



# **THE TREATMENT OF EQUALITIES IN REGENERATION OUTCOME AGREEMENTS**

## **Report to Communities Scotland**

Roseann Maguire and Sheila Riddell, Centre for Research in Education Inclusion and Diversity, The Moray House School of Education, University of Edinburgh



Centre for Research in  
Education Inclusion  
and Diversity

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	1
Introduction.....	3
Table 1.....	3
Mainstreaming Equality in Regeneration Outcome Agreements .....	3
The politics of redistribution and the politics of recognition .....	4
The presence of an equality strategy or policy statement .....	5
Understanding of equality issues.....	7
Understanding of mainstreaming equality.....	8
Engagement of equalities groups in the consultation process .....	9
Consideration of Equalities in the National Priorities for Community Regeneration.....	11
Table 2: Services targeted at specific groups in relation to National Priority 1 .....	12
Table 3: National Priority 1: ROAs, Services and Target Groups .....	12
Table 4: National Priority 3: ROAs, Outcomes and Target Groups .....	14
Table 5: National Priority 3: ROAs, Services and Target Groups .....	14
Table 6: Other priorities: services/activities and target groups .....	16
Specific targeting .....	17
Table 7: Numbers of ROAs targeting specific services at specified equality groups.....	17
The funding and scale of activities .....	17
Linking equalities to other plans .....	18
Monitoring and evaluation .....	18
Compliance with the legislation .....	19
Key points.....	20
Conclusion.....	20
References .....	21

## Introduction

In July 2004, a new Community Regeneration Fund (CRF) was announced to replace the Social Inclusion Partnerships and Better Neighbourhood Services Fund. The purpose of the new fund was to bring improvements to Scotland's most deprived areas and help individuals and families escape poverty. It was therefore focused on the 15 per cent most deprived areas. Local Authorities were required to produce a Regeneration Outcome Agreement document explaining the outcomes they intended to achieve as a result of their CRF grant over a three year period. To assist them in producing these documents, Communities Scotland produced a guidance document (Communities Scotland, 2004) which summarised the objectives of the CRF and the way in which these articulated with a range of Scottish Executive priorities, particularly those associated with ameliorating poverty and promoting social justice.

As noted in the guidance document, the principal purpose of the CRF was to achieve the Closing the Opportunity Gap (CtOG) objective of:

- **Regenerating the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods, so that people living there can take advantage of job opportunities and improve their quality of life**

The five national priorities for community regeneration are intended to articulate with the objectives of the Closing the Opportunity Gap objectives, as indicated in the table below:

**Table 1**

<b>National priorities for community regeneration</b>	<b>Closing the Opportunity Gap Objectives</b>
1. Building strong, safe and attractive communities.	A. Reducing the vulnerability of low income families to financial exclusion and multiple debts – in order to prevent them becoming over-indebted and/or to lift them out of poverty.
2. Getting people back into work.	B. Increasing the chances of sustained employment for vulnerable and disadvantaged groups – in order to lift them permanently out of poverty.
3. Improving health.	C. Increasing the rate of improvement of the health status of people living in the most deprived communities – in order to improve their quality of life, including their employability prospects.
4. Raising educational attainment.	D. Improving the confidence and skills of the most disadvantaged children and young people in order to provide them with the greatest chance of avoiding poverty when they leave school.
5. Engaging young people.	Relates to all the Closing the Opportunity Gap objectives

## Mainstreaming Equality in Regeneration Outcome Agreements

The Scottish Executive is committed to mainstreaming equality throughout its work, defining mainstreaming in the following way:

The systematic integration of an equality perspective into the everyday work of government, involving policy makers across all government departments, as well as equality specialists and external partners. (Scottish Executive, 2000)

Definitions of equalities vary for different administrative purposes and across different jurisdictions. The power to legislate on equal opportunities is reserved to the UK Parliament. There are two exceptions to the reservation listed under Schedule 5 of the Act, which states that the following matters may be undertaken by the Scottish Executive:

- The encouragement (other than by prohibition or regulation) of equal opportunities.
- The imposition of duties on any office holder in the Scottish administration or any public authority, to make arrangements with a view to ensuring that their functions are carried out with due regard to the need to meet the equal opportunities requirements.

The Scotland Act 1998 defines equal opportunities as:

The prevention, elimination or regulation of discrimination between persons on grounds of sex or marital status, on racial grounds or on grounds of disability, age, sexual orientation, language or social origin, or of other personal attributes including beliefs or opinions such as religious beliefs or political opinions.

Recent European employment directives have established six equality grounds which must be reflected in the employment legislation of all member states. These are the following: race, gender, disability, sexual orientation, age and religion/belief. In the UK, there is a gradual trend to strengthen equalities legislation by placing a duty on public sector bodies to actively promote equality, rather than simply avoid discrimination. The Race Relations Amendment Act 2000 already makes this provision at GB level in relation to race, and the Disability Act 2005 establishes a similar public sector duty in relation to disability. The Equality Bill, being debated in the House of Lords at the time of writing, extends the public sector duty to gender. Following the establishment of the Commission for Equality and Human Rights, the Government is committed to reviewing and harmonising equalities legislation, so in the future it is likely that a public sector duty to positively promote equality will apply to all six strands.

Despite the very wide definition of equalities in Scotland, which recognises the inter-connection of identity and economic issues, there is a tendency for regeneration and equalities policy agendas to develop along parallel lines, with little cross-reference between them. Riddell et al (2005) described this tendency in connection with employment policies for disabled people, which do not feature prominently in regeneration strategies, despite the fact that by far the largest group of economically inactive people are those on incapacity benefit. Edwards (2002) has also noted the disconnection of disabled people from the world of regeneration. She argued that unless regeneration managers explicitly target disabled people and other equality groups as part of their overall strategy, then they will continue to be neglected, since the capacity of such groups to demand a greater share of resources may be limited.

The aim of this report is to consider to what extent Regeneration Outcome Agreements in Scotland were taking account of equality issues by formulating a mainstreaming equality policy, formulating projects with a view to meeting the needs of specific equality groups, engaging with equality groups in the community and explicitly setting up monitoring processes to consider the outcomes for particular groups. In addition to considering the extent to which the Regeneration Outcome Agreements had built equality into their general strategy, we also consider the treatment of equality issues in relation to each of the national priorities set out in the table above.

### **The politics of redistribution and the politics of recognition**

The relationship between what have been termed 'the politics of recognition' and 'the politics of redistribution' is complex and continues to be debated in the social science literature. Young (1990) argued for a new focus on issues of identity or recognition, suggesting that the

left's preoccupation with social class ignored that fact that much inequality arose as a result of other aspects of an individual's identity, such as their gender, race or disability status. Fraser (1997) criticised the new focus on identity politics, which, she argued, distracted attention away from social class which, she maintained, was by far the most salient factor in determining the distribution of social goods. Phillips (1999) attempted to reconcile the positions of Young and Fraser, maintaining that social class continued to be an extremely important factor in accounting for the production and reproduction of social inequality. However, social class and identity politics were inextricably linked, since people occupying the lowest social class positions were likely to possess a cluster of other characteristics, relating to, for example, race, gender and disability. These are not merely academic debates, but have very practical implications for the targeting of help to the most socially disadvantaged. If social class is the main determinant of social inequality, then the main goal of regeneration strategies should be to focus help on the poorest, irrespective of their other social characteristics. If, on the other hand, it is believed that poverty arises as a result of discrimination against specific groups, such as women, black people or disabled people, then a more nuanced strategy is required, aimed at improving the social recognition of such groups as well as improving their economic situation. Clearly, the Scottish Executive is requiring local authorities to develop a far more complex understanding of the underlying causes of and remedies for social inequality. Given the unresolved nature of these debates in the social science literature, it is not altogether surprising that a lack of conceptual clarity is evident in the current crop of RoAs,

### **The presence of an equality strategy or policy statement**

The majority of the Regeneration Outcome Agreements have a commitment to equalities but the extent and detail of this commitment varies considerably. At one end of the spectrum two local authorities (Aberdeenshire and West Lothian) make no mention of equality issues while at the other, two local authorities, (Renfrewshire and Fife) identify outcomes and services across national priorities in terms of equality groups, with the remaining majority having, at least, a broad policy commitment to equalities.

Four make no mention of equality issues although two of them (Moray and Scottish Borders) are focused on children and young people, so in a sense they are aimed at one particular equality group. Seven local authorities make a general commitment to equality of opportunity in terms of promoting social justice and social inclusion or improving the lives of the most disadvantaged within their communities. Of these, three (Stirling, Dumfries and Galloway and North Lanarkshire) appear to acknowledge the need to look at disadvantage within traditional equality groups, although these are not mentioned explicitly.

Five have a general policy statement on equality of opportunity (which might be referring to economic inequality rather than inequality of identity) but do not specify equality groups, for example:

We aim to uphold the principles of equality of opportunity and promote measures to reduce inequalities. (North Ayrshire)

Of these, two are in the process of developing equality strategies; Highlands is developing a *Highland Wellbeing Alliance Equal Opportunities and Diversity Strategy*; and Inverclyde is developing a *Social Justice Strategy* which attempts to mainstream social justice across all of its activities, to combat what it terms 'poverty of opportunity'.

Sixteen local authorities refer to the recognised equality groups and eight of these have an equalities section in the ROA. Four make reference to equality groups in strategic terms, three are in the process of developing a strategy and one (Western Isles) relates equalities to the theme of sustainability. The prominence of equalities and the content of the strategies vary. For example, the Angus ROA has a broad commitment to oppose all forms of unlawful or unfair discrimination on the grounds of race, ethnic or national origin, religion, age, sexual and marital status and disability by adopting policies that provide accessible services to the whole community, promote accessibility and develop and maintain consultative links with the

community. However, no detail is given as to how this will be achieved. Other strategies recognise the ongoing work needed in relation to equalities, for example, East Lothian is undertaking a whole scale review of approaches to equality. Two local authorities, East Dunbartonshire and Argyll and Bute have the explicit strategy of mainstreaming equal opportunities as a horizontal theme within the ROA through project design, monitoring and evaluation and programme development. Although the strategy describes what has to be done, there is no specific detail as to how and there is no attempt to link it to outcomes and activities within the current documents. Dundee's strategy takes a different form, outlining the remit of its equality and diversity partnership, and providing examples of its working and future priorities:

#### *Remit*

- To contribute to the strategic objectives of community planning and the achievement of equality
- To promote good practice both within member organisations and in partnership working in achieving equality and diversity objectives
- To identify member org and partnership training needs
- To take a leading role in developing inter agency training programmes
- To encourage and develop joint working groups to implement the objectives of the partnership
- Through Dundee equality forum, to involve communities of interest and community org which reflect diversity within Dundee in the Community planning process
- To encourage at all levels activity aimed at promoting equality and diversity
- To seek and promote access to external funding sources
- To monitor and review the implementation of equality and diversity policies
- To publish regular reports in accessible and widely available formats
- To encourage community group involvement in activities aimed at promoting equality and diversity (Dundee ROA p8)

#### *Workings*

- Shared diversity training opportunities and approaches between Tayside Police, NHS Fire service and the equality forum
- Opening access to the council interpreting and translation service to public and voluntary partners
- Formation of a racist incident multi agency panel, involving all public authorities, which has a shared reporting, monitoring and casework system

#### *Future priorities*

- A review of local practice in service impact assessment
- An agreement on coordination of consultation methods and events
- An agreement on a common approach to monitoring and reporting on equalities

This strategy gives prominence to equalities directly, in that one regeneration outcome is directed at increasing engagement with minority, vulnerable and excluded groups and recognises the cross cutting nature of equalities by indicating that equality and diversity community groups were involved in determining other priorities. However, it does not identify what other outcomes and activities impact on equality groups.

Only two local authorities (Fife, Renfrewshire) attempt to systematically identify outcomes and key services that address equalities issues. Fife has a specific regeneration objective that relates to equality (to address the needs of key groups of people giving priority to the needs of vulnerable young people, children and families, elderly people and those vulnerable to discrimination), defining outcomes and activities for it in template form. It does not categorise outcomes or activities under any particular national priority, stating that, as a cross cutting objective, it relates to all the national priorities. In the same way, specific services and activities are not related to outcomes. Renfrewshire's approach is to identify some key services that address equality issues under each of the national priorities and to reference them together in the section on mainstreaming equalities.

Although none of the eight remaining authorities, has an equality section, they express a commitment to equality as a strategic objective. Although the ROA from Midlothian is incomplete, it indicates that it is in the process of developing programmes aimed at particular

equality groups (race, disability, women, children and young people). Falkirk and Aberdeen are also currently developing equality strategies. West Dunbartonshire defines the monitoring of equalities as a distinct outcome across all national priorities and South Ayrshire makes an explicit commitment to comply with equality legislation. Reference to equality issues are dispersed throughout Glasgow's ROA, initially appearing somewhat fragmented but when the issues are teased out a more cohesive picture emerges. Its broad strategy is defined in terms of inclusion, a regeneration objective that underlies all others such that no one should be denied access to the opportunities that the city affords as a result of his/her social or economic position, geographical location, or as an aspect of race or creed, physical ability, sex or sexuality. In addition Glasgow has developed an equality strategy that specifically relates to employment (equal access strategy) and community engagement (community engagement strategy). It relates strategy to outcome by defining equality and diversity as a cross cutting outcome although activities and services are only identified under one national priority. Its targeted themes of GARA (Glasgow Anti Racist Alliance); the Big Step (vocational guidance for young people leaving care) and Routes out of Prostitution are all targeted at equality groups.

Like Glasgow, equality issues are dispersed throughout the Edinburgh ROA, however, there is an overall lack of clarity since the information is spread across three documents. The equality strategy specified in the Closing the Gap document promotes equality of opportunity and good relations between members of different communities and seeks the elimination of unlawful discrimination. It is one of the underlying principles of the regeneration strategy which states that through the mechanism of the Edinburgh Partnership, it addresses the equal opportunities aspects of social inclusion by engaging with equality groups through five equality forums; Women; Race; Disability; Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender and Elderly. A mapping exercise of the extent, variety and effectiveness of community engagement is currently being undertaken and part of its remit is to determine how the equalities agenda is embedded in community engagement. Apart from this, the strategy does not refer to outcomes and services in terms of equality groups.

**Whilst the majority of the Regeneration Outcome Agreements have a commitment to including a range of equality groups within their regeneration strategies, the extent and detail of this commitment varies. In the majority of cases, the ways in which equalities and regeneration policies and strategies inter-relate are only partially articulated.**

## **Understanding of equality issues**

As is evident from the discussion above, equality issues are most commonly referred to in terms of community engagement within the ROAs. Equality groups are often defined as 'difficult to reach' and the focus is on developing mechanisms to increase their participation in the development of regeneration strategies. Equalities are generally treated as a cross-cutting. Most ROAs name specific equality groups as recipients of targeted initiatives, although the groups specified vary. A small number of local authorities (East Ayrshire, East Dunbartonshire and Shetlands) do not distinguish between different groups but treat them as a single entity. Many describe equality groups as excluded, usually in terms of employment or services, however, evidence for the degree to which specific equality groups experience social exclusion is generally not provided. However, Edinburgh's ROA refers to the findings of a small area deprivation study, which revealed that there are new areas of deprivation characterised by factors such as age, disability and health as opposed to traditional areas characterised by economic issues, housing and access to employment. Edinburgh's ROA highlights the way in which programmes aimed at targeting geographical areas will benefit equality groups and vice versa because of the clustering of disadvantaged groups in the geographic regeneration areas. If this pattern holds true in other local authorities, it is likely that programmes targeted at those experiencing the greatest degree of economic inequality will benefit specific equality groups. However, most local authorities appear not to have carried out the type of statistical analysis of the cluster of factors associated with disadvantage in their particular neighbourhoods.

**The range of equalities specified by local authorities in their RoAs varies and most do not present evidence on the relationship between social deprivation and other social characteristics. Where specific groups are specified, young people are most commonly mentioned.**

## **Understanding of mainstreaming equality**

The majority (22) of ROAs contain no reference to mainstreaming equalities. The concept is clearly evident in ten, with two referring to it in the context of developing strategies and eight having policies in place for mainstreaming equalities. The extent to which this policy has been worked out in detail varies in detail across the ROAs. Two (Argyll and Bute and East Dunbartonshire) give an identical account of the work to be undertaken in order to mainstream equalities:

- Project design: developing a framework to ensure equal opportunities is considered as a central element of project design and implementation. Guidance will be issued to partner agencies and organisations delivering programme activity in relation to the framework required for monitoring equal opportunities
- Monitoring and evaluation: all projects activities supported through the ROA will require to record and assess the impact in relation to equal opportunities. It will be expected that data will be gathered in relation to participation and impact in terms of gender, ethnicity, disability etc.
- Programme development – detailed consideration will be given on an ongoing basis to the targeting of services to ensure equality and access by all sections of the community.

Ensuring equalities are mainstreamed in community regeneration is an explicit objective of one RoA (Falkirk). It states that equalities will be an important horizontal theme of the revised Community Plan. In addition, all applicants to the Community Regeneration Fund are required to clearly demonstrate how they have taken equalities into account when developing and implementing the outputs. However, it is not clear from the outputs how this has been done. Glasgow also has equality as a horizontal theme defining equality and diversity in terms of a cross-cutting outcome. The ROA specifically focuses on mainstreaming race equality through the allocation of funds and support to the Glasgow Anti- Racist Alliance and makes a commitment to engage with all local CPP structures to assist them to mainstream race equality. While Edinburgh does not specifically refer to mainstreaming in its strategy, it does state that equality forums were involved in strategic development of the ROA and that it is envisaged that the corporate children's commissioner function will be fully mainstreamed by the end of the ROA period.

Three ROAs (Fife, Renfrewshire and Dundee) appear most developed in terms of mainstreaming. The evidence suggests that their approaches are evolving towards the systematic consideration of the particular effects of all policies, (at the point of planning, implementation and evaluation) on equality groups. Although Fife and Dundee do not specifically refer to mainstreaming, both give prominence to equality issues. Fife has established an equality forum whose primary role is to tackle inequality and discrimination by auditing and scrutinising current practice in employment of service delivery to people who face discrimination, for example on the grounds of race, gender, disability, age, sexuality, or religious belief. It also specifies some outcomes and activities for equality groups. Dundee has an Equality and Diversity Partnership with a wide remit (see p2) which is consistent with mainstreaming equality although not defined in those terms. Renfrewshire explicitly states its commitment to mainstreaming and refers to the annual Social Justice Report produced by Renfrewshire Council on behalf of Renfrewshire Community Planning Partnership for a comprehensive description of key services across community planning partners that promote equalities. Within the draft Regeneration Outcome Agreement, some key services addressing equalities issues are identified under each of the national priorities.

Although 22 ROAs make no specific reference to mainstreaming most (19) adhere to the national priority Engaging Young People and several refer to the development of a community



engagement strategy. In a minority of cases (Shetland, Moray, Scottish Borders, Orkney) the RoA 's principal focus is young people with the aim of engaging them, in varying degrees, in the provision of services that affect them. For example, Scottish Borders's overall outcome is *to improve the capacity socially of excluded young people to engage with the service delivery and to ensure services are delivered in a more sensitive way to meet their needs*. Significant attention is given to activities for children and young people in the majority of the ROAs, either in terms of the national priority or as a thematic target group. If children and young people are perceived as an equality group, then it is reasonable to say that mainstreaming is evident for this particular group in the majority of ROAs as most are considering ways to include them in the policy processes that impact on them. Similarly the consideration given to engaging other 'difficult to reach' groups in many ROAs could perhaps be understood as the initial stage of mainstreaming.

**Most ROAs do not have an explicit policy of mainstreaming equalities, and their ROAs do not exemplify a clear understanding of the concept. A minority of ROAs indicate a commitment to mainstreaming equality, often expressed through a strategy of engaging a range of equality groups in the discussion of policy priorities.**

### **Engagement of equalities groups in the consultation process**

The majority of the ROAs (27) make some reference to equalities in terms of community engagement. Twelve have included at least one equality group in the consultation process and another eleven ROAs are currently developing community engagement strategies that consider equality issues. The remaining five give no actual details of involving equality groups in the development of the ROA. Two (Inverclyde and South Lanarkshire) state that their approaches to equality within the context of community involvement conform to the Executive's priority principles without furnishing any detail, while the other three (West Lothian, Angus and Orkney) specify engagement with only one group, young people. There is no evidence of community engagement of equality groups within four ROAs but two of these (East Dunbartonshire and Argyll and Bute) have clear equalities strategies, recognising that there should be a focus on communities of interest and planning to develop local structures during the first year of the ROA. However they do not specify what this will entail in terms of reaching specific equality groups.

Of the eleven ROAs which are in the process of developing mechanisms to engage equality groups, five (Stirling, East Renfrewshire, Shetland, Perth and Kinross, Highlands) do not identify particular groups. Rather they refer to 'hard to reach' groups or 'communities of interest'. All five, however, indicate that young people have been or will be involved in influencing policies that affect them. The commitment to engaging young people is similarly highlighted in the other six developing strategies. Five also place particular emphasis on engaging black and minority ethnic people (BME), four refer specifically to people with disabilities, four make reference to older people and one specifies the inclusion of women. These ROAs are at various stages of progress in relation to community engagement strategies but all appear to have, or are working towards having, mechanisms in place to engage several equality groups, in particular, Black and minority ethnic groups (BME), disabled people, older people and young people. Virtually no attention is given to the engagement of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transsexual community (LGBT) and religion/belief is also a neglected category.

Twelve Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) using a variety of consultation approaches and consulted with at least one equality group to develop their ROA. Two (Dundee and West Dunbartonshire) state that members of equality and diversity groups were involved in shaping the ROA but do not identify the groups nor the nature of their involvement. While West Dunbartonshire's CPP acknowledges the need to build in specific measures to ensure the engagement of excluded groups, within the current ROA there is only evidence of consultation with young people through a youth forum. Another two also give examples of how young people were involved. The outputs of a number of events and initiatives informed the development of Moray's ROA, and the outcome of a Youth Transition Event contributed to East Ayrshire's ROA.. No other equality group is reported as having influenced these ROAs,

although East Ayrshire alludes to consulting people with disabilities. One CPP (Dumfries and Galloway) was unable to organise activities and events specifically around the production of the ROA due to time constraints but explains how the proposals for action are nonetheless based on needs identified by communities through other processes, including consultations with the Elderly Forum, the Older Persons Services Development Group and the Youth Strategy Executive Group. The ROA also refers to other minority group representation on the Inclusive Communities Forum (only minority ethnic groups are specified) to be used as a basis to begin to work with traditionally hard to reach groups.

Five ROAs clearly document that equality groups were involved in their development. Three of these (Western Isles, South Ayrshire, Falkirk, Renfrewshire) report consultations, events or activities that centre on the ROA. Of these, Renfrewshire gives the clearest account of engaging equality groups. The ROA utilised focus groups, made up of residents with particular characteristics, in order to explore the views of a diverse range of communities. The focus group discussions were conducted in order to inform the development of the Regeneration Outcome Agreement and specifically sought the views of a range of minority or hard to reach groups such as lone parents, people with disabilities/limiting long term illness and people from minority ethnic groups. Young people and older people also participated in the discussions which were structured around the national priorities. The key issues raised in discussions contributing to Renfrewshire's ROA were as follows.

- Which of the following are the most important to you and why?
  - *Building strong, safe and attractive communities*
  - *Getting people back to work*
  - *Raising educational attainment*
  - *Improving Health*
  - *Engaging young people*
  - *Getting people back to work*
  - *Raising educational attainment*
  - *Improving Health*
  - *Engaging young people*
- What would make the area where you live safer and more attractive?
- How can we get people in your area back to work?
- How can educational attainment be raised?
- How can the health of people in your area be improved?
- What issues do we need to engage young people on and how can this be done?

Neither Aberdeen nor Falkirk specify a particular consultative event centring on the ROA, but is evident that at least some equality groups have been involved. Apart from religious belief, each equality area in Aberdeen has a consultative forum which sends between two and four representatives to the civic forum which is represented in the in the community planning framework. These equality forums are at different stages of organisational development and a new action plan for each is currently underway. Within the Falkirk ROA, it is acknowledged that there is a lack of mechanisms and structures in place to specifically target 'harder to reach' and equalities groups (only young people, older people and some people with disabilities were consulted). It is therefore proposed that the Community Regeneration Fund should support a consultation project, entitled Equality Matters, geared to accessing the views of a wider range of equality groups. The project would aim to communicate with different equality groups in order for them to develop an autonomous voice within community planning structures, enabling them to make presentations, deliver equality training programmes and run campaigns.

Although it is difficult to ascertain from the ROAs of Edinburgh and Fife exactly how equality groups have been engaged in the consultation process, the existence of equality fora for women, BME people, disabled people and older people is evident. In addition, Edinburgh has a mechanism in place to consult LGBT people. The Edinburgh ROA explicitly states that there is improved scope for equalities groups to influence services through the fora and the prominence given to equalities activities and outcomes in the Fife ROA suggests that the consultation process has worked well.

**The majority of ROAs state a commitment to consulting equality groups, but only a small minority appear to have robust consultation processes in place with the six equality groups identified by the Commission for Equality and Human Rights. Consultation with LGBT groups, and those based on religion/belief, appears to be in an early stage of development.**

## **Consideration of Equalities in the National Priorities for Community Regeneration**

The identification of outcomes, services and activities aimed at equality groups is problematic. The majority of ROAs make little attempt to specify the targeting of outcomes and outputs in terms of equality groups. However careful analysis of templates 1 and 2 (where available) indicates that many ROAs's outcomes are inclusive of some equality groups and that the provision of certain services are targeted at particular groups. Outcomes aimed at the whole population of target areas, or certain sections of the population, for example, the unemployed, may nonetheless have an impact on one or more equality groups. The equality areas given most attention across the national priorities are age, (in terms of children and young people and older people) gender (women, usually indicated by lone parent) and disability, (either physical or mental health problems). It is interesting to note that age does not include those in the mid-life stages, who may have caring responsibilities for older and younger people, gender does not include boys who are likely to under-perform at school, or older men who may be excluded from employment, and disability tends not to include learning difficulties. Often a specific outcome targets these groups collectively. A minority of ROAs have outcomes and services that relate to race, none have outcomes or activities that refer to religious belief and only two refer to sexual orientation. The following section, attempts to give an overview of outcomes, activities and services that relate to equalities, within each national priority. However it is not a definitive analysis, for within some ROAs, outcomes address more than one priority and also activities and services can meet more than one outcome. Different ROAs also place similar services under different outcomes and priorities.

**The majority of ROAs make little attempt to specify the way in which outcomes and outputs relate to specific equality groups Race, religion/belief and sexual orientation are the least likely to be mentioned.**

### *National Priority 1: Building Strong and Safe Communities*

Within the priority *Building Strong and Safe Communities*, six ROAs (Aberdeen, Clackmannanshire, Falkirk, Glasgow Renfrewshire and West Dunbartonshire) explicitly frame outcomes in terms of particular equality groups. One (West Dunbartonshire) defines equality itself as an outcome: *We will promote and ensure equality and reduce discrimination* while another (Falkirk) directs its engagement outcome, *The participation of local people in the planning and delivery of local services developed and supported* specifically at BME people, children and young people and older people. The Renfrewshire RoA states that one of its outcomes is to increase the satisfaction of equality groups within the local area. The others define outcomes for BME people, LGBT people and women. All three have an outcome to reduce race crime, and one (Glasgow) also targets an engagement outcome at this group. The detection of homophobic crime is addressed by one ROA (Aberdeen) and it also specifies the reduction of domestic abuse incidents as a specific outcome. This outcome, which relates to an identifiable equality group, also applies in six other ROAs, evidenced by the existence of, for example, a domestic abuse project, but is categorised under a broader outcome such as creating safe neighbourhoods.

There are many other different outcomes and activities in the ROAs, not specifically targeted at equality groups, but which nonetheless impact on them. The most common outcomes under this priority are:

1. Increase positive perceptions of safety/ reducing the fear of crime
2. Increase residents' satisfaction with area/services

3. Reduce levels of anti-social behaviour/increase reported levels of anti-social behaviour

At least one of the above is specified in approximately a third of ROAs and all apply to gender, (women, in particular lone parents) disability and age. Outcome 3 has interesting implications for young people, who tend to be viewed as the source of anti-social behaviour, whereas other groups are to be protected from such behaviour. This is despite the fact that recent research on young people in severely disadvantaged neighbourhoods indicates a widespread fear of violence and being the victim of anti-social behaviour (Stafford et al, 2005). Two ROAs (Renfrewshire and South Lanarkshire) include BME people in outcome 2 and one (Stirling) in outcome 1. Individual ROAs have a variety of other outcomes relating to particular equality groups and these are listed below.

**Table 2: Services targeted at specific groups in relation to National Priority 1**

- Increase usage of recreational facilities Young people
- Financial inclusion Older people, women, disabled people
- Road safety Children and young people
- Improve quality of housing Older people, disabled people
- New learning communities Young people
- Women with addiction issues reduce drug related crime Women
- Reduction in accidents in home Children, older people
- Increased number of young people settling in communities Young people
- Increase usage of recreational facilities Young people
- Income maximization Women, older people, disabled people

#### Services and Activities

Not all outcomes had corresponding activities and services but the following table gives an indication of the type of services being developed in order to build strong, safe and attractive communities.

**Table 3: National Priority 1: ROAs, Services and Target Groups**

Service / activity	No of ROAs with service	Equality groups
Diversions activities	7	Young people
Women's safety projects	7	Women
Restorative justice	6	Young people
Income maximisation projects	3	Women, disabled people, older people
Road safety education/officer	2	Children and young people
Safer/ supported homes.	3	Disabled people, older people
Outreach worker	2	Young people
Community training and development	2	BME, young people, older people
Police in schools	1	Young people
Recreational facilities	1	Children and young people

As can be seen from above, the majority of services specified are targeted at young people.

### *National Priority 2: Getting people into work*

Four ROAs (Edinburgh, Glasgow, Renfrewshire and West Dunbartonshire) explicitly target outcomes at equalities groups under the national priority *Getting People into Work*. West Dunbartonshire reiterates the same cross cutting outcome of ensuring equality and reducing discrimination, whereas Edinburgh specifies women, BME people and people with disabilities as recipients for the outcome, *Increased uptake of opportunities by JU4J (Joined Up for Jobs)*. Glasgow also targets disability, ethnicity, age, and gender through its *Equal Access to Employment Strategy* aimed at addressing issues that prevent access to employment. Renfrewshire identifies disability, age (old and young) and gender groups in relation to outcomes for increased employment opportunities.

Around 50% of ROAs have an outcome referring to increased training for and employability of workless people, including certain equality groups; women (lone parents), people with disabilities and young people. Four (East Renfrewshire, Fife, Glasgow and Edinburgh) also direct this outcome at ethnic minorities. Around 50% of ROAs also target young people exclusively in a separate outcome to reduce NEET (the number not in education, employment or training). One ROA (West Lothian) also targets this outcome at people with disabilities. Two (Fife and Glasgow) specify women, people with disabilities and older people for the reduction of the number of low income households, two (East Renfrewshire and Stirling) specify the same groups for income maximisation and two (Aberdeenshire and Inverclyde) focus exclusively on support for women to enable them to return to work.

#### Services and Activities

There are three principal types of service provision to support the above outcomes. These are:

1. Employability projects aimed at increasing skills
2. Childcare provision
3. Income maximisation

Employability activities are directed at people with disabilities, women (lone parents) and young people in approximately half of the ROAs. One (Fife) specifies only young people, and two (Glasgow and Edinburgh) also specify ethnic minorities. Six envisage improving childcare provision and three provide income maximisation services.

### *National Priority 3: Improving Health*

Under the priority *Improving Health* three ROAs (Glasgow, Angus and Renfrewshire) explicitly identify outcomes in terms of addressing equality issues. Glasgow places its cross-cutting outcome of diversity and equality under this priority and targets BME people, particularly the young and disabled children. Angus targets its outcomes of improved access to health information and services and increased opportunities to make positive health and lifestyle choices at ethnic minorities and travelling people, women, older people and children and young people. Renfrewshire's focus is mothers and children and young people, aiming to reduce the number of low birth weight babies and increased levels of activity and healthy eating for young people. Some of these outcomes are common to other ROAs but are not identified as pertaining to equalities.

Most ROAs have outcomes under this priority that impact on equalities. The following table illustrates outcomes, the related equality groups and the number of ROAs with each outcome.

**Table 4: National Priority 3: ROAs, Outcomes and Target Groups**

Outcome	No of ROAs	Equality group
Improve health of children and young people	12	CYP
Improve health	10	Women, disabled people, CYP
Reduce smoking, alcohol and substance abuse	11	Young people
Improve mental health and well being	7	Disabled people, older people
Promote positive mental health for children and young people	5	CYP
Improve sexual health of young people	5	Young people
Improve support for elderly for independent living	4	Older people
Awareness of healthy lifestyle men	4	Men
Awareness of healthy lifestyle women	2	Women
Increase support for children of substance abuser	3	Children and young people
Increased opportunity to make positive health and lifestyle choices	3	CYP, older people
Improved awareness of access to and use of a variety of health improvement provisions	3	Women, disabled people, CYP
Improve health of disabled CYP	1	Disabled people
Increase the number of people with disability living and participating in community	1	Disabled people

Improving health outcomes are most often targeted at people with disabilities and children and young people.

#### Services and Activities

The table below lists the provision of services for equality groups. It is evident from this that many activities and services are directed at specific groups and are thus addressing equality issues in some way even if this is not clearly defined in the individual ROAs. Three ROAs were particularly clear about the way in which particular outcomes would benefit specific equality groups. Aberdeen supports ethnic minorities and travellers outreach programme; Glasgow is developing several activities for ethnic minorities including an interpreting service to enable participation in services and service planning and a refugee/asylum seeker healthy living centre capacity to meet the health improvement needs of this group and Renfrewshire has established activities to improve the health of children and a service for disadvantaged expectant mothers.

**Table 5: National Priority 3: ROAs, Services and Target Groups**

Type of Service/Activity	No of ROAs with service	Equality groups
Smoking Cessation	12	Women/mothers/girls
	3	Young people
Health promoting schools	10	Children and young people
Reduce teenage pregnancies	7	Young women
Family centres, healthy living	5	Women, CYP, age
Youth drop in health centres	5	Young people
Physical Activities	5	Young people, 1 particularly young women
	4	Older people, disabled people,

	2	men
	4	Young , age, disability
Men's health	5	men
Domestic abuse project	3	Women, children
Community health	2	Women, children and young people, disabled people
Primary mental health	3	Women, disabled people
Substance abuse education	2	Young people

#### *National Priority 4: Raising Educational Attainment Levels*

Within the priority *Raising Educational Attainment Levels*, three ROAs specifically identify equalities in relation to outcomes. Two (Aberdeenshire and Stirling) target an outcome, aimed at improving social and vocational skills, at women, people with disabilities and young people. One, (Glasgow) targets its outcome, support for learning transitions, at ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, young people, and LGBT people. Another outcome, to continue to become a city of confident literate and numerate community, is aimed at ethnic minorities, people with disabilities and young people.

The most common outcome under this priority is a general commitment to raise attainment at all levels of school provision (50% of ROAs). Several (9) also refer to reducing the gap between pupils in ROA areas and the wider local authority area. Two (Renfrewshire and Inverclyde) target male pupils in an effort to close the gap between girls' and boys' attainment levels and one (Clackmannanshire) specifies the inclusion of children with disabilities. The other outcomes directed at young people are: (no of ROAs which contain outcomes in brackets)

- To reduce NEET (5)
- To Increase skills, employability (2)
- To increase support for learning for young offenders (1)
- Increase lifelong\* learning (4)
- Improved attainment for those with complex issues (1)

Around a third of ROAs refer to a range of school based initiatives in order to fulfil the general outcome of increasing attainment levels. Other services, some of which indicated CRF funding, are:

- Vocational Courses
- Youth Justice Mentoring
- Befriending
- Education and Disability services - CRF
- Pupil support - CRF
- Skillsforce – CRF
- Pupil transitional support – CRF

#### *National Priority 5: Engaging Young People*

The majority of ROAs have outcomes related to engaging young people, and have identified the services which will deliver these outcomes. Six ROAs have no outcomes in relation to engaging young people, although one (Angus) states this underpins all other priorities and another clearly has a relevant service (Outreach worker) under a different priority. Three (Fife, Renfrewshire and Scottish Borders) have the priority itself as the outcome, and a further 18 offer a variety of outcomes centring on the involvement of children and young people in decisions that affect them. Other outcomes specified are:

- To increase the confidence and self esteem of children and young people
- Increased usage of leisure facilities by children and young people
- Increased use of mainstream services by children and young people
- Increased numbers of young people volunteering

The following represents a selection of the types of activities and services developed to meet the engagement outcomes:

- The development of youth facilities
- Youth forums
- Dialogue youth
- Special needs youth clubs
- Activity clubs
- Sports facilities
- Projects to improve self esteem
- Black youth groups
- School holiday activities
- Outreach
- Support and training for young people
- Children's commissioner
- Drama activities
- Community learning and development
- Engage children and young people in cultural life

Generally outcomes and activities are targeted at all children and young people but some ROAs (Aberdeen, Glasgow, East Lothian, Highlands, Falkirk, Perth and Kinross, Stirling ) specify the inclusion of particular groups including ethnic minorities, travellers, children with disabilities, young care leavers and those of non-heterosexual orientation.

#### *Other Priorities*

One ROA (Dundee), under the priority *community engagement*, states that it intends to increase engagement with excluded vulnerable groups, ethnic minorities, and particularly ethnic minority women. Related services for this outcome include a learning project, an international women's centre, a translation service and fair play training for ethnic minority mothers.

As previously mentioned, Fife's approach is to present its outcomes and services that address equality issues in template form under the one objective. This approach gives prominence to equalities and provides a snapshot of key outcomes and types of activities associated with equalities. Under the strategic objective: *to address the needs of key groups of people giving priority to the needs of vulnerable young people, vulnerable children and families, vulnerable elderly people, and those vulnerable to discrimination*, the ROA specifies the following outcomes.

- Improvement in service provision and access reflecting the circumstances and needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups
- Increase in confidence and capacity within communities vulnerable to discrimination
- Decrease in proportion of children living in families on low income
- Increase in economic participation within communities vulnerable to discrimination – ethnic minorities
- Increase in economic participation within communities vulnerable to discrimination – disabled persons
- Reduction in offending by young people
- Increase in breast feeding by young mothers
- Reduction in domestic violence and abuse rates
- Decrease in proportion of pensioners living on low income

These outcomes are supported by the activities in the table below.

**Table 6: Other priorities: services/activities and target groups**

<b>Services/activities</b>	<b>Equality groups</b>
Equality forum support	Older people, disabled people, women
Thematic project FRAE: Fife	BME communities
Youth community safety initiatives fund	Young people under 18



Youth diversion project	Young people attending high schools
Young people's health issues	12-24yr olds
Evening facilities for young people	Young people
Cultural activities for young people	Young people

### Specific targeting

Young people are the mostly frequently targeted group within the ROAs. Twenty four make an explicit commitment to engage them and four focus provision of services at them. Less than half of the ROAs (11) specifically target other equality groups. Of the five that direct targeting at equalities collectively, four refer to ethnic minorities, disabled people and families and children as groups in need of specific provision. One ROA (Shetland) defines equalities groups as a specific thematic target but gives no further details and one ROA (Stirling) is giving consideration to the targeting of specific groups. The remaining six target individual equality groups. The table below illustrates which equality areas are specifically targeted in the ROAs. It also indicates the additional targeting evident when outcomes and activities that pertain to equalities are taken into account.

**Table 7: Numbers of ROAs targeting specific services at specified equality groups**

Equality group	No of ROAs specifically targeted	No of ROAs Outcome/Activities
Gender – women	3	12
men	0	4
Race - Ethnic minorities	5	10
Travelling people	3	3
Disability	6	12
Young people	24	24
Older people	2	7
Religion/belief	0	0
Sexual orientation	1	2

**Young people are by far the most frequently targeted group in relation to the national priorities for community regeneration, No consideration is given to religion/ belief in the RoAs and little attention is given to issues relating to sexual orientation.**

### The funding and scale of activities

It has not been possible to adequately address which equality areas are attracting the greatest amount of funding for a number of reasons. Information on funding is missing from many ROAs, whilst others provide information only in terms of total funding required across each national priority, rather than relating this to individual activities and services. Partial information is often given, and, even where funding details are given, it is difficult to tease out which specific funds are for particular equality areas, as individual services may target more than one group; apply to more than one outcome and cut across priorities. There are also issues in relation to assessing and quantifying partner contributions particularly in relation to core services. Some ROAs sometimes quantify them, whereas others do not detail contributions from these mainstream services. From the information given in the present ROAs, it is not possible to comment with any degree of accuracy on what areas are attracting the greatest funding. Similarly, the lack of consistency within and across the ROAs has prohibited the identification of the scale of activity and the lead agency associated with particular activities by each equality area. Some ROAs give no details of service provision other than a title; some give partial details of timescale, funding and lead agencies; others detail some but not all activities or lead partner agencies. In addition, services are often directed at more than one equality group.

**Because of partial information, it is not possible to provide information on the amount of funding dedicated to specific equality groups.**

### **Linking equalities to other plans**

Consideration of the linkages made with other plans has also been problematic. Generally, ROAs have not linked their equality strategies specifically with other plans, other than in terms of social justice, social inclusion and community engagement. The linkage of outcomes, services and activities with other plans is made with the national priorities, not individual services. Therefore it is difficult to comment meaningfully about specific links with other plans, other than in general term related to the national priorities. Thus activities for any equality group under, for example, *Building Strong Communities* might be linked to local housing strategy, local community planning, anti- social behaviour strategy, domestic abuse strategy community safety strategy or others particular to individual local authorities. The point is that linkages are made with priority areas rather than outcomes and activities. One link consistently made across the priorities is the provision of services for children and young people through an integrated Children's Services Plan, whereas others, (health improvement plans, community safety, education, employment strategies, community learning) tend to be area specific.

**In most cases, the strategies to meet the needs of equality groups in ROAs are not cross-referenced to approaches in other policy documents and plans.**

### **Monitoring and evaluation**

The Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality in Scotland by the Commission for Racial Equality indicates a range of methods that can be used to monitor and analyse the effects of policies on different racial groups. These can be also be applied to other equality groups and include.

1. statistical analysis of equalities monitoring data
2. satisfaction surveys (analysed by the racial or other equality groups to which the people surveyed belong)
3. random targeted surveys
4. meetings, focus groups, citizen juries

It is difficult to comprehensively assess monitoring and evaluation practices in the ROAs because of a lack of information. A majority (20) of the ROAs make little or no reference to the monitoring and evaluation of equality issues and many provide no baseline indicators for all or some outcomes. One, West Dunbartonshire, which has the monitoring of equality issues as a specific outcome, finds it challenging for areas with a proportionately small minority ethnic population. Two (Argyll and Clyde, East Dunbartonshire) describe their approach to monitoring and evaluation thus:

All projects activities supported through the ROA will require to record and assess the impact in relation to equal opportunities. It will be expected that data will be gathered in relation to participation and impact in terms of gender, ethnicity, disability etc.

These monitoring procedures appear to be under development, since no detail of how they might operate is given. Other ROAs state that monitoring and evaluation procedures are being developed (Dumfries and Galloway East Lothian, South Ayrshire, Perth and Kinross). Even the ROAs (Fife, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Renfrewshire, Falkirk and Dundee) that have more evident monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are engaged in ongoing development, particularly in relation to disaggregated data. Some give details of the geographic target area populations by SIMD indicators, thereby providing limited equalities information in terms of disability, and a few extend this to include ethnic origin and or gender. However, when the baseline and target indicators for outcomes associated with equalities are examined, there is scant evidence that these are or will be disaggregated by equality groups. However the need

to source and provide disaggregated data is recognised and some RoAs state they are working towards it. Fife provides a good example of monitoring practices using disaggregated data and qualitative surveys.

**In most ROAs, monitoring and evaluation procedures in relation to equalities are at a relatively early stage of development.**

### **Compliance with the legislation**

In order to comply with the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000 and the new public sector duty in relation to gender and disability (the latter not enacted at the point when the documents were compiled), ROAs should state how equalities principles are being addressed in the development and delivery of the ROA. Two, East Lothian and Perth and Kinross, explicitly refer to the legislation.

#### East Lothian

- Actions are underway within the Council to undertake a whole scale review of approaches to equality specifically race equality to comply with race legislation. This process will encompass work within the CPP and take forward action to engage specifically with communities of interest. It is our intention that this process will be influential to how new and existing projects are undertaken and our processes of monitoring and evaluating regeneration activities.

#### Perth and Kinross

- At present, Perth and Kinross Council subscribes to the Racial Equalities Scheme. The principles within this scheme will be applied to any projects undertaken as a result of the ROA. This Scheme is due to be revised in November 2006 to take into account of new disability legislation. Those partners involved in implementing the ROA will work with the Equality Planning Officer in order to promote social inclusion and equality, and in particular, will aim to engage with hard-to-reach group

Whilst others do not directly specify what they are doing to comply with legislation, the overall impression of provision from some (Fife, Dundee, Glasgow, Renfrewshire and Edinburgh) indicates their procedures for legislative compliance may be fairly well developed, This is particularly the case for the Glasgow and Edinburgh ROAs.

However the majority do not explicitly state what they are doing in terms of the legislation. Thus in order to broadly ascertain whether or not an ROA is compliant with the legislation, consideration was given to the following factors.

1. Are equality groups involved in the development of the ROA?
2. Are outcomes or sub-outcomes defined for particular groups?
3. Are services/activities defined for particular groups?
4. Are there monitoring mechanisms in place?

An analysis of the ROAs indicates that most progress is being made in relation to question one in that the majority of ROAs are making attempts to engage with equality groups. The responses to two and three above are less clear, for although only a few ROAs specifically target outcomes at equality groups many services and activities are directed at them. The response to question four is very clear; few ROAs have an established monitoring system in place.

These findings are not surprising, given equality issues are generally perceived in terms of engagement, and perhaps this is a necessary starting point; engage first and then develop activities to meet needs. However, in order to comply with the legislation, ROAs need to analyse current activities in terms of impact on relevant equality groups. There is a need for a more consistent approach to the disaggregation of data and indicators in terms of equality groups. Processes of engagement and monitoring need to be carried out in tandem.

**At the time of writing, only a minority of local authorities appeared to be compliant with the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000 in terms of actively promoting equality of minority ethnic groups, and monitoring progress towards stated outcomes.**

## **Key points**

- Whilst the majority of the Regeneration Outcome Agreements have a commitment to including a range of equality groups within their regeneration strategies, the extent and detail of this commitment varies. In the majority of cases, the ways in which equalities and regeneration policies and strategies inter-relate are only partially articulated.
- The range of equalities specified by local authorities in their ROAs varies and most do not present evidence on the relationship between social deprivation and other social characteristics. Where specific groups are specified, young people are most commonly mentioned. Little attempt is made to explore the inter-relationship of a range of factors, such as age, gender and ethnicity.
- A minority of ROAs indicate a commitment to mainstreaming equality, often expressed through a strategy of engaging a range of equality groups in the discussion of policy priorities. However, most ROAs do not have an explicit policy of mainstreaming equalities, and their ROAs do not exemplify a clear understanding of the concept.
- The majority of ROAs state a commitment to consulting equality groups, but only a small minority appear to have robust consultation processes in place with the six equality groups identified by the Commission for Equality and Human Rights. Consultation with LGBT groups, and those based on religion/belief, appears to be in an early stage of development.
- The majority of ROAs make little attempt to specify the way in which outcomes and outputs relate to specific equality groups. Race, religion/belief and sexual orientation are the least likely to be mentioned.
- Young people are by far the most frequently targeted group in relation to the national priorities for community regeneration, No consideration is given to religion/ belief in the ROAs and little attention is given to issues relating to sexual orientation.
- Insufficient data are available to be able to comment on the amount of money spent on particular equality groups by each local authority.
- In most cases, the strategies to meet the needs of equality groups in RoAs are not cross-referenced to approaches in other policy documents and plans.
- At the time of writing, only a minority of local authorities appeared to be compliant with the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000 in terms of actively promoting equality of minority ethnic groups, and monitoring progress towards stated outcomes.

## **Conclusion**

In its guidance to local authorities on the production of ROAs, the Scottish Executive makes clear that there is a need to move beyond the traditional the traditional boundary between regeneration strategies, dealing with issues of redistribution, and equalities policies, dealing with issues of recognition. However, in the social science literature there continues to be a debate about the relationship between economic and identity aspects of social justice. Most local authorities have a commitment to including equality policies in the ROAs. However, few have a clear view about a way forward in terms of pursuing a joint approach to these issues, and this is evidenced by a lack of a coherent equalities policy statement in many ROAs. In

addition, equalities are defined differently within different jurisdictions, with different grounds being identified for different purposes. Unsurprisingly, there is variation across local authorities in terms of the types of equalities they recognise, and many fail to state explicitly the aspects of equality which their ROA aims to address. In terms of targeted groups, young people are most frequently mentioned, and some mention is also made of older people. In relation to gender, most attention is focused on lone parents and much less attention is paid to under-achieving boys and economically inactive men. Disabled people are often undifferentiated, and the distinction between ill-health and disability is not always made clear. Less attention is focused on BME groups, and specific communities are not distinguished although their characteristics and service needs may be very different. Throughout the ROAs, little attention is paid to sexual orientation and religion/belief, and these are areas where it is fairly clear that more conceptual work needs to be carried out. There is also a need to explore the inter-relationship of specific factors, such as disability and age, so that services may be more finely targeted. Overall, it is evident that there is a need for better analysis of statistical data, so that the relationship between economic deprivation and wider social characteristics is clarified. This information is also necessary for purposes of monitoring and evaluation the success of particular initiatives and services.

Some progress has been made in relation to consultation of particular groups. However, there is a danger that consultation may be seen as an end in itself. In addition, if small groups of people are endlessly consulted, then consultation fatigue may set in.

In terms of the agencies and services which may be mobilised towards meeting the needs of particular equality groups, it is clear that thought has been paid to the contribution of education, family support, employment, health and youth work. Further thought could be given to other areas which are salient in people's lives, such as the housing needs of a range of equality groups.

It is evident that the ROAs produced by many local authorities may not as yet be compliant with existing and forthcoming equalities legislation, in that they fail to specify how they will establish a baseline in relation to the position of particular groups and a strategy for monitoring progress towards attaining a greater degree of equality. Assistance may be needed from the Scottish Executive and Communities Scotland in terms of clarifying the complex conceptual and definitional issues surrounding equalities, and in providing further advice on monitoring and evaluation. Overall, it appears that some progress has been made in ensuring that equalities feature more prominently in regeneration strategies, but much work remains to be done.

## References

- Communities Scotland (2004) *Community Regeneration Fund: Guidance on Regeneration Outcome Agreements* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive
- Edwards, C. (2002) 'Barriers to involvement: the disconnected worlds of disability and regeneration' *Local Economy* 17, 2, 123-135.
- Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice Interruptus* London: Routledge
- Phillips, A. (1997) *Which Equalities Matter?* Cambridge: Polity Press
- Riddell, S., Banks, p. and Tinklin, T. (2005) *Disability and Employment in Scotland: A Review of the Evidence Base* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research
- Scottish Executive (2000) *Towards an Equality Strategy: A Consultation Paper* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive