

# **Counting the Cost**

**Final Report  
August 2010**

**ODS Consulting  
in partnership with  
Fitzgerald Associates and Unify**

**2 Myrtle Park  
Glasgow  
G42 8UQ  
Tel: 0141 424 3765  
Email: [andrew.fyfe@odsconsulting.co.uk](mailto:andrew.fyfe@odsconsulting.co.uk)**



## Contents

Executive Summary .....	i
1. Introduction .....	1
1.1 About this report.....	1
1.2 About the Equality and Human Rights Commission.....	1
1.3 Research aims .....	2
1.4 Our methodology.....	2
1.5 Our research methods .....	4
2. The Context in 2007/08 and 2008/09.....	7
2.1 Introduction .....	7
2.2 The Public Sector Equality Duties .....	7
2.3 Local authority responsibilities .....	9
2.4 The context .....	10
2.5 Summary.....	14
3. Gender.....	15
3.1 Introduction .....	15
3.2 The Gender Equality Duty .....	15
3.3 Support to women’s organisations .....	15
3.4 Support for tackling violence against women .....	17
3.5 Approaches to supporting gender equality–change and development.	18
3.6 Involvement, consultation and decision making .....	20
3.7 Equality Impact Assessments .....	21
3.8 2009/10 onwards.....	21
3.9 Summary.....	26
3.10 Commentary.....	27
4. Race .....	28
4.1 Introduction .....	28
4.2 Race Equality Duty.....	28
4.3 Support to ethnic minority organisations .....	29
4.4 Support for migrant communities .....	32
4.5 Social work support for people from ethnic minorities .....	34
4.6 Approaches to supporting race equality–change and development.....	35
4.7 Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) .....	37
4.8 Involvement, consultation and decision making .....	38
4.9 2009/10 onwards.....	39
4.10 Summary.....	41
4.11 Commentary.....	42
5. Disability .....	44
5.1 Introduction .....	44
5.2 Disability Discrimination Act .....	44
5.3 Support to disability organisations.....	44
5.4 Support to advocacy services .....	47
5.5 Approaches to supporting disability equality–change and development	48
5.6 Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) .....	49
5.7 Involvement, consultation and decision making .....	50
5.8 2009/10 onwards.....	50
5.9 Summary.....	53
5.10 Commentary.....	54

6.	Looking Forward .....	55
6.1	Introduction .....	55
6.2	Financial pressures .....	55
6.3	Use of contracts and Service Level Agreements.....	55
6.4	Equality Act 2010 .....	56
7.	Key Findings and Recommendations .....	58
7.1	Notes of caution .....	58
7.2	Key findings.....	58
7.3	Recommendations .....	61

## Tables

Table 2.1	The public sector equalities duties – general duties .....	7
Table 2.2	The public sector equality duties – specific duties .....	8
Table 3.1	Financial support to women’s organisations (other than violence against women) 2007/08 and 2008/09.....	16
Table 3.2	Financial support to tackle violence against women 2007/08 and 2008/09.....	17
Table 3.3	Financial support to women’s organisations (other than violence against women) 2008/09 and 2009/10.....	22
Table 3.4	Financial support to tackle violence against women 2008/09 and 2009/10.....	22
Table 4.1	Financial support to ethnic minority organisations 2007/08 and 2008/09.....	29
Table 4.2	Financial support for services for migrant communities 2007/08 and 2008/09.....	33
Table 4.3	Financial support for social work services for people from ethnic minorities 2007/08 and 2008/09.....	34
Table 4.4	Financial support to ethnic minority organisations 2008/09 and 2009/10.....	39
Table 5.1	Financial support to disability organisations 2007/08 and 2008/09.....	45
Table 5.2	Type of disability (responses from 6 authorities.....	47
Table 5.3	Financial support to advocacy organisations 2007/08 and 2008/09.....	47
Table 5.4	Financial support to disability organisations 2008/09 and 2009/10.....	51

## Appendices

Appendix One: Discussion guide local authority staff

Appendix Two: Discussion guide voluntary organisations

## Executive Summary

---

### 1. Research aims

During 2007/08 and 2008/09, the landscape in which local authorities in Scotland operated was changing. The Concordat between the Scottish Government and COSLA set out a new relationship between central and local government, based on respect and joint working. There was a greater focus on outcomes and local authorities were given greater scope to decide how best to achieve these outcomes. In addition, the economic climate in the UK worsened significantly, with the global economic crisis leading to a recession in the UK in 2008/09.

The aim of this research is to provide an understanding of the role of the Public Sector Equalities Duties in local authority decision making in the years 2007/08 and 2008/09. The Equality and Human Rights Commission wished to find out how the changes in the context in which local authorities work impacted on activity to promote equality.

### 2. Methodology

The research considered three equality groups:

- ethnic minority people (in relation to the Race Equality Duty);
- disabled people (in relation to the Disability Equality Duty); and
- women, particularly those who have been victims of violence or abuse (in relation to the Gender Duty).

The research involved every local authority in Scotland. We looked at two of the duties in the four largest cities and one duty in the other local authorities. This allowed us to research each of the duties in 12 different local authorities.

To focus our work, we looked at specific themes:

- **Gender Equality Duty** – funding for women’s organisations **and** support for women experiencing violence or abuse.
- **Disability Equality Duty** – funding for organisations supporting disabled people **and** advocacy services for disabled people.
- **Race Equality Duty** – Funding for organisations supporting ethnic minority people **and either** Social Work Services (including relevant ‘Section 10’ grant funding for ethnic minority groups) **or** services for migrant workers, depending on which appeared to have greater priority in the local authority’s Race Equality Scheme.

This allowed us to explore changes in:

- dedicated funding programmes – those funding streams targeted specifically at equality activity;
- more general funding programmes – including specific funds like the Fairer Scotland Fund and ‘mainstream’ departmental core budgets – like Social Work and Housing; and
- funding which was provided by the local authorities to external organisations, as well as funding for services delivered in-house by the local authorities.

We do not believe that had we looked at other themes or different areas that we would have come to different conclusions.

We followed a five stage methodology:

- We made initial contact with the race, disability or gender equality officer (or equivalent) in each local authority. This key contact identified the range of people that would need to be involved in the research.
- We gathered information about the level of funding; the funding streams used; and the decision making process (including Committee papers and minutes; plans and strategies and Equality Impact Assessments).
- We interviewed officers in each local authority – a total of 88 officers were involved. Almost all interviews were undertaken (as planned) over the phone. However, in two of the larger local authorities we met face to face with a group of staff involved in decision making.
- We consulted with relevant equality focused voluntary organisations to understand their perspective on funding; mainstream service delivery; and views on future pressures and opportunities.
- We analysed all of the information gathered; identified the main findings; and considered recommendations.

### 3. Gender – Summary

- All 12 local authorities provided financial support to tackle violence against women. The total level of support increased by 2.1% between 2007/08 and 2008/09, and by 3.3% between 2008/09 and 2009/10.
- Four of the 12 local authorities provided financial support to women's organisations not involved directly in violence against women. In two cases there were substantial grants to organisations providing services and meeting places specifically for women. In other cases the sums involved were small. The level of support increased by 7.8% between 2007/08 and 2008/09, but decreased by 0.5% in 2008/09 and 2009/10.
- The gradual removal of some ring fenced funding (in 2008 and then 2010) does not appear to have yet had a significant impact on funding levels. In some cases it has led to changes in the way services are delivered.
- Local authorities believed that they would see more significant changes as a result of reduced ring fencing and increased financial pressures in 2011/12.
- Although most local authorities discussed their plans with the voluntary organisations that they funded, there was no evidence of wider consultation with victims of domestic abuse, women, or other women's organisations.
- There was no evidence that Equality Impact Assessments had been carried out in relation to decisions about services to address violence against women or support to women's organisations.

- Since 2007/08 there has been a shift towards increased use of Service Level Agreements and contracts. This is bringing about positive and negative changes. It can result in enhanced stability with longer term agreements. But there is some concern from voluntary organisations about the focus on funding based on the number of people using the service, rather than the quality of the outcomes achieved.

#### 4. Race – Summary

- Between 2007/08 and 2008/09, there was a £535,090 (11.5%) decrease in funding for ethnic minority organisations across the 12 local authorities studied. This reduction was accounted for by a significant reduction in one city authority.
- Patterns within each authority were very different. Funding decreased in five authorities, increased in four and remained broadly the same in three. Small fluctuations in funding levels were often due to lower or higher demand for one off grants.
- The level of funding to support migrant communities increased substantially by £51,806 (75%) between 2007/08 and 2008/09. However, in three of the six local authorities considered, all support was ad hoc, in kind and unquantifiable.
- Social work financial support for services for ethnic minority people decreased by £8,500 (1.2%) over the two years. This was largely due to efficiency savings at one large local authority and a shift from grants to contracts.
- In smaller authorities, resource decisions were largely made on an ad hoc basis with limited strategic planning or monitoring. However, some city local authorities had taken a strategic approach to understanding needs and demographics and allocating resources accordingly.
- Authorities were often working to balance the need for mainstream and targeted services for ethnic minority people, recognising the need for both in different circumstances. Consultation and evaluation helped two city authorities decide whether mainstream or targeted services were most appropriate, but decisions could be controversial.
- Some local authorities had clear consultation and involvement structures and processes, particularly social work services. In smaller areas consultation tended to be more ad hoc.
- Funding for ethnic minority organisations again decreased in 2009/10, by £28,566 (7.6%). There was concern about impending budget cuts. Equality Impact Assessments were used in some instances, generally by

the city authorities, and some other local authorities seemed well aware of the need to assess the impact of cuts on equality groups.

## 5. Disability – Summary

- Between 2007/08 and 2008/09, local authority funding to disability organisations increased slightly (by 2%). In two of the 12 authorities considered funding levels increased significantly, by around one quarter.
- Very few local authorities had dedicated disability equality budgets. Funding for disability organisations was mainly from general grant funds or mainstream budgets. Most funding (around 50%) went to supporting people with learning disabilities.
- Funding specifically for advocacy for disabled people increased by 4.6% between 2007/08 and 2008/09. Funding remained the same or increased in all but one local authority.
- In some cases, local authorities had increased the amount of funding for advocacy projects in response to high demand, or to enhance the service provided to particular groups.
- Local authorities often shared responsibility for decision making about support to disability organisations, and particularly advocacy, with other organisations, for example health boards.
- Overall, local authorities did not feel that the Concordat; the removal of ring fencing and the introduction of the Single Outcome Agreements made a significant difference to funding during 2007/08 and 2008/09.
- Funding levels were influenced by a shift to contracts and Service Level Agreements rather than grants; national Scottish Government priorities and statutory duties; and local priorities, needs and demographics.
- Local authorities were not routinely undertaking Equality Impact Assessments in 2007/08 and 2008/09, stating that this was because there was no significant change in funding levels. Some EIAs were undertaken in relation to service redesign, and one local authority did EIAs at a more detailed, operational level.
- Although many local authorities had consultation and involvement structures in place, disabled people were not generally consulted or involved in funding decisions.
- Based on the information available, funding for disability organisations decreased by 4% from 2008/09 to 2009/10. Many local authorities mentioned that this was due to efficiency savings, resulting in funding cuts for funded organisations.

- Most local authorities anticipated further budget pressures resulting in reduced funding for equality groups from 2010/11 onwards.

## 6. Looking Forward

This research looked specifically at the years 2007/08 and 2008/09. But the lessons learned from this period are extremely important in relation to tackling inequality in Scotland in the future.

In the coming years the financial pressures on local authorities will intensify substantially. And the current equality duties will broaden with the new Public Sector Equality Duty introduced by the Equality Act 2010.

### Financial pressures

It is clear that the financial pressures on local authorities are going to intensify from 2011. The recent UK Budget set out plans to reduce the scale of the public sector. It is suggested that this will mean a reduction of up to 25% in expenditure in the public sector over three years in the UK.

We found that, in many authorities, decisions about equality expenditure were not underpinned by Equality Impact Assessment or by a set of planned objectives and desired outcomes. In the resource climate for local government over the next three years, there must be a concern that robust evidence of the impact of change is often not available. This will make decision making very difficult indeed.

### Equality Act 2010

The Equality Act 2010 introduces a new public sector duty bringing together the current duties relating to gender, race and disability, while also extending coverage to sexual orientation, age and religion or belief.

Scottish Ministers are developing new specific duties for Scottish public authorities to help them meet the general duty. The key aims of the new duties are for them to be more outcomes-focused, and less prescriptive, so that equality work is more mainstreamed into the core business of public authorities.

On the basis of our research, we believe that it is important that the new specific duties set out clear measurable requirements of public authorities. The legislation which puts race, disability and gender equality duties on public bodies has been in place for several years (in the case of race the legislation has been in place since 2000 and the guidance since 2002). Despite this, most of the local authorities that we spoke to as part of our research were not carrying out the assessments (or consultation and involvement) in the themes that we examined that would be necessary to make sure that they were meeting their existing duties.



## 7. Key findings

### Local authorities and the public sector equality duties

- Overall our research found that while local authorities allocated resources to meet the needs of women; ethnic minority people and disabled people, this allocation process was in the large majority of authorities not informed by Equality Impact Assessment or by a set of planned objectives and desired outcomes.
- Most local authorities stated that expenditure on equality for the period 2007/08 and 2008/09 had not been changed. Therefore, they did not undertake EIAs to assess potential differential impact.
- However, we believe that a further contributing factor is that budget development and allocation is not clearly linked to policymaking and delivery. Nor, in most cases, is it linked to local authorities' own Equality Schemes. As a result, there is no evidence that previous or existing expenditure is delivering equality outcomes that tie to any policy or strategy objective.
- We found that (in the areas we were examining) there is no clear process within most local authorities for assessing the relative (and changing) priorities and needs among equality groups and that in most authorities there was no baseline information.
- Budgets often appeared to be decided on the basis of previous expenditure rather than an analysis of current or future need – or the identification of desired outcomes.
- There appears to be some confusion in local authorities between funding equality organisations, funding equality outcomes or funding particular services (that may or may not be equality driven) that happen to be delivered to an equality group.
- There was no evidence that there had been a general reduction in the budgets we were examining between 2007/08 and 2008/09. Equally, there was no consistent evidence of deliberate policy-driven increases although most budgets had shown some uplift for inflation.
- We found that in many local authorities, departmental budgets are not aggregated to provide evidence of spending in response to meeting the needs of equality groups. The result is that they do not have an easy way of knowing how much they are spending in this area – nor the overall outcomes that are being achieved.
- Many local authorities said that they were increasingly moving towards a 'mainstreamed' approach to service provision but they appeared to have little evidence against which to assess the impact, effectiveness or cost implications of such an approach.

- We found very few examples of the consultation or involvement of people from equalities groups in discussing policies or resource decisions.

### Expenditure trends

- There was no systematic evidence that the resources identified by local authorities to meet the needs of equality groups had been affected (either positively or adversely) by the Concordat, the end of ring fencing, or the overall availability of public resources between 2007/08 and 2008/09.
- Total expenditure grew from £91.9 million to £93.1 million – an increase of 1.3%.
- There had been larger changes in a number of areas (some upwards and some downwards). We were usually able to understand **what** had changed – but not **why** the change had occurred – or indeed whether it was the right change for the local need and context.
- There was a high level of awareness that there would be intense pressure on all budgets from April 2011.

### Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

- One of the reasons that we could not assess changes is that, in almost every case, no Equality Impact Assessment had been carried out. Three of the larger cities and two other councils had carried out relevant EIAs in 2007/08 and 2008/09. Twenty-seven authorities had not carried out an EIA that was relevant for our work. We would have expected that EIAs would have been used in many more cases. There were a number of reasons given for not carrying out EIAs – some of which do not stand up well to scrutiny:
  - a number of authorities said that since policies (and, usually, resources) were not changing, there was no requirement;
  - others said that since funding levels were remaining broadly the same, there was no requirement – EIAs tend to be undertaken where significant funding cuts are planned, or major new services introduced;
  - others felt that they would not carry out an EIA for relatively small parts of their work (*'it would be impractical to 'micro assess everything we do'*); and
  - others (particularly those outside the largest cities) said that the use of EIAs was not systematically built into the working practices of the authority in 2007/08 and 2008/09.
- Another reason we believe was that the desired outcomes were not clear – with budget focused planning rather than outcomes focused planning the norm.

### Financial decision-making

- Monitoring arrangements within local authorities do not provide the equality data necessary to inform decisions about spending. As indicated, departmental budgets are not aggregated within local authorities to provide

evidence of spending in response to meeting the needs of particular equality groups.

- Where equality monitoring (of service provision or users of either specialised or mainstreamed services) is carried out there is no evidence that the data from this is then analysed to tailor or amend the service or to inform broader planning.
- Because of the lack of basic information; the fact that EIAs were rarely undertaken; and the disconnection between policy, funding and outcomes, the decision making process is not as transparent as it should be. This, in turn, means that there is a question about accountability. The lack of basic information makes it more difficult to justify change – and may lead to the continuation of services through inertia.

## 8. Recommendations

### Starting with strategic clarity

- The Scottish Government and local authorities need to make sure that national, regional and local equalities strategies are aligned. Strategies need to be constantly informed and updated through analysis of changing needs and patterns. The policy initiatives which would flow from such clear strategies should be more focused with:
  - defined objectives;
  - a clear understanding of intended outcomes; and
  - a robust measurement framework.
- Local authorities should be clearer about the relationship between targeted and mainstream services. Where mainstreaming is a corporate objective, the necessary mechanisms need to be in place to ensure services are being equally accessed and delivering equal benefit. Where bespoke services remain strategically important, these should be regularly assessed:
  - to consider their cost and benefit;
  - to ensure the continued quality and relevance of the service; and
  - to deliver long term sustainability in the light of overarching integration objectives.
- Local authorities should adopt a more planned approach to delivering specific and prioritised equality outcomes – and this should replace the often ad-hoc activities and investments observed through this research.
- Local authorities need to help develop the skills of equality organisations in relation to outcomes focused planning and monitoring if these organisations are increasingly expected to deliver services according to a commissioning based model.

### **Equality budget analysis**

- The Equality and Human Rights Commission should work with local authorities to make sure that equality budget analysis is embedded in the work of authorities. This would involve building equality considerations into budgetary allocations by local authorities at strategic and at programme level. It would mean looking at mainstream financial decisions as well as dedicated and departmental budgets.
- Adopting an equality sensitive approach in drawing up budgets by local authorities involves assessing all spending allocations with specific reference to policy outcomes. This requires transparent financial processes and a structured relationship between policy and finance personnel. This connection will assist in making the link between policy priorities, resource allocation and targeted outcomes. It will also provide local authorities with evidence of compliance with equality legislation and it will support financial and policy accountability.

### **Improved monitoring**

- The Scottish Government and local authorities should routinely collect and analyse equality monitoring data to inform service changes and allow impact to be assessed.
- The Equality and Human Rights Commission should further promote the use of their Equality Impact Assessment Guidance – as it is clear that many local authorities have not embedded equality assessment into policy making and review; financial decision making and resource allocation.

### **Introducing the new Public Sector Equality Duty**

- The Scottish Government should reflect the lessons learned from this research in preparing the guidance for the new Public Sector Equality Duty. The current duties are not always being met by local authorities. We suggest that the new specific duties should require:
  - explicit recognition of the relationship between strategy and policy development and specific equality needs and objectives;
  - clear equality outcomes for the policies and resources;
  - evaluation of policies and programmes to determine the most effective approaches;
  - the routine inclusion of mainstream services within the assessment process;
  - gathering relevant evidence relating to the different equalities groups and analysing this to inform service provision;
  - Equality Impact Assessments to be undertaken whenever a change in policy or a significant reduction (or increase) in funding is planned;
  - clear links between policy priorities and budgetary choices; and
  - a corporate responsibility to demonstrate that the duties are being met.

### **Future research**

- The Equality and Human Right Commission should adapt the methodology used in this baseline research (in the light of experience) and undertake further similar and comparable research in two years time. This would allow assessment of the impact in Scotland of the Integrated Equality Duty. In addition, it would provide information about the impact of significant reductions in public expenditure on the achievement of equality in Scotland.

## 1. Introduction

---

### 1.1 About this report

During 2007/08 and 2008/09, the landscape in which local authorities in Scotland operated was changing. Two key shifts took place:

- **Changing relationship with central government** - In November 2007, the Scottish Government and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) signed an agreement which set out the new relationship between the Scottish Government and local government. This set out a new way of working, based on respect and joint working. The new relationship was based on a greater focus on outcomes. It also gave local authorities more scope to decide how to achieve these outcomes – with less ‘ring-fencing’ of local authority budgets by central government.
- **Economic climate** - In mid 2007, it became clear that the UK – along with many other countries across the world - was facing an economic slowdown. Throughout 2008, many banks and private companies faced severe financial difficulties due to a global economic crisis. The UK officially entered a recession (with two consecutive quarters of negative economic growth) in January 2009.

This report explores the decisions that local authorities in Scotland made during 2007/08 and 2008/09 about funding for services to support:

- ethnic minority people;
- disabled people; and
- women.

It is a retrospective analysis of the extent to which local authorities took account of their public sector duties in relation to race, disability and gender when making funding decisions.

The Equality and Human Rights Commission appointed ODS Consulting, working in partnership with Fitzgerald Associates and Unify to undertake this research in 2010.

### 1.2 About the Equality and Human Rights Commission

The Equality and Human Rights Commission (the Commission) was set up to protect, enforce and promote equality across seven areas – disability, gender, race, age, religion and belief, sexual orientation and gender reassignment – and human rights. It replaced three separate commissions – the Equal Opportunities Commission, the Commission for Racial Equality and the Disability Rights Commission.

Since October 2007, the Commission has, among a wide range of other roles, been responsible for assessing how effectively public bodies are meeting their duties in relation to equality. In 2007/08 and 2008/09, the timeframe for this research, local

authorities had general and specific statutory duties in relation to race, disability and gender equality. More information on these duties is provided in Chapter Two.

### 1.3 Research aims

The aim of this research is to provide an understanding of the role of the Public Sector Equality Duties in local authority decision making.

The Commission wished to undertake this research due to the significant changes in the context in which Scottish local authorities work. It wanted to learn about the impact of these changes on activity to promote equality, and to gather evidence about decision making on funding for equality issues.

The research provides an overview of:

- the levels of local authority expenditure on a sample of services in 2007/08 and 2008/09;
- the changes in funding for equality activities in these sampled services;
- the extent to which there was a clear rationale for expenditure in terms of policy, needs analysis and desired outcomes;
- the issues putting pressure on the level of resources – and those providing opportunities to increase resources;
- the extent to which funding decisions were informed by Equality Impact Assessments (EIA);
- the accountability and transparency of the decision making process; and
- the extent to which there was a coherence between policy and budget decisions.

The research does not focus on the merits of particular decisions. Instead it explores the decision making process – particularly in light of the public sector equality duties in relation to race, disability and gender. Clarity and transparency in financial decision making processes are critical for local authorities if they are to demonstrate that they are meeting the requirements of the public sector equality duties.

### 1.4 Our methodology

#### Defining the scope and focus of the work

We wanted to look at a number of areas of the work of local authorities that would give us a good insight into the role of the Public Sector Equality Duties in local authority decision making.

The brief specified that the research should focus on:

- ethnic minority people (in relation to the Race Equality Duty);
- disabled people (in relation to the Disability Equality Duty); and
- women, particularly those who have been victims of violence or abuse (in relation to the Gender Duty).

The Commission set out which duty should be investigated in each local authority. In 28 of the authorities we were to investigate one of the duties. In the four largest

cities<sup>1</sup> we were to investigate two of the duties. As a result we were able to research each of the duties in 12 different local authorities.

### **Focusing on a particular theme within each equality duty**

It would be impractical to analyse the impact of every decision taken by each local authority during 2007/08 and 2008/09, in relation to race, disability or gender. So we identified a number of services or themes that would demonstrate the approaches undertaken by local authorities.

To help us identify appropriate themes for our research, we analysed the relevant Race, Gender, Disability or Single Equality Scheme<sup>2</sup> in place in 2007/08, for each local authority. From this we were able to identify key themes that were commonly included by local authorities in their equality schemes.

Following discussions with the Commission, it was agreed we would examine:

- **Gender Equality Duty** – funding for women’s organisations **and** support for women experiencing violence or abuse.
- **Disability Equality Duty** – funding for organisations supporting disabled people **and** advocacy services for disabled people.
- **Race Equality Duty** – Funding for organisations supporting ethnic minority people **and either** Social Work Services (including relevant ‘Section 10’ grant funding<sup>3</sup> for ethnic minority groups) **or** services for migrant communities, depending on which appeared to have greater priority in the local authority’s Race Equality Scheme.

This allowed us to explore changes in:

- dedicated funding programmes – those funding streams targeted specifically at equality activity;
- more general funding programmes – including specific funds like the Fairer Scotland Fund and ‘mainstream’ departmental core budgets – like Social Work and Housing; and
- funding which was provided by the local authorities to external organisations, as well as funding for services delivered in-house by the local authorities.

We were able to explore the use of Equality Impact Assessment and consultation with equality organisations in a range of different services - and to assess the extent to which this was used to inform resource allocation.

We believe that the range of services considered – and the fact that we were able to gather information on these across Scotland – provides a reliable basis for this research. The responses that we received suggest to us that the main findings would not have been markedly different had we selected a different group of services to examine.

---

<sup>1</sup> Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Dundee

<sup>2</sup> Every public authority is required to prepare a Race Equality Scheme, a Disability Equality Scheme and a Gender Equality Scheme. Some authorities bring these together in a Single Equality Scheme. The Schemes set out how the authority will meet its obligations under equality legislation.

<sup>3</sup> Local authorities are empowered under the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968 to make grants of payments to voluntary organisations whose sole or primary purpose is to promote social welfare.



## 1.5 Our research methods

Once the scope and focus of the research had been defined, we followed a five stage methodology:

### Stage One: Making contact

Following an introductory letter from the Commission to the Chief Executive of each local authority, we made initial contact with the race, disability or gender equality officer (or equivalent) in each local authority area. We explained the purpose of the research and the information required. The key contact also identified the range of other people that we would require to speak with to gather information and views.

### Stage Two: Gathering information

We gathered information about:

- the funding streams used within each of the areas being explored;
- the level of funding dedicated to services for ethnic minority people, for disabled people or for women; and
- the decision making process – including relevant Committee papers and minutes; plans and strategies; and Equality Impact Assessments.

In a number of authorities, the information provided was relevant and good quality. But in most cases staff told us that there were difficulties in gathering the information. Some of the reasons staff gave to us for this were:

- often information gathering and recording systems had changed or staff had moved on;
- much activity was ad-hoc, with decisions made on a project by project basis – rather than as part of a wider strategy; and
- in many cases no single member of staff had an overview of the activities that were funded under any one theme.

We also found very few authorities where any Equality Impact Assessment had been carried out in the services and themes we were examining. Relevant EIAs had been carried out in five of the 32 councils between 2007/08 and 2008/09. We had access to a total of 14 relevant EIAs – ten of these had been carried out in three of the larger city authorities.

In a minority of local authorities, staff dedicated significant time to collating the information required, and took clear responsibility for providing this for the whole local authority. However, in most cases there was no senior leadership or overarching responsibility for providing consolidated financial information about expenditure on equality under different policies. This meant that often we had to piece together information from a range of different sources. As a result, the information that we have gathered had generally not previously been considered ‘in the round’ by the relevant local authority.

Each local authority provided slightly different financial information in response to our requests. We focused on ensuring that each local authority provided information that would allow comparison of their funding levels between 2007/08 and 2008/09. This means that comparisons between 2007/08 and 2008/09 for each individual local

authority are robust. However, it is important to note that comparing funding levels between local authorities would not be appropriate – given that each local authority provided different information and that each defined services for women, ethnic minority people and disabled people in slightly different ways. And, of course, local authority expenditures will have been shaped by local priorities and practices.

We had agreed with the Commission that there was a strong rationale for working with local authorities on a voluntary basis wherever possible. This provided a positive basis for constructive engagement between local authorities and the Commission. It also complies with good practice in research ethics which recommends that participation in research should be voluntary.<sup>4</sup>

All but one local authority (Argyll and Bute) co-operated and provided relevant information for both 2007/08 and 2008/09.

### **Stage Three: Consultation within local authorities**

We held telephone interviews with local authority staff across Scotland. This involved a wide range of consultees, including:

- equality officers; and
- representatives from relevant local authority departments.

We spoke with a total of 88 people. Almost all interviews were undertaken (as planned) over the phone. However, in two of the larger local authorities we met face to face with a group of staff involved in decision making.

We used a discussion guide in these interviews. This was agreed in advance with the Commission. It was adapted in each area to take account of the information received and key areas of exploration. We explored issues around:

- funding – streams used, levels and change between 2007/08 and 2008/09;
- the decision making process – including Equality Impact Assessments;
- involvement and consultation of people from equality groups; and
- key changes since 2008/09 and views on the future.

An example from the suite of discussion guides is included as Appendix One.

### **Stage Four: Consultation with voluntary organisations**

We aimed to hold a telephone interview with one relevant equality-focused voluntary organisation in each area. We spoke with a total of 33 people (from 27 different local authority areas). We explored:

- trends in funding received from the local authority;
- views on changes in mainstream service delivery for ethnic minority people, disabled people or women; and
- views on future pressures and opportunities.

An example from the suite of discussion guides used is included as Appendix Two.

---

<sup>4</sup> For example The Code of Practice issued by the Market Research Society (April 2010) states “Researchers shall ensure that participation in their activities is based on voluntary informed consent”.

**Stage Five: Analysing and reporting**

The final stage involved analysing all of the information gathered. We reviewed the quantitative and qualitative information we had gathered under each of the themes; identified the key findings; and considered recommendations.

## 2. The Context in 2007/08 and 2008/09

### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out the context in which local authorities were operating in 2007/08 and 2008/09. It includes exploration of the public sector equality duties and how compliance with these duties is monitored. It sets out local authority responsibilities in relation to the areas on which this research focuses.

### 2.2 The Public Sector Equality Duties

During the period covered by this research, local authorities had specific duties in relation to race, disability and gender equality. The duties are set out in:

- the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000;
- the Disability Discrimination Act 2005; and
- the Equality Act 2006.

The three duties are known as the public sector equality duties. They are statutory duties, meaning that they are legally enforceable. All public bodies that are subject to the duties – which includes all local authorities - are legally obliged to pay 'due regard' to the need to take action on race, disability and gender equality.

<b>Race: General Duties</b>	<b>Disability: General Duties</b>	<b>Gender: General Duties</b>
Eliminate unlawful discrimination	Eliminate unlawful discrimination	Eliminate unlawful discrimination and harassment
Promote equality of opportunity	Promote equality of opportunity	Promote equality of opportunity
Promote good relations	Promote positive attitudes	
	Eliminate harassment	
	Take account of disabilities	
	Encourage disabled people's participation in public life	
Introduced by the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000	Introduced by the Disability Discrimination Act 2005	Introduced by the Equality Act 2006

In addition, local authorities are subject to specific duties. These set out the steps that an organisation needs to take to help it to meet these general duties.

**Table 2.2 The Public Sector Equality Duties – specific duties**

<b>Race: Specific Duties</b>	<b>Disability: Specific Duties</b>	<b>Gender: Specific Duties</b>
Publish a race equality scheme	Publish a disability equality scheme	Publish a gender equality scheme
Assess and consult on the likely impact of proposed policies	Involve disabled people in developing the scheme	Consult employees, service users and others
Publish the results of impact assessments, consultation and monitoring	Include methods for undertaking impact assessments	Assess the impact of current and future policies and practices
Review relevant functions/ policies at least every three years	Review and revise the equality scheme every three years	Review and revise the scheme every three years
	Include arrangements for gathering and using information on the effect of policies and practices	Include arrangements for gathering and using information on gender equality in employment, services and functions
	Develop and implement an action plan	Formulate gender equality objectives and ensure implementation of these
	Report annually on progress	Report annually on progress
Make sure the public have access to information and services		
Train staff on both the general and specific duties		

Both the general and specific duties are worded differently for each equality group, but are the same in spirit and intention across all three duties. Overall, the Commission recommends<sup>5</sup> that public bodies should take five steps to comply with their public sector duties:

- gather information on how your work affects different racial groups, disabled people and men and women, including transsexual men and women;
- consult employees, service users, trade unions and other stakeholders, and involve disabled people;
- assess the impact of your policies and practices;
- in the light of this evidence decide what your priorities for taking action should be; and

<sup>5</sup> Public Sector Equality Duties, Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2009

- take the action that will deliver the best outcomes in race, disability and gender equality.

The Commission has also produced guidance how these duties should relate to financial decisions<sup>6</sup>. This was published in March 2009, after the time that was the focus of our work. It makes absolutely clear the requirement for public authorities to meet their public sector equality duties, including undertaking EIAs:

To ensure that they have complied with the equality duties, and to ensure that any decision made does not unfairly discriminate, public authorities should carry out robust equality impact assessments and consult and involve relevant stakeholders as part of the decision making process.

It is important that public authorities can also show that there is an effective link between policy and resource allocation.

### 2.3 Local authority responsibilities

This study focuses not only on funding for equality activities, but also places a specific focus on:

- advocacy for disabled people;
- support for women experiencing violence or abuse;
- social work support for ethnic minority people; and
- support for migrant communities.

Local authorities have specific legal responsibilities in relation to advocacy for disabled people. They have a statutory duty to ensure that independent advocacy services are available for people with a mental health difficulty, dementia, learning disability, autism, brain injury or personality disorder. This right was introduced by the Mental Health (Care and Treatment) (Scotland) Act 2003, and came into effect in October 2005. Local authorities and Health Boards must work together to ensure that services are available, free of charge.

While authorities were not under a specific statutory duty to provide the other services we examined, they were selected because they are seen as central to the promotion of equality. The Scottish Government clearly states that tackling violence against women is essential in meeting the Gender Equality Duty<sup>7</sup>. The Scottish Ministers have also identified tackling violence against women as a priority area for gender equality in Scotland<sup>8</sup>. And many of the Equality Schemes published by local authorities recognised that social work services and support for migrant workers are important elements in meeting the Race Equality Duty.

<sup>6</sup> Public Sector Equality Duties and Financial Decisions, EHRC, 2009

<sup>7</sup> Safer Lives: Changed Lives, Scottish Government, June 2009

<sup>8</sup> The Gender Equality Duty in Scotland required Scottish Ministers to set out priority areas for equality of opportunity between women and men. In June 2009, Scottish Ministers agreed that tackling violence against women was one of two priority areas.

## 2.4 The context

During 2007/08 and 2008/09, the landscape in which local authorities in Scotland operated was changing. A number of key shifts took place.

### Changing relationship with central government

In November 2007, the Scottish Government and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) signed an agreement which set out the new relationship between the Scottish Government and local government. This set out a new way of working, based on respect and joint working.

The Concordat<sup>9</sup> set out:

- commitments from the Scottish Government to local authorities – including overall level of funding and arrangements for measuring and reporting on performance;
- commitments to allow local authorities more flexibility in their use of funding, including the removal of ‘ring fenced funding’ – funding intended for a specific purpose – in most cases; and
- commitments from local authorities – including freezing council tax levels and a range of other commitments.

### Overall level of funding

The Concordat sets out the funding to be provided to local government from 2008/09 to 2010/11. This study therefore covers funding decisions made by local authorities in the year before the Concordat was introduced (2007/08) and the first year of its operation (2008/09).

The overall level of funding from the Scottish Government to local authorities in 2007/08 was £10.6billion. In 2008/09 this increased to £11.1billion. There was agreement that local authorities would maintain council tax levels at the same rate as 2007/08. Including council tax and other local income, the overall level of funding increased from £16.6billion to £17.3billion. This is an increase of approximately four per cent.

The Concordat set out a programme of planned increases in overall funding levels, from £11.1billion in 2008/09 to £12 billion in 2010/11. This is also an increase of approximately four per cent per year.

### Removal of ring fencing

In 2007/08, £2.7billion of grant funding provided by the Scottish Government was ring fenced – intended to be used only for a specific purpose<sup>10</sup>. The Concordat set out the Scottish Government’s commitment to reducing the amount of funding which was ring fenced for a specific purpose. This would give local authorities more flexibility in deciding how to use their resources. By 2008/09, only £0.5billion was ring fenced, plus a further £0.56billion in Police Grant (which the Scottish Government and local authorities have agreed will remain ring fenced). The

<sup>9</sup> Concordat between Scottish Government and local government, November 2007  
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2007/11/13092240/concordat>

<sup>10</sup> This included 59 separate funding streams.

intention was to reduce ring fencing to £0.3billion (excluding Police Grant) by 2010/11.

A total of 43 previously ring fenced funding streams were rolled up into the general settlement to each local authority in 2008/09. These included funds targeted specifically at equality groups, such as:

- Children's Services – Women's Aid Fund (although this applied only to four projects where Women's Aid was not in a position to continue to deliver services and these resources were allocated to councils. The Fund has continued to support more than 40 Women's Aid projects between 2008 and 2011);
- Violence Against Women Fund (although this applied to 26 projects out of the total of 87 that were funded. The fund has continued to support a significant number of Violence Against Women projects between 2008 and 2011);
- Mental Health Specific Grant; and
- Supporting People.

A total of 16 funding streams remained ring fenced in 2008/09 - seven of these were brought together in the Fairer Scotland Fund:

- Community Regeneration Fund;
- Community Voices Fund;
- Working for Families;
- Workforce Plus;
- More Choices More Chances;
- Financial Inclusion; and
- Changing Children's Services Fund.

The Fairer Scotland Fund was ring fenced until March 2010. The fund was intended to tackle disadvantage, with the priorities of regenerating disadvantaged communities, tackling poverty, and overcoming barriers to employment. It was allocated to Community Planning Partnerships<sup>11</sup>, which were responsible for deciding how the fund was used at a local level.

### **Outcomes focused approach**

The Concordat also included a shift to an outcomes focused approach to planning and delivering services at a local authority level. The Scottish Government established 15 National Outcomes to be achieved between 2008 and 2018. These included, 'We have tackled the significant inequalities in Scottish society'. But none of the indicators of progress refer specifically to race, disability or gender, and more generally 'significant inequalities' are not defined. Given the importance of these indicators in guiding local actions, there are concerns that this may have reduced the priority which local authorities gave to race, disability and gender in determining their local priorities.

---

<sup>11</sup> Community Planning Partners are not 'public authorities' and are not themselves subject to the public sector equality duties. However, each public authority partner remains subject to the duties in their role as a community planning partner.



The Concordat required each local authority to develop a Single Outcome Agreement in 2008. By 2009 Single Outcome Agreements were to be prepared by the Community Planning Partnership. This was to set out clear links between the national outcomes and the local outcomes that each local authority (and its partners) aimed to achieve, and the services and activities in place to achieve this. Each local authority has to submit an annual report setting out progress and achievements towards national outcomes, starting in 2008/09.

The Scottish Government assessed the equality impact of this shift to Single Outcome Agreements, in a retrospective Equality Impact Assessment published in November 2008<sup>12</sup>. There has not been a consistent approach to undertaking Equality Impact Assessments on each local authority's Single Outcome Agreement, although some local authorities did assess their Single Outcome Agreements in relation to equality. The Scottish Government did not require local authorities to submit their Equality Impact Assessments, and did not assess Single Outcome Agreements against their own national equality policy, strategy and guidance or any particular local equality objectives.

The Equality and Human Rights Commission did make clear the importance of assessing the equality impact of Single Outcome Agreements and raised concerns about the retrospective EIA by the Scottish Government. However, the Commission's primary interest is not the content of the Single Outcome Agreements, but with how this translates into actions – including the resources and services that are available – and what outcomes are achieved as a result. This is the focus of this research.

### **Economic climate**

The economic climate will also have a significant impact on how local authorities operate. In mid 2007, it became clear that the UK – along with many other countries across the world - was facing an economic slowdown. Throughout 2008, many banks and private companies faced severe financial difficulties due to a global economic crisis. The UK officially entered a recession (with two consecutive quarters of negative economic growth) in January 2009. Scotland officially entered a recession in April 2009.

In April 2009, the Scottish Parliament Information Centre<sup>13</sup> suggested that 2010/11 would be the year that Scottish local authorities saw significant financial pressures, including:

- reduced capital investment due to additional spending in 2008/09 and 2009/10;
- reduced revenue from taxes, fees and asset sales; and
- increased pressure on services including social work, housing, justice, advice and economic development.

---

<sup>12</sup> Equality Impact Assessment, Scottish Government, November 2008  
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/Equality/18507/EQIADetails/Q/Id/166>

<sup>13</sup> Impact of Recession on Scotland's Public Finances, SPICE, April 2009

And the UK budget in June 2010 makes clear the additional substantial budget reductions that will now be required in the public sector. The Scottish Government has postponed the budgeted reduction in public expenditure of £332 million in 2010/11 until 2011/12. In 2011/12, this reduction will be introduced along with the additional substantial reductions that will be required by the UK Comprehensive Spending Review which will be published in October 2010.

This means that any financial pressures experienced by local authorities in 2007/08 and 2008/09 were modest in relation to the much more significant pressures which are still to come.

## 2.5 Summary

- Throughout 2007/08 and 2008/09, local authorities had specific duties in relation to race, disability and gender equality. These duties required local authorities to work to eliminate unlawful discrimination and harassment; promote equality of opportunity; and promote good relations and positive attitudes.
- Local authorities also have a specific statutory duty to ensure that independent advocacy services are available for people with a mental health difficulty, dementia, learning disability, autism, brain injury or personality disorder.
- During 2007/08 and 2008/09, a number of key shifts were taking place which influenced local authorities in Scotland.
- In November 2007, the Scottish Government and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) signed a Concordat which set out the new relationship between the Scottish Government and local government.
- The agreement set out the funding to be provided to local government from 2008/09 to 2010/11. This study covers funding decisions made by local authorities in the year before the Concordat was introduced (2007/08) and the first year of its operation (2008/09).
- In 2007/08, £2.7billion of grant funding provided by the Scottish Government was ring fenced – intended for a specific purpose. By 2008/09, this had fallen to just over £1billion. Forty-three previously ring fenced funding streams were included in the general settlement to each local authority in 2008/09.
- The Concordat also introduced a shift to outcomes focused arrangements for planning and delivering services at a local authority level. The Concordat required that each local authority have in place a Single Outcome Agreement during 2008/09.
- The global economic climate has also influenced local authorities in Scotland. The UK officially entered a recession in January 2009. Scotland officially entered a recession in April 2009.
- Research shows that the full impact of the recession was not felt by the public sector during 2007/08 and 2008/09, but was likely to impact significantly in 2010/11. There will be substantial reductions in public expenditure in Scotland from 2011.

## 3. Gender

---

### 3.1 Introduction

This Chapter considers the financial support that local authorities provided in 2007/08 and 2008/09 to:

- women's organisations; and
- work to tackle violence against women.

It sets out the financial information gathered from local authorities and describes decision making processes and the views of local authority staff and voluntary organisations. The final section in this Chapter provides commentary on our findings in relation to support for gender equality.

It is possible to compare the financial support that an individual local authority made between 2007/08 and 2008/09, but it is not possible to directly compare the figures between different local authorities, as individual local authorities recording systems, funding arrangements and services all vary.

### 3.2 The Gender Equality Duty

The Gender Equality Duties are set out in the Equality Act 2006. There are general duties to eliminate unlawful discrimination and harassment and to promote equality of duty. There are specific duties to:

- publish a gender equality scheme;
- consult employees, service users and others;
- include arrangements for gathering and using information on gender equality in employment, services and functions;
- formulate gender equality objectives and ensure implementation of these;
- assess the impact of current and future policies and practices;
- review and revise the gender equality scheme every three years; and
- report annually on progress.

### 3.3 Support to women's organisations

#### Level of funding

The research looked at 12 local authority areas. In eight of the 12 areas, all substantial support to women's organisations related to tackling violence against women. In these eight authorities, no support was identified in 2007/08 and 2008/09 in relation to other support given to women's organisations (or men's organisations).

It was clear that, for all the local authorities involved, their service delivery priorities for gender equality were focused heavily on violence and the impact of gender based crime. This reflects the priority of the Scottish Government. The strategic approach taken by the Scottish Government in tackling violence against women has been commended in national research<sup>14</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> Map of Gaps 2, End Violence Against Women and Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2009

One other gender issue which had high priority for local authorities in their Gender Equality Schemes was the role of authorities as employers (which was not part of this research). Again, this is a national priority for the Scottish Government.

Four authorities identified that they had supported women's organisations in 2007/08 and 2008/09 that were not directly related to violence against women. In two cases there were substantial grants to organisations providing services and meeting places specifically for women. In most cases the sums involved were extremely small (often amounting to a few hundred pounds) for organisations like the Women's Royal Institute and the Women's Guild. The expenditure relating to violence against women (whether provided in house or through funding organisations such as Women's Aid) is all included in Section 3.4 and Table 3.2 rather than here.

<b>Table 3.1 Financial support to women's organisations (other than violence against women) 2007/08 and 2008/09</b>			
<b>Authority</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>Change</b>
A	£94,543	£109,163	+15.5%
B	£150,544	£155,200	+3.1%
C	£7,500	£7,725	+3.0%
D	£23,623	£25,636	+8.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>£276,210</b>	<b>£297,724</b>	<b>+7.8%</b>

The expenditure in these four areas increased between 2007/08 and 2008/09 – by a total of 7.8%. This increase appeared to be made up of three components:

- a year on year increase to cover inflation, for some established projects;
- increases to allow additional services to be provided by existing projects; and
- the 'chance' allocation of small grants to women's organisations – this was as a result of the applications made for general small grants or community grants in a given year rather than related to strategic decisions about gender equality.

### **Funding sources and activities**

The funding originated from a wide range of sources including:

- Community Regeneration Fund and Fairer Scotland Fund;
- equality and diversity funds;
- leisure and community services;
- small grants budgets or community grants; and
- area committees.

We found that it was very difficult to gather information about support for women's (or men's) organisations as (in most local authorities) there was no overview of this funding, which came from a variety of sources. There was no system in place for local authority staff to gather information on whether small grants had been paid to women's or men's organisations. Particularly for the smaller grants there was no information about the outcomes or the equality impact that this expenditure was expected to deliver.

### 3.4 Support for tackling violence against women

#### Level of funding

All 12 local authorities were able to identify the main expenditure that they were making for tackling violence against women. In most cases, there was a modest increase in the amount of funding between 2007/08 and 2008/09. This was usually due to small increases to cover inflation. Across all 12 authorities the total funding rose by 2.1% between 2007/08 and 2008/09.

<b>Table 3.2 Financial support to tackle violence against women 2007/08 and 2008/09</b>			
<b>Authority</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>Change</b>
A	£202,164	£206,290	+2.0%
B	£267,560	£283,033	+5.8%
C	£176,300	£177,300	+0.6%
D	£297,244	£303,310	+2.0%
E	£195,930	£199,809	+2.0%
F	£184,859	£175,729	-4.9%
G	£835,567	£803,437	-3.8%
H	£558,773	£558,733	0.0%
I	£369,531	£456,349	+23.5%
J	£458,708	£468,070	+2.0%
K	£399,800	£399,800	0.0%
L	£76,540	£76,922	+0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>£4,022,976</b>	<b>£4,108,782</b>	<b>2.1%</b>

Only two authorities (out of 12) reported a reduction in funding across these two years. In both cases this was described as having varied to take account of the level of 'contractually defined' activities in these two years. In one local authority there had been a substantial increase in funding (up by 23.5%). This was as a result of the local authority introducing a new domestic abuse service and increasing support to Rape Crisis.

We spoke to third sector organisations involved in tackling violence against women. Generally, they confirmed that the resources available to them from local authorities had been maintained between 2007/08 and 2008/09. The exceptions related to situations where the money paid to the organisation was less than originally budgeted. This was because (in terms of the Service Level Agreement between the local authority and the organisation) payments were made on the basis of the actual number of women supported (or some other 'output' measure), rather than as a fixed grant.

#### Funding sources and activities

Four of the Scottish Government funding streams that had been used by local authorities to support work to tackle violence against women had ring-fenced allocations until March 2008. However, in three cases most of the resources from these funds continued to be ring fenced.

The Children's Services (Women's Aid Fund) was included in Annex B of the Concordat as one of the funds for which ring fencing would end in March 2008. However, in practice, this only applied to four projects where Women's Aid was not in a position to continue to deliver services and these resources were allocated to councils. The Fund has continued to support more than 40 Women's Aid projects between 2008 and 2011. No decision has been taken about the future of the fund after March 2011.

The Violence Against Women Fund was also included in the Concordat as one of the funds for which ring fencing would end in March 2008. However, in practice, this applied only to the 26 of the 87 projects that were funded. The fund has continued to support the remaining projects between 2008 and 2011. No decision has been taken about the future of the fund after March 2011.

The Community Regeneration Fund which had been used by some local authorities for tackling violence against women in 2007/08 was integrated into a new Fairer Scotland Fund (FSF) on 1 April 2008. However, the FSF remained a ring fenced budget until March 2010 – covering a range of activities to tackle poverty and disadvantage.

The fourth fund, Supporting People, was no longer ring fenced – with the previously ring fenced resources added to the local authorities' overall grant settlement for 2008/09.

In addition to these funds from Scottish Government, social work grants were another important source of funding for organisations like Women's Aid. Housing benefit was a significant contributor to projects that included accommodation.

The funding for tackling violence against women was provided for a range of purposes. Some were common across most local authorities:

- domestic abuse services;
- providing running costs for refuges for women and their children;
- training, education and awareness raising about domestic violence and other violence against women; and
- supporting multi agency violence against women partnerships and other similar work.

Others were present in a smaller number of the authorities surveyed:

- rape counselling;
- advocacy; and
- alarms (for victims of domestic abuse).

### **3.5 Approaches to supporting gender equality–change and development**

#### **The Concordat and the impact of the end of ring fencing**

Local authority staff highlighted that the (relatively limited) removal of ring fencing had little or no impact in terms of the continued commitment given to gender issues – and particularly violence against women. The figures that we have gathered bear this out.

This view was also shared by representatives of women's organisations - although many felt that the removal of ring fencing would make future funding less secure.

It is difficult to maintain a strategic view and provide best value when future funding is so uncertain. The ending of ring fencing has increased uncertainty. I would like to see some form of ring fencing being put back.  
Third sector organisation

When the ring fencing was in place, we felt that we had some leverage – but now we feel very much at the mercy of the council. They could move the goalposts at any time.  
Third sector organisation

For at least three of the local authorities, the end of ring fencing was seen as providing a major opportunity.

The ending of ring fencing meant that the six staff involved were no longer on two year rolling contracts. This enabled the council to offer permanent contracts to existing staff, thus ensuring greater continuity in the work delivered. Greater job security has improved team performance and allowed us to retain experienced employees.  
Local authority officer

The removal of ring fencing has allowed a more flexible and responsive approach to delivering services.  
Local authority officer

The end of ring fencing has had a positive effect on violence against women services as it has allowed the council to increase and supplement the existing funding levels and it has also allowed us to be more creative and strategic in the development of support services.  
Local authority officer

Two local authorities had taken in-house the work previously done by equality organisations. But this was as part of one or more local authority officers' jobs rather than as a dedicated post. These authorities felt that the arrangements were appropriate and continued to give the same amount of support. Women's Aid groups in these areas did express some concerns at what they saw as the dilution of support. No Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken in either of these cases. This means that it is very difficult for the council to demonstrate (for itself or to others) whether the new arrangements were appropriate or not.

In one case, a Women's Aid organisation linked the ending of ring fencing to significant changes in the way that the local authority provided support.

First of all the council have pushed us towards a merger with another Women's Aid organisation working in our area. Now they are putting the provision of support out to competitive tender. This wouldn't have



happened before the ending of ring fencing. It has led to great uncertainty.

Third sector organisation

### Single Outcome Agreements

For some local authority staff, the links between their work and the Single Outcome Agreement (SOA) were not clear.

The SOA does not give a true indication of the work done on violence against women. This is because the SOA targets are at a very strategic level and it would be unmanageable if all the detail of the work on violence against women was included.

Local authority officer

For others, the SOA had been used as a vehicle for focusing effort and prioritising work to address violence against women. However staff noted that this was made more difficult by the fact that equality in general, and gender in particular, does not feature in the Scottish Government's national outcomes and, particularly, indicators.

The impact of the SOA has been two-fold. On the one hand it has codified our commitment to addressing violence against women and ensured sign up by community planning partners. However, the relatively low profile of gender and of violence against women in the national performance indicators has been a barrier to prioritisation at local level. In 2008 we were one of only four Community Planning Partnerships to have a local outcome within the SOA specifically focused on violence against women

Local authority officer

### 3.6 Involvement, consultation and decision making

In most local authorities there had been some level of discussion with the main third sector providers of services they funded (particularly Women's Aid). This covered a range of areas including (in some local authorities) the end of the ring fencing for a number of funds to provide support to tackle violence against women in 2008. There was no evidence of wider consultation with victims of domestic abuse or with other women's organisations.

One local authority was planning to undertake an evaluation of services to women and will, in the future, be asking service users for their views, based on their experience of the service. In another, the multi agency partnership is considering its strategy. As part of that process an EIA will be undertaken – along with consultation and engagement with women, including victims of violence.

Most of the decisions about expenditure in 2007/08 and 2008/09 were influenced by multi agency partnerships on violence against women; community safety partnerships; or community planning partnerships (particularly in relation to the Community Regeneration Fund and Fairer Scotland Fund). In all cases, final decisions were taken by local authorities (with appropriate delegation to the relevant committee or committees). As no Equality Impact Assessments were carried out during this period on the themes we were analysing, it was clear that these decisions

were generally taken on the basis of the overall local authority budget opportunities and pressures, rather than on an assessment of needs – or the progress that was being made in delivering gender equality outcomes.

### **3.7 Equality Impact Assessments**

We found no evidence that any Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) had been carried out in any of the 12 local authorities in 2007/08 and 2008/09 in relation to their policies and priorities on tackling violence against women or support to women's organisations. There were a number of reasons given to us for this:

- some authorities said that since policies were not changing, there was no requirement to undertake an EIA;
- others said that since funding levels were remaining broadly the same, there was no requirement – stating that EIAs tend to be undertaken where significant funding cuts are planned, or major new services introduced;
- others felt that they would not carry out an EIA for relatively small parts of their work; and
- others said that the use of EIAs was not systematically built into the working practices of the authority in 2007/08 and 2008/09 – the duty to assess the impact of policies and practices in relation to gender became a legal requirement in June 2007 .

One (larger) authority said that it had recently increased the use of Equality Impact Assessment. It had not undertaken an EIA in 2008, when a number of funding streams were brought together to become the Fairer Scotland Fund. But it had – in 2010 - undertaken a Rapid Equality Impact Assessment on the removal of ring fencing for the Fairer Scotland Fund. However, this assessment did not identify any significant equality issues as a result of the removal of ring fencing.

Another local authority drew attention to the fact that it was currently undertaking an Equality Impact Assessment on its plan to manage the impact of reductions in public sector spending. This will assess the impact on all equality strands, including gender.

### **3.8 2009/10 onwards**

The focus of our research was on 2007/08 and 2008/09. However, in our discussions with local authorities, many also provided information on funding for women's organisations in 2009/10. This section sets out our findings.

#### **Support to women's organisations**

Four authorities had identified expenditure for women's organisations and violence against women in 2007/08 and 2008/09 that was not directly related to violence against women. The same four authorities identified that they had supported women's organisations in 2009/10.

**Table 3.3 Financial support to women's organisations (other than violence against women) 2008/09 and 2009/10**

Authority	2008/09	2009/10	Change
B	£109,163	£102,975	-5.6%
D	£155,200	£160,000	+3.1%
G	£7,725	£7,957	+3.0%
H	£23,626	£23,375	-1.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>£295,714</b>	<b>£294,307</b>	<b>-0.5%</b>

Between 2008/09 and 2009/10, there was a small overall reduction in funding. One reduction was attributed to the impact of a 15% reduction in the budget for tackling disadvantage following the mainstreaming of the Fairer Scotland Fund (which impacted less on support to women's organisations than other themes). The other was attributed to 'the vagaries of annual small grant allocations'. The two local authorities that saw an increase stated that this was to reflect inflation.

### Support for tackling violence against women

All twelve authorities provided financial information related to violence against women for 2007/08 and 2008/09. Eleven of these also provided information about funding in 2009/10.

**Table 3.4 Financial support to tackle violence against women 2008/09 and 2009/10**

Authority	2008/09	2009/10	Change
A	£206,290	£210,500	+2.0%
B	£283,083	£285,846	+1.0%
C	£177,300	£187,850	+6.0%
D	£303,310	£309,500	+2.0%
E	£199,809	£203,621	+1.9%
G	£803,437	£794,430	-1.1%
H	£558,733	£598,773	+7.2%
I	£456,349	£421,173	-7.7%
J	£468,070	£477,622	+2.0%
K	£399,800	£497,400	+24.4%
L	£76,922	£77,314	+0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>£3,933,103</b>	<b>£4,064,029</b>	<b>+3.3%</b>

Six of the 12 had increased expenditure by up to 5%. Three had increased expenditure by more than 5% - in one case by nearly a quarter. Two had reduced expenditure. One of these was the authority which had previously substantially increased expenditure (by 23.5%) between 2007/08 and 2008/09. Overall expenditure increased by 3.3% between 2008/09 and 2009/10.

### Impact of the end of ring fencing

The second round of ending ring fencing – mainly the Fairer Scotland Fund - from April 2010 appears to have had more impact than the initial round in 2008. A number of local authorities confirmed that they plan to reduce the amount of money

previously allocated to the Fairer Scotland Fund (often by 10-20%). These planned reductions appear to be related more to the overall financial position for local authorities, rather than a reaction to the ending of ring fencing. In the main, in 2009/10 these reductions had not yet had significant impact on support for tackling violence against women.

### **A greater focus on contracts**

Two local authorities are currently preparing to put their support for women affected by violence out to competitive tender. From the local authorities' perspective, this is to demonstrate value for money (and, it is suggested by one of the authorities, to meet European Union procurement requirements). From the perspective of the current third sector providers of services, this was seen as threatening and disruptive.

Most of the local authority areas have some form of contract or Service Level Agreement (SLA) with third sector providers of services. These have developed over recent years – and have generally replaced the more 'traditional' payment of grants. Most of the SLAs were for three years. Three year agreements were seen to give some stability. But there were some concerns from Women's Aid organisations that since payments are made on outputs (number of women) rather than a single known annual grant, the amount received by the Women's Aid provider can fall short (in some cases significantly) from the amount budgeted by the local authority.

There are some tensions around payments. In one case, although £130,000 had been budgeted to support a refuge, Women's Aid could only draw down £70,000 in terms of the interpretation of the contract.

The relationship with the council is difficult as each of the different Women's Aid groups have a different contact person in the council to deal with their contract. Each one interprets the contract differently."

Third sector officer

In one case a three year Service Level Agreement had been reduced to 18 months, which resulted in the third sector organisation having to review its financial plans in the middle of a financial year. In another case the local authority brought the provision of services in house and ended its previous approach of commissioning Women's Aid to provide the services.

The move towards a 'more business like' approach has brought some tensions between local authorities and organisations – with some Women's Aid organisations concerned that increased administration was taking away time that they felt they should be spending on delivering improved outcomes for women. In addition, two Women's Aid organisations said that they felt the more contractual arrangements had reduced their flexibility. This in turn had led to less adaptation of services to meet specific needs and a reduction in specialisation.

The council now requires a great deal more information about our management and performance. In the past we got a grant and could use this to provide services that really were supportive to individual women. Now we are less flexible.

Third sector officer

Contracts can also limit the financial flexibility of third sector providers.

We generated income from training activities and had hoped to be able to use this money. But the council insisted that it was used in the same financial year – or we would lose funding. We had hoped to take on a new member of staff, but we can't do that with the present arrangement.

Third sector officer

### **Equality Impact Assessment**

From our discussions with staff it was evident that in many authorities Equality Impact Assessments were still rarely carried out – so that there was limited assessment of policy impacts in relation to gender.

In March 2010 one local authority shut down the women's refuge which it ran. The authority felt that the building was no longer fit for purpose and impractical to upgrade. It will now use other local authority properties and bed and breakfast accommodation. No EIA was carried out to inform this change.

### **Future prospects**

We repeatedly heard of the potential impact of the overall economic position and looming substantial budget reductions for local authorities and other public agencies. The details of this were not known at the time that we were carrying out our interviews – but it was clear that local authority staff recognised that the next years were going to require difficult financial decisions by local government.

There are continuing challenges in ensuring the sustainability of much of this funding. This threatens the future viability of services and can have a major impact on both the clients and the workers delivering services. In the current period of severe financial restraint on the public sector, this becomes even more challenging.

Local authority officer

Over the years, local authorities have drawn together a wide variety of funding sources. There are concerns that a number of these will come under pressure.

Funding for this area of work is contributed by a number of sources including funding from partners; national funding streams and individual service departments. It is difficult to be sure going forward what the impact might be if one or more of these funding streams cease. However, our commitment means that we will explore all possible avenues to maintain and develop our activity in this area.

Local authority officer

A number of Scottish Government funding streams will come to an end in March 2011 and no decision has been taken on their future. These are the support to Women's Aid Training Consortia (there are 15 in Scotland); the Children's Services Women's Aid Fund (the vast majority of which was not included in the removal of ring fencing in 2008) and the Violence Against Women Fund (most of which was not included in the removal of ring fencing in 2008). No decision has been taken on the future of these funds beyond March 2011. This will be determined in the discussions about the Scottish Budget. There are widespread concerns about the potential reduction in resources as a result.

### 3.9 Summary

- All 12 local authorities provided financial support to tackle violence against women. The total level of support increased by 2.1% between 2007/08 and 2008/09, and by 3.3% between 2008/09 and 2009/10.
- Four of the 12 local authorities provided financial support to women's organisations not involved directly in violence against women. In two cases there were substantial grants to organisations providing services and meeting places specifically for women. In other cases the sums involved were small. The level of support increased by 7.8% between 2007/08 and 2008/09, but decreased by 0.5% in 2008/09 and 2009/10.
- The gradual removal of some ring fenced funding (in 2008 and then 2010) does not appear to have yet had a significant impact on funding levels. In some cases it has led to changes in the way services are delivered.
- Local authorities believed that they would see more significant changes as a result of reduced ring fencing and increased financial pressures in 2011/12.
- Although most local authorities discussed their plans with the voluntary organisations that they funded, there was no evidence of wider consultation with victims of domestic abuse, women, or other women's organisations.
- There was no evidence that Equality Impact Assessments had been carried out in relation to decisions about services to address violence against women or support to women's organisations.
- Since 2007/08 there has been a shift towards increased use of Service Level Agreements and contracts. This is bringing about positive and negative changes. It can result in enhanced stability with longer term agreements. But there is some concern from voluntary organisations about the focus on funding based on the number of people using the service, rather than the outcomes achieved.

### 3.10 Commentary

It is clear that local authorities are focusing strongly on tackling gender based violence, and many authorities in Scotland are receiving recognition as leaders in this field across the UK. Local authority funding in this area has increased year on year between 2007/08 and 2009/10. The strategic priority which the Scottish Government gives to this area is clearly having an impact at a local level. Although outwith the focus of our study, local authorities also indicated that they are taking their responsibilities as employers seriously, and focusing on addressing gender inequality.

Few local authorities involved in this study were providing support to organisations to tackle the range of other inequalities that women can face in society, for example in relation to learning; employment opportunities or health.

Clearly tackling violence against women is of vital importance and rightly has been a priority for local authorities. However, if activity to tackle this violence is removed from funding considerations, we found little local authority funding that was dedicated to supporting equality between women and men. This is not the case for the other equality strands considered in this research – ethnic minority people and disabled people. Although there is activity to tackle crime, harassment and violence towards ethnic minority people and disabled people, funding for this activity does not dominate in the same way. It would be helpful if local authorities developed a robust strategic view of all gender inequalities in their area (underpinned by equality impact assessments). This would provide a clear rationale to support their prioritisation of resources. In the absence of this (in most authorities) the rationale is not clear.

While funding for tackling violence against women is clearly related to policy priorities, local authorities are still developing their systems for measuring the difference that their funding makes in relation to gender equality. In some cases, measurement is very output focused, which can overlook the vital difference made in terms of softer outcomes – such as quality of life or health and wellbeing. In other cases, there is little measurement of either outputs or outcomes in return for funding. This will make it difficult for both local authorities and service providers to demonstrate the value of activity related to gender equality.

In addition to this, funding is not related to a clear assessment of need and demand. In 2007/08 and 2008/09, there was no evidence of local authorities undertaking Equality Impact Assessments in the areas covered in the research. Undertaking Equality Impact Assessments on gender equality has been a legal requirement since June 2007<sup>15</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> Gender Equality Duty Code of Practice Scotland, Equal Opportunities Commission Scotland. 2007



## 4. Race

---

### 4.1 Introduction

This section considers the support that local authorities have been giving in respect of the race equality duty. The research looked at 12 local authority areas and focused on:

- the support that has been given to ethnic minority organisations (across all 12 areas);
- support for migrant workers (in six of the local authority areas); and
- support from social work services for people from ethnic minorities (in six of the local authority areas).

It sets out the financial information gathered from local authorities, and describes decision making processes and the views of local authority staff, and voluntary organisations. The final section in this chapter provides commentary on our findings in relation to support for race equality.

It is possible to compare the financial support that an individual local authority made between 2007/08 and 2008/09. But it is not possible to directly compare the figures between different local authorities, as individual local authorities recording systems, funding arrangements and services all vary.

### 4.2 Race Equality Duty

The Public Sector Equality Duty in relation to race was set out in the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000. All local authorities are legally obliged to pay 'due regard' to the need to take action on race. The Act sets out the following general duties:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination;
- promote equality of opportunity; and
- promote good relations.

Local authorities are also subject to specific duties. These set out the steps that a public body needs to take to help to meet the general duties:

- publish a race equality scheme;
- assess and consult on the likely impact of proposed policies;
- publish the results of impact assessments, consultation and monitoring;
- monitor policies for adverse impact;
- make sure the public have access to information and services;
- review relevant functions / policies at least every three years; and
- train staff on both the general and specific duties.

### 4.3 Support to ethnic minority organisations

#### Level of funding

All 12 local authorities provided information on the level of funding that they provide to support ethnic minority organisations. Between 2007/08 and 2008/09 there was a reduction of 11.5%.

<b>Table 4.1 Financial support to ethnic minority organisations 2007/08 and 2008/09</b>			
<b>Authority</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>Change</b>
A	£125,953	£115,954	-7.9%
B	0	£950	∞
C	£8,059	£8,220	+2.0%
D	£47,500	£35,000	-26.3%
E	£183,747	£203,486	+10.7%
F	£47,255	£51,175	+8.3%
G	£11,706	£8,400	-28.2%
H	£357,932	£357,929	0.0%
I	£3,846,480	£3,316,112	-13.8%
J	0 (in kind support)	0 (in kind support)	0.0%
K	£7,500	£3,250	-56.7%
L	£1,432	£1,998	+39.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>£4,637,564</b>	<b>£4,102,474</b>	<b>-11.5%</b>

Across the 12 authorities there was a mixed picture in terms of the change in spending. Spending decreased in five of the 12 local authorities and increased in four areas. In the remaining three areas there was no significant change in overall spending.

The most notable decreases in spending tended to occur in larger (mainly urban) local authorities. The most significant drop occurred at one urban authority, where support to ethnic minority organisations decreased by over £500,000 (13.8%) between 2007/08 and 2008/09. The reduced spending in this area has impacted on the overall picture. Excluding this one local authority, there was a drop of less than £5,000 (0.6%) in spending among the other authorities. Reasons for the large decrease in the single city authority were:

- the reduction in the overall amount of funding available to tackle disadvantage;
- disproportionately high spending in 2007/08 due to a significant carry forward of funding from the previous year and additional funding dedicated to race in that year; and
- an efficiency saving exercise carried out by the Community Planning Partnership over the two financial years.

Four other local authorities reduced financial support to ethnic minority organisations. For three of these this was due to lower demand for one-off grants for voluntary and community groups. However, in one rural local authority there was a reduction in support to organisations as a result of the ending of ring fencing for a particular fund (the Quality of Life Fund). This money was transferred to a local

authority department for reallocation. This process resulted in a decrease in funding for ethnic minority organisations.

Several of the authorities told us that support to groups and organisations is led by the applications that they receive. This means that demand for and uptake of financial support tends to vary from year to year. Some authorities were concerned about low demand for financial support from ethnic minority organisations and often encouraging appropriate uptake had been more of an issue than providing adequate resources. In one local authority, for example, poor take up of one programme to promote equality of opportunity had led to the decision to use press and radio advertisement to attract more interest.

In areas where there was an increase in support, the most common reason was an increase in demand (applications) for small grants. However, in one city authority there was an increase over the two years due to the transition from the Community Regeneration Fund to the Fairer Scotland Fund and a 10% increase in funding for ethnic minority groups in that area as a result.

### **Funding sources and activities**

A wide range of activities were undertaken across the 12 local authorities and supported through a range of different funding streams. Generally, the city authorities were most likely to have a dedicated funding stream to support organisations and activities for people from ethnic minorities (either a dedicated budget or distinct programme under a larger funding stream).

Larger authorities (and particularly the cities) were also more likely to be making use of Service Level Agreements and contracts than the rural authorities. Smaller (mainly rural) local authorities were more likely to be supporting ethnic minority organisations through small, 'one-off' grants. This was usually from a generic fund for voluntary and community organisations, not relating specifically to equality.

- **Community grant schemes**

In most of the smaller local authorities that we looked at, financial support for ethnic minority organisations was mainly from 'community grant schemes'. These were usually hosted by the Corporate Services division or equivalent. These schemes did not have a dedicated funding stream for equality and there was open competition for this funding.

Small community grants are typically awarded on a project or activity basis. Typical recipients are local cultural and welfare groups and representative or advocacy organisations (such as ethnic minority law centres). There were also examples of small grants to regional or national organisations where the organisation was delivering a specific activity for local people. Grants were often used for one-off cultural events. In one case community grants were used to support a project which aimed to help people from ethnic minorities access local services. Ultimately, this project aims to identify service needs and gaps and improve mainstream service provision.

- **Dedicated equality and diversity funding**

Three of the city authorities had distinct funds providing financial support to ethnic minority organisations. There was variation in the structure and administration of these funds. The examples below come from three different local authorities. The first two include relatively substantial grants. The second two are for small grants.

***Minority ethnic capacity building***

This fund is managed by the local authority's corporate services, and supports developing skills among ethnic minority groups. It is used to support organisations like the Race Equality Council and a local Ethnic Minority Law Centre.

***Race equality budget***

The race equality budget is a funding stream aligned to the local authority's Race Equality Scheme. It is used for support to organisations like the Race Equality Council, a regional multi-ethnic organisation and the authority's International Centre.

***Equality of opportunity grants***

This fund provides grants to support community groups and other non-profit organisations contributing to equality and diversity. These grants support positive relations, raising awareness and understanding. Most grants are in the £250 to £500 range. There is a strong focus on work with ethnic minority groups. There is an application and assessment procedure, with clear local authority priorities for funding allocations. Applications are considered by the authority's Resources Management Committee on a regular basis.

***Equality and diversity fund***

This fund is intended to promote equality of opportunity for people and groups who experience discrimination and disadvantage. It is available to local voluntary organisations promoting equality and inclusion, or aiming to increase the diversity of their service users. Where awards are less than £500, decisions are made by the local authority's head of service for Leisure and Communities, and by the Leisure and Communities Committee where more than £500.

- **Targeted support from larger funding programmes**

Some local authorities dedicated parts of larger funding programmes to support ethnic minority organisations. In three of the city authorities the Community Regeneration Fund (CRF) (in 2007/08) and the Fairer Scotland Fund (FSF) (in 2008/09) were considerable funding sources contributing to ethnic minority organisations. In two cases, the CRF/FSF was the largest source.

***Community Regeneration Fund/ Fairer Scotland Fund***

These are community planning funds used to tackle disadvantage and inequality. City authorities used them to support ethnic minority organisations. For example, in one city there were dedicated funds for race equality within both the CRF (Integration Resources) and the FSF (a dedicated Equality and Diversity Programme with a stream for race equality, which was a very high priority). Integration Resources was a Scottish Government fund specific to one city relating to the integration of asylum seekers in the communities in which they were housed.

In one local authority the Social Inclusion Budget for tackling disadvantage was also used to support ethnic minority organisations.

- **Mainstream service budgets**

In several of the local authorities that we looked at, funding to ethnic minority organisations came from service departments' revenue budgets, including:

- children and families;
- leisure and communities – including sports, arts and youth grants;
- adult literacy and numeracy;
- English for Speakers of Other Languages;
- technical services budget; and
- corporate development and central services grants.

- **Other funding streams for ethnic minority organisations**

Other funding sources were used by the local authorities to support ethnic minority organisations. Organisations received funding from national funding streams and from local authority service revenue budgets.

### ***Supporting people***

This national funding was used to support vulnerable people to enable them to live at home more effectively. It had been used to support people from ethnic minorities. It was ring fenced until March 2008 and became a part of local authorities' general grant settlements after then.

### ***Quality of life***

This was a national funding programme which was targeted at two broad themes: *improving the local environment* and (for 2006-08) *improving community well-being*. The funding ceased to be ring-fenced in 2008. One authority used this funding stream to support a local multi-cultural organisation.

- **Additional / in kind support to organisations**

Several authorities - particularly those that gave comparatively small financial support to organisations - stressed the 'in kind' support that they give to race equality activities. This was not quantified, but typically involves officer time to support and develop voluntary organisations. Examples of in kind support to organisations included officer support to a local Chinese group with their annual New Year celebration and support to the local Muslim community on the development of a mosque. Ethnic minority organisations also regularly receive free use of local authority venues for meetings and events.

## **4.4 Support for migrant communities**

### **Level of funding**

We explored the support that had been provided for services supporting migrant communities in 2007/08 and 2008/09 in six local authorities. It should be noted that these six authorities do not include Scotland's four larger city authorities.

**Table 4.2 Financial support for services for migrant communities 2007/08 and 2008/09**

Authority	2007/08	2008/09	Change
<i>B</i>	£54,000	£53,000	-1.9%
<i>C</i>	0 (in kind / within ESOL)	0 (in kind / within ESOL)	-
<i>D</i>	0 (through local vol org / within ESOL)	0 (through local vol org / within ESOL)	-
<i>F</i>	0 (vol info group)	0 (vol info group)	-
<i>J</i>	£14,608	£10,914	-25.3%
<i>L</i>	£500	£57,000	+11300.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>£69,108</b>	<b>£120,914</b>	<b>+75.0%</b>

The picture of financial support for migrant communities was very varied across the six areas. This reflected different approaches to supporting migrant communities and significant difficulties (for half of the local authorities we spoke to) in quantifying the resources involved.

Some local authorities had a dedicated service and / or development officers focused on supporting migrant communities. But three areas were not able to calculate the level of financial support to migrant communities. In these areas support has involved:

- ad hoc officer support to migrant communities (not calculated);
- support delivered by local voluntary organisations (or individuals on a voluntary basis); and
- support provided through mainstream ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) services, with no clear distinction between migrant communities and long-term residents.

Overall, there was a significant increase in financial support to migrant communities in the six areas between 2007/08 and 2008/09. This increase was entirely due to one local authority (and its partners) setting up a new Migrant Support Service in 2008/09.

In two local authorities financial support reduced. This was due to reduced demand for interpreting or translation support or specific projects coming to an end.

### **Funding sources and activity**

Financial support to migrant communities in the authorities we looked at tended to come from service departments, although the Fairer Scotland Fund (FSF) was used in one authority. Sources used included:

- library and information services budget – to develop the minority language collection in response to an identified need within the new migrant community;
- economic development revenue budget – to develop a welcome booklet and fund a migrant worker project delivered by a local college;
- housing revenue budget – one local authority had funded a full time development officer to support migrants to access housing services;

- chief executive revenue budget - to fund a part time development officer to provide information and advice and support migrants to access services; and
- Fairer Scotland Fund – to support a Migrants Support Service and a ‘welcome handbook’ for new migrant communities.

In three areas, support for migrant communities was provided ‘in kind’, or on an ad hoc or voluntary basis. For example, one local authority held a series of information road shows for seasonal migrant communities organised in one local area. These involved key public partners and were delivered at key sites such as farms, factories and accommodation. The service providers attended with an interpreter and gave presentations on rights and information about key services. They had a dialogue with the migrants and got feedback on needs and services. This is an example of activity that was done on an ad hoc basis and has not been costed by the authority.

At another authority, officers helped support the establishment of a voluntary organisation which is focused on migrant integration. Officers provided ongoing support to the organisations (for example at its open days and events). Again, this was ad hoc and not quantified.

In a different authority, ESOL staff providing support to children of newly arrived families had become aware of the information and support needs of parents. These officers initially met with parents to explain and answer questions on the education system. These information sessions have become more regular and focus on all service needs of the families (for example they have had invited speakers from the Police and NHS). The meetings take place in the evening and have become an opportunity for these people to meet up regularly and discuss wider issues. This service is organised by the two ESOL staff members in their own time and the group does not receive funding from the local authority.

#### 4.5 Social work support for people from ethnic minorities

##### Level of funding

In six of the local authorities we explored the social work support that had been provided specifically for people from ethnic minorities in 2007/08 and 2008/09.

<b>Table 4.3 Financial support for social work services for people from ethnic minorities 2007/08 and 2008/09</b>			
<b>Authority</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>Change</b>
A	0	0	-
E	£8,585	£9,585	+11.6%
G	£1,000	0	-100.0%
H	£399,924	£389,924	-2.5%
I	£315,660*	£315,660	0.0%
K	0	£1,500	∞
<b>Total</b>	<b>£725,169</b>	<b>£716,669</b>	<b>-1.2%</b>

\* estimate for social work spend 07/08

There was significant variation in levels of financial support. For example, while one city authority provided just under £400,000 each year for specific services for ethnic minority people, another city did not provide any financial support for this type of

activity. This authority's social work service confirmed that they provide no Section 10 funding for ethnic minority groups, and fund no specific services for people from ethnic minorities.

Overall, there was a decrease in spending of 1.2% for this area of activity. This was mainly due to a decrease in spending at one of the city authorities. This reduction was due to a considerable shift from grant funding to Service Level Agreements, reflecting a more contractual and outcomes focused arrangement with funded organisations. The service at this local authority was required to create efficiency savings, with pressures in 2007/08 and 2008/09.

### **Funding sources and activities**

This area of exploration focused on funding through social work services. There were two main funding sources for supporting services for ethnic minority people – either the core social work budget or Section 10 grants.

Section 10 of the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968 allows local authorities to make contributions, by way of grants or loans, to any voluntary organisation whose sole purpose is the promotion of social welfare. The focus is on person-centred community care services, and collaboration and joint working among agencies and organisations to improve outcomes for service users.

Social work services also provide funding through 'grants to voluntary organisations' (and some no longer refer to 'Section 10' grants). There is no clear distinction between the ways in which these types of grants have been used. Activities supported across the six local authorities we looked at included:

- a Chinese lunch club;
- a multi-ethnic lunch club;
- multi-ethnic 'drop in' centres;
- Muslim day centres;
- Chinese centres; and
- An ethnic minority mental health project.

There has been a trend (particularly in larger authorities) to move away from one-off grant payments towards greater use of SLAs and more contractual approaches focusing on the achievement of outcomes and outputs.

Across the local authorities there has been a mix of financial and officer support. For example, in one area funding was provided for a lunch club, along with officer support in facilitating the service and providing a free venue.

### **4.6 Approaches to supporting race equality–change and development**

Approaches to supporting race equality varied across local authorities. In smaller local authorities funding to organisations was small and was awarded on an ad hoc, project by project basis. The level of resources committed to organisations tended to change as result of the applications that had been received and the activities that organisations were pursuing. Funding to ethnic minority organisations was often contained within broader funds for the voluntary or community sector. In these cases



there was no strategic planning for, or monitoring of, the level of resource given to ethnic minority groups.

Discussions with voluntary organisations receiving funding suggested that available funding was limited and was rarely sufficient to meet needs. Although some authorities actively promote funding opportunities to ethnic minority organisations, uptake remains an issue and organisations believe that there is a need for more publicity and consultation on barriers to accessing funding.

Support to migrant communities was also inconsistent. One authority provided a dedicated support service, while another was unable to identify any services targeted at migrant communities. In some authorities, officers recognised the needs of recently arrived migrants and either adapted services or (in some cases) undertook work in their own time to address these needs. In these areas there was frustration at the lack of a strategy - and matching resources - to address the needs of migrant communities.

In other local authorities robust work was underway to consult with migrant communities and provide information, advice and appropriate support services. The provision of this support was not always well joined up. Support could be given by a number of different departments; was considered by a range of committees; and activities were undertaken in partnership with a wide range of agencies. As a result it was very difficult to quantify the level of resources going into supporting migrant communities.

There was an increasing use of third sector organisations in the delivery of appropriate social care services for people from ethnic minorities. Lunch clubs and 'drop in' day centres are in operation in both large and small local authorities.

A number of issues have emerged as a result of the fieldwork in the 12 local authorities. These issues have impacted on decisions in relation to supporting race equality activities.

- **Increase in external services** – Generally, the local authorities (and particularly social work services) saw an increase in the volume of the budget which is spent on external services, from 2007/08 onwards. At one city authority around 50% of its social work budget now goes on externally purchased services. One member of staff explained that the authority “has looked to different ways of doing things as a way of creating efficiency savings. This has included reviews of services and modernisation. It has been difficult, as people don't like change”.
- **Increase in commissioning** – Most social work services were moving away from a grant based approach to an outcomes focussed commissioning approach. This involves funding services for specific activities or outcomes.
- **Understanding needs and demographics** – With varying success, authorities have been working to address the changing demographics, and service needs, in their areas. For example, in one authority the Community Regeneration Fund included a funding stream to support asylum seekers and refugees. The Community Planning Partnership worked with an experienced

researcher to explore the location and needs of asylum seekers. They used the information gathered to devise a rational formula for funding activity.

- **Balancing needs** – Across the local authorities there has been debate about the balance of financial support for different groups, for example between recently arrived migrants and settled residents from ethnic minorities.
- **Recognising wider context** – Local authorities often consider what funding is available from other organisations when making decisions in relation to funding and support.
- **Mainstreaming** – Generally, local authorities have been working hard to mainstream equality. For example, some local authorities have asked funded projects to target specific communities, and provide monitoring information. Contracts with service providers often have specific targets in relation to equality built in. Targeted services are only provided where there is a clear need.

In some cases, funding has moved to mainstream services from targeted activities. For example, a review of a local ethnic minority day care centre found that people did not need a dedicated service. And in another local authority, an independent evaluation found that mainstream services were offering more effective support to people from ethnic minority groups than the targeted service. The targeted service ceased to receive funding, and the mainstream service received additional funding to employ more ethnic minority people.

But, there are some concerns about how mainstreaming is viewed, with some voluntary organisations feeling that services for ethnic minority groups are being cut. Officers mentioned that sometimes it is difficult to stop funding dedicated services for fear of being accused of racism. Consultation with one voluntary organisation found scepticism that this approach was working, and concern that general employability services are not effectively meeting the needs of people from ethnic minorities.

We do accept the need for specific services for specific groups with specific needs.

Local authority officer

#### 4.7 Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs)

The 12 local authorities considered in this research did not use Equality Impact Assessments widely in the areas under consideration for the period 2007/08 and 2008/09. Local authorities said that this was mainly because there had not been significant changes to the level of resources committed.

Smaller local authorities told us that EIAs have tended to be done for higher level policy changes and not for all decisions. We were told that it would be impractical to try and ‘micro-assess’ everything that they do.

Several smaller authorities told us that EIAs were gradually becoming a more important part of their work. It was clear that in larger city authorities EIAs have now become ‘embedded’ in the decision making process. In one city we were told that

only since 2009/10 EIAs have been undertaken as a matter of course, “Now EIAs are part of the day job”. It should be noted, however, that, in relation to race, this has been a legal requirement since 2002.

#### 4.8 Involvement, consultation and decision making

The 12 local authorities had different approaches to consultation with people from ethnic minorities. In some areas there was very limited consultation, while in others there was extensive consultation by the Community Planning Partnership and through equality forums. Generally, consultation activity focused on identifying service needs and it was less common for ethnic minority people to be represented in formal decision making processes.

In smaller local authorities where ethnic minority organisations received funding through generic community grants, people from ethnic minorities had very little (if any) involvement in the way funding decisions are made or the way the application process is designed and administered.

##### **Example: formal structures for consultation**

One large local authority has a range of structures for involvement and consultation. A recent best value assessment found 64 different mechanisms. There is an overall feeling that while consultation and involvement mechanisms are generally good, they are not joined up effectively. This authority has a range of different ways that equality groups are consulted:

- In 2007/08 and 2008/09, it had six Equality Forums – including a Race Equality Forum. These were loosely linked to the Community Planning Partnership (CPP).
- There are 12 Neighbourhood Partnerships all with Community Engagement Plans (which are all EIA assessed).
- There is an annual survey of 5,000 people, which is statistically representative across equality areas.
- There are equality representatives on strategy development groups.

In 2009/10 the six Equality Forums were dissolved and a new Equality Network was brought in. There was a significant review and EIA. It is hoped that the new Equality Network will help the authority and its community planning partners to involve and consult people with a shared approach and perspective.

Voluntary organisations felt that generally people from ethnic minorities were not consulted or involved adequately. There was some concern that only one equality representative was involved in each CPP group – as people may be expert in one equality theme but not cover them all. However, there was a feeling that consultation and involvement was improving generally – although there remain inconsistencies between departments.

Consultation with migrant communities tended to be carried out more sporadically – with local authority officers gathering feedback at information sessions.

Social work services generally had more consistent consultation with equality groups generally. For example, in one local authority, the social work department has an area-wide consultation network. In this area people from ethnic minorities are also

able to get involved through Community Health and Care Partnerships at the local level. Community development engagement staff are also in contact with at least 70 local organisations.

**Example: Involvement in service decisions**

At one local authority, social work regularly involves ethnic minority service users in its decision making. For example, it recently consulted on merging local lunch clubs into a larger meals service across the whole local authority. While this was seen as appropriate for many groups, users of the ethnic minority lunch club felt that the targeted service was still required. This meant that social work retained the dedicated service for older ethnic minority people, and envisaged continuing this in the foreseeable future.

In early 2007, the authority commissioned community consultation work to explore their performance in relation to race equality. This involved four focus groups with people from ethnic minorities. This found issues around communication and awareness – particularly in relation to translation and interpretation services.

**4.9 2009/10 onwards**

The local authorities consulted for this research were not specifically asked to provide figures for 2009/10 as the focus of our research was the two previous financial years. However, seven local authorities did provide figures for 2009/10. The table shows that among these authorities there has been a 7.6% decrease in the funding to ethnic minority organisations.

**Table 4.4 Financial support to ethnic minority organisations 2008/09 and 2009/10**

Authority	2008/09	2009/10	% change
A	£115,954	£107,539	-7.3%
C	£8,220	£8,424	+2.4%
D	£35,000	£40,000	+14.3%
E	£203,486	£174,886	-14.1%
G	£8,400	£8,210	-2.3%
J	0 (in kind support)	0 (in kind support)	-
K	£3,250	£6,700	+106.2%
L	£1,998*	£1,983	-0.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>£376,308</b>	<b>£347,742</b>	<b>- 7.6%</b>

\*estimate

Across the 12 local authorities there was concern about the impact that impending budget cuts would have on frontline services. There was significant uncertainty about what changes budget restraint would bring about. And there were mixed views on whether there would be a disproportionate impact on services for people from ethnic minorities.

One authority felt that since it spent a high proportion on equality, cuts would affect people from equality groups disproportionately. Local voluntary organisations shared this view, arguing that equality groups within the voluntary sector are most likely to suffer from public sector spending cuts. There was a feeling that while there

were opportunities – such as more sustainable contracts – small organisations were often not geared up to take advantage of these. Voluntary organisations indicated that they need support to develop skills. They were also concerned that there were pressures on wider funding sources, creating “financial pressure all round”.

One local authority felt that the impact of cuts would be felt more equitably. Their Equality Impact Assessments did not identify disproportionate disadvantage for equality groups. However, they did feel that innovation and new approaches would be affected. This authority also stressed the changing relationship with the third sector and increasing use of contractual approaches. They are having a “frank dialogue” with the third sector to encourage it to become more efficient, rationalise and share services – as the public sector has had to do. It feels that ethnic minority organisations need additional support and skills development to prepare them for this new relationship.

#### 4.10 Summary

- Between 2007/08 and 2008/09, there was a £535,090 (11.5%) decrease in funding for ethnic minority organisations across the 12 local authorities studied. This reduction was accounted for by a significant reduction in one city authority.
- Patterns within each authority were very different. Funding decreased in five authorities, increased in four and remained broadly the same in three. Small fluctuations in funding levels were often due to lower or higher demand for one off grants.
- The level of funding to support migrant communities increased substantially by £51,806 (75%) between 2007/08 and 2008/09. However, in three of the six local authorities considered, all support was ad hoc, in kind and unquantifiable.
- Social work financial support for services for ethnic minority people decreased by £8,500 (1.2%) over the two years. This was largely due to efficiency savings at one large local authority and a shift from grants to contracts.
- In smaller authorities, resource decisions were largely made on an ad hoc basis with limited strategic planning or monitoring. However, some city local authorities had taken a strategic approach to understanding needs and demographics and allocating resources accordingly.
- Authorities were often working to balance the need for mainstream and targeted services for ethnic minority people, recognising the need for both in different circumstances. Consultation and evaluation helped two city authorities decide whether mainstream or targeted services were most appropriate, but decisions could be controversial.
- Some local authorities had clear consultation and involvement structures and processes, particularly social work services. In smaller areas consultation tended to be more ad hoc.
- Funding for ethnic minority organisations again decreased in 2009/10, by £28,566 (7.6%). There was concern about impending budget cuts. Equality Impact Assessments were used in some instances, generally by the city authorities, and some other local authorities seemed well aware of the need to assess the impact of cuts on equality groups.

#### 4.11 Commentary

There is an apparent trend of reducing local authority funding for organisations working with ethnic minority people. This is in contrast to funding for organisations working with women and disabled people, which saw slight increases over these years. However, in 2007/08 and 2008/09 this was due entirely to the reduction in one large authority caused by a combination of budget pressures and disproportionately high expenditure in 2007/08 because of carry forward agreed from the previous year.

Some smaller reductions occurred elsewhere, due to fluctuations in demand for and success in achieving grant funding from the local authority. Many authorities had never reviewed and compared the level of funding allocated year to year to ethnic minority people, even within individual funding streams. In a minority of cases officers responsible for managing funding streams had no knowledge at all of how much funding had been allocated and to which organisation and equality theme. This meant that funding decisions were not linked to a strategic approach to supporting ethnic minority people.

However, in a small number of authorities the reduction of funding to organisations working with ethnic minority people is as a result of a conscious, planned effort to mainstream services. This approach is more prevalent in the city areas considered within this research.

Some – but not all - city authorities are working to assess needs, evaluate progress to date and take strategic decisions about resources. Often this has resulted in previously targeted services being delivered by general or mainstream services. Many targeted services were unable to demonstrate the outcomes that they were achieving, and their fit with local authority strategic objectives.

This is in some ways unsurprising, given that many local authorities indicated that until recently, funding has been allocated simply because organisations exist – rather than based on agreement about the reason why organisations were receiving this funding. There is a clear need for support and developing skills work with many ethnic minority organisations to support this transition to both outcomes focused approaches and more contractual funding arrangements.

Some, largely city, authorities provided financial information about the resources which had gone into making mainstream services accessible to and appropriate for ethnic minority people. However, many found it difficult to quantify the resources that mainstream services dedicated to ethnic minority people.

This is evidenced in the social work support to ethnic minority people considered in this research. There was a slight decrease in support to ethnic minority people over 2007/08 and 2008/09. This was explained, in some cases, as being a result of 'mainstreaming' support. Most local authorities were unable to demonstrate that mainstream services were actually dedicating increased resources to services for ethnic minority people.

There have been variations in funding levels in response to perceived need. Funding for migrant communities increased significantly in the local authorities considered (which were predominantly rural rather than urban). Here, there appears to have been a clear recognition of need – often by front line officers – with action taken in response to this. However, with very few Equality Impact Assessments being undertaken in 2007/08 and 2008/09, this link between needs assessment, policy, resource allocation and outcomes was not being made by the majority of local authorities considered in this research.



## 5. Disability

---

### 5.1 Introduction

This section considers the support that local authorities have been giving in respect of the disability equality duty. The research looked at 12 local authorities and focused on:

- the grant support for organisations supporting disabled people; and
- the financial support to advocacy for disabled people.

It sets out the financial information gathered from local authorities, and describes decision making processes and the views of local authority staff, and voluntary organisations. The final section in this Chapter provides commentary on our findings in relation to support for disability equality.

It is possible to compare the financial support that an individual local authority made between 2007/08 and 2008/09. But it is not possible to directly compare the figures between different local authorities, as individual local authorities recording systems, funding arrangements and services all vary.

### 5.2 Disability Discrimination Act

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (amended by the Disability Discrimination Act 2005) places a positive duty on all public sector authorities to promote disability equality. The duty is aimed at tackling discrimination against disabled people.

Each local authority must pay due regard to the need to:

- promote equality of opportunity between disabled people and other people;
- eliminate discrimination that is unlawful under the Disability Discrimination Act;
- eliminate harassment of disabled people that is related to their disability;
- promote positive attitudes towards disabled people;
- encourage participation by disabled people in public life; and
- take steps to meet disabled people's needs, even if this requires more favourable treatment.

The specific duties set out a framework to guide public authorities to fulfil the general duty. A core aspect is the requirement to produce and publish a Disability Equality Scheme and action plan. The scheme needs to show how the public body has involved disabled people in its development and how it assesses the impact of policy and practice and reports progress.

### 5.3 Support to disability organisations

#### Level of funding

Between 2007/08 and 2008/09, there was a small increase of 2% in local authority funding for disability organisations. This increase amounted to about £1.5 million in total.

<b>Table 5.1 Financial support to disability organisations 2007/08 and 2008/09</b>			
<b>Authority</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>% change</b>
A	£18,104,124	£17,861,011	-1.3%
B*	£221,300	£218,669	-1.2%
C	£36,901,527	£37,057,256	0.4%
D	£1,198,878	£1,518,732	+26.6%
E	£4,381,618	£4,438,610	+1.3%
F	£125,010	£127,822	+2.2%
G	£1,165,064	£1,240,445	+6.4%
H	£1,547,804	£1,547,804	0
I	£1,689,970	£1,750,005	+3.5%
J	£5,274,059	£6,509,226	+23.4%
K	£283,329	£283,329	0
L	£9,170,259	£9,004,189	-1.8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£80,062,942</b>	<b>£81,557,098</b>	<b>+1.9%</b>

\* This local authority did not provide all the information requested for this research.

Two local authorities saw significant increases – of 27% and 23%. One of these had provided an extra £200,000 to an existing project, to develop a second business outlet. The other had increased funding to eight existing projects in 2008/09.

Three local authorities had slightly decreased their funding to disability organisations. One local authority attributed this decrease to a fall in purchases of day care and supported employment services.

Funding for organisations in the three city areas considered for this theme were far greater than the other local authorities combined. When removing these three cities from the overall funding figure, there was an increase in funding for the remaining local authorities of £1.5 million (7.3%).

### **Funding sources and activities**

Local authorities used a variety of sources of funding for disability organisations.

Very few had a dedicated budget for equality in general, or disability in particular. In one local authority there was a dedicated budget aligned to the Disability Equality Scheme, which amounted to approximately £100,000 for 2007/08 and £110,000 in 2008/09. This authority also had 'Equality of Opportunity Grants' to support community groups and other non-profit organisations which contributed to equality and diversity. These grants support positive relations, raising awareness and understanding. Most grants are in the £250 to £500 range. There is an application and assessment procedure, with clear local authority priorities for funding allocations. In addition, one local authority social work department had a grant scheme specifically for disability organisations. The Social Care Grants Scheme saw a slight increase in funding over the two years. Organisations applied for grants, with decisions made by Heads of Service and a small group including elected members.

The most common way of funding disability organisations was through a combination of more general grant schemes and mainstream budgets – such as social work or education. Grant schemes being used to fund disability organisations included:

- **Community Chest** - a small grant programme providing grants of up to £1,000 and free training to help small community groups sustain and develop their activities. Groups can apply for funding for a wide range of activities or operational costs. Community Chest grants are particularly for groups who work with disability or health related issues.
- **Section 10 grants** - Section 10 of the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968 allows local authorities to make contributions, by way of grants or loans, to any voluntary organisation whose sole purpose is the promotion of social welfare.
- **Leisure, Education and Social Welfare Grant Scheme** – One local authority offered ‘vulnerable groups’ and individuals the chance to apply for funding. This includes the themes of mental health, social or economic deprivation, older people and disability groups. The annual budget was £45,000 over three years (from 2007).
- **Community Regeneration Fund and Fairer Scotland Fund** – Many local authorities used these community planning funds aimed at tackling disadvantage to support disability organisations. In addition, one local authority had its own fund to tackle disadvantage which it used, in part, to support disability organisations.

Local authorities also funded disability organisations through their mainstream budgets:

- **Social work and social care** – Many social work departments commissioned services for disabled people and supported disability organisations through their mainstream budgets. Generally contracts or service level agreements were in place with funded organisations.
- **Education/ children and families** - In some local authorities, support for particular disability groups came from the authorities’ Education or Children and Families department budgets. Again, these services often took a contractual approach to funding, with Service Level Agreements and contracts in place.
- **Housing** - Similarly, the housing department in some local authorities also supported disability groups. This was often through advocacy work.

In six cases, local authorities voluntarily provided detailed information on the type of activity that their funding was supporting.

<b>Table 5.2 Type of disability (responses from 6 authorities)</b>			
	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>% change</b>
Mental health projects	£2,740,731	£2,925,244	+6.7%
Learning disability projects	£11,266,617	£11,275,906	+0.1%
Physical disability projects	£5,863,895	£6,946,428	+18.4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£19,871,243</b>	<b>£21,147,578</b>	<b>+6%</b>

Based on the information provided, over 50% of funding was going towards learning disability projects in 2007/08. By 2008/09, funding to mental health and physical disability had increased slightly, bringing the proportion going towards learning disability to 49%.

#### **5.4 Support to advocacy services**

##### **Level of funding**

This research focused specifically on local authority financial support for advocacy services to support disabled people. Advocacy services support people who are disadvantaged or disempowered to have a direct say in the issues that affect their lives. Local authorities have a statutory duty to ensure that advocacy services are available under the Mental Health (Care and Treatment) Act (Scotland) 2003.

Local authorities made £2.2 million available to advocacy services in 2007/08. This increased by 4.6% in 2008/09.

<b>Table 5.3 Financial support to advocacy organisations 2007/08 and 2008/09</b>			
<b>Authority</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>% change</b>
A	£95,000	£98,000	+3.2%
B	No information provided		
C	£572,771	£572,771	0
D	£290,752	£306,524	+5.4%
E	£210,000	£210,000	0
F	£35,000	£35,000	0
G	£173,049	£218,625	+26.3%
H	£191,395	£191,395	0
I	£200,000	£200,000	0
J	£225,458	£269,595	+19.5%
K	£33,460	£33,460	0
L	£125,987	£118,040	-6.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£2,152,872</b>	<b>£2,253,410</b>	<b>+4.6%</b>

One local authority had a significant increase of over £45,000. This was for a new advocacy project that was set up in 2008/09. Overall, local authorities broadly maintained their level of funding to advocacy projects over these financial years. Excluding the three city areas considered under this theme, there was a slightly higher increase of 7.6%.

### **Funding sources and activities**

Advocacy projects were funded in different ways. For example, some organisations received funds from mainstream budgets such as social work and education. Some local authorities used grant or specific funding streams, including Section 10 funds and Fairer Scotland funding. Advocacy services were often jointly funded by the local authority and the local health board.

Advocacy services were generally provided through an external, independent organisation. The local authorities tended to have a Service Level Agreement in place with these organisations. In one local authority additional funding, over and above the SLA, was provided in 2007. This was because the service was attracting a waiting list and so extra funding was made available out of the social work budget, to pay for a part time worker to ease the waiting list.

Advocacy services supported people who use health and social services, people with learning difficulties, with mental health difficulties and physical disabilities. A number of local authorities indicated that they had recently provided additional funding to enhance services for people with mental health difficulties, in response to the Mental Health Act 2003.

### **5.5 Approaches to supporting disability equality–change and development**

Local authorities did not think that there had been a great change in the level of funding available to disability organisations, and the funding tables show that this is broadly the case. On average, the cities have generally seen proportionately smaller increases (around 1%) than other local authorities (around 2%). Two local authorities saw substantial increases in funding, and none saw substantial decreases.

Local authorities made decisions about funding in different ways. Responsibility for decision making was often shared with others, such as community planning partners or organisations like the NHS. This meant that decisions were also influenced by the priorities of other organisations.

Overall, local authorities did not feel that the Concordat; the removal of ring fencing and the introduction of the Single Outcome Agreements made a significant difference to funding during 2007/08 and 2008/09. Some funding streams (like the Fairer Scotland Fund) were still ring fenced in 2007/08 and 2008/09. However, there were a number of other factors which influenced how support to disability equality changed and developed. Other issues have an impact on decision making:

- **Increase in external services** – Many local authority departments, particularly social work services, had increased the proportion of their budget spent on external services.
- **Increase in contracts and Service Level Agreements** – Many services are moving away from a grants based approach to an outcomes focused contract with funded organisations. This involves funding services for specific activities or outcomes. Again, this approach is particularly prevalent within social work. This shift to commissioning is partly driven by the desire to become more efficient and manage funding effectively, but some local authorities stated that this was also due to changing procurement legislation.

- **National priorities** - Scottish Government priorities can give an impetus to activity. For example, local authorities highlighted that there was no national strategy for physical disability and there was felt to be a lack of direction. Normally, 'resources fall in line with national strategy'.
- **Local priorities and demographics** – An ageing population means that the need for disability services is becoming greater. Demand for services is increasing. Some local authorities had invested considerable resources in exploring need and demand for services, while others appeared to take a more ad hoc approach to provision.
- **Focus on outcomes** - In the past, many organisations were funded because they existed. Now, local authorities are focusing more on an output or outcomes driven approach. This involves setting out and agreeing targets with the authority and continued funding is based on performance against these targets. However, not all local authorities were moving to focus on outcomes during 2007/08 and 2008/09, and this change was often only happening in 2009/10 – and, in some cases was planned from 2010/11.
- **Care at home** - Some local authorities pointed to the fact that their care models were changing, with more focus on support at home and in the community. This can lead to more expensive packages of care, and influences service delivery models.
- **Mainstreaming** – Some local authorities highlighted changes to mainstream services. This meant that in many cases, equality was a consideration across all activity – and services were required to set targets, provide monitoring information and have appropriate policies and practices. This is also the case with funded services, both general and targeted services for disabled people.

## 5.6 Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs)

For the most part, local authorities had not carried out Equality Impact Assessments in the areas we explored through this research, during 2007/08 and 2008/09. Officers told us that this was because there had not been a significant change in funding levels.

Generally, if EIAs were undertaken they related to changing funding levels or major changes in service delivery. In some areas EIAs had been conducted where new procurement processes were being introduced, or were planned alongside the restructuring of local authority services. In one local authority, EIAs had been undertaken at a more operational level. The equality officer had conducted EIAs on individual funding contributions through the Disability Equality Scheme, where they had changed.

By 2009/10, local authorities did appear to be more aware of the importance of EIA. For some local authorities, EIAs were now embedded in authority activity and were published on their website. For example, in one local authority, a paper had been circulated to remind staff that although there would be increasing financial pressures on services, equality could not be forgotten. However, this was not the case across all local authorities considered in this research.

**Example: Equality Impact Assessment**

One local authority undertook a number of Equality Impact Assessments on grant awards to disability focused organisations in 2007/08 and 2008/09. It reviewed the impact of increasing financial support to two voluntary organisations, and transferring the funding source from social work to a dedicated disability equality grant stream.

This EIA involved detailed consideration of the potential impact of this change. However, the EIA did not involve consultation with disabled people. It was solely based on officer perceptions.

**5.7 Involvement, consultation and decision making**

Most local authority Disability Equality Schemes set out the requirement for involving disabled people. The Disability Equality Duty is different to the duties for race and gender equality, in that it includes a specific requirement for disabled people to be involved in decision making, rather than simply consulted. Most local authorities stated their commitment to communicate with and involve disabled people in designing and developing services.

Many local authorities had structures in place for consulting with and involving disabled people. This included forums and partnerships within the community planning partnership, or dedicated equality forums and networks. However, we received little evidence that disabled people had been involved in or consulted on funding decisions. In some (generally city) authorities, there was evidence of consultation, but this was not the norm. In most cases, local authorities said that this was because services have not been reviewed or changed substantially.

**5.8 2009/10 onwards**

The local authorities consulted for this research were not specifically asked to provide figures for 2009/10. The focus of our research was the two previous financial years. However, seven local authorities did provide figures for 2009/10 and these are presented below. The table shows that there was a 4% decrease in funding to disability groups between 2008/09 and 2009/10.

<b>Table 5.4 Financial support to disability organisations 2008/09 and 2009/10</b>			
<b>Authority</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>% change</b>
A	£17,861,011	£16,326,846	-8.6%
B	£218,669	£231,289	+5.7%
D	£1,518,732	£1,348,715	-11.1%
F	£127,822	£130,700	+2.3%
G	£1,240,445	£1,125,975	-9.2%
H	£1,547,804	£1,547,804	0
L	£9,004,189	£9,538,227	+5.9%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£31,518,672</b>	<b>£30,249,556</b>	<b>-4.0%</b>

Funding increased in three areas, decreased in three, and remained the same in one. Many local authorities mentioned that in 2009/10 they were required to make efficiency savings.

Some of the local authorities were experiencing restructuring and associated financial pressures. Ultimately this has led to some services being cut, or funding decreasing. These authorities were focusing on 'core business' – identifying key priorities and statutory services. Equality was generally seen as being part of this core business, and legal responsibilities were broadly recognised.

In addition, some services had made a specific effort to continue to prioritise the most vulnerable people. However, local authorities emphasised that this is not always equality groups and could also be about life stage or experience (like unemployment or early years). In some cases, Equality Impact Assessments had been undertaken.

**Example: Equality Impact Assessment 2009/10**

More local authorities were undertaking EIAs by 2009/10. One authority undertook an assessment of the impact of proposed social work budget savings in 2009/10. This EIA found that it was unlikely that budget cuts would impact on frontline services, and did not identify any negative impacts on equality groups as a result of budget savings. It identified only positive impacts – including services more clearly tailored to needs. While consultation mechanisms were laid out in the EIA, it did not include any findings from this consultation.

A number of local authorities expressed concern that while there were financial pressures on services, at the same time the Scottish population is ageing. Local authorities recognised the correlation between age and disability, and felt that demand for services would increase in future years, putting pressure on services. All local authorities recognised that there would be future financial pressures. Many felt that as much had been done as possible through 'efficiency savings' and that future cuts would impact on front line services.

Many third sector organisations supporting disabled people had been told to expect cuts in their funding. Some were advised to seek alternative sources of funding. In some local authorities, external funding advisors were in place to help organisations



to find alternative sources of funding. However, voluntary organisations expressed concern that many funding sources were decreasing and that there were not many funding opportunities for people to tap into. And, more generally, the cost of this advice needs to be paid for from hard pressed budgets

Local authorities felt that the end of ring fencing of further funding streams – particularly the Fairer Scotland Fund in March 2010 – would create additional pressures.

**Example: Shopmobility**

This organisation assists disabled people to access amenities and shopping by providing mobility scooters and other mobility aids. This branch of the organisation currently receives funding from the local authority and this has been a fairly constant sum over the past few years.

It also receives funding from other local funding bodies – but this is becoming more difficult due to greater levels of competition. It has found securing funding for specific equipment to be easier than for core funding.

This organisation felt that securing grant support from the local authority had become more difficult over the past few years. The application process had become a little more complex and as they mostly employ volunteers, it can be quite challenging. It has been told that the local authority grant may be less next year due to spending cuts and they will inevitably have to seek alternative sources of funding.

## 5.9 Summary

- Between 2007/08 and 2008/09, local authority funding to disability organisations increased slightly (by 2%). In two of the 12 authorities considered funding levels increased significantly, by around one quarter.
- Very few local authorities had dedicated disability equality budgets. Funding for disability organisations was mainly from general grant funds or mainstream budgets. Most funding (around 50%) went to supporting people with learning disabilities.
- Funding specifically for advocacy for disabled people increased by 4.6% between 2007/08 and 2008/09. Funding remained the same or increased in all but one local authority.
- In some cases, local authorities had increased the amount of funding for advocacy projects in response to high demand, or to enhance the service provided to particular groups.
- Local authorities often shared responsibility for decision making about support to disability organisations, and particularly advocacy, with other organisations, for example with health boards.
- Overall, local authorities did not feel that the Concordat; the removal of ring fencing and the introduction of the Single Outcome Agreements made a significant difference to funding during 2007/08 and 2008/09.
- Funding levels were influenced by a shift to contracts and Service Level Agreements rather than grants; national Scottish Government priorities and statutory duties; and local priorities, needs and demographics.
- Local authorities were not routinely undertaking Equality Impact Assessments in 2007/08 and 2008/09, stating that this was because there was no significant change in funding levels. Some EIAs were undertaken in relation to service redesign, and one local authority did EIAs at a more detailed, operational level.
- Although many local authorities had consultation and involvement structures in place, disabled people were not generally consulted or involved in funding decisions.
- Based on the information available, funding for disability organisations decreased by 4% from 2008/09 to 2009/10. Many local authorities mentioned that this was due to efficiency savings, resulting in funding cuts for funded organisations.
- Most local authorities anticipated further budget pressures resulting in reduced funding for equality groups from 2010/11 onwards.

### 5.10 Commentary

There were few significant changes in the level of funding for services to support disabled people in the local authorities considered, during 2007/08 and 2008/09. Where funding declined, this was generally attributed to financial pressures. However, local authorities do appear to have been in very different financial positions at this time. Some authorities, and services within them, were under pressure to make financial savings. Others had overall funding levels broadly comparable in real terms to previous years. The picture across Scotland is therefore mixed.

Very few local authorities had dedicated budgets for disability equality. Services for disabled people were largely funded from mainstream budgets, particularly social work services. Disabled people appear to be very much seen as a core client group for local authorities, with relatively clear national priorities, statutory duties and service provision requirements in comparison with other equality groups. Providing services for disabled people appears to be seen as less about 'equality' and more about ensuring that individuals can live a full and healthy life.

Perhaps related to this, local authorities demonstrated a slightly better position in relation to Equality Impact Assessments for disability equality than the other equality strands considered in this research. However, although more EIAs appear to have been done during 2007/08 and 2008/09 in relation to disability equality, the quality of these was often poor. A minority of local authorities had taken a positive and responsible approach to EIA. However, of those who had done EIAs, most were lacking in detail, exhibited very limited or no signs of consultation or involvement, and failed to adequately identify potential equality impacts.

Most local authorities felt that although services for disabled people were a priority, future budget pressures would inevitably mean cuts in funding for disability organisations. Generally local authorities felt that there would be cuts across all areas, and that while steps would be taken to ensure that equality groups were not disproportionately affected, it was not possible to fully protect the level of service currently provided.

## 6. Looking Forward

---

### 6.1 Introduction

This research looked specifically at the years 2007/08 and 2008/09. But the lessons learned from this period are extremely important in relation to tackling inequality in Scotland in the future.

### 6.2 Financial pressures

The changes which took place between 2007/08 and 2008/09 – including the agreement of the Concordat, the reduction in ring fencing of budgets to local authorities and the early signs of pressure on authority budgets do not appear to have had a significant general impact on the resources and policies for equality (at least in the themes and areas we considered). We did not get the sense that had we looked at other themes or different areas that we would have come to any different conclusions.

There were some signs that the financial position for local authorities was putting some additional pressure on their budgets in 2009/10 and 2010/11. But it was very clear that from April 2011 there will be very severe pressures on the finances of local authorities. The start of this period of particularly tight budgets coincides with the introduction of the new Public Sector Equality Duty.

The recent UK Budget set out plans to reduce the scale of the public sector. It is suggested that this will mean a reduction of up to 25% in expenditure in the public sector over three years in the UK (with the health and overseas aid budgets protected from these cuts). These reductions will come into effect immediately in England. But because the Scottish Parliament (along with the Welsh and Northern Ireland Assemblies) had already set the budget for 2009/10 at the time of the General Election, it has been agreed that the reductions (including the required reduction for this year) will be implemented from 2011 in Scotland.

Our research suggests that many local authorities are not currently undertaking the assessments and consultations that they should under the three current Equality Duties. Funding is often piecemeal – with no corporate overview of expenditure (or impacts).

We found that, in many authorities, decisions about equality expenditure were not underpinned by Equality Impact Assessment or by a set of planned objectives and desired outcomes. In the resource climate for local government over the next three years, there must be a concern that robust evidence of the impact of change is often not available. This will make decision making very difficult indeed.

### 6.3 Use of contracts and Service Level Agreements

Local authorities have been operating under a Best Value regime, monitored by Audit Scotland. Under this, they are seeking to maximise the economy, effectiveness and efficiency of their service delivery. One of the ways that authorities have been dealing with this is to specify more clearly the outputs or outcomes that they wish to achieve through their expenditure. In the past some

authorities would have provided grants to equality organisations (or to organisations providing service for people from equality groups). In general these grants could be used for relatively broad purposes. Increasingly, authorities are now setting out their requirements in Service Level Agreements or contracts. And in some cases they are using competitive tendering to demonstrate that they are achieving best value.

This movement from general grant support to more carefully defined agreements on the outputs or outcomes to be achieved is a sensible reaction to making sure that it can be shown that public resources are being well used. However, this change has placed some tensions on the relationship between the local authority and those that receive funding support. We spoke to a number of the organisations that have received support from local authorities over a period of time. Many had noted the move to a more contractual basis. A number of voluntary organisations expressed concerns about this move. The reasons they gave for their concerns included:

- some organisations felt that contracts reduced the organisation's flexibility;
- some organisations had to spend more time providing the local authority with information about management and performance – leaving less time to deliver services;
- there was a lack of certainty about funding – some gave examples of substantial in-year reduction in outputs from the originally agreed figure, which meant significant unplanned reductions in resources;
- some organisations felt that contracts were a step along the way to competitive tendering of services – and were concerned that large organisations with less understanding of the local position may be awarded contracts because they could bring lower prices on the back of economies of scale; and
- some organisations felt uneasy about having to move to a 'more business-like approach'.

Despite these reservations, organisations did understand the reasons for the move to a more contractual arrangement. However, there could be better communication between some local authorities and organisations about the introduction of change and discussions about how to manage the change process.

#### **6.4 Equality Act 2010**

The Equality Act 2010 introduces a new public sector duty bringing together the current duties relating to gender, race and disability, while also extending coverage to sexual orientation, age and religion or belief.

Scottish Ministers are developing new specific duties for Scottish public authorities to help them meet the general duty. The key aims of the new duties are for them to be more outcomes-focused, and less prescriptive, so that equality work is more mainstreamed into the core business of public authorities.

On the basis of our research, we believe that it is important that the new specific duties set out clear measurable requirements of public authorities. The legislation which puts race, disability and gender equality duties on public bodies has been in place for several years (in the case of race the legislation has been in place since 2000 and the guidance since 2002). Despite this, most of the local authorities that

we spoke to as part of our research were not carrying out the assessments (or consultation and involvement) in the themes that we examined that would be necessary to make sure that they were meeting their existing duties.

The new guidance should require:

- explicit recognition of the relationship between strategy and policy development and specific equality needs and objectives;
- clear equality outcomes for the policies and resources;
- evaluation of policies and programmes to determine the most effective approaches;
- the routine inclusion of mainstream services within the assessment process;
- gathering relevant evidence relating to the different equalities groups and analysing this to inform service provision;
- Equality Impact Assessments to be undertaken whenever a change in policy or a significant reduction (or increase) is planned;
- clear links between policy priorities and budgetary choices; and
- a corporate responsibility to demonstrate that the duties are being met.

## 7. Key Findings and Recommendations

---

### 7.1 Notes of caution

Two of the larger city authorities made particularly helpful contributions to our research. They suggested that a number of 'notes of caution' should be included in our report:

- It is important to remember that some organisations will work with multiple equality groups – such as women from ethnic minorities, or disabled young people.
- There is a tension between specialist and generalist services for equality groups. Although integration into generalist services can help with promoting good relations, removing funding from specialist services can be seen very negatively and can reduce the level and quality of services to individuals.
- Commissioned services for social care are very much 'mainstream' services – over half of the budget goes to third party organisations.
- A wide range of factors influence decision making – including budget pressures, demographics, joint decision making and procurement regulations. Funding amounts must be analysed in light of the wider context.
- Individual services have seen different pressures and trends at different times. But there is now a general severe pressure on finances due to the recession.
- Direct payments to disabled people will make a big difference to funding streams as more service users opt out of local authority provision. Individuals will receive funding, rather than organisations. People will have control over what services they buy. This should be borne in mind for any future studies.

### 7.2 Key findings

#### Local authorities and the public sector equality duties

- Overall our research found that while local authorities allocated resources to meet the needs of women; ethnic minority people and disabled people, this allocation process was in the large majority of authorities not informed by Equality Impact Assessment or by a set of planned objectives and desired outcomes.
- Most local authorities stated that expenditure on equality for the period 2007/08 and 2008/09 had not been changed. Therefore, they did not undertake EIAs to assess potential differential impact.
- However, we believe that a further contributing factor is that budget development and allocation is not clearly linked to policymaking and delivery. Nor, in most cases, is it linked to local authorities' own Equality Schemes. As a result, there is no evidence that previous or existing expenditure is delivering equality outcomes that tie to any policy or strategy objective.

- We found that (in the areas we were examining) there is no clear process within most local authorities for assessing the relative (and changing) priorities and needs among equality groups and that in most authorities there was no baseline information.
- Budgets often appeared to be decided on the basis of previous expenditure rather than an analysis of current or future need – or the identification of desired outcomes.
- There appears to be some confusion in local authorities between funding equality organisations, funding equality outcomes or funding particular services (that may or may not be equality driven) that happen to be delivered to an equality group.
- There was no evidence that there had been a general reduction in the budgets we were examining between 2007/08 and 2008/09. Equally, there was no consistent evidence of deliberate policy-driven increases although most budgets had shown some uplift for inflation.
- We found that in many local authorities, departmental budgets are not aggregated to provide evidence of spending in response to meeting the needs of equality groups. The result is that they do not have an easy way of knowing how much they are spending in this area – nor the overall outcomes that are being achieved.
- Many local authorities said that they were increasingly moving towards a ‘mainstreamed’ approach to service provision but they appeared to have little evidence against which to assess the impact, effectiveness or cost implications of such an approach.
- We found very few examples of the consultation or involvement of people from equalities groups in discussing policies or resource decisions.

### Expenditure trends

- There was no systematic evidence that the resources identified by local authorities to meet the needs of equality groups had been affected (either positively or adversely) by the Concordat, the end of ring fencing, or the overall availability of public resources between 2007/08 and 2008/09.
- Total expenditure grew from £91.9 million to £93.1 million – an increase of 1.3%.
- There had been larger changes in a number of areas (some upwards and some downwards). We were usually able to understand **what** had changed – but not **why** the change had occurred – or indeed whether it was the right change for the local need and context.



- There was a high level of awareness that there would be intense pressure on all budgets from April 2011.

### Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

- One of the reasons that we could not assess changes is that, in almost every case, no Equality Impact Assessment had been carried out. Three of the larger cities and two other councils had carried out relevant EIAs in 2007/08 and 2008/09. Twenty-seven authorities had not carried out an EIA that was relevant for our work. We would have expected that EIAs would have been used in many more cases. There were a number of reasons given for not carrying out EIAs – some of which do not stand up well to scrutiny:
  - a number of authorities said that since policies (and, usually, resources) were not changing, there was no requirement;
  - others said that since funding levels were remaining broadly the same, there was no requirement – EIAs tend to be undertaken where significant funding cuts are planned, or major new services introduced;
  - others felt that they would not carry out an EIA for relatively small parts of their work (*'it would be impractical to 'micro assess everything we do'*); and
  - others (particularly those outside the largest cities) said that the use of EIAs was not systematically built into the working practices of the authority in 2007/08 and 2008/09.
- Another reason we believe was that the desired outcomes were not clear – with budget focused planning rather than outcomes focused planning the norm.

### Financial decision-making

- Monitoring arrangements within local authorities do not provide the equality data necessary to inform decisions about spending. As indicated, departmental budgets are not aggregated within local authorities to provide evidence of spending in response to meeting the needs of particular equality groups.
- Where equality monitoring (of service provision or users of either specialised or mainstreamed services) is carried out there is no evidence that the data from this is then analysed to tailor or amend the service or to inform broader planning.
- Because of the lack of basic information; the fact that EIAs were rarely undertaken; and the disconnection between policy, funding and outcomes, the decision making process is not as transparent as it should be. This, in turn, means that there is a question about accountability. The lack of basic information makes it more difficult to justify change – and may lead to the continuation of services through inertia.

Many of these findings echo those of Audit Scotland in 2009<sup>16</sup>:

---

<sup>16</sup> An overview of the audits of Best Value and Community Planning 2004–09, Audit Scotland, 2009

Few councils had a well integrated strategic approach to coordinating activity aimed at tackling inequality. Councils were generally poor at monitoring and assessing the impact of this activity. In general ...councils had made better progress with their equalities duties as an employer. However, the issue of equalities in service delivery is more complex and councils were less well advanced in this area.

Good corporate leadership of equalities is essential to ensure that consideration of equalities issues become embedded throughout the organisation.

Audit Scotland

### 7.3 Recommendations

#### Starting with strategic clarity

- The Scottish Government and local authorities need to make sure that national, regional and local equalities strategies are aligned. Strategies need to be constantly informed and updated through analysis of changing needs and patterns. The policy initiatives which would flow from such clear strategies should be more focused with:
  - defined objectives;
  - a clear understanding of intended outcomes; and
  - a robust measurement framework.
- Local authorities should be clearer about the relationship between targeted and mainstream services. Where mainstreaming is a corporate objective, the necessary mechanisms need to be in place to ensure services are being equally accessed and delivering equal benefit. Where bespoke services remain strategically important, these should be regularly assessed:
  - to consider their cost and benefit;
  - to ensure the continued quality and relevance of the service; and
  - to deliver long term sustainability in the light of overarching integration objectives.
- Local authorities should adopt a more planned approach to delivering specific and prioritised equality outcomes – and this should replace the often ad-hoc activities and investments observed through this research.
- Local authorities need to help develop the skills of equality organisations in relation to outcomes focused planning and monitoring if these organisations are increasingly expected to deliver services according to a commissioning based model.

### **Equality budget analysis**

- The Equality and Human Rights Commission should work with local authorities to make sure that equality budget analysis is embedded in the work of authorities. This would involve building equality considerations into budgetary allocations by local authorities at strategic and at programme level. It would mean looking at mainstream financial decisions as well as dedicated and departmental budgets.
- Adopting an equality sensitive approach in drawing up budgets by local authorities involves assessing all spending allocations with specific reference to policy outcomes. This requires transparent financial processes and a structured relationship between policy and finance personnel. This connection will assist in making the link between policy priorities, resource allocation and targeted outcomes. It will also provide local authorities with evidence of compliance with equality legislation and it will support financial and policy accountability.

### **Improved monitoring**

- The Scottish Government and local authorities should routinely collect and analyse equality monitoring data to inform service changes and allow impact to be assessed.
- The Equality and Human Rights Commission should further promote the use of their Equality Impact Assessment Guidance – as it is clear that many local authorities have not embedded equality assessment into policy making and review; financial decision making and resource allocation.

### **Introducing the new Public Sector Equality Duty**

- The Scottish Government should reflect the lessons learned from this research in preparing the guidance for the new Public Sector Equality Duty. The current duties are not always being met by local authorities. We suggest that the new specific duties should require:
  - explicit recognition of the relationship between strategy and policy development and specific equality needs and objectives;
  - clear equality outcomes for the policies and resources;
  - evaluation of policies and programmes to determine the most effective approaches;
  - the routine inclusion of mainstream services within the assessment process;
  - gathering relevant evidence relating to the different equalities groups and analysing this to inform service provision;
  - equality impact assessments to be undertaken whenever a change in policy or a significant reduction (or increase) in funding is planned;
  - clear links between policy priorities and budgetary choices; and
  - a corporate responsibility to demonstrate that the duties are being met.

### **Future research**

- The Equality and Human Right Commission should adapt the methodology used in this baseline research (in the light of experience) and undertake further similar and comparable research in two years time. This would allow assessment of the impact in Scotland of the Integrated Equality Duty. In addition, it would provide information about the impact of significant reductions in public expenditure on the achievement of equality in Scotland.

## **Example: Gender**

### **Section 1 - Initial contact with the relevant equality or policy officer**

#### **Introduction**

I work with a company called ODS. We have been commissioned by the Equality and Human Rights Commission to undertake Scottish wide research on any budgetary and organisational changes in relation to equality.

The research is to provide a baseline – so we will not identify any specific local authority or individual in our report. We are trying to build up a picture across the whole of Scotland.

The years we are looking at are 2007/08 and 2008/09 – although we are happy to have any additional information about 2009/10. In your authority we are looking at **gender**. There are two areas that we wish to look at:

- Your grant (and other) support for women’s or men’s organisations in your area; and
- Your financial (and other) support in relation to violence against women

#### **Contacts**

It would be very helpful if you could identify the most appropriate officers in the local authority to speak to about each of these things – name, phone number and email.

We will also be speaking to one of the organisations that support women in your area.

### **Section 2 – Telephone interview with the officer responsible for funding to women’s or men’s organisations**

#### **Introduction**

##### **The Current Position**

- Do you currently have a dedicated fund or budget for equality groups generally and/ or women’s or men’s organisations specifically? *If yes, please provide details*
- If not, what ranges of funds are used to support women’s or men’s organisations?
- Could you please summarise the funding (through grant or similar support) that the local authority currently makes to women’s or men’s organisations? It might include funding for:
  - Local organisations working with women or men
  - National organisations working with women or men
  - Grant funding for engagement/ involvement structures

## **Change**

- Is the current position different to last year (2008/09)? If so how?
- Was there any change in the level of support between 2007/08 and 2008/09?
- Have any of the following made any difference to your thinking about funding for women's or men's organisations:
  - the ending of ring fencing (for example for Children's Services Women's Aid Fund or the Violence Against Women Fund)?
  - the introduction of the Single Outcome Agreement?
  - pressure on public sector resources?
- If there has been any change in support – was this upward or downward?
- Have there been any changes to policies or delivery arrangements? For example, has mainstream service delivery changed?
- How do you feel that the changes that have taken place have impacted on women and men in your area?

## **Decision making**

- Who is responsible for taking decisions about grant funding for women's and men's organisations?
  - And what is the local authority's role in decision making?
- If there has been a change (or any consideration of a change) did you:
  - Do an EqIA? Y/N
  - Consult women or men? Y/N
  - Involve women or men in the decision making process? Y/N
- If there has been a change (or any consideration of a change), what papers are available to outline that consideration:
  - Committee (or council) papers;
  - Papers for officers' groups;
  - An Equality Impact Assessment;
  - Notes of discussions with relevant representative organisations;
  - Any other papers?
- Could you please send us copies of these documents – preferably electronic copies (or tell us where we would find them on your web site)?

## **Future pressures**

- What do you think will be the main future opportunities or pressures on funding for women's and men's organisations in your area?
- In light of these pressures, has your local authority considered how to meet its public duty to consider equality for women and men?

## **Our next steps**

We are also speaking with people within the council responsible for support in relation to violence against women. We will gather and analyse the information that you both provide. We would like to receive information within one week – unless we agree otherwise just now.

If there is anyone else (*one or two people*) with an **overview** of grant funding for disabled people that you think it is essential for us to speak to, please let us know.

### **Section 3 – Telephone interview with the officer responsible for support in relation to violence against women**

#### **Introduction**

#### **The Current Position**

- Could you please summarise the financial (and other) support that the council makes to the provision of support in relation to violence against women?

#### **Change**

- Has there been any change since 2008/09?
- Was there any change in the level of support between 2007/08 and 2008/09?
- Have any of the following made any difference to your thinking about supporting advocacy for disabled people:
  - the ending of ring fencing (for example for Children's Services Women's Aid Fund or the Violence Against Women Fund)?
  - the introduction of the Single Outcome Agreement?
  - pressure on public sector resources?
- If there has been any change in support – was this upward or downward?
- Have there been any changes to policies or delivery arrangements? For example, has mainstream service delivery changed?
- How do you feel that the changes that have taken place have impacted on women experiencing violence?

#### **Decision making**

- Who is responsible for taking decisions about funding in relation to violence against women?
  - And what is the local authority's role in decision making?
- If there has been a change (or any consideration of a change) did you:
  - Do an EIA? Y/N
  - Consult women, including victims of violence against women? Y/N
  - Involve women, including victims of violence against women in the decision making process? Y/N
- If there has been any change (or consideration of a change), what papers are available to outline that consideration:
  - Committee (or council) papers;
  - Papers for officers' groups;
  - An Equality Impact Assessment;
  - Notes of discussions with relevant representative organisations;
  - Any other papers?
- Could you please send us copies of these documents - preferably electronic copies (or tell us where we would find them on your web site)?

#### **Future pressures**

- What do you think will be the main future opportunities or pressures on funding in relation to violence against women?

**Our next steps**

We are speaking with people within the council responsible for funding for women's and men's organisations. We will gather and analyse the information that you both provide. We would like to receive information within one week – unless we agree otherwise just now.

If there is anyone else (*one or two people*) with an **overview** of grant funding for disabled people that you think it is essential for us to speak to, please let us know.



## Appendix Two: Discussion Guide: Voluntary Organisations

### Your Organisation

- Does your organisation currently receive funding from the council?
- How has this changed over recent years? *Amount/ source/ process?*
- What do you think the reasons for these changes were?
  - Your organisation providing different services/ activities?
  - Ending of ring fencing?
  - Introduction of SOA?
  - Pressure on public sector resources?

### Wider Support for Organisations Working With Disabled People/ Women/ Ethnic Minority People

- Overall, how do you feel grant support for organisations supporting disabled people/ women/ ethnic minority people has changed (if at all) over the last three years? *(2007/08 to 2009/10)*
- How do you feel funding for the following areas has changed, if at all:
  - Local and national organisations working with disabled people/ women/ ethnic minority people
  - Grant funding for support for independent living
  - Grant funding for support for migrant workers
  - Grant funding for support for women experiencing violence
  - Grant funding for engagement/ involvement structures
- If these areas have changed, do you feel that:
  - disabled people/ women/ ethnic minority people have been involved?
  - disabled people/ women/ ethnic minority people have been consulted?

### Changes in Mainstream Service Delivery

- Have there been any changes to policies or delivery arrangements within the council? For example, has mainstream service delivery changed?
- How do you feel that the changes that have taken place have impacted on disabled people/ women/ ethnic minority people in your area?

### Specific Support

- **Advocacy:** Have you noticed any changes in support for advocacy for disabled people?
- **Social Work:** Have you noticed any changes in Social Work Section 10 grants to voluntary organisations working with ethnic minority communities? Have you noticed any changes in Social Work services more widely?
- **Migrant Workers:** Have you noticed any changes in support for migrant workers?

### Future Pressures

- What do you think will be the main future opportunities or pressures on funding for organisations supporting disabled people/ women/ ethnic minority people?