

Social Recovery Taskforce
26 January 2021 at 14:00
Via Microsoft Teams

Agenda

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Apologies
Chair
2. Minute of Previous Meeting Attached
Chair
3. Matters Arising
Chair
4. Community Engagement Update
Judith Hunter
5. City Volunteer Review Attached
Jill Miller / Ian Bruce / David Maxwell
6. Microbriefings and Research Priorities
Des McNulty
7. Disability Research
Chris Harkins
8. Action Plan Template
John Dawson
9. Workstreams Updates
 - i. Third Sector – *Ian Bruce*
 - ii. Disabled Communities – *Cllr Layden/Tressa Burke*
 - iii. Local Employability Partnership (GPEG) – *Mike McNally*
10. AOCB
Chair
11. Meeting Schedule:

25/02/2021, 14:00
18/03/2021, 14:00
15/04/2021, 14:00
20/05/2021, 14:00
10/06/2021, 14:00
08/07/2021, 14:00

OFFICIAL

MINUTES

**Social Recovery Task Force
3rd December 2020, at 14:00
via Microsoft Teams**

Present: Councillor Richard Bell, Glasgow City Council (Chair); Councillor Jennifer Layden, Glasgow City Council; Councillor Ruairi Kelly, Glasgow City Council; Bernadette Monaghan, Glasgow City Council, Community Empowerment Services; Shaw Anderson, Glasgow City Council, Community Empowerment Services;); Neil McInroy, The Centre of Local Economic Strategy; Judith Hunter, Glasgow City Council, Community Empowerment Services; Martin Cassidy, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service; Des McNulty, University of Glasgow; Ian Bruce, Glasgow Third Sector Interface; Jatin Haria, BAME Representative; Pete Seaman, Glasgow Centre for Population Health; Gary l'Anson, Police Scotland; Robin Ashton, Glasgow Kelvin College; Vicky Bond, GCC CED; Andrea McMillan, Glasgow Life; Tressa Burke, Glasgow Disability Alliance; Douglas Taylor, Glasgow Third Sector Interface; Anne Fehilly, Glasgow City Council, Violence Against Women; Marshall Poulton, Glasgow City Council, Neighbourhoods and Sustainability (Transport); Lorraine Barrie, Glasgow Equality Forum; Paul Buchanan, Glasgow Colleges Regional Board; Gary Dover, Glasgow City Health & Social Care Partnership; Dawn Fyfe, Glasgow Women's Voluntary Sector Network; Candy Walker, Glasgow's Advice & Information Network (GAIN); Sharon Kelly, Skills Development Scotland; Fiona Moss, Glasgow City Health and Social Care Partnership; Valerie McNeice, Glasgow Centre for Population Health; Sue John, Glasgow Women's Library; Gabrielle MacBeth, Glasgow Women's Library; Sarah Weakley, Academic Advisory Group; Afton Hill, Glasgow City Council, Strategic Policy & Planning (Equalities).

In attendance:

Mary McPhail, Glasgow City Council, Community Empowerment Services
Gerald Tonner, Glasgow City Council, Community Empowerment Services

Apologies:

Linda De Caestecker, Glasgow City Health and Social Care Partnership; Colin Lee, BAME Representative; Jill Miller, Glasgow Life; Des McNulty, Academic Advisory Group.

1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Minute of Previous Meeting

No amendments were requested and the minute was approved.

3. Matters Arising

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

Participatory Budgeting will be taken forward, initially through a small working group that will meet for the first time next week. Chris Harkins will be part of this group.

4. Community Engagement Update

Judith gave a short update on progress made from the last meeting. The Steering Group plans to meet again on Dec. 14th to discuss what needs to be done in preparation to start the interviews in January.

Judith has had no feedback yet from anyone in Education. She has had conversations with the Children's Neighbourhood Team who advised on their method of working with young people as peer interviewers/recorders of other young people - these can be done in schools and also in the neighbourhoods. Judith has also been in contact with the GCPH who have offered to help in analysing the information. The Chair directed Judith drop him an e-mail and he would contact Maureen McKenna.

As no contact has been made by anyone from the ERT, Judith asked if someone from this group could help facilitate this. Cllr Kelly offered to help - Judith to let him know what it is she's looking for.

5. Community Wealth Building

The Chair described Neil as an inspirational speaker and was pleased that he could come along today to speak to the group. Neil explained that he's the Chief Executive for the Centre of Local Economic Strategy and is also seconded to the Scottish Government 2 days a week.

Neil went onto give an outline of what CWB (community wealth building) is and how it relates to economic recovery. CWB has been running for around 20 years and is a practical and outcome focussed means of delivering a better economy for everyone - it focusses on jobs, enterprise and a community stake in the economy. Neil described CWB as 'hotwiring' social community environmental benefits into all economic activity. Traditionally, the focus was on redistribution of wealth after it was created through a tax system, now CWB supports redistribution as pre-distribution with ownership of the economy being key. There are 5 pillars to CWB – procurement, jobs, land and property assets, finance and ownership.

Referring to projects being carried out in the U.S.A. and elsewhere, Neil explained that in terms of recovery, 4 key things have started to emerge about CWB:

- public sector anchors have a key role in recovery due to the assets they have and the number of people they employ
- local economic recovery organisations in regard to their municipal holding companies
- understanding of sectors – foundational (food, health, care), future growth (manufacturing, bio technology)
- city investment growth deals

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

Cllr Kelly gave an update on what the Council's doing in terms of CWB and going forward. Large anchor organisations (public and private) are being contacted to create a forum to get some sort of commitment of what they intend to do as well as what we can do. The forum will look at what opportunities the organisations can provide and where local groups or organisations can fill these opportunities. In reference to holding companies, the Council is meeting next week on this topic - officers will look at what sectors would potentially benefit from this, where the funding will come from and where the holding company could step in to help viable businesses with the end view being to hand over to employee ownership. Both Cllr Kelly and the Chair will meet with representatives from the Scottish Government about investment.

Neil went onto answer questions raised in regard to CWB which included:

- how CWB impacts on areas roundabout
- the role of the cultural sector
- how it fits with disabled people who find it difficult to enter the employment market
- the impact of shop closures on the High St.

The Chair thanked Neil for his talk, describing it as hugely interesting. Gavin asked Neil to have a look at the Circular Economy Route Map which has just gone through the City Administration Committee today (and has been approved by the Council) as a lot of what's been discussed today is exactly what's contained within the document. Gavin asked if Neil could provide him with feedback on it, if he has the time.

6. Climate Emergency Implementation Plan

Gavin provided a link in the chat to the plan and consultation on CEIP (Climate Emergency Implementation Plan). He explained the **background, challenges, proposal, themes and next steps** of it and asked the group to take some time to respond to the consultation.

Background

In 2018 the IPCC published a report highlighting the need for global action and gave the Council 10 years to act on climate change. Glasgow set up a Climate Emergency Working Group and in 2019 declared a climate and ecological emergency. The CEWG produced a report making 61 recommendations in its aim to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030.

Challenges

The challenges to be carbon neutral by 2030 and net-zero emissions by 2045, requires major action from businesses, individuals, and communities. This not just the responsibility of the Council, but the responsibility of everyone – all have a role to play in this. Gavin advised that what we've learned from the COVID crisis can help us deal with the crisis of climate emergency.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

From 2006 to 2018, we have done significantly well in reducing emissions. The need now is to increase the scope, scale and intensity of actions and to build resilience to the local weather impacts. Bold leadership and investment is required.

Proposal

The plan is a response to the 61 recommendations made by the CEWG. Within the plan there are 53 actions that will be taken forward – these actions are around food, energy, renewables, transport and pension funds. The plan is not trying to duplicate or compete with strategies already in place. A separate group was set up to look at the ecological emergency and their findings will be incorporated into the climate plan as well. The actions are aligned with the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals.

Themes

There are 5 emergency themes:

- Communication and Community Empowerment (7 actions are linked to this theme)
- Just and Inclusive Place (6 actions are linked to this theme)
- Well Connected and Thriving City (22 actions are linked to this theme)
- Health and Wellbeing (5 actions are linked to this theme)
- Green Recovery (16 actions are linked to this theme)

Gavin explained each of the themes and what's involved.

Next Steps

The consultation is underway. Conversations will be prepared and carried out (using whatever tools are available) as a means to engage with agencies, businesses and communities. A series of Webinars will be run in January. A revised plan will be taken back to Committee for approval and will then be our plan in moving forward to 2030 and 2045. The city will report annually on the progress of the 5 themes and (due to the rate of change) will be a living document and updated every year. This will also align to the UN Sustainable Development Goals and as these can be arbitrary, Gavin is looking at how they could be localised.

Gavin finished his presentation by asking the group to look at the plan and feedback any comments. The Chair thanked Gavin for his presentation and asked that it be circulated.

Agreed Actions

- Presentation to be circulated.

7. Workstream Updates

Bernadette spoke of a recent meeting with the 3 new workstream leads to discuss/reflect on what's been discussed so far – where we're going as a taskforce, are we focussing enough on outcomes and how do we capture it all. John Sherry is providing support by pulling together an action planning template. This will be distributed to all of the workstreams to capture the key priorities/key outcomes that we can achieve by next year, and how we can evidence the impact.

OFFICIAL

Bernadette hopes to pull together a meeting with all the workstream leads in the new year to look at the feasibility of regular meetings, discuss progress, take stock of what we're doing and what we need to focus on. She also wants to regulate reporting on what's being done. Being conscious of the number of meetings people are attending, she suggested bringing the leads together every couple of months – this will be taken forward.

Bernadette stressed that the taskforce action plan is being pulled together and will be circulated as soon as possible.

Third Sector

Ian advised that the 3rd Sector is looking primarily at the relationship between the 3rd Sector and public partners in the city and what it needs to look like in the future. The program is a two part process. The first part is the 3rd Sector looking at the history and values they'd hope to have in their relationship with local authorities/public partners, with the second part about discussing these findings with partners with the intention of reviewing the current Concordat. Bernadette thought that a fresh Concordat would be worthwhile.

The review group consists of 13 people and have met twice, with the intention of meeting every 2 weeks. Each meeting will result in a discussion/recommendations paper to go out for consultation with 3rd and public sectors to get the workstream right and potentially start identifying things that can be worked on before the process is complete. At the end of the process, the papers will be pulled together to form the overall report and to agree the action plan on going forward.

Disabled Communities

Cllr Layden reported that the first Disability Communities Workstream meeting has been arranged for 15th Dec to look at work going forward.

Tressa advised that a background paper has been done, taking a steer from Des McNulty's advice on the importance of basing what we're doing on evidence and how it then shapes policy making. The purpose of the workstream is to examine the position affecting disabled people, to establish the evidence that we do have, to consider what has worked well and lessons learned so far.

The first meeting is to agree the principles and approach of the workstream. Tressa stated that she want a systems change approach to it - one that acknowledges power and participation. Tressa hopes the workstream will have a plan of what it wants to do in the new year.

Tressa added that Nick Watson (University of Glasgow) and Chris Harkins are on the working group. Also, GCPH is working with her on a joint micro-briefing. Tressa praised the robust research that the academics have provided.

Young People and Transitions

Robin advised that a number of groups are already in place and focussed on young people and transitions (particularly on the youth employment angle). At the last SRT, Mike McNally

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

gave an update from the GPEG employment and skills hub. A key focus of this work is on the Youth Guarantee Project.

Mike gave a further update on the development of the Young Persons Guarantee in Glasgow. A steering group has been set up that has representatives from various agencies. The group has pulled together a submission and a delivery plan and financial template was submitted to the Scottish Government last week. The £4.3 million budget submission included:

- Glasgow core learning project (digital training and support)
- supported learning programme through HSCP
- employment recruitment centres
- support in growth programme (unemployed or under-employed graduates)
- sustainability for modern apprenticeships
- enhance workforce co-ordinators in schools
- volunteering program (working with Glasgow Life)
- Kickstart

The Chair thanked Robin and Mike for their input and asked Mike to keep him posted about the application.

8. Date of Next Meeting

Thursday, 21st January at 14:00

OFFICIAL

Social Recovery Task Force Meeting
Tuesday 26 January 2021
City Volunteer Review
Jill Miller / Ian Bruce / David Maxwell

ITEM 5

1. Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to update the Social Renewal Taskforce on the initial output of the City Volunteer Review which took place over the last quarter of 2020. Following agreement with the Community Planning Partnership Executive Group in June 2020, Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector, Volunteer Glasgow and Glasgow Life commissioned Advantage Training Consultancy to conduct a review of the City's Volunteering Strategy (2019-2024) and volunteering infrastructure in light of the Covid-19 response. The aim of the review was to provide recommendations to help achieve the vision outlined in *Volunteering for All 2019*, that Glasgow becomes a place "where everyone can volunteer, more often, and throughout their lives."

2. Process

The review involved a number of methods including analysis of existing data, of which there is no shortage, individual and group interviews and an online survey to increase the reach. There are a number of limitations noted in the report mostly resulting from constraints to engage fully due to COVID restrictions. That noted this has been an extremely useful process which has provided recommendations for the City stakeholders to focus on.

3. Report Review of Volunteering in Glasgow

The Final Summary Report Review of Volunteering in Glasgow is attached and the full report can be provided to stakeholders if required. The following table shows the 17 recommendations from the report and the three commissioning partners response. In some cases, the recommendations are accepted while others will need more discussion and agreement on how to proceed. However, at this stage, commissioning partners are looking for feedback from the Stakeholders on the Social Recovery Taskforce to shape the developing action plan which must be informed by these recommendations.

Consultant's Recommendations		Partners' Initial Response
1	<p>Revise Glasgow's Volunteering Charter or use a different method to monitor and assess Community Planning Partner (CPP) commitment to volunteering.</p>	<p>The partners recognise the need for a Review of the Charter. Progress in this area has not been to the level that we would have hoped. Now is an excellent time for us to undertake that review. We recognise that different partners will have different aspirations and expectations. In particular, we think there are important differences between sectors (public, third and private) and between those organisations whose centre of decision-making lies in Glasgow, and those whose decision-making structures are more distant. Volunteer Glasgow will seek to take forward this review dependent upon resources. We want to learn from the development and ensure it is fit for purpose in the future. We believe there is potential to take the Charter further – including revising it to become a National Charter, taking into account the emerging priorities from the National Volunteering Framework</p>
2	<p>Marketing messages should be revised to highlight wider benefits of volunteering. Greater emphasis should be placed on 'volunteering to make a difference' and 'volunteering to give back', in addition to the health and wellbeing benefits. Caution should be used when speaking about employability benefits given the current economic climate. It may be better to speak of 'gaining skills and experience'.</p>	<p>The partners agree with this recommendation, although we would go further and reflect ourselves that it is not just the message that requires change, but also potentially our approach to marketing. There is a need for a consistent marketing approach that can be used consistently by the three partners but also able to be adopted by wider partners.</p> <p>We will focus work on this and aim to bring a paper to a future CPP / Social Recovery Task Force meeting as appropriate.</p>
3	<p>More emphasis is needed to encourage, support and capture data on 'volunteering', in its widest sense, in deprived areas. This might involve working in different ways such as co-locating advice and support for those interested in offering their time in unpaid capacities in existing community venues such as libraries or health centres.</p>	<p>We recognise the value of this work, although it has been particularly difficult to do during Covid-19 and the changes that have been happening for partners during the period. We will seek to develop proposals for co-locating support and development services and there is potential to continue our research group to support increased data capture. It is however resource intensive. There are strong links in this recommendation to Recommendations (2) and (13). Glasgow does have an apparently unrivalled amount of population data on volunteering and further discussions are required with stakeholders to explain key findings and to inform decisions on the best use of resources for optimal combination of polices, programmes and services.</p>

4	<p>Since Volunteer Glasgow is considered by some to 'quality assure' the volunteering opportunities it advertises, perhaps it should consider only advertising those which offer to reimburse volunteers for any out-of-pocket expenses as soon as they are incurred. This may help reduce financial barriers to participation.</p>	<p>We have considered this recommendation and we understand the value that this would bring. However, there is also a significant value in having one single database for volunteering. Excluding volunteering opportunities because they don't meet our standards risks alienating partners and driving the development of multiple places to seek volunteering opportunities. We see a need to strike the correct balance. As such we will continue to work to support organisations to pay expenses, while also considering how we can provide additional promotion to those opportunities that are compliant with our expectations of good practice.</p>
5	<p>There still seems to be some way to go to make many volunteering opportunities accessible to those with physical disabilities. Some awareness raising may help advise VIOs that not all 'reasonable adjustments' have significant financial implications. It may also be worth thinking creatively e.g., could Self Directed Support direct payments enable those eligible to access volunteering opportunities more effectively?</p>	<p>We agree the recommendations here and recognise this as a critical area. This is an area that highlights the importance of good communications work. Some existing work has been successful and can be maintained and developed by the partners. There is key work here for GCVS in regards to their work with the Health and Social Care Partnership.</p>
6	<p>Volunteer Glasgow 'Taster Courses' are well received by traditionally excluded groups. Consideration should be given to increasing the reach of this programme across the whole city and to include other groups such as young people.</p>	<p>The partners welcome the feedback on this bit of work which has been innovative and well-received. Resourcing will be a challenge, but we will prioritise this work within that.</p>
7	<p>Childcare responsibilities are a barrier to volunteering for some groups. Thought could be given to encouraging partnership working between childcare providers/NC, HNC or SVQ childcare placements and VIOs; potentially linking the Volunteering Strategy with the (Vocational) Education Strategy.</p>	<p>We agree these recommendations, although some areas are more challenging than others. We see three key strands interconnecting here which we must address to reduce this barrier:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Childcare providers as volunteer involving organisations, well-placed to understand the needs of parents and children 2) The importance of expenses for volunteers, recognising that childcare is a valid expense and encouraging organisations to cover this cost. 3) Developing more 'Family Volunteering' opportunities, where families volunteer together, thus reducing the need for childcare while also supporting good quality family development.
8	<p>VIOs should be encouraged and supported to put volunteers through certificated courses.</p>	<p>This has merit, but some consideration is needed as to when this is appropriate. This needs to be targeted towards where it most relevant –for example where volunteering is contributing towards employability. It will be important to review this regularly to check progress.</p>

9	To be more inclusive and accessible, the volunteering database of opportunities could be developed.	We do recognise the challenge here. The software (Kinetic) that is used by the partners is a relatively low-cost off-the-shelf model. As such we have reduced ability to adapt the software. Recommendations can be made to the organisation that runs the system. It is possible to commission standalone developments, but this would require significant co-design and specification to get us to that point, alongside the resource to commission the work.
10	To be more inclusive, accessible and efficient, there should be a simple, universal application form for all volunteering opportunities advertised on the central Glasgow volunteering database.	<p>While this is attractive, we have concerns about its viability in practice. In developing such an approach, we would have to consider the needs of both volunteers and volunteer involving organisations. We would also need to take into account the different information needs associated with different volunteering opportunities.</p> <p>That said, at its core this is an equalities issue, and as such we will do some work alongside Recommendation (9) to consider how we can make the application process for volunteering simpler.</p>
11	<p>Building on what was delivered during COVID-19, better, more accessible volunteer management training is required; training suitable for Mutual Aid organisations and informal volunteering too. Thinking creatively, this support could perhaps come from the private sector, offering their expertise in a voluntary capacity.</p>	<p>We agree with this recommendation, although we do not agree that the private sector is the appropriate place from which to identify more volunteer management training.</p> <p>The partners have developed online learning, which we believe will make it significantly more accessible for some communities. A blended approach to include those who cannot or don't want to engage online will continue to be necessary.</p>
12	<p>There is a need to work more closely and more effectively with the private / corporate sector. In the wake of COVID-19, with both people and organisations feeling an increased social responsibility, now might be the time to have conversations with corporations about how they can support VIOs (in the widest sense) more effectively to support the local community e.g., as Trustees/Board Members/Advisors on specific topics including digital literacy/inclusion and mental wellbeing support for volunteers.</p>	This is a strong recommendation and one that GCVS and Volunteer Glasgow will take forward jointly. GCVS are already involved in work with key partners such as the Chamber of Commerce and the Institute of Directors and Volunteer Glasgow have had discussions with Social Good Connect.

13	<p>Language is important. ‘Volunteering’ needs to be rebranded to include the breadth of people’s contributions to their neighbours and communities.</p> <p>Many people do not see what they do as ‘volunteering’, nor are they attracted to what they perceive to be ‘volunteering’ in the traditional, formal sense.</p> <p>Emphasis should be placed on ‘giving back’ and ‘community benefit’. Opportunities within the public sector, mutual aid groups and other forms of informal volunteering should be highlighted.</p>	<p>We agree that language is important here. We don’t recognise any bit of language that better describes what we mean than volunteering – but we do recognise that the public often has an inaccurate and outdated perception of what volunteering is. There is an importance here in being part of a wider Scottish approach, and this issue will be discussed with national partners to see what opportunities exist for joint working.</p>
14	<p>Celebrate volunteering in its widest sense.</p> <p>Many of those consulted with as part of this review felt volunteers were not fully appreciated. There was a desire for some sort of celebratory event where the full range of contributions were acknowledged at a city level – including the informal roles prevalent during the pandemic response.</p> <p>Volunteer Week (June) might be the obvious time to conduct such a celebratory event, and it may be prudent to seek feedback from volunteers about how they want to be recognised.</p>	<p>We agree with this strongly, but there are resource challenges from the scale of the city. Again, there is an opportunity to look for national approaches as this challenge is not unique to Glasgow.</p> <p>In our experience there is often a disconnect here between how individual volunteer involving organisations recognise their volunteers, the wider recognition schemes that are put in place, and the way that volunteering is valued and embedded in public policy.</p> <p>That disconnect needs to be addressed as part of developing our response to this recommendation.</p>
15	<p>There is a need for a single, focused leadership with a strong, cohesive vision for volunteering and the capacity to provide corresponding support to VIOs.</p> <p>A single leadership body, with the power and accountability to drive forward the volunteering strategy across the city – to get ‘buy in’ at an operational level – is required.</p>	<p>The partners accept the recommendation and understand the challenge.</p> <p>This is a complex area and will require ongoing discussions between the partners. The partners are committed to having these discussions and to consider all possible options.</p>
16	<p>Consideration should be given to liaising with the national charities responsible for the COVID-19 volunteering response. Migrating responsibility for ongoing contact with those Glasgow residents not used in the national programme, to a local body, may foster better relationships with potential future volunteers.</p>	<p>We understand this recommendation and have been frustrated at the approach that was taken nationally. Those potential volunteers who gave permission for their details to be shared with Volunteer Glasgow (the overwhelming majority of those who signed up via Volunteer Scotland) have been contacted regularly by Volunteer Glasgow since. There are lessons to be learned from the recruitment approach taken by Scottish Government.</p>

17	Traditional sources of funding have significantly altered in financial year 2020/21. Perhaps new funding streams from the Council / Health & Social Care Partnerships etc. should be linked to the Volunteering Strategy and include requirements to work better together.	We agree with this and will work with partners to support the implementation which is outside of our control. The recommendation has been referred to the Third Sector group to consider as part of their work looking at funding. We will need to work across public / third sector to identify opportunities to gain resources for volunteering in the city. We are hopeful of Scottish Government confirming what they will fund directly as part of the delivery of the national Volunteering for All framework.
----	--	--

4. Recommendations

The Taskforce discuss and feed into the above initial response.

The Taskforce asks for the subsequent action plan to be brought to a future meeting.

REVIEW OF VOLUNTEERING IN GLASGOW

Summary Report

September – November 2020



Allan Johnston & Donna Nicholas (PhD)

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

In September 2020, Advantage Training Consultancy were commissioned by Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector, Volunteer Glasgow and Glasgow Life ('the commissioners') to conduct a review into the city's approach to promoting and developing volunteering.

The aim of the review was to provide recommendations to help achieve the vision outlined in *Volunteering for All 2019*, that Glasgow becomes a place "where everyone can volunteer, more often, and throughout their lives."¹

STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

This is a summary report of the key findings and the recommendations.

It contains a brief description of how the review of volunteering was undertaken; outlines some of the limitations of the review; summarises the status of volunteering across the city now; and explains the recommendations and how they were reached.

For full details of the review, please see the main report.

HOW THE REVIEW WAS CONDUCTED

A desk-based analysis of existing data was undertaken which helped inform the content of virtual interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders.

Stakeholders consulted included the commissioners, strategic partners, volunteer involving organisations (VIOs) and members of the public (n=69).

Participants were asked for their views on topics such as:

- What has gone well in terms of facilitating volunteering and community action over the last 12 months? (Pre-COVID; Post-COVID)

¹ Scottish Government. 2019. Volunteering for All: national framework. National Framework, Edinburgh: Scottish Government. p.31.

- What could have gone better in terms of facilitating volunteering and community action over the last 12 months? (Pre-COVID; Post-COVID)
- What type of society do we want to see in the future?
- How can volunteering, community and third sector activity help us achieve this?
- Are Glasgow's strategies and structures for facilitating volunteering and community action fit for 'building back better'?

With the strategic partners and some VIOs, 14 hypotheses generated by the Glasgow Volunteering Strategy Governance Group (Policy and Research Sub Group) were also discussed to some extent.² These hypotheses were derived from analysis of a wide range of national and local survey and statistical data and included assertions to explain differences in rates of volunteering across ages; genders; areas of deprivation and localities.

A short online survey was also distributed for completion by members of the public, VIOs and other interested organisations (n=110).

LIMITATIONS OF THE REVIEW

All projects of this type are subject to a range of limitations. These include:

- The views expressed by all participants are their own – they do not necessarily represent the views of the organisations they are employed by/volunteer with.
- Very few stakeholders were able to offer informed views on the hypotheses generated by the Policy and Research Sub Group. Instead, most were able to offer more general views on the circumstances pertaining in Glasgow on the issues in question e.g., on patterns of volunteering within particular groups.
- Despite best efforts, it has not been possible to gather the views of many Glasgow residents who do not currently volunteer nor the views of disabled people who live in Glasgow. The views of these demographics are therefore not represented as comprehensively as the consultants would have wished.
- Members of the public who have engaged with this review are a 'self-selecting sample' and therefore cannot be considered wholly representative.

² See Appendix One.

STATUS OF VOLUNTEERING IN GLASGOW

The main report is written in a 'SWOT' (Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, Threat) analysis format and is divided into three substantive chapters:

- The Volunteering Strategy and Action Plan for 2019-24³ – Key themes identified include: the different ways people are now volunteering; persisting inequality of place; the impacts (positive and negative) of COVID-19 and financial concerns.
- Activities which can support identified needs – Key themes identified include: the need to elevate the profile of volunteering; altering the vocabulary used; and better addressing people's motivation for volunteering.
- Structures and the use of resources in the city – Key themes identified include: the people of Glasgow were seen as a significant strength and the perceived lack of a single, focused leadership for volunteering was the major weakness highlighted, along with a gap between the volunteering strategy and its operation.

Running through all three chapters are several 'golden threads' which are summarised below.

WHERE GLASGOW EXCELS IN TERMS OF VOLUNTEERING

'People really do make Glasgow' and see the benefits of volunteering

Stakeholders from all groups mentioned there is a 'civic passion' in Glasgow and people from all walks of life were seen to want to contribute:

- *"The people of Glasgow are passionate; there is a desire to get involved."* (VIO)

Resident's volunteering response to COVID-19 exemplified this desire to help their communities and support their neighbours – often in informal ways:

- *"People's volunteering response has been incredibly effective. Informal volunteering widened with COVID-19."* (Commissioner)

³ Glasgow Community Planning Partnership (CPP). 2019. Glasgow's Volunteering Strategy 2019 – 24. <http://www.volunteerglasgow.org/downloads/Glasgows-Volunteering-Strategy-2019-24-as-presented-to-GCPP-26-03-2019.pdf>.

The benefits of volunteering to the individual as well as to society were widely recognised. Stakeholders who participated in this review believed volunteering contributed to positive physical and mental wellbeing and to community development:

- *"Volunteering is really good for your mental wellbeing – you make friends."* (Volunteer)
- *"It [volunteering] also gives many people an opportunity to improve their health, especially older people..."* (Volunteer via survey)
- *"It allows you to connect your community. It helps to make new friends and boost your Social skills..."* (Volunteer via survey)

WHERE GLASGOW COULD IMPROVE IN TERMS OF VOLUNTEERING

Language is important: The term 'volunteering' does not capture the full range of people's contributions to their neighbours and communities

Many people in Glasgow – including those traditionally under-represented in volunteering (e.g., those in poverty) – have been undertaking tasks that they do not consider 'volunteering'. This means their contribution to the community may not always be effectively captured or fully supported. Widening the definition of volunteering and elevating its profile was seen to be important by numerous stakeholders – particularly since the manner in which services and supports were delivered altered with COVID-19:

- *"Mutual aid – people don't see it as volunteering; it's a cultural thing. We underestimate the full range of people's contributions. Organisations are beginning to see it now..."* (Commissioner)
- *How we capture information about informal volunteering is important – those living in deprivation are less likely to consider themselves a 'volunteer' despite 'informally volunteering'. (Commissioner)*
- *"We need to get rid of the term 'volunteering' and replace it with 'social responsibility'. And we should start talking about it in schools."* (VIO)
- *"There's something about messaging. Engaging people and understanding their motivation. Often it's about 'giving back to the community' or 'helping people'."* (VIO)

In addition to altering the vocabulary used, having a single leadership body in Glasgow for volunteering was also seen to be a crucial area for development.

There is no single, focused leadership with a strong, cohesive vision for volunteering and corresponding support to VIOs to promote the vision and strategy

Many stakeholders highlighted the lack of a single leadership body, pushing forward and 'owning' a vision and strategy for volunteering, as a weakness in Glasgow:

- *"Volunteer Glasgow and GCVS should function as one organisation – they are two sides of the same coin."* (Strategic Partner)
- *"GCVS, Volunteer Glasgow and Glasgow Social Enterprise Network are all in the leadership frame. Where is volunteering happening? Glasgow Life."* (Strategic Partner)
- *'What could be done differently?': A single agency that handles and integrates volunteering alongside capacity building and enterprise development would be most useful for third sector organisations to go to when they want to develop themselves."* (VIO via survey)
- *"Who is going to own the strategy and drive it forwards? Someone needs to. There's a gap between strategy and operation."* (Strategic Partner)

RECOMMENDATIONS

These evidence-based conclusions and recommendations consider the data gathered as part of this review in its entirety, and draw justification from across the whole body of work. **Please note, the recommendations are presented in analytic order, not in any order of importance or priority.**

Recommendation One

Revise Glasgow's Volunteering Charter or use a different method to monitor and assess Community Planning Partner (CPP) commitment to volunteering.

The figures produced for the Charter do not necessarily reflect the ethos or activity of the CPPs. Given the current economic climate and the response to COVID-19, it may be that CPPs have created new ways of working to accommodate volunteering. Further consultation with these bodies to ascertain how best to support them to achieve appropriate volunteering strategies might be prudent.

Recommendation Two

Marketing messages should be revised to highlight wider benefits of volunteering.

Greater emphasis should be placed on 'volunteering to make a difference' and 'volunteering to give back', in addition to the health and wellbeing benefits.

Caution should be used when speaking about employability benefits given the current economic climate. It may be better to speak of 'gaining skills and experience'.

Recommendation Three

More emphasis is needed to encourage, support and capture data on 'volunteering', in its widest sense, in deprived areas. This might involve working in different ways such as co-locating advice and support for those interested in offering their time in unpaid capacities in existing community venues such as libraries or health centres.

Given anecdotal evidence and indications from reports on the response to COVID-19, those in areas of higher deprivation; the unemployed; those in rented/social housing etc. are more likely to informally volunteer, work with mutual aid groups, or offer their time to others in some 'unassigned' manner than to volunteer in a 'formal' way.

Their contribution is not always recognised because they do not consider what they do as 'volunteering' and, for the same reason, they may not access support available to them in their role that they might benefit from.

Having visible support, easily accessible in locations people already attend, may go some way to help increase data capture and may also encourage local residents to get involved with opportunities that interest them.

Linked to this recommendation is Recommendation Thirteen – to widen the definition of 'volunteering'.

Recommendation Four

Since Volunteer Glasgow is considered by some to 'quality assure' the volunteering opportunities it advertises, perhaps it should consider only advertising those which offer to reimburse volunteers for any out-of-pocket expenses as soon as they are incurred. This may help reduce financial barriers to participation.

Recommendation Five

There still seems to be some way to go to make many volunteering opportunities accessible to those with physical disabilities.

Some awareness raising may help advise VIOs that not all 'reasonable adjustments' have significant financial implications.

It may also be worth thinking creatively e.g., could Self Directed Support direct payments enable those eligible to access volunteering opportunities more effectively?

Recommendation Six

Volunteer Glasgow 'Taster Courses'⁴ are well received by traditionally excluded groups. Consideration should be given to increasing the reach of this programme across the whole city and to include other groups such as young people.

Recommendation Seven

Childcare responsibilities are a barrier to volunteering for some groups. Thought could be given to encouraging partnership working between childcare providers/NC, HNC or SVQ childcare placements and VIOs; potentially linking the Volunteering Strategy with the (Vocational) Education Strategy.

⁴ A two-week programme where volunteers are supported to experience a wide range of volunteering placements across different sectors and use different skills.

Recommendation Eight

VIOs should be encouraged and supported to put volunteers through certificated courses.

A central body could perhaps coordinate the organisation of a range of popular courses and provide VIOs with the opportunity to book places on an ad hoc basis.

Recommendation Nine

To be more inclusive and accessible, the volunteering database of opportunities could be developed.

Ideas suggested included:

- having the ability to match volunteer skills/wants to the opportunities available;
- having the instructions on how to use the database available in a range of popular languages such as Farsi, Arabic, Kurdish etc.
- having the instructions on how to use the database available in 'simple English';
- using some simple graphics to help with explanation.

Linked to this recommendation, is Recommendation Ten.

Recommendation Ten

To be more inclusive, accessible and efficient, there should be a simple, universal application form for all volunteering opportunities advertised on the central Glasgow volunteering database.

Recommendation Eleven

Building on what was delivered during COVID-19, better, more accessible volunteer management training is required; training suitable for Mutual Aid organisations and informal volunteering too.

Thinking creatively, this support could perhaps come from the private sector, offering their expertise in a voluntary capacity.

This links in with Recommendation Twelve.

Recommendation Twelve

There is a need to work more closely and more effectively with the private / corporate sector.

In the wake of COVID-19, with both people and organisations feeling an increased social responsibility, now might be the time to have conversations with corporations about how they can support VIOs (in the widest sense) more effectively to support the local community e.g., as Trustees/Board Members/Advisors on specific topics including digital literacy/inclusion and mental wellbeing support for volunteers.

Recommendation Thirteen

Language is important. 'Volunteering' needs to be rebranded to include the breadth of people's contributions to their neighbours and communities.

Many people do not see what they do as 'volunteering', nor are they attracted to what they perceive to be 'volunteering' in the traditional, formal sense.

Emphasis should be placed on 'giving back' and 'community benefit'. Opportunities within the public sector, mutual aid groups and other forms of informal volunteering should be highlighted.

Recommendation Fourteen

Celebrate volunteering in its widest sense.

Many of those consulted with as part of this review felt volunteers were not fully appreciated. There was a desire for some sort of celebratory event where the full range of contributions were acknowledged at a city level – including the informal roles prevalent during the pandemic response.

Volunteer Week (June) might be the obvious time to conduct such a celebratory event, and it may be prudent to seek feedback from volunteers about how they want to be recognised.

Recommendation Fifteen

There is a need for a single, focused leadership with a strong, cohesive vision for volunteering and the capacity to provide corresponding support to VIOs.

A single leadership body, with the power and accountability to drive forward the volunteering strategy across the city – to get ‘buy in’ at an operational level – is required.

Recommendation Sixteen

Consideration should be given to liaising with the national charities responsible for the COVID-19 volunteering response. Migrating responsibility for ongoing contact with those Glasgow residents not used in the national programme, to a local body, may foster better relationships with potential future volunteers.

Recommendation Seventeen

Traditional sources of funding have significantly altered in financial year 2020/21. Perhaps new funding streams from the Council / Health & Social Care Partnerships etc. should be linked to the Volunteering Strategy and include requirements to work better together.

Going forwards, funding should perhaps be more strategic to reflect national and local priorities – including as they pertain to volunteering (in its widest sense).⁵ Perhaps new funding streams need to be linked to the Volunteering Strategy and include requirements to work better together.

⁵ For instance, see: ‘Resilient and Empowered Communities’, *Glasgow City Council Strategic Plan 2017 to 2022* (Glasgow City Council 2017) and links with the five strategic priorities for the Glasgow City IJB / HSCP for health and social care in Glasgow e.g., Prevention, early intervention and harm reduction (Integrated Joint Board 2019).

APPENDIX ONE | HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis	Sources of Evidence
<p>Gender</p> <p>1. There is a greater amount of formal volunteering in sport in Glasgow City as a proportion of all formal volunteering as male participation has always been higher in sport.</p> <p>2. There are a plethora of projects which focus on increasing male volunteering.</p>	<p>NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Health and Wellbeing Survey 2017-18 Volunteering Cross Sectional Analysis.</p>
<p>Each of the other LAAs recorded a significant reduction in volunteering participation over the period 2014/15-2017/18, while Glasgow City rate remained steady.</p> <p>3. The public awareness campaigns and inclusion programmes for event volunteering at Glasgow 2014, Homeless World Cup and Glasgow 2018 mitigated the effects of wider economic conditions and social security policies on adult participation in Glasgow City but not in the other LAAs/GGC area overall.</p> <p>4. A possible reduction in infrastructure support services for volunteering in other LAAs also contributed to a reduction in participation rates.</p> <p>5. Local VG support and TP community engagement programmes both before and throughout the period contributed to Govanhill and Greater Gorbals increases: such programmes didn't exist or started later in the other TPs/neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Health and Wellbeing Survey - time series: 2014-15 and 2017-18 for NHSGGC</p>
<p>Volunteering more common in older school pupils in least deprived areas than in most deprived areas; more common in girls than boys.</p> <p>6. There are likely to be fewer volunteering opportunities in more deprived areas.</p> <p>7. Volunteering in young people is also likely to be shaped by parental attitudes and behaviour in relation to volunteering.</p>	<p>NHS GGC schools' surveys - Glasgow City Schools Health & Well Being Survey 2014/15.</p>
<p>Mega-event volunteering programmes tend to attract people who are already volunteering and in employment, particularly from more affluent areas.</p> <p>8. Volunteering programmes were not designed to promote participation from people in most deprived areas/those furthest from volunteering.</p>	<p>Evaluations of event volunteering programmes 2014-18</p>
<p>Higher levels of mortality recorded in Scotland compared with other parts of the UK cannot be explained entirely in terms of poverty and socioeconomic deprivation alone. One possible contributory factor here is volunteering: Volunteering rates in Glasgow are significantly lower than in Manchester and Liverpool, which are cities with similar levels of deprivation.</p>	<p>GCPH and Co - Excess Mortality</p>

<p>9. Other cities may have transitioned to post-industrial life more effectively. Liverpool is a more socially and politically active city - population has developed capacities for coping with stressful events. Manchester much more ethnically diverse. Artefact: currently used measures of deprivation fail to capture important differences in the complex 'lived reality' of deprivation and poverty in Scotland, and especially in Glasgow, compared with elsewhere in the UK.</p>	
<p>Why is there less regular volunteering in Glasgow than in Scotland?</p> <p>10. As 47% of Glasgow residents live in 1st quintile SIMD datazones (2016), the overall Glasgow rate is significantly impacted by poverty. But are the rates in Glasgow consistent with the national rates for each quintile or...?</p>	<p>SHS analysis for Glasgow City: 2013 - 2016</p>
<p>Formal youth volunteer participation is 49%, nearly double the adult formal volunteer figure of 26%.</p> <p>11. Consistent policies and programmes across a population segment can increase volunteering participation rates and address inequalities.</p> <p>12. Survey data gives compelling evidence that for those in education, there are a range of 'push factors' and 'influencers' in their lives which encourages much higher volunteering participation in young people. Indeed, the formal volunteering participation rate is nearly double that for the adult volunteering participation in Scotland.</p>	<p>Young People in Scotland SURVEYS</p>
<p>Volunteering participation has increased by 26% during covid19 lockdown, from 48% to 74% of those surveyed. Informal volunteering has much higher participation (35%) compared to mutual aid (16%) and formal volunteering (13%).</p> <p>13. People's availability to volunteer increased as a result of furlough scheme and lockdown restrictions.</p> <p>14. People encouraged to volunteer informally and in mutual aid groups particularly via social media and via TSIs/Volunteer Centres/Volunteer Scotland and LAA partners.</p>	<p>IPSOS-MORI for Volunteer Scotland</p>