

The Impact of the Regional
Economic Strategy on
Social Inclusion

Scrutiny
Enquiry 2

Foreword from the Chair of the Panel

This review has looked at a topic which is of key importance to the region - the extent to which economic interventions delivered as part of the Regional Economic Strategy are promoting social inclusion in Yorkshire and Humber. It has considered many things, including responsibility for setting the inclusion agenda in the region, and the extent to which delivery is currently meeting the needs of our most disadvantaged communities.

This is an issue about which many agencies and individuals have strong views. All of the Panel were impressed with the commitment and passion obvious in the evidence that we heard and the constructive and helpful way it was presented.

It is vital that we remember that the purpose of scrutiny is to help all regional partners refine and improve their performance. We all have an interest in this - local authorities, businesses, government, the voluntary sector and, indeed, everyone who lives and works in the region. We all share a single vision - to see Yorkshire and Humber become a region, "where the economic, environmental and social well-being of all our region and its people advances rapidly and sustainably." The main intention of this report is to help us work together to deliver this vision.

I believe that this is a report which all partners will view as helpful and constructive. Social inclusion is a complex issue, and one which requires us to work together if we are to make a real difference to all of our communities.

I would like to thank everybody who has contributed to this final report - my fellow panel members for giving up so much of their time and putting in so much hard work, all of those who were interviewed or who submitted written evidence and the officers who supported the process at both Yorkshire and Humber Assembly and Yorkshire Forward.

The challenge now for the region is how we build upon the report's findings in order to bring about real and lasting change for all of our communities.

Cllr Terry Sharman

*Deputy Leader Rotherham Council
Chair of the Scrutiny Panel*

Contents

Introduction 5

Summary and Recommendations 6

Part One

Issues and Findings 8

Part Two

Monitoring and Impact 21

Conclusion 24

Part Three

Response to the Findings 25

Appendix 1 - Scrutiny Review - Terms of Reference 27

Appendix 2 - Interview Schedule 29

Appendix 3 - Research Sources 30

Appendix 4 - Participants 31

Introduction

This report contains the findings of the scrutiny review that the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly (YHA) has carried out considering the extent to which economic interventions, delivered as part of the Regional Economic Strategy (RES), have been successful in promoting social inclusion in our region.

The first part of the report sets out the key issues and findings arising from interviews with Yorkshire Forward officers, regional, sub regional and local partners, the submission of written evidence from partners and two enquiry hearings held in public:

- With Partners
- With Yorkshire Forward Board members

The report considers how economic interventions can address social inclusion and the roles and responsibilities of the different organisations responsible for delivery.

The report asks Yorkshire Forward to consider the findings and identify ways to address the issues raised within an agreed timescale.

The second part of the report goes on to look at the delivery and impact of past and current activities, considering how successfully economic interventions have tackled inclusion over the past three years in Yorkshire and the Humber.

It calls on the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly, Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber and Yorkshire Forward to review jointly the findings and consider how they can be used to enhance and support the social inclusion agenda and the role of all partners developing or delivering projects at a regional, sub-regional and local level.

The final part of the report sets out the response of Yorkshire Forward to the enquiry summary and recommendations. It also says how the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly will take forward the opportunities for wider regional learning identified in the report.

Summary and Recommendations

In the course of this review, the scrutiny panel has, on behalf of the region, considered the way in which economic interventions delivered as part of the RES have promoted social inclusion in Yorkshire and Humber. The panel has taken into account the views of all key regional agencies and the views of a wide range of stakeholders who are involved in the delivery of initiatives with a social inclusion benefit.

The main conclusions of the panel are:

- There is concern amongst partners that the region lacks a clear sense of vision setting out the way that all partners will work to tackle the social inclusion agenda. The region would benefit from the development of a clear shaped statement, which defines the key social inclusion priorities for Yorkshire and Humber.
- Many partners remain concerned about the status of social inclusion within the RES, believing that its presence as a cross-cutting theme means that it is not central to RES activity. In the light of these concerns, Yorkshire Forward should undertake further work with partners to communicate why the RES has chosen to adopt a cross-cutting approach to social inclusion. In the longer term, Yorkshire Forward may wish to consider whether a cross-cutting approach is the most effective way in which the RES can tackle social inclusion issues.
- The Panel fully endorses the rejection of ‘trickle down’ as an effective way of tackling social inclusion issues. However, as a region, we still have a limited understanding of the way in which economic activity can make a real and lasting impact on socially excluded communities. Yorkshire Forward has a clear lead role in helping the region to develop such understanding.
- The Panel remains uncertain on the extent to which Government Office can actually be held accountable to the region for driving social inclusion at the regional level.
- Many organisations have unrealistic expectations about what the role and remit of Yorkshire Forward is in relation to social inclusion. Yorkshire Forward needs to review how they communicate their role in tackling social inclusion - particularly to smaller delivery organisations which may not have an accurate view of what Yorkshire Forward is able to do. This communication also needs to ensure that learning from successful projects is shared across the region.
- The delivery of initiatives to address the social inclusion issues within the region may be hampered by the difficulties of linking the aims of regional strategies with the actions in local community plans. Critical to this is the work of LSPs. Further work should be undertaken to build the links between local delivery partners and sub regional and the aims and objectives of regional strategies.
- There needs to be further consideration as to how community and local groups access Single Pot funding. Part of this process needs to consider how the current funding regime will link with legacy programmes, particularly in terms of ensuring that the sustainability of existing successful and effective projects can be encouraged.
- Regionally agreed indicators should be developed that demonstrate the way in which RES activities are meeting social inclusion objectives. Such indicators need to be incorporated within the commissioning and monitoring process of all projects funded by Yorkshire Forward - and communicated to all partners. These indicators should look at qualitative as well as quantitative data.

Recommendation

That Yorkshire Forward considers the findings set out in this report and, working with other key regional agencies, identifies ways to address the actions raised. The Assembly ask that a timed Action Plan be produced detailing how this will be achieved.

Wider Regional Learning

This scrutiny review was also charged with considering how successfully regional strategies that address different policy areas are being translated into effective joined up local action. The responsibility for producing and implementing regional strategies belongs to all key regional agencies and the findings of this report have implications for Government Office, Yorkshire Forward and the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly itself. The lessons learned from this review go beyond the social inclusion and have relevance to other policy areas.

Recommendation

That all key regional agencies meet to review the findings in this report and consider the generic lessons around the barriers which prevent regional strategies being translated into local level delivery.

Part One

Issues and Findings

The following section details the issues emerging from the scrutiny review into the impact of the RES on social inclusion. The findings of this report are based upon desk research, written evidence, interviews and subsequent scrutiny hearings. The request for written evidence was widely circulated within the region and detailed written submissions were received from 21 organisations. A full list of those organisations which submitted written evidence is included in Appendix 3 and full copies of all responses received are available on the Assembly's website.

The findings of the scrutiny panel provide a challenge for the region's policy makers to adopt a more co-ordinated approach to social inclusion. Given the nature of the topic, this report is necessarily wide ranging and has implications for all regional, sub-regional and local bodies.

A Vision for Social Inclusion

Written evidence from one key regional agency asked the question:

The Yorkshire and Humber Regional Forum for Voluntary and Community Organisations

Views *'We welcome Yorkshire Forward's 'Inclusion and Skills Unit' but which agency in the region has the lead on social inclusion?'*¹

'What agency ensures that all interventions and roles complement each other and that one is not at the expense of another?'

This was the clearest articulation of a question that was raised repeatedly by a wide range of respondents. The region is not clear who is, or ought to be, leading on the social inclusion agenda and how this agenda both supports, and is supported by, economic development interventions.

A Vision in the RES?

The Regional Economic Strategy (RES) has recently been revised to re-emphasise the relationship between a prosperous, diverse and inclusive region and sustainable economic development. Many partners commented upon, and welcomed, the increased clarity that this change has brought.

The strategy states that the region believes that the only way to achieve lasting growth is to create integrated sustainable development and address social inclusion by *'providing opportunities for socially excluded people and deliver environmental and health benefits'*.

This focus is developed as one of the three strategic aims of the RES: *'releasing and enhancing the potential of all Yorkshire and Humber's people to achieve a healthy learning region and social inclusion'*.

This strategic aim is supported by an objective to: *'connect all of the region's communities to economic opportunity through targeted regeneration activity'*.

¹ Yorkshire Forward have pointed out that it does not have an inclusion and skills unit as such, rather a team which is responsible for the strategic investment on Inclusion and Skills.

Additionally, in addressing social inclusion, the RES also sets out six “cross cutting” themes that also reinforce how the region will deliver the ‘umbrella’ of sustainable development. One of these themes relates to social inclusion and diversity. All RES initiatives must: *‘Advance social issues including healthy lifestyles, culture, housing and community safety’.*

The RES sets out to provide a framework of common objectives and priorities around which businesses, public agencies, voluntary groups and communities can unite.

The enquiry identified a number of issues related to this treatment of social inclusion in the RES.

Views *The Yorkshire and Humber Regional Forum for Voluntary and Community Organisations. ‘An explicit statement in the RES about its approach to tackling economic and social inclusion would be helpful to develop a debate and thus, common understanding’*

Whilst many other partners commented upon the need for a clear vision, there was a widespread acknowledgement by Yorkshire Forward and its partners that the RES cannot be the place where the vision for social inclusion in the region is set out. However, Yorkshire Forward would need to be a key partner in any work to draw up a clear vision for social inclusion in Yorkshire and Humber.

In many ways, it is the clarity of RES on the economic agenda which throws into relief the absence of a similar clarity on the inclusion agenda. Many partners, through misunderstanding of the role of the strategy, expressed a desire to see the RES establishing a clear vision for social inclusion. One partner commented that

“what is missing from the RES is a clear statement of, for example, five core social inclusion themes that need to be addressed”.

Many others shared this view that the RES ought to be leading on the social inclusion agenda. However, Yorkshire Forward and other partners were clear that the extent to which the RES is able to do this is necessarily limited.

This divergence of views suggests two things:

1. There is a need for clarity of vision/definition regarding the social inclusion agenda
2. There remains a lack of clarity in the region about the new role that the RES has had to adopt in relation to social inclusion.

Views *Rotherham Local Strategic Partnership*

‘The past three years have seen a fundamental shift in attitude toward the integration of social inclusion issues during the economic planning process. The move away from a reactive stance to a more proactive planned approach must be welcomed. However with the exception of specifically targeted small-scale schemes the impact has been minimal.’

The panel found:

The Panel accept that due to its economic focus, it would not be appropriate for the RES to be the region’s overarching social inclusion strategy - despite many respondents suggesting that this would be useful.

The region needs to have a clear shaped statement, which defines the key social inclusion priorities for Yorkshire and Humber. Whether this ultimately becomes a ‘social inclusion strategy’ is something which requires more thought and dialogue with regional partners. Yorkshire Forward has a responsibility to help shape this statement working alongside YHA and Government Office. Work is already underway, involving

these three agencies, to move towards a shared statement defining social inclusion priorities for the region.

This statement should be specific enough to set out key priorities for social inclusion and should inform and influence the actions of Yorkshire Forward when they are delivering their primarily economic agenda.

The YHA, through its Commissions structure has a clear lead role in developing the regional statement on social inclusion and all regional partners have a responsibility for ensuring that this statement informs their own delivery. The final statement should be communicated to all agencies operating within and across the region.

Social Inclusion as a Cross Cutting Theme

The revised RES sets out social inclusion as a cross cutting theme to reinforce how the region will develop in a sustainable way.

The theme states that it will: *'Advance social issues including healthy lifestyles, culture, housing and community safety'*.

The RES suggests cross cutting themes should be addressed in two ways:

- Firstly, the themes should "permeate all initiatives, both at the design stage and in project implementation".²
- Secondly, certain actions are also required to push forward these themes - examples include actions on corporate social responsibility and minority ethnic enterprise initiatives

The cross-cutting themes must therefore be considered by all project applications to the Single Pot. The approach must provide partners developing projects at a regional or sub-regional level with a strong enough steer to ensure their activities are addressing regional social inclusion priorities. However, many partners felt that the way in which social inclusion is currently tackled was 'mechanistic' and 'did not encourage real integration':

Views *Doncaster Borough Council*

'The appraisal of projects should recognise the importance of social inclusion. Whilst the RAP and SRAP appraisal templates seeks to recognise a project's contribution towards social inclusion, it appears little more than a mechanistic 'tick box' approach which does not seek to put social exclusion at the centre of the project approval process'.

Yorkshire Forward informed the Panel that social inclusion issues are addressed and embedded in all project applications by the following process:

- 1) The Action Planning Guidance explains how applicants should address this area and what it means in practical terms
- 2) The detailed appraisal of every project ensures the social inclusion theme is picked up and evaluated as part of the process of project approval.

Yorkshire Forward's confidence in the current measures is clearly not shared by all of the partners who are

² Regional Economic Strategy, revised draft 2003, p.60.

involved in delivering RES activities. This creates a tension between the declared intentions of RES and the delivery of initiatives on the ground.

In part this tension is the result of differing views as to the status of cross-cutting themes in the RES.

Views *Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council*

'Whilst social inclusion is a cross cutting theme, there is only limited demonstration within the RES that the concept, principles and approach are truly at the heart of the RES activity.'

Views *Scarborough Borough Council*

'The lack of direct focus on social inclusion is exemplified by social inclusion being treated as a cross cutting theme rather than a strategic objective in its own right.'

Views *South Yorkshire Strategic Health Authority*

'Specific actions on these issues in the RES appear to be limited and it is our view that cross-cutting themes can easily "get lost" in the push to deliver its main economic objectives.'

This was a commonly expressed view amongst a large number of partners; that the status of social inclusion as a cross cutting theme made it marginal to RES activities rather than central to them. Conversely, Yorkshire Forward genuinely believes that this is not the case. There is a clear disparity between what Yorkshire Forward believes they are doing and what partners on the ground perceive them as doing. This echoes the situation regarding the vision for social inclusion outlined above.

The Panel acknowledge that Yorkshire Forward consulted widely on the revised RES and this is something that was mentioned positively by partners. Yorkshire Forward itself provided a great deal of useful information about the way in which the consultation process picked up the treatment of social inclusion as a cross-cutting theme. As part of the consultation process for RES, ninety-two detailed questionnaires were completed by regional stakeholders. These questionnaires asked about the importance of social inclusion as a cross-cutting theme. Of those responding:

69% said it was 'top priority' or 'very important'
27% said it was 'important'
4% said it had 'some importance'

Clearly, there is regional consensus on the importance of ensuring the RES helps tackle social inclusion issues. However, the Panel recommend that Yorkshire Forward should undertake further work with partners to communicate why the RES has chosen to promote a cross-cutting approach to social inclusion activities. In the longer term, Yorkshire Forward may wish to consider whether a cross-cutting approach is the most effective way in which the RES can tackle social inclusion issues. The recent consultation process, whilst useful, did not directly ask whether respondents believed that a cross-cutting approach was a more effective way of tackling social inclusion than, for example, having social inclusion as a 'stand-alone theme'.

In order to inform this debate, the Panel felt that Yorkshire Forward needed to work with partners more to consider how effective the Project Management Framework is in ensuring social inclusion issues were addressed during the commissioning and management of projects.

Yorkshire Forward also needs to communicate the way in which the cross-cutting theme approach works more effectively than they do at present.

The panel found

Yorkshire Forward should undertake further work with partners to communicate why the RES has chosen to promote a cross-cutting approach to social inclusion activities. In the longer term, Yorkshire Forward may wish to consider whether a cross-cutting approach is the most effective way in which the RES can tackle social inclusion issues.

Partners require further guidance that demonstrates how cross cutting themes should be embedded within all project applications delivering the Regional Economic Strategy.

The Performance Management Framework should be evaluated to assess whether it is successful in ensuring social inclusion is embedded in all project applications.

Linking Economic Activity and Social Inclusion

Yorkshire Forward states in the RES that they do not accept “trickle down” as a way of addressing social inclusion and therefore are looking to fund economic initiatives that directly address the social inclusion agenda.

This approach is echoed by a number of the region’s partners:

Views Hull City Council

‘We wholeheartedly concur with the Regional Economic Strategy’s statement that ‘Wealth will not ‘trickle down’ to deprived areas, so intervention is needed to ensure that the most deprived communities benefit from economic growth’.

Whilst most key partners were aware of this emphasis within the RES, many were unsure how it would translate into delivery.

Furthermore, there was some scepticism around whether economic interventions could really have a lasting impact on a particular community - and whether the impact that these interventions do have is necessarily always positive.

Views Hull City Council

‘There is evidence in Hull of the beneficial impact of economic interventions on social inclusion (jobs created, people acquiring new skills). However, such interventions are not ‘improving’ or ‘making Hull better’ in its totality (e.g. the deprivation indices show Hull getting ‘worse’ and out migration is continuing apace).’

Views Leeds City Council

‘The Council considers that economic interventions will not automatically contribute to social inclusion, and that it is both desirable and necessary to be proactive in order to ensure that economic development promotes inclusion’.

Views Bradford University

‘Current procedures for allocating regeneration funding tend to place deprived communities in competition with one another for scarce resources, so that economic interventions can arguably militate against social inclusion and wider community cohesion’.

Views *Neighbourhood Resource Centre (a faith based community initiative).*

'Frequently the very strategies designed to bring about inclusion only serve to widen the gap and increase the barriers to inclusion'.

There was regional consensus on the need for economic interventions to impact positively on those groups and communities which are at the greatest risk of social exclusion. This belief in the value of targeted initiatives is both led by, and reflected in, the current RES. However, it is less clear to partners what this position means when it comes to commissioning, supporting and evaluating projects which are being delivered as part of the RES.

As a region, we remain unclear about the link between economic activity and social inclusion. The Panel acknowledge that there are ongoing projects which, when evaluated, may provide useful examples of good practice. However, evaluated examples of successful projects, which have linked economic interventions with clear social inclusion outputs, are relatively few, and the region lacks the mechanisms to share the good practice that these projects have generated in a systematic way. One example cited by Yorkshire Forward was the Manor and Castle Development Trust. The Trust is successfully working with the Advanced Manufacturing Park at Waverley to ensure that local people are linked to job opportunities both now and in the future. Other examples cited included Royds in Bradford and Tesco in Seacroft.

Yorkshire Forward describes their challenge as repeating such successes elsewhere in the region through early community engagement and by encouraging employers to understand and accept their responsibilities to the wider community.

Despite this stated aim, what remains unclear is how social inclusion benefits are linked into all initiatives that are delivered as part of the RES. The number of times the relatively small number of evaluated examples was cited suggests that there is not enough known about the inclusion benefits of RES activities over-all to be able to say whether or not it is having a positive impact on inclusion.

Views *Leeds Metropolitan University*

'There are some good examples of social inclusion programmes related to economic development (i.e. building relationships with new employers to encourage them to take on local staff). However, this type of intervention is not straightforward, and not always successful. Good practice needs to be shared better.'

Yorkshire Forward does recognise that it has a role in capturing these successes and ensuring that they are replicated elsewhere in the region. However, the roots of success are often difficult to identify, and, in the case of locality projects, may be the result of regeneration activities over many years carried out by a range of organisations.

Yorkshire Forward does not have the capacity, remit or resources to recreate these same conditions which led to success in other locations in the region. The circumstances leading to success are often very complicated and recreating this environment may not always be wholly in Yorkshire Forward's gift.

The panel found

Yorkshire Forward should develop its understanding of what the conditions were which led to particular projects delivering clear social inclusion outcomes - for example, perhaps long term capacity building activities had taken place before Yorkshire Forward made any intervention of its own. This will provide the region with a clear sense of how any Yorkshire Forward interventions have 'added value' and will allow Yorkshire Forward to plan future interventions more effectively - i.e. by locating projects in areas with a similar set of existing conditions.

The Panel supports the rejection of 'trickle down' as an effective way of tackling social inclusion issues. However, the region would benefit from more clarity on the implications of this rejection, particularly given the shift to Single Pot funding which is less clearly targeted than previous funding regimes.

Roles and Responsibilities

To address the Region's key social inclusion priorities there needs to be clarity between key regional agencies as to who is championing the agenda and how regional, sub regional and local level delivery is coordinated. As was demonstrated in an earlier section of this report, there is currently uncertainty about the respective roles of the key regional agencies: the YHA, GOYH and Yorkshire Forward regarding vision and definition. The consequences of this uncertainty ultimately are played out in delivery.

The Role of Yorkshire Forward

Yorkshire Forward, the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Development Agency, was created in April 1999 with the mission of revitalising the region's economy. Yorkshire Forward's business plans are aligned around this strategic economic role and are characterised by the delivery of high impact 'breakthrough' projects.

Yorkshire Forward has fifteen Board Members appointed by the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry. The business-led Board includes representatives from a range of private, public and voluntary sectors across the region.

Yorkshire Forward's work and investment (£280m in 2002/2003) is guided by the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) which is prepared by Yorkshire Forward for ownership by the region. Yorkshire Forward's core business depends upon effective communication with regional partners in order to:

- Strengthen the impact of the RES;
- Make effective sub-regional delivery a reality;
- Invest in key clusters;
- Build and exploit a strong business network;
- Connect people to economic opportunity;
- Facilitate the strategic infrastructure for economic growth; and
- Build the capacity of Yorkshire Forward to continuously improve and innovate.

The RES states that Yorkshire Forward's role will be to deliver its economic development role in a way that connects partners to economic opportunity and delivers wider inclusion benefits where possible. However, Yorkshire Forward's primary responsibility relates to economic development.

The Role of Government Office

The Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber brings together the activities and interests of nine national Government departments at a regional level. GOYH acts as "Whitehall in the Region" explaining and delivering the Government's objectives in a co-ordinated way appropriate to the particular regional and local circumstances of Yorkshire and the Humber, and feeding back the regional perspective to inform national

policy. GOYH is accountable to the nine parent Departments and Ministers for whom it undertakes work. GOYH's core aim is to contribute towards sustainable development (economic, environmental and social) in Yorkshire and Humber through the integrated and coherent delivery of government policies and programmes and through effective partnership working in the region. GOYH's detailed business plans are built around four strategic objectives.

- To support the increased trend growth of GDP in Yorkshire and the Humber;
- To improve the quality of life for all those who live or work in Yorkshire and the Humber;
- To protect and improve the environment of the region;
- To keep GOYH at the leading edge of modernising the Civil Service.

Government Office is named within the RES as having the lead role in driving social inclusion and neighbourhood renewal at the regional level. As part of this role, Government Office is currently working to establish a 'social inclusion panel' for the region - to pull together key individuals to provide leadership on this agenda.

The Role of Yorkshire and Humber Assembly

Launched in October 2001, the YHA is the region's high-level strategic partnership. Its members include the region's twenty-two local authorities and representatives from business, education, the health sector, environmental agencies and the voluntary and community sector - amongst others.

The YHA works with others to plan for the region's future, in order to create a more sustainable region - economically, socially and environmentally. The YHA has a key co-ordinating role in ensuring that regional strategies are aligned - a role that Chapter 2 of the recent White Paper, *Your Region, Your Choice* has strengthened.

Key to delivering the Assembly's social inclusion agenda is the 'Quality of Life Commission', which draws together a diverse range of partner organisations.

Whilst these key regional agencies were reasonably consistent in their understanding of their respective roles, this was not necessarily shared across other regional and local partners. In general, there was a very mixed view 'on the ground' about who was responsible for what.

In particular, many interviewees also questioned the ability of Government Office to drive forward the social inclusion agenda at regional level - with some partners suggesting that currently Government Office interprets national policy at a regional level rather than actively pursuing 'regional priorities'. This may lead to a tension between regional and national priorities. For example, the recent emphasis on 'street crime' reflected national policy priorities rather than identified regional priorities.

This leads to a broader issue regarding the extent to which Government Office, which is the lead agency within the RES on social inclusion issues, can actually be held accountable to the region in the same way as other lead partners are. The accountability of Government Office staff is to ministers rather than to the region itself. This may lead to circumstances where it is difficult to 'join-up' the social inclusion agenda with the region's economic development.

More work needs to be undertaken to understand fully the positive and the negative impacts that national policy initiatives can have when they are delivered at a regional level. This should include opportunities for the region to be involved in the early stages of national policy development.

Government Office's move towards establishing a Social Inclusion Panel, which will include Yorkshire Forward and the YHA, is welcomed by this review. However, plans for the work of the Panel are not widely known and much more clarity is needed on its functions and, in particular, how the panel will link to the work of the Quality of Life Commission. The region will need to ensure that work undertaken by the Social Inclusion Panel feeds into the Quality of Life Commission. This will ensure that there is the widest possible involvement of partners in the regional debate on social inclusion.

Views Hull City Council

'Whilst social exclusion is both a strategic objective and cross-cutting theme of the RES, the lead on social inclusion in the region is taken by Government Office. However, other regions of England have examined the social inclusion agenda, and have questioned whether there needs to be a more leadership and integration regionally on the social inclusion agenda.'

Regional - Local Links

Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) are seen by all key partners as having a critical role in co-ordinating the delivery of local activity to address social inclusion. The value of local responses to local issues was emphasised by a number of respondents:

Views Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

'Local Strategic Partnerships across the region are working hard and effectively on community planning and the development of community strategies. These, increasingly, drill down to estate and neighbourhood level and provide both vision and outcomes. [...] The most effective LSPs are bending services and bringing innovation to neighbourhood delivery.'

Views Leeds City Council

'We strongly believe that action to ensure economic development supports social inclusion must be taken at the local or neighbourhood level. Local authorities, working with their partners in the LSP, are best placed to deliver.'

Many partners also questioned the extent to which local activity, whether successful or not, was connected in any meaningful way to the RES objectives:

Views Doncaster Metropolitan Council

'Experience in Doncaster has demonstrated that the most successful solutions are those that are identified locally, but with the support of professional expertise leading to local implementation. Our perception is that local communities do not recognise the RES, nor its supporting plans, assisting them with specific problems. As a result it is difficult for the RES to become mainstream in focusing on exclusion.'

Despite widespread consent on the potential of LSPs to co-ordinate delivery at local level, some partners also highlighted the fact that the work of the LSPs can be limited, as:

- They are embryonic.
- They may not have the capacity or resources to have a full and active role in this area.

- They essentially exist in order to respond to local agendas - not to implement or co-ordinate 'top down' strategies.

Some stakeholders were unsure as to how far a local delivery mechanism could, or indeed should, be tied into regional strategies and priorities. In general, the links between the RES and LSP activity were seen as being patchy, inconsistent and unclear.

Currently, Yorkshire Forward Officers do attend LSP Board meetings and help the LSP to link regional strategy with local delivery objectives. A number of LSPs have commented that they find this process extremely helpful. However, further clarification and guidance on how partnerships should link with regional strategy was requested by LSPs.

Moreover, if LSPs are to co-ordinate delivery effectively, then there is the need to address the issue of how they are to be resourced and supported in the long term. Supporting LSPs and monitoring their delivery is primarily the responsibility of Government Office. However, LSPs are also cited within the RES as a lead partner for delivery. In order to ensure that they are able to fulfil this additional role effectively, Yorkshire Forward needs to work with partners to ensure that LSPs have the skills and capacity to co-ordinate delivery in an effective way.

Views West Yorkshire Strategic Health Authority

'What is less clear is the process for the translation of the RES into action; a process which needs to be all-inclusive and focused as the overall objectives. The structures and rules of engagement at sub-regional and local level need now to reflect those developing regionally to ensure delivery on the ground'.

The panel found:

Effective partnerships with clear understanding of roles and responsibilities for delivery at a regional, sub regional, district, local and neighbourhood level are vital to delivering the RES. There needs to be greater clarity about what needs to be done to make this a reality.

More joint work on defining the relationship between economic interventions and social inclusion would be helpful in achieving this.

The Panel remains uncertain on the extent to which Government Office can actually be held accountable to the region for driving social inclusion at the regional level. The Panel requests more guidance from regionally based civil servants and from relevant ministers.

The nature of the relationship between the planned regional social inclusion panel and the Quality of Life Commission needs to be defined. This relates to;

- *Which agency is the key driver for this agenda in the region?*
- *How we can ensure the widest range of stakeholders are involved in this work?*

The shift away from area-based initiatives will demand that the infrastructure at a local level to support social inclusion delivery is in place and fully resourced. LSPs appear to be best placed to provide this infrastructure, but there needs to be clarity on their long term funding and capacity to deliver this agenda.

Communications with Partners

Communication is one of the common themes which has emerged throughout this review process. Two-way communication is crucial to ensure:

- actions set out to promote social inclusion in the RES are undertaken;
- To gain clarity on who is responsible for leading and delivering this agenda; and
- To ensure that expectations about what the RES can deliver in relation to social inclusion are accurate and realistic.

Yorkshire Forward expresses the view that it is communicating well and that the region understands its key priorities and its role in relation to social inclusion. However, there is a perception amongst some partners that this is not the case, with some interviewees suggesting that social inclusion does not appear to be a significant priority for the RDA.

These partners believe that Yorkshire Forward is not effectively reconciling the needs and demands of 'economic partners' with the needs and demands of other partners. The perception is that Yorkshire Forward 'exists for businesses'. The Panel do not believe that this perception is accurate, but it is certainly widespread. Yorkshire Forward needs to consider how it will challenge this view.

Whilst Yorkshire Forward argue they have made their role clear to the region, clearly, the effectiveness of any communication strategy must be gauged by the understanding of those receiving the information as well as those transmitting it.

It would therefore be helpful for the region if Yorkshire Forward were able to be more explicit about their role. The current lack of clarity can lead to unrealistic expectations of Yorkshire Forward and what they are able to do.

Additional efforts to communicate this message should focus on helping partners understand how initiatives to deliver social inclusion are being taken forward by the RES. They should also identify the attributes of those projects that have produced clear inclusion outcomes. It would also be helpful if there was some indication of the levels of funding being allocated to support social inclusion activity.

Whilst Yorkshire Forward accepted the need to communicate its aims well it did suggest that, as a strategic body, it was not always necessary for everyone to know what it did. This was accepted by the Panel. However, the assumption of Yorkshire Forward, that some groups do not need to know what it does, ignores the reality that many groups do not, "know nothing about Yorkshire Forward", but actually believe inaccurate information. This can lead to frustration as unrealistic expectations build up.

The panel found:

Yorkshire Forward needs to review how they communicate their role in tackling social inclusion - particularly to smaller delivery organisations which appear to not have an accurate view of what Yorkshire Forward is able to do.

There needs to be better dissemination of information within the region. This should ensure partners understand what projects are successfully delivering against the strategy and the impact they are achieving on social inclusion.

Delivery

The social inclusion agenda has previously been supported primarily through locality based, targeted interventions via the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB). However, over time, SRB funding has been directed at projects with a more specific economic focus that have a less direct impact on inclusion issues. More recently, inclusion issues have been addressed through the objectives and cross cutting theme approach laid out in the RES. This is in line with the changed role of RDAs required by Government.

Whilst legacy programmes like SRB still make up a significant part of Yorkshire Forward spending, new activities to deliver the RES are set out in the Regional (RAP) and Sub-Regional (SRAP) Action Plans.

Yorkshire Forward believes that the action planning process allows them to take a “subsidiarity approach” to social inclusion. This means that projects are devised at the lowest level and then fitted together at regional level to ensure overall delivery of RES cross cutting themes. Despite this approach, evidence suggests that whilst it is possible to see the linkages between the RES as the overarching economic strategy and the regional and sub-regional action plans, it is less clear how community plans and locality based initiatives fit into the picture. It is therefore difficult for local initiatives to see how, and/or if, they are delivering regional priorities.

Views Leeds Metropolitan University

‘This has been exacerbated by the complexities of seeking to fit in with regional delivery plans which might be operationalised and interpreted quite differently even by the same agencies at sub-regional and district levels. Nor has it been clear which was the appropriate agency to deal with in taking delivery processes forward.’

Views Scarborough Borough Council

‘The movement away from geographically targeted holistic programmes with social inclusion as a key objective means that fewer resources are going into disadvantaged communities’

A key issue also raised by partners involves the possible conflicts between locally determined priorities and those in the RES:

Views Two Dales Partnership

‘Within the sparsely populated rural uplands of North Yorkshire it has never been fully accepted that the RES is appropriate. First in terms of individuals there is virtually full employment with the result that job creation is not a prime need. Second, the strategy for promoting new businesses fails to recognise the limited employment opportunities that can be created by new businesses because of the remoteness of the area.’

There was also concern expressed by partners that because of the necessarily economic focus of the RES, many RES initiatives may only address social inclusion in an incidental way. This makes it very difficult to plan inclusion benefits strategically.

Single Pot Funding

The Single Pot is considered by many to be a significant source of funding for regeneration activity in the region. This is despite the fact that the total resources available within the Single Pot are extremely small relative to the budgets of, for example, local authorities or Primary Care Trusts in the region. However, throughout this review, issues relating to the Single Pot were consistently raised as being a key area of concern for partners.

Positively, many partners indicated that the Single Pot process has created a much more strategic approach to funding activities which meet the region's economic development priorities and significantly moves away from ad hoc funding of one off, short term projects.

Views Business in the Community

'Yorkshire Forward has broken new ground as an RDA providing support to achieve change in social, economic and environmental objectives by leveraging business involvement. It looks extremely promising as a delivery mechanism'.

However, a number of key partners report that they still do not fully understand how they can participate in the regional and the sub-regional Action Planning process to access Single Pot. This was not just the message from very small local groups, but some larger groups with experience of delivering and supporting large-scale regional projects.

Community groups and local delivery agencies believe that the infrastructure at a sub-regional level is not accessible to them, and thus they lack an effective means of developing and submitting inclusion related projects to Yorkshire Forward. The issue of the timing of action planning rounds also presented a problem to local delivery partnerships.

Views The Churches Regional Commission for the Yorkshire and Humber

'At the moment there seems to be mixed messages about who can access the money (the Single Pot). It is good practice to contract with bodies with existing credibility, contacts and capacity, and where this happens we applaud it. However we are concerned that the regional approach may work against local partners'.

The panel found:

The delivery of initiatives to address the social inclusion issues within the region may be hampered by the difficulties of linking the aims of regional strategies with the actions in local community plans. Critical to this is the work of LSPs. Further work should be undertaken to build the links between local delivery partners and sub regional and the aims and objectives of regional strategies.

There needs to be further consideration as to how community and local groups access Single Pot funding. Part of this process needs to consider how the current funding regime will link with legacy programmes, particularly in terms of ensuring that the sustainability of existing successful and effective projects can be encouraged.

Part Two

Monitoring and Impact

Significant funding has been spent or committed over the last three years through SRB funding rounds and more recently the Single Pot. The strategic impact of the funding is reported in Progress in the Region whilst specific measures like jobs created, business started are reported at project level.

RES monitoring includes mapping progress against 'Tier 1 and Tier 2 targets' for the region. Tier 1 targets have to be achieved by 2010 and Tier 2 by 2005. For the RES objective 'connecting people to economic opportunity' the target is to halve the number of deprived wards in the most deprived 10% according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation.

Whilst regional progress against these high level targets is published annually, evidence suggests there has been little systematic feedback to the region specifically on the impact of economic interventions on inclusion.

There has also been little systematic feedback on the amount of funding which has been spent in the region's most deprived wards. Such information was not easily available and is certainly not routinely shared with partners in an effective way.

As has already been discussed in this report, only a limited number of projects are cited as good examples of how economic intervention has positively impacted upon social inclusion issues. Some partners felt that often these projects originated in Neighbourhood Renewal Strategies rather than in response to RES objectives. This is not a problem in itself insofar as it illustrates how local and regional activity can be complementary. However, it does suggest that there are limited examples of where a clear connection can be seen between specifically Yorkshire Forward led activity and positive inclusion outcomes. In addition, interviews with stakeholders suggest that it is unclear how learning from these 'flagship' projects has been systematically shared across the region, or how Yorkshire Forward has attempted to recreate these successes in other locations.

Review and Monitoring

The enquiry has found little substantial evidence that the region has considered what projects have been successful in the past and then shared the good practice in order to build on the characteristics of a successful project. Yorkshire Forward sees this replication of successes as part of its role.

Views Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

'We could also do more together to pilot "demonstration models" of new ways of working and learning from the best of regional and trans-national practice. The region has some outstanding thinkers and do-ers and we should showcase our achievements more.'

Yorkshire Forward are aware that many projects may not show improvements in the short term and will require measurement over the longer term to ascertain their real impact. They propose over time to use lifestyle data to gain a much clearer understanding of the impact of projects at local and individual level. The Panel welcomes this increased sophistication in terms of monitoring impact.

The enquiry identified a number of additional issues relating to the review and monitoring of social inclusion projects:

- Partners perceive that detailed measurement and monitoring are only undertaken at project level rather than at a regional level. This means that individual projects are not always clear about how the work that they are delivering is contributing to the wider strategy as contained in the RES.
- More work needs to be undertaken to aggregate findings to enable wider lessons to be learnt. The current monitoring arrangements may lead to 'goal displacement', where agencies seek to deliver outputs rather than working towards a broader vision. This can lead to a fragmentary approach across the region. More work needs to be done at a regional level to develop an agreed, common system for measuring progress made in addressing social inclusion issues.
- The inclusion of qualitative measurements of progress to stand alongside economic measurements is seen as crucial by a large number of partners in order to provide a more accurate picture of the impact projects can have.
- There are examples where regeneration outputs had been met by the project delivering support but the conditions and levels of deprivation in the community or estate has not improved. Again, this suggests the need for more sophistication in the way in which impact is assessed.

The panel found:

The information provided from the monitoring and review of social inclusion outcomes appears limited and only high-level progress is published regularly.

The region must be clear on the impact funding has had on the most disadvantaged communities in Yorkshire and Humber. More information is required for partners to understand the impact of the activity related to social inclusion.

Significant work needs to be undertaken before a project starts to be clear about the existing situation so that the impact of a project on the socially excluded groups or areas can be properly judged.

Regionally agreed indicators should be developed that demonstrate the way in which RES activities are meeting social inclusion objectives. Such indicators need to be incorporated within the commissioning and monitoring process of all projects funded by Yorkshire Forward - and communicated to all partners.

Further consideration should be given to the appropriateness of using economic indicators as a way of measuring improvements in social inclusion. The current deprivation measures used by the region are often out of date and are not always an accurate gauge of the issues at ward level. This is a particularly problem in rural areas.

A number of projects based in our region are currently using Quality of Life surveying as a way to understand how intervention affects the lives of people in a neighbourhood (e.g. Manor and Castle work in South Yorkshire and the Goodwin Centre in Hull). Yorkshire Forward may wish to consider how useful these approaches could be for other agencies in the region.

An improvement in sharing good practice on a regional and sub regional level would help partners understand better the characteristics of an effective project and what types of initiatives achieve successful impact.

The Panel recommend that Yorkshire Forward produce a regular list of all projects that receive Single Pot or other support. This should be a brief summary, widely circulated, showing:

- *Description of the project*
- *Amount of resource allocated*
- *Planned social inclusion benefits*
- *Contact name and number for project*

The Panel believe that this increased openness is essential to demonstrate to the region how public money is being used to deliver economic and social benefits to all groups the region.

Conclusion

This review has considered a wide range of issues relating to the way in which economic interventions can promote social inclusion. It has looked at where the vision for social inclusion is, and should be, coming from, the tangle of roles and responsibilities for this agenda, delivery and impact.

The Panel thank everyone who has been involved in this review - including interviewees, those submitting written evidence, those attending the public hearings and officers of the Assembly and Yorkshire Forward.

This is a report which we hope all partners will view as a helpful and constructive document which ultimately brings increased clarity and coherence to what is a very complex and confusing agenda. The Assembly looks forward to working with Yorkshire Forward, Government Office and other agencies to consider the findings of this report and to identify ways to address the issues raised.

Part Three

Action Plan in Response to the Scrutiny Enquiry 2 - The Impact of the Regional Economic Strategy on Social Inclusion June 2003

Recommendations	Actions	Timescale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a concern amongst partners that the region lacks a clear sense of vision setting out the way that all partners will work to tackle the social inclusion agenda. The region would benefit from the development of a clear shaped statement, which defines the key social inclusion priorities for Yorkshire & Humber. 	<p>The recently formed Social Inclusion Panel, convened by GOYH, is starting to discuss social inclusion within Yorkshire & Humber. Yorkshire Forward is represented at Director level on this panel and will propose that such a statement be developed by GOYH.</p>	<p>September 2003</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many partners remain concerned about the status of social inclusion within the RES, believing that its presence as a cross cutting-theme means that it is not central to RES activity. In the light of these concerns, Yorkshire Forward should undertake further work with partners to communicate why the RES has chosen to adopt a cross-cutting approach to social inclusion. In the longer term, Yorkshire Forward may wish to consider whether a cross-cutting approach is the most effective way in which the RES can tackle social inclusion issues. 	<p>Following the recent extensive consultation on the RES review in 2002, the Y&H Assembly endorsed the RES as the Region's strategy for the next 3 years. Within the 2002 review the questions were asked as to whether a cross cutting theme was the most effective way to incorporate social inclusion into the RES, and this approach was endorsed.</p> <p>The YH Assembly Quality of Life Commission to be the initial point of focus to communicate with partners the cross cutting - theme. To communicate through the Regional Action Planning and Sub Regional Action Planning process in prioritising key investments through Yorkshire Forward.</p>	<p>To be reviewed in 3 years time, within the full consultation of the RES.</p> <p>Regional and Sub Regional Action planning in the Autumn of 2003.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel fully endorses the rejection of 'trickle down' as an effective way of tackling social inclusion issues. However, as a region, we still have a limited understanding of the way in which economic activity can make a real and lasting impact on socially excluded communities. Yorkshire Forward has a clear lead role in helping the region to develop such understanding. 	<p>The evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget round 1, is soon to be completed. It will be written and produced in a form which will identify the social inclusion impacts on the life of communities and individuals. It will be an open and accessible publication.</p>	<p>The first report will be published in July 2003 and there will be further evaluation of SRB and other investments.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many organisations have unrealistic expectations about what the role and remit of Yorkshire Forward is in relation to social inclusion. Yorkshire Forward needs to review how they communicate their role in tackling social inclusion - particularly the smaller organisations which may not have an accurate view of what Yorkshire Forward is able to do. This communication also needs to ensure that learning from successful projects is shared across the region. 	<p>Current contracts with the Regional Forum for Voluntary & Community Organisations invests in active networks to increase participation in the social economic development and neighbourhood renewal through the Local Strategic Partnerships.</p> <p>Additional work with the Prince's Trust, Churches Regional Commission Business in the Community and Arts and Business are extensive, and work</p>	<p>To meet delivery partners identified in the RES, June 2003 to agree the roles and delivery against the RES.</p> <p>Current work started in 2003/03 to include voluntary and community groups in the delivery of Objectives within the RES.</p>

Recommendations	Actions	Timescale
	<p>on the ground with a wide range of community groups, demonstrates a wide range of investments in inclusion projects through 'connecting people to economic activity' still in the first year of delivery.</p> <p>There are deliverables in the RES, where these organisations are taking the lead role. - Objective 5 c) I) 'Promote community participation in regeneration.'</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The delivery of initiatives to address the social inclusion issues within the region may be hampered by the difficulty of linking the aims of regional strategies with the actions in local community plans. Critical to this is the work of LSP's. Further work should be undertaken to build the links between local delivery partners and sub regional and the aims and objectives of the regional strategies. 	<p>The key stakeholders in the sub regions are represented on the sub regional partnerships. The links with the LSP's and sub regional deliverers is an area we are seeking to strengthen through representation of Yorkshire Forward staff and board members now on each of the LSP's, across the region.</p>	<p>The LSP's will be a key delivery vehicle for the local social inclusion agenda and the links will be made with the priorities in the Corporate Plan and RES.</p> <p>The role of Yorkshire Forward representation on LSP's to be reviewed and consolidated in September 2003.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There needs to be further consideration as to how community and local groups access Single Pot funding. Part of this process needs to consider how the current funding regime will link with legacy programmes, particularly in terms of ensuring that the sustainability of existing successful and effective projects can be encouraged. 	<p>We are investing in projects/ initiatives, which have a proven successful track record, we will support them to greater sustainability through the Research Led Pilots project.</p> <p>The dissemination of best and effective practice are evident in the publications on Urban Renaissance and reports produced by a series of regeneration initiatives, plus through the emerging Centre for Excellence in regeneration.</p>	<p>The Centre of Excellence in regeneration/renaissance is in the second stage of development summer 2003/04. To address the linkage and sustainability.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regionally agreed indicators should be developed that demonstrate the way in which RES activities are meeting social inclusion objectives. Such indicators need to be incorporated within the commissioning and monitoring process of all projects funded through Yorkshire Forward - and communicated to all partners. These indicators should look at qualitative as well as quantitative data. 	<p>The Performance Management Framework is designed to identify all cross-cutting themes and their consideration and impact within project appraisal. We are the first and only RDA to invite external partners in to the appraisal of projects, the Y&H Assembly and the GOYH. The internal cross - cutting themes group evaluates the integration of the themes, where appropriate.</p> <p>GOYH and the Y&H Assembly lead on social inclusion through the Social Inclusion Panel and the Quality of Life Commission, we would propose that these bodies, with the involvement of external partners lead on the development of regional indicators.</p> <p>The 'Quality of Life' indicators in the recent Yorkshire Futures publication 'Co-ordinating Regional Monitoring Activities' will form the starting point for this work.</p>	<p>To start work on the regional revised sustainable development model for appraisal, September 2003.</p> <p>Impact of cross cutting themes on projects within the RES and benefits to target groups, to be monitored 2004.</p>

Appendix 1

Scrutiny Review - Terms of Reference

The Yorkshire and Humber Assembly Scrutiny review has considered the extent to which economic interventions have been successful in promoting social inclusion in Yorkshire and Humber.

This is a very complex area with a wide range of regional and national policy and a very diverse delivery structure across the region.

The review investigated social inclusion in two parts:

- **The first part considers how economic interventions can address social inclusion and identify the different organisations responsible for delivery**
- **The second part evaluates how successfully economic interventions have tackled inclusion over the past three years in the region.**

Part 1 - The Context

To find out if there is a common understanding between regional partners about how economic interventions can promote social inclusion and to identify respective responsibilities for funding and delivery

The Enquiry seeks to establish:

- If there is a common understanding about how economic intervention can promote social inclusion
- Identify the specific roles of key national, regional, sub regional and local delivery agencies
- Clarify the processes for accessing funding to tackle social inclusion issues through targeted economic interventions

Part 2 - The Impact

To evaluate how successful economic interventions identified in the RES have been in promoting social inclusion over the past three years.

The Enquiry seeks to:

- Examine whether the RES treatment of social inclusion as a cross cutting theme is the most effective way of encouraging delivery
- Consider whether inclusion is adequately addressed through main stream activities of delivery agencies
- Review the systems available to monitor and evaluate the impact of the RES initiatives in the most deprived wards and communities in the region
- Examine the tools and techniques available to ensure that the mainstream activities of delivery agencies address the wider inclusion agenda in the region.

Regional Learning and Added Value

The review also considers how successfully regional strategies that address different policy areas are being translated into effective joined up local action.

Evidence for both these areas of investigation will be gathered through face-to-face and telephone interviews with regional stakeholders and through written evidence collated as part of the scrutiny review.

Further evidence will be collected at the two Panel Hearings with regional stakeholders and Yorkshire Forward. This approach will give focus to the scrutiny review and give practical examples of policy in practice, which will greatly benefit regional learning and the added value gained from the regional scrutiny process.

Appendix 2

Interview Schedule

The following partners were interviewed as part of the research process:

Interviewee	Role & Organisation	Date of Interview
Helen Thomson	Head of Economic Inclusion, Yorkshire Forward	24/01/03 and 7/02/03
Don Stewart	Executive Director, Yorkshire Forward	24/01/03
Ian Keith	Area Development Manager, Yorkshire Forward (Hull Development Zone)	28/01/03
Isobel Mills	Director, People and Communities, GOYH	29/01/03
Mike Eggar	CEO Business Link Humber	24/01/03
Brian James	CEO Business Link South Yorkshire	24/01/03
Eddie Rogers	CEO Business Link West Yorkshire	24/01/03
Helen West	CEO Business Link York & North Yorkshire	22/01/03
Julian Cummins	Churches Regional Commission	27/01/03
Hilary Wilmer	Leeds Churches Institute	28/01/03
Gary Topp	Chief Executive, Yorkshire Cultural Consortium	22/01/03
Pam Lee	Regional Director BITC	28/01/03
David Smith	Director of Calderdale Forward	20/01/03
Sharmila Gandhi	Chief Executive, Bradford Vision	27/01/03
Janet Dean	Executive Director Doncaster MBC	27/01/03
Tessa Archibald	BME Regional Network	30/01/03
Jonathon French	North Yorkshire Partnership Unit	21/01/03
Alison Patey	Regional Public Health Team	24/01/03
Derek Ireland	Team Leader Connexions	29/01/03
Judy Robinson	Regional Forum	07/02/03
Alan Smith	Regeneration Policy Manager, Hull City Vision	27/01/03
Fergus Beesley	Chief Executive SCEDU	24/01/03
Hugh Rolo	Development Trusts Association	27/01/03
Deborah Fellowes	Social Inclusion Policy Manager, Hull City Council	27/01/03
Jane Walton	Director (Learning and Skills) Yorkshire Museum Council	29/01/03
Vin McCabe	Leeds Construction Training Agency	28/01/03
Zahid Ahmed	BME Regional Network	30/01/03

Appendix 3

Research Sources

Written evidence has been submitted from the following organisations:

- Barnsley Primary Care Trust
- Business in the Community
- Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
- Forestry Commission
- Government Office for Yorkshire and Humber
- Groundwork UK
- Hambleton and Richmondshire Social Services
- Hull City Council Regeneration Services
- Leeds City Council
- Leeds Metropolitan University
- Neighbourhood Resource Centre, Verdon Street, Sheffield
- North and North East Lincolnshire Primary Care Trust
- Regional Forum for Voluntary and Community Organisations
- Rotherham Borough Council
- Rotherham Local Strategic Partnership
- Scarborough Borough Council
- South Yorkshire Coalfield Partnership
- South Yorkshire Strategic Health Authority
- The Prince's Trust
- Two Dales Partnership
- University of Bradford
- West Yorkshire Strategic Health Authority and Workforce Confederation
- Yorkshire Arts
- Yorkshire Churches
- Yorkshire Cultural Consortium

Appendix 4

Participants

The scrutiny panel was selected from the 'approved list' of scrutineers established by the Assembly. Members of the 'approved list' had all completed scrutiny training.

The scrutiny panel were:

Cllr Dick Fordham

Member of the Assembly; North Lincolnshire Council (Deputising for Leader)

E. H. Joce

Member of the Assembly's Advanced Economy Commission; Parish Councillor, Executive Member and Treasurer, Yorkshire Rural Community Council

Maggie Jones

Member of the Assembly's Quality of Life Commission; Policy and Practice Development Manager, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Cllr Terry Sharman (Chair of the Panel)

Member of the Assembly; Deputy Leader, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (Deputising for Leader)

Liz Wright

Member of the Assembly's Quality of Life Commission; Regional Support Officer, Association of Colleges, Yorkshire and Humber

In carrying out their investigation the panel were supported by:

Rob Warm

Social Policy Manager, Yorkshire and Humber Assembly

Hannah Howe

Development Manager, Yorkshire and Humber Assembly

Nicola Plumstead

Policy Assistant

QED Consulting was commissioned as advisers to the panel and undertook research to support the enquiry including interviews with Yorkshire Forward and regional partners.

Regional Stakeholder Interviewees Attending Public Hearings

Meetings were held in public for regional stakeholders who were called to give evidence to the panel. These meetings were held on 12 February 2003. Individuals giving evidence to the panel were:

- Brigid Kane - South Yorkshire Strategic Health Authority
- Carol Massey - West Yorkshire Strategic Health Authority
- Richard Breese - Coalfields Regeneration Trust
- Judy Robinson - Regional Forum for Voluntary and Community Organisations
- Chris Peat - Leeds City Council
- Chris Tebbutt - Leeds City Council
- Jenny Pupius - Manor & Castle
- Hugh Rolo - Development Trusts Association
- Fergus Beesley - Sheffield Community Enterprise Development Unit
- Brian Lawrence - The Prince's Trust
- Barrie Schofield - Royds Community Association

Yorkshire Forward Interviewees at Public Hearing

A meeting was held in public between the scrutiny panel and a panel of Yorkshire Forward board members. This meeting took place on 20 February 2003. The Yorkshire Forward Panel comprised of:

Jeanne Coburn

Yorkshire Forward Board member with lead role on education.

Richard Gregory

Yorkshire Forward's Deputy Chairman with lead responsibility for scrutiny

Paul Jagger

Yorkshire Forward Board member with a lead role on improving the skills and training base in the region and a support role for the South Yorkshire sub-region.

Tom Riordan

Yorkshire Forward Executive Director of Strategy and Policy.

Don Stewart

Yorkshire Forward Executive Director of People.

Yorkshire and Humber Assembly
18 King Street
Wakefield
WF1 2SQ

Tel: 01924 331555
Fax: 01924 331559
e: mail@yhassembly.gov.uk
w: www.yhassembly.gov.uk