City Council have developed a joint agreement (“concordat”) to build on and develop the work of both the council and the third sector. Around 300 organizations, including many smaller, community based groups, have been in receipt of a grant from the council under the Integrated Grants Fund which ends in March 2020 and is to be replaced with a new grants fund. Opening up the application process to all eligible organisations will widen the fund’s reach, but many organisations in Glasgow are concerned about losing funding as a result of this change.

2.3 Funding and access to sustainable, long term funding remains a top concern for third sector organisations of all shapes and sizes; our work with the sector is responding to the demand for training on funding, funding diversification and how to ensure organisations can demonstrate the difference they are making.

2.4 GCVS members and third sector colleagues consistently raise concerns about ever increasing demand from people and communities, while at the same time there is less public funding available. Whether in relation to carer support, welfare rights/financial support or working with children or lone parents, comments in our annual Stakeholder Survey and input at many of our networking events are focused on the sector’s ability to respond increasingly to people in crisis and more people seeking help.

2.5 We have yet to understand the wider impact of Brexit (in any form) on the third sector, but are concerned about potential economic shocks and any subsequent impact on public funding and on third sector funding at national or local level. After at least a decade of cuts or (at best) standstill budgets, there is little more the third sector can do to respond to this kind of shock. The sector has wider concern about how Brexit will impact on the citizens it currently supports.

3. Inquiry Questions

http://www.glasgow.gov.uk/councillorsandcommittees/viewSelectedDocument.asp?c=P62AFQDN0GDX0GZLZ3
GCVS Annual Stakeholder survey, 2019
GCVS Supporting You Survey, 2019/20
3.1 In this section, we lay out our responses to some of the questions posed by the Committee for this inquiry.

In developing this, GCVS has drawn on all of the work outlined above alongside our understanding and awareness of evidence from other third sector colleagues and networks, e.g., Human Rights Commission Scotland.

3.2 Whilst we do not have the capacity to look at all of the issues raised by the Committee in detail, our experience and feedback consistently provides a key message from Glasgow’s third sector;

*There is a significant gap between national language and rhetoric on human rights, and families and communities’ experience on the ground; between often good national laws and policies and how these are delivered on the ground by public services. We know that people in need can be turned away from the very services that are meant to help them. We know that families can be denied the right to a family life; to care and support which enables them to be part of their communities.*

*The third sector is often there to pick up the pieces and finds itself firefighting when it could do more to prevent crisis and help communities to thrive.*

*The sector is expected to do more with less – this cannot continue. Yet even in challenging circumstances, we are open to new approaches, to new partnerships and to working with local authorities, HSCPs and other bodies to secure change and ensure that no single citizen is left behind.*

3.3 We ask the Committee to take this message forward to Ministers and in its evidence sessions with public bodies and others as this inquiry goes forward.

3.4 The next part of the GCVS response focuses on some of the inquiry questions.

**Question 1**

*What are the key public policy areas where individuals and protected groups are struggling to access their rights?*

3.5 We understand that others will respond in detail on their key areas of expertise. We have chosen three specific policy areas where we have identified a gap between positive policy intentions and the reality of access to basic rights.

3.6 **Housing**

According to the EHRC, housing is a human right and is necessary in helping people to access other important human rights. Poor quality of housing can have a huge impact on wellbeing and where houses are not properly accessible or adapted, for example, there is a risk of poorer mental and physical health.

In May 2018, EHRC Scotland published a report which highlighted that many disabled people are isolated in their homes or live in homes which fail to meet their needs. This also impacts on their right, under the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, to live...
independently. The situation is caused by a lack of suitable housing and long waiting lists for adaptations. Systemic issues are further aggravated or caused by a lack of information or effective data on needs across the country.

Charities such as MND Scotland and others see the impact of this in their daily work, with people waiting far too long to access appropriate housing or adaptations to existing homes. Given that those with a MND diagnosis are terminally ill, this bureaucracy and lack of appropriate new or adapted housing has a particularly stark effect on families.

Access to suitable, accessible, good-quality housing remains a significant issue, especially for people with disabilities. Age Scotland has recently highlighted concerns about how older people are housed and the need for greater public policy recognition of the number of older people living alone. Planning law and housing developments respond to this should come from a human rights perspective.

We continue to have concerns about the recent de-funding of well established, charitable homelessness services and the speedy move towards the Housing First model. While we support the policy aims of Housing First, the impact of a sudden reduction in the numbers of emergency beds must be considered.

3.7 Social care and health

Social care is another area of deep concern for third sector organizations working with disabled children, people and unpaid carers in Glasgow.

Concerns relate to social care charging, in spite of free personal care. We have heard of individuals contemplating suicide because increases in care charges have pushed them into destitution. Rationing of access to care and support. and to self-directed support is another continuing concern. This is a system which is bureaucratic, inaccessible, costly and disempowering.

Recent developments in Glasgow have raised concerns about the loss of personal overnight care; the movement of people with complex needs from continuing care to social care and loss of access to key primary care services such as podiatry (which then isolate people in their homes as they cannot walk or are at risk of falls).

Glasgow Disability Alliance surveyed its members late in 2018 on the delivery of social care in the City and found significant concerns about the ability of disabled people to leave their homes, to be safe or to be included in the activities within their communities.

---

12 Feedback from Glasgow based care and support provider – they wish to remain anonymous
14 As 17.
The ability of disabled people and carers to challenge social care decisions is often limited because of difficulties in accessing and/or funding judicial reviews. Whilst work done by MECOPP and others recognizes this and is funded at national level to help provide tools to individuals and organizations, navigating complaints procedures remains complex and off-putting for many.

There has been a poor approach to Equalities Impact assessments in the context of integration of health and social care, with papers proposing major policy changes appearing without full EQIAs. A recent example was cuts made to homelessness services.\(^\text{17}\)

We fully recognize the challenges facing partnerships and other public bodies but there is a strong sense that, with some exceptions, the work of the third sector in tackling key health inequalities is not always valued enough, nor is its impact fully acknowledged.\(^\text{18}\)

### 3.8 Welfare Reform

The impact of key policies such as the Two Child Limit, the development of Universal Credit and the DLA to PIP transfer are key factors in creating poverty and in some cases destitution.

Evidence from the Child Poverty Action Group\(^\text{19}\) and others around an increasingly hostile benefits environment apply to Glasgow disproportionately, given that the City has a higher level of benefit claimants with poorer health and higher levels of disability. A paper produced by the Scottish Campaign for Welfare Reform summarizes some of the challenges\(^\text{20}\). More widely, foodbanks in the City have had to appeal more often for supplies. The emergence of Glasgow Disability Alliance’s own welfare rights service, Rights Now, highlights the need for support for people often left in crisis or without sufficient incomes.\(^\text{21}\)

GCVS’s Community Connectors service often deals with clients who have reached crisis point as a result of engaging with the benefits system and the main focus at that point is to try to help people stabilize their finances before looking at wider health or care needs.\(^\text{22}\) The development of holiday hunger programmes by Glasgow City Council, alongside the third sector, provides an example of what can be achieved when third sector expertise and reach is recognized. However, such approaches illustrate the very desperate situation for families in the City dealing with an inadequate benefits system.

### 3.9 Other gaps

From Glasgow’s Human Rights Defenders Network, and our links with the sector, we believe that gaps exist in other policy areas; gaps between national policy intention and the way in which people experience support on the ground. We fully support any submissions from charities around these areas e.g. mental health, access to health services for groups such as adults with learning disabilities, people with addiction issues and groups such as lone parents.

**Question 2**


\(^{19}\) [https://cpag.org.uk/policy-and-campaigns/list/nation/uk/type/briefing?f%5B0%5D=field_policy_type%3A22&f%5B1%5D=field_nation%3A74](https://cpag.org.uk/policy-and-campaigns/list/nation/uk/type/briefing?f%5B0%5D=field_policy_type%3A22&f%5B1%5D=field_nation%3A74)

\(^{20}\) [SCOWR response to Scottish Affairs Committee inquiry in Welfare in Scotland, August 2019](http://www.scottishcampaign.org.uk/)

\(^{21}\) [http://gda.scot/welfare-rights-now](http://gda.scot/welfare-rights-now)

\(^{22}\) [http://www.communityconnectors.org/#!](http://www.communityconnectors.org/#!)
**Which groups of people are most likely to be affected and why?**

3.11 Third sector organisations in Glasgow are:

- Having to respond to situations where the rights of disabled people are being undermined;
- Responding to the impact of poverty/destitution especially in light of a complex and increasingly hostile benefits system;
- Helping people and families access decent, quality homes;
- Highlighting challenges in accessing high quality childcare to realise children’s rights;
- Advocating for people who are terminally ill and who struggle to access much needed support;
- Locating people who are isolated and alone, with no real links to community or services.

We see charities and community groups at the vanguard in terms of working WITH people to help them achieve their rights and a better quality of life, often in the face of a challenging financial and operational environment.

The sector regularly highlights key areas of policy where women, disabled people (including those with learning disabilities), unpaid carers, lone parents and children/young people are not able to access full rights e.g. to a home, to family life, and so on.

**Question 3**

What type of public sector funding is provided to your organization to support vulnerable groups and those with protected characteristics to access public services?

3.12 GCVS does not currently receive core funding which specifically supports vulnerable groups and those with protected characteristics to access public services – although it has in the past from the Scottish Government and previously had a strong track record in this regard e.g. employability and Future Jobs Fund. However, as a third sector expert and intermediary, we know that the third sector in Glasgow works within an increasingly diverse and complex environment mirrored in the many funding sources which charities access, which include European Funding, grants from public bodies, from the Scottish Government, the National Lottery, charitable trusts and also local fundraising activities. Some third sector organisations have set up social enterprises to try to increase their sustainability. The ending of Glasgow City Council’s Integrated Grants Fund is a major source of uncertainty for the approx. 300 charities in the city who have had that funding over the course of many years, as the new fund will likely see increased competition for grants.

Virtually none of these funding sources fund explicitly from a human rights perspective, although there is some funding for equalities work, such as those supporting people with protected characteristics, and most funders will consider vulnerability of service-users and/or poverty and deprivation in a specific locality as key factors.

We note that the Scottish Government is increasingly being called in to fund organisations where local funding is being cut e.g. lone parent and autism charities.

---

23 E.g. work of charities such as C-Change and MECOPP
24 GCVS response to SHRC strategy consultation, June 2019 – completed in partnership with Carole Ewart Communications
25 https://glasgowgg.org.uk/befriending/
26 Community Connectors – Our Story: Success, Learnings and Impact
Continued funding challenges make it increasingly difficult for the sector to help people fight for the rights to which they are entitled.

**Question 4**

*Is the level of public funding provided enough to deliver national priorities and better outcomes for people in communities?*

3.13 We fully support the national direction of travel and attempts to build policy which has human rights as the foundation, but this needs to be supported effectively and the sector must have the freedom to challenge and fight for the people it supports both in Glasgow and beyond.

**Question 5**

*Are there public funding challenges for the third sector, if so, what would be the implications for delivering equalities and human rights outcomes?*

3.14 Please see comments above about funding concerns (section 2), raised by community and voluntary organisations in Glasgow. These concerns are shared by other respondents to this inquiry and have also been raised in response to other committee inquiries e.g. social prescribing, Health Committee.²⁷

We support comments made by the Scottish Human Rights Commission in its response to this Draft Budget scrutiny inquiry, relating to government responsibility (local and national) to fund organisations which support people to access key rights. Our Everyone’s Children project also makes this point in its response to the incorporation of UNCRC consultation. As they point out, individuals are rarely “likely to pursue breaches of their rights in court and that ... it is therefore vital that their rights are respected during their everyday interactions with the state.”²⁹ They argue that the third sector in Glasgow has a key role to play in protecting all key human rights in its daily work with people and families in need in this context.

If the Scottish budget and any work linked to the First Minister’s task force on human rights is to make a real difference in citizens’ lives, the third sector must be effectively resourced to defend and protect those it works with. *That applies at local level in particular*, bearing in mind the gap between policy rhetoric and reality on the ground that we have already highlighted.

SCVO and other such as CCPS argue that commissioning and tendering activity remains a challenge for the sector – in Glasgow recently, tendering for Carers Services was a major cause of concern for a number of longstanding, well established charities. Lack of transparency in the contracting process was raised with GCVS.

This wider research base also highlights the challenges facing charities in areas such as social care alongside concerns around living wage provisions – all contribute to an environment which makes it more difficult for the sector to be fully effective in its work with vulnerable people. The impact of policy into practice also runs counter to the Scottish Governments Economic Strategy and priority to create an inclusive economy. Procurement and commissioning approaches

---

²⁷ E.g. see response from Scottish Volunteering Forum which GCVS has contributed to and supports.
²⁹ Everyone’s Children – response to consultation on Incorporation of UNCRC and Human Rights Defenders
mean Third Sector organisations (and their employees) rarely if ever enjoy the same terms and conditions as public sector colleagues working in social care.

Research showing that charities are increasingly handing contracts back must be treated seriously.\(^{31}\) Recent announcements about taking back social care contracts in-house (Labour party and at least one Scottish local authority) suggest a further reduction in the important role that the third sector has in helping people to live the lives they deserve, and ignores the better quality of services often delivered by charities.\(^{32}\) People’s right to choose under Self Directed Support legislation – itself grounded in human rights – may also be weakened.

On local funding, we know that valued and experienced staff are lost on a regular basis when grant or contract awards are delayed. Voluntary and community organisations cannot plan when funding is allocated on a year-by-year basis.

At the recent HRCS event on this Committee inquiry,\(^{33}\) sector representatives from across Scotland raised concerns about the ability of charities to remain independent and scrutinise national and local policy and decision making. We would concur with this concern and share the worry of colleagues that some contracts between public services and the third sector may contain conditions which require them not to challenge the services/authorities which fund them. There is also concern that the need to maintain positive relationships with funders may prevent charities from supporting legal action in cases where individual/family rights have clearly been breached.\(^{34}\)

The funding environment remains consistently challenging for the sector. All of the above factors impact on rights in other ways e.g. static wages and insecurity of work for third sector employees. Commissioning and procurement for cost more than quality contribute to such insecurity. This has been evidenced by the Fair Work Commission.\(^{35}\)

Questions 6 and 7

What type of administrative systems are in place to monitor the impact on equalities and human rights from public sector funding to the third sector?

What changes could be made to improve accountability for national priorities being delivered by the public sector in partnership with the third sector?

3.15 There needs to be a clearer line of sight from the National Performance framework outcome relating to human rights, through the Scottish budget and budget allocations to local authorities, NHS boards and public bodies.

Whilst equality and rights are part of the third sector’s “DNA”, monitoring at local level does not always link to national outcomes or the national policy direction of travel e.g. First Minister’s Human Rights activity and taskforce.

Whilst Glasgow City HSCP’s recent strategic plan makes direct (and welcome) reference to human rights, there is not a clear or consistent “human rights” dialogue at local level, despite the


\(^{33}\) HRCS event on Equality Committee Draft Budget inquiry – 7/9/19

\(^{34}\) As above

appointment of an Executive Lead for Human Rights in the new City Council administration. There is little discussion of human rights and health/care at Integrated Joint Board meetings.

The new grants fund being brought in by Glasgow City Council will need to maintain appropriate balance between allocations to place (organisations working in the most deprived communities) and allocation to human rights and those with protected characteristics (organisations working with vulnerable groups regardless of location).

3.16 How human rights policy developments at national level filter through to local delivery must be a key question for the Equality and Human Rights Committee. However, the precariousness of third sector funding limits the ability of local charities and community groups to develop and respond to the changing national policy environment. If a requirement linked to human rights filtered through to local reporting systems, there would need to be support for organisations – often small with limited capacity – to respond and report on outcomes appropriately.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Like other sector colleagues, GCVS struggled to respond to this important inquiry – partly in relation to capacity within our own organisation and partly due to the inquiry’s complexity. This is not the only inquiry that the third sector is responding to and Committees need to take cognizance of the ability of local charities to become involved in parliamentary inquiries.

The issues raised by the Committee in this inquiry are those which matter to the third sector in Glasgow. There is, however, a tremendous sense of frustration about the disconnect between national goals and local delivery, based on the experience of the sector on the ground as it works with disabled people, women and others who are facing erosion of key rights. We would recommend an ongoing role for this Committee in the scrutiny of human rights delivery and funding.

4.2 We expect that other responses to the Committee will highlight many of the same points that our response has raised, particularly in relation to the policy areas where people struggle to achieve key rights e.g. social care, housing, food etc. We would therefore urge the Committee to consider future inquiries focused on these common policy areas to gain a deeper understanding of what is going wrong and why.

In its further investigations and in future work on the issues raised by this inquiry, we urge the Committee to go out and meet groups and people who are fighting to access their rights, as it plans to do with TSIs for this current inquiry.

4.3 There remains a real issue with effective equality impact assessment of policies by statutory agencies, with many policies tabled at council and community planning meetings without a full assessment. The HSCP locally is gradually improving on this front, but often provides partial EQIAs with no in-depth assessment of what changes to services might mean for individuals on the ground. This must be addressed and we ask the Committee to consider this issue in its evidence sessions.

4.4 We support the work of the Scottish Human Rights Commission on human rights budgeting and on how we seek clearer links between policy intentions and how budgets are allocated/spent at local level. What is the link between public funding and outcomes? Transparency issues highlighted by the Audit Scotland Progress Review on health and social
care integration are relevant here and may be worth further investigation in the context of this inquiry.  

4.5 We would also urge the inquiry to ask how Scottish Government ministers can use letters of allocation following the finalisation of the Scottish Budget to reference key messages on human rights and expectations of public bodies in how they engage with the third sector as a defender of rights and as advocates. An example of how clear instructions in budget award letters made positive change was the instruction to local authorities and health boards to allocate a clear percentage of the Reshaping Care Change Fund to support unpaid carers in 2011/12 – and indeed in the requirement for Third Sector sign off of RCOP Plans.

4.6 In closing, we highlight a quote from the SHRC’s response to this inquiry:

“Budgets are a key sign of a government’s values. So, if human rights are not in there, what’s being said is that they are not a value worth counting”. (Prof Aiofe Nolan)

The challenge has been laid down by the First Minister’s taskforce on human rights. If that is to truly mean something then we need to see human rights filtering down to all levels of government, with the third sector being actively supported to advocate and fight for those who are being denied such rights. The current challenging circumstances make it unlikely that national vision will become local reality.

4.7 Human rights can be a thread which both permeates and brings together budgets and services across a range of portfolios. A drive to ensure that every citizen has the chance to thrive and achieve their full potential should be at the heart of government.

---

Appendix 1

Glasgow’s Third Sector

Glasgow’s Third Sector is comprised of over 3,000 charities, organisations, services, social enterprises, and voluntary groups. These are supported by the Third Sector Interface, which provides advice and support services. The operating environment of the sector is now more challenging than ever, as Glaswegians keenly feel the impact of public spending cuts and austerity. This diverse and resilient sector continues to provide crucial support and services to our city’s most vulnerable people and families.

Some Facts and Figures about the Sector in Glasgow

There are almost 27,000 paid staff in Glasgow’s third sector.

It is estimated over 110,000 Glaswegians do some unpaid voluntary work every week for organisations.

The annual income of the sector is estimated to be c. £2.8 billion.

Over 600 organisations across the city focus their work on one or more equality group ranging from BME, women, asylum seekers, refugees, and people with disabilities.

Over 20% focus on providing services to children, young people and families.

16% provide sport and leisure opportunities to Glaswegians.

16% provide arts and culture experiences.

14% are faith related.

13% provide services to older people

Source: GCVS Database, OSCR, Volunteer Scotland