

## **Local Government and Communities Committee**

### **Consultation of the Scottish Parliament on the Scottish Government's Revised National Outcomes**

#### **Submission from the Scottish Community Development Centre & Community Health Exchange**

SCDC broadly welcomes the review of the National Performance Framework, the National Outcomes and indicators.

We have a few comments on the following areas:

- National Outcomes – we feel that the new outcome areas broadly reflect the aspirations for Scotland for the next 5-10 years and welcome the work to begin to align them with the Sustainable Development Goals.
- National Indicators – it would be beneficial to have examples of how these indicators can be measured and what kind of evidence could be gathered as part of this process. Specifically we feel that the indicators for the outcome on 'we live in communities that are inclusive, empowered, resilient and safe' should include specific indicators on community/civic engagement such as:
  - Levels of participation in civic dialogue/community forums
  - Levels of community-led services/regeneration
  - Levels of community-owned or community-run assets
  - Existence of community-led action plans
  - Levels of community cohesion
- Process – while making a bold attempt at engaging the general public in the discussion about national outcomes we would query whether there has been a robust enough attempt at engaging a broad cross section of civic society organisations (e.g. tenants/residents groups, community development trusts, community interest groups, etc.) and citizens in the conversation. This sector makes a significant contribution to achieving the national outcomes through their participation in civic dialogue, local democratic structures, and in community-led services, activities and assets. They are becoming an increasingly important part of the planning of local services (through community planning processes) and the development/use of local infrastructure and assets (through place-based approaches, local place planning, etc.). Also, there was very little evidence of Community Planning Partnerships being involved in the process which, given that the Local Outcomes Improvement Plans should have regard to the national outcomes, seems to be quite a significant omission. We would recommend that this be noted for future Review processes.