

Appendix Two

A response to the grounds of call-in

1. "Insufficient consultation evidence was presented to the Committee"

"Members were asked to note and approve a process stated to represent the views of the community. However, the report did not include the underlying consultation evidence, survey findings, stakeholder submissions, details of proposals received, or a comprehensive summary of the feedback gathered through the engagement process. As a consequence, members were unable to independently assess whether the recommendations accurately reflected the views expressed by residents, community organisations and stakeholders."

Response

The recommendations were developed from a [substantial body of engagement and evidence](#) gathering undertaken over a number of months.

They were considered by the Area Partnerships and submitted to the CAC by the APs on the basis of that evidence.

The report reflects the fact that CAC members are entitled to rely on the consideration of evidence by Area Partnerships which are the local, ward-based committees, chaired by an elected member, charged by the council with representing their communities.

The process included:

- An online community survey which generated 58 responses and 63 proposals/ideas.
- Consideration of wider engagement evidence already available through the Shaping Shettleston Local Place Plan.
- Consideration of engagement undertaken through the Child Poverty Demonstration of Change Programme.
- Discussions with members of the Calton and Shettleston Area Partnerships at two meetings.
- Discussion with Pladis regarding the intended purpose of the donation.
- Any submission and assessment of proposals from community and third-sector organisations.
- Any submissions and assessment of proposals by council services.

2. "Concerns regarding the characterisation of community engagement"

"It has been alleged that the report presented to the Committee did not accurately reflect the role and outcome of discussions held through the Area Partnership and related engagement processes.

Individuals who attended those meetings understood them to be consultative and feedback sessions rather than decision-making forums. Participants were advised that their views would inform recommendations and that decisions would ultimately be taken by the City Administration Committee.

Concerns have subsequently been raised by participants regarding the conclusions attributed to those engagement sessions and whether the report accurately represented the views expressed.”

Response

The report confirms that the engagement process was consultative in nature and the final decision remained with the City Administration Committee. It also confirms that the APs contributed alongside survey evidence, existing engagement activity and officer assessment.

The report reflected that:

- Area Partnership members were engaged in discussions.
- Feedback was sought on priorities.
- Consultation evidence formed one part of the overall process.
- Recommendations were ultimately presented to Committee for approval.

This is consistent with a consultative approach rather than a delegated decision-making process.

3. "Lack of transparency in the decision-making process"

“During consideration of the report, committee members were advised that additional information relating to the consultation process could be provided separately.

Given that the report invited members to endorse a process said to reflect community views, the omission of key consultation material from the committee papers limited members' ability to properly scrutinise the recommendations and reach an informed decision on the basis of the evidence.”

Response

The decision-making process is evidenced by the paper which identifies:

- When and why the donation was received.
- The purposes for which Pladis wished the funding to be used.
- The consultation methodology employed.
- The criteria used to assess proposals including:
 - to provide enhanced support for health and wellbeing and
 - to support local people into employment or training
 - whether the idea is viable/affordable and deliverable
- The rationale for recommended projects.

- The proposed financial allocations to be approved by Committee.

A clear audit trail exists within the paper from:

1. Acceptance of the donation by Committee.
2. Community engagement activity.
3. Area Partnership discussions.
4. Project proposal development.
5. Officer assessment.
6. Committee approval of allocations.

4. "Need for further scrutiny of the evidence base"

"Questions remain regarding:

- the consultation methodology employed;
- the results of any surveys undertaken;
- the organisations and stakeholders who submitted proposals;
- the assessment criteria used in determining recommended projects;
- the extent to which recommended allocations align with identified community priorities; and
- whether alternative proposals were considered and, if so, on what basis they were not recommended."

Response

The call-in identifies six areas.

1. Consultation methodology

The process included online consultation, Area Partnership engagement, consideration of existing community evidence and discussions with relevant stakeholders. The methodology can therefore be fully described and evidenced.

2. Survey results

The survey generated 58 responses and 63 separate ideas for use of the funding. Detailed survey analysis has been supplied. There is a 'data dump' from Smart Survey on Excel as well as the Appendix submitted to the AP meeting in March. There is also analysis showing the percentage of ideas mentioning play and open spaces.

3. Organisations and stakeholders who submitted proposals

Community and third-sector organisations submitted proposals which were subsequently assessed by officers. There were very few proposals submitted by third

sector organisations (8 out of 63) even though there was a specific section in the online survey asking for contact details of the organisation that could potentially deliver.

Some proposals submitted were not viable, too expensive, vague, had ongoing revenue requirements or were more appropriate for programmes such as the Neighbourhood Infrastructure Improvement Fund. Some were advocating for play and open spaces provision which led to the proposed allocations to Area Partnerships.

4. Assessment criteria

These were described through the process and included:

- Alignment with Pladis objectives.
- Community priorities.
- Employability and health and wellbeing outcomes.
- Deliverability.
- Organisational capacity.
- Ability to evidence impact and outcomes.
- Strategic fit with Council and Community Planning priorities.

Accordingly, projects were not selected arbitrarily but assessed against established criteria.

5. Alignment with community priorities

The approved projects align closely with priorities consistently identified through engagement activity, including:

- Employability.
- Poverty reduction.
- Financial inclusion.
- Youth support.
- Family wellbeing.
- Community food provision.
- Public space improvements.

The approved projects correspond directly to those priority themes.

6. Alternative proposals

Alternative ideas and proposals were considered through the survey and engagement process.

As is often the case with a competitive assessment exercise, not all proposals could be taken forward within the available £1 million budget. Recommendations therefore focused on those projects which best met the agreed criteria and demonstrated capacity to deliver measurable outcomes.

Conclusion

The report presented to Committee was intended to summarise a lengthy engagement and assessment process. The consultation evidence and survey data which was fully considered by elected members at two Area Partnership meetings do exist and have been made available to members.

The recommendations were informed by multiple sources of community engagement, stakeholder submissions and officer evaluation before being presented to the City Administration Committee for decision.

The report reflected the fact that CAC members are entitled to rely on the consideration of evidence by the local, ward-based committees, chaired by an elected member, charged with representing their communities when making a decision.