CORRA FOUNDATION

collaborate
for social change

Place-based working in Scotland: learning from six case-studies

Annabel Davidson Knight

Zoë Rush

Acknowledgements

Corra Foundation exists to make a difference to the lives of people and communities.

We work closely with other charities and funders, communities and policy makers to encourage positive change, opportunity, fairness and growth of aspirations which improve quality of life. Our vision is for a society in which people create positive change and enjoy fulfilling lives.

Collaborate is a social consultancy that helps services to the public to collaborate to tackle complex social challenges. Issues such as rising inequality, multiple needs, devolution and fairer economic growth require collaborative responses. We create partnerships that get beyond traditional silos to deliver credible change on the ground.

We are values-led, not for profit and driven by a belief in the power of collaborative services as a force for social and economic progress. Our clients and partners span local government, NHS, civil society and the private sector. For more information, see collaboratecic.com

Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction

The case study research was funded by Scottish Government as part of a six month research project looking at place-based working that Corra Foundation undertook as part of their People in Place programme. The project focused on building a coherent view around place-based working by regularly meeting with a cross-sector group of practitioners of place-based working and following their lines of enquiry with further research. Qualitative research into examples of place-based working in Scotland sought to assess their effectiveness against good place-based practice here and elsewhere, and understand the current enabling conditions, as well as barriers, to wider adoption of good place-based working in Scotland. Collaborate were commissioned by Corra Foundation to lead on the research into case studies in Scotland, which were first presented at an event on 27 of March looking at place-based working. This report details those findings.

Main research questions:

- What are the distinct features of place-based working in Scotland?
- How are examples of place-based working operating in Scotland?
- What are the barriers and enablers of place-based working in Scotland?
- How could place-based working in Scotland be improved?

Key concepts

To address these questions Collaborate and Corra Foundation developed a framework of eight 'qualities' of place-based work. These formed the basis for the case study selection criteria and interview questionnaire. The eight qualities were developed from a variety of sources including: the cross-sector groups' deliberations; Collaborate's own learning around systems change and collaborative practices; research on international good place-based practice; and, The Scottish Government's policy frameworks and guidance. The qualities are displayed below, in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Eight qualities of place-based working.

Six initiatives were selected with a range of areas of focus and scales: North Harris; Lochgelly; Galson; Glasgow Canal Regeneration Partnership (GCRP); East Renfrewshire Health and Social Care Partnership (HSCP) and Evidence2Success (E2S), with a focus on Renfrewshire's 'Achieving Step Change'. Key partners from each initiative were interviewed (c. 5 per case study) and an overarching analysis highlighted where place-based working in Scotland were successful and where more work was required. We developed a set of recommendations based on responses from interviewed partners.

Key findings

The following are the particular strengths in place-based working in Scotland:

1. Communities have greater power

Community ownership of land and green energy has dramatically changed the fortunes of some areas, bringing opportunity and investment that would not have been present otherwise. We also see an increase in community activity where improved place-based working across agencies and with communities catalysed greater involvement.

2. Anchor organisations improve sustainability

Actions to sustain the life of communities – for instance ensuring a good level of health within the population- through good infrastructure, services and economic activity, was the aim behind most place-based working initiatives. Local anchor organisations/ groups drove the place-based work, while keeping an eye on this long-term goal of sustainability, with some anchor organisations becoming development agencies in their own right- enabling and supporting other community led activities.

3. Alignment of local priorities

Alignment between the priorities of place-based collaborations and the local public sector (e.g. regeneration, housing, care services) was often present. Particular individuals hold community and public sector collaboration together successfully, whilst institutional support was overall mixed.

4. Supportive policy environment

The policy landscape in Scotland supports good place-based working, underpinned by the Christie Commission. The Community Empowerment Act and locality planning requirements, the Land Reform Act, Health and Social Care Integration, with the Planning Act reform and Local Governance Review (pending) provide a supportive policy infrastructure and context.

5. Collaboration and long-term, personal commitment

Collaborative working involved a mix of informal and formal structures, aligned by a shared vision. The time, energy and dedication from individuals to improve their places was evident, and partners often reported strong relationships and enjoyment of the collaborative way of working.

We also assessed the present challenges to place-based working in Scotland:

1. Uncertainty of a shifting policy landscape

The shifting policy landscape was generally very positive for place-based working, but was hard to keep track of as a community organisation and the complexity looks to increase with Brexit on the horizon. Improved legislation has also led to increased requirements and a sense of people having to do more and measure more, with little space left for anything else.

2. Institutional vs. collaborative culture

Individuals struggled against traditional organisational structures and 'silos' that made collaborating with place-based partners and sharing data more difficult, especially local public services and health partners.

3. Unintended consequences of funding approaches

Funding applications and reporting on funding took a huge amount of time from paid staff and volunteers with funders largely not aligned around place outcomes and some overly focussed on short-term financial outcomes.

4. Narrative of growth supersedes sustainability

Funding and attention tended to be focussed on the physical and economic, whilst communities were often trying to achieve a broader sustainability for themselves.

5. Learning and measurement were underdone

Formal learning and measuring only occurred in a minority of case studies, where resource was directed to agreeing and developing measures, and creating localised data where necessary. The learning and measurement was more informal in other examples, often based on countable outputs rather than agreed outcomes, and was felt to be driven by diverse reporting requirements for funding which reduced scope to develop collective place-based measures.

6. Tensions with external models

In some areas external agencies were felt to have 'parachuted' in, rather than building on the work that community groups or individuals were involved in. Linking external consultants, through key people or organisations, into the work that is ongoing ensures replications are avoided.

7. Missing players

The private sector, young people and health partners were frequently mentioned as absent, or slower to get involved, yet all were believed vital for the sustainability of the initiatives.

Recommendations

Based on the analysis of the case studies and interviews with practitioners several actions stood out as being helpful for further developing good place-based practice in Scotland:

- Greater coordination between funders (independent and statutory) to align funding requirements in a place. Co-producing these with organisations doing place-based work would enable an evidence-base to be built of what works.

- Place-based partnerships need to agree and direct resource into a shared measurement; aligned measures and a theory of change will help evidence impact and draw in more resource. Community organisations will need support and national organisations can help spread the learning and good practice to other areas.

- Developing and encouraging professional skills in facilitation and brokering would improve communication across organisations and with community engagement

work. Local skill- and community capacity building also need to be invested in to build social infrastructure and support public sector transformation.

- Training opportunities for elected members like Councillors, MPs and MSPs to learn about place-based working as it complements their 'generalist' way of working and centres decisions on communities (their electorate).

- Growing the connectivity and sharing of learning between place-based initiatives and national organisations involved in this work.

Conclusion

Overall, we were struck by the optimism shown by people working in these initiatives of the potential of place-based working to tackle the long-term and complex issues affecting their communities and build sustainable futures.

Our research qualitatively analysed the effectiveness of six case studies in Scotland. The empowerment and pride felt by those making their communities more sustainable; the trust and relationships developing across sectors; and the culture of looking holistically at a place and the vision of its communities, are all indicative of effective adoption of good place-based practices.

Compared to international models, such as Collective Impact in North America[1] and Australia, there are many similarities; however practice in Scotland appears significantly weaker around measurement (with notable exceptions). The ability to collaborate around measurement and evidence impact would help place-based initiatives overcome barriers in accessing funding and establish the value of good place-based working.

---

[1] http://collectiveimpactforum.org/

Introduction

Scottish Government has funded Corra Foundation to undertake a system change project to make place-based working (PBW) more effective in Scotland. One component of the project is qualitative research into a small number of case studies in Scotland to assess their effectiveness against standards of international practice and note the particular barriers and opportunities that exist to create "enabling conditions for communities to thrive". Corra Foundation commissioned Collaborate (a social consultancy supporting place-based change across the UK) to lead on the case study research, with the lead secretariat and research intern at Corra Foundation providing support.

What is place-based working?

Place-based working does not have one single definition but rather is determined by what people take to be a useful issue to tackle and, the scale and location they can work with, as a collaborative group, to change what is happening in that place. Lankelly Chase have said:

> "The term 'place based', … is currently used to describe a range of approaches, from grant-making in a specific geographic area to long-term, multifaceted collaborative partnerships aimed at achieving significant change. In most cases, it is more than just a term to describe the target location of funding; it also describes a style and philosophy of approach which seeks to achieve 'joined-up' systems change."[2]

The philosophy of approach goes beyond traditional area-based initiatives to incorporate emerging elements of good practice from different sectors (procurement; public sector reform; systems change) and then applies these in a holistic place-based context[3]. Place-based working has become a common 'flavour' in Scotland, reflected in a favourable policy environment (Local Empowerment Act 2015) and wide adoption of the term 'place-based' to describe initiatives that are happening in a place:

> "It offers a holistic or 'whole place' approach that crosses policy sectors and silos. Its added attraction for policy-makers is that it sounds tangible, immediate and local… [but it] can easily become a catchall for a range of potentially inconsistent policy agendas… it [can be] weakly-specified, poorly-evidenced and 'a receptacle for odds and ends."[4]

---

[2] http://lankellychase.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Historical-review-of-place-based-approaches.pdf
p6 from Anheier and Leat (2006); Association for the Study and Development of Community (2007).
[3] *Place-Based Approaches to Joint Planning, Resourcing and Delivery: An Overview of current practice in Scotland*, Improvement Service, 2016.
[4] http://www.lgiuscotland.org.uk/2017/09/20/why-place/.

In order to bring coherence about what place-based working means in Scotland and avoid it becoming a catch-all we have worked alongside a cross-sector group of practitioners interested in place-based working to build a shared understanding of its meaning. This work was combined with the case study research that built a framework around qualities of effective place-based working, based on the literature in Scotland, rest of the UK and international practice, and quantitative research undertaken by EKOS[5] on measuring place-based work.

Purpose of this paper

The purpose of the case studies research was to:

- Combine the cross-sector group's understanding of Scottish place-based work with the rest of the UK and international research to develop eight qualities of place-based working.
- Build qualitative evidence of how initiatives in Scotland are performing against these qualities.
- Understand what barriers and enablers exist in the Scottish landscape.
- Give recommendations for growing the good practice.

The case study areas were selected to represent different aspects of well-performing place-based work at different scales and with different areas of focus. The research combined desk-based research and interviews with key people in each initiative to examine the behaviours, cultures and practices alongside a set of features we would expect to see in effective place-based working. This information was presented by Collaborate at an event in the Lighthouse, Glasgow on the 27 March 2018 to a group of practitioners and interested parties.

This report covers the learning from the analysis of the case studies and our recommendations for how place-based work could be further developed in Scotland. We saw this project as an opportunity to further strengthen the field of practice by developing clear narratives which demonstrate the purpose and impact of place-based working underway in Scotland, providing essential learning for practitioners wishing to adopt or deepen their own approach. We hope our analysis which explores the implications for stakeholders in the wider system – at the national and local levels, from across public services and in the third and private sectors – will help to support the adoption of the approach across Scotland where its ability to solve complex problems is of value.

---

[5] http://www.ekos-consultants.co.uk/.

Section 1: Case studies

We undertook a number of activities to select case studies throughout Scotland:

- Cross-sector group generated lists of place-based initiatives in Scotland
- Conversations with a range of intermediaries and place practitioners to help us identify place-based initiatives which fitted the criteria.
- Created a longlist of place-based examples which became a shortlist for interviews.
- Invited a range of initiatives (different themes, locations and partnership types) to take part (see Table 1).

We have used this section to describe each case study initiative in some detail, followed by an in-depth analysis of the eight qualities across the case studies.

Table 1. Brief description of case study areas

Where?	What?	Why?
North Harris, Outer Hebrides[6]	One of the first Community Land Trusts in Scotland	Early pioneer of community land ownership
Lochgelly, Fife[7]	A regeneration partnership between council, housing association and community	Regeneration of a town that builds community capacity and vision alongside physical infrastructure
Glasgow Canal Regeneration Partnership, Glasgow[8]	Partnership between Scottish Canals, Glasgow City Council, Bigg Regeneration and local businesses	Creative regeneration partnership in an urban environment
Galson, Outer Hebrides[9]	A Community Land Trust with a Community Investment Fund	Expanding remit from land management to developmental agency for local community
East Renfrewshire Health and Social Care Partnership[10]	A partnership between East Renfrewshire Council and NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde	Long tradition of collaborative working from earlier Community Health and Care Partnership
Evidence2Success; focus on Renfrewshire[11]	A programme that supports local collaborations for needs-led commissioning of children and young people's services	Exemplar in measuring and evidencing impact

---

[6] http://www.north-harris.org/
[7] https://lcdf.org.uk/
[8] https://www.scottishcanals.co.uk/news/tag/north-glasgow/

[9] https://www.galsontrust.com/about-the-trust
[10] http://www.eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk/health-and-social-care-integration
[11] https://archive.dartington.org.uk/inc/uploads/DSRU-reflections&lessons_report_web.pdf

North Harris

When the 55,000 acre North Harris Estate went on sale in 2003 The North Harris Trust (NHT) was established by local residents to facilitate a community buyout. A partnership with a private owner enabled the Trust to take over land management of the estate on the community's behalf. Over the years the Trust's role has evolved beyond land management to include tourism activities, and other community development schemes and services. The Trust also manages the areas of Loch Seaforth Estate and Scalpay Estate.

NHT has received support from Comhairle nan Eilean Siar (Western Isles Council), Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE), Scottish Natural Heritage and independent funders such as the Big Lottery Fund through the Scottish Land Fund and other programmes. They were a founding member of Community Land Scotland and regularly work in partnership with a range of organisations including more recently through the Harris Forum, itself an important collaboration locally (comprising of other Community Trusts, Harris Development Ltd, three Community Councils and Youth Councils, the Community Learning and Development team at the Council and local community groups). While NHT employ a growing number of staff, the Trust Directors are community volunteers and have dedicated time and often professional skills pro-bono over the years. The community on the estate has been generally supportive of the Trust, and sustaining that engagement and interest is an ongoing aim.

Like other island Trusts, NHT looked to renewable energy for income generation. This has been challenging as turbulent wind conditions on the island has meant NHT has struggled to find suitable wind turbines. A company from New Zealand offered to test their model in the locality for a low risk, low pay-out scheme. Much of the Trust's income is derived from estate management activities. NHT's provision of services has increased over the years, though they are careful in navigating the balance of risk to benefit in the changing relationship between public services and the Trust.

Sustainability through increasing population, housing, jobs and amenities, is a priority for NHT and local partners, including the Council. There is recognition that Trusts on the islands will need to strengthen their entrepreneurial and strategic activities in the face of increasing uncertainty in funding, not least in light of the likely loss of EU Funds to the UK.

Milestones

2003 Trust established and community buy-out of North Harris Estate.

2006 Loch Seaforth Estate purchased by NHT; 2013 Scalpay Estate gifted to its community, who decide to join NHT.

2014 First full scale wind turbine, after 9 years of planning.

Points of Interest

Early pioneer of community land ownership providing valuable peer advice and learning to other communities.

There are structural issues with renewables and community-owned energy in remote areas.

Lochgelly

The long-term regeneration scheme in a former coal-mining town in Fife began in 2000 when Fife Council launched a competitive process in partnership with the community organisation Lochgelly Community Development Forum (LCDF), to secure a partner to assist and fund the development of a masterplan. Ore Valley Housing Association (OVHA) became that partner, along with other local businesses. LCDF held meetings to understand what local people wanted and fed this into the development plans of the Council and OVHA. While the focus of the partnership began with physical regeneration, it has expanded over the years to consider the social infrastructure of the area and community empowerment.

The physical regeneration of Lochgelly was combined with a strategy towards changing the perception of Lochgelly, among residents and outsiders alike. Increasing the pride of place and giving the local community more of a say in future planning were instrumental to increasing local capacity. The partnership persisted despite early set-backs, including a nomination for the Carbuncle Award[12] as worst town in Britain, and tensions with the community over a charrette[13] in 2010. A lot of time and energy went into rebuilding trust. Approaches like participatory budgeting have increased community activity over the years, culminating in the co-produced Community Action Plan.

The partnership has relied on key individuals and relationships over its journey. To ensure momentum is maintained partners are increasingly focusing on drawing in younger residents. The successes in Lochgelly have helped to embed place-based working in certain council departments; and there is a desire to spread these good approaches to other parts of the Council, to ensure lasting impact is had. There is a strong alignment between partners regarding long-term goals but brokering is necessary between different groups' priorities in the short-term. Mature communication was cited as a key success factor, with well-communicated decision making processes and honesty about problems as they arose integral to good working practice among partners and with the community.

> Milestones
>
> 2000 Fife Council initiates regeneration partnership working with Ore Valley Housing, LCDF, local business and the wider community to develop Lochgelly Masterplan.
>
> 2010 Charrette held and Lochgelly named an exemplar of Scottish Sustainable Communities Initiative.
>
> 2016 Lochgelly Community Action Plan 2016-21, co-produced between Council and community; named winner of 'Most Improved Town' SURF award category.
>
> Points of Interest
>
> Journey evolved from physical regeneration to co-producing a vision with the community.

[12] http://www.urbanrealm.com/carbuncles/2010/The_Carbuncle_Awards_2010.html
[13] A **charrette** is a planning session(s) where citizens, designers and others collaborate on a vision for development in an area: http://www.scotlandstowns.org/town_centre_charrettes

Glasgow Canal Regeneration Partnership

Glasgow Canal Regeneration Partnership (GCRP) is a regeneration partnership that takes a holistic and long-term view towards development in North Glasgow's canal corridor. The partnership is a longstanding relationship between the City Council and Scottish Canals, with Bigg Regeneration formalised as a partner in 2015. However, GCRP works in partnership with many local organisations, including local housing associations, Taktal (an organisation involved in creative uses of space) and the budding Glasgow Canal Co-op. The partners' aim is to build on the cultural, social and sporting assets in the place and plug the area back in to surrounding neighbourhoods by increasing the connectivity across physical boundaries such as the motorway and canal itself. Partners take the lead on individual projects and work closely together on many, which they align with the overall vision for the area, the aim being that they cumulatively create significant change.

Like other place-based regeneration schemes the partnership focused first on improving the physical infrastructure and making connections back into the surrounding neighbourhoods and city centre of Glasgow. The partnership built on the cultural assets of the place, renovating historic building and using local cultural organisations such as Scottish Opera and the Glasgow Sculptor Studio as anchors to draw in other cultural and artistic agencies to the newly developed spaces. The Glasgow Canal Co-op has been established between 12 local businesses in order to feed-in to the partnership's decision making structures and help drive development in the area.

This partnership has an unusual dynamic with the local communities as there are still large areas of brownfield sites which are in development and increasing the population in the area is a long-term aspiration. GCRP have a history of creative innovation and a willingness for community groups to develop their own ideas on partnership-owned land; for example the Hamiltonhill Claypits Local Nature Reserve[14] is managed by local residents. North Glasgow Canal corridor is an example of effective partnership working between a range of agencies, aligned in the aim of carefully developing and sustaining a dramatic change to the social fabric of North Glasgow.

Milestones

2004 GCRP formed between Glasgow City Council, Scottish Canals and Waterside Places; in 2015 Bigg Regeneration replaced Waterside Places.

2010 Phoenix Flowers built; 2011 Glue Factory restored, 2012 The Whisky Bond developed.

2014 Port Dundas Charrette; 2015 Applecross-Woodside-Hamiltonhill-Firhill Charrette

Points of Interest

Importance of role of cultural institutions as drivers for change in a creative fashion and innovative use of arts and creativity as a catalyst for exploring the dynamics of a place.

---

[14] https://www.scottishcanals.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/60484-BW-SC-Claypits-Nature-Reserve-A5-4pp-Rev5.pdf

Galson

The Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 inspired a group of locals on the Isle of Lewis to set up a steering group to look at buying-out Galson Estate. This group was formalised into Urras Oighreachd Ghabhsainn (UOG; Galson Estate Trust), facilitating the buyout of the 56,000 acre estate from a private landlord in 2007. UOG initially focused on large-scale projects such as setting up wind turbines, which enabled them to begin paying staff members after many years of the board members working pro-bono. More recently they have turned towards engagement with the local community to develop a co-owned and co-produced 20 year plan for the area, alongside a Community Investment Fund that recirculates profits from the green energy back into the community.

UOG has had support from Comhairle nan Eilean Siar (Western Isles Council), Community Energy Scotland, Community Land Scotland, Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE) and the Big Lottery Fund through the Scottish Land Fund and other programmes. The Outer Hebrides Forum is a significant mechanism for sharing learning between a number of Community Land Trusts operating in the area, aligning activities and developing shared resource including staff on occasion. UOG are very active in wider decision making structures for services in the area, brokering opportunities between the community and wider system. Crofts are common on the estate and townships and grazing committees have been central in the decision making structure.

UOG's wind turbines generate significant income which enables deeper community development activity and ensures the sustainability of the initiative. The strategic plan co-produced between locals and UOG aligns well with the aims of formal structures such as the Council, HSCP and Community Planning Partnership (CPP). The role and remit of UOG is becoming a hot-topic as public services struggle to achieve their priorities and are looking more at alternative local models for delivering some of these services. Recently UOG have brought forward a proposal for a Community Wellbeing Hub and supported living accommodation, which integrates community care with wider social activities- priorities identified through the Strategic Plan.

Milestones

2004 Urras Oighreachd Ghabhsainn established, 2007 community buy-out of Galson Estate.

2009-16 Wind turbines set up to generate an income for UOG.

2017 20 year plan for the area co-produced with local communities.

2018 Proposal for Community Wellbeing Hub.

Points of Interest

Key member of Outer Hebrides Forum of local community trusts, sharing learning and resources.

UOG acts as development agency for the area, and increasingly more involved in service delivery.

East Renfrewshire Health and Social Care Partnership

The Health and Social Care Partnership (HSCP) is a partnership between East Renfrewshire Council and NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. It aims to bring together services for children, families, adults and older people and to improve health inequalities in its locality. Locality Planning (in HSCP and Community Planning Partnerships) are helping establish local implementation. Key to this is historic appreciation of community led activity – the area had established a Community Health and Care Partnership ahead of Scottish Government legislation – with strong community engagement and co-production of initiatives to strategies and good partnership working across services, the third sector and communities. Statutory partners work closely with the local Third Sector Interface (Voluntary Action East Renfrewshire) in delivering this work. External consultants have been key to supporting public sector transformation and building partnership working.

Some of the initiatives chosen by the HSCP give an indication of some factors necessary for good place-based working. The workforce are flexible, trained in engagement and used to being out in the community. Due to the history of the Community Health and Care Partnership there is a sense that community engagement is relatively mature in this area, and there is a high turn-out for meetings and community steering groups. Comparing initiatives across the Local Authority area there was more tension expressed around external models such as the initiative 'Talking Points' compared to models like the 'Care Collective,' which was co-produced locally to help with the implementation of the Carer's Act.

Public sector transformation brings the potential for communities to coproduce plans and take joint responsibility for outcomes with local HSCP partners. HSCP strategy tends to be high level and clear in terms of vision and outcomes, but often lacks clarity in terms of implementation making it difficult for communities to clearly see how they fit in; this seems to be the case in East Renfrewshire. While local partners and the wider community in East Renfrewshire have a certain level of maturity in collaborative working, they nonetheless face issues common to other places studied; barriers regarding the lack of clarity regarding their role; how to account for risk; and the tendency of the public services to revert to siloed behaviour and culture.

Milestones

2006- 2015 Community Health and Care Partnership establishes new ways of working across sectors

2014 HSCP legislation from Scottish Government

Points of Interest

Partnership working between services and sectors relatively mature; beginning to look more now at commissioning practice to support new ways of working

Evidence2Success

Evidence2Success (E2S) seeks to facilitate greater collaboration between public sector and communities around children's services to increase investments in evidence-based prevention and early intervention. E2S comprises key components including school-based and community-based surveys (ChildrenCount 0-16 years) to identify the needs of children and young people; a method for mapping current investments in services for children and families in order to identify a proportion for reinvestment; a strong focus on evidence of what works; and dashboards for monitoring programme implementation. Robust governance arrangements for the cross-sector partnerships are required to embed the shared responsibility and accountability for improving children's lives between partners.

The approach was incubated by The Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF), one of the largest child-focused philanthropic bodies in the US, to address their frustration with public agencies' struggle to use the expanding body of 'what works' information. Dartington Service Design Lab (DSDL) has worked in partnership with numerous local authorities and Scottish Government to implement the approach across the UK.

Elements of this approach have been used to inform strategy development and investment in children's services in various initiatives throughout the UK. An early version 'Achieving Step Change' began in Renfrewshire in 2010/11 to collect and use data on children's well-being and service use to inform needs-led commissioning. It is the first site to repeat the survey and it is the focus of this research (see case study below). The full programme E2S was implemented in Perth and Kinross; and Dundee, Angus and North Ayrshire implemented a version of the programme, 'Improving Children's Outcomes.' Elements of the approach have since been adopted by Realigning Children's Services and replicated in several local authorities.

The data-led approach to service provision has enabled areas to understand the problems faced at a very local level and the ChildrenCount dashboards create a baseline for each location; enabling comparisons across time and location. An independent evaluation of E2S identified capacity building as key for successful collaborations between communities and professionals after initial issues with felt power imbalances.[15]

---

[15] https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/building-better-outcomes-children-evidence-based-practice-evidence2success-perth-kinross

Case study: Achieving Step Change, Renfrewshire

The first area in the UK to rerun the ChildrenCount survey, Renfrewshire demonstrates an evolving approach to community involvement. Initially the programme was service-led and contained within the Community Planning Partnership with less focus on the role of community. The second round engaged with a wider audience including groups that work with children in the local authority, the children themselves and wider group of senior managers in the CPP. Currently involvement of communities is based around dispersing the data, understanding their priorities and feeding-in their views on the Council's approach. Future engagement could go further in embedding the community in coproducing plans around children's services. Participatory budgeting was being explored as a means to this.

The Council was careful to consider the organisational 'readiness' of themselves and partners to change towards more collaborative practices when the programme began. Sharing data across the partners was initially difficult due to silos of information and a lack of understanding of why it was necessary. A major barrier in data-sharing was the inability of the partners like the HSCP to break down expenditure to the local level that was required, hence the expenditure-mapping that had been used in E2S was unavailable. However, since the partnership with DSDL there has been a cultural shift in the local authority towards utilising data to make evidence-driven decision making and working across organisations.

Milestones

2010/11 Achieving Step Change in Children's Outcomes project; 2016/17 repeat of survey.

Point of Interest

Exemplar in needs-led commissioning and measuring impact in place-based working

Section 2: Learning from the Case studies

Eight Qualities of Place-Based Working

In order to bring greater coherence to the field of place-based work and to provide a starting point for our analysis, we devised a set of eight qualities. These provided a framework for our research questions and helped us to test common features for place-based work described in the literature and found in our collective experience. The qualities of place-based working below draw on a range of sources;

- A developing place-based narrative and co-design work conducted during group sessions to identify key features of place-based work
- Existing Scottish Government policy frameworks and guidance (including the Place Principle, Place Standard Tool, the Community Empowerment Act, Health and Social Care Locality Planning, Community Rights to Buy Land or Transfer Assets and evolving City and region deals)
- Secondary analysis of existing research on place-based working from a range of international settings, collating common strengths and features
- Collaborate's own learning and frameworks including:
  - **Collaboration Readiness** – a framework which provides an overview of key components for place-based collaboration
  - **Building Collaborative Places** – a report which unpacks and describes the required infrastructure for place-based systems change
  - **Behaving like a system** – which explores the cultural, behavioural and relational building blocks for transformation to collaborative practice

---

Qualities of Place-based working

Place-based working is…

Collaborative
Works across scales
Community centred

this is achieved through…

Ingenuity and persistence
Collective resourcefulness
Learning and measuring

And the journey of place-based working is…

Evolving and developing
Sustainable, with a shared long-term vision

> 1. Collaborative
>   Involving a range of partners and institutions from across sectors who are key to the place (ideally public, private, third sector and community); the partnership displays a variety of good mechanisms which sustain both technical and cultural conditions which enable effective collaborative working methods. Partners work towards aligning or in some cases integrating their activities in such a way that their core work is reconfigured to best support the collaborative effort.

Shift from the formal to the relational

In the places studied, all emphasised the importance of key individuals involved and the relationships established over time.

"Recognition that if key people are not here, we'd probably go back to somewhere… maybe not back to the beginning. If key people don't buy in it can wither on the vine." (Council Employee)

This was paramount and many described formal arrangements acting in service to good collaborative working (not the other way around). This shift in attitude is evident in the lack of formalised agreements between partners in the majority of cases (excepting those in funding agreements, or necessary through statutory partners) – which in turn seems to help partners flex arrangements over time with those engaged at the core changing over time, as guided by changing priorities locally. Some however, expressed a desire for revisiting and formalising arrangements to ensure the contributions of key partners remain.

Shared priorities across partners was key to success for all, with a focus on community aspirations often driving alignment between very different partners (some had developed priorities as set by communities, not organisations). Those interviewed demonstrated a depth of understanding about their partners – their particular drivers, aspirations and pressures. This supports (and is supported by) good personal relationships, underpinning effective collaborative working between partners who are aware and able to adapt their approaches to help and support one another towards shared aims. **Flexible working arrangements** in some cases had made a real difference, enabling people to spend much of their time out of the office with other partners and in communities. It was heartening to hear such passion and enjoyment among those we spoke with for their work; the pleasure afforded by building relationships across organisations and with communities was a clear benefit and driver of personal engagement for work which many admitted was not easy and requires real personal resilience.

Size impacts structure

Partners involved in place-based working of course vary from place to place. A core **anchor group** or organisation is essential to hold and drive activity and can be seen in each place (analogous to the 'backbone organisation' described in the Collective Impact model), though the size of the geography and population appear to impact on the model adopted. In larger places this is often in the form of a steering group or community forum representing a number of partners from different organisations, whereas in smaller places and in the case of Community Land Trusts who are community owned, the Trust itself often has representation from a range of actors and groups and is its own self-contained delivery unit. In all cases, there exists a **wider set of stakeholders** who are brought in and engaged at different points for different reasons (for example partner organisations on particular projects; wide community engagement at key points of change). Across the case studies, few had seen significant involvement from the private sector and some had found the sector hard to engage.

> ### 2. Works across scale
> Local neighbourhoods and villages are part of larger places – cities, local authorities areas, country estates, islands. A prerequisite for achieving sustainable change around complex, wicked issues is recognition of the interrelationship of planning and delivery across these differing levels. Smaller, local schemes help to shape and influence practice and behaviours in the wider place and leaders in the wider place create the enabling environment and infrastructure for good local practice. National policy when effective supports good local and regional interrelations in strategy and delivery.

Balancing top-down and bottom-up priorities

The **national policy context** in Scotland presents real opportunities for place-based working; the Community Empowerment Act and related Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) and their Local Outcome Improvement Plans (LOIPs) mandate some form of community engagement around local plans, with Health and Social Care Partnerships (HSCP) required to develop Locality Plans too. The Land Reform Act, the Local Governance review and Planning Act reform (and the Islands Deal), all point towards opportunities for strengthening local community decision making. Among those interviewed however, there were clearly questions as to how well these opportunities were then implemented locally.

At the local level, the picture is mixed; in almost all cases the **Community Planning Partnerships** were not aligning with the place-based activity. In one case the local community had developed a plan through wide engagement and consultation which the CPP would not take on, but instead insisted on developing a new version leading to many members of the community refusing to engage with the CPP process or further Council-led initiatives. On the other hand, in many places **priorities naturally aligned well** between place-based partners and local services, with some groups adopting the Single Outcomes Framework developed by their local authority, and many are clearly aligned in their ambitions for regeneration and community sustainability.

The disjoint between people and (public) institutions

In every case it is clear very good working relationships have been developed between people working for public bodies and place-based partnerships thanks to the **involvement of key individuals.** Council staff often formed part of the core group and showed personal commitment to the work, acting as essential brokers, facilitating the relationship with their wider organisation and managers, providing in-kind resource, support and guidance. However, in many (though not all) cases there was a serious sense of disconnect – between the relationship with key individuals, and with the wider institution. Many described having excellent relationships with one or maybe two departments at the council, but still struggling with the majority who 'don't get it' and the legacy of old processes and behaviours.

Silos and expertise vs generalists

Siloed working in public services is still clearly a major barrier for most places. It affects both mindset and culture (with many wedded to their professional role and remit, struggling to understand their purpose outside of this definition) and practice (with processes still delivered departmentally and hierarchically e.g. budgets and measurement).

"[It's] difficult for us always to chart a wholly innovative path when structures are pulling back to traditional modes and models." (council employee)

This clearly affects the work of local public services with place-based partners, but also with each other, with cross-departmental/institutional working often an issue. The disconnection between in and outpatient services was referenced by many. In all the cases we spoke with, **health services** had been more difficult to engage or had remained entirely absent from place-based working, though some are beginning to make positive progress.

Some cited their local Councillors as important brokers and *"valuable generalists"* who, like particular council staff involved, work across different issues and groups flexibly *"as the silos make little sense to them either."* (*council employee*).

The context of public service transformation

There are of course significant changes under way in how services to the public are delivered, with the Christie Commission paving the way for greater collaboration across services and strengthening the role of communities in the way services are designed and delivered. Health and Social Care Integration; and the push towards Community Empowerment are two reforms of major significance, but there are others. Every area is grappling with major cultural change within their institutions and what this means for the roles and relationships between people and service professionals. This is challenging for both those in leadership positions and those working at the frontline for distinct reasons. In the places we spoke with, there was the sense such change is slow to come and there was a clear gap in support for the culture and skills required which underpin such approaches;

"There is a real need to build understanding and create the conditions for people to adopt new ways of working for what is huge service transformation across the system – this includes risk." (council employee)

> ### 3. Community centred
> Communities and other stakeholders and institutions in a place recognise their interdependence and work together to shape the area; communication platforms and insight sharing methods are robust and support this collaborative place-shaping among citizens and decision makers, which in turn builds pride and belonging; this is underpinned by commitments (pledges, agreements, joint plans) which build trust while recognising power dynamics and differences.

Changing relationship between people and services

Place-based working sits against the backdrop of fundamental change in the relationship between public services and communities as part of wider public service transformation described above. For the shift towards preventative solutions in public services to be achieved, public bodies recognise the need to engage and equip communities in new ways. We saw evidence of this shift in a number of places with collaborations taking on services and assets and a desire among public servants to enable communities to take on greater ownership of these (see below). However, a number spoke of the significant lack of resources being directed at the kind of capacity building for communities needed to sustain such change; the anchor groups we spoke with were rarely properly resourced for such work but in many cases were providing the kind of support that will be essential to sustain the shift in relationship and responsibility between services and citizens.

For the public sector partners we spoke with, the challenge seems to be one of implementation; they understand the changes required on their part, a shift from deliverer to enabler. But they experience limitations within their own systems; there are officers trained to engage and support community activities, but these are few in number and more widely professional training touches lightly (if at all) on community engagement/empowerment, nor supports the cultural shift required among staff. Some admitted too that while community engagement was sought for some issues and projects, communities still had no real say in major decisions on, for example, on infrastructure or housing developments.

The issue is highly complex and vexed as to who takes responsibility for what, with many concerned that people's **rights and needs** are not forgotten as things change. Partners across the collaborations, from across sectors, are wary this agenda becomes driven by the need for savings and all were keeping a careful eye on ensuring any provision or assets undertaken align with community priorities.

"We will still need to have the public sector managing demand for services and hospital discharge and the like. But we want communities more engaged, planning and organising around communities of interest – things important to them." (public sector partner)

Changing role of the anchor group

The anchor group who drive the place-based approach in each case were working as a key connector and **broker** from neighbourhood to local service level, connecting across scales and between different organisations. They were playing an important translation role, providing insight and creating vital feedback loops between formal systems (such as decision making fora in councils and HSCPs) and local residents.

In some cases, and particularly on the islands, some organisations were **also taking on services** previously managed by the council, including waste and recycling services, housing and, transport, with one even beginning to explore care provision. There are clear sensitivities however about this evolving role and the responsibility and remit for such organisations to take on an increasing number of services. Some interviewees expressed concern they were perceived to 'be the council', and found they were regularly **managing expectations with residents**. There is a good deal of debate about the extent to which such bodies should continue to explore greater responsibility for service provision, balancing the benefit more localised services can bring to people (in the form of outcomes and greater say in decisions that affect them) and to the local councils (in the form of savings) with the risk of taking on responsibilities for services where a depth of knowledge is needed and for which there is questionable mandate. Running a recycling centre is one thing but delivering care contracts is quite another; the line between the two is clearly a matter of ongoing debate and one requiring focus and honest discussion.

It is of note that a good number of the place-based groups we spoke with had become quasi-**development agencies** in their own right. Over time and as they have established their own governance and operations, some of the groups we spoke with had started to seed and support the emergence of other local projects and schemes, playing an important role in the local ecology and providing significant value for local residents at low cost. In both Galson and Lochgelly the Trust and Development Forum respectively have been able to use a grant pot to support such activity, which in the case of Lochgelly, used Participatory Budgeting methods.

The need for 'community engagement'?

While avoiding a lengthy debate about the nature and definition of community, it is clear that across the places and across partners too, questions about community involvement and engagement were met with varied responses. The size of geography clearly has an impact, with smaller populations leading to much closer networks and less of a distinction between 'the community' and 'the powers-that-be.' In this way 'community engagement' is more comprehensible (and arguably more of a necessity) in a large urban area than in a small rural community where your local council officers and Councillors are known to you and accessible. Within the Community Land Trusts for example, the Trust is community owned, with directors drawn from the community and representing many other groups and local interests. In such areas, engaging with people in the community was felt to be a more natural and ordinary process, though these anchor groups were not without their own processes of reaching out and involving people more widely when needed.

A real route to community empowerment

The extent to which these place-based collaborations demonstrate community centred approaches should be seen as a real strength. The majority have had significant success in garnering community interest and involvement with the affairs of their localities in new ways, whether through direct ownership of land and assets, or in co-designing housing and services. For many, the collaboration's work has created a new lease of life in their place, increased economic activity, community participation and for a number a physical impact on the landscape.

"Community ownership has unleashed real zeal and entrepreneurialism among those involved" (third sector partner)

Journey of engagement

Common across the case study areas was the experience of community engagement which maintains a sustained and constant thread, but where focused and intensive activity ebbs and flows over time around particular milestones. Periods of more intense engagement intersperse a lighter-touch connection with the wider community.

Getting the balance right between genuine involvement and 'consultation fatigue' was clearly a concern among many we interviewed.

Good communications: mature, diverse in method and timely

The importance of strong, appropriate and sustained communication was felt to be important by all groups in engendering trust and close working with the community. Overall, we can see a move away from traditional public consultation methods and towards more community based and online platforms.

Some emphasised the importance of **mature communication** between partners (particularly professionals) and local communities, agreeing and sticking to core principles to build trust – but crucially – being honest when things are not working and when difficult decisions need to be made, to ensure these are done in concert with communities. Using accessible language was seen to be key here, and a number admitted some partners had not always achieved this.

Methods to **sustain communication** included through local media and newsletters, online community fora, including social media sites and through regular meetings. Creating opportunities for more in-person discussion was considered very important by many, with a number investing in physical spaces where people could come and engage with the partners and work. Some had gone further by creating de facto community hubs, making space available to others at low cost and hosting events to draw in a wider variety of people. Increasingly, public meetings were felt to serve little purpose, and instead an increasing number were attending others' meetings – both formal decision making groups of local services, and of other local partners and fora (mostly third sector).

Periodic engagement methods were centred around key milestones and points of decision – for example, devising joint plans, facilitating a community buy out or taking on new projects and schemes. Charrettes and a range of imaginative and in-depth consultation and engagement methods were used, some delivered with great success while others met significant challenges (see below).

Importance of tangible impact

Nearly all those interviewed highlighted how important making a tangible, physical impact early on had made a difference to keeping energy and interest from the wider community. Establishing wind turbines, regeneration of old buildings and infrastructure had all helped local people buy-in to the work of the place-based collaboration.

Two schemes had also been able to establish **community funds** which again created a clear mechanism for community groups and individuals to engage through grants for particular projects.

Community tensions

Every collaboration is working within their own particular local community dynamic but a number of common tensions were mentioned; those **between different groups in a place**, and the need to ensure all voices are heard and it is not the 'usual suspects' always taking charge; **between resident communities and new arrivals**, whether internal migrants or tourists, there were some tensions between long-term residents and incomers on whom the sustainability of some communities relies; and **between the local community and the Public sector**. A number of collaborations we spoke with were mindful of these dynamics and taking steps to ensure they included a range of voices, acting as neutral brokers of varied interests.

Challenges with 'top-down' engagement

In our research we came across a few examples of community engagement schemes and methods which had not been well received, and in some areas had set back relationships across community and partners considerably. In these particular examples the schemes had been brought in by external agencies in the main, funded by local or Scottish Government. While well intended, in each instance the engagement scheme had in some way cut across previous activity, as if starting from scratch when in fact local partners and communities had well established relationships and some success under their belts.

"[It] cut across what they were already doing in communities – community led support which was being done in place specific way. Felt like this was being super imposed in the place. Was it just about reducing social care waiting lists? Took about a year for partners to take control of it again as partnership." (third sector partner)

> ## 4. Ingenuity and persistence
> Working to make change to complex, intractable issues, place-based partners have an awareness of the system of which they are part, the dynamics of that landscape and are able to make headway by being ingenious and creative in the face of structural and cultural barriers. Risk is shared across the partners with resilience and a new attitude to failure being necessary protective factors.

Entrepreneurial, agile, experimental

In every area, being members of the anchor group developing the place-based work provides the opportunity for **greater awareness of the wider system** – partners and colleagues in other organisations and sectors and their relative contexts. In all the places studied as described above, many of these individual members considered it an essential part of their role to broker across the collaboration and their respective employers.

Partners display agility in the way they work *"[we're] willing to blur the rules – no one is saying 'that's not my job' [instead] 'how can we best get on and do it?" (Community Trust partner)* However, some are working within organisational environments that do not always support collaborative working and have to develop real personal resilience and energy.

Two examples emerged where partners had good strategic awareness and long-term planning and had been able to take advantage of funding opportunities as they arose for significant projects.

Attitudes to risk were mixed

While the anchor groups in each place displayed in the main a healthy appetite to risk – willing to take collective and personal responsibility and try new things – among wider partners and the community attitudes sometimes differed. In the public sector, historic attitudes towards risk were creating barriers to new approaches being adopted, with instances of people falling back to hierarchies out of habit and without the necessary delegated authority to make decisions (though some took risks and made decisions despite this lack of support). Collaborations are trying various ways to support people to feel more comfortable with risk.

"Intelligence and measurement of how money is being spent, what is being delivered, helps people feel better about risk of new approaches" (public sector partner).

Within communities the picture is mixed, with some groups not wishing to adapt their ways of working and others more open to taking risks. It is worth noting that many of the anchor groups, and particularly community organisations involved, were having to take on increasingly greater levels of risk to deliver their work. For community ownership schemes in particular, taking on new assets provided a hitherto unknown level of financial risk and responsibility for such groups in creating and sustaining value – ordinarily where other public or private interests have failed.

> 5. Collective Resourcefulness
> Understanding – and making best use of – resources and assets in the place (people, buildings, the natural environment, services etc.); activities draw from across these resources (as well as external funds) supported by new approaches to funding and commissioning including pooling budgets, collective allocation of resource, and collaborative commissioning.

Frugality and austerity

Among those we spoke with nearly all have had to be extremely **frugal and creative** in order to deliver on their ambitions, relying on a lot of in-kind support and unpaid hours by key people to keep things going. Urras Oighreachd Ghabhsainn, for example, had challenges in accessing developmental funding particularly in the early phase, and while they did receive vital funding and support, there were no paid staff for the first 4/5 years of activity, during which time the group managed the community buy out and early developmental work on a renewable project. The majority of collaborations we spoke to had been able to access funding for physical infrastructure but felt there was less in the way of funding for 'social infrastructure' such as brokering across partners and developing community capacity locally which was often hard to fund. Some said they struggled to sustain or attract new funding once they were well known and felt "penalised for [their] success".

The **impact of cuts** made by the public sector varied across collaborations. While most spoke of the lack of resource now available for development work (community, regeneration and economic development) creating challenges for the work they deliver, some had found it a catalyst for new thinking. Having to do more with less has provided the push needed in some areas for partners from across sectors to come together and look at what might be achieved together and working more closely with local communities. Among many however, the prospect of further cuts and the uncertainty of Brexit was a great cause of concern.

Significant time spent liaising with funders

All place-based collaborations (either collectively, independently or both) were spending a considerable proportion of their time chasing funding – one individual was spending roughly 40% of her time seeking funding or reporting back to funders. The amount of time given to reporting to funders was considerable – many complaining of having to report to multiple funders, all in different formats, to different outcomes and with different measures. The likelihood of this causing duplication of reports and waste of personnel is clearly likely.

Shared and aligned resources

There were varying levels of resource sharing among partners – one had pooled resources across the collaboration for activities, but most collaborations were taking a more flexible

approach to resource management, with different partners providing different resource depending on need. This is mostly represented by in-kind support by a range of actors, sharing information and knowledge, physical resources and assets, staff time and in some cases, employing staff as a shared resource across partner organisations.

Slow shifts in commissioning practice

There are exceptions, but in the main, place-based working groups found that commissioning processes were not aligning well with their work and not set up to support collaborative or participative work, with competition still dominant. That said, some areas were beginning to explore alternatives to traditional commissioning and procurement – including more community-led commissioning and alliance contracting. Participatory budgeting was present in one area, but relatively small scale and for short-term projects.

Rebalancing market forces

The issue of market drivers came up in nearly every area as a key consideration when investing in place. Many were concerned that the public sector measure of success was too often focused on economic impact and regularly failed to properly recognise or count social impact. Some felt local authority decision making was too influenced by market drivers, prioritising financial returns or savings over community needs, and failing to appreciate how one could support the other.

Place-based approaches, some held, often misalign with market forces whose rationale is to invest in the simplest propositions with proven, short term gains. Place-based work on the other hand involves whole-systems, multiple partners, are long-term by nature and often delivering untested solutions. With the two fundamentally misaligned, it was felt that it should be the job of government, local and national, to rebalance in favour of place-based approaches, providing greater equity across regions. There were questions among a number as to how well they are delivering on this responsibility.

> ### 6. Learning and measuring
> Shared measures drive learning and improvement across the place-based partnership to reach agreed outcomes. The partnership uses evidence and insight from elsewhere to explore effective approaches for their own place. A culture of learning and adaptation ensures partners observe, measure and understand their shared impact and act according to what emerges, sharing in accountability too.

Largely informal and anecdotal

Overall, learning and measurement by place-based collaborations can be seen to be highly informal and largely anecdotal. Where insights are shared between partners at regular anchor organisation/group meetings, they tend to focus on reporting on activity with some reflection on progress.

Some had worked to develop and define shared outcomes, and the Place Standard Tool, Social Return on Investment (SROI), Single Outcomes Framework and National Health and Wellbeing Measures all mentioned as guiding this process. However, few were defining outcomes and revisiting these on a regular basis. In some cases collaborations were jointly monitoring outcomes related to particular projects, but in the main where measurement existed, it tended to be carried out separately by particular organisations for their own reasons. In a number of initiatives we studied there were no clear examples of regular data sharing mechanisms.

The exceptions to this is the work carried out in East Renfrewshire with the Health and Social Care Partnerships and the E2S scheme in Perth and Kinross – though both are quite different models to the others explored.

Utilising data in learning and measuring

In E2S a core component of the scheme is the ability to analyse the council-wide survey data from children and young people in smaller geographical areas to identify local priorities. Place-specific priorities are decided by service providers and local communities during the data dissemination sessions which enables planning services to tailor their needs-led commissioning around local issues. The ChildrenCount (0-16) survey data is displayed on dashboards to enable monitoring programme implementation as well as comparisons of data across areas in Scotland.

Regional learning fora

Looking to neighbouring areas seemed a common point of inspiration for many. In the Western Isles, what started as loose and informal relationships between different

Community Trusts has become more established over time and the Outer Hebrides Forum now meets on a regular basis and shares learning, resources and even staff.

Funders and commissioners define the space

Across the collaborations, it is clear that behaviours around learning and measurement are almost exclusively driven by the requirements of funders and commissioners. Much of what is measured is what is requested by funders or commissioners, and the diverse array of funds place-based partners draw on can leave them little room for real learning and improvement because time is taken up with monitoring and reporting the plethora of targets. There was a strong sense of staff feeling overburdened by the complexity and scale of measures requested by different types of funders, often with each wanting something different.

Some felt this burden was increasing, with the need to report to increasing numbers of targets, but with little clarity as to what positive impact this could be having;

"Rules do seem to change and become ever more onerous. Rules come from upon high – government, Europe - they come from a much higher level. To expect communities to keep ahead of the game is a bit of an ask." (public sector partner)

> 7. Evolving (and developing)
>
> The content of the work and the partners involved change and adapt over time, dependent on the needs and desires of the place and its people. The ambition is long term with partners recognising the length of time needed to develop and embed real and lasting collaborative ways of working. Work is often conducted in phases with core partners engaged on delivering to identified goals, and wider engagement necessary at key milestones and points of change.

It takes time

"Back in 2000 we were saying to people in Lochgelly, this isn't a quick fix – this will take 10 years. What we've learned is that 10 years is really optimistic when talking about a project which is about a whole community" (third sector partner)

The above quote succinctly captures the truth exhibited by all the collaborations studied; sustainable, collaborative efforts that bring people together in a place take a good deal of time and effort. Positive relationships between individuals and institutions develop over long periods and are necessary to build wider trust which acts as a bedrock for good place-based working. It cannot be rushed and requires organisational and personal commitment. Planning for the long-term from the outset with communities had helped some areas in creating the right expectations and culture for collaborative place-based work.

Evolving and expanding focus

Most of those interviewed had begun work on a single programme or project acting as a catalyst for place-based collaboration and expanded their focus over time. Many now encompass so many activities and projects often no one body or partner has oversight of the whole. The place-based approaches exhibited here have been generative producing a great deal of activity which it was felt would not have been achieved without their work. In the case of Community Land Trusts, the shift from private to community ownership undoubtedly meant access to funds and support that would not otherwise be available.

The journey of place-based regeneration appeared to be a distinct pattern occurring in the case studies which evolved around a physical asset. We have laid out our tentative observations (see Appendix A).

> 8. Sustainable, with a long-term shared vision
>   Change sought is long term and sustainable, building places which strive in the long term to thrive socially, environmentally and economically. Sustainability is asset based, recognising longevity is achieved through the 'soft stuff' (strong relationships, embedded cultures and ways of working, commitment and passion of individuals) as well as the 'hard' stuff (financial resource, operational structures, agreements).

Sustainable communities overarching aim

"That's place-based – that's the confidence you have for the land you own – confidence you have for the long term, you're in it for life" (Community Land Trust)

In the majority of place-based examples we studied, the core aim was to ensure long-term sustainability of the community, though with differing emphasis on social, economic and environmental sustainability. For the Islands retaining and attracting residents is a crucial issue, whereas in urban areas like Lochgelly, where regeneration is the focus, the size of population is not an issue but ensuring it is socially and economically vibrant is as important.

Common activities undertaken by place-based collaborations to ensure sustainability of the community included affordable housing, good infrastructure and services and attracting private investment, and tourism.

Some felt concern around the predominance of the narrative of growth, particularly among the public sector, and how ill-matched this was to community activity that strives for sustainability and balance. This divergence in values and language was felt to underlie some of the disconnect between public sector versus communities' interpretation of success for place.

Precarious financial sustainability

Good strides were being made in some places towards income generation, but all were to some degree still reliant on external support and/or funding for their activities. Community owned assets in the main take a long while to generate returns so this is not unexpected, but in some cases means managing expectations, not only of residents, but also of funders and external supporters who might hope for such schemes to 'stand on their own two feet' sooner than possible.

Sustainability: people and pride

There was recognition across the place-based collaborations that sustaining efforts and achieving success is highly dependent on the people involved. All those interviewed spoke of key figures in their work who had been critical to the achievements of the collaboration

and many bore in mind the importance of both supporting key individuals but also looking carefully at succession planning in staff and boards to ensure dependency was mitigated.

A number of areas considered involving **young people** in future work to be an important priority with a sense there was much more to do here, but for many areas attracting and retaining young people and families would be key to longer term sustainability of their communities, as one respondent sums up;

"My long term ambition is to hear kids voices in my village again" (Community Trust member)

There was a real sense of optimism and pride among those interviewed for what had been achieved – optimism for the future and personal pride expressed by many for having been part of collective success. People spoke of their enjoyment and fulfilment gained by being involved in their place-based collaboration. Such generative and positive attitudes seem to be a key part of what drives and sustains good place-based working and this cannot be overstated.

Section 3: Lessons and recommendations

What follows is an assessment of what aspects of place-based work are working well in Scotland, areas that need improvement; and finally, our recommendations for building the practice to be more widely adopted when the ability to address complexity through a holistic approach is necessary.

What's working well in Scotland:

Comparing the initiatives we studied against features of well-preforming place-based working we were able to qualitatively assess the effectiveness of these initiatives in Scotland and can highlight the following strengths:

Communities have greater power

Place-based working is fundamentally about improving outcomes for communities and individuals through them being in the driving seat. In Scotland the recent but influential history of community ownership has been a key development and as exhibited in the cases we studied, has dramatically changed the fortunes of some areas, bringing opportunity and investment that otherwise wouldn't have been present. In places where community ownership has had less influence, we also see an increase in community activity with improved place-based working across agencies and with communities catalysing greater community involvement. There was a great sense of pride and optimism for the potential of place-based work to create a more inclusive and **sustainable future** among those we interviewed.

Anchor organisations improve sustainability

Almost all of the areas studied have a core focus on actions to sustain the life of their communities; ensuring a healthy population level through good infrastructure, services and economic activity. The role of the local anchor organisation or group seems key to maintaining a steady and committed eye on this aim, prioritising long-term goals over quick wins (echoing the 'Backbone organisation' in the Collective Impact model). As well as important brokers between statutory, third sector and community partners, some have become important development agencies in their own right, providing inspiration and support to emerging community led activities.

Alignment of local priorities

In all areas there was clear alignment between the priorities of place-based collaborations and those of the local public sector (e.g. regeneration, housing, care services). Working relationships between anchor organisations/groups and staff within the local public services were largely very good, with individuals demonstrating flexibility and resourcefulness in achieving shared goals, and over time developing strong partnerships. This did not however always extend to the wider organisation where culture and practice often still creates barriers to progress. Nonetheless, some anchor organisations are beginning to take on increased service provision responsibilities; a development which is significant in a time of public sector transformation offering, as it may, an alternative to the outsourcing model currently being adopted by some local authorities. However even where anchors were expanding their remit into service delivery they stressed that it was not about 'picking up the pieces' and will require support and careful implementation.

Supportive policy environment

The national policy landscape offers good potential for supporting place-based approaches underpinned by the catalytic work of the Christie Commission. This includes through the Community Empowerment Act and related Locality Planning requirements, the Land Reform Act and Community Right to Buy and Health and Social Care integration with the Planning Act reform and Local Governance Review pending. How well these opportunities are implemented locally is an ongoing challenge with wide variation in practice.

Collaboration and long, personal commitment

In each of the initiatives we studied there was a good culture of collaborative working within the partnerships. While these collaborations demonstrated a mix of informal and formal structures, all rely on a clear, shared vision for their joint work. The long-term nature of place-based change (which many stressed) enables relationships and collaborative culture to develop over time with activity that is rewarding and enjoyable for individuals involved. The time, energy and dedication from partners to improve their places is clear. The skills and culture to undertake place-based working are clearly developing in pockets across Scotland, with people moving beyond their job's remit to 'unblock' systems and facilitate collaborations between a variety of organisations, helping individuals to step outside of individual organisational priorities and focus on community priorities.

What needs more work:

Our analysis also brought to light some of the issues practitioners of place-based working face at the local and national level:

Uncertainty of a shifting policy landscape

The shifting policy landscape, while generally positive for place-based work, can be hard to keep track of as a community organisation and the complexity looks to increase with Brexit on the horizon. Changes to service provision through a number of public sector transformation agendas is requiring attention and understandably distracting from other local issues. Improved legislation has undoubtedly also led to increased requirements and there was a general sense of people having to do and measure more and more with little space left for anything else. Simplifying and greater alignment to reduce over-reporting and burden seems important.

Institutional vs. collaborative culture

Individuals struggled against traditional organisational structures and 'silos' that made collaborating and sharing data with place-based partners difficult, especially local public services and health partners. Some partners felt that this collaborative way of working was supported but old structures made practices like sharing data difficult. Others worried that only pockets of people supported the good practice of place-based working and the drivers in the wider system (for example financial preoccupations) misaligned with what they were trying to do. In some cases initial sharing of data across organisation for a specific project encouraged a wider culture of collaboration to spread.

Unintended consequences of funding approaches

Applications for funding took a huge amount of paid- and volunteered time and most initiatives felt reporting to multiple funders, often using different measures and outcomes, took away from valuable time that could be spent on development work or evaluating their impact. Where communities had taken control of assets (land, green energy) these took considerable time to begin generating profit and there was a concern that commitments of financial support from external agencies was not reflective of this.

Narrative of growth supersedes sustainability

The aim of sustainability and the long-term, holistic nature of place-based working was felt by many to misalign with market forces that seek easier and cheaper solutions to problems. The issues these initiatives have in measuring and evidencing their impact and value is further exacerbated in an environment that prioritises decisions based on financial bottom lines rather than social and environmental sustainability. Participants felt funding streams were easier to access for physical rather than social development.

Learning and measurement were underdone

Formal learning and measuring was not consistently strong across the initiatives we studied. The diversity of requirements and measures being reported to funders was felt to affect the ability of partners to put time into developing a strategy around measuring and evaluating their impact. Where significant time and skill was directed into measurement it galvanised collaborative working between partners and enabled evidence-led decision making.

Tensions with external models

Where external agencies enter an area care must be exercised so that it does not feel like 'parachuting' in and not building on the work that came before. Anchor organisations and key individuals in a place often have the trust that comes with building a good track record over a long period of time. Across the initiatives external consultants or models worked best when they tapped in to previous work rather than 'reinventing the wheel'. Community Planning Partnerships have very different relationships with place-based initiatives across Scotland, with some more successfully aligning their visions than others. Time-heavy, opaque and bureaucratic processes, combined with poor representation of communities were frequent complaints.

Missing players

Across the different case studies we saw a lack of connections with the private sector, or where they were involved they began to retreat over time. Structures by which to engage local businesses, and feed their ideas into the decision making process worked well in two examples and aligned the vision of the area between a greater number of local interests. Sharing learning from places that have successfully involved the private sector would help illustrate successful mechanisms. Engagement of young people was also believed to be a priority for the sustainability of the initiatives, although many struggled with sustaining their involvement over long time periods. Finally, across the case studies Health partners were often absent or took time to establish their involvement with other partners.

Recommendations:

Across the case studies we asked partners for their opinions on what would enable good place-based practice to grow. The following is based on our learning from the case studies, other research and recommendations from those we interviewed:

- Greater coordination between funders (independent and statutory) to align funding requirements in a place. If these requirements could be co-produced with organisations doing place-based work this would be enable building evidence of good place-based working practice, and reduce compliance burden and risk.

- Place-based partnerships need to agree and direct resource into a shared measurement as aligned measures and a shared theory of change will help support partnership working as well as evidence impact and draw in more resource. Community organisations will need support- national organisations can help spread the learning and good practice to other areas

- Developing and encouraging professional skills in facilitation and brokering would improve communication across organisations and particularly help with community engagement. Skills also need to be built locally that can hold the weight of public service transformation and community empowerment. External consultants have important roles here around supporting and growing that capacity, not doing it all themselves.

- Training opportunities for elected officials such as councillors, MPs and MSPs to learn about place-based working as each could play an important role in supporting place-based working initiatives as it complements their 'generalist' way of working and centres decisions on communities (their electorate).

- Grow the connectivity and sharing of learning between place-based initiatives and national organisations involved in this work. By developing or growing this network resources and skills could be shared as seen in the island communities and knowledge around measurement and good practice spread.

Conclusion

Place-based working in Scotland is a continuation of a long history of building local sustainability. Currently it is developing alongside transformations in how the public-sector views its role in service delivery and a growing belief that local democracy can build resilience in the context of globalisation.[16]

Our analysis of the case studies shows similarities with other place-based initiatives across the world. The Collective Impact model often used for place-based working in North America and Australia shares many features with the partnerships we examined (a common agenda, aligned activity, ongoing communication, and backbone support)[17], although these elements were less formal in Scotland. The Scottish approach could be improved by adopting lessons around shared measurement from this international model. While there are pockets of good measurement practice being developed in Scotland (E2S, GoWell in Glasgow[18]) there needs to be a consistent approach where partnerships take the time to develop a theory of change and decide on shared measures. Coordination between funders and place-based collaborations around what measures they report could significantly help evidence the long-term benefits place-based working has, as strong measurement has been able to do with the Collective Impact model[19]. While our report is generally consistent with the Improvement Service's (IS) overview of place-based practices in 2016 we found a difference in interviewees' perceptions about how enabling the Community Planning Partnership processes are to place-based working[20]. Some areas found the structure difficult to engage with and feed-in community-led ideas, while other areas found working through their CPP helped galvanise partnership working in an area.

This report has identified eight qualities of well-preforming place-based work from reviews of UK and international practice, alongside discussions with a cross-sector group. We have used this framework to qualitatively assess how effective place-based working is in Scotland, based on interviews with partners in six case studies. This has built a picture of the enabling conditions and barriers to the wider adoption of this practice in Scotland. The information from these case studies was shared with a wider group of practitioners on the27 March, 2018 and inspired conversations around enablers and barriers with a wider range of voices (see Appendix B).

---

[16] See, for instance: https://democracycollaborative.org/publications.

[17] http://collectiveimpactforum.org/

[18] http://www.gowellonline.com/

[19] *When Collective Impact has an impact: a cross-site study of 25 Collective Impact Initiatives,* Spark Policy Institute and ORS Impact, 2018.

[20] *Place-Based Approaches to Joint Planning, Resourcing and Delivery: An Overview of current practice in Scotland*, Improvement Service, 2016.

Appendices

Appendix A- Tentative observations around the journey of regeneration

During the analysis of the case studies a pattern emerged of the journey several initiatives went on from dealing with primarily physical regenerations to the social infrastructure in a place. The below is included only as an observation.

Set up:

Beginning with a specific opportunity or catalyst to draw key people in the community (and support agencies) together.

> Physical asset often the catalyst (land, regen of land or housing…)

Phase one:

Focus on the first priority – establishing big physical project, consolidating position.

> Major investment, often in capital projects

> Community engaged throughout (to deeper or lesser degree, but some engagement)

> Once first goal consolidated, chance to take stock. Successful ones do this while widening out community consultation again

Phase two:

A focus on wider social issues – typically services and projects.

> Requires (or receives?) less money than the big capital and energy projects.

> More 'handing over' to community groups. Focus shifts to enabling and greater role for central group or anchor organisation in enabling and developing rather than so much delivering.

> Questions about momentum: in a number of successful case studies, some fear at this stage that efforts will lose pace and ambition – risk of resting on laurels and not continuing to innovate, improve and meet community aspirations.

Appendix B- Barriers to place-based working from discussion on 27th March

Hard to work together	Silos	Power	Exhausted, disconnected people	Measurement is hard	Policy Context
We're not good at listening	Organisations looking at own aims, not the overall vision of a place	Power 'seats' and power dynamics affect interactions	There is a citizen-professional disconnect- we are both.	Difference between what's easy to measure and what's important	Tension between electoral cycle timings compared to time needed for transformation
Myths are bought into and not always critically assessed	Resources are often distributed on a 'project' basis, not pooled across place or in hands of the people	Are there resistant professions? Planning, property, finance, transport	Volunteer exhaustion- how do we sustain it?	Real change takes a long time but we also needs short-term, noticeable changes to build momentum	Funding cycles are short term
Need more accessible language and less jargon	This behaviour is persistent despite identified disadvantages	Unclarity about our end-game. Why are we here? What is the point? What are the priorities?	Complexity of the situation	No well-known measures of collaborative work to make the case	Tension between spatial vs community planning
Compromise is inevitable (but do communities bare this to a greater extent?)	Bound to own organisation's outcomes and reporting methods	City Region Deals-example of opaque process with no community engagement	Are activists unintentionally denying themselves access to the wider dialogue?		Differing policy objectives and pressure on the government to demonstrate their measures
	Need our collaborations to include private businesses		Poverty, deprivation and unbalanced skill sets depending on what place you live in		Don't have an awareness of the impact when we deinvest

Appendix B- Enablers of place-based working: discussion on 27th March

Harness Fiery Spirits	Create a long-term vision	Build skills in facilitation	Use Passion and Emotion	Measurement	Policy Enablement	Investment
Finding the right people; passion and energy; willing to pass on power and responsibility	Creating a more coherent movement of change towards a sustainable future	Recognition of skilled professionals with a connector and facilitator role	People are ready; there is an acknowledgement of problems in system; the planets are aligning. Use this energy	Need to be measuring outcomes and collecting stories to get a complete picture	Use the Christie Principles as a reference point, structure for change.	Capital investment- with front-loaded revenue
Strong leadership and 'system fixers' (generalists), with the desire for this work	Simplification. It's about people and places. Deconstruct tools and talk to the people.	Use this skill for inclusion and healthier processes; across sector issues, and with communities.	Rich heritage to draw upon; people's pride in place	Need collective and individual narratives in an area to understand what's going on in a place	Agreed Local Governance and help create flexible system of governance	A place can only change from within- outside practitioners need to enable locals to do it
Recognition of contribution by volunteers	Quick wins are needed; also medium and long-term wins over 10-20 years	Honest, transparent and accessible conversations	"Change happens at the speed of trust"	Use International learning to get inspiration and share learning	Potential of the planning reform to bridge gap between spatial planning and enabling communities	
Young people are key to a new culture of collaboration	Genuine standing together and commitment to letting go of power	Mediate the top down and bottom up processes as they meet in the middle	Seize what can be done now in policy and on the ground		Frontloaded 'Inclusive engagement'	

Appendix C- Research Methodology

The project moved at pace through a series of steps; the delivery of the project is described under these steps:

i) Research design;

For this phase, Collaborate developed in conversation with Corra Foundation staff a set of place-based qualities drawn from the sources below to help us develop a criterion for selecting case studies and as the basis of the research design, forming questions for interview to align with the features identified. During this phase we:

- designed a set of place-based working (PBW) qualities
- contacted and conducted a select number of scoping conversations with a range of intermediaries and place practitioners to help us identify schemes which fit the criteria
- compiled a longlist of PBW examples, and selected the shortlist for interview, covering a range of geographies, issues and partnership types
- invited PBW initiatives to take part
- designed research templates for use in interviews, with corresponding analysis questions.

North Harris Trust, North Glasgow Canal Corridor, Evidence to Success, Lochgelly, Galson and East Renfrewshire HSCP were selected as our case studies

The development of the place-based qualities was a key stage in the process and were designed drawing on a rich and wide range of sources:

- Corra Foundation's developing PBW narrative and co-design work conducted during group sessions to identify key features of place-based work
- Existing Scottish Government policy frameworks and guidance (including the Place Standard Tool, the Community Empowerment Act, Health and Social Care Locality Planning, Community Rights to Buy Land or Transfer Assets and evolving City and region deals)
- Secondary analysis of existing research on PBW from a range of international settings, collating common strengths and features of PBW
- Collaborate's Collaboration Readiness framework (being adapted for Scottish Context). This provides an overview of key components for place-based collaboration and in addition
  - Building Collaborative Places report and framework (this unpacks structural elements/considerations)
  - Behaving like a system (this unpacks cultural, relational elements)

iii) Desk research;

During this phase desk research was primarily undertaken by Corra Foundation staff with Collaborate designing and guiding the process. Desk research focused on two sources;

- Information on the case study PBW initiatives
- International and rest of UK research, learning and best practice on local PBW.

iv)   Interviews;

Collaborate worked with Corra Foundation staff on delivering interviews with case study partners.

- 8 pre-selection phone calls were conducted to explore potential case studies with wider partners (e.g. contacts at HIE).
- 30 in-depth telephone and 2 in-person interviews were conducted with key partners involved in Galson Estate Trust, Lochgelly, North Harris Trust, E2S, East Renfrewshire HSCP partners and North Glasgow Canal Regeneration project
- We sought to interview a mix of key partners in PBW, commissioners/funders and community groups/representatives.

v)   Analysis;

Collaborate led on the analysis design and delivery, with Corra Foundation staff providing support, this phase included;

- Analysing responses from 32 interviewees and 5 conversations with other partners
- Drawing up written analysis for each individual case study using the frame of the developed qualities to identify key issues, common and differing responses across partners in place, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats
- Using these to draw together common findings from across all PBW case studies, for presentation at final event (see appendices)
- Writing up a separate analysis document on learning for wider systems stakeholders, identifying opportunities, issues and threats to PBW across Scotland.

vi)   Cross-sector group;

To strengthen the field of practice across Scotland by developing clear narratives around PBW, Scottish Government supported a group of people from community, third sector organisations, funders, local and central government to meet and consider what is meant by place-based work.

We would like to thank the cross-sector group for their contribution to this project. They include: Andrew McGowan (Inspiring Scotland), Andy Milne (SURF), Anna Watt (Corra Foundation), Carolyn Sawers (Corra Foundation), Carol Calder (Audit Scotland), Claire Bynner (Glasgow University), Claire Sweeney (Audit Scotland), Diarmaid Lawlor (Architecture and Design Scotland: AD&S), David Allan (Scottish Communities Development Centre: SCDC), Emily Watts (Corra Foundation), Fiona Garven (SCDC), Fiona McKenzie (Centrestage), Frazer McNaughton (Scottish National Heritage), Gavin Paterson (N Ayrshire HSCP), Helen Forsyth (Berwickshire Housing Association), Helena Huws (Scottish Canals), Ian Gilzean (Scottish Government), Irene Beautyman (Improvement Service), Jennifer McLean (Glasgow University), John Howie (NHS), Keith Jack (Violence Reduction Unit Scotland), Kieran Wardrop (East Ayrshire Council), Kim Black (Centrestage), Linsay Chalmers (Community Land Scotland), Mhairi Reid (Big Lottery Fund), Mick Doyle (SCDC), Neil Ross (HIE), Nick Wilding (Scottish Government), Phil Prentice (Scotland's Towns Partnership), Russel Gunson (Institute for Public Policy Research), Sam Cassels (Scottish Futures Trust), Susan Bolt (Scottish Government), Viv Gray (Scottish National Heritage) and Zoe Laird (HIE).

Corra Foundation has linked the evolving narrative around Scottish PBW from these meetings into the case study research by:

- Using exercises to agree and establish the qualities of good PBW
- Using the group members' expertise to locate interesting examples of PBW in Scotland
- The group sense-checked and gave feed-back on the developed qualities of PBW.

vii)   Qualities of PBW

Based on desk-based research into international and Scottish PBW literature and deliberations of the cross-sector group the eight qualities of PBW were established.

Appendix D- Questionnaire

Preamble

The Scottish Government has funded Corra Foundation to undertake a system change project to make Place-Based Working (PBW) more effective in Scotland. One element of the project is to undertake case study research into PBW undertaken in Scotland. The Foundation has commissioned Collaborate, a social consultancy supporting place-based change across the country, to undertake the research in partnership with Corra staff.

Through this interview, we will be looking to understand more of the detail behind your initiative; your history and your ambitions for the future, your key stakeholders and ways of working to understand what is working well and where more focus might be needed. This will help us to build up a picture of how a range of different PBW initiatives are faring across Scotland, drawing out learning that can help further the development of this field.

- Firstly, thank you for sparing the time to speak today – our conversation will take up to an hour
- We're speaking with a number of people involved in your partnership and would like to run through a set of questions with you –but we will be flexible in our conversation
- Please feel free to ask any questions at any time, or to say anything you feel is important but that you haven't been asked about.
- I will take notes, so you may hear some typing sounds, and would like to record this interview if you agree?
- We also have a consent form if you would be kind enough to read and sign that. *(if not already complete)*
- We will take insights from across the partnership to form the case study material, but individual responses will be anonymised in any later reporting
- Any questions before we start?

About the partnership
1. In your own words, can you please describe your involvement with the partnership? *Prompts: Job description, remit, role.*
2. Can you describe the journey of your partnership? Where you started, what has changed over time?
Collaborative Involving a range of partners and institutions from across sectors who are key to the place (ideally public, private, 3rd sector and community); the partnership displays a variety of good mechanisms which sustain both technical and cultural conditions which enable effective collaborative working methods. *Questions cover: Vision – governance and leadership – delivery – culture change - what might be done differently/better?* **And…**

Systems ingenuity

Working to make change to complex, intractable issues, place-based partners have an awareness of the system of which they are part, the dynamics of that landscape and are able to make headway by being ingenious and creative in the face of structural and cultural barriers. Risk is shared across the partners with resilience and a new attitude to failure necessary protective factors.

Questions cover: Systems awareness – systems dynamics (asking dif ppl and comparing; asking ppl to reflect on key players/absences) – attitude to risk – ingenuity/ problem solving

3. Is there a shared vision for your place-based partnership? Can you describe it?

4. What are the leadership and governance arrangements for the partnership (as far as they exist)?

5. How do you communicate and make decisions across the partnership?
   Prompts: Senior/delivery levels; through meetings, picking up the phone..

6. What enables and supports good collaborative working practice in your partnership?
   Prompts: people, agreements, cultures or principles

7. What have been the challenges in delivering your work?
   Prompts: technical and practical issues? Cultural or relational issues?

8. What do you do when you encounter challenges or barriers to progress? (**Systems Ingenuity**)
   Prompts: As an individual, an organisation, the partnership

9. What is the attitude to risk across the partnership? (**Systems Ingenuity**)

Managing across scale

Local neighbourhoods, villages are part of larger places – cities, Local Authorities, country estates, islands. Prerequisite for achieving sustainable change around complex, wicked issues is recognition of the interrelationship of planning and delivery across these differing levels. Smaller, local schemes help to shape and influence practice and behaviours in the wider place and leaders in the wider place create the enabling environment and infrastructure for good local practice.

Questions cover: Dependencies and influencing across the small/big – infrastructure and mechanisms which connect the two – challenges/what's not working - what's working/ what's not working?

10. Thinking about the wider …*Local Authority area/HSCP area etc…*, how joined up does thinking and practice feel? (e.g. in the system of support for children in East Glasgow?)(**Systems Ingenuity**)

11. Are there any 'bits of the system' or key players who feel absent? (**Systems Ingenuity**) *Prompts: From your work or more generally?*
12. <u>For those working in the smaller geography</u>: To what extent does your work feel supported by decisionmakers and key stakeholders acting in the Local Authority/HSCP/the wider place (as appropriate)? *Prompts: Do you have the permissions you need? Do you feel you're working in spite of or supported by the wider system?*
13. <u>For those working in the smaller geography:</u> Are you able to shift practice and influence decisions at that level?
14. <u>For those working in the larger geography:</u> To what extent does the work of the partnership feel aligned to your (the Council's etc.) priorities?
15. <u>For those working in the larger geography:</u> What is your involvement in the work? What is the benefit for you (the Council etc.)?

Community Centred

Communities and other place stakeholders and institutions recognise their interdependence and work together to shape the place; communication platforms and insight sharing methods are sufficiently robust to support collaborative place-shaping among citizens and decisionmakers which builds pride and belonging; this is underpinned by commitment mechanisms (pledges, agreements, joint plans) which build trust while recognising power dynamics/differences.

Questions cover: Staff capabilities – citizen influence – engagement platforms, mechanisms – what's working/ what's not working?

16. Can you describe how the community is involved with the work? Are they/you involved in decisionmaking? How?
17. <u>For citizens</u>: Do you feel you have an influence of what's happening (through this partnership/initiative/in our town)?
18. <u>For citizens</u>: How do you feel about living in (*insert name of place*)?
19. <u>For frontline staff:</u> How are you supported with community engagement, developing the right skills and so on?
20. Is there anything you'd change to strengthen the relationship between the community and other stakeholders involved in the partnership?

Learning

Shared measures drive learning and improvement across the place-based partnership to reach agreed outcomes. The partnership uses evidence and insight from elsewhere to explore effective

approaches for their own place. A culture of learning and adaptation ensures partners observe, measure and understand their shared impact and act according to what emerges, sharing in accountability too.

Questions cover: define outcomes and measures – evidence/insight gathering – learning culture and mechanisms – ability to adapt

21. What are the outcomes you are working towards through the partnership? Both long term and intermediate – and how do they connect?

22. Is your work informed by learning and evidence from elsewhere?

23. How do you know you are making a difference or making progress towards these? *Prompts: method of insight and data collection*

24. What enables you to learn and adapt to what is happening in your place? *Prompts: meetings, sharing data, regular contacts*

25. Who is accountable to delivering to the outcomes you mentioned? Accountable to whom?

Collective Resourcefulness
Understanding – and making best use of – resources and assets in the place (people, buildings, the natural environment, services etc.); activities draw from across these resources (as well as external funds) supported by new approaches to funding and commissioning including pooling budgets, collective allocation of resource, and collaborative commissioning.

Questions cover: Funds/resources/assets which support partnership – decisionmaking on spending/allocation

26. What resources does the partnership draw on to enable the work? *Prompts: Funding, commissioning, contracts; other assets and in-kind offers*

27. How are decisions made on allocation of resource? And how is this managed?

28. Does the commissioning and contracting environment support collaborative working?

Sustainable
Change sought is long term and sustainable, building places which strive in the long term to thrive socially, environmentally and economically. Sustainability is asset based, recognising longevity is achieved through the 'soft' (strong relationships, embedded cultures and ways of working, energy and passion of individuals) as well as the 'hard' stuff (financial resource, operational structures, agreements).

Questions cover: define long-term plans re sustaining/embedding – sustainability of resource – sustainability in relationships and culture – what's working/ what's not working?
29. Can you describe the long-term ambition and plans for the work?
30. Finally, what do you think would help you get there? Is there any external support or input that would make a difference?
31. Who in your view are key stakeholders in developing the field and good practice of PBAs in Scotland? (And what should/could they do?)
32. Any final comments or questions?

Insight gathering will cover;

A. About the PBW initiative – through desk research, possible survey (incl visuals for final outputs)
B. Effectiveness – through interviews
C. Wider landscape – through interviews, comparative desk research, wider engagement (working group etc.)

Key questions for analysis:

➢ How effective is PBW in Scotland when assessed against the above qualities? (individually, and across case studies)
➢ Where do they excel? (individually, and across case studies)
➢ Where is more work needed? (individually, and across case studies)

➢ What can we learn about the wider Scottish landscape and its support of PBW?
➢ Who are the key stakeholders and networks at the national or regional level who are key to change?
➢ What are the opportunities to strengthen the field and spread effective PBW across Scotland?

Riverside House, 502 Gorgie Road Edinburgh EH11 3AF
e: hello@corra.scot
t: 0131 444 4020
www.corrascot