



Community Board Quarterly Meeting

Thursday 22 April 2021, 2-4pm

Microsoft Teams

Chair: Dave Gorman, Director of Social Responsibility and Sustainability

Attending

Sarah Anderson, Community Engagement Programme Manager

Michelle Brown, Deputy Director and Head of SRS Programmes, Social Responsibility and Sustainability

Katrina Castle, Head of Strategic Partnerships and Transitions, Student Recruitment and Admissions

Gavin Donoghue, Deputy Director, Stakeholder Relations, Communications and Marketing

Patricia Erskine, Head of Stakeholder Relations & Policy Officer, College Office – CAHSS

Ian Fyfe, Senior Lecturer, Moray House School of Education and Sport, IECS

Christina Hinds, Development Worker: Organisational Development & Capacity Building, EVOC

Anne-Sofie Laegran, Head of Knowledge Exchange and Impact, Edinburgh Research Office

Jacky MacBeath, Head of Museums, Museums

Lesley McAra, Assistant Principal Community Relations and Director, Edinburgh Futures Institute

Kate McHugh, Director of Open Studies, Centre for Open Learning

Derek MacLeod, Head of Global Partnerships, Edinburgh Global

Jen Middleton, Head of Engagement, Communications and Marketing, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

Cameron Ritchie, Depute Director and Head of Operations, University Sport and Exercise

Amanda Scully, EUSA VP Community

Sean Smith, Director of the Centre for Future Infrastructure, Institute for Infrastructure and Environment

Zoe Stephens, Head of Organisational Development and Change, Estates Management Group

Suart Tooley, Community Relations Manager, Communications and Marketing

Apologies: None received

In Attendance:

Anne Douglas, Community Engagement Administrator & Projects Coordinator

Brendan Seenan, Community Engagement Projects Coordinator, Social Responsibility & Sustainability

Agenda

	Time	Item	Paper
1.	2.00pm	Approval of meeting minute of 20 January 2021 (Dave Gorman)	A (open)
2.	2.05pm	Matters Arising, not otherwise covered in the agenda (Dave Gorman)	
3.	2.15pm	Update on Focus, Purpose, Remit and Responsibilities of the Board (Gavin Donoghue) <i>Paper for discussion</i>	B (open)
4.	2.30pm	Reflection on progress 2016 – 2020 and forward look (Dave Gorman) <i>Paper for discussion</i>	C (open)
5.	2.45pm	Community Plan, measures of success and implementation plan (Sarah Anderson & Stuart Tooley) <i>2 papers for discussion</i>	D (open) & E (open)

6.	3.15pm	Employee volunteering and digital inclusion (including IT re-use highlights) (Brendan Seenan & Sarah Anderson) <i>2 papers for discussion</i>	F (open) & G (closed)
7.	3.30pm	Social Impact Pledge (Lesley McAra & Sarah Anderson) <i>Verbal update</i>	
8.	3.40pm	Poverty Commission & other City of Edinburgh Council priorities (Gavin Donoghue) <i>Paper for discussion</i>	H (Annex closed)
9.	3.50pm	Standing Item: Community Team update (Sarah Anderson & Stuart Tooley) <i>Paper for information</i>	I (open)
10.	3.55pm	A.O.B. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COP26 and the city and our developing thinking (Michelle Brown) 	
11.	4.00pm	Meeting close	



UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

MINUTE OF A MEETING of the Community Board held via MS Teams on Wednesday 20 January 2021.

- Present:** Dave Gorman, Director of Social Responsibility and Sustainability (Chair) (DG)
Sarah Anderson, Community Engagement Programme Manager (SA)
Katrina Castle, Head of Strategic Partnerships and Transitions, Student Recruitment and Admissions (KC)
Gavin Donoghue, Deputy Director, Stakeholder Relations, Communications and Marketing (GD)
Patricia Erskine, Head of Stakeholder Relations & Policy Officer, College Office – CAHSS (PE)
Ian Fyfe, Senior Lecturer, Moray House School of Education and Sport, IECS (IF)
Christina Hinds, Development Worker: Organisational Development & Capacity Building, EVOC (CH)
Anne-Sofie Laegran, Head of Knowledge Exchange and Impact, Edinburgh Research Office (ASL)
Jacky MacBeath, Head of Museums, Museums (JMacB)
Lesley McAra, Assistant Principal Community Relations and Director, Edinburgh Futures Institute (LMcA)
Kate McHugh, Director of Open Studies, Centre for Open Learning (KM)
Derek MacLeod, Head of Global Partnerships, Edinburgh Global (DM)
Jen Middleton, Head of Engagement, Communications and Marketing, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (JM)
Cameron Ritchie, Depute Director and Head of Operations, University Sport and Exercise (CR)
Amanda Scully, EUSA VP Community (AS)
Sean Smith, Director of the Centre for Future Infrastructure, Institute for Infrastructure and Environment (SS)
Zoe Stephens, Head of Organisational Development and Change, Estates Management Group (ZS)
- In attendance:** Anne Douglas, Community Engagement Administrator & Project Coordinator (AD) (minute)
- Apologies:** None

1 Welcome and Introductions

Dave Gorman welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Community Board.

2 Board Member Introductions

Everyone introduced themselves.

3 Focus, Purpose, Remit and Responsibilities of the Board

Gavin Donoghue presented his paper on the focus, purpose, remit and responsibilities of the new Community Board.

Issues discussed included:

- The need for coordinated community engagement involving the whole University
- The capacity to deliver the Community Plan and having parameters on delivery scope

- Having a strategic understanding of what is meant by community, and how the community voice is to be heard
- The future possibility of broader external membership of the Board
- The importance of engaging with hardest to reach communities, which takes time
- With reference to new priorities and ideas not currently covered in the Community Plan, the need for capacity in pursuance of any new ideas
- Recognising money/budgetary considerations

It was explained that KPIs will sit under the Community Plan and these will be reported to the October 2021 SRS Committee

Action GD: Update paper on Board remit in advance of April 2021 meeting.

5 Community Board Operations

Sarah Anderson and Anne Douglas introduced a paper on Community Board Operations.

There was discussion on the need for a Social Impact Survey. Lesley McAra explained the background and the work that she will be pursuing with DDI for a new survey. It was also queried whether Measures of Success may be more relevant to the Community Plan assessment than numerically focussed KPIs.

SA flagged outstanding actions from the final, November 2020 Community Engagement Programme Board. A number of actions had also been completed since November 2020.

The Board agreed that the minutes of Board meetings would be made public.

Further consideration will be given to the usefulness of an action tracker.

6 Granton Waterfront Development

Lesley McAra and Katrina Castle presented on the Granton Waterfront Development, outlining the opportunities and challenges this presented to the University. KC informed the Board of the Scottish Funding Council pilot project bringing together schools, colleges and the University that aims to optimise data and digital changes to include a broad range of students.

Action All: Pass on details to LMcA and KC of any known Granton projects, or suggestions for the Granton development work

Action AD: Circulate the Granton Waterfront Development presentation slides to the Board

7 Community Grants

Sarah Anderson and Anne Douglas introduced a paper on the community grants scheme which outlined the scheme's key achievements and operations.

Ideas were discussed for generating other University income sources for the grants scheme, including consultancy fees and royalties. It was recommended that the grant scheme take into account of the vulnerability of many community organisations in a post-Covid environment.

Action All: Consider alternative ways to source funds for the community grants scheme (e.g. University employee consultancy fees, royalties)

Action SA: Community Team to discuss grants scheme with Ian Fyfe with respect to what it needs to look like to best meet future community needs

8 Agenda Forward Look

Dave Gorman proposed items for future Board meeting agendas.

For the April Board meeting it was agreed that the agenda include:

- Reflection on progress 2016 – 2020 and forward look
- Community Plan, specifically an implementation plan, to be discussed
- Progress report from the Community Team to be a standing item

- IT re-use and/or employee volunteering/digital inclusion (subject to available time)
- Edinburgh Poverty Commission report update (subject to available time)

To optimise meeting time it was suggested that the Board focus on discussion instead of presentations, as information in papers/reports will be circulated ahead of meetings. It was also suggested that, if necessary, a separate meeting could update Board members on the Community Plan.

Action (Com Team): Prepare draft of Community Plan action plan and KPIs/measures of success for review at April Board

Action (DG): Review April agenda meeting timings for all items listed above

9 AOB

There was no further business.



Community Board

22 April 2021

Community Board - Purpose, Remit and Responsibilities (part 2)

Description of paper

1. The purpose of this paper is to set out the proposed purpose, remit and responsibilities of the Community Board for discussion at the Board’s meeting on 22 April 2021.
2. This paper is an update to the paper previously presented and discussed at the Community Board meeting on 20 January 2021, and has been updated in light of feedback from Board members.

Action requested

3. The Board is asked to discuss and endorse the proposals contained in paragraphs 9-11

Background

4. The University’s new Community Plan was approved by Executive on 8 September 2020 and included a commitment to restructure the Community Engagement Programme Board (CEPB) into a new ‘Community Board’.
5. This change has taken place to reflect different commitments in the new Community Plan, and due to the fact that roles and responsibilities of staff have evolved and matured since the original 2016 Community Engagement Strategy. For instance, there is now an established Community Team made up of members of SRS and CAM that meet on a weekly basis.
6. A more detailed paper was subsequently approved by SRS Committee in October 2020 to restructure the Community Board and update its purpose, remit and responsibilities.
7. A discussion took place at the previous Community Board meeting on 20 January 2021 and the following changes have been made to the Board’s purpose, remit and responsibilities in light of the feedback received:

Feedback	Previous paper	Updated paper
Should drive the delivery of the Community Plan	The oversight of the delivery of existing Community Plan commitments and the reporting to the SRS Committee on delivery.	To drive the delivery, and have oversight, of Community Plan commitments and to report on this to the SCSR Committee.

Should be advocates for it internally		Positively contribute to the successful implementation of the Community Plan's commitments by advocating on its behalf in their own areas, and across the University
Should deliver and establish measures of success for delivery of commitments	N/A	Ensuring the delivery of the Community Plan, by establishing measures to judge success against, and helping resolve potential obstacles to positive outcomes
Reflect the need for coordinated community engagement involving the whole University	Linking up of the Community Plan with campus, College, school, professional group, and community partner activities and priorities to ensure alignment and maximise impact	Reflecting the 'whole institution' approach by linking up the Community Plan with campus, College, school, and professional group activities and priorities
Reflect capacity to deliver the Community Plan and have parameters on scope	The generation and discussion of any new priorities and ideas not currently covered in the Community Plan, and ensuring their successful delivery	The generation, discussion and evaluation of any new priorities and ideas not currently covered in the Community Plan, bearing in mind resource requirements, and ensuring their successful delivery should they be agreed
Recognise resource considerations (financial/human)	Oversee the progress, and delivery, of the Community Plan's implementation plan Oversee the work of the Community Team, and provide strategic direction to the team as required	Oversee the progress, and delivery, of the Community Plan's implementation plan and provide strategic direction for further priorities if required
Have a strategic understanding of what is meant by community The importance of engaging with hardest to reach communities	N/A	Linking up the Community Plan with the priorities and activities of community partners (geographical and communities of interest) across Edinburgh and South East Scotland, with a specific focus on our nearest neighbours and harder to reach communities

The future possibility of broader external membership of the Board	If there are gaps identified in Board membership, agree on further representation from colleagues, or community partners, taking equality and diversity issues into account	<p>Linking up the Community Plan with the priorities and activities of community partners (geographical and communities of interest) across Edinburgh and South East Scotland, with a specific focus on our nearest neighbours and harder to reach communities</p> <p>If there are gaps identified in Board membership, agree on further representation from colleagues, or community partners, taking equality and diversity issues into account</p>
--	---	---

Discussion

8. The Board is, therefore, asked to discuss and endorse the following proposals for the group's purpose, remit and responsibilities.
9. The Community Board's purpose as being:

To drive the delivery, and have oversight, of Community Plan commitments and to report on this to the SCSR Committee.
10. The remit of the new Board is proposed to be:
 - a. Ensuring the delivery of the Community Plan, by establishing measures to judge success against, and helping resolve potential obstacles to positive outcomes
 - b. Reflecting the 'whole institution' approach by linking up the Community Plan with campus, College, school, and professional group activities and priorities
 - c. Linking up the Community Plan with the priorities and activities of community partners (geographical and communities of interest) across Edinburgh and South East Scotland, with a specific focus on our nearest neighbours and harder to reach communities
 - d. The generation, discussion and evaluation of any new priorities and ideas not currently covered in the Community Plan, bearing in mind

resource requirements, and helping ensure their successful delivery should they be agreed

- e. Taking reports from the University's Community Team for discussion and endorsement, and providing any further guidance requested by the team
- f. Working with EUSA and the Community Team to look for ways to increase student representation in other community-focused settings and activities
- g. If there are gaps identified in Board membership, agree on further representation from colleagues, or community partners, taking equality and diversity issues into account

11. The responsibilities of the Board include:

- h. Positively contribute to the successful implementation of the Community Plan's commitments by advocating on its behalf in their own areas, and across the University
- i. Oversee and drive the delivery of the Community Plan's implementation plan, and provide strategic direction for further priorities if required
- j. Hold quarterly minuted meetings, and make these minutes publicly available online
- k. Provide an annual progress report to SCSR Committee at its October meeting.

12. The Community Team will be responsible for the operationalising of the Community Plan's commitments, including the production of an implementation plan, and a representative of the Team will report to the Board on progress and to seek any further direction that is required.

Next steps

13. Once agreed, the purpose, remit and responsibilities of the Community Board will be added to the [Board's public webpage](#) in order to aid openness and transparency about its operations.

Further Information

14. Authors and presenters

Gavin Donoghue (author and presenter)
Deputy Director, Stakeholder Relations
Communications and Marketing



Community Board

22nd April 2021

Reflection on progress 2016 – 2020 and forward look

Description of paper

1. This paper provides a reflection on the progress, lessons learned and stories of change since the University's first community engagement strategy was approved in 2016. It also offers a forward look for the remainder of the period of its updated community strategy (the Community Plan), which runs until 2025.

Action requested

2. The Community Board is requested to discuss the paper's contents.

Progress 2016-20

3. It was a major achievement to secure approval for the University's very first community engagement strategy in 2016. It was down to the persistence, over several years, of Moira Gibson (formerly of Communications and Marketing; now retired) and, latterly, Lesley McAra. The initial strategy had some weaknesses in terms of its clarity, lack of attention to reducing societal inequalities and the fact that local communities had not been involved with its creation. Nevertheless, it was a powerful catalyst for action within the University.
4. The University also signed its very first Scottish Government Social Impact Pledges in 2016, and was only the second University in Scotland to do so.
5. In 2017, 2 new half-time, fixed-term community roles were created within the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability (SRS). These roles, taken up by Eppy Harries-Pugh and Sarah Anderson, made it possible to:
 - 5.1. Deliver projects named in the University's Social Impact Pledge
 - 5.2. Create the Edinburgh Local brand and associated communications channels
 - 5.3. Set up and run the Community Engagement Programme Board (the predecessor to the Community Board)
 - 5.4. Create the University's Community Grant scheme
 - 5.5. Begin to identify and involve staff and students who work with local community partners
 - 5.6. Run events to showcase some of the University's work with community partners and facilitate internal networking and networking with community partners
6. In 2018, Stuart Tooley took up the role of Community Relations Manager in Communications and Marketing. Stuart and SRS community colleagues started to regularly meet to ensure coordination of work, a group that has now been formalised at the Community Team.
7. University-wide achievements under the first community engagement strategy can be viewed here: [The story so far | The University of Edinburgh](#)

Lessons learned and stories of change

8. Working with local communities has been a strength of many individual parts of the University for decades, if not centuries. Putting in place a strategy is a hook for coordinating these efforts, gaining recognition and resources for the staff and students involved with them, scaling up best practice that works well, and embedding working with local communities as part of the 'business as usual' of the University. We are not there yet! But we are on our way.
9. We have so much invaluable knowledge and expertise within the University, some of which merits more of a profile. For example, our colleagues in Community Education are a small team of 6 mostly part-time and/or fixed-term teaching fellows and lecturers, yet their knowledge, experience and relationships with community partners are an enormous asset to the University: they literally train people to go and work in community organisations.
10. The community grants scheme has been more successful than we probably ever envisaged. We managed to disburse double the scheme's basic annual budget between 2017 and 2020 through additional internal fundraising. Something that became apparent very quickly was that awarding a grant is a great way to start an ongoing relationship with communities the University would otherwise find hard to reach. While noting there is a power imbalance that means these relationships should be drawn on carefully, they are clearly a great asset to the University.
11. Given community engagement and relations are inherently about relationships, the full positive outcomes of the work that began in 2016 may take much longer than 4 years to develop. (For this reason, we did not readily hit all of the KPIs on which the business case for the new SRS roles and community grants was based – notably, that around income generation.)
12. Brands can be an asset, but also confusing! The creation of 'Edinburgh Local' created an impression, for some people, that there is a discrete 'Edinburgh Local team'. Expectations from colleagues and community partners have not necessarily matched the actual staff time, budget and influence of what is now known as the Community Team.

Forward look

13. With this new Board, assuming it has similar momentum to its predecessor, we are in a position to meet or exceed the commitments laid out in the 2020 Community Plan, in some cases before 2025. Work done over the next 5 years will also have an impact beyond 2025.
14. Ensuring an institutional memory of community relationships, and sharing information about them within the University, is key to tracking the long-term impact of this work. As relationships will always be changing, mechanisms like this Board, the Community Engagement Forum, the Community Team and other internal networks are key.
15. We will be in 2025, and in need of an updated strategy, before we know it. Ideally, that will be iteratively shaped by the ongoing conversations we are having with community partners and within the University community over the next 5 years, rather than a short, time-limited engagement process in 2024.

16. Communications, both externally and internally-facing, will remain a significant piece of work. 'Demystification' of Edinburgh Local, the Community Board and the Community Team, among others, will not only manage expectations but will make it easier for others to engage with the Community Plan. This, in turn, should aid delivery of the Plan to its maximum potential.

Further Information

17. Presenter

Dave Gorman, Director of Social Responsibility and Sustainability
dave.gorman@ed.ac.uk

18. Author

Sarah Anderson, Community Engagement Programme Manager
sarah.anderson@ed.ac.uk

19. Paper status

This paper is open.



COMMUNITY BOARD

22 April 2021

Measures of success for the Community Plan

Description of paper

1. This paper sets out how the Community Board and Team will measure the success of the Community Plan.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The Board is asked to review and comment on the proposed approach towards measures of success.

3. Specifically, the Board is asked to consider whether the appropriate commitments/measures of success are the right ones to report up to the Social and Civic Responsibility Plan.

Background and context

4. The Community Plan was launched in November 2020. It contained 32 substantive commitments, and a further five commitments concerned with delivering on the plan.

5. These commitments were drafted with extensive consultation both internally and externally. However, while care was taken to ensure that commitments were both realistic and ambitious, at the time of drafting there was varying levels of thought given to how the University could meet these commitments, and what success would look like.

6. As a result, the Community Team have developed an Implementation Plan (covered in a paper under agenda item 5) and Measures of Success (this paper).

Discussion

7. This paper seeks to look at two separate ways of measuring the success of the Community Plan. The first is an overall view of whether the Community Plan is meeting the aims of the plan itself. The second is a consideration of whether the individual commitments are being met or are on target to being met.

8. Meeting the aims measurement

For the overall view, we must first define what the aims are of the Plan. I am not aware that any aims were set out at the beginning of the Community Plan process, or in the actual plan itself. However, having been involved in the production of the Plan, the following aims would cover the primary reasons for its existence:

- a. To provide a document that puts the detail on the Community side of the Social and Civic Responsibility focus/plan.
- b. To reshape the governance and management of the University's Community work, through a strategic, broader, and more high-level board

- c. To set out a number of commitments to our local communities, which we can work towards across the five years.
- d. To use as a communication tool externally – providing example of the University’s positive community work, and to show ambitious future plans
- e. To use as a communication tool internally – providing information on University priorities, contacts, and to pull together somewhat disparate work under one cohesive banner.

9. With the production of the plan itself, and the reshaping of the governance, these aims (with the exception of actually completing the commitments) are now complete. However, there may be further secondary aims behind the plan, which we may wish to consider:

- a. Changing the culture of the University among staff and students, specifically around: valuing work in the community; embedding positive community interaction into teaching, learning, and operations; and clarity around who to approach for professional help and advice in this area.
- b. Changing the perception of the University externally – for example to encourage local residents and organisation to view the University in a more positive light through proactive action and better communications.

10. Ways of measuring these could involve staff and student surveys and a public poll at the beginning and end of the five year period of the plan.

11. Measuring these is perhaps not as direct and straightforward as the commitment metrics below. As an example, perceptions of reputation, priority or value can be heavily influenced by recent events – including those completely outside the Board’s control. However, if we believe these secondary aims to be fundamental to the success or otherwise of the plan, it would be worth establishing these baselines now in order to measure any change.

12. **Commitment measurement**

On a connected note, the Plan’s commitments provide the framework that should shape our work over the next five years. If these commitments are met, one would expect that the secondary aims in paragraph 8 would improve. Likewise, there is an internal and external reputational risk of not meeting our promises. It is therefore important that we are tracking our commitments.

13. Much of the paper on the plans for implementation has dealt with how the Community Team will work with units across the University on plans to meet the commitments, and report any important changes and issues to the Board.

14. Related to this, is how we measure whether or not the commitment is being met. Where possible, our aim has been to set measures of success that are already in use by that unit. Each commitment may have a number of associated measures of success.

15. The importance of these individual metrics, which can be viewed on the second page of the [implementation table](#), is that they will help to determine:

- a. Whether or not we are on track to meet the commitment, and if not allow us to direct additional attention to it
- b. Help to determine the RAG status of the commitment as a whole
- c. Provide the basis on which we can report – through the annual report – on progress against the commitments.

16. At this stage, the Community Team have not yet had the opportunity to discuss the potential measures of success with many of the units who will be responsible. Therefore the table remains a work in progress. However, as an example of how this might work, the measures of success for commitment 6¹, are set out below:

#	Measure of Success	Baseline	What does success look like?	When will it be measured?
6-a	Centre in Craigmillar opened, partnerships with local schools established	-	Centre open, partnerships established	2021
6-b	Unique students at Craigmillar centre: 450 by Autumn 2022; 900, 2023; 1,000 by 2024 and 2025	0	450 by Autumn 2022; 900, 2023; 1,000 by 2024 and 2025	2022-25
6-c	Outcomes: S5/S6 progression	TBC	TBC	2022-25

In this example, you can see that there will be a combination of activity, outcome and output –based metrics. This will mean there are some, like 6-a above, which we will effectively be able to tick off, where others will be tracked throughout the five years.

17. In addition to the 37 Community Plan commitments, following consultation with Michelle Brown, two commitments from the Social and Civic Responsibility Plan will also be tracked in the implementation plan. These are fair work and poverty awareness, neither of which were in the Community Plan. One of these, Fair Work, already has a [well-defined metric](#) through the SCR Plan.

18. There is some cross-over between the SCR Plan metrics and the Community Plan measures of success. The SRC Plan metrics have pulled out the following performance indicators, and the table below shows how they map to the Community Plan commitments:

Performance Indicator	Community Plan Commitment
Sustain and grow activities related to our social impact pledges.	1 – Social impact pledges
Community engagement and service will be part of an	15 – Community Engagement – student courses

¹ Work with local schools and the third sector to establish a new learning centre in a community within Edinburgh in 2021. The centre will respond to educational disadvantage and poverty, and will foster aspiration and improve access to higher education and training.

Edinburgh university student experience.	
We will continue to be Living Wage accredited.	N/A
Encourage staff to take part in the University's 'Day to Make a Difference' scheme.	9 – Day to Make a Difference
We will invest (at least) £50,000 annually to support the development of community activities through the Edinburgh Local Community Grants scheme by 2030.	3 – Community Grants
Continue to support and grow student social enterprise in partnership with the Students' Association, Edinburgh Innovations and local networks.	27 – Student social enterprise

19. The Board is asked to consider whether these are the most important or representative set of indicators that should be reported to SCR level.

20. Unlike the changes in RAG status, which will be flagged to the Board at each meeting, allowing actions to be discussed, it is proposed that measures of success will only be reported to the Board once per year, ahead of the Annual Report (November-December), which will also include some measures of success to help communicate the progress made over the past year.

Resource implications

21. The monitoring of the status of each of the commitments will require some resource, from both the responsible unit and Community Team. However, every effort has been made to stress to responsible units that where there reporting requirements for measures of success associated with the Community Plan, these should be in line with existing reporting requirements, so as to avoid duplication of effort.

Risk Management

22. There are reputational risks associated with failing to achieve the commitments in the Community Plan.

23. The proactive management of risks and issues through the implementation plan provides is a proportionate way of ensuring that risk is mitigated.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

24. Not applicable as this paper is around the measures of success of the Community Plan, which has already been assessed against Climate Emergency & SDGs.

Equality & Diversity

25. Not applicable as this paper is around the measurement of success of the Community Plan, which has already been assessed for its impact on equality and diversity.

Next steps/implications

26. The Community Team will keep the measures of success table up to date and ensure that the Board is updated in an annual update ahead of the Annual Report.

27. Further work will be done with responsible units/responsible Board members to help define what measures of success will match each of the commitments.

Consultation

28. This paper has been drawn up based on conversations with the Community Team.

29. Some consultation has taken place with responsible units on the status of their commitments. These include conversations with Museums and Collections, Widening Participation, CAM, the Community Team. Further consultation is required to look at measures of success of other commitments.

Further information

29. Author

Presenter

Stuart Tooley

Stuart Tooley

Community Relations Manager
Communications and Marketing
(on behalf of the Community Team)

Freedom of Information

30. Open paper



COMMUNITY BOARD

22 April 2021

Implementation of the Community Plan

Description of paper

1. This paper sets out how the Community Board and Team will manage the implementation of the Community Plan.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The Board is asked to review and comment on the proposed implementation plan.

3. The Board is also asked to review and comment on the risks and issues associated with the commitments, especially those that are marked as Red in para 15, and help to provide guidance on those in para 14.

Background and context

4. The Community Plan was launched in November 2020. It contained 32 substantive commitments, and a further five commitments concerned with delivering on the plan.

5. These commitments were drafted with extensive consultation both internally and externally. However, while care was taken to ensure that commitments were both realistic and ambitious, at the time of drafting there was varying levels of thought given to how the University could meet these commitments, and what success would look like.

6. As a result, the Community Team have developed an Implementation Plan (covered in this paper) and Measures of Success (covered in a separate paper under agenda item 5).

Discussion

7. With 37 commitments across a wide range of activities across the University, it is not practical to set out a detailed plan for each commitment in one document. As a cross-University plan, it is not the responsibility of the Board or the Community Team to dictate to units across the University how to achieve these commitments.

8. The value of an implementation plan at Board level is therefore to draw together information from across the University to allow the Board to direct resources, resolve problems and make useful connections between teams. The implementation plan therefore takes the form of a project management document that allows Board members to see which commitments are at various stages of completion, and to note any issues.

9. The exception to this is where commitments fall on the Community Team itself. In these cases, specific project plans may well be drawn up, and these are linked from the implementation plan itself.

10. The implementation plan (available as a [live document](#)), therefore has the following information against each commitment:

Column name	Meaning
Community Team member	Indicates which of the Community Team members have oversight of this commitment. This person is responsible for updating the implementation plan document, and liaising with the responsible unit of the University.
Community Board member	Indicates which Board member has responsibility for overseeing the commitment (see para 11 below).
Responsible unit	Indicates which part of the University is responsible for achieving this commitment. This may be a person, department, working group, or other group depending on the commitment.
Project plan	Where project plans exist – normally for projects where the responsible unit is the Community team – these are linked to.
RAG status	This provides a snapshot of the status of each commitment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gold – this commitment is complete, and requires no further action • Green – this commitment is on track, with no major issues or risks • Amber – this commitment may be yet to begin or have an issue or risk for Board consideration • Red – this commitment has a significant issue or risk that requires Board intervention or support, or a risk that threatens the success of the commitment
Issues and risk	This provides information on any issues and risks for Board information.
Progress expected in 2021	This indicates what progress has been/is likely to be made in 2021.

11. As indicated in the table above there is a RAG status with associated issues and risks for each commitment. In line with the Board’s remit to drive the delivery of the Community Plan, where possible removing obstacles to success. While there are specific Board and Team members against each commitment, the Board as a whole has collective responsibility for delivery of the plan, and should be seeking to look across the University for advice, support and assistance to deliver it. Where there are particular issues that require immediate attention, the responsible Community Board member should be active between Board meetings to try to resolve issues.

12. Rather than republishing the entire table for each Board meeting, the Community Team will provide, in its regular update, a summary of any changes since the last Board meeting, along with any that remain Red. This will allow an at-a-glance view of the changes, and dissuade a detailed discussion of each commitment at Board meetings. The full table will always be available, as it is a live document.

13. At present the commitments are in the following categories:

Commitment RAG status	Number
Red	4
Amber	17
Green	13
Gold	3

14. There are a number of Ambers against commitments where the primary risk/issue is that the Community Team are yet to have a substantive discussion with the responsible unit to help define the work, measures of success, and RAG status. It is anticipated that as consultation with responsible units continues through the first half of 2021, many of these will move to Green. Two in particular require some Board input on who from the board should lead, and who should be the responsible unit:

Commitment	Commitment text
Community Engagement - student courses (15)	Support and scale-up opportunities for all students to undertake community engagement projects as part of their degree programmes
Cultural heritage and green spaces (32)	Work with community partners to protect our shared cultural heritage and enhance access to green spaces

15. The Board is asked to specifically consider the Red commitments and offer any comments:

Commitment	Commitment text	Risks and issues
Community Planning (7)	Work with local communities to find new ways in which local residents can take part in community planning	Yet to work out what this means in practical terms
Physical front doors (28)	Designate a physical front door on each of our campuses all year round, so that members of our community know how to reach us in person	University currently mostly closed to the public due to Covid-19; resourcing (e.g. reception staff) not in place
Community room booking (29)	Trial opening up some of our buildings to allow community bookings on a cost-free basis	Pandemic means no rooms possible
Social impact survey (36)	Undertake a social impact survey to measure our impact and make sure we are meeting our social and civic responsibilities	No plan or budget at this point; how will it interact with measures of success/KPIs?

16. It is acknowledged that it will not be possible to make significant progress in all 37 commitments each year. It is necessary to prioritise our limited resources on commitments where resourcing, restrictions due to Covid-19, and broader University efforts align. The Community Team will endeavour to provide regular updates on prioritised commitments in the Community Team papers at each Board meeting. Across the five years of the plan, this should allow us to achieve all of the commitments.

17. There are 14 prioritised commitments at present, where we have or are likely to see some significant progress in 2021:

Commitment	Progress expected in 2021
Social impact pledges (1)	Submit social impact pledges and activities around them (Agenda item 7)
Community Grants (3 and 4)	Work around diversification and impact assessment will be going on in 2021
IntoUniversity (6)	Scheduled to begin operation in 2021
Co-created programme of exhibitions (12)	Online exhibitions in 2021
Knowledge exchange (13)	New pages on public engagement with research likely to be on Edinburgh Local in 2021
Centre for Open Learning (14)	Outreach plan published in 2021
Scottish University Community Network (17)	First Scotland-wide meeting will be in 2021
2050 Edinburgh City Vision (18)	Complete
Links to slavery and colonialism (22)	Lots of work on this going on across the University
Museums and Collections (25)	Likely to be further work on this in 2021
Governance reform (34 & 35)	Complete
Annual report (37)	Should be published late 2021

18. In addition to the 37 Community Plan commitments, following consultation with Michelle Brown, two commitments from the Social and Civic Responsibility Plan will also be tracked in this implementation plan. These are fair work and poverty awareness, neither of which were in the Community Plan.

Resource implications

19. The monitoring of the status of each of the commitments will require some resource, from both the responsible unit and Community Team. However, every effort has been made to stress to responsible units that where there reporting requirements for measures of success associated with the Community Plan, these should be in line with existing reporting requirements, so as to avoid duplication of effort.

20. Achieving the commitments in the Community Plan will inevitably require resources, and it is assumed that these will be met within responsible unit's budgets/staffing. However where issues arise, these should be brought to the Board's attention through this implementation plan and its updates.

Risk Management

21. There are reputational risks associated with failing to achieve the commitments in the Community Plan. Some of the individual commitments themselves will have risks – including legal, reputational and health and safety. It is up to the appropriate responsible unit to ensure that these risks are well mitigated, and where appropriate for the Community Team to communicate this to the Board through the implementation plan.

22. The proactive management of risks and issues through the implementation plan provides is a proportionate way of ensuring that risk is mitigated.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

23. Not applicable as this paper is around the implementation of the Community Plan, which has already been assessed against Climate Emergency & SDGs.

Equality & Diversity

24. Not applicable as this paper is around the implementation of the Community Plan, which has already been assessed for its impact on equality and diversity.

Next steps/implications

25. The Community Team will continue to keep the Board updated on changes to RAG status and new risks/issues through their regular report at Board meetings.

26. Further work will be done with responsible units/responsible Board members to help define what work needs to be done on commitments where this is yet to happen. This work will take place in the first half of 2021.

Consultation

27. This paper has been drawn up based on conversations with the Community Team.

28. Some consultation has taken place with responsible units on the status of their commitments. These include conversations with Museums and Collections, Widening Participation, CAM, the Community Team. Further consultation is required to look at implementation and measures of success of other commitments.

Further information

29. Author

Presenter

Stuart Tooley

Stuart Tooley

Community Relations Manager
Communications and Marketing
(on behalf of the Community Team)

Freedom of Information

30. Open paper



COMMUNITY BOARD

22 April 2021

Employee Volunteering – Project Update

Description of paper

1. This paper provides an update on employee volunteering at the University of Edinburgh, in relation to Volunteering Activities as part of the Special Leave Policy.
2. Commitment 9 of the Community Plan 2020-2025 is to “Encourage staff to take part in the University’s new ‘Day to Make a Difference’.

Action requested

3. The Community Board is invited to discuss the paper’s contents.

Background and context

4. The Special Leave policy states that employees are entitled to one paid day of leave for volunteering activities.
 - i. The extent of guidance is: *“You can request time off to volunteer. This can be with a charity or local organisation or at a sporting or other high profile events, e.g. Royal Edinburgh Hospital, the Commonwealth Games.”*
5. The University has committed to promote and support staff and student volunteering activities with local communities in both the Social and Civic Responsibility Delivery Plan and Community Plan 2020-2025
6. There was additional prioritisation and capacity from May 2020 for project coordination provided by the Community Engagement Projects Coordinator in the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability (SRS).

Progress during 2020-2021

7. The Project Coordinator began their role at the end of May 2020. Early activity centred on gathering information about the policy, its development and its ownership.
8. A project plan was developed and agreed upon by the Community Team and resourced by staff in the Department of Social Responsibility and Sustainability, together with Communications and Marketing (CAM) and Human Resources (HR). Aims and objectives:

- i. Raise awareness for the Special Leave policy, reward and recognition and current opportunities for volunteering.
 - ii. Create a culture of volunteering through training and guidance, storytelling and branding of A Day to Make a Difference.
 - iii. Maximise benefit for the University and Communities
 - iv. Ensure the policy is accessible to all staff and the provision of support by The Community team is sustainable.
9. A Working Group was established bringing together CAM, SRS and HR. This had been previously attempted with the original policy proposal (People Committee 2018) but not achieved.
10. The working group members developed and led awareness raising activities:
- i. Volunteering resources were added to Edinburgh Local as part of its redevelopment. This marked a change as the site now provides information for internal University audiences, as well external audiences.
 - ii. Policy guidance was established and communicated, for staff and line managers, in accordance with wider HR policy and practice.
 - iii. Webpage content was developed and demonstrated University-wide engagement with volunteering activities: case studies, volunteering stories, 'how-to' guides.
 - iv. Branding and communication assets for A Day to Make a Difference (DTMAD) were developed and channels for engagement were identified.
 - a. Specific highlights include a sponsored post on the University's LinkedIn page that reached 1,300 staff members; articles in the staff magazine Bulletin, and posts from the main social media accounts of the University.
 - v. DTMAD was a headline commitment as part of the Community Plan launch, including in videos featuring the Principal.
 - vi. Staff volunteering was a key request in the Community Team's discussions with departments and schools on the Community Plan.
11. Culture change activities
- i. The Working Group members collaborated with HR to develop staff learning and development objectives – not yet live.
 - ii. Research showed that there was limited external recognition schemes for adults over 25 and were not fit for recognising limited volunteering efforts. Cross departmental discussions demonstrated a desire for a scheme but challenges in its design.
 - iii. Staff volunteering activities, beyond DTMAD and in personal capacities, were recognised as part of the SRS Changemakers Awards 2021 (1 x Winner; 2 x Highly commended)

- iv. Training and best practice support signposted to the Third Sector Interface. The Working Group assessed their capacity to create and deliver training, but it was deemed beyond capacity.
 - v. Employee volunteering was integrated into the Health and Wellbeing Hub, as well as induction and onboarding resources, to ensure visibility for new staff as they join
12. Opportunity management
- i. Volunteer Edinburgh continue to be the most valuable source of volunteering opportunities – they are prominently signposted.
 - ii. The Community Team explored the establishment of a preferred partner system with Community Grantees. For many the limited engagement of staff was not compatible with their limited resources. Additionally student volunteers were consistently seen as more desirable.
 - iii. Trustee Volunteering was identified as an area of need and opportunity so additional signposting was implemented. Bespoke training was explored with EVOC and Volunteer Edinburgh Trustee Volunteering, but research suggested limited staff capacity would lead to a low uptake.
 - iv. At the height of the pandemic the Working Group supported the Student Volunteering Service's position that in-person volunteering was not recommended by the University.

Achievements

- 13. Increased awareness for DTMAD and understanding recognition of the Community Team's support for the policy. Demonstrated by requests from communities and staff for support and coordination; increased requests to present to colleagues.
- 14. The Working Group provided access to HR policy understanding and implementation. Additionally for integrating with University wide processes. Representation from CAM enabled access to key communication channels and skills to develop assets. This collaboration occurred quickly but had previously been difficult to fulfil.
- 15. Prioritising employee volunteering has enabled the Working Group to commit resources to development of support.
- 16. There is University-wide support for employee volunteering and a shared understanding of its value. The Working Group has successfully raised awareness and invited interest, as seen by the number of consultation requests and presentations.
- 17. The launch of People and Money increased visibility of the policy and the mechanism to collect and record data. Employees are better able to

understand and request their leave. This is important for understanding whether or not the actions taken over the last year to raise awareness will lead to increases in employees taking their leave.

Challenges

18. The COVID-19 Pandemic changed the way staff and students engage with the University and their job. The challenges associated with working remotely and collaborating challenged the Working Group supporting the policy and staff participating in it.
 - i. Many staff had reduced capacity due to caring commitments, increased workload, and personal health.
 - ii. The nature of volunteering changed – research indicates that in-person group volunteering is most effective for driving participation. These opportunities were impossible, and remain challenging.

19. Many volunteering opportunities require significant preparation and management of the individual. Only a subset of all volunteering opportunities are able to utilise one-off volunteers with minimal preparation and management. Employees are not all willing to commit to long term opportunities.

20. Volunteering is hard to define, and can be achieved in many ways. The Working Group promoted best practice as activities most closely aligned with the University's goals to work with local communities, but acknowledged the variety of ways to engage socially and civically.
 - i. The Community Team did not preside over qualification of activities as volunteering or otherwise. There must be clear communication between an employee and their manager to ensure the activities are suitable.

21. The Working Group was unable to collect data for participation in employee volunteering, which could provide a baseline for the measures of success. People and Money will provide this data in time and will allow us to follow the trends in uptake.

Recommendations for Employee Volunteering

22. The Working Group should continue to coordinate employee volunteering support and guidance, and meet every quarter or at times of particular increased activity relating to volunteering e.g. Volunteers Week, June 2021.
 - i. Key activities and objectives should be defined in each area of work: CAM - awareness raising activities for Volunteers Week 2021; HR - the launch of Learning and Development Objectives, People and Money data; Community Team - Community Grantee partnership development.

- ii. In spite of reduced capacity, the Edinburgh Local webpages should remain the go-to place for up-to-date information. Enquiries requiring further coordination should be shared between the community engagement staff in SRS, CAM and HR depending on the subject or request.
 - iii. Key milestones, outputs and objectives will be determined at the Working Group meeting 24th April for the following year, for review after 12 months.
23. Group volunteering is the hook for individuals and teams. As restrictions ease communications around in-person opportunities should increase. With limited capacity the Working Group should increase focus on group activities rather than individual volunteering (limited by 1 day and one-off engagement).
 24. Assess the implementation of employee annual review and objectives and record the engagement with employee volunteering activities.
 25. Include DTMAD in departmental Community Plan action plans, developed by the Community Team and Departmental leaders.
 26. Organise a city-wide volunteering day, with multiple projects providing in-person group volunteering activities, organised for employees centrally by the University.

Risk Management

27. The pandemic has increased social concern and community minded activities. There is a risk of missed opportunity if this energy dissipates as restrictions ease. The Working Group will identify key opportunities to promote volunteering.
 - i. The Working Group has provided consultation and support for departments and schools to develop their response to the Community Plan, and embed activities like DTMAD.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

28. 10 – *Reduce inequality within and among countries* – volunteers often engage with the most vulnerable groups in society, who have been hit hardest by the pandemic.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

29. No Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken because there are no proposed changes to the policy at this stage.

Further information

30. Authors & Presenters
Brendan Seenan, SRS Community Engagement Projects Coordinator
Brendan.seenan@ed.ac.uk

Sarah Anderson, Community Engagement Programme Manager
Sarah.anderson@ed.ac.uk

31. Consulted on this paper
Michelle Brown, Deputy Director Social Responsibility and Sustainability and
Head of SRS Programmes
M.H.Brown@ed.ac.uk
Stuart Tooley, Community Relations Manager, Communications and
Marketing
Stuart.Tooley@ed.ac.uk

Freedom of Information

32. This is an open paper and can be published in full.



Community Board

22 April 2021

Community Board – Interaction with City of Edinburgh Council priorities

Description of paper

1. The purpose of this paper is to set out the current priorities of one of the University's key partner organisations, the City of Edinburgh Council (CEC), in order to update the Board and to stimulate discussion about how the Community Plan and Community Board could interact with specific CEC outcomes.

Action requested

2. The Board is asked to discuss and endorse the recommendations contained in paragraphs 13, 17 and 22.

Background

3. The CEC recently published its new [Business Plan 2021: Our Future Council, Our Future City](#). This plan covers the years 2021-2024 and sets out three ongoing priorities:
 - a. ending poverty and preventing adverse outcomes such as homelessness and unemployment
 - b. becoming a sustainable and net zero city
 - c. making sure wellbeing and equalities are enhanced for all.
4. The plan is designed to link the CEC's operations to the shared goals and commitments of the Edinburgh Partnership Board (on which the University sits) and move it towards the long-term ambitions set out in the 2050 Edinburgh City Vision (which the University has signed up to as part of the Community Plan).
5. The plan has 15 specific outcomes in relation to the three priorities, and the University has, or will have, an interaction with almost all of these. However, for the purposes of this paper, three specific CEC outcomes have been outlined for discussion as the most pressing and relevant issues for the Community Board.

Discussion

6. **Outcome 1: On track to end poverty in Edinburgh by 2030 by meeting the targets set by the Edinburgh Poverty Commission**
7. The [Edinburgh Poverty Commission](#) concluded its report in September 2020 and made its conclusions under the following headings:
 - a. The right support in the places we live and work
 - b. Fair work that provides enough to live on
 - c. A decent home we can afford to live in

- d. Income security that offers a real lifeline
 - e. Opportunities that drive justice and boost prospects
 - f. Connections in a city that belongs to us
 - g. Equality in our health and wellbeing
8. The University was specifically mentioned under (e) in relation to doing “more to improve opportunities for people on low incomes, for example by sharing teaching and learning resources online”.
 9. While the recommendations are mainly designed for statutory service providers, as the third largest employer in Edinburgh and an anchor institution within the city, the University interacts with many of the Commission’s recommendations and is also directly referenced within the report.
 10. As a member of the Edinburgh Partnership Board, the University is expected to act on the Poverty Commission’s recommendations. The University has also signed up to the 2050 Edinburgh City Vision – itself a commitment in the Community Plan.
 11. Acting on the Commission’s recommendations will also help the University show progress on actions aligned to the delivery of SDG 11 (sustainable cities and communities) and SDG 1 (no poverty), as well as other SDGs as set out in our Social & Civic Responsibility Delivery Plan.
 12. An initial mapping exercise was carried out with University colleagues in November/December 2020 to see where the University could interact with the recommendations (see Annex A), but further action was paused while the Community Board was being set up.
 13. Recommendation: The Board is invited to agree to convene a subgroup Chaired by the Deputy Director, Stakeholder Relations, to look at how the University can meet the recommendations of the Edinburgh Poverty Commission; to progress these proposals as far as possible in-between Community Board meetings; and to report back to future Community Board meetings on progress, as required.
 14. **Outcome 4: Intervene before the point of crisis to prevent homelessness**
 15. This outcome specifically calls for investment in homelessness services focusing on the prevention of homelessness in the first place and early intervention.
 16. This relates directly to the first commitment in the University’s Community Plan:

“Sustain and grow activities related to our social impact pledges including: Tackling homelessness and rough sleeping...”
 17. Recommendation: The Board is invited to note the importance of preventing homelessness to the CEC for its business planning purposes, and the overlap with the commitments in the Community Plan. The Board is also invited to

discuss the potential benefits of the University maintaining a commitment to tackling homelessness in its own Social Impact Pledges.

18. Outcome 12: People can access the support they need in the place they live and work

19. This outcome specifically mentions the importance of the 20-minute neighbourhood, which CEC believes can help it deliver across all three business plan priorities.

20. A recent presentation about the purpose of 20-minute neighbourhoods is attached for further detail (see attached)

21. Initial discussions have already taken place with CEC about the 20-minute neighbourhood proposals as they potentially relate to the IntoUniversity learning Centre in Craigmillar (a commitment in the Community Plan), as well as ongoing plans for the BioQuarter and the potential regeneration work at the Granton Waterfront. CEC are now looking for a single point of contact from the University in order to progress these proposals in a more holistic manner.

22. Recommendation: The Board is invited to note the increased importance of the 20-minute neighbourhood proposals to CEC for its business planning purposes and how they overlap with various University proposals; and to agree on a common approach to any further engagement with CEC, including a single point of contact in either CAM or Estates.

Further Information

23. Authors and presenters

Gavin Donoghue (author and presenter)
Deputy Director, Stakeholder Relations
Communications and Marketing



COMMUNITY BOARD

22 April 2021

Community Team update

Description of paper

1. This paper is a regular update on the activity of the Community Team since the last Board meeting.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The Board is asked to note the paper.

Background and context

3. The Community Team will provide a regular update to each Board meeting. As described in Paper D on the Implementation of the Community Plan, this update will include any commitments where the RAG status has changed, or remains Red. This is not in this paper, as that information is in Paper D.

4. Otherwise, this paper will provide any updates of note that are not covered in other papers, and will primarily be for noting, rather than looking for specific input from the Board.

Discussion

5. Community Plan commitments that have seen significant progress due to Community Team activity since the January Board meeting include:

- a. **Community Grants** (3 and 5) – a further round of Community Grants with c. £35,000 to allocate have closed and will be determined on 27 April 2021. A meeting of the Community Grantees network took place on 25 February 2021, and a series of 1:1 meetings have taken place with grantees to better understand the impact of their projects, and to seek further partnerships. Microgrants continue to be dispersed, and there are plans for a round of these related to environmental matters in the run up to COP26.
- b. **Communication of the Community Plan** (33) has continued including meeting with the City of Edinburgh Council on 17 March 2021, and IGMM (now IGC) all staff meeting on 3 March 2021.
- c. **The publication of the Community Board's membership**, remit and papers (35) has now happened and are available [here](#). This page is also linked to from the [Strategic Planning pages](#) of the University website.

6. Major work has been going on in relation to Day to Make a Difference (9), and this is reported in Paper F.

7. Community Relations activities ongoing on include a project around the anti-social behaviour issues in Bristo Square, and liaison around the changes that are likely to happen to the kids' garden as a result of the EFI development.

8. Community Engagement activities include supporting a new series of 50 minute forums put together by Ruthanne Baxter (Museums) on Communities in Focus and a new project called Edinburgh Eats which is a new recipe box scheme designed to tackle poverty and inequality.

Resource implications

9. Not applicable as this is an update.

Risk Management

10. Not applicable as this is an update.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

11. Not applicable as this is an update.

Equality & Diversity

12. Not applicable as this is an update.

Next steps/implications

13. Not applicable as this is an update.

Consultation

14. This paper has been drawn up based on conversations with the Community Team.

Further information

29. Author

Presenter

Stuart Tooley

Community Relations Manager
Communications and Marketing
(on behalf of the Community Team)

Stuart Tooley

Freedom of Information

30. Open paper