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SYNOPSIS.

In Britain today, the case for planning is fully accepted and comprehensive planning has been with us for many years. The main challenge and focus of planning's attention now, ought to be with improving the process, so that what takes place in practice is more related and relevant to community needs and desires. Evaluation is considered to play a vital role in the improvement of public policy-making. Until relatively recently evaluation has been a surprisingly neglected part of that process.

Attention has been given to advancing the methodological and technical aspects of plan/policy evaluation. However, there has been little emphasis on its appropriate role in the planning process. The few studies which have been undertaken including Lichfield et al's seminal contribution have only discussed pre-evaluation.

This study examines the role of post-evaluation in the planning process and the implications that it has for improving the public policy-making process.

Part one is concerned with the rhetoric - the concepts and theory underpinning the role of evaluation in the planning process. Chapter one outlines the aims and scope of the study and discusses those factors contributing to an increased need for evaluation.

Chapter two focusses attention on the planning process and the way in which evaluation fits into that process. Different models of the process have different implications for the role of evaluation.

Chapter three looks at the institutionalisation of evaluation into the planning process. It examines the government procedures and structures within which planning takes place and the consequent implications this has for the role of evaluation. The dearth of legislation serves to illustrate the lack of importance attached to evaluation.
Chapter four, builds on the first three chapters and develops a typology of potential roles which evaluation might play in the planning process.

Part two looks at the reality - by examining the extent to which these potential roles have been achieved in practice. The support for and constraints against an enhanced role for evaluation are discussed and tentative recommendations made.

Chapter five examines the role of evaluation in the planning process of a local authority, namely Strathclyde Regional Council. This empirical research considers various of the evaluative machinery and the views of elected members and officers in the Council. The typology constructed is used as a framework for this appraisal.

Chapter six discusses the emergent issues and draws tentative conclusions. From an understanding of the reasons of support for and constraints against evaluation, some tentative policy recommendations are made to make for an improved and a more effective public policy-making process and local government.
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PART ONE

THE RHETORIC
CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION.

"We must continually learn to unlearn much that we have learned, and learn to learn that we have not been taught. Only thus do we and our subject grow."

R.D. Laing
The Politics of the Family and Other Essays 1972.

This quotation encapsulates several themes central to this study: the emerging view of planning as a continuous cyclical process; the need for flexibility and adaptability in the planning process in order that policies maintain their relevance, (one of Lichfield's (1979) requirements for an acceptable planning system); the necessity for local government to become a learning system; and the need for humility in recognition that there is no single consensual 'public interest'. Hence there can be no single ideal plan or policy, even without considering the effects of change on the process.

1.1 Aims and Methodology.

The aims of this study are four fold: to discover how the nature and hence the role of evaluation is influenced by the nature of the planning process and the framework of government procedures and structures within which it takes place; to so develop a typology of potential roles that evaluation might play; to use this typology as a framework for appraising its actual role in a local government context - a case study of Strathclyde Regional Council; and on the basis of this appraisal to make recommendations for enhancing this role.
The exposition of its potential role will encompass:

(a) the level of activity, active or passive;
(b) the nature or type, for example coordinative or educative;
(c) the depth of the activity.

The latter (c) involves the adoption of Rivlin's (1971) classification.

(1) Estimation of the extent and nature of the problem and identification of who benefits and who loses from present policy.
(2) Comparison of benefits between programmes in order to determine whether it is better to shift resources from one programme to another.
(3) Distinguishing between the relative effectiveness of different approaches and methods of solving problems and delivering services.

A number of hypotheses are generated from this,
(1) The role of evaluation will have evolved and extended over time with the changes in philosophy and approaches to planning. It is expected there will be a gap between that advocated in theory and that achieved in practice.
(2) The low profile of evaluation, has been as much due to the narrow concept, definition and hence role of evaluation adhered to by both officials and members, as to any resistance to it per se.
(3) One would expect greatest development and formalisation of evaluation, in a large 'one party' authority such as Strathclyde. It is likely to present less organisational and political difficulties in that context.
1.2 Scope of the Study.

This study is not intended to be an exhaustive discussion of evaluation. Rather, an attempt to draw together those elements which appear most appropriate to discovering both the potential and actual roles that evaluation might and does play in the planning process. By understanding the real constraints, both on these roles and on the formalisation of evaluation into the planning process, one might then prescribe realistic ways of enhancing the role it plays.

Clearly the emphasis is on the application of evaluation in local government. Therefore, I shall discuss the methodological and technical issues of evaluation only in so far as they have a bearing on this. Much of the existing evaluation literature has predominantly dealt with those two aspects.

1.3 Definitions.

The definition of evaluation adopted obviously has implications for the roles one ultimately attributes to it. Definitions of evaluation abound. They range from those that emphasise the information seeking aspects of evaluation such as Greenberg (1968):

"the procedure by which programs are studied to ascertain their effectiveness in the fulfillment of goals"

and Suchman (1967):

"the determination...of the results... attained by some activity to accomplish some valued goal or objective."

to those stressing the judgemental characteristics of evaluation exemplified by Scriven (1967):

"methodological activity which combines performance data with a goal scale."
Glass (1971) defines evaluation as an attempt to assess worth or social utility. Suchman (1969) describes it as "a general process of making judgements of worth".

Its role may be restricted because of adherence to a strict rigid definition.

There are essentially two instances whereby evaluation impinges on the planning process. Firstly, at the stage where alternative plans/policies are considered. At this stage evaluation is employed to facilitate choice, between these in order to determine the 'best' one. This is commonly known as pre-evaluation. The second instance is after a plan/policy has been implemented. At this stage evaluation is employed to assess the impact the plan/policy has had. This is commonly known as post-evaluation. The prime difference between the two is that there are data rather than speculations for the latter. It is therefore possible to ask a much more complicated series of questions about the relationship between an action and an outcome. In this way, post-evaluation provides greater scope for considering the role of evaluation and for improving public policy-making.

Post-evaluation is usefully thought of, as taking two broad forms: in one it is the consideration of an ongoing plan/policy; in the other it is the de post facto consideration of a plan/policy. These can be labelled respectively formative or prospective and summative or retrospective evaluation. (Scriven 1967)

I shall focus my attention on the post-evaluation of plans/policies. A broad definition of evaluation will be adopted,

"an assessment of the performance and impact of plans/policies on a community."
Both post-evaluation and the application of evaluation have been surprisingly neglected areas of research. They are becoming increasingly important areas, for reasons to be discussed. King (1976) has noted that little has been done in these fields of post evaluation and application. Heclo, declares this as

"one of the most rapidly expanding and least well mapped areas of political science."

(Heclo 1972)

As King (1976) remarks, one could not draw up a bibliography of British literature in this area as Dolbeare (1975) has for the United States. We rely heavily on U.S. experience in this field. It may not be transferable. Application is of the utmost importance. The true test of any method or technique such as evaluation is whether it can be used. The few studies that have been carried out have almost entirely, only considered pre-evaluation. This is illustrated by the Notts-Derby Study (1969) the Coventry-Solihull Study (1971). Even Lichfield et al (1975) in their book entitled "Evaluation in the Planning Process" concentrate exclusively on pre-evaluation. Post evaluation is not even considered. The exception is a study by Gillis et al (1974) on monitoring.

Implicit in the above discussion is the assumption that evaluation is 'a good thing'. There is an implicit assumption that public policymaking, implementation and performance are not perfect at present, and that evaluation can help in their improvement. Planning is supposedly carried out for the benefit of the community. It should ensure that its policies remain relevant, and are having the desired effects.
It would be foolish and naive to suggest that evaluation offers the new Excalibur to local government. Evaluation may serve to clarify issues and expose conflict. It may, as is proposed in this study, be more than a judgement of whether a plan/policy has been a success or failure. It can determine the reasons behind success or failure and hence help to foster a learning system of government. However, it will not of itself 'solve' problems. It is but one of the inputs to the political decision-making process.

1.4 The Level of Evaluation - The Active-Passive Continuum.

Various factors have coalesced recently to highlight the need for evaluation to be incorporated into the planning process. They have also created conditions which serve to make it more likely that it will be in the future. There are both, push and pull factors, endogenous and exogenous to the local government system. They are all working in the same general direction - to enhance the role of evaluation by moving it towards the active end of the continuum.

1.5 Factors Contributing to an Enhanced Level of Evaluation.
(a) Change and Uncertainty.

As Rose (1976) and Travis (1969) argue respectively

"Change is one of the few certainties of life"

and

"Nothing is more inevitable than change"

Indeed, as Bennis et al (1972) argue, it is an acknowledge- ment of change that makes us plan. The planner assumes the world will continue to change and that this may have undesirable effects, if it is not guided. An implicit
The assumption of the public planning process is that it is necessarily concerned with future action and hence it must concern itself with change. If the underlying rationale of planning is to aid human development, which is itself the purposeful contrivance of change, then it must deal with change and respond to the inherent uncertainty on which action is based.

There are several areas in which change impinges on the planning process. Firstly, there are changes in the environment, which local government seeks to control and direct. As Eversley (1979) put it:

"the last time this country experienced a relatively 'stable state' (Schon 1967) must have been a century or two ago before the first Industrial Revolution."
"since then change has taken place at an ever-increasing rate"

Change is endemic in our society. Its economic, social, political and environmental attributes are constantly changing. The total population and its constituent elements alter, the economic and employment situation constantly change and there are shifts in social structures, attitudes and aspirations. These shifts will have important implications for the range, type and approach taken in the services provided by local government. Local government must respond to and perhaps anticipate the changes which are taking place.

Secondly, the aspirations and values of the community, on which the plan/policy is based, alter. To maintain its relevance, the plan/policy must alter to optimise these.

Change leads to uncertainty. Friend (1977) identifies three components of uncertainty which permeate the
planning process. These correspond to the discussion above on change. They are: uncertainty in the knowledge of the external operating environment; uncertainty as to the future intentions of contiguous policy systems; and uncertainty as to the set of appropriate policy values in the community. As Friend (1977) points out, uncertainty undermines policy. Change and uncertainty then inevitably lead to plan/policy obsolescence.

"The greater the degree of uncertainty, the greater the likelihood that plans right today will be wrong tomorrow."

(Trist 1968)

Plans/policies are based either implicitly or explicitly on a series of assumptions about the way in which the environment works and of the way a policy can guide development at one point in time. If it is to remain a relevant and useful context for decision-making its performance must be reviewed and policy re-evaluated in the light of any significant changes.

Schon (1967) in his concept of the "loss of the stable state", describes the extent to which local government is acting in a highly uncertain environment. It cannot respond to situations before they have been superceded.

Implications for the Role of Evaluation.

Change and uncertainty provide the backdrop for contemporary planning practice. The planning process must acknowledge this, if it is to become and remain relevant and effective. We can never remove uncertainty entirely, only the passing of time can do that. We can reduce it to more manageable proportions. Clearly, plans/policies can never keep up with change. It is impossible by definition. However, it is imperative to develop some capacity to move with it. There is a
need for greater flexibility and adaptation (Jefferson 1973). Paradoxically,

"the more turbulent the environment the more equilibrium they seek - failing to realise that the only equilibrium that can be obtained in a turbulent environment is dynamic - like a ship in the sea"

(Ackoff 1978)

Plans/policies therefore cannot be precise statements but rather contingency arrangements. They must be robust - a concept developed by Gupta and Rosenhead (1968) to describe the number of 'good' outcomes that are left open or made possible by the actions taken.

As acknowledged by the R.T.P.I. symposium of 1976, we must attempt to look objectively at what kind of planning system is needed to satisfy these conditions of change and uncertainty. It implies the need for the planning process to be effective, flexible, action-oriented and adaptive to local needs and change. Evaluation may help in the realisation of this process, by enabling the local government system to become more of a learning process. Feedback will heighten the awareness of changes in both the environment and in values.

"The wise problem-solver constantly monitors solutions to past problems to be sure they are meeting his expectations. If they are not, he finds out why, and modifies them"

(Jefferson 1973)

In addition,

"Monitoring the environment, tracing out effects and side effects, analysing the environment could present us with a much firmer basis for policy formulation than we have now - its the business of learning"

(Eddison 1973)
The learning process is dependent not just on the feedback that evaluation provides. It will only come about if evaluation is linked to the decision-making process.

Intuitive approaches to the evaluation of policy may be sufficient in a slowly changing environment. In the turbulent environment described, there may be a need for a more integrated systematic approach to evaluation. This may call for its formalisation into the planning process.

This discussion draws out one of the dilemmas posed by evaluation in practice. It is not possible or indeed desirable to attempt to continue analysis until one has a full understanding of the problem, because the problem is itself changing.

"At some point one has to stop and take action".

(F. Wedgwood-Oppenheim, 1972)

It is therefore imperative to pitch evaluation at an appropriate level for the problem under consideration. That is, in terms of financial resources, time and manpower. A broader concept of evaluation may serve to make it more acceptable and hence more likely to be adopted by local government.

Evaluation presents an opportunity for taking account of change and uncertainty in the local government system and environment. It may thus serve to improve decision-making and to enable the planning process to become more flexible and adaptive.

(b) The "Era of Restraint".

This term was first coined by J.D. Stewart (1977) to mark the end of planning for growth and to herald the
era of planning in a period of decline.

Broadly speaking, until the mid seventies, local government administered a rising level of expenditure and an expanding range of services. Between 1954-1974 local authority expenditure rose at twice the rate of G.N.P. and increased as a percentage of public expenditure from 23% to 31%. Benington (1975) described this period as that when

"local government has become a big business".

Since then, however, it has become increasingly clear that the scope for continued growth in public expenditure is severely constrained. The White Paper on Public Expenditure (Cmnd. 7746, 1976) confirmed that the previous era of expansion was over. Particularly since the present government took office in May 1979, there has been a new and much sharper emphasis on the need to reduce expenditure and to achieve maximum value for money, that is efficiency. Efficiency and effectiveness are not the same thing. As planners we must ensure that adherence to the former is not at the expense of the latter. Local government expenditure did not decline by the 14% forecast in the White Paper (Cmnd.7746). The cutbacks are cuts in previous planned growth rather than in real terms. Hepworth (1980) examines changes in local government expenditure. He states that it actually rose up to 1979-1980. It is set to decline by 3.9% in 1980-1981. The White Paper (Cmnd.7439, 1979) bears this out. It shows an overall increase in expenditure from £46,608 million at 1978 survey prices for 1979-1980 to £46,748 million for 1980-1981. Figure 1 illustrates these changes in local government expenditure.
Changes in local authorities' expenditure plans in each survey (United Kingdom) 1974-75 to 1980-81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month and year of survey</th>
<th>(% change over previous year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current expenditure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.1975</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.1976</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.1977</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.1978</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.1979</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.1975</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.1976</td>
<td>-12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.1977</td>
<td>-15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.1978</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.1979</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar.1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio capital/current expenditure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1980 survey</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: various Public Expenditure White Papers.
Although it has not been as severe as the myths portray, any cuts albeit in planned growth will have repercussions on the services provided. To a large extent, the resources available determine the type and standard of service provided. One must consider resource constraint simultaneously with the demand for services. There is a continued high level of both needs and expectation by the public. This is not merely for access to services but increased quality of service.

Resource constraint necessitates priorities to be established. These ought to be on a rational basis to ensure that the best projects in terms of impact and effectiveness are preserved. Not, arbitrary axeing of the last in, first out - or the vetoing of new projects.

Eversley (1975) suspects that we have not yet correctly or sufficiently adjusted to planning in an era of decline. He argues that periods of expansion encourage the development of certain skills in planning but lead to the neglect of others. As R. Young suggests (1977)

"When money is plentiful there is little need to pose the question 'why'. There is no need to set priorities"

In addition, Stewart (1977) discusses how growth can be used to conceal conflict. But,

"In the harsher climate of retrenchment, conflict may replace consensus"

Implications for the Role of Evaluation.

Planning in a period of decline, requires a change in focus from the preparation of plans towards a greater
understanding: of the environment it seeks to control; of resources, their control impact and outcome and of learning.

It is in times of resource constraint that we must support the most needy. Evaluation may help by providing an informed basis for the government of difference (Stewart 1977). It is a mechanism for learning. It can determine who gains and who loses from particular plans/policies. By comparing the benefits of different programmes, it may aid in setting priorities. It might provide a basis for improving modes of service delivery which again will aid in the setting of priorities. Hatry and Dunn (1971) place great importance on the allocation of funds to measure effectiveness, in order to make better use of resources.

The fiscal crisis has undoubtedly forced local authorities to take seriously the need to evaluate their policies. As Young (1977) points out, it is paradoxically the worst possible time to do so. Evaluation is more likely to be perceived as a threat to budgets and hence more likely to be resisted. However, one would expect a more active role for evaluation, with increased financial stringency.

(c) **Local Government Accountability.**

"The age of government accountability is with us"

(Helliboe 1978)

Suchman (1967) describes this as when

"social institutions...are required to produce 'proof' of their legitimacy and effectiveness, in order to justify society's continual support".

Dye (1978) describes the previous attitude whereby it
was more or less taken for granted that once a law was passed and the money allocated and spent – that the problem was taken care of. There was no regard for the vicissitudes of implementation or the reliability of the theory of causality. However, there has been growing discontent both from the public and from within local government itself, at its impotence in solving problems. Many old problems still remain. The housing problem shows no sign of going away instead, it changes form, every decade or so. New problems emerge:– the Inner City problem and Multiple Deprivation. Nelson and Longbottom (1978) discuss the growing feeling that resource allocation ought to be managed more effectively to improve the benefits to the public.

Local government is in the position of a monopoly supplier. As Schulze (1969) argues, business relies on profit and turnover to act as a regulator on the quality of decisions. Local government has no such regulator to say when it is not productive, when it could be more efficient, or when plans/policies should be displaced.

The R.T.P.I. (1979) stated

"Planning is rightly going to be increasingly called to account for its performance".

It expressed a concern that all departments ought to use available resources to the full.

At the end of the day, planning will be judged by its performance and impact not on the purity of its motives.

Accountability demonstrates the political nature
of the planning process. In a pluralist society there can be no single public interest and there can be no single 'best' plan/policy. The redistributive effects of policy will always mean that pleasure to some is pain to others.

"it matters in a political economy who pays and who profits"

(Webber 1971)

A politician in pursuing a policy to meet a particular end must constantly check to see if those ends are being met. Indeed, he must check whether the 'ends' themselves have altered.

This factor (c) must be considered in conjunction with the previous (b). At the same time as there has been a relative cut in resources, there has been a rise in the expectations of the public, with regard to service provision. The local government role has expanded from providing services which could not otherwise be met or were better so provided. Now it is expected to meet all demands, and to take initiative. Stewart (1980) describes these respectively as the 'maintenance' and 'change' roles of local government. He argues that the former has been predominant in the past, but the latter is of most importance now and needs to be strengthened.

Implications for the Role of Evaluation.

Evaluation has an important role to play in making local government more accountable. Councillors might be expected to welcome it. As one protagonist put it evaluation

" is of unequivocal importance and of indisputable political virtue.. it is politics"
It would enable them to demonstrate the effects of their policies. It might also however reveal some unpalatable facts. If policies were not having the desired effects, evaluation may establish why, in order that they might be altered. Evaluation would support and encourage the 'change' role of local government.

The combination of factors (b) and (c) put local government in somewhat of a 'Catch 22' situation. Many see local government to be facing a crisis. As Jackson (1976) reminds us, the Chinese ideographic for 'crisis' is 'opportunity'. Evaluation could seize this opportunity to establish itself as an integral part of the planning process.

Evaluation naturally made little sense in a self satisfied context, when impact and performance were not perceived as problems. Now, the seeds of discontent are sown and flourishing. This will undoubtedly enhance the role evaluation can play in the planning process.
CHAPTER 2.

THE PLANNING PROCESS.

In order to fully understand the role that evaluation can play in the planning process, clearly one must examine this process. Naturally, different definitions and different methods of operation used in the planning process, will have repercussions on, and implications for, the role that evaluation can play. These factors determine the way it is or is not fitted into the process. One might postulate, that if the planning process were significantly redefined, either conceptually or in form, then this role would also be transformed.

This chapter attempts to outline a broad conceptual framework of what can be identified as the process of planning, its intrinsic meaning, in order to structure the discussion of the role of evaluation in the planning process. The limited number of conceptual schemes considered, are of necessity oversimplified. The definitions of planning and the planning process are not as comprehensive in scope as would be possible were this study devoted to these subjects per se.

2.1 Definitions of Planning and the Planning Process.

Planning is often portrayed as meaning all things to all men. The multitude of definitions applied to it, bear this out. The Oxford English Dictionary simply states, that to plan is "to arrange beforehand"

Planning is essentially purposefully contrived change because it is directed towards the achievement of a specified goal. The purpose of planning is surely to assist human development towards the achievement of its goals. It is implicitly assumed that change will continue
to occur without it, and that this may have undesirable effects. It is also implicitly assumed that planners can, indeed, change the future.

There is a distinct pattern in the types of definition applied. One can discern a movement away from those which emphasise the regulation of land-use,

"Planning is a conscious exercise of the powers of combination and design"

(Abercrombie, 1933)

to those which encompass social, economic and environmental factors.

"The planner...is an allocator of scarce resources".

(Eversley, 1973)

More recently planning is regarded as a form of control, guiding change.

"Planning is a process for controlling the environment"

(Notts Derby Unit/Gillis et al. 1974)

McLoughlin (1969) describes it as the control of complex systems, in order to achieve homeostasis. According to Eversley (1973) it is interventionist

"it is social action"

Friedmann (1959) defined it as,

"an activity by which man in society endeavours to gain mastery over himself and to shape his collective future by power of this reason. Planning is nothing more than a certain manner of arriving at decisions and actions, the intention of which is to promote the social good of society undergoing rapid changes".

(Friedmann, 1959)
One clearly discerns a movement from the consideration of planning as an impartial apolitical technical process. It is now portrayed as a contentious highly political process.

"Planning is a political not a technical process."

(McLoughlin, 1969)

This view is re-echoed by Friend and Jessop (1969) where it is regarded as

"a process of strategic choice"

They identify the 'government system' acting on behalf of and responding to the 'community system'.

Obviously, what one considers planning to be and the purposes it is intended to serve, will have an important influence on the process generated to fulfill this. The preceding discussion illustrated shifts in the definition of planning. As Sarly (1972) expounds, the definitions clearly demonstrate that there have been some fundamental changes in what one considers to be the scope and purpose of planning. Paralleling these, there has been a movement away from the consideration of the planning process in operational terms as a linear sequence Fig.2.1, towards that of it as a 'continuous cyclical process', Figure 2.2. (McLoughlin, 1969).

Dror (1963), Webber (1965) and Faludi (1971) all regard the process as a continuous activity in the sense that it has no definite beginning or end.

This process is characterised by recognisable stages (see Fig.2.2). These are the same as those of the linear process, survey analysis and plan or action, but in addition include implementation and review stages. It therefore includes not only input, flow and output, but also, feedback.
FIGURE 2.1. THE LINEAR PLANNING PROCESS.

SURVEY
↓
ANALYSIS
↓
GOAL FORMULATION
↓
IDENTIFICATION OF OBJECTIVES
↓
EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES
↓
SELECTION FROM ALTERNATIVES
↓
IMPLEMENTATION

FIGURE 2.2. THE CONTINUOUS CYCLICAL PLANNING PROCESS.

ENVIRONMENT IS SCANNED
(needs and desires of the community.)

GOAL FORMULATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF OBJECTIVES

STUDY OF POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION
(to achieve objectives.)

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

SELECTION FROM ALTERNATIVES

ACTION TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN/POLICY

MONITORING

REVIEW AND POST EVALUATION OF THE PLAN/POLICY
AND THE CONTROL MECHANISM.
The R.I.P.I. (1974) support this emerging concept of the planning process and,

"Look on planning much more as a process and much less in terms of the land-use fulfillment of plans."

If one asks, what planning is for, several answers spring to mind. Justifications range from the distributive and social justice arguments of (Harvey, 1973), to externality and market system deficiency arguments. These are mainly negative reasons. On the positive side as Dror (1968) emphasises, the significant output of the planning process is its effect on social situations. Thus, the key to understanding the role of evaluation in the planning process is to find out the way in which it contributes to this output. This is to be more fully discussed in chapter four.

Another emerging concept of the planning process is that it is goal-oriented, (Perraton, 1974) and (Haynes, 1974) and in some sense rational. The former is supported by Meyerson and Banfield (1955) who feel that planning ought to seek to choose the means which best promote the most valued ends. The latter is promoted by Paludi (1971). To be precise, he sees the process as lying somewhere between the dimensional extremes of the rational deduction and disjointed incrementalism models of planning. These models are to be discussed.

An increasingly popular view is that of planning as

"planning an activity centrally concerned with the linkage between knowledge and organised action."

(Friedmann and Hudson, 1974)

**Implications for the Role of Evaluation.**

Despite the impression given by the above discussion; that a definition of planning and the planning process
eludes consensual agreement, all the definitions indicate that it is future-oriented. As such, it is therefore subject to the difficulties and consequent implications that change and uncertainty bring. These have been outlined in the previous chapter. Suffice to note, they serve to enhance the role of evaluation, moving it along towards the active end of the active passive spectrum.

If planning is concerned with control of a system or more realistically with its guidance, there must be some mechanism to detect significant changes. For control to be effective, it must direct and more importantly respond to change. Evaluation has a role to play therefore in the collection and analysis of information - feedback.

If one considers planning to be a political process, in the same vein as Friend and Jessop (1969), then evaluation must play an essential role. If the 'government system' is regarded as acting on behalf of and responding to the 'community system' then plans/policies, must be based by definition, on the goals and objectives of that community. Not, on those of the plan/policy producers. These change over time. Evaluative studies can help by determining whether plans/policies are still relevant, to community needs and desires. Furthermore, this consideration of planning necessitates an evaluation of the impact of plans/policies in order to ascertain whether they are having the desired effects.

It has been established that the key to understanding the role of evaluation in the planning process is to find out the ways in which it contributes to output or effect. Evaluation, as a formal assessment of the comparative advantages and disadvantages of a project, can bring to light when a given plan/policy is not
living up to its expectations, causing harmful effects or indeed, underlining its success. This in turn may be used to alter the plan/policy, so that it has an improved desirable impact and effect on the given situation.

The notion of the planning process as a continuous and cyclical has profound implications for the role of evaluation. Figures 2.1 and 2.2 demonstrate, that the essential difference between a linear planning process and a continuous cyclical one, is a feedback loop. Evaluation provides this feedback and as such is the critical element in the realisation of a continuous cyclical planning process. Evaluation enables the process to respond to change.

A continuous planning process supposedly consists of the systematic continuous, forward looking application of the best information available. As such, it necessitates the constant re-examination of traditions and decisions in order to adapt and adjust policies. Eddison (1975) argues strongly that for a process to be continuous it must of necessity be based on learning.

"Planning is the process of preparing a set of decisions for action in the future directed at achieving goals by optimal means and of learning from the outcome and possible new sets of decisions, new goals to be achieved."

(Eddison 1975)

and

"Learning and feedback are not fashionable glosses to planning but the crucial links which give the dynamic to the process... The whole essence of planning is that it is dynamic and that the approach to it should be likewise"

(Eddison, 1975)
The following section intends to examine various models of the planning process and draw from these, implications for the role of evaluation. It is not proposed to give an in-depth analysis of the various stages of these processes. These are readily apparent from the description. To reiterate, there are two points where evaluation fits into a planning process. At the selection of alternatives stage - pre-evaluation and of concern here, during or after the implementation stage. (See Figure 2.2) - post evaluation.

2.2 Models and Modes of Planning.

(a) The Rational - Deductive Model.

The rational ideal model, has always played a major role in planning ideas and still is, to some extent, the dominant paradigm of planning according to the profession. However, of late, academics have moved somewhat from this stance. As described by Etzioni

"Rationality is the widely held concept of how decisions ought to be made."

(Etzioni, 1967)

It is suggested that as man and society have become more sophisticated, so they both attempt to become and assume that they are more rational. Hence the view, as Bird (1968) has suggested, that valid planning can exist, only in a society that attempts rationality and that a rational society must necessarily involve planning in some form. Dahl purports that

"planning is more and more regarded as equivalent to rational social action, that is, as a social process for reaching a rational decision."

(Dahl, 1959)
Sarly (1972) argues that undertaking planning, necessarily obliges the planner to be explicit and rational in his activity, in order to reduce uncertainty in his understanding of the problem and to expand the scope of his considerations beyond the matter immediately at hand. The goals towards which the planning process is oriented are prescribed to be pursued by optimal means, that is, they are rationally deduced.

These considerations underline to some extent why rationality has been such a tempting norm to planners. As Regan remarks,

"The assertion on all sides is that decisions can and should be as rational as possible."

(Regan 1978)

Planners have sought refuge in this, attempted comprehensive planning and maintained political non-alignment.

Others, disagree with the views expounded above. Some, such as Simmie (1974) question whether planning can ever be rational.

The rational model is composed of:

1. Clarification of objectives or values
2. Survey of all alternative means of reaching objectives
3. Identification of all consequences, including side-effects or by-products of each alternative means
4. Evaluation of each set of consequences in the light of the objectives.

As such it is a goal oriented, comprehensive, ends-means model of planning. As (1) points out, it is not devoid of a value base.

There are many limitations to this model and these have been taken up by Braybrooke and Lindblom (1963) in their assertion for the incrementalist model. They criticise the synoptic ideal on the grounds that it is neither possible nor even desirable.
The limitations of this model include:

(1) It assumes perfect knowledge of goals and values;
(2) It necessitates a comprehensive analysis of the situation. One must both know and understand all variables. In reality, one could not even identify them all;
(3) It assumes one can identify all relevant alternatives;
(4) It assumes one can evaluate the consequences of all these alternatives;
(5) It assumes one can thus choose the 'best' one to implement. This assumes, that it is possible to implement and more importantly that there is a solution to the problem within our capacity to control.

Braybrooke and Lindblom (1963), state that this synoptic ideal is not suited to the problems of man as a problem-solving animal. The operational shortcomings include,

(a) It is not suited to human intellectual limitations
(b) It is not adapted to the inadequacy of information
(c) No account is taken of the costliness of analysis
(d) No account is taken of the failure to create adequate evaluation methods and weighting methodologies. Nor that evaluation is not as yet systematic.
(e) There is no acknowledgement of the connectedness of fact and value.
(f) It is not appropriate to the openness of real systems.
(g) It is not adaptive to the need for strategic sequence of analysis and implementation
(h) It does not consider that goal setting is complex, conflictory and ambiguous. Even in the absence of social disagreement there is great difficulty in specifying goals. To elaborate, Banfield argues that
"society has no goals except at the level of vague generality"  
(Banfield 1965)

and Millward suggests that

"concrete meaningful goals do not always exist, sometimes cannot be articulated and seldom are agreed upon even within the confines of a specific agency"  
(Millward 1968)

(i) There is no account taken of political variables or the importance of vested interests.

(j) It assumes certainty and stability.

These points illustrate the narrow and utopian nature of this model. It is an ideal, as such, it has virtues. Both Faludi (1971) and Dykman (1969) denounce it as purely idealistic although they consider it has potential. Unlike Lindblom (1959), Banfield (1959) on finding that organisations do not engage in rational planning, continues to uphold this model as an ideal. He regards the adoption of means to ends as a valid and rewarding concept.

If there is a great disparity between the ideal of rational comprehensive planning and the reality of governmental decision-making as Banfield (1959) and Schon (1967) suggest, then what is the worth of having a rational mode of analysis? Both, demonstrate how problems militate against the planning process ever becoming a truly rational process. Decision makers may not have any intention of making a rational decision. Indeed, as Lichfield (1968) suggests, good decisions can be reached through other means such as prejudice, power, precedent and politics.

Implications of the Model for the Role of Evaluation.

All these issues are pertinent to the idea of formalising evaluation into the planning process. For,
to some extent, evaluation itself might be likened to a rational process.

There are contrary influences of this model for the role of evaluation. It might be expected to play a major and active role, for the model explicitly recognises it, as stage four. The model requires the consideration of all alternatives and their evaluation. On the other hand, the theory of this model is formulated on the principle of complete certainty. It assumes complete and perfect information and therefore specifically excludes learning. In this case evaluation would have a negligible role to play because if it is considered that the 'best' has been done (all alternatives are considered and the 'best' chosen) then the best possible impact will already be attained and the raison d'être of evaluation removed.

This model is an ideal to strive for and indeed one that practising planners work towards. It is important to recognise its limitations, in order to improve its fulfillment. Evaluation could contribute towards the attainment of greater rationality in the planning process. It could do so by providing more information in the form of feedback from the environment, of changes in it and of the effects of policy. In order to achieve the optimum solution, a decision-maker must know the courses of action open to him, their costs and returns.

An important role envisaged for evaluation might be in the validation of the goals and objectives of the rational process. These are taken as given in the model. However, they are likely to alter over time. Evaluation might aid in maintaining the relevance of this rational process over time.

An emergent issue, is that of complete and perfect information. Information is always necessary to decision-makers, but given the finite nature of resources which
can in practice be devoted to gaining additional increments of information, (time financial and manpower) a decision must be taken about the amount of information required. Evaluation must itself be evaluated. Some balance must be struck between resources spent in this manner and on provision of services. Too much information is fruitless as diminishing returns set in. Some decisions for plans/policies may only require intuitive subjective judgement not a systematic formal evaluation. An analogy with a card game may serve to illustrate this point. If one played Patience in a purely rational manner, one is most likely to 'win' though it may take a long time to do so. If one played as one does in reality, taking chances based on some subjective judgement, one might lose but one might also win, in a much shorter time. This begs the question of just what is the most appropriate depth and extent of evaluation and analysis.

If the rational process is taken too literally it runs the risk of introducing a conservative bias towards the production and implementation of 'safe' policies. Less support would be given to perhaps innovative ideas, with relatively high chances of failure even though the opportunity for accomplishing such proposals may be significant. Millward (1968) suggests that this has important implications for pressing social problems, where high risk programmes must be tried. Once again, one might make the same reservations about the formalisation of evaluation into the planning process.

No one would actually advocate irrational decision-making. The real problem, as I see it, has been the rigid restricted form that both the rational process and evaluation have taken up till now. This technical narrow concept has clouded the perception of practitioners in the
field. It has served to denigrate the role assigned to evaluation. Hence Wildavsky's (1969) plea, to "rescue policy analysis from P.P.B.S". The implication being, otherwise it too will suffer from the latter's reputation. P.P.B.S. has been put forward as a form of rational decision-making. In practice, it has tended to be a system or set of techniques - a narrow inflexible set.

What then of the planners' zeal for a rational process of decision-making? If it is not defined too strictly, there is an important role for evaluation in the progressive movement towards rationality. One could propose that human action is rational in so far as it pursues ends that are possible, within the conditions of the situation. Be means, which amongst those available, were considered to be the best adapted to this end, for reasons verifiable by evidence, experience of past decisions and a value system. Evaluation and the creation of a learning system of government can supply this evidence and experience.

(b) The Incrementalist Model.

From the previous discussion on the limitations of the rational decision-making process, Braybrooke and Lindblom (1963) assert that in reality decision-making tends to be:

(1) incremental, that is it tends towards relatively small changes at the margin.
(2) remedial, in that decisions are made to move away from problems rather than toward goals.
(3) serial, in that problems are not solved at one stroke but are rather successively attacked.
(4) exploratory, in that goals are continually being redefined or newly discovered.
(5) fragmented or limited, in that problems are attacked by considering a limited number of alternatives rather than all possible alternatives.
(6) disjointed, in that there are many dispersed decision points.

This model is based on what is purported to be the empirical character of plan/policy making. As such they assert that it is more likely to be effective than the traditional notion of synoptic or rational comprehensive idealism, which they maintain is impossible to attain anyway. Although this model may indeed be more realistic, in that it accords more with how decisions are actually made, and meets the characteristic difficulties of synoptic planning, it is questionable whether for those reasons it is therefore a 'better' model. Rationality may be a preferred normative model and incrementalism a better descriptive model.

According to this model, the planner would not attempt comprehensive planning. Rather he would work with segmented and incremental policy problems as they arose. Analysis would be partial. Plans would be envisaged as short run reactions to problems. There would be no attempt to define or articulate goals, rather, merely to describe the problems foreseen and how they might be dealt with. The planner would not attempt to devise means to meet particular ends (as he did in the rational model). Instead, he would select ends appropriate to the available means. There would be no attempt to identify all the possible alternative solutions to a problem. Nor, any concern with unforeseen effects which might arise. All decisions, plans/policies, are considered as marginal adjustments to the current situation. The baseline from which planners work are the current policies, not some ideal.
Implications of the model for the Role of Evaluation.

As Etzioni (1967) suggests,

"Democracy must accept a relatively high degree of incrementalism...because of the greater need to give gain support for new decisions from many and conflicting subsocieties, a need which reduces their capacity to follow a long run plan."

Dror (1968) argues that this model would be fine, if one was sure that the results of past/present policies were effective and relevant and given a relatively stable environment. We do not know about the former conditions, paradoxically because of the lack of evaluation. However, it has been previously argued that the environment within which local government works and seeks to control, is a rapidly changing, turbulent one.

On the one hand, as there is no attempt made at comprehensiveness, then the role of evaluation might be negligible and/or passive. The incremental, remedial, serial, fragmented and disjointed elements of this process would also result in a limited role for evaluation.

Yet, on the other hand, it does acknowledge that change will occur, albeit at the margin. Indeed, flexibility and adaptability at the margin, are the essence of this model. In this sense the role for evaluation is likely to be enhanced. If one considers change to be on the basis of small serial remedial steps it could be argued that this would facilitate a place for evaluation. The amount of data required, the number of variables to be controlled and thus the potential cost of evaluation would be reduced.

Clearly, it would be a reactive role and somewhat passive in the sense that it would be ad hoc in nature, and peripheral to the process of decision-making.
One of the most important limitations of this role is that it leads to conservatism. It reinforces inertia and supports the status quo. It is an anti-innovative force. It may result in unjust planning and costly opportunity costs, by not initiating radical changes if these are needed. Evaluation could increase its awareness that such changes are needed.

It does not attempt to define goals. This would pose great problems for evaluation. Goals and objectives provide the basis for comparison. In its proposal to have no consideration for side-effects, one can discern a fairly low profile for evaluation. Consideration of this sort is on underlying rationale of evaluation, but this model does not perceive this to be of any importance.

In recognition of the fact that this is the process or model most close to reality, one might distinguish a role for evaluation, in attempting to enable incremental decisions to be taken in a more rational manner. It could do so, by the application of more facts and knowledge to the process. At the end of the day though final decision rests with elected members and evaluation findings will form but one part of their overall consideration.

Given that decisions are taken at the margin, evaluation studies could become a device to help a decision maker, by contributing to his bargaining power. (Quade 1976)

This model has repercussions for the formalisation of evaluation into the planning process. It regards review as being partial and reactive, in response to a particular stimulus. That is it is advocates evaluation on an ad hoc basis.

By way of summary Dror (1975) in his forward to
Skitt's (1975) "Practical Corporate Planning" remarks that "muddling through" or "disjointed incrementalism" implies a positive outcome, in the sense that somehow one "gets through". This mode of decision-making has an underlying assumption, namely, that the mud is not more than three feet deep. When the mud is ten feet deep, clearly some other method for "getting through" is necessary. Dror (1975) sees this other method as corporate planning based on constant and rapid learning. Clearly, this other method includes a major role for evaluation.

(c) The Mixed-Scanning Model.

This model was developed by Etzioni (1967) in criticism of both the rational-deductive and the incrementalist models. As Dror expounded (1963)

"What is needed is a model which fits reality while being directed towards its improvement".

This model is a synthesis, an attempt to combine the strongest features of the other two models. It involves a two phase decision-making process.

(1) A broad sweep or scan of planning problems and options assessed against their value. These are all considered in low detail.

(2) Within the above, decision-making proposals are considered incrementally. These are considered in very great detail.

Implications of the Model for the Role of Evaluation.

This model explicitly acknowledges the need for review of implementation, and hence there is potentially an active role for evaluation. In order to realise its ambitions, evaluation would need to be central to the process and hence of a more systematic nature than has
occurred to date. In scanning for new alternatives, problems and goals, evaluation will be critical. We can see here a move from the first of Rivlin's (1971) classification - the extent and nature of the problem to an attempt to take stock of what 'package' fits best and even towards how to improve delivery of a particular 'package'.

This model acknowledges that different situations call for different decision-making techniques. Hence, that evaluation does not have to be of a standard uniform type, but rather ought to be pitched at an appropriate level according to the task or role it is supposed to perform. This model includes the acceptance of elements of risk which any action involves and as such it compliments the view of man attempting to gain control over his environment and yet seeking to learn from the consequences of his action. Once again, evaluation as part of a learning process is an important feature of this process.

(d) The Adaptive - Iterative Mode of Planning.

Due to the vagaries of change and uncertainty many critics feel that long term planning is not possible or desirable. Although plans/policies change the environment, the environment conversely changes both the plans/policies and the interrelated set of concepts underlying the planning process.

As Hart (1976) documents, a significant body of opinion began to crystallise during the sixties, around the belief that planning, if it were to remain effective, should operate as a reciprocal system. Adaptive planning is then an attempt to build in flexibility into the planning process.

In 1969, Friend and Jessop stated their belief in the difficulty of formulating strategies which were sufficient to cope with all conceivable contingencies.
The complexity of the system and our imperfect understanding of it, prevented it. Therefore, they proposed that planning must become in some sense an 'adaptive process'. Flexibility would be of the utmost importance in this process, to keep choice open for the future. It is not to be seen as a promotion of vagueness but rather commitment compatible with a range of alternative future strategies. As Wedgwood-Oppenheim (1972) purports adaptive planning.

"appears to provide a practical framework for planning under conditions of uncertainty"

Hart (1976) also sees this process as improving on the satisficing high and incremental policy-making in accepting a degree of uncertainty. Adaptive planning is considered necessary in order to take explicit account of uncertainty.

Adaptive planning differs from disjointed incrementalism in at least four distinct ways: In the adaptive planning process

1. There is deliberate search for potential future problems,
2. Choices are based not only on current action, but future implications.
3. Decisions and effects may be incremental but they are chosen not to avoid disruption but consciously as a result of exploration of long run and wide ranging considerations.
4. It uses issues not problems as a base. It means not only tackling current problems but scanning existing activities to search for potential future problems.

The output/outcome of the adaptive planning process is not a plan as such but action of immediate concern and a deeper understanding of both current and future problems.
Information can only reduce uncertainty it cannot eliminate it. Hence, this process is cyclic and continuous. Adaptive planning is as Hart (1976) suggests, an iterative process, involving repeated cycles of formulating alternative futures, evaluation and refinement. A plan/policy is produced and implemented. More information and evaluation is carried out and the plan/policy is modified. New problems arise and new solutions are advocated.

**Implications of the Model for the Role of Evaluation.**

This process involves not just response to change but also creating change. In its acknowledgement of uncertainty and the need to reduce it, it explicitly advocates an active role for evaluation in a continuous planning process. Flexibility is seen as a necessary response to the requirement of maintaining effectiveness and relevance. The adaptive planning process relies on feedback from past experience and current policy, to apply this to both current and future problems and solutions. This mode of planning has all the characteristics of a learning process. In terms of the type or depth of evaluation, this process really only embraces the first of Rivlin's (1971) typology.

Evaluation is central to this model of planning, it enables it to identify and so respond to significant changes. Almost by definition adaptive planning can be no more than an ideal if there is no monitoring or evaluative mechanism.

(e) The Systems Approach.

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, a system is

"a complex whole, a set of connected things or parts, a department of knowledge or belief considered as an organised whole."
The definition of any particular system is arbitrary and defined systems exist within larger systems. Friend and Jessop (1969) identify the government system and the community system. Planning is at the interface between the two. Of particular relevance to this study, is that a system also exists in relation to an environment, and the system may be 'open' or 'closed' in relation to that environment. The local government system under discussion here, might be best considered as an 'open' system. Open systems are in a continual state of interaction with their environment and hence can never reach a state of pure equilibrium. However, relative stability may be achieved by a continuous relationship between inputs, flows and outputs. Burns and Stalker (1961) also distinguish between 'mechanistic' and 'organic' or 'adaptive' systems. The latter is the most typical of human decision-making processes. Systems analysis is the analysis of systems which according to Catanese and Steiss (1968) involves the separation of a system with its component sub-systems in order to examine the relations to one another and to the system as a whole. It is a direct descendant of operational research which was a method for solving tactical and strategic problems of a military nature during the last war. Its goal was the optimisation of resource allocation and it has since been adapted in business and industry as a technique for optimising the performance of a system.

Of late, the systems approach has been increasingly applied in the social sciences and public policy. A well known attempt to apply such an approach to an important area of government was that of P.P.B.S. in the United States Department of Defence in the early sixties. President Johnson then advocated extending its use to all government departments. In the United Kingdom the systems approach to planning was first advocated by McLoughlin (1969) and Chadwick (1972).
Clearly if one considers the definition of planning as that of the control, or perhaps more realistically, the guidance of complex systems such as cities and regions rather than merely land use regulation - then this approach will have considerable relevance in providing a conceptual framework. The systems approach supports the idea of a continuous adaptive planning process, of necessity. In order to explain this necessity, one must consider in more detail the nature of a system, and the control of systems. The literature on cybernetics is of relevance as it may be defined as

"The control and regulation of complex systems".

N. Weiner defined cybernetics in 1948 as

"the science of control and communication in the animal and in the machine"

Ashby (1956) proposes it as the art of 'steermanship'. He also sees it as offering a hope of providing effective methods for the study and control of systems that are 'intrinsically extremely complex'.

The planner is concerned with a system, the object of which is to perform a specified function. The object of his deliberate control is to maintain the output which will satisfy the system's requirements. That is, the needs and desires of the community on whose behalf it is working. If the plan/policy is deemed to be correct at a given time, the control is aimed at providing direction and conformance to the plan or the maintenance of variations from it, within tolerable limits. As conditions needs and aspirations alter, so the output of the government system, the plan/policy must be brought into line.

The basic elements common to every control situation are; (1) a controlled situation; (2) a sensory device or method for measuring that condition; (3) a control unit or equipment which will compare the measured data with the planned performance and which directs a correcting
mechanism which is capable of bringing about a change in the operating system.

The controlled situation of relevance to planning is the evolving system that is being planned. The basis of control is the comparison of changes in the system, actual against proposed. On the basis of this information feedback on actual performance, the system may then adjust accordingly in order to increase homeostasis. The plan/policy's goals and objectives will change over time, partly as a result of changes in the system and partly in response to extra system pressures. See Fig. 2.3 for a diagrammatical representation of a control process. In order to maintain the performance of the system within tolerable limits, the planner must naturally be continuously aware of the state of the system. This necessitates monitoring and evaluation, so as to provide a continuous flow of relevant information about those changes and to provide some basis for the consideration of whether they are significant changes or not. Evaluation can be proposed having a major role in providing a feedback loop to the decision makers.

Feedback.

From the foregoing discussion one can see that evaluation fits into the planning process as feedback. It supplies the results of past decisions and actions to be then fed forward to the decision makers. This may allow for changes in the plan/policy to occur and it aids therefore in the creation of a learning process. As McLoughlin (1969) argues,

"If we wish that policies are relevant to the needs of the community there must be feedback from the action level to the review of policy. If we wish policies to result in effective programmes, the same is true."
A control situation relies on feedback. Feedback is simply the input of information about the effects of control on the system. It is a form of negative entropy. Information feedback of a negative type enables a system to perceive and correct the deviations from a given course. The ultimate function of negative feedback processes is to establish "homeostasis" or internal stability. All highly complex systems are reputed to achieve or seek to achieve this state. Biological systems maintain homeostatic equilibrium by a form of more or less automatic thermostat. However, doubts have been expressed as to whether the homeostatic principle can apply to all complex systems.

Some systems, such as social systems, the planning and local government system would fit in this category, clearly counteract entropy and thus adapt to the environment by growth and expansion. Hence, the broader interpretation of homeostasis as more the preservation of the character of the system. Ashby (1960) argues that after a disturbance of some kind, a system regains stability. This system state may not be the same as the former one, when disturbed again it may once more become stable at another state. This characteristic is termed 'ultrastability'. Successive ultrastable states represent levels of system adaptation. Ultrastability is a condition reached through the action of positive feedback which has the effect of reinforcing or amplifying some change in the system. The condition of stability is the goal or objective proposed by the system.

The typical control situation previously discussed as relevant to the planning and local government situation, strives to achieve both a degree of homeostasis and ultrastability through the forces of negative (deviation-
controlling) and positive (deviation - amplifying) feedback, respectively. There is a process of adaptation, of the evolving system to the plan/policy and of the plan/policy to the system changes. This is not by itself enough to ensure successful control. The system must also incorporate a learning mechanism using this feedback.

**Implications for the Role of Evaluation.**

An important emergent implication from the preceding discussion is that evaluation is, in the same manner as feedback, of little value unless it results in corrective action being taken. It is necessary but not sufficient on its own, a learning mechanism must be set up. Similarly, there is a need for evaluation to be linked not only to the planning process, but also to the political decision-making process for feedforward to occur. The formalisation of evaluation into the planning process by the creation of a unit to carry out this task (that is structural systemisation) alone, will permit feedback to occur but not necessarily allow feedforward to the decision making process. If this is the case, evaluation will be restricted to a narrow role of information analysis rather than the broader one of an aid to policy formulation or the creation of a learning system.

Evaluation acts as the pulse-taker or as Pearson (1970) describes it as an "early warning system" of changes occurring in the environment. If it is linked to the political process it may even set up criteria to determine whether these changes are significant or not. It may aid in the decision of whether and how to respond to that change. Although clearly those decisions are ultimately the prerogative of the elected members.

If one subscribes to the systems approach then one must necessarily include the implications of a feature such as the "Law of Requisite Variety". Ashby's law (1956)
is a fundamental principle of cybernetics control and system regulation. It states that if the regulation of the system is to be effective, then the variety in the control device must be at least equal to that of the system disturbances. The planning process attempts to control a high variety world. The control mechanism must therefore be capable of being sufficiently flexible and adaptive so as to match up to this variety.

If one is attempting to control the outcomes of a large number of actions which result in a continuous flow of change through time, then, the control mechanism which is keeping the system on this course must also be continuous. If one defines planning as the control of a complex system then the planning process must also be continuous. The essential feature of a continuous process as opposed to a linear sequence, is a feedback loop, hence the importance of evaluation. A plan/policy is a description of the preferred or desired future state of a system. The implementation of this plan/policy is the control or guidance of the system along this path. This necessitates a monitoring and evaluation device to act as an early warning system by heralding deviations from this course. Evaluation aids in the comparison of the actual and desired states and in identifying significant changes in the system. Evaluation can aid in the revision of a plan/policy by making decision-makers aware of the state of the system and advising action. New goals may be identified and new objectives identified as the whole process is brought full circle and recycled.

There are two methods to achieve homeostasis or ultrastability, peculiar to complex systems. Firstly, by internal organisation and secondly, by the capacity of the system to anticipate and absorb disturbances from the environment. The latter enables the system to remain
viable, as the results of the comparison between actual and desired states, are fed back into the model in order to amplify its predictive powers and increase the sensitivity of the control device. The latter makes it a better regulator of change. The key to control is comparative analysis of the states of the system. Evaluation is of paramount importance for by definition it is the key to control.

A factor determining the effectiveness of a control mechanism such as planning is the rate of response. It must be rapid enough to amend a deviant situation before the system alters again and becomes incompatible with the corrective response. This rate is obviously dependent on the time taken to sense and process information as well as time taken in the prescription of the necessary regulatory action, be this remedial or modification of the plan/policy, and in initiating that control.

If evaluation is the key to control and the effectiveness of that control is dependent on the rapidity of response, then the planning process if it is to be effective must move towards becoming a rapid learning process. The mere existence of high variety and rapid response will not of themselves ensure successful control of the system. Ad-hoc plan/policy reviews may not be sufficient to demonstrate when change is needed. The Census, five yearly reviews or even annual blanket surveys may prove too infrequent a process. Ad hoc reviews usually only occur in response to a particular stimulus, such as a crisis or the need for a decision. In this way, where there is no such stimulus, whole areas of concern may never be subject to even ad-hoc review. Rapidity of response underlines the need for evaluation to be able to supply the feedback required
at a moments notice. This calls for more systematic evaluation. Rapidity of response also underlines the point that to be of use in the decision-making process, the results must be ready before the decision is taken. Perfection information is worthless, if it is too late to be incorporated. The 'Law of Requisite Variety' demonstrates the importance of variety. Evaluation need not be a standard inflexible procedure but pitched at an appropriate level for the task at hand. McLoughlin (1969) envisaged a continuum of major reviews at longish intervals which mesh with special action exercises, until the day to day processes of control were reached.

Wilson (1969) interprets this law as implying the need for a wide range of institutions to be involved in the planning of urban systems. Evaluation may have an important coordinative role as a medium of liaison and communication. It can aid institutions develop an awareness of the common task. (Sir G. Vickers 1965).

**Systemic Planning.**

The systems approach has had a significant effect on the traditional method of planning based on a narrow land use base and the production of a static plan.

As an approach to planning it implies adherence to the rational decision model and is irrevocably tied to the concept of a continuous cyclical process. It requires that goals and objectives be rendered explicit in order to supply performance criteria against which the future system is first designed implemented and finally evaluated. The systems approach to planning is valuable in its attempt to explain and understand the complex environment and man's relationship with it. McConnell (1969) states that the systematic approach to understanding the complexities of cities is undoubtedly the beginning of a new town planning.
This approach has its limitations, just as any other. Dr. Hoos (1969) is critical of the possible misapplication of formal models constructed in the spirit of natural sciences, to social policy. The latter area is concerned with unpredictable and at times unquantifiable activities. She is also critical of the growing inclination to substitute mathematical technologies for hunch, experience, judgement and wisdom. She too, would appear to have fallen into the trap of defining evaluation as a type of mathematical technology. It can be, as is proposed in this study, a much broader process ranging from hunch and experience through to mathematical technology.

In the likes of an engineering or a biological system, the components are tangible, the variables controlled and the outputs identifiable. In the social sphere, the crucial elements often defy definition and control and do not behave according to a set of rules. There may be a danger that evaluators may introduce a subtle bias in favour of measurables and tangibles, at the expense of the often more crucial intangibles. Taking this one step further, a bias may be introduced at the policy formulation stage, to only produce plans/policies that were in some sense evaluable. This is unlikely to occur unless evaluation were formalised into the planning process. Even then it would have to wield much more power than it does at present. Were this to occur however, it would result in 'safe' 'conservative' planning at the expense of more radical experimentation, to discover new solutions. Evaluation would then stagnate at the first of Rivlin's (1971) classification.

This approach cannot be put forward as a panacea. One must be aware of the fact expressed by Pahl (1969) in a review of McLoughlin's book (1969)
"that many young acolytes will rush into the delights of systems analysis and forget that techniques are only tools"

(Pahl 1969)

The real debate ought to be concerned with what use we should make of them.

There has been a considerable backlash of scepticism to it, in the United States. It is still very much in vogue in British planning practice.

This approach underlines a point of significance to the adaptive planning process also. Structure flexibility of a plan/policy is not of itself sufficient to enable the sort of continuous evaluation process of implementation which the proponents of these two types of planning seek to achieve. Whilst the plan/policy may indeed possess the capacity for change, there has been up till now no associated mechanism for indicating whether change would be appropriate or the instigation of that change. Evaluation could fulfill this role. This has been one of the main arguments for the formalisation of evaluation into the planning process. The mere fact of change does not determine whether or how decision makers will respond.

2.5 Conclusions

The preceding discussion has established the various ways in which evaluation has fitted into the planning process: the nature of this evaluation in terms of its level, type and depth; and the implications this had for the formulation of evaluation into this process.

Different models have implied different and at times contrary implications for the role of evaluation. Indeed, even within a given model, contrary influence make it difficult to draw any hard and fast conclusions. Empirical research, might shed light on the outcome of
contrary influences. However, it is likely that it will depend very much on the circumstances of a given local authority. These might be expected to include political, administrative, organisational and personal factors. It would be possible to make generalisations for some of these but not all. The case-study of Strathclyde Regional Council elaborates on these emergent issues.

It has been noted that there has been a movement towards the systems approach and the rational model. The development and application of these have been explored. Attention has been drawn to both their promising advantages and, some of their major limitations and their implications for the role of evaluation.

As planning becomes increasingly complex in both its scope and operation, there is naturally a certain attraction for a clearly defined ideal planning process to facilitate its management. It has been implicitly put forward that evaluation, systematic evaluation is an integral part of that process. Whether it should be formalised into this process, or to be more explicit whether it ought to be formalised in an 'ideal package' form is debateable. I would argue that it ought not be imposed as a conceptual idea but be allowed to develop as it is shaped by the user for his requirements. There is therefore a place for intuitive hunches and judgemental evaluation. There is little evidence to show that a single ideal process is any more valid than a single ideal plan (previously denounced). Just as a plan can be viewed as a set of elements combined to satisfy requirements at a point in time, so then ought the planning process and evaluation be seen.

However, unless the means are provided to measure the rate of progress towards any particular goal then
the planning process becomes arbitrary.

It is all very well to consider in conceptual, abstract terms, the implications the planning process holds for the role of evaluation. It is another, to observe which, if any of these processes have been fully or partially carried out in practice. Up to this point the roles discerned have been merely potential roles. The following chapter discusses the institutionalisation of evaluation into the planning process.
CHAPTER 3.

THE INSTITUTIONALISATION OF EVALUATION THROUGHOUT THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PLANNING.

Paralleling the conceptual changes in the planning process outlined in the previous chapter, there have also been statutory and practical changes, pertinent to the role of evaluation. This chapter attempts to examine the growing practical influence of these conceptual ideas, by tracing their impact on the contemporary government reports, statutory legislation and central government advice. It is intended that this will provide a link between the conceptual role that has evolved for evaluation in the planning process and the empirical research to follow. This is conducted by observation of the way in which evaluation has become institutionalised into the planning process, by a demonstration of the changes in philosophy and subsequent changes in approach to planning. To some extent, these will define the changing roles evaluation might play which is partly dependent on the nature of planning thought and practice at any given time.

Hence, this chapter is not intended to present a detailed account of the history of planning. Rather, it endeavours to draw from the historical development of planning, those features and events which would appear to have a bearing on the role of evaluation in the planning process, both conceptually and in practice.

For the purposes of this study, I have divided up this development into distinct periods which I feel are recognisably discrete, in terms of both, in some way delineating the role evaluation can play and in illustrating the way in which planning has moved through the models
described in chapter 2.

Clearly, planning practice will be influenced by and follow on after, the articulation of the "current" ideas of academics. Several reasons for this gap between theory and practice are proposed. Namely: the time lag both for ideas and educational changes to filter through to practitioners; inertia to change; Schon's (1967) 'dynamics of conservation'; lack of adequate data and information systems. Bearing this in mind, it is in some ways distortive to so divide up the historical development, because the events and philosophical changes arising in one period will follow on or indeed not be picked up at all until the following period.

3.1 The Period Pre-1950.

Although the first real planning legislation was not passed until 1947, The Town and Country Planning Act, the previous years were important in laying the philosophical foundations of planning thought and practice until the fifties. Ideas from the previous century achieved formalisation in these statutes.

As Bruton (1974) describes, the origins of town planning lay in the social reforms the nineteenth century. Planning was performed through the medium of physical plans and was very much a reaction against the 'evils' of the Industrial Revolution. This was, according to Diamond (1977) the era of the "City Safe".

This period also included the era of the "City Beautiful" (Diamond, 1977). Cherry (1974) proposes that two features of the Renaissance and post Renaissance made important contributions to the development of planning ideas in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Firstly, the social vision of ideal communities and secondly, the idea of architectural order. These paved
the way for the utopian tradition and futurism of planning. They laid the foundations for end-state planning which worked towards blueprint solutions.

Another reason for the emphasis on the "City Beautiful" was the fact that at this time, planning was shaped by the influence of architects, engineers and lawyers. Not surprisingly then, there was a marked leaning toward physical planning and lane-use regulation. One of the first textbooks on planning was that of R. Unwin's (1909) entitled "Town Planning in Practice" and subtitled "The Art of Designing Cities and Suburbs".

There was an increased emphasis on planning by the early forties. A Ministry of Town and Country Planning had been established for the reconstruction efforts of war damaged cities. Abercrombie's "Greater London Plan" (1944) and "Country Plan" are examples of both the unitary end-state approach to planning and the 'master plan' attitude.

This period evolved around a belief that

"the pace of future change was expected to be slow, and therefore a plan for a 'once and for all' expected change was perfectly reasonable."

(Cherry, 1974)

A series of reports executed by central government committees brought together the ideas about planning and laid the intellectual foundations for the subsequent legislation: The Barlow Report (1940); the Scott Report (1942).

The statutory planning process emanated from the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act. It provided the basis for post-war land-use control and it centred on
the Development Plan. The primary objective was the production of a detailed land-use plan and hence the planning process was geared towards plan-making as an end in itself. The planning process could be best described as a linear sequence, in the Geddesian tradition of "survey, analysis and plan". The essential function of the system was end-state planning, working toward blueprint solutions. Despite the fact that the 1947 Act had made deliberate provisions for the review of plans every five years.

The war had promoted the idea of a national consensus. There was a belief in a single public interest and an orthodoxy of opinion as to what the country wanted. Planning was considered to be a technical and politically neutral process. As Cherry (1974) suggests, there was a certainty about the nature of the problems to be tackled and of the methods to be used to tackle them.

3.2 Implications for the Role of Evaluation.

For the reasons stated above, particularly those on certainty and stability, this was a self satisfied, contented and unquestioning period. It is therefore not surprising that there was little or no consideration of implementation or review of the 'plan'. It was not perceived to be necessary. There was no notion that a gap might occur between the actual and desired results. There was therefore no place for evaluation in this linear planning process. This period best accords with the rational comprehensive model of planning, set in a climate of certainty.

Paradoxically this was also the period when evaluation would have been easiest. Planning was then
regarded as merely the organisation and management of the physical environment (although its foundations lay in ideas of social reform). Indicators of performance would have been more conducive to measurement, than the problematic social indicators required for performance evaluation today. In addition, planning focussed on meeting a single objective rather than the multiple objectives of the contemporary period.

3.3 The Period 1950 - 1970.

There had always been regard to social problems. As previously discussed the town planning movement was built on this, as was the Garden City Movement. However, up until the fifties, the major impetus of planning was in physical terms. This period heralded the beginnings of "social planning" and explicit recognition of the social environment and social aims of planning. The Committee on the Qualifications of Planners, (The Schuster Committee, (1950) in some way provides an enlightened description of the proper concern of town planning and its policy field. The Committee concluded, that definitions of town planning in the statute book made it clear that this was referring to: "planning the use and development of land" but in so doing, raised large questions concerning social and economic objectives, both nationally and locally which have a profound effect on the lives of people in any area. It emphasised the inherent interconnectedness of problems and put forth the view that because of this, problems which find their spatial expression in physical development plans, cannot merely be conceived of, in terms land-use and location. The report also recognised that planning ought to be concerned more with 'getting
things done' and emphasised the importance of implementa-
tion. One can therefore see the linear planning process
grow, to one of "survey analysis plan and implementation".

emphasised the need for a more 'adaptive' approach to
planning. It endorsed the view that to remain effective,
the planning system needed both to respond to and reflect
change. In its review of the planning system, its
criticisms were most pertinent to this study. Firstly,
the fact that it was essentially based on land-use,
secondly, that it gave the appearance of certainty and
stability and thirdly there were problems of plan
obsolescence. The Report concluded that detailed land-
use development plans as enacted by the 1947 Town
and Country Planning Act, were no longer suited to
the rapidly changing situations of the sixties. The
conclusions and recommendations of this Report were
given statutory recognition by their embodiment in the
The latter is included in this period despite its date,
for continuity.

The preceding discussion clearly illustrates a
shift in emphasis and explicit acknowledgement of change
and uncertainty. As Foley (1964) discusses, planning
needs to be based on a greater understanding of the
system and its development over time. It must

"seek to influence various of the
development forces at work rather
than aiming at a future metropolitan
form as a goal."

(Foley, 1964)

With the introduction of the aforementioned Acts,
the Development Plan has been superceded by the new two
tier system of development plans. Under this system, a
Structure Plan is prepared which is a general statement intended to embrace physical, economic and social policy proposals. This is to provide a broad strategic framework within which the more detailed development proposals of the Local Plans will fit. Of relevance to this study are the proposals contained in this legislation which state explicitly, the necessity for some form of evaluation in the process. In particular, Section 6 (1) of the 1971 Town and Country Planning Act asserts:

"...it shall be the duty of the local planning authority to institute a survey of the area...and in any event to keep all such matters under review."

There was then statutory recognition for evaluation and an expression of the vision of the PAG Report that plan making should be a continuous process. Subsequent central government advice elaborates on the implications of these statutory requirements. Circular 98/74, "Structure Plans" emphasises the need to keep the plan up to date and considers that an explanation of the means of monitoring and reviewing it, should be part of the submission to the D.O.E. The Circular states that Structure Plans are or will be based on assumptions of population and employment trends which rarely remain accurate for more than a few years. Hence, the basic assumptions on which the trends are based will require to be regularly monitored and adjustments made, if necessary. The policies of the plan will also have to be regularly examined and a full review of the plan undertaken, if these prove to be fundamentally changed.
"Planning in short, is a continuous process which is not completed when a plan is produced. The plan is necessary as a statement of the authority's intentions at a particular time for the initiation, encouragement and control of development, but the assumptions on which these intentions are based must be regularly monitored and the plan must be amended if and when necessary."

(D.O.E. C98/74 Section 2d)

and

"Plans must not be allowed to degenerate into static blueprints...if plans are not kept up to date they will soon lose much of their relevance."

(D.O.E. C98/74 Section 2d)

Structure plans are not regarded as definitive statements but rather as an initial basis on which to build a continuous improved planning process.

One discerns a shift in emphasis from plan-making as the ultimate goal and output of the process, towards the incorporation of new information and past experience for planning as a continuous process. This idea of planning was suggested by Paludi (1971) and was at that time a revolutionary statement. Plans were then still regarded as land-use blueprints, with no consideration to implementation or review. The deficiency of the blueprint process was argued cogently by Petersen, (1966).

"Blueprints cannot be used successfully to plan entities as complex as cities or national economies. The attempt to plan such units deductively leads either to a systematic distortion of reality through monistic theories, or to an escape from reality altogether, through Utopian thinking."

The sixties also marked the period of the first strategic and sub-regional plans. There are not statutory documents but they serve to highlight the feelings and opinions of the planners of the day. They emphasised both land-use and social and economic issues. These were the first practical proposals incorporating evaluation proposals. However, they focussed on pre-evaluation of plans/policies rather than post evaluation. Yet, the Leicestershire (1969) and Notts/Derby (1969) plans recognised the necessity to take account of change. The Teeside Plan (1969) claimed that long run planning was not possible because of uncertainty and hence the need for planning to become more flexible.

Another plan, the 1969 Greater London Plan explicitly acknowledges that

"planning dealt with a complex inter-dependent and dynamic environment"

(Hart, 1976)

The Report of Studies on the Greater London Plan (1969) noted, that account must be taken of social and demographic changes. These two examples and Bruton's description (1974) of the difference between planning in 1947 and 1968 serve to illustrate the movement from planning with confidence and certainty towards an end product, to planning for uncertainty, in a complex interconnected environment. Simply making the best use of existing resources and resisting dramatic interventions in the system to achieve some desired end.

The sixties marked the period of an increased awareness that Britain was a pluralist society and the consequent erosion of the idea that there was a
single public interest whose interests planning served. From this point on, planning was no longer regarded as an apolitical process.

This period was one of expansion, growth and rapid change. Willmott (1969) and Cullingworth (1973) explored some of these changing trends. There was a reiteration of some of the emergent threads of the Schuster Report (1950) in particular, the interrelatedness of problems. Several reports underline this focus and supported the critique of local government: The Buchanan Report (1963) which discussed the interrelationship between traffic and the environment; the Plowden Report (1967) and the Seebohm Report (1968). All testified to the growing discontent and awareness that problems could not be dealt with along conventional departmental lines. Many old problems remained and new ones emerged. Hence, the call for 'across the board' approaches.

The sixties laid the foundations for what may be described as

"a search for new forms of urban management"

Stewart (1974)

3.4 Implications for the Role of Evaluation.

By definition, a movement towards flexible, responsive, and adaptive planning will enhance the role that evaluation is likely to play in the planning process. The statutory and practical recognition of evaluation bears witness to that.

There has been a departure from a myopic view of planning as a series of one-shot attempts at optimisation, to a logical basis for the creation of a planning that leads to better performance. Planning is becoming less and less a matter of precise proposals and more a
matter of ideas and policies loosely assembled and intended to be kept under constant review. In terms of the planning process outlined in chapter two, this period best accords with the incrementalist or adaptive models and particularly with that of 'mixed scanning'. Within that, there was still a search for rationality.

The dissatisfaction from both within and without the local government system and the general questioning nature of this era is likely to enhance the role of evaluation. Although this would essentially be in terms of information feedback it may be expected to also consist of feedforward to the decision-makers as an aid in policy formulation.

The increased recognition of planning as essentially a political process in a pluralist society, may have contrary influences on the role of evaluation. On the one hand, the elected member may welcome evaluation, as a way to demonstrate the effects his policies are having on the community. On the other hand, in recognition of the redistributive effects of policy, evaluation may pose a threat, by explicitly recognising that some must 'lose'. In addition, if one acknowledges that planning is a matter of judgement and political choice, then evaluation can only help to improve the basis on which decisions are taken. It cannot prescribe 'solutions'.

As far as administrative and organisational implications are concerned this period presented the first statutory duty to evaluate. The role of evaluation was undoubtedly enhanced by this, in terms of making it more active. From a fairly cynical viewpoint however, evaluation was imposed on local authorities
from the outside. It may therefore be carried out with some reluctance or at best without conviction or realisation of the benefits it can bestow. In practice, there may be no real commitment to evaluate and this will have an important bearing on the sort of role ascribed to it and the depth of that role.


By the early seventies, the influence of those ideas and theoretical developments described in chapter two and in the previous section of this chapter became apparent. At least, they were advocated as that which ought to occur, even if they were not fully carried out in practice.

In particular, is the example of the influence of the systems approach, as expressed by McLoughlin (1969) and Chadwick (1972). From the previous conception of the production of a static plan, the planning process was now seen as an essentially dynamic cyclical process. Planning was now considered to involve the control of complex systems. The contemporary legislation, that is, the 1971 Town and Country Planning Act underlines this development. As Argenti (1968) describes, there was a clear movement towards regarding the plan as merely the beginning of the process rather than its pinnacle.

This period witnessed the ravages of inflation. As previously discussed, 1974 heralded the end of the growth era, with all the attendant implications for evaluation that this has brought about.

There is a dearth of statutory legislation pertinent to the potential role evaluation might play in this period. However, it is considered that both the advent
of local government reform and the rise of corporate and inter-corporate planning, have had considerable impact on the role and informal institutionalisation of evaluation in the planning process.

The call for reform came in the sixties. Several strands underpin the movement, both positive calls for a new system and negative outcries in criticism of the old system. An example of the former was the growing interest in and experiments with, new 'rational' approaches to decision-making which were seen as making, potentially, a major contribution to the improvement of government policy-making. In Central Government, the 1970 White Paper on the 'Reorganisation of Central Government' introduced P.A.R. (Programme Analysis and Review) as a supplement to P.E.S. (Public Expenditure Survey) and established C.P.R.S. (Central Policy Review Staff). P.A.Rs were in depth studies of departmental programmes designed to assess how effective they were in attaining their objectives. C.P.R.S. was established in order to review the government's overall strategy in applying its programme and to undertake specific study projects to evaluate the government's policy and possible options available. Local government in emulation, sought to introduce more 'rational' methods of decision-making. Most of these amounted to the introduction of M.B.O. (Management by Objectives) or P.P.B.S. (Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems). Both are technical, rigid processes. Hence, Wildavsky's concern (1969) to "Rescue policy analysis from P.P.B.S." lest it should become tarnished by the reputation of P.P.B.S.

One of the deficiencies of the old system was, that it had been set up to cope with nineteenth century
problems. Policies were fragmented and this was further reinforced by the internal management and committee structures. These problems were exacerbated by the rapid expansion of local authority services and outmoded geographical boundaries. Services were neither efficient or effective. These problems had repercussions on local democracy. Once articulated these deficiencies were given official voice in a number of Reports: The Redcliffe-Maud Report (1969), The Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government in England; the Mallaby Report (1967) on the staffing of local government; The Bains Report "The New Local Authorities, Management and Structure" (1972); and their Scottish counterparts, The Wheatley Report "The Royal Commission on Local Government in Scotland" (1969) and the Paterson report "The New Scottish Local Authorities" (1973). These expressed the feelings that various government Reports had previously, Plowden (1967), Buchanan (1963) and Seebohm (1968), that, local government should become more efficient and effective in tackling problems. To this end, they required a more coherent method of policy formulation and improved co-ordination between services in order to rectify the 'evils' of departmentalism and professionalism which restricted a comprehensive 'total approach'. Evidently, the blame for this inaccessible and unresponsive government was put squarely though implicitly on the shoulders of administrative rationality. Hence, because of the definition of the problem, the methods proposed to rectify the situation were seen purely in terms of structural reform. Although one might argue that structure is an essential prerequisite for processual and behavioural reform, it cannot be regarded as sufficient on its own to bring these about. To some
extent, this study also emphasises administrative rationality rather than the popularisation of support or fiscal inadequacy as the important factor in an effective adaptive and responsive local government. Evaluation is depicted as a process or method to be formalised into the machinery of local government. However, clearly the evaluation of plans/policies may serve to bring out the reasons behind a policy's success or failure. In this way it may demonstrate the importance of the other factors for effective government.

Final reform in Scotland was based on Wheatley's recommendations for a two-tier structure of region and district authorities. Central government accepted these proposals in its White Paper of February 1971 (Cmd 4583) and the final proposals became law in the Local Government (Scotland) Act of 1973.

As far as dissatisfaction with the internal structure of the authority was concerned there were, according to Stewart and Eddison (1975), two root causes. The first was an awareness that the tradition of management, whereby a local authority was regarded as a collection of essentially separate services, staffed by separate professions, was inappropriate to the management of a local authority facing increasingly complex and interrelated problems in its environment. They had grown in response to the problems of the last century and this had been further strengthened from within by the 'esprit de corps' of the separate professions. Departments, were no longer centred on current problems.

The second was an awareness of the need for an authority to review its activities in the light of changing needs and problems. Kakabadse (1977) notes that where review had been undertaken in the past
there was an inbuilt bias towards the authority as a "producer of services". Success was measured by the quantity rather than the quality of service provision. There was little questioning as to whether objectives were being achieved or whether the most appropriate methods were being employed. Corporate planning is

"Corporate planning means planning as an authority rather than by departments in the major areas of the authority's work. It implies that planning is carried out in the knowledge of defined and agreed objectives, that once formulated are plans for action and are flexible and responsive to change."

(Skitt, 1975)

It is a move towards a comprehensive approach. The corporate rationale is, according to Stewart (1974) in pursuit of a truly responsive local authority and a learning organisation.

One must consider the characteristics and common elements of the corporate process, because these will determine the effect it may have on the role of evaluation. Stewart (1973) outlines these characteristics as explicit policy-making and goal formulation, systemic policy review, an increased concern for environmental analysis explicit identification of the authority's objectives, a need for policy analysis and a concern for output measurement. Nelson and Longbottom (1977) emphasise five key issues which are the concern of corporate planning in practical terms. Firstly, what is the department trying to achieve? - its objectives. Secondly, what services are contributing to these? Thirdly, what resources are allocated to these? Fourthly, what is actually being achieved 'output' and 'impact'? Fifthly, what changes could be brought about in resource allocation and service provision to increase the contribution to these objectives.
The integrated planning process according to Grey (1972) must fulfill five conditions. It must be: outward looking, recognising that the needs of the community must come before its needs; anticipatory, it does not merely react to problems but anticipates future needs and changes; systemic, recognising that problems are interconnected; flexible, continually adopting decisions to take account of uncertainty; and self critical; evaluating the extent to which it achieves its stated objectives both in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.

These reforms in management may have contributed to the popularisation of evaluation in the planning process, despite the fact that they are not statutorily defined. An examination of the Paterson Report (1973) reveals where allowances have been made for the inclusion of evaluation in the planning process, as designed for Scotland. Paterson (1973) argues that the process of corporate management is

"to carry out a systematic and continuous review of the programmes in the light of progress made and of changing circumstances"

and

"to measure real achievement in relation to the stated objectives"

and

"An essential characteristic of the process is its continuous cyclical nature"

Structure partly determines process. Paterson (1973) proposes the establishment of a Policy and Resources Committee. He stresses that the organisation and evaluation of performance, is a vital task.
"so vital that we see this as the main function of the Policy and Resources Committee".

Paterson (1973) commends P.P.B.S. as a system but rejects it as being too sophisticated and expensive to install.

The seventies have witnessed a growing interest in intercorporate planning. It encapsulates the sentiments expressed in the opening citation of this study – the need for humility. It appreciates that local government is not the only body responsible for the management of the environment. It recognises that urban problems seldom fall neatly within the remit of a single agency.

"The difficulty of dividing policy space into exclusive units, of necessity leads to 'multiple organisational interaction' in functional areas in much the same way as happens in geographical space". (Aitkenhead, 1979)

We cannot rely on goodwill to coordinate the plans/policies of disparate bodies. There are many instances such as Donnison (1973) describes, of this failure to coordinate action, to the disbenefit of the community. He relates how a Community Development Project on Educational Priority Area and a 'Shelter' housing project were set up in Liverpool, in different areas and unrelated. The potential impact of such projects was diluted and dissipated. Meyerson and Banfield (1955) illustrate this problem in relation to public housing programmes in Chicago.

Intercorporate planning underlines the interrelatedness of problems and the need for all agencies to develop an

"appreciation of the common task"

(Sir G. Vickers, 1965)

Figure 3 illustrates the complexity of intergovernmental relationships.
Figure 3. Intergovernmental Relationships and the Community System.
Paterson (1973) emphasises the need for
"close harmonious cooperation among authorities".

Both corporate and intercorporate planning stress that planning is for the community.

A recent development has been a movement towards greater politicisation of the planning process. Attempts have been made to develop machinery for greater political control and simultaneously more rational decision-making.

3.6 Implications for the Role of Evaluation.

Clearly, this period has made substantial inroads for systematic policy analysis and evaluation. One would expect it to play a much more active and broader role. Legislation is a good way behind current planning thought. Where attention has been given, it has been to pre rather than post evaluation. There is a dearth of legislation and central government advice in relation to the applicability of evaluation in this period. This demonstrates the relatively low level of importance attached to it. However, this may prove to be advantageous, by an analogy with P.P.B.S. in the United States. P.P.B.S. was heavily criticised and thrown out because of its narrow inflexible and technical nature. So, the role of evaluation may be enhanced and extended precisely because it has not been statutorily defined and conceived. Its role might be expected to evolve according to local conditions, with due regard to the constraints imposed by its administrative and organisational setting. Of course, the corollary is that if it is not on statute, it will not even be considered by an authority. Local government is widely documented as a conservative animal and resistant to change. (Schon 1967) and (Wildavsky 1972).
Corporate planning emphasises the importance for local government to understand the environment it seeks to control and purports to act on behalf of. Evaluation has therefore an important potential role to play in educating both elected members and officials as to what is going on and what effects their policies are having. This may help prevent the situation where

"A local authority undertakes many
Too often it knows but little of their
impact. A service is provided. That is assumed to be enough."

(Stewart 1971)

Corporate planning enhances its role because it explicitly stresses adaptive planning. It also underlines the need for effective planning and government, by greater systematic review of policies in the light of changes both in the environment and in the aspirations of the community. Eddison (1971) describes the method to achieve responsive planning in a corporate planning process,

"Continuously monitoring the environment and evaluating the policy in the light of any changes."

Two characteristics of the corporate planning process are of particular relevance to this discussion. Firstly, the concern for effectiveness rather than merely efficiency. There is no value in efficiently carrying out the wrong policy. The second is the shift in emphasis from ad-hoc to systematic policy review. As Gillis et al (1964) narrate some form of review is usually carried out. It is of an ad-hoc and reactive nature. Without some stimulus such as a crisis, it is unlikely to occur. In this way, many areas are never reviewed.
Adaptive and responsive planning requires for its fulfillment, the means whereby continual refinement of policy can be built into the system. Co-ordination may be put forward as a means for more effective local government. It will be seriously weakened if we improve co-ordination - but of the same old policies!

Structural reform is important because to some extent, the behaviour of both officials and members is moulded by it. For instance, if a monitoring and evaluation unit or a research and intelligence unit is established, it is likely that evaluation will have a more influential role than if this were not the case. The case for it will have already been made. However, structural changes of themselves will not be enough. They provide the bones (Eddison 1971), the framework. As such, they are essential prerequisites for systematic evaluation, but they are not sufficient for it to come about. Attitudes, the confidence of top management of its value and the commitment of all staff are more important determinants of its successful establishment. These may take a long time to achieve.

Evaluation may contribute to more coherent 'rational' policy formulation in the corporate planning process. By providing relevant feedback it may make policy makers aware of gaps in provision or achievement. Eddison (1973) proposes four attributes of improved decision-making:

"(1) Decisions are likely to be better if we know what it is we are trying to achieve.

(2) Decisions are likely to be better if information is available as to how resources are being deployed as between objectives rather than as between a department or committee responsible for implementation."
Decisions are likely to be better if the effectiveness of current programmes, policies and projects are evaluated.

Decisions are likely to be better if alternative ways of achieving an objective are considered and analysed."

These give evaluation a role of primary importance in decision-making. Whether these have penetrated into practice is another matter. Although evaluation may aid problem solving and contribute to more 'rational' decision making, it will not of itself 'solve' problems or provide ready made solutions. At the end of the day this is a matter of judgement, of political choice. Evaluation can only identify and clarify issues and expose conflict. In this way it may help to make it more productive.

The seventies accords best with the 'mixed scanning' model of planning with a leaning towards increased rationality. Evaluation has a role to play in 'scanning' the environment for significant changes. The implications of this model for evaluation have been previously discussed (chapter 2).

The implication of the 'era of restraint' have been documented. (chapter 1)

The emergence of intercorporate planning gives evaluation a potential new role to play as a médium of liaison and communication. It could contribute to the development of an "appreciation of the common task"

(Sir G. Vickers 1965).

It could contribute to the development of the 'reticulist' function as outlined by Friend and Jessop (1969). This function is not merely a hypothetical theoretical development. It is a necessary component of effective action by government.
The emergence of a repoliticisation of the planning process has profound implications for the potential role of evaluation. It can contribute to more 'rational' decision-making. In the past, this was on an incremental basis. Decisions were taken (where possible) by the party caucus and therefore without the benefit of officers advice. They were taken frequently on purely a cost basis. Councillors are now anxious to become more involved in the real policy matters, rather than trivial day to day administration. Evaluation can enhance their awareness of needs and achievements. It can set a learning process in motion. If the members take the upper hand, by determining what issues are to be evaluated when and how, they will gain greater political control over the running of the authority.

Evaluation studies must generate information which is of more than historical interest and in a form which bears on the realities of its context. Perhaps it ought to take another leaf out of P.P.B.S's book. An important reason for its failure, was surely because its success was dependent on removing much of the ambiguity which is central to the political process. We must be aware of this constraint and build it in. For systematic evaluation to work and its potential roles to be fulfilled, there must be political will behind it. So far, the emphasis has leaned heavily on the official side. This may well have hampered the role of evaluation in the past.

These implications bestow a potentially enormous role for evaluation. If corporate and intercorporate planning were practised as they are prescribed this would indeed be the case. At present, many of these
are concerns which have still to be realised.

Several reasons suggest they may remain as purely potential roles. Its role is hindered because there is no systematic mechanism to demonstrate when something is wrong and change is needed. There is no process to decide what ought to be evaluated, that is, in terms of programme areas, clients or issues. There is customarily a gap between what is thought of as conceptually ideal and that which is practised. There is naturally some time lag between the thought, the decision and the action. There are technical and methodological problems inherent in any evaluation process. (Suchman 1967), (Weiss, 1972) and (Rossi and Williams 1972). In brief, one of the first steps in evaluation is the identification of goals and objectives. In the real world these are multiple and often conflict. They are often nebulous desires such as 'improving the quality of life'. There has been a lack of relevant data particularly of the 'soft' variety. Evaluation takes up resources. A balance must be struck between further analysis and the use of the resources in providing services. It has only been ten years or so since the systems approach, corporate planning and adaptive planning were first advocated. Hence, ten years since there was explicit recognition of the need for evaluation. This may not be long enough for planning education to reorient itself from the traditional planning methods and practice, or for an administration to overcome inertia, the "dynamics of conservatism" (Schon 1967). There is still a general feeling that the 'plan' is the essential ingredient of the process.

Despite these obstacles, it is at least commonly agreed that the process ought to be a continuous cyclical one and evaluation is an integral part of that process.
CHAPTER 4.

A TYPOLOGY OF POTENTIAL ROLES.

From the two preceding chapters, it would appear that the foundations have been laid for a dynamic and growing role for evaluation in the planning process. In conceptual terms the planning process has bestowed on evaluation an essential role. It is the critical link in the practical realisation of a continuous cyclical planning process. The institutionalisation of evaluation in the planning process has in practice, lagged somewhat behind the pioneering developments of planning thought.

This chapter intends to build on the findings and implications of the previous two, in order to develop a typology of potential roles that evaluation might play in the planning process. Some of these roles have already been cursorily described. Others, are put forward because they raise important questions for both the future role of evaluation in local government and indeed the future role of local government.

This typology will be applied to the local government situation in the case-study of Strathclyde Region in order to assess how far these roles have developed in practice.

There are problems in demarcating roles in this way. There is much overlap between roles and the roles are not mutually exclusive.

To some extent, the roles that evaluation can play in the planning process of local government, are dependent on the role of local government. Stewart (1980) in Cameron (1980), identified two such roles, a 'maintenance' and a 'change' role. The latter consists of both directive and responsive change. Stewart (1980) states that in the past the 'maintenance' role has been predominant. He asserts that if local government is to become more effective
then the 'change' role needs to be developed. Evaluation is of paramount importance to a change role. Therefore, one might postulate an enhanced role for evaluation.

4.1 **Level of Evaluation - The Active-Passive Continuum**

The level of evaluation may be fitted in somewhere along an active-passive continuum. That is, in relation to the degree to which the type of role is utilised in practice. A role may be actively pursued and all pervasive or it may be passively pursued, of negligible importance and peripheral to the local government system. Between these two extremes there are numerous possibilities.

4.2 **Type of Role.**

The nature and scope of the evaluative mechanism is dependent to a large extent on the type of feedback it is expected to produce and the role it is expected to play. It is dependent on the nature of the demand for it. Hence, a limited concept and perception of its usefulness will produce an inbuilt bias to assign it, a limited role. The Youth Volunteer Force (1976) argue that the roles will be different because of the different intentions, the instigators have for wanting evaluation. For instance, they may be the sponsors of the project, the managers or the consumers.

There are essentially two sorts of functions a role may fulfill. Namely, a diagnostic function, whereby it seeks to determine the current position and a prescriptive function, whereby it may result in the adjustment of action within established policies or a review of the plan/policy.

(a) **Informative fact-finding Role - Feedback.**

Until relatively recently this role was the most commonly accepted definition of evaluation. Information
supply is the lifeblood of an effective evaluation system. Indeed, all the roles to follow are built on this one. The essence of this role is not merely information collection, (more the realm of monitoring) but the assessment of its significance, its analysis presentation and consequent application to the decision making process.

This role may be likened to the first of Rivlin's (1971) classification in that it clarifies the dimensions of the problem. It helps to answer the seemingly simple but often unanswered questions such as, what the programmes are, who they are for and what they are achieving. Output and performance information of action and conditions across a city is important if one purports to be practising positive discrimination.

This role is of the utmost importance for without the ability to gauge performance, criticisms are unconfirmed, solutions are largely guesswork and the planning process is arbitrary. Evaluation may help to challenge 'sacred cows' by making the results of actions explicit. In this way it may foster innovation in service provision and delivery - the second and third categories in Rivlin's (1971) classification.

Information and review are essential if policies are to maintain their relevance.

Information helps to amplify the understanding of the system which local government seeks to control. It thereby helps to reduce the inherent uncertainty.

(b) **Control Role.**

The perspective of evaluation gained from organisation theory is that it is a controlling process, binding the organisation together. Evaluation can play a control role by maintaining the plan/policy on its course and altering this course when the need arises.
By detecting changing trends in the system, the assumptions of the plan/policy and the needs and aspirations of the community, evaluation checks both the performance and the relevance of plan/policies. As Argenti (1968) states, there will always be a gap between the desired and actual outcomes. Evaluation may help to close this slightly.

Unlike biological systems, local government does not have an automatic regulator to cause adjustments in a predetermined way, in the event of changes. Evaluation thus becomes a management tool for control, by informing the policymakers when a plan/policy is diverging significantly from its desired course.

(c) **Advisory Role - Feedforward.**

A monitoring and evaluation unit can produce abundant evaluations and information. However, the informative role is meaningless if it is not linked to the political decision making process. Evaluation has an advisory role to play in the communication of information.

Having discovered discrepancies between the actual and desired outcomes of a plan/policy, it may advocate preventative, compensatory or accommodative action.

This role in combination with (a) and (b), if thoughtfully conceived and designed, could be a powerful tool in the attainment of the much desired but as yet elusive aim of flexibility.

(d) **Aid to Decision-making - Policy Formulation.**

This role is necessarily linked to (c). It emphasises that the ultimate success of evaluation is determined to a considerable extent by its ability to translate information into meaningful advice for a local authority. This will then according to Eddison (1973) provide a sounder
"Monitoring the environment, tracing out effects and side effects, analysing the environment would present us with a much firmer basis for policy formulation."

(Eddison 1973)

Clearly, if one is aware of the consequences of past decisions then subjective judgement is reduced. This will raise the level of debate and facilitate more rational decision-making. Choices must be made. There will never be enough resources to do all one might wish. Hence, priorities must be established. Particularly with the prospect of 'no growth' local authorities will need to establish priorities. Evaluation may make this a more rational process.

Eddison (1973) has proposed four determinants of improved decision-making. (See Section 3.3). Evaluation can contribute to the achievement of all of these.

Evaluation has a role to play in policy formulation, not just in providing evidence when a decision is being taken on existing or new policy. It can do so by discovering problems and difficulties in areas in which no policy has yet been formulated. This discovery may be accidental, whilst evaluating a current policy. On the other hand it may have been commissioned to look into this area. Either way it will play a critical role in the consequent policy formulation.

Evaluation is not carried out in a vacuum, but in an institutional environment. Planning policies are not the result of purely technical processes. They are proposed, defined, debated and adopted via political processes. Policy changes or new policies can be determined only via political processes. Evaluation results cannot remove political judgement and will. It is merely a tool to aid judgement not a substitute for it. Evaluation will constitute just one piece of evidence actually used in decision -
making. The evidence it puts forward may be clearly logical and scientific, and it may have an important place, but rarely will it be decisive. Other political, organisational and administrative considerations will have a dominant influence. Prejudice, ideology, persuasion and bargaining may all be brought to bear, in order to arrive at a decision. Personal factors may be of importance. Judgements about the quality of particular individuals may be crucial in determining whether a plan/policy is to be carried out.

(e) **Educative Role.**

Evaluation educates officers, elected members and the public alike. It does so by making them aware of the impact and results of past and current plans/policies. It facilitates the development of a greater understanding of the system under control. The particular influences on the different actors described, are dealt with under their respective sections. Suffice to note that this education enhances the councillors role, can improve public participation, co-ordination between different agencies and increases general knowledge on which plans/policies are based.

(f) **Learning and Knowledge Building Role.**

The aim of an action plan/policy is to achieve a desired state. For various reasons discussed earlier, the actual and desired outcomes rarely coincide. Repeated refinements of policy, by learning from past experience could lead to some convergence. Evaluation can provide a platform for learning, on which future policy can be based. The only knowledge we can be certain of is past knowledge. Evaluation provides the results of past experience and performance. It thus enables more reliable causal inferences regarding the impact of social policies.
and projects to be made. This may be used as a basis for improved forecasting for future policy.

Evaluation has a significant role to play in the understanding of the causes and consequences of plan/policy decisions. It can improve our knowledge of both society and societal behaviour. The evaluation of past and current policies can give policymakers insight as to which, where and why certain policies have failed in the past and more importantly to demonstrate successful policies. Evaluations must go beyond merely assessing whether a plan/policy has been a 'success' or a 'failure' and discover why this has been so. These results may then be taken into account in subsequent policy formulation. Figure 4.1 outlines the process of evaluation and figure 4.2 depicts possible reasons for 'failure' or 'success'.

Any policy may be thought of as representing a theory or hypothesis in that the decision-makers decide to carry it out and expect it to cause certain predictable effects. If these do not occur there may be many explanations. On the one hand the policy may not have activated the causal process that would have culminated in the intended goals. This is a failure of the policy in terms of its implementation. On the other hand, it may have set the prescribed 'causal' process in motion but this did not have the desired effect. In this case failure is attributable to the theory or cause-effect relationship behind the policy. Whether intervention results in the subsequent attainment of the ultimate goal is dependent on the validity of this theory. Suchman (1967) distinguishes between process evaluation,- the extent to which a programme is implemented according to its stated guidelines, and impact evaluation - the extent to which a policy causes a change in the intended direction. The difference is important for a learning system. If
Fig 4.1. THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION.

GENERAL CONCERNS
(selected policy topics and
organisational issues;
general ideas)

questions in relation to
each plan/policy and the processes associated with it.

WHAT IS (OR IS NOT) GOING ON?
(e.g. idea generation, proposals, implementation.)

WHAT IS THE PERFORMANCE IN
RELATION TO CRITERIA?
(e.g. improved understanding of the area, more sensitive policies, better relationships)

WHY ARE THERE SUCCESSES AND FAILURES?
(e.g. 'blockages' in admin. processes, priorities, skills.)

WHAT IS THE RESPONSE TO SUCCESS AND FAILURE?
(e.g. roles of central units, monitoring systems, relationships.)

DATA, COMPARISONS,
COMMENTARY AND HYPOTHESES
FOR DISCUSSION WITH PEOPLE INVOLVED.

GENERALISED AND CONTINGENT LESSONS.
Figure 4.2. Reasons for the success or failure of plans/policies.
a policy is not implemented as intended, then one ought not be surprised if it does not have the desired effects. It is important to establish the reasons for failure, so that we do not 'throw out' approaches unduly. If one can determine why a policy has failed, adjustments can be made in the ongoing policy and/or in any new policy. Many reasons attributed to a failure of implementation such as communication, structure, resources and relationships are amendable to alteration. Where the failure is due to invalid theory, evaluation can bring this to the attention of academics and researchers. In so doing, it may help both in the expansion of knowledge, and in the use of the most up to date theory in the provision and delivery of public services. Evaluation can thus improve decision-making by making us more aware of the reasons behind success and failure, and hence to explicate and refine that practice principles that underlie programming efforts.

Plans/policies often give rise to unforeseen and undesirable effects. Evaluation may make us more aware of these and able to learn from them. For instance, in the early sixties many authorities judged that the development of high rise flats would provide a large number of relatively cheap homes while avoiding excessive requirements for building land. In the event, there was much evidence suggesting that these were not suitable for families with children. Obviously the 'success' or 'failure' of the policy in providing the right number of homes is less important than the associated undesirable social consequences.

(g) Bridging Role

This role is a natural progression from the previous
one. Evaluation studies may help to bridge the current gap between the needs of applied fields and the accomplishment of basic research, and between decision-makers in local government and academics. This would give practitioners access to research which is of direct value to them and which is both relevant and sensitive to real issues. From within local government, the research based in academia is too often described as delivering the wrong goods, at the wrong time.

Evaluation can help to bridge this gap. Hoole (1978) believes that for both policy and theory building reasons we need to understand better, the impact of activities designed to bring about political, economic and social change.

Clearly no one would advocate using outmoded techniques, methods and approaches. Evaluation in its bridging role, would facilitate the application of the most up to date effective methods, by speeding up the filtering process between the two. This process is diagrammatically represented in figure 4.3.

(h) A Change Agent.

Evaluation may identify the need for a change in policy. Change is necessary in order that the authority keeps up with the rapidly changing society it aspires to control. It is necessary for an authority to be adaptive and flexible. Evaluation may determine when significant deviations from a plan/policy occur and identify the need for change thus supporting a continuous responsive planning process. Evaluation cannot of itself produce change. It acts as a catalyst for it. Other considerations previously discussed have a dominant influence. In addition evaluation studies may discover that improved educational attainment is gained by improving the living conditions and employment opportunities of a family. A local authority
FIGURE 4.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACTION AND RESEARCH
does not have control over the latter variable, it is subject to regional and national influence. Hence, it cannot initiate change to remedy the situation.

(i) **Innovative Role.**

Evaluation provides a safety-valve against the dangers of experimentation. It permits the testing of new policies on a small scale with a variety of conditions, for use in the guidance of large projects. It can give advice on decisions as to whether and under what conditions to set up similar projects in different areas. It therefore contributes to more innovative planning, and the discovery of new and improved approaches to service provision, within an authority.

This role may also enhance innovation between authorities. Evaluation can offer generalisations, lessons and guidelines, to those considering the adoption of such projects/plans/policies, which will help them to decide whether and in what form to go ahead. This cross-fertilisation of ideas and practices may greatly enhance the effectiveness of local government.

This role underlines the need to view evaluation as a broad flexible concept. The form and scope of evaluation will be necessarily different depending on whether it is an ongoing operational project, a demonstration experimental project, a model or prototype. The latter types will necessitate great flexibility and a variety of conditions. The former calls for a 'tighter' more controlled evaluation.

Were this potential role to be developed, we would be approaching the second and third categories in Rivlin's (1971) classification.
(j) **Co-ordinative Role - Liaison and Communication.**

Evaluation may provide a medium of liaison and communication both within and between local authorities.

"It is clear that a gulf of understanding exists between those responsible for forward planning and those responsible for implementation."

(Harris and Scott 1974)

Evaluation by deliberately setting out to assess the effectiveness of plan/policy-making and to channel this information back into the plan/policy-making process, helps to co-ordinate the activities of a planning department.

Between local authorities and other public agencies evaluation has a role to play in furthering an 'appreciation of the common task' (Sir. G. Vickers, 1965).

This role is vital for the effective working of the two-tier planning system where decision-making is fragmented between different agencies with different sets of objectives. Some services are the joint responsibility of different tiers such as leisure and recreation and physical planning, others are closely linked such as housing and social work.

"With the present division of responsibilities and reluctant collaboration between District councils this may be difficult to achieve but it is essential if the process (of planning) is to retain its validity over time"

(Loew, 1973)

Brazier and Harris (1975) suggest this calls for 'connective planning' and consider evaluation to be one of the keys to liaison, co-operation and co-ordinated decision-making. They have no illusion that evaluation will remove conflict. However, by clarifying and exposing
it, evaluation may create a platform for negotiation and resolution.

Evaluation plays the role of a 'reticulist' (Friend and Jessop 1969). It can create and use informal networks of communication, sound out opinion and bring issues which require joint decision-making to the attention of the appropriate people. Friend and Yewlett (1974) describe it as a trouble-shooter.

(k) **Advocacy Role - Enhance Public Participation.**

Evaluation may focus and inform public participation in the planning process. It may give a community greater leverage with the authority and thereby help them to shape their own development. In the interests of local democracy evaluation results should always be made public.

An Evaluation study ought to incorporate the views of the community. Scott (1976) argues that their evaluation of a plan/policy is an important measure of government performance, as much as any other indicator. Indeed one could argue that if we purport to plan for the needs and desires of the community, then their evaluation of a plan/policy's performance is the important indicator of success or failure.

"Client participation is not a luxury in evaluation. It is a necessity."

(Bush and Gordon 1978)

A systematic evaluation process fully integrated into the planning and churning out assessments of success and failure, will be of little value if,

"A successful poverty programme to the government is an unsuccessful programme to the poor."

(J. Higgins 1978)
(1) Politicisation of the Planning Process.

Local government was not created in order to administer services. Any agency might do this local government was created to facilitate democracy and to act as a framework to determine what the community needs.

Of late, there has been much concern by councillors over a feeling of minimal political involvement and a consequent call for their role to be revitalised. The general discontent arises from the day to day administrative trivia involved in the committee system. Councillors express a desire to become more actively involved in the real policy questions and policy formulation.

Evaluation has an important role to play in this repolicisation of the planning process. It will enable facts to be put before members so that they can review their stance on particular issues. It will enable the political will to be more clearly specified and implemented and resource allocation to more closely reflect their priorities.

Evaluation may help to overcome the constraints of the present committee system by focussing issues on a more 'across the board' approach.

Evaluation results may lend some objectivity to the division of rival claims by different services/ departments for scarce resources.

Evaluation of plans/policies may enhance the role of the backbencher. It will promote greater understanding of the environment and the policies under the auspices of the Council. Greater understanding may improve communication. Members are both better qualified and more confident to question policy. They may feel a greater sense of purpose and involvement which by increasing morale, may also serve to enrich debate. In this way,
evaluation may serve not only to improve policy-making through continual refinement but to enhance local democracy and repoliticise the planning process.

There are political influences which hinder the development of this role of evaluation. By identifying the 'winners' and the 'losers' from current policies it may constitute a threat to members anxious not to lose votes. Its very strengths then are also its weaknesses. By probing deeply it exposes crucial choices. Many members may therefore shy away from the formalisation of evaluation into the planning process. Some argue that if policies were truly not effective and people felt strongly enough there would be pressure for change. Any change in advance of such pressure is seen to be not only unnecessary (let sleeping dogs lie) but undemocratic (R. Young 1977).

Evaluation has always been considered on the officials and administrative side of an authority. The review of its institutionalisation bears witness to this. However Bains (1973) states that

"the regular monitoring and review of programmes against defined objectives is a responsibility which must rest principally on the members"

Information is the essence of power.

If the evaluation function and system were controlled by the political side of an authority it would provide a powerful method of control over the administrative side. This would mean that the political leadership would decide what issues were to be evaluated, when and by whom. Evaluation would undoubtedly contribute to the repoliticisation of the planning process.

4.3 Depth of Role

Rivlin (1971) proposed three categories. These have
been set out in chapter one. It is noted here, because it provides part of the typology of roles to be used as a framework in the following chapter.

4.4 **Conclusions.**

Numerous diverse potential roles have been developed for evaluation to play in the local government context. Figure 4.4 illustrates the typology derived from the previous chapters and extant literature. These will require different treatment in terms of their depth and their level of objectiveness. The rigour of evaluation ought to be appropriate to its use. The co-ordinative role does not necessitate in-depth probing, merely an indication of the effects policies are having and where gaps and duplication arise. On the other hand the learning role requires rigorous evaluation of a technical nature, in order to elucidate the determinants of success or failure. Evaluation is itself subject to evaluation as it ought to be weighed against the benefits to be derived. Marris and Rein (1974) demonstrate the destructive influence of 'purely scientific' approaches to evaluation when applied to approaches of urban renewal. This may help to answer the criticisms levelled at evaluation in methodological and technical terms. Evaluation need not be solely regarded as a highly objective technical exercise. This is neither possible (Suchman 1967 and Weiss 1972) nor it is argued here, is it desirable. It is difficult to imagine cost-benefit analysis or P.P.B.S. taking on more than a couple of these roles. Yet, these two are often regarded as the personification of evaluation. Evaluation must be a messy fuzzy process if it is to fulfill its potential roles.

This chapter has sounded a note of caution to the
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formalisation of evaluation into the process. It may be absorbed by the bureaucracy and became a rigid uniform concept. If it is considered in too narrow terms it may be incapable of providing answers to problems.

Two important issues that must be addressed are firstly, how a local authority initiates and sustains efforts towards the accomplishment of these roles. Secondly, where the momentum comes from, for the confidence and ability to tolerate the threat it brings. We have previously attributed some of the required momentum to external factors such as inflation, the era of financial restraint and concern over effectiveness and accountability. Where has its support come from? This is to be analysed in the following chapter, alongside an appraisal of the degree to which the potential roles derived, have been achieved in practice.
PART TWO

THE REALITY
CHAPTER 5.

FROM THE RHETORIC TO THE REALITY - A CASE STUDY
OF THE ROLE OF EVALUATION IN THE PLANNING PROCESS
OF STRATHCLYDE REGIONAL COUNCIL.

This chapter explores the role that evaluation actually plays in the planning process of a local authority, namely, Strathclyde Regional Council. The intention is to discuss the concepts hypotheses and assertions previously introduced, in relation to Strathclyde Region. The typology of potential roles constructed in the previous chapter is used as a framework for the appraisal of just how far these roles have developed in practice. There will undoubtedly be some gap between the possibilities and prevalent practice. However, by identifying the problems of combining the political life of an organisation with analytic awareness, one would then be able to use this understanding of the constraints imposed to enhance its role in the future.

5.1 Methodology.

There are essentially two parts to this empirical research,

(1) Various parts of the evaluative machinery of the planning process are examined in relation to the developed typology, in order to examine the level, type and depth of the role, of evaluation. Each begins with a short resume of the history of its initiation, its purpose and essential elements. It is impossible to give a complete picture, examples are taken which demonstrate where different roles have been taken up by evaluation, or are likely to be in the future.
A discussion on the role and importance of evaluation from the officials and elected members viewpoint, in order to put the former aspect into perspective. This section will give an indication of the future role for evaluation by elucidating the climate of opinion towards it, in terms of their attitudes, beliefs and perceptions of it.

5.2 Limitations.

This part of the study involved the examination of government documents, Council minutes and newspapers. Numerous interviews were conducted with officials, elected members and others currently involved (See Appendix 1). This served both to verify and supplement the former information. Indeed so little documentation exists on the evaluative machinery of the process that the chapter is mainly dependent on the interviews. This in itself says a lot for the importance and influence afforded to evaluation in the planning process.

Therefore, it must be borne in mind that there is the possibility of distortion, a tendency for vagueness and exaggeration. In addition those involved will naturally colour everything with their personal bias and value judgement. At times there were difficulties in studying the process in terms of confidentiality.

The most serious limitation is that there is only one case study. Therefore, there is no means of comparison to provide a basis for reliable generalisations to be made. However, any role developed in Strathclyde Region could potentially be developed in any other authority, ceteris paribus. It is most probable that in a large progressive authority such as Strathclyde there will have been a good deal of scope for the development of evaluation. Hence, it will provide a good example of the difficulties encountered in developing these roles and formalising evaluation into the planning process.
Most of the remarks are applicable to any local government process and hence this will permit some tentative conclusions to be drawn on this basis.

5.3 **Strathclyde Region - Background.**

Strathclyde Region is one of the most populous regions in Scotland. Indeed, it contains approximately half the Scottish population some 2.5 million. It is the second largest of the nine mainland regional authorities established in Scotland after local government reorganisation in 1975, under the 1973 Local Government (Scotland) Act. It is a large progressive authority which has introduced corporate planning.

5.4 **Evaluative Machinery.**

(a) **The Physical Planning Department Research & Intelligence Unit**

Strathclyde Region does not have an evaluation unit as such to evaluate projects and programmes. This is important in itself in accounting for the low profile of evaluation. Although not sufficient in itself for evaluation to play a leading role, it is a necessary prerequisite.

However both the Physical Planning and the former Policy Planning Unit have research and intelligence units. The concern is predominantly with monitoring and the production of data rather than with its analysis and evaluation. The Physical Planning unit produces performance indicators and small area statistics which are used in the evaluative machinery. This type of evaluation is the informative control role. It is a technical exercise. Appendix 2. It most closely coincides with Rivlin's (1971) first classification. It establishes the extent and nature of the problem and who 'benefits' and 'loses' from current
policy. It is purely descriptive, it offers no solution to the problem.

Strathclyde Region in its Regional Report (1976) emphasises two key factors, namely:–

"(a) the need to increase the number of jobs in the Region; and

(b) the need to tackle urban deprivation."

These are the key issues in the Structure Plan also. These are then the goals of the planning process. As previously discussed the key to identifying the role of evaluation is to ascertain the way in which evaluation contributes to the output of the planning process.

The Regional Report (para. 18.15) does state the intention to monitor its services. The Secretary of State in his reply, stated that he expected the objectives to be also reviewed.

The Research and Intelligence Unit monitors the Regional Report, Structure Plan and the Deprivation Strategy. The latter intends to

"ensure the effectiveness and sensitivity of all services operating in the areas of need."

Strathclyde (1976b)

The Policy Planning Research and Intelligence Unit also had an input to these Departments were asked where they had directed and redirected resources. The submissions were bland. For example, the Education Departments statement that policy impact was incorporated into the budget as far as resource provision and the needs of the service would allow. It gave no details in terms of the actual amounts.

The Demographic Indicators Study 1974-76 published in 1979 was an attempt to monitor conditions in the Region in order to establish whether the 114 and the 45 Areas for Priority Treatment identified in the Regional Report and
based on an analysis of 1971 Census data were still those in greatest need. These 45 provide the framework for the Council's deprivation policy. In order for it to maintain its relevance one must be sure that these are still the most needy areas. In this case the role of evaluation was intended to be advisory and an aid to decision-making. As one protagonist put it:

"It is intended that the data contained in the Report will provide objective information to review the Council's APT's, but it is recognised that this must be part of a wider consultation process."

That is, that evaluation is just one input to the decision-making process.

Another example is that of the "Social Needs and Social Work Resources" study. This examines APT's and the urban programme funds. Here the role is predominantly one of information too, though they hope:

"that some of the issues raised by this information will occasion the re-examination of existing policies and will stimulate a debate on future resource planning."

(Interview)

(b) Policy Review Groups and the New Chief Executive

The Regional Council in determining its overall organisation and structure at reorganisation in May 1975, wanted to adopt the corporate management process and new organisational concepts advocated by Paterson (1973). However, for reasons of continuity of service, and staff matching they settled for an interim management structure. At the same time, they decided that the structures and issues would be reviewed at a future date when sufficient operational experience was available, but before the provisional arrangements had become firmly entrenched.
At the end of their first year in office in 1976, the Council held a seminar at Seamill to consider the past year's events and experiences. It discussed the implications of local government reorganisation on the councillor and ways to enhance his role. The concept of Policy Review Groups emerged from this seminar. They were to be ad-hoc bodies capable of permitting the councillor to study selected policy issues "across the board".

"Since reorganisation the Labour Group have been attempting to secure greater political control over the administration".  
(Cllr. R. Young)

They felt that the committee system did not permit

"a careful and sustained examination by members of the nature, basis and effects of policies"

nor an indepth analysis of issues which

"straddle the boundaries of service committees"  
(Strathclyde Labour Group 1976)

There was a general feeling that structural changes for corporate planning were all on the officers side, and this balance needed to be redressed. There was no structure whereby he could

"gain systematic insights into the problems of service delivery and future needs"  
(Strathclyde Labour Group 1976)

There was concern over the failings of the existing political structures to allow councillors to monitor and review policy performance and to act to facilitate optimal use of scarce resources.

Accordingly, in December 1976 two Policy Review Groups were set up. One, on the organisational and
departmental structure of the Council, the other, on
departmental policy in relation to Community Development.


This Group conducted a review of the roles, structures
process, practices, relations and staffing levels of all
Departments.

"with a view to improving the efficiency and
effectiveness of the Regional Council's
management structure".

(Strathclyde Regional Council 1978)

It consisted of ten members with Councillor Stewart as
the Chairman of a political 'core'. The exercise included
numerous officers many seconded full-time, for eighteen
months from the Management Services Department and senior
officers of Depute status to give the results weight.
Hundreds of staff were interviewed to give their opinions
on the structure and organisation. This ensured grass-
root involvement and acceptance, of the evaluation.

Its overall conclusions were that the Executive
office as proposed by Paterson was

"too loose an arrangement to deal
effectively with the practical
complexities of the organisation",

(Strathclyde Regional Council 1978)
in decision-making, policy formulation, implementation,
coordination and review.

"The existing structure represents a
barrier to the full achievement,
of and benefits of the corporate
approach".

(Strathclyde Regional Council 1978)
The individual elements of the planning process from
policy formulation to monitoring and review were dispersed
and fragmented among the Departments. This caused
duplication, basic data was generated from different Departments. This was seen to negate the essential integrated and cyclical nature of the corporate process. In order to rectify this the Group recommended a Chief Executive Department be established. They felt that structural weaknesses had to be rectified first before proceeding.

**The Chief Executive Department.**

This was to consist of the amalgamation of the Department of Administration, the Policy Planning Unit, the Industrial Development Unit and parts of the Physical Planning Department. There would then be a unified control and coordination, over policy formulation, implementation and review. The Chief Executive is to have five Deputes each responsible for the planning, co-ordination and monitoring of all initiatives within their remits. The Chief Executive as the central co-ordinator is a vehicle for evaluation. It exercises a monitoring and review process in order to produce feedback on what is going on throughout the organisation and to take corrective action where this is deemed necessary. All Reports to Committees pass through it to enable a consistency to develop and to ensure that duplication and overlap of service provision do not occur or at least are kept to a minimum. It is the overseer of the urban programme to be discussed. In relation to this, the Chief Executive sees that aid goes to the risk areas and that the balance of funding lies more or less with new approaches and innovative schemes, rather than with those services which are properly mainstream. It is seen as a means of achieving and sustaining a close working relationship with the senior politicians.
of the ruling administration. Therefore, it acknowledges the need for political commitment and will to tackle particular issues. In this way it is possible for the Chief Executive Department to identify broad areas of policy to which the ruling party are committed and to exercise a policy analysis role in those areas. Mr. I. Stuart the Depute for the Personal Services section of the Chief Executive states that this basically comprises of an analysis of

"what we are doing now, why we are doing this, what the problems are, searching for alternative solutions and which of these shall be used"

He states that one needs the commitment of all officers down to the grass roots level.

"Unless all the staff know what we are trying to achieve overall then it will be impossible to get the feedback which is essential if we are to evaluate the policies and take corrective measures if necessary to so ensure that the ultimate aims and objectives of our policies are realised to the satisfaction of the Council and to the community it serves."

(Mr. I. Stuart, Depute Director)

The Policy Review Group is an example of evaluation of a management structure. The conduct of evaluation in this setting is likely to create somewhat different problems in the formulation of the evaluation study, its relations and in particular the personal interests of the 'evaluators' and utilisation of the findings. This type of evaluation is concerned with broad objectives and policy questions. As such, it does not constitute a threat to an administrator. The whole system is under attack but the threat is impersonal. This type of evaluation will tend to stress adjustive mechanisms and
"monitor the impact of council and other public bodies on the area, from the viewpoint of the community."

(I. Hill)

One of the methods of doing this is in the production of an annual "Community Report".

They are also to study the

"existing deployment of staff and other resources, to see whether resources can be diverted to meet newly identified needs without asking for additional budgetary allocations."

(E. Farquar)

This evaluative mechanism emphasises the co-ordinative role of evaluation both within and between the authority. The A.D.T's will consist of all agencies involved in a particular area and may help them to highlight issues that need resolution. It also emphasises the participative role of evaluation. The Community Reports, on the same general lines as the Community Review adopted in D.O.E. Sunderland Study (1973), will incorporate the views and evaluation of performance of the community. In the sense that the teams will see how the Council performs they are acting in the control role as previously defined. The results of the review will identify where projects are not having the desired results and hence it takes on a learning role, when these are fed back into the policy-making process.

It remains to be seen whether an analysis of the deployment of staff and resources is in fact carried out. If a diversion of resources does occur from certain services and methods of service delivery to others, then one will have increased the depth of evaluation considerably. This would mean a movement from merely describing the 'winners' and 'losers' to more constructively discovering what service has the most effect and how to improve the impact of a given service or method of delivery.
Officer - Member Groups.

This evaluative mechanism was another initiative undertaken largely as a result of the Seamill Seminar in June 1976. This was a mechanism designed to strengthen political purposiveness and control in the decision-making of Strathclyde Region. The Strathclyde Labour Group regard this as a move towards

"a more relevant and responsive system of local government"

(Strathclyde Labour Group 1976)

Four groups were established in child care, addiction, mental handicap and after care of offenders. The origins of the idea lay within the Social Work Department and derived from the need to create structures for staff consultation. The inclusion of councillors came later. The Groups are co-chaired by a councillor and an officer. The members are from the sub-committee of the Social Work Committee. The officers come from various levels within the Social Work Department. Initially, four Groups were set up on child care, addiction, service to the offender and services to the mentally handicapped. The remits of these groups specify the intention to review the policies and practices of the Social Work Committee and Department.

The Group consulted various bodies and members of staff at all levels to submit proposals for improved services. It was an attempt to demonstrate that the views of field workers could directly reach and influence policy-makers despite the organisational impediments. Appendix 3.

The Reports "Room to Grow" (1978), Collusion or Cover-up (1978), Who Cares (1978) and "Services to the Mentally Handicapped" contained many radical recommendations requiring additional expenditure. The "Room to Grow" Report (1978) contained 190 recommendations, many of which are unimplementable. If proposals are not feasible one cannot
be surprised if they are not carried out. The Reports called for changes in the policy of other Committees as well as the Social Work Committee. They identified necessary shifts in the policy of other agencies to contribute to the social welfare of the community.

"As these review processes have emerged accidentally, from a mixture of councillor and staff concerns - there has been little thought given to their organisation and linkage to mainstream policy-making - whether formal or informal".

(Young and Jay, 1979)

They evolved, they were not centrally set up. They have no executive power. To be effective in policy formulation they may need to be synchronised with the processes they seek to influence. Members were drawn exclusively from the Social Work Committee and Department. However, clearly this does not enable a real critical examination of existing policies in other Departments. Other Departments must be integrated into the review and not just confronted with their recommendations. This was the case of the Education Department in relation to the "Room to Grow" Report (1978).

These reviews have helped to produce commitment. They have played an educative role for both members and officers alike. One protagonist stated that as a result councillors

"tend to be a lot more informed."

It is an informal approach which leads to more questioning and meaningful discussion. By breaking down the traditional barriers between officers and members they promote increased and productive relations. Members are less dependent for advice and respond more positively and critically. Greater
understanding provides a firmer base for policy-making and make it a more constructive two way process.

By picking up on problematic areas they fulfill a "trouble-shooting role"
(R. Young)

They have enabled improved co-ordination between Departments and between the authority and bodies by examining issues on an "across the board" basis. They encourage a corporate approach as they are connected up to policy-making levels and down to grass-roots level, albeit on an informal basis. They have provided the political muscle for improved negotiations with the likes of central government and the Health Boards, where alterations in their policy was felt necessary. What has effectively emerged is an additional source of new policies. Though, the procedure and links to the central policy process have not yet been formally established.

Though they clearly play an important role, it is essentially a peripheral one. Firstly, they are not meshed in to the central policy process. Another manifestation of their peripheral nature is the fact that officers are nominated into these groups. They may not be the most enthusiastic or committed officers. Staff turnover could mean a loss of continuity. For most of their working time the officers must operate on functional lines.

Most importantly one can discern the role that this evaluative mechanism plays in the policisation of the planning process. There is widespread political commitment for the mechanism amongst the influential councillors. The Majority Group Leader and the Secretary to the Labour Group rigorously promote this idea. Subsequently, the strong party line prevails. This commitment is not surprising as the Labour Group were instrumental in setting the mechanism up.
If these are to be effective political structures to control the administrative side of the process, then the political side must gain tighter control over the process by which issues are selected. The Regional Report process enabled the Council to define the major issues confronting it, and the extent to which departmental policies were relevant to these problems. This process no longer exists. This begs the question of how to ensure that they are continuing to direct their attention to key community problems. These mechanisms if developed would go a long way to fulfilling this need.

To put this role into perspective these mechanisms only apply to the Social Work Committee and Department. Of late, Education members and officers have been introduced to overcome some of the problems discussed. There is still minimal political involvement in other areas. Some regard this as a unique pioneering experiment to make local government more democratic and responsive. Others, see it as a

"time-consuming exercise which threatens to produce more conflict."

(Interview)

The most important factor relevant to their future is whether there is real commitment to these Groups or whether they are regarded as Labour academic cliques.

By an examination of one of these Groups, the Addiction Group, the various roles played by this evaluative mechanism become clearer. The role of aiding policy formulation is most pronounced. Until this Group was set up there had been no statement of commitment by the Council to this problem (I. Wilson). There was virtually nil local authority provision and the voluntary sector provision was aimed predominantly at the single homeless. The Groups fulfilled a co-ordinative role, they met with the Brewers Society, the Scotch Whisky Association, the Scottish Football
Association, the Health Boards and numerous others. See Appendices (4, 5, and 6). A Report of the Development Sub-Committee of Social Work on 29th January 1981 recommended that the Regional Council should make an approach through the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities to the Secretary of State for a national ban on alcohol advertising. It also recommended that the Regional Council should initiate a ban on all alcohol advertising over which it has control in response to C.O.S.L.A. Social Work Committee's approach to Regional and District Authorities to take such a step. (D. Scott, The Scotsman 1980). It was generally felt, that the revenue lost some £75,000 was barely measureable in relation to the Council's overall budget and would bear no relationship to the political kudos which such a decision would promote. The recommendation was approved (Social Work Committee, Development Sub-Committee, 29.1.81).

In the light of the experience of this first wave others have been set up. At the moment there are eight working groups at various stages of activity:

(i) Children's Hearings (established more than two years ago)
(ii) The role of the Leisure Department (established in the early summer of 1979).
(iii) The first two years of the secondary school system (established in November 1979); Remit - see appendix. 8.
(iv) The role of F.E. colleges (established in November 1979);
    Remit See Appendix. 9.
(v) The problems of the disabled (established in November 1979);
    Remit see Appendix. 10.
(vi) The review of the Structure Plan
(vii) The T.P.P.

The first two of these groups will be phased out in the very near future; the three which were established in
November 1979 will be issuing interim reports in the next few months.

The next wave of working groups are likely to be in the fields of Highways and Transportation and Employment Strategy - as well as a monitoring group for the Deprivation strategy.

These groups are not formalised into the planning process. This has been to their advantage in that they can cut corners and make speedy responses. It is also working against them in terms of their credibility, status and ultimate impact on the workings of the authority. Many protagonists feel that their systematic formalisation into the process will have a deadening impact, they will become bureaucratised.

Monitoring Groups.

There are currently four such groups in Child Care, After Care of Offenders, Mental-Handicap and Addiction. These were established to take up the recommendations of the four officer-member groups discussed. Their job was to put flesh on the general framework and policies set out in the Reports, to negotiate and 'sell' them to outside agencies and Departments, and to monitor subsequent events, implementation and provide feedback to the Social Work Committee.

They consist of six councillors and six officers. One of these is from the Education Department in an effort to overcome the difficulties previously discussed. They are still clearly Social Work structures. In many ways they are a more radical piece of machinery as there is no time limit on their existence. They play a purely advisory role and as with the Officer-Member Groups are not centrally defined. They have played a co-ordinate role visiting and negotiating with such bodies as the District Councils Health Boards and academic institutions, with varying degrees of success. A lot of this is related to the enormous number of recommendations. Monitoring Group is somewhat of a misnomer as most of their work has concentrated on 'selling' policies rather than monitoring.
The implementation of the recommendations is undertaken by Divisional Implementation Schemes. Glasgow Division has so far successfully implemented recommendations 5, 7, 9, 12 and 15 of the Addiction Officer Member Group (See Appendix 7.)

They have played a co-ordinative role between Departments and helped to move towards a more corporate approach. In this regard, they established joint review groups with Education on each of the officer member group reports. Although this did not result in complete agreement between Departments it served to expose where conflict existed and made for negotiation and compromise on an informed basis.

Similar to the previous groups they have played an educative role for members and officers alike. They are seen as a framework of accountability for the staff and the Officer-Member Groups and as a means of indicating political commitment. They play an important role in the politicisation of the planning process.

They do not want to be formalised into the planning process.

"Their strength lies in their unilateral commitment, their flexibility of style, their access to any unit or individual and the ability to study issues and recommend solutions". (R. Young)

There is a danger that they may become self perpetuating talking shops. They have no power and as such their very informality and lack of clear contact with the formal policy making machinery may work against them.

In direct contrast to the Officer Member Groups they have had no public participation involvement. In monitoring the Regional Council's policy it will be important to rectify this.
A number of projects illustrate the role evaluation plays in the planning process.

(e) **Area Initiative Schemes.**

These were set up as part of the Multiple Deprivation Strategy. It involves a joint approach with the District Councils. It is essentially a policy of area co-ordination established in seven of the forty-five A.P.Ts namely in Maryhill, North-West Kilmarnock, Doon Valley, Faifley/ Hardgate, Renton and G.E.A.R. Each area has a co-ordinator. The main aim of the initiatives is to promote a level of service which is

"improved in quality, more corporate and more sensitive to the needs of the community"

(A. Newlands)

Set up in 1977 a decision on their future was to be taken in January of this year. It has not yet been finalised. Initially they were set up for a three year life span.

The Scottish Office were anxious to promote this idea (Urban Renewal Unit) because it represents the most significant commitment to date by local authorities jointly, to apply an area-based approach to the problem of multiple deprivation. They were considering the possibility of extension of the programme and its potential elsewhere in Scotland. They felt it was important to draw from the programme's experience, lessons which could inform the future development of this type of policy. An evaluation would fulfill this requirement and that of the decision as to their future.

The Institute of Operational Research were commissioned to evaluate the Initiatives. Their brief as G. Lind describes was
"to describe and assess the basic policy management elements of the strategy, in a way which provides an ongoing cumulative evaluation of its development and general effectiveness as an innovative policy mechanism... of it as a policy approach or mechanism through a study of the organisational and policy processes it stimulates...It does not require us to monitor the actual impact of the Initiative on the areas - that is a matter of the Local Authorities themselves."

(G. Lind)

This evaluation illustrates the role of evaluation in its co-ordinative role. Also in developing an awareness of the 'common task', the Initiatives evaluation have helped to develop and strengthen, new and existing, formal and informal communication networks. In this way it has acted as a 'reticulist'.

The description of the type of evaluation to be conducted emphasises the constructive elements of rather than the destructive. Evaluation is to have a learning and knowledge-building role, to pass on to other authorities considering this type of approach via the Scottish Office. This evaluation seeks to find out why a policy did not work not just to terminate at a judgement of its success or failure.

"A splendid failure may be more important than limited solid achievements in this context because it may lead to a greater understanding"

(G. Lind)

It is also intended that the role includes giving advice to policy management. How much it will influence the decision on the future of these Initiatives is debateable. Many of the protagonists had different views as to what the evaluation was supposed to consist of.
This could have serious repercussions on its utilisation. Many felt that it was to be a substantive evaluation of the impact the Initiatives had made - I.O.R. presume this will be done by the authorities themselves.

Each Initiative has developed in relation to its situation, they are not uniform structures. One can learn from comparison between them, by noting the different styles of co-ordinators, functioning of area teams and roles of elected members and how these have contributed to its success or failure. Evaluation as a change agent and innovator may enable this experimental project to become an operational programme.

The depth of the role is greatly increased in this instance. This role encompasses stage three of Rivlin's classification (1971). That is, it seeks to determine more effective modes of service delivery. It does so by evaluating the policy mechanism rather than just the outcome of a project, and the way in which this can be improved.

(.f) **Urban Aid Programme.**

This programme was launched in July 1968 to help tackle the social problems of deprived communities. The legislation (Local Government Grants Social Need) Act 1969 enabled the Secretary of State to pay 75% grant to

"local authorities who, in his opinion, are required in the exercise of any of their functions to incur expenditure by reason of the existence in any urban area of special social needs"

The grant is available both for local authority projects and for those which the local authority approves, but which are carried out by a voluntary organisation. The
budget for Strathclyde Regional Council amounts to some £5½ million. There are guidelines for disbursement both for geographical area and type of project. The grant is normally available for three years although the Scottish Office are open to persuasion to allow funding for a further two years. Evaluation is clearly necessary to allow the Council to assess which of three options it should take: to submit the project for a further two years funding to absorb the project within the Department (Education or Social Work) or to terminate the project. After the five year period a choice must again be made to cease or absorb the projects.

With the public expenditure cutbacks to mainstream services, this programme represents the surest source of development in the future; particularly with regard to new and innovative projects.

The evaluation carried out in this area is the most systematic of all in the authority. This is because it is a condition in the funding. Indeed, a couple of protagonists regarded this as the only evaluation of projects that went on in the authority. This is tied up with the factor previously discussed that evaluation is carried out only in response to a stimulus, such as the requirement for a decision to be made.

It has been recognised by officers and members that

"a more effective monitoring and reporting system was required for certain innovative projects." (I. Hill)

The impetus for improved evaluation comes

"in view of the increased expenditure" (I. Hill)

There are difficulties involved in dealing at full committee with these evaluation reports: There are a great deal of
them; there is a lack of time for detailed questioning; and a lack of opportunity for the members to meet the staff involved and question them about their work.

An important consideration is that these evaluation reports are written by those involved in the project. There is therefore likely to be some bias for the continuation of the project - or at the least, less than detached objectivity. This type of individual project evaluation directly challenges the worthwhile-ness of specific activities and more importantly of specific individuals. These reports are predominantly bland descriptions, there are no uniform guidelines for the structure of such a report.

Over the past years as the Urban Programme has grown dramatically in size, it has become practice to work with much more summarised information. Approval is sought 'in principle'. The Scottish Office has accepted this reduction in information and so approved these projects, trusting that the Council will thereafter secure their effective implementation. For many projects, this system is satisfactory. However, for a number of projects it is difficult to subsequently evaluate these because of the lack of a detailed project specification. The practical aims, targets and the means adopted for these are not laid down. This practical framework is an essential prerequisite of successful evaluation at political and officer level at a later stage. These considerations have led to the application for two 'project development workers' or 'evaluators' attached to the Chief Executive. These would be deployed in the selection, detailed specification and evaluation of innovative Urban Aid projects.
"It is hoped that these would lead to an increased understanding of the impact made by projects and make it easier for the Council and the Scottish Office, to take informed decisions regarding the implications of the results achieved for the mainstreams of Education and Social Work".

(I. Hill)

The evaluation of this programme draws out numerous roles that evaluation is currently playing. It is an advisory agent and an aid to decision-making in that it helps to determine the fate of projects after their period of funding expires. It plays an innovative role and acts as a catalyst for change because it may enable innovative projects to be absorbed into the mainstream budgets.

This programme evaluation only addresses itself to the first of Rivlin's (1971 classification.

(g) Experimental Programmes.

One such innovative project is examined here in order to explore the roles that evaluation plays in practice.

The Family Learning Units (FLU) project was initiated by the Department of Education of the Regional Council during 1977-1978. The Council intends to extend the project for three years. These units are presently established in three Glasgow schools, North Kelvinside, St. Columba's of Iona and St. Mungo's.

The ultimate goal of the FLU project is to reduce the incidence of academic failure and drop-out at the secondary school level, particularly among youth living in areas of urban deprivation. The project seeks to accomplish this goal by bringing families and school staff together to jointly address the social adjustment and learning problems of students making the transition
from primary school to secondary school. A central premise of the FLU approach is that parents can and should play an important role in both educating their children and nurturing their children's "commitment to schooling".

It is a demonstration or pilot project. It was recognised that too great a degree of specificity may limit opportunities. Therefore, no rigid rules or guidelines were laid down, each evolved according to the needs of the pupils, their families and schools.

The Policy and Resources Committee have sought funds for the appointment of evaluators

"The project has reached a critical juncture. Now is the time to take stock - to sift the rich anecdotal data that has been accumulated, to scrutinise FLU and school records for evidence of impact, and to so plan very deliberately the next steps in the programme's development."

(I. Hill)

This would involve ascertaining what change has been accomplished, under what conditions it has been accomplished and what barriers to change have been encountered. One predicts that this process of self-study will reveal both strengths and weaknesses of the current program and suggest changes that might be made to improve program implementation and ultimately program impact on families and children.

The process of self-examination recommended here can be viewed as "formative evaluation". not intended to assess the ultimate merit of the program (e.g. whether the FLU project causes a reduction in drop-outs) but to provide information that is useful to program staff in improving program operations and implementation.
Although the Strathclyde Regional Council is ultimately interested in knowing whether the FLU program can reduce academic failure and drop-out, a prior question is whether the program can effect those changes within and between social institutions—families, schools, and social service agencies—believed to be prerequisite to achieving the ultimate goals. Thus, formulating clear operational objectives that represent the prerequisite intermediate impacts is a necessary step toward summative evaluation of the program.

Demonstration programmes are meaningless without evaluation. The objective is to develop a model or prototype for future operational programmes. The education report is expected

"to provide the material for decision-making by the appropriate committees, as well as material for the use of professionals in analysing the impact of the projects and learning from their successes and failures."

(I. Hill)

Clearly evaluation is taking on an innovative role. The results of this study may mean that such an approach is adapted by the Education Department on a much grander scale throughout the Region. There is a learning and knowledge-building role in that the study may determine whether the integrated involvement of pupils, families and schools really has an effect on the incidence of academic failure or school drop-out.

To some extent one can envisage this project as fulfilling the second of Rivlin's (1971) classification. It may help to determine whether this approach is more successful than the more traditional methods of education.
5.5 The Role and Importance of Evaluation from the Councillors and Officials Viewpoint.

The previous section gave the impression of a considerable advanced role for evaluation in the Region. This section will put this into perspective. For although it fulfills many of the roles it is peripheral to the overall planning process, ad-hoc, reactive and shallow in depth.

In answer to the question what is the most pervasive form of evaluation prevalent in the Region came, "Gossip and rumour" (Interview)

Although the idea is essentially an attractive one in principle, (all those interviewed saw the potential benefits it could bestow) in practice it is regarded as almost impossible to achieve. Hence despite stating that it is "an unequivocal and indisputable political virtue"

there is resistance to it or at least a lack of positive support for it.

A frequent reason given for the pancity of evaluation was that it was too expensive in time and effort, particularly in the present economic climate. This may be a valid point but if the Region is politically committed to tackling the problems and issues laid out in the Regional Report and the Structure Plan - namely urban deprivation and unemployment, then to make any real impression, they need to know whether the present policies are working, and if not, why not and change them. Only by developing Rivlin's (1971) classification can they judge the comparative benefits of different programmes and improve delivery within a given service. The initial high costs of evaluation are likely to fall off over time. An official pointed to the irony whereby at a time of scarce resources evaluation was both more necessary to set priorities and more difficult to establish. He stated
that the members needed tangible evidence such as buildings to hold them accountable to the public. Monies allocated to evaluation will not generally be 'seen' in the same way.

There was some antagonism toward it

"It is just a window-dressing exercise"

and

"Without subjective judgement it floats in a vacuum"

Unlike Caro (1971) suggests, it was not greatly considered to be a substitute for action. Nor, Suchman's (1978) eyewash, whitewash or submarine categories. Evaluation is judgemental and as such constitutes a threat to individuals responsible. As Caro (1971) suggests

"the staff have invested considerable time effort and sentiment in the programmes."

Evaluation is usually undertaken when there is some dissatisfaction to puzzlement or a decision to be taken. It is reactive. Hence, the evaluation is bound to pose a challenge to their effectiveness. The programme personnel have to operate under assumptions of success and an evaluation constitutes a questioning of these assumptions. A project is often some officials 'baby'. There will be some resistance to evaluation. Objective evidence of programme effects have not been for modifying programmes. As one official stated,

"It takes a peripheral role. We do not do it, because no-one really wants us to. Challenging questions on the need for programmes and their effects are not raised so we do not need it."

(Interview)

Most officers seemed quite satisfied with the informal impressionistic intuitive forms of evaluation. They did not perceive a need for systematic formalised evaluation.
One officer said it merely put an information gloss on what he already knew.

A couple of protagonists regarded it as

"a waste of resources in attempting to measure the unmeasurable".

Programmes tended to be couched in broad vague terms which is not conductive to evaluation.

An official stated "that there was not sufficiently developed machinery to undertake systematic evaluation". An elected member said the most efficacious form of evaluation for their purposes was practical and applied not academic. He stated that the intangibles were most important and that evaluation must have an empathy with the people.

This accounts for on the one hand the councillors' abhorrence at the lack of evaluation and yet on the other their reluctance to formalise systematic evaluation into the process. It is not quite the unequivocal virtue described, but rather suits people some of the time but not all the time. Members felt it was their role to evaluate policy in their constituency.

Evaluation is inherently political, inviting as it does the consideration that policies do not always lead to the effective realisation of the advanced objectives. In this way its very rationale and raison-détre is its downfall.

"It is political to reveal 'winners' and 'losers'. It can create conflict."

(Interview Councillor)

This conflict is exposed when each group can no longer in the absence of data and analysis live cocooned in the belief that it is everyone else who is wrong. It stops buck-passing.
These impressions are important for this is the way change comes about in an organisation. People plugging away for or against a method or approach. The balance seems to lie in favour of a growing role for evaluation, all agreed on the potential benefits it could bestow.

5.6 The Current Position.

This section attempts to draw together the various roles played by evaluation in Strathclyde Region.

Although there has been no systematic formalisation of evaluation into the planning process, it is, ad hoc in nature, progress has been made. In terms of the typology, evaluation does not just play an information collection and analysis feedback role. It also plays an advisory and control role by the work of the Physical Planning, Research and Intelligence Unit. Evaluation aids in the decision making and policy formulation parts of the process - well illustrated by the work of the officer member and monitoring groups. It has resulted in policy where there was none previously. Attention has been given to apply it to experimental innovative projects such as the Family Learning Unit in order to learn from the strengths and weaknesses of such a programme. These results may lead to innovative changes in the mainstream of the Education Department. Such results may enhance theory building in this area also. There has been an important educative role for members and officers alike again associated with the work of the officer-member groups and monitory groups. Not a great deal has been accomplished with regard to the co-ordinative role though progress has been made by the monitoring groups attempts to implement the recommendation of the officer-member Reports. Little progress has been achieved in taking on a participative role. Overall there is
considerable opportunity to develop the approach further. The Member-Officer and Monitory Groups have greatly enhanced the politicisation of the planning process. They have provided new political structures for corporate planning Councillors are better able to pursue their real political function.

In terms of the depth of the roles outlined by Rivlin (1971) little has been achieved in practice. The Physical Planning, Research and Intelligence Unit carries out the first category. The Policy options exercise could go some way to meeting the second, if it was carried out on a more systematic basis. At the moment many 'sacred cows' are never considered as an option. One Councillor intimated that for many projects no-one had any idea what was spent on them or the effectiveness compared to alternatives. The exercise is purely judgemental. There is no basis for deciding that one project is better than another. In a small way the I.O.R. evaluation of the 'area' policy mechanism approaches Rivlin's (1971) third category, though there is no measure of comparison and it has not been established whether one approach is more effective than another or why some projects succeed in one area and not in another.

In order to draw tentative conclusions and make policy recommendations one must understand the support for and constraints against more systematic evaluation. The most important of these according to this analysis are political backing, and the perceptions and attitudes of the protagonists.

Where the roles have most successfully developed such as in the Officer-Member Groups there was strong consistent political support. Particularly, from the
academic and most influential party members, the upper echelons of the Labour Group. In many ways this derives from the stable political position in Strathclyde. Indeed, the Group were responsible for setting up these innovations in evaluation and policy formulation. It is of no value to state scientifically logical or obvious recommendations, they must be sensitive to the political realities of the authority or they will not be utilised. The scientifically rational may not be politically feasible.

The reality of evaluation appears to be related to the perception of those concerned as to how useful they expect it to be. Also how its use might affect the existing organisation and management and particular people in it. It depends on where they stand, their position. The upper echelons of an organisation may stand to lose power and are more likely to see it as 'rocking the boat'. Fieldworkers are more likely to welcome it. Commitment is important if it is to have any real impact and overcome the problems associated with its introduction.

Strathclyde is a long way from the "self-evaluating organisation" (Wildavsky, 1972). He regards evaluation and organisation as contradictory terms, the one seeking change and the other stability. To a large extent, this case-study bears this out, the organisational administrative and political forces elucidated, hinder a greater development of evaluation.

Given the pessimistic nature of most writings on the utilisation of evaluation (Weiss, 1972), I began the study fully expecting that the major problem would be to find that it had any effect - that there was any role, save the traditional one of information collection and analysis.
Clearly the reality is considerably more complex and less dismal than my original impressions led me to expect.

Evaluation is used not for the 'grand decisions' but in a more subtle manner. It is not used in the visible coherent clear cut ways expected. The results of the interviews suggest that it is generally considered in too narrow definitive terms. Most protagonists defined it as a method of analysis similar to cost-benefit analysis a couple assumed that cost-benefit analysis and P.P.B.S. was what I meant when I used the term 'evaluation'. It was regarded as information collection.

"That's what the Research and Intelligence Unit do."

(Interview)

However on closer examination evaluation does play a broad role. It provides additional information to a problem and so reduces the uncertainty of the decision-maker. It can confirm facts already known.

"It verified my suspicions"

(Interview)

It essentially plays the part of a catalyst providing an impetus to start a policy or to speed things up by clarifying and reinforcing issues and arguments.

Figure 5 illustrates how far the potential roles have been achieved and how far along the road Strathclyde Region have come according to Rivlin's (1971) classification.
FIGURE 5. THE TYPOLOGY OF ROLES - STRATHCLYDE. (ACTUAL)
CHAPTER 6.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

This chapter seeks to draw conclusions from the foregoing description and analysis of the rhetoric and reality surrounding the role of evaluation in the planning process. Using the insights gained in relation to the gap between the theory and the practice, it prescribes some tentative policy recommendations for narrowing this gap and for improving the planning and public policy-making process.

6.1 Conclusions - Resume.

This study set out to examine the role of post evaluation in the planning process, in theory and in practice. The process largely determines the role played. The emerging view of planning and the planning process is that it is goal-oriented, moving towards the rational model, adaptive and a continuous cyclical process for the control of complex systems. These have implications for the role that evaluation might play in the process. Evaluation is the feedback loop the key to control of the system. By definition, moves towards adaptive planning will enhance the role of evaluation for without feedback and a learning mechanism it cannot be realised. Evaluation is the critical element that turns a linear planning process into a cyclical one. The systems approach proposes that one way to develop a system commensurate with reality is by creating a continuous process. This will require a greater emphasis on evaluation than has hitherto been the case. To be an effective control mechanism the response rate must be high. This necessitates a more systematic process of evaluation formalised into the planning process. Evaluation provides the means towards greater rationality in the process.
The nature of the planning process is largely determined by statutory legislation. No legislation for evaluation existed until the sixties, with the passing of the 'Town and Country Planning Acts' 1968 and 1971, which introduced the Structure Plan process. It is therefore not surprising that evaluation has taken a back seat. The rise of corporate and intercorporate planning though not statutorily legislated for has had important implications in the popularisation of evaluation and its informal institutionalisation. Both call for a more responsive effective local government.

As hypothesised, the role of evaluation has evolved and extended over time with the changes in philosophy and approaches to planning.

Various potential roles can be assigned to evaluation in terms of its level, type and depth. In practice, as hypothesised, there is a gap between that proposed conceptually and that actually achieved. The case-study accords best with the mixed-scanning model of planning with a leaning towards rationality. The implications of this for the evaluative role have been discussed. They require it to be systematic. The empirical research relates to the 1970-81 period discussed in Chapter three, with its attendant implications for the role of evaluation. As hypothesised the role of evaluation has been well developed in Strathclyde at least in terms of the breadth of roles. Despite the strong rationale for it, the roles are shallow in depth. Evaluation is ad-hoc and reactive in nature and peripheral to the main planning process. It is not immediately visible or coherent rather it plays a subtle clarifying and reinforcing role.

6.2 Recommendations.

In Britain today, the need to plan is fully accepted
and comprehensive planning has been with us for many years. The main challenge and focus of planning now ought to be with the improvement of the process so that what takes place in practice is more related to the needs and desires of the community.

Given the tenets of this analysis, what recommendations can be made to enhance the role of evaluation, close this gap and to so improve the planning and policy-making processes of local government in general and Strathclyde in particular, in terms of a more sensitive co-ordinated and timely response.

The case-study highlighted the major factors creating this gap in an organisational context. Others have been noted previously.

(a) **Attitudes and Commitment.**

These can create and foster either a supportive or hostile climate for evaluation. It gains status and credibility if it is supported by the top management. To create a 'self-evaluating organisation', all staff down to grass roots level will have to be infused with this evaluation ethic. As Yavitz and Schnee put it, to see it

"not as a luxury but rather a basic and vital need"

(Yavitz & Schnee 1977)

As hypothesised its low profile was as much due to its narrow definition as to any resistance to it per se. It must be seen in broad terms, not narrowly defined or highly technical but rather,

"The determination (whether based on opinions, records, subjective or objective data) of the results (whether desirable or undesirable; transient or permanent; immediate or delayed) attained by some activity (whether a programme or part of a programme, a drug or a therapy, an ongoing or one shot approach) designed to accomplish some valued goal or objective. (Whether ultimate, intermediate or immediate effect or performance, long or short range)"

(Suchman, 1978)
Recommendations:

Greater in-service training is required both to speed up the filtering process between current planning thought, education and practice and to make staff aware of the overall objectives of the organisation, thereby encouraging a self critical ethic. Members and Officers tend to regard themselves at present as working for a particular Department or Committee.

Little attention has been given to Rivlin's (1971) third classification - whether one mode of service delivery is superior to another. Some system of incentives ought to be set up to encourage more efficient and effective services.

Greater attention ought to be given to evaluation in planning education.

(b) Political Support.

To be effective evaluation must have the political will behind it. This is more likely to come about where members take an active part in the evaluation. The support of a single ruling Majority Party will greatly enhance the role of evaluation.

Recommendation:

Greater attention must be paid to involving the political side of the organisation than has hitherto been the case. They ought to decide what issues are to be evaluated when and by whom. Joint Working Groups ought to be set up for all Departments not just Social Work.

(c) Formalisation into the Planning Process.

To be successful in providing a context for decision-making clearly it must be linked into that process. Evaluation is more likely to be ignored if it is peripheral and lacks status or power.
Recommendation:

In Strathclyde Region both the Officer-Member Groups and the Monitoring Groups ought to be linked to the Policy and Resource Committee. They would gain credibility and greater status would be given to their recommendations, than the bland acceptance from some Departments and outside agencies to date.

(d) Public Participation.

In many ways the rationale for evaluation and client activism overlap. Both are concerned with the delivery of effective services. Little has been done to increase the involvement of the community concerned to evaluate its services. This must be rectified.

(e) Dissemination.

There ought to be a greater dissemination of the results of evaluation studies on a national basis. This would encourage a cross fertilisation of ideas and enable authorities to learn from others. This is particularly important when setting up new and innovative projects.

(f) A Continuous Cyclical Review.

The Officer-Member Group Reports were produced in 1978. They need to be updated as the problems have changed, even before their recommendations have been fully implemented. This process of revisal and reassessment could be made to recur on a cycle of some number of years, providing a cyclical process of service review and forward planning. This would constitute a major advance in local government administration.

(g) Resource Allocation

Little has been achieved in terms of the depth of the role of evaluation. In some ways this is not surprising
because of the difficulty of shifting resources across departmental lines, were it to be found that one service was more beneficial than another - the second of Rivlin's (1971) classification.

(h) Co-ordination.

The co-ordinative role is proving to be difficult for Strathclyde. The situation might be eased if the Monitory Groups focussed on a few issues rather than hundreds. The Region has various links with external agencies. For example, the District Councils, liaison take place for the Housing Plan, the Local Plan and the Monitoring Groups. Representation ought to be co-ordinated to prevent duplication and to provide a united front for the consideration of policy changes.

6.3: Future Directions.

What is the likely future for evaluation? Cameron (1977) considers that the most serious deficiency in British planning and policy-making is

"the paucity of rigorous evaluations of planning and policy effects. We are brilliant at thinking up new policy weapons, we have skillful... administrators who implement the politicians wishes, but we are misers when it comes to spending upon evaluations of what policy has or has not achieved."

There will always be methodological and technical problems associated with the introduction of evaluation. The magnitude and difficulty posed by these does not make it any less important or invalidate the general case for it. If Local Government has any impact which it is
responsible for it must evaluate in order to prevent disappointing results arising from albeit good intentions.

It would be folly to argue that all the problems and deficiencies of present plans/policies could be swept away by greater evaluation. As Quade (1977) argues,

"There are always considerations that cannot be handled quantitatively, or systematically, there may be problems with no solution. In the end politics and intuitive judgement must rule."

Evaluation can be but an adjunct to the judgement, intuition and experience of decision-makers.

There are dangers with formalising evaluation into the planning process. It may lead to conservative 'safe' planning by introducing a bias to only adopt plans/policies that were in some sense evaluable. It may make decision-makers fearful of taking decisions without irrefutable evidence and so lead to "paralysis by analysis"

(R. Young)

Perhaps the greatest contribution it can make is in its educative role, by facilitating the development of a greater understanding of the system the causes and consequences of policies for officers members and the public alike. In this way, it can help to improve the public policy-making process by creating a more sensitive timely and co-ordinated government response. We will never find the optimum method of service delivery, we can only try to improve. Perhaps the last words ought to be those of Rivlin (1971)

"Until programmes are organised so that analysts can learn from them and systematic experimentation is undertaken on a significant scale prospects seem dim for learning how to produce better social services."

(Rivlin, 1971)
APPENDIX I

LIST OF INTERVIEWS

MR. I. STUART DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PERSONAL SERVICES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

MR. I. HILL CHIEF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

MISS E. FARQUAR CHIEF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

MR. A. NEWLANDS CHIEF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

MISS I. WILSON SOCIAL WORK DEPARTMENT

COUNCILLOR R. YOUNG SECRETARY OF THE LABOUR GROUP (GREENOCK 1)

COUNCILLOR A. VIOLA (EASTERHOUSE)

MR. G. LIND INSTITUTE OF OPERATIONAL RESEARCH.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Infant mortality</td>
<td>Total crimes and offences</td>
<td>Journey to work mode</td>
<td>Shopping basket costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 15</td>
<td>Free school meals</td>
<td>Birth rate</td>
<td>Selected crimes and offences</td>
<td>Average travel to work cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 18</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Morbidity statistics</td>
<td>Child offenders</td>
<td>Frequency and bus service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of local authority houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term vacancy rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reason for transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment:</td>
<td>Age analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work:</td>
<td>New case referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children in care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's panel:</td>
<td>New referrals by age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reason for referral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Example of Relations of Officer Member Monitoring Groups and Working Groups with External Bodies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>As given - see Appendix.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scot. Office</td>
<td>Examples Yes/No, small, moderate, large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scot. Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.C.E.T.S.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Estab.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.H.S.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital implications for S.R.C.</td>
<td>Financial, manpower, staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue implications for S.R.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of implementation</td>
<td>Under review, immediate, medium term, part implementation, early, short term, long term, negotiations to begin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be implemented within Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>In hand, some progress, nil, some, current policy measures, limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Other agencies, councillors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMBERS OF THE OFFICER/MEMBER GROUP ON ADDICTION

Councillors A. Long (co-chairman)
       J. McCorkindale
       L. McGarry
       W. Perry
       D. Walker

Mr. D. Campbell     Principal Social Worker, Douglas
                    Inch Clinic (Resigned 3.10.77).

Mr. B. Coyle        Senior Social Worker, Douglas Inch
                    Centre and Charing Cross Clinic

Miss M. Forsyth     Information Officer, Ayr Division.

Mr. K. Gardner      District Social Work Manager
                    Glasgow North District (Co-chairman).

Mr. J. Henderson    Field Work Teacher, Kerelaw School

Mr. D. Higgins      Principal Social Worker, Gartloch
                    Hospital.

Mr. K. Hutton       Mental Health and Family Casework
                    Consultant - Renfrew Division

Mr. B. McGinnie     Divisional Organiser (Development)
                    Lanark Division.

Mr. D. McKendrick  Divisional Organiser (Fieldwork
                    and Community) Lanark Division.

Mrs. A. Pilley      Senior Social Worker, Southern
                    General Hospital.
Co-opted

Mrs. M. Emery
Area Health Education Officer -
Argyll/Clyde Health Board (Nov. 1977).

Dr. J. Hubley
Research Fellow, Paisley College
of Technology.

Dr. P. Mullin
Charing Cross Clinic.

Strathclyde Police
Supt. MacIntyre, replaced by Supt.
Community Involvement Branch
Izatt.

Strathclyde Police
Detective Chief Inspector Beattie,
Drugs Squad
replaced by Detective Chief
Inspection Rogers.

Dr. Joyce Watson
(Resigned Sept. 1977).

Research Assistant
Miss M. Prooth, University of
Glasgow, Job Creation Project.
MONITORING GROUPS ON ADDICTION

ADDICTION (11)

Member-Chairman: Councillor Wm. Perry
Officer-Chairman: K. Gardner, District Manager, Glasgow North
Others: Councillor John McCorkindale
        Councillor Donald Masterton
        Councillor Jas. Gibson (Education)
        Councillor Andrew Ferguson
        Councillor Alexander Viola
        B. McGinnie, Divisional Organiser
          (Development) Lanark Div.
        G. Isles, C.D. Jay, Regional HQ
        Hamish Allan, Social Worker, Renfrew Div.

ADDICTION - Identify area teams and centres in each division, discuss notes at monitoring group meeting and take up points arising at the Divisional Advisory Group meeting.

ADDICTION

Craigneuk Centre - Wishaw
Area Office - Castlemilk
Area Office - Greenock Central
Scottish Football Assoc. - 16 April 1980
(Advertising & Sponsorship)

FULL MEETINGS OF THE MONITORING GROUP OVER PAST SIX MONTHS
ADDICTION
29th May (Joint meeting with offenders)
27th May
21st April
16th April
21st March
22nd February
25th January
17th December 1979
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

(1) Regional Council to seek dialogue with Area Health Boards on joint planning of Services. (18)

(2) Regional Council to pursue de-criminalisation of drunkenness with Scottish Office and Crown Office. (21)

(3) Grants Sub-Committee to consider interlinking arrangements between voluntary organisations in determining award of grants. (22)

(4) Voluntary bodies to be funded for the life of the administration. Such bodies to be seen as working in partnership on an agency basis. (22)

(5) A programme of day care provision to be undertaken. (23)

(6) Participation by voluntary groups in management and work of day centres to be part of criteria for grant aid. (24)

(7) Appropriate social work staff to be identified and given in-service training. (25)

(8) Discussions with training bodies regarding course content on subject of alcohol abuse. (25)

(9) Secondment of staff to proposed full time course at Paisley College of Technology. (31)

(10) Establishment of post of Principal Social Worker (Addiction) (25)

(11) Establishment in consultation with other bodies of Centre of Excellence as Pilot Project. (26)

(12) Establishment of Pilot Recovery Programmes. (26)

(13) Research resources for study of incidence of alcohol related problems in Social Workers' work loads. (31)
(14) Committee Debate on priorities - account to be taken of Alcohol Related Factor. (26)

(15) Provision of residential facilities (Hostels and small group homes). (27)

(16) Detailed examination of D.H.S.S. report on prevention. (28)


(18) In-service training for teachers on alcohol factor in Health Education. (29)

(19) Education Committee to determine when such education begins. (29)

(20) Educational activities on alcohol to be carried out in consultation with Scottish Health Education Unit and Health Education Department of Health Boards. (31)

(21) In-service training for youth and community workers. (29)

(22) Community education to consider possibility of adult education classes. (30)

(23) Health Education programmes on alcohol to be monitored and research facilities provided. (29)

(24) Regional Council to discuss with District Councils control of advertising on hoardings; donation of equivalent space on Health Education; provision of publicity in libraries etc; education for members of Licensing Boards. (30)

(25) Council to seek a six month ban on alcohol advertising on T.V. which would be monitored and assessed. (33)

(26) Council to take steps to ensure continuation of Industrial Alcoholism Unit until it is on a more secure financial footing. (35)
Regional Council to urge industry and commerce to formulate policies for employees with alcohol related problems.

Regional Council to give lead by initiation of positive health approach to alcohol abusers within its employment.

Regional Council to urge Secretary of State to make stated commitment towards improvement of services and provision of resources.

Secretary of State to be urged to set up Advisory Council on Addiction.

Partnership with Scottish Council on Alcoholism to be explored.

Grant aid to be given to local Councils on Alcoholism following individual evaluation.

Regional Council to have discussion with manufacturers regarding assistance in combating problems arising from their product.

A planning group to be established to make recommendations to the Council year by year on planned programme for development of facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Started</th>
<th>To do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding voluntary bodies for the life of the administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only three bodies applied and hence so funded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme of day care provision to be undertaken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 further projects proposed: GEAR and Drumchapel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary groups to participate in day centres as part of criteria for grant aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now regularly considered when grant applications assessed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Work staff to be identified and given in-service training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 members of staff have now attended the Paisley College Course and in-service training courses completed in 2 Divisions. The remaining Divisions will have run courses before the end of this year.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions with training bodies re including alcohol abuse in course content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some approaches to training colleges have been made but with little positive response to date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondment of Staff to Paisley College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See (7) above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(10) **Appoint Principal Officer (Addiction)**

(11) **Establish centre of excellence as pilot project**

Some already developing networks of services, e.g. in Clydebank, Paisley and Inverclyde are moving towards being such centres. Hence, operationally, there would be no advantages in establishing a separate pilot project at this time.

(no longer recommended)

(12) **Establish Pilot Recovery Programmes**

Despite continual emphasis being placed on the need for these with Divisions, no proposals have yet been put forward. A PRP is under consideration in Glasgow Division.

✓

(13) **Research on incidence of alcohol related problems in case loads**

A pilot study was made but was inconclusive and other studies remain to be initiated.

✓

(14) **Committee debate on priorities - taking into account alcohol related factor**

It is now considered that dealing with alcohol problems should be a normal and integral part of many facets of Social Work rather than attempt to place this service in competition with other services in areas of e.g. child care, offenders etc.

(no longer recommended)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(15) <strong>Provision of residential facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With financial and professional support the first hostel for female alcoholics in the Region has been established in Clydebank and there is an approved Urban Aid project for a Group Home in Lanarkshire.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other proposals by voluntary bodies are being supported by the Department e.g. extension of the Church of Scotland hostel provision at Inchbank, Glasgow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) <strong>Examination of DHSS report on prevention</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) <strong>Implementation of SED Curriculum Paper 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both topics have been examined at length by the joint Social Work and Education Sub Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) <strong>In-Service training for teachers on Education Committee to determine when this begins</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) <strong>Educational activities to be undertaken in consultation with the Scottish Health Education Unit and Health Education Departments of Health Boards</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational activities to be undertaken in consultation with the Scottish Health Education Unit and Health Education Departments of Health Boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These matters have also been given emphasis at the joint Sub group meetings and agreed in principle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) <strong>In-Service training for Youth and Community Workers</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet embarked upon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) <strong>Community education to consider possibility of adult education classes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) <strong>Health Education programmes on alcohol to be monitored and research provided</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics also raised at the joint Sub-group meetings but not yet commenced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) <strong>Discuss with District Councils advertising on hoardings; equivalent space donated to education; publicity in libraries; education for Licensing Board members</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These needs were emphasised at the series of meetings between the Social Work Committee and the District Councils in 1979. The educational use of hoardings has been examined in consultation with the Scottish Health Education Unit and its advertising advisers from which it was concluded that considerable resources would be required, if it were to be effective, and these are not available at the present time. A series of Seminars for one Licensing Board (East Kilbride) was undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) <strong>A six month ban on TV alcohol advertising to be sought.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol advertising is one of the items associated with the issues which have been identified for discussion with central government. The subject of advertising is also being explored with the Highways &amp; Transport Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26) Ensure the continuation of the Industrial Alcoholism Unit</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants have been made which meet this requirement. The Unit has also moved to new premises in West Regent Street (by direct arrangement with the Health Board pending finalising terms of the lease to the Region).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) Industry and commerce to be urged to formulate employee alcohol policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28) Lead to be given by positive approach to the Region's own employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources are being concentrated initially on the Region's own needs, although the Principal Officer (Addiction) has also responded to requests for advice from a number of major industrial concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) Secretary of State to be urged to make stated commitment to the services and resources</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30) Secretary of State to be urged to set up Advisory Council on Addiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are also issues for discussion with central government and preliminary discussions have been held with officials of the Scottish Office. In the meantime additional resources have been made available from central funds for the provision of additional services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation | Implementation
---|---
(31) Partnership with the Scottish Council on Alcoholism to be explored | ✓
(32) Grant Aid to be given to Local Councils on Alcoholism | ✓

Regular meetings between the Social Work Department and the Council and its Local Councils have been established and significant additional support provided and partnership developed.

(33) Discussions to be held with drink manufacturers re assistance in combating alcohol problems

Approaches to the industry's trade associations are in hand which indicate their willingness to participate.

(34) Planning Group to be established for development of Services

A major report on operational proposals for corporate planning of Services is now under consideration by management and planning groups in two Divisions have already been established.

The above review shows that:

- for 11 recommendations (32%) implementation has been completed
- 17 (50%) implementation has commenced;
- 4 (12%) implementation remains to be started;
- 2 (6%) implementation is no longer recommended.

- 34 (100%)
WORKING GROUP ON SECONDARY SCHOOLING (S1, S2)

Remit.

To review the provision and organisation of secondary education in years S1 and S2 with particular reference to the following areas:

1. The transition from primary to secondary education

2. (a) The concept of education at S1 and S2 as a period of orientation through a common course of study for all pupils
   (b) The class organisation required by the above concept.

3. Curriculum content

4. Teaching methods

5. Assessment - aims and procedures

6. Parental involvement

7. Attendance - truancy

8. The role of guidance

9. School management structure

10. The transition from S2 to S3

Time-table.

The Working Group agreed procedures for the carrying out of its remit and indicated its intention to complete its report to the Policy and Resources Committee by December 1980.
PROPOSED REMIT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE ROLE OF FURTHER EDUCATION COLLEGES.

The remit of the Working Group on the Role of Further Education Colleges will be:

(1) to produce by December, 1979 a plan of course provision for session 1980/81;
(2) to produce a plan of course provision for the long-term future, having regard to the need for flexibility in the Further Education Service to permit timeous response to changing needs;
(3) to relate the plan of course provision in Colleges to other Further Education provision outwith Colleges and to make recommendations as to their future inter-relationship;
(4) in the above process:
   (a) to identify and examine areas of provision requiring priority consideration over the next few years;
   (b) to examine the distribution of course provision and suggest any necessary rationalisation;
   (c) to suggest changes in the allocation of resources in the context of any rationalisation of provision; and
   (d) to consult appropriate agencies as necessary; and
(5) to report and make recommendations by 14th November, 1980.
The remit of the Working Group on the Physically Handicapped will be:-

"1. to identify the needs of physically handicapped people of all age groups

2. to examine the efficiency and effectiveness of services and assistance to the physically handicapped that are available in Strathclyde Region

3. to indicate any changes and new developments in both service and assistance that may be required to meet present and future needs, with a ranking of priorities

4. to report and make recommendations by April 1981."

NOTES:

Service and assistance in the above context refers primarily to the provision by Strathclyde Regional Council but the Working Group will feel free to comment on services to the physically handicapped provided by other agencies if this seems appropriate.

The review of existing services for the physically handicapped will cover not only the nature, scale and range of such services, but also their quality. Current and future developments will also be considered. Staff, individuals and other agencies will be consulted where appropriate.
APPENDIX.11.


Remit.
(1) To examine the question of how non-operational property was being dealt with and how procedures could be improved. In relation to the time taken for properties to be declared surplus to the Service Committees requirements. The extent of maintenance on vacant properties for future use.
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