



GLASGOW'S OPERATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK THE GOVANHILL LOCALITY PLAN – CHALLENGES AND LEARNING

Glasgow

Glasgow is a city with a population of 626,000. It is growing faster than any other area of Scotland. In 2018, the population of Glasgow City increased by 0.9% compared to 0.2% in the rest of Scotland.

Glasgow has the most ethnically diverse population in Scotland. Total net migration into Glasgow has increased, principally due to an increase in overseas migrants coming to Glasgow. Over the last 10 years the non-UK born population of Glasgow has risen from 6% to 12%.

Just over 99,000 children (aged 0 - 15 years) live in Glasgow (2017). Children make up 16% of Glasgow's total population. Over a third of Glasgow's children live in the 10% most deprived areas of Scotland.

Glasgow and URBinclusion

URBinclusion concentrated on area based approaches to address challenges in deprived urban areas. URBinclusion is about change and process – how can implementation create change in local areas and what process should be followed to maximise this change. This is dependent on the local context and environment and Glasgow selected an area that required a change in implementation.

When Glasgow joined the URBinclusion network, implementation was planned for the area of Govanhill. A neighbourhood in close proximity to the city centre and meeting the area-based conditions of the network, the 'Govanhill Plan' was in place which offered the baseline and partner profile.

As URBinclusion progressed, national legislation and local structures changed, making implementation difficult. Therefore the best solution was to observe and evaluate the process that took place to create and move forward the Govanhill Plan. URBinclusion assumed the role of monitor of events and evaluated the



implementation journey of the Govanhill Plan. We are only now at the implementation stage of that plan but we thought it would be useful for the OIF to look at what happened step by step, assess the strengths and weaknesses and offer solutions in relation to the mandatory challenges.

About Govanhill

Govanhill is Scotland's most ethnically diverse locality, and one of the most diverse areas outside London. It is also the city's most densely populated area. Historically it has been the first point of settlement when people first arrive in Glasgow or in Scotland. The Govanhill population is c15,000 but the official figures are accepted as lower than the actual.



Govanhill is made up of approximately 40% of people from an ethnic minority background including an estimated 3,500-5,000 Roma people from Slovakia, Romania and Bulgaria. The Scottish population are a mix of working class Scots who have lived in the area for many years and a growing number of artists, students and social entrepreneurs who are attracted by cheap rental possibilities and close proximity and easy access to the city centre.

Govanhill has different characteristics to the rest of Glasgow city. The area has more men (53%) than women (47%) than other parts of the city. Govanhill has a



much higher number of children and young people than the rest of the city. Almost 18% of the population are under 16 years old. In Govanhill 52% of under 25s are from a minority ethnic group. But only 19% of all households in the area have children living in them. The number of people aged 65 or older is lower (11%) than in wider Glasgow (13.8%).

Family poverty is evident but not fully quantified by available data. Statistics show that 3,525 of Govanhill's citizens are living in poverty and that child poverty rates are 30%, 2% above the Glasgow figure.

Overcrowding is a Govanhill-specific problem – the incidence of overcrowding is 88% higher than in the rest of the city. In Govanhill South West over one third (34%) of households with children live in overcrowded conditions. This places considerable strain on local infrastructure and services and is exacerbating community environmental problems, community tensions and other social issues.

Govanhill was one of the few inner-city areas to survive the policy of demolition and replacement with new buildings during the 1960s. A different approach included the establishment of a community-based Housing Association – Govanhill Housing Association – in 1974, run by residents. As an alternative to mass demolition, there was a steady programme of refurbishment of traditional tenement properties complemented by new build developments. The refurbishment of Govanhill's tenement housing was not fully completed and the area is now the subject of an ongoing public and third sector-led housing purchase and improvement programme.

Govanhill has a distinctive collection of shops that cannot be found elsewhere in Scotland, including clothing, fresh food stores of many types, traditional shops, and an incredibly varied range of eating places and businesses supporting international connections (such as money transfer businesses, cargo services and travel agencies).

The area has a thriving, and growing, creative arts community and a vibrant voluntary and faith-based sector where over 50 organisations are actively providing support services related to the environment, youth and intergenerational, promoting integration, tackling addictions, and a range of arts, education and leisure opportunities.



OIF Contents

This Operational Implementation Framework (OIF) has been active throughout the period of Glasgow's involvement in the URBACT URBinclusion implementation network.

The aim of the Glasgow OIF was to chart the implementation journey that occurred for Govanhill while Glasgow was part of the URBinclusion network. What follows is the breakdown of that journey and the strengths and weaknesses identified.



Review of Baseline

Review Operational Environment

Strategic Commitment

Appointment of Anchor Agency

Implementation

Step 1 - Review of the Baseline

In September - December 2017 a review of the Baseline position revealed a number of critical changes in the operational planning for the city and for the Govanhill area.

1. A national level change in Community Planning



The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act changed community planning in Scotland. It introduced a two-level framework for all Scottish local authorities. The Act required a **Local Outcome Improvement Plan (now known as Glasgow's Community Plan)** and identification of specific areas requiring targeted support – where improved service delivery can be guided by a Locality Plan. The Glasgow Community Plan set out 3 priorities

- · economic growth;
- · resilient communities; and
- a fairer more equal Glasgow.

2. A new citywide structure for community planning 'Thriving Places'

Thriving Places had been introduced to create a neighbourhood focus, targeting specific areas of Glasgow. Ten neighbourhoods were identified as 'Thriving Places' because of their consistent levels of inequality compared to other parts of the city, based on child poverty, health indictors and levels of unemployment. The Thriving Places aim is to engage and support individuals, groups and communities who would not normally participate and to focus on building community capacity, skills and strengths to work in partnership with residents to plan and deliver services. The expected outcomes are:

- a neighbourhood-focused approach to reflect the specific and individual community needs;
- partners working much more collaboratively with one another; and
- communities making better use of existing resources and assets.

3. Govanhill designated a 'Thriving Place' = New Locality Plan

In response, the new Scotland-wide framework for community planning a 'Locality Plan' was published by the Govanhill Regeneration Group, titled - A Better Govanhill - offering a 10-year vision and Community Plan for the Govanhill area.

The Locality Plan set out an improvement plan for Govanhill for ten years from 2017 to 2027. The Locality Plan focuses on seven priority areas including:



- Cohesion and Community Engagement
- Economy
- Environment
- Health
- Housing
- Learning
- Safety

Strengths

- The act brought about a regulatory framework,
- Named specific partners and placing statutory duty on partners to ensure effective delivery;
- Citywide approach with dedicated team and resource given to anchor organisations in localities;
- Community connectors assigned to each area via anchor organisation.

Weaknesses

- Top-down;
- Short lead-in time did not give a lot of time to build local community ownership and commitment.

Step 2 – Review of the operational environment at local level

1. Connect with Key Stakeholders

In the period between October to December 2017 the URBinclusion ULSG carried out a rapid review to connect with a range of stakeholders to discuss their role locally, their input to the locality plan and to bring out their ideas for taking the plan forward. The following recommendations emerged from this:



- To build cohesion among all sectors through a 'place-making communications strategy' led by the community;
- To deliver several small, beneficial local actions that will animate the Locality Plan and bring better visibility to the community;
- To develop a more holistic, community-led approach to baseline and monitoring of ongoing actions to show successes and lessons learned in public service areas that benefit the community;
- To develop a strategy for the third sector organisations in the Govanhill area to ensure they are fit for purpose and to reduce duplication of activities and offer a framework to measure success:
- To develop an association for local businesses to promote economic development and employment opportunities in Govanhill;
- To look at service redesign for some of public services being delivered in Govanhill, to make them more effective and efficient.

A summary report was prepared which set out the key findings and recommendations that emerged from this consultation exercise.

2. Assessment of Existing Plans

A literature review revealed that a significant collection of plans existed for Govanhill, either as a dedicated area or as part of Glasgow South. Most organisations working in the area, public and third sector, have their own plans with their own priorities, aims and objectives.

A clear shortcoming in many of the plans is the absence of indicators to measure change or a clear means to measure and to report success to the community. Much is being achieved in Govanhill but the negative messages prevail.



Strengths

- Very strong committment from local service providers to improve quality of life of Govanhill residents;
- Strong desire to improve Govanhill.

Weaknesses

- No clear vision of what an improved Govanhill should look like;
- Organisations are working in silos not enough joined up working or coproduction;
- No means to measure progress/ improvement or to advertise this;
- Community not sufficiently involved in leading or monitoring change.
- Businesses not sufficiently involved in original consultation process.

Step 3 – Draft Implementation Plan

On 9^{th} January, Glasgow produced the URBinclusion Implementation Plan for the delivery of the Govanhill Locality Plan.

The purpose of the Implementation Plan was to overcome some of the mandatory challenges and to transform the Locality Plan into a cohesive plan with actions, indicators and a methodology to involve local stakeholders in delivery and measurement of progress.



Strengths

Implementation Plan now contains clear actions.

Weaknesses

- Participatory approach required to create indicators the plan lacked indicators to measure change;
- The plan was created for URBinclusion but did not have the resources attached to build local ownership;
- Implementation relied on existing resources that were already overstreched.

Step 4 – Strategic Commitment from Govanhill Regeneration Group (ULG)

The draft implementation plan was agreed by the Govanhill Regeneration Group, the strategic multi agency group that oversees local actions in Govanhill and functioned as the URBACT Local Group.

The concept of a Participatory Community Led monitoring structure was presented, discussed and agreed in principle.



The concept of Participatory Community Led monitoring structure was also presented and discussed with URBinclusion partners at network meeting in Lyon.

Strengths

 High level approval was obtained to finalise the implemenation plan political support and support from key stakeholders in ULG.

Weaknesses

- No dedicated resource at that time to take forward the proposed short-term actions presented in the implementation plan;
- No dedicated team of operational experts to oversee delivery of the locality plan.

Step 5 – Anchor Agency Appointed

Following the development of the Implementation Plan by URBinclusion, a lengthy period of discussion took place about the model of implementation to be used in Govanhill.

Following the same model used in other Thriving Places in the city, the local community based Housing Association (HA) was selected as the anchor agency. Their role is to house the 'Community Connector', whose remit is to bring



together people, organisations and businesses. This role is funded jointly by Glasgow City Council and the Health and Social Care partnership and should work in tandem with existing community development workers in the local area.

Once these discussions were concluded and the anchor agency appointed, the URBinclusion journey was coming to an end.

Strengths

 Additional support for the local area to connect people and organisations.

Weaknesses

- Govanhill is unique therefore a different model may have been better, taking into consideration both the challenges and the wide network of organisations working in the local area;
- The time delay prohibited any real implementation during the timeframe of the URBinclusion project.

Plan



Implemenation

IDENTIFYING THE CHALLENGES OF IMPLEMENTATION

Based on Glasgow's different approach and structural changes during the course of URBinclusion, we have identified a series of challenges and responded to each by looking at where we are, what the challenges present to us and how to overcome these challenges.



Step 6 – Fostering and Integrated approach

BASELINE

- Strategic framework in place National and City levels
- Integrated approach widespread in Glasgow through the mandatory thriving place approach.
- Good, cross-sectoral representation on ULG with strong political support.

CHALLENGES

- Community or civil society participation not fully embedded in the design of the locality plan
- Various subject plans in place, education, health, social work, housing
- Strong and innovative implementation but interaction and multidisciplianary approach between providers not augranteed
- Absence of a common vision and relatistic indicators to track progess

HOW TO OVERCOME

- •Use the current legislative requirement to review Thriving Places to be a step-change in the approach in Govanhill
- •Use previous URBACT Local Action Planning experience to enhance the existing approach
- •Establish an operational stakeholder group of subject experts, local organisations and community activists to drive and monitor the process.

Step 7 – Involving local stakeholders and organising decision making for delivery



- •Local stakeholders want to be involved in shaping the vision for Govanhill and the subsequent decision making
- •Recognition that current indicators do not track change
- •Negaive media dumbs down reporting or celebrating local succes
- Participatory community-led approach to developing local indicators was very well received and should be developed

CHALLENGE

- Availble resource and the structure of Thriving Places has meant processes can be slow and inflexible
- Difficult to maintain stakeholder involvement beyond strategy development due to resource pressures
- •Local community needs to be embedded more as stakeholders but the diveristy and poverty in the area can be an obstacle to participation

HOW TO OVERCOME

- Put the driving / change leading responsibilites clearly within the contol of the communityEngage with sectoral experts and community to embed approrate, community-led indicators to help shape the vision for Govanhill
- •Use this exerience to transfer learning across the city's Thirving Places.

Step 8 - Create indicators and efficient monitoring system to track local level change



- Participatory, community-led monitoring framework welcomed by local providers
- Subject experts to develop relevant indicators
- Community members connected and interested to be in the process

CHALLENGE

- •Establishing a community-led frorum to develop inclusive indicators
- Engaging with disadvantaged groups
- •Using a methodology that is understood and flexible
- Ensuring that forum members are trained to lead the methodology

HOW TO OVERCOME

- Develop indicators with subject experts together with the community, so that they can use and recognise these indicators
- Capitalise on new and innovative ways of monitoring more subtle changes within the community.
- Use a measure of resilience. Look at how secure and safe people feel.

Step 9 – Identify and build on innovative implementation solutions

Financial and social innovation through enterprise



During the course of URBinclusion, there were a number of innovative solutions that were identified and present a real opportunity to demonstrate implementation success stories.

BASELINE

- •Successful models of financial innovation across city;
- •Mapping of social enterprise development in the local area is showing good foundations are being made.
- Ensure social enterprises are part of an enterprise network being applied in the area

CHALLENGE

- •Maintain sustainability of the fund and funded ventures;
- •Build capacity of social enterprises to develop alternative models of ethical financing
- Ensuring that innovative financial models are available to everyone.
- Create an enterprise network that is of value to all local businesses

HOW TO OVERCOME

- Continue to support fair and ethical business to grow in the local area
- Provide innovative business development support
- Help the businesses to meet demand where there are gaps in the market
- Encourage co-operation between local actors to maximise opportunity for funding.

Facing the educational challenges of local diversity



- Pupils with no knowledge of English language, no prior connection of education system, parents with low level education and living in poverty and poor housing
- An education system designed for year on year learning unsuitable for the needs of many children
- Educational targets and outcomes to deliver to sustain city level support (financial and resources)

CHALLENGE

- Parents who want their children to be educated but do not know how to connect with the system or offer the necessary support for their child
- How to meet the educational needs of children and local familes to guarantee learning outcomes
- Get approval from the city and the school inspectorate system

HOW TO OVERCOME

- Develop an alternative approach to education to overcome obstacles pupils face
- Build trust with families to overcome systemic resistence
- Test and monitor the approach to prove it works
- Use indicators to track the process which are nonstandard, tailored and school-specific
- Seek approval at city level education policy and the school inspectorate
- Roll out the approach to schools facing the same needs

Support the needs and build the capacity of a segment of the community with specific challenges



- Families where English is not generally understood
- People living in poor housing and poverty hand to mouth existence
- Detachment and a lack of understanding or connection with the pubic sector systems

CHALLENGE

- Find a means to connect with the community to understand their needs and aspirations
- Create services to assist people to improve their living conditions and quality of life and to connect with existing services
- maximise the income levels of families in the area
- Improve the housing conditions of people in the area
- Secure funding to create such a project

HOW TO OVERCOME

- Undertake a listening survey to hear, record and analyse the views of local people
- Create a local support group to lead and maintain community connections
- Create an ethos of "doing with" instead of "doing for/to?" people
- Develop and deliver services to meet the needs of the community through a mix of volunteers and paid staff
- Employ local people to deliver the services, build their capacity to manage and deliver the local actions
- Monitor change and celebrate change at local level

Main Points of Conclusion - What We Learned

Unpacking our OIF was challenging. However we used the opportunity to learn from those challenges and identified a number of key points of conclusion.



Innovative people facing complicated local challenges will find innovative solutions to address these local challenges. This will happen with or without a local plan.

Having a Local
Plan with a
budget
dedicated to it
is not on its
own sufficient
to mobilise
local actions.

Having a shared vision between the community, local organisations and service providers may help to accelerate the achievement of local results.

Indicators that are relevant and easily recognised by everyone are the best means to measure change and create an opportunity to celebrate local success.

Involving the community in a genuine way that builds their agency and ability to drive change is a highly challenging process that requires significant time and dedicated resources.

New systems and structures put in place by the City can be an obstacle that slows down and hinders implementation.

New systems take time to be absorbed into local structures.

The URBACT model of bringing together sectoral experts working at operational level with the community remains a highly relevant model to progress local implementation. But when implementation is already ongoing it can be difficult to embed this group into local structures. When the time is right, the need for such a group will emerge. Such a group may develop organically from a need to get together to understand what is happening locally and to share expertise.