

LEAP

Worked Examples:
Applying LEAP to real-life situations

Revised Edition

LEAP

Worked Examples:
Applying LEAP to real-life situations

Revised Edition

© Crown copyright 2007

ISBN: 978-0-7559-5517-6

The Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

Produced for the Scottish Government by RR Donnelley B52956 11/07

Published by the Scottish Government, November, 2007

Further copies are available from
Blackwell's Bookshop
53 South Bridge
Edinburgh
EH1 1YS

The text pages of this document are printed on recycled paper and are 100% recyclable

Contents

Introduction	2
1. Youth work – the ‘Northside Team’	5
2. Adult learning – Maria’s story	12
3. Capacity building – Northside Women’s Group story	19
4. Programme/operational management level example	27
5. Policy/strategic management level example	38
Appendix 1: Outcomes of CLD from Delivering Change	48

Introduction

In this document the practice of LEAP is illustrated in relation to a number of levels:

- project/practice;
- programme/operational management; and
- policy/strategic management level activity.

All the illustrations are set in the city of Strathinver with particular reference to the Northside neighbourhood.

Three project/practice level examples illustrate a LEAP approach to each of the national CLD priorities set out in the WALT guidance:

1. The story of the Northside team, illustrates achieving change through work with young people.
2. The story of Maria, and her experience in an adult literacies programme, illustrates achieving change through learning for adults.
3. Northside Women's Group illustrates achievement of change through capacity building.

Each story is related to the others to illustrate the potential interplay between the three priority areas.

The fourth example focuses on a LEAP approach to planning and evaluating a programme of CLD activity. It relates to the role of CLD working with local community planning partners to instigate an initiative to respond to a shared concern about the needs of recently arrived economic migrants and refugees who have become a significant part of the population of Northside.

The final example moves to the application of LEAP at policy and strategic level. It focuses on policy review and planning for an integrated, inter-agency approach to effective support for community organisations across Strathinver.

Each example is set out using a common format that describes the need (see section 2, part i of the LEAP manual), identifies the stakeholders (see section 2, parts ii and iv), explores the outcomes and associated indicators (see section 3, parts i and ii and section 2, part ii), summarises the action plan (see section 3, part iii) and the monitoring arrangements for its implementation (see section 3, part iv), and finishes with a review of the evidence and lessons from evaluation (see sections 3, part v and section 2, part v).

The Context

1. CLD and Community Planning:

The CLD team which is a significant contributor to all the examples is part of Strathinver Community Service Department. The department also includes: libraries, museums, leisure and sport, arts and information services. Strathinver Council has committed itself strongly to community planning and the Community Services Director is a member of the Corporate Management Team that seeks to present an integrated Council contribution to this partnership.

The CLD team has a strong working relationship with the Northside Area Regeneration and Community Planning Officer, who is employed within the Chief Executive's department of the Strathinver Council but accountable to the Strathinver Community Planning Partnership Co-ordinator. CLD is seen as a key contributor to local community planning and develops its work in line with priorities set within the Strathinver Community Plan.

Partnership and collaborative practice is therefore a defining characteristic of the way that the team works. Other statutory partners have increasingly recognised that the principles of participatory governance reflected in community planning require them to develop their practice, adopting CLD approaches within their wider repertoires of intervention.

It is recognised that the sum of the partnership working collaboratively has the potential to have far greater impact than the parts working alone. Apart from the CLD team key partners involved in the Northside Partnership are: the range of Council departments delivering services in the area (Community Services, Housing, Social Work, Education, Planning and Transport, Environmental Health and Trading Standards); Northside College; Northside NHS Health Improvement Team, Strathinver Police and Fire Services. Voluntary sector involvement is from Strathinver Voluntary Action Council and Volunteer Centre and Strathinver Housing Association both of which have active involvement in Northside. Community partners are represented through the Northside Community Forum (which also operates as the Public Partnership Forum in relation to health issues and is built on a former Tenants and Residents Forum), Northside Adult Learners Forum and Northside Youth Forum.

2. Strathinver and Northside

Strathinver is a port and resort city of 155,000 people in an attractive location. It grew up around its port services, resort facilities, ship building and textile manufacturing much of which has been in decline for 30 years. Economic diversification has been based around computer manufacture, call centres and retail shopping development and regeneration of tourism. The last has been particularly significant as Strathinver has seen major investment as part of its regeneration programme in a hotel, marina, golf course and multi-activity commercial leisure complex.

The Strathinver Council and Community Planning Partnership area is significantly larger than the city alone as it takes in a substantial rural hinterland with several commuter villages close by, but it also reaches out to a series of remote glens.

Northside is a large post war estate built on the edges of the city as a slum clearance programme in the 1960s. It is a regeneration area with a population of 25,000 people. It consists of a mixture of high rise flats, tenement, and back and front door houses. The hub of the area is a rather bleak, windswept shopping mall that also contains a local community services centre (managed though the Community Service Department but not by the CLD team) which houses meeting facilities, a community café, youth drop-in centre, library, local learning centre and a gym.

Northside suffers from a range of social, economic and health problems. Unemployment is high, poverty is common, housing conditions are relatively poor, associated ill health is apparent, educational performance and access to further and higher education is low, drug misuse is fuelling criminality and community safety is a significant issue. The area is already physically detached from the city and transport costs are high. All these factors reinforce the negative image of the area.

The following table indicates socio-economic characteristics of Strathinver, Northside and Scotland as a whole:

	Strathinver	Northside	Scotland
Unemployment	7%	15%	6%
No formal qualifications	34%	47%	33%
Long term illness or disability	21%	27%	20%
Access to personal transport	70%	40%	74%
Dependent children with no working parent	15%	25%	15%

Project/practice level stories

1 Youth work – the ‘Northside Team’

The need (see LEAP manual section 2, part i)

The ‘Northside Team’ is an informal group of 13-15 year old young people who live in the Northside district of Strathinver. They are keen on skateboarding and BMX riding but have been getting into trouble with the police for doing this in their favourite gathering place at the local shopping mall and for being generally rowdy. They feel they are being hounded.

They don’t want to be in trouble and would like things to change. By speaking to the outreach youth worker they express the needs that they feel. But their perceived needs are only part of what needs to be considered before a decision is taken to work with them.

The role of the outreach worker is to help implement a children’s services plan that emphasises the importance of protecting the safety of children and of taking a preventive approach to anti-social behaviour. Evidence from the police indicates that youth crime, particularly related to under age drinking and drug misuse, is growing. From this perspective there is a recognised need to protect young people and the statistics also show that the risks are higher in Northside than elsewhere in the town.

This represents a combination of expressed, normative and comparative need that justifies targeting resources on this group. In addition the motivation shown by the group, and the fact that working with them would be consistent with the intent of policy, suggest that there will be strengths to build on.

The stakeholders (see section 2, parts ii and iv)

By stating their wish to do something about their situation, the Northside Team are the primary stakeholders. If a response is to be made they need the support of the outreach youth worker who, in turn, needs the support of his CLD team and its managers. They too are stakeholders. But they know that responding to the needs that have been identified will ultimately need wider collaboration with others (for example the Strathinver police, planners and sports and arts team). They are not yet actively involved but in the long run they may be.

Though not immediately involved, a range of policy makers concerned with children, young people and regeneration has created the conditions in which it is possible for the CLD team and others to work with the Northside Team. These policy makers are also potential stakeholders because they have an active interest in actions taken to fulfil policy objectives and may need to be persuaded to make available new resources.

Stakeholder analysis (see framework in LEAP manual section 2, part ii.)

System Factor	Outreach Youth Worker/Agency	The Northside Team	Other potential partners	Targets for change
Motivation	<p>Personal and agency commitment to social inclusion and targeting youth work support.</p> <p>Congruence with national youth strategy and children's service plan priorities.</p> <p>Awareness of risk to young people.</p>	<p>Frustration about being 'hassled' by the police.</p> <p>Wanting better facilities.</p> <p>Escape from boredom.</p> <p>Vision of a difference that could be made.</p>	<p>Community arts worker: Personal and agency values.</p> <p>Benefit of collaboration.</p> <p>Police: Reduced anti-social behaviour and risk of drugs offences.</p> <p>Parents: Greater safety.</p> <p>Purposeful activity.</p>	<p>Motivation to resist change:</p> <p>Planners: do not see project as a priority.</p> <p>Adults in the community: Punitive and negative attitudes to young people.</p> <p>Councillors: tight budget constraints.</p> <p>Local press: Negative reporting about young people and anti-social behaviour.</p>
Capacity	<p>Skills and experience of detached youth work.</p> <p>Access to drop in centre in town.</p> <p>Operational support budget.</p> <p>Equipment, e.g. minibus, computer.</p> <p>Managerial and policy support.</p> <p>Confidence about the potential of young people.</p>	<p>Energy.</p> <p>Enthusiasm.</p> <p>Time.</p> <p>(But limited knowledge, experience, confidence and trust.)</p>	<p>Community arts worker: skills and knowledge; access to arts resources and equipment.</p> <p>Police: Time of community police officer.</p> <p>Parents: Time, experience of young people.</p>	<p>Council control of public funds.</p> <p>Responsibility for planning regulations and advice.</p> <p>Power of the press to mould public opinion.</p> <p>Expression of negative public attitudes.</p>
Opportunity	<p>Potential for support from the community arts worker.</p> <p>Interest of Communities Committee in targeted youth work following youth work strategy consultation.</p> <p>Already being known to the Northside Team.</p>	<p>Knowing the outreach worker.</p>	<p>Access to arts budget.</p> <p>Policing with the community policy.</p> <p>Setting up of women's group in Northside.</p>	<p>Contradiction between Communities Committee policy and Council funding constraints.</p> <p>Neutrality of the planning officers.</p> <p>Potential to get good newspaper stories about young people doing things for themselves.</p>

Agreeing outcomes – the difference the stakeholders wanted to make (see section 3, parts i and ii and section 2, part ii)

The young people are agreed on quite specific outcomes – somewhere in the neighbourhood where they can gather and have fun in peace – preferably a proper skate park.

The outreach worker, his team and manager are influenced by the intended outcomes of CLD work with young people as set out in "Delivering Change" and section 2.1 of HGIOCLD? 2. They are interested in the self-confidence of the young people, their self-expectation, self responsibility, increased ability to come up with ideas and solutions and capacity to work with adults. As partners in developing the children's service plan, like other agency staff and policy makers, they share a desire to achieve outcomes for children that make them; safe, healthy, achieving, active, included, respected and responsible.

Other potential stakeholders, like the police, may bring a desire to achieve additional, often more specific, outcomes such as reduced complaints about young people, reduced public disorder and levels of youth crime.

Outcomes and outcome indicators

<p>The young people want this outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ somewhere in town where they can gather and have fun in peace. <p>Outcomes identified by other stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Self-confidence. ○ Increased expectations of themselves and each other. ○ Increased responsibility for themselves and their actions. ○ Increased ability to come up with ideas and solutions. ○ Working together and with adults. ○ That they are safe, healthy, achieving, active, included, respected and responsible. 	<p>These are potential indicators of success:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A facility is established that enables them to meet and enjoy themselves. ○ There are no complaints to the police about their behaviour. <p>These are potential indicators of success:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The group members speak confidently to adults, e.g. they take their issues to the Councillor's surgery. ○ The young people recognise that they need to acquire skills and seek to do so. ○ The direction of activity is driven by realistic ideas coming from the young people. ○ Adults with whom the young people come into contact report favourably on their maturity. ○ Anti-social behaviour and substance misuse do not become problems for these young people.
---	--

Action planning (see LEAP manual section 3, part iii)

The initial action plan is drawn up at a first formal meeting with the Northside team in the youth drop-in centre in town. The meeting follows informal street-based contact between the young people and the outreach youth worker, which has identified the desired outcomes of the young people and demonstrated that these are compatible with the outcomes sought by the youth work team.

Inputs/resources	Processes/methods	Outputs/specific actions	Time
Youth worker/team Meeting place The Northside Team members	Outreach and organisation	The outreach worker will meet with the group in the youth drop-in centre in town to help them to think about what is involved in taking action and decide how they want to proceed.	Week 1
Community arts worker Arts resources Police Councillor/s	Investigation	The outreach youth worker will support the group to find out about skate-parks, what they cost, where they can be located, who would need to be persuaded to provide the funds, who might be able to help them to develop a good campaign, etc. The investigation would include a 'seeing is believing' visit to Southtown to meet young people who have successfully campaigned for a skate-park there.	Weeks 2-5
Planners Funders Youth forum Community groups Community Safety Forum	Capacity building for campaigning and negotiation	With the help of the outreach worker and the support of the community arts worker, who has agreed to be involved, the group will think about what is involved in an imaginative campaign. Together they will work out whose support they will need, what sorts of communication are likely to be most effective with different sorts of people, etc. Arts workshops will be used to design leaflets and posters.	Weeks 6-12
	Campaigning	Leaflets and posters will be distributed, a petition will be organised. Contact will be made and meetings sought with: the youth forum, community police officers, the Planning Department, the local councillor, the chair of the Communities Committee of the Council, the Community Safety Forum, and local community groups.	Weeks 12-onwards
	Confidence building	Sessions using drama and role play will be provided by the community arts worker to rehearse speaking to the people they want to influence. Mock up art work will be tested.	Weeks 12-20
	Reflection and learning	No formal process will be used but throughout, in consultation with the group, the outreach worker will record progress and encourage the group to think about what has worked, what has not and why.	Throughout

Northside team's plan in brief

How will we go about it?		
What resources will we use?	What methods will we use?	What actions will we take?
Northside Team	Outreach youth work	Meeting with Northside Team
Youth worker/team	Investigation	Information gathering about skate parks
Arts worker/resources	Capacity building	Planning for campaign
Police	Campaigning	Preparation of publicity
Councillors	Confidence building	Drama and role play
Planners	Reflection	Contacting key people
Funders	Learning	Meetings with officials and councillors
Youth forum		Recording and reviewing progress



Monitoring (see LEAP manual section 3, part iv)

Though several other people are potentially involved the pivotal role in the action plan falls to the youth outreach worker. It is therefore agreed that all other contributors, including the young people themselves, will report to him on agreed actions and how they have gone. To enable him to monitor progress he uses a pictorial wall chart prepared with members of the Team that sets out the action plan with key tasks and dates for their completion. This is displayed publicly on a wall in the drop-in centre and provides a visible and shared record of what is happening.

Evaluation (see section 3, part v and section 2, part v)

This review focuses on the evaluation of the action plan that the Team were party to drawing up. To conduct their evaluation of progress at the end of this stage the stakeholders who have been actively involved meet at the drop-in centre. The participants include several members of the Northside Team, the outreach youth worker and the community arts worker. Though other people, such as the police, planners, councillors, the Youth Forum and the Community Safety Forum have a potential stake in the activities, up to this stage the action plan has treated them as targets to influence rather than as partners. Part of the evaluation is to assess whether others are now willing to be part of the active stakeholder group.

They begin by reviewing their pictorial wall chart. For the most part they agree that the plan has been put into action but they note that the timescales have slipped a bit and that some of the members of the team who had said they would come on the visit to Southtown did not turn up. This group has been very negative saying that the idea of a campaign is a waste of time and that no-one will listen to them anyway.

Though this has been discouraging to the others, who have been subject to derogatory comments and a degree of ridicule, they have stayed involved. The records show a core group of eight young people have been consistently involved. The primary reason they give for this is that the visit to Southtown and the contacts they have made with the Youth Forum have convinced them that young people can take action and that it is possible to get the kind of facility they are looking for. However they also comment that they have enjoyed the arts and drama workshops, are proud of the posters and leaflet they have created and surprised that the people they had wanted to lobby have been willing to talk to them.

In particular they are impressed that the Chair of the Communities Committee has invited them to come and present their case for a skate park at the committee. They have met with the chair and vice chair of the Youth Forum which has gone on to discuss their campaign and give it support. As a result of their posters and leaflets they have also been contacted by the Northside Women's group who have said they will support them in their campaign. They are wary that the Youth Forum and the Women's group might steal their thunder but have decided to work with them.

In terms of the outcome they had set for themselves the Northside Team members believe they have made some progress toward getting a skate park. Though they have been warned by the councillor and the planning department that there is no money currently available for their project, they feel they are being treated seriously and being listened to. They still fear that they might be being patronised by the adults they are in contact with. They think the Youth Forum is made up of 'swots' and are ambivalent about being associated with them. Though it was not an outcome they stated, they acknowledge that being involved in the campaign has made them feel more positive about themselves and more confident.

Outcomes sought by the outreach worker, the community arts worker and by policy makers and managers concerned with children's services are also in evidence. Though there is disappointment that not all members of the Northside Team have become involved, for those that have there is evidence both in the behaviour of the young people, and in the feedback from adults they have been in contact with, that self-confidence, self-esteem and self-responsibility have grown. It is clear that they are learning to work with adults and negotiate their ideas; the young people are achieving, active, socially included and involved in local democracy.

There are also some outcomes that had not been anticipated. On the positive side, several of the young people have enjoyed the arts workshops so much that they have become involved in a wider community arts project that is producing murals for public buildings in Northside.

On the negative side the split in the Northside Team is raising fears of bullying of those who have become involved by those who have not. As an expression of their disaffection the latter group also seems more prone to anti-social behaviour and potentially to be more at risk from the drug dealers. Another unexpected outcome is that the experience of contact with the Youth Forum has led to discussion in the CLD team about how representative of typical young people the Youth Forum is and whether this issue needs to be addressed.

Though the primary outcome from the point of view of the Northside Team remains to be achieved, at the end of this stage of the action plan all active stakeholders are satisfied by progress but aware that they need to reflect on the experience to decide what they should be doing next, both to progress work on their desired outcomes and to address negative outcomes that have emerged. As they move back to step 1 and the question 'what will we need to do now?' they are aware that there are new stakeholders who will potentially be involved and new forms action to be resourced.

2. Adult learning – Maria’s story

The need (see LEAP manual section 2, part i)

Maria, age 45, is a UK citizen who originally came to Northside as a refugee from Chile with her husband but he has died. She is now a socially isolated lone parent with two children (Graciella aged 4 and Pablo aged 13). She has been unable to find employment since the electronics factory she worked in as a manual worker closed down two years ago. She is dependent on benefits and is on medication for depression.

Maria has been assessed as eligible for literacies support. English is her second language, and she still has difficulty communicating effectively in it. She is particularly worried about Pablo who seems to spend a lot of time with a group of young people in the local shopping mall. Maria attends a community health fair, organised in collaboration with the Community Mental Health Team, where she talks to workers on the adult literacies stall. The fair has enabled her felt needs to be expressed. The workers recognise her concerns as ones that are priorities to be addressed in the literacies partnership strategy in which statistical evidence indicates a high level of literacy difficulties in Northside.

The strategy is based on the social practices model of literacy work and seeks to respond to literacy and numeracy needs with a focus on helping people to achieve social benefits. As in the Northside Team’s story Maria’s expressed needs are compatible with priorities defined using normative criteria. In addition Maria’s particular circumstances reflect a wider range of needs of refugee and migrant communities in Northside that are currently being assessed by the Northside Partnership (see example 4).

The stakeholders (see section 2, parts ii and iv)

Maria is of course the primary stakeholder but, as in the Northside Team’s story and for the same reasons, workers, agency managers and policy makers/resource providers involved in the literacies partnership all have a potential stake in the response that is made. The Community Mental Health Team also has a stake in that it has encouraged Maria to address her literacy needs as part of its response to her depression.

Stakeholder analysis (see framework in section 2, part ii)

System Factor	Literacies team	Maria	Other potential partners	Targets for change
Motivation	<p>Personal and agency commitment to social practices model of literacies.</p> <p>Fit with national literacies strategy and local CLD priorities.</p> <p>Awareness of risk for Maria and her children.</p>	<p>Desire for better health.</p> <p>Desire for social connection and ability to communicate.</p> <p>Fulfillment of her potential.</p> <p>Escape from poverty.</p> <p>Concerns about welfare of her children.</p> <p>Vision of a different quality of life.</p>	<p>Health: Support to Maria in achieving health improvements.</p> <p>Child care: Providing nursery support service for priority groups in Northside.</p>	<p>In this case there is no immediate resistance to change coming from external sources though there is concern that if Maria is to fulfil her ambitions she could encounter discriminatory attitudes and behaviours, e.g. from potential employers.</p>
Capacity	<p>Skills and experience of literacies work.</p> <p>Access to literacies resources including operational support budget, equipment, e.g. computers.</p> <p>Managerial and policy support.</p> <p>Confidence about the potential of adult learners.</p>	<p>Time.</p> <p>Coping skills already demonstrated in managing extremely demanding life circumstances.</p> <p>But initial capacity likely to be affected by lack of confidence, self esteem, depression.</p>	<p>Community Mental Health Team: Skills and experience in working with women with depression.</p> <p>Childcare: Payment for service for Graciella.</p>	<p>Not yet apparent.</p>
Opportunity	<p>Maria's own motivation for change.</p> <p>Potential for support from the Community Mental Health team.</p> <p>Emerging interest in refugee communities in Northside (see example 4).</p>	<p>Positive support and encouragement from literacies team and health worker</p> <p>Access to funded service.</p>	<p>Community Mental Health Team: Potential of relationship with Literacies team established through health fair and shared support for Maria</p>	<p>Not yet apparent.</p>

Agreeing outcomes – the difference the stakeholders wanted to make (see LEAP manual section 3, parts i and ii and section 2, part ii)

The outcomes that Maria wants are that she will have new skills, including language, to enable her to get a job, provide for her children, lead a more fulfilling social life and be free of depression. As these are totally consistent with the purposes of the literacies programme these outcomes are shared by the literacies workers, their manager and other members of the literacies partnership. The outcomes are also consistent with Learning Connections adult learning outcome statements and the HIGIOCLD? 2 emphasis on successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens and effective contributors.

Specific agencies within the literacies partnership may have a particular emphasis, for example Job Centre Plus on employability outcomes, but such priorities are perfectly compatible with the wider range of outcomes sought.

Outcomes and outcome indicators

<p>Maria wants these outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To acquire new employability skills. ○ To improve her English. ○ To provide for her children. ○ To be more socially involved. ○ To experience better mental health. <p>Other stakeholders have identified these outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Successful learning. ○ Individual confidence. ○ Responsible citizenship. ○ Effective contributor. 	<p>These are potential indicators of success:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maria achieves vocational qualifications. ○ She gets a skilled job. ○ Maria writes a successful job application. ○ She participates in group discussions in English. ○ Maria assists her children with homework and reports that they do better at school. ○ She can afford to take her children on holiday. ○ Maria joins in social activity in the community. ○ Maria comes off tranquilisers. ○ She is optimistic about the future. <p>The same indicators as those relating to Maria’s outcomes would also provide evidence in relation to other stakeholder’s outcomes.</p>
---	--

The Action Plan (see section 3, part iii)

The action plan for Maria assumes that there is a wider literacies programme and strategy within which the specific responses to her needs are developed. However it also recognises that the needs that Maria presents may be ones that affect others and that the action plan should include attention to newly emerging needs that might require development of new features of the literacies programme. If it becomes clear that Maria's experience indicates similar needs in the community it is likely that a new LEAP process will emerge that sets down outcomes for wider work, relevant progress indicators and an action plan.

Inputs/resources	Processes/methods	Outputs/specific actions	Time
Literacies programme co-ordinator.	Information/publicity.	An information pack about adult learning/literacy opportunities will be sent immediately to Maria by the programme co-ordinator.	Immediate
Maria.	Outreach work.	The programme co-ordinator will arrange to meet Maria at her home to discuss options that could help her achieve her ambitions.	By week 2
Literacies volunteer tutor.	Literacy tutoring.	If appropriate, the programme co-ordinators will match Maria with a volunteer tutor and a programme of literacy support will be planned with her for a specified period drawing on the learning resources of the local literacies programme.	By week 4
Child care support.	Confidence building.	In the process of the literacies programme volunteer tutors will encourage participants to support one another and arrange specific joint events and activities in the Northside learning centre. The volunteer tutor will identify opportunities for Maria to use her new skills to positively reinforce the progress she is making.	Throughout
Learning materials.			
Equipment to support learning.	Securing resources.	The programme co-ordinators will arrange child care support for her younger child to enable Maria to participate in learning and will make enquiries about potential financial support with travel costs.	Throughout
Travel costs.			
Peer support.	Counselling/guidance.	A date will be set 3 months after commencing tutoring, for a review between Maria, the programme co-ordinator and the volunteer tutor of Maria's progress in achieving her aims. Guidance will be offered at that time about further learning opportunities and other ways that she can make progress in meeting her needs, in particular information about community resources and activities that might be helpful to her.	By week 4
Support from other professionals, e.g. mental health services, children's teachers, refugee support agency.			
	Referral to other services.	Progress reviews between the tutor and the programme co-ordinator will consider whether referral to other agencies could be helpful, e.g. to Northside Association for Mental Health or the careers service. This will be discussed with Maria and where appropriate referral will be made.	Week 16
	Networking and resource development.	The programme co-coordinator will review wider supports for refugee families and report on development of literacies services for refugees including potential for collaboration with specialist refugee agencies.	4 weekly Week 1- 8

Maria's plan in brief

How will we go about it?		
What resources will we use?	What methods will we use?	What actions will we take?
Maria	Publicity	Information pack
Literacies co-ordinator/ tutor	Outreach work	Interview with Maria
Child care	Tutoring	Learning plan
Learning materials	Confidence building	Child care package
Equipment	Securing resources	Tutorials
Travel costs	Counselling	Review meeting
Peer support	Guidance	Guidance on further learning
Support from other professionals, e.g. mental health, refugee agency	Referral	Records of progress
	Networking	



Monitoring (see LEAP manual section 3, part iv)

Once Maria has become active in the literacies programme, as with other learners, a learning plan is established which reflects the agreed action plan. The plan is an open record shared between Maria, the volunteer tutor and the literacies programme co-ordinator. It is used both to record actions that have been taken and evidence of progress towards the agreed outcomes for Maria.

Evaluation (see section 3, part v and section 2, part v)

In Maria's story step 5 is built in to the review meeting that was set for week sixteen of the action plan between Maria, the volunteer tutor and the literacies co-ordinator. By this time Maria has been working directly with the volunteer tutor for three months. The learning plan provides a primary source of information for the evaluation. It records the outcomes that Maria said she was looking for, the elements of the action plan and subsequent developments arising through the tutoring sessions she has had.

They begin the meeting by reviewing whether the action plan has actually been carried out. They are all satisfied that it has. Maria has enjoyed the tutoring relationship. She has felt understood and valued. The tutor has recorded evidence of improved capacity to understand English and communicate in writing and orally. The tutor feels that Maria's apparent literacy difficulty actually has as much to do with her self-confidence as it does with her basic ability.

The tutor has spent time with Maria role-playing situations in which she has felt disadvantaged by her language competence such as going to her children's school open evenings, going to the job centre, attending her local church. The lack of self-confidence has contributed to her social isolation.

In the process of their work the tutor has discovered that Maria has felt unable to properly support her children in their school work because their use of English is much better than hers and this has spilled over into a general lack of confidence as a parent, which is particularly worrying her in relation to Pablo who likes to hang out with his mates in the local shopping mall.

In one of the joint student events in the literacies programme Maria has met a neighbour who has joined a newly formed women's group in Northside. The neighbour has invited her to go along with her and she is now a member of the group and, motivated to protect her son Pablo, she is particularly interested in the Northside Team skate park campaign. Maria tends to be self-deprecating and to have lower expectations of herself than appropriate for her abilities. The positive experience of the literacies programme encourages her to be more positive about herself and think about the kind of work she would like to do. She expresses an interest in social care work. With the support of her tutor she has arranged an interview with the careers service. Overall she expresses much more optimism about her future.

In terms of the outcomes Maria is seeking she feels that she has achieved some of them and is making progress towards others. She has developed sufficient confidence to join the Northside Women's group and in so doing feels she is doing something to support Pablo to become more responsible. Maria reports that getting involved in the literacies programme and establishing social contact in her community has made her feel more positive. She is also more confident that she can establish the skills she will need to be employable and has taken action to identify what she needs to do.

From the point of view of the literacies programme the same evidence demonstrates progress that relates to the overall outcomes set for the programme. Though Maria has not yet set out to achieve formal qualifications, there is ample evidence of successful learning in her increasingly confident engagement with her neighbours and community. Her self-esteem has benefited greatly by being confident enough to contribute to community life by involvement in the women's group.

There are also some unanticipated outcomes. As part of the action plan the literacies co-ordinator agreed to review the wider needs of refugees for literacies services. As a result she has been in discussion with Northside Refugee Council and is planning a joint initiative with them to publicise literacies services. Maria expresses interest in being involved in this.

In the light of the evaluation of progress made consideration is given to the question: 'what will we need to do now?'. Some of Maria's outcomes remain unchanged but new ones are emerging. Similarly the experience of working with Maria has resulted in recognition of wider needs of refugees and the literacies team is embarking on a new LEAP cycle to address these.

3. Capacity building – Northside Women’s Group story

The need (see LEAP manual section 2, part i)

The women’s group in Northside was formed after women in the area protested spontaneously about discarded needles being found in the car park at the back of the shopping mall. They see this as a symptom of the increasing risk from drug dealing and misuse in their community. They are particularly fearful of the risks to their children not only from the drugs themselves but increasing violence and risk of being drawn into criminality.

They have achieved publicity for their concerns in the local paper and have approached the CLD team for support. On the basis of relevant statistical evidence of deprivation, Northside is within the worst 15% in the country and already designated as a regeneration area. Crime statistics highlight drug misuse as a problem. The community development worker recognises the relevance of the expressed need in the context of the general problems of regeneration and the policy commitment to action in the area. He also knows that the spontaneous action of the women will provide strengths on which to build and that being involved in these issues will fit with policy priorities

The stakeholders (see section 2, parts ii and iv)

The women’s group is the primary stakeholder. As they are acting on an issue that others in the community may have an interest in, potentially there could be other community stakeholders that emerge. As in the other stories the worker, managers and policy makers have an established interest. These interests are not limited to the CLD team but also potentially involve a range of other agencies that are involved in the Northside regeneration partnership and the Strathinver community safety partnership (for example: health improvement, Northside Housing Association, Strathinver police).

Stakeholder analysis (see framework in section 2, part ii)

System Factor	CLD team	Women's Group	Other potential partners	Targets for change
Motivation	<p>Individual worker and agency commitment to building capacity of community to address local needs.</p> <p>Fit with national CLD priorities and Strathinver CLD strategy.</p> <p>Commitment to tackling drug culture and its consequences for community safety.</p>	<p>Anger about threat to safety and welfare of children.</p> <p>Fear of dangers to children and adults.</p> <p>Vision of a safe, attractive and positive community.</p> <p>Enjoyment of working with others to achieve change.</p>	<p>Alcohol and Drugs Action Team: Goal of tackling drug misuse.</p> <p>Police: Concern for community safety.</p> <p>Need to tackle drug crime.</p> <p>Health: Promotion of health improvement.</p> <p>Schools: Safety for children.</p> <p>Politicians: Commitment to tackle drug trade and misuse.</p> <p>Other community groups: Shared concern about impact of drug trade.</p> <p>(N.B. most of these come together in the Community Safety Forum)</p>	<p>Drug suppliers and dealers: To maintain power and income, likely to be actively resistant and potentially threatening.</p> <p>Drug Users: Likely to resist loss of access to supply but may also be motivated by personal desire for change.</p> <p>Passive members of the community: May not wish to challenge behaviour of neighbours or family members.</p> <p>Resistant professionals among potential partners: Fear of the consequences of the confrontational style of the Women's Group.</p>
Capacity	<p>Skills and experience of capacity building.</p> <p>Access to resources including operational support budget, equipment.</p> <p>Access to specialist advice and support of Alcohol and Drugs Action Team (ADAT).</p> <p>Managerial and policy support.</p> <p>Belief in the potential of the Women's group.</p>	<p>Time.</p> <p>Energy.</p> <p>Resilience in face of adversity.</p> <p>Self-organisation skills.</p> <p>Communication skills in highlighting the threat.</p> <p>Confidence/self belief to tackle the threat.</p>	<p>Each of the above brings relevant knowledge, skills and resources that can contribute to tackling the issues.</p>	<p>Drug suppliers and dealers: Violence and threat of violence.</p> <p>Hold over drug users.</p> <p>Resources to promote and extend drugs market.</p> <p>Drug users: Anti-social behaviour, collusion with suppliers and dealers.</p> <p>Passive members of the community: Inaction.</p> <p>Resistant professionals: Use of professional power and authority, control of access to resources.</p>

Stakeholder analysis continued

System Factor	CLD team	Women's group	Other potential partners	Targets for change
Opportunity	Shared interest of other potential partners in tackling drug misuse. Heightened sense of crisis indicated by spontaneous protests.	Positive support from CLD team. Interest expressed by other potential partners. Positive response from local press. High profile of the issues in national and local policy.	For all agencies interested in drug misuse the potential to work with a local driven campaign.	Desire for change among users. Desire for change among passive community members. Ability of Women's Group to demonstrate competence to resistant professionals.

Agreeing outcomes – the difference the stakeholders wanted to make (see LEAP manual section 3, parts i and ii and section 2, part ii)

The women's group in Northside are highly motivated to achieve change and their vision of the outcome they want is a safe community where their children are free of the risks of the drug trade and have opportunities for enjoyable and worthwhile activities in an environment that will encourage them to become mature adults.

The community development worker, CLD team and their managers regard these as desirable outcomes but they see them in a wider context that is informed by policy for their work. In line with HGIOCLD? 2 and the Learning Connections CLD outcomes guidance they emphasise process outcomes for the group: growth in confidence and skills, capacity to plan and take action together, widened community networks, becoming more influential, accessing and using resources to achieve change and influence on policy and practice of agencies working in the community.

Other agencies, for example those in the Strathinver community safety partnership, are interested in supporting the women's group for other reasons. For example the health improvement team identify outcomes in terms of reduced drug dependency, the police seek outcomes related to reduced crime and the housing association seeks an improved image for the community.

Outcomes and outcome indicators

<p>The women want these outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A safe community where their children are free of the risks of the drug trade. ○ Opportunities for enjoyable and worthwhile activities for young people. <p>Other stakeholder have identified these outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Growth in confidence and skills ○ Capacity to plan and take action together ○ Widened networks in the community ○ Become more influential ○ Access and use resources to achieve change. ○ Influence policy and practice of agencies working in the community. ○ Improved image for the community. 	<p>These are potential indicators of success:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recorded drug related crime reduces. ○ People say they feel safer walking in the neighbourhood at night. ○ Group collaborate with others, e.g. support to the Northside Team campaign for a skate park helps them to achieve their outcome. <p>Potential indicators of success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The group applies for and carries out a Community Action Research Fund project. ○ The group supports the Northside Team campaign. ○ The group is invited to present its research findings to the Alcohol and Drugs Action Team. ○ The group participates in the development of the Youth Strategy and is invited to present a workshop based on its research project. ○ The group lobbies the local councillor and MSP who respond by agreeing to regular meetings with them.
--	--

The Action Plan (see section 3, part iii)

In the Northside women’s group story the action plan also falls into stages. It can be confidently predicted that stage 1 can be carried through because the inputs are committed. However stage 2 and 3 would depend on further developments and commitments and are therefore more speculative.

In presenting outlines of the kind of content that could be included in action plans for Maria, the Northside Team and the Women’s Group, the following should be noted:

- Action plans may in practice evolve in stages that are dependent on commitment of new inputs.
- The inputs may come from a wide variety of sources but have to be securely committed before they can form the basis for a plan.
- The processes and methods reflect the overall practice theory and competences that underpin CLD and should be familiar to all qualified workers.
- The outputs are statements of actions that will be taken, the purpose of which is to make progress towards the intended outcomes identified at step 1.
- Responsibilities for delivering the outputs are clearly identified.
- The timescales within which the outputs should be delivered are clearly identified.

Inputs/resources	Processes/methods	Outputs/specific actions	Time
Stage 1: Community development worker.	Stage 1: Outreach.	Stage 1: Community Development (CD) worker will meet with women's group to discuss issues and actions.	Immediate
Women's group.	Information.	CD worker will provide information about action that other community organisations have taken about drug issues.	Weeks 2-6
The wider community.	Acquiring resources.	Alcohol and Drugs Action Team will be asked to provide information about drug misuse and services and ongoing advice.	Weeks 6-10
Alcohol and Drugs Action Team (ADAT).		Women's group, supported by CD worker, will apply to SCARF for funding to carry out investigation into attitudes to drug misuse in the community and local services and actions that could be effective at community level.	Weeks 6 onwards
Meeting place.			
Stage 2: All the above plus: Scottish Community Action Research Fund (SCARF).	Stage 2: Capacity and confidence building.	Stage 2: CD worker will work with group to identify, audit and where necessary develop specific skills they may need to take action on the identified issues. If application to SCARF is successful this will be supplemented by specific research skills support from a research mentor	Weeks 16-40
	Investigation	The women's group will conduct its research project and prepare a report on potential actions	Weeks 40-44
Stage 3: All of the above plus: Councillors.	Stage 3: Campaign planning	Stage 3: Using evidence gathered and supported by the CD worker the group will prepare a campaign plan including identifying key influencers (e.g. MSP, Councillor, Divisional Police Commander) considering how best to put over information they have gathered, considering how to build community support and involvement and how to engage the interest of service providers, (e.g. Health Board and Social Work).	Week 44 onwards
MSP.	Campaigning	Meetings arranged by group, discussion held, reports distributed, lobbying conducted, etc.	Week 44 onwards
Police.	Networking and resource development	The group will develop and sustain contact, and where possible collaborate, with others with a shared interest in the need, e.g. ADAT, Community Safety Forum, Northside Youth Forum.	Weeks 10, 40 and 6 monthly thereafter
Community Safety Forum.		Evidence of progress against intended outcomes will be recorded by group and CD worker and reviewed at the end of each stage of the action plan.	
Youth Forum.			
Social Work Department.	Evaluation, reflection and learning		
Health Board health practitioners			

Northside Women's Group plan in brief

How will we go about it?		
What resources will we use?	What methods will we use?	What actions will we take?
Women's group	Outreach	Planning meeting
CD worker	Information gathering	Information pack
Wider community	Capacity building	SCARF application
ADAT	Investigation	Programme of development meetings
Meeting place	Planning campaign	Research – planning, data collection, analysis, dissemination
SCARF	Campaigning	Campaign plan
Councillors	Networking	Contacting other interested parties
MSP	Seeking resources	Monthly progress reviews
Police	Review and learning	
Council Departments		
Health Board		



Monitoring (see LEAP manual section 3, part iv)

The lead role in achieving change is taken by the women's group itself and it is agreed that they will co-ordinate monitoring of the action plan. Supported by the community development worker they will do this by using the minutes of their meetings to record all action points that would be required to implement the action plan. At each meeting these actions will be reviewed to ensure that progress has been made on the tasks identified. Any evidence of progress against the intended outcomes will be recorded in the minutes.

Evaluation (see section 3, part v and section 2, part v)

The women's group set out a three stage action plan that they agreed would be evaluated at the end of each key stage, with a commitment to six monthly reviews thereafter. The evaluations of progress are based on the records kept by the group and observations and records of other stakeholders.

At the end of the first stage the key stakeholders were the group, the community development workers and a worker from the Alcohol and Drugs Action team that is providing advice and support. In stage 2 as they were successful in getting funding for the community action research project, a worker from the fund also became an active stakeholder.

As they move into stage 3, their campaign phase, they have established a collaborative relationship with the Community Safety Forum and the Northside Youth Forum who also become active stakeholders. There are other people they are still seeking to influence such as the MSP and councillor, the police, health board and social work department. As yet they are not actively involved as stakeholders but as we shall see by the end of stage 3 they too are on board.

By the end of stage 1 the women's group has not achieved any of the end outcomes it is seeking, however they have established a positive working relationship with the community development worker and the ADAT team member that has enabled them to acquire a better understanding of drugs issues and the kinds of responses that community organisations can make.

They have also applied for funding to investigate attitudes to drug misuse in their community. They recognise that these are necessary preliminary actions and are satisfied that they are in a stronger position to move forward. For the community development worker there is evidence of the process outcomes that he is seeking. The group is demonstrating its continuing commitment to learning about drugs issues, showing that it can access and use resources and beginning to show competence in planning and taking action together.

By the end of stage 2 the women's group has still not achieved any of the end outcomes it is seeking, however they have run a skills development programme with the support of the community development worker, successfully obtained funding, developed their research skills and carried out a community led research project.

All of these things demonstrate that the process outcomes prioritised by the community development worker are being achieved. The research fund officer is also able to identify the capacity building outcomes that the programme seeks to achieve. The group is increasingly self-confident, well organised and resourceful. The worker encourages them to recognise and value the process outcomes as these will improve the chances of addressing the core problem of drug dealing and misuse.

Whilst the underlying problem remains, the women do feel that the activity has been worthwhile. They had not set it as an outcome but the fact that they no longer feel helpless in relation to tackling the drug issue is seen as valuable. They are also pleased that they have been able to provide support to the Northside Team campaign for a skate park. Such collaboration directly with young people acting on their own behalf is an unexpected outcome.

By the end of stage 3 of the action plan the group has established a good working relationship with the MSP and the councillor who are both supporting their campaign. The MSP has raised questions about drug policy in the Scottish Parliament. The group has also established a good working relationship with the Northside Youth Forum, which is also raising the issues.

Prompted by the political support for the group, police, health board and social work department are all now meeting regularly with the group. The group has also been invited to be represented on the community safety forum and drug issues have been given high priority in its work as part of a Strathinver Community Plan well-being theme.

An unexpected outcome is that several of the leaders of the group have become well known public figures, regularly interviewed in the press and consulted by service agencies. But another unanticipated and negative outcome is that they have also been threatened by drug dealers. Worrying as this is it does suggest to them that they may be beginning to have some direct impact on the drugs trade. The threats have prompted higher profile police action and residents are expressing the view that the streets feel safer. Police statistics are beginning to show a decline in recorded drug crime in the area. By this stage, then, the group is seeing direct evidence that its primary outcomes are beginning to be achieved. Worryingly, though, police report increased drug related incidents in other neighbourhoods which may mean that the problem is being displaced rather than being resolved.

As the group and the other active stakeholders look to further stages in their action and ask the question 'what will we need to do now?' they recognise that they need to retain attention on the original end outcomes but widen the campaign to the whole of Strathinver. The network of stakeholders with commitment to the outcomes originally formulated by the women's group is now extensive and involves policy, programme and project levels. A new LEAP action plan is to be developed through the Community Safety Forum on behalf of the Community Planning Partnership. Whilst the women's group welcome this they also fear loss of their own identity and 'edge' and decide that they also need a plan for their own independent actions.

4. Programme/operational management level example

Northside Partnership 'New' Communities Initiative

At this level the focus is on the use of LEAP as a tool for planning and evaluation at team, organisational or local partnership levels. For illustrative purposes the example will focus on the work of the Northside community learning and development (CLD) team and its partners in the Northside Partnership. In it they use LEAP to develop a co-ordinated approach to the needs of refugees, asylum seekers and economic migrants in the area.

The need (see LEAP manual section 2, part i)

Northside has recently seen a significant demographic change with the arrival of approximately 1500 migrant workers, asylum seekers and refugees in an area that has traditionally been predominantly made up of indigenous white working-class residents.

Several factors have led to this change. Firstly the Scottish Government is encouraging in migration to compensate for the decline of the Scottish population. Surplus housing stock particularly in the high rise areas was used by the Council to house asylum seekers as part of a national dispersal programme. Many of them have now acquired refugee status and remained in the community where family members have been able to join them. The widening of the European Union which has led to internal economic migration has attracted significant numbers of workers who are finding employment opportunities, particularly in the resurgent tourism industry. They too have been able to benefit from the availability of surplus housing stock in Northside.

The three groups are in many ways quite different but also have similarities. The refugees and asylum seekers come from all parts of the world and many of them have had to deal with traumatic circumstances which impinge on their health and ability to adapt to their new circumstances. Their journeys have been enforced whilst those of the economic migrants have been by choice. The refugees enjoy a degree of security that asylum seekers do not. The economic migrant workers are generally white, whilst refugees and asylum seekers are frequently visibly more distinct because of their racial origins. Migrant workers are often younger and single. Asylum seekers are also often on their own whereas the refugees are more likely to be in family units.

Transience is a characteristic of all the groups. Refugees and asylum seekers frequently prefer to relocate to areas where there are others from the same place of origin and the economic migrants do not necessarily see their long-term future in Scotland. For nearly all of them English is a second language. However their levels of educational qualification (though not necessarily recognised in the UK) are typically higher than for the indigenous community.

Whilst only a relatively small part of the overall population, these new arrivals have potentially much to contribute to the local economy and community. However, there are needs to be addressed. Refugees and asylum seekers in particular have been a focus of racism and discriminatory behaviour, and community cohesion is under threat. The police have recorded several incidents of racially motivated attacks and a racially-based gang fight has raised concern.

The local schools have been challenged by the increased number of children for whom English is not their first language and there has been negative reaction from other parents. Youth workers are aware of heightened tensions on the streets. Adult learning workers are experiencing new demands for ESOL support. Health workers are aware of new health needs but also identify reluctance to use services. Local residents complain that new job opportunities in the tourism industry have gone to economic migrants but fail to recognise that they frequently lack the necessary skills for this market. Whilst the new arrivals are a focus for community tension, it is apparent that there are no organised groups that represent the interests of these communities.

The stakeholders (see LEAP manual section 2, parts ii and iv)

In the light of these circumstances the Northside Partnership identified responding to the issues as a priority. A working group of the partnership was charged with developing and implementing a coordinated interagency plan of action. The group consisted of the Area CLD Officer (with a lead role in co-ordinating the partnership), the Area Community Planning and Regeneration Officer, the NHS Public Health Practitioner, a depute principal of Northside College, a police inspector, the Northside Voluntary Action Council Director, Strathinver Community Relations Forum Director and two representatives from the Community Forum.

However at the start there were no organised groups representing the respective migrant communities. It was recognised that they should be key stakeholders but were not yet able to be.

Stakeholder analysis (see framework in section 2, part ii)

System Factor	CLD Officer	New communities of Northside	Other partners	Targets for change
Motivation	<p>Personal and agency commitment to equalities and promotion of community cohesion.</p> <p>National commitment to target disadvantaged communities including ethnic minorities.</p> <p>Commitment to building partnership with agencies involved in local community planning.</p>	Motivations yet to be investigated.	<p>All other agencies in the partnership share common commitment to equalities and social cohesion policies.</p> <p>Some individuals, (e.g. Community Relations Forum Director) have strong personal commitment to anti-racism.</p>	<p>Among Staff of partner agencies: Discriminatory attitudes and behaviours.</p> <p>In the Northside Community: Discriminatory attitudes and behaviours.</p> <p>Fear of change.</p> <p>Lack of interest in some groups to engage with wider community.</p>
Capacity	<p>Support and commitment of the Northside Partnership.</p> <p>Previous experience of co-ordinating working groups.</p> <p>Time committed within workload.</p> <p>Access to facilities, equipment and budget.</p> <p>Support of staff team in Northside.</p>	Capacity yet to be investigated.	<p>Time commitment agreed through Northside Partnership.</p> <p>Specific skills and knowledge from relevant professional roles.</p> <p>Resource support particularly from Council, Police and College.</p> <p>Connections to voluntary sector through Voluntary Action Council.</p> <p>Specific knowledge, skills and resources of Community Relations Forum Director.</p>	<p>Among Staff of partner agencies: Overt challenge to policy unlikely but capacity to resist change through passivity and covert behaviour with potential peer support.</p> <p>In the Northside Community: Active criticism of attention to 'new' communities, e.g. through local press; potential links to far right political campaigns; sectarian and nationalist divisions in and between 'new' communities.</p>
Opportunity	<p>Shared motivation of a range of agencies to work together in a new forum.</p> <p>Opportunity to capitalise on access to diverse resources.</p> <p>Potential of the new communities to contribute positively to Northside.</p>	Not yet clear.	<p>Shared motivation of a range of agencies to work together in a new forum.</p> <p>Opportunity to capitalise on access to diverse resources.</p> <p>Potential of the new communities to contribute positively to Northside.</p>	Exploitation of community tensions.

Agreeing outcomes – the differences the stakeholders wanted to make (see section 3, parts i and ii and section 2, part ii)

The stakeholders envisioned the difference they would like to see. Each had different priorities but it was possible to identify a package of outcomes that everyone could agree on. The ultimate outcomes sought were: a safe, healthy, socially cohesive, economically thriving community in which new arrivals would be able to prosper as individuals and families and participate fully as equal and contributing members.

To achieve this, intermediate outcomes were identified: elimination of racist behaviours and threats; establishment of skills that enable individual refugees and migrants to participate fully and community leaders effectively to represent community interests; establishment of strong social capital within the new communities represented by their own organisations and strong social networks that are connected into the community as a whole.

Initially, however, it was recognised that first stage key outcomes would need to be: establishment of understanding of the aspirations, assets, needs and priorities of the new communities and how they related to those of the wider community; and development of capacity for the communities to articulate and represent their own interests.

Outcomes and outcome indicators

<p>Stage 1</p> <p>The 'new' communities are engaged.</p> <p>Needs and aspirations of new communities are known and used to inform planning by agencies.</p> <p>Communities are organised and able to represent themselves effectively.</p>	<p>Potential indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Members of the communities participate in events. ○ Reports based on reliable evidence illuminate understanding and are reflected in policies and practices of agencies. ○ There are representative organisations of self-identified communities and interest groups. ○ These organisations are participating in planning for their communities.
<p>Stage 2</p> <p>Racist behaviour has been eliminated.</p> <p>Member of the community have the skills they need.</p> <p>Community leaders have the skills that they need.</p> <p>Strong social capital has been formed.</p> <p>New community networks link with those of the existing community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Police report no racist incidents. ○ Community groups report positively on the absence of threatening behaviours. ○ Participation in learning opportunities; qualifications achieved; success in accessing job opportunities; increased incomes. ○ The communities are well represented by their leaders – issues and concerns appear on agendas, they are given serious attention, agency policies and practices indicate responsiveness to community concerns. ○ There is an infrastructure of local self-help groups and activities, people feel that their communities enable them to meet their own needs, members of the community are contributing to each other's welfare in informal and formal ways. ○ Established community structures including the community forum, youth forum, adult learner's forum include representatives from the new communities. Issues specific to their needs are given proper attention and the representatives contribute to work on commonly experienced concerns.

<p>Stage 3</p> <p>The new communities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Safe. ○ Healthy. ○ Socially cohesive. ○ Economically thriving. ○ Participating and contributing fully. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Crime statistics improve. ○ New residents feel safe. ○ Health statistics improve against baseline evidence. ○ Inter-communal threats and violence cease. Community organisations act in the common interests of all. The communities of Northside celebrate their own and each other's identity. ○ Employment statistics, patterns and type of employment are more secure and adequately paid. ○ Member of the 'new' communities have become equally involved in community organisations, interest groups, political parties.
---	--

The action plan (see LEAP manual section 3, part iii)

The action plan was built on CLD principles as all stakeholders believed that a participatory and empowering approach would be essential if an appropriate response was to be made to the community needs. It was therefore recognised that action planning would need to be developed through a series of LEAP cycles relating to the staged outcomes they had identified.

It was agreed that all the agencies and community bodies which had contact with members of the new communities would collaborate in an effort to establish a working dialogue with them. It was recognised that they would themselves need to address their own competence for the task and need to be able also to call on specialist external resources, for example, translators and interpreters.

The grid below sets out a summary of the action plan for stage 1 which focused on better understanding of the needs of the communities and building their capacity for engagement. This plan represents the overall work that the partnership would undertake. Many of the activities (for example the open day) represented project level elements of the emerging overall programme and were subject in their own right to specific LEAP plans to aid their conduct.

Inputs/resources	Processes/methods	Outputs/specific actions	Time
Stage 1			
Area Community Planning and Regeneration officer (ACPRO). CLD Team. Northside College Community links worker. Public Health Practitioners. Community Police Officers.	Agency capacity building. Outreach and street work.	As preparation for the instigation of activity, a day seminar will be organised by the Northside College community links worker and CLD Capacity Building Team for staff of local agencies and community leaders about rights, circumstances and needs of asylum seekers, refugees and migrant workers. The organisers will seek support from specialist agencies (COLSA Consortium, Scottish Refugee Council). The CLD capacity building team will conduct a programme of street based and house to house contact with members of the new communities to find out more about their priorities and concerns. The youth work team will conduct a similar process of street based contact with young people.	To be held at week 10 From week 10-16
Chief Executives Department Research Team. Voluntary Action Council. Training resources and advice from: Scottish Refugee Council, COSLA Refugee and Asylum Seeker Consortium. Strathinver Community Relations Forum. Community Forum. Youth Forum. Adult Learning Forum.	Investigation/research. Data analysis. Providing and sharing information.	The ACPRO and Senior CLD officer (capacity building) working with the Chief Executive's Dept Research Team, drawing on the insights from the street work, will prepare a plan and tools for investigating needs of the new communities. All front line workers in all agencies in contact with members of the new communities will participate in collection of data over a two week period using these tools. Analysis of data will be conducted by the CE Research team The CLD capacity building team working with the Voluntary Action Council and the Community Relations Forum will co-ordinate the organisations of an open day event for members of the new communities in the Northside Community Centre at which all local services, voluntary and community organisations will be asked to provide information stalls about what they do. This event will incorporate an informal 'world café' session where participants will be able to eat lunch around tables where there will be themed discussions about issues such as health, learning, jobs, housing, arts, leisure, sport and recreation that draw on the research evidence.	Preparation week 16 to 20, research period 20-22 Weeks 22-25 Planning from week 10, event held week 28
Interpreters and translation services.	Organisational development. Knowledge exchange and review.	Based on contacts made through all of the above members of the capacity building team will take a lead in encouraging the formation of one or more community group around area of common interest. A further day seminar for the partnership agencies will be organised by the capacity building team and Northside College to share the knowledge gained from the investigation and the open day/world café event and review its implications for further action.	From week 10 onwards Week 31

Northside 'New' Communities Initiative stage 1 plan in brief

How will we go about it?		
What resources will we use?	What methods will we use?	What actions will we take?
ACPRO	Capacity building	Agency preparatory day seminar
CLD team	Outreach/street work	Outreach to establish profile of community needs
College Comm links worker	Investigation/research	Investigation project by front line staff
Public health practitioner	Data analysis	Data analysis by research team
Community police	Information sharing	Open day event and 'world café'
CE research team	Organisational development	Capacity building support to development of new organisations
Refugee Council	Knowledge exchange and review	
COSLA		
Community relations		
Community, youth and adult learning forums		
interpreters		



Monitoring (see LEAP manual section 3, part iv)

The initial stage of the development programme was complex. It required the active collaboration of a wide range of participants in a series of actions, each of which involved careful planning in its own right. Ensuring that all elements of the programme were effectively conducted and integrated was essential.

To this end the partners agreed that the CLD Area Officer would take on a co-ordinating role on behalf of all agencies and contributors. Each of the initiatives in the first stage had an identified leader and it was agreed that these people would report directly to the CLD Area Officer and form a co-ordinating group that would meet with her on a six weekly cycle to retain oversight of the action plan.

Evaluation (see section 3, part v and section 2, part v)

The stage 1 action plan was evaluated as the basis for the second round of LEAP planning. This was conducted at two levels. At the first level, project leaders, working with the CLD Area Officer and appropriate stakeholders, conducted evaluation of each of the initiatives that they were responsible for (i.e. the agency capacity building/knowledge exchange, outreach and street work, investigation/research and data analysis, open day, organisation building).

At the second level, the project leaders and the CLD Area Officer, meeting as a co-ordinating group, considered the outcomes that had resulted from the sum of the activities as a programme. They drew on the evidence of each of the elements of the programme and used this as the basis for an evaluative review of progress with all the stakeholders, conducted as part of the week 31 knowledge exchange event.

Evaluation of specific elements of the programme revealed mixed success and some unexpected outcomes. From the initial day seminar for agencies it became apparent that whilst the Northside Partnership was presenting a common commitment to an effective response, some staff of some agencies were reluctant to give the issues priority. Several who had been registered to attend did not do so or left the seminar early.

Resistance was mostly passive but it was felt that further actions could be undermined by lack of commitment. More direct challenge to the initiative also surfaced at the seminar with representatives of the community forum questioning why a specific initiative was being organised around the needs of newly arrived members of the community when problems affecting many long-standing community members remained unresolved.

The street work by the capacity building and youth work teams had been aided by good summer weather and both had been able to build up contacts. By being on the streets the workers had also become more aware of the tensions that were in evidence. Unexpectedly they had discovered that there were not only tensions between the indigenous and new communities but also different national groups within the refugee and asylum seeker communities.

They had also found that their contacts had more commonly been with men and boys than women and girls and feared that they were at risk of developing a partial understanding of community perspectives. Generally, however, the contacts had reinforced prior perceptions of the issues that the communities were experiencing (see needs section above).

Fortunately the weaknesses of the street work as a basis for understanding community needs were to a degree compensated for by an investigatory research project which proved more successful in reaching women in the communities. The research project had developed a simple questionnaire to be used in contacts with members of the new communities by agency front-line staff over the designated two week period. This focused on hopes, fears, positive and negative aspects of living in Northside.

Again the evidence reinforced the perceptions of the needs at the start of the programme (see needs section above). A significant additional feature of the evidence was a very high level of confusion about public service entitlements and how these are accessed. However it was acknowledged that the approach had been flawed because it required community members to be in touch with agencies for there to be opportunity to express themselves and it was already known that level of service take up was an issue.

Both the street-work and research project had revealed the frequency with which language was a barrier to effective communication and the difficulty of accessing interpretation at the point when it was needed. This difficulty was much greater for the refugee and asylum seeker community. Interpreting services were available but advance notice was needed and more spontaneous exchange was often very limited in scope. Children and young people often inadvertently became interpreters. Whilst in the informal street-based contact this was not of so much concern, for more formal contacts that involved discussion of more personal difficulties it was recognised as an important issue.

The street-work and research project had helped the open day to be widely publicised. All agencies had participated as planned. Those representing agencies demonstrated a strong commitment to the purpose of the event. Overall it was well attended with 350 people from the communities participating. 150 of them had participated in the 'world café' event which had produced further important insights into the needs of the new communities.

A positive but unanticipated aspect of the event was the opportunity it gave for agency staff to network with one another at an event where information about what services provided was on display. Agency participants frequently commented that they had learned much about the roles of other services and had made useful contacts that could enable more collaborative practice not just in relation to the target group for the event but in other areas of practice, for example, practical integration of children's services.

More negatively publicity for the event had elicited critical comments from some members of the wider community. Letters had been published in the Strathinver Post complaining of preferential treatment for migrants and lack of attention to the long-standing needs of Northside. One of the letters was signed by an office bearer of the Community Forum resulting in a counter response from another. It was clear that the initiative had created a split in the ranks of the forum that would need to be addressed.

Organisational development within the new communities of Northside had been fostered with the support of the CLD capacity building team. Three meetings had been held of an informal group of community representatives that was now in the process of constituting itself as a formal community organisation called 'Kune', the Esperanto word for together. The participants were mainly men from the refugee and asylum seeker communities though there was interest from all the newly arrived groups. The purpose of the group would be to address commonly experienced needs and promote a positive role in the community as a whole.

The issues identified from the various elements of the programme were presented at the partnership knowledge exchange event. Participants concluded that they had made reasonable progress in relation to the outcomes set for stage 1 (namely that needs and aspirations of new communities are known and used to inform planning by agencies and the new communities are organised and able to represent themselves effectively).

They felt that though their methods of engaging the community had not reached everyone, they had a much better understanding of the experience of these communities. However they had also learned a great deal about the difficulty they would have in making effective responses. These difficulties related to an emerging recognition of the need to improve professional skills, develop responsive and cultural sensitive practice and acquire new resources such as readily available interpreters.

However the need to do these things was not universally acknowledged. As a result some participants felt the responses of some agencies had revealed latent institutional racism, as well as discriminatory attitudes on the part of some staff. This was a significant source of tension.

The problem was also reflected in the wider community responses to the special initiative. While some of the negativity seemed to be overtly racist, it was widely recognised that the community as a whole had major problems that should not seem to be overshadowed by action to address the needs of a minority. It was agreed that much more attention needed to be given to a strategic approach that demonstrably addressed the overall needs of the community. Without this there was a fear that the initiative, far from promoting community cohesion, could actually undermine it. At the same time the majority view was that a more overtly anti-racist stance was required on the part of all agencies and groups in the community.

The emergence of Kune as a potential vehicle for the participation of the new communities was generally welcomed. Given the tensions in the community it was felt that support for its development needed to encourage links with existing mechanisms for community representation, especially the Community Forum.

The evaluation of progress at stage 1 led into a review by the Northside Partnership of the outcomes that were set for stages 2 and 3. All of these remained valid – indeed the need for them was reinforced. Elimination of racist behaviour remained central, however the assumption that racism was a community and not an agency problem had been challenged.

Developing the individual skills of community members through adult learning opportunities was still a priority and the need for specific skill development for emerging community leaders was apparent. The building of social capital remained an important concern but how far this should be treated as distinct from the social capital of Northside as a whole needed to be addressed.

Working links between the 'new' and 'old' communities of Northside remained a desirable outcome but the dimension of inter-community tension had become more apparent and would need to be addressed. The long term outcome of stage three that the new communities are: safe, healthy, socially cohesive, economically thriving and participating and contributing fully remained unchanged but there was emerging recognition that unless this was true for all members of the Northside community it would be unachievable for part of it. With this in mind the 'New' Communities Initiative would need to be developed in a much more integrated way with strategic regeneration of Northside as a whole.

With these issues in mind a new LEAP planning and evaluation cycle commenced.

5. Policy/strategic management level example

Building strong community infrastructure for Strathinver

The need (see LEAP manual section 2, part i)

Strathinver Council and its community planning partners, in line with the requirements of the relevant legislation and guidance, adopted a commitment to participation of communities in the planning and delivery of all services. In the conduct of this approach it became apparent that from the perspective of community participants the integration of support services to community and local voluntary organisations was not as effective as it could be.

The following problems were reported: duplication of roles between agencies; gaps in support in particular areas and to particular types of group; inconsistency in attitudes to the independent authority of community groups; lack of integration of budgets to provide most effective support; short-term funding strategies; need for more effective community engagement methods; poor overall co-ordination of activities; inconsistent and confused approach to capacity building.

The partners decided that a participatory review of policy and practice was needed that fully involved those that the services were intended to benefit. It was recognised that within Strathinver those agencies with the competences to conduct the review were also service providers. There were therefore potential issues relating to objectivity, especially if one organisation conducted the review.

They therefore chose to bring together a consortium of senior representatives of lead agencies who would plan and conduct the work involving representation from three city-wide community groups and employing external consultants. The lead officers were drawn from the Community Service department CLD team, the Chief Executive's department Community Planning and Regeneration division, the Strathinver Voluntary Action Council and the Strathinver Housing Association. Community representation was from the Strathinver Community Regeneration Forum, the Strathinver Community Care Forum and the Strathinver Tenants and Residents Federation.

Together they successfully applied for funding to enable them to conduct a review with the assistance of external consultants, who would facilitate community engagement and undertake desk research. The grant would be paid to the Voluntary Action Council which would employ the consultants.

Consideration was given to which services should provide support to local organisations, what forms this should take and how it could best be structured. Though ultimate decision-making authority in relation to recommendations from the review was retained by each agency, they would take advice from a procedure in which community organisations were at the heart and which was conducted collaboratively between statutory and voluntary sector agencies.

The stakeholders (see section 2, parts ii and iv)

In practice the initial stakeholders were the organising group. They comprised the agencies for which community support was a primary role and the three council-wide community representative structures. Though they were the initial stakeholders they were charged with developing a review process that would enable a wide range of others to be actively engaged. The wider stakeholders in the review potentially included all the agencies that provided or could provide supports to community and local voluntary organisations and all of those that used or could use the services on offer.

A range of other service providers was identified who either provided some community support as part of their wider functions or for whom such activity in Strathinver was part of commitment across a wider geographical area. The first group was made up of agencies that provide support that relates to their specific functions and responsibilities: NHS Strathinver (health improvement), Strathinver Police (crime prevention and community safety), Strathinver Fire Service (community safety) and from the council; Social Work (care services) and Housing (tenant involvement). The second group included two national voluntary organisations that have local community capacity building projects. All of these were potential stakeholders

The number of community organisations that could potentially have been considered stakeholders was uncertain as a complete mapping of such groups was not in place. Even if only those that were in membership of the Voluntary Action Council and those that had already had direct support from the agencies were concerned, there were over 250 local organisations with an active interest. These included neighbourhood community regeneration forums, tenants and residents associations, community enterprises, community arts and recreation groups, organisations of and for young people, older people, black and minority ethnic groups, health and care service users, and disabled people, amongst others. No single body represented all these interests. At the start they were all potential stakeholders and the review was open to their participation but not all of them chose to exercise their stake.

Though external consultants were to assist the review process they did not have a direct interest in the outcomes of the focus of the engagement and were not therefore stakeholders but facilitators.

Stakeholder analysis (see framework in section 2 part ii)

System Factor	Core Agency Partnership members (CLD, Community Planning, Vol Action, Housing Assoc.)	Core Community Partnership members (Regen Forum, Care Forum, Tenants and Residents Fed.)	Wider partners agency and community	Targets for change
Motivation	<p>More effective community support.</p> <p>More efficient use of support resources.</p> <p>Maximising benefits of role of community sector.</p> <p>Commitment to principles of vibrant civil society.</p> <p>Fulfilment of national and local policy objectives.</p>	<p>Increased capacity for the community sector.</p> <p>Improvement of support system e.g. sustainable funding, better community engagement.</p> <p>Greater influence for the community sector.</p> <p>Resolution of specific deficiencies of the support system.</p> <p>Commitment to the value of voluntary action.</p>	<p>Agency: Clarity about support systems.</p> <p>Synergy from collaborative planning.</p> <p>Integration of specific support schemes with wider programmes.</p> <p>Community: Access to appropriate sustainable support in a straightforward manner.</p>	<p>The primary targets for change were the core and wider partner agencies themselves. Motivation to resist change would therefore be internal to the members of the partnership and could come, for example, from fear of loss of control over resources, distrust of potential partners, negative attitudes to community empowerment.</p>
Capacity	<p>Skills, knowledge and experience of supporting the community sector, leading and conducting participatory policy reviews.</p> <p>Commitment of time and resources for the review process and employment of consultants.</p> <p>Previous positive experience of collaboration with partners.</p>	<p>Established experience of engagement with the agencies leading the review.</p> <p>Communication and negotiation skills.</p> <p>Strong networking relationships with range of groups in the community sector.</p> <p>Access to expenses to support participation.</p>	<p>Agency: Skills, knowledge and experience of specific aspects of community support.</p> <p>Established links through Community Planning.</p> <p>Community: Front line experience and knowledge.</p>	<p>Use of countervailing power or influence by senior staff or elected members to subvert the process.</p> <p>Token commitment to respond to recommendations.</p> <p>Unwillingness to release or share resources.</p> <p>Lack of staff commitment to culture of community partnership and participation.</p>
Opportunity	<p>Funding.</p> <p>Shared recognition between agencies of the need to address the issues.</p> <p>Willingness of lead community bodies to participate.</p> <p>Legislation and guidance emphasising importance of supporting community sector.</p>	<p>Commitment of partners to a participatory approach to the review.</p> <p>Chance to establish commitment to best practice.</p> <p>Use of National Standards for Community Engagement and other best practice guidance.</p>	<p>Agency and community: Specific policy guidance relating to community involvement.</p> <p>Community: Use of National Standards for Community Engagement and other best practice guidance.</p>	<p>Tight spending restrictions.</p> <p>Lack of binding legislation relating to performance in community support and engagement.</p>

Agreeing outcomes – the differences the stakeholders wanted to make (see LEAP manual section 3, parts i and ii and section 2, part ii)

The outcomes identified here reflect the reasons why the Community Planning Partnership supported a review and the initial visioning exercise conducted by the lead consortium. It was anticipated that as the review developed a wider range of stakeholders would become engaged and be able to influence its direction.

Outcomes were identified at two levels. Firstly the consortium was concerned that the review itself should result in a positive working relationship between the stakeholders that built up trust and capacity to work together effectively. However these outcomes were seen only as assisting the development of policy and practice that, once implemented, would lead to direct improvements in the conduct of support to community groups.

At this second level, the key outcomes sought were that community organisations in Strathinver should: be fully aware of the support and resources available to community groups; be able to access appropriate support and resources to enable them to contribute effectively to community well-being; be engaged effectively; experience a consistent and integrated approach from agencies; feel that their independence was respected and valued; be recognised for their substantial role in meeting the needs of and representing the communities of Strathinver.

The consortium identified an overarching outcome which was that support agencies would have developed the ability to maximise the role and potential of the community sector in Strathinver to the benefit of residents.

Outcomes and Outcome Indicators

<p>Outcomes</p> <p>First level</p> <p>The process of the review would establish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Trust between stakeholders. ○ Effective joint working relationships. <p>Second level</p> <p>Community organisations in Strathinver should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Be fully aware of the support and resources available to community groups. ○ Be able to access appropriate support and resources to enable them to contribute effectively to community well-being. ○ Be engaged effectively. ○ Experience a consistent and integrated approach from agencies. ○ Feel that their independence was respected and valued. ○ Be recognised for their substantial role in meeting the needs of and representing the communities of Strathinver. 	<p>Potential indicators:</p> <p>First level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased willingness to participate. ○ Confidence expressed by stakeholders about the conduct of joint work. ○ Willingness to address controversial issues and deal with them constructively and openly. <p>Second level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Records of level and appropriateness of requests for support. ○ Take-up of available support. ○ Satisfaction level with: funding application procedures; speed of grant assessment; level of funding; length of funding period; ease of monitoring and accountability procedures. ○ Satisfaction with accessibility and usefulness of capacity building support. ○ Satisfaction with collaboration between support agencies. ○ Celebration of the contribution of community groups. ○ Satisfaction with engagement methods and positive attitudes of elected members and officials towards community groups.
--	--

The action plan (see section 3, part iii)

The action plan developed by the consortium was in effect a LEAP plan for the conduct of community engagement relating to reviewing the support needs of the community sector and the way that partner agencies could most effectively respond to them.

They were already familiar with, and using, the National Standards for Community Engagement and prepared the plan in the light of the standards and best practice indicators. They recognised: that the plan would need to enable all the potential stakeholders to participate if they chose to do so; that appropriate supports would therefore need to be in place; that the methods would need to be varied, accessible and appropriate; that they would need to enable effective dialogue between the participants that was seen as relevant from all perspectives; that there would need to be attention to the quality of the information about the review, its conduct and the issues to be addressed; and that good means of feedback would be essential.

The consortium felt that the conduct of the review needed to be both in-depth and provide extensive opportunity for participation. They therefore adopted a variety of engagement methods. It was also recognised that the outcomes that had been identified would all be dependent on the development of an effective policy that was adopted and implemented by all relevant agencies. It was agreed that the review should not be rushed and it was therefore planned that it would be completed over a one year period with a further commitment to evaluate the impact of the resulting policy and practice changes one year later. The main elements of the plan were as follows:

Inputs/resources	Processes/methods	Outputs/specific actions	Time
The consortium lead members.	Recruitment.	The consortium will draw up a tender brief for the consultants and recruit.	Week 1-6
Community organisations.	Publicity.	Preparation, by the consortium, of a leaflet explaining the purpose and conduct of the review to be distributed to all known community organisations and inviting expressions of interest in participating.	Week 6
Support service providers.			
Funding.	Desk research.	Mapping by the consultants of the current funding programmes (level, purposes, eligibility conditions, application procedures, etc), capacity building and other supports provided by all agencies, statutory and voluntary, across Strathinver.	Week 10-16
External consultants.			
Meeting places and facilities.	Community engagement, action research and data analysis.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus groups to be conducted by the consultants in partnership with consortium lead members in each local community plan area (8) and on a partnership wide basis with thematic groups: youth, older people, LGBT, black and minority ethnic, disabled, health and care, tenants, environmental, transport (9). Focus groups to test knowledge of the current supports identified through the mapping, distil the positive and negative features of the support currently offered to community organisations and envision alternatives.. 2. 'Citizen's' jury to be formed consisting of one representative selected by the participants in each focus group. Jury to be serviced by the external consultants, and to draw on the focus group records to identify core areas for evidence gathering. Jury will have powers to call for evidence from all local services providers and from experts in funding and capacity building for the community sector. 	Week 20-28
	Report preparation and dissemination/ feedback.	Consultants to prepare interim report on findings of focus groups and jury and work with the consortium lead members to identify draft policy recommendations. Report to be prepared in accessible format.	Week 30-32
	Review event.	Strathinver community conference to be organised by consultants and consortium to enable broad based discussion between members of community organisations, voluntary and statutory agencies and elected members.	Week 33-35
	Policy proposals.	Final report with formal policy recommendations to be prepared by the consortium for consideration by the Strathinver Community Planning Partnership Board and the individual partners.	Week 40
	Co-ordination and monitoring and evaluation of policy implementation.	Providing a satisfactory policy proposal is prepared that is adopted by all partners, the consortium lead group will establish a monitoring system for the implementation process and evaluate its impact through a survey and recall community conference.	Week 40-46

Strathnaver community support review: plan in brief

How will we go about it?		
What resources will we use?	What methods will we use?	What actions will we take?
The consortium lead members	Recruitment Publicity	Tender brief Leaflet
Community organisations	Desk research	Mapping of support services to community groups
Support service providers	Community engagement, action research and data analysis	Focus groups
Funding from Communities Scotland	Report preparation and dissemination	Citizen's jury
External consultants	Review event	Interim report
Meeting places and facilities	Policy proposals Implementation monitoring	Community conference Final report and policy recommendations Monitoring and evaluation system



Monitoring (see LEAP manual section 3, part iv)

The purpose of establishing a consortium approach to the conduct of the review was to ensure that there was a core group who could co-ordinate the involvement of all the key stakeholders in IT and in debate about the findings of the review. However it was agreed that it was desirable that a named individual should be designated the co-ordinator for the review process.

It was agreed that the Director for the Voluntary Action Council (VAC) should play this role. This reflected recognition of well established contacts with all service providers and extensive networks within the community sector. Given the employment of the external consultants through the VAC the director was also seen as the operational manager for the consultancy. However the partnership basis of the review required a regular cycle of progress monitoring meetings. Eight were scheduled on a six-weekly basis to be convened by the VAC director. The option of further co-ordinating meetings at critical stages was retained.

Evaluation (see section 3, part v and section 2, part v)

Whilst they were able to review satisfaction with engagement in the policy review through feedback from participants at the completion of each element of the process, the consortium recognised that the second level outcomes that were sought could only be tested once the new policy was established and implemented. This evaluation of impact was accomplished by a survey of perceptions of all the community groups and agencies of how well the process was working and a stakeholder conference held one year after the new policy was established. A special meeting of the consortium was held at the end of year two to review and evaluate the whole process and consider what might now need to be done.

In terms of the process of the review the varied participatory approach was particularly welcomed by the community organisations. They also welcomed the key lead role played by the voluntary sector in the process and the use of independent consultants who were not associated with any of the support agencies. Over 100 community groups and a total of 180 individuals directly contributed to focus groups and, though this was felt to be satisfactory, concern was felt that this still represented a minority of known community groups.

The citizen's jury process had been particularly influential with positive feedback from jury members and witnesses about: the process of selection of jury members; the opportunity for in-depth exploration of options; the chance to draw on knowledge and experience from outside as well as within Strathinver. An unexpected outcome of the jury process was that members wanted to continue to play a monitoring role to follow through the response made to their proposals.

While this was potentially beneficial it also raised some tensions with the members of the existing representative structures for community groups across Strathinver who felt that their roles were being usurped and that the jury was not properly accountable. The use of a community conference to critically examine the ideas emerging for the jury was seen as valuable.

Agencies were positive about the quality and realism of the proposals that emerged but community representatives complained that the deliberations of the Community Planning Partnership board were protracted and not always transparent, often seeming to be conducted beyond public scrutiny of the community and voluntary sector representatives. Thus whilst trust and confidence had been built up through the process of the review, at the final stage it was to some degree undermined by the way that the community planning partners dealt with it.

The policy that emerged from the process involved the establishment of:

- An integrated community engagement strategy including establishing a new civic forum representing all neighbourhoods and interest communities that would act as the primary mechanism for partnership wide engagement with community organisations.
- An integrated community capacity building strategy.
- An agreement by partners to report to the partnership on all financial support to community organisations.
- The establishment of common procedures and requirements for applications for grants.
- A common protocol for the assessment of grant applications.
- A common protocol between agencies relating to terms and condition of funding to community groups, including a commitment, when funding local groups to provide services, to move, wherever possible, to a three year funding cycle with a review built in at the end of year two.
- The establishment of an annual awards scheme to celebrate the most successful and innovative community initiatives.

To facilitate the implementation of these changes the core support agencies that had formed the consortium for the review (alongside representatives of the three Strathinver-wide community groups) agreed to contribute, through staff secondments, to the establishment of a community support unit to be managed by the partnership and located within the Chief Executive's department. All partners agreed to work with this unit. The unit was set up to:

- Establish and support the new Civic Forum.
- Co-ordinate and monitor the conduct of all formal engagement between service providers and community groups (including a calendar of engagement activity and supporting collaboration in areas of common interest).
- Provide capacity building support for community engagement to agencies and community groups.
- Monitor the overall demand for and allocation of support resources to community groups.

-
- Monitor allocation of resources by neighbourhood, in line with indicators of need used in establishing Regeneration Outcome Agreements.
 - Monitor allocation of resources by interest community.
 - Monitor the application the agreed protocol between agencies relating to terms and condition of funding to community groups.
 - Manage the awards scheme.
 - Assess the experience of community organisations of the new policy.
 - Report to the Community Planning Partnership on performance and make recommendations for further policy and practice changes.

In terms of the second level outcomes it was believed that these initiatives would have significant impact on the quality and effectiveness of community support. The assessment at the end of the year, conducted by the consortium, identified the following headlines:

- Significant improvement in the co-ordination of funding to community organisations.
- More coherence in the conduct of community engagement but some difficulty establishing the relationship between the civic forum and other Strathinver wide community structures.
- Need to extend the capacity building support to agencies to establish confident and skilled engagement practice.
- Need to focus capacity building for community leaders on those that were now involved in the increasingly complex procedures.
- Satisfaction among community groups that the support processes were becoming more transparent and particularly that the complexities of different funding streams and procedures had been reduced.
- Concern that the complexity of the task, and the propensity of agencies to operate without taking account of the need to work collaboratively, had been underestimated.
- Concern that whilst the unit had a co-ordinating role it lacked the authority to hold partners to account.

With these issues in mind the newly formed community support unit facilitated a new LEAP visioning and planning exercise with the board of the Strathinver Community Planning Partnership.

Appendix 1:

Outcomes of CLD from 'Delivering Change' (Learning Connections, 2006)

CLD IS ABOUT PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

1. CLD supports people to become **confident individuals**.

Through being involved in CLD adults and young people:

- 1.1 Are more confident.
- 1.2 Feel better about themselves (increased self-esteem).
- 1.3 Expect to achieve more.
- 1.4 Are more able to do things for themselves.
- 1.5 Are more able to take responsibility for themselves and their actions.
- 1.6 Are more able to understand and discuss their own values and beliefs.
- 1.7 Are more able to understand and discuss their needs and aspirations.

2. CLD supports people to become **effective contributors**.

Through being involved in CLD adults and young people are more able to:

- 2.1 Communicate with other people.
- 2.2 Solve problems and make decisions.
- 2.3 Work with others.
- 2.4 Form and develop good relationships.
- 2.5 Use their skills and experience to support and lead others.

3. CLD supports people to become **responsible citizens**.

Through being involved in CLD adults and young people are:

- 3.1 More able to discuss and understand complex issues that affect their community, society and the wider world.
- 3.2 More able to plan and take action on issues for their community, society and the wider world.
- 3.3 More able to make sure that their views and opinions are heard and taken on board.
- 3.4 More aware and understanding of different people's experiences, abilities, backgrounds and beliefs.
- 3.5 Better able to get on with people with different experiences, abilities, backgrounds and beliefs.

4. CLD supports people to become **successful learners**.

Through being involved in CLD adults and young people:

- 4.1 Have more belief in their ability to learn.
- 4.2 Are more motivated to learn.
- 4.3 Are more able to identify and understand what they need and want to learn.
- 4.4 Understand different ways to learn.
- 4.5 Are more able to choose ways of learning that suit them in different situations.
- 4.6 Are more able to take control of how and what they learn
- 4.7 Are more able to share their learning with others.
- 4.8 Are more able to use what they have learned in different situations in their lives.
- 4.9 Are more able to use ICT (e.g. computers).
- 4.10 Are more able to use their skills with numbers.

CLD IS ABOUT BUILDING COMMUNITY CAPACITY

1. CLD supports people to be **confident, skilled** and **active community members**.

Through involvement in CLD, adults and young people:

- 1.1 Are more confident about working with others in their community.
- 1.2 Have more skills and knowledge they can use in their community.
- 1.3 Are more able to use what they have learned in different situations in their community.
- 1.4 Are more able to see how things in their community can change for the better.

2. CLD supports communities to be **active** and **influential**.

Through involvement in CLD, adults and young people are more able to:

- 2.1 Make links with others in their community and build working relationships with them.
- 2.2 Take action together on the issues that are important to them.

And community organisations:

- 2.3 Have more influence on the issues that are important to them.

3. CLD supports community organisations to be **resourced** and to **deliver services effectively**.

Through support from CLD, community organisations become more able to:

- 3.1 Access resources (like meeting places, equipment and money) that allow them to work on the issues they think are important.
- 3.2 Control assets that allow them to work on the issues they think are important.
- 3.3 Deliver services directly, where that's the most appropriate way of addressing an issue they think is important.

4. CLD supports effective **planning, management** and **evaluation** by community organisations.

Through support from CLD, community organisations are more able to:

- 4.1 Find out about and understand issues for the community.
- 4.2 Develop a plan of action on issues identified by the community.
- 4.3 Manage themselves well.
- 4.4 Learn lessons from what they do and act on them.

5. CLD supports the development of **inclusive** community organisations

Through support from CLD, community organisations:

- 5.1 Are more aware of different cultures, backgrounds and beliefs within their community.
- 5.2 Value and use the positive contributions of people with a wide range of experiences, abilities, backgrounds and beliefs.
- 5.3 Are more able to work well with other organisations representing people with different experiences, abilities, backgrounds and beliefs.

6. CLD supports **productive networks** and **relationships**

Through support from CLD, community organisations are more able to:

- 6.1 Make links with organisations from other communities and build working relationships with them.
- 6.2 Develop and keep working relationships with other organisations and services in their area

Wider Outcomes of CLD

Outcomes related to economic activity and employment

These might include:

- Improved employability;
- Increased levels of employment;
- Improved labour market position (e.g. getting a better paid or more skilled job);
- Increased levels of activity in the social economy; and
- Increased entrepreneurial and enterprising attitudes.

Outcomes related to learning and education

These might include:

- Improved performance at school;
- Reduced levels of truancy and exclusion; and
- Increased participation and progression in lifelong learning, including to further/higher education.

Outcomes related to democratic participation and engagement

These might include:

- Increased and more inclusive participation in democratic processes; and
- Improved engagement between democratic representatives and communities.

Outcomes related to health

These might include:

- Improved health;
- Higher levels of physical activity; and,
- Improved support being available to community members.

Other wider outcomes of CLD

In addition to these, there are a range of other areas where the **end outcomes** of CLD can also be important. These include:

- **Outcomes related to community safety** such as reduced crime or fear of crime (including anti-social behaviour).
- **Outcomes related to community cohesion and inclusion** such as decreased discrimination and increased celebration of identity and diversity.
- **Outcomes related to artistic, sporting and cultural participation.**
- **Outcomes related to the physical and natural environment.**



**The Scottish
Government**

© Crown copyright 2007

This document is also available on the Scottish Government
website: www.scotland.gov.uk

This document is available in alternative formats on request

RR Donnelley B52956 11/07

Further copies are available from
Blackwell's Bookshop
53 South Bridge
Edinburgh
EH1 1YS

Telephone orders and enquiries
0131 622 8283 or 0131 622 8258

Fax orders
0131 557 8149

Email orders
business.edinburgh@blackwell.co.uk

w w w . s c o t l a n d . g o v . u k