

# **Edinburgh Regeneration Outcome Agreement**

**Annual Report 2005/06**

**June 2006**

(Formally approved November 2006)



## Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
1.0 Update of the ROA - Strategic Overview .....	5
2.0 Overview of progress on achieving outcomes .....	9
3.0 Main challenges for 2006/07 .....	16
4.0 Community Engagement.....	21
5.0 Partnership Working.....	25
6.0 Progress on aspects of the ROA highlighted for improvement ..	30
7.0 Financial Commentary.....	32
8.0 Examples of good practice.....	36
9.0 Constraints.....	38
Template 1.1 .....	40
Strong and Safe Communities (ROA Ref 1) .....	40
People into Work (ROA Ref- 2) .....	43
Improving Health (ROA Ref- 3) .....	45
Engaging young people (ROA Ref- 4) .....	46
Raising Educational Attainment (ROA Ref- 5) .....	48
Template 2.1 Community Engagement Assessment.....	50
Template 2.2 Community Engagement Action Plan .....	52
Template 3.1 National Community Regeneration Priorities – CRF Activity Relationships.....	56
Template 4b Detail of Planned CRF Expenditure .....	60
APPENDIX ONE- EXAMPLES OF CRF FUNDED COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT .....	74
APPENDIX TWO - EQUALITIES.....	78

## Executive Summary

This is the first annual report on the Edinburgh Community Planning Partnership's Regeneration Outcome Agreement. It uses a wide range of data to lay out a comprehensive picture of progress against the agreed outcomes and targets, highlighting achievements and difficulties encountered in the process. The management data is summarised in the accompanying templates for ease of reference and, overall, the format and content of this document broadly reflects the guidance received from Communities Scotland in 2005 on the required presentation for annual reports.

Section One below gives a high level overview of the year outlining contextual changes which have or will impact on outcomes whilst the import all of the statistics and data sets currently available is articulated in Section Two which describes the position in respect of each of the national priorities. Some changes are positive, some less so. Differences are also noted in respect of overall city performance and that of the ROA areas. Template 1 presents the statistics overall highlighting the main changes.

The remainder of the report considers the city's major challenges for the coming years and what plans are in place or needed to meet them, the degree and nature of community involvement in decision making processes and how joint working is developing. Best practice examples and a summary of the CRF spending pattern for the city round off the report.

### **Messages from the data**

For the ROA areas the data suggests improvements can be seen in the following:

- access to bank accounts,
- some types of crime,
- the number of children in workless households,
- the number of mothers breastfeeding,
- teenage pregnancies,
- admissions to hospital for coronary heart disease,
- proportion of school leavers going to higher education and
- improvement in some of the attainment data at primary and secondary school,
- staying on rates post 16.
- young people's engagement and participation in their community and in sport (in at least one area) and the fact that the focus areas outperform the city as a whole.

Although these are encouraging in other areas of activity there is cause for some concern, for instance the situations relating to;

- crimes that can be linked to anti-social behaviour;
- deaths related to drugs in the city as a whole;
- the unemployment rate,
- the number of school leavers not in education, employment or training;

- mothers smoking whilst pregnant;
- hospital admissions for treatment for cancer;
- school leavers going on to further education, and
- primary school attainment in some subjects and for some age groups.

These have all worsened according to the data.

### **Review Process**

This report is a key stage in a rolling process of evidence gathering, analysis, review and implementation which began under the previous Social Justice framework. Where the key indicators suggest the need for action then the main delivery partners are asked to consider the findings and consider what can and should be done to counteract difficulties. This process is underway now, reflecting this year's data position and changes made as a result will feature, alongside impact analysis where available, in the next review.

### **Case Studies**

Looking at statistics only presents part of the story and much of the narrative in this report highlights projects and initiatives that are already working to tackle these issues. Some are large with significant direct impact on the targets of the ROA (Prevention 2010 for instance). Others will support the ROA aims through more indirect means (the Risk Factory). These project outlines help describe and reflect the range and scope of the programme that support the ROA objectives. Consideration is given to both mainstream and CRF funded projects that are working in specific local geographies and this will be returned to later in the year.

Some these initiatives are highlighted in text boxes throughout the report, these feature activities where there are clear links to outcome changes and some of the new services or service changes adopted in order to address specific difficulties. Case studies featured cover everything from community engagement to childcare.

The later sections on Partnership Working and Community Engagement do not fully reflect the range of activities and structures that exist in the city and in the local areas to support both these aims, but constraints of space limit what we can discuss in this report.

## 1.0 Update of the ROA - Strategic Overview

Although changes in the overall economic and social context within which the CPP seeks to deliver the ROA happen almost daily, be it at local or macro level, there are four key developments worth highlighting in this section:

- Changes within the structure of the City of Edinburgh Council;
- The no vote to stock transfer vote returned by LA tenants;
- The development of Community Health Partnerships; and
- Proposed changes in the monitoring and evaluation of the programme.

In addition there are a number of benefits that will be generated from the strategic development areas in the city and the final paragraphs of this section looks at linking opportunities with the needs of local communities.

### **Council Restructuring**

Over the last year, significant structural changes have been implemented across the City of Edinburgh Council. Children and Families combines the education service with those previously social work functions relating to children and young people. Health and Social Care takes on responsibility for adult focused social work alongside some direct health provision and planning. For regeneration outcomes these changes should have a positive impact as it should make partnership working easier with greater client focus. Whilst this positive impact on the ROA will show in the long term, more recently this has been a time of transition as the new departments are established.

In terms of governance and SIP transition after a long period of gestation the geography and structure of local Community Planning Partnerships has been established. This recognises the existence and experience of SIPs where they have been active and allows for their full integration into the wider planning and delivery efforts of the new partnerships. Issues around the representation of community interests within the new structures have been addressed and a flexible model allowing representation through structures other than Community Councils agreed where desired locally. Management and support of local community planning comes within the new Services for Communities grouping.

### **Stock Transfer**

The vote against the stock transfer, although positive in its reflection of the popularity of the existing service and of the strength of community engagement and the influence that can have on policy, does mean that the proposed physical improvements will have to be revisited. The initial resource plan was predicated on transfer. Fundamental policy and programme review is currently in process. Work is now ongoing to develop a delivery plan to bring all the stock up to Scottish Housing Quality Standard by 2015. Part of this work will be to find a solution for stock in some or the target areas where the stock is of such a built form that it cannot be physically or financially brought up to a decent standard.

The original publicly funded early action programme continues apace with critical support from private sector partners in the development of sites with a mix of housing through the affordable housing policy and the development of private sector leasing schemes to provide accommodation for homeless households.

### **Community Health Partnerships**

Over the course of 2005/06 the health priorities of the Community Health Partnerships have settled and now clearly reflect the themes of the ROA. We now have specific locally relevant health targets, but perhaps more important is the impact of Community Health Partnerships themselves and their capacity and willingness to take on board the existing health inequality work supported by the SIPs and latterly by the CRF. The level and quality of partnership working across all five key themes is likely to be improved by this settling of the health delivery structure for the city and the clearer definition of a health inequalities programme which has been achieved. Major instances of collaborative working between health and employment, housing, education and other key community impact services are already evident and this trend is set to continue.

### **Monitoring and evaluation**

Currently CRF projects are monitored annually through Self Monitoring Annual Reports. These are used mainly at local level to provide a picture of activity and outputs achieved to inform funding decisions made in the autumn for the next financial year.

This initial ROA report and process focuses mainly on outcomes. There is no in depth examination of the 200 or so projects funded by the CRF and associated mainstream activity. This is something that is carried, out to an extent, by the local partnerships although any evaluation activity tends to relate directly to immediate funding decisions. Any locally generated reports on projects will be taken into account in the mid year update.

Taken together these two current levels of monitoring do not provide a sufficient understanding of the connections between activity, whether CRF funded or mainstream, and outcomes. Whilst the SMAR approach is a cost effective way to gather broad headline figures for a projects outputs, they are not precise enough to allow us to see in detail what differences the interventions and support from projects have made to the life of an individual. This year CCP will instigate an evaluation programme in partnership with local and strategic partners covering, over the period of the ROA, all projects funded through CRF. This will be a client/user research based programme akin to that piloted in 2005/06 for the West Edinburgh LCPP

### **CRF Monitoring and Allocation**

As can be seen in Template 4b CRF funding is contributing to a range of activities across the 5 themes. This template reflects all of the funds allocated as of June 2006. Given the local focus of the Edinburgh ROA and the strong commitment to community engagement through participation in funding decisions, it is appropriate that not all funds have been allocated for the life of the ROA. This reflects the fact that the local funding panels, in which community engagement is central, often wish to see evidence of success in the early years prior to allocating funds for subsequent years. These can be updated as allocations are made in year.

## **Linking Opportunity and Need**

Edinburgh's extensive private and public sector development programmes afford a range of opportunities to link opportunity and need and capture social benefits from physical regeneration activity.

Edinburgh's Waterfront developments, taken together, represent the most extensive current development programme anywhere in Scotland. The Waterfront Recruitment Centre is now in place and beginning to have effect at day to day operational level. Over 200 job placements have been achieved since its opening but the major benefits lie ahead. As the pace of development begins to pick up the WRC now has the development capacity to properly structure an advance planning process linking training and recruitment activity directly to specific development activity as and when the development timetable is known. An example of this is the discussions already in place with Morrisons for the construction phase and agreement on the end use phase with up to 3-400 jobs potentially available for local sourcing. Operational delivery on this will be through an active partnership involving at core JCP, the Retail Academy and WRC directly. This is the type of engagement which will characterise WRC's future operation.

Currently in North Edinburgh there are active discussions with the three owner/developers operating at the Waterfront looking at agreeing an employment accord. The aim is that this will establish community benefit clauses in the working arrangements between developers and contractors and which focus on local people gaining access to employment.

The Waterfront Partnership is about to commission an economic impacts/benefits statement for all the Waterfront regeneration work. This should be completed in November and, once complete, will inform a review of all the social and economic objectives/targets to be derived locally and to Edinburgh more widely.

Similar arrangements are already in place in Craigmillar where the aim is to exploit the massive extension at the Fort Retail Park. In this case the Retail Academy, local intermediary and JCP are lining up the delivery arrangements. The Partnership has been developing with PARC and CEC City Development an agreement to implement and fund an effective Business and Labour Charter. The purpose will be to ensure that all reasonable endeavours are made by building contractors to employ local labour and local sub-contractors. PARC is establishing an apprenticeship scheme and has placed three young people in professional jobs with contractors working on their developments. An active local partnership with contractors on the Queen Margaret University site in Musselburgh has provided employment opportunities for residents of Craigmillar. Worktrack have established excellent relationships with the two main contractors working on the site and with JCP have placed a recruitment cabin on site. They also run a construction passport course as a first step to working on a construction site.

In January 2006 142 Craigmillar residents were employed at ERI and CRF funded projects continue to work with the hospital to develop the skills needed which will allow Craigmillar residents to take advantage of the opportunities available.

These proactive approaches linking opportunity and need in both the North and East of the city will deliver better local (and city level) outcomes throughout the development periods. There remain a number of issues and barriers to maximum exploitation which can be addressed through partnership action. These, along with related action points are considered below

#### Issues and Barriers

An issue remains around a lack of local employment in some of the construction work, particularly in North Edinburgh and the qualifications barriers to the industry. Adaptation of some of the approaches in Craigmillar and elsewhere in Scotland would help, the requirement overall is for ;

- More and better training for local young people to overcome the qualifications barriers to the industry.

A major perceived issue in North Edinburgh is an apparent lack of connection in the Waterfront programme between aspects of the development, planning, training and job matching processes. To counter this there is a need to;

- Establish processes which routinely brings these interests together. This can, to a great extent, be through the existing WRC which, in particular should be the route for bringing together the existing forward planning and job matching functions with the training resource which is within the college
- Further development in particular of the Waterfront partnership which may help raise the bar on procurement and in meeting the needs of the various communities served by the development

A common barrier to progress in each area is the perception that amongst the client group there are a low level of skills and qualifications. To get more information on this qualitative research into the dynamics of the local labour markets of Craigmillar and North Edinburgh is being undertaken local labour markets to identify any remaining supply side restraints. This is in hand through CCP and should influence programme provision once available.

Further extension and development of active in school vocational programmes would also be useful in developing skills amongst this client group.

## 2.0 Overview of progress on achieving outcomes

### Messages from the data

This section outlines what the evidence says about progress against the targets set when the ROA was adopted. The summaries below take each national priority in turn. This is an imperfect process in that there are still some major data issues which have not been resolved and these are detailed at the end of this section. For Edinburgh this process flows on from the social justice indicators monitoring which has been undertaken in a continuous series since 2001. For this reason and, in many cases because of data availability problems, some of the baseline precedes the ROA specific timeframe. Wherever possible both absolute and relative (Closing the Gap) progress is reported. A full description of the evidence across all of the themes is summarised at Template 1.

### 2.1. Strong Safe Communities

This is the most diverse of the regeneration themes reflecting community safety, financial inclusion, housing and community satisfaction.

#### Housing indicators

In terms of resident satisfaction the data for the city as a whole shows that satisfaction with their own neighbourhood was high in 1999/2000 and had increased by 2% by 2003/04. Whilst the data for the focus areas of the ROA does not illustrate the same improvement, at 74% it still indicates that three quarters of residents were satisfied with their local area as a place to live (**Outcome 1a, pg 40**)

In terms of house prices the gap has increased between an average price in the city and an average price in focus areas (**Outcome 1b, pg 40**). Between 2004 and 2005 house prices in the regeneration areas fell (from £94,992 to £86,700). Although the price differential is increased, this should make house purchase more affordable in the focus areas in 2005 than was the case in 2004. For context the price variation is much less dramatic at ward level, suggesting that small numbers of transactions are disproportionately affecting rates.

#### Financial inclusion

Financial inclusion indicators show progress although there is a data time lag. There were fewer people without access to a bank or building society accounts by 2003/04 than had been the case in 1999/2000. For Edinburgh the percentage without access to accounts which was 8.8% in 1999/2000 had fallen to 6.5% in 2003/04 (**Outcome 1c, pg 41**). In the target areas the percentage without access to accounts was 21.1% in 1999/2000 and this had fallen to 14.6% in 2003/04. Although the target appears to have already been met for the focus areas it would be wise to wait for the results of the next survey (2005/06) to confirm this.

### Community safety

Overall, crime rates for the city have fallen slightly and they have also fallen in the regeneration areas (**Outcome 1d, pp41-42**).

In terms of minor, serious and indecent assaults the focus areas have seen a fall of around 3.5% in the rate (from 26.51 per 1,000 to 25.56 per 1,000). In the city as a whole a fall of just under 1% can be seen with the rate in 2004 of 17.36 falling to 17.24 crimes per 1,000 people.

For crimes of violence, again it is in the target areas where the greatest improvement can be seen. Here the rate has fallen from 30.67 per 1,000 in 2004 to 28.96 per 1,000 in 2005 (a fall of 5.6% in the rate). In terms of the city as a whole there is again a fall, but not the same extent (fallen from 19.71 in 2004 to 19.24 in 2005).

The rate of housebreaking has fallen in the target areas, year on year by almost 20% (from 8.68 per 1,000 in 2004 to 7.09 in 2005) compared to an increase for the city as a whole (from 4.88 per 1,000 in 2004 to 5.55 per 1,000 in 2005).

Overall, although it is only one year in, there is clear evidence of the gap being closed in that the incidence of those types of crimes identified by the community safety partnership as priorities appear to be falling in the areas in which CRF money is being spent. Less positive is the incidence of crimes that broadly reflecting anti-social behaviour which in the focus areas has increased from 38.06 per 1,000 in 2004 to 44.58 per 1,000 in 2005).

On the other hand, for accidental dwelling fires the data shows that for Edinburgh, between 2003/04 and 2004/05 there was a 2.2% fall (from 688 fires to 673). In terms of secondary fires – the type of fire that could be seen as being anti-social behaviour – the fall is more dramatic at 42.5% from 3,973 reported in 2003/04 to 2,283 reported in 2004/05. Again this is only one year's data but if this trend continues and consolidates the targets look to be on course to being met.

## **2.2 People Into Work**

### Unemployment

Under this heading 8 data sets are used to track progress. The main underlying one concerns unemployment and here the goal is to reduce the gap between the city as a whole and the target areas by 20% by 2008. In 2004 the gap between the city and the 61 data zones was 4.38%. As of June 2006 information is given for the 12 focus wards rather than the 61 DZs as this has yet to be posted on the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics site. From this we can see that for the city as a whole there has been an increase in the unemployment rate from 2.4% to 2.5%. For the 12 focus wards the rate increased from 4.73% to 4.98%<sup>1</sup>. The gap (in terms of unemployment) has increased slightly between the focus areas and the city as a whole, however the increase is minor and relates to ward geography only. (**Outcome 2a, pg 43**)

---

<sup>1</sup> This is based on data from City Development and is comparing March 2005 to March 2006.

The Jobs Strategy group are currently considering and researching the apparent levelling off of reductions in two key areas and will report on trend and action in the course of 2006/07.

#### Economic activity

The percentage of the working age population who are economically active has, according to the data available, increased by 2.4% since the 2001 census (**Outcome 2b, pg. 43**). According to the data for 2005 the target set has already been met. There are some doubts about the degree of accuracy of the relevant data so it would be prudent to say that *indications* are that economic activity in the city is improving but further data is required. Whilst we have baseline data for the target areas we as yet have no update information available in which to monitor progress. Targets will be reviewed once confirmative data is available at both levels.

DWP data on children in workless households suggests that there has been a fall in the proportion of JSA claimants with dependents. Encouragingly, this fall is more marked in the 61 target data zones than in the city as a whole. It is still only one year into the ROA and the change (**Outcome 2c, pg 43**) although encouraging, is still small – a 0.4% improvement in the city as a whole and a 1% improvement in the 61 focus data zones. Over time more information may become available as the client focused monitoring approach discussed in the summary and in more detail later in this report develops. SMARS do not show the family composition of beneficiaries whereas client focussed reporting will.

#### **Joined Up For Jobs (Outcome 2, pp. 43-44).**

‘Joined up for Jobs’ is Edinburgh’s long standing employability framework, one that operates in the ROA geographies through intermediaries but also targets vulnerable groups, who are exactly those difficult to reach groups highlighted in the Executive’s recently published *Workforce Plus an Employability Framework for Scotland*

This, like the UK level *City Strategy Initiative*, seeks to engender practice across the country which is, in essence, similar to that existing under JU4J.

Last year’s outputs include 928 clients of the four CCP funded area intermediaries with positive outcomes – mostly directly into employment

Major trends already affecting, or likely to affect, outcomes in respect of unemployment and economic activity include;

- Mainstream resource shifts away from the city in terms of the New Deals and Scottish Enterprise’s national programmes
- The impending loss of key ESF funds which tend to support the more in depth client focussed employability support required with the Edinburgh target groups
- The highly visible increase in numbers of accession state migrants with skills and aptitudes for work. There is undoubtedly a squeeze on entry level jobs evident from this source which cannot but have an impact on a demand led strategy

#### The NEET Group

The city has increasing numbers of school leavers not in education, employment or training. In 2003/4 in the city as a whole 19.4% of school leavers were within this NEET group. In 2004/05 the figure was 22.5%, a 3.1% increase. In the target areas the 2003/04 figure was 25.3% and the 2004/05 figure was 27.9%, an increase of 2.6%. The target for 2008 is 17% and 20% respectively so clearly the trend is in the wrong direction (**Outcome 2d, pg 44**) This is the second annual rise and, as will be

seen later in this report, a number of additional initiatives have already been developed to tackle this particular issue. The Edinburgh position reflects the national picture on this and our anxiety about, and focus on, this issue is shared by the Executive. Some of the national measures announced in June 2006 will impact positively on the Edinburgh position and complement measures already in place as a result of last year's local review based on previous deterioration in the figures.

### 2.3 Improving Health

For Improving Health we monitor seven indicators. As can be in the template below much of the data predates the ROA. On the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics site, for health data at small areas the most recent data (as at June 2006) is from 2004. As more up to date information becomes available this table will be updated. What data is available highlights that between 2003 and 2004 there were improvements in the health of the city as reflected by the selected indicators and some evidence of health gaps closing. For instance the rate of emergency admissions for under 15 year olds had fallen by 2.3% in the focus data zones (from 7,523 cases per 100,000 people to 7,349 cases per 100,000) and had increased very slightly (0.3%) in the city as a whole (from 5,150 cases per 100,000 to 5,170 cases per 100,000) (**Outcome 3a, pg 45**).

Similarly we can see an increase in the rates of breastfeeding in the target areas with 4.4% more mother's breastfeeding in 2004 (27.43%) than was the case in 2003 (23.08%), - well above target. Edinburgh as a whole had a very high level to start with and this increased slightly between 2003 and 2004 - 55.76% increased to 55.95% (**Outcome 3a, pg 45**).

Most encouraging of all the health improvements is the fall in the rate of admission to hospital due to Coronary Heart Disease. In the city as a whole the admission rate fell by 7% (from 284 cases per 100,000 in 2003 to 264 cases per 100,000 in 2004) and in the focus data zones the rate fell by 21.6% (from 660 per 100,000 in 2003 to 517 per 100,000 in 2004) (**Outcome 3a, pg 45**).

#### Integration of Health Inequalities into the ROA (**Outcome 3a, pg 45**)

As noted elsewhere there have been encouraging improvements in partnership working as the Community Health Partnerships have become established and this will continue. The local impact of the 2010 project will begin to be felt in ROA areas over the course of this year - In total £1million is available through Prevention 2010 and an additional £400,000 through related smoking cessation support. The additional resources are to be targeted at 4 clusters of medical practices that work with the population located in the 61 data zones. The focus is on cardiovascular disease and interventions that will make the greatest difference to health outcomes in the short term. Early indications of impact will feature in the 2006-07 report.

As with other data discussed these are only one year's statistics and we should wait to see if outcomes data from 2005 continues to reflect these positive movements. As it stands however progress is being made towards the targets outlined in the template below. A new factor to consider in forthcoming reports will be the effect of the implementation of Prevention 2010 (see below). This may result in an increase short term in CHD admissions as medical practitioners actively seek out people at risk of

CHD, and this may result in individuals who would have had their CHD undiscovered in the short term being diagnosed and then supported. Essentially in the short term the number of *admissions* may increase, but in the long term the number of CHD *deaths* should reduce.

There has been some concern about the lack of fit between some local objectives and the higher level aggregate outcomes highlighted and recorded here in the ROA. Whilst, to an extent, this is the case across all of the key themes it is most evident here in Health Improvement, perhaps in part, because of the lack, up to now, of higher level and specific ROA timetabled targets and outcomes at city level. A one size fits all approach is rarely effective and there is room for a variety of approaches here, particularly where it is driven locally by community priorities. If, and this is unlikely from our current knowledge, there is an issue of CRF resource use feeding the wrong outcomes this will be flushed out in the more qualitative evaluation process outlined elsewhere in the report.

## 2.4 Engaging With Young People

Monitoring on this theme is reliant on data from surveys for all but one of the indicators and as such we are unlikely to be able to return to discuss progress till after 2007 and the completion of Viewfinder 3. What we can comment on at this stage is the differences between young people in the city as a whole and young people in the areas that the ROA focuses upon.

In terms of participation in arts activities young people from the focus areas were less likely to participate (53% versus 43%) (**Outcome 4b, pg 46**). Since the publication of this survey result, efforts have been made to greater involve young people in the Edinburgh Cultural Partnership and over 2006/07 they will play a part in setting their own targets for involvement. Actively engaging with the community that is young people is something which is covered elsewhere in this report.

**Outcome 4c (pg 46)** looks at participation in sports and physical activities and highlights that it is slightly higher amongst young people in the focus areas than in the city as a whole (69% v 67%). Perhaps the most interesting finding of the Viewfinder survey was in terms of young people's engagement (used as a proxy for confidence and self esteem but given the focus on community engagement interesting in its own right). For all four of the indicators chosen the Viewfinder survey found that young people in the focus areas were more engaged than young people in the city as a whole (**Outcome 4d, pg 46**).

## 2.5 Raising Educational Attainment

For raising educational attainment there are 12 indicators monitored. The data suggests some positive movements, but also some difficulties.

### Primary School

For primary school age children we monitor attainment at P3 and P7 for maths, reading and writing. Overall at the P3 level there is not much of a gap between the schools in the targets areas and Edinburgh as a whole in terms of maths. However

there is a pronounced gap in terms of attainment in reading and writing (**Outcome 5b, pg 48**).

For the city as a whole there have been positive improvements for maths at P3 and reading at P7. There has been no change for maths at P7 and writing at P7. There have been positive movements for the schools in the target areas for maths at P3 and P7 and reading and writing at P7 (**Outcome 5b, pg 48**).

#### **Early Intervention (Outcome 5b, pg 48)**

The Local Authority has invested in an early numeracy package for P1/2. Total Numeracy and Maths planners are available to all schools and in addition, staff who have been seconded to support school clusters have also focused on maths. All of these interventions are likely to have played a part in continuing improvements in maths.

More concerning are some falls in attainment recorded. Attainment for reading and writing at P3 for the target areas fell between 2003/04 and 2004/05 (for reading from 79% to 71% and for writing 78% to 71%) whilst for the city as a whole attainment fell in terms of reading and writing for P3 pupils (for reading from 87% to 83% and for writing from 86% to 82%). In terms of targets, as can be seen in the templates, some have been exceeded already, and although others look to be achievable by 2008 some targets are unlikely to be met on current trends (**Outcome 5b, pg 48**).

#### **Attainment amongst BME Pupils (Outcome 5, pg 48-49)**

Earlier in this report we identified the mixed results in terms of attainment at school. Children and Families Department have been monitoring attainment for ethnic minorities and found that BME pupils are attaining less well than their white peers. Although small in number (around 8% of the school roll) further research is being undertaken to identify factors affecting this underachievement and is an example of a focus on equalities combined with one of the key themes. Practically the research will include an examination of the level of English of newly arriving BME pupils. At the same time a principal teacher post will continue to be funded as part of the English as an Additional Language Service, with a particular focus on raising BME attainment. The Council recognise that there is a need to refine and improve the monitoring and interpretation of information about the attainment of BME pupils. To enhance this, and to improve access to provision work will be undertaken with Edinburgh University to investigate and report on access to early years services by BME families. An Equalities Impact Assessment for BME pupils has informed future work in this area.

#### Secondary Schools

Although attendance at primary school has remained static, at secondary schools both in the city as a whole and in the focus areas there has been an improvement and the targets set have already been met (2004/05 secondary attendance was 90% in Edinburgh and 86.4% in the focus areas) (**Outcome 5b, pg 48**).

Improvements in attendance are likely to have had an impact on the attainment. For secondary school students the focus is on the percentage of the S4 cohort who, by the end of S6, have attained 5 or more awards at SCQF level 4 or better. What this means is that whilst the 5-14 attainment and primary school data discussed above, is based on single year performance, the SCQF data is based on three year averages. This records what a pupil leaves school with, regardless of the year that they sat the qualification. Each individual school in the city had a target for 2005 as did the city as

a whole. In the city the target of 74% of pupils was exceeded with 75% obtaining 5 or more awards. Each of the focus schools also met their target, across the focus schools 60% of pupils achieved 5 or more awards at level 4 or better (against a target of 56%). New targets are currently being set.

### School leavers

The pattern of school leavers' entry to further and higher education is interesting. For FE there is less of a difference between the rate of participation of school leavers from the target areas and the city as a whole in 2004/05 than was the case in 2003/04, which is encouraging.

In 2003/04 27.8% of school leavers in the city and 18.7% of those from the target wards went on to higher education. In 2004/05 this had increased so that 29.7% went to higher education from the city as a whole and 21.6% from the focus areas- essentially the gap had closed by 1% even as overall rates increased. Less encouraging is the fact that, over the same period, the overall total number of pupils going on to FE has fallen. This is reflected in the increase in the NEET group discussed above (**Outcome 5a, pg 48**).

Participation in learning and educational attainment is the focus of the next CCP scrutiny session, and, as with other themes, the main service delivery partners have been asked to review key issues arising from the data, discuss the trends and the factors which may underpin them and advise on initiatives and programmes already in place or planned which will address these. Outline information from this can be considered in the Autumn review.

## **2.6 Data Issues affecting all key themes**

In total there are 49 outcome indicators reflected in the Edinburgh ROA. Some of these are only able to present a city perspective due to data availability, whilst others are broken down to reflect the city as a whole and the focus areas for the ROA. Where these two levels of data are available we are able to monitor 'closing the gap' trends. Ideally all data sets reproduced in this report would have the same baseline date and the same revision date, this is not always the case however and sometimes different dates have had to be used for baselines and updates. In addition some are being monitored to the same timeframe as the ROA, and it will therefore be 2007/08 before evidence of progress or otherwise is to hand. In some cases, proxy data is used to give some indication of interim progress.

One particular point concerns the currency of the data. In some instances the data available, particularly to the small local focus areas of the 61 data zones, predates the adoption of the ROA. In some cases there is no available alternative data. In these situations, rather than leave a 'monitoring gap', we use what we do have to give local communities and partner agencies some indication of trend and to provide an evidence base for assessment and policy development. In many cases we are usefully continuing and following trends from Social Justice Monitoring which preceded the ROA process. The SIP programme and funding tackled similar issues to the ROA and it is useful, where ROA specific data is not available, to highlight trend change and indications of impact wherever possible.

### 3.0 Main challenges for 2006/07

Some of the key contextual changes impacting on ROA outcomes are outlined in the Strategic Overview and although they, in many ways, represent both the main challenges and opportunities facing the partners they are not reproduced in detail here.

That said perhaps the major challenge for 2006/07 concerns the housing aspects of the **Strong Safe Communities** theme. The rejection of the stock transfer proposal by council tenants has required a full re-appraisal of options which is currently underway. Clearly there is still be a need for affordable housing to improve the stock, but this was to be achieved by a new housing association underpinned by Community Ownership Programme monies. The impact on ROA areas –where housing remains dominated by local authority renting- is under review. A recent report published by Communities Scotland<sup>2</sup> suggested that there “...is a major structural problem of affordability in the Edinburgh HMA” pg 35 HMA-Housing Market Area and the same report presents Bramley’s findings that there is housing shortfall in Edinburgh alone of around 3,000 units.

In Craigmillar the challenge in 2006/07 and beyond will be for PARC to deliver the Urban Design Framework that was approved by the Councils Planning Committee in September 2005. The master plan for Wauchope Square has been approved, as has detailed applications for the first phase of 61 homes and the St Francis and Niddrie Mill joint campus primary schools. Construction of these two projects will start in the autumn. Detailed applications for three more phases in Wauchope Square are being prepared for the summer. The Thistle Foundation has started a major refurbishment of their stock and has also received outline planning permission to build around 170 new units, mostly for sale.

There are a number of major development proposals that are likely to start across the West Edinburgh Community Planning Partnership (WECPP) area over the next couple of years. In Wester Hailes there are proposals for around 200 new houses at a site at Harvesters Way and on the larger adjoining site there is likely to be a significant mixed use development. To the north of the railway line there is a proposal for a 70,000 square feet superstore adjacent to the existing Westside Plaza site. In Sighthill there are plans for a new national sports stadium on Sighthill Park and it is expected that the City of Edinburgh Council will prioritise the redevelopment of the housing at north Sighthill. The challenge for the WECPP is to ensure these developments are coordinated and that there is significant community input and involvement in the development of the proposals. With this in mind the Partnership has established a number of neighbourhood service partnerships.

In North Edinburgh aspects of the anticipated Waterfront development programme have been coming through more slowly than anticipated and there is concern as to the lack of visible impact on regeneration themes and areas from this major strategic initiative. The Waterfront Recruitment Centre is a partial response to the employment aspects of this concern but it is too early to evaluate its effect yet.

---

<sup>2</sup> Affordable Housing and the Labour Market in Scotland (2006) by A Glass, A MacGregor, A. McTier, T O’Sullivan and G. Young . Communities Scotland

Elsewhere the messages from the data are that we face challenges in;

- the rising incidence of anti-social behaviour (**Outcome 1d, pg 41**)
- the levelling off of unemployment rates (**Outcome 2a, pg 43**) and
- increases in young people leaving school without known positive destinations (NEET). (**Outcome 2d, pg 44**)
- although CHD admissions are reducing the gap between the areas of deprivation and the city as a whole the gap is wide and is of concern (**Outcome 3a, pg 45**)

These issues, and indications of initial service responses, are considered below

### **Anti Social Behaviour**

We can see from Template 1 (**Outcome 1d, pg 41**) and the discussion in the overview that anti-social behaviour, as represented by certain types of reported crimes, has increased. A Fear of Crime Survey carried out by MORI in April 2005 on behalf of the Edinburgh Community Safety Partnership found that the Edinburgh Community as a whole thought that graffiti and vandalism were the most common types of crime in the city (38%). Thus perception reflects reality in this case as vandalism is the most commonly recorded crime in the city. The MORI study found that a quarter of all residents (26%) felt that anti-social behaviour was a problem in their neighbourhood. As a result of this partners are developing programmes to tackle the complex reality that manifests itself as Anti-Social Behaviour. This issue overall will be subject of the CCP scrutiny process later this year. Meanwhile, as with other themes, the main service delivery partners have been asked to review key issues arising from the data, discuss the trends and the factors which may underpin them and advise on initiatives and programmes already in place or planned which will address these. Outline information from this can be considered in the autumn review.

Initial responses already planned or in place include;

- Youth strategy enhanced leisure provision in local areas 2006/7
- Case Management Pilots programme focussed on the most disruptive and vulnerable families underway in North Edinburgh and to be piloted in 2005/6 in South Edinburgh (focus on young people) and now being developed by CEC Children and Families for East Area (includes Craigmillar) as an Early Intervention project.
- Massively enhanced local area youth and community policing resources through a CEC/Police partnership (72 additional police officers are now in place funded through the Council budget)
- Gallery 37 2006

### **Adult unemployment and inactivity – the Jobs Strategy (Outcome 2a, pg 43)**

#### New initiatives

In respect of **adult employment** support programmes a major initiative this year will see the establishment of a cross sectoral programme for adults with multiple and significant barriers to employment. This local successor to the National New Futures

Fund, working closely with and within mainstream programmes through the city's Drugs and Alcohol Action Team, should be operational by November.

The **Working for Families** programme was introduced in April 2006, and will run until March 2008 with one Advisor already in post with the EASE organisation in South Edinburgh. The main themes of the programme in Edinburgh will be to establish a network of 6 working for families advisors spread across the regeneration areas and introduce three specific funds;

- WFF transition fund which should support costs for in-work expenses
- WFF childcare support fund, which will look at meeting childcare costs when no other source is available.
- WFF training fund, supports non-vocational training costs

This will include a demand-led training pilot, which is seen as an exemplar project within CEC. The targets for the programme are to get 300 clients into full or part time employment, 150 clients into training/ education, 45 clients will take up volunteering opportunities, 90 clients will sustain or enhance their employment and 165 clients will complete personal development programmes. This is a project that will help reverse the increases in unemployment reported in Template 1.

#### Mainstream improvements

The roll out of Jobcentreplus in its new delivery format, the adoption of Job Outcome targets, the introduction of extended help for lone parents in October and the reconfiguration of the regional contracts package will impact significantly on the level and effect of national programmes in the city over the year. Edinburgh may also be one of the cities in the first phase of the National City Strategy Initiative and this will give access to greater flexibility and capacity to innovate if successful.

CCP's own contracting programme is moving to outcome based payment for area intermediaries and it is anticipated that this, alongside an increasingly joined up approach system wide, will push up outputs and outcomes in key datazones to bring downward unemployment and inactivity trends back into play in these key areas.

These are new challenges that face the Joined up for Jobs Partners and these are on top of the existing work that was delivered in 2005/06 which saw the local intermediaries work with 1,395 new clients in 2005/06 and supported 757 of them into work. Half year data for the academies indicates that in the 6 months from October 2005 to March 2006 they worked with 391 clients and 154 of them went in to work.

#### Youth unemployment (Outcome 2d, pg 44)

One primary challenge that continues to cause concern is the rising incidence of **youth unemployment** as indicated in the NEET figures (see template 1 below). This is a key issue for partners this year, as it was in 2004/5 when the rising trend became apparent. To tackle this in 2006/07 there are a number of initiatives that focus on young people and school leavers.

Some such as Gallery 37 will replicate successful programmes from previous years (worked with 22 young people and of the 68% who completed the course 86% had a positive outcome).

Others pilot new approaches to try and reduce the NEET group which over time have the potential to become both significant and mainstream responses to the problem. In South Edinburgh Gracemount High School, the employment academies collective, Careers Scotland and NHS Lothian have combined to create the Jobs Education and Training (JET) programme. The aim is to connect schools and employers to provide students with relevant learning experiences, marketable skills and qualifications (academic and vocational). The programme delivers school and work based learning and efforts are made to connect the two. It is due to start in August 2006 and will be offered to 20 S4 pupils. It will run over the whole academic year.

A Development Officer has now been funded through the CCP budget and is working within the Children & Families department to extend the reach of this type of provision across the city.

The area intermediaries funded by CRF and working within the Joined up for Jobs strategy worked with 238<sup>3</sup> 16-19 year olds in 2006/07. Overall these projects help support over 50% of their clients into employment. This trend towards a younger client group will continue. Edinburgh's concerns broadly mirror the national situation announced and it will be positively affected by the measures announced with the launch of national NEET Strategy *More Choices, More Chances* on June 13<sup>th</sup> 2006.

A complementary program has been developed through the Youth Strategy for Edinburgh whose Action Plan, agreed in March 2006, includes its own employment strategy for young people. This will result in additional support being made available for young people leaving school who have additional needs. It will also improve arrangements for work placements, to allow young people to gain more work experience. The Council have agreed that by the start of the school year 2007/08 there will be 320 placements available.

These initiatives complement a range of other projects throughout the city in each of the local CRF areas and thematically through CCP funded programmes

### **CHD Admissions (Outcome 3a, pg 45)**

Indicators around **health**, although generally improving still show stark area based differences – the rate for CHD admissions in the focus data zones is twice as high than it is in the city as a whole. The Challenges presented by health inequalities, in particularly CHD health issues, will be the focus for major interventions in 2006/07.

NHS Lothian through the Community Health Partnerships will deliver a Prevention 2010 programme, which in addition to the health board is supported by the Scottish Executive. In total £1million pounds is available through Prevention 2010 and an additional £400,000 through related smoking cessation support. The additional

---

<sup>3</sup> This is based on returns from 3 of the four area intermediaries so we would expect the final figure to be closer to 300.

resources will target 4 clusters of medical practices that work with the population located in the 61 data zones. The focus is on cardiovascular disease and interventions that will make the greatest difference to health outcomes in the short term.

Prevention 2010 will target 45-64 year olds with high cardiovascular risk and the smoking cessation support will complement this, but will also work with other age groups. The key will be successful assessment and engagement with difficult to reach groups and this will be achieved through active partnership with existing community networks and services. The first clients should start to be assessed in September.

## 4.0 Community Engagement

### Edinburgh Context

Edinburgh's Community Planning Partnership has long since recognised that traditional SIP communities have not felt fully engaged in the development of Community Planning processes. A full community Engagement improvement Strategy has been agreed based on the local application of the national standards for community engagement and will be launched in September. The launch will be an interactive event where the participants will be able to see community engagement in action and will be asked to explore how they can take it forward in their own organisation or community. The strategy, '*Listening to Communities to Improve Services*', recognises the good work that is done in community engagement and seeks to harness and improve this.

The most recent 'Community Plan for Edinburgh' captures this commitment with the key action pledge "*Partners will adopt and promote good practice in engagement with communities and evaluate their progress against agreed standards.*" The Community Safety Partnership and the Youth Strategy team have both carried out large scale surveys to find out community views on Crime<sup>4</sup> and young persons views in general<sup>5</sup> In addition there are forums and actions groups in the city that look at all of the following topics: women, education, young people, regeneration, housing, equalities, older people, community safety, community issues, environmental, health, culture, disability, religion, community councils, transport, sport and leisure, children's services, politics/citizenship, and belief/non belief.

The vice chair of Capital City Partnership is, by constitutional requirement, a community representative appointed by ECRN and the board invites representatives from all of the CRF eligible areas and from each of the Equalities Fora to its regular scrutiny sessions.

### **CASE STUDY 1 Community engagement in local area regeneration (Outcome 1a, pg 40)**

Given the scale of regeneration planned for Craigmillar, there has been an unprecedented amount of consultation and attempts to engage the community. The Planning Committee has been particularly concerned to ensure that all applications are fully consulted upon. PARC has drawn up a protocol with each relevant CEC department to ensure that there are regular meetings and detailed discussions with relevant interest groups as plans are developed. These discussions and debates have fed into the meeting of the two wider representative bodies in Craigmillar; the Community Council and Craigmillar Regeneration Forum. Both bodies have commented, in writing and at meetings of the Planning Committee, on plans that have been considered by the council. The role of these two bodies has thus become so prominent that when the triennial Community Council elections were called in May an unprecedented 36 candidates stood for 16 places and 32 local interest groups for 8 places. The election stirred much debate in the area and in the event over 900 people voted on the day the highest turnout ever for a Community Council election in Scotland.

<sup>4</sup> MORI (2005) *Edinburgh: Fear of Crime Survey*, Edinburgh Community Safety Partnership

<sup>5</sup> MORI (2005) *Viewfinder2*, Research Study Conducted for Young Edinburgh

As mentioned elsewhere in this report, local partnerships, in which local community representatives are active and supported by projects funded by the CRF, were instrumental in identifying the practical interventions that they would wish to see contribute locally to meeting the city wide thematic goals outlined in Template 1. The Edinburgh Partnership has two Community Representatives on its board representing communities of place and of interest.

In ROA areas there is more of a history of community engagement. From the People's Panels that operated in the SIPs, the community representatives that sit on the partnership boards and the CRF supported projects that currently support community engagement. In total 30 different projects that are supported in the focus areas which contribute to the theme of community engagement, and just over £950,000 of CRF funds support, directly or indirectly community involvement in the decision making processes. Template 4b lists these projects The key aim of this funding is to resource the support mechanisms that allow the local representatives to engage in planning and delivering the regeneration of their areas and be supported in that process when discussing service delivery with partners.

### **CASE STUDY 2 Community Engagement With Young People (Outcomes 1a, pg 40 and Outcome 4, pg 46)**

- In the past year the Youth Services Advisory Committee at the Council has been very supportive of the development of student councils, which is seen as a way of improving student participation in decision making. In practical terms the committee allocated £50,000 in 2005/06 to support funding proposals put forward by student councils. All the secondary schools that work with students from the focus areas had projects funded.
- Engagement with young people was also a key aim of the Viewfinder survey. Not only was the questionnaire designed by a steering group that consisted of partner agencies and young people working alongside the researchers from MORI, the findings of the report have been picked up quickly and fed into the development of new initiatives. For example issues around young people and buses have been highlighted in national studies<sup>1</sup> and Viewfinder highlighted that 29% of local young people felt that they weren't treated with respect by bus drivers. When you consider that 77% of young people were regular bus users it is clear that this is an issue. As a result the Youth Strategy Team, along with bus companies in Lothian, is developing a charter for young people and transport staff, in an attempt to overcome these conflicts and the plan is to launch the strategy in May 2007.
- Other initiatives that aim to work with young people and to help develop policy are also being pursued as part of the Youth Strategy. For instance 'health' event is planned for latter in 2006 to allow young people to talk to health service providers and influence the development services for young people. An equality event is also planned for young people from excluded groups and the youth Strategy team are working with a wide range of partners to ensure opportunities for young people to be involved in community planning both across the city as a whole and in the LCPPs
- Art South Edinburgh developed a project entitled "Drink: Just for a Laugh?" that worked with young people and the local community focusing on the issue of underage drinking.
- In Craigmillar Oot N Aboot, the street work arm of Café K informed around 200 young people about the regeneration process. The project has used a variety of methods (questionnaires, focus groups, DVDs, residential's, etc.) to elicit young peoples views in relation to regeneration and their involvement in the community) and the findings are reported back to the Youth Service Providers Forum and other relevant bodies.

In the ROA there are no specific outcomes for community engagement. Instead the approach is that community engagement underpins **all** of the outcomes. The key

measures in this part of the ROA are of outputs rather than outcomes. The definition and articulation of outcomes in this area of work in anything other than the most general terms is not sensible. The desired outcomes quite simply are compliance in spirit and in practice with the agreed national standards. This can be measured by periodic review. Attached at Appendix 1 are a wide range of examples of what the CRF Community Engagement funding actually buys.

It can be seen that Community Engagement is already influencing service provision – for instance in the box above the development of a charter for young people and transport staff is one example that stands out. It is anticipated that as time progresses service improvements such as the ones described above will become more widespread.

### **CASE STUDY 3 Involvement of Equalities Groups – The Approach in West Edinburgh**

In West Edinburgh forums have been established for the Black and Minority Ethnic population and for those people with disabilities, and these complement the existing forums for older people and young people. The disability forum has proved to be hugely popular with twenty three local disabled people signing up as members in the first two months. Practically this group is making progress on getting a number of streetscape improvements carried out such as dropped kerbs and additional handrails at a number of popular facilities. The Black and Minority Ethnic Forum has focussed on the employability needs of members of that community. A questionnaire was distributed around a number of groups representing the BME community as well as being more widely publicised across the area. In terms of direct impact on service provision as a result of this research organisations delivering employability services have agreed to tailor specific services to the BME community. Currently the forum is working to measure what impact this initiative has had on reducing barriers to employment for the BME community.

#### Community engagement in Community Planning

Community Engagement in all its forms can and does affect mainstream policy and practice as is most clearly evidenced by the rejection of both congestion charging and stock transfer proposals this year. It is useful to reflect on this mainstream impact and some of the other community engagement activities that have been undertaken by statutory service providers. Some of this, relating to young people is highlighted in the case study box below. As the transition to Community planning gathers pace, CCP has commissioned supporting research from Step Ahead Ltd. This will identify the variety of interest groups that exist in any community and review how the balance between consultation and representation has been achieved. It will report on best practice and bring the benefit of experience that has built up in the SIPs across to the new Community Planning Partnerships.

### **CASE STUDY 4 Involvement of Faith Groups in local area regeneration**

Since 1996 the Ripple project, part of St Margaret's Church of Scotland Community Outreach programme, has been working in the community of Lochend and Restalrig. The services it provides include, the 'Friday Club' a social club for the elderly, a parent/carer and toddlers group, out of school care for P1s to P7s, a drop in youth café for young people of secondary age, an arts group (Ripple Xpress) for P2 to P7 and the provision of a community newspaper – The Speaker.

### Local Engagement

Clearly some of the most direct forms of community engagement are found in the structures and substructures of local partnerships where local activists combine with partnership and service delivery staff to agree local priorities and how to achieve them. Issues that are the focus of the ROA are continually examined in each of the localities by thematic sub groups. This is the bread and butter of local engagement and will be carried through into local community planning structures.

### Impact and influence

All strands of partnership working are directly or indirectly impacted by a variety of engagement mechanisms and activities, sometimes in the least obvious ways. For example - the Joined up for Jobs program has been able to commission studies which have looked at the issues around gender and ethnicity in the Jobs strategy. This has helped to influence the manner in which it works and the client groups that the programme focuses upon. Equal funding is supporting the Pathways from Addictions to Work. This project works closely with service users in designing the programme, good practice that will be transferred to other strands of the programme.

Not all engagement happens face to face, round a table, or in a sub-group. It is important to use as wide a range of engagement mechanisms as is available to achieve resident and user input to policy and implementation. It is also important, in this particular context, to allow these 'traditional SIP' mechanisms a place in the community planning structures or we will lose valuable energy, input and the exchange of ideas which arises from sustained dialogue and a feeling of making a difference.

## 5.0 Partnership Working

Partnership working is the key to successful delivery of ROA objectives.

The overall aim of the ROA process is to provide a framework in the medium term for the joint planning and delivery of mainstream and special funded services (CRF and others) The Edinburgh ROA starts from the premise that, in the long term, success lies in reaching a position where all of the day to day services which support economic, social and physical regeneration in our most excluded communities are delivered in an integrated fashion and in ways which meet the needs of disadvantaged clients as well as they address universal needs. These services will, ideally, be delivered through, or funded from, mainstream programmes with the role of CRF or other special funds being to test out and pilot new approaches or to meet specific time limited objectives.

Key examples of progression towards the mainstream and/or service integration for regeneration priorities and good partnership working citywide and at local level are outlined below

### **Mainstreaming Health Inequalities Programmes**

The development of strong partnerships between Health and other aspects of the ROA programme is a recurring and welcome feature of this year's report.

In December 2005 the two Community Health Partnerships jointly hosted an event that brought together just on 150 people from NHS Lothian, the CHPs, the voluntary sector and local authority to identify issues, opportunities and priorities for tackling health inequalities in Edinburgh. After 21 different workshop sessions a number of priorities were identified and it was highlighted that underlying all of the priorities was the need to involve local people and engaging with communities. The priority themes were

- Support for community health projects, and successful pilot projects are able to get more secure funding.
- A steering group set up to take the lead on community flats.
- Young people- issues of mental health and alcohol misuse.
- Develop a more consistent approach to supporting older people across the city
- Look at issues around food and health: for young people and schools; the role of community projects and access to food; and questions around breastfeeding.
- Examine issues around physical activity at a city level
- Income maximisation through benefit take up campaigns at one level and the need for supporting people into work. / Health and employment.

A number of these priorities reflect the actions that have been supported by SIP and CRF funding in the past. The recognition by the CHP of the work going on in the local communities is to be welcomed. This will be supplemented by the Prevention 2010 programme.

## **Mainstreaming Safer Stronger Communities**

In 2004/5 the partnership committed £150,000 to develop and pilot an early intervention project bringing together the main statutory child support services under a case management system targeted on the most dysfunctional families in local communities and operating by referral and predictive indicators. This is now in place within the Services for Communities grouping in North and West Edinburgh operating within the existing neighbourhood management scheme. A full evaluation of the first year of operation including outputs, outcomes and impact will be available by the mid year review.

### **CASE STUDY 5 – Mainstreaming Interventions in the Strong Safe and Attractive Communities Theme – Case Management Pilot (Outcome 1, pg 40-42)**

The Early Intervention Pilot Project was initiated in April 2005. It aims to coordinate support for vulnerable and challenging families within neighbourhoods and to move towards a more systematic approach to early intervention. The aim is to work with around 40 families over a 2 year period in the North and West of the city. This is a large scale project funded by CCP and CEC through the anti-social behaviour strategy. In total the project received £265,000 in 2005/06 and £150,000 of this was from CCP. Over the course of the 2005/06 the project worked with 23 families and this meant that they had 106 individual project 'users'. Of these 106, 48 were male, 8 were disabled. They have found that

- 26% of the families have been moved to more suitable accommodation
- School attendance has improved in 61% of the families with school aged children
- 44% of families have had no police involvement since working with the project
- 35% have made progress in address substance misuse within the family
- 26% have made progress in seeking help for mental or physical health problems
- 58% with addressing debt and financial difficulties
- 61% now have appropriate social work involvement where necessary.

The pilot stage of the project has now been completed and the full cost of the project will in future be met by CEC through mainstream funding

For Community Safety generally the Problem Solving Partnership approach brings together a range of relevant agencies to deliver specific interventions to solve problems for local communities. To give an example two Problem Solving Partnerships exist in Craigmillar and involve the police, the council and others with a focus on Bingham and Greendykes. They have brought combined resources to bear on the issue of motorcycle use by young people in inappropriate locations, without insurance and without training. Pilton Youth and Children Project have worked in partnership with RUTS to tackle similar issues in North Edinburgh. Over the last year four young people have been able to obtain certificates in motorcycle maintenance through this arrangement.

An active partner in the Community Safety Partnership is the Fire Service. In the Cool Down Crew project, the Fire Service have a very popular project that works with young people who may be at risk of being, or actually are, involved in anti-social behaviour. Young people are referred to the program from a range of partner agencies and the programme is funded by the CSP and currently runs at Liberton station in South Edinburgh. In practice the Cool Down Crew runs as a week long program based in the station itself and reflects the recruitment training programme that the fire service have. The local YAT and the ambulance service are also involved. The

programme is now oversubscribed and a teacher has now been seconded to the Police Community Safety to develop teaching resources for use in Personal and Social Education classes for S1 through to S6.

### **Locally focussed Partnership working – examples and best practice**

In Craigmillar local economic development organisations collectively aim to ensure a strong link between the physical regeneration of the area and an improvement to the local economy and community. A Business and Labour Charter has been agreed to facilitate the generation of local employment, self employment and business growth opportunities from sub contracting related to physical regeneration. They are working with PARC to tie building contractors, sub-contractors and maintenance contractors into 'reasonable endeavours' clauses on community benefits from contracts.

In South Edinburgh the local Partnership has combined with NHS Lothian and the Local Health Partnership to establish a Health Inequalities group. This group jointly plans, monitors and evaluates specific projects, and is working to the joint health improvement/inequalities agenda of both the NHS and the South Edinburgh Partnership. The group involves local people directly in the process and is led by a public health practitioner.

The Craigmillar European Programme has played a lead role in developing a major forestry project to transform Craigmillar Castle Park. CEC Culture and Leisure with funding from ERDF and the Forestry Commission have employed a forester on site to up-grade and extend the path network; install seating and picnic areas; improve the entrances and the woodland management. Training is planned that will be certificated and related to landscape and forestry work, or more craft related. People with learning difficulties from Enable are already undertaking training and physical works in the park.

In North Edinburgh a Neighbourhood Management Pilot project aims to identify service delivery priorities and to improve local service delivery and coordination. The partners involved in this project include the Community Safety Team, Congeries, Estates and Environment Team, Early Intervention Case Management, Housing Management and the Police.

Also in North Edinburgh is the Waterfront Recruitment Centre, aiming to capture employment opportunities from the massive regeneration programme underway. This is a partnership led by SEEL and co-funded by the JU4J joint infrastructure fund and delivered by staff from Job Centre alongside the local employment intermediary Working Links. Scottish Business in the Community has been active in establishing a North Edinburgh business network and are also linked directly in to employment initiatives through the WRC. By March 2006 107 people had been supported into jobs through the recruitment centre. Job Centre plus are involved in a similar Partnership arrangement with Worktrack in Craigmillar and have run joint recruitment sessions at Fort Kinnaird and are now working closely with the contractors building the Queen Margaret University College campus at Newcraighall. JCP now have a Disability Employment Advisor based three days per week in the Worktrack offices and one day with Craigmillar Ability Network (CAN)

In West Edinburgh where transport issues are a key concern for the local community the West Edinburgh Community Planning Partnership Transport Services Forum works to highlight people’s concerns and push for the improvements that the community needs. In 2005, in response to requests from across the community, the Forum worked closely with Lothian Buses and the City of Edinburgh Council to get the No. 20 bus service enhanced. The service is now more frequent and user-friendly providing a loop service that links up key areas of West Edinburgh with major shopping amenities. Overall, the Transport Forum helped secure over £50,000 worth of improvements on this route.

Across the city all of the local partnerships develop and deliver policy through ‘sub-groups’. These are in effect local thematic partnerships between service providers and the local communities. The Table below, using Craigmillar as an example, highlights the typical range and type of group, of content and of membership.

**Table 1 Craigmillar Partnership Thematic Sub Groups and Membership**

<b>Economic Development</b>	<b>Housing and Environment</b>	<b>Health and Community Care</b>	<b>Education Sub Group</b>	<b>Community Safety</b>
CEC City Development	CEC Services for Community	SE Edinburgh LHP-public health	CEC Children and Families (HQ Staff)	CEC Community Safety
SEEL	PARC	SE Edinburgh LHP-primary care	Community Education	CEC Services for Communities
Napier University	Housing Associations	Craigmillar Medical Centre	Nursery School Heads	CEC Children and Families
Craigmillar and District Business Association	Tenants and Residents Associations	CEC Health and Social Care	Primary School Heads	Lothian and Borders Police
Local Economic Development Organisations	Craigmillar Regeneration Forum	CEC Equalities Unit	Secondary School Heads	Fire Brigade
Local ILMs	Craigmillar Arts and Environment	Local Community Health and Care Organisations	CEC Culture and Leisure	BME Groups
Housing Associations	Edinburgh Greenbelt Trust	Capacity Building Organisations	Local Adult Education Providers	Youth Service Providers
Social Enterprises	CEC Children and Families	Community Pharmacist	IT Projects	Housing Associations
	CEC Environmental Services	Community Dentist	Youth Service Providers	Tenants and Residents Associations
			Capacity Building Organisations	Capacity Building Organisations
			FE Colleges	Edinburgh Leisure
			Napier University	
			Careers Scotland	

### **Thematic Partnership Working - Joined up for Jobs**

Perhaps the most visible, almost the longest standing, and arguably the most effective thematic partnership for regeneration is ‘Joined up for Jobs’. Much of the output and outcomes from JU4J is noted elsewhere in this report but in terms of partnership working itself it remains, and has developed even further as, a model of good practice referenced increasingly at national level.

It features a clear and consistent strategy focussed on local labour market conditions, increasingly well informed by labour market information and client group research. It features at its core a strategy group comprising the key funders of employability services with a small secretariat funded in part by CRF resource.

Its wider partnership now includes a regular 'Partners Forum' for providers and service delivery partners whose meetings now draw regular attendance from more than 40 providers, an 'Academies Collective' and a wide range of communications methods including a quarterly newsletter, a dedicated website and an increasingly shared ICT framework.

These key elements of Edinburgh's jobs partnership are, for the most part, what the Executive seeks to engender in Scotland through the Employability Framework and what the DWP seeks to foster UK wide in its City Strategy Initiative within which the Edinburgh partners hope to play a key role.

## 6.0 Progress on aspects of the ROA highlighted for improvement

### Health

The in-year discussion highlighted the need for local health targets, largely missing in the original ROA. We now have two CHPs operating in the City and relevant targets for the health outcomes in the ROA.

### Improvements in Outcomes Analysis and Project Monitoring

The structure of the CCP and the manner in which the partnership overall works, has developed since the ROA was first adopted to bring the entire focus onto the reporting on and delivery of ROA outcomes. Each Board meeting now scrutinises a specific ROA theme and brings a wider partnership group into the scrutiny process. Scrutiny is facilitated by the presentation of an in depth thematic paper, (the board in July for example will examine Educational Attainment) each paper compares the focus areas of Edinburgh both against the city as a whole and against comparable areas elsewhere in Scotland. At each of these board meetings a range of practitioners working in the field concerned are asked to give their experience of what is being done to improve the situation. This information will be used to inform practice within the Partner agencies and also within the local communities.

Over the coming years this role will develop as the partnership brings to bear a stronger client focussed evaluation of local and thematic projects. The monitoring process, based to date on the Monitoring reports that each individual local partnership requires to be completed by funded projects, will be supplemented by these client focused surveys carried out directly by CCP. This will provide improved outcome information. An initial activities report, based on current project monitoring will be available for the in year stocktake in the Autumn. The first outcomes from the evaluation studies will be reported in the second ROA report.

### Equalities monitoring

In the early part of 2006, an Equalities Analysis of the ROA was undertaken as part of a larger piece of work commissioned by Communities Scotland. This has been an important and insightful exercise and has highlighted gaps in the approach to Equalities taken in the ROA, not least the relative weakness of the policy framework for a partnership approach to equality work. It also flagged up the need to consider mechanisms and strategies by which mainstreaming aspects of the ROA might be improved, particularly how this might be supported at the local level. Proposals to address these gaps have therefore been developed along two tracks: a focus on developing and supporting local capacity; and action, reinforced by a stronger and more robust strategic framework. Looking at both in turn and what this will mean for the coming year.

### Strategic framework

Progress is being made towards the production of an overall equalities statement. While the statement of intent, with strategic actions, is being developed with the ROA in mind, it is also an opportunity to consolidate the Edinburgh Partnership's policy commitment and approach to equality overall. The draft statement and accompanying strategic actions, addresses gaps and areas for development that were identified by the Equalities Analysis. The objective of the ROA element of this work is to establish and develop capacity and the capability to mainstream equality at the local level, while recognising and capitalising upon opportunities for sharing learning on a city-wide and agency-wide basis. The intention is to prepare a statement which is sufficiently flexible to enable local and city-wide relevance. The timetable for this process is:

- Initial draft at Edinburgh Partnership (EP) Board in August 2006.
- EPIC conference scheduled for November 2006 to consider and involve local and citywide equalities communities in discussions regarding the measurement of equality performance. This draft equalities statement will also be presented for discussion at this conference.
- thereafter formal homologation by EP board in Feb 2007.

It should be noted that although the timetable is necessarily fitted into scheduled EP board meetings; it is envisaged that the "spirit" of the statement and some of the strategic actions will be in place earlier capacity building support and developmental work already in planning.

### Local capacity and action

A brief is currently being developed for the delivery of a capacity-building session on equalities for local practitioners. This session will cover processes and techniques and aim to establish a common level of understanding about equalities work within ROAs.

### Equalities Impact Assessment

The City of Edinburgh Council, in its Equality Scheme for 2005–2008 has also committed to undertake an Equalities Impact Assessment of the ROA during the current financial year. The outcomes and follow-up work from this assessment, together with the specific planned actions noted above, will ensure significant advances are made in the mainstreaming of equality into the ROA.

## 7.0 Financial Commentary

This section considers the geographic and thematic allocation of the Edinburgh CRF. Templates 3.1 and 4b contain all of the required detail. To enhance future monitoring this data has now been translated into Covalent, a system adopted by the City of Edinburgh Council to aid monitoring of service delivery and which reflects the Citistat pilot developed by the Scottish Executive. The system is now in place and the monitoring information from the five local areas will be used to measure progress.

Throughout the text below some examples are given of outputs from funding. These highlighted boxes clearly do not represent all the interventions under a given theme, nor all of the actions of the projects highlighted. They do give a strong feel for the range and type of interventions that are being supported by the CRF.

As can be seen in template 3, in 2006/07 £1,156,449 of CRF money has been allocated to projects that broadly fall under the heading of *Building Strong Safe and Attractive Communities*. In total 36 projects were funded under this heading receiving from £1,000 through to almost £150,000. As this theme encompasses housing and physical development this sum is, in practice, dwarfed by the mainstream funds into these areas for physical development and housing improvements.

### **CASE STUDY 6 – Interventions in the Strong Safe and Attractive Communities Theme (Outcome 1, pg 40-42)**

The CRF funded Black Community Development Project delivers a range of services aimed at the BME community in North Edinburgh. In 2005 one of these tasks was to carry out 4 outreach sessions with the aim of highlighting the anti-racist ethos of the organisation and developing this through partnership work. The outreach sessions led it to make contact with 27 new people from the BME community (in total it works with around 250 people a year).

The Broomhouse Rep Council operates in West Edinburgh. This CRF funded project has 110 project users (the target in 2005/06 was to work with 100) and runs the following groups: Parents Support Group, Dementia Day Care, Youth Befriending, Special Needs Lunch Club, 2 carers groups a Café Training Project and 2 young carers support groups. It is very reliant on volunteers to deliver these services (40 people volunteered in 2005/06).

After concern raised by local people in North Edinburgh regarding the number of young people taking part in anti-social behaviour on Friday nights the Drylaw Neighbourhood Centre introduced a Friday night Youth Club which offered 49 sessions from 6-8pm for local young people under the age of 12. This club has been successful in reducing the number of calls to the local police station that related to young people and has benefited 56 young people.

*Getting People into Work* continues to require support - the levelling off of local unemployment rates and the continued increase in the NEET group demonstrate need. In terms of local CRF funds 25 projects are supported with, in total, £1,441,456 allocated to employability support projects. In the local partnerships childcare projects are the main beneficiaries with 70% of the funds allocated under this heading going to projects providing childcare services to support entry to work or education. Added to this is the £1,229,147 for employment intermediary and other projects supported directly by CCP.

### **CASE STUDY 7 – Interventions in the Getting people into Work Theme (Outcome 2, pg 43- 44)**

In the city four large child care organisations are supported by CRF funds. As at June 2006 CCP has monitoring information for three of them which shows 1,265 children and young people benefiting from the childcare supported by CRF. The availability of low cost childcare for residents allows parents and carers to look for work and re enter the job market or re-engage with education and training. In June/July 2005 CCP carried out a questionnaire survey of past and present clients of One Stop Childcare – the West Edinburgh Childcare Project. Of the 40 who returned their questionnaire 13 were employed full time and 21 employed part time. Of the remainder 4 were studying full time, 1 was self employed and 1 did not specify. 85% said that Onestop had been a factor in their entry to the Labour market. In answer to the question “*If the facilities offered by One Stop were to stop tomorrow what would you do?*” of the 37 who answered this question 6 respondents said that they would give up current work or study, 19 said that they would have to find another childcare provider and 12 said that they would have to use informal childcare (family, friends, etc.).

*Improving Health* is the category with the greatest number of individual projects supported – 45 in total. These 45 projects together receive £978,843. Only three of the projects funded under this heading receive over £50,000 in CRF grant and the vast majority receive under £25,000 allocation. The projects range across all aspects of health from drug and alcohol use, to healthy eating and physical activities. The Prevention 2010 programme discussed above will support the work of many of these projects.

### **CASE STUDY 8 – Interventions in the Improving Health Theme (Outcome 3, pg 45)**

The CRF supported South Edinburgh Health Living Initiative (Active Life) has provided a range of activities through the year with the aim of encouraging physical activity and improving health. The weekly walk programme has been attended by 107 different people through the course of the year. In an attempt increase activity amongst children a range of programmes were delivered. One focused on sports hall athletics. Taster sessions in sport hall athletics were attended by 256 P6 pupils, and the follow on after school club attracted 80% of them. Other health interventions supported by CRF deal with a far wider range of health issues. The Pilton Community Health project, for example, which amongst many outputs provided 405 one to one support sessions for women to focus on stress, Wester Hailes Health Agency, had projects that focused on smoking cessation (48 people had one to one smoking cessation support), and the Health Opportunities Team in South Edinburgh worked with 350 different young women providing sexual and emotional health education.

Template 3 highlights that under the *Engaging Young People theme* - £926,419 has been allocated to a total of 31 projects. Individually the allocations range from over £160,000 to support a youth project in North Edinburgh to an award of £2,720 to maintain an all weather sports pitch in North Edinburgh.

### **CASE STUDY 9 – Interventions in the Engaging Young People Theme (Outcome 4, pg 46-47)**

CRF money supports Children 1<sup>st</sup> in South Edinburgh. In 2005/06 this project worked with 28 families where substance misuse, domestic violence, parental mental health problems, bereavement or sexual abuse were having a significant impact on the 50 plus children living in these households. Interventions have, helped improve family relationships, parenting, children’s emotional well being, resilience and educational attainment.

The theme attracting the lowest CRF allocation is *Raising Educational Attainment* which reflects its already 'in the mainstream' nature. In 2006/07 £436,445 was allocated to 27 projects operating in this area.

*Supporting Community Engagement* is a key commitment of the ROA, overall some £967,582 has been allocated to 37 projects providing a range of support services. These range from direct support for communities involved in CPPs through to newspaper and transport initiatives. In addition to the CRF money close to £200,000 of funds through the Community Voices Programme is also allocated under this theme.

### **CASE STUDY 10 Interventions Supporting Community Engagement**

- In South Edinburgh CRF monies supports the Volunteer Centre, supports people to become volunteers within their local community. In 2005/06 the centre gave advice to 180 potential volunteers. Of these 60 became volunteers. In August 2005 the project carried out user surveys and found that 71% of those that responded felt that their overall wellbeing had improved through doing voluntary work and 50% said that they wouldn't have found out about volunteering if there hadn't been a CRF supported volunteer centre in South Edinburgh. To put the importance of volunteers in context 41% of projects registered with the volunteer centre said that their organisation would cease to exist if they did not have volunteers.
- In West Edinburgh the Community Empowerment Project (formerly Broomhouse Empowerment Project) was funded through CRF to support 20 local community groups. In fact it exceeded this target and supported 36 groups. The range of groups varied from older people who took part in the "Reminiscence Project" through to young parents. PACT (Young Parent Group) were supported to extend their project and find additional funding obtained. In 2005/06 this group also undertook local community research amongst their peers and relevant organisations. Not only did this prove a big learning curve for the young people involved in the project it has also provided this community group with more information for future development and engagement.
- The Pilton Partnership is the single largest community engagement organisation in North Edinburgh with a wide range of objectives and achievements. In 2005/06 they engaged with Drylaw and Telford neighbourhood councils and established 3 new community councils. This required an event for community activists (49 attended). In Drylaw Community Council as an example this meant that an initial activist workshop, attended by 18 community activists, every household in the neighbourhood being leafleted twice and 3 drop /in open sessions held where 165 local people turned up to get more information. Other groups that the Partnership team have developed or supported include: *Tenants In Pilton (TIP)*, who have had 15 meetings; *Crewe Excluded Residents* – 10 meetings held; *Granton Medway Action Group* – 12 meetings held; *Pennywell Owners Group* – 13 meetings held; *Pennywell Tenants / Residents Assoc* – 12 meetings held; *Royston Owners Group* – 2 meetings held

Arguably the support of this process should be integrated into mainstream programmes over time reflecting that it is carried out, not as a special practice but integral to service development. At this time the principle resource supporting community involvement in the regeneration and other local policy agenda is CRF. It is difficult to see this changing significantly in the lifetime of the ROA without either a substantial change in Community Support practice i.e. a diminution of generic

capacity building programmes like Pilton Partnership or CBP or the acceptance of budgetary or other responsibility for this process within mainstream programmes.

This report covers what has been allocated as at 15<sup>th</sup> June 2006. There are funds as yet unallocated and there are also some decisions that have yet to be formally ratified by funding panels. As the year goes therefore, the totals for each theme will increase as the remaining funds are allocated.

CRF money is also supports the administration and management of the programme both in the local areas and in the city as whole. In 2006/07 £695,241 has been allocated to fund support costs and some reviews and evaluations. Most of this, over time, should become part of the mainstream provision of the Council and other partners although CRF support for this transition will remain a requirement.

Overall there has been a fall in the funds allocated this year compared to last year, broadly reflecting the reduction in the CRF allocation. For two themes - *Engaging Young People*, and *Improving Health* this is not the case both of which show an increase. This reflects full allocations of Leith and Restalrig funds this year as local processes and priorities have become established.

In terms of Partner Contributions the SMAR forms collected by the local partnerships give an indication of the amount of additional funds that support CRF funded projects and this is presented in Template 3.1 below. In total we can see that there are approaching 60 different funders supporting the local CRF projects that are helping to deliver the ROA. These include Lottery funds, support from Europe, charitable trusts such as Esmee Fairbairn and the Robertson Trust, individual CEC departments, various topic focused programmes supported by the Executive and Communities Scotland and private sector support. In total around £9.6 million, in addition to the CRF funds, supports the projects highlighted in Template 4b. This estimate does not include information for all projects and we would expect that this would increase as the data becomes available from the programme in Leith and Restalrig and from individual projects in the other areas that have still to submit a financial section for their SMAR.

## 8.0 Examples of good practice

A large number of successful projects and programmes have been highlighted in the text throughout the report. Other good practice exemplars are described below

### **Homelessness Service**

The statutory inspection of Edinburgh's Homelessness service in 2005 concluded that it was providing an "excellent" service to homeless people in the city. The council became the first local authority to be awarded an "excellent" or "A" grade in an inspection by Communities Scotland, who found that the council's approach is customer-focused with a culture of assistance. Other areas of strength included the council's work with its partners particularly in providing services for rough sleepers and young people. By way of outcomes an example of the impact of this is that in May 2006 only 8 people were found sleeping rough compared to 42 in 1999 and somewhere between 22 and 50 in 2005.

### **Gallery 37**

In 2005 Edinburgh saw the first pilot Gallery 37 programme. This arts based programme, originally modelled in Chicago and delivered annually in the UK in Birmingham works with young people who have not reached their full potential at school or since leaving school. The pilot worked intensively with 22 young people over the course of four weeks using arts as the medium, 68% of participants completed the programme and of these 86% reported a positive outcome in terms of education, employment or training in the six months following the programme. The programme will run again in extended form in 2006 as part of the strategic response to rising NEET numbers

### **Capacity and Incapacity**

Edinburgh missed out on the national Pathways to Work pilot programme but did pilot two innovative local initiatives going directly to the heart of the IB reform ethos. The first is the **Healthy Return** project, funded by Job Centre Plus and Capital City Partnership and planned and operated in co-operation with public health practitioners. The Edinburgh pilot provided work capacity assessments and offered targeted physical and mental health interventions based on these to clients on Incapacity Benefit. It ran from January to March 2006 taking in 60+ referrals delivering 40+ health interventions and bringing 20+ long term clients IB clients into work or active work seeking over its short period of operation. JCP and Health are now implementing a large scale condition management project along similar lines the first impacts of which will be considered in the next annual review. A second trial is the **Social Prescription project** in South Edinburgh. This encourages primary care staff to refer patients whose health they consider would benefit from non medical support, to two CRF supported projects that operate in the area, EASE for employability support and CHAI for money advice and debt management. In the first three months of the project 21 referrals have been made from the 4 surgeries involved – 14 to CHAI and 7 to EASE. GPs already report that the advice given had a positive impact on patient health and well being.

### **Young People and Safety**

The Viewfinder 2 survey represented the largest study of young people's views ever undertaken in Edinburgh. Some of the findings of this work have already been discussed in this report – the development of the bus service charter for example. A major finding of the study was the extent of concerns expressed by young people about their own personal safety. As a result the Youth Strategy team have developed a personal safety curriculum which will be delivered in secondary schools based on identified needs from August 2006 onwards. The projects will be evaluated in 2007 and the results of this evaluation will be reported back in the 2007/08 annual report.

## 9.0 Constraints

There were a number of practical constraints on action, beyond those major challenges identified elsewhere in the report, over the course of the year.

Leith and Restalrig have had to develop from first principles with no pre-existing SIP framework. To do this effectively has taken time, compounded to an extent by the initial delay in ROA approval. Some initiatives didn't get up and running till January 2006 and funds have been slower to allocate in these areas as funding decisions were delayed until local priorities had been assessed and agreed.

Staff recruitment and retention issues, common in Edinburgh across all sectors are particularly impactful in this setting. In West Edinburgh, for example, WHALE was unable to provide the planned opportunities for young trainee artists to work alongside artists as only having one dedicated project officer meant that they were unable to give the essential support required to maintain trainees in these positions and therefore had to lessen their availability.

In a high value overheated property market, availability and affordability of premises for social purposes is a common constraint on delivery for statutory services and in particular for smaller voluntary run and funded programmes. In South Edinburgh a recent review found many of the buildings in social use close to being unfit for purpose. When new buildings do become available they quickly become oversubscribed and space becomes limited, as in the case of the new LAHA building.

In Craigmillar a particular constraint is uncertainty arising from the impending run down the current ERDF programme. There are concerns locally that the 2007-2013 programme will not start on time, and even when it has started it will be much reduced. The practical impact of this is that European Funded projects, such as Craigmillar Business Incubator have had to stretch budgets to cope with this, whilst others such as the Capacity Building Project and Craigmillar Childcare Services, are facing the real possibility of reducing services and possibly redundancies.

# **Edinburgh Regeneration Outcome Agreement**

## **Templates and Appendices**

# Template 1.1

## Strong and Safe Communities (ROA Ref 1)

### Target Groups – Population in the focus areas

1 & 2	3	4	6	7	8	9
Outcome	CRF Indicator	Target Area	Baseline (2004 unless otherwise stated)	Final Target	Update (2005 unless otherwise stated)	Comment on change
<b>1a</b> Increase resident satisfaction with their local area as a place to live	Resident satisfaction with their local area as a place to live <sup>6</sup>	Edinburgh	91.4% (1999/2000)	To retain and improve satisfaction with neighbourhood as a place to live (95% & 78% respectively)	93.5% (2003/04)	Improving
		SIP Areas	74.8% (1999/2000)		74% (2003/04)	Static
<b>1b.</b> Increased quality and variety of affordable housing options	Dwelling Type (Baseline from 2001 Census Update from 2003/04 SHS) <sup>7</sup>	Edinburgh	House/Bungalow 40.9% Flat 59.0%	2011 Census to retain similar dwelling type diversity	House/bungalow 42.3% Flat... ..57.4%	Reduced proportion of flats
		Target Wards	House/Bungalow 39.5% Flat 60.5%		House/bungalow 21.4% Flat 8.3%	Increased proportion of flats
	Tenure (Baseline from 2001 Census Update from 2003/04 SHS) <sup>8</sup>	Edinburgh	O/O 68.6% Rented 31.4%	2011 Census to show that tenure in the 61 focus data zones better reflect the tenure in the city as a whole	O/O 68.4% Rented 29.5%	Less rented homes
		61 DZs	O/O 32.5% Rented 66.5%		O/O 34.5 % Rented 63%	Less rented homes
<i>NB Please note that targets and priorities in this case may change in light of the No vote in December's stock transfer ballot as the housing strategy was</i>	House Prices <sup>9</sup>	Edinburgh	£143,009	To equalise price inflation rates between the city and Focus DZs	£162,018	Price differential increasing
		61 DZs	£94,992		£86,700	
	% of Social Housing meeting quality standard <sup>10</sup>	Edinburgh	Estimate that it is 60-70%	70% by 2006/07 100% by 2015	Source is SHCS – see note <sup>9</sup>	No data available to monitor
	Number of new	SIP areas	128 (2004/05)	1,000 units <sup>11</sup>	83 (2005/06)	Increase in number built

<sup>6</sup> This is based on the SHS. In 1999/2000 there was a sample for Edinburgh of 2,818 and 450 for the SIP areas. In 2003/04 there was a sample of 2,875 for Edinburgh and 322 from the 15% worst areas as identified by the SIMD. It is important to keep the size of this sample in mind when examining this data. The SHS is available every 2 years at a level that provides a large enough sample to reflect the focus areas. Update information will therefore not be available until 2007

<i>based on this going ahead.</i>	affordable homes	Edinburgh (other)	242 (2004/05)		344 (2005/06)	
	Level of homelessness <sup>12</sup>	Edinburgh	5,478 (2003/04)	Est that 5,300 cases received in 2011 <sup>13</sup>	5,029 (2005/06)	Improving
<b>1c.</b> Increased income and access to mainstream financial products	% of respondents or their partners with access to a bank or building society account <sup>14</sup>	Target Wards	78.9% (1999/2000)	80%	85.4% (2003/04)	Improving
		Edinburgh	91.2% (1999/2000)	94%	93.5% (2003/04)	
<b>1d.</b> Reduced crime, fear of crime and increased domestic and community safety	Crime rates	Target Wards	14,638 (recorded)/152.2 (rate)	Reduce recording levels based on a 5 year average – LBP Service Plan 2005/06	152.22	Static
		Edinburgh	51,995 (recorded)/114.6 (rate)		113.91	Improving
<i>These targets are</i>	Number of minor serious and indecent assaults <sup>15</sup>	Target Wards	2,549/26.51	Reduce by 15% by 2008	25.56	Improving
		Edinburgh	7,874/17.36		17.24	Improving

<sup>7</sup> From 2001 Census Table UV56 – Accommodation Type, with the SHS data provided to allow for an update. The Census data although accurate is not available in between census dates. Therefore a secondary source is used for updates – the Scottish Household Survey. Updated version of the SHS will be used to monitor progress

<sup>8</sup> From 2001 Census Table UV56 – Accommodation Type, with the SHS data provided to allow for an update. The Census data although accurate is not available in between census dates. Therefore a secondary source is used for updates – the Scottish Household Survey. Updated version of the SHS will be used to monitor progress

<sup>9</sup> This is from the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics site April 2006

<sup>10</sup> Rely on the Scottish House Condition Survey for this and update of this data will not be available until Communities Scotland have three years data collected which means end 2007 at the earliest- Dave Cormack Communities Scotland

<sup>11</sup> This was based on the stock transfer going ahead.

<sup>12</sup> Homeless presentations- City of Edinburgh Council Housing Department

<sup>13</sup> This is from CEC Housing Department. In 2012 Scottish Executive plan to abolish homeless priorities.

<sup>14</sup> This is based on the SHS. In 1999/2000 there was a sample for Edinburgh of 2,818 and 450 for the SIP areas. In 2003/04 there was a sample of 2,875 for Edinburgh and 322 from the 15% worst areas as identified by the SIMD. It is important to keep the size of this sample in mind when examining this data. The SHS is available every 2 years at a level that provides a large enough sample to reflect the focus areas. Update information will therefore not be available until 2007. The 2003/04 data includes credit union accounts, which wasn't the case in 1999/00, this may account for the increase.

The police data is presented as number of recorded crimes and then rate per 1,000 population, which is based on the 2004 MYE for Edinburgh and this has been extrapolated for the 12 focus wards (96,150, 2004 estimated population). The actual recorded number of crimes is from LBP and refers to 2004 data.

<sup>15</sup> Includes the following crimes: 047001 Minor Assault (an offence rather than a crime); 004000 Serious Assault; and 016000 Indecent Assault.

<i>from the Edinburgh Community Safety Partnership Strategy 2005-2008</i>	Crimes of Violence <sup>16</sup>	Target Wards	2,949/30.67	Reduce by 15% by 2008	28.96	Improving	
		Edinburgh	8,940/19.71		19.24		
	House breaking <sup>17</sup>	Target Wards	835/8.68	Reduce risk by 15% by 2008	7.09	Improving	
		Edinburgh	2,212/4.88		5.55		Worsening
	Anti social behaviour <sup>18</sup>	Target Wards	3,659/38.06	Reduce the incidence of anti-social behaviour in Edinburgh	44.58	Worsening	
		Edinburgh	10,432/22.9		25.33		Worsening
	<i>Injuries at home<sup>19</sup>65 year olds or over</i>	<i>61 DZs</i>	<i>912 (2,954)</i>		<i>Suggest consider removing these 2 as Community Safety Partnership don't have target, nor is it within the CHP target. Raises question why are we looking at it?</i>		
		<i>Edinburgh</i>	<i>507</i>				
	<i>Injuries at home<sup>20</sup> Under 5 years of age</i>	<i>61 DZs</i>	<i>882 (1,730)</i>				
		<i>Edinburgh</i>	<i>213</i>				
Number of premature alcohol and drug related deaths <sup>21</sup>	Edinburgh	24 drug deaths in EH postcodes (2004/05)	Reduce the number of premature alcohol and drug related deaths by 10% by 2008	31 drug deaths in EH postcodes (2005/06)	Worsening		
Accidental dwelling fires <sup>22</sup>	Edinburgh	688 (2003/04)	Reduce the number of accidental dwelling fires by 6% by 2008	673 (2004/05)	Improving		
Deliberately set secondary fires <sup>22</sup>	Edinburgh	3,973 (2003/04)	Reduce the number of deliberately set secondary fires by 12% by 2008	2,283 (2004/05)	Improving		

NB CCP and Partners continue to investigate alternative sources of data upon which to monitor progress, if and when these become available they will be recorded in these tables and replace or supplement data such as the census (which has temporal issues for this ROA) and the SHS (which is problematic at the small areas of the target wards and data zones)

<sup>16</sup> Crimes of violence include: 047001 Minor Assault (an offence rather than a crime); 016000 Indecent Assault; 002000 Attempted Murder; 003001 Culpable Homicide; 001000 Murder; 006000 Robbery and Assault with Intent to Rob; 004000 Serious Assault; 017001 Lewd & Libidinous Practices; 014000 Rape; and 015000 Assault with Intent to Ravish

<sup>17</sup> Housebreaking includes: 019005 Theft HB Domestic (Dwell), 019008 Theft HB with intent, domestic (Dwell), 019010 Attempt theft HB domestic (Dwell)

<sup>18</sup> Data used relates to vandalism malicious damage and malicious mischief.

<sup>19</sup> This data is from ISD (SMR01). The data for Edinburgh refers to 2004. For the 61 data zones the number of admissions in any one year is small and so ISD have provided data based on admissions over a 7 year period (1998-2004) - the number of cases in the city as a whole over that period is given in brackets to provide context.

<sup>20</sup> This data is from ISD (SMR01). The data for Edinburgh refers to 2004. For the 61 data zones the number of admissions in any one year is small and so ISD have provided data based on admissions over a 7 year period (1998-2004) - the number of cases in the city as a whole over that period is given in brackets to provide context.

<sup>21</sup> Data made available to Craigmillar Partnership under FOI Act

<sup>22</sup> Data provide by the Community Safety Section Lothian and Borders Fire and Rescue Service, January 2006

## People into Work (ROA Ref- 2)

Target Groups – People of working age

<b>1 &amp; 2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>CRF Indicator</b>	<b>Target Area</b>	<b>Baseline (2004)</b>	<b>Final Target</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>2a)</b> Reduced unemployment rates in target areas	Unemployment Rates <sup>23</sup>	Edinburgh	2.19%	Gap closed by 20%	2.5% (2006)	Worsening
		Target Wards	4.28%		4.98% (2006)	
		61 DZs	6.57%			
<b>2b)</b> Increased employment rates for key groups and areas	Working age population in employment-economic activity <sup>24</sup>	Edinburgh	74.5% (2001) 69.9% 2003	76%	76.9%	Improving
		Target Wards	69.7% (2001)- 67.08% 2003			
		Edinburgh	65.9% (2001)	70%	72.7%	
		Target Wards	62% (2001)			
<b>2c)</b> Reduced benefit dependency overall and particularly in target areas	IB/SDA claim rate <sup>25</sup>	Edinburgh	7.28%	6%	7.2%	Improving
		Target Wards	15.09%	10%	15.04%	
		61 DZs	18.7%		18.5%	
	IB/SDA duration <sup>26</sup>	Edinburgh	75.93%			
		Target Wards	75.65%			
		61 DZs	74.82%			

<sup>23</sup> The 2004 data is from the DWP website and the 2005 data is from CEC City Development based on figures for March. The data for DZs is from the SNS and this is due to be updated mid July 2006

<b>2d)</b> Better post school outcomes overall and closing the gap in positive post-school outcomes for key groups and areas	Income Support <sup>27</sup>	Edinburgh	6.32%			
		Target Wards	15%			
		61 DZs	24.2%		23.9%	
	Children in workless households <sup>28</sup>	Edinburgh	30.9%		30.5%	Improving
		61 DZs	33.9%		32.9%	
	Number of 16-19 year olds not in education, training or employment <sup>29</sup>	Edinburgh	19.4% (2003/4)	17%	22.5% (2004/5)	Worsening
		Focus Schools (all wards)	25.3% (2003/4)	20%	27.9% (2004/5)	

NB During 2006/7 the job strategy group will be looking at many of these issues in relation to their commitment within the national city strategy pathfinder programme. As a result targets may be identified where they don't yet exist and be better defined where they already do exist

<sup>24</sup> Economic activity has three sources. Firstly the most reliable is the 2001 Census (16-64 age group) a full count of the whole population. Problem with this is the data update won't be available till after 2011 Census. Second option the 2005 data is from LLMU, divided by 306,827 working age population (2002 mid year estimate for Edinburgh). The 2003 data is from the SNS site which has been reproduced due to a lack of alternatives. They stress that this data is experimental and it should be used with caution. Employment rates calculated as employees and self employed as a % of 16-64 population. LLMU did not provide the same data for wards or data zones.

<sup>25</sup> The data for Edinburgh and the wards is from the DWP website. In this case the claim rate is based on the 16-64 (working age) population. The information for the data zones is from the SNS site (August 2006) it is based on the claim rate for Q3 information for 2004 and 2005. the duration data for IBSDA is based on the percentage of the claimants who have been on that benefit for 24 months or more. The IBSDA data for 2005 is from JC+

<sup>26</sup> The data for Edinburgh and the wards is from the DWP website and the duration data for IBSDA is based on the percentage of the claimants who have been on that benefit for 24 months or more. The IBSDA data for 2005 is from JC+

<sup>27</sup> The data for Edinburgh and the wards is from the DWP website and the duration whilst the data for the data zones is from the SNS site based on the % of the 16-59 year old population claiming income support. It is based on the data for Q3 2004 and Q3 2005.

<sup>28</sup> This is based on data provided by the DWP based on number of dependents of JSA claimants divided by number of JSA claimants overall. Provided by e-mail December 2005.

<sup>29</sup> Data by school for 2003/04 and 2004/5 from Scottish Executive based on school leaver destination that are NOT education, training or employment.

### Improving Health (ROA Ref- 3)

1&2	3	4	6	7	8	9
Outcome	CRF Indicator	Target Area	Baseline 2003	Final Target	Achieved to End of 2004	Comment
3a A sustained reduction in health inequalities in the city, as a key step to improve the health and wellbeing of Edinburgh's people.	Emergency Admissions for under 15 year olds <sup>30</sup>	Edinburgh	5,150		5,170	Static
		61 DZ	7,523		7,349	Improving
	Breastfeeding (%) <sup>31</sup>	Edinburgh	55.76	1% increase per annum <sup>32</sup>	55.95	Improving
		61 DZ	23.08		27.43	Improving
	Smoking whilst pregnant <sup>33</sup>	Edinburgh	16.7 (2004)	Increase the rate of improvement by 15% in the most deprived communities	17.1 (2005)	Worsening
		61 DZ	40.8 (2004)		41.4 (2005)	Worsening
	CHD Admissions 15-64 years old <sup>34</sup>	Edinburgh	284		264	Improving
		61 DZ	660		517	Improving
	Cancer Admissions 15-64 years old <sup>35</sup>	Edinburgh	2,171		2,271	Worsening
		61 DZs	2,159		2,274 (est) <sup>36</sup>	Worsening
	Teenage Pregnancies <sup>37</sup>	Edinburgh	9.8	target for 13-15 yr olds is to be 6.8 per 1,000 by 2010	10.1	Worsening
		61 DZ	59.6		48	Improving
	Nos of Households in Fuel Poverty <sup>38</sup>	Edinburgh (2002)	33,000 hhds	Source is SHCS – see note <sup>10</sup>	No data available to monitor	

<sup>30</sup> Number of Emergency admissions to non-psychiatric/non-obstetric hospitals in Scotland. Information presented is for patients treated as inpatients or day cases only. Based on rate per 100,000 population. **Source:** Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics, April 2006

<sup>31</sup> Percentage of babies breastfed at 6-8 weeks **Source:** CHSP, Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics

<sup>32</sup> From Breastfeeding in Lothian 2004 report <http://www.nhsllothian.scot.nhs.uk/publications/health%5Fplan%5F2005/pdf/breastfeeding.pdf>

<sup>33</sup> Percentage of mothers smoking at Health Visitors first visit **Source:** Lothian Health CHSP, Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics

<sup>34</sup> Number of admissions to non-psychiatric/non-obstetric hospitals in Scotland with a main diagnosis of Coronary Heart Disease. Coronary Heart Disease is defined using the International Classification of Diseases Volume 10 (ICD10) codes (C00:C97). Based on a rate per 100,000 population. **Source** Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics

<sup>35</sup> Number of admissions to non-psychiatric/non-obstetric hospitals in Scotland with a main diagnosis of Cancer. Cancer is defined using the International Classification of Diseases Volume 10 (ICD10) codes (I20:I25). Based on a rate per 100,000 population. **Source** Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics

<sup>36</sup> At the time of preparing this report the SNS site summary was not available, a simple average figure for the 61 DZs has been used and this will be replaced when the SNS site is updated.

<sup>37</sup> Based on 13-15 year olds and rate per 1,000 **Source:** SMR01 AND SMR02 from Lothian Health CHSP

<sup>38</sup> From LEEP based on the SHCS Fuel Poverty Report which has been updated from the 2002 baseline by energy watch to take account of increases in fuel prices that have occurred over the previous 18 month period. As it is based on the SHCS output of this type will not be available until Communities Scotland have three years data collected which means end 2007 at the earliest. If this is met by Communities Scotland then the final report for 2007/08 should have data with which to monitor progress.

## Engaging young people (ROA Ref- 4)

### Target Group Young People

1&2	3	4	6	7	8	9
Outcome	CRF Indicator	Target Area	2004	Final Target	2005	Comment
4a. Reduced child poverty	Children in workless households <sup>39</sup>	Edinburgh	30.9%	Reduce the percentage overall and to close the gap between the city and the 61 focus data zones	30.5	Seeing some progress gap has fallen from 3% to 2.4%. Only one years figure but promising
		61 DZs	33.9%		32.9	
4b. Better engagement of children and young people in the social and cultural life of their community	Young peoples participation rates in arts activities <sup>40</sup>	Edinburgh	53%	Not yet set, young people now involved in the Edinburgh Cultural Partnership and will play a part in setting targets for their own involvement		Viewfinder 3 survey will take place in 2007 as a result no update to the available data will be in place until then
		61 DZs	43%			
4c. Higher rates of participation in sports and physical activities	Young people's participation in sports and physical activities <sup>41</sup>	Edinburgh	67%	80% of primary children will be physically active. 85% of those aged 13-17 will take part in sport in addition to the school curriculum more than once a week 55% of those aged 17-24 will take part in sport more than twice a week		
		61 DZs	69%	46% of those aged 14+ in SIPS will take part in sport at least once a week		
4d. Increased levels of confidence and self esteem for pupils and	Young people's confidence and self	Respond	Edi	61%	Target areas are showing greater levels of involvement, aim is for this to be reflected in the 2007 Viewfinder 3 study.	
			DZ	75%		

<sup>39</sup> This is based on data provided by the DWP based on number of dependents of JSA claimants divided by number of JSA claimants overall. Provided by e-mail December 2005

post school young people in key areas	esteem (as demonstrated by their ability to participate in decision making) <sup>42</sup>	Attend	Edi	43%			
			61	66%			
		Participate	Edi	29%			
			DZ	45%			
		Stand for election	Edi	21%			
			DZ	34%			

<sup>40</sup> Viewfinder 2 study carried out by MORI on behalf of Youngedinburgh, 2004. The survey looked at the views of 11-25 year olds and involved 5,728 in the city as a whole and 662 from the 61 focus data zones. The data for this table is in answer to Q20 “Which of the things in the list below do you do in your spare time?” A group of arts activity answers was formed from those that answered: go to the theatre/ see a play and/or take lessons (music, dance, swimming, etc) have been used in this table.

<sup>41</sup> Viewfinder 2 study. The data for this table is in answer to Q20 “Which of the things in the list below do you do in your spare time?” A group of sports/ physical activity answers was formed from those that answered: go swimming/to sports centre/fitness centre and or take part in team sports games. It should be noted that the targets are indicative from Sports Scotland documents and that the baseline does not directly correspond to them. The targets are from “Sport 21 2003-2007. The National Strategy for Sport. Shaping Scotland’s Future” and are national targets.

<sup>42</sup> Viewfinder 2 study. The data for this table is in answer to Q3 “Which of these things, if any, would you be prepared to give up your time to do?” The groups are made up of people who say they would do the following:

**Respond-** take part in surveys of young people; e-mail my ideas through a link on a young persons website; vote for other young people standing for election.

**Attend-** attend events organised for/by young people from across the city, attend events organised by or for young people locally.

**Participate-** take part in a group or committee that takes decisions on how to spend money to improve services for young people; take part in a group or committee that takes important decisions for young people in Edinburgh; help organise consultations and events where young people could give their views to be part of a special enquiry or commission set up to look at how things might change.

**Stand for election** – stand for election to a student council; stand for election to the Scottish Youth Parliament; stand for election to the Edinburgh Youth Council

**NB the data presented in this table suggests that young people in the deprived areas are prepared to be actively involved in decision making and participate more readily than young people elsewhere in the city.**

## Raising Educational Attainment (ROA Ref- 5)

### Target group - residents of ROA target areas, particularly school age

1 & 2	3	4	6	7	8	9	
Outcome	CRF Indicator	Target Area	Baseline (2003/04 unless otherwise stated)	Final Target	2004/05	Comment	
5a Increased participation in learning	School <i>Primary</i> attendance rates <sup>43</sup> <i>Secondary</i>	Edinburgh	95% (2002/03)	95%	95%	Static	
		Target Wards	92% (2002/03)	94%	92%	Static	
		Edinburgh	86.2% (2002/03)	90%	90%	Improving	
		Target Wards	82.1% (2002/03)	85%	86.4%	Improving	
	Proportion of school leavers going into FE <sup>44</sup>	Edinburgh	20.4	Target not yet determined	17.2	Worsening	
		Target Wards	18.8		16.4	Worsening	
	Proportion of school leavers going HE <sup>32</sup>	Edinburgh	27.8		29.7	Improving	
		Target Wards	18.7		21.6	Improving	
	Adult literacy and numeracy <sup>45</sup>	Edinburgh	75,000 people (est)		Work with 3,000 people a year	70,000 (2006 est)	Improving
		61 DZs	9,000 people (est)			8,400 (2006 est)	Improving
5b Improved educational attainment and closing of the gaps between key groups and the city norm	Maths <sup>46</sup> –P3	Edinburgh	95	93	96	Improving	
		Target Wards	86	91	92	Improving	
	Maths –P7	Edinburgh	69	72	69	Static	
		Target Wards	52	56	53	Improving	
	Reading - P3	Edinburgh	87	89	83	Worsening	
		Target Wards	79	80	71.4	Worsening	
	Reading - P7	Edinburgh	74	75	76	Improving	
		Target Wards	58	60	62.3	Improving	
	Writing –P3	Edinburgh	86	89	82	Worsening	
		Target Wards	78	80	70.9	Worsening	
	Writing - P7	Edinburgh	61	67	61	Static	
		Target Wards	42	50	48.1	Worsening	

<sup>43</sup> Attendance rates are from CEC Education Department 2006 and the target is for 2008

<sup>44</sup> School leaver destinations are from Scottish Executive- December 2005

<sup>45</sup> Literacy and Numeracy are extrapolated from national figures published in CLAN Evaluation report 2004

<sup>46</sup> Primary school attainment data is from CEC Education department and is based on the average attainment for pupils in the city and for pupils attending one of 29 primary schools that are located in the focus wards

S4 Attainment 5+ awards at level 4 or better <sup>47</sup>	Edinburgh	75% (2002/04)	Previous targets were for 2002-2005 new targets will be set in 2006	75% (2003/05)	The targets for 2005 have been exceeded both for the city and the individual targets for the focus schools
	Focus Schools	59% (2002/04)		60% (2003/05)	
	61 DZs	45.2% (2003)		50.1% (2004)	
Number of People staying on at school post 16 <sup>48</sup>	Edinburgh	62	80	63 (2004/05)	Improving
	Focus Schools (all wards)	42	70	45(2004/05)	Improving

#### Schools Used for 12 Focus Wards for 5A and 5B

- **Craigmillar:** Castlebrae Secondary and St Francis , Castleview, Niddriemill and Newcraighall
- **Dudingston:** Holyrood and Portobello Secondary and Dudingston, Lismore and St Johns primaries
- **Granton:** No secondaries and Granton PS
- **Muirhouse/ Drylaw:** Craigroyston Secondary and Craigroyston and Ferryhill primaries
- **Pilton:** No secondaries, Royston, Inchview, St. Davids and Pirniehall primaries
- **Harbour:** No secondaries and Bonnington primary schools.
- **Newhaven:** Trinity secondary and Trinity, Fort and Victoria primaries.
- **Kaimes:** Gracemount secondary and Gracemount, Burdiehouse and St Catherine's primary schools.
- **Parkhead:** No secondary and Longstone, Drumbryden and Clovenstone primary schools
- **Moredun:** No secondary and Craighour Park primary school
- **Murrayburn:** Wester Hailes Education Centre and Sighthill and Hailesland primary schools
- **Restalrig:** No secondary and St Ninians and Craigentenny primary schools

<sup>47</sup> The data for the focus schools and for Edinburgh is from CEC Attainment Report 2005 (25<sup>th</sup> April 2006). It is based on average attainment for the city as whole and for the 7 secondary schools. It is worked out as the % of the original S4 cohort who, by the end of S6 have attained 5+ awards at level 4 or better- this is the dataset Education Department use to monitor progress and it is the one that targets are set against. The data for the 61 data zones is from SNS site and this is based on attainment of pupils living in the 61 focus data zones regardless of the location of the school that they attend. It is different from that monitored by the council as it reflects the % of the S4 cohort who achieve SCQF level 4 or better

<sup>48</sup> Estimated S5 January roll as a % of the S4 roll in September of the previous session. The data for this is based on the January S5 stay-on figures. The January figures are produced to give an accurate reflection of the proportion of pupils who may actually be available to take exams in S5. Provided by CEC 4<sup>th</sup> May 2006

## Template 2.1 Community Engagement Assessment

Evidence given in the narrative of this report highlights extensive community engagement both in the focus areas for the ROA and with Communities of Interest through the Support Network. In September 2006 CCP sent a questionnaire to the Community Representatives working in the local regeneration areas to ask them a range of questions and to support the completion of this Template. The response was poor with only 3 questionnaires being returned.

Community Representatives in Leith and Restalrig were not part of this exercise, with feedback being gathered at community meetings. Only the meeting in Restalrig had taken place by the time this assessment was completed and 7 community representatives were consulted. All 7 of the Restalrig Community Representatives said that they hadn't heard of the national standards and as a result their responses have not been put into this template.

The table below presents the responses. A score of 5 represents a positive response rate of 100% to the relevant question (4=80%, 3=60%, 2=40% and 1=20%). Please bear in mind the low response rate- for most of the table **only 3 responses** are available to be analysed and if this table were not compulsory we would not have presented this information.

<b>Each question is followed by some standards from the National Standards of Community Engagement. Using these will help partnerships complete the self assessment exercise</b>	<b>Score 1-5</b>	<b>What evidence is there for the score you have given? You will find the indicators for the National Standards for Community Engagement useful in providing the Evidence</b>
CPP uses the national standards for community engagement to underpin its work	5 – based on the 2 respondents who had heard of the standards	When asked the question “ <i>Are you familiar with the standards of community engagement?</i> ” only 2 of the 10 said they were, so only these 2 would be in a position to judge whether or not the CPP uses the national standards. Out of these both thought that they did use the standards.
CPP engages with a broad range of representative structures within the community including the most excluded groups (Involvement standard, Working Together Standards, Working with others Standard)	5	When asked the question “ <i>In your opinion do you think the Partnership engages with a broad range of representative structures within the community – including the most excluded groups?</i> ” All three respondents answered yes.

CPP uses a broad range of approaches to engage communities (Methods Standard)	5	When asked “ <i>Do you think the Partnership is flexible and uses a broad range of approaches to engage with the local community?</i> ” All three respondents answered yes.
CPP provides relevant information needed for effective engagement	5	In answer to the question “ <i>Do you think you have received necessary information to allow you to effectively engage in discussions?</i> ” all three community representatives who replied said yes.
CPP monitors and evaluates community engagement in the ROA (Sharing Information Standard; Support Standard; Feedback Standard; Monitoring and Evaluation Standard)	5	“ <i>As far as you are aware does the Partnership monitor and evaluate community engagement in regeneration?</i> ” All three respondents think that the Partnership does monitor and evaluate community engagement in regeneration.
CPP identifies resources for community engagement and continuous improvement (Improvement Standard; Support Standard)	5	When asked “ <i>Do you think the Partnership identifies resources for community engagement and continuous improvement</i> ” All three respondents answered yes to this question.
CPP improves public services in response to community priorities (Planning Standard)	5	When asked “ <i>Do you think the Partnership has improved public services in response to Community Priorities?</i> ” All three respondents said
CPP refers to Community Learning and Development strategy to show how it understands these can support engagement	2	Only one of the three respondents had heard of the Community Learning and Development Strategy. This Community representative thought that the partnership does refer to it to support engagement.
CPP refers to Tenant Participation strategy to show how it understands these can support engagement	5	All three respondents had heard of the Tenant Participation Strategy and thought that it was used to support community engagement.

## Template 2.2 Community Engagement Action Plan

On the 27<sup>th</sup> September 2006 Edinburgh Partnership launched the “Improving Community Engagement in Edinburgh – Strategy and Action Plan 2006-08”. This document takes template 2.1 and suggests that this is used as a Community Engagement Assessment Tool by agencies, partnerships and community groups. The strategy also focuses on a range of actions that have been used to complete this template. The full strategy can be viewed on [http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/internet/Council/Partnerships/Community\\_planning/CEC\\_draft\\_-\\_community\\_engagement](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/internet/Council/Partnerships/Community_planning/CEC_draft_-_community_engagement)

<b>Key barriers to having more effective community involvement in delivering the ROA</b>	<b>Planned action</b>	<b>Partners</b>	<b>How will you judge success</b>
A clear understanding of the policy processes of partner agencies is not available i.e. information on how decisions are made	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report on how community engagement currently impacts how services are developed and designed.</li> <li>• Provide information about when and how policies /services are developed in partner agencies.</li> <li>• Further plans to be developed following the gathering of this information</li> </ul>	Community Engagement Strategy subgroup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement will have a clear impact on how decisions are made - examples evident</li> <li>• Details will be available showing when decisions are made in each agency</li> </ul>
Unsure if all partner agencies consistently evaluate and report on community engagement activity against the National Standards for Community Engagement. This will require partner agencies to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a common way of reporting performance based on the National Standards for Community Engagement</li> </ul>	Community Engagement Strategy subgroup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All partners will submit meaningful reports to the Edinburgh Partnership, using self assessment against the agreed strategy</li> <li>• Report on trends in community engagement through the annual report and annual reports of</li> </ul>

actively demonstrate how community engagement has lead to improved services.			partners
Not clear which resources are used in community engagement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gather further information about the resources currently being used in community engagement by partner agencies and strategic partnerships* (including identifying resources to enable communities to take part in community engagement activities)</li> <li>• Create central list of resources e.g. database of community groups and forums, tools to assist community engagement, venues etc</li> </ul>	Community Engagement Strategy subgroup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through a baseline report and compilation of a database of resources.</li> <li>• Sharing of resources actively demonstrated</li> <li>• Under resourcing will be challenged</li> </ul>
Although an effective network for community representatives (Edinburgh Community Reps Network) in Edinburgh does exist there is still a need to develop this and engage with other partners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create an email discussion forum</li> <li>• Online directory of community engagement contacts</li> </ul>	Community Engagement Co-ordinator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information will be shared amongst those involved in community engagement</li> <li>• Email resource developed and forum available October 2006</li> <li>• Attendance at network events increasing</li> <li>• Number of times the email resource is used</li> </ul>
Coordination of community engagement across the city is lacking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a practical way to record and co-ordinate community engagement activity</li> <li>• Develop an effective Edinburgh Partnership Citizens Panel</li> <li>• Pilot project to demonstrate joint</li> </ul>	Community Engagement Co-ordinator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of joined up community engagement activity</li> <li>• Reduced levels of consultation fatigue</li> <li>• Improved response rates to</li> </ul>

	engagement activity		engagement activity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater staff awareness of tools available to co-ordinate activity</li> <li>• Tool to co-ordinate community engagement will be in place</li> <li>• Number of times the tool is used</li> <li>• Recorded levels of publicity developed and distributed to promote the tool</li> <li>• Edinburgh Partnership Citizens Panel in place</li> <li>• Number of times the panel is used</li> <li>• Baseline of community engagement activity will be in place</li> </ul>
Unsure whether practitioners understand the purpose of different community engagement methods and processes and are able to select relevant approaches and use them confidently and effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create an effective programme of learning opportunities</li> <li>• Create a calendar of learning opportunities</li> <li>• Create a variety of opportunities for shadowing, skill sharing, mentoring etc</li> </ul>	Community Engagement Co-ordinator in association with partner agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive evaluations of community engagement methods and approaches by stakeholders and external agencies</li> <li>• Increased understanding and confidence amongst practitioners</li> <li>• Calendar of learning opportunities in place</li> <li>• Joint programme of learning opportunities in place</li> </ul>
Currently the community engagement approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a range of opportunities for shadowing; skill sharing; mentoring;</li> </ul>	Community Engagement Co-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of increased creativity and innovation, and use of a wider</li> </ul>

<p>doesn't appear to underpin partner agencies' work with communities. As a result will try to create a learning environment amongst the partner agencies that values the benefits of community engagement</p>	<p>secondment; research; study visits; conferences; seminars and courses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create networks for learning across the city</li> <li>• Hold events to share experience and practice</li> <li>• Act on reviews of community engagement</li> <li>• Use CE practitioners network as a base for these events</li> </ul>	<p>ordinator in association with partner agencies</p>	<p>range of methods at individual level and partner level city wide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased understanding and confidence amongst practitioners</li> <li>• Positive experiences of community engagement are shared and celebrated</li> <li>• Problematic experiences are shared, learned from and where appropriate challenged</li> <li>• Opportunities for learning reflect the variety of community engagement methods and contexts</li> <li>• Formal and informal learning networks are developed across traditional partnership, agency, community or professional</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

## Template 3.1 National Community Regeneration Priorities – CRF Activity Relationships

Please note that the partner contributions are based on the SMAR forms returned for North Edinburgh, South Edinburgh, West Edinburgh and Capital City Partnership. About 1 in 10 of the projects has still to return a form or it has not yet been forwarded by the local monitoring officers. The information for Craigmillar was provided in a summarised form as leverage. As a result we can not identify individual partners contributions and these have been recorded under the others heading. As yet CCP have no data on the partners contributions for Leith or Restalrig.

National Community Regeneration Priorities	Broad types of project/services funded by the CRF contributing to meeting the priority	Total CRF spend contributing to the priority 2005-2006	Partners making financial contributions to the CRF activities identified in Column 2	For each of these partners, financial contribution 2005-2006
Building Strong Safe and Attractive Communities	Capital projects, Equalities groups, Community help and advice, environmental improvements	£1,229,752	Action on Drugs and Alcohol in Edinburgh	£61,101
			Lothian Health	£84,463
			CEC Corporate Services	£16,078
			CEC Educations	£133,729
			CEC Early Intervention	£3,000
			CEC Social Work	£198,560
			CEC Consumer and Environmental Services	£24,55
			Other CEC	£130,665
			LDC	£397
			Lottery	£116,503
			EVOT	£1,000
			Nancie Massey Charitable Trust	£2,000
			Lloyds TSB	£13,570
			Children in Need	£20,000
			HBOS	£4,000
			Scottish Community Foundation	£4,730
			Homepoint	£5,000
			Scottish Executive	£29,000
			Working Together	£28,813
			SureStart	£84,857
			OOSHLA	£3,016
			SSSC	£35,444
Student Fees	£19,785			
Other Trusts	£51,927			
Help the Aged	£10,000			
Ethnic Minority Grant Scheme	£26,682			
Income	£13,518			

			Comic Relief	£29,202
			Communities Scotland	£25,000
			Queens Institute of District Nursing	£2,500
			Donations and Fundraising	£250
			Supporting People	£608,002
			European Funds	£57,095
			Others	£149,444
Getting People into Work	Childcare, business development, employment access and support	£1,568,202	Lothian Health	£28,359
			CEC Corporate Services	£44,726
			CEC Education	£93,750
			CEC Social Work	£111,150
			CEC Economic Development	£178,250
			Other CEC	£114,031
			LDC	£6,750
			Lottery	£381,756
			European Funds	£1,056,771
			Lloyds TSB	£11,500
			Esmee Fairbairn	£19,379
			Scottish Executive	£111,611
			Private Support	£31,000
			Other Trusts	£260,552
			Edinburgh Business Development	£35,826
			Waterfront Edinburgh	£10,000
			Childcare Partnership	£142,135
			Scottish Arts Council	£12,000
			Access to Industry	£5,000
			Arts and Business	£1,000
			Communities Scotland	£122,089
			Training for Work	£15,680
			Careers Scotland	£49,100
			Childcare Strategy Fund	£115,646
			New Deal	£26,000
			National Galleries Scotland	£9,000
			SEEL	£112,000
Better Off Funding	£100,807			
Job Centre Plus	£25,000			
Donations and Fundraising	£68,906			
Other	£968,536			
Improving Health	Health promotion, active lifestyles, young people and health, sexual health, healthy eating	£864,568	Lothian Health	£159,082
			CEC Corporate Services	£48,075
			CEC Social Work	£46,175
			Lottery	£206,110

			Paths to Health	£23,298
			Choose Life	£62,380
			Supporting People	£38,000
			Health Improvement Fund	£25,016
			Working Together	£60,000
			Sure Start	£72,619
			Other	£491,025
Raising Educational Attainment	IT support, reading promotion, after school clubs, arts and education	£419,693	European Funds	£100,000
			Other	£71,194
Engaging Young People	Youth clubs, diversionary activities, recreation facilities, support for young mothers, youth participation, Streetwork	£933,642	CEC Corporate Services	£11,768
			CEC Education/Children and Families	£318,082
			CEC Social Work	£158,904
			CEC Culture and Leisure	£105,199
			Other CEC	£41,046
			Lottery	£136,795
			Scottish Natural Heritage	£12,203
			Children in Need	£16,000
			Robertson Trust	£9,167
			CLAN Edinburgh	£5,808
			Community Safety	£13,835
			Sure Start	£60,224
			Edinvar HA	£2,000
			Tudor Trust	£20,000
			Income (rents, cafes, etc)	£101,763
			Donations	£39,187
			The Rank Foundation	£34,859
			EYSIP	£3,203
			Other Trusts	£10,700
			WREN	£25,000
			Other	£184,696
Supporting Community Involvement	Capacity building, older and people forum, community newspapers, community events	£1,101,203	CEC Corporate Service	£78,760
			CEC Education	£21,165
			CEC Housing	£4,400
			Other CEC	£20,764
			Lottery	£56,800
			European Funds	£79,835
			Lloyds TSB	£6,000
			Edinburgh Community Newspaper Trust	£75,500
			Community Regeneration Fund	£6,957
			Income	£18,886
			Trusts and Funds	£5,438
			Other	£292,414

Supporting Community Involvement: Community Voices Programme		£125,270	Community Voices Programme	£34,671
Core Support Monitoring and Evaluation	Support teams, monitoring, evaluation and reviews	£585,507		
Administration Costs		£166,799		
Total		£6,939,366		£9,652,644

## Template 4b Detail of Planned CRF Expenditure

A full picture of CRF expenditure for 2005/6 is given. For 2006-7 and 2007-8 a full expenditure plan is not available yet. Local processes in each local CPP area determined spend priorities related to local and national priorities for 2006-8. Worth noting here is that Edinburgh, unlike most ROA areas is managing a downturn in CRF resources. It is part of the proactive management of this downturn to keep some flexibility in the resource programme to match, complement or reflect mainstreaming of previously funded services. It is therefore unlikely and undesirable that the full three year ROA commitment be decided in advance.

These figures are likely to change as unallocated funds are allocated. This Template is based on figures provided by CEC Finance 15<sup>th</sup> June 2006.

<b>National priority: Building strong, safe and attractive communities</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Key service/ project</b>	<b>Funding recipient</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2005/06</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2006/07</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2007/08</b>
SEP	Burdiehouse Burn Project	CEC	£100,000	£60,000	Nil (capital)
SEP	Community Help and Advice	Voluntary	£30,750	£30,750	
WEP	Broomhouse Representative council	Voluntary	£7,882	£7,333	£6,784
WEP	Community One Stop Shop	Voluntary	£22,465	£20,901	£19,336
WEP	Dove Centre	Voluntary	£28,800	£26,796	£24,789
WEP	Community Help and Advice project	Voluntary	£154,697	£143,930	£133,150
NEP	Black Community Development	Voluntary	£122,176	£110,176	£110,176
NEP	Muirhouse Millennium Centre	Voluntary	£124,661	£110,994	£103,994
NEP	Drylaw Neighbourhood Centre	Voluntary	£86,365	£65,382	£65,382
NEP	Muirhouse under 3s	Voluntary	£11,317	£24,476	£6,776
NEP	Granton Information Centre (including benefits take up)	Voluntary	£150,863	£147,739	£87,031
NEP	Pilton Elderly Project	Voluntary	£64,918	£52,918	£52,918
NEP	North Edinburgh Regeneration Fund	Voluntary	£70,000*	£25,000	

NEP	North Edinburgh European Fund	Voluntary	£10,000*	£10,000	£10,000
NEP	Muirhouse Shopping Centre	CEC	£13,684		
NEP	North Edinburgh Activists training	Voluntary	£34,363	£34,363	£34,363
NEP	North Edinburgh Capital Small Grants fund	Voluntary	£25,000		
NEP	Small Projects Community Regeneration Fund	Voluntary	£35,000		
NEP	Community Mediation Project	Voluntary		£15,000	
NEO	Muirhouse 6 O	Voluntary	£16,000		
CR	Craigmillar Neighbourhood Alliance	Voluntary	£27,034	£27,034	
CR	Arts and Environmental project	Voluntary	£28,988	£28,088	
Leith	THI Development project	CEC	£15,000	£100,000	£150,000
Leith	Graffiti, Whose problem is it?	CEC	£6,800	£5,388 <sup>2</sup>	
Leith	Environmental improvements	CEC	£46,000		
Leith	Action Research Project			£24,068	
Restalrig	Craigentiny environmental improvements	CEC	£30,000		
Restalrig	Restalrig road shops – environmental	CEC	£10,000		
Restalrig	Enhanced Graffiti treatment service	CEC	£15,938		
Restalrig	Edinvar community care – housing support	RSL	£6,593	£25,674	£26,470
Restalrig	Home Safety Project		£4,458	£6,242	
Restalrig	Toddler Zone			£1,000	£35,000 (ring fenced)
Restalrig	Home Safety Project			£6,242	
Restalrig	Financial Inclusion Service			£15,301	£15,700
Restalrig	Restalrig Benefits Advice Project			£18,204	£18,565
Restalrig	Minibus			£19,742	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>£1,299,752</b>	<b>£1,156,449</b>	<b>£900,525</b>

\*Generic, spend could be under any priority

Some Leith awards contain an element of carry forward from 2005/06

<b>National priority: Getting people into Work</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Key service/ project</b>	<b>Funding recipient</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2005/06</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2006/07</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2007/08</b>
SEP	Transitions	Voluntary	£30,000		
SEP	SE Supported Employment	Voluntary	£15,075		
SEP	Women onto Work	Voluntary	£16,950	£15,000	
SEP	Childcare Connections	Voluntary	£115,000	£115,000	
SEP	Business Development fund	Voluntary	£5,000		
SEP	SE Enterprise Campaign	Voluntary	£5,000		
SEP	Activate	Careers Scotland	£11,200	Nil – mainstreamed	Nil
WEP	Onestop Childcare	Voluntary	£245,579	£228,487	£211,373
SP	Worktrack Oxfangs	Voluntary	£11,000	£5,500	Nil
NEP	Greater Pilton Carers Project (North West Carers Centre)	Voluntary	£57,894	£57,894	£57,894
NEP	North Edinburgh Childcare	Voluntary	£418,104	£387,104	£387,104
NEP	Business Incubator	Voluntary	£30,885	£30,885	£30,885
CR	Craigmillar Development Enterprise	Voluntary	£170,000	£170,000	
CR	MIME	Voluntary	£60,293	£60,293	
CR	Craigmillar Childcare Services	Voluntary	£206,536	£206,356	
CR	Worktrack	Voluntary	£168,866	Nil – CCP funded	Nil
Leith	Fort Link Up (Working Links)	Voluntary	£1,000		
Leith	Customer Support Worker			£22,400	£22,579
Leith	Newhaven and Harbour Link Up			£33,327	£48,890
Leith	Women onto Work			£18,627	£19,186
Leith	Transition			£18,789	£25,485
Restalrig	Transition			£18,789	£19,664

Restalrig	Restalrig Youth Options Programme			£14,427	£14,427
Restalrig	Women onto Work			£18,628	
Restalrig	Action Group			£19,950	£19,950
	<b>Total</b>		<b>£1,568,202</b>	<b>£1,441,456</b>	<b>£857,437</b>

<b>National priority: Improving Health</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Key service/ project</b>	<b>Funding recipient</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2005/06</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2006/07</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2007/08</b>
SEP	Health Opportunities Team	NHS	£44,810	£40,000	
SEP	Health Improvement Fund	Voluntary	£8,000		Nil
SEP	LAHA Activities	Voluntary	£59,634	£40,000	
SEP	SEHLI Family Lifestyles	NHS	£30,000	£30,000	Nil
SEP	SEHLI Active lifestyles	NHS	£23,556	£20,000	Nil
SEP	Vocal Carers Support	Voluntary	£22,495	£30,000	
SEP	Vocal Family Support (Addictions)	Voluntary	£35,000	£30,000	
SEP	Children 1 <sup>st</sup> Family Support	Voluntary	£30,000	£30,000	
WEP	Wester Hailes Health Agency	Voluntary	£43,589	£40,555	£37,518
SP	Canongate Youth Drug & Alcohol Education	Voluntary	£19,000	£9,500	
SP	Oxgangs Community Support	Voluntary	£34,000	£17,000	
SP	Oxgangs Community Health Project	Voluntary	£25,000	£12,500	
NEP	Healthy Living Centre	NHS	£21,367		
NEP	Paths to Health	Voluntary			
NEP	Artzone- Artist in Residence	Voluntary	£10,000	£10,000	
NEP	Pilton Community Health Project	Voluntary	£66,532	£67,927	£46,282
CR	Bingham 50+	Voluntary	£5,000	£5,000	
CR	Womanzone	Voluntary	£27,454	Final decision on funding in 2006/07 dependent on further information required	
CR	Richmond Cafe	Voluntary	£8,367	£8,367	

CR	Community Food Initiative	Voluntary	£5,250	£5,250	
CR	HOT	Voluntary	£103,922	£103,922	
CR	Phonelink	Voluntary	£67,859	£67,859	
CR	Aberlour Outreach Project	Voluntary	£21,908	£21,908	
CR	Castle Project	Voluntary	£28,092	£28,092	
Leith	Domestic abuse initiative	NHS	£5,175	£10,710	£11,780
Leith	Young person's health worker –alcohol	Voluntary	£10,125	£19,401	£22,200
Leith	Aberlour family Outreach	Voluntary	£11,873	£41,511	£42,697
Leith	First Steps in Leith	Edinburgh Leisure	£4,466	£18,362	£18,362
Leith	Edinburgh Community Food Initiative	Voluntary	£3,308		
Leith	The Junction	Voluntary	£32,746	£30,006	£32,000
Leith	Teenage Health Clinic	NHS	£3,292	£6,233	£6,232
Leith	Young Person's Counselling Service	Voluntary	£15,931	£30,513	£32,800
Leith	Healthy Bodies and Healthy Minds (Stanwell)		£1,993		
Leith	Advice in Health Settings			£17,253	£17,902
Leith	Older Men's Health and Wellbeing Project			£7,375	£8,112
Leith	Access to Healthy Food			£31,867	£40,200
Leith	Healthy Living Initiative			£28,466	£36,967
Restalrig	The Listening Place	Voluntary	£2,646	£5,146	£5,300
Restalrig	Lochend community Resource Centre	Voluntary	£19,489	£14,910	£13,910
Restalrig	Lochend/Restalrig Community Café Project			£40,587	£44,250
Restalrig	Fsu Scotland – Harbour project	Voluntary	£3,453	£15,000	£15,000
Restalrig	Teenage health project	NHS	£3,292	£6,232	£6,232
Restalrig	Young person's health worker –alcohol	Voluntary	£3,994	£9,701	£11,000
Restalrig	Health promotion worker	CEC	£2,000	£19,750	
Restalrig	The Ripple Lunch Club			£7,941	£8,230
	<b>Total</b>		<b>£864,568</b>	<b>£978,843</b>	<b>£457,074</b>

**A number of the Leith projects had 2006/07 monies enhanced with an element of carry forward from 2005/06**

<b>National priority: Engaging young people</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Key service/ project</b>	<b>Funding recipient</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2005/06</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2006/07</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2007/08</b>
SEP	Branded	Voluntary	£27,000	£4,500	
SEP	Children 1 <sup>st</sup> – Bfriends	Voluntary	£18,000	£18,000	
SEP	Homelink	Voluntary	£30,069	£30,000	
SEP	Streetwork – Give Youth a Chance	Voluntary	£74,582		
SEP	Youth Provision			£80,000 ring- fenced funding subject to outcome of tendering process	
SEP	SE Skate/Wheel Park	CEC	£50,000	Completed and in use	
SEP	FABB Open Doors	Voluntary	£33,210	£6,480	
SEP	Multi Sports Court St John Vianney's	CEC	£30,000		
WEP	Youth Agency	Voluntary	£56,101	£52,196	£48,287
WEP	Citylife	Voluntary	£2,700	£2,512	£2,324
WEP	Young Persons Service Forum	Voluntary	£10,800	£10,048	£9,296
NEP	Granton Youth Centre	Voluntary	£92,002	£90,092	£90,092
NEP	Muirhouse Youth Development Group	Voluntary	£86,222	£112,222	£86,222
NEP	Muirhouse Youth Development Group- Active Futures	Voluntary		£18,000	
NEP	Royston All Weather	CEC	£2,720	£2,720	£2,720
NEP	PYCP	Voluntary	£160,544	£160,544	£160,544
NEP	North Edinburgh Arts	Voluntary	£18,531	£28,531	£28,531
NEP	Stepping Stones	Voluntary		£17,170	
NEP	Review of Youth Organisations			£5,000	

CR	The Venchie	Voluntary	£88,240	£88,240	
CR	Café K	Voluntary	£56,646	£56,646	
Leith	Youth Participation initiative	Voluntary	£20,456	£39,747	£41,121
Leith	Summer Programme for Young People			£30,096	
Leith	Summer Play Clubs for Early Years			£9,636	
Restalrig	Street football for all	Voluntary	£9,750		
Restalrig	Craigentenny Community Centre	CEC	£2,530		
Restalrig	Lochend Youth Football Club	Voluntary	£43,357		£16,643
Restalrig	The Youth Bus	Voluntary	£4,350	£12,530	£12,906
Restalrig	Youth worker- The Ripple Project	Voluntary	£10,832	£27,430	£29,050
Restalrig	The Youth Bus (Ripple)		£5,000	£14,515	£14,515
Restalrig	Detached Youth Work			£6,732	£5,532
	<b>Total</b>		<b>£933,642</b>	<b>£926,419</b>	<b>£547,783</b>

**Some of the Leith Awards for 2006/07 include an element of carry forward from 2005/06**

<b>National priority: Raising Educational Attainment</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Key service/ project</b>	<b>Funding recipient</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2005/06</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2006/07</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2007/08</b>
SEP	Café Connect	Voluntary	£35,872		
SEP	Local Learning Fund	Voluntary	£10,000	£10,000	
SEP	Children Learning Through Recreation	CEC	£5,000	Mainstreamed	
SEP	Children 1 <sup>st</sup> - Teacher Support	Voluntary	£15,000	£20,000	
SEP	Computer Training	Voluntary		£10,000	
NEP	Primary School ICT	CEC	£35,417		
WEP	WHALE	Voluntary	£62,552	£58,198	£53,839
SP	Holyrood IT Centre	Voluntary	£50,000	£25,000	
CR	Adult Student Link	CEC	£44,597	£44,597	
CR	Lothian Community Development Trust (Haywired)	Voluntary	£100,000	£100,000	
Leith	Health breakfasts in schools	Voluntary	£1,000		
Leith	Fort After School provision	Voluntary	£20,138	£55,346	£40,270
Leith	Bookstart	CEC	£10,000	£18,000	£19,000
Leith	Dr Bells development	Voluntary	£13,745	£52,031	£45,070
Leith	Multicultural family base – stuffy support	Voluntary	£8,500		
Leith	Study Support			£17,910	£17,910
Leith	Acorn Youth Project	Voluntary	£2,000		
Leith	Fort Primary School	CEC	£2,000		
Leith	Sikh Sanjog	Voluntary	£1,272		
Leith	A-Z for Leith Families	CEC	£1,600		
Leith	Bonnington Primary School Family Learning	CEC	£500		
Leith	Homestart Leith & NE Edinburgh	Voluntary	£500		
Leith	Family Learning – Support for Parents			£4,418	£1,831
Leith	Leith FM			£2,965	

Restalrig	Write On			£4,578	£4,578
Restalrig	Young Women's Health and Well Being Programme			£3,402	
Restalrig	Schools Curriculum Support			£10,000	£10,000
	<b>Total</b>		<b>£419,693</b>	<b>£436,445</b>	<b>£192,498</b>

**Figures for 2006/07 for Leith includes an element of carry forward from 2005/06**

**Template 4b: Detail of planned CRF expenditure (CVP= Community Voices Programme)**

<b>Community Involvement</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Key service/ project</b>	<b>Funding recipient</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2005/06</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2006/07</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2007/08</b>
SEP	Community Development Initiative	Voluntary	£56,100 & £45,000 CVP	£56,100 & £34,146 CVP	
SEP	SEAG Community Transport	Voluntary	£48,149	£40,000	
SEP	SE Day Centre Volunteers Forum (Transport) (2006/07 South Edinburgh Lunch Club Support Service)	Voluntary	£10,261	£10,216	
SEP	ARTse South Edinburgh	Voluntary	£22,161	Mainstreamed	
SEP	South Edinburgh Echo	Voluntary	£27,000	£27,000	
SEP	SE Vol Sector Support Project	Voluntary	£44,453	£40,000	
SEP	SE Volunteer Centre	Voluntary	£50,000	£40,000	
SEP	Small Grants scheme (2006/07 Small Projects Fund)	Voluntary	£61,455	£40,000	
WEP	Broomhouse Empowerment	Voluntary	£27,855	£25,916	£23,975
WEP	Wester Hailes Rep Council	Voluntary	£108,000	£100,483	£92,957
WEP	West Edinburgh Times	Voluntary	£17,280	£16,077	£14,873
WEP	Older Person's Forum	Voluntary	£10,800	£10,048	£9,296
WEP	Voluntary Sector Forum	Voluntary	£6,957 and £8000 CVP	£6,473	£5,988
SP	Oxgangs Community Forum	Voluntary	£11,000	£5,000	
NEP	Pilton Partnership	Voluntary	£192,033 and £45,000 CVP	£192,033 and £34,146 CVP	£192,033
NEP	Communications Strategy	Voluntary	£18,150		
NEP	Pilton Partnership Asset Base	Voluntary	£10,000		
NEP	North Edinburgh News	Voluntary	£70,523	£70,523	£70,523

CR	Capacity Building Project	Voluntary	£164,595 & £45,000 CVP	£175,448 and £35,000 CVP	
CR	Craigmillar Chronicle	Voluntary	£37,859	£37,859	
CR	Bingham Community Planning	Voluntary	£13,000	£13,000	
CR	Bingham Small Grants	Voluntary	£25,000		
CR	Lismore Parents Action	Voluntary	£12,000	Final decision on funding in 2006/07 dependent on further information required	
CR	Craigmillar Ability Network	Voluntary	£52,617	£52,617	
Restalrig	Christmas event		£4,000	£4,000	£4,000
Restalrig	The Speaker Community Newspaper		£14,000 CVP	£4,789 and £15,211 CVP	£20,600
Restalrig	Restalrig Community Relations Project		£8,000 CVP	£17,000 CVP	
Restalrig	Grass Roots Community Fare		£856 CVP	£1,618 CVP	£1,618 CVP
Restalrig	Capacity Building Worker		£11,802 CVP	£32,763 CVP	£33,981 CVP
Restalrig	Link Up Women's Support		£776 CVP		
Restalrig	Ripple Project		£2,680 CVP		
Restalrig	Community Consultation		£900 CVP		
Restalrig	Craigentenny Community Education		£1,644 CVP		
Leith	Leith Community Involvement Project		£17,500 CVP	£22,452 CVP	£23,125 CVP
Leith	Older Person's Forum		£5,300 CVP	£6,527 CVP	£6,829 CVP
Leith	BME Fact Finding		£4,026 CVP		
Leith	Wireless Participation Project		£9,786 CVP		
	<b>Total</b>		<b>£1,101,203 and £225,270 CVP</b>	<b>£967,582 and £198,863CVP</b>	<b>£434,245 &amp; £65,553 CVP</b>

<b>Core support, monitoring and Evaluation</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Key service/ project</b>	<b>Funding recipient</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2005/06</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2006/07</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2007/08</b>
SEP	Partnership Team	Voluntary	£250,000	£230,000	
WEP	Evaluation an support costs	CEC	£25,677 and £18,443 CVP	£23,808	£22,028
NEP	NEAR support costs	CEC	£68,133	£79,133	£86,283
NEP	Review of Youth Organisations			£5,000	
CR	Partnership Team	Voluntary	£240,332	£200,000	
Leith	Support Costs		£1,000	£1,000	
Restalrig			£365	£300	
ALL	Administration Fees	CEC	£166,799 and £3,000 CVP	£161,000	£97,611
	<b>Total</b>		<b>£752,306 and £21,443 CVP</b>	<b>£695,241</b>	<b>£205,922</b>

### Unallocated

	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	<b>2007/08</b>
South Edinburgh	£16	£5,806	£820,173
North Edinburgh	£5,538	£50,045	£115,812
West Edinburgh	-	£4	
Craigmillar	-	£140,743	£1,556,352
SURA		£500	
Leith	£2,551	£104,929	£59,756
Restalrig	-	£194	£28,423
<b>Total</b>	<b>£8,105</b>	<b>£302,221</b>	<b>£2,580,516</b>

<b>TOTAL</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Key service/ project</b>	<b>Funding recipient</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2005/06</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2006/07</b>	<b>Planned CRF spend 2007/08</b>
	<b>Total</b>		<b>£7,194,184</b>	<b>£7,197,949</b>	<b>£6,356,000</b>

## APPENDIX ONE- EXAMPLES OF CRF FUNDED COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- In South Edinburgh the funding for the SEAG bus has meant that members of the community with mobility problems are able to attend and contribute at community meetings.
- Funding of Community newspapers, such as the West Edinburgh Times, not only informs the local community of events, meetings and discussions that are happening in the local area, it also provides a conduit for positive images of what is happening in the area. This year CCP paid for initial scoping of a commercial development plan for Community Newspapers as a key communication tool for local partnerships. Futurebuilders funding allowed for full commercial feasibility to be tested alongside advertising revenue potential for sustainability. The essentially positive results are being taken forward by a consortium of the existing titles, the hope is to retain this key community involvement platform as a mainstream initiative and in a sustainable (advertising funded) form
- Fora in West Edinburgh support groups such as the elderly to be involved in consultations and decision making – practically supporting community engagement.
- Projects such as the Pilton Partnership and the Capacity Building Project support community representatives in their role on local Partnership boards and will perform a similar role if required in the new LCPPs. In the case of the Pilton Partnership they are central to decisions on CRF funding allocations – sitting the local community at the very heart of where CRF money is spent in the local community. A more detailed breakdown of the outputs from the projects funded will be available in time for the in-year stock take.
- The Health Sub Group in Craigmillar is preparing a Reducing Health Inequalities Plan and to support this a programme of research on people’s views on the quality of their lives, how they feel in themselves, what they do to stay well and how they can be helped is being undertaken. This research is supported by the SCARF programme and will therefore follow an Action Research model.
- In North Edinburgh a Community Consultation seminar is planned for September 2006 to explore issues around the Waterfront Development. It will look at developing a precise outline from the community of what they want from the development, in terms of environment, employment opportunities, facilities, etc.
- In Restalrig the ‘Have Your Say’ consultation exercise was carried out in January by 2 local activists. The purpose was to raise awareness of the ROA and to find out what local people felt the regeneration monies should be spent on. The survey was carried out in the YWCA in Lochend to coincide with the local food co-op and a total of 107 residents took part.
- Leith Community Involvement Project ran a series of consultation events in February using different venues within the area. A letter of invitation was distributed to all residents within the ROA. Again, the purpose was to provide residents with an opportunity to identify their priorities for the regeneration of the area. In addition to attending one of the events, residents were also provided with the

opportunity of having their details added to the projects mailing list so they could be kept informed of developments/ progress on the ROA.

Engaging with equalities groups is a key focus for the local partnerships and examples of this kind of work include:

#### Race

- The Pilton Partnership and the Black Community Development Project (both of which receive CRF funding) have been co-working on an audit of BME and East European households in the North Edinburgh.
- The North Edinburgh Equalities Forum is a multi-agency planning group which aims to raise awareness amongst local projects of equalities issues. It also ensures that local issues relating to exclusion are heard and referred to the appropriate agency for action, organises relevant training opportunities and looks at equalities monitoring issues. Specific activities last year included organising a Race Relations Amendment Act training session and an Equalities Monitoring session.
- In West Edinburgh a BME Forum has recently been established. The Forum aims to offer support to local BME groups and their members. Through working in partnership with agencies it aims to improve service delivery and address issues of real and perceived racial bias.
- The Restalrig Community Relations Project, which is being run by Edinburgh and Lothians Racial Equality Council, aims to increase the involvement and participation of BME communities in the area, particularly young people. Activities include a survey to identify the needs and aspirations of BME communities and an education programme targeted on BME young people.
- The Leith BME Fact Finding Project, managed by Edinburgh and Lothians Racial Equality Council, will survey the needs and priorities of the local BME communities.

#### Disabilities

- In North Edinburgh a new group for people with disabilities has been set up in response to local need. A major event is currently being organised around the Giants exhibition, which portrays images and challenges stereotypes of people with disabilities. The event will involve workshops, discussions, arts activities and social events across four venues.
- In early 2006, West Edinburgh launched a Disabilities Issues Forum. The Forum provides a voice for local disabled people and a vehicle for ensuring action in relation to identified priorities, including areas such as transport, streetscape, housing and employment.

## Young People

- North Edinburgh has a Young Persons Forum. Recent activities include involving young people in research into school meals, meetings around policing and anti-social behaviour issues and an inter-generational event with members of OPEN (Older Persons Forum).
- West Edinburgh Community Planning Partnership has a Young Persons Service Forum. The Forum carries out consultation events that aim to involve young people in decision-making processes and to obtain feedback for agencies/service providers. The forum uses informal meetings with young people in their own environments, an approach that has proved successful with around 180 young people having been actively involved in consultations and a further 170 taking part in surveys and petitions. The Forum uses a wide range of publicity mechanisms to get young people involved and has seen tangible results including repairs to local facilities such as kick pitches and the re-instatement of withdrawn services.
- In Leith, a Youth Participation Initiative has been funded with the aim of increasing the involvement of young people in decision-making structures. Part of the work is to establish a local youth council of 45 young people, with an active committee. Other activities such as small common interest groups and open-access events are also planned.
- In Restalrig youth involvement is being addressed through funding of a dedicated Youth Worker whose role is to work with agencies to establish and support a Children and Young People's Forum for the area.

## Older People

- West Edinburgh has an Old Persons Service Forum that has been operating since 2002. The Forum brings together older people (aged 50 years or over) to discuss key issues of concern. Recent issues have included transport, crime and disability access. The Forum has also provided input to the city-wide strategy for the elderly.
- In Leith funding has been allocated to support an Older Peoples Forum. The project aims to increase the involvement of older people in wider decision-making processes. Involving older carers, minority ethnic elders or those who are isolated or live alone is a particular focus.

## Wider Engagement

Although non CRF funded also indicative of the active engagement strategy is the process whereby the Edinburgh Partnership board supported elections for selecting the communities of Interest Representative. The election process itself was used to form a Communities of Interest Support Network (COISN) which supports board members and to bring forward issues from individual fora. In February 2006 COISN held an away day session in which the network focused on their capacity building needs in respect of equality and diversity issues. This work is now leading to the development of a full training and development programme for all Equality Fora in 2006/07 (there are currently 6 attached to the

Edinburgh Partnership Board via the COISN). The key aim here is to build a pool of community representatives who are willing and able to participate at this level of community planning. At the same time the Edinburgh Interfaith Association was established to represent people of belief and non belief throughout the city.

## APPENDIX TWO - EQUALITIES

### Project level data and Support work examples

At project level an illustration of data available to support equalities monitoring is outlined below

**Table 2 Illustration of Equalities Data Collected by Projects – Homelink Family Support 2005/06**

Age	Male	Female	BME	Disability
0-2 Years	10	16	3	3
3-5 Years	11	10	6	6
5-12 Years	8	7	2	5
13-16 Years	5	3	2	
16-25 Years	7	8	1	4
25-50 Years	21	27	5	6
50+	0	2	0	0

Existing project monitoring approaches identify clients by ethnicity and age, gender and by disability where self reported. As an example the table above presents this information for one CRF funded project – Homelink Family Support. Homelink offers support to families that are in distress, sometimes verging on crisis, and as a result of which the children are suffering. The primary aim of this project is to prevent the situation from worsening and to provide a measure of stability and prevent long term damage to children. The client group that the project works with is broken down by age, gender, ethnicity and disability. From this we can see for example that 14% of the client group are BME (the proportion of BME residents in South Edinburgh in the 2001 census was 4.3%) and 17% have a disability.

This type of information is available for all CRF projects and will be available in aggregate form for the mid year stocktake. Recording of users' sexual orientation is patchy for the practical reason that it can be seen as intrusive and may put people off using the services. None of the monitoring reports used for CRF funded projects in Edinburgh record the religion of users. The client based surveys that will help determine outcome achievements will seek to reflect equalities groups. In terms of headline outcome indicators of the type presented in template 1 there

has been no reflection of equalities groups as this data is not available at small area level by gender, ethnicity, sexuality, disability. As the information becomes available from the Scottish Executive efforts will be made to reflect this in future reports.

Examples of the wide range of existing Equalities support work within the ROA programme are detailed at Appendix Two

In practical terms there are a number of CRF funded projects that work with specific equalities groups, for instance;

- The Black Community Development Project in North Edinburgh
- Women Supporting Women- North Edinburgh
- Young Women's Project -Health Opportunities Team South Edinburgh
- South Edinburgh Supported Employment.
- Women onto Work – South Edinburgh
- The Dove Centre (older people) in West Edinburgh
- Craigmillar Ability Network (people with disabilities) in Craigmillar
- Womanzone in Craigmillar
- Domestic Abuse Initiative in Leith
- Young Women's Health and Well Being Programme in Restalrig

Looking at one in more detail. South Edinburgh Supported Employment works with people with learning and other disabilities with the aim of helping them enter training and work. This fits with the national strategy of moving people off of benefits and in to work. All of the targets that this organisation set itself were met in 2005/06 and of the 13 clients that the project worked with 5 clients gained jobs in open employment.

In addition to the individual projects listed above a range of research, consultation and involvement projects that engage with equalities groups in the city in general and in the focus areas in particular have also developed. The table below looks at a few to give an indication of the type of work that is being carried out and of the range of partners involved.

**Table 3 Equalities Research and Development Initiatives**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Lead Partners</b>	<b>Timescales</b>
A. North and Leith BME community participation project – shared learning programme between local BME community representatives and key public sector services operating in the area	Centre for Human Ecology BME community CEC Equalities Unit NHS Lothian – North CHP LB Police – A Division	11/05–9/06 Learning programme
		10/06–03/07 Evaluation
B. Leith BME research project – ELREC to undertake research of local needs within BME community and ascertain support needs to promote BME involvement in ROA structures. Project to link to 4 A	Leith ROA ELREC CEC – Local Community Planning and Regeneration Unit	March 2006
C. West Edinburgh Community Planning Partnership – Disability Involvement Project – Community Engagement Officer at WECPP looking to improve understanding of disability equality issues within key local services and projects and create a system to ensure involvement of young disabled people in the WECPP	WECPP CEC Equalities Unit CEC Local Community Planning and Regeneration Unit	March 2007
D. Local Older Peoples Fora – A range of local partnerships around the City including East Edinburgh Older People’s Forum; Gilmerton Pensioners Forum; Northeast Edinburgh Care Action Group (NEECAG); Older People Empowered Now; West Edinburgh Senior Forum. Current activity to establish a forum for central Edinburgh	CEC / NHS Lothian - A City for All Ages Strategy CEC Equalities Unit LDC Co-ordinators SAGE Pilmenny Development Project Pilton Elderly Project CEC Community Education	Ongoing
E. Restalrig ROA / ELREC outreach project – ELREC workers required to undertake street work with BME and other youth in the ROA area to look at race equality issues and set up referral systems between ELREC services and local individuals	Restalrig ROA ELREC CEC Local Community Planning and Regeneration Unit	March 2006
F. First Class Project - Pilton Partnership have a 20 hour a week development worker post working around disability issues. A number of courses have been run which focus on disability and these have been aimed at local people with disabilities. A forum or action group will be established with those people who have expressed an interest.	Pilton Partnership	