A GCPH report for Glasgow City Council:

An evaluation of Glasgow City participatory budgeting pilot wards 2018/19

Chris Harkins

Glasgow Centre for Population Health

October 2019

Acknowledgements

This report should be cited as:

Harkins C. A GCPH report for Glasgow City Council: An e*valuation of Glasgow City participatory budgeting pilot wards 2018/19.* Glasgow; GCPH: 2019.

Contact

Chris Harkins
Senior Public Health Research Specialist
Glasgow Centre for Population Health
Web: www.gcph.co.uk
Twitter: @theGCPH
Tel: 0141 330 2039
Email: christopher.harkins@glasgow.ac.uk

Summary and key points

- In recent years the Scottish Government has set out an unprecedented level of political, legislative and investment support for community empowerment, participation and the strengthening of local democratic processes. Participatory budgeting (PB) has emerged as a principal approach in achieving these goals and has gained significant traction and support across Scotland.

- PB is a process that involves citizens in deciding how to spend public money. PB is driven by the desire to reallocate public money locally and democratically to priority initiatives, projects and services identified by local people.

- In 2018 the Council committed one million pounds to the development of four PB pilot areas (within council wards; Calton, Canal, Greater Pollok and Pollokshields) to inform the development of PB across the City moving forward. We were commissioned to independently evaluate the process learning from the four PB pilot areas. This report presents the findings of the evaluation.

- The pilot areas were delivered in a partnership approach by the Council, local anchor organisations and third sector specialist equalities groups. The pilots adopted a citizens' panel approach to PB, where small groups of community members represented the wider community in the planning, development and implementation of the overall PB process.

- The dedication of the partners involved and the authenticity and quality of the PB processes developed within the pilot areas was evident. Those leading the PB pilots and the equalities agencies involved have consistently 'gone the extra mile' to deliver the highest quality PB processes within the time and resource constraints. The community members who formed the citizens' panels deserve recognition for the time and energy they have given to these PB processes.

- Glasgow City Council has demonstrated a strong commitment to promoting inclusive and accessible PB. The pilots have been delivered within disadvantaged geographical communities or have been targeted at often-excluded communities of interest and identity who face significant and multiple barriers to participation. These PB pilot areas have been chosen with a clear objective of addressing inequalities through the PB process. The Council is working with communities, anchor organisations and specialist partner equalities organisations to enable all citizens to exercise right to participate in local decision-making.

- The PB pilots are a rich source of learning and highlight important considerations moving forward with PB in Glasgow City. The pilot areas were unanimous in stating that the level of funding allocated to support the development of citizens' panels and the implementation of the PB processes should have been higher. Relatedly, the timescales in which the pilot areas were expected to deliver the PB processes were consistently described as 'too tight'. The citizens' panel members would also have welcomed stronger communication from the Council throughout the implementation of the PB processes. In addition, there was uncertainty around the capital and revenue funding constraints imposed on the PB processes which was described as restrictive.

- There are strengths to approaching PB at a Council ward level, but the pilot areas have also highlighted some challenges. Council wards include multiple communities or neighbourhoods and the boundaries of Council wards frequently cut across communities. This presents some difficulties for PB, and for the development of citizens' panels, if the boundaries of the ward are to be adhered to exactly.

- The role of local elected representatives within a more direct democratic structure such as PB has not been clear in Scotland, nor was it clear within the PB pilot ward areas. Councillors had limited involvement in the PB pilot areas.

- Learning from the PB pilots suggests that care must be taken to ensure that the inequalities focus within defined communities is clear at the outset. This should involve working with expert equalities agencies during the planning of PB as well as in the implementation. A lack of clarity as to the inequalities vision and aims of the Pollokshields PB pilot has caused significant delays in that ward.

- The citizens' panel approach proved to be a strong PB model in which the processes were tailored to the local community context and where community interests and priorities are represented throughout the process before voting takes place. The citizens' panels had a strong emphasis on dialogue and deliberation which allowed exploration, discovery, learning and scrutiny, which in turn produced more robust, informed and considered PB decision-making.

- The PB pilot leads have developed supportive, authentic and trusted relationships with the citizens' panel members – this has been an important factor in the success of the pilots. Amid the largely technical narratives that surround the imminent mainstreaming of PB, the approaches developed in the pilots represent a timely reminder that effective PB is about communities and people's lives and is built upon relationships.

- This report emphasises that like any democratic process, PB is an imperfect process and there is much to be learned from the pilot areas which can be adapted and improved moving forward with the next iterations of PB within the City. The recommendations within this report are based on the learning points described above, these include continuation and expansion of ward-based citizens' PB panels, increasing PB capacity building and process timescales and establishing a Glasgow PB learning network and external evaluation support.

- An over-arching priority within the recommendations is to develop a city-wide PB strategy. In keeping with the ethos and vision demonstrated in the pilot wards, this should be underpinned by an equalities framework and co-produced with equalities agencies, anchor organisations and with communities. Through the progressive PB developed in the pilot wards it is clear that Glasgow City Council has a strong and clear vision for inclusive, accessible and inequalities-focused PB. Building upon the development of the City's PB strategic plan, Glasgow can potentially lead the way in addressing the national 'leadership gap' concerning the transition towards the target of 1% of council budgets being allocated via PB by 2021.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Creating inclusive, democratic opportunities and spaces for *all citizens* to exercise their rights, to shape local decisions and have a well-informed say on national matters is a significant challenge.

The Scottish Government has set out an unprecedented level of political, legislative and investment support for community empowerment, participation and the strengthening of local democratic processes[1-3]. Participatory Budgeting (PB) has emerged as a principal approach in achieving these goals and has gained significant traction and support across Scotland in recent years. At its core PB is a process that involves citizens in deciding how to spend public money. PB tends to have an inequalities focus, which is driven by the desire to reallocate public money locally and democratically within disadvantaged communities to priority initiatives, projects and services identified by local people[4].

In broader terms PB has the potential to energise and empower communities and to transform and enrich the relationships between citizens, community groups, community anchor organisations and all levels of government and public service[5]. Like all democratic processes PB is imperfect; however, when it works well it can be a process of significant learning and collaborative development for those involved. Through the opportunity for 'dialogue and deliberation' PB enables communities to learn more about the challenges and constraints inherent in public spending and service delivery[6]. PB can also provide public services and anchor organisations with rich insights from equality groups and communities as to the complexity of promoting equitable engagement and meaningful participation among 'easy to ignore' communities, such as people with disabilities or those facing multiple inequalities[7]. PB can illuminate community aspirations and priorities and provide clear direction as to the ways in which service delivery can be improved and potentially co-produced.

The first iterations of PB in Scotland began around a decade ago as a peripheral, grassroots tool to promote community engagement and participation using small grants. Within the past five years, underpinned by significant Scottish Government investment in PB training, capacity building, digitised voting and practice development and exchange, the second phase of PB in Scotland has seen many empowering processes involving substantial funding across the nation. The forthcoming phase of PB in Scotland could be considered as the 'mainstreaming' of PB[8].

In 2017 the Scottish Government and COSLA agreed a target of 1% of local authority budgets to be allocated to PB by 2021. This 1% target is designed to embed democratic participation within the normal working practice of local authorities[9]. However, the transition from the current forms of PB towards 'mainstreaming' is not likely to be achieved by a simple continuation of the current development journey of PB. A 2019 national evaluation of PB in Scotland has identified a potential leadership gap at the juncture between current PB and the 1% mainstreaming target[10]. Evidence from the evaluation suggests there is ongoing uncertainty as to how to expand and support the necessary increased participation in local resource allocation decisions as part of the 1% PB budget target.

Glasgow City Council has demonstrated a strong commitment to embedding PB across the city. Some of Scotland's first forays into PB were in Glasgow[11] and in 2016, the Glasgow Community Planning Partnership carried out PB processes in each of the then 21 Area Partnerships with funds provided by the Council and match funded by the Scottish Government[12]. Building upon this and with a view to informing this mainstreaming of PB within the city, in 2018 Glasgow City Council committed £1 million to the development of four PB pilot areas[13]. Delivered in a partnership approach by the Council, local anchor organisations and third sector specialist equalities groups, the pilot areas were underpinned by an acute focus on addressing inequalities, and the engagement and participation of often excluded or vulnerable groups within PB[13].

We were commissioned to independently evaluate the process learning from the four PB pilot areas. The timescales involved in this evaluation preclude any assessment of the PB funded projects or their impacts.

Evaluation remit and approach

The GCPH was established in 2004 to generate insights and evidence and to provide leadership in pursuit of improving the health of the city and to address inequalities. Our programmes of work are expansive and have evolved over the years, but an enduring theme has been to work collaboratively with communities, community groups, anchor organisations and a range of service delivery and academic partners to help develop approaches to promote community engagement, empowerment and participation. We have been involved in the delivery and evaluation of PB since 2010 and has published a range of outputs to support the understanding, development, evaluation and implementation of PB within Scotland[4,8,10,14].

We were approached by Glasgow City Council in April 2019 to conduct a short-term evaluation of the four PB pilot areas. The Council provided a well-defined remit for the evaluation, which was to generate a concise, accessible report by September 2019 detailing implementation learning from the PB processes within the pilot areas and to make recommendations based on this learning for the development of PB in the city and the imminent move towards 'mainstreaming PB' by 2021. The two research questions agreed with Glasgow City Council were:

1. What were the key characteristics of the PB processes developed in each pilot ward and what are the evaluator's observations and reflections on these processes?

2. What are the emerging learning themes from the PB pilot wards and what recommendations can the evaluator make for PB within Glasgow moving forward and with a view to informing the longer-term mainstreaming of PB in the city?

Measuring the impacts of community engagement, empowerment and participation has always been a difficult task; causation between these processes and outcomes, for example health and employment is difficult to evidence due to the wide range of variables and external influences which affect such outcomes. Furthermore, impacts accruing from community-based approaches can manifest in a diffuse and unpredictable manner. Combined, these factors make measurement a costly, time-consuming, complex and imprecise process[15].

In response to these challenges, and with a short evaluation timescale and limited budget, the PB pilots were treated as a stand-alone case study which deployed qualitative methods to gather evidence and engage a range of perspectives in developing an understanding of the PB processes, the key learning points and related stakeholder insights and reflections.

In responding to research question 1, the PB processes within the pilot area were broadly considered against a GCPH-developed logic model to support community-based evaluations of PB[14] (Appendix A). The logic model depicts five sequential steps within PB processes.

These are:

1) Participatory budgeting context.
2) Community engagement.
3) Democratic process.
4) Projects funded.
5) Impacts.

The short-term nature of this evaluation precludes any assessment of the projects funded (4) and their impacts (5). The evaluation fieldwork took place at the time of the PB voting events or closely thereafter (the conclusion of step 3; democratic process) in three of the wards and during step 2

(community engagement) within one of the wards. Therefore, the focus of what is reported in the following section relates to the first three steps of the logic model only.

Data were gathered through eight interviews with the PB leads and partner equalities agencies and four focus groups with citizens' panels (the citizens' panel approach to PB involves a small group of community members acting as representatives of the wider community in leading, developing and implementing the PB process; more detail is provided in the 'key learning' section. Interviews and focus groups were recorded with the verbal permission of participants using a portable digital device and then transcribed verbatim. In addition, analysis of Council documents, pilot self-evaluation reports and YouTube video content produced by the pilot areas was carried out. This constitutes the full dataset that was analysed.

The analysis was thematic in nature in order to systemise and summarise the content of the data and develop the key learning themes and recommendations[16]. Three over-arching codes emerged from the data under which the key learning themes were grouped, these were:

1. Equalities and inclusion
2. Communities and local democracy
3. PB processes and practicalities.

The key learning themes and recommendations were shaped through consideration of the growth and development of PB within Glasgow to date and the national PB mainstreaming agenda.

Evaluation findings

Overview of the PB pilots and reflections on the process evaluation

This section provides an overview of the four PB pilot wards and details of the PB processes within each area. Included within these descriptions are an overview of the ward areas, the agencies involved, the pilot theme and key stages of the PB processes. Also included are some quotes directly from citizens' panel members. The overviews also contain some evaluation reflections as to the successes and challenges of delivering the PB processes and the contributions made by the agencies and the citizens' panel members involved.

In addition to the pilot ward areas, Glasgow Disability Alliance (GDA) and the Young Movers youth charity were commissioned by the Council to have a city-wide PB remit to support the inclusion of disabled populations and young people respectively.

The descriptions of the pilot ward areas and related insights concerning health, economic and environmental markers are drawn from statistical sources only. While this information is important in contextualising the importance of community-led PB in these areas, statistics alone do not capture the lived experience of life in ward areas, nor do they reflect the amount of time and energy local elected members, and a range of service providers and community members are investing to improve local circumstances and opportunities.

Table 1 details Glasgow City Council's expenditure over the 2018/19 financial year, on the four PB pilot wards and on partner agencies commissioned to deliver city-wide PB support. The table also includes details of the allocation of capital costs (expenditure on assets such as property or equipment) and revenue costs (short-term expenditure such as staffing costs).

Table 1. Glasgow City Council 2018/19 PB expenditure.

Council Ward/ Partner Agency	Revenue Split (£)		Capital (£)	Total (£)
	PB support costs (£)	PB projects costs (£)		
Calton (ward 9)	20,000	80,000	125,000	225,000
Canal (ward 16)	15,000	80,000	125,000	220,000
Greater Pollok (ward 3)	20,000	80,000	125,000	225,000
Pollokshields (ward 6)	20,000	80,000	125,000	225,000
Glasgow Disability Alliance	-	100,000	-	100,000
Young Movers*	5,000	-	-	5,000
Total (£)	**80,000**	**420,000**	**500,000**	**1,000,000**

Young Movers received a further £15,000 from the Scottish Government and an additional £5,000 from Glasgow City Council's community engagement budget to support PB among young people in North Glasgow.

City-wide PB support

City-wide PB lead: Glasgow Disability Alliance

GDA aims to support people with disabilities in the Greater Glasgow area to participate on a full and equal basis in all aspects of their lives and communities, and within society[17]. GDA is led by people with disabilities and has almost 5,000 members across Greater Glasgow. Through fully accessible programmes of learning and events, GDA supports people with disabilities and people with long-term conditions to come together, to build confidence, social connections, and make contributions through peer support, civic participation, and sharing their lived experience to influence change.

Through their ongoing 'Budgeting for Equality' programme, GDA have developed a comprehensive and inclusive PB delivery framework which sets out mechanisms through which people with disabilities can play a full and meaningful role in PB across Scotland[18]. GDA are clear that people with disabilities face significant barriers to participation and cycles of exclusion rooted within poverty, environmental factors and a lack of support.

In approaching the development of the PB pilot areas, Glasgow City Council recognised that concerted, specialist support is required to ensure people with disabilities can lead how they wish to participate, that the pilots are accessible and that the voice of people with disabilities is fully heard and that their views and priorities are equitably represented. The Council therefore commissioned GDA (£100,000) to provide city-wide support for the four PB pilot areas to ensure people with disabilities are included and can participate effectively within the respective PB processes.

GDA has contributed approximately 1,500 hours of specialist support across the four pilot areas to enable 60 people with disabilities to engage with the development of the PB processes. This has involved an intensive engagement phase in each of the ward areas comprising outreach, PB promotion and information distribution to disabled people. Engagement has also involved scoping out accessible venues and transportation. This was generally followed by exploratory meetings and discussion with people with disabilities in each of the wards in order to establish how they would like to contribute to the PB processes and their aspirations for taking part; this was coupled with discussion as to what individual support might be needed to facilitate involvement.

GDA delivered bespoke PB capacity-building and related programmes for people with disabilities in each of the ward areas. This involved meetings, training and personal development including collective learning and deliberative dialogue. Support was also provided to help individuals express and share their experience of disability and how it had limited their participation within their local areas. GDA delivered capacity building training among the citizens' panels in each ward alongside the PB leads and local partners: this involved disability equality training as well as practical support to enhance the inclusion and participation of disabled people within the pilot wards. GDA facilitated the connections between the citizens' panels and disabled people, including local partners, PB leads and other local GDA projects.

Building upon the work in each PB pilot ward, a citizens' panel of people with disabilities has been developed and supported by GDA. This panel now has the skills and capacity to participate in the city's overall PB development and implementation moving forward and to ensure that the needs and aspirations of people with disabilities are included in this journey.

Evaluation reflections

GDA has been a committed and influential partner across all four pilot wards demonstrating significant expertise, experience and leadership in approaches to community engagement, empowerment and participation working with people with disabilities. Through working with people with disabilities GDA also have a strong track record in engaging effectively with people with long-term conditions, multiple morbidities, mental health issues and those living in poverty. GDA's insights and learning around successfully engaging with populations affected by multiple forms of disadvantage have broader application across the wider population and for the ongoing development of PB within Glasgow and beyond.

City-wide PB lead: Young Movers

Young Movers, known as "YoMo", is a youth-led charity which aims to support youth empowerment through a range of services and approaches across the North East and North West of the city[19]. YoMo's mission is to enable young people to empower themselves by promoting activities relating

to human rights, active citizenship, volunteering and lifelong learning. Many of the opportunities YoMo offer are accredited and emphasise supporting educational progression and positive post-school destinations. YoMo has consistently championed and promoted the interests of young people and their right to be involved in decision-making processes that impact on their lives.

These values have led YoMo to develop a range of youth PB activities and processes over recent years. In particular, YoMo has led a comprehensive programme of PB awareness-raising and a range of PB processes across the North of the city which aim to build capacity among young people in readiness for the mainstreaming of PB. YoMo have not provided direct support to the PB pilot wards; instead, in recognition of the gap in PB development for young people in the North of the city, Glasgow City Council commissioned YoMo to undertake PB awareness-raising and the delivery of a PB process led by young people. At the time of reporting, a youth citizens' panel with ten members had developed and led a PB process, with a spend of just under £30,000 with 15 youth projects being funded. It is anticipated that the projects will include approximately 2,000 young people.

Evaluation reflections

YoMo's empowerment ethos is evident in the way that staff work with and interact with young people; valuing their skills, abilities and insights and ensuring that young people lead the development of PB processes, with support if required. YoMo provide accreditation for many of the opportunities they offer including opportunities relating to PB, this provides additional incentive for young people to participate.

PB pilot wards

PB pilot area: Calton (Council ward 9)
Theme: Child poverty. Pilot lead: Child Poverty Action Group

Calton is an area within Glasgow City situated north of the River Clyde, and just to the east of the city centre. The Calton council ward (ward 9) encompasses a wider geography including Bridgeton, Dalmarnock and Camlachie[20]. The communities within this ward have been subject to a range of regeneration initiatives and investment over the years. Persistent inequalities in health, education and environmental factors affect these areas relative to the rest of Glasgow City. Calton and Bridgeton have high rates of lone parent households (51%) and in particular have high levels of child poverty: 41% of children living in these areas are living in poverty. The well evidenced associations between poverty and childhood obesity are evident in Calton and Bridgeton with almost one-in-ten Primary 1 children living in these areas being obese or severely obese, which is 38% higher than the rate seen across the city[21].

The Child Poverty Action Group (CPAG) were commissioned to lead the development of the 'childhood poverty' PB pilot within ward 9. CPAG is a UK-wide charity that advocates for the complete absence of child poverty[22]. CPAG undertakes lobbying, generates evidence and develops policy recommendations in the pursuit of eradicating childhood poverty. CPAG also has significant experience working in partnership and delivering training in approaches to mitigate the impacts of childhood poverty, including the national Cost of the School Day programme[23].

CPAG began the process of community engagement and PB awareness-raising in the summer of 2018, devoting around 7-10 hours per week to this work. Working with 'Urban Fox', a local voluntary agency working with young people, CPAG developed a brand "Calton W9" (Ward 9) and developed online promotional content to be used on social media platforms. PB awareness-raising was also achieved through community-based, face-to-face canvassing within local venues such as the Forge

shopping centre and at family fun days and community events. Community Planning Partners also supported awareness raising through their local networks. To try and avoid stigma and negative labelling, CPAG and Urban Fox decided not to use the phrase 'child poverty' in the online and physical promotional material, but instead to discuss local challenges and priorities, including the high rates of child poverty, in discussion with community members. The PB promotion and awareness-raising was successful and an established panel of 15 members began meeting in the autumn of 2018. The panel members themselves further raised the profile and awareness of PB across the ward area through their own networks:

> *"We tried a few things to raise awareness. So a whole selection of posters we put up. We used social media and we tried to engage with local groups and a few people did go, a few of the panel members did go to local groups. The panel members themselves if they knew local people that they would actually engage with them. There was a lot on the panel who were actually very good at going out and promoting PB within the community and within their local groups and other groups, this was a lot of effort and commitment getting out there in the evenings and weekends."*

> Citizens' panel member, Calton ward.

With the support of the CPAG PB co-ordinator in a facilitation role, there followed a period of intensive dialogue and deliberation among the Calton citizens' panel. This involved discussing themes and approaches to support those affected by child poverty, aligning these with evidence of the causes of poverty, local information and assessing what support services were already in place locally. The outcome of this deliberation was a workable list of 13 'targets' that the panel wished to publicise, each aimed at attracting funding applications that would impact on child poverty in the ward. The targets included:

1. Children's activities
2. Community access to green space
3. Creating employment
4. Financial inclusion and money advice
5. Flexible childcare
6. Improved access to transport
7. Kinship care support
8. Living wage
9. Mentoring, peer support for new mums
10. Promoting equality and diversity
11. Quality work
12. Reducing food poverty
13. Support for children with autism and special needs.

By early 2019 the panel began developing the PB funding application process including the criteria for funding. The criteria emphasised a desire for fresh thinking, a preference for organisations already effectively delivering services in Ward 9 and a willingness to support small or unconstituted groups, particularly if they could be hosted by larger established community organisations. The panel also clarified their vision and values at this stage, their overarching banner was *'We wish to alleviate child poverty through action and support'*. Further materials (including publications in Chinese and Polish, common languages in Ward 9, and a film) were distributed, and a range of community consultations took place to promote the PB applications.

In total the panel received 22 applications. Due to technical issues with the voting platform used, online voting in Calton did not commence until the second week of April 2019 and concluded on

May 4th to coincide with a community voting event at 'The Space' venue in the east of the city. Almost 1,200 votes were cast by Ward 9 community members, with half being made in person at the event, and half using the online voting platform. A total of ten projects were funded in full, all of which aligned with the child poverty 'targets' developed by the Calton citizens' panel as well as the overall vision, values and criteria of funding developed by the panel.

Evaluation reflections

The PB process evaluation found several important issues within the Calton pilot ward. The quality and reach of the PB awareness raising efforts led by CPAG with support from Urban Fox is impressive. So too is the quality of dialogue and deliberation among the citizens' panel and the strategic development of the child poverty 'targets'. The entire PB process within the Calton pilot, including the facilitation of the panel, has been led by CPAG, undertaking this substantial range of activity on little more than a day a week. The CPAG PB co-ordinator reported being extremely stretched during the development of the PB process and that working in these circumstances was not ideal or sustainable in the long term. Similarly, citizen panel members in Calton also reported feeling pressured by the timescales involved and stated that they would have liked more support in developing the PB process.

PB pilot area: Canal (Council Ward 16)
Theme: Income & employment deprivation. Pilot lead: North West Glasgow Voluntary Sector Network

Council Ward 16 has a population of 25,000 people and encompasses a range of communities including Possilpark, Milton, Lambhill, Ruchill and Parkhouse. The ward is collectively known as "Canal" on account of the Forth and Clyde canal which dissects the ward[24]. Just 4% of the Lambhill and Milton communities identify as Black and Minority Ethnicity (BME). The area experiences a range of social, economic and health inequalities compared with Glasgow City overall. The theme for the PB work in the ward was income and employment deprivation, since almost a third of the Lambhill and Milton populations claim out-of-work benefits, this rate being 52% higher than the Glasgow City rate. Closely related to this are the educational inequalities evidenced within Lambhill and Milton where rates of adults with qualifications at 'Highers' level or above is some 45% lower than the Glasgow City average. The rate of young people not in education, employment or training is also 49% higher than in the rest of Glasgow[25].

The North West Glasgow Voluntary Sector Network (NWGVSN) supports and represents around 600 voluntary sector and community groups in the North West of Glasgow[26]. The network was commissioned to lead and support the implementation of the PB pilot in the Canal ward. The network aims to be a collective voice for the voluntary sector in the North West of Glasgow and to provide advice, information and support to local voluntary organisations. The network was well placed to support PB delivery due to their longstanding community connections and also their experience of playing a vital role in facilitating the input of the voluntary sector into the community planning process locally. Over the summer of 2018, the network manager at NWGVSN began the process of PB awareness-raising across the network partner agencies within the Canal ward. This was closely followed by the community engagement required to develop the citizens' panel. By August 2018, 13 panel members were recruited.

Citizens' panel members describe the group as well-functioning and supportive, however they also recognised that this required significant input from the network manager over several months. The group took part in training, developed their PB project plan, and worked through the practicalities of

developing the PB process. This included creating a statement of intent, designing the PB application process and planning the PB voting event. The panel initially met fortnightly, but this increased to weekly meetings towards the end of 2018 when the group comprised eight members who were committed to taking forward the PB process. The training the group received included PB training and looking at examples of best practice, co-production and community engagement and evaluation.

The citizens' panel members in Canal expressed that they valued the input and support of the NWGVSN network manager. They were also clear that they learned a lot through the training and development, including through their contact with GDA in terms of how they approached PB with an acute focus on equalities more broadly, and the specific needs of disabled populations.

The dialogue and deliberation undertaken by the Canal citizens' panel and supported by the network manager was intensive and lasted several weeks. To begin with, the panel members recognised that the Canal ward comprised a range of communities and that the panel needed to learn more about those communities and their priorities, needs and aspirations. To do so the panel members initiated 12 focus groups with a variety of community groups and initiatives across the seven communities within the Canal ward. This involved a consultation with 200 residents. This served to strengthen and enrich the panel's understanding as to how PB would be able to create positive change within the ward areas, but it also enabled further community awareness of the imminent PB process. Alongside this community engagement the panel undertook three learning and development sessions with key stakeholders within Glasgow concerning employability; the panel referred to this group as the 'Information and Resource Group'. The citizens' panel members valued the external expertise and advice available to them through the Information and Resource Group in shaping their understanding of how to take forward the pilot:

> *"But we had Glasgow Social Enterprise Network, that's who it was. So, we had the CEO from them came in, which was great. And they gave us an insight into small businesses people coming in for small grants for start-up funds, which was great as well because it gave us the idea that there were people in the local community who were looking to start a business or maybe bring an idea that we can then hope to maybe adapt and evolve with the PB, whether it's volunteering, the impact of volunteering, how people can benefit from it. The impact on the community, the fact that you can provide an opportunity for people to then develop at very little monetary cost, but there's also added value for them as well and value for the community. So, we talked about that and how the PB could take that forward."*

> Citizens' panel member, Canal ward

Based on this discussion, learning and deliberation, the panel developed a number of funding priorities, which were: mentoring; confidence building; pre-employability; re-employability; volunteering; and social enterprise. The group also developed a small 'try it out' fund for local people or unconstituted groups to test an employability idea.

A total of 41 PB applications were received with 34 of these meeting the panel's criteria and progressing to the voting event. The panel invested significant time in considering all the applications thoroughly. Glasgow City Council had stipulated that the £205,000 available for PB had to be split into £110,000 revenue (short-term expenditure, for example, staff costs) and £95,000 capital (expenditure on assets, for example, buildings). The panel were clear that this restriction did not suit an employability theme; the revenue bids (for staff, training, sessional hours and so on) were significantly over budget. In the end the Council exercised some flexibility on this matter to more effectively meet the funding applications. An issue identified by the panel members at this stage was that some of them had been involved in submitting PB funding applications which clearly was a conflict of interest. The panel was functioning effectively, and members reflected that they

felt the integrity and transparency of the PB process was not undermined. However, the panel did recognise this as an important issue concerning the delivery of PB through citizens' panels moving forward. A total of 16 PB funding applications were funded through the Canal PB pilot.

Evaluation reflections

The citizens' panel members in Canal played a significant role in delivering a progressive, well-considered, thorough and high-quality PB process. This has been based on a strong work ethic and a commitment to ensuring the PB resources were allocated in a way that reflected the priorities and aspirations of community members within the ward area. Both NWGVSN and the network manager made considerable contributions to the overall PB process and in supporting the panel's development, learning and functioning. Similar to the feedback within the Calton ward the network manager in Canal reported being extremely stretched in terms of resource and time in delivering the PB process overall, and that moving forward this way of working would be unsustainable.

PB pilot area: Pollokshields (Council Ward 6)
Theme: Black & minority ethnic populations. Pilot lead: Coalition for Racial Equality and Rights

Pollokshields is a culturally diverse area in the South of Glasgow. The Pollokshields council ward (ward 6) has a population of almost 30,000 people, of which approximately one third identify as Black and minority ethnicity. The Pollokshields ward encompasses parts of Shawlands as well as the communities in Maxwell Park, Dumbreck, Bellahouston and Craigton[27]. Both male and female life expectancy is higher in Pollokshields in comparison with the Glasgow City average. The area also has generally high levels of educational attainment.

The ward has a mixed health, social, economic and environmental profile. Pollokshields West is relatively affluent, with high levels of education and employment, and lower levels of income deprivation and poverty compared with the Glasgow City averages. However, within Pollokshields East, levels of child poverty are 5% higher than the Glasgow average, the proportion of overcrowded households is 54% higher and the proportion of people living within 500 metres of vacant or derelict land is 55% higher[28].

The progress of the pilot within the Pollokshields ward was found to be markedly slower than in the other PB pilot wards. This was due to a range of factors at the outset of the pilot relating to a lack of clarity as to the vision and aims of the pilot, and in what way it would prioritise and engage with the BME communities within the ward. It was also not clear if the pilot would be working with BME communities exclusively. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to explore the range of these perspectives within the communities in the Pollokshields ward; however, it was clear that this created tensions and unease around the implementation of PB within the area. Recognising these difficulties, Glasgow City Council subsequently commissioned the Coalition for Racial Equality and Rights (CRER) to lead the pilot and support the development of a citizens' panel[29].

CRER is a Scottish strategic racial equality charity, based in Glasgow. CRER works to eliminate racial discrimination and harassment and promote racial justice across Scotland. CRER has had an important role nationally in advocating, campaigning, and influencing developments to promote racial equality. The CRER officer leading the Pollokshields pilot began the process of community awareness-raising and engagement in the early summer of 2019. Integral to this was developing a clear vision for the PB pilot: that it was for all residents in the ward area, that efforts would be made to promote accessible, inclusive PB for everyone, and that some BME communities might require additional support. CRER led the delivery of PB information sessions across the ward in September

2019, accompanied by the development of a range of online guidance and support materials for ward 6 community members and groups to develop PB applications and to become constituted.

During this time CRER also supported the formation of a citizens' panel comprising around 15 residents from across the ward area. In order to gather views among the wider community, the citizens' panel developed a community survey based on the Equality and Human Rights Commission's Measurement Framework for Equality and Human Rights[30]. CRER supported the implementation of the survey which was designed to gather community views on priority actions within education, health, justice and security, living standards, participation in decision-making, work and other aspects of life in ward 6. The survey results then served to underpin the panel's discussion and development of the PB funding application criteria, which at the time of writing is ongoing.

Evaluation reflections

Although the Pollokshields PB pilot was delayed it is vital that Glasgow City Council and the community partners within the area recognise that the pilot lacked clarity at the outset, and that this negatively impacted on the potential of the PB pilot overall. The subsequent commissioning of CRER was a positive step and the PB process is progressing well at the time of writing. CRER bring significant experience, insight and leadership and have shown their commitment and ability in transferring and instilling their values within the delivery of PB in diverse communities. It has been a challenging process for CRER to rebuild relationships and to foster trust between the community members and groups initially involved. However, it is clear that CRER have managed this, and that relationships within the pilot ward are positive. To their credit, many of the community members who were disheartened by the initial PB development within the pilot have reengaged with the PB process led by CRER and are contributing effectively to the citizens' panel.

PB pilot area: Greater Pollok (Council Ward 3)
Theme: Young people. Pilot lead: Swamp media

With a population of over 30,000 people, the Greater Pollok ward is the largest of the PB pilot areas. The ward area comprises the communities of Crookston, Househillwood, Nitshill, Priesthill, Southpark Village, Darnley and parts of Deaconsbank[31]. Almost a fifth of the Pollok population comprises children and young people aged 15 years and under; this is 18% higher than the Glasgow City average. The estimates of both male and female life expectancy in Pollok are above the Glasgow average. The area has a low proportion of people from an ethnic minority and a high proportion of owner-occupied households compared with the Glasgow average.

Glasgow City Council commissioned Swamp Media (SM) to lead the PB process development with young people in Pollok[32]. SM was established in 1996 and is a Community Development Trust and registered charity, using accredited training, outreach, film, music, digital technologies, gardening and the creative arts to enable and empower social change. SM was one of the first organisations in Glasgow to use creative media, digital arts and new technologies as tools for community engagement to enhance and support wider skills and learning, and later adopted the Curriculum for Excellence approach within the programme design. SM works predominantly with children and young people but also engages with older people and the wider local community.

In the summer of 2018 SM began the PB awareness-raising process among their network of young people within Greater Pollok. SM stated that they were looking for a group of young people to form a citizens' panel and to shape and lead the PB process. In order to generate interest and maintain panel membership and participation among the young people, SM emphasised that the panel were empowered to take this PB process in their chosen direction and that they would also be developing

skills and experience in the process. In total, 25 young people joined the panel initially; this decreased over time, to a dozen regular members. SM wanted the PB process to be appealing to young people and emphasised the skills development inherent in the creative use of digital technology to promote and market the PB process to other young people across the ward. At the outset, the panel members articulated a desire to have a large PB voting event with a celebratory tone and were keen to incorporate digital creativity and their skills development into this event.

The panel members participated in a range of workshops to understand more about PB and its related implementation stages. These workshops were coupled with panel-led development of a 'PBTV' (participatory budgeting television) brand and identity for the PB awareness-raising they were undertaking. Panel members developed and created video content in the form of an online YouTube channel to promote PB across the ward. In the process they gained experience and learned a range of skills including filming, editing, sound engineering, digital visual effects, script writing and presenting. As the young people's skills and confidence developed in these areas, so too did their confidence in, and understanding, of PB. In particular the young people who were on the citizens' panel described becoming much more adept at communicating the ethos, vision and process of PB to other young people and youth organisations in the area. Through regular meetings of the panel throughout the latter stages of 2018 and into 2019, the panel refined their PB funding criteria and began planning the PB voting event.

> *"Impacts, for me the big one is confidence, definitely. From where I was at the start of getting all the PB stuff going and to where I am now – definitely confidence. I hadn't a clue about participatory budgeting, couldn't even say it, but then got to a stage of talking to loads of folk and groups about it and communicating it to them. It was hard leading the whole process… has been really challenging but we did it… we can look back and say we did that. It's been so rewarding, empowering! That's the word empowering, definitely empowering to feel you've had a say in stuff in the area for young folk."*

<div align="right">Citizens' panel member, Greater Pollok ward.</div>

The Greater Pollok citizens' panel, supported by SM, led the planning and delivery of a large PB voting event within a local cinema at the nearby Silverburn shopping centre. Taking place in mid-April 2019, the event was called the Greater Pollok PBTV 'Big Night In'. The event enabled local young people and youth organisations to pitch their PB funding ideas to the audience of around 150 young people. The event also involved live singing performances from local young people and was streamed live on YouTube[A]. The 150 attendees voted on their preferred PB applications and a further 500 online votes were cast by young people across ward 3. The citizens' panel members were critical of the accessibility, online registration process and length of time it took to participate in online voting overall. Despite this a total of 650 young people voting in ward 3 was regarded as highly successful in comparison with the scale of other participation opportunities for young people held in the area in the past. The event concluded with 16 projects being funded.

Evaluation reflections

There was a vibrant and positive feel brought by the young people to the 'Big Night In' event along with a commitment to the citizens' panel, and in leading and developing the PB process over several months. The authenticity and quality of relationships that SM were able to foster with the young people who formed the citizens' panel underpinned many of the positive findings within the Greater Pollok pilot ward. This quality relationship, coupled with the use of creative digital media and the related skills development, has proven an effective method of engagement and achieved a sustained

---

[A] The Greater Pollok PBTV 'Big Night In' event can be viewed at: https://youtu.be/lq7_vfazWx4

level of participation in PB processes among young people. Similar to the Calton and Canal wards, the PB lead within SM described the resource allocation and time constraints involved in the PB process as very demanding and pressured.

Key learning from PB pilot wards

This section summarises key learning from the pilot areas. The learning themes have emerged from the thematic analysis of data gathered during interviews and focus groups with citizens' panel members, PB lead agencies and the equalities agencies involved.

The learning themes are grouped under three headings: *Equalities and inclusion; Communities and local democracy; and PB processes and practicalities.*

Equalities and inclusion

Commitment to embedding PB

The commitment of all partners involved and the authenticity of the PB processes developed within the pilot areas was striking.

Those leading the PB pilots consistently 'went the extra mile' to deliver the highest quality PB processes within the time and resource constraints. The PB leads showed dedication to the communities they worked within and fostered strong and valued relationships across these communities and with members of the citizens' panels.

The community members who formed the citizens' panels deserve recognition for the time and energy they have given to these PB processes. The success of the pilots has been based largely on the skills, local knowledge and wisdom of the citizens' panel members. This has involved sustained, intensive periods of working for the panel members especially during the initial phases of developing and planning the PB processes and the related dialogue and deliberation.

Developing inclusive PB

Glasgow City Council has demonstrated a strong commitment to promoting inclusive and accessible PB. The pilots were delivered within disadvantaged geographical communities or targeted at often-excluded communities of interest and identity (such as young people) who can face significant and multiple barriers to participation. The PB pilot areas were also underpinned by a clear focus on addressing inequalities. The Council is working with communities, anchor organisations and specialist partner equalities organisations to enable all citizens to exercise their right to participate in local decision-making.

The Council recognised that this focus on inclusion is a prerequisite for PB across the city. Working in this way enabled invaluable insights as to how the PB processes should be tailored to overcome local barriers to engagement and participation for the groups concerned, including people with disabilities, BME populations and young people. The learning from these pilots s vital to the next iterations of PB within the city and should inform the national PB mainstreaming agenda.

Framing inequalities within PB

Glasgow City Council's proactive approach to developing inclusive and accessible PB is clear and was evident throughout the planning and delivery of the PB processes. However, learning from the pilots suggests that care must be taken to ensure that the inequalities focus within defined communities is clear at the outset, which should involve working with expert equalities agencies during the planning stages of PB as well as in the implementation. Clarity should also be sought as to the level of

anticipated impacts resulting from PB investment, and these must of course be commensurate with the resources and timescales involved.

For example, designating the Pollokshields ward as a 'Black and minority ethnic population' did cause uncertainty which played a part in the delays within this pilot ward. The Council's aim for the pilot was to embed important learning as to how to support the equitable engagement and participation of BME communities within PB moving forward. However, some stakeholders expressed concern that it might be construed as identifying the BME population as a problem. It was also unclear whether the PB pilot was to be targeted towards BME residents only. A more effective way of framing this pilot would, for example, have been 'Supporting PB participation within diverse communities'.

Within the Calton ward there was also a degree of ambiguity as to the scale and nature of impacts on child poverty that could be achieved within the level of PB investment and timescales. Child poverty is a societal issue which is perpetuated through a range of complex mechanisms, not least UK political decision-making and policy. With this in mind, Calton citizens' panel members felt that with hindsight it would have been better to frame the pilot as 'mitigating the impacts of child poverty within Calton'.

Communities and local democracy

Developing citizens' panels – a strong deliberative PB model

The citizens' panel approach to PB adopted within the pilot areas involved small groups of community members representing the wider community in the planning, development and implementation of the overall PB process. On average approximately 12 panel members consistently engaged with the processes in each pilot area. This proved to be a strong PB model in which the processes were tailored to the local community context and where community interests and priorities were represented throughout the process, before voting took place.

The citizens' panels had a strong emphasis on dialogue and deliberation which allowed exploration, discovery, learning and scrutiny, which in turn produced more robust, informed and considered decision-making. This directly improved the democratic quality of the PB pilot areas by enabling opportunities for collective reflection, innovation and action. Such deliberation shaped the understanding of the pilot area priorities, the development of funding criteria and thus the range of prospective PB projects for communities to vote on. The PB voting events within the pilot areas enabled voters within the wider community to hear pitches from PB funding applicants, or to speak directly to the applicants and to discuss the PB project ideas that were competing for their votes. This enabled voting to become a fuller expression of community preferences and considered judgement.

The pilot areas also demonstrated the value of equalities agencies in supporting the capacity building within the citizens' panels. For example, GDA facilitated focus groups with panel members, involving people with disabilities. This enabled the panel members to learn about the range of issues and barriers affecting people with disabilities in exercising their rights to participate in local democracy.

The level of capacity building and support required to develop the citizens' panels was considerable. Key areas of capacity building identified within the pilot areas were financial and IT literacy and planning and project managements skills.

Defining geographical communities within PB

It is worthwhile recognising that while there are strengths to approaching PB at a council ward level there are also challenges. Council wards contain a size of population which is conducive to PB and clearly there are already established democratic structures at a ward level which PB can align with. However, a clear lesson from the PB pilot is that council wards include multiple communities or neighbourhoods and the boundaries of Council wards frequently cut across communities. This presents some difficulties for PB, and for the development of citizens' panels, if the boundaries of the ward are to be adhered to precisely.

Prioritising relationships within PB

The PB pilot leads developed supportive, authentic and trusted relationships with the citizens' panel members – this was an important factor in the success of the pilots. These relationships have taken time to build and while there were difficulties and setbacks, the patience, empathy, emotional intelligence and commitment of those involved was vital to ensuring positive PB processes were implemented.

Amid the largely technical narratives surrounding what mainstream PB might look like in Scotland, the approaches developed in the pilots represent a timely reminder that effective PB is about communities and people and is built upon relationships. The interpersonal skills and attributes of those responsible for developing and delivering PB are hugely important and an often overlooked component within effective PB.

Role of elected representatives within PB

The role of elected representatives within a more direct democratic structure such as PB has not been made clear in Scotland, and nor was it clear within these pilot wards. Elected representatives did not play a significant direct role in the development of the PB pilots. However, one pilot area reported that a local elected representative attended the community voting event, while another noted that one of the area's elected representatives helped support awareness-raising of the PB funds in the area and the planned process.

PB processes and practicalities

PB process timescales

The timescales for the PB processes within the pilot wards was unanimously described as too short by both the citizen panel members and the support and equalities agencies involved. While these stakeholders were generally pleased with the PB processes and their funded projects there was a clear sense that the quality of PB could have been improved had the timescales been longer. In particular, the dialogue and deliberation and wider community engagement phases, including the voting within the PB processes, felt under-prepared and rushed.

PB support and capacity building resource

Approximately 10% of each of the PB pilot area budgets were allocated to PB lead and equalities agencies to support the development of PB processes and the capacity building of the citizens' panels. This level of resource was consistently described as inadequate by both citizen panel members and the agencies involved. The agencies described being extremely stretched and pressured throughout the panel capacity building and subsequent PB planning and implementation. It was felt that the quality and reach of the PB processes, while successful, could have been enhanced with greater support and capacity building resource.

Capital and revenue PB funding constraints

The PB funding available within the pilot areas came with the stipulation that there was a capital (55%) and revenue (45%) investment split as a result of the funding streams the Council used to finance the PB pilots. The resources for PB lead and equalities agencies to support PB were taken from the revenue budget within each ward meaning that the funding split available to the PB projects was nearer to 65% capital and 35% revenue. There was a consistent feeling across the PB pilots that they were not certain as to why this was the case and that it was restrictive in terms of what projects could be funded and disempowering to a degree. Panel members were clear that they did not expect complete autonomy and freedom in how the PB funds could be used, but that to some extent this restriction went against the ethos of PB and its underlying community empowerment agenda.

Communication within PB

The citizens' panels, PB lead and equalities agencies recognised the pressure that all stakeholders were under during the development and implementation of the PB processes; however, they stated that they would have valued more frequent communication from the Council. Panel members were unsure as to the reasoning behind some of the decision-making within the Council in relation to the pilot areas, the funding constraints and the timeline of the PB processes. This led to a degree of confusion at times among the pilot areas. At present there appears to be a lack of clarity as to the 'next steps' for the PB pilot areas and whether further PB will be resourced over the 2019/20 financial year. This has dampened the momentum and positivity among the pilot areas.

Online PB voting platform

Digital voting platforms used for PB have been heralded as a means of furthering the reach and engagement of processes[31]. PB pilot leads and citizens' panel members were enthusiastic about the potential of online approaches but were for the most part disappointed by the delivery of the system deployed. The online system was late in going live within the Calton and Canal wards; these delays hindered the PB processes that were developed and their planned timelines. The online system did not accept some popular email domains in setting up voting accounts and this was deemed to limit accessibility Within Greater Pollok, the young people's citizens' panel described how the online voting system required too much time and information before the votes could be cast; they felt that this might be a barrier for young people voting in PB. The Pollok panel members described how a faster, more accessible, simpler online voting platform would be more desirable.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are aimed at supporting the continuation and development of PB within Glasgow City. The recommendations are based on the learning from the four PB pilot areas but are also contextualised within the current stage of growth and development of PB within Glasgow to date. Importantly, the recommendations are also responsive to the imminent transition towards 1% of local authority budgets being committed to 'mainstreaming PB' by 2021.

Development of Glasgow City PB strategy underpinned by equalities framework

To harness the learning and momentum from the PB pilot wards, and to drive PB to fulfil its transformative potential in the city, Glasgow City Council should ignite a collaborative city-wide process to develop a shared PB strategy for Glasgow. This process should aim to:

- co-produce a clear shared vision for PB in Glasgow, underlining its role as a principal approach for the delivery of the aims and priorities within Glasgow's Strategic Plan (2017-22), and in particular:

    - Inclusive Economic Growth.
    - Promoting Human Rights and reducing inequalities.
    - Improving life chances and choices.
    - Changing ways of working to empower citizens to become involved in decisions that affect them, including how money is spent and how services are developed.

- establish a shared understanding of expectations and approaches required to support delivery of the national 1% local authority budget commitment to PB in Glasgow, and the step-change towards embedding participation in mainstream budget decisions.

- To uphold and strengthen Glasgow City Council's clear commitment to embedding equalities within Glasgow's PB approach; a robust equalities framework is required to underpin the development of a citywide PB strategy. This framework should be co-produced with equalities-led organisations and communities of interest and identity, aiming to:

    - Synthesise learning from the diverse range of approaches taken across the PB pilots, and the wealth of equalities expertise in the city, to help inform and 'equalities-proof' PB moving forward.
    - Cultivate a shared understanding of barriers faced by equalities groups and how best to mitigate and overcome these, both in PB processes (to prevent PB from widening inequalities) and more widely within communities, at ward level or city-wide. This would maximise the potential for PB to address the priority issues of more marginalised groups.
    - Establish a collective understanding of equalities legislation, and how the Public Sector Equality duties can be fulfilled and enhanced through PB by eliminating discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering effective relationships. For example, mainstreaming participation could be advanced, and decision-making improved, by means of routine involvement of relevant communities or equalities groups within Equality Impact Assessments.

- To develop and maximise the potential for PB to help reduce inequalities, the following will be vital:

- Leadership based on shared PB understanding among politicians, public services, third sector agencies and communities.
- A strategic, collaborative approach to PB built around trust and sharing power.
- Building the PB capacity, knowledge, skills and confidence of all stakeholders.
- Deliberative methods at the core of PB, enabling opportunities and processes to enable participation in decision-making about local budgets and mainstream services.
- Investment of resource in PB – both of time and funding.
- Commitment to the equalities framework underpinning PB processes.

Continuation and expansion of ward-based citizens' PB panels

A clear finding from the PB pilot areas is that the citizens' panels represent a strong and viable form of deliberative democracy for Glasgow City. There is much to discuss and plan concerning the next iterations of PB within the city. The following recommendations should inform the development of citizens' panels within Glasgow City:

- The citizens' panel model should be continued within the pilot wards, with a view to being deployed across the City's 23 council wards within a manageable timescale.

- A key consideration moving forward is whether the city's PB resource should be evenly distributed across all the wards or whether greater funding should be targeted to disadvantaged wards where greatest inequalities are evident and where longstanding democratic deficits persist. The latter of these two approaches appears more in keeping with the Council's inclusive, inequalities focus on PB demonstrated within the pilot wards.

- The citizens' panels require significant facilitation and PB capacity building especially during their first years of development and this should be factored into the city's PB planning and budgets moving forward.

- The pilot wards have been a rich source of learning concerning the development of citizens' panels and inclusive, accessible PB processes. There is significant community capacity and strong relationships with PB lead agencies and the specialist equalities agencies. There is also a collective willingness to deliver more PB within the areas. The pilot wards should continue to take forward further pilot activity and be subject to the associated evaluation.

Like any form of democracy, PB is imperfect, and the citizens' panel approach is not infallible. Care should be taken to ensure that the characteristics of the members are as representative of the community demographics as possible; this is an enduring challenge. This should be considered and monitored against the equalities framework within the future PB strategic plan.

A point of learning from the PB pilot areas is that it may be beneficial to the democratic quality and transparency of the PB process to ensure that panel members are not eligible to submit PB funding applications themselves. This may be difficult in practice given that community members who are willing to commit their time and energy in order to be part of citizens' panel are likely to be long-standing residents and may be involved with existing initiatives and groups within the area.

The quality of dialogue and deliberation within the pilot citizens' panels was impressive, and the community members involved brought an invaluable mix of skills, insights and experiences to the PB processes. With this in mind:

- Moving forward, there is significant potential for relevant pubic service and third sector partners to join citizens' panels in a support and advisory capacity. Their inclusion within the panels would be based on a reciprocal desire to learn more from each other's skills, experiences, perspectives and points of view in the collective ambition of furthering PB across the city and improving services and outcomes within communities.

Increased PB capacity building and timescales

The PB pilots were unanimous in stating that they felt significant time pressures in delivering the PB process. It would be remiss to be overly prescriptive in terms of how long effective PB processes should take as there are a variety of factors which can influence this. It must be kept in mind that the citizens' panels were newly initiated and required time in setting up and supporting their PB development. However:

- Based on the learning from the pilot areas overall, the timescales for PB should be extended from 10 to 12 months. This represents a more realistic timeframe to establish new citizens' panels and to deliver a quality PB process. This timescale may shorten, or the frequency of meeting and intensity of dialogue and deliberation may lessen as citizens' panels oversee repeated PB processes.

- An important point to make in support of extending the timeline of PB processes relates to equalities. Tight timescales that 'rush' PB processes can represent a barrier to sustained inclusion and meaningful participation for some populations such as older people or those with a learning disability.

Approximately 10% of the PB pilot area budgets were allocated to the pilot lead agencies to support the development of the community awareness-raising, citizens' panels and the related capacity building and facilitation. This was driven by a well-intended desire to get as much of the PB resource 'into the hands of the community' in order to maximise the potential impacts of the PB processes. However:

- On reflection, the proportion of resource allocated to the PB lead and equalities agencies to support the citizens' panels and the PB process was inadequate and should be significantly increased moving forward. This increased funding for PB support agencies would align more effectively with the longer-term PB agenda within the city which should aim for well-functioning citizens' panels and significant community awareness, capacity and readiness for mainstream PB within every ward.

Establishing Glasgow PB learning network and evaluation support

PB is a complex undertaking and no democratic process is ever perfect. The implementation of PB within Glasgow is still in its infancy and it is recommended that its development be underpinned by a culture of 'trying, testing and learning'. Moving forward:

- Opportunities should be created regularly to share learning and insights concerning the implementation of PB across the city. This requires resource, organisation and facilitation and should also include the specialist equalities agencies in supporting the inclusion and participation of citizens who are experiencing multiple disadvantage. This may involve large events involving all PB stakeholders but should also include regular meetings among PB delivery agencies and citizens' panel representatives from across the city.

The development and delivery of PB is demanding: thus, the responsibility for gathering evidence and insights, and for distilling the learning, should not lie with the PB delivery staff, partner agencies or communities:

- Instead, the next iterations of PB in the city should incorporate a longer-term external PB evaluation. This requires resource and the formation of an evaluation governance group. The evaluation has much to do in terms of developing a shared understanding among city-wide stakeholders as to the key components of PB processes and the range of anticipated impacts for communities and participants. There is a role for academics and research institutions to lead this, but evaluation methodologies must ensure that the voices of those responsible for delivering PB, the equalities agencies involved, and the views of the citizens' panel members feature directly and prominently in the evaluation outputs.

Limitations of this evaluation

This report presents the findings of a short-term evaluation of the PB pilot wards deploying only qualitative methods. While the evaluation engaged a range of stakeholder and community perspectives, the data collection was limited by time and resources. For example, the views of PB funding applicants or the wider community were not gathered, instead only insights from community members involved in the citizens' panels and the PB lead agencies and equalities partner agencies were recorded. This therefore limits the range of perspectives represented in this report and hence restricts the potential range of learning themes. The analysis of data collected was thematic, structured and rigorous allowing emergent learning themes to be presented with confidence. However, the analysis was limited in scope and again curtailed by time pressures. The focus of the evaluation was on process learning and the timescales precluded any quantitative consideration of impacts at either an individual or community level.

Conclusion

The four PB pilot areas within Glasgow City have proven to be a rich source of learning which can inform the continued development and implementation of PB across the city. Through the ethos and vision demonstrated within the pilots it is clear that Glasgow City Council is developing a PB process which is designed to be inclusive and accessible to all citizens and is underpinned by a commitment to addressing inequalities. This is a strong foundation from which to deepen and strengthen democratic processes and structures within Glasgow City.

The PB pilot wards demonstrate that the Council recognises and values the contributions that specialist equalities agencies such as GDA, CPAG, Young Movers and CRER can make to the equitable delivery of PB. These organisations bring the skills, experience and insight in the 'craft of inclusive engagement'[33] within the communities of interest and identity they support. Similarly, community anchor organisations such as SM and the NWGVSN bring a level of community focus, insight and understanding that is vital to ensuring PB processes are tailored to the local community context and that community interests and priorities are represented throughout the process. Both equalities agencies and anchor organisations have demonstrated impressive community engagement and PB facilitation skills, this has been evident in the quality of community-led dialogue and deliberation evident within the pilot wards.

A consistent observation from the PB pilots was the level of commitment, knowledge, skills and wisdom that community members brought to PB. In this regard, the citizens' panel approach adopted within the pilot areas was a strong model of PB which fitted well with the level of resources available for PB and with the council ward geographies.

This report emphasises that PB is an imperfect process and there is much to be learned from the pilot areas which can be adapted and improved moving forward with the next iterations of PB within the city. The recommendations are based on this learning and an over-arching priority is to develop a city-wide PB strategy. In keeping with the ethos and vision underpinning the pilot wards, this should be underpinned by an equalities framework and co-produced with equalities agencies, anchor organisations and with communities.

Through the progressive PB developed in the pilot wards it is clear that Glasgow City Council has a strong and clear vision for inclusive, accessible and inequalities-focused PB. The development of the city's PB strategic plan would enable Glasgow to potentially lead the way in addressing the national 'leadership gap' concerning the transition towards the target of 1% of council budgets being allocated via PB.

Challenges remain in moving towards mainstream PB in Glasgow City, and the key learning points and recommendations in this report highlight some of these. A fundamental challenge moving forward is promoting Council-wide ownership of PB and the recognition of its transformative potential beyond that of a community engagement tool. Furthermore, an enduring task is to foster the necessary cultural shifts, alongside changing practice, required to embed PB and to normalise sustained and meaningful community participation in local resource allocation decisions.

References

1. Scottish Government. *Commission on the future delivery of public services*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government; 2011.

2. Scottish Parliament. *Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015*. Edinburgh: Scottish Parliament; 2015.

3. Scottish Parliament. *National Standards for Community Engagement Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Parliament; 2016.

4. Baiocchi G, Ganuza E. Participatory Budgeting as if emancipation mattered. *Politics and Society* 2014;42(1):29-50.

5. Harkins C, Escobar O. *Participatory Budgeting in Scotland: An overview of strategic design choices and principles for effective delivery.* Glasgow: GCPH, WWS; 2015. Available at: www.gcph.co.uk/publications/605_participatory_budgeting_in_scotland_design_choices_delivery_principles (accessed September 2019)

6. Stipanowich TJ. The international evolution of mediation: a call for dialogue and deliberation. Victoria U. Wellington L. *Review* 2015;46:1191.

7. Matthews P, Netto G, Besemer K. *'Hard-to-Reach'or 'Easy-to-Ignore'? A rapid review of place-based policies and equality.* Stirling: Stirling University; 2012.

8. Harkins C, Moore K, Escobar O. *Review of 1st generation participatory budgeting in Scotland.* Edinburgh: What Works Scotland; 2016.

9. COSLA. *Participatory Budgeting mainstreaming activity.* Edinburgh: COSLA; 2017. Availible at: https://www.cosla.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/17-11-03_cwb_item_09_-_participatory_budgeting.pdf#targetText=COSLA%20and%20Scottish%20Government%20have,public%20and%20third%20sector%20partners. (accessed September 2019)

10. O'Hagan A, Hill-O'Connor C, MacRae C, Teedon P. Evaluation of Participatory Budgeting Activity in Scotland 2016-2018. Glasgow: Glasgow Caledonian University; 2019.

11. Harkins C, Egan J. *The role of participatory budgeting in promoting localism and mobilising community assets. But where next for participatory budgeting in Scotland?* Glasgow: GCPH; 2012. Available at: https://www.gcph.co.uk/publications/321_participatory_budgeting-learning_from_govanhill_equally_well_test_site

12. Glasgow City Council. *Community Budgeting Pilot, 2016*. Availible at: https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19305 (accessed September 2019)

13. Glasgow City Council. *PB Update, 2018*. Available at: http://www.glasgow.gov.uk/Councillorsandcommittees/viewSelectedDocument.asp?c=P62AFQDN2UNTDX81NT (accessed September 2019)

14. Glasgow Centre for Population Health. *Briefing Paper 53: Supporting community-based evaluations of participatory budgeting..* Glasgow: GCPH; 2018. Available at: https://www.gcph.co.uk/publications/852_briefing_paper_53_community-based_evaluations_of_participatory_budgeting

15. Egan M, Kearns A, Mason P, Tannahill C, Bond L, Coyle J, Beck S, Crawford F, Hanlon P, Lawson L, McLean J, Petticrew M, Sautkina E, Thomson H, Walsh D, the GoWell Team. Protocol for a mixed methods study investigating the impact of investment in housing, regeneration and neighbourhood renewal on the health and wellbeing of residents: the GoWell programme. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 2010;10(1):41

16. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 2006;3(2):77-101.

17. Glasgow Disability Alliance http://gda.scot/

18. Glasgow Disability Alliance. *Budgeting for Equality*. Glasgow: GDA; 2018. Available at: http://gda.scot//content/publications/Final-GDA-BudgetingforEquality.pdf (accessed September 2019)

19. Young Movers http://www.yomo-online.co.uk/

20. Glasgow City Council. *City Ward Factsheets 2017 Ward 9 – Calton*. https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=3710&p=0 (accessed September 2019)

21. Understanding Glasgow. *Neighbourhood profiles Calton and Bridgeton*. https://www.understandingglasgow.com/profiles/neighbourhood_profiles/1_ne_sector/20_calton_and_bridgeton (accessed September 2019)

22. Child Poverty Action Group https://cpag.org.uk/

23. Egan J. *Learning from the cost of the school day project.* Glasgow; GCPH: 2016. Available at: https://www.gcph.co.uk/publications/676_bp_49_learning_from_the_cost_of_the_school_day_project (accessed September 2019)

24. Glasgow City Council. *City Ward Factsheets 2017 Ward 16 – Canal*. https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=10435&p=0 (accessed September 2019)

25. Understanding Glasgow. *Neighbourhood profiles Lambhill and Milton.* https://www.understandingglasgow.com/profiles/neighbourhood_profiles/3_nw_sector/5_lambhill_and_milton (accessed September 2019)

26. North West Glasgow Voluntary Sector Network https://nwgvsn.org.uk/

27. Glasgow City Council. *City Ward Factsheets 2017 Ward 6 – Pollokshields*. https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=6022&p=0 (accessed September 2019)

28. Understanding Glasgow. *Neighbourhood profiles Pollokshields East and West.* https://www.understandingglasgow.com/profiles/neighbourhood_profiles/2_south_sector/46_pollokshields_east (accessed September 2019)

29. Coalition for racial Equalities and Rights https://www.crer.scot/

30. Equality and Human Rights Commission's Measurement Framework for Equality and Human Rights https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/measurement-framework-interactive.pdf

31. Swamp Media https://www.swampglasgow.co.uk/

32. Barros SA, Sampaio RC. Do citizens trust electronic participatory budgeting? Public expression in online forums as an evaluation method in Belo Horizonte. *Policy & Internet* 2016;8(3):292-312.

33. Lightbody, R. *'Hard to reach' or 'easy to ignore'? Promoting equality in community engagement.* Edinburgh: What Works Scotland; 2017.

Appendix A: GCPH-developed logic model to support community-based evaluations of PB processes

The term 'PB process' refers to all the actionable steps which are logically progressed as part of the PB implementation process. It is our experience that diagrammatic representations of processes, such as "logic modelling" (which can also be thought of as a flowchart) can be useful in planning, implementation and evaluation.

The aim of using a logic model is to support PB practitioners in communicating the narrative of the process and their learning to wider audiences such as funders, including local and national government. However, it is also important to caution from the outset that logic modelling is likely to depict a somewhat linear and simplified account of PB processes and community contexts and a limited range of potential impacts.

Figure A1 depicts the PB process logic model, which is proposed as a broad starting point for practitioners to consider and assess the development, evaluation and reporting of their own PB processes. The headings are designed to be self-explanatory and intuitive to practitioners. A descriptor of each stage of the PB process alongside some examples to illustrate key points is provided within the full briefing paper which is available to download from the GCPH website[14].

Figure 1: GCPH-developed logic model to support community-based evaluations of PB processes.

1. PB context	2. Community engagement	3. Democratic process	4. Projects funded	5. Impacts
• Vision & aims • Community • Leadership • Resources • Timescales • Planning	• Basic counts • Profile data • Marketing • Access • Inclusion • Representation • Pragmatic • Realistic	• Design • Facilitation • Participation • Dialogue & deliberation • Transparency & accountability • Group reflections	• Project narratives • Assets and aspirations • Sustainability, governance & management • Value	• Process impacts • Wellbeing • Social Capital & Participation • Surveys and methods • Project impacts • Place impacts