



The Effectiveness of Birmingham SRB Programmes in Getting People into Work

develop economic strategies for their regions. Their funding streams included the SRB from 1999 onwards. More recently their remit has been reinforced as the strategic leader of economic development and regeneration in regions such as the West Midlands.

The Learning and Skills Council is a nationally run organisation with 47 local Learning and Skills Councils across England. The Council was formed in April 2001 replacing the Training and Enterprise Councils and the Further Education Funding Council to work with partners, employers, learning providers, community groups and individuals to develop and implement strategies that meet the Government's aims set out in the 'Learning to Succeed' White Paper. The LSC is responsible for all post-16 education and training.

Jobcentre Plus replaced the Employment Service and Benefits Agency in April 2002 and was a major part of the government's Welfare to Work Strategy. It sought to establish a work focus in relation to all new or repeat claims for benefit: to do so required the integration of benefit claiming, (the core business of the Benefits Agency) and work placement/job seeking (a central role of the Employment Service). The new service (which will not be fully operational till 2006) means that customers have one point of contact for benefits advice and help to get back into work.

Connexions is the government's new support service for all young people aged 13 - 19 in England. The service aims to provide integrated advice, guidance and access to personal development opportunities for this group and to help them make a smooth transition to adulthood and working life. Connexions joins up the work of six government Departments and their agencies and organisations on the ground, together with private and voluntary sector groups and youth and careers services. It offers practical help with choosing the right courses and careers, including access to broader personal development through activities like sport, performing arts and volunteering activities. It will also provide help and advice on issues like drug abuse, sexual health and homelessness.

6.6.3 Conclusions

Since the introduction of the SRB there have been significant changes in the policy environment in which the programme has operated. This has led to a considerable amount of organisational change in government departments and the agencies responsible to them.

However many of the issues, which the scheme and the new policy directives were set up to address remain of serious concern. Partly this is about the intractable, deep-rooted and complex nature of unemployment and market failure in some inner city urban areas and



The Effectiveness of Birmingham SRB Programmes in Getting People into Work

the complexity of actions to resolve this. In part it may be that there is a lack of added value from the range of schemes and initiatives working together.

We received a number of comments broadly suggesting that the government should reduce the number of initiatives, provide local areas and cities with adequate funds and trust them to get on with it. This would reduce the enormous costs of the bureaucracy and administration currently needed to underpin this raft of initiatives.



The Effectiveness of Birmingham SRB Programmes in Getting People into Work

7: Conclusions

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter we draw on the evidence and findings presented in the previous chapters to summarise the main issues and features of the Birmingham based SRB programmes relative to the objectives of the review. We will identify what is working well and what improvements could be made to regeneration programmes across the city. The information will be presented in the following sections:

- ❑ The employment impact of the SRB programmes in Birmingham
- ❑ The partnership process and involvement of stakeholders
- ❑ Sustainability of Regeneration Actions

7.2 The Employment Impact of SRB Programmes in Birmingham.

The SRBCF, in drawing together eighteen previously separate budgets, was designed to encourage a more coherent, holistic and strategic approach to the design of regeneration interventions. Birmingham was successful in winning resources in five of the six rounds of the SRBCF. Across the city there are eleven separate programmes which are either thematic in approach, or they are area-based, focussing on a large range of issues in a defined geographical area. Each of these programmes included some or all of core SRB objectives identified in Chapter 5 Section 1 of the report.

In reviewing the delivery plans and performance reports for each programme it is immediately clear that the visions are ambitious, the programmes complex and varied in their objectives and the methods they used to achieve these. This is particularly so in the way each partnership tackles the issues related to employment making comparisons between schemes difficult.

However we are able to say that the SRB programmes in Birmingham have created over 8,000 jobs and safeguarded a further 28,700. Enterprise Link, part of SRB1, was the only programme which was solely concerned with jobs related outputs. This scheme overachieved its targets. Although the remaining programmes with the exception of the CEBP all had jobs related outcome targets the scale and scope of these varied from 20 to 6543 jobs created.

In undertaking this review we requested information from a wide



The Effectiveness of Birmingham SRB Programmes in Getting People into Work

range of people and agencies involved in or benefiting from the SRBCF in the city. Unfortunately the information provided has not been consistent across all programmes and we have had limited success in identifying the types of jobs created and the beneficiaries of those jobs.

This was partly due to the emphasis which GOWM put on the assessment of outputs against the delivery plan targets. This has led to SRB being very much output (as opposed to outcome) focussed. Thus, any assessment of achievements tends to be preoccupied with whether the individual projects are achieving their targets, assessed against short-term quantitative indicators, (for example the number of jobs created or saved, the number of trainees trained), rather than whether the strategic objectives have been met.

It is this output dominated audit culture which has characterised the SRB in all rounds rather than a concern with what differences the SRB programmes have made to the quality of life for those living in the most disadvantaged areas.

The second problem we encountered in obtaining evidence for the review relates to the way this output data is assembled at different layers of management throughout the process. For example there is specific evidence required to claim a job created output but this appears to be held at the point of project delivery. This qualitative information is not collated at programme or Accountable Body level in the majority of cases. There is no suggestion that the claims are inaccurate (it was outside the scope of this review to examine that issue) and there are comprehensive audit processes in place, which have been made more robust over recent years. The concern is that the information is difficult to find and in many cases not available.

We conclude from this assessment that in future, SRB programmes should have employment evaluation procedures built into every stage of the planning and delivery process - so that the 'additionality' of the programme can be clearly demonstrated at key milestones during the project and as part of a final evaluation & exit strategy. Client tracking, surveys of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries and better administrative data are all examples of good practice leading to improvements in evaluation.

7.3 The Scale and Breadth of the Programmes

Individual contributors and the visits also highlighted remarkable differences around the physical scale, population and the complexity of the activities to be delivered in comparison to other areas. The amount of funding and lifetime of the programme was also felt to be significant.



The Effectiveness of Birmingham SRB Programmes in Getting People into Work

Chapter 6 highlights that the population density and geographical area covered in each of the Birmingham SRB schemes is between two and three times higher than in Castle Vale or Liverpool. Funding levels vary too. Castle Vale is a twelve year £300m programme but SRB1 in Saltley and Small Heath was £12.8m and SRB2 was £23m both over 7 years.

Value for money was an aspect of the competitive nature of the SRB and bidders reported that it was difficult to anticipate what GOWM was looking for in a successful bid. This perhaps encouraged projects to be over ambitious in what they could achieve in order to secure the resources. This was felt to be more of an issue in the early rounds when there were few if any alternative funding opportunities. This approach failed to acknowledge the deep seated, intransigent nature of the problems of market failure in urban areas.

Some respondents and the early evaluation reports identified the tendency for projects to operate in silos and to neglect the opportunities to interact. There is a clear need to ensure that there is a better understanding of the consequence of one type of action on another e.g. housing demolition, the types of jobs created and the skills development of the local communities, along with the transport infrastructure.

7.4 The Partnership Process and Involvement of Stakeholders

One of the key aspects of the SRB approach was its emphasis on the partnership model of delivery. This was fundamental to the delivery of each scheme, as it was believed that this would lead to better regeneration outcomes and to the sustainability of the process.

There were many comments about the role of strategic agencies (who in the main were co-signatories of the bids) and their attitude to regeneration monies, particularly in the early rounds. The views were expressed that these key agencies should clearly state what their contribution and commitment to the programme is over its lifetime and beyond, which would ensure the sustainability of the regeneration process. Further it was felt that they should be more proactive in identifying innovative best practice from the regeneration initiatives and apply this to mainstream activities and funding regimes.

It was also reported that setting up the initial partnerships which pulled the bids together was relatively easy but it proved to be much more difficult to develop the partnerships beyond this to a more collaborative form of working with a shared vision and common



The Effectiveness of Birmingham SRB Programmes in Getting People into Work

objectives. This is in part due to the conflicting objectives of funding bodies and the significant number of new regeneration initiatives over the last five years. The considerable changes in Government Departments and in organisational structures of a range of agencies has also contributed to this aspect of the partnership.

There were a range of models adopted across the different rounds in setting up the partnership boards. These varied from a board of Chief Executives of agencies in the Core Skills Partnership to an elected board of Community Representatives in SRB6. In general contributors felt that the board structures were difficult to establish but once set up worked reasonably well.

We received many comments about the partnerships, stakeholder involvement and the role of key agencies concerning the early rounds in particular. A key message coming through was that the City Council should provide clearer leadership and adopt a role, which was more facilitative than dominant.

There were also a number of comments concerning the partnership process and particularly involving the community in identification of needs, decision-making and planning. Although there is evidence of higher community involvement in the later rounds several respondents highlighted that the partners were slow to take on board the lessons from both mistakes and good practice of the earlier rounds.

Further issues related to the range of partners involved (and equally as important not involved) in the programmes and the need to be clear what was expected of each partner and each board member. Overall a considerable amount of time is spent in developing the partnerships in regeneration. However there is little hard evidence on the impact, effectiveness and added value these partnerships bring to the regeneration process. No partnership indicators were identified during the review although anecdotally some respondents thought the process worked well and others did not.

7.5 Sustainability of Regeneration Actions

Partnerships should be clearer about the issues they are trying to resolve before the programme starts. This could be summed up as funding the programme rather than programming the funds and would provide a better focus for the interventions and projects within the programme. In order to know what has been achieved an audit of the existing and planned mainstream contributions in the area should be completed before the programme commences.

There is limited evidence that mainstream agencies endeavour to



The Effectiveness of Birmingham SRB Programmes in Getting People into Work

ensure that innovation and best practice from programmes is taken forward in mainstream delivery. Stakeholders also suggested that the lessons of past mistakes or good practice were not being learned and this is due, in part, to the culture of short term contracts for staff on programmes. The knowledge and skill gained throughout the programme is lost to future programmes as staff leave for other jobs before the end of the programme. This is particularly important in terms of establishing boards and evaluation of activities.

Individual partnerships carry out their own interim and final evaluations without pressure from GOWM/AWM but there have not been evaluations of the whole impact of the programmes. Neither GOWM nor AWM have pushed for this, the reasons perhaps being the scale and complexity of the SRB programmes in the West Midlands and Birmingham in particular, makes the demand on staff time and resources that would be required prohibitive.

Whilst GOWM said they might evaluate the impact SRB has had on the West Midlands little work has been done to date. Yet some assessment of the impact on Birmingham and the region would appear to be essential if the next generation of urban policy is to benefit from the lessons to be drawn from the challenge fund approach.

The recommendations presented in the following chapter are drawn from the findings of the review. We hope that they will contribute to future policy on regeneration support both organisations and staff delivering future regeneration activities to improve their understanding of the issues and have a greater impact on the desired outcome.



The Effectiveness of Birmingham SRB Programmes in Getting People into Work

8: Recommendations

No	Recommendation	Responsibility	Completion Date
1	Future regeneration priorities of the city should have clearer objectives linked to defined outcomes and methods of measurement. They should be set down in the Community Strategy, show the linkage between the regeneration priorities and the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy and Targets and other relevant strategies and identify the funding to deliver the actions.	The Leader of the Council in consultation with the City Strategic Partnership, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and GOWM	Oct 2003
2	Protocols for Partnership should be developed for all major regeneration programmes. This will ensure that the added value of the partnership process is clear at the outset.	Cabinet Member for Regeneration should make representation to AWM and GOWM	Oct 2003
3	Identify the freedoms and flexibilities, which can be achieved through mainstream services to ensure the sustainability of best practice and innovation at the local level.	Cabinet Member for Regeneration to make representations to AWM, GOWM and ODPM	Dec 2003
4	Improve the guidance provided in setting up future regeneration partnerships, boards and delivery vehicles. This could be achieved through seminars and discussions with partners and communities in the city, region and nationally.	Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Director of Economic Development	Dec 2003
5	Ensure that there is coherence of delivery and objectives in relation to these and future regeneration programmes and other initiatives that can be targeted on specified areas.	Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Director of Economic Development	Dec 2003
6	Review the staffing structures of existing regeneration programmes to ensure that they have the capacity to deliver the activities. Ensure that future programmes have a staff resource plan in place at the outset.	Director of Economic Development	Dec 2003
7	Ensure all current and future regeneration schemes put in place and implement effective tracking and evaluation mechanisms to measure the impact of the	Director of Economic Development and AWM in taking forward SRB6, NDC1 and 2 and	Dec 2003



The Effectiveness of Birmingham SRB Programmes in Getting People into Work

	actions on intended beneficiaries and issues.	future Regeneration programmes	
8	Review succession (including exit) strategies of the current range of programmes to establish how they are managed to the end of the funding and ensure the regeneration process is sustainable.	Director Of Economic Development	Jan 2004
9	Ensure that there are clear and continuous progression opportunities for long term unemployed people to develop the necessary skills to access jobs.	Director of Economic Development through the Employment Strategy Group to ensure the links are made across all projects and programmes.	Dec 2003
10	Progress on actions within these recommendations should be reported to the Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	Named persons in 1-8 above	Dec 2003 and annually thereafter.



LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Appendix A

Name	Organisation	Evidence					
		Writ- ten/ email	Quest- ionn- aire	Inter- views	Presen- -tation	Visit	Focus Group
Councillors / MPs							
Cllr David Williams	Deputy Leader, Birmingham City Council	✓					
Cllr John Tyrrell	Birmingham City Council	✓					
Cllr Roy Benjamin	Birmingham City Council	✓					
Cllr Steve Bedser	Birmingham City Council	✓					
Cllr Andrew Coulson	Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Birmingham City Council			✓			
Rt Hon Terry Davis MP		✓					
Signatories to Bid Documents							
Jane Slowey	Chief Executive Birmingham CAN! Chief Executive BVSC		✓				
Clive Wright	Executive Director Groundwork Birmingham		✓				
Margaret Tovey	District Manager Birmingham & Solihull Job Centre Plus		✓				
Olu Olanrewaju	Managing Director Midland Area Housing Association		✓				
Board Members							
Dr Abid Hussain	Chair of Sub Board SRB1 Saltley/Small Heath		✓				
Zualfquar Hussain	Vice Chair SRB1 Saltley/Small Heath Chief Executive Small Heath Community Forum		✓				
Rosa Hardwick	Chair of Board SRB2 SSTARI		✓				
Mohammed Shafique	Vice Chair of Board SRB2 SSTARI		✓				
Jonathan Drifill	Chair of SRB4 Birmingham CAN! Director if Community Regeneration FCH Housing & Care		✓				
Cynthia Bower	Chair of SRB5 Family Support		✓				
Programme Managers							
Geoff Bateson	Programme Manager, SRB2 Core Skills		✓	✓			
Afzal Hussain	Economic Regeneration Manager, Focus Housing (SRB2 Aston Venture)		✓				
Graham Edwards	Programme Manager SRB1 Saltley/Small Heath, SRB2 SSTARI			✓	✓		

Appendix A



Nicola Tyler	Programme Manager, SRB4 Birmingham CAN!		✓				
Hans Schlappa	Programme Manager, SRB4 Community Safety		✓				
Fiona Hughes	Programme Manager, SRB5 Family Support		✓	✓			
Waheed Nazir	Programme Manager, SRB6 Corridors of Regeneration		✓	✓	✓		
Paul Hanna	Programme Manager, SRB1 Enterprise Link			✓			
Those involved in the delivery of SRB in Birmingham							
Mary Green	Vice Principal (Strategy & Technology) City College, SRB1 plus 5 & 6		✓				
Adrian Banham	Community Economic Development Officer, EDD, SRB1 Saltley/Small Heath		✓				
Steve Forrest	Land & Property Manager, Housing Dept, BCC, SRB2 SSTARI		✓				
Jeremy Shields	Contract Monitoring Officer, Housing Dept, BCC, SRB2 SSTARI		✓				
Karen Parker	Investment Programme Manager, Housing Dept, BCC, SRB2 SSTARI		✓				
Colin Weaver	Project Manager, Housing Dept, BCC, SRB2 SSTARI		✓				
Judy Webster	Commissioning Officer – Regeneration, Social Services, SRB2 SSTARI		✓				
Debbie Southwood	Children's Services Manager, Barnados Girlspace, SRB4 Community Safety		✓				
Dawn McCracken	Development Manager, Access, B&SLSC, SRB5 Family Support		✓				
Roger Saunders	Chief Executive, PEP (Priory Estates Project) Ltd, SRB5 Family Support		✓				
Billy Foreman	Assistant Director, Regeneration & Health, South B'ham PCT, SRB5 Family Support				✓		
Russell Johnson	Service Manager, Turning Point, EESPRO Project SRB4 Community Safety				✓		
Susan Crow	Service Delivery Manager, Business Link				✓		
Tim Straker	Recruitment and Selection, SRB2 SSTARI					✓	
Eddie Edmead	Development Officer, SRB5 HART					✓	
Mike Carty	GWINTO Programme Manager (West Midlands)					✓	
Neil Vyse	Planning Department	✓					
Kishor Pala	Business Link	✓					
Vijay Kundalia	Economic Development	✓					
Seamus	Education Department	✓					

Appendix A



Gaynor							
Barry Fulford	Housing Department*	✓					
Tony Burridge	Housing Department	✓					
Robin Taylor	Economic Development	✓					
Steven Hira	Economic Development	✓					
Suresh Patel	Economic Development	✓					
Jean Buxton	Economic Development	✓					
Adrian Jones	Housing Department	✓					
Adrian Rourke	Leisure and Culture	✓					
Phil Ware	Leisure and Culture	✓					
Helen D Davis	Leisure and Culture	✓					
Howard Clay	Leisure And Culture	✓					
Becky Jones	Leisure and Culture	✓					
Paul Capelin	Housing Department						
Martyn Hamond	Housing Department	✓					
Martin Fisher	South Birmingham PCT	✓					
Accountable Body							
Jackie Culliford	Co-ordination and Accountabilities Manager, Economic Development, BCC			✓	✓		
Denise Barratt	Principle Policy Officer, Regeneration, BCC	✓		✓			
Others							
Rod Griffin	Head of the Eastern Team, Advantage West Midlands			✓			
Siobhan Clarke	Regeneration Officer, Advantage West Midlands			✓			
Donald MacIntosh	Director of Economic Development, Castle Vale HAT					✓	
Julie Haywood	Training Manager, Castle Vale HAT					✓	
Nina Jassal	Optima Housing Association	✓					
Lyn Spencer	Director, South Liverpool Partnership					✓	
Glen Walker	General Manager, CREATE Project, Liverpool					✓	
Nick Hughes	Director, JET Shop, South Liverpool					✓	
Jas	Trainee on GWINTO Project			✓			

Appendix A



Christopher	Trainee on GWINTO Project			✓			
David	Trainee on GWINTO Project			✓			
Trainees	SRB2 524 Centre						✓
Trainees	SRB2 Community Education						✓
Trainees	SRB5 Phoenix Training						✓



SUMMARY OF SELECTED JOB RELATED OUTPUTS FOR SRB PROGRAMMES APPENDIX B

The figures in the first two columns show the latest approved targets as shown in the Delivery Plans, followed by the performance to date (Q2 2002/3). The two columns on the right show the same figures for black and ethnic minorities.

CODE	OUTPUT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL	ALL	BME	BME
		YEARS			
		Latest Approved Del Plan Targets	Total Actual to date	Latest Approved Del Plan Targets	Actual to date
SRB1 - SALTLEY/SMALL HEATH					
1A	Number of jobs (i) created	202	298	54	77
	(ii) safeguarded	0	2213	0	561
1C	Number of people trained obtaining qualifications	2923	4062	1659	2638
	No of residents of target areas accessing employment through training, advice or specifically targetted assistance.				
1D		1426	1553	1007	1122
1F(I)	Number of trained people obtaining jobs.	150	166	48	53
	Survival Rate of new business - number surviving for				
2C(ii)	52 weeks	0	0	0	0
2D	Number of businesses advised	1803	2184	643	814
6A	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed for open space	5	7	0	0
	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed/serviced for				
6B	development	18	18	0	0
	(i) Number of voluntary organisations supported				
8A	wholly or in part by SRB Fund	679	871	298	460
	(ii) Number of community groups supported wholly				
	or in part by SRB Fund	0	26	0	4
SRB1 - CEBP					
1A	Number of jobs (i) created	0	0		0
	(ii) safeguarded	0	0		0
1C	Number of people trained obtaining qualifications	7000	6263	2077	2077
	No of residents of target areas accessing employment through training, advice or specifically targetted assistance.				
1D		0	0		0
1F(I)	Number of trained people obtaining jobs.	0	0		0
	Survival Rate of new business - number surviving for				
2C(ii)	52 weeks	0	0		0
2D	Number of businesses advised	0	0		0
6A	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed for open space	0	0		0
	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed/serviced for				
6B	development	0	0		0
	(i) Number of voluntary organisations supported				
8A	wholly or in part by SRB Fund	0	0		0
	(ii) Number of community groups supported wholly				
	or in part by SRB Fund	0	0		0



SRB 1 - ENTERPRISE LINK					
1A	Number of jobs (i) created	6048	6543	1055	1259
	(ii) safeguarded	0	0		0
1C	Number of people trained obtaining qualifications	0	0		0
	No of residents of target areas accessing employment through training, advice or specifically targetted assistance.	6048	6543	1055	1259
1D	Number of trained people obtaining jobs.	6048	6543	1055	1259
1F(I)	Survival Rate of new business - number surviving for 52 weeks	3027	3237	486	647
2C(ii)	Number of businesses advised	0	0		0
2D	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed for open space	0	0		0
6A	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed/serviced for development	0	0		0
6B	(i) Number of voluntary organisations supported wholly or in part by SRB Fund	0	0		0
8A	(ii) Number of community groups supported wholly or in part by SRB Fund	0	0		0
SRB2 - SPARKBROOK, SPARKHILL AND TYSELEY					
1A	Number of jobs (i) created	1315	1535	657	720.2
	(ii) safeguarded	0	7949	0	1427
1C	Number of people trained obtaining qualifications	9036	13814	6865	11564
	No of residents of target areas accessing employment through training, advice or specifically targetted assistance.	1191	717	700	477
1D	Number of trained people obtaining jobs.	156	410	93	58
1F(I)	Survival Rate of new business - number surviving for 52 weeks	196	196	102	100
2C(ii)	Number of businesses advised	1972	2838	712	631
2D	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed for open space	7	8		0
6A	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed/serviced for development	0	0		0
6B	(i) Number of voluntary organisations supported wholly or in part by SRB Fund	172	649	125	404
8A	(ii) Number of community groups supported wholly or in part by SRB Fund	120	279	43	109
SRB2 - CORE SKILLS					
1A	Number of jobs (i) created	41	41	5	4.6
	(ii) safeguarded	21000	15943	4200	2837
1C	Number of people trained obtaining qualifications	19402	17331	3947	4553
	No of residents of target areas accessing employment through training, advice or specifically targetted assistance.	0	0		0
1D	Number of trained people obtaining jobs.	3745	3632	1412	1364
1F(I)	Survival Rate of new business - number surviving for 52 weeks	0	0		0
2C(ii)	Number of businesses advised	1104	848		0

Appendix B



6A	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed for open space	0	0		0
6B	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed/serviced for development	0	0		0
8A	(i) Number of voluntary organisations supported wholly or in part by SRB Fund	178	198	50	47
	(ii) Number of community groups supported wholly or in part by SRB Fund	73	90	24	25
SRB4 - COMMUNITY SAFETY 4 BIRMINGHAM					
1A	Number of jobs (i) created	47	50	20	21
	(ii) safeguarded	1659	2246	446	499
1C	Number of people trained obtaining qualifications	2908	1659	768	508
	No of residents of target areas accessing employment through training, advice or specifically targetted assistance.				
1D		3	2	3	0
1F(I)	Number of trained people obtaining jobs.	34	26	5	5
	Survival Rate of new business - number surviving for 52 weeks				
2C(ii)		0	0		0
2D	Number of businesses advised	645	875		97
6A	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed for open space	0	0		0
6B	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed/serviced for development	0	0		0
8A	(i) Number of voluntary organisations supported wholly or in part by SRB Fund	510	440	87	119
	(ii) Number of community groups supported wholly or in part by SRB Fund	282	211	64	42
9A	Value of other public & private sector funding : (i) Total SRB Fund spend (£k)	9888	5472		0
	(ii) Total Other Public Spend (£k)	9663	7307		0
	(iii) Total Private Sector Leverage (£k)	1860	1520		0
SRB5- FAMILY SUPPORT ('actuals' to the end of 2001/2)					
1A	Number of jobs (i) created	50	21	13	11
	(ii) safeguarded	52	35	21	10
SRB6 - NORTH WEST CORRIDORS OF REGENERATION					
1A	Number of jobs (i) created	887	20	387	10
	(ii) safeguarded	1536	71	797	7
1C	Number of people trained obtaining qualifications	4218	33	3355	33
	No of residents of target areas accessing employment through training, advice or specifically targetted assistance.				
1D		4039	31	1225	29
1F(I)	Number of trained people obtaining jobs.	210	0	85	0
	Survival Rate of new business - number surviving for 52 weeks				
2C(ii)		0	0		0
2D	Number of businesses advised	365	45	103	20
6A	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed for open space	47	3		0
6B	Hectares of land improved/reclaimed/serviced for development	12	0		0

Appendix B

8A	(i) Number of voluntary organisations supported wholly or in part by SRB Fund	166	33	34	20
	(ii) Number of community groups supported wholly or in part by SRB Fund	340	14	190	11
Value of other public & private sector funding :					
9A	(i) Total SRB Fund spend (£k)	*34,272	3,364		
	(ii) Total Other Public Spend (£k)	48,024	2,491		
	(iii) Total private sector leverage (£k)	63,097	69		

* A total of £39.96M will be available subject to satisfactory performance on key indicators



Appendix C Bibliography

National SRB Evaluation References

1. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister/Cambridge University: Lessons and Evaluation Evidence from ten Single Regeneration budget case studies, January 2002
2. Cambridge University: Answering the Really Difficult Questions: the Role of Local Social surveys in Assessing the Impact of Regeneration Initiatives, January 2002
3. Cambridge University: Evaluation Of The Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund: Summary Household Survey results 1996-1999, January 2002
4. Cambridge University: Evaluation Of The Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund: Second Final Evaluation of two SRB Short Duration Case Studies, April 2000
5. Cambridge University: Evaluation Of The Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund: An Examination Of Baseline Issues, June 1999
6. Cambridge University: New Findings on the nature of Economic and Social Exclusion in England and the implications for New Policy initiatives, August 1998
7. Cambridge University: The Distribution of SRB Challenge Fund Expenditure in relation to Local Area Needs in England, March 1998
8. Cambridge University: Evaluation of Regeneration Activities funded under the Single Regeneration Budget Bidding Round, March 1997
9. Christine Whitehead (London School of Economics) and Lesley Smith (DETR): Evaluation Of The Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund: Key Results from the Residents' Baseline Social Surveys, No date given

Other References: Government Guidance

10. DTLR: Single Regeneration Budget Bidding Guidance, September 1999
11. DTLR: New Deal for Communities: Monitoring, Review and Evaluation, September 2000
12. HM Treasury: The Green Book, Consultation Draft, July 2002
13. HM Treasury: The Green Book, January 1997
14. HM Treasury: A Framework for the Evaluation of Regeneration Projects and Programmes, January 1995

Birmingham SRB Evaluation References

15. Birmingham City Council: Single Regeneration Budget – 1, 2 and 4: Review of Performance 2001/02; Priorities for 2002/03: Programme and Individual Project Budgets for 2002/03 and Future Years, Report to Cabinet Member for Regeneration, July 2002
16. Birmingham City Council: Single Regeneration Budget 6 – North West Corridors of Regeneration: Review of Performance to date; Priorities for 2002/03: Programme and Individual Project Budgets for 2002/03 and Future Years, Report to Cabinet Member for Regeneration, July 2002



SRB1 and SRB2 Evaluation Reference

17. Birmingham City Council: Single Regeneration Budget Evaluation Report Rounds 1 and 2, March 1999

SRB1 Evaluation References

18. FCI: Qualitative Framework for the Saltley and Small Heath SRB Programme Final Report, April 1997
19. Richard Dunne, University of Portsmouth: Evaluation for Birmingham Core Skills Development Partnership: The Securing Attainment Project, October 1997
20. Gillian A Prout, Birmingham Education Business Partnership: Raising Achievement through Partnership, Technology Tree Evaluation Project 1995/96, October 1997
21. Peter Paisley Associates: Saltley and Small Heath Support for Business Project: An Evaluation and Forward Strategy Report, March 1998
22. Shillam and Smith Architects: A Community Led Vision for Saltley and Small Heath, March 1998
23. The Garton Gresham Learning Company: Opportunities for Core Skills Development within the Weekend College Curriculum: A Draft Report, April 1998
24. Michael Byrne: Equality of Access to Business Link Services, July 1998
25. Richard Dunne: The Demonstration Teaching Project Evaluation, September 1998
26. Marian Sainsbury: Evaluation of the National Literacy Project Summary Report, National Foundation for Educational Research, December 1998
27. The Basic Skills Agency: Review of Birmingham Family Learning, January 1999
28. Birmingham City Council: Report to Saltley and Small Heath SRB Area Board from the Regeneration Support Officer, 27 January 1999
29. Birmingham City Council: Birmingham Partnership: Single Regeneration Budget Evaluation Report Rounds 1 and 2, March 1999
30. Birmingham City Council: Aston SRB Venture Mid Term Evaluation: Evaluating the Structures and Processes, October 1999
31. The CSR Partnership: Enterprise Link: Mid Term Evaluation, March 1999
32. Sarah Crawley, Learn Link Research and Development: A Report on Birmingham City Council's Economic Development (ED) Views on involvement and future opportunities within the Core Skills Partnership, January 2000
33. Sarah Crawley, Learn Link Research and Development: Core Skills Impact and Process Evaluation, February 2000
34. Vector Research: Enterprise Link Evaluation and Research Project: Final Report, March 2002

SRB2 Evaluation References

35. MORI: SSTARI Residents Research Study, April–May 1998
36. Helen Sullivan and Dr. Mike Beazley, School of Public Policy, University of Birmingham: Evaluation of SRB Community Capacity Building Initiative 1997/8, June 1998
37. Birmingham City Council: Birmingham Partnership: Single Regeneration Budget Evaluation Report Rounds 1 and 2, March 1999
38. EDAW: Thematic Evaluation of Education, Training, Business and Economy Projects – Final Report, February 2000
39. EDAW: SSTARI Residents Household Survey 2000, October–November 2000



-
40. EDAW (& BMG): Sparkbrook, Sparkhill and Tyseley Area Regeneration Initiative – Forward Strategy, March 2001
 41. EDAW: SSTARI Social, Cultural and Health Thematic Evaluation Final Report, February 2002
 42. EDAW: URBAN programme: Final Evaluation, date missing

SRB4 Evaluation References

43. NACRO: Mid-term evaluation of Community Safety Regeneration 4 Birmingham Programme Final Report and Appendices, February 2002