

**Social Recovery Taskforce  
05 November 2020 at 14:00  
Via Microsoft Teams**

**Agenda**

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Apologies  
*Chair*
2. Minute of Previous Meeting Attached  
*Chair*
3. Matters Arising  
*Chair*
4. Engagement Proposal for Social Recovery Taskforce Attached  
*Judith Hunter*
5. VAW Partnership Recovery Plan Presentation  
*Kirsti Hay / Anne Fehilly*
6. Academic Advisory Group Attached
  - i. Ten Questions Attached
  - ii. Participatory Budgeting – Lessons Learned Attached
7. GCPH COVID-19 micro briefings Verbal Update  
*Chris Harkins*
8. Workstreams Updates Verbal Updates
  - i. Third Sector
  - ii. Disabled Communities
  - iii. Young People and Transitions
9. Meeting Schedule:  

**03/12/2020, 14:00**  
**21/01/2021, 14:00**  
**25/02/2021, 14:00**  
**18/03/2021, 14:00**  
**15/04/2021, 14:00**  
**20/05/2021, 14:00**  
**10/06/2021, 14:00**  
**08/07/2021, 14:00**

# OFFICIAL

## Social Recovery Taskforce 1 October 2020 at 14:00

### Via Microsoft Teams MINUTES

#### **Present:**

Councillor Richard Bell (Chair), Glasgow City Council; Councillor Ruairi Kelly, Glasgow City Council; Martin Booth, Glasgow City Council; Bernadette Monaghan, Glasgow City Council, Community Empowerment Services; Chris Harkins, Glasgow Centre for Population Health; Des McNulty, University of Glasgow; Valerie Mcneice, Glasgow Centre for Population Health; Ian Bruce, Glasgow Third Sector Interface Network; Jatin Haria, GCC BME Taskgroup; Colin Lee, GCC BME Taskgroup; Pete Seaman, Glasgow Centre for Population Health; Fiona Moss, Glasgow City Health and Social Care Partnership; Tressa Burke, Glasgow Disability Alliance; Kirsti Hay, Glasgow City Council, Violence Against Women; Lorraine Barrie, Glasgow Equality Forum; Cormac Quinn, Glasgow City Council, Strategic Policy and Planning (Equalities); Robin Ashton, Glasgow Kelvin College; Sarah Weakley, University of Glasgow; Natalie Carr, Police Scotland; Chris Casey, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service; Gary Dover, Glasgow City Health & Social Care Partnership; Paul Buchanan, Glasgow Colleges Regional Board; Louise McKenzie, Glasgow City Council; Kathleen Caskie, Glasgow Third Sector Interface Network; Councillor Jennifer Layden, Glasgow City Council; Anne Fehilly, Glasgow City Council, Violence Against Women;

#### **In attendance:**

Helen Hunter, Glasgow City Council, Community Empowerment Services; Gerald Tonner, Glasgow City Council, Community Empowerment Services; Shaw Anderson, Glasgow City Council, Community Empowerment Services;

**Apologies:** Annemarie O'Donnell, Glasgow City Council; Linda De Caestecker, Glasgow City Health and Social Care Partnership; Colleen Rowan, Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations; Janie McCusker, Glasgow Colleges Regional Board; Martin Cassidy, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service; Parveen Khan, GCC BME Taskgroup; Jill Miller, Glasgow Life; Sharon Kelly, SDS; Douglas Taylor, Glasgow Third Sector Interface Network; Marshall Poulton, Glasgow City Council, Neighbourhoods & Sustainability (Transport); Gavin Slater, Glasgow City Council, Neighbourhoods & Sustainability; Afton Hill, Glasgow City Council, Strategic Policy and Planning (Equalities)

#### **1. Welcome, Introductions, and Apologies**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made.

#### **2. Minute of Previous Meeting**

Minutes agreed as an accurate record.

#### **3. Matters Arising**

No matters arising that are not on the agenda.

#### **4. Community Engagement – Community Listening Events**

OFFICIAL

## OFFICIAL

Judith spoke to a report and gave the group the following update:

She has been in conversation with colleagues in Glasgow Life about how we can work more closely together with tighter development of community engagement, learning and development in the city. The Community Empowerment Services team recently got involved in carrying out listening exercises for the Scottish Government Social Renewal Advisory Board (SRAB). Due to the tight timescale it was decided that instead of doing focus groups they would prefer to do telephone interviews using our own connections. About 80 telephone interviews were carried out over the space of a week. All responses will be analysed by Scottish Government. SRAB requested that the 3 following questions were addressed:

1. What changed for you and your community during lockdown?
2. What worked and what didn't? This question can be focussed on the response to COVID-19 initially.
3. What does a good life look like to you?

Judith added that the responses for Glasgow had not been formally analysed by Scottish Government yet and detailed some of the key issues highlighted during the interviews.

There is now potential for further engagement through joining up our resources. Community Empowerment Services and Glasgow Life both have resources available and are aware of other public sector partners who could also contribute. Judith suggested pulling together resources with other partners to do some community engagement. She asked if any partners would be interested in getting together to agree available resources, agree questions, carry out telephone interviews and develop a plan.

The Chair thanked Judith for her update and discussions took place with members of the group to highlight some of the work already being done.

Bernadette added that we have good momentum with colleagues on the Economic Recovery Taskforce and suggested a joint engagement event. Additionally this group has good access to further resources who may want to get involved in some off table work in setting the questions we may want to ask. She suggested building on the Scottish Government Social Renewal Advisory Board questions.

### **Agreed Action**

- Judith to get in touch with partners as well as the Economic Recovery Taskforce to set up a working group to develop the proposal for a joint approach to community engagement.

### **5. A) Research**

*Issues and questions for workstreams to consider*

Des advised members that he had established the Academic Support Group with colleagues from GCPH. The Group produced a discussion paper with some questions for the Taskforce to address at today's meeting as well as a series of questions to be looked at over the next 12 months. He detailed some of the issues Glasgow faced and noted that although there was

OFFICIAL

## OFFICIAL

not much additional money there was an argument for the groups to work together to capture the complexity as well as the scale of the need in Glasgow. The pandemic highlighted the importance of the need for partners to connect, collaborate and contribute with others building resilience at local level. The questions to be addressed at today's meeting are:

1. What **lessons should we learn** from our shared experience up to this point?
2. How can we maintain and enhance that spirit of co-operation and shared purpose over the next 12 months in what are going to be difficult circumstances?

It was recommended that each of the working groups, focusing on their own area of interest, draw on their specialist expertise and understanding of the impact of the pandemic to address a common set of questions. The responses will be integrated into a report or a series of reports from the Taskforce which will be fed to appropriate Council committees and external bodies as appropriate. Des detailed the 10 questions and suggested these questions could be become part of the community consultation.

Pete added that the challenge is how we link a very diverse set of experiences and recommendations into a common narrative that also links to some of the wider city priorities. He added that within the questions there is something about the jobs crisis but there is also a need to keep an eye on green recovery and child poverty. Des asked the group if they thought the questions detailed were the right set of questions to be taking to the work streams and if so, what was the process for signing it off and, what is the process for engagement with the work streams? He added that it was also important to look at ways to evidence the impact of the work.

The Chair thanked Des and Pete and asked members for their views.

Fiona agreed the questions were in the right territory and she fully supported them, however she was thoughtful of how we do the impact analysis. There might need to be some ethical and academic support within each of the work streams to try and work out the best way of prioritising.

Lorraine agreed the questions looked good but highlighted an issue with wording of Question 10. She suggested it looked like a leading question. She agreed system changes are required but proposed removing the suggestion around commissioning systems for service delivery. If we took that out and responses came back saying that commissioning systems were not wanted then it would be accepted but suggested the third sector would have concerns about commissioning and how it further compounded exclusion.

Tressa felt the questions were really useful and a good starting point. She suggested they be used as guiding principles and a framework for the work streams. She also agreed with Lorraine's question about system change and asked about the chronology of the questions. She also asked if the work streams were to work through the questions and then consider the system changes. She referenced a paper from Langkelly Chase on system change, action enquiries and system behaviours and would like to integrate some of this into the Disabled Communities work stream.

OFFICIAL

## OFFICIAL

Ian suggested that question 10 sits right at the core of the Third Sector work stream and he is comfortable with the question. He suggested commissioning is not the same as procurement.

Des thanked members for comments and advised members as follows:

He agreed with Fiona's point about the ethics dilemma, but felt that would always be something people would struggle with. Ultimately it's a political judgement and a resource decision.

With regards to Lorraine's point on commissioning systems, he advised that they are not advocating commissioning as an alternative to grant funding or as the appropriate model for third sector service delivery, but just saying that if we want to look at system change, then we need to consider alternative models. It's up to the Taskforce to identify what the different system is going to be and also be clear about why they would object to an alternative. Question 10 is a challenge for people to think radically.

Des advised that there was no chronology of the questions, suggesting that system change should come first. Questions could be reversed.

The Chair thanked Des for covering all the points raised. He added that it was important that although the questions are a framework / guiding principles, we do not avoid the difficult questions. He made reference to a question raised in the Teams chat from Gary which stated 'should we have a question about what we should stop doing so that we can do other things that are more impactful?' Des suggested point 3 covers this.

The Chair also referred to more questions raised in the Teams chat:

Ian asked if it was worth looking at the Christie Commission principles and having some questions that directly challenge wither we are implementing those principles;

Valerie suggested we more directly consider the links between economic and social recovery, recognising that economic factors remain the biggest determinants of inequality;

Des suggested we can make renewed efforts to take forward the Christie principles and agreed with the importance of economic issues and links to employment.

The Chair thanked Des and Pete for their work and efforts. The group agreed the set of questions would be the focus for setting the priorities of all the work streams and reporting on progress as we go forward.

### **5. B) The COVID-19 Crisis and Universal Credit in Glasgow: September 2020**

Sarah gave a presentation to the group which detailed the following key findings based on data taken from DWP's Stat X-plore administrative data system to 9 July 2020.

#### **Key Findings:**

- Glasgow's UC caseload since the beginning of March has grown by 82% to just over 68,000 people –an increase of 31,000. Some will be accessing the benefit system in this way for the first time.

OFFICIAL

## OFFICIAL

- The largest groups of recipients are still those aged between 25 and 54. Claims and starts for these populations have returned (for now) to almost pre-crisis levels.
- However, people under the age of 24 continue to flow onto UC at elevated levels. In Glasgow the number of young people starting on UC in July was still over double the number in March.
- Now, roughly 12% of young people in Glasgow are receiving UC.
- Staying on UC for longer: Nearly 10,000 people who came on to Universal Credit in Glasgow in the first month of the lockdown have not been able to leave the caseload – trends of extended periods of labour market disengagement.
- Conditionality: Before the crisis, UC primarily served those not working and those who had no work requirements (70%). Now almost 70% of the caseload is comprised of the two groups (working/not working) subject to conditionality: 44,000 people in Glasgow. (Double March totals)
- The majority of new claimants are not experiencing a disability.
- Low vacancies = additional resources for employability, money advice and welfare rights are needed. Vacancies, while improving, are still at roughly 50% of pre-crisis levels. The end of the furlough scheme with insufficient replacement will see the crisis worsen.
- Equalities Groups and Universal Credit
- Gender: larger percentage of males on Glasgow caseload than females (consistent with pre-crisis trend).
- Disability: We can roughly approximate those with a disability on the caseload using conditionality group information for those in 'no work requirements' and 'preparing for work': 18,000 in July (19% increase) This however overestimates because of families with very young children and carers in the 'no work requirements' group 41,000 people on legacy ESA in Glasgow (Feb 2020)
- Survey Welfare at a (Social) Distance project sheds a little more light on this, although their survey was UK wide, 38% of new claimants had a disability compared to 67% of existing claimants
- Ethnicity: 8% of new claimants are from BAME backgrounds compared to 6% of existing claimants. This suggests a disproportionate impact on BAME groups.

### Impacts:

- Increased demand for welfare rights, money advice and employability services
- Targeted employability services (e.g. Kickstart) for young people on UC but more support needed for those over 24 than JCP staff can provide
- Adequacy of UC payments will continue to be an issue: £20 UC uplift deadline, Scottish Child Payment apps open in November with February 2021 first payment.
- What resources at local level can be mobilised for this population and those not included in these figures (legacy benefits and those with no recourse to public funds)?

### Next steps:

- Sarah said that she will aim to update this briefing every quarter with new figures and asked members for feedback about how she could make it more useful for them and how it could be used to evidence need at the national level also.

OFFICIAL

## OFFICIAL

The Chair thanked Sarah for her presentation and asked members for questions.

Gary asked if there was any projections about how bad it will get. Sarah suggested it was impossible to predict, but resolution foundation is the best source for information and analysis.

Fiona asked if Sarah could provide information on sanctioning in Glasgow. Sarah suggested contacting David Webster at CPAG and shared his information on the Teams chat.

Kirsti noted her interest on the impact at the end of the furlough scheme particularly for women. Sarah suggested that one of things that would be useful to look at is the Joseph Roundtree Foundation document called Storm Ready and shared the document on the Teams chat.

Tressa asked if there was any analysis on disabled people and welfare rights. Sarah agreed to try and find an analysis of this and send it on.

- **Agreed Action**

A copy of the presentation would be forward to group.

### **6. New Workstreams Update**

- *Third Sector – Ian Bruce*

Ian said that the intention is to recruit about 12 third sector leaders by open invitation and to get diversity of representation. He will bring a paper to this group which outlines a series of key questions, based on the questions set out by Des in his paper.

- *Disabled Communities – Louise MacKenzie*

Louise reported that a paper had been submitted to the General Purposes Committee in November 2019 on Improving Outcomes for Disabled People. A number of broad themes and a cross party approach had also been agreed then, but work was subsequently unable to progress because of the pandemic. There is now an opportunity to progress this work through the Taskforce with support from Louise and colleagues. Louise also advised that the outline approach has been revised and they now have evidence gathered by Glasgow Disability Alliance (GDA). Her team are also involved in preparatory work for the GCC equality outcomes and are therefore well placed to lead on this work in collaboration with GDA and other partners.

- *Young People / Transitions – Sharon Kelly / Robin Ashton*

Discussions about whether a separate work stream is needed to focus on young people and transitions / youth unemployment are still ongoing. Robin reported that he and Sharon had so far met with Bernadette, Gerry Lyons and Mike McNally to explore how this work stream might fit within the existing employment and skills landscape. As a result, the focus of this work stream might already have a home within the Glasgow Partnership for Employment Group (GPEG). Discussions to shape the focus of the work and what is needed are still ongoing and Robin will bring a further update to the next meeting.

OFFICIAL

## OFFICIAL

### 7. Challenge Child Poverty Partnership

Fiona gave a presentation on 'Glasgow Recovering from Child Poverty'. The following points were covered:

- Our situation
- Messages for Recovery
- Considerations for the Taskforce
- Largest proportion (37%) number and intensity of child poverty
- Helping Families meet their basic needs during the pandemic
- Child Poverty Action Plan
- Who has been talking about Child poverty
- What we have heard during the pandemic (and before)
- Priorities for LCPAR
- List of dreams

Fiona welcomed the views of the group.

Sarah informed members that the Scottish Government has topped up the Scottish Welfare Fund. A Recent report showed strong variation between how people use the fund. It is difficult for people to access on the website so uptake has been really low and this resource is underutilised.

Kirsti said the presentation resonated with her. Before lockdown, the Violence Against Women Partnership had established a Financial Inclusion working group and had been developing a bid to the Scottish Government's Equally Safe programme. The Partnership are still intending to submit a bid and are keen to ensure that there are connections between VAW Partnership and the Challenge Child Poverty Partnership.

Councillor Layden asked if we could take forward an updated Equality Impact Assessment around the links between violence against women and child poverty.

Fiona advised that the issues with the Scottish Welfare Fund had been raised at the last Child Poverty Group meeting and they are looking at it. Also Gina Howe is on the Partnership so will make sure the right linkages are there for VAW. She agreed with Councillor Layden with regards doing an updated EQIA.

Tressa asked if there had been problems with Broadband when giving out devices to families. Giving people limited data can sometimes cause more problems and can limit what people can do. She added that they are also doing some work around disabled parents and it would be useful for her to share this with the group when it is ready.

Fiona advised that Connecting Scotland Phase 2 is now open and bids are being invited. She agreed connectivity was an issue but suggested it sits with the digital group who are leading on digital inclusion.

### Agreed Action

OFFICIAL



## OFFICIAL

- Copy of presentation to be circulated to the group.

### 8. Participatory Budgeting

Chris informed the group it had been agreed at previous meeting he would develop a scoping paper to look at what might be possible for Participatory Budgeting (PB) in Glasgow, however due it being a rapidly developing piece of work a paper will be produced for the following meeting.

He added that he had been in touch with Scottish Government for clarity to see if the target (1% of Council budget) was still realistic during pandemic and they advised they would provide an update as soon as possible. Chris suggested the key decision to be made at today's meeting was on the theme.

Chris highlighted the following points:

- Young people could be the focus of the work initially, potentially involving other groups and communities moving forward.
- A good first step would be to establish a diverse and representative young persons' group and GCPH would coordinate this.
- The young persons' group could present or feed in to the SRTF before Christmas - a good first step for *participation* within the Taskforce.
- We could assess how useful this was for the partners and the appetite to hear from other groups within the Task Force moving forward.
- The young persons' group could then feed into Neighbourhoods and Sustainability within the Council, becoming a *mainstreamed* way of working (lots to discuss and develop here).
- There is no cost implication for the Council as GCPH would lead this work and would generate the resource to undertake this work in the short-term.
- We can review our position on all of this subject to the imminent Scottish Government announcement regarding the potential delay of the 1% 2021 PB mainstreaming target for local authorities.

Chris added that he wanted to be clear that he had not driven the potential young people theme, but that it had emerged organically through discussions with potential local partners. He remained open and responsive to other possibilities.

The Chair thanked Chris and asked the group for comments.

After a brief discussion the Chair confirmed that the group was supportive of the idea but added that he would like to get a better understanding of the potential resource implications.

### Agreed action

PB will continue to be discussed at meetings of the Taskforce.

### 9. Meeting Schedule:

Please note meeting schedule has changed, calendar invites will be updated.

**05/11/2020, 14:00**

OFFICIAL

**OFFICIAL**

**03/12/2020, 14:00**  
**21/01/2021, 14:00**  
**25/02/2021, 14:00**  
**18/03/2021, 14:00**  
**15/04/2021, 14:00**  
**20/05/2021, 14:00**  
**10/06/2021, 14:00**  
**08/07/2021, 14:00**

# OFFICIAL

## Community Engagement Proposal for Social Recovery Task Force

5.11.2020

### Introduction

As agreed, at the Social Recovery Task Force (SRTF) in October, a small group met to discuss and plan for community engagement in the work of this task force and the Economic Recovery Task Force (ERTF).

This paper provides an update and a proposal for the next stages of this work, with resources and time scale outlined. At the time of writing this paper, the ERTF have been contacted but they have not yet linked with the planning group.

A brief reminder of the most pressing of the agreed tasks is below:

1. A short, working group should bring together a few partners to make a community engagement plan and deliver it. *These partners must have resources they can commit*, either expertise (in case of equalities for example) or staff who have the experience of engagement and can carry it out. CES/GL to lead this process – with other partners and the Third Sector, bearing in mind the shifting priorities for many organisations.
2. The group needs to be able to engage with both the SRTF and the ERTF to ensure that engagement is joined up and covers the proposed work streams, with both groups agreeing to be responsive to the needs identified by communities.
3. The group needs to be able to plan and carry out targeted engagement over the next three months to avoid progressing work streams without engagement. To borrow a phrase popular with community groups: ‘nothing for us, without us.’

### The Group

Following the meeting, the group below met to discuss the next steps:

Judith Hunter and Jonny Pickering - Community Empowerment Services

Alex Byres and Coleen Willoughby (currently absent) – Glasgow Life

Maggie Murphy – Glasgow Kelvin College

Callum Lynch – Health and Social Care Partnership

The Group discussed the wider community engagement and development landscape as well as focusing on this task, which is a small, practical test of how well we can work together to deliver a wider community engagement strategy in future. For this exercise however, the purpose is not to gather screeds of quantitative data; this is a qualitative approach.

OFFICIAL

## OFFICIAL

It was agreed not to duplicate the engagement already carried out by a wide variety of partners, including those relevant for specific SRTF work streams, e.g. GDA's reports from service users etc.

### The proposal

It was felt that added value would be gained, in the first instance, by engaging with two predominant groups:

- those that were shielded during the first lockdown
- young people.

Within the shielded group, we would wish to split the targeted group into:

- older people
- people in the 'economically active' age group

The shielded group were suggested as among them, there will be many people who have experienced major changes to their lives as a result of Covid. With further restrictions possible in future, this is a group that will be in need of 'recovery' in different ways. In the medium to longer term, young people are arguably one of the most affected groups, particularly regarding employment and education, so the group felt it was crucial to have young people's participation.

It was also agreed to follow the approach of the interviews for the Scottish Government in September and stick to three, simple questions, in this case:

- How has life changed for you since the start of the pandemic?
- What are the good and bad things about that? (prompting to focus on the challenges)
- What help, if any, do you think you will need in the future? (short and longer term, prompting for ideas about what this might look like)
- A final question, asking people if they would like to be involved in this work going forward.

As before, we have agreed to deliver this via telephone interviews, although some people may wish to use Teams etc. It was felt that telephone would be the simplest and most effective method for the conversations we hope to have with individuals, especially for anyone who is now self-isolating again.

The expectation is that some conversations will be five minutes long, but others could be up to half an hour. Therefore, as part of this first stage, we would identify the people who are interested and would like to participate in the next stage: online focus groups including members of the SRTF/ERTF who are developing programmes and workstreams. The stages beyond that would need to be agreed with both Task Forces, however the longer term

OFFICIAL

## OFFICIAL

ambition is to support and develop groups of empowered citizens who can participate fully in civic life.

The engagement routes for young people will be slightly different. Education have been contacted to ask about the possibility of carrying out socially distanced focus groups in schools, and we will engage through partners and youth providers.

### Resources

Currently, the group can offer the following resources:

- Community Empowerment Services, GC - eight officers in the Communities Team
- Glasgow Life - Community Services Officers
- Glasgow Kelvin College – support from two community connectors and wider youth/adult learning team
- HSCP – support of two community engagement officers

Conversations have also taken place with the wider Community Connector network and some have agreed to support this work. The Children's Neighbourhood officers are also keen to support the project and may be able to help by carrying out a few focus groups with young people.

How much of the time we can use of officers time depends on what is required, fitting interviews in with other workload and time scales. However, if an officer could spend two days a week interviewing, they could carry out 15-20 interviews per week. A month of engagement via all the partners could deliver a substantial sample of citizen views and needs. It is suggested that a month of interviewing should be the maximum, based on the capacity of officers to interview people, and to ensure that the process keeps moving forward.

### Timescale

There is a high level of uncertainty just now in relation to lockdown, furlough, regulations and so on. There are also a number of support and admin tasks required to ensure the engagement is carried out well: recording proformas, interview guidance and prompts, referral routes for people identifying issues, support info for interviewers (as people can disclose difficult issues) etc. We also need to develop models for analysing the information that we gather.

To ensure that everything is set up correctly and to avoid going into the festive season, our recommendation is for the interviews to be carried out over the month of January. February can be used to analyse and deliver the targeted focus groups, giving time for the communities to influence provision going into the new financial year.

OFFICIAL

## **OFFICIAL**

Following agreement at this meeting, the Group will have just over a month to get all the project materials and systems in place, ready to start in January. It would be helpful for the SRTF to consider anything missing from this proposal. One possibility might be an elected member to act as a 'champion' – to act as advocate for community engagement and keep other elected members briefed on progress.

### **Next steps**

If members of the SRTF are happy, the planning group will go and prepare for a January engagement exercise. There are longer term ideas and ambitions regarding community engagement, which will require involvement from wider community learning and development partners. For the short term, the focus is on carrying out this piece of work, so that the community can influence the future recovery work of the city.

Judith Hunter,

Principal Officer (Equalities),

Community Empowerment Services

2.11.20

**OFFICIAL**

## OFFICIAL

### Social Recovery Taskforce | Academic Advisory Group – 10 Questions for Workstreams

It is suggested that each of the working groups, focusing on their own area of interest, draw on specialist expertise and understanding of the impact of the pandemic to address a common set of questions. We anticipate that the answers will come back over a period of time and may not be dealt with in the order given below – some of the questions can be responded to quickly while others make take longer. Responses will be integrated into a report or a series of reports from the taskforce which will then be discussed by the taskforce and/or be fed to appropriate Council committees and external bodies as appropriate. The questions are:

1. How can local knowledge and experience be communicated to policy makers at national level in ways that genuinely inform and improve decision making?
2. How can the Council and its partners better **evidence the** complex, multiple nature of needs that services in the city of Glasgow are responding to, and more effectively make the case for increased resources and /or support to the city from the Scottish and UK governments that takes account of the higher level of need?
3. What robust (i.e. non-anecdotal) evidence do we have about **local partnerships** that have worked well, enabling voluntary sector, Council and other partners to respond **quickly and effectively to the challenges posed by the pandemic? Conversely, what evidence** do we have about things that have not worked so well? Evidence in this context might take the form of short case studies, especially if they highlight the complexity of need, challenges and opportunities within partnership working and show what can be done when the right conditions are created or illustrate some of the barriers to effectiveness.
4. What worked well during the lockdown period and its aftermath in identifying and addressing need? Are the mechanisms involved in the initial emergency response e.g. methods of funding or ways of collaborative working, being adopted or modified in the light of experience? How are partner organisations and the Council learning from experience?
5. Given that we face a combined health and jobs crisis, what are the **(small number) of best first moves** that the partners (not just the Council) should be taking?
6. Given limited resource and competing priorities, why are these (the recommended best first moves) the **most appropriate steps** to take now?
7. How would your workstream define and measure success? What evidence is there (or will there be by next July) that the steps recommended and taken will be (or have been) the most impactful and that other options would have (had) less impact?
8. How would success measures relate to the city's priorities? What evidence is there (or will there be by next July) that steps being taken now or proposed by the social recovery partners will **contribute towards key shared objectives** including addressing poverty, making progress on equalities, tackling climate change and delivering inclusive growth?
9. Are there other actions proposed or that should be considered that would help improve collaboration between the social recovery partners and/or lead to enhanced future community engagement?
10. **Are system changes required** in the relationship between the Council and voluntary sector partners to reduce duplication and lead to greater transparency in determining how resources should be distributed between place, interest and identity priorities? The working groups are asked to consider a range of options including the possibility of moving to a commissioning system for service delivery rather than the bidding and scoring system used for the Communities Fund. There is no preferred option at this stage – this is a consultative and exploratory exercise.

OFFICIAL

## **Participatory Budgeting within Glasgow City: Learning from the past and visioning the future**

**Chris Harkins, Glasgow Centre for Population Health**

### **Introduction**

Participatory Budgeting (PB) has the potential to empower and energise communities and to transform and strengthen the relationship between citizens, civil society organisations and all levels of government and public service. PB is a process that involves citizens in deciding how to spend public money. PB is driven by the desire to reallocate public money locally and democratically to priority initiatives, projects and services identified by local people.

In recent years the Scottish Government has set out an unprecedented level of political, legislative and investment support for community empowerment, participation and the strengthening of local democratic processes. PB has emerged as the principal approach in achieving these goals and has gained significant traction and support across Scotland. PB also has a potential role in responding to the pandemic; the ethos and values of PB including being place-based, inclusive and participative fit well with the principles of social recovery endorsed by the Scottish Government's Social Renewal Advisory Board.

### **Important juncture for PB in Scotland**

At present, the development of PB in Scotland is at a challenging and important juncture. The ability of some Local Authorities to maintain progress on PB and to meet the 2021 'mainstreaming' target<sup>1</sup> has undoubtedly been compromised by the pandemic. The initial emergency response to the first wave of COVID-19 has stretched community planning partners' collective capacity and resource.

At present, partners are preparing for and responding to the demands of a second wave of COVID-19 whilst maintaining a focus on social renewal and economic recovery. Despite capacity and resource remaining stretched, a convincing argument can be made that in order for responses to the pandemic to be effective they must be informed by the knowledge, insights and wisdom of communities, in particular those who have additional vulnerability to the disease and the related 'lockdown' disease containment policies; including, among others - older people, people with disabilities, BME populations and young people.

This paper is designed to support the Social Recovery Task Force in considering the ongoing development of PB within Glasgow City. The next sections detail some important learning concerning recent PB in Glasgow, and some discussion points for the Task Force to consider moving forward.

### **Recent learning from PB within Glasgow City**

Over 2018/19 the Council committed one million pounds to the development of four PB pilot areas (within council wards; Calton, Canal, Greater Pollok and Pollokshields) to inform the development of PB across the City moving forward. The GCPH was commissioned to independently evaluate the process learning from the four PB pilot areas. Some of the key learning points are described below and are considered within the context of the pandemic:

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2017 the Scottish Government and COSLA agreed a target of 1% of local authority budgets to be allocated to PB by 2021. This 1% 'mainstreaming' target is designed to embed democratic participation within the normal working practice of local authorities.



**Inequalities focussed PB during the pandemic is essential.** Through the 2018/19 pilots, Glasgow City Council has demonstrated a strong commitment to promoting inclusive and accessible PB. The pilots were delivered within disadvantaged geographical communities or have been targeted at often-excluded communities of interest and identity who face significant and multiple barriers to participation. This inequalities focus must be maintained to ensure the participation of population groups at higher risk during the pandemic.

**PB capacity building requires time, skill and resource.** The pilot areas were unanimous in stating that the level of funding allocated to support the development of citizens' panels, build PB capacity and oversee the implementation of the processes should have been higher. Relatedly, the timescales in which the pilot areas were expected to deliver the PB processes was described as pressured. A vital point within the pandemic is to maintain an inequalities focus to PB. To effectively support populations such as young people, people with disabilities and BME populations requires specific skills and experience; a key strength of the PB pilots were that the Council worked with specialist equalities agencies to ensure successful and equitable participation and inclusion among these groups.

**Citizens' panels represent a strong PB model moving forward.** A clear finding from the PB pilot areas is that the citizens' panels represent an effective and viable form of deliberative democracy for Glasgow City. Panels involve small groups of community members who represent the wider community in the planning, development and implementation of the overall PB process. Within mainstreamed PB, citizens' panels can represent the views and aspirations of the communities they represent within Local Authority decision making and budget allocation, crucial to this is dialogue and deliberation between citizens' panels, Council staff and representatives and wider partners. Related to the previous learning point; well-functioning and representative citizens' panel require time and resource to build capacity.

**Inclusive PB has both geographic and communities of interest and identity focus.** The pilot areas were delivered in a partnership approach by the Council, local anchor organisations and third sector specialist equalities groups. Specialist equalities agencies such as Glasgow Disability Alliance effectively supported the inclusion of people with disabilities within PB. This focus on inequalities, and the inclusion of communities of interest or identity was a clear strength of the pilots. Local anchor organisations were highly effective in supporting citizens' panels in tailoring PB processes to geographic communities; local circumstances, needs and community aspirations. The Scottish Government's Social Renewal Advisory Board have endorsed that geographic or 'place-based' approaches are vital in the social recovery response to the pandemic as is a distinct and clear focus on the inclusion and participation of vulnerable groups in both co-designing and accessing services.

**PB is a 'people powered' democratic process.** The dedication and commitment of the partners involved and the authenticity and quality of the PB processes developed within the pilot areas was evident. The PB pilot leads developed supportive and trusted relationships with the citizens' panel members – this was an important factor in the success of the pilots. Amid the largely technical narratives that surround the imminent mainstreaming of PB, the approaches developed in the pilots represent a timely reminder that effective PB is about communities and people's lives and is built upon relationships. PB relies on people driving the processes forward and relationships to make the processes successful. This point relates well to the way in which communities have mobilised in response to the pandemic to support those most vulnerable and that relationships formed during times of crises can have longevity.

## Key considerations and questions for PB within Glasgow moving forward

Developing political will and partnership consensus around the next iterations of PB across Scotland during the pandemic is challenging for all Local Authorities. Within Glasgow City, the Council has demonstrated a clear vision for inclusive and accessible PB which aims to reduce inequalities. In response to the pandemic, within social recovery, this inclusive, accessible and inequalities-focused PB is absolutely essential, in this regard PB led by Glasgow City Council has strong foundations from which to build moving forward.

Discussion within the Social Recovery Task Force has made clear the aspiration to move from the small-grants model of PB towards a more progressive mainstreaming model which aims to deepen local democratic processes. This mainstream PB would enable community members to have the opportunity to feed into Council decision making and that this would become a normal way of working. This means that there would potentially be no resource for ward level PB processes, but that PB capacity building and ongoing support for vulnerable and often overlooked communities is still required across the City to enable participation within Council structures and decision making.

Mainstreaming PB also requires significant leadership and change management within the Council to redress longstanding power inequalities and to facilitate meaningful and inclusive community participation within decision making. Keeping this context in mind, some key questions concerning the next iterations of PB in the City include:

- **PB capacity building.** Can PB capacity building be undertaken across all Council wards at this time, or is it appropriate or more manageable to progressively roll out PB in the coming years prioritising disadvantaged wards with greatest need? Would the Council be ready to enable meaningful participation opportunities if all wards received PB capacity building at once?
- **Reconciling communities of interest and geographic PB.** How do we reconcile geographic, ward-based PB with priority communities of interest and identity? Might a PB inequalities group, comprised of specialist equalities agencies, oversee the geographic implementation or roll out of PB capacity building to ensure inclusive, representative and accessible PB?
- **Citizens panels and council structures.** How can 23 ward-based citizens panels meaningfully connect to Council structures and participate in decision making? Could one representative from each citizens' panel join a lead PB group which would sit within Council hierarchy and contribute to key committees etc?
- **Utilising existing structures and expertise.** It has previously been said that there are advantages to PB being seen as a new innovation within communities. However in the current climate, would it avoid duplication and save time and money if citizens panels are embedded within area partnerships and supported or delivered through community councils? If a community council becomes a citizens' panel with a PB mainstream agenda and no direct resource, in what way is this adding value?
- **First moves within the Council.** Keeping in mind that effective PB is 'people powered' – who and where are the 'solid PB anchor points' within the Council? i.e. what departments are already doing PB? What departments want to do PB and who within these departments can lead the internal changes and cultural shifts towards supporting community participation

within the department decision making? Can Council PB advocates lead the internal change needed within the Council? Ultimately how can senior and cross party PB 'buy in' be achieved?