



# Active Partners

Benchmarking **Community Participation** in  
Regeneration



# Contents

	PAGE
Foreword	1
Executive Summary	2
<b>Section 1</b>	
<b>Benchmarks for Community Participation</b>	5
Application of Benchmarks to Community Participation	6
Benchmarks for Community Participation	8
<b>Section 2</b>	
<b>Understanding Community Participation in Regeneration</b>	11
Context	12
The Concept of Benchmarking in Regeneration	13
Definition of Terms	14
<b>Section 3</b>	
<b>Tools for Achieving and Evidencing the Benchmarks</b>	17
Introduction	18
• Influence Benchmarks	21
• Inclusivity Benchmarks	33
• Communication Benchmarks	41
• Capacity Benchmarks	47
Useful Publications	52
<b>Section 4</b>	
<b>Background Report</b>	53
Origins of the Benchmarking Commission	54
Underpinning Principles	55
Research Methodology and Findings	56
<b>Appendices</b>	59
Appendix A Snapshot Studies	60
Appendix B Summary of literature reviewed	64
Appendix C Contributors	66
Active Partners	
Acknowledgements	68





Victoria House  
2 Victoria Place  
Leeds LS11 5AE  
Tel: 0113 243 9222  
Fax: 0113 243 1088  
Website: [www.yorkshire-forward.com](http://www.yorkshire-forward.com)

## Foreword

Regional Development Agencies were established by Government to spearhead the economic, social and environmental regeneration of the English regions. In Yorkshire Forward we are determined to search out and apply best practice in achieving the sustainable regeneration of disadvantaged communities in our region.

The Government has stated clearly that regeneration can only be achieved with the active participation of local communities in disadvantaged areas. Regeneration is done by and with people, it is not done to them. Yet until now there has been no means of measuring whether community participation actually takes place or to what degree. Too often, communities have been consulted, but not given the chance to actively participate. They have been involved in detail, but not in strategy.

If community participation is key to success, it needs to happen across the range of public spending, and it needs to be measured. *Active Partners* offers twelve benchmarks for communities and public policy makers to assess the extent to which community participation is taking place. It offers a tool kit for analysing weaknesses, suggestions for best practice and a framework for improvement. Community participation has no finishing line. *Active Partners* will encourage the best to do better, and the worst to reach the standards that will bring success.

We intend to use these benchmarks as a key criterion in assessing bids to the Yorkshire Forward Development Fund, including the Single Regeneration Budget. But our responsibility is not restricted to schemes we fund directly. We will only achieve the objectives set by Government in conjunction with our partners. I hope that Local Authorities, the Health Service and other branches of Government will adopt these benchmarks as a key tool for the delivery of all public services in this region.

I also hope that these benchmarks will be taken up in other regions and by national Government. In his foreword to the Social Exclusion Report *Bringing People Together*, the Prime Minister wrote, 'Too much has been imposed from above, when experience shows that success depends on communities themselves having the power and taking the responsibility to make things better'. *Active Partners* gives us all a tool for putting that experience into practice and measuring its achievement.

I am grateful to Hilary Willmer and her colleagues from the Churches and voluntary sector who proposed and managed this project on our behalf. I am also grateful to COGS (Communities and Organisations – Growth and Support) for undertaking this work, and to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the Regional Assembly for Yorkshire and Humberside who part-funded its evaluation. *Active Partners* has been participatory in process as well as in intent. I am convinced it will make a major contribution to sustainable regeneration.

Julian Cummins  
*Board Member*  
*Yorkshire Forward*

# Executive Summary

## Section 1 – Benchmarks for Community Participation

### APPLICATION OF BENCHMARKS TO COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Benchmarking, as a means of evaluating schemes, is relevant throughout all stages of regeneration:

- initiation;
- bid preparation;
- implementation;
- forward strategy.

Community participation can be identified as having four core dimensions:

- influence;
- inclusivity;
- communication;
- capacity.

The benchmarks can be used as a framework for developing and implementing a community participation strategy, reviewing progress and setting future objectives. They assist in evaluation of the extent or nature of that participation which is expected to be in degrees rather than absolutes. It is also in the nature of that participation that communities should be engaged in the benchmarking evaluation, alongside other partners.

### THE BENCHMARKS

The twelve benchmarks are listed in relation to the four key dimensions of participation. Each benchmark is accompanied by key questions for consideration. This provides a clear and easily reproduced two-page summary of the benchmarks themselves and the issues they raise.

## Section 2 – Understanding Community Participation in Regeneration

### CONTEXT

Regeneration programmes have been undertaken since the 1960s. Central government and European funding is now available for such programmes. The importance of community participation has been recognised and is endorsed but often occurs as an 'add-on' rather than as intrinsic at all stages of regeneration.

### THE CONCEPT OF BENCHMARKING IN REGENERATION

Communities are complex and diverse and the same is true of their needs. Thus, evaluating a scheme for community participation is most appropriate within, and not between, such schemes. Use of the benchmarks to compare performance across schemes has to take account of the different contexts within which schemes are operating.

### DEFINITION OF TERMS

Some terms in the community sector, as elsewhere, are too much in general currency to have precision of meaning. Some of the terms are defined here.

## Section 3 – Tools for achieving and evidencing the benchmarks

### INTRODUCTION

This includes some practical suggestions for using the benchmarks, gathering evidence and recording progress.

### TOOLS AND WORKSHEETS

These further information and recording sheets can be used as a practical resource when applying the benchmarks. Each benchmark is set out again with further explanation in an 'Understanding the benchmark' section, accompanied by another section of 'Suggestions for good practice'. In addition for each benchmark a series of indicator statements are provided in a format which permits 'Notes', 'Additional Indicators' and 'Priorities for future development' to be recorded.

## **Section 4 – Background Report**

### **ORIGINS OF THE BENCHMARKING COMMISSION**

In 1998 the Churches Regional Commission identified the lack of involvement of local people in community regeneration. Yorkshire Forward: the Regional Development Agency for Yorkshire and Humber agreed that creating 'Benchmarks' would be a means of measuring the effectiveness of community involvement.

### **UNDERPINNING PRINCIPLES**

Recognition of the diversity of communities and the need for qualitative analysis were the starting points. Key features of the research approach were the acceptance of underpinning principles concerned with working with communities; an intention to benefit from existing findings; and inclusion through participation and ownership for communities in the research process.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

A literature review and initial contact request to RDAs and partnerships identified a wide range of issues including:

- tokenism by authorities in community participation;
- failure to learn lessons in participation and the need for training;
- communities are complex and diverse;
- effective participation requires resources, support and a creative approach;
- community involvement takes time to develop.

Four workshops were held in a range of contrasting communities to develop the benchmarks, two 'snapshot' studies were carried out and the draft benchmarks were 'piloted' to gather comment and feedback from thirteen regeneration schemes across the region.





SECTION 1

Benchmarks for  
Community Participation

# Application of Benchmarks to Community Participation

Community participation is crucial to the success of regeneration strategies from their very inception; therefore benchmarks are relevant from the pre-bid stage through to forward strategies.

Four stages of development can be identified as:

1. **Initiation** – initiating the strategy and developing the broad focus of the bid.
2. **Bid preparation** – this stage includes: community audits; determining objectives; outlining strategy; delivery and management arrangements; development of the partnership; the setting out of broad project proposals; and defining outcomes.
3. **Implementation** – putting the strategy into action; developing projects; making operational and strategic decisions; and review and evaluation.
4. **Forward strategy** – ensuring sustainability.

Benchmarks provide both a framework for developing a strategic approach to community participation and a means of evaluating and reviewing progress.

## THE DIMENSIONS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Community participation is identified as comprising four core dimensions:

- **Influence:** This is about ensuring that participation leads to real influence over what happens in regeneration schemes at both a strategic and operational level.
- **Inclusivity:** This is about valuing diversity and addressing inequality in order to ensure inclusive and equal participation. This may mean targeting specific groups and taking positive action.
- **Communication:** This is about implementing clear information processes, transparent and accessible policies and procedures.
- **Capacity:** This is about developing the understanding, skills and knowledge of all partners; and the organisational capacity of communities and public agencies.

## THE BENCHMARKS

Twelve benchmarks have been developed to clearly describe what regeneration activities should be working towards in relation to the community participation dimensions.

Against each benchmark a number of questions are posed under the heading of ‘**key considerations**’. In thinking about how you would answer these questions you will be beginning to explore important aspects of process and performance in relation to the related benchmark.

## USING THE BENCHMARKS

These benchmarks should be applicable across the range of contexts, themes, and starting points in which regeneration activities are taking place. Those using them should assess their own baseline position in relation to each benchmark as the starting point for developing and implementing strategy, reviewing progress and setting future objectives. It is the extent and nature of community participation that needs to be considered in measuring achievement. This is more likely to be a question of degree rather than an absolute.

Whilst specific consideration needs to be given to each benchmark they are all integral elements of a co-ordinated community participation strategy and all need to be addressed in the development of action plans and the measuring of progress.

It is acknowledged that the time required for the development of participation will vary from scheme to scheme and that some of the areas in most need of regeneration will be those starting from a low level of existing community participation. Schemes should therefore be realistic about their planned progress in relation to the benchmarks and aim to illustrate continuous improvement over a period of time.

It is important that communities themselves participate in assessing performance against the benchmarks. This should include but not be limited to, a public summary of achievement which can be endorsed or challenged by communities.

Section 3 provides more detailed guidance on implementation.

# Benchmarks for Community Participation

The benchmarks are related to the four dimensions of community participation:

**Influence:** ensuring that community participation leads to real influence over regeneration strategy and activity.

**Inclusivity:** valuing diversity and addressing inequality, to ensure inclusive and equal participation.

**Communication:** implementing clear information processes, transparent and accessible policies and procedures.

**Capacity:** developing the understanding, skills and knowledge of all partners, and the organisational capacity of communities and public agencies.

	Benchmarks	Key considerations
I N F L U E N C E	The community is recognised and valued as an equal partner at all stages of the process. (Page 22)	<i>Who has had the first word in your regeneration strategy and how are community agendas reflected from day one and throughout the process?</i>  <i>How are community members made to feel valued as equal partners?</i>
	There is meaningful community representation on all decision making bodies from initiation. (Page 24)	<i>How are communities represented on decision making groups (in addition to/instead of the bigger players such as local councillors)?</i>  <i>How are your decision making processes enabling communities to be heard and to influence?</i>  <i>How have communities determined decision making agendas from the preparatory stage through to the forward strategy?</i>
	All community members have the opportunity to participate. (Page 26)	<i>How are you supporting community networks/ structures through which all communities can contribute to decision making?</i>  <i>What creative/flexible approaches have you developed to engage members of all communities?</i>  <i>What are the range of opportunities through which community members can influence decisions?</i>
	Communities have access to and control over resources. (Page 28)	<i>In what ways do regeneration workers and decision makers make themselves accessible to community members?</i>  <i>How is community control of resources being increased?</i>
	Evaluation of regeneration partnerships incorporates a community agenda. (Page 30)	<i>How are you ensuring community ownership of evaluation processes?</i>

	Benchmarks	Key considerations
INCLUSIVITY	The diversity of local communities and interests are reflected at all levels of the regeneration process. (Page 34)	<p><i>What steps are you taking to ensure that all communities can be involved with and influence regeneration strategy and activity?</i></p> <p><i>What actions are you taking to ensure that representation by all partner agencies and staff composition reflect the gender balance and ethnic diversity of the geographical area?</i></p>
	Equal opportunities policies are in place and implemented. (Page 36)	<p><i>What support and training is offered to the development of equal opportunities policies and anti-discriminatory practice?</i></p> <p><i>How are you monitoring and reviewing practice in relation to equal opportunities?</i></p>
	Unpaid workers/volunteer activists are valued. (Page 38)	<p><i>How do you support and resource unpaid workers and voluntary activists?</i></p> <p><i>What opportunities do you provide for their personal development and career progression?</i></p>
COMMUNICATION	A two-way information strategy is developed and implemented. (Page 42)	<p><i>How do you ensure that information is clear and accessible and reaches all communities in time for it to be acted upon?</i></p> <p><i>How are those involved in regeneration informed about the communities with whom they are working?</i></p>
	Programme and project procedures are clear and accessible. (Page 44)	<i>What steps are you taking to ensure that scheme procedures facilitate community participation rather than act as a barrier?</i>
CAPACITY	Communities are resourced to participate. (Page 48)	<p><i>What resources are provided for the development of community led networks and community groups?</i></p> <p><i>What support is provided for community members and community representatives?</i></p> <p><i>What strategy is in place to support community led sustainability?</i></p>
	Understanding, knowledge and skills are developed to support partnership working. (Page 50)	<p><i>How are you ensuring that all partners (including senior people from the public and private sectors), develop the understanding, knowledge and skills to work in partnership and engage with communities?</i></p> <p><i>What training is provided and who is participating in both the delivery and learning?</i></p>



SECTION 2

Understanding  
Community Participation  
in  
Regeneration

## Context

Regeneration programmes are not new and there have been several since the introduction of the Urban Programme in the late 1960s. Since then, Central Government resources alongside funds from Europe have been targeted at particular communities.

### COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN REGENERATION PROGRAMMES

Public recognition of the importance of community participation is also not new.

The City Challenge Programme of the early 1990s promoted such aspirations and yet current Government initiatives are still trying to find ways of getting it right.

A review of four studies on regeneration and communities illustrates the continuing frustrations of not getting it right ('Joined-up Places? Social Cohesion and Neighbourhood Regeneration' JRF 1999).

The research cites how residents in Liverpool felt that they were not really trusted by the authorities to manage finances or to spend money wisely.

In several cases the residents felt that their suggestions were not acted upon and that there was no follow up to what was said. Nor could they identify outcomes which had occurred as a result of their involvement.

Residents involved in the Nottingham Partnership felt that the lengthy and bureaucratic processes of making spending decisions had led to the decline of community involvement. They clearly felt they were giving a lot and receiving very little in return. But perhaps the most damning indictment in this study came from a respondent in East London '*There's a lot of money to be made out of poor people as long as you don't pay them to do it*'.

To conclude however that people based regeneration fails to work would be to throw the baby out with the bath water.

The Government continues to press for regeneration initiatives in which local communities play a leading part because it believes '*Community involvement enhances the effectiveness of regeneration programmes by encouraging better decision making, fostering more effective programme delivery, and helping to ensure the benefits of regeneration programmes are sustained over the long term*' (DETR; SRB Bidding Guidance, September 1998).

Yorkshire Forward endorses this perspective, stressing that '*Increasing the capacity of disadvantaged communities to influence decisions affecting their lives is an essential first step to community led regeneration and will underpin all our programmes, thereby reinforcing the Government's local democratic renewal agenda*' (Yorkshire Forward: The Regional Economic Strategy, 1999).

### UNDERSTANDING AND PLANNING FOR COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Community participation in regeneration strategies begins with the principle that people have a right to be involved in changes affecting them and goes on to recognise that the failure to involve communities can undermine the regeneration process. But the rationale for community participation is also very much based on tangible social and economic outcomes:

- it enhances social cohesion because communities recognise the value of working in partnership with each other and with statutory agencies;
- it enhances effectiveness as communities bring understanding, knowledge and experience essential to the regeneration process;
- it adds economic value both through the mobilisation of voluntary contributions to deliver regeneration and through skill development which enhance the opportunities for employment and an increase in community wealth;
- it provides relevance as community members can offer understanding and insight, thereby appropriately influencing priorities for action;
- it promotes sustainability because community members have ownership of their communities and can develop the confidence and skills to sustain developments once the 'extra' resources have gone.



Community participation is part and parcel of current thinking around the more recent regeneration initiatives.

*'Bids should mobilise the talents of all sectors including the faith based voluntary sector, the wider voluntary sector, ethnic minorities and local volunteers'* (DETR; SRB Bidding Guidance 1998).

It is however, being approached with varying degrees of success by lead bodies in regeneration partnerships. Community participation too often appears as an 'add-on'.

But research, and indeed Government guidelines, illustrate that to be at all meaningful community participation must happen at all stages and levels of the regeneration process.

Community participation must be effective during initial planning, strategic development, implementation and evaluation, and at policy, programme, scheme and project levels as well as at regional, sub-regional and local levels.

Whilst it is acknowledged that not all members of communities want to participate in regeneration, it also needs to be recognised that opportunities need to reach out beyond traditional representative structures and beyond those already most active. This then allows the fullest possible participation at levels appropriate to individuals.

## The Concept of Benchmarking in Regeneration

The concept of benchmarks is more complex and contentious than might appear at first sight. Benchmarks have been described as standards, levels and comparative measures.

They are frequently implemented as a 'Best Value' exercise – X is provided for Y amount of money. J Foot (1998) 'How to do benchmarking: A Practitioner's Guide' defines benchmarking as *'a process of measuring your service's processes and performance and systematically comparing them to the performance of others in order to seek 'best practice''*.

In the regeneration context however, measurement is more appropriate as a method of comparing and contrasting performance within a scheme, i.e. 'continuous improvement'. In the Yorkshire and Humber Region regeneration schemes vary enormously in response to the geographical and cultural diversity of the area. Urban and rural dimensions are just one indicator of this diversity of communities illustrating that across schemes:

- the needs and purposes of regeneration are very different;
- the nature and strength of relationships between key stakeholders are different;
- the starting points in terms of community participation are different;
- the regeneration monies allocated are often vastly different.

Community participation benchmarks against which performance in regeneration can be measured should therefore assess and review performance from one year to another within the scheme. Any use of benchmarks to compare performance between schemes needs to recognise and take account of the range of contexts within which schemes are operating.

## Definition of Terms

**Community** is most often used to mean a geographical community in which people live and work.

This is the most common use of the term in regeneration programmes. It is also accepted that community can be used to mean people with a common interest or perspective and there are examples of regeneration schemes directed at, for example, young people. Community can be understood therefore as both geographically based **and** of interest, i.e. people identifying with the area in which they live and work, alongside identification with specific groups of people within and without that geographical area.

Within all spatial communities there will be many communities of interest, and so there will be a variety of perspectives, needs, and priorities.

Men, women, white people, black and minority ethnic communities, different faith communities, disabled people, older people, young people, children, employed people and unemployed people, gay and straight people may all have different agendas. There is no one homogeneous community. This has significant implications for consultation and participation.

**Community members** are the individuals living and working in a geographical area or belonging to a community of interest. Typically, they comprise a diverse grouping expressing different views and priorities.

**Community groups** refer to those very small groups and organisations which might range from self-help groups to neighbourhood controlled community infrastructures. Community groups are characterised by their self-help nature, are self-controlling, typically have few resources and are totally, or almost always, reliant on voluntary effort.

**The community sector** is an umbrella classification for community groups.

**The voluntary sector** is made up of organisations which are 'not for profit' and are set up and run by voluntary management committees which may or may not include local people or service users. Most employ paid staff and might, though not necessarily, involve volunteers in carrying out their service. Some, but not all, are charitable.

Over the last five years there has developed a much greater clarity about the distinction between the community and voluntary sectors. A key issue is that the voluntary sector does not necessarily equate with 'community' – that whilst they may share some common agendas and concerns and are often supported and serviced by the same structures – they may also have very different and often competing needs and agendas.

The voluntary and community sectors provide an added dimension to the regeneration of communities which is crucial to long term development. Their strength and success lie in their independence from the state. They should be valued for their independence and every effort should be made to ensure that 'partnership' does not mean co-option, that they are encouraged to remain autonomous.

**The faith sector** comprises religious organisations which are a focus for community activities, involving voluntary contributions from within their membership. They generally operate within an established legal and constitutional framework.

**Community consultation** is often used to mean the process of explaining and helping people to understand ideas and plans. It may include the seeking of views but often those consulted are little more than 'listeners'. It demands that prior work has been undertaken in order to have something around which people can air their views. It does not necessarily imply that there is the scope for much input or change.

**Community involvement** encompasses a commitment to engaging people. People can be involved in a variety of ways and there should be methods of ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to be involved. Community involvement can infer however that people are passive recipients of the involvement process – someone else's agenda demands their involvement and seeks it out.

**Community participation** signifies the playing of an active part in a process along with a degree of power and control. It is this understanding with which this piece of developmental research is concerned – affording the access and opportunities to take part as equals in the regeneration process.

The work of Sherry Arnstein and of David Wilcox and their respective ‘ladders’ and ‘levels’ to participation combine community consultation, community and community participation into one framework. The frameworks can be helpful in understanding and planning commitment to, and identifying the degree of, working with communities.

Wilcox identifies five levels of participation:

1. information;
2. consultation;
3. deciding together;
4. acting together;
5. supporting individual community initiatives.

Steve Skinner (‘Building Community Strengths’, CDF 1995) develops this concept as ‘five roles for the community’:

1. as beneficiaries of the programme and users of services;
2. as consultees and representatives of local opinion;
3. as the source of general community activity;
4. as a source of delivery for regeneration programmes;
5. as potential long term partners in regeneration.

**Social exclusion** is the process through which individuals and groups are excluded from participation in the society in which they live.

**Programmes** are the strategy – criteria and broad range objectives – through which Government policy is implemented, such as Single Regeneration Budget, Rural Development Programme.

**Partnerships** refer (in this document) to the formal arrangements established to implement and oversee the delivery of a programme. They typically include local authority members, private sector interests and voluntary sector representation. They should include community sector representation (though this is less often the case).

**Schemes** represent ‘*the totality of the proposal put forward by partnerships,*’ (DETR, Single Regeneration Budget Bidding Guidance 1998), indicating broad objectives for a specific purpose. Decision making functions related to delivery mechanisms may be delegated by partnerships to scheme management structures. There is more likely to be community sector representation at this level.

**Projects** are the individual components of a scheme relating to planned activity. They may be large scale such as those around housing renewal or very small such as a local credit union.

**Evaluation** is the process through which pre-agreed quantitative and qualitative measures are used to gauge performance. The benchmarks constitute the means by which the effectiveness of community participation in social and economic regenerative activity in urban and rural areas can be measured. An objective of evaluation is continuing improvement.



## SECTION 3

# Tools for Achieving and Evidencing the Benchmarks

# Introduction

These tools are provided to help you consider the benchmarks in relation to your own practice. They include:

1. **Understanding the benchmark** – explaining its context and purpose.
2. **The key considerations** – the questions listed against each benchmark.
3. **Suggestions for good practice** – providing some pointers to the resources and processes required.
4. **Benchmark indicators** – suggestions as to the basis for assessment of performance in relation to the benchmark. They outline the evidence that will satisfactorily answer the key considerations.  
**Additional indicators** – space for you to add indicators specific to, and developed by, your scheme.
5. **Notes** – this is space to record your own notes in relation to this benchmark. These could include relevant activities which evidence the benchmark, or signposts to other information sources which evidence performance.
6. **Priorities for future development** – this space should be used to summarise action plans that will help you progress and sustain benchmark achievement.

It may be useful to copy these worksheets for circulation to other stakeholders so that they can comment on, and contribute to, the evidencing of performance within a scheme.

## USE OF BENCHMARKS

The benchmarks are designed to help schemes think through their strategy in relation to community participation and can be used developmentally in this way.

For example, the benchmarks:

- should inform the planning of schemes from the very start;
- help to raise the profile of community participation and its role within regeneration;
- may be particularly useful in informing induction session agendas for partnership boards and scheme management committees or could provide the basis for themed discussions at regular meetings;

- can provide the basis of training sessions for all partners in the regeneration process as well as be useful in addressing other agendas such as implementing the 'Modernising Local Government' agenda and the role of local councillors.

## GATHERING OF EVIDENCE AND RECORDING OF PROGRESS

It is important that there is community participation in the benchmarking process itself. Ideas suggested include:

- incorporating the questions raised by the benchmarks in annual 'baseline tracking' surveys;
- using the benchmarks as themes for existing consultative forums;
- developing the answers to the key considerations to provide some evidence of progress and achievement and identify future priorities;
- an annual workshop held in the Autumn could set priorities for the following year and be incorporated into the Delivery Plan;
- using the benchmarks to provide a point of interest to 'kick-start' a new community reference group;
- developing a simple score sheet where projects and groups can rate or grade progress against each benchmark;
- establishing a community participation project within the scheme with the specific task of involving communities in scheme strategy and implementation.

It is not possible to properly evidence progress and achievement of the benchmarks by ticking boxes. It demands qualitative information which does not always fit neatly into simple recording sheets. However, it may be useful to briefly summarise action plans and progress related to each benchmark on a simple form. For example:

Benchmark	Priority indicators	Action	Progress/ milestone	Observations
The community is recognised and valued as an equal partner at all stages of the process.				
There is meaningful representation on all decision making bodies.				

Observations should be related to both achievements and difficulties. These could include:

- why and how action has been successful;
- why and how an action has not been successful.

It would also be useful to record what is stopping you from making progress including the policy context and procedures within which you are working.





# Influence Benchmarks

# Benchmark – Influence

## Understanding the Benchmark

For all the rhetoric of community involvement, communities are often the last to be considered when plans are being developed.

It is important to be seen to be valuing community partners by ensuring they have an equal voice from the very start rather than half way through the process.

Communities need to have the same opportunities to influence where a scheme or project might develop and to bid for delivery monies. They should therefore be encouraged to play a leading part in regenerating their areas and be the first port of call for developing and delivering projects.

## Key considerations

*Who has had the first word in your regeneration strategy and how are community agendas reflected from day one and throughout the process?*

*How are community members made to feel valued as equal partners?*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ The achievement of this benchmark is central to the achievement of all the others. The processes involved in achieving this benchmark should therefore be in place before specific schemes are even considered.
- ▶ Communities should be involved in the identification of areas for regeneration, through to the development of a succession strategy. This would demonstrate some equality.
- ▶ The starting point and baseline for regeneration strategies needs to recognise the range of existing skills, knowledge, experience and ideas within communities. The identification of this 'capacity' should not be restricted to an individual 'household survey' approach but also include consideration of the organisational and development capacity within community groups.
- ▶ The first step towards meeting strategic objectives should be to consider the input that could be made by the communities themselves, e.g. in the delivery of projects. External agencies should only be commissioned when it is agreed that additional skills and expertise are required.
- ▶ One of the criteria when selecting or commissioning external agencies should be their ability to work with community partners and to adopt a community development approach to their work.
- ▶ Recognition must be given to communities' rights for self-determination. Exit strategies must not be based on assumptions of ongoing community ownership without securing the required degree of commitment and resources.

**The community is recognised and valued as an equal partner at all stages of the process.**

<p><b>Indicators</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Community members are involved in the identification, evidencing and interpretation of community needs</li><li>2. The involvement and ideas of community members are an integral part of the initial bid / delivery plans / project delivery</li><li>3. Information is gathered about the individual and collective experience, knowledge and skills existing within the community</li><li>4. The existing capacity within communities to deliver projects is recognised and utilised</li><li>5. Credit is given to communities for their input and ideas</li></ol>	<p><b>Notes</b></p>
<p><b>Additional indicators</b></p>	
<p><b>Priorities for future development</b></p>	

# Benchmark – Influence

## Understanding the Benchmark

The critical word in this benchmark is 'meaningful'. While most regeneration schemes may claim to include community representation it is often seen as a token gesture and/or happens too late in the process.

Representation needs to:

- be in place at the very beginning
- be at all decision making levels
- reflect a range of community perspectives
- be accountable to the wider community
- ensure that the voices of communities are heard and do have some influence

## Key considerations

*How are communities represented on decision making groups (in addition to/instead of the bigger players such as local councillors)?*

*How are your decision making processes enabling communities to be heard and to influence?*

*How have communities determined decision making agendas from the preparatory stage through to the forward strategy?*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ All decision making bodies should include full voting places for community representatives. At scheme level these should be equal to, or more in numbers, than other partners.
- ▶ All projects should be required to establish management or advisory groups in community representation. Clear terms of reference should be agreed and adhered to.
- ▶ Voting strength does not on its own result in equal influence. Community members often feel that they are just being asked to rubber stamp decisions already made behind closed doors. Decision making processes must be open and informed.
- ▶ The way in which meetings are conducted can be based upon the culture of other partners which may not encourage equal participation. Meetings need to be carefully planned to ensure that everyone is heard and feels able to contribute.
- ▶ Community representation can easily result in the same few community members taking on increasing responsibility (and power!). Regeneration partnerships and community groups/forums need to invest time, imagination and sensitivity in:
  - reaching out to those traditionally under-represented;
  - providing a range of ways in which communities can influence the decision making process, e.g. open forums
- ✓ 50% of the North Halifax Partnership Board are from community organisations. The Chair represents the community sector. Quarterly open meetings are held to report on progress and receive feedback on activity. There is also a requirement for projects to have management committees/steering groups with strong community representation.

**There is a meaningful community representation on all decision making bodies from initiation.**

<p><b>Indicators</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. There is community representation on all decision making groups at partnership level</li><li>2. The number of community representatives on all decision making bodies at scheme level is at least equal to that of other partners</li><li>3. Community based management / steering / advisory groups are in place for all regeneration projects</li><li>4. Community representatives are elected by, and accountable to the wider community</li><li>5. Community representatives reflect the diversity of local communities</li><li>6. Decision making processes are open and participative</li><li>7. There is community representation in the recruitment and selection of all regeneration workers</li></ol>	<p><b>Notes</b></p>
<p><b>Additional indicators</b></p>	
<p><b>Priorities for future development</b></p>	

# Benchmark – Influence

## Understanding the Benchmark

Creative approaches are required to ensure that everyone can participate. Many people do not like meetings but would participate in other ways.

Although community groups and networks provide a crucial channel for community participation there are also many community members who are not, and do not want to be, involved in community activities. That does not mean, however that they do not have views and ideas about the regeneration of their communities.

## Key considerations

*How are you supporting community networks / structures through which all communities can contribute to decision making?*

*What creative/flexible approaches have you developed to engage members of all communities?*

*What are the range of opportunities through which community members can influence decisions?*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ Develop ways to make contact with those people not involved with community groups e.g. through the regeneration newsletter, talking to parents outside the school gate, street meetings, a stall at the summer fair etc.
  - ▶ Develop imaginative and creative approaches to engage people, e.g. regeneration ideas can be developed through creative arts, young people can be involved through schools and youth projects.
  - ▶ Ensure that all those involved in working with communities as part of the regeneration activities have an understanding of participative processes which facilitate a sharing of ideas and experiences.
  - ▶ Develop some ground-rules for good practice which include responsibilities for feed-back.
  - ▶ Provide a range of opportunities through which community members can influence decision making, e.g. regular open forums, referendums.
  - ▶ Aim to maintain participation by supporting network development and remaining in contact.
- 
- ✓ In Doncaster councillors and officers conduct street walks – if residents want to talk to them they put a card in their window.
  - ✓ Sowerby Bridge Forum conducts an annual residents survey of at least 800 residents.
  - ✓ In rural areas participative village appraisals (e.g. 'Planning for Real') have proved to be very effective.

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Additional indicators</b>	
<b>Priorities for future development</b>	

1. Representative structures are complemented by other opportunities for participation and community influence
2. A range of creative approaches are taken to engage community members and include those who are more isolated and/or not active in groups or networks
3. Community members understand the scope of their influence and are informed of its outcomes
4. Barriers to participation are recognised and addressed
5. An increasing number of community members participate in a meaningful way
6. Clear groundrules for participative processes are established and enforced

# Benchmark – Influence

## Understanding the Benchmark

Communities often feel that it is other partners and external agencies who control or benefit from regeneration resources rather than the community itself. Those resources that are available for community groups and interests may be 'crumbs', which end up being given to those community groups, and interests who are more organised or 'in the know'.

The potential for communities themselves to develop projects and activities as an integral part of regeneration should be recognised and resourced accordingly.

The development of community controlled assets is integral to the long term sustainability of time limited regeneration programmes.

## Key considerations

*In what ways do regeneration workers and decision makers make themselves accessible to community members?*

*How is community control of resources being increased?*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ Contact and access can be initiated by ensuring that key regeneration workers are based locally and are known and approachable.
- ▶ Strategies need to ensure that communities themselves have priority access to the resources being provided through regeneration programmes and that the potential for community owned and developed projects is maximised.
- ▶ Support, training and easily accessible funding should be provided to help community members and community groups to develop ideas into clearly researched and feasible projects.
- ▶ Funding should be sufficiently flexible to be accessed by interest groups who operate beyond scheme boundaries.
- ▶ All community groups should be informed and offered training about funding criteria, appraisal, application and appeal processes.
- ▶ An agreed amount of community controlled funding should be specifically allocated for the development of community groups, projects and activities.
- ▶ Support and resources should be provided to enable communities to manage and control any community based assets provided through regeneration activities.
- ✓ A Community Investment Fund is being piloted by Hull City Vision. Up to £25,000 is available to any community/voluntary group that has a real community base and a good idea. A local appraisal board composed mainly of community representatives considers applications.



## Communities have access to and control over resources.

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Additional indicators</b>	
<b>Priorities for future development</b>	

1. There is an increase in community controlled assets
2. Community members can easily access decision makers and regeneration workers
3. An agreed percentage of programme funding is committed to community led projects
4. Steps are taken to ensure increased community access to funding
5. Community members control 'Community Chest'/'Community initiative' Funds
6. Funding bodies recognise the need for some flexibility and a degree of risk taking

# Benchmark – Influence

## Understanding the Benchmark

Community members must have some ownership of the process of evaluating the regeneration of their communities. Evaluation needs to address such questions as to what extent the programme is bringing about the changes and developments that the community itself is hoping for.

Evaluation is an important part of the development process through which all partners can review progress, celebrate successes and focus on areas of failure and concern.

Creative ways of engaging communities should be built into all stages of the evaluation process.

## Key considerations

*How are you ensuring community ownership of evaluation processes*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ The process of evaluation should begin from day 1 and include opportunities for community members to identify the questions that need to be asked to evaluate the programme as it develops.
- ▶ It is important to develop measures that not only relate to 'hard' data such as numbers trained / employed etc but also people's views and insights into their own development and that of the community.
- ▶ The most appropriate people to collect and analyse information for evaluation are often community members. Training, support and resources should be provided for those who participate.
- ▶ The findings of any community based evaluation should first of all be fed back to the community itself for validation and discussion. This could be done through existing networks and open forums.
- ▶ Evaluation should inform future development. Ensure that clear action plans are developed in relation to any evaluation recommendations.
- ▶ Make sure that these action plans are fed back to all those who contributed to the evaluation process.
- ✓ Eastwood / Oakhill Challenge Scheme funded a community evaluation project through which six local people were employed.

<p><b>Indicators</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Opportunities are provided for community members to be active partners in setting the evaluation agenda</li><li>2. The processes of involvement and influence are evaluated as well as outputs</li><li>3. Community members are involved in the collection of information and its analysis</li><li>4. Community members are involved in validating evaluation findings and developing subsequent joint agency and community action plans.</li></ol>	<p><b>Notes</b></p>
<p><b>Additional indicators</b></p>	
<p><b>Priorities for future development</b></p>	



# Inclusivity Benchmarks

# Benchmark – Inclusivity

## Understanding the Benchmark

Communities are rarely, if ever, homogeneous. They comprise a range of people with different needs, interests and perspectives. This diversity needs to be understood and valued. Regeneration partners should make every effort to ensure they are reaching a broad range considering such factors as gender, race, age and faith. For example, the diversity of black and minority ethnic communities, the differing priorities and agendas of disabled people, young people or older people should be illustrated through involvement in consultation processes through to representation on decision making bodies.

## Key considerations

*What steps are you taking to ensure that all communities can be involved with and influence regeneration strategy and activity?*

*What actions are you taking to ensure that representation by all partner agencies and staff composition reflect the gender balance and ethnic diversity of the geographical area?*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ The first step is to be aware of the different interests and perspectives present.
- ▶ Record the range and level of involvement and identify gaps.
- ▶ Actively work towards the participation of identified marginalised groups.
- ▶ Try not to stereotype – there will be different interests and priorities within identified groups.
- ▶ Recognise differing literacy levels and cater for them e.g. use non-paper methods of communication where possible.
- ▶ Use a variety of community venues for meetings.
- ▶ Every effort should be made to identify and use venues with level access. If none are identified, top priority should be given to the adaption of existing buildings.
- ▶ Carefully consider the timing of events and meetings, recognising school hours, meal times, public transport, religious commitments etc.
- ▶ A budget should be made available for support/participation costs, e.g. child and dependant care, signers, interpreters, personal assistance, travel expenses.
- ▶ Support multi-faith working.
- ▶ Recognise and respond to the implications of different cultural and faith calendars.
- ▶ Set agreed targets for representative involvement in decision making structures.
- ✓ Dewsbury Partnership Ltd has a community involvement strategy that specifically addresses the involvement of young people. Young people have representation on the community forum and on the Partnership Board.

The diversity of local communities and interests are reflected at all levels of the regeneration process.

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Additional indicators</b>	
<b>Priorities for future development</b>	

# Benchmark – Inclusivity

## Understanding the Benchmark

Many of the barriers to participation relate to inequality of opportunity. An understanding of these, of the degrees of confidence and power to participate, is crucial in creating equal access. An opportunity for one person may be a barrier for another.

Equal opportunities policies should enshrine public recognition of, and commitment to addressing, equalities issues. The process of working up a policy needs to be as inclusive as possible to enable the development of understanding. Policies will include a statement of intent, and commitments in relation to employment, volunteer recruitment and support, committee membership, and accessibility of procedures and services.

## Key considerations

*What support and training is offered to the development of equal opportunities policies and anti-discriminatory practice?*

*How are you monitoring and reviewing practice in relation to equal opportunities?*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ Lead agencies should publicise and make available their own policies to encourage others.
  - ▶ The development of the policy could begin by all partners identifying opportunities and barriers to involvement in the agency or group.
  - ▶ Training around anti-discriminatory practice should be made available to, and expected of, all partners.
  - ▶ Workshops could be organised to help agencies and groups think through the content and implications of equal opportunities policies.
  - ▶ 'Ownership' of a policy will derive from an understanding and a 'seeing' of its benefits. For this reason platitudes and rhetorical statements should be avoided – use plain and accessible language.
  - ▶ It can be more helpful to start with a simple policy and build upon it rather than adopting one that is so complex nobody can understand.
  - ▶ The key achievement is to enact the policy – to refer to its content, monitor effectiveness and review its content in doing so. If this happens, then many of the other benchmarks will also be achieved.
- 
- ✓ An SRB funded community group in Sheffield held an afternoon workshop to begin to develop an equal opportunities policy. Members explored why the group needed one, their understanding of, and commitment to, anti-discriminatory practice and identified objectives for development and action.



## Equal opportunities policies are in place and implemented.

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Additional indicators</b>	
<b>Priorities for future development</b>	

1. An equal opportunities policy is developed, acted upon and monitored at partnership level
2. An equal opportunities policy is developed, acted upon and monitored at scheme level
3. Equal opportunities policies are developed, acted upon and monitored at project level
4. Other groups are given active encouragement to develop equal opportunities policies
5. Training and support around equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory practices and the development of appropriate policies is provided

# Benchmark – Inclusivity

## Understanding the Benchmark

Community members who are committed to improving their communities and are not paid to do so often define themselves as 'Unpaid Workers' or 'Volunteer Activists'.

These community members often feel that their commitment, knowledge and skills are not recognised or valued. This criticism is levelled at the paid officers of key agencies and at the communities in which they live. The contribution made by community members is crucial to successful regeneration and yet those giving, often considerable, unpaid time can feel less equal than the paid representatives of other partners and agencies.

Valuing involves the recognition and acknowledgement of both contribution and needs.

## Key considerations

*How do you support and resource unpaid workers and voluntary activists?*

*What opportunities do you provide for their personal development and career progression?*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ Respect the knowledge and experience of unpaid workers and listen to their views.
  - ▶ Take every opportunity to publicly acknowledge their contribution. This may be through presentations, written reports, meetings and in day to day conversation.
  - ▶ Provide expenses to cover all costs that may be incurred by unpaid workers including travel, child care, telephone calls, postage etc. These should be paid in cash, if required, and either provided in advance through an expenses float arrangement or immediately reimbursed.
  - ▶ Consider the possibilities for accrediting the work carried out. This could be through NVQs, through linked training courses and by providing your own Certificates of Achievement.
  - ▶ Identify training the scheme itself should be providing for unpaid workers. Make sure that any training provided is linked to possible progression routes and provide information about these.
  - ▶ Make sure that unpaid workers are aware of other training opportunities in the area.
  - ▶ Ensure that unpaid workers have equal access to attend relevant conferences and events and to network and learn from others.
  - ▶ Encourage unpaid workers to apply for paid posts within the scheme and provide advice and training in CVs, interviews etc.
  - ▶ Do not use existing unpaid effort as an excuse for cutting costs and seek to find ways to pay the rate for the job.
  - ▶ Successes should be celebrated in a way which involves all those who have had a part to play. This also provides an opportunity for public acknowledgment.
- ✓ Hull DOC (Developing Our Communities) is working with Hull CVS to establish an apprenticeship scheme for unpaid workers.

## Unpaid workers/volunteer activists are valued.

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Additional indicators</b>	
<b>Priorities for future development</b>	

1. The contribution of unpaid workers/volunteer activists and their organisations is publicly acknowledged and success is jointly celebrated
2. Resources and support are made available so that unpaid workers/volunteer activists are able to play an equal part
3. Opportunities to pay unpaid workers/volunteer activists are identified and pursued
4. Opportunities for unpaid workers/volunteer activists to gain accreditation, personal development and progression are provided
5. Support to enable unpaid workers/volunteer activists to apply for development worker, and other paid posts, is provided



# Communication Benchmarks

# Benchmark – Communication

## Understanding the Benchmark

Information (or lack of it) is cited as one of the greatest barriers to participation. Participation can be hampered if communities do not know what is going on at the scheme level but also if one council department does not know what another is doing for example. It is important that there is a strategic approach to information collection and dissemination rather than bits and pieces on an ad hoc basis.

This benchmark is about information sharing between and within partnerships, schemes, projects and communities. It is also about linking policy and practice enabling communities to understand and influence local, regional and national policy.

## Key considerations

*How do you ensure that information is clear and accessible and reaches all communities in time for it to be acted upon?*

*How are those involved in regeneration informed about the communities with whom they are working?*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ One approach to developing a strategy is to ask officers, members, project workers and community members what confuses them and what they would like to know and start from there!
  - ▶ A 'who's who' directory should be produced on an annual basis to identify who is doing what, different roles and methods of contact.
  - ▶ Information can be circulated through newsletters. If these are aimed at communities then communities should be involved in their production. Regular newsletters that provide clear information and an opportunity for sharing views and ideas encourage participation. Glossy newsletters full of success stories may be seen as just propaganda.
  - ▶ Community groups and networks could be funded to produce their own newsletters in appropriate language and style.
  - ▶ Links with local journalists can ensure that newspapers are a method of information sharing. Lead regeneration partners may well have a fair bit of clout with the local press!
  - ▶ Information should be understandable. Every effort should be made to refrain from using jargon, and to speak and write in plain language. A 'jargon buster' may be useful to help explain regeneration and bureaucratic terms.
  - ▶ Timescales need to take account of the time it takes for information to reach all sections of the community and the period of notice community members need to enable them to fully participate.
- 
- ✓ The Dearne Valley partnership has a weekly slot in a Barnsley newspaper.
  - ✓ Royds Community Association (community led scheme, Bradford) produce a colourful newspaper 'The Royds Reporter'.

## A two-way information strategy is developed and implemented.

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. An information strategy is developed and reviewed</li><li>2. A directory of community groups, useful resources and contacts is produced, circulated and regularly updated</li><li>3. Information is provided in plain and relevant languages and in a variety of formats</li><li>4. Information is circulated from, to and within all communities</li><li>5. Communication channels enable communities to understand and inform local, regional and national policy</li><li>6. Communities participate in producing regular regeneration newsletters</li><li>7. Communities are informed in advance of regeneration planning processes and activities to enable participation</li><li>8. Regeneration workers and projects gather information about communities from community members</li></ol>	
<b>Additional indicators</b>	
<b>Priorities for future development</b>	

# Benchmark – Communication

## Understanding the Benchmark

Procedures describe the process and steps involved in making decisions and carrying out activities. In the context of regeneration these might include bidding and appraisal processes and other funding procedures, delivery plan development, appointment procedures. It should be clear who makes a decision and the way in which it is made.

This benchmark is not only about ensuring that people know what the procedures are but also ensuring that issues of community participation are addressed in the development of procedures. Two of the main barriers to participation are unrealistic timescales and bureaucracy gone mad.

## Key considerations

*What steps are you taking to ensure that scheme procedures facilitate community participation rather than act as a barrier?*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ Identify the areas of activity and decision making which require agreed procedures and terms of reference.
- ▶ Involve community members / representatives in developing agreed procedures which include appropriate opportunities for community participation. E.g. making sure that funding deadlines allow for the time required to publicise the funding opportunities and for the time community groups will need to develop their applications.
- ▶ Ensure that the red tape and bureaucracy, which can so easily confuse or become a burden, is kept to a minimum by constantly reviewing how procedures can be simplified.
- ▶ Procedures should be written in clear and easy to understand language(s).
- ▶ Details of all procedures should be publicly available and opportunities provided for explanation and clarification. E.g. briefing sessions for community members new to the area or new community representatives or groups interested in funding opportunities.



## Programme and project procedures are clear and accessible.

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Additional indicators</b>	
<b>Priorities for future development</b>	

1. Information about all procedures throughout a partnership/scheme/project's life is made publicly available in plain and clear language(s)
2. Procedural timescales allow adequate time for community participation
3. Bureaucracy is kept to a minimum
4. The terms of reference and membership of decision-making bodies is circulated regularly to projects, networks and community groups
5. Decision-making meetings at partnership and scheme levels are open to the public unless there are explicit reasons for not doing so
6. Briefing sessions are provided for community members new to the regeneration



# Capacity Benchmarks

# Benchmark – Capacity

## Understanding the Benchmark

If there is to be effective representation of communities then there need to be community networks/forums through which community members and community groups can support each other and build their own independent accountable structures.

Communities need a range of resources to be able to participate in regeneration on a more equal footing with other partners who are often backed up by substantial services and expertise. Developing effective community participation involves a financial investment.

Community determined exit strategies need to be developed at an early stage to allow for skills and confidence building, and a planned transfer of assets and decision making processes

## Key considerations

*What resources are provided for the development of community led networks and community groups?*

*What support is provided for community members and community representatives?*

*What strategy is in place to support community led sustainability?*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ Communities need resources before the bid stage if they are to play an equal part in developing the initial scheme strategy.
- ▶ Community work posts should be funded to support the development of community groups and networks.
- ▶ Support needs to be made available to the small very local groups and networks just as much as the larger ones.
- ▶ Dedicated workers should be employed, ideally by communities themselves, to service and support community participation. This might include administrative support, bringing community representatives together before and after meetings to collectively work through agendas and prioritise issues.
- ▶ Administrative resources e.g. computers should be made available free of charge. These could be just one part of a community resource centre providing shared resources for community groups.
- ▶ Community initiatives funds/community chest monies should form up to 10% of total regeneration budget for feasibility studies, group development etc.
- ▶ All community groups could be offered say £750 as a 'one-off' to kick start their development.
- ▶ Regeneration partnerships and schemes should invest some planning time to work with community groups on creating more flexible and accessible approaches to funding. E.g. within one scheme there could be a credit union development project for which match funding is already secured so that individual credit unions can bid for resources without the barriers of complex funding management.
- ✓ West Yorkshire Community Work Training Company pays fees to local Advisory Board members as well as travel and child and dependent care costs.

## Communities are resourced to participate.

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Communities are resourced to contribute to the initial development of scheme strategy</li><li>2. Support and resources are provided to enable community networking at local, regional and national levels</li><li>3. Community workers are employed to support community involvement and group development</li><li>4. Resources are provided to support the development of inclusive, representative and accountable community structures</li><li>5. Travel and other volunteer expenses are provided to community participants</li><li>6. Secretariat services are provided for community representatives</li><li>7. A pool of resources including technical advice and support is provided for use by community groups</li><li>8. Support and training are provided to enable communities to take control over assets and decision making processes</li></ol>	
<b>Additional indicators</b>	
<b>Priorities for future development</b>	

# Benchmark – Capacity

## Understanding the Benchmark

Partnership working is still a relatively new concept. It requires respect for, and understanding of, the other partners; meetings and negotiation skills; a wide ranging knowledge base of other partners' interests as well as of the structures and processes established to enable the partnership to function.

It is sometimes assumed that it is only communities that need training or 'capacity building' in order to develop the required knowledge and skills for partnership working. In practice all partners have much to learn and much to offer. Partnership working is not easy and everyone should have access to training and learning which will benefit their contributions.

## Key considerations

*How are you ensuring that all partners (including senior people from the public and private sectors), develop the understanding, knowledge and skills to work in partnership and engage with communities?*

*What training is provided and who is participating in both the delivery and learning?*

## Suggestions for good practice

- ▶ Training needs could be identified on a regular basis (perhaps annually) and learning programmes set up.
- ▶ Some training may require external facilitation to ensure that personal agendas and vested interests do not dominate.
- ▶ Partners can train each other. For example, regeneration officers may be able to pass on information about regeneration processes to community members and community members could in turn share information with them. (For example, this has been suggested around cultural and race issues).
- ▶ Shadowing schemes could be established whereby community members shadow scheme managers and project officers, and vice versa.
- ▶ Training and facilitation involve understanding and skills. People should not be set up to provide either without support. Housing officers for example may well need training themselves before organising community planning sessions and community members may require facilitation skills to effectively manage group conflict.
- ▶ The more partners meet together, the more they are likely to understand each other. It may be helpful to build in informal breaks at meetings to allow people to chat in a relaxed environment.
- ▶ Recognise that there may be inherent conflict within partnerships and try to deal with it sensitively as it arises.
- ✓ The West Yorkshire Community Work Training Company is SRB funded to work across partnerships in the county. It provides accredited training courses.

**Understanding, knowledge and skills are developed to support partnership working.**

<p><b>Indicators</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. All partners identify and agree knowledge and skills for effective partnership working</li><li>2. All partners understand and are committed to agreed values and principles of community based regeneration</li><li>3. All partners develop an understanding of inequalities in power and influence and seek to reduce them</li><li>4. Communities identify their own development needs and agreed learning and training opportunities are provided</li><li>5. All other partners identify their development needs and training programmes are provided</li><li>6. Partnership working is enhanced through an increase in the knowledge and skills of all partners</li><li>7. Routes for progression to further learning and qualification are developed</li></ol>	<p><b>Notes</b></p>
<p><b>Additional indicators</b></p>	
<p><b>Priorities for future development</b></p>	

## Useful Publications

**Action Checklists for Capacity Building:** Coventry and Warwickshire Partnerships Ltd. Produced by Adept Community Development Agency Ltd and CDF, 1998.

Provides a detailed definition of community capacity building and develops checklists for assessing 'consultation and involvement' and for assessing 'resourcing the community'.

**A Guide to Effective Partnership: David Wilcox; Partnership, 1994.**

Sets out a number of key principles for public participation at different levels. It provides detailed information on techniques and an A – Z of Participation.

**Building Community Strengths: A Resource Book on Capacity Building. Steve Skinner, Community Development Foundation, 1997.**

A resource for those seeking to encourage community involvement. It defines capacity building and highlights key factors. It suggests five roles for the community in regeneration from that of service user or beneficiary to that of long-term partner. It then explores implications for community capacity building in relation to each role, providing practical techniques.

**Community Involvement in Health. J. Smithies & G. Webster.**

Promotes a three-focus approach to community involvement – looking at communities, looking within organisations, and looking at how to create an interface between the two. Also provides a five point community involvement model.

**Developing Effective Community Involvement Strategies: Guidance for SRB bids; Joseph Rowntree Foundation report for the DETR, 1999.**

The report draws on research to show that the impact of community involvement on regeneration has been modest and often tokenistic. It provides a framework for developing effective community involvement strategies which are long lasting and sustainable.

**Involving Communities in Urban and Rural Regeneration: A Guide for Practitioners; DETR Manual, 2nd edition September 1997.**

A practical guide aimed at anyone involved in regeneration partnerships which looks at why and how to involve communities throughout the entire process. It contains examples and suggests techniques. It has specific chapters on involving ethnic minorities, faith communities and young people. Useful appendices.

**Local Community Involvement – A Handbook for Good Practice; European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 1999.**

**Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Development in Northern Ireland; Voluntary Activity Unit, 1996.**

**Regeneration & Sustainable Communities; Community Development Foundation, 1999.**

Suggests the need for modern, bolder, multi-layered regeneration strategies which concentrate on capacity building in order to achieve effective community involvement. Gives detailed guidance on how to assess the sustainability of a community which looks beyond job creation and refurbishment. Suggests five different roles for the community and outcome indicators for each.

**Where Do We Go From Here?: A review of Community Participation Methods; Jigso, 1998.**

Raises questions about power and powerlessness and whether participation is a 'top down' concession by those in power.



SECTION 4

Background  
Report

## Origins of the Benchmarking Commission

In 1998 a sub-group of the Churches Regional Commission was established to address issues relating to social exclusion. Members of this group identified poor or non-existent involvement of local people in the regeneration of their communities as a key issue.

They specifically highlighted three areas for concern:

- the reality of consultation processes as simply a stamp of agreement for plans already made;
- lack of participation in decision-making structures;
- the lack of control over resources.

All of these, despite the rhetoric, still lay firmly in the hands of lead partners such as local authorities and TECs.

The development of concise and accessible 'Benchmarks of Genuine Community Involvement' were conceived as a useful contribution to the promotion of 'social inclusion'. Yorkshire Forward, the Regional Development Agency for the Yorkshire and Humber Region, supported the proposal and the development of these benchmarks.

A Steering Group was established involving representation from the Churches Regional Commission, Rural Community Councils and Yorkshire and the Humber Regional Forum for Voluntary and Community Organisations. The Steering Group commissioned consultants COGS (Communities and Organisations – Growth and Support) to undertake research and create 'Benchmarks of Genuine Community Involvement'.

### AIMS OF THE COMMISSION

'To deliver a clear benchmarking system for measuring the effectiveness of community involvement in social and economic regenerative activity in urban and rural areas.'

In taking forward these aims the research would:

- exemplify social inclusion throughout the process by actively engaging local people in the establishment of meaningful benchmarks;
- underpin the work by research to establish good practice in community involvement both regionally and nationally;
- include a methodology which will enable Yorkshire Forward to evaluate the development of community involvement in the region against agreed benchmarks;
- ensure the process is reliable, robust, measurable and capable of being applied to the full range of social inclusion initiatives.

# Underpinning Principles

This study is concerned with benchmarking community participation within a variety of social, economic and political contexts.

The starting point was recognition of the heterogeneity and elaborate nature of communities and the need for qualitative analysis, which measures progress from diverse starting points. Community participation is both a process and an outcome. The development of appropriate benchmarks therefore requires an understanding and prioritising of processes as well as indicators of successful outcomes. Change must be seen to be taking place and benefits must be felt but for this change to be lasting it has to be underpinned with learning and commitment. This takes time.

## KEY FEATURES OF APPROACH

Much has been written about involvement and participation in regeneration. The process of research and development has itself aimed to promote social inclusion. The starting point for the steering group and the consultants was an acceptance of several key areas:

- the necessity of understanding the community/communities – composition, needs, priorities, tensions, strengths, existing networks etc;
- the need for partnership working and resourcing of participation at all stages of the regeneration process and the need for recognition of long term involvement;
- sensitivity around accountability and representation structures – building effective structures and infrastructures which strengthen communities rather than divide them;
- the need for a range of wider (formal and informal) ways in which people can participate in debate and discussion, creating some local ownership and control;
- the need for clarity and recognition of influence – evidence that communities have been heard, that decisions have been informed by communities;
- the recognition that people participate from a variety of starting points and cultural experience and that this has implications for how people learn and contribute.

## THE INTENTION TO BENEFIT FROM EXISTING FINDINGS

- researching and reviewing existing literature of relevance to community involvement and social inclusion in a regeneration context
- analysing the relevance of work of a similar nature being undertaken within and outside the region, i.e. consulting all Regional Development Agencies about their progress on benchmarks for community participation; identifying and contacting regeneration partnerships and schemes within Yorkshire and Humber Region; identifying and contacting schemes and projects with a track record of good practice.

## INCLUSION THROUGH PARTICIPATION AND OWNERSHIP IN THE RESEARCH PROCESS

- making effective use of local skills and experience
- helping community members shape and own the outcomes of their participation
- working in an anti-discriminatory and anti-oppressive way
- facilitating a process which is developmental in itself
- valuing networking and the sharing of experience
- making use of existing community networks to promote the work and invite contributions
- identifying a minimum of 4 geographical areas within the region which reflected different social, economic and political contexts, identifying potential groups to involve in the process and holding two workshops of community activists in each
- carrying out two ‘snapshot’ studies to test the concepts and applicability of community participation (one urban and one rural) through interviews with a range of stakeholders
- providing opportunities for feedback from all those involved in developing the materials and inviting feedback on draft materials from other selected commentators (chosen to reflect a range of knowledge and interest).

# Research Methodology and Findings

## LITERATURE REVIEW

An initial desk-based research exercise gathered details of related research and literature to examine and develop an overview of the issues around community participation. Over forty papers and publications were included from Government departments, academic institutions, research / consultancy bodies and organisations / networks in the field of community development and regeneration, (Appendix B). We were also given information relating to a number of potentially relevant studies and reports but which were not published at the time (e.g. reports being written for the Social Exclusion Unit and the Joseph Rowntree Foundation).

## RECURRING THEMES ARISING FROM THE RESEARCH

- many communities continue to view the commitment of others to participation as tokenistic and rhetorical
- lessons are not being learned and good practice is not being shared
- communities are complex, diverse and often 'messy'.
- marginalised groups are not fully involved
- effective participation requires resources and support.

## SOME OF THE ISSUES IDENTIFIED

- need to understand social exclusion and the need for a strategic approach. Social exclusion means that regeneration is about more than just housing and jobs
- all partners need to be involved before setting the vision and strategic objectives thus enabling communities to be involved in developing ideas and implementing bids
- community involvement can be seen simply as a way of delivering outputs, i.e. people are used as an instrument for delivering agendas set elsewhere
- the commitment to community involvement has to be seen by the community as more than just tokenistic
- training and employing local people to carry out community profiles and needs surveys has proved to be very successful as a way of involving local people from the start, developing local skills and getting effective

results. There need to be ongoing analyses to ensure resources match community needs as schemes develop and communities change. In addition, local skills audits as well as needs analyses can engender confidence in, and within, communities

- creative opportunities should be provided for all partners to work together, e.g. workshops not just meetings
- a significant factor in partnership relations can lie in the honest recognition of the structural inequality in partnerships. Power imbalances are compounded at partnership level: *'The rules of partnership are set in the mould of the more powerful partners – it is the community partner who has to adapt to existing systems.'* Marilyn Taylor
- all partners in the process need training
- there are significant differences between the community sector and the voluntary sector
- communities are not homogeneous and comprise many and often conflicting interests. Under-represented groups and interests should be identified
- involvement comes through many and diverse routes
- people need to be able to contribute from an informed position
- individuals are not necessarily 'representative' of their community. Relevant and flexible structures and channels to ensure representation and accountability are required
- participation takes time. Regeneration programme timetables need to take account of this fact
- community participation cannot be turned on and off as agendas change
- mechanisms are needed whereby lessons can be learned and examples of good and bad practice shared, at local, sub-regional, regional and national levels.

## GENERAL CONTACT MAKING AND INFORMATION GATHERING

An information flyer about this study was sent to all Regional Development Agencies in England including a response form requesting information about related work in other regions.

Information was circulated to all Yorkshire Forward funded regeneration partnerships. A brief questionnaire was attached to gather some basic information about approaches and experiences related to community participation across the region.

Information about the work was also circulated through community and voluntary sector networks in the region including Yorkshire and Humber Regional Forum for Voluntary and Community Organisations, the North Yorkshire Forum for Voluntary Organisations, the Objective 1 Open Forum etc.

## RESPONSES AND FINDINGS

Five RDAs and 15 Partnerships responded to requests for information in addition to contributions from many projects.

Analysis of the returns showed:

- no other Regional Development Agency has yet developed benchmarks for community participation although there is a lot of interest in doing so;
- approximately 50% of partnerships have developed community involvement strategies;
- all partnerships cited examples of structures, processes or resources they have or are developing to facilitate community involvement (ranging from community audits to neighbourhood forums to roadshows to voluntary and community sector led partnerships);
- just over half of those responding have carried out evaluations of the effectiveness of community involvement. Findings have varied across and within partnership areas. Effectiveness has been dependent upon a number of factors including existing structures and levels of community activity;
- key achievements cited ranged from the establishment and maintenance of community forums to the increased capacity of individuals through participation and access to training;
- over 30 different key difficulties/issues were identified as needing to be addressed. These included: how to reach people not actively engaged at present; paternalism by

authorities; tackling high levels of bureaucracy and red tape; lack of a clear or shared definition of what is meant by 'community involvement'; the need to help more powerful partners to understand that communities are complex and full of contradictions and competing priorities.

## PARTICIPATIVE RESEARCH

Initially, the approach to benchmarking community participation was informed by the framework developed and promoted by the Scottish Community Development Centre – 'Achieving Better Community Development (ABCD)'. Its central focus is the identification of four dimensions of community empowerment which can be understood as both processes and outcomes. One of the starting points for consultations was to locate community participation and regeneration within this framework.

## WORKSHOPS

The four workshops invited participants from

- coalfield communities (Wakefield District and Dearne Valley)
- a coastal zone (Bridlington, Scarborough and Hornsea)
- inner city and multi-racial communities (Sheffield and Rotherham)
- rural communities (North Richmondshire)

Participation in these workshops was enabled and encouraged through:

- resources for childcare/ dependant support;
- travel assistance;
- use of accessible venues;
- translation/interpretation/signers;
- timing of meetings;
- comfortable space and refreshments;
- understandable language and encouragement to question language used;
- participatory and creative techniques;
- opportunities for individuals to take on specific roles, e.g. acting as a link person at local level;
- recognition of the value of contribution e.g. through public acknowledgement.

Around 120 people were involved in the workshops including approximately (through self identification) 52% women and 48% men; 12% Black people and 88% white people; and 50% unpaid workers (community activists) and 50% paid workers. Each workshop group met twice. On the first occasion people worked through a series of participatory exercises to explore:

- key issues related to the local context;
- what is required to support community empowerment;
- enablers and barriers to community participation;
- objectives for inclusion in community participation strategies.

The outcomes of these workshops provided the basis for the development of the draft benchmarks and indicators. At the second session participants had the opportunity to comment upon, amend and add to the draft materials.

The workshops had a broader outcome than simply contributing to the development of the benchmarks. They also provided a very useful networking opportunity for local people and groups. A limited amount of funding was provided to each workshop group to enable such contacts to be sustained and developed.

### **‘SNAPSHOT’ STUDIES**

Two specific regeneration schemes were identified to further the research and test out initial thinking about community participation. These were:

- a Rural Development Programme funded project in North Lincolnshire (based around Crowle Resource Centre)
- an SRB 4 Scheme in South Leeds

In each area a variety of stakeholders were interviewed to consider:

- their role in relation to regeneration;
- how the dimensions of community participation had been incorporated/ proactively developed at different stages;
- learning points including what has been successful issues and difficulties.

It was originally envisaged that these studies would be described in some detail within this report. This has not proved possible and there would be a limit to its usefulness as the development of the benchmarks moved on from the stage they were at during the interviews. The information collected from those people interviewed however, has been extremely useful in aiding the development of the benchmark materials and provided the opportunity to test out the benchmarks and the concepts of community participation at a mid stage point.

A summary of the points and issues raised during the interviews is provided in Appendix A.

### **PILOTING**

The draft benchmarks were tested out by circulating them to thirteen regeneration schemes across the region. The schemes selected covered a range of contexts in relation to their communities and focus. Visits were made to each of these schemes to both complete a questionnaire about the materials produced and to discuss ideas for the implementation of the benchmarks. This also provided schemes with an opportunity to raise any concerns about the benchmarking process. The schemes then came together at a workshop, to validate and discuss a feed-back report of the visits and further explore issues of implementation.

### **DEVELOPMENT**

The literature research, the gathering of information from partnerships, schemes and projects, the workshops and the case studies have all contributed to the development of the benchmarks. The benchmarks are the beginning of a process of review and identification of achievement. They will no doubt need some refinement as experience of their application is assessed.

# Appendices



# Appendix A – Snapshot Studies

## South Leeds – SRB 4 Scheme

The following represents a snapshot of views at a particular point in time. Many of the comments below relate to the early stages of the scheme's development. Overall there is an impression of much frustration with the processes of regeneration and partnership but a commitment to work at it. As illustrated in the text, there are now new developments happening, in part due to particular council officers appointed during the last year and the positive contribution of some of them is appreciated.

### Influence

Points of influence are cited as – the Regeneration Delivery Group, voluntary and community sector group (independent), and via informal community involvement work e.g. planning for real.

Bureaucracy is seen as a major hurdle – lots of hoops to jump through.

The Interim Regeneration Delivery group ended up with lots of officers; the Housing Associations playing a big part. There has been a battle for voluntary sector involvement. Votes are rarely taken and those with 'observer' status do influence.

Some voluntary organisations feel that different rules are being applied and that the more powerful stakeholders benefit more than others.

Work is being done to ensure local people make more decisions. A Community Involvement Unit has been established which is trying to encourage groups to be established. A local community plan is being developed which will help to inform SRB 4. Processes for involving local people include consultation events, e.g. planning for real, questionnaires and community video – catching and recording views in the street.

There appears to have been a lack of respect and acknowledgement – when the local authority was challenged about not involving the voluntary and community in the appointment of the locality co-ordinator it was suggested that they wouldn't be professional enough. Some smaller groups gave a lot of time but were not named or mentioned in the Bid document.

At the first SRB meetings at least 50 people would attend but it dwindled to a handful. 'We refused to go away – it took a lot of persistence'. Attendance is now picking up again, as people see things happen.

### Inclusivity

Despite a sizeable Asian population, there have been no additional votes for minority ethnic representatives and the regeneration officers do not reflect the local area. They therefore have to bring in community language specialists on a temporary basis from time to time. A forum of those working with minority ethnic communities is developing which hopefully will allow those with 'years of expertise of living and working in the area,' to have a greater voice.

'Had I not been there as an individual the Asian Community would have missed the boat'.

A consortium approach to SRB funding prevented some groups accessing money. The only two established core funded groups from minority-ethnic communities were told they could not have any money as stand alone projects. 'What's this saying to black organisations?'

'Going out to talk to local people was good but always a feeling that they'll go away and do what they want anyway'

Regeneration workers are keen that young people engage in developments. Youth Forum development is taking place across Leeds – looking at how young people can be involved in creative ways; this will have a multi-cultural approach.



## Capacity

SRB has led to more networking and more doing things together.

Community forums are being established though are not necessarily independent of the Council. Indeed whilst some local councillors were very supportive, others were against community forums having influence.

Lack of training and support for groups.

More support and information is required for groups to be involved.

'If I hadn't been a paid worker, we couldn't have dedicated the necessary amount of time.'

'Appraisal forms just lower people's confidence'.

It was stressed that any voluntary organisation not working in SRB areas prior to the money coming in, should not be eligible for the money.

There needs to be a degree of risk taking, otherwise the voluntary/community sectors lose out.

## Communication

'Lack of clarity and communication about whole scheme – even from the project officers. Meetings left us more baffled.' There was a sense of the early processes as arduous, time consuming and frustrating and there is concern that although officers are now trying to turn some processes around, there is a feeling that this should have been done earlier.

There is a need to go thorough existing agencies who have rapport with local people rather than 'knocking on doors' themselves, and a need to link popular activities to consultation processes rather than 'clipboards or sitting in a circle'. People need to feel confident as a starting point.

'People need to be told they're top'.

Concerns around procedures centre on:

1. Delivery plan processes are too prescriptive.
2. Appraisal process – forms too complicated and the same process applied whether bids are for £20,000 or £200,000
3. Only 6 weeks to do delivery plan.
4. Inability to move funding from year to year.
5. Problem of delay between sending in bid and being able to start spending money.

The scheme is trying to develop projects as umbrella 'pots' so that the scheme can give out feasibility money without groups having to go through the whole appraisal process.

## Learning points

The high levels of bureaucracy create barriers to participation. 'SRB is not geared up for community groups to benefit and statutory bodies come along and cream off bulk of money.'

'It's like running the Grand National – people fall at different hurdles, and only a few make it past the post.' Local people had no influence over which areas are chosen for SRB bids and the initial consultation and involvement processes were not strategic nor was there a systematic approach to elective representation.

SRB 4 in South Leeds illustrates the need for a strategic community participation approach from the start. There is limited confidence on the part of the voluntary and community sectors that they can make a difference and clearly a feeling that any gains have come after a great deal of effort and struggle. But, good officers make a difference. Those from the voluntary sector who were interviewed have praised the 'exemplary' community involvement work now being carried out by Laurie Russell and the support provided by others, both officers and councillors, in SRB 4.

# Appendix A – Snapshot Studies

## Crowle

The following represents a snapshot of views at a particular point in time. Rural Development Programme funding has been used, alongside other funding, to support a number of developments in Crowle, a village in North Lincolnshire. Interviews with community members, project workers and LA officials highlight some of the issues related to community participation in rural regeneration.

### Influence

Local people feel remote from the overarching development of rural strategy (for East Riding and North Lincs) which sets parameters within which Rural Development funded projects have to fit.

Time scale for development of rural development plan for North Lincs gave insufficient time for effective community participation. Consequently it is seen as tending to be a LA led and shaped strategy.

The major RDP funded project, Crowle Resource Centre is LA initiated. While the Rural Community Council organised a series of workshops to consult local people about the services needed some ideas could not be incorporated when planning restrictions were placed on the design of the building.

The Management Committee recruited four community members (for a committee of 12) through a process of application and selection advertised door to door. Eleven people applied. Some people feel that a positive result of this process has been that places on the committee have not automatically gone to established 'community leaders' but to 'newer faces'. Two young people, involved through the local school, share a place as Youth Representative.

There is a criticism voiced by some that the Town Council could do much more to act as a catalyst and forum for the development of community led ideas and influence

### Inclusivity

Processes need to recognise the geographical 'boundaries' of rural communities and the potential animosity and competitiveness between communities. They also need to address access issues – particularly transport.

A number of people commented on the need to recognise the division perceived by some between the 'established' community and 'newcomers'. 'You are regarded as a newcomer if you have lived here for less than fifteen years.'

Although a number of approaches have been tried to involve local people including workshops, roadshows, public meetings some people felt that more creative ways need to be found to encourage more participation, particularly by those not already involved in community groups and young people.

There is a greater suspicion in rural areas and proactive efforts have to be made to 'get people over the threshold'. Effective community participation required slow and patient development work.

## Capacity

It is felt that funders have a different attitude to LAs than to the voluntary and community sector as it is assumed that the capacity of the LA does not need to be questioned as much.

Smaller projects wanting very little funding have to go through the same hoops as larger projects.

While some local people are active in a number of community groups and 'wear many hats' there was also a feeling that there need to be more effective formal networks between groups. Division sometimes occurs when groups feel that other groups are in competition with them.

There was some concern expressed that local initiatives in relation to regeneration have been restricted to small scale improvements and that there is need to address the bigger issues.

## Communication

Funding procedures are too bureaucratic and complicated. In rural areas, perhaps more than urban areas, projects are often reliant on a range of different funding sources requiring different procedures and accounting systems, e.g. Crowle Resource Centre is funded from RDP, Europe, North Lincs Council and Crowle Council.

It was felt that there is sometimes a lack of feed-back from Yorkshire Forward to those who fail to get funding.

At present the Rural Development programme includes no requirement for evidence of community involvement.

## Learning points

Although in some senses the community is very active it appears that meaningful community participation in and influence over any strategic regeneration of the area is limited. Such development is hindered by a number of factors including:

- remoteness of strategic decision making;
- funding procedures being bureaucratic, complex and project based;
- weakness of community networks;
- attitude of some of the more powerful stakeholders.

## Appendix B – Summary of literature reviewed

**Achieving Best Value Through Partnership:** DETR.

**Action Checklists for Capacity Building:** Coventry and Warwickshire Partnerships Ltd. Produced by Adept Community Development Agency Ltd and CDF, 1998.

**Benchmark of the 'Ideal' Local Authority:** Improvement and Development Agency, 1999.

**Best Value and Consultation:** Issue Paper prepared for the LGA/LGMB Working Group on Public Consultation and Political Leadership.

**Bridges to a Sustainable Future:** Towards a Quality of Life for All; Report on Workshop for Black and Minority Ethnic Groups, 1998.

**Bringing Britain Together:** A National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal. Report by the Social Exclusion Unit, September 1998.

**Bringing Britain Together: What Works.** Social Exclusion Unit.

**Building Community Strengths:** A Resource Book on Capacity Building. Steve Skinner, Community Development Foundation, 1997.

**Community Involvement in City Challenge:** A Good Practice Guide. Richard MacFarlane, NCVO, 1993.

**Community Involvement in Health:** J. Smithies & G. Webster.

**Community-Based Regeneration Initiatives:** DETR Working Paper, 1998.

**Community Participation and Partnership – A Review of Community Participation in the Liverpool Objective 1 Partnerships:** Paul Kyprianou; Liverpool Community Rights.

**Co-operating for Health:** The Potential Contribution of the Co-operative Movement and Community Well-being Centres to Health of the Nation Activities; Centre for Research in Social Policy, July 1996.

**Developing Effective Community Involvement Strategies:** Guidance for SRB bids; Joseph Rowntree Foundation report for the DETR, 1999.

**Evaluating Consultation – The Corporate View; and Evaluating Individual Consultation Exercises:** Papers prepared for the LGA / LGMB Best Value Working Group on Consultation and Political Leadership.

**An Evaluation Resource for Healthy Living Centres:** Health Education Authority, 1999.

**A Guide to Effective Partnership:** David Wilcox; Partnership, 1994.

**Good Practice Guidelines for Partnership Organisations:** Val Harris; Partnership Health Checks.

**Guidelines to the Community Involvement Aspects of Rural Challenge:** Community Development Foundation, 1995.

**Healthy Living Centres:** Department of Health commissioned study; Centre for Research in Social Policy, December 1998.

**Inclusive Regeneration:** Local Authorities Corporate Strategies for tackling Disadvantage; P. Alcock et al; Commissioned by the DETR, 1998.

**Inclusive Strategies for Race and Gender in Urban Regeneration:** Joseph Rowntree Foundation Findings.

**Involving Communities in Urban and Rural Regeneration:** A Guide for Practitioners; DETR Manual, 2nd edition September 1997.

**Interim Report to the SRB Local Management Board Community Representatives in Sheffield:** Wendy Davies, April 1998.

**Invisible Partners – The Impact of the SRB on Black Communities:** Black Training and Enterprise Group, 1995.

**Joined-up Places? Social Cohesion and Neighbourhood Regeneration:** Ray Forrest & Ade Kearns; Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 1999.

**Local Community Involvement – A Handbook for Good Practice:** European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 1999.

**Learning To Make a Difference:** A Preliminary Review of Health Action Zones submitted to the Department of Health, June 1999.

**Measuring the Process:** Guidelines for Evaluating Social Development; INTRAC, 1994.

**Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Development in Northern Ireland:** Voluntary Activity Unit, 1996.

**Making Partnerships Work:** National Regeneration Convention, Brighton, 1999: Notes from Speeches.

**The New Commitment to Regeneration:** Local Government Association, 1998; Paper submitted to Government as a contribution to the review of regeneration policies.

**New Deal For Communities:** Phase 1 Proposals; DETR Report, September 1998.

**Partnerships and Networks:** An Evaluation and Development Manual; A. McCabe, V. Lowndes & C. Skelcher, 1997.

**Partnerships: Do They Measure Up?:** M. Smith & M. Beasley, Univ. of Birmingham.

**People and Regeneration:** Measuring the Impact; Briefing Paper by New Economic Foundation, commissioned by Barclays and Groundwork.

**Project Appraisal and Partnership Performance in SRB:** KPMG.

**Regeneration & Sustainable Communities:** Community Development Foundation, 1999.

**Regeneration and the Community:** Guidelines to the Community Involvement Aspect of the SRB Challenge Fund; Community Development Foundation, 1997 edition.

**Regeneration Programmes – The Way Forward:** DETR Discussion Paper, Nov 1997.

**SRB Bidding Guidance – A Guide for Partnerships:** DETR, September 1998 (round 5).

**South Yorkshire Objective One Voluntary and Community Sector Consultation Exercise Reports:** Rose Ardon, The South Yorkshire Forum Policy Unit, 1999.

**Training and Education in Urban Regeneration:** A Framework for Participants; P. Henderson & M. Mayo; JRF and the Policy Press, 1998.

**Two Research Pointers (briefing papers) from the Improvement and Development Agency:** Who Asked You? and, History, Strategy or Lottery?

**Urban Regeneration: Partnerships for Success:** Docklands Forum / Pan London Community Regeneration Consortium.

**Unleashing the Potential – Bringing Residents to the Centre of Regeneration:** Marilyn Taylor; Joseph Rowntree Foundation, December 1995.

**Where Do We Go From Here?:** A review of Community Participation Methods; Jigso, 1998.

## Appendix C – Contributors

### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Ken Ambler	Bridlington	Ruby Chan	Sheffield
Barbara Atherton	Bridlington	Tony Clabby	Rotherham
Phil Back	Bridlington	Jean Cromar	Sheffield
Gina Culling	Bridlington	Ken Curran	Sheffield
Hilary Daley	Bridlington	Francis Feeley	Sheffield
F. De Casparis	Bridlington	Chris Gardner	Sheffield
Robert Downing	Bridlington	Nurul Haque	Sheffield
J Downing	Bridlington	Ray Hearne	Rotherham
Sandra Elliott	Bridlington	Janet Hilbert	Sheffield
Beryl Gallagher	Bridlington	Saleema Imam	Sheffield
Michael Gaunt	Hornsea	Mohammed Iqbal	Sheffield
T.W. Gillingham	Bridlington	Sue James	Sheffield
Joan Harding	Bridlington	Christopher Lee Nuttall	Rotherham
William Henderson	Scarborough	Neil Parry	Sheffield
Shirley Hester	Bridlington	Paula Pennock	Rotherham
Stan Hodges	Bridlington	Richard Pinder	Sheffield
Elizabeth Hodges	Bridlington	Margaret Prescott	Rotherham
A Holmes	Scarborough	Nusrat Rehman	Sheffield
Christine Holton	Bridlington	Anna Revill	Sheffield
Debbie Jefferson	Bridlington	Mohammed Shaffique	Sheffield
Malcolm Johnson	York	Di Sheppard	Sheffield
John Kilby	Hornsea	Eric Singleton	Rotherham
Jean Newsam	Bridlington	Chris Sissons	Sheffield
Frank Newsam	Bridlington	Charles Smith	Rotherham
Maureen Pepworth	Bridlington	Amina Souleiman	Sheffield
Val Sparkes	Hull	George Stanton	Sheffield
S Sparkes	Hull	Kate Strutt	Sheffield
Alex Thompson	Bridlington	Muna Tahar	Sheffield
Colin Tregalass	Bridlington	Vincent Walsh	Sheffield
Marjorie Wade	Bridlington	John Wraw	Rotherham
Perrie White	Bridlington	C. Wray	Sheffield
Granville Wilson	Scarborough	Wendy Young	Sheffield
Barry Woodcock	Bridlington	Alan Allcock	Wakefield
Jean Wormwell	Bridlington	G Baker	Wakefield
Judith Bromfield	Catterick Garrison	S Bassett	Wakefield
Annette Clark	Richmond	Ann Bennett	Hemsworth
Andrew D'arcy	Richmond	Keith Bottomley	Pontefract
Julie D'arcy	Richmond	Terry Catton	South Hiendley
Peter Fowler	Catterick Garrison	Phyllis Catton	South Hiendley
Robert Langford	Richmond	J Dodd	Pontefract
Jb Nichols	West Burton	M Fothergill	Knottingley
Wendy Robertson	Catterick Garrison	Karen Gouley	Castleford
Betty Robertson	Catterick Garrison	Stephen Groves	Wakefield
Ian Sykes	Northallerton	Terry Hall	Rotherham
Richard Weaver	Catterick Garrison	Paul Harding	Rotherham
A Ali	Sheffield	Christine Hyde	Castleford
Mohammed Alsaahimi	Sheffield	Steven Hyde	Castleford
Mohammam Altaf	Sheffield	Lynn Liddle	Pontefract
Cathy Angel	Sheffield	Jane Masterman	Castleford
Rose Ardron	Sheffield	Liz Matthews	Rotherham
Elaine Atkin	Sheffield	Rebecca Matthews	Wakefield
Andrew Atkin	Sheffield	Helen Monks	Castleford
M Awali	Sheffield	Helen Mycroft	Castleford
Amanda Bancroft	Sheffield	Mary Roche	Wakefield
John Barnes	Rotherham	Pat Russell	Rotherham
Mary Blacka	Sheffield	Jean Thompson	Pontefract
Joanne Bott	Rotherham	Steve Wadsworth	Wakefield
Melanie Broomhead	Sheffield	Carol White	Wakefield
Mike Cameron	Sheffield		



## **SCHEMES / PARTNERSHIPS WHO PARTICIPATED IN PILOTING :**

Bradford: Newlands Partnership  
Dewsbury Partnership  
Hull City Vision  
Kirklees: Routeways to Success  
Leeds: Investing in the Community  
North East Lincolnshire: Ports Districts  
North Lincolnshire: Acorns Partnership  
Rotherham: Young People Sharing Rotherham's Future  
Ryedale Regeneration Partnership  
Sheffield SRB Round 5  
West Central Halifax  
West Yorkshire Community Work Training Company  
York: North Clifton Regeneration Project

## **SNAPSHOT STUDIES**

### **South Leeds Participants:**

Neil Bishop  
Jane Daguerre  
Helen Bishop  
Hanif Malik  
Caroline Leadsom  
Laurie Russell  
John Bracewell

### **Crowle Participants:**

Jenny Couch  
Ian Rose  
Betsy Lutz  
Steve Pearse  
Ann Hindley  
Jackie Wass

## **Regional Development Agencies who provided information:**

Advantage West Midlands  
East of England Development Agency  
East Midlands Development Agency  
Northwest Development Agency  
South East England Development Agency.

## **Partnerships who provided information :**

Barnsley SRB  
Boothferry Enterprise 2000  
Calderdale Communities of the Future  
Dearne Valley Partnership  
Dewsbury Partnership  
Hull City Vision  
Keighley Regeneration Partnership Association  
North East Lincolnshire Round 1  
North Halifax Partnership  
Routeways to Success (Huddersfield)  
Royds Community Association (Bradford)  
Ryedale Regeneration Partnership  
Sowerby Bridge Forum  
South Elmsall, South Kirkby and Upton (SESKU)  
Regeneration Partnership, West Yorkshire  
Community Work Training Company  
YMCA Rural Foyers Partnership

## **Commentators on draft materials:**

Christine Bainton  
Lindsay Knott  
Claire Nash  
Neil Irving  
Ian McCollough  
Jenny Sayer  
Marjorie Mayo  
Mike Parry-Jones  
Steve Kimberley  
Val Harris  
Black Training and Enterprise Group

**Thank you also to the very many projects who contacted us.**

# Active Partners

## Benchmarking **Community Participation** in Regeneration

### Acknowledgements

#### **The Benchmarking Research Steering Group**

Hilary Willmer (Steering Group Chair)  
Vice Chair – Churches Regional Commission  
Dr Rosemary Suttill  
Vice Chair - Yorkshire and the Humber Regional  
Forum for Voluntary and Community  
Organisations  
Phil Back (until October 99)  
Humber and Wolds Rural Community Council

#### **Sponsors**

Yorkshire Forward  
Joseph Rowntree Foundation  
Regional Assembly for Yorkshire & Humberside

#### **Advisors – Yorkshire Forward**

Jim Brockbank  
Ian Collins

#### **Consultants**

Mandy Wilson COGS  
Pete Wilde COGS  
Annie Rosewarne COGS

### Developed by **COGS** on behalf of **Yorkshire Forward**

COGS is an independent Community Development Consultancy (based in Sheffield) with experience in training and development work and specialising in community consultation and participation.

COGS is the trading name for the consultancy and training work undertaken by Mandy Wilson and Pete Wilde, and associates.

March 2000