

## Option 1 – Maintain current arrangements and identify areas for improvement.

<b>Governance and Accountability</b>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The Scottish Government allocates the Fairer Scotland Fund to the Community Planning Partnership, to enable them to <b>tackle area based and individual poverty and to help more people access and sustain employment opportunities</b>.</p> <p>The Aberdeen City Alliance established the Fairer Scotland Fund Board to manage the fund on its behalf. This Board includes representatives from Partner organisations, Elected Members, and community representatives from the Regeneration areas and the Civic Forum. Aberdeen City Council administers the grant and supports the FSF Board, through Community Planning and Regeneration, on behalf of TACA. The fund is linked to the outcomes in the Single Outcome Agreement between TACA and the Scottish Government.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>The current governance and accountability involves a range of stakeholders, with final decisions made by the FSF Board. Once the FSF is no longer ring fenced, governance could be enhanced by providing regular updates for TACA and Council Committees.</p>
<b>Partnership Working and Stakeholder Involvement</b>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>Partners represented on the Board include ACC, NHS Grampian, Grampian Police, ACVO and Community representatives via Regeneration Matters Group and Civic Forum. Currently programmes of thematic activities are developed by sub groups of TACA, for example Aberdeen Works and the Community Health Partnership. Neighbourhood Fairer Scotland Fund programmes are developed with Neighbourhood Networks and Forums. This ensures that funded activity meets local outcomes, fits with strategic priorities, and addresses the needs of deprived communities and vulnerable individuals.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Carrying on existing arrangements would ensure that all Partners, and the community, have an involvement in how the Fund is allocated. This would ensure continuation of the positive Partnership work that has been developed and supported. Stakeholders' views would continue to be a consideration in allocating the fund. Making more use of Community Planning Forums would increase the opportunity to influence mainstream spend not only for Council services but also partner budgets.</p>
<b>Community Involvement and Engagement in Decision Making</b>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>There is a high level of community involvement in the Fairer Scotland Fund, as there has been in previous regeneration funding. The process for allocating neighbourhood funding involves neighbourhood groups, networks and forums, and ties in with neighbourhood planning. This ensures that local needs are identified and addressed, and neighbourhood groups consider and make</p>

	<p>recommendations on proposals for funding. The Fairer Scotland Fund Board also has a high level of community involvement, with 7 community representatives from the main regeneration areas and 3 from the Civic Forum. The representatives from the regeneration areas are selected through the Regeneration Matters group, which brings together all the regeneration areas, and is supported by the Fairer Scotland Fund Development Officer.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Maintaining current arrangements would ensure that the high level of community involvement would continue, and regeneration communities would continue to feel empowered and included in decision making that affects their areas. The benefits of local experience and knowledge would not be lost.</p>
<p><b>Performance Management and Quality Assurance</b></p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The Fairer Scotland Fund is currently linked to outcomes in the Single Outcome Agreement. Funded Projects are monitored to ensure they are complying with the Terms and Conditions of Grant and meeting their outputs and targets. Currently there is only one outcome, in employability, which has stretch targets for the Regeneration communities. Given the transition period from previous funding streams to FSF, some aspects of the programme are relatively new and it may be difficult to demonstrate whether they have had an impact in a relatively short time.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>The current performance management arrangements could be improved by including more stretch targets within the SOA, to measure reductions in inequality. Continuing the current programme of activity for another year would allow for a more robust evaluation to be carried out, identifying effective work and developing proposals for the following year.</p>
<p><b>Resource Implications and Best Value</b></p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The Fairer Scotland Fund Support Team currently consists of 3 members of staff, supporting the development and monitoring of thematic and neighbourhood programmes, community involvement, and the day to day running of the fund. This keeps bureaucracy to a minimum and ensures the maximum amount of funding is available to support vulnerable communities and individuals, making a direct impact within regeneration areas. The current breakdown of funding allocates over £1,290,000 to the Voluntary and Community Sector, £540,000 to ACC, and £370,000 to other Community Planning Partners.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Continuing current arrangements would ensure there was no increase in bureaucracy and associated costs.</p>

## Option 2 - Distribute Fund across key Council Service Committees

<p><b>Governance and Accountability</b></p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The current thematic FSF programmes combined with an analysis of how the Fairer Scotland Fund is currently applied does provide an opportunity to dispense the fund differently through Key Council service committees to add to existing mainstream resources as identified at Table A.</p> <p>This would ensure that Directors of mainstream services are accountable for the use of FSF within their professional lead and directly accountable to service committees for these specific outcomes. However, Council's new structure needs to be given time to bed in and the budget challenges facing the Council could lead to decisions to prop up mainstream service reductions by withdrawing funding to successful Fairer Scotland Fund initiatives. The fund also provides support for a level of innovation in service delivery and community engagement. This is difficult to secure in mainstream service provision in a time of reducing budgets. The specific role of the fund would be to continue to sponsor innovations in achieving the desired outcomes in the regeneration areas which should based on their evaluation be considered for mainstream funding and scaling up across the services or areas. This level of governance of the fund and its mainstream investment has yet to be achieved.</p> <p>The Head of Community Planning and Regeneration has prepared a paper for CMT demonstrating the link between the Councils Committee Structure links and the Community Planning structure within the context of a shared Single Outcome Agreement. Further work has been completed to show the wider leadership and links to other community planning partners.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>It would be possible to develop this option in due course but it would depend on mainstream services identifying the resources that they currently apply to address the causes and effects of poverty, primarily in our disadvantaged neighbourhoods, and how they would prioritize and focus the additionality that could be brought with Fairer Scotland Fund allocations.</p>
<p><b>Partnership Working and Stakeholder Involvement</b></p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>This could be developed with closer linkage between TACA'S forum structure and the Councils Committee Structure, building on the existing Fairer Scotland Fund structure. Key TACA Forums could be utilised to inform Council Committees on how the FSF allocations should be used to enhance mainstream provision i.e. see Table A. The city council directors and senior staff of partner organisations have a key role to facilitate this exchange and dialogue.</p> <p>The development of Neighbourhood Community Action Plans could be used to inform Council Committees and TACA Forums on priorities emerging from our most disadvantaged communities.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p>

	<p>The incorporation of Fairer Scotland Fund within mainstream Council Service budgets will weaken the partners perspective on partnership working, as would any reduction in direct stakeholder involvement and partners ability to play a part in driving the strategic investment of FSF. Alongside the community participation that currently exists this is unlikely to enhance partnership working. There is also a risk that the fund, in relation to improving outcomes for those people affected by poverty, will get lost within mainstream service decision making and the wider financial challenges facing the public sector.</p>
<p><b>Community Involvement and Engagement in Decision Making</b></p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>It would be possible for services to consult on proposals for use of FSF allocations through existing Neighbourhood networks and forums building on Neighbourhood Planning developments and city wide communities of interest groups. Also, linking proposals to TACA forums would also allow a level of community engagement through those structures.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>If it is accepted that there is a need for effective community involvement and engagement in decision making regarding the use of FSF resources then logically this needs to apply to all mainstream resources; particularly those being invested in those communities where we need a clear focus on addressing poverty.</p>
<p><b>Performance Management and Quality Assurance</b></p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>Approximately, 75% of current services funded through FSF are being delivered by third sector and other public service organisations Council services would need to consider how best to scale up or absorb the successful and innovative initiatives into their existing service plans, performance management and quality assurance systems. If these projects are seen to work well as independent projects then monitoring, evaluation and service level agreements would need to be considered to demonstrate that mainstream and external project level activity is contributing to the outcomes identified in the Single Outcome Agreement.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to increased scrutiny of existing mainstream performance in our most disadvantaged communities with a view to setting more stretch targets for key services in the regeneration areas within the Single Outcome Agreement.</p>
<p><b>Resource Implications and Best Value</b></p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>Allocations of FSF monies to specific services could have resource implications in terms of requiring additional duties for existing staff or the need for additional staffing to support partnership working with other partners and communities. Potentially services will need to consider what arrangements they may need to put in place to ensure programmes and projects receiving funding have appropriate arrangements in place and in line with Following the Public Pound.</p>

	<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Within existing services there may be arrangements for managing external funding in place that can be built on; this though would need to be determined in due course if this is the preferred option. There is though a risk that the bureaucracy associated with managing the fund via mainstream services is increased through duplication of function across Council services as a whole thus reducing the level of funding available for frontline delivery of services aimed at tackling poverty. There would also be a loss of an overview on the over all impact of the investment in achieving outcomes.</p>
--	---

**Option 3 - Development of new Partnership Arrangements**

<p><b>Governance and Accountability</b></p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>Currently there are no formal arrangements at the neighbourhood level to manage and provide accountability for Fairer Scotland Fund if decision making is devolved to more localised partnerships. Neighbourhood Planning arrangements are currently under review and there is the potential to build on the work to date through established Neighbourhood Networks. The previous arrangements relating to Social Inclusion Partnerships e.g. the Great Northern Partnership which operated between 1996 and 2005 could also be considered as a model to ensure robust governance and accountability structures are in place.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Given the spread of disadvantaged neighbourhoods across the city and dependant on the outcome of the SIMD 2009 it may be possible to cluster various disadvantaged neighbourhoods through new localised partnership arrangements. Consideration would need to be given though to thematic programmes of work which enable more flexibility to tackle the needs of individuals and groups.</p>
<p><b>Partnership Working and Stakeholder Involvement</b></p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The development of Neighbourhood Planning and the existence of Neighbourhood Community Action Plans for each of Aberdeen's 37 neighbourhoods provides a realistic basis to develop more robust partnership arrangements; particularly for the most disadvantaged and priority regeneration parts of the city.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Currently, local network arrangements and Community forums are used to inform the Fairer Scotland Fund Board on proposals relating to neighbourhood allocations of FSF. These arrangements though are inconsistent across neighbourhoods and do not necessarily involve a full range of mainstream public sector partners. Neighbourhood Planning arrangements are being reviewed which should lead to improved arrangements for localised partnership working. Application of FSF investment through local partnership arrangements has the potential to strengthen partnership working.</p>

<p><b>Community Involvement and Engagement in Decision Making</b></p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>More formalised partnership arrangements would potentially increase the opportunity for increased community participation in decision making. It would also require more investment in the administrative and staff support for a series of partnerships vs one city wide partnership arrangement.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>More localised partnership could increase level of community involvement in decision making although there would still be a need for clear strategic direction from TACA's structure to ensure investment is used to deliver the Single Outcome Agreement.</p>
<p><b>Performance Management and Quality Assurance</b></p>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>This would need to be developed and managed dependant on the partnerships that may be required. Consideration would need to be given in relation to the thematic programmes and city wide initiatives regarding how they interface with local partnerships arrangements. Without a clear structure for partnership performance monitoring this could lead to inconsistency in priority setting and investment that may respond to some identified local priorities to the detriment of other activity that needs to be undertaken to deliver on Single Outcome Agreement objectives.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>If more localised partnerships are a preferred option there would be a need to ensure performance management and quality assurance issues are tied back to the targets set within the Single Outcome Agreement with stretch targets set for Partnerships and agreed with mainstream providers for each area covered.</p>

<b>Resource Implications and Best Value</b>	<p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>A likely implication of developing partnerships at a local level would be the need for increased support staff requirement to enable increased partnership working and monitor programmes. This may lead to increased bureaucracy and reduction in funding available to support frontline mainstream service delivery. It may also have the potential to diffuse the focus on outcomes and effectively create a fragmentation of effort in each cluster of areas.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Increased localised partnership working has the potential to deliver on the outcomes identified for Fairer Scotland Fund but it would require true commitment from all mainstream services to engage in joint working at a more local level by setting improvement targets that will close the gap for the city's most disadvantaged communities. If this approach is going to be developed it needs to go beyond the experience of Social Inclusion Partnerships where some key local services failed to engage and participate in joint working to any great degree. Other partners and services may feel this is replicating the previous neighbourhood arrangements but only in certain areas. This may have a negative reaction from other neighbourhoods in the city.</p>
---	--