Acknowledgements

FMR would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who gave their views via a depth interview or by responding to the online survey. Thanks also to Suzie Scott and Laura Dover of Everyone’s Children and Liz McEntee, Director of External Affairs, GCVS for their valued assistance throughout the evaluation process.
Executive Summary

Background and method

This report aims to provide an independent evaluation of the Everyone’s Children project. The project was originally initiated to support the Third Sector around the implementation of Getting It Right for Every Child (GIRFEC) and has since moved on to assist on a variety of policy issues relating to children, young people and families (CYPF) including child poverty, attainment, family support, early learning & childcare. Everyone’s Children (EC) was devised and is hosted by Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector (GCVS). It has been funded by the Scottish Government since July 2013.

Depth interviews were conducted with 13 key stakeholders and an online survey was issued to the EC mailing list and other relevant fora. 103 responses were used in the analysis, the majority of whom were employees (93%) in the Third Sector (91%) at a mix of service delivery, middle management and senior management/governance levels and organisation size. The fieldwork took place during September and October 2018.

Key findings

Awareness of Everyone’s Children’s activities was high with both sets of stakeholders (as it should be given the sampling approach which targeted survey completion at those on the mailing list and depth interviewees had all been involved in some way). Everyone was aware that EC runs training programmes and events and 91% of survey respondents were aware of the newsletters. Usage rates were also high, with over half of respondents using each of the EC activities tested.

Feedback on training and events was very positive with mean ‘marks out of 10’ of 8.33 and scores of 8+ on each aspect tested (relevance, quality of content, quality of trainer/speaker and networking opportunities). Praise was given by stakeholders – who were more likely to have been involved in delivery of training or events - for good numbers in attendance, EC’s willingness to help and ability to recruit specialist audiences, the mix of sectors/types of organisation and the level of engagement by participants.

Newsletters were also well-received, with 41% reading them fully and 31% often clicking on links for further information. Two-thirds rated them 8+ out of 10, with a mean of 8.1. Stakeholders felt they were a valuable resource which were well-written and a useful one-stop-shop for policy and practice information, training and funding opportunities.

Everyone’s Children supports the Children, Young People and Families Citywide Forum which was established in 2016 to enhance Third Sector influence, involvement and representation in policy development and service planning. The Forum facilitates two-way communication between public sector partners/initiatives and the wider Third Sector who work with CYPF. Ratings were very positive, with 7.7 out of 10 overall, 8 for representation of the Third Sector, 7.4 for involvement in children’s services planning and 6.7 for ability to influence children’s services planning. Stakeholders were extremely positive about the Citywide Forum and the impact it has already had on representation and voice within the city, for example by influencing the definition of family support.

EC’s support has been key to making the Forum happen, with stakeholders taking the view that it would not be as developed, or as effective without their input. The way in which EC has supported the Forum to develop, with Third Sector organisations taking the lead, was perceived to be true community development. However, this is perceived to be a ‘make or break’ phase for the Forum: the sector is involved on more groups and committees, communications within and between sectors have improved, engagement feels two-way and genuine, and changes to take account of Third Sector views are happening… but this needs
to continue to grow and the Sector’s influence on policies and services must be tangible to keep this momentum going.

Everyone’s Children conducted extensive mapping of the sector when first established, which highlighted the scope and scale of TS activity around CYPF. Stakeholders found this to be extremely useful data which helped move the dialogue around engagement and voice forward. The mapping data, and recent update, helped to populate directories of TS organisations working with CYPF in each sector of the city. Fewer people responding to the survey had used the directories, but those who had gave a mean score of 7.4 out of 10. There was strong support for the directories to be made available as a searchable, interactive database (86% said it would be helpful), although stakeholders felt some would still like a printable copy.

Depth interviewees gave the project a mean rating of 8.1 out of 10, with a lowest score of 7 and highest of 9 so the project was held in consistently high regard.

“There’s always room for improvement but it [EC] has a big agenda, a small team but they have achieved a lot. I think it shows good value for money.”

The project has several functions and survey respondents were asked to give each of these ‘marks out of 10. The project was rated highly, with each scoring a mean of at least 7.5 out of 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of Everyone’s Children</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Score of 8 - 10</th>
<th>10/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting and supporting the Third Sector (n=51)</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating greater involvement of the Third Sector in children’s services planning, design &amp; delivery in Glasgow (n=47)</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information (n=50)</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation responses, e.g. Early Learning and Childcare, Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill (n=47)</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing good practice (n=47)</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research findings, e.g. Early Learning &amp; Childcare, Pupil Equity Fund (n=44)</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter feed (n=26)</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65% of those who gave an opinion felt that Everyone’s Children had made a significant impact, i.e. that things would not have happened or would not have progressed as far without them. The project team were perceived to work collaboratively, with excellent networking skills, and to have delivered. No stakeholders could identify EC activity which had not worked well. That said, a number of challenges were identified for the project:

- The short-term nature of funding, and late decision on funding this year, which impacts on planning and what can be achieved.
- The amount of funding, which has remained static over the last five years, which restricts the number of staff and activities which can be supported. Stakeholders perceived value for money to be high, as much has been achieved within these limitations, however.
- Being located with GCVS was highlighted as a potential challenge by some, as representation and service delivery functions can be a source of tension for the wider Third Sector, particularly if it is seen to be competing for the same resources as members.
- The role of SCIF in Third Sector representation/consultation, when EC was first established.
- Some public sector partners have been perceived to inhibit EC working as effectively as it might like by not fully understanding the role it and/or the sector plays.
- Running services and attending training, meetings or events is a challenge for Third Sector organisations, which impacts on what EC can achieve. This can also impact
on the number of TS organisations involved in the Citywide Forum and associated representative roles.

- There is no Scottish Government strategy and dedicated funding stream for children and young people.
- The scale of issues like child poverty will continue to be a challenge for EC and partners for some time.

Whilst satisfaction with the project was high, and stakeholders were keen to see Everyone’s Children continue doing what it does, they were asked for any suggestions for improvement or development. The following suggestions were made:

- Training: locality-based training to facilitate local linkages; multi-agency sessions; more advanced training (ASN and child protection); more training around youth work, autism/ASN, child protection, resilience, parental mental health, funding and equalities.
- Taking a stronger policy position on issues and being more involved in policy development.
- Being more proactive, less reactive.
- A searchable directory and building on the mapping work with more of an overview of what the Third Sector brings, who it is working for and where the gaps are, as a potential area for development.
- Raise the profile and promote the project, for example via 1:1 meetings with key individuals, as current awareness is limited in the public sector.

**Key impacts**

Everyone’s Children were perceived to be making a difference to policy areas, such as child poverty via the summer food programme, family support, children’s services planning and national consultations such around early learning and childcare, for example.

The original policy focus was GIRFEC, of course, and the survey sought to check if progress had been made in this area. Use of GIRFEC was much higher in this survey than the previous one\(^1\), with 55% saying they incorporate GIRFEC in all they do (20% in 2014). The language of GIRFEC (81%) and the SHANARRI wellbeing indicators (76%) were the most widely used tools and all GIRFEC tools were more widely used now than in 2014.

Glasgow was also perceived to have improved, as a city, in terms of delivering key aspects of GIRFEC, with at least two-thirds rating it as quite or very good at co-ordinating services (69%, up from 48% in 2014), involving the Third Sector (68%, from 40%), children’s services planning (70%, from 38%) and delivering across the wellbeing indicators (68%, from 41%).

Use of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) was also higher, with almost 90% of respondents using it at least some of the time.

Partnership working: Awareness of the key policies tested was high, with 99% being aware of at least one of the key policies. Early Years Collaborative and Thriving Places had the highest awareness levels, improving from 2014 (from 61% to 84% and 33% to 78%, respectively). Involvement was highest with Thriving Places and the Glasgow Family Support Strategy (both 26%). Involvement in EYC and Thriving Places – the only two tested in both 2014 and 2018 - had both increased since 2014, from 16% to 22% and 9% to 26%, respectively.

**Awareness and involvement in the planning** structures tested was also high, with 97% being aware of at least one. Highest awareness levels were of the Glasgow Third Sector Forum (85%), local voluntary sector networks (84%) and Community Planning Sector of Area Partnership (77%). Awareness of the CYPF Citywide Forum was excellent, with 75%\(^1\)

---

aware of it and 30% were involved. Highest levels of involvement were the Glasgow Third Sector Forum (45%) and the local voluntary sector network (44%).

Three-quarters of survey respondents who were able to comment felt planning structures for CYPF in Glasgow enabled the Third Sector contribution at the moment.

**Experiences of partnership working** varied, with survey respondents rating their experience of working with Everyone’s Children (88%), Third Sector forums or networks (79%) and small Third Sector organisations (74%) positively. The least positive experiences were with Jobs and Business Glasgow (27%) and Community Safety Glasgow (38%).

80% of survey respondents agreed that the Third Sector has become more involved in Glasgow’s planning structures in the last 5 years and 79% agreed that the Third Sector are open to working in partnership with others. However, whilst 52% felt Third Sector organisations have good working relationships with public sector partners, 72% disagreed that Third Sector organisations are treated as equal partners by public sector organisations. Overall, there was an improvement in perceptions about partnership working in the city since 2014.

90% of survey respondents who gave a view felt that partnership working around CYPF in Glasgow has improved a lot (41%) or a little (49%) in the last five years.

The contribution of Everyone’s Children to investing time and effort into building better relationships and effecting these positive changes was recognised by stakeholders. Three-quarters of survey respondents (74%) felt that Everyone’s Children had helped give the Third Sector more of a voice in the city’s work around CYPF and 26% that it had helped a little. No one felt it had not helped at all.

83% of respondents felt the influence of the Third Sector on policy and practice was better now than five years ago.

Everyone’s Children was perceived by stakeholders to have **improved the number and diversity of Third Sector organisations engaging** and giving their views to influence policy and practice in the city. The Citywide Forum has played a significant role in this, but so have training, events and other mapping, co-ordinating and networking activities. The Everyone’s Children team were perceived to play a useful advocacy role for the Third Sector, reflecting the range of opinions and situations when representing them at multi-agency meetings.

Whilst making a positive difference to communities was not an original stated aim of the project, stakeholders were clear that this is happening because its work is impacting on organisations who work with CYPF. Improving the workforce’s knowledge, skills and the influence of the Third Sector was considered to inevitably impact positively on communities.

**Looking to the future…**

All stakeholders were keen to see Everyone’s Children continue as it performs well and helps to meet clear needs.

It was noted that it takes time to build trust, relationships and a good reputation and the project is now established so is becoming integral to CYPF work in the city and is delivering impacts. Ceasing investment in this important role was considered to be unhelpful, particularly given the significant issues currently on the agenda (ELC, family support, child poverty and attainment, etc.) where EC can help. The loss of Everyone’s Children was considered to have an impact on both Third and public sectors.

Stakeholders want to see all that is currently done by EC continue and for the project to enhance its policy work, continue to represent the sector well and develop initiatives like the very successful Citywide Forum to become more effective, sustainable and impactful. Being
less reactive and having a clearer development strategy, possible with the help of a renewed advisory group, were also suggested.

Survey respondents prioritised Supporting the Third Sector to alleviating Child Poverty (75%), Workforce development through training and events (72%), Sharing good practice through networking (68%) and family support (66%) as the priorities for the future.

Other recommendations for consideration are as follows:

- The project has credibility with key public sector partners, but it needs to raise its profile and communicate its achievements and potential uses beyond those immediately relevant to activities. One to one meetings were suggested as a possible way to do this, in addition to outlining what it does and has achieved at events and via written communications. This will help to embed the project, its activities and approaches more fully within the wider landscape and may open up further areas for development, involvement and influence of the Third Sector, to achieve greater co-ordination, value for money and positive impacts for CYPF.

- There was support for taking a stronger policy position on issues and being more involved in policy development. Producing policy briefings on key issues would be a useful first step to highlight issues and engage the sector in debate.

- The project may wish to consider an interactive, searchable directory of Third Sector services, if feasible, but some stakeholders would still be keen to have a printable version, so this should be considered. There was also some interest in building on the mapping work by providing more of an overview of what the Third Sector brings, who it is working for and where the gaps are. GCVS’s CRM system may help on both of these issues.

- The project may wish to consider feedback on more advanced training and additional training topics, as suggested by stakeholders.

- GCVS, the Scottish Government and wider TSI networks may wish to consider the Everyone’s Children model as a potential future option to help the Third Sector build capacity, be involved and influence services around a range of issues and target groups. A symposium or think tank may be a useful way forward to widening the debate on this.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

This report outlines the research conducted by FMR Research to evaluate the Everyone’s Children project. Everyone’s Children (EC) was devised and is hosted by Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector (GCVS). It has been funded by the Scottish Government since July 2013.

The project initially aimed to support Glasgow’s Third Sector around the implementation of GIRFEC (Getting It Right For Every Child) but it has since adapted to support the Third Sector with a variety of different policy agendas relating to children, young people and families (CYPF). These include Child Poverty, Early Learning and Childcare (ELC, particularly the Blueprint for 2020 expansion of provision) and Closing the Attainment Gap, for example. The Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014 and associated guidance also stressed the importance of Third Sector involvement in the preparation of Children’s Services Plans. The Everyone’s Children project has also played a key role in supporting public sector partners to engage with the Third Sector around this over the past couple of years, in addition to consultations around ELC, Family Support, for example.

The core objectives of Everyone’s Children are to:

- capture the contribution of Glasgow’s Third Sector to policies around children, young people and families;
- develop local Third Sector capacity to deliver wellbeing outcomes;
- ensure Third Sector contributions to planning, service design and delivery are valued and strengthened in the city; and
- share learning with other Third Sector interfaces and key stakeholders.

Everyone’s Children has a small, dedicated team to meet these objectives, consisting of a manager and one or two others over the course of the project to date. The original staff team are no longer in place, with the current complement delivering services since 2016. The EC team has delivered a variety of support services to the Third Sector, including:

- sharing information and good practice via regular newsletters, social media, training courses and events on a variety of topics;
- helping Third Sector organisation to establish the Children, Young People & Families Citywide Forum, and providing ongoing support;
- mapping Third Sector organisations working with CYPF in Glasgow (in 2014 and early 2018), to help quantify the sector’s contribution and produce directories of Third Sector organisations supporting children, young people and families to facilitate greater awareness/use;
- research to inform key policy agendas, such as the role of the Third Sector in ELC to better inform the support provided and expansion plans, and the Third Sector experience of Pupil Equity Funding;
- providing formal responses to Glasgow City Council and Scottish Government consultations, for example around ELC, Children’s Services planning and Child Poverty, on behalf of the sector;
- representing the sector on different groups and committees, to ensure it is involved in Children’s Services planning, etc.; and
- supporting Third Sector organisations around key policy areas such as GIRFEC, Early Learning & Childcare, Child Poverty and Attainment.
1.2 Objectives

The key aim of the evaluation was to obtain feedback from key stakeholders, to inform future funding and direction of the project. Specific objectives relate to:

- gaining a sense of the scope and scale of impact of Everyone’s Children to date;
- identifying what has worked particularly well;
- identify what, if anything, has not worked well; and
- to prioritise future focus of the project, if appropriate.

Please note that the Everyone’s Children project gathers monitoring and evaluation data on an ongoing basis and reports to the Scottish Government bi-annually. This report does no seek to duplicate but sits alongside that data as an independently-prepared review of progress to date.
2 Method

2.1 Introduction

The evaluation involved two key elements:

1. depth interviews with key stakeholders; and
2. an online survey.

2.2 Depth interviews

Twelve depth interviews\(^2\) were conducted with a variety of stakeholders in the Third and public sectors, who had been involved with Everyone’s Children in some way. Seven discussions took place face to face and the remaining five by telephone.

Whilst some stakeholders could comment on the Everyone’s Children project since it started, and did so, the main focus was on the last two or three years of activity.

Intervieweess were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Euan Carmichael</td>
<td>Team Leader – Service Models, Early Learning and Childcare Programme, Scottish Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Caskie</td>
<td>Third Sector Forum Network Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Dover</td>
<td>Head of Planning and Strategy, Children and Families &amp; North East Sector, Glasgow Health and Social Care Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Kane</td>
<td>Assistant Director – Glasgow and East Dunbartonshire, Barnardo’s and Chair of the Children, Young People and Families Citywide Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine Hawthorn</td>
<td>Assistant Director - Operations, Aberlour; Member of Children, Young People and Families Citywide Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronnie Hill</td>
<td>Associate Director in Children &amp; Young People and GIRFEC lead, The Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Macneil</td>
<td>Chief Executive, Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Mathias</td>
<td>Strategic Lead for ELC, Health and Social Care Standards, Care Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz McEntee</td>
<td>Director of External Affairs, Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen McAteer</td>
<td>Assistant Director - Attainment, Barnardo’s and former Director of National GIRFEC Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Morris</td>
<td>Health Improvement Lead – Children and Young People, NHS Greater Glasgow &amp; Clyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liann Weir</td>
<td>Managing Co-ordinator Glasgow Children’s Services, Crossreach and member of Citywide Forum Early Learning and Childcare sub-group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Wilson</td>
<td>Head of Service - Quality, Education Services, Glasgow City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Online survey

2.3.1 The process

An online survey was designed and issued to relevant stakeholders: primarily the 495 contacts on the Everyone’s Children mailing list, plus an invitation to participate was extended to approximately 100 additional contacts on the Children, Young People and Families Citywide Forum and the NW Children and Families Network.

\(^2\) One was conducted as a paired interview, so 13 people gave their views in total.
In total, 141 people accessed the survey, with 53 fully completing the questionnaire. Of the 88 partial responses, 38 were not used at all as they had only completed some of the first few profiling questions. Therefore 103 remaining responses were used in the analysis, represents a 17% response rate (9% fully completed). The response was lower than the original mapping research conducted in 2014, where 184 people gave their views. That was not directly comparable, however, as the invitation to participate was issued to a larger number of organisations, only Third Sector organisations were invited to give their views, the focus of the survey was slightly different (with greater emphasis on mapping the sector) and there was a significant amount of focus on GIRFEC at the time, which Third Sector organisations were keen to learn more about.

The survey repeated some of the questions asked in the mapping exercise\(^3\), although some of these were modified to suit 2018, and additional questions were asked explicitly about the Everyone’s Children project. FMR designed the survey with input from the Everyone’s Children team. The invitation to participate, with a link to the survey, was issued by Everyone’s Children (as a trusted source). The survey was issued on 5\(^{th}\) September 2018, with an initial deadline of 25\(^{th}\) September. FMR reported progress on responses to EC staff and several reminders were sent by the EC team to increase the response. The survey was closed on Monday 1\(^{st}\) October 2018.

This report details the results and highlights how these varied from the mapping exercise where appropriate. The profile of respondents to the recent survey is detailed below.

Please note: the number of respondents is noted in/under each chart/table. In some cases, percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding or multiple responses.

### 2.3.2 Profile of respondents

Respondents were initially asked a series of questions about themselves and their organisations, to profile those who had responded and to help interpret the findings.

**Employment**

Most respondents classed themselves as employees (93%, 96 respondents), with 5% (5) identifying themselves as volunteers. Two did not respond.

**Figure 1** Are you…?

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

\(n=103\)

\(^3\) Updated profiling of organisations providing services to children, young people and families has recently been completed by the EC team (for 124 organisations, once incomplete and duplicate data were excluded).
Role
Respondents were then asked to specify which level reflected their position in their organisation – 31% (32 respondents) were at a senior management or governance level; 39% (40) were middle managers; and 26% (27) worked at service delivery level. Four respondents described themselves as ‘other’. Responses are shown in Figure 2.

As the balance of probabilities would suggest, those responding from smaller organisation (<10 employees) were more likely to hold a senior role (42%) compared to those in large (50+ employees) organisations where 22% of respondents held a senior role. All volunteers who responded operated at a senior (board) level.

Figure 2  Which of the following best reflects you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior management/governance level</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management level</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery level</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=103

Sector
As would be expected from the target audience, most organisations operated in the Third Sector (90%, 93 respondents). Of the remainder, 8 were from public sector organisations, one private sector and one did not provide this information.

Figure 3  What sector do you operate in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Sector</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=102
**Organisation size**
Respondents were asked about the size of their organisation, in terms of employee numbers. A quarter of respondents (25%, 26) were from small organisations with less than 10 employees, with the remainder being evenly spread between medium-sized organisations with 10-49 employees (39%, 40) and larger (50+ employees) organisations (36%, 37). This is shown in Figure 4 below.

As would be expected, the majority of those who worked for public or private sector organisations were in larger organisations (78%, 7).

This profile differs from the 2014 survey, where almost half of organisations were small (49%), 35% were medium-sized and 16% large.

**Figure 4  What size is your organisation?**

![Pie Chart showing organisation sizes]
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**Area of activity**
The organisations’ geographic areas of activity were explored. Using the area of widest coverage given (some organisations gave specific areas of Glasgow in addition to saying they covered Scotland wide or UK wide), 59% (61) were active in the Glasgow area only, 9% (9) were active in Glasgow and other parts of Scotland, 27% (28) were active Scotland-wide and 5% (5) UK-wide.

As might be expected, larger organisations were more likely to be active across a wider area – 46% of large 50+ employee organisations were active either Scotland- or UK-wide, compared to only 19% of those with less than 10 employees.
Figure 5 Where is your organisation active? (widest coverage given)

Looking more closely at activity in Glasgow, although all organisations appeared to be active in at least one sector of Glasgow, only 76 respondents specified individual sectors, i.e. North East, North West or South Glasgow.

Figure 6 Activity in Glasgow City

This is a similar profile to the 2014 survey where there was a more even representation across the North East and South of the city:

- 57% North East Glasgow;
- 66% North West Glasgow; and
- 54% South Glasgow.

However, the survey’s profile is similar to the previous survey in terms of coverage of all Glasgow areas, with 36% (27 organisations) active across all three areas (34%, 62 organisations in 2014). Similarly, the likelihood of them being active across the city increased with size of the organisation.
Working with children, young people and families

Three-quarters of respondents worked with families (74%, 76 respondents), closely followed by 70% (72) working with children. Only three organisations did not work with children or young people, i.e. only with parents/lone parents or foster/kinship carers, and 13 said they did not work with any of the groups given. Of these, 8 indicated that they gave support to other Third Sector organisations who work with children, families or parents.

The 5 ‘something else’ responses cited additional groups, such as older people, or specific groups of children, young people and adults, such as the bereaved, people with disabilities and survivors of trauma/adverse childhood experiences.

Figure 7  Who does your organisation work with?

- Families (i.e. parents + children together): 74%
- Children: 70%
- Young people: 56%
- Parents/lone parents: 56%
- Children or young people with ASN: 50%
- Foster/kinship carers: 41%
- None of the above: 13%
- Something else: 5%

*n=103*

The proportion working with pre-school or primary aged children was slightly higher in this survey compared to 2014, with 67% (60) working with pre-school children and 76% (68) working with primary age children (42% pre-school and 70% primary age in 2014). Conversely, the proportion of those working with older children was lower.

Figure 8  Do you work with any children and young people in the following age groups?

- 0 - 4: 67%
- 5 - 11: 76%
- 12 - 17: 65%
- 18 - 24: 56%
- None of these age groups: 7%

*n=89*

A wide range of services and specific activities for children, young people and families were provided. Parenting support and activities for younger children were more prominent (arts &
cultural and sporting activities topped the list in 2014), reflecting the younger profile of children worked with and the different profile of those invited to give their views.

**Figure 9** What do you do with the children, young people and families you work with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting support or training</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play opportunities</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday childcare/playschemes</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical or mental health &amp; wellbeing support</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family support</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery/preschool childcare</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early years education</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General youth club/activities</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and toddler group</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based support to pupils</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and empowerment work</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with specific issues, e.g. addictions, disabilities</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and cultural activities</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection support</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money and benefits advice to young people</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money and benefits advice to parents</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting activities</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterschool care</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist group work</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Social Care</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to young carers</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play therapy</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast club provision</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative learning environments for excluded pupils</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher/Further Education</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something else</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=79*
3 Key findings

3.1 Introduction

This section outlines the key findings from both the depth interviews and the online survey. It aims to present findings in an integrated, thematic way to avoid unnecessary duplication and/or confusion. Please note that the questions about the Everyone’s Children project were asked at the end of the online survey to avoid biasing responses to the questions around GIRFEC, partnership working and involvement, etc., which were asked in the 2014 mapping survey. The following commentary therefore follows a different order to the online survey questionnaire, and the number of responses should be noted as it was subject to attrition over the course of the survey.

3.2 Awareness and usage of Everyone’s Children

3.2.1 Overview

Both the survey and depth interviews illustrated excellent awareness levels of the different Everyone’s Children activities on offer. All survey respondents were aware that Everyone’s Children provided training and events, and newsletters were also well-known (91%, 50 respondents), which is unsurprising as the newsletter mailing list was the primary channel for the survey. Usage rates of both were also high (87% and 91% respectively). Whilst awareness of the directories of TS organisations supporting CYPF and the project’s support of the Citywide Forum remained high (84% for both, 46), usage was lower although still over half of respondents (56% and 58% respectively, 31/32).

Figure 10 Everyone’s Children has a variety of activities, which of the following a) are you aware of and b) have you used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Aware of</th>
<th>Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training/events</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directories of Third Sector organisations</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supporting children, young people and families</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the Children, Young People &amp;</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Citywide Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=55
Depth interviewees were aware of Everyone’s Children’s activities to different degrees. Most had at least heard of each of the activities, with training, events and newsletters all being familiar to interviewees. Those engaged more fully with the project, for example via the CYPF Citywide Forum or other regular planning groups, were well aware of its varied activities and were involved with/had direct experience of several of them. Stakeholders with a national remit who had contact with Everyone’s Children for specific events, training or consultations were less familiar with the detail of its other activities, as would be expected.

Each of the activities was explored in more detail with survey respondents and depth interviewees.

### 3.2.2 Training/Events

Everyone’s Children has convened over 100 training sessions or events since October 2013. Training has been provided by Everyone’s Children directly, by GCVS’ CLD team and by external trainers. Events have involved consultation around various local and national public sector strategies relating to children, young people and families and issues of interest, with a wide variety of speakers, e.g. UNICEF, the Children’s Commissioner, Children First, Care Inspectorate, Scottish Government, The Alliance, CPAG, Women’s Library and BEMIS. The programme has been varied, including topics such as GIRFEC, children’s rights, dyslexia, autism, ELC, holiday hunger/summer food programme, child protection, active play, mental health, health and social care standards and, of course, networking opportunities. Evening sessions have also been trialled as Third Sector organisations can find it challenging to provide cover for staff attending training during the working day. The number of attendees has varied from 6 (this was unusually low for one of the evening sessions) to 180 (Resilience documentary screening) but most have been in the 15 – 55 range, with stronger attendance (70 – 120) for events with high profile speakers/issues of broader interest.

Of those survey respondents who had used the training courses or events, 36% (16) had attended one or two, 38% (17) three or four and 27% (12) five or more. Although numbers in each group are small, those working at a service delivery level were more likely to attend a small number of training/events (71%, 5 had attended only 1 or 2) compared to those in more senior roles (24%, 4 senior management/governance and 33%, 7 middle managers). Similarly, those in small organisations were more likely to only attend one or two training courses/events (57%, 8) compared to those in larger organisations (19%, 3).

**Figure 11** How many training courses/events run by Everyone’s Children have you attended?

![Pie chart showing training attendance](image)

Training events provided by Everyone’s Children were rated very highly: a mean score of 8.33 out of 10 overall and mean scores around the 8 out of 10 mark for relevance, quality of content/speaker and networking opportunities. At least three-quarters of survey respondents
gave a rating of 8 or more out of 10 in each of the aspects tested, with 20 – 30% awarding top marks:

- Relevance to you – 77% rated 8+, 23% gave 10 out of 10;
- Quality of content – 74% rated 8+, 20% gave 10 out of 10;
- Quality of trainer/speaker – 83% rated 8+, 20% gave 10 out of 10;
- Networking opportunities – 76% rated 8+, 30% gave 10 out of 10;
- Overall – 83% rated 8+, 28% gave 10 out of 10.

The mean scores for each aspect are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to you</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of content</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of trainer/speaker(s)</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several stakeholders who took part in the depth interviews had been involved in training and/or events run by Everyone’s Children. Feedback was very positive in terms of attendance numbers (100+ was mentioned by more than one person for events, 30+ for training), their ability to recruit for specialist meetings (e.g. around D/deaf and disability issues) and more widely within the Third Sector, the mix of sectors and types/size of organisations represented, and most importantly about the level of engagement by participants. Everyone’s Children were perceived to “have traction with the sector”, which helped in achieving all of the above. The EC team were perceived by stakeholders to be credible, knowledgeable and have good contacts (both in terms of reach and awareness of the Third Sector and public sector partners). They were also seen to work hard, listen, respond appropriately and deliver on promises. All of this makes stakeholders wish to engage with them – they are easy to engage with – and contributes towards an excellent reputation.

“I’ve had a good experience. I’ve worked with a number of [EC] staff and it’s all worked really well. They’ve all tried to do a good job and they have good relationships and the newsletter – without those it wouldn’t happen.”

The EC team were perceived to be receptive to convening events with Third Sector organisations, which national stakeholders would not have been able to reach as easily, quickly or with such a wide variety of participants without their help. This was much appreciated.

“They help around events was great. It’s always difficult to get people and they did get people. It was a very helpful discussion and good to get
perspectives from the Third Sector. We would have struggled to engage the Third Sector without them [EC].”

“It [organising an event] would have taken longer and it would have required a lot more effort to get people round the table. Having an invite from GCVS helps – they are more familiar to organisations – and I’m not sure we would have managed to get access to the variety of organisations or the same level of engagement if the invite came from us, with limited access to organisations.”

3.2.3 Newsletters and communications

Everyone’s Children issues a regular e-newsletter and maintains a social media presence to engage with stakeholders and raise awareness of policy issues, training or funding opportunities and share other information and good practice. EC is featured on the GCVS website but has its own distinct identity and logo. The website outlines what the projects does and also shares outputs, e.g. the mapping study, research reports and its newsletter archive.

The recent GDPR deadline instigated overt interest to be expressed for inclusion on the Everyone’s Children newsletter mailing list and this was the main channel to survey respondents. Awareness and readership would be expected to be high, and they were.

The newsletters were well received, with no one saying they rarely opened them. 41% (20) said they try to read them fully and 31% (15) often click on links to further information with the remainder usually scanning them briefly (37%, 18).

**Figure 13** Which one of the following best describes your use of the Everyone’s Children newsletter?

As with the training courses and events, newsletters were rated highly, with two-thirds (67%, 28) awarding them 8 or more out of 10 and a quarter (24%, 10) giving top marks. The mean rating was 8.1 (n=42).

Depth interviewees who were familiar with them were very positive about the newsletters. Those who commented found them to be a valuable resource which were well-written and a useful one-stop-shop for policy and practice information, in addition to identifying training and funding opportunities, for example. Stakeholders highlighted that they found them particularly useful as they knew the newsletter would flag up the issues they needed to be
aware of, with a brief outline and, helpfully, links to further information if they wanted to know more.

“We don’t have time to keep an eye on everything so it’s great to have information highlighted for us.”

A few stakeholders also commented that they also found the EC team’s Twitter activity to be helpful as it also highlights issues of interest in an easily accessible way. The website was not highlight as a particularly well-used resource, but stakeholders felt it was useful to have nonetheless. The Everyone’s Children’s team communications were generally rated highly in terms of relevance, accessibility, links to further information if desired. This echoes views on verbal communications at meetings/events, where the team were praised for being open, pragmatic, willing to share information and knowledgeable.

**Children, Young People & Families Citywide Forum**

The Children, Young People & Families Citywide Forum was launched at the GCVS Children’s Services Plan event in January 2017. The Forum responded to the needs of both public sector partners and Third Sector organisations working with children, young people and families. The Third Sector were keen to have their voices heard by public sector partners, to influence policy and make services for children, young people and families more joined up in the city. Public sector partners were keen to have a recognised route to engage with the Third Sector collectively and to gain Third Sector involvement on relevant policy and planning groups. Social Care Ideas Factory (SCIF) had been commissioned by GCC to facilitate engagement with the sector around service planning but ceased trading around this time.

The Third Sector is large and varied, which the public sector has found difficult to engage well, so a small number of known Third Sector organisations were involved in policy development/service planning. This was not representative of the wider Third Sector, either in terms of reflecting the make-up of the sector or being in a position to represent the wider sector (as there was no mechanism to communicate between any groups and the sector specifically on CYPF issues). It was also a significant workload for those Third Sector representatives who were involved in policy/planning structures, as they were often involved in more than one, with significant time input. This favoured larger organisations. So, after various discussions, the CYPF Citywide Forum was established.

The Citywide Forum was established to enhance Third Sector influence and involvement in policy and planning, supplementing local networks which existed in the city. The Forum is managed by a steering group of Third Sector organisations working with children, young people and families in the city, and is supported by the Everyone’s Children team. It has its own distinct identity and is chaired by Eddie Kane, Assistant Director of Barnardo’s, who drove its formation. According to the GCVS website, it aims to provide “a strong and coordinated voice to partner agencies to influence Children’s Services across the city. It works to:

- Co-ordinate reps from the third sector on strategic committees on Children’s Services
- Ensure two-way communication and feedback
- Share knowledge, experience and good practice
- Gather and co-ordinate views
- Ensure that the voices of service users are heard”

Stakeholders who were involved with or aware of the Citywide Forum were very positive about it. There is an obvious caveat that those who were not involved or aware may have a different view, but it made sense to seek the views of those who were involved at this stage.

The Forum was perceived to be a useful medium for the public sector to engage with the Third Sector, and vice versa, which stakeholders from both Third and public sectors praised. It was also seen to have made positive steps towards widening the involvement of Third Sector organisations in policy development and service planning in the city. More and different individuals/organisations are now involved in the city’s planning groups. It was recognised that there is still work to be done on engaging further Third Sector organisations and strengthening representation, but the Forum was widely perceived by those who could comment to have achieved real progress in the last couple of years, which was seen to have made positive impacts.

“Everyone’s Children provides a forum and voice for all, and for the voluntary sector in Glasgow to be represented.”

“We’re still on a journey but great progress has been made. It’s a complicated landscape but the Citywide Forum has helped to make the Third Sector input more cohesive in the last couple of years. It feels like we’ve progressed beyond tokenism now, it’s not just a box ticking exercise.”

“It’s the best network in the city. They’re reliable, more organised, they attend meetings, are responsive to issues and have good knowledge of their data.”

“The Citywide Forum is in print as a key part of the Children and Young People’s Integrated Services Plan, feeding directly into the CSEG. That shows how far we have come.”

“The Forum is key to both sides [Third and public sectors]. If is useful, it will be used, and it is.”

“We needed a structure to engage meaningfully.”

“The Forum is the jewel in the crown – they’ve done it well and it’s taken a lot of resource, although not everyone will see that. It’s been sustained too, it’s still up there.”

“The Forum provides a clear mechanism for dealings with the Third Sector, which brings benefits. It was very fragmented before, which was unhelpful.”

The role of EC in supporting the Forum was highlighted as critical. The support role is not a sexy one, but it is a vital one. The Everyone’s Children team help organise meetings, events, prepare minutes and manage communications on behalf of the Forum, in addition to making linkages to its other activities. For example, Everyone’s Children Manager Suzie Scott has been involved in a number of strategic and project-specific groups of relevance to the Forum, such as the Children’s Services Planning Group, Summer Food Programme steering group and schools survey questionnaire group. Stakeholders were quite clear that without the excellent support from Everyone’s Children, progress with the Forum would have been much slower and may not have happened at all because of inevitable pressures of “the day job” for key players.

Several stakeholders suggested that the Forum was at a critical point in its development: it needs to build on success to date and move forward positively. There was a sense that “it’s done really well but the real test is what happens next”. This related to whether it grows its representative base further, its continuing strong reputation greater involvement in multi-agency groups and, most importantly, tangible evidence of significant impacts.

The widening of representation on relevant multi-agency groups was specifically raised as an important step forward for the sector, with improved understanding on both sides as a result. The Forum has provided Third Sector representatives to a number of multi-agency
groups such as the Child Protection Committee, Family Support Planning Group, Mental Health and Wellbeing Group, GIRFEC Lead Officers Group, CSEG, etc. Representation is two-way when engaging with multi-agency groups, with Forum sub-groups established to ensure the wider Third Sector is represented and information from the groups is also fed back to the Third Sector. Public sector players also often attend the Forum to share information and seek views. The value of the Forum as a consultative structure has been recognised by public sector partners, as £7.5k funding has been allocated to help with events, etc., although a greater investment would be welcomed.

“I've been involved with different groups at different levels. It was intimidating at first but there's a really good vibe that the Third Sector is there and we're all working together to achieve the same things.”

“We're involved in the steering group looking at the Family Support Framework, where the Third Sector fits, etc. It's a major achievement to be invited onto this group and help shape or influence what happens. It's early days but it's symbolic that it was our sub group's definition of family support that was used.”

“The Third Sector reps make good contributions to the group.”

Stakeholders also felt the Forum has helped the Third Sector to work together more effectively. Funding sources can pitch organisations against each other to compete for funding, which can restrict joint working, information sharing and so on. The imminent Family Support Framework was suggested to be a test of how well the new relationships and understanding have embedded.

“We [the Third Sector] can work together more and not compete.”

Survey respondents who had used the Children, Young People & Families Citywide Forum were asked to rate four aspects of it on a scale of 0 – 10, with a ‘don’t know’ option. Ratings from those who were able to give an opinion (don’t know excluded) were positive, although they probably reflect the fact that it is a relatively new structure. Those stakeholders who were closer to the Forum felt strongly that there was already evidence of influencing children's services planning but this may be less obvious to those not directly involved.

- Representation of the Third Sector – 67% rated 8+, 30% gave 10 out of 10;
- Involvement in children’s services planning – 62% rated 8+, 14% gave 10 out of 10;
- Ability to influence children’s services planning – 43% rated 8+, 11% gave 10 out of 10;
- Overall – 61% rated 8+, 14% gave 10 out of 10.

Mean scores are shown below.
Directories

Following its mapping activities of Third Sector organisations working with Children, Young People and Families, Everyone’s Children has produced area-based directories (one for Glasgow City and one each of the NW, NE and South sectors) to facilitate Third and public sector organisations to find the services they need. These are currently available online in pdf format, so are printable.

Of the 28 survey respondents who had used the directories, 57% gave it a rating of 8 or more out of 10 in terms of usefulness, with 7% (2) awarding top marks. However, 18% (5) rated them at 5 or less, suggesting there is some room for improvement. The mean score was still a healthy 7.39 (n=28).

The majority of depth interviewees were less familiar with the directories but most knew that they existed and thought they were useful to provide.

As could be anticipated, there was strong support for the directories to be made available as a searchable, interactive database, with 86% (37) saying this would be helpful and the remainder saying it might be helpful. This was echoed by the depth interviewees, although several commented that many people still like to have a hard copy to hand for easy reference.
3.3 Everyone’s Children’s performance

3.3.1 Rating of activities

Survey respondents were asked to rate the Everyone’s Children project across seven different aspects, in terms of marks out of 10, with ‘don’t know’ and ‘not aware of’ options. Don’t know and not aware of accounted for between 4% and 11% of responses for all aspects with the exception of ‘Twitter Feed’ (40% said don’t know and 11% were not aware of) and ‘Research findings’ (13% don’t knows and 4% not aware of).

The highest rated aspect was Everyone’s Children’s achievement in promoting and supporting the Third Sector, where 82% (42) of those who gave a score (i.e. don’t know and not aware responses excluded), gave a rating of 8+, 33% gave 10 out of 10 and the mean score was 8.45. All aspects scored 7.5+ out of 10, with 19-33% awarding top marks. Results are shown in the figures below.

### Table 1 Rating of aspects of Everyone’s Children project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of Everyone’s Children</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Score of 8 - 10</th>
<th>10/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting and supporting the Third Sector (n=51)</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating greater involvement of the Third Sector in children’s services planning, design &amp; delivery in Glasgow (n=47)</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information (n=50)</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation responses, e.g. Early Learning and Childcare, Child Poverty (Scotland) Bill (n=47)</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing good practice (n=47)</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research findings, e.g. Early Learning &amp; Childcare, Pupil Equity Fund (n=44)</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter feed (n=26)</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents from large organisations were more likely to give higher scores to all aspects of Everyone’s Children, than those from medium or small organisations, and middle managers were more likely to rate EC more highly than those in senior/governance or service level roles.

Depth interviewees were also asked to rate Everyone’s Children in terms of marks out of 10. The mean score was 8.1, with 11 out of 13 interviewees rating the project as 8+ out of 10. The lowest rating was 7 and highest rating was 9 out of 10, so the project was held in consistently high regard by stakeholders.

Many comments were made about the Everyone’s Children project and team, for example:

“There’s always room for improvement but it’s in first class. It’s one of the TSIs which has an organised and functioning CYP angle, a clear identity and functions well.”

“They do try very hard to be everywhere and do everything. They bring people together. The Third Sector has a stronger voice than I’ve ever known in the city, because of Everyone’s Children. They work their socks off.”

“They’re very professional and command respect because of that. Suzie represents Everyone’s Children well. She’s direct but fair, not aggressive, and determined, which is an asset to the Third Sector. Suzie helps to advance the Third Sector cause because she behaves appropriately and
understands the culture of the public sector, so she can talk and engage constructively.”

“I’m impressed with Suzie. She’s more inclusive and good to work with, she will work with people and recognises there is an element of fitting the jigsaw pieces together. She’s a good person to represent the Third Sector, because of her skills but also because she is seen as a more objective rep for the sector. She can recognise the issues for different parts of the sector and communicate those different views. She’s a strategic thinker. She’s out there contributing, she’s generous with the Albany and turns things around quickly. She’s fabulous, she never says no and always follows things up.”

“There’s always room for improvement but it [EC] has a big agenda, a small team but they have achieved a lot. I think it shows good value for money.”

“The fact that important public sector players – Mike Burns, Gary Dover, Heather Douglas etc – have regularly attended events, and not just those where they were speaking, says a lot. They support the work and are available or at least visible, making the right noises about the Third Sector. There is a strong core of Third Sector players who attend many public sector events too, and this support does not go un-noticed.”

“They have worked hard and consistently tried to engage a lot of people via a proper community development approach. It’s very impressive where they have got to, working with a wide range of stakeholders. They’re on the road to 10/10 but it’s a work in progress. It can be hard to do this sort of thing well, with rigour and integrity, to gain respect from a wide range of people.”

Very positive comments were also made about Everyone’s Children’s Twitter and other networking activities. The way in which the project runs events in the Albany, local areas, or elsewhere helps with consultation and also showing what the Third Sector does well. The project was also considered to be strong on information sharing.

“It’s focussed on what it’s meant to be doing. The practical work on the ground helps show relevance and use, and Everyone’s Children has provided really useful information on the [Third] sector. The Forum has been useful to us and we will use it to consult again.”

“The training is good and it helps that it is either free or low cost. That makes all the difference between staff attending or not.”

3.3.2 Everyone’s Children’s impact on Third Sector involvement

When asked about the impact of Everyone’s Children on the Third Sector’s involvement in Children, Young People and Families work in the city overall in the last five years, two-thirds of respondents who gave an opinion (65%, 31 respondents) felt EC had made a significant impact, i.e. that things wouldn’t have happened or we wouldn’t be as far on without them. A further 31% (15) felt Everyone’s Children had had some impact, i.e. some things would have happened anyway, perhaps just a bit slower without them. Only 4% (2) felt there was little or no impact, i.e. not much has happened/changed as a result of Everyone’s Children. Responses are shown below.

Those in senior management/governance roles were more likely to suggest a significant impact (78%) compared to 61% of middle managers and 43% of those at a service delivery level who gave a greater mix of significant impact/some impact responses.
Figure 17  How much of an impact has Everyone’s Children made on the Third Sector’s involvement in Children, Young People & Families work in the city overall in the last five years?

![Pie chart showing the impact of Everyone’s Children project]

- **A significant impact**: 65%
- **Some impact**: 31%
- **Little or no impact**: 4%

*n=48*

This sentiment was also communicated in the depth interviews. Interviewees were very positive about the progress made by the Everyone’s Children project, particularly in the last two or three years. The Citywide Forum was a key part of this rating for many, but the project team were perceived to perform well across the range of activities provided and the team members were spoken of very highly. The project team were seen to do the right things, in the right ways.

“Suzie is very good. She’s tuned in, knows what we do, the role of our services and is vocal about it to decision-makers.”

### 3.4 What has worked particularly well?

Depth stakeholders were asked which aspects of Everyone’s Children they felt had worked particularly well. Responses included what EC does – training, events and networking were primarily mentioned – in addition to how EC operates, as the quotes below illustrate.

“**Their level of engagement is very impressive. They are very organised and have the infrastructure in place to network and engage their stakeholders.**”

“**They’ve carved out their own very positive contribution around specific defined areas…they are doing a lot of good work, engaging well, it has a profile, it’s delivering training, consultations, looking after the sector…. and has been very flexible, responding to every policy issue, getting the sector view and shaping a response. It’s a great example of TSI activity, supporting, influencing, etc.”**

“I value the role as an intermediary – crucial and under-valued but how do you get the contribution of the sector otherwise?”

“They have the contacts and the ability to – every time – fill a room. It’s never empty or not worked.**”
“Everyone’s Children has a distinct identity from GCVS, which is helpful.”

“Everyone’s Children has a different identity – a separate profile, which is a positive thing because it is just for children and young people. It’s important the voice of specialised Third Sector organisations is heard and Everyone’s Children’s mapping and directories makes it easy to engage with the Third Sector. The sector can be hidden, so mapping, highlighting and representing it is very positive.”

“Providing lots of free or low cost training. It’s helpful to learn about the topic but also important for networking and information sharing and it’s a struggle to pay for staff training.”

“Building relationships in the Third Sector is key. I’ve benefitted from being involved as I now know more people in Third Sector organisations so can meaningfully contribute to groups.”

3.5 What has not worked so well?

Depth interviewees found it very challenging to think of any aspects of Everyone’s Children which had been less successful:

“I’m struggling to suggest anything as it’s all been so positive. If anything has not worked so well, it’s not because Everyone’s Children is lacking.”

“Our contact was good.”

“Not anything I’ve been involved in.”

“Nothing I know of hasn’t worked well. Short-term funding might have influenced what they are able to do, but they do it all well. It would be good to have a longer-term development plan, though.”

3.6 Key challenges to making progress

One of the key challenges to making progress has been the short-term nature of funding. This is a widespread issue throughout the Third Sector, but no less of a challenge because of that. The late notification of continued funding by the Scottish Government this year was also highlighted. Everyone’s Children was considered to be fortunate that the current staff team and GCVS are committed to the project and this helped ‘weather’ the delayed funding without losing staff. It is fair to say that lack of visibility on funding in the mid to longer term will inevitably have had an impact on what the project does and how it does it.

The amount of funding (£141k per annum) has not grown at all over the life of the project and this obviously restricts the number of staff and activities which can be supported. That said, a couple of stakeholders commented on the value for money achieved by the Everyone’s Children project within the resources available. The calibre of the current staff team was perceived to be very high, which will have had a bearing on this view.

Being part of GCVS was highlighted as a potential challenge/point of criticism in some quarters, with competing agendas of representation and service delivery perceived to be a source of tension for the wider Third Sector. For example, if GCVS is seen to be competing for the same resources as organisations it seeks to represent, that can impact on trust, clarity of purpose and may impact on the degree to which the sector supports GCVS and its projects.
“It’s difficult to take whatever money is going and then be the voice of the sector.”

The role of SCIF when EC was first established made initial progress challenging, but this situation changed over the lifetime of the project. SCIF ceased trading around the same time the EC project manager changed and the HSCP was established, facilitating the move to establish the Citywide Forum and other representative/networking activities.

Some public sector partners have been perceived to be inhibitors to EC working effectively at times on specific issues and adding as much value as the project would have liked. Whilst EC has a good reputation with some key players, they do not necessarily have a high profile throughout public sector partner agencies, which has a bearing on this. There are still some ‘hearts and minds’ in the public sector to be won in terms of truly appreciating the role the Third Sector can and does play in terms of children, young people and families.

That said, there was a view that Everyone’s Children (or at least Suzie as an individual) was more visible, proactive and prominent than was previously the case. This suggests that it wasn’t as well-known or connected originally, when the focus was more on policy than networking, so it has improved.

The challenge of capacity - running services whilst attending meetings - was also raised by a stakeholder. Partnership working is important and helps improve understanding to then impact on policies and services. But meetings can be challenging for personnel from small and larger Third Sector organisations to attend if that is not their function (which is not often the case), and service issues arise.

It was highlighted that there is no Scottish Government strategy for children and young people, with associated dedicated funding stream. There has been much focus on early years for some time, but the transition through adolescence can be very challenging for young people’s mental health and this has been widely recognised. Investment in young people at the P7 and S1/2 stages is critical, introducing early intervention and prevention approaches to maintain positive mental health.

Whilst the number of Third Sector organisations who are involved in the Citywide Forum and associated representation has grown and diversified, it can still be challenging to get the wider Third Sector who are working with CYPF involved in the Forum or other activities. There is a strong core of 20 – 30 organisations which are regularly involved, with a consistent attendance of 10 – 15 at each Forum meeting.

A couple of stakeholder specifically cited the scale of issues such as child poverty has been and will continue to be a challenge to Everyone’s Children and partners.

3.7 Suggestions for improvement and/or development

Stakeholders were asked if they had any suggestions for improvement or development of the project. As satisfaction levels were high and stakeholders appreciated what was already being achieved, suggestions focussed more on areas for further development rather than those which required urgent improvement.

“It’s hard to say as I’m generally very happy with it [Everyone’s Children].”

Training and events
Suggestions for improvement were few, with several survey respondents taking the opportunity to give further praise.

“Perfect as they are. Very welcoming and fun.”

“It was all very good and relevant”
There were a few, one-off suggestions around better marketing, locality-based training to help build local links, the need for training to be free and more youth work focussed topics. The full list is given in the data tables.

"Maybe have focus on ACE and how we can normalise not medicalise life events which bring challenges so young people and children feel more supported within the family, school and community."

When asked if there were any particular subjects they would like to see covered, 25% (13) respondents said there were. Suggestions focussed around specific issues, such as autism/ASN, child protection, resilience, parental mental health, etc. Other suggestions were funding, multi-agency events (involving Third and public sector), or equalities. A couple of respondents highlighted the need for more advanced training (ASN and child protection) rather than basic/introductions to the topics. This was echoed in discussions with stakeholders, where the focus on introductory level topics and a bias towards early years was noted.

Policy development
Other development points emerged - particularly when discussing why Everyone’s Children was not yet 10 out 10 with depth interviewees - particularly placing a greater emphasis on proactive policy development.

“I would like to see them take a stronger policy position on things. Say we’ve taken this to our members, our view or position on this is x, y or z and this is what we want done about it.”

“I’d like to see more of a policy development role. The big nationals have policy and research officers to do all their very professional policy statements, but it would be good to see Everyone’s Children pick up and adapt these for Glasgow-specific responses. That would be a very useful role for them to play.”

“They could be more proactive and less reactive, but this is a minor criticism. Overall their support is very good. They are very supportive to the Third Sector which deliver to children and young people.”

Mapping+
One stakeholder suggested developing more of an overview of what the Third Sector brings, who it is working for and where the gaps are, as a potential area for development, building on the mapping work to date.

Raising the profile
Raise the profile of the project more, for example via 1:1 meetings with key individuals and be more proactive at any opportunity to say what their role is, what they do, how they can help.

“The project could be even more effective if it is seen as the key place to go by everyone.”

Reality check
Others recognised that there is a limit to what can be achieved with limited resources and a small team, but that it should grow:

“It needs more money, resources and time to do more good work. We need to invest in things that work well.”

“We need a well-resourced core structure whose role is to disseminate information in a clear and transparent way.”
3.8 Key impacts

The key impacts of Everyone’s Children were explored in more detail with both survey respondents and depth interviewees.

3.8.1 Making a difference to policy implementation

The project has brought the Third Sector influence to national and local policies and strategies, such as the Blueprint for ELC provision, the children’s service planning process and the development and implementation of other policies, such as the Family Support Strategy.

“They do highlight policy areas that they think people need to be informed about so they can engage. Policy implementation is two-way. Governments and organisations need to implement policy through partnerships. I’ve seen that [EC] programmes are around the current policy areas and they’re always trying to inform, give evidence and so on. They attend meetings which helps to feed that evidence into new policies, sharing research and information.”

Everyone’s Children was also perceived to have made a significant impact on short-term policy initiatives like the Summer Food Programme. This funding was only made available in April/May and Everyone’s Children helped the Third Sector to turn things around in time for summer delivery. Voluntary Action Fund (VAF) managed the fund, but EC was on the steering group to influence what was done and how it was done. The project also provided direct assistance to Third Sector organisations so they could access funding, for example raising awareness of the fund (via newsletter, social media and events), providing REHIS food hygiene and child protection training.

Stakeholders were quick to comment that it takes time to gain the trust and credibility to influence policy development and implementation, but that good progress has been made in a short space of time:

“Everything takes time to bed down and Everyone’s Children is no different. They have gained momentum and now they’re motoring, so we’re all seeing the benefits.”

“It doesn’t feel like us and them, it feels like we’re in it together.”

GIRFEC

Everyone’s Children was initially set up to help raise awareness, understanding and implementation of GIRFEC in the Third Sector. Whilst stakeholders felt GIRFEC was still fundamentally important to children, young people and families, it is more familiar to everyone in the field now so is not spoken of as overtly as perhaps it once was.

“GIRFEC has been subsumed into children’s services planning, which is correct as it can’t be a stand alone. It must be embedded and tangible.”

“There’s more GIRFEC now than ever before.”

The mapping study conducted in 2013/14 asked a variety of questions around the Third Sector’s awareness and use of GIRFEC principles and tools. Some of these were repeated to gauge how things have moved on (or not) in the past few years and the findings are shown below.

Use of GIRFEC was encouragingly much higher in this survey than in the previous one, with 55% (45) saying they incorporate GIRFEC in all that they do (compared to only 20% in 2014). Larger organisations (50+ employees) were more likely to incorporate GIRFEC in all
they do: 69% (20) gave this response, compared to only 29% (7) of organisations with less than 10 employees.

**Figure 18** Which of the following statements applies most closely to your organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We incorporate GIRFEC in all that we do</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We deliver on GIRFEC principles but don’t call it that</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have implemented aspects of GIRFEC but it is not the ‘be all and end all’ for us</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are interested in implementing GIRFEC but haven’t done so yet</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not interested in implementing GIRFEC</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=82*

The language of GIRFEC and the SHANARRI (Safe, Healthy, Achieving, Nurtured, Active, Respected, Responsible and Included) wellbeing indicators were the most widely used planning, monitoring and evaluation tools associated with GIRFEC (by 81%, 65, and 76%, 61, of organisations respectively). Across the board, the GIRFEC tools were also more widely used now than in 2014, as shown below.

Other tools mentioned were several in the ‘How Good Is Our….’ range, the Outcome Star, Wellbeing Bingo and other bespoke tools.

**Figure 19** Do you currently use any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The language of GIRFEC</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SHANARRI wellbeing indicators</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My World Triangle assessment tool</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience Matrix analysis tool</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government interactive online self-evaluation guide for the Third Sector</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other planning, monitoring or evaluation tools which capture aspects of GIRFEC</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=80 (2018), 119 (2014)*

The 2018 survey again looked at how well participants thought the city overall was doing on specific aspects of delivering the key outcomes of GIRFEC. Perceptions were positive, with over two-thirds of those who felt able to respond rating Glasgow as very or quite good on each of the four aspects, as shown below. Again, this is an encouraging change from 2014.
Figure 20  How would you rate Glasgow overall in terms of how well the SHANARRI wellbeing outcomes are being met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinating services (n=59, 67)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving the Third Sector (n=63, 77)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s services planning (n=61, 63)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering across the wellbeing indicators (n=57, 63)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) was explored and was found to be used at least some of the time by almost 90% of respondents who were able to give a view, as shown below. An additional 5 people said ‘don’t know’ and only 1 respondent was unaware of UNCRC.

Although the response options were different in the previous survey (2014 – yes, no, don’t know and not aware) this is again a very positive move from the 54% who replied ‘yes’ in 2014. Also, those saying they were unaware dropped considerably from 11% in 2014 to just 1% now.
3.8.2 Partnership working and involvement in service planning, design and delivery

The 2013/14 mapping study showed Third Sector awareness of partnership processes and structures around children, young people and families was patchy, and involvement in these was often limited to a few Third Sector organisations which were usually larger, national organisations and/or those which had a commissioned relationship with the public sector. The same people often attended a number of different groups, which was onerous for them (and would have precluded many smaller Third Sector organisations from performing this role) and was not representative of the sector. Policy and planning structures have changed since then, but the online survey sought to repeat this exercise with a current list, to see how awareness and involvement had shifted.

Awareness of and involvement in 16 partnership processes and structures, divided into key policies (7) and planning structures (9), was explored.

Awareness and involvement in key policies
Awareness of the key policies tested was high, with 99% (72) of those responding being aware of at least one of the key policies. Early Years Collaborative (EYC) and Thriving Places had the highest levels of awareness. These were the only two which were also tested in 2014, and for both, levels of awareness had improved significantly, from 61% in 2014 to 84% in 2018 for Early Years Collaborative and from 33% to 78% for Thriving Places.

Awareness was higher amongst those working in larger (50+ employees) organisations than smaller organisations, and also tended to be the case for those in senior management/governance roles.

41% of those responding said they weren’t involved in any of the key policies tested. Highest levels of involvement were with Thriving Places and the Glasgow Family Support Strategy (both 26%, 19 respondents involved). Levels of involvement in the EYC and Thriving Places had both increased since 2014 (from 16% to 22% and 9% to 26% respectively).

Consistently across all key policies, the level of involvement increased with the level of seniority of the respondent. And similarly, levels of involvement increased with the size of the organisation, with the exception of Thriving Places, where 32% of those working in small
(<10 employees) organisations were involved compared to only 21% of those working in organisations with 50+ employees.

The figure below shows the levels of awareness of and involvement in the key policies tested.

**Figure 22** Which of the following partnership processes/structures are you aware of/involved in? – Key policies

![Graph showing levels of awareness and involvement in key policies](image)

*n=73*

**Awareness and involvement in planning structures**

Awareness and involvement in the planning structures tested was also high, with 97% (71) being aware of at least one of the planning structures. Highest levels of awareness were seen with the Glasgow Third Sector Forum (85%, 62), Local voluntary sector network (84%, 61) and Community Planning Sector of Area Partnership (77%, 56). These also had the highest levels of awareness in 2014, although levels were lower at 67%, 60% and 67% respectively. Awareness was again higher amongst those working in larger (50+ employees) organisations than smaller organisations, but did not show the same trend with level of seniority as seen with the key policies.

Awareness of the relatively new Children, Young People and Families Citywide Forum was excellent, with three-quarters of respondents saying they were aware of it (75%, 55). This showed a higher level of awareness than more long-standing and local groups/networks, which is very positive. In addition, 30% of respondents (22) said they were involved in the Citywide Forum.

27% of those responding said they weren’t involved in any of the planning structures tested. Highest levels of involvement were with the Glasgow Third Sector Forum (45%, 33) and the local Voluntary sector network (44%, 32), with the Children’s Services Executive Group having the lowest level of involvement at 4% (3), as would be expected with this high level group.
The figure below shows the levels of awareness of and involvement in the planning structures tested.

**Figure 23** Which of the following partnership processes/structures are you aware of/involved in? – Planning structures

Respondents were asked about involvement in other planning groups or structures across the city related to children, young people and families – 22% (13) of those who responded said they were and went on to mention a wide selection of groups and networks which are given in full in the data tables supplied to GCVS.

**Planning structures in Glasgow**

When asked to what degree respondents thought the planning structures for children, young people and families within Glasgow enabled the Third Sector contribution at the moment, three-quarters (75%, 44) of those able to comment were positive.
To what degree do you think the planning structures for children, young people and families within Glasgow enable the Third Sector contribution at the moment?

n=59

Those who answered ‘not very well’ or ‘not at all well’ were asked how this could be improved. Only seven chose to respond, citing better understanding of, investment in or appreciation of the Third Sector by statutory agencies, as illustrated by some of the quotes below.

“Greater understanding by statutory partners of the role and reach of the third sector.”

“By GCC and SG actually listening to the needs of the Third Sector and valuing the contribution the Third Sector makes. Investing in the Third Sector instead of being dismissive.”

“By public agencies in the city recognising and valuing the high quality contribution TS organisations could make to planning, developing and delivering improved services to children young people and families … and actually making practical use of their skills, knowledge and competencies – and understanding of communities – to influence resource allocations and direct and manage locality planning and delivery processes more effectively than the public agencies currently do.”

**Partnership working**

Partnership working with a number of different organisations was explored by asking respondents about their experience of working with them on children, young people and families issues. Experiences were varied, with some being very positively received, such as GCVS Everyone’s Children where 88% (49) said their experience was good (43%) or very good (45%); Third Sector forums or networks (79% good or very good); and small Third Sector organisations (74% good or very good). Less positive experiences were with Jobs and Business Glasgow (27% good or very good although almost half had ‘no strong feelings’); and Community Safety Glasgow (38% good or very good, 45% no strong feelings). Responses for all organisations are shown below.
How would you rate your experience of joint working on children, young people and families issues with each of the following...?

Just focussing on the very/quite good responses can be misleading, so we also looked at this by assigning numbers to the rating scale (i.e. 5 = very good, 4 quite good, etc) to calculate a ‘mean score’. The difference between the ratings given in 2018 and 2014 (where direct comparisons can be made) were examined (for those who were able to give an opinion).

The following organisations showed the biggest improvement in ratings:
- Third Sector forums and networks – rating increased from 3.47 in 2014 to 4.07 in 2018 (+0.6);
- Multi-agency partnerships generally – rating increased from 3.30 to 3.69 (+0.39);
- Community Safety Glasgow (formerly GCSS) – rating increased from 2.96 to 3.24 (+0.28);
- Large Third Sector organisations – rating increased from 3.38 to 3.64 (+0.26); and
- Community Planning – rating increased from 3.16 to 3.35 (+0.18).

It was encouraging to see this positive shift, with obvious caveats of sample size etc. Community Planning and Community Safety Glasgow had two of the highest levels of negative ratings in 2014 (a quarter), so these have improved on reducing these as well as increasing positive ratings.
While the rating associated with GCVS improved markedly from 3.51 to 4.30 (+0.8), this is not directly comparable as in 2014 the survey asked about GCVS in general, whereas it asked about GCVS Everyone’s Children in 2018. The important point to take from this is the high regard in which the Everyone’s Children project (and team) are held.

Jobs and Business Glasgow showed the greatest decline in rating, decreasing from 3.26 in 2014 to 2.93 in 2018 (-0.34) and showing both decreased positive ratings and increased negative ratings, possibly reflecting its recent challenges. Social Work Services polarised views more in 2014, with 48% giving positive ratings and 35% giving negative ones about partnership working. Direct comparisons do not exist as the introduction of the HSCP meant this was asked differently this year. However, ratings for Social Work Services were 3.16 in 2014 and GHSCP was 3.47 (+0.31) and Other Social Work Services 3.3 (+0.14), so this looks like a positive shift in opinions. NHS ratings and Other NHS ratings were relatively static (3.41 and 3.43).

Respondents were then asked how much they agreed or disagreed with seven statements about partnership working within Glasgow City. The responses can be seen in the figure below, which shows the perceived improvement in the Third Sector involvement in planning structures – 80% (40) agreed or strongly agreed that the Third Sector has become more involved in Glasgow’s planning structures in the last 5 years. The openness of Third Sector organisations to working with others was also noticeable – 79% (45) agreed or strongly agreed with ‘most Third Sector organisations are open to working in partnership with others’.

There was little support, however, for the statement that ‘Third Sector organisations are treated as equal partners by public sector organisations’ with 72% (41) either disagreeing (63%) or strongly disagreeing (9%). That said, just over half (52%, 29) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement ‘Third Sector organisations generally have good working relationships with public sector partners.’
Figure 26  How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about partnership working in the City?

\[ \text{Agree/strongly agree} \quad \text{No strong feelings} \quad \text{Disagree/strongly disagree} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% agreed/strongly agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Sector organisations are treated as equal partners by public sector organisations</td>
<td>18% 11% 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Sector organisations generally have good working relationships with public sector partners</td>
<td>52% 30% 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector partners work well with each other</td>
<td>28% 45% 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Third Sector organisations are open to working in partnership with others</td>
<td>79% 12% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most public sector organisations are open to working in partnership with the Third Sector</td>
<td>44% 38% 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning structures are good at linking different aspects of support for children, young people and families</td>
<td>37% 38% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Third Sector has become more involved in Glasgow’s planning structures in the last 5 years</td>
<td>82% 18% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n=49 \text{ – } 57 \)

Overall, there was an improvement in perceptions of partnership working in the City from 2014, although comparisons cannot be made directly with all statements, as some were combined in the 2018 survey. The following table shows some comparisons.

Table 2  Comparison of agreement with statements 2018 and 2014 surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Sector organisations are treated as equal partners by public sector organisations (2014 added ‘in practice’)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Sector organisations generally have good working relationships (with public sector partners – 2018)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46% (with one PS partner at a time) 26% (with more than one at a time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector partners work well with each other</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Third Sector organisations are open to working in partnership (with others - 2018)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72% (with each other) 80% (with the public sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most public sector organisations are open to working in partnership with the Third Sector</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning structures are good at linking different aspects of support for children, young people and families</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These positive shifts were reinforced with the question on how partnership working around children, young people and families in Glasgow has changed in the last five years. 90% of respondents who expressed an opinion said that it had improved a lot (41%, 20) or improved a little (49%, 24). Only three respondents felt it had deteriorated and two felt that it had stayed the same.

**Figure 27** How do you think partnership working around children, young people and families in Glasgow has changed in the last five years?

- Improved a lot: 41%
- Improved a little: 49%
- Stayed the same: 4%
- Deteriorated a little: 4%
- Deteriorated a lot: 2%

\( n=49 \)

**Everyone’s Children project’s contribution**

Depth interviewees were extremely positive about the contribution Everyone’s Children had made to extending the scope and scale of Third Sector involvement in the city.

Stakeholders felt that Everyone’s Children had invested time and effort in helping to raise awareness of and build better relationships between the Third Sector and public sector agencies (primarily, although some private sector relationships may have also been strengthened, particularly around ELC). All EC activities were perceived to contribute towards that, plus other positive outcomes like a more knowledgeable and skilled workforce through training and sharing information and best practice.

“I feel more connected to other organisations. It hasn’t meant new work necessarily, yet, but we all know what each other does and where we all sit in relation to each other and that will open up future opportunities.”

“I’ve really seen progress… for years it was so hard, but there’s been so much activity and wider political input so the Third Sector has a much higher profile, is being accepted and taken seriously. I see hope.”

In the online survey, almost three-quarters of respondents (74%, 37) felt that the Everyone’s Children project had helped give the Third Sector more of a voice in the city’s work around children, young people and families and a further 26% (13) felt it had helped a little. No one said it had not helped at all.
Has the Everyone’s Children project helped give the Third Sector more of a voice in the city’s work around children, young people and families?

**Third Sector influence**

A stronger Third Sector voice is a good thing, but the critical next step is for that voice to be heard and to translate into practical changes to policies and practice in response to the views expressed. The majority of depth interviewees felt that this had started to happen and could give examples of where the Third Sector had influenced changes. A couple of stakeholders felt it was too early to tell but were hopeful that it would happen as the foundations have been laid. Early steps to influencing policy were suggested to include things like being invited to sit on different multi-agency groups and the face that key national and local public sector players are keen to attend EC/Forum meetings and events and to actively seek the views of the sector. Third Sector stakeholders felt their views were being received – “They say what it means for the Third Sector before I get the chance to ask now.” – and acted upon:

> “The ELC consultation was really positive. We were involved and they took our advice on the definition of family support. They listened to us and used our words exactly. That means a lot. That is a tangible benefit of being involved.”

There was an appetite for this to grow, with greater involvement and influence in future as both public and Third Sector stakeholders recognised the significant skills, knowledge and capacity the Third Sector has to offer children, young people and families. Some stakeholders felt that this is a pivotal moment as progress has been made on representation and involvement, some changes have been effected because of that, but it will be interesting to see how that is built upon (or not) over the coming months.

> “I see a big difference after two years. I feel like it’s coming into its own now, there’s been a shift in attitudes.”

The influence of the Third Sector on policy and practice was seen to be better now that five years ago by 83% (40) of those who were able to express an opinion on this. No one felt it was now worse.
Thinking about the way in which the Third Sector influences policy and practice around children, young people and families in the city, does it feel different now to five years ago? For example in terms of impacts on GIRFEC, Child Protection, Early Learning & Childcare and Child Poverty issues.

When asked how partnership working could be improved in the city, many survey respondents emphasised the need for public sector agencies to value the Third Sector….

“Continuing to change the mind set of public sector and greater awareness of what the third sector provides.”

“Third sector be seen and feel as more equal partners instead of commissioned services. Children, young people and families' voices are more embedded into service planning.”

… while others mentioned more collaborative working.

“…I think it is time for all agencies to come together collectively and make changes and share knowledge/understanding of our communities and work closer to address the many many issues within our communities.”

This was supported by discussions with stakeholders, which suggests there are Third Sector ‘champions’ in the public sector who understand the role, relevance and importance of the sector. However, there is a need to raise awareness beyond these individuals, so that more decision-makers in the public sector know about the good work and contribution of Everyone’s Children and the wider sector.

3.8.3 Improving number and diversity of Third Sector voice

One of key aims of the Citywide Forum, and of Everyone’s Children, was to increase the number and diversity of Third Sector organisations who were engaged in planning and implementing positive outcomes for children, young people and families. The original and updated mapping exercises were perceived to have been very useful to help quantify the sector and its activities and the number of organisations who are actively engaging via the Forum, training and networking opportunities was perceived to have extended.

“It’s made a huge difference. There’s obviously more they can do but Everyone’s Children brought balance to the children and young people arena with its ability to engage. Eddie Kane got it and helped develop the city forum, bringing in the big nationals. He’s shown real leadership on
this. Everyone’s Children has done well to bring coherence to the voice of children and young people in the city and increasingly developed prestige… It started out as more of a policy project but the networking side has grown and other things have enabled that. Networking has been a really welcome development. If there was no Everyone’s Children, small Third Sector organisations would be even more fragile. Everyone’s Children has had a pivotal role in training which was not provided elsewhere and in other ways, e.g. summer food programme. Everyone’s Children made sure there was as much for community projects as possible, so projects could add the food on to what they were doing anyway. That wouldn’t have happened without their networks.”

“The [Citywide] Forum and other networks make a big difference. They are involving more people and engaging well. It wouldn’t have happened nearly as well with the Everyone’s Children approach and people to progress it.”

“If there was no Everyone’s Children, with Glasgow the size it is, I don’t know how organised it would be. There are hundreds, thousands of voluntary organisations and without co-ordination by Everyone’s Children I don’t know how the [policy makers] could have engaged with the Third Sector. You need some central post for communications, some co-ordinating function. They do a good job and have carried on with different people consistently well.”

3.8.4 Making a difference to communities

Whilst making a difference to communities was not a stated aim of Everyone’s Children, stakeholders were asked if the project had made a difference to them or not. Stakeholders clearly felt that the training, networking, mapping, sharing information and best practice and active involvement in key initiatives will inevitably have made a positive impact on communities.

“They have been very supportive and helpful… without their contacts and knowledge we wouldn’t have been able to deliver the summer food programme. They did a lot around contacts, child protection training, food workshops, etc.”

“Yes, the small community-based Third Sector organisations are life-changing for people when they deliver well and Everyone’s Children helps them to deliver better services to people. They have helped big nationals to engage so the forum/networks are more representative of the Third Sector and are more diverse. People have a say and the Forum is a better way to manage that Third Sector engagement in a more representative way.”

“The ethos and culture of Everyone’s Children touches communities and they’re in the right place.”

“That is one real benefit of training – it better equips the workforce working with families. I have no doubt [Everyone’s Children] has benefitted communities. The training and information sharing have made a difference. We have a lot of discussion in our team afterwards and apply what we’ve learned to our service. For example, with information sharing we know that the family is the priority so now go back to Social Work and update them or ask for updates before we contact a family. It has improved our practice and is beneficial for families. Lots of other things like the food hygiene courses are also of practical help to communities.”
“Yes, because the consultation and working on all these issues is to achieve better outcomes for children, young people and families. They are all relevant and grounded in need and helping to bring the voice of the sector and children, young people and families to meetings and committees so that will shape what and how things are done. Also, people in the community talk to us, the Third Sector, and the public sector are coming to recognise that. We understand the issues and can also be helpful when it comes to consultation and involvement, so that communities are involved in things that affect them.”

“We’re having different discussion with public sector partners and each other, so we understand the issues better and are doing new things or in different ways, which is good for communities.”

3.9 The future of Everyone’s Children

3.9.1 Should it continue?

All stakeholders were keen to see Everyone’s Children continue. No-one felt it had run its course and all felt there was still a need for it to continue. It was perceived to have started to make a difference to Third Sector organisations, public sector partners and to have an impact on communities. It takes time to build the momentum to effect change so stakeholders were quick to say that it would be a wasted investment by the Scottish Government to cease funding now, as further investment could yield even greater impacts. There was a sense that the Everyone’s Children project had built trust, proved that it could be useful to both Third and public sectors and was now being sought out to be involved with initiatives related to children, young people and families, such as the Summer Food Programme.

“An essential project to meet the needs of organisations supporting children and families in the city.”

“It’s not a two or three year project. It doesn’t happen overnight as trust and credibility need to be built or earned. Yes, Everyone’s Children should continue. There’s at least three years’ work and probably more from there, which will become clear over the next three years.”

“Their overall objective means there would be a big hole to not continue, I think. It would be very helpful to me if it continues!”

“I would definitely support their continuation… [EC] really does help me do my job.”

“Yes, it is a resource with contacts that have real value, which are helpful for us to draw on.”

“Yes, I would like to see them go on to do more, building on what they have achieved.”

“Everyone’s Children is really important to ensure there is a coherent response from the Third Sector. It is really good at connecting small Third Sector organisations and they probably get more out of it than larger ones.”

“It would be really frustrating if all this work to get our voice heard was dropped. There is a fabulous relationship with GCC now. The Concordat is the start of something, it’s exciting. There’s a lot going on that we should be involved in – like ELC - and it won’t be as good for children and families if we aren’t involved.”
The amount of progress which has been made in terms of improving partnership working and the Third Sector voice in the city around children, young people and families was considered not to have been achievable without Everyone’s Children. Some progress may have been made, but stakeholders who commented on this felt it would not have been as much progress, or as quickly. Similarly, ceasing funding would have a significant impact on future progress.

“If it stopped it would have a big impact on the Forum. We need the support of Everyone’s Children to help tie it all together. Suzie is reliable, confident, she links things from different meetings together and follows things up. The events get a good turnout and go well.”

Whilst several stakeholders did not have a view on who should fund Everyone’s Children in future, the majority of those who did felt that the Scottish Government should continue to fund it. The remainder felt it could perhaps be funded by local players but, importantly, none of these were from the NHS, GCC or GHSCP, who would be the most likely potential local funders. It was recognised that this topic-specific model should be funded in addition to GCVS/TSI core funding, as it is an effective model which facilitates progress to be made on important target groups/topics. It was suggested by a couple of stakeholders that this model could be used for other issues or groups.

“The Third Sector would struggle to do without Everyone’s Children and so would the public sector. It’s part of the planning framework now and it works, but it needs to lift its profile so it is represented in more discussions. It needs to be bigger to do that, and then it can take on more issues, like youth health. There are all sorts of things it could and should be involved in.”

3.9.2 Future priorities

Finally, the survey asked to choose five priorities for the future for Everyone’s Children from a list of options. The most frequently mentioned priorities were ‘Supporting the Third Sector contribution to alleviating Child Poverty’ (75%, 40), ‘Workforce development through training and events’ (72%, 38), ‘Sharing good practice through networking events (68%, 36) and ‘Family Support’ (66%, 35). The full list of options and their levels of support are shown below.
Figure 30  What do you think Everyone’s Children priorities should be in future? Please tick the FIVE most important

- Workforce development through training and events 72%
- Sharing information through newsletters and twitter 53%
- Sharing good practice through networking events 68%
- Supporting the Citywide Forum 55%
- Supporting the Third Sector contribution to.....
  - alleviating Child Poverty 75%
  - Bridging the Attainment Gap 53%
  - Early Learning and Childcare 47%
  - Family Support 66%
  - Child Protection 51%
  - Youth Employment 23%
  - the roll out of Named Person 26%
  Something else 2%

n=53

Depth interviewees were also asked what they would like to see the project focussing on in future, should funding be continued. All that is currently delivered was perceived to be of value – networking, training, events, etc. - so stakeholders would like to see that continue. They would also like to see progress to date further developed to enhance Everyone’s Children’s policy work and help public sector partners to implement other policies, such as ELC, child poverty, etc. Everyone’s Children was already seen to be working on the key policy areas, so this needs to continue to help address the challenges ahead - these were all perceived to be substantial agendas which need sustained focus - whilst representing the views and needs of the Third Sector. Equalities groups were perceived to be important but, as GIRFEC suggests, every child needs to be considered. Stakeholder felt that EC activities should reflect the widest view and be as inclusive as possible. A universal, inclusive approach is good, but our equalities work would suggest that sometimes targeted work around equalities groups is required to achieve that. Suggestions included increased resources, continued opportunities for networking, transitions for young people with disabilities/LTCs, representing the voice of those least heard, ELC, wellbeing and responding to potential opportunities in the carers’ strategy, as the quotes below illustrate.

"Third Sector staff and volunteers have a continuing need to come together with others, not just in their own sphere - young carers butting up against housing support, butting up against advocacy services, butting up against
experts in benefits, and so on. We see people making contact and collaborating, all really good connections around the city."

"The qualities of [EC] officers are appreciated. The big policy areas are covered, all are relevant. We’re really concerned about transitions from child to adult services for children with disabilities or long-term conditions and their families. How can Third Sector organisation work with statutory services to effect a better transition and co-ordination when funding falls of a cliff?"

"Everyone’s Children needs to represent the voice of the sector in the ELC expansion. Pockets can go unheard and need a voice. Lots of voluntary sector organisations who give support and advice to children, young people and families are not inspected yet so are not always part of the picture and can be marginalised. Everyone’s Children do, and need to, position themselves so they are not in one clear silo. Everyone’s Children is well placed to help attract new people into the ELC sector and diversify the workforce."

"Wellbeing of the child is all connected to GIRFEC, so it’s still relevant to focus on GIRFEC. Next, we have to make sure there is city-wide implementation and impacts of wellbeing. Poverty and attainment all come back to wellbeing and adverse childhood experiences so we need to enhance wellbeing."

"The obvious thing is to increase resources. This is an important resource, which works well so stakeholders will be keen to see more from the project."

"The carers strategy is coming out – people assume it focuses on carers of adults but children and families will be impacted too. Will SDS provide the same opportunities for carers?"

"Everyone’s Children should have morphed into something different to how it started and it has. Suzie has taken heed of the data and is supported by the public sector on what the priorities are. She’s on the right groups."

A specific task for the Citywide Forum was seen to be increasing the number of organisations who are regularly involved, particularly smaller organisations. Having a larger pool of people to draw upon to be involved in the Forum, its sub-groups and other partnership meetings was perceived to be helpful as more could then be achieved. Support for the Citywide Forum to continue and develop further was consistently:

"It’s made an enormous difference, although there is still a long way to go. Having representative structures which are taken seriously – and it is, as the Forum is on the children’s planning structure so it’s acknowledged at a strategic level as the way to engage the Third Sector. The next shift is to make more strategic partnerships, within the Third Sector and between the Third and public sectors. Will we then see a re-allocation of resources if the voice of the Third Sector is heard around tables?"

"Training, capacity building, networking, linking to national policy-makers and initiatives are all important but the Forum is the most important work to build on. It needs the support of Everyone’s Children. It would be a real shame to stop now – it has taken 4 or 5 years to get here but it would only take 4 months to fall apart without support. We need to keep that momentum going, it would be soul-destroying to lose it or to have to start again now that all that effort is starting to pay off."
“It’s important that EC doesn’t chair the Forum as that would bring a different feel to it altogether, being independent of GCVS. But it needs to support it. Everyone’s Children couldn’t do it without the Third Sector organisations, especially the bigger ones, and they couldn’t do it without Everyone’s Children.”

One stakeholder suggested more could be done in terms of family support for refugees and asylum seekers and those in disadvantaged communities.

A few suggestions were made in terms of priorities for training (over and above what was cited earlier): plugging any gaps in training/knowledge, such as cross-cutting issues, covering a broader spectrum of topic areas and having some round-table sessions. Continuing to raise awareness of training to smaller Third Sector organisations, and facilitating access via a free/low cost model, was perceived to be vital. It was also suggested that resources or checklists could be developed for staff who are unable to attend training but would still appreciate some input.

A couple of stakeholders also suggested that EC needs a clearer development strategy on where to focus efforts as it was considered to have been more reactive to date (not unhelpfully). It was recognised that the partnership based approach works and it needs to continue. The EC project was perceived to be necessary to help support that approach and both the Third and public sectors. Whilst one stakeholder felt that projects generally require more resources to become established which can then be reduced to a ‘maintenance’ level, others felt this was not the case for Everyone’s Children. They felt the project has already shifted from being just policy-based to expand its networking activity and has become involved in many different topics, all of which are significant (in terms of importance and the effort required to facilitate them). Stakeholders did not see the need for Everyone’s Children diminishing and, moreover, some were overtly keen to see it grow.

“Glasgow has a very opaque structure, so it was really helpful to have Everyone’s Children to do the legwork to make this clearer. We [TS] couldn’t have found the resources to progress that. We needed the full-time activity, effort and sheer doggedness of Everyone’s Children to push it. The city knew we needed it but it’s so complex we didn’t think it would happen. It’s a great endorsement of the project.”

“They take a proper community development approach, which works.”

“It’s not just GCVS – it’s subtle, collective endeavour.”

PEF events very helpful and EC was seen as an “honest broker” for teachers and Third Sector organisations to trust. More of this type of activity would be welcomed.

“The mapping exercise to establish the scale and scope of the sector and its impacts was very helpful. It’s used by different people, including me, all the time.”

The project originally had an advisory group to help act as a sounding board and facilitate progress, but this fell away after a couple of years. A couple of stakeholders felt this could have sharpened the focus around direction (not that it has been wrong, just that this might have helped short-cut things) and been used positively to help support the project. It was suggested that an advisory group can be useful so that any ‘challenging’ conversations can be played out there rather than in public, so there may be merit in considering its reinstatement if funding is continued.
3.10 Further comments and observations

3.10.1 Identity

There was some discussion with stakeholders about identity. From the way people responded to questions and spoke of Everyone’s Children, GCVS, the TSI, the Citywide Forum and EC team members there were clearly different views on identity. Some people used each of these labels very specifically when discussing Everyone’s Children and its activities, whilst others used them more inter-changeably and, potentially, incorrectly. For example, some talked about Everyone’s Children and the Citywide Forum as if it was one entity and others spoke of GCVS when responding to questions about Everyone’s Children and were unsure what, if any, the difference was. Others were very clear that the Forum, Everyone’s Children and GCVS all had very distinct identities, personalities and strengths/weaknesses. For example:

“Everyone’s Children is the biggest, best-organised thematic network in the city. [It is] part of the fabric of Third Sector infrastructure in the city, it’s such a strong, coherent network.”

“I wouldn’t have been as involved and well-informed without Everyone’s Children. Knowing the TSI and that they’re there to advocate and help is good. It feels like family now, comfortable.”

“It has helped that Everyone’s Children is different to GCVS. It’s not so political or provocative and it is focussed on children, young people and families. Suzie is on the CSEG so has been adopted at a high level. A more collegiate approach helps both public and Third Sectors.”

3.10.2 Symposium or think tank

GCVS senior managers were interested to know if a symposium, think tank or some other way of maximising the learning from Everyone’s Children would be helpful. Whilst some learning may not transpose to remote and rural locations, it was recognised that learning may be helpful for other geographic areas as well as for the Glasgow context. Sharing what works, how to move on from mistakes and how to spot areas for improvement were all suggested for specific aspects for inclusion. The benefits of reflection, sharing learning and considering what is transferable to other spheres of activity were acknowledged by all stakeholders, if appropriate.

“Yes, very helpful. There is strength in bringing people together and events are usually well-attended. It can take people a while to get their head around the complex landscape in Glasgow, so I’m sure it would be of use.”

“Yes, there will be a lot of learning and people would be inspired. If it can happen in Glasgow…”
4 Conclusions & recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

Feedback on the Everyone’s Children project was extremely positive, from both the online survey and depth interviews. The Everyone’s Children team is small, with limited resources, but they were seen to deliver to a high standard across a variety of activities and topics, and to have made a significant impact. The project has not been without challenges, but the team were perceived to be doing the right things in the right way. It has acted on the recommendations of the mapping study at the start of the project by:

- raising awareness, understanding and use of GIRFEC within the sector and the contribution the sector can/do make in the city;
- helping to move forward Third Sector representation and influence around children, young people and families in the city; and
- building the capacity of the Third Sector workforce to benefit children, young people and families in communities.

The project team have built trust and a good reputation with both Third and public sector players as they are perceived to be knowledgeable, pragmatic and they deliver on commitments. Stronger relationships were evident between the project and both sectors, but also between organisations within the Third Sector and between the wider Third Sector and key public sector agencies. The formation of the CYPF Citywide Forum was viewed as a critical development, which was universally reviewed very positively. It is perceived as a means of engaging with the Third Sector, of widening involvement by different Third Sector organisations – through the Forum, its sub-groups and representation on multi-agency groups.

There appears to be greater buy-in from key public sector players to work more closely with the Third Sector, with invitations to be involved in meetings/committees, to engage around key policies, plans and services and the Third Sector was seen to be starting to influence these. Both the Forum and EC were perceived to be useful conduits to Third Sector views by public sector partners, which they could not have achieved otherwise, at all or as easily. Much has been achieved in a relatively short space of time, directly or supported by EC, but the next few months and years will be the true test of collaborative working. How much of a voice and genuine influence will the Third Sector have in policies, spending priorities and the way in which services are delivered to CYPF in Glasgow?

Awareness and usage of activities like newsletters, training and events was high and these were also rated very positively. These activities were seen to help Third Sector organisations to be aware of the wider policy and practice landscape by providing targeted information, good practice, training, funding opportunities or events. This was greatly appreciated by the sector, who are often very busy delivering services and do not have the resources to harvest this information themselves.

Awareness and involvement in GIRFEC and other policy and planning structures within the city have all improved since the original mapping study in 2014. Stakeholders were more positive about their experiences of partnership working and their degree of involvement and influence in planning structures. There is still work to be done in terms of the Third Sector feeling like an equal partner to the public sector, but positive changes have been made so there is hope that this will continue to grow.
Everyone’s Children was credited with making much of this progress, directly and by facilitating the Citywide Forum, wider Third Sector and public sector partners, so there is a strong desire to see the project continue. Impacts have been achieved, but the support of the project is required to maintain and develop those further – there is still perceived to be a need for the Everyone’s Children project. Losing investment and momentum now was seen to be a backward step which would be a real disadvantage to the city’s children, young people and families.

Indeed, the EC model of gathering data and learning on a specific sector, building capacity, improving relationships, giving voice to the sector and impacting on policy and practice was seen to be a valuable one. This ‘targeted TSI’ with a distinct identity was perceived to be a positive one which could be used on other topics or target groups. If this approach is embraced by funders and partners, there is potential for more joined up services for specific groups/issues, greater value for money and impacts to be achieved.

4.2 Recommendations

The key recommendation to suggest for consideration is the continued funding of the Everyone’s Children project and for it to keep doing what it is currently doing.

Stakeholders clearly felt there is a need for it, it performs useful functions and is making a difference to the Third Sector, public sector partners and, ultimately, children, young people and families in the city. The survey suggested child poverty, workforce development through training and events, sharing good practice through networking and family support were the key priorities for the future. Continued support of the Citywide Forum was also prioritised specifically by stakeholders. As ever, longer-term funding which would facilitate forward planning and a more proactive, strategic approach to delivery would be helpful.

Other suggestions are as follows:

- The project has credibility with key public sector partners, but it needs to raise its profile and communicate its achievements and potential uses beyond those immediately relevant to activities. One to one meetings were suggested as a possible way to do this, in addition to outlining what it does and has achieved at events and via written communications. This will help to embed the project, its activities and approaches more fully within the wider landscape and may open up further areas for development, involvement and influence of the Third Sector, to achieve greater co-ordination, value for money and positive impacts for CYPF.

- There was support for taking a stronger policy position on issues and being more involved in policy development. Producing policy briefings on key issues would be a useful first step to highlight issues and engage the sector in debate.

- The project may wish to consider an interactive, searchable directory of Third Sector services, if feasible, but some stakeholders would still be keen to have a printable version, so this should be considered. There was also some interest in building on the mapping work by providing more of an overview of what the Third Sector brings, who it is working for and where the gaps are. GCVS’s CRM system may help on both of these issues.

- The project may wish to consider feedback on more advanced training and additional training topics, as suggested by stakeholders.

- GCVS, the Scottish Government and wider TSI networks may wish to consider the Everyone’s Children model as a potential future option to help the Third Sector build capacity, be involved and influence services around a range of issues and target groups. A symposium or think tank may be a useful way forward to widening the debate on this.