

**EVALUATION OF THE SINGLE REGENERATION
BUDGET CHALLENGE FUND;
AN EXAMINATION OF BASELINE ISSUES**

prepared by

**THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND ECONOMY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE**

in association with
Cambridge Policy Consultants

for the

**Department of the Environment,
Transport and the Regions**

**Department of Land Economy
University of Cambridge
Tel: (01223 337147)**

June 1999

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	The quality of the baseline in the twenty case studies.....	5
3.	Overview of the baseline position in the twenty case study areas	15
4.	Implications for the national evaluation of the SRB.....	52
	ANNEX A Essential features of a baseline	57

1. INTRODUCTION

The evaluation brief for the baseline work had three main components:-

- to examine and assess the quality of the baseline proposals in the twenty case study schemes, to identify strengths and weaknesses of these proposals and identify important gaps which needed to be filled
- where weaknesses and gaps in scheme baseline proposals are identified these should be rectified by the evaluation team by re-casting the baseline in the twenty case studies and, where necessary, obtaining estimates for indicators in the base year.
- to draw out lessons from the case studies which would improve good practice in baseline measurement in SRB schemes as a whole.

This report concentrates on the first and last of these objectives with only a brief overview of the baseline position in each of the case study Partnerships presented.

1.1 The Baseline work

A key component of the research methodology which underpins the national evaluation of the SRB is the construction of a baseline position for the twenty SRB Partnership areas which were selected to be case studies. Baselines are required for two main reasons. The first is to allow the nature and extent of the problems which face the areas concerned to be identified wherever possible through a range of quantitative indicators. The second is to provide a benchmark position from which to assess whether the incidence of the underlying problems is changing through time and whether any relative improvement can be attributed to the effects of the SRB initiative. In other words, the baseline is designed to help in assessing the true effectiveness of the SRB.

This report is structured in the following way. The next chapter considers the strengths and weaknesses of the original baseline material that had been assembled by the twenty case study Partnerships (and identifies the main gaps in the baseline material that the research team had to fill, particularly with respect to the key indicators). The twenty case studies are clearly only a relatively small sample of the over 400 Partnership schemes that have formed

the basis of SRB Rounds One and Two. Nevertheless, it is felt that they offer considerable insight into the nature of the problems faced by Partnerships in assembling good baselines. Chapter three describes briefly the augmented baselines that have been assembled for each of the twenty case study Partnerships.

The report concludes by drawing together the findings of the research, lessons to be learned and makes recommendations as to where improvements might occur with respect to the articulation of baselines for future SRB schemes as a whole.

What are the essential features of the baseline and what is it for?

This section provides a brief overview of the essential features, and purpose, of a baseline. A more wide ranging discussion of these issues can be found in Annex A which covers: the lessons from City Challenge baseline studies; what an ideal baseline should measure; the appropriateness of a set of core baseline indicators for SRB; and the constraints imposed by the availability of local data.

The first key feature of a baseline is that it measures social and economic conditions in the designated area at a point in time immediately prior to the commencement of the intervention of the regeneration programme. Ideally, these baseline economic and social conditions should be measured relative to some 'standard' or norm which may represent the wider local area or region or national average. This commencing baseline position would also ideally record whether relative social and economic conditions had been deteriorating, constant or improving in the past relative to the standard comparator, although this has been rarely attempted.

The second key feature of the baseline is that the same economic and social conditions in the area should be revisited and measured again at the end (or continuously during) the period of regeneration policy intervention - again relative to the standard comparator. This converts the static baseline conditions to a dynamic measure of change in economic/social conditions during the course of the programme and will indicate:-

- whether there has been improvement, no change or deterioration in economic and social conditions in absolute terms
- whether there has been improvement, no change or deterioration relative to changing conditions elsewhere in the 'standard' comparator.

This dynamic feature of the baseline should therefore reveal the degree of progress, if any, in regenerating the area, irrespective of its causes.

The third essential feature of the baseline is that it measures economic and social outcomes for the target areas. It follows that the change indicators used to measure the baseline should measure a range of social and economic outcomes which adequately reflect progress or otherwise in economic and social regeneration in a broad sense.

Baseline indicators therefore measure a broader set of economic and social changes than indicators which measure the specific gross outputs of programme/project policy interventions. Baseline indicators must be capable of being influenced by programme/project interventions but are also subject to a wide variety of other policy and non policy influences. For this reason baseline indicators and gross output indicators need to be clearly distinguished. This is particularly so with programmes with multiple economic and social objectives, such as SRB, because different parts of the programmes may generate interactive and hopefully cumulative benefits. For example, social and environmental projects enhance economic performance, leading in turn to a more rapid improvement in incomes and social conditions.

Thus, the fourth essential feature of the baseline is that it is capable of recording change or progress in those conditions which relate directly to each strategic objective of the regeneration programme but also is capable of measuring more general economic and social conditions which are capable of being influenced (directly and indirectly) by all strategic objectives and interventions. These conditions should reflect not only the benefits to area residents but also any alleviation of constraints on the regeneration processes in the area.

Baseline measurement is needed, therefore, as an integral part of the evaluation evidence in order to assess the overall and wider achievements of the policy interventions, the value for money of the programme and the limitations of the programme in relation to changing regeneration needs.

A further desirable feature of baseline measurement is that indicators as far as possible should be measured consistently across the whole programme. This is not easy to secure across hundreds of SRB schemes which vary widely in terms of size of geographical area and type of policy intervention and scheme strategic objectives. The need for consistency in the choice of indicators and their precise measurement is to enable valid comparisons to be made of social and economic change as influenced by the regeneration achievements of different types of SRB scheme in different types and sizes of local area in different parts of the country.

Finally, measurement of baseline conditions implies that indicators be quantitative in nature even where qualitative change is being assessed. For example perceptions such as fear of crime or extent of community involvement or image of an area, which are all potentially valuable qualitative changes associated with regeneration outcomes, can be given a quantitative dimension using sample survey techniques by indicating the extent to which perceptions in the resident population have changed.

2. THE QUALITY OF THE BASELINE IN THE TWENTY CASE STUDIES

2.1 Introduction

In order to assess the quality of the baselines contained in the twenty case studies it was important to establish clear criteria as to what constitutes good practice across the SRB programme. It should be realised, however, that in Rounds 1 and 2 of SRB, the Partnerships were asked to develop their baselines from the perspective of their own individual regeneration schemes. For evaluation purposes five key features of good baselines stand-out, these are;

- That the baselines are comparable across Partnerships both in terms of the indicators chosen and the definitions used for each indicator
- That the indicators selected are consistent in the type of information they convey about baseline outcomes, so that for example jobs created are defined in the same way whether derived from small business support measures or from training grants to larger companies.
- That the indicators selected are measurable for the geographical area
- That similar ‘scaling’ factors and/or standard/average comparator indicators are suggested
- That there are few gaps in the baseline information, in particular that important economic and social outcomes are adequately covered

With these features of ‘good’ baseline practice in mind the research team examined all of the twenty case study baselines. The next section examines the strengths and weaknesses of the baselines by strategic SRB objective.

2.2 Strengths and weaknesses of the baselines according to strategic SRB objective.

A general comment

The overall impression from an analysis of the baselines in the 20 delivery plans is that they were constructed over a short time scale, by putting together

an ad hoc collection of indicators which were likely to be more or less measurable at some kind of local level. In some cases a very large number of indicators have been suggested. There was no recognition of the possibility or desirability of a core set of comparable indicators, supported by supplementary indicators particularly under the strategic objectives on which the bid focused.

In most case study schemes, the indicators proposed were linked to the strategic objectives which is wholly appropriate. However, there was little recognition that policy action under, say, an economic strategic action might lead to improvements in outcomes under social objectives such as crime reduction or quality of life improvements.

These weaknesses may, in part, have reflected the absence of specific guidance in Rounds 1 and 2 on how baselines should be considered, constructed and used. Some minimum guidance was issued by way of a table giving an illustrative example, and some schemes have based their baseline proposals on this rather limited guidance.

Overall the problem with the baselines was not one of a large number of gaps in the indicators selected but rather one of prioritising the indicators selected, standardising on the definitions used and measuring them in a consistent and comparable way using the same scaling factors and standard comparators.

Quality of baseline according to strategic objective

SO1 (a) Skills and Education

There were three types of indicator reflecting differences in the nature of bids. One group related to education attainment of school leavers, another group to participation levels in industry/school links projects and a third to educational difficulties of ethnic communities particularly in relation to English language capabilities amongst primary school children. One or two bids are hoping to measure the destination of school leavers or 16 year olds in terms of job placement, youth training or further education. This is a

penetrating indicator of skill problems but one which is notoriously difficult to measure on a basis which is consistent through time and across geographical areas.

One general weakness of the baseline indicators is that they are not identified with sufficient precision. Most are measured, for example, as simple numbers of pupils whereas a percentage measure is also needed, if meaningful comparisons are to be made through time and across geographical areas and relative to a standard or average.

One issue regarding data on educational achievements generally is that such data are only available by individual school. As schools tend to take at least a minority of pupils from a wider catchment area than some small SRB areas and as some children in SRB target areas will travel to schools outside the area, data on individual schools will rarely match SRB bid local areas directly and cross boundary school attendance could be an important distorting element.

SO1 (b) Employment and Unemployment

Strategic Objective SO1 covers employment prospects as well as education and skills. Bids varied widely in the choice of unemployment indicator - some using numbers, others using unemployment rates in total or for some sub-set of the “population of unemployed” such as male, young people, ethnic minority, short term/long term. Several different definitions of long term unemployment were adopted ranging from 6 months to 24 months. It was rarely clear what the definition of unemployment rates was or from which source they would be taken e.g. claimant unemployed or the ‘non-active’ Labour Force Survey definition or whether the unemployment rate was for the resident population only or related to work places. In some bids the proposed indicator related to a much larger geographical area than the target area of the bid itself. Only one or two bids were proposing to examine the local area position relative to changes in a wider sub-regional area.

Whilst unemployment has a place as one of a core set of baseline indicators, there needs to be greater care taken in achieving comparability and consistency of measurement across bid areas.

In principle unemployment data are available by post-code and therefore by ward area, which will correspond closely with even the smallest SRB bid target local areas. In practice Job Centres are not always in a position to provide information for current and past data.

SO2 Sustainable economic growth, wealth creation, competitiveness and business support.

This is the one strategic objective which focuses directly on the local economy of bid areas, their firms, the competitiveness of firms and the employment opportunities they generate within the designated bid area. The word “sustainable” in the objective suggests that the baseline indicator would ideally demonstrate evidence of the correction of market failure (as opposed to permanently compensating for it through benefits, subsidies, etc.).

Of the 17 case studies with SO2 baseline indicators the most frequently used indicators were numbers of new business start-ups and survival rates of new business start-ups. These data would be collected from local enterprise agencies/TECs etc. and would not necessarily be comprehensive. One or two bidders planned to use the stock of firms in the area as a baseline indicator either measured through VAT registration or the Census of Employment. Other indicators being adopted by a small minority of bids included stock of small business premises, premises occupancy/vacancy rates, sectoral data on premises e.g. food manufacturing construction or retailing and sites available. None sought to measure aggregate employment or employment structure - i.e. workplace employment in firms in the designated area.

On the basis of this evidence from 20 case studies there is a need to extend and tidy up the baseline indicators for SO2 in the majority of bids which include economic objectives. Start up of new businesses and their survival rates is a reasonably good indicator of sustainable enterprise generation and should be retained. In addition indicators of the stock of firms by size and

aggregate employment would ideally figure in the baseline for schemes with significant economic aspirations. However, the data for these would have to be extracted from the Census of Employment NOMIS data base which implies some expense. The NOMIS data base is preferable to the VAT registrations data base in that the latter does not capture very small firms whose turnover is below the VAT threshold of about £46,000 per annum.

In relation to wealth creation and competitiveness it would be useful to have local data on income per head or average earnings. However, Fenton's proposal¹ of using the New Earnings Survey is far from ideal, except at the County/London Borough level, because sample sizes would be so small that any data would be far from robust. For example some 10,000 employees would have to exist in an area to produce 100 observations on earnings in an area across all types of occupations/industries/part-time/full-time etc. Many SRB bid target areas have many fewer jobs than 10,000 within them. However, where a bid area corresponds to a large local authority district, borough or county, the New Earnings Survey might well be useful.

In the case of smaller bid areas we suggest that it is preferable to focus on the degree of poverty/low incomes, rather than the level of average incomes by estimating the proportion of the target area resident households which is in receipt of social security/housing benefits. This latter measure is in any case needed as an input into the measurement of social exclusion.

SO3 Improving Housing

Those bids which concentrate on the housing objective tended to have six or seven baseline indicators covering housing conditions, tenure, voids, waiting lists, over-crowding and management issues. The three most used indicators are directed at some aspect of housing condition, the structure of housing tenure and the number of empty properties.

¹ 'Baseline Studies and updates : What can we collect and what does it run?' Mike Fenton, Local Economy Policy Unit.

Generally, for those of bids which are intervening in the housing sector, the baseline indicators proposed are comprehensive, appropriate and reasonably consistent across the ten bids. Local authority housing departments represent a comprehensive source of robust local data. Providing the bids are making good progress in actually quantifying the indicators proposed there are no major weaknesses in the baselines covering the housing objectives.

SO4 Initiatives of benefit to ethnic communities

For those schemes which were of benefit to ethnic community groups the case study Partnerships used a wide selection of baseline indicators including

- low proficiency in English language at various ages
- numbers of businesses owned by members of ethnic communities
- unemployment rates in ethnic communities
- participation in training and business support programmes by members of ethnic communities
- percent of population in ethnic communities
- level of community/voluntary sector activity
- educational attainment
- numbers of ethnic population newly arrived

If SO4 is the strategic objective under which the conditions of ethnic minorities - relative to other communities - is to be measured then a relatively large number of baseline indicators can be expected, since many of the core baseline indicators for target areas under other strategic objectives would also be measured under SO4 purely for ethnic communities. Such a comparison may often not be possible from local data resources, consequently in practice a separate baseline for ethnic communities will only be feasible where there are local data sources.

SO5 Tackle Crime and Community Safety

A common baseline indicator used in the other twelve bids was the number of recorded crimes, sometimes broken down to distinguish burglaries (thefts of property) and thefts of and from cars, from other kinds of crime.

Other indicators were proposed by one or two case study schemes, such as juvenile crime, cases of racial harassment, street drinking, vandalism and rates of school suspension.

Few schemes planned to present crime statistics in the target area relative to a wider surrounding area and few had considered the appropriate scaling factors (eg crimes per 1000 population).

Separate indicators were proposed for community safety, namely the number and participation in crime prevention activities, number of dwellings with security problems, extent of drug misuse, and numbers given advice on drugs. Generally, these were well tailored to the precise nature of the type of projects to be financed under the SRB scheme.

Data on recorded crimes should be available at the level of police beats although there is often reluctance to release data at this level. Police statistics will not correspond precisely to SRB target areas but they will be reasonably representative of target areas and adequate for baseline purposes.

SO6 Improve environment, infrastructure, design

A very wide range of indicators was proposed from carbon monoxide levels through to, buildings in state of disrepair, the upgrading of roads and walkways, the provision of recreational open space, the value of development land, road safety and congestion, derelict and vacant land, number of listed buildings, degree of vandalism and local survey based perceptions of image.

The diversity and variety of these indicators properly reflects the diversity in the ways of improving the environment and infrastructure in SRB projects

and for this reason it would be counter-productive to impose uniformity, consistency and comparability of baseline indicators across schemes. Within this strategic objective, baseline indicators are likely to be closely related to gross output measures as for example with respect to the area of derelict land to be cleared by SRB funded projects.

SO7 Enhance quality of life, health, culture, sports facilities

A very wide variety of baseline indicators are used by Partnerships with this objective. There are inconsistencies of classification with other strategic objectives e.g. with respect to drug abuse elsewhere under “crime and community safety” and “community facilities and voluntary sector activity and involvement” elsewhere under SO8 (see below).

The baseline indicators used in most schemes relate to the number of community, cultural, recreational and sports centres and facilities. A smaller number of schemes go one step further and propose to measure attendance at such centres and the number of trained staff and volunteers working in them.

Only two case study schemes have baseline indicators relating to health. One uses infant mortality rates as an indicator whilst the other selects long term illness, deaths from notifiable diseases, deaths from lung cancer, the coverage of the child health surveillance programme and the uptake of child immunisation as proposed baseline indicators.

Apart from health indicators under this strategic objective it is difficult to identify appropriate indicators for “quality of life” which are different and separate from the indicators proposed under all the other strategic objectives such as education attainment, employment/unemployment, housing, crime, the environment, community facilities and community involvement. We would not propose to weight together these other indicators in order to construct a general quality of life index which could be regarded as an over-elaborate artefact and a potentially misleading statistic unless there is a sound conceptual basis for determining the weights.

SO8 To Harness the Talents and Resources of the Voluntary and Community Sectors.

Schemes selected indicators at various depths of beneficial outcome. Some are content to measure only the number of voluntary sector organisations and community groups of various kinds (e.g. child-care, youth workers, elderly, recreational, cultural sports etc.). Only four schemes go deeper and propose to measure the numbers of residents attending such groups (and in one case the frequency of attendance). Several schemes take the slightly easier route of measuring the full and part time, paid and unpaid jobs associated with the voluntary sector and community groups.

It is worth recalling that when these Round 1 and 2 bids were prepared the emphasis given to community involvement, both in the guidance and elsewhere, was not as strong as it now is for subsequent SRB rounds.

2.3 Overall comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the baselines

The diversity and wide variety of indicators selected means that

- some baseline indicators are superficial and lacking in depth
- that there is insufficient use of key indicators which would enable comparability across areas
- too little thought has been given to the need to compare indicators in the scheme area with their average counterparts in wider areas
- scaling factors and precise definitions of indicators varies widely across bids

Overall, however, there are not all that many major gaps in baseline information which are common to all case studies. There is a significant gap in the economic strategic objective (SO2) for those bids with a strong economic focus (as opposed to education/training/access to jobs focus). Baseline indicators on the stock of firms by size and aggregate employment are candidates for extending the scope of the baseline but data has to be carefully extracted (by ward) from the NOMIS data base which normally involves some charges.

Another gap identified is the degree of resident involvement in the activities of community groups and voluntary organisations.

3. OVERVIEW OF THE BASELINE POSITION IN THE TWENTY CASE STUDY AREAS

A substantial programme of work has been undertaken by the evaluation team to fill the gaps which were identified in each of the twenty case-study baselines. In order to provide some consistent indicators across the 20 case study baselines the evaluation team developed a core of “key indicators” to supplement - where appropriate - the Partnerships’ own baseline. The key indicators were used according to whether a Partnership was active in the relevant strategic objective. They were selected on the basis of the data being available at a low cost and on the basis that it was possible to match them reasonably closely with the Partnership area. The key indicators are:

ECONOMIC

Employment aggregate and/or sectoral	Census of Employment
Numbers of firms aggregate and/or sectoral and by size	Census of Employment
Unemployment claimant definition	Census of Employment

AREA ENVIRONMENT

Area of derelict/vacant land	LA Planning Dept
Area of derelict/vacant commercial buildings	LA Planning Dept

SOCIAL

GCSE passes (5 A-C), (1 A-C), (5 A-G)	Local Education Authority
Reported crimes per 1000 population - total/burglary/theft	Police Authority
Housing tenure	LA Housing Dept
Number of unfit dwellings	LA Housing Dept
Households in receipt of housing benefit	LA Housing Dept/DSS
Long-term unemployed	Census of Employment

In addition, information was also brought together for non-key indicators relating to particular aspects of the regeneration scheme in the area. For example, sector specific employment in West Midlands (engineering), Lancashire Manufacturing and West Cornwall (manufacturing), gross value added in West Cornwall and Lancashire Manufacturing and mortality rates in Bristol and West Cornwall.

This section produces an overview of baseline templates as supplemented by the evaluation team for each of the twenty case study Partnerships and comments on the basic nature of the problem in the area and what has been the focus of the SRB initiative. This section also contains a brief description of the case study areas which are the focus of the SRB Partnership scheme and uses 1991 Census of Population material to highlight some of the socio-economic characteristics of the area concerned. The 1991 Census has been used to allow comparability across the Partnerships. Readers should be aware that the actual baselines made use - where possible - of more up-to-date information.

The Northumbria Community Safety Partnership

Mission

The mission of this Partnership is to encourage and focus the bringing together of organisations and individuals to achieve sustainable local regeneration through increased community safety (through the Community Safety Strategy) and to supplement and expand multi-agency work on drug misuse (through Drugs Accord). Its Strategic Objectives relate to crime, employment and ethnicity.

Background

The Community Safety Strategy and Drugs Accord apply to the whole of Northumbria (the counties of Northumberland and Tyne and Wear) embracing a population of approximately 1.4 million. It received £0.9 million from the SRB Challenge Fund in Round 1. Its first year of operation was 1995/96 and it was programmed to last 2 years. 1996/97 was its final year.

The lead partner was Gateshead MBC. Other partners were Northumbria Police Authority, Newcastle City Council, North Tyneside MBC, Northumberland County Council, South Tyneside MBC, Sunderland City Council and the Northumbria Coalition Against Crime.

Local Characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
1.4m	23	17	99	-	1
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
63	9	21	33	4	8
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
45	35	23	6	7	28

Source: Census of Population 1991

Its economic characteristics are such that unemployment rate at 9% is above the national average of 7.4%. The basis of the Partnership scheme lies in a recognition of the problems posed to the indigenous population and particularly the young from increased crime. A central objective therefore is to improve community safety and thus improve the quality of life of the existing inhabitants of the area, as well as making the area an attractive place for industry to invest in. A specific aspect of the scheme is to increase awareness amongst the young of the problems associated with drug abuse.

Baseline position

In recognition of the focus of the Partnership on reducing crime and improving community safety the key baseline indicators relate to reported crimes in the area, particularly those which were drug related in a recent year (1995). Other non-key indicators reflect the numbers of people benefiting from Community Safety Initiatives in the area and a range of activity indicators including attendance of specific groups at events relating to drug awareness.

The West Midlands Industrial Club

Mission

The mission of this programme was to achieve the attraction, education and training of young people into the engineering and manufacturing industry. Of a total population of about 6.4 million, nearly a quarter are aged 18 or below

and it is this group that is the principal focus of the scheme. As such the Strategic Objectives are focused on education and skills and community involvement.

Background

The West Midlands Industrial Club covers the whole of the West Midlands region. It is a three year programme receiving a total of £400,000 from the SRB Challenge Fund. As a Round 2 scheme it began in 1996/97 and is due to complete in 1998/99.

The programme is led by the West Midlands Industrial Club other partners are the Education Business Partnerships from Warwickshire, Birmingham and Sandwell, Dudley TEC, Hereford and Worcestershire TEC, Walsall TEC, Shropshire TEC and the Stafford Partnership

Local characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
6.1m	23	16	92	2	9
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
68	7	25	21	3	7
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
69	37	25	5	6	25

Source: Census of Population 1991

Evidence collected by the Engineering Employers' Federation, based in Birmingham, suggests that awareness amongst young people across the West Midlands of the opportunities and desirability of a career in engineering is relatively poor. There is thus a problem that local industry continues to experience shortfalls of recruits with the right skills when the local urban economy expands, whilst at the same time young people experience difficulties in obtaining jobs in, and around, the traditional urban core of the West Midlands.

Baseline position

The SRB strategic objectives which are of relevance for the West Midlands Business Club are thus those of SO1b; Employment prospects, education and skills and SO8, Involvement of Local communities and the voluntary sector. Two additional key indicators which provide some indication of the size of the engineering sector in the West Midland are the number of companies and the number of people employed in the sector in the West Midlands region. Thus, at the time of the baseline, there were 294,000 employed in the engineering industry in the West Midlands is some 7674 companies.

A range of other non-key additional activity indicators are used in the baseline. These include the numbers of employers, pupils and community and educational groups participating in the scheme. At the beginning of the programme there were some 5300 pupils participating in the scheme and some 300 employers. It was desirable to gain some feel for the number of apprenticeships likely to be available for young people to enter in the West Midlands in 1995/96 and evidence collected by the Partnership indicated that some 220 companies were looking for about 800 apprenticeships in 1995/96.

The Limes Farm Partnership

Mission

The primary focus of the Limes Farm Partnership is to regenerate the Limes Farm housing estate by; the improvement of public housing, the development of Housing Association housing. In addition it seeks the enhancement of the local physical environment, improvement of community safety, development of a community identity and the provision of training, education and personal development opportunities.

Background

The Limes Farm estate in Chigwell, Essex has a total population of around 2,500 in the District of Epping Forest. The programme will receive £1 million from the SRB Challenge Fund. A Round one scheme it has a three

year duration. It started in April 1995 and completed at the end of March 1998.

The lead partner was Epping Forest District Council. Other partners were Essex County Council, the Metropolitan Police, Limes Farm Residents Association (now Community Association), Essex & Herts NHS Trust the London and Quadrant Housing Trust, Essex Probation Service and Essex TEC.

Local characteristics

Unemployment is a particular problem in the Grange-Hill ward which is the focus of the scheme. In 1991 there were some 15% unemployed compared with an England average of 9%. There are also problems relating to poor quality housing and a considerable amount of concern amongst residents about their safety and the amount of crime in the area. Approximately 8% of the population is Asian.

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
6,100	27	12	90	1	8
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
68	6	37	18	-	4
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
78	36	28	8	5	21

Source: Census of Population 1991

Baseline position

The Partnership scheme is designed to tackle issues which relate to a relatively wide range of objectives. These include improving employment prospects, education and business skills, helping to establish the conditions necessary for sustainable economic growth, improving housing conditions, tackling crime and improving community safety, and also improving the environment and quality of life in the area. Considerable emphasis is placed on involving local communities and the voluntary sector.

The breadth of objectives means that a considerable diversity of indicators are required to summarise the baseline position in the Partnership area. The indicators thus include the two key indicators of numbers claiming unemployment benefit and the number who are long term unemployed. There are also many other indicators which relate to the quality of the local housing stock, aspects of the physical environment and the presence of local community resources (like youth centres). There are also some indicators which describe the level of community involvement.

A number of statistics summarise the quality of the public housing stock. The centre of the estate comprises 443 high density council properties, of these some 275 (62%) were in need of energy efficiency improvements. There were 104 (24%) empty flats/maisonettes and 40 (9%) ground floor dwellings in need of clearance and redevelopment. In addition there was no local estate management and no Housing Association presence.

With respect to the availability of local community facilities at the time of the baseline there was an inadequate local health facility, no youth centre and the area did not have any local community development workers.

A range of qualitative statements are provided to give an indication of the quality of local facilities and the general quality of life experienced by residents. Thus, there is evidence provided from the Local Authority about the existence of indefensible spaces or the presence of underground pedestrian pathways. At the baseline there was no local beat police officer, no traffic calming measures in force or even a pedestrian crossing on busy sections of the local roads.

West Cornwall Initiative

Mission

The mission of the West Cornwall initiative was to help regenerate the corridor of old industrial areas which stretched from Penzance through Hayle, Camborne and Redruth to Falmouth and Penryn by revitalising the town centres and creating new job opportunities throughout West Cornwall.

Background

The target area for the programme is the whole of West Cornwall which comprises the three local authority districts of Carrick, Kerrier and Penwith with a total population of 233,200. Funding from the SRB Challenge Fund amounted to £2.8 million being spread over 4 years. A Round one scheme the programme commenced in 1995 and is due to complete around March 1999.

The lead partner is Kerrier District Council. Other partners are Carrick and Penwith District Councils, Cornwall County Council, Devon & Cornwall

TEC, Business Link, the Rural Development Commission, Cornwall College, West Cornwall Enterprise Trust Ltd, Groundwork Kerrier, West Cornwall LEADER Project, English Partnerships, Business in the Community.

Local characteristics

The three Districts have a population with a high proportion of retirement age and couples with no children. Almost the whole population (99%) is white. Owner occupation in housing is relatively high and unemployment rates and educational achievements are close to or rather better than the national average.

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
229,000	21	20	99	-	-
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
64	8	23	13	1	11
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
74	39	24	4	6	26

Source: Census of Population 1991

Baseline position

This scheme focuses on regenerating the town centre areas of the older (formerly mining) small towns in the three rural West Cornwall Districts of Carrick, Kerrier and Penwith. These towns include Redruth, Camborne,

Hayle and Penzance which increasingly rely on tourism activities for much of their income.

The scheme identifies high priority town centre areas and then clears sites, promotes new development, improves shopping areas and provides some new housing units, often above shops.

The Cambridge evaluation team have reconstructed baseline proposals which are appropriate to the regeneration objectives of the scheme. Indicators reflect both specific and general aspects of rural development. The main indicators are derelict sites, vacant premises, levels of crime, employment, numbers of firms, numbers of tourism visitors, employment in tourism, educational achievements, activity rates and income levels. The base year figures suggest that average income levels across the three Districts are very low - at approximately two-thirds of the average for England as a whole. Consequently income support levels tend to be above the national average.

Brent & Harrow

Mission

The Brent & Harrow Partnership seeks to improve the vitality of the local economy in North West London through improving the quality and growth rates of new businesses, enhancing education business links and enabling the participation of voluntary groups via the development of successful community enterprises.

Background

The area targeted by the Partnership is the London boroughs of Brent and Harrow which comprise a total population of around 451,000. Over the three year programme £1.6 million of SRB Challenge Funds was dedicated to the scheme. The programme began in 1995 during Round one of the Challenge Fund and was completed in March of 1998.

The lead partner was North West London TEC. Other partners were the London Boroughs of Brent and Harrow Councils, Careers Service Partnership, Education Business Partnership, Brent Business Venture, Harrow in Business, Harrow Council for Racial Equality, Midland bank, Princes Youth Trust, Brent Regeneration Agency, Park Royal Partnership and the Brent & Harrow Refugee Community Project.

Local characteristics

The ethnic mix of the area is quite different to that of the national average with two thirds white, nearly one quarter Asian and 11% black.

Unemployment in Brent is unacceptably high and the activities of the Partnership focus heavily on improving the employability of local residents. Thus, according to the baseline information in December/January 1994/5 unemployment in Brent was 16% compared with an English average of 8%. The employability of young people was not enhanced in the light of the Borough's educational achievement. Only 35% of Brent school children achieved 5 or more GCSEs in the range A-C in 1994 compared with the English average of 43%.

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
443,000	23	13	64	11	23
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
67	8	32	14	5	15
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
67	30	23	7	11	27

Source: Census of Population 1991

Baseline position

Besides the evidence on unemployment and school leavers achievement the baseline contains indicators relating to the number of business start-ups and the survival rates of new businesses. Importantly, the baseline records the number of unemployed school leavers. Some limited evidence is recorded on the number of community enterprises holding public sector contracts.

Hangleton and Knoll Project

Mission

The Hangleton and Knoll Project tackles the need for: employment (particularly amongst young people and lone parents); skills and experience enhancement; the diversion of young people from crime, alcohol and substance abuse; activity to diffuse tensions between generations through increased sporting, cultural and health facilities; and the physical regeneration of the environment.

Background

The Hangleton Knoll Project focuses on a relatively small, tightly defined area comprising a population of approximately 8000 people in 3000 households situated in the north of the Borough of Hove. This is a four year scheme that was successful at Round two of the SRB Challenge Fund with a total of £1.6 million SRB funds. It began in 1996 and is due to complete around March 2000.

The lead partner is the Hangleton and Knoll project with Hove Borough Council as the accountable body. Other partners are the Hangleton Community Association, Kick-start Motorbike Project, East Sussex Careers Service, Hangleton & Knoll Community Festival, Sussex Chamber of Commerce and Knoll Community Association.

Local characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
12,789	24	20	98	-	1
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
68	6	27	28	3	4
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
66	40	22	6	7	24

Source: Census of Population 1991

The area suffers from a range of problems which has led to a Partnership activity designed to improve the educational and employment prospects of the local inhabitants, particularly those who are young, or single parents.

The scheme also seeks to tackle crime and improve community safety, protect and improve the environment, improve the quality of life, health and cultural facilities in the area and secure greater and effective involvement of the local community and voluntary sector.

Baseline position

Again given the diversity of objectives, there is a considerable range of baseline indicators. The indicators preferred under education are mainly qualitative in scope. Those relating to employment prospects assess the position in the target area in relation to that of the wider East Sussex average from data supplied by the Careers Service. The indicators on crime and community safety present the volume of crime in the target area as a proportion of the crime in the whole of the Hove area. There are a range of indicators pertaining to the quality of life, health and sporting facilities in the area, together with indicators of the involvement of the local community.

The baseline indicators suggest poor awareness amongst young people in the target area of training opportunities, relatively poor educational attainment, and high drop-out rates in formal training courses. Unemployment amongst certain groups is in double figures. High levels of crime and juvenile delinquency are reported by local residents and represent a major problem.

Bristol 2020

Mission

The mission of this programme is to generate and develop strong, diverse and sustainable communities in the Bristol Crescent where, through the linking of people with opportunities, individuals and employers can prosper in confidence. There is also an emphasis on improving the quality of life for local inhabitants by reducing crime and improving safety and also a focus on

involving local communities and the voluntary sector in the process of local regeneration.

Background

The Bristol 2020 Partnership scheme covers the Bristol Urban Crescent which includes the inner city, Knowle West, Hartcliffe and Withywood, Southmead, Lawrence Weston and Lockleaze. The area has a total population of some 165,000. This is a Round one scheme with a six year duration and a completion date of around March 2001. SRB Challenge Fund spend is at £7.9 million.

The lead partner is Bristol City Council. Other partners are WESTEC, Bristol Chamber of Commerce, Western Development Partnership, Bristol Black Voluntary Sector, Voluntary Sector Standing Conference on Urban Regeneration (VOSCUR) and South West Region TUC.

Local characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
135,000	25	15	92	5	3
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
63	11	16	37	5	7
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
51	31	20	9	9	29

Source: Census of Population 1991

Baseline position

The baseline contains a number of key indicators including the number of pupils obtaining 5 GCSEs, total number of unemployment claimants, number of long term unemployed, numbers of employed and companies in the area and those committing notified crime. Other indicators relate to educational achievement, unemployment amongst ethnic minorities, health measures pertinent to the quality of life in the wards concerned and also the involvement of community groups.

The baseline indicators identify poor educational attainment in local schools, relatively high long-term unemployment in certain areas and high crime rates. All of these problems are being addressed within the Partnership scheme.

The Merseyside Learning Partnership

Mission

The Merseyside Learning Partnership was set up to address a social/educational problem of growing concern which is important for longer term economic and social regeneration - namely disadvantaged, disaffected and underachieving pupils who are excluded from school or at risk of exclusion. The scheme aims to supplement the activities of local educational authorities in attempting to reintegrate already disaffected and excluded 14-16 year olds as well as take more general action in Merseyside schools to prevent younger pupils from becoming disaffected as they progress through secondary school.

Background

The target geographical area is the three metropolitan district areas of Liverpool, Knowsley and Sefton in which 900,000 people live and 140,000 pupils attend primary and secondary schools. This is a Round two scheme spread over five years. It began in 1996 and is due to finish in 2001. A total of £4.4 million is dedicated to the scheme from the SRB Challenge Fund.

Merseyside TEC is the lead partner. Other partners are the Local Education Authorities for Knowsley, Liverpool and Sefton, Cities in Schools (UK), The Prince's Trust, Liverpool City Challenge, Bootle Maritime City Challenge, Liverpool - City of Learning, Healthy Cities and the Merseyside Council for Voluntary Service.

Some 2600 of pupils (2%) are from ethnic minority groups. Liverpool and Knowsley in particular experience severe economic problems with activity rates 14 percentage points below the England average and levels of income

support twice the England average accompanied by generally high rates of claimant unemployment and long term unemployment.

Local characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
900,000 ²	25	14	98	-	1
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
51	18	16	53	3	4
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
40	28	20	9	10	30

Source: Census of Population 1991

Baseline position

The baseline indicators selected for this scheme reflect closely the highly thematic nature of the scheme being directed at “difficult” pupils with very low educational achievements. The main indicators are unauthorised absences from schools, pupils excluded from school, year 11 pupils entering further education and young people entering unemployment. Two more general indicators are also included, namely, achievements in GCSEs for all pupils and claimant unemployment rates.

The base year figures for these indicators reveal an disappointing situation, even for the average of the three large LEAs. The Knowsley LEA has a particularly serious problem of disaffected and underachieving pupils and some individual schools are much worse than the LEA average. In Knowsley educational attainment is less than half the England average and unauthorised absences and exclusions from school are more than twice the England average. The number of school children obtaining 5 or more GCSEs at grades A-C in 1994 in the bid area was 31% compared with an English average in that year of 43% and the percentage of young people entering unemployment at 16 was 16% in the bid area compared to 8% in England. Generally the

2

The rest of this template refers to one ward in the target area; namely Gilmoor

picture on Merseyside continues to be one of low educational standards, low skills and high unemployment leading to inter-generational social and economic disaffection with detrimental consequences for regeneration.

Chalkhill Estate Partnership

Mission

The Chalkhill Estate Partnership mission is to use the regeneration process as the means for improving the skill base and wealth earning capacity of Chalkhill residents. It also seeks to ensure a focus on external labour markets and contract opportunities as well as on internal estate-based opportunities. Its Strategic Objective is employment.

Background

The Chalkhill Estate Partnership has as its primary focus the Chalkhill housing estate in the ward of St Andrew in the borough of Brent, although the benefits will also be felt by residents in the rest of the St Andrew's ward and the neighbouring St Raphael's ward. Total population in Chalkhill is around 6,200. It is a five year programme which started during Round one in 1995 and is due for completion in 2000. Total SRB expenditure on the scheme is £3.3 million.

The lead partner is New Horizons (Brent) Ltd. Other partners are the Brent Regeneration Agency, Wimpey Homes and the Metropolitan Housing Trust.

Local characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
6,172	27	11	45	30	22
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
54	14	31	59	2	8
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult

32	14	20	15	15	34
----	----	----	----	----	----

Source: Census of Population 1991

Chalkhill has a population of about 6,200, with families with children comprising some 35% of households. Less than half of the population are white, while nearly a third are black and over a fifth are Asian. Unemployment is relatively high and owner occupation is low, over sixty percent are social housing tenants.

Baseline position

The activities of the Partnership are concentrated on improving the skill base of residents in the Chalkhill area and thus enhancing their employability. The baseline indicators focus on a range of key indicators including the aggregate number of people employed, the aggregate number of companies, and the number unemployed. The very severe impact of high unemployment in the area is illustrated by an unemployment rate in Chalkhill of 27% compared with an English average in 1994 of 8%. These key statistics are augmented by other labour market indicators detailing employment in the construction industry and the number of those unemployed in the area who have construction relevant skills. This was to capture the impact of the substantial house building/ improvement components of the SRB regeneration scheme on local residents..

The Lancashire Manufacturing Partnership

Mission

The Lancashire Manufacturing Partnership aims to improve the competitiveness and performance of the manufacturing sector in the administrative county area of Lancashire through its strategically targeted programme of integrated support for the manufacturing sector. Its Strategic Objectives are economic and employment.

Background

The scheme is focused on the manufacturing sector of the whole of Lancashire which covers a population of 1.4 million. This includes the

coastal area of West Lancashire containing towns such as Morecambe, Lancaster, Blackpool and Preston and the former traditional textile area of East Lancashire containing towns such as Blackburn, Burnley, Accrington, Nelson and Colne and Rossendale. It is a five year programme which started in Round one in 1995 and is due to complete in 2000. SRB Challenge Fund spend is £8.7 million.

The Lancashire Manufacturing Partnership is the lead partner. There are only three other partners, Lancashire Enterprises, Lancashire Area West TEC and East Lancashire TEC.

Local characteristics

The population of the whole county is 1.4 million of which about 62,000 (4.4%) are from mainly Asian ethnic minority groups who originally were employed in the textile mills of the East Lancashire towns. Part of the scheme is devoted to assisting Asian communities in starting up new businesses and expanding existing enterprises. Taken as a whole the target area is not markedly disadvantaged economically or socially relative to the English average.

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
1.4m	23	17	96	-	4
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
69	6	26	13	2	8
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
76	37	24	5	6	27

Source: Census of Population 1991

Baseline position

The textile and engineering (including defence) industries of Lancashire have been in steady persistent decline for over four decades and major restructuring of economic activities continues to take place. The labour force has relevant manufacturing skills and is adaptable. Even so the area still has an above average proportion of its labour force employed in manufacturing

activities. The SRB scheme therefore aims to slow down, halt and hopefully reverse the strong and persistent trends of manufacturing decline with a wide range of business support and training initiatives designed to improve the competitiveness and performance of small and larger manufacturers and to raise the rate at which new enterprises are being started up.

The baseline indicators selected for this scheme closely reflect the thematic manufacturing support objectives of the Partnership. The selected indicators attempt to measure employment, value added (net output), productivity and investment for the manufacturing sector as well as the size structure of manufacturing businesses, the business start-up rate and business failure rate. In the base year all these indicators suggest a below England average performance for the manufacturing sector in Lancashire. We have also included in the baseline the achievement of school leavers (similar to the England average in the base year), claimant unemployment rates (slightly better than the England average in the base year) and overall Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita (well below the England average in the base year). The data for the baseline indicators is taken from the Census of Production, the Census of Employment, the VAT register and from the two Training and Enterprise Councils. Overall, the baseline proposals for this scheme are relevant, appropriate and reasonably comprehensive - and should be capable of being updated when the scheme ends in three years time.

Canalside Rochdale

Mission

The regeneration of the Canalside area of Rochdale is the mission for this programme. This is to be achieved through the physical renewal of land and premises, by stimulating and supporting local businesses, by helping local people get appropriate training to help them get the jobs created, by renewing poor condition housing and by helping local residents and business people to build a safer community.

Background

Canalside is an area to the south of the town centre covering 215 hectares with a population of over 11,000. The wider population of Rochdale with a population of 35,000, however, will also benefit from aspects of the programme. This is a five year scheme which commenced in 1995 and is due to complete in 2000. It has £10.5 million from the SRB Challenge Fund.

There are five members of the Rochdale Partnership. Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council (who are the Accountable Body), Rochdale Development Agency, Rochdale TEC, Rochdale Chamber of Commerce and the Rochdale Voluntary Sector Forum.

Local characteristics

The core area has a significant Asian minority population which make up a quarter of the population.

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
14,281	30	14	76	1	23
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
57	12	11	22	10	7
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
62	30	24	9	5	31

Source: Census of Population 1991

Baseline position

There are a range of baseline key indicators including numbers of male and females unemployed, vacant industrial and derelict land, housing tenure and a range of crime indicators. Unemployment in this area is relatively high and incomes are low. The male unemployment rate in 1995 was 21% compared with the English average of 12%. Female unemployment rate was 14% compared with an English average of 5%.

A relatively high proportion of dwellings lack adequate basic amenities. Thus, some 20% of the dwellings in the area lacked central heating (compared with a Borough average of 16%).

Other indicators include information on the number of ethnic minorities involved in vocational training and participating in other forms of labour market training. The baseline also contains indicators relating to the number of companies gaining business support. Indicators have also been added in order to provide evidence on dwellings adjacent to poor quality sites and the state of roadway infrastructure.

Regenerating Wolverhampton

Mission

This is a multi-objective scheme with a mission to regenerate Wolverhampton as a competitive economy with a first class workforce, a sustainable city providing access to a range of land and property and a harmonious community.

Background

The Partnership scheme covers the borough of Wolverhampton which is one of the most relatively deprived urban areas in the West Midlands. It has a population of over 242,000. It is a Round one scheme with a five year duration, due to finish in 2000. £16.5 million of the SRB Challenge Fund has been assigned to the scheme.

The Partnership is led by Wolverhampton Metropolitan Borough Council. Other partners are; Wolverhampton TEC, Wolverhampton Chamber of Commerce, Wolverhampton Voluntary Sector Council, West Midlands Police, Wolverhampton Health Executive, Black Country Development Corporation, Wolverhampton Race Equality Council and the Wolverhampton and District Trades Council.

Local characteristics

One in five of the population are non white, with the majority of these being Asian. Unemployment and social deprivation is high, particularly amongst ethnic groups and the physical environment still suffers from the legacy of the area being near to the centre of the industrial revolution. Owner occupation is relatively low and a high proportion of the households in Wolverhampton live in council houses. The condition of the housing stock is very mixed, with some very poor housing indeed.

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
242,000	24	16	81	5	13
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
62	11	20	34	3	6
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple depts	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
58	35	24	6	7	26

Source: Census of Population 1991

Baseline position

Against this background the Wolverhampton SRB Partnership is seeking to regenerate Wolverhampton and make it an attractive environment for people to live in and to encourage private sector investment. The scheme emphasises the achievement of sustainable outcomes and an approach to economic regeneration which involves all local stake-holders including the community and voluntary sector.

As might be expected, the baseline template covers a very large range of indicators. Key indicators include the numbers unemployed, and the amount of vacant commercial floorspace. The unemployment position is really very severe at the baseline with some 15000 unemployed in the Travel To Work Area representing an unemployment rate of 14.% compared with the national average of around 8%. Around 9000 had been unemployed for 6 months or more giving a figure 60% for long term unemployment as a % of all unemployed, compared with 56% nationally.

Non key indicators cover the educational and skill characteristics of ethnic minorities, number of engineering companies in Wolverhampton, key characteristics of the housing stock, several crime statistics, as well as information on the quality of life and level of community involvement in the area.

Overall, the indicators point to high levels of unemployment, poor educational prospects, particularly amongst the ethnic communities, and poor housing with high levels of social deprivation.

Swadlincote Woodlands

Mission

This is a multi-objective scheme which seeks to enhance employment prospects and education skills, encourage sustainable economic growth and wealth creation, protect and improve local environment and infrastructure, improve housing and housing conditions, tackle crime and improve community safety and enhance quality of life of local people of Swadlincote.

Background

Swadlincote Woodlands is a regeneration Partnership focused on an area of approximately 32000 population located at the administrative district of South Derbyshire located at the heart of the National Forest in the District of South Derbyshire. It is a second Round scheme of six years duration, due to complete in 2002 with a total of £3.4 million of the SRB Challenge Fund.

South Derbyshire District Council are the lead partners. The other partners are Business Link Southern Derbyshire, Derby and Derbyshire Business Venture, Derbyshire County Council, Gresley Investments Ltd, National Forest Company, South Derbyshire Chamber of Commerce and the Swadlincote and South Derbyshire Chamber of Trade, Commerce and Industry.

Local characteristics

The area has a very low proportion of residents from ethnic minority communities and while unemployment is below the national average in terms of the South Derbyshire District as a whole, 54% of unemployment fell within the Swadlincote area in 1995. In addition 85% of all derelict land for the District was in the target area. The Partnership scheme embraces a wide range of activities designed to achieve objectives relating to education and skill training, business support, improving housing quality, the state of the physical environment, and tackling crime and improving community safety.

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
31,977	24	15	99	-	-
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
69	6	18	21	1	6
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
73	41	28	5	5	22

Source: Census of Population 1991

Baseline position

The baseline indicators are extensive, covering the level of training courses provided in the area and indicating the paucity of an adequate level of provision. The aggregate level of employment, number of companies in the area and the level of unemployment are all given, together with an assessment of the amount of vacant floorspace. A range of indicators are used to describe the quality of the housing stock, including evidence to show a high level of dwellings regarded as unfit for human habitation. A relatively high level of owner occupation is revealed. Crime statistics are provided to reflect the high incidence of burglary and low level of community involvement in crime prevention schemes. Specific indicators focus on the amount of land available for amenity. Other indicators concentrate on numbers in receipt of housing benefit, and the amount of community involvement.

South Leytonstone Partnership

Mission

The mission of this programme is to transform South Leytonstone from an area with high levels of unemployment, crime and poor housing conditions, into one in which people are proud to live and work. While the focus is on housing other strategic objectives are employment, economic, crime and quality of life.

Background

The South Leytonstone Partnership scheme is focused on a relatively small area containing a population of approximately 22,000 people with a relatively high concentration of ethnic groups. It is a seven year bid which began in 1996 and is not due to complete until 2003. It has £10 million of the SRB Challenge Fund.

It is led by the Stratford Development Partnership. The other partners are; Waltham Forest Council, Waltham Forest Housing Action Trust, East Thames Housing Group, Holy Trinity Church, Avenue Steering Group, Newham Chamber of Commerce, Stratford Community Forum, Newham Council, Harry Cohen MP, Metropolitan Police Service, LETEC, Cathall Road Steering Group, Waltham Forest Chamber of Commerce, Stratford Business Forum and Bovis Construction Ltd.

Local characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
22,000	27	12	61	21	16
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
60	12	17	36	6	12
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
46	23	18	12	12	34

Source: Census of Population 1991

60 % of the population are white, 20% black and 16% Asian. Over one in three families are lone parents. Owner occupation is relatively low (below 50%) and there is a significant private rented sector. The area has an unemployment rate above the national average with a large concentration of long term unemployment particularly amongst the ethnic groups.

Baseline position

Again, the wide range of social, economic and physical infrastructure problems in the area is reflected in the strategic orientation of the scheme with a focus on improving employment prospects, creating the conditions for sustainable economic growth and a vibrant business sector, and improving the quality of the housing stock in the local area. There is also emphasis on reducing crime and improving safety.

The baseline indicators reflect the diversity of the problems in the area and contains a number of key indicators. The high unemployment in the area is reflected in the overall unemployment rate in the Cann Hall and Cathall wards of over 18%. Unemployment amongst the young is very high indeed. The relatively poor quality of some of the housing stock is reflected in the number of dwellings in the area in need of improvement. A further key indicator is the number of reported crimes in the target area. Other non key indicators encompass the value of development land and the number of health and sports facilities in the area.

Regenerating Central Brighton

Mission

The mission is to regenerate Central Brighton through a number of interrelated projects falling within the four themes of cultural industries, Regency Revival, the Phoenix Brewery and small business development. The bid is focused on all the SRB Strategic Objectives.

Background

The central Brighton area incorporates the historic and commercial heart of Brighton comprises all of the Regency ward and part of the Seven Dials and St Peters wards with a population of around 17,000 and covering an area of 216 hectares. It is a Round two scheme due to finish in 2001 with £10.1 million from the SRB Challenge Fund.

Brighton & Hove Council is the lead partner. Other partners are Sussex Enterprise, East Sussex County Council, East Sussex, Brighton & Hove Health Authority, PACT Community Projects, Brighton & Hove Economic Development Company, Brighton Consortium of Housing Associations, Brighton Festival and the Regency Area Trader & Community Associations.

Local characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
16,800	12	16	95	1	3
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
67	11	32	5	3	35
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
58	27	10	4	15	43

Source: Census of Population 1991

Single adult households predominate though they have a low proportion of residents from ethnic community groups. In recognition of the relatively poor job prospects in the area particularly for the under 25's, long term unemployed and black and other ethnic minority groups (including Sudanese refugees) the Partnership scheme concentrates on improving employment prospects and the human resource base of the area. There is an emphasis on creating sustainable growth but also improving the quality of local housing and tackling crime. Despite the low proportion of ethnic minority groups within the area, such groups suffer poor access to the local labour market, in consequence there is specific scheme action to address this. The scheme is also concentrating on improving the local physical environment and promoting the cultural and tourist attraction of the Central Brighton area.

Baseline position

The baseline contains a number of key and non-key indicators. The relatively high levels of unemployment in the area is reflected in the number of claimants. Unemployment in certain groups is three times the national average and long term unemployment is a particular problem with ethnic minority groups finding it particularly difficult to get work. Inactivity amongst the young is high with an inactivity rate of 33% for those below 25 compared with the East Sussex average of 14%. The evidence on business formation suggests a relatively low rate of formation compared to the South East average.

A considerable range of housing indicators are used including numbers on Council waiting lists, number of overcrowded households. The key indicator relating to housing tenure indicates that owner occupation is relatively low and private renting relatively high. Numbers in receipt of housing benefit is particularly high.

The key indicator relating to the number of dwellings in need of improvement suggests that four times the national average of the dwellings lack basic amenities. There are a range of qualitative statements relating to the extent to which ethnic minority groups are able to gain access to local services. A range of key and non-key indicators are used to describe the level of crime in the area and particular emphasis is given to the high level of domestic crime. Considerable effort has been devoted to including indicators relating to the quality of the environment, quality of life and the involvement of the community sector.

The City of Sunderland Partnership

Mission

This scheme focuses on target areas of the City: to promote sustainable economic growth, secure improved access to education, training and employment, improve environment and infrastructure, tackle crime and community safety, improve housing quality and choice, promote initiatives of benefit to ethnic minorities and enhance quality of life communities.

Background

The City of Sunderland Partnership area focuses on three specific areas; Sunderland City Centre, Houghton-Hetton coalfield communities and the Hendon-East Maritime Zone. This area embraces a relatively large area of some 55,000 people. It is a Round one scheme of long duration covering seven years completing in 2002 and has £10.9 million of SRB Challenge Fund.

The lead partner if the City of Sunderland Partnership, partners are the City of Sunderland Form, City of Sunderland TEC, Tyne & Wear Development Corporation, the University of Sunderland, City of Sunderland Business Forum and North East Chamber of Commerce, Trade & Industry.

Local characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
55,403	22	17	99	-	1
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
58	10	18	37	5	5
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
53	36	24	6	6	28

Source: Census of Population 1991

The area covers parts of the North East which have experienced significant structural change which has led to the collapse of some local industries with coal mining being the obvious example. The consequence of this has been that there has been very high levels of unemployment amongst relatively tightly defined communities and the new jobs and opportunities which have been created in recent years have largely passed the individuals and families concerned by. There are pockets of poor quality housing and environmental degradation and in some areas high levels of social deprivation. Tackling crime and improving community safety retain a high priority.

Baseline position

In recognition of the problems which have been identified the scheme places emphasis on improving local infrastructure and the environment, improving housing quality and choice, improving access to education and promoting sustainable growth. The base line contains a range of indicators on educational achievement and these show a relatively low level of current attainment in the target areas. Employment prospects are currently bleak and the unemployment indicators adopted show this most clearly. Key indicators are adopted to reflect the number of companies in the target areas and evidence is also gathered referring to the survival rate of new businesses after 18 months.

Evidence on housing points to the extremely high level of council tenancy in the Easington area and other evidence is presented which reflects the quality of the built environment. A number of quantitative measures are adopted to provide insight into the very high level of crime in some of the target areas. Quality of life indicators reveal a number of health problems in specific parts. Evidence is also given on local community involvement. Educational attainment is poor with only 32% of school leavers gaining five or more GCSEs at Grades A-C compared with an average of 43% in England at the baseline.

Hull CityVision

Mission

The mission at Hull CityVision is to create a new Gipsyville (estate), to provide a strategic framework for the regeneration of the area and to establish more pride and prosperity through a targeted integrated package of measures to physically improve the estate, create jobs, increase training opportunities and enhance the quality of life.

Background

The Gipsyville Estate has an estimated population of around 4,330 and lies in the West of the City straddling part of the wards of Pickering and Newington.

It is an interwar estate requiring significant renovation and has been designated a Regeneration Priority Area within the City Plan. It is a Round two scheme which has £11.7 million from the SRB Challenge Fund. It began in 1996 and is due to finish in 2001.

Hull CityVision Ltd is the lead partner. Other partners are Gipsyville Action Centre Steering Group, Francis Askew School, Humberside TEC, Hull & Holderness NHS Trust/East Riding Health Authority, Keepmoat Holdings plc, Hull City Council and the University of Hull.

Local characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
36,800	27	18	99	-	1
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
49	17	11	68	3	3
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
27	37	22	7	12	29

Source: Census of Population 1991

The problems facing the Hull CityVision Partnership are formidable. Hull itself stands out in terms of both high rates of unemployment and publicly rented housing tenure. The area has a very low proportion of residents from ethnic minority groups with unemployment at over 17% and most households living in local authority housing. The work of the Partnership is focused specifically on the Gipsyville Estate (population of approximately 4330) which lies in the west of the city across the wards of Pickering and Newington. The estate dates from after the second world war and is a “Regeneration Priority Area” within the City Plan. In recognition of considerable problems facing the area the work of the regeneration Partnership seeks to improve employability, tackle the poor quality of the physical environment including the housing stock, and improve community safety and reduce crime.

Baseline position

The baseline is calibrated such that it focuses on education, skills and employment prospects by school; and reveals very poor achievement in some cases. Unemployment is identified as being very high indeed in Gipsyville and Hull itself. Thus, unemployment in Gipsyville is estimated to be 27% at the baseline compared with 8% nationally (May 1995). Evidence on the poor quality of the housing stock is revealed through a number of key and non-key indicators, with very low levels of owner occupation. Crime statistics reflect the incidence of crime per 1000 population and it is insightful that some 70% of the residents in the Gipsyville area feel unsafe. The quality of life indicators portray a very poor level of health and general well being and quality of life. Educational attainment is also very poor with the percentage of local school leavers attaining 5 GCSEs at A-C being 6-13% in local schools compared with 43% nationally and a Hull average of 21%.

Nottingham - capturing the dynamics

Mission

This multi-objective scheme focuses on the regeneration of three inter-linked disadvantaged communities in the City of Nottingham. The aim is to the physical, social and economic regeneration of the areas.

Background

The three areas in the scheme are the Broxtowe housing estate, the Bestwood housing estate and the Urban Initiative Area which comprises Radford, Hyson Green and Forest Fields. It is a six year programme which began in 1996 during the second Round of SRB and has £13.2 million of SRB funds.

Nottingham City Council is the lead partner. The other partners are the Greater Nottingham TEC/Business Link, Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottingham Development Enterprise, the Voluntary Sector Urban Regeneration Forum and the Nottingham Colleges Partnership.

Local characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
32,246	28	12	80	8	11
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
48	19	8	40	10	18
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
32	23	20	13	10	33

Source: Census of Population 1991

Approximately 80% of the population is white, with Asian residents the largest minority, followed by black residents. The areas concerned are traditional deprived urban areas. The Partnership scheme seeks to increase the employability of local people, give support to local business, promote initiatives to benefit local ethnic communities, involve local communities, tackle crime and improve the quality of local community facilities.

Baseline position

The baseline focuses heavily on educational and skill achievement and reveals relatively low levels of individuals staying-on in education after 16. Further indicators cover a number of aspects of the training received by the young. Relatively high levels of unemployment are revealed in the target areas. Key indicators focus on the number of businesses in the business support areas of the scheme.

Other baseline indicators cover the number of households receiving housing benefit and this is revealed to be very high in the target areas. Considerable emphasis is given to assessing the ethnic characteristics of the population and the degree to which local residents feel that they have an influence in shaping their local environment. Other indicators measure the incidence of crime and what local residents feel would improve the quality of life in the local area.

Greenwich-Woolwich Revival

Mission

The aim of the scheme is to regenerate Woolwich by: the regeneration of Woolwich Arsenal and its integration with Woolwich Centre, the stimulation of new business and manufacturing jobs, thriving commercial and retail centre, improvements to housing, long-term consolidation of University of Greenwich, community, health and security development, school improvement/language support, and the enhancement of quality of life for Woolwich residents.

Background

The area comprises the four wards of St Marys, Arsenal, Glyndon and Lakedale in the London Borough of Greenwich with a population of over 24,000 people. It is a Round one scheme of seven years duration with £24.9 million of SRB monies. It is due to complete in 2002.

The programme is managed by the Woolwich Development Agency. The partners are the London Borough of Greenwich, Greenwich Waterfront Business Forum, Greenwich Waterfront Community Forum, the University of Greenwich, the Greenwich Council for Racial Equality and the Bexley and Greenwich Health Authority.

Local characteristics

Over three quarters of the population is white with Asian residents accounting for a further 13% and black residents 8%. Unemployment at over 20% in the base year is very high. The majority of residents are council tenants, with only just over a third of residents being owner occupiers. The scheme seeks to improve employability, the quality of the local physical environment including housing, provide business support, tackle crime and improve community safety, involve the local community and stimulate the provision of benefits to the local ethnic community.

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
24,600	28	12	77	8	13

Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
59	21	17	54	4	10
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
35	21	22	12	11	34

Source: Census of Population 1991

Baseline position

The Woolwich baseline indicators reflect the problems which the scheme seeks to address. There is a comprehensive overview of the unemployed detailed by ethnic group, which describes the severe labour market problems which exist. Long term unemployment is a particular problem. Educational attainment is weak as indicated by the percentage of students obtaining 5 GCSE's. The attainment figures are compared and contrasted with Greenwich overall and England.

Further evidence is given in the baseline relating to floorspace vacancies, together with a considerable body of evidence concerning the poor quality of dwellings on the Cardwell estate. Other evidence is given to describe the level of access by ethnic groups to schooling.

Information is given on the degree to which residents feel threatened by crime and a worryingly high percentage of women feel afraid in Woolwich Town Centre. Key indicators are provided about crime. In 1993 some 51% of local female residents felt threatened by crime compared with a national comparator of 39%. Some consideration is also given to the quality of the physical environment and the degree of involvement of the community sector.

Royds Bradford

Mission

The mission is to regenerate the Royds area by; encouraging refurbishment of public sector housing, building new homes for rent and sale, regeneration the

environment, creating new jobs and improving training infrastructure, improving educational attainment and social provision and building the capacity of local people to create sustained and sustainable regeneration in the area.

Background

The focus is the Royds area of Bradford, which is a complex of three housing estates (Buttershaw, Woodside and Delf Hill) located on the south periphery of the main urban area of the District of Bradford with a population of around 12,000. It is a seven year scheme which began in 1995 and will continue until 2002. It has £31 million of SRB Challenge Fund monies.

It is led by the Royds Community Association with other partners; Bradford Metropolitan District Council, Bradford TEC, Keepmoat Construction, Brunel Family Housing Association, Bradford College, Council of Churches and Haslam Homes.

Local characteristics

Population:			Ethnicity:		
Total	% <18	% >65	% white	% black	% Asian
12,491	31	12	97	1	1
Employment %			Tenure %		
FT + PT	Unemployed	SEG 1-4	Rented LA	Rented HA	Private
59	13	13	44	3	7
Tenure %	Household Structure %				
Owner occ	Couple n/d	Couple deps	Lone parent	Large adult	Single adult
46	28	23	18	7	24

Source: Census of Population 1991

The area is perhaps atypical of Bradford in having a very small Asian and black population. Unemployment is above the national average, owner occupation is low and some 44% of households are council tenants.

Baseline position

The scheme concentrates heavily on refurbishing public sector housing, building new homes for rent and sale, improving the broader physical environment, improving employability, helping local business and involving the community.

The baseline focuses on the percentage of school leavers which are placed into jobs and their educational attainment, which is below average with 17% of school leavers achieving GCSE Grade A-C compared with 43% in England. Male unemployment on the estates concerned is a particular problem with an estimated unemployment rate of 28% compared with an English average of 10% at the time of the baseline. There is a high incidence of long term unemployment with over 50% of the males in this position. Most of the houses in the area are council houses and most do not have central heating. Evidence on the number of burglaries and related crimes is provided. The level of community facilities and the involvement of the community sector is also assessed and found to be relatively limited at present.

4. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL EVALUATION OF THE SRB

This paper has been concerned with the baseline indicators for the 20 case studies which form the core of the SRB evaluation and presents the benchmark position for each of the case studies. It has considered the position of the baselines as they currently stand in the 20 case study Partnerships and how they might be supplemented. The overall national evaluation will also have the benefit of a series of residents' surveys in seven of these case study areas.

4.1 Assessment of original baseline proposals in the twenty case study Partnerships

Our assessment of the original baseline proposals in the 20 case studies and the identification of deficiencies and gaps are discussed in section 2. We concluded that about one third of case studies had followed good baseline practice and had formulated proposals of good quality which could not be significantly improved upon, given the constraints of data availability. At the other extreme a third of case studies had suggested baseline proposals which were poor in design and concept and weak in progress on measurement or both. The remaining third of the case studies were in between these two extremes displaying some good features but also showing some weaknesses and significant gaps remaining to be filled.

The assessment therefore concluded that the quality of the baseline proposals was extremely variable - a mixture of good and bad practice. Our discussions with Government Regional Offices further suggest that our findings on the 20 case studies are not out of line with the position on the 400 Round 1 and Round 2 schemes as a whole.

The main common deficiencies and gaps in case study baseline proposals were:-

- baseline proposals relating to two specific strategic objectives were generally weak - notably SO2 "Sustainable economic growth, wealth creation, competitiveness and business support" and SO4 "Initiatives of

benefit to ethnic communities”. The absence of appropriate data at the local area level accounts for much of the deficiency and is therefore outside the control of the Partnership. However, some of the case study schemes could have been more imaginative in the use of local survey data and local breakdown of national survey sources.

- an important gap was the failure, under SO1 and SO2, to make more use of Census of Employment data on numbers of firms by size and total and sectoral employment from the NOMIS database.
- there was too little awareness of the need to compare the baseline position of the target local area with wider city, regional or national averages - as a base year indicator of the relative needs of the area at the outset and a means of subsequently tracking local progress in relation to future changes in wider comparator areas.
- wider use of scaling factors (expressing indicators scaled by population) would have improved consistency and comparability across SRB scheme
- insufficient use was made of a small number of key indicators which are potentially measurable for all local areas on a consistent basis
- some Partnerships fall into the trap of devising baselines of excessive detail and complexity without considering whether they would be capable of being updated at the end of the scheme
- some case studies had devised baseline indicators but not attempted to measure them for the base year even though the scheme had been running for a year or more.
- some weaker Partnerships had used gross outputs measures as baseline indicators.

4.2 What the evaluation team have done to improve baseline data collecting, what gaps still exist & implications for future evaluation

We devised a short list of key indicators which we considered should be included in the baseline indicators of all case study schemes which were actively promoting regeneration under the appropriate strategic objective. In proposing this course of action we are arguing that schemes should be encouraged to use a list of key indicators as and when they are carrying out regeneration programmes which should impact on changes in one or more key indicators.

Throughout the baseline work much has been guided by the “hands-off” spirit of the SRB Challenge Fund initiative in which local Partnerships take the lead in designing and executing local regeneration schemes. Hence we favour the encouragement of the use of key relevant indicators rather than imposing a compulsory set of core indicators to be used by all schemes, irrespective of the type of regeneration scheme being undertaken. For the same reason we have not taken out of case study baseline proposals detailed local indicators which could only be measured for that area and which some might regard as a little eccentric or unusual

The end result for the case study baselines remains one of considerable variety in baseline indicators but to a large extent this variety reflects wide variations in types of regeneration activities being carried out by case study Partnerships and also the wide variation in sizes and types of scheme target areas and in the availability of local data. Nonetheless the baseline proposals, as supplemented by the evaluation team, show greater resort to key indicators and more consistency and comparability in design, concept and measurement, as well as the quantification of indicators for the base year.

4.3 Lessons and recommendations for SRB schemes as a whole

There is a good case for using the lessons which have been learned from the 20 case studies to see what can be done to improve the baseline work of SRB Partnerships as a whole, since GORs consider that the case studies were not untypical of the totality of SRB schemes. Amongst options for communicating lessons the evaluation team consider that the best way forward would be to amend the central guidance notes which are circulated to all Partnerships in such a way as to spread good baseline practice more widely³.

Any strengthening of central guidance on the construction and measurement of the baseline need not be lengthy, detailed or very prescriptive. The aim would be to guide the weaker applicants without forcing compulsion on the stronger applicants thus allowing the latter to operate in a flexible way to

³ DETR has published good practice guidance by the Roger Tyms Partnership entitled “Local Evaluation for Regeneration Partnerships: Good Practice Guidance”

devise a baseline which is both appropriate to the local target area and to the objectives of the particular scheme. In the past weaker applicants have spent a lot of time and effort on the baseline which has not been fruitful. Further guidance would save them time and effort whilst improving the quality of the end result.

Our thoughts on the content of any new guidance are

- a short list of key indicators for the various SRB objectives, as presented above, which bidders should be encouraged to adopt when their scheme is active with respect to that objective
- a common set of definitions/scaling factors for the key indicators, including local sources of data
- a comment on the need for Partnership to measure the baseline in the base year and to update it subsequently
- a paragraph of brief text on the conceptual basis of the baseline (and how it differs from scheme gross outputs) and what the purpose and uses of baseline work are.

In the longer term we believe that consideration should be given to developing a local area database with national coverage for the key indicators discussed in this report (eg housing tenure, housing condition, crime, benefit dependency etc) on the lines of what currently exists for labour market statistics for the NOMIS database⁴. This would allow local Partnerships in conjunction with other agencies and other organisations to prepare consistent baselines and needs assessments at the local/regional level in an efficient manner

4

This is being taken forward by the Social Exclusion Unit Policy Action Team 18 on “Better Information”. DETR are also exploring how small area data might be improved through the review of the Index of Local Deprivation and the possibility of developing a database of key statistics on deprivation.

The fieldwork indicated that about a third of Partnerships did not have a good understanding of what the baseline was, or what it was for, and had spent time and effort trying to devise a baseline for their scheme to not very good effect. Central guidance could be revised to help these weaker Partnerships without in any way constraining other Partnerships in designing a baseline tailored to their particular schemes.

A1 **Lessons from City Challenge baseline studies.**

A study by Russell and Garside in June 1994⁽¹⁾ examined the baseline work which had been undertaken in 31 City Challenge Partnerships. They found that 11 Partnerships had no baseline data or analysis at all. The other 20 Partnerships had commissioned baseline studies to be undertaken by consultants. An examination of the 20 baseline studies led to the following conclusions of relevance to SRB:-

- there was heavy reliance on 1991 Census of Population data which could not be updated at the end of the initiative without substantial local survey work which is expensive and which only a minority of Partnerships undertook
- there were considerable and often unresolved problems or area mismatch in that the area for which data could be obtained did not match the designated City Challenge area
- amongst the core impact indicators suggested by DOE guidance at that time the 20 Partnerships varied widely in the coverage of indicators used and consistency in the way in which they were measured. Coverage and consistency levels achieved were high for unemployment, employment, GCSE passes and owner occupation, substantially lower for crime, and unfit dwellings and very low for income support, derelict and vacant land and buildings and, as could be expected, for the “confidence” indicator.
- there was little consistency across Partnerships in the choice of non-core baseline indicators, or how precisely they were measured.

In considering the nature and scope of baseline work for SRB it is important to make use of any lessons from the City Challenge programme, since SRB shares many of its principal features. In particular the idea of a reasonably small number of core baseline indicators is attractive in that it facilitates

(1) Monitoring and evaluation Issues: Interim Report Hilary Russell and Peter Garside, European Institute for Urban Russell and Peter Garside, European Institute for Urban Affairs, Liverpool John Moores University, June 1994.

consistency in the choice of indicators and how they should be measured across scheme areas, thus enabling baseline comparisons to be made through time across geographical areas.

The City Challenge Initiative increasingly focused on ten key core baseline indicators:-

1. Numbers unemployed - total/male/female/long-term/youth
2. Employment - full time/part time/structure
3. Heads of household in receipt of income support or housing benefit
4. GCSE passes A-C - numbers passing 5 or more and zero
5. Housing tenure
6. Number of unfit dwellings
7. Area of derelict/vacant land
8. Area of derelict/vacant buildings
9. Reported crimes per 1000 population - burglary/theft of and from cars
10. Confidence/perception/image/quality of life - local survey of attitudes

All these are worthy of consideration in the SRB context and some are currently being used in SRB schemes. They feature larger in our own suggested list of key baseline indicators.

In the course of their assessment of the City Challenge baseline work Russell and Garside suggested other potential candidates for adding to this list of ten core baseline indicators. These were:-

- number of lone parent families
- destinations of school leavers
- conditions of ethnic communities relative to other local communities
- changing base of numbers of firms in the area.

Other conclusions were that City Challenge baseline work was too reliant on Census of Population data, non core measures were not comparable, there was little or nothing on ethnic communities, there was little or no comparative area analysis, there were ad hoc, uncoordinated local attitudinal surveys, and that the measurement of baseline social conditions was ill-defined, weak and not linked to community development.

The messages are clear for SRB. There is room for improvement beyond the standard approach which relies heavily on the Census of Population towards an approach making more use of sources of local data which means something more than a mechanical and indiscriminate throwing together of ad hoc variables. The baseline variables selected should include those which can be expected to be principally affected by the objectives/projects and gross outputs generated by an SRB scheme but should also include variables which would be sensitive to the overall cumulative downstream regeneration achievements or outcomes of bids with multiple economic and social objectives. The baseline variables selected should be desirable on conceptual grounds but also need, from a practical perspective, to be measurable at different spatial levels, including small local areas. Achieving this balance is a tall order.

A2 What should the baseline measure?

The question of what the baseline would ideally measure, conceptually, is linked to another question of what constitutes success in regeneration programmes. Success would be achieved if an area no longer experienced economic, social, housing and environmental problems - except those displayed on average throughout England - and that this position was sustained in the local area without further recourse to publicly funded regeneration initiatives. The baseline variables therefore need to measure the essence of the local economic and social conditions prevailing in the location both at the start of the programme and at the end of the programme, relative to the national average. In addition, the baseline also ideally needs to throw light on whether any improvement in baseline conditions recorded is likely to be sustainable when the programme ends or whether any improvements made could only be sustained if the regeneration effort continued; that is, a careful

distinction would ideally be made between the correction or solution of problems by policy as opposed to providing short-term compensation to alleviate the manifestation of problems which remain unresolved in the medium and longer term. Individual baseline variables which can be measured may not be capable of allowing insights into this important distinction but at the very least we should have the distinction clearly in mind when trying to design baseline work and whenever baseline changes are assessed and interpreted.

The economic and social problems which a run-down, deprived area displays are interactive and linked and are consequently not easily compartmentalised and separated out for analysis. Economic failure past or present can cause social problems which in turn give the area an image which can prevent economic improvement. But subsequent economic improvement would not necessarily solve future social problems which may become permanent and intergenerational, often exacerbated by additional problems relating to housing conditions, high rates of crime, poverty, and the absence of community development. These would then have to be solved before economic solutions can be found, or at least tackled simultaneously. These interactions rule out any idea that the baseline could be made up of a single composite variable or even two or three weighted together. The baseline variables chosen need to be able to measure sustainable economic change as well as a wide range of social problems, including ideally social exclusion.

Baseline measurement of sustainable economic improvement

Local area regeneration programmes are conventionally justified in terms of their ability to correct (as opposed to compensate for) failures in the operation of free markets, and in these cases the baseline would ideally be designed to demonstrate whether or not the programme is correcting those market failures in a sustainable way. (See Treasury Evaluation Guidance). Failure can occur with respect to land, property, labour and capital markets and in 'enterprise'. Failure occurs either when a market does not exist or the actual prices prevailing in markets differ from those market clearing prices which would equate demand and supply. In land markets for example problems of few, lumpy transactions, multiple ownership of sites, the costs of clearing dereliction and in securing the value of some of the external benefits prevents

landowners from selling land now at a price which is economic for developers to pay, given current rental and capital values of housing and/or commercial/industrial premises which prevail in the area. It pays landowners to sit tight in the hope that these constraints will be removed in future. In this particular case the stock of derelict vacant land and the stock of derelict and vacant premises are appropriate baseline indicators for recording progress in correcting market failure - although as indicators of market correction they can be distorted by the land use planning system.

Failure in labour markets is more difficult to assess and is affected more by complex segmentation, cultural considerations, discrimination of various kinds and a system of national compensatory benefits which, for the lower skilled, affects incentives to work and leads to unemployment/poverty traps. These are exacerbated by institutional failures and disadvantages attached to personal characteristics which cause, for example, low attainment at schools, inaccessible public sector programmes which lead to long term unemployment and ultimately social alienation and exclusion, particularly if levels of community involvement are low. Indicators which would record genuine and more sustainable correction of various aspects of labour market failure would include:-

- changes in the proportion of economically active amongst the population of working age groups relative to the national average
- reducing claimant unemployment rates relative to other areas or wider average
- relative improvements in school leaver attainment levels
- reducing benefit dependency relative to the nation (or other) average.

With respect to capital and enterprise market failure, banks and venture capital companies may be behaving quite rationally in refusing loans to companies in deprived urban areas.

Firms which choose not to move into or choose to move out of deprived inner urban areas because the costs of risks of being in the area may be prohibitive are also behaving rationally. To this extent the failure lies in the local area failing to provide a suitable competitive environment for the private sector rather than in the working of markets per se. Moreover, since some SRB

schemes are limited to one or two housing estates it is not meaningful to think in terms of capital or enterprise market failure within the designated area because there would be no space for large or small firms to operate. Residents of the estate(s) have to look to the wider sub-regional or local labour market area as a source of jobs and action within the area would rightly concentrate on improving the competitiveness of residents for obtaining employment in the wider labour market.

It is the case that some wider labour market areas, particularly those in peripheral areas and regions undergoing major structural change, suffer from “regional market failure” which leads to a shortage of employment opportunities in relation to the numbers wanting jobs. Whilst a small number of thematic SRB schemes applied at the wider labour market level may help to address this problem (e.g. the Lancashire Manufacturing Partnership) these issues are more directly addressed by other DTI regional and EU structural fund policies. Most SRB schemes, directed at regeneration problems in small deprived urban areas, cannot be expected to resolve this wider issue of job shortages at the wider labour market area although it may make a contribution to it if the area is suitable for economic development on a significant scale, as indicated by the area local plan.

Nevertheless, this is one instance where an external indicator (job opportunities in the wider area) should be included in the baseline, since it will influence how effective the SRB projects can be in placing people into jobs.

Appropriate baseline indicators for measuring progress in correcting market failure in capital and enterprise markets include

- stock of occupied industrial/commercial floor space
- number of enterprises
- number of new business start-ups and survival rates
- numbers self employed per 1000 population
- aggregate employment in the area

- job opportunities in the wider area relative to the numbers in the wider area seeking jobs.

Baseline measurement of changes in social conditions

Some of the SRB strategic objectives address social problems as a means of achieving overall regeneration rather than purely economic and these issues relate specifically to improving conditions of housing, ethnic communities relative to other local communities, quality of life and reducing the levels and incidence of crime. It is to be expected that baseline indicators relating to these objectives should appear in those bids which have multiple economic and social objectives.

None of these indicators relating to housing and crime, necessarily capture those aspects of social conditions which relate to the personal social circumstances of families such as income, poverty, single parenthood, and benefit dependency, which can lead to alienation and exclusion to the extent of not wanting to take part in social or community activities, even if these exist. Thus, other indicators may be needed which more adequately reflect these more general downstream social outcomes or degree of social malaise/exclusion.

The long term unemployed make up a large proportion of the socially excluded but by no means all. In addition many of those who feel an element of social exclusion are not registered as unemployed and include the elderly, those in poverty, the disabled, the homeless and the long term sick. But whilst long term unemployment excludes people from the labour market and low incomes of those not working may reduce the ability of others to have even a minimum stake in society, the third important strand of social exclusion is whether or not individuals are involved in local social/community/voluntary groups or performing voluntary/community activities which may prevent them from feeling totally alienated and excluded. There is a case therefore for having baseline indicators which together represent downstream social outcomes and hence the degree of social exclusion. The survey of residents in seven of the case study areas has been designed to do this.

Issues relating to the appropriate geographical boundaries covered by the indicators

There are clearly pragmatic data considerations relating to the geographical building blocks for which information relevant to an indicator is collected. However, there are also conceptual issues as to what are the most appropriate boundaries. Clearly, in some cases the effects of Partnership activity might spill-over from the area which is the specific focus of the delivery plan. Such spill-overs will occur through the workings of labour and property markets and could involve significant displacement and externality effects.

A3. The appropriateness of core baseline indicators in the SRB programme

It was noted earlier that, in the City Challenge initiative there had been a gradual move towards the concept of a set of core baseline indicators which every scheme could use and would be expected to use. Each core indicator would have a clear definition and their use in all schemes would permit comparability in baseline positions and subsequent changes in them as the schemes progress. The concept of a set of compulsory, core baseline indicators is appropriate for the City Challenge Programme to the extent that there were relatively few City Challenge Partnerships (20 of the total of 31 Partnerships measured their baselines) and that many of the Partnerships were embarking on similar types of regeneration schemes with similar scheme compositions and projects.

There is much more variety and diversity amongst SRB schemes and there are many more of them. There were about 400 approved SRB schemes in the first two rounds alone. Their target areas vary from a single large housing estate to a county or region. Their scheme content varies from single strategic objective thematic schemes concerned with, for example, crime and community safety, business support, education and housing through to multiple objective schemes which include activity in most or all of the strategic regeneration objectives set out for SRB schemes.

Moreover, even the single objective thematic schemes are by no means similar in their objectives. For example there are two business support

schemes amongst our 20 case studies. One, Lancashire Manufacturing, has the objective of enhancing competitiveness in the manufacturing sector of Lancashire through a wide variety of projects which include investment grants, premises provision, advice to SMEs, new start-up assistance, market research and development and training. The second, West Midlands Industrial Club, focuses on the issue of enhancing the recruitment of school leavers into specifically engineering firms in the West Midlands. A general type of core economic baseline indicator such as aggregate GDP, employment of aggregate number of firms in the target area would not be appropriate for either of these bids. What would be needed is indicators for the manufacturing sector in one case and the engineering sector in the other. Moreover, in neither of these two cases would it be appropriate to insist on a compulsory set of core social baseline indicators relating to say crime, housing or health because the activities of the two schemes could not be expected to have any influence on these.

An initial conclusion therefore is not to propose a set of compulsory core baseline indicators which must be used for all SRB schemes whatever their content or target area.

What would seem sensible instead is a list of key baseline indicators which can be used flexibly in their application to the 20 case studies depending on their content. For example, all case studies which contain activities in educational improvement would have the key education baseline indicators applied to it and similarly bids which included crime and housing strategic objectives would all have the key housing and crime indicators applied to them. Where case study bids were not active at all with respect to a strategic objective there would be no baseline indicator relating to that objective.

In addition to the list of key indicators there are a number of non-key indicators which are closely tailored to individual schemes. Some of the case study delivery plans have suggested a very large number of these but not all of these can be measured or have been measured.

A4. Constraints imposed by data availability from local sources

To be included on the list of key baseline indicators data needs to be available at least in principle for target local areas of very different sizes ranging from a large housing estate to a local authority district or county. The larger the area and the more closely it corresponds to official administrative boundaries the more likely is it that data which applies precisely to the target area will be readily available. But even at district or county level there may be difficulties in matching data to areas. For example, education data may be available at school level but in some areas many pupils cross district and county boundaries to attend school (in both directions) whilst other residents will attend private schools across the UK as a whole. Similarly, crime statistics collected at beat level do not correspond to administrative boundaries and beat areas will rarely match small local target SRB areas. It is inevitable that much of the local data sources available to use will not match the SRB target areas exactly.

For each of the strategic objectives in which SRB operates we have reviewed the position with respect to local data sources which are in principle available for local areas (see table A1). In some cases the data is collected locally but assembled nationally so that data for specific local areas would only be available if the department or agency concerned would undertake special computer runs - which frequently involve charges. Even local organisations may be reluctant to undertake the costs of releasing data for non standard local areas. Availability in principle does not imply that it will actually be available or available free of charge.

Table A1 Local Data Sources for Strategic Objectives

Indicator	Source	Comments
ECONOMIC		
GDP - Net output	Census of Production, (Every 3 years with 2 yr delay special runs needed. Production Industries only)	Cannot be used below level of region because of combined return problem
Aggregate & sectoral employment	Census of Employment (Every 3 years with 1 yr delay. Subject to NOMIS charges)	Confidentiality restrictions for small areas/sectors.
No of firms in area	Census of Employment VAT register	NOMIS charges. Excludes small firms (below £46,000 turnover)
Unemployment & Long-term unemployment	Census of Employment (claimant definition)	NOMIS charges
	Job centres (claimant definition)	Will not coincide with many SRB areas
	Labour Force Survey (wider definition)	Cannot be used , small sample sizes
Average Earnings/Incomes	New Earnings Survey (small sample sizes)	Only available in aggregate at level of county, larger borough and above.
	Inland Revenue data Regional Accounts data	Not available below county level.
ENVIRONMENT		
Area of derelict/vacant land	Local Authority Planning Departments	Could be measured for scheme target areas
Area of derelict vacant buildings	Local Authority Planning Departments	Some LA's keep register - others do not
SOCIAL		
<i>Educational achievement</i>		
GCSE 5 grades A-C GCSE 5 grades A-G GCSE 1 grade A-C A level score Staying-on rates Unauthorised absence	Local Education Authorities data for individual schools	School rolls will not measure small SRB target areas (match should be judged in each case on its merits)
<i>Health</i>		
Pre-natal, infant mortality rates and standard mortality rates Numbers permanently sick	Regional Health Authorities	Admin Health Areas will not match many local SRB target areas (judge each case on its merits)

Indicator	Source	Comments
<i>Crime</i> Reported crime - total, burglary, street crime, car crime	Police authority collected at beat area level	Beat areas will not always match SRB target areas but many will be close enough
<i>Housing</i> Housing tenure Voids/unfit housing Numbers in receipt of housing benefit	Local Authority Housing Departments	HIP strategy statements. Work will be required to match some SRB target areas.
<i>Poverty</i> Benefit receipt Numbers in receipt of income support	DSS Benefit Agency	Special runs would be needed by post-code area.

A further issue relates to the degree to which it will be possible to disaggregate data to establish the impact of Partnership activity in specific groups in the target area; most notably ethnic minorities.

This brief summary of data available from local sources (for local areas) in principle suggests that the most promising possibilities of obtaining useful baseline indicators consistently across scheme target areas, at relatively low cost are in the fields of education, housing and reported crimes. Even in these three most promising areas indicators may not be available for SRB target areas but for larger areas containing the target area in whole or in part. In these three most promising of areas it was necessary to make a judgement about each of the 20 case studies to see how close a match between areas can be obtained. If the match is not close the baseline indicator could be misleading with respect to progress being made in the SRB area and it may well be judged preferable to have no baseline information than to have something which is misleading.

In other cases, where local data might be obtained as a special sub-set of national data bases, a judgement is needed as to whether the cost of carrying out special computer runs could be justified in terms of the likely analytical benefit which might accrue from having the baseline indicator.

Overall, the position on the availability of baseline indicators from local or existing data sources, and the ability to obtain them for specified small SRB target areas is such as to provide a major constraint on any conceptually based aspirations to have a common set of compulsory core indicators which should be applied to all case study bids. It is partly for this reason that we propose a list of key indicators for each strategic objective which should be applied to each case study which is active in that strategic objective if it is appropriate to do so from a reasonably close area matching perspective.

Few of the indicators which might be available from existing/local data sources represent good measures of more general downstream outcomes of “well-being” which might be expected to accrue and accumulate from SRB across the broad spectrum of activities. These downstream outcomes are frequently described in such terms of deprivation, social exclusion, poverty, fear of crime and residents perceptions of the area in which they live. It is the role of the resident survey to provide this extra dimension in seven case study areas.

The two potential indicators from existing data sources which partly reflect these downstream outcomes are long-term unemployment and numbers on housing benefit.

