



# **THIRD SECTOR SUPPORT NEEDS SURVEY**

## **ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY**

**OCTOBER 2010**

# THIRD SECTOR SUPPORT NEEDS SURVEY ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY

## KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. WHO ARE LEEDS INFRASTRUCTURE CONSORTIUM?

The purpose of the Leeds Infrastructure Consortium (LIC) is to support and develop frontline voluntary, community and faith organisations (VCFO's) and social enterprises, so that they can provide effective services to local people in Leeds.

It was set up in 2004 as a response to the need for greater co-ordination and to encourage collaboration between organisations providing frontline support. It has been funded at a level of approximately £9,000 a year for the past 3 years through a Consortium Development Grant from Capacity Builders (as part of a wider sub-regional scheme administered by Fit4Funding on behalf of WYLDA (West Yorkshire's sub-regional infrastructure consortium)).

The aim and objectives of LIC are:

#### **Aim:**

To work together to try to meet the needs of frontline voluntary and community organisations. (The term "voluntary and community" is intended to include faith sector organisations.)

#### **Objectives:**

- to meet, discuss and identify issues of concern
- to support and promote and improve (where necessary) existing channels of communication that put forward the views of not-for-profit infrastructure support organisations to the statutory and private sectors
- to work together to address gaps in provision.

### 2. PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This report is the first of a three-step process. The report aims to summarise feedback from Third Sector organisations in Leeds regarding their priority support and development needs both the last three years and into also three years into the future. More detail on the methodology used to produce the report is available in **Appendix 1 – Methodology**. The aim of this work is to assist in prioritising funding in the current challenging funding environment.

The next two stages are:

- a. An outline of what third sector support and development work is required in Leeds – a refresh of work carried out in 2008 by LIC which analysed what provision was required in Leeds to meet the needs of all third sector organisations in the City (due out in late December)
- b. An analysis of how current support and development funding is being spent in Leeds (due out in late December)

Following the completion of the above process we will work with key partners and stakeholders to prioritise current funding and to identify how the support and development needs of third sector organisations in Leeds can be met in the future.

### 3. KEY FINDINGS

The data was analysed according to income levels as follows: income under £20,000 (total of 62 responses); income £20k to £100k (total of 42 responses); income between £100k and £500k (total of 47 responses); and income of over £500k (25 respondents).

The detailed analysis of the replies in the individual income brackets can be found in **Appendix 2 – Analysis**. At each level we analysed the top priorities (out of a total of 17 indicators) with the following results.

#### Area of need

- **Funding** (fundraising and income generation, planning fundable projects, researching funding sources and preparing applications) remains a key priority at all levels, both in terms of past provision and future needs. It was ranked as being most important in the under £20k and the £20k to £100k, as well as scoring highly on the higher income levels. Whilst some indicated they wanted to know more about where to go for funding and how to apply, most indicated they wanted specific help with funding bids.
- **Monitoring & Evaluation** (demonstrate the impact / outcomes of your work, help with internal systems, project evaluation) appears as an important need in all categories – coming 4<sup>th</sup> in the under £20k, 3<sup>rd</sup> in £20-£100k and high in both over £100k categories.
- **Volunteering** (recruiting, supporting and training volunteers) was also in the top key needs for all levels, coming higher in the lower income categories, but still being amongst the top 10 priorities for both £100-£500k and £500k+.
- **Collaboration** (networking; developing partnerships / consortia, merger) was slightly lower in the lowest income group (ranked 6<sup>th</sup>) but scored very highly in the £20k-£100k (second ranked) and was top priority in the two upper income levels.
- **Networking** (activities to meet other VCFO's, share experiences and identify common issues and approaches) was seen as being most important in the £100k+ group (ranked 2<sup>nd</sup>) and less so in the lower levels (7<sup>th</sup> in under £20k and 6<sup>th</sup> in 20-£100k) and mid table in the £500k+.
- **Strategic Leadership** (information about changes in national and local priorities that affect the sector, influencing public sector funders) which scored lower in the two lower level brackets but 3<sup>rd</sup> in £500k+ and 4<sup>th</sup> in 100k+.
- **Representation and engagement** (how to get your voice heard; strategic representation) scored 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> out of 17 in the upper two income brackets, was joint 7<sup>th</sup> in the under £20k category and not a priority in 20-£100k.
- **Governance** (constitutions, legal structures, management committee issues), **finance** (annual accounts preparation/examination, financial management support and book-keeping) and **marketing** (how to write press releases, web development, how to promote your group) scored highest in the lowest income group, and just below mid table in £20k-£100k. They were not ranked as a particular priority in the top two income brackets.
- **Commissioning/Contracting** (gaining contracts to deliver services), **Performance** (quality assurance and developing quality systems, policies and procedures) were only identified as being a priority (and a high one) at 100k and 500K, near top.
- **Employment issues** (recruiting and retaining staff; resolving HR and employment issues, redundancy), **IT** (technical facilities and support) and **Project management** (business and project planning) did not score highly in any of the categories.

## How they want support providing

In terms of the preferred method for groups to receive support, the priority for groups in under £20k and over £100k was in written form, followed by training. In the £20k-£100k bracket the priority was reversed, with training ranking as the most popular form of provision. In all the categories face-to-face support was identified as being important, too. Clearly in some areas, such as networking, face-to-face was identified as being the most preferred form of support but this is hardly surprising. Telephone support scored consistently low with consultancy beginning to rise in popularity in the higher income brackets.

In terms of provision, most groups said they could not afford to pay: 56% in the lower bracket, 45% in £20k to £100k and 45% in the upper brackets. There were several comments saying they would pay if the support was tailored to their needs / specific.

## Other points to Note

When groups were asked to identify who had helped them, some named specific organisations and others just ticked the type of support that had been provided. In many instances it is not easy to identify the actual provider i.e. Fit4Funding providing support at a Funding Fair organised by Leeds Community Foundation or WYCAS offering training as part of VA-L's training programme.

In addition, with some of the questions, groups were asked to look at strategic development as opposed to operational requirements. This may explain why areas that scored highly in terms of what support is currently being accessed (finance, governance, HR in particular) do not necessarily appear high in the priorities for the future. This is not to say that their services are not required and this is backed up by anecdotal evidence from organisations providing these services who say demand remains strong.

## 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

We believe the report has clear implications for both funders and providers.

### For funders of infrastructure support

An initial analysis suggests the following priorities:

- Provision of appropriate information about **funding**, and one-to-one help with funding applications, is key at all levels as is support and information on **Monitoring & Evaluation**.
- The need for ongoing support in **volunteering** remains high for all groups.
- Two other areas also scored highly that should really be grouped together - **Collaboration** and **Networking**. Demand for these services was particularly high in the upper income levels.
- Although **Strategic Leadership** was a high priority for groups with higher income (classified as being information about changes in national and local priorities that affect the sector, influencing public sector funders), **Representation and Engagement** (how to get your voice heard; strategic representation) did not score particularly highly in the survey.
- Some services were only priorities in some income brackets such as **governance, finance & marketing** being more of interest to lower income groups and **commissioning & contracting** and **performance** being a priority only for higher income groups.

- Consideration should be given to prioritising support and development funding towards the needs of smaller groups (the bottom two income brackets within the survey). It is recognised that smaller organisations often speak up/provide services for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged in society (often within communities (both of place and interest)). It is a priority that infrastructure services are available, affordable and accessible for these smaller groups.

### For infrastructure providers

Whilst LCC and other funders are reviewing the potential investment they can make, infrastructure groups also need to review the services they provide and look at different models of delivery that still meet local needs.

#### **1. Continue the review how support is being provided**

The review suggests that there is a greater need to provide more quality written support material as well as maintaining a good, broad-based training programme that is accessible and affordable to all. However the key area that will need to be addressed is the number of groups indicating they need face-to-face support, when compared to the number of frontline support and development workers that current work with the sector, as need clearly outstrips supply by a wide margin.

There is also a need to consider an alternative way of providing this face-to-face support, perhaps on a one-to-many not a one-to-one basis. Three examples are:

- a. VA-L have agreed the following approach to providing support:
  - Make as much information as possible available online in an easy-to-read and accessible manner and make this the first port of call for groups (in many cases this involves signposting to Fit4Funding, PERS, WYCAS and other websites, as specialist providers.
  - Ensure that there is sufficient training available to suit all levels of knowledge in the key areas of need identified, perhaps classifying them as basic, intermediary and advanced.
  - Only when the above two options have been considered will one-to-one support be available.
- b. Leeds Community Foundation is looking to expand its successful Funding Fair model to other areas with ½ day sessions on areas such as Marketing, Small Grants Applications, Monitoring & Evaluation and Crisis Management.
- c. Supporting Links to Commissioning (SLTC) is jointly exploring with LAF and Volition the possibility of training up other development workers as part of their development at work to increase the resource to work 1:1. There is also some potential to explore the use of trained volunteers.

#### **2. Review funding / charging for support**

Groups need to realise that there is a “value” to the services that are offered and that there are costs involved. Whilst access to online resources is likely to be free, support via training, one-to-one or group sessions may need to be charged for.

However, it is extremely important that the training and support remains accessible for those who cannot afford to pay, so the concept of a sliding scale of charges and / or access to bursaries needs to be considered, based on the models already used by WYCAS and VA-L.

### **3. Shared Delivery Model**

Some members (Leeds Community Foundation & VA-L; Voice & VA-L for example) are looking to move to a shared delivery model so as to pool their resources, as well as attempting to harness the support of the private sector. WYCAS, Fit4Funding, PERS and WYLC are also exploring closer working arrangements.

### **5. NEXT STEPS**

The funding for infrastructure support in Leeds is complex. Some comes directly from Leeds City Council via the Infrastructure Support Fund, whilst other elements are funded by other departments in the Council and by NHS Leeds. Some key organisations also receive external funding from bodies such as National Lottery, Capacity Builders etc, to deliver infrastructure services. All these sources are likely to come under pressure in the next few months.

We believe the next steps are as follows:

- a. Environment and Neighbourhoods use the contents of this report to inform their own discussions about the best use of the infrastructure fund in 2011-12. This is currently distributed to Voluntary Action Leeds, Leeds Voice, WYCAS, PERS and Leeds Community Foundation and is likely to be reduced for the coming year.
- b. Environment and Neighbourhoods consult with other departments in the Council, and with NHS Leeds, who also provide funding for infrastructure support via a range of third sector agencies. We believe this wider consultation is very important so that funding for infrastructure support is considered more as a whole, not in silos. This will mean we are better able to respond to the needs of local groups in a coherent and joined up fashion, whilst leaving enough flexibility in delivery for providers to be able to respond to new, emerging or changing needs over the next 3 years. It would also enable providers to prioritise groups for support whose needs were not being met elsewhere.
- c. LIC members use the results of a separate questionnaire that 10 out of 15 members completed to review future, planned services. This is to be used to conduct a gap analysis to match what services groups require to what services are currently being provided. Many of the providers are very flexible in their approach and we are aware that some members are looking at introducing new services, as well as the potential for charging for events that were previously free of charge. We also acknowledge that some groups will be reducing the amount of infrastructure support that they can provide due to funding restraints.

We believe that this ongoing review of future services needs to go hand-in-hand with the consultation that we are aware Leeds City Council will be undertaking regarding future funding for infrastructure and other types of third sector related activity.

In addition to the direct provision of services that this report highlights, a further point of context to note is the role of VAL in providing the management and administration for LIC, and Leeds Voice in terms of Third Sector Leeds. The funding for LIC, at £9,000 p.a. comes from Capacity Builders (subsidised by the internal resources of VA-L and other members) and this is one of the agencies that has been ear-marked for closure. It is unlikely that any funds will be forthcoming post April 2011, as decisions about infrastructure funding have not yet been taken nationally. Although there is no specific funding earmarked for TSL per se, the secretariat costs are born out of central grants that Leeds Voice receives from Leeds City Council.

Although neither LIC nor TSL directly provide infrastructure support to frontline groups, they do "enable" a considerable quantity of activity to take place in that arena with focus of LIC being coherent, high quality service delivery and TSL being strategic representation.

A final point to note is that organisations such as Fit4Funding are also funded via the West Yorkshire Grants, funding for which originates from local Councils. There is some discussion as to whether or not this money should remain with the local Councils for their own distribution and this, too, might affect availability of infrastructure support provided in Leeds.

## Appendix 1. – METHODOLOGY

### Background

During the course of 2010 several members of LIC started to conduct an informal review of the needs of the groups that they support. The driver for this was the changes in economic circumstances and the growing concerns expressed by the sector as to their future viability.

At the same time, Leeds City Council (LCC) was conducting a review of the infrastructure support that it funds primarily through the Infrastructure Fund (IFS Fund). This was part of an ongoing annual review process but was also in anticipation of likely future cuts to this fund.

Following discussions between representatives of LIC (Richard Jackson and Sally-Anne Greenfield) and LCC (Julie Station and Julia Holden) it was agreed that LIC should conduct a formal review of needs by issuing a questionnaire to local groups. The results were to be analysed by LIC and a report presented to LCC, together with the questionnaire results. LCC would then use this to guide their ongoing consultations about future funding and would also seek to broaden these discussions to include other departments within the Council and more broadly with NHS Leeds and other infrastructure providers.

### Methodology

Terms of Reference were agreed by LIC (**Appendix 3**) and a questionnaire was produced that was made available both online and as a paper-based form (**Appendix 4**). In early September 2010 this was sent by LIC members to the groups they support in Leeds, with a deadline of 30<sup>th</sup> September 2010. The results were then analysed by a sub-group and presented to LIC on 14<sup>th</sup> October. This paper represents the final report that was presented to and approved by LIC on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2010.

Over 200 replies were received but some were incomplete and there 3-4 duplications. The result is that there were 176 valid replies and these have formed the basis of the analysis. Whilst no-one really knows the answer to how many groups there are in Leeds, a conservative estimate would result in 2,000 groups so this analysis is approximately 10% response. We found this very encouraging and is broadly in line with the expected response rates of questionnaires of this kind.

It was agreed to analyse the results by income level of the groups as it was felt that the needs of a group with an income of under £20,000 would vary considerably from those of one with an income of £1million+. We also felt there was sufficient spread of groups across the income brackets to make this a valid exercise. The brackets we chose were: income under £20,000 (total of 62 responses); income £20k to £100k (total of 42 responses); income between £100k and £500k (total of 47 responses); and income of over £500k (25 respondents).

The key observations in the report and appendices are based on the data that has been drawn from the questionnaire. In addition to data analysis, some added commentary is provided that is based on the knowledge and expertise of the sub-group, who already provide infrastructure support to local groups.

## APPENDIX 2 - ANALYSIS

### 1. ANALYSIS OF THE UNDER £20,000 RANGE

#### Analysis of respondents

A total of 62 groups with an income of under £20,000 responded which is approximately 35% of the total sample. The majority (33 groups) had income of between £1k and £10k with 14 groups having between £10k and £20k and 15 with an income of under £1,000.

The geographical analysis has not been easy as many groups ticked more than one area. However, they appear to be reasonably well-spread in terms of geography – 20 operating in west/north-west Leeds, 14 in East/North-east and 9 in South/South-east. 16 of the groups said they operated citywide, 21 in West Yorkshire or Yorkshire and 4 said national and international.

It was not surprising, given the income size, that there was only 2 full-time members of staff and 20 part-time across all the respondents. The groups reported a total of 394 management committee members and an additional 1,003 volunteers.

#### Past Experience of Infrastructure Support

Section B asked groups to talk about the support they have received in the past 3 years. In this income category, the top six areas were as follows, with the number indicating the number of groups that ticked having accessed this support. By far the largest area was funding advice, with 29 groups saying this had been the most useful area of support provided.

Funding support – 41 groups	Governance – 14 groups
Volunteering – 14 groups	Collaboration – 13 groups
Networking – 13 groups	Finance – 11 groups

It is not surprising that areas such as contracting and employment support had low scores as these are not common areas of need for groups with a low income.

In terms of where the support came from

- LCF: 15 groups saying they had received grants and 6 stating other support
- VA-L: 7 groups stated they had received advice and 3 said training
- WYCAS: 4 groups stated they had received support

None of this is surprising and it confirms the fact that LCF, VA-L and WYCAS are all active in this area and appear to be targeting their support well. Supporting Links to Commissioning also provides support regarding funding, governance & collaboration although groups might not distinguish this as being SLTC as opposed to Voice.

#### Analysis of Future Needs

Groups were asked to rank services as being of high, medium or low importance. We have chosen to combine high and medium together for the purposes of this analysis and look at the top needs which were

- Funding: researching sources and preparing applications: 54 groups (87%)
- Funding: understanding fundraising / income generation, planning – 47 groups (76%)
- Volunteering: recruiting, supporting and training volunteers – 43 groups (69%)
- Marketing: press releases, websites, promotions – 40 groups (65%)
- Monitoring and evaluation: impact / outcomes – 36 groups (58%)
- Collaboration: networking; developing partnerships / consortia, merger – 34 groups (55%)

- Strategic leadership, Networking, Representation and Finance all received 31 or 32 votes

Groups were asked about their top 3 priorities for the next 3 years and these came out as Funding (37 groups), volunteering (12), project management (12) and marketing (10). The project management category is surprising because it did not score particularly highly in the high/medium/low importance.

When looking at this in the context of the support they have received over the past 3 years, there are some interesting comparisons:

- Funding support, volunteering and collaboration remain high in terms of past support received, and future needs
- Whilst governance, networking and finance were high in terms of past support received, they did not feature in the top 6 for future needs (though still scored relatively high)
- The new future needs that were identified were marketing and monitoring and evaluation

What we believe this shows is that groups realise they need to do more to market themselves and demonstrate the impact of their work and have identified this as being an area where they need further support. We do not believe it shows that the previously well-used areas (governance, collaboration, networking and finance) are no longer required, just that they are not as much of a priority as the new needs at present.

It is helpful, in this context, to look at Section D, too, looking at future support needs.

- 35 groups would like to know more about new and emerging strategic priorities (60%)
- 34 groups would need to recruit more volunteers (59%)
- 33 groups would like help with influencing funders and public sector (57%)
- 31 groups would need to increase income generation (53%)
- 20 groups in total were interested in merging, forming consortium
- 5 groups were looking to reduce the hours of paid staff or make staff redundant
- Only 4 groups were considering closure

It was not surprising that few groups of this size considered merging, consortia work or reducing staff hours. What was, perhaps, surprising is the high level of response from groups wanting more strategic input around priorities and influencing funders, although this could be a reflection of the current uncertain climate.

### How support is provided

In terms of how they wanted delivery providing, and focusing just on the top identified future needs above,

- Funding: bid writing: 25 groups selected written, 18 face to face, 15 training, 8 telephone support and 5 consultancy.
- Funding: planning: 27 written, 19 face to face, 18 training, 7 telephone and 4 consultancy
- Volunteering: 25 written, 19 training, 15 face to face, and 2 groups for both telephone and consultancy support
- Marketing: 21 written, 17 training, 11 face to face, 3 consultancy and 2 telephone
- Monitoring and evaluation: 24 written, 14 training, 14 face to face, 3 consultancy and 2 telephone.
- Collaboration: 22 written, 13 face to face, 7 training, 3 consultancy and 2 telephone.

What is perhaps surprising is that so many of these small groups were happy with written support, scoring highest on all 6 measures. The next most popular provision was by training (3<sup>rd</sup> priority in 3 areas, 3<sup>rd</sup> in 4) and then face-to-face support (3<sup>rd</sup> priority in 4 and 3<sup>rd</sup> in 3). We believe that this means there is a great need to continue to provide written support materials (albeit in an

accessible form) whilst recognizing that training and face-to-face support are also critical. Unsurprisingly consultancy support scored very low in this area. In terms of their ability to pay for services: 45 said no /possibly (56%), 4 said yes for very specific support (5%) and 5 said yes (6%).

## Conclusions

In this category of groups, with an income of under £20,000, most of the results were as anticipated.

Given the high numbers of volunteers and low income levels, the support they have accessed in the past has been around funding, volunteering, finance, governance and general networking / collaboration and not around employment, contracting or commissioning. In terms of the future, they were not overly concerned about closure or down-sizing (4% and 5% respectively) but it was clear that support around funding (both in terms of research and face-to-face support) is a key priority, as was marketing and monitoring & evaluation. Unsurprisingly, support for volunteering was also a key priority.

The perhaps surprising results were the number of groups that appeared to be happy receiving the information in written format (although the responses made it very clear that training and face-to-face support are key).

The results of Section D also indicated a much greater interest in strategic priorities and influencing funders than might have been anticipated, but we believe this is more to do with uncertainty about future funding streams as opposed to a real desire to become more engaged at a strategic level.

In terms of provision of future support for this category, we believe this needs to focus on

- Funding, marketing, monitoring and evaluation and volunteering
- Provided in written format, through training and face-to-face support
- Available for free (or at very low cost)

With regards the provision of current services, much of the above is currently provided with the exception of marketing, monitoring & evaluation so this gap would need to be filled.

## **2. ANALYSIS OF THE £20,000 TO £100,000 RANGE**

### Analysis of respondents

A total of 42 groups with an income of between £20,000 and £100,000 responded which is approximately 24% of the total sample. There was a fair split with 10 groups having income between £20k and £30k, 15 between £30k and £50k and 17 groups with income between £50k and £100k.

The geographical analysis was hampered by the fact that many groups ticked more than one area but there was a good spread of groups operating just in one wedge (7, 8 and 6 groups), city-wide (13) and further afield in West Yorkshire and Yorkshire (15). 5 said they operated nationally or internationally.

Between them the groups employed 45 F/T staff and 138 p/t staff, and have 1,271 volunteers, which works out at a ratio of 8 volunteers for every staff member.

### Past Experience of Infrastructure Support

Section B analysed the support groups had received in the past 3 years. In this income category, the top areas were as follows, with the number indicating the number of groups that ticked having accessed this support.

In terms of analysing which were most useful, finance and governance scored highest with 19 and 10 votes accordingly.

Funding Support – 24 groups	Volunteering - 15 groups
Finance – 24 groups	Governance - 15 groups
Collaboration – 18 groups	Employment – 14 groups
Networking - 17 groups	

It is not surprising that areas such as strategic leadership and project management scored low in this section (6 groups each).

The 5 organisations identified as providing the most useful support, in order of ranking, were:-

- WYCAS – 9 groups
- VAL – 8 groups
- LCF – 5 groups
- PERS – 3 groups
- LOPF – 2 groups

In addition in many cases only a type of support was named and not the organisation that provided it; the top 5 of these were Finance (12), Governance (10), Funding Research (5), Employment (4), and Information (4). These rankings correlate well with the type of support provided by the 5 organisations stated above.

### Future Needs

Section C asked organisations to **anticipate** future needs in the light of the possibility that they may be different from those in the past. They were asked to rank these as being of high, medium or low importance. We have chosen to combine high and medium together for the purposes of this analysis and look at the top needs which were

- Funding: researching sources and preparing applications: 35 groups (83%)
- Collaboration: networking; partnerships / consortia, merger – 30 groups (71%)
- Monitoring and evaluation: impact / outcomes – 30 groups (71%)
- Funding: understanding fundraising / income generation, planning – 30 groups (71%)
- Volunteering: recruiting, supporting and training volunteers – 28 groups (66%)
- Networking activities – 27 groups (64%)
- Project management – 27 groups (64%)
- Strategic leadership, representation and finance all scores 25 /26

Groups were asked about their top 3 priorities for the next 3 years and these came out as Funding (22 groups), collaboration (12), monitoring & Evaluation (10) which supports the above analysis.

When looking at this in the context of the support they have received over the past 3 years, there are some interesting comparisons:

- Funding support, collaboration, networking and volunteering remain high in terms of past support received, and future needs identified
- Whilst governance and employment were high in terms of past support received, they did not feature in the top 6 for future needs
- The new future needs that were identified was monitoring and evaluation

The Section C responses need to be viewed in context of the Section D responses where groups were asked whether they would need to adopt **new strategies** in the light of forthcoming budget cuts. Here we have added “very likely” and “likely” together

- 32 groups would like to know more about new and emerging strategic priorities (74%)
- 30 groups would like help with influencing funders and public sector (70%)
- 27 groups would need to increase income generation (63%)
- 27 groups would consider merging or forming a consortium (only 6 ticking merger)
- 23 groups would need to recruit more volunteers (53%)
- 19 groups in total were interested in merging, forming consortium (44%)
- 18 groups were looking to reduce the hours of paid staff or make staff redundant
- Only 1 group was considering closure

The emphasis here appears to be on:-

- Income generation and influencing funders
- Consortia (but not mergers)
- Understanding the implications of new priorities
- Recruiting more volunteers (possible reduction in paid staff)

### How support is provided

In terms of how they wanted delivery providing, and focusing just on the top future needs above,

- Funding: bid writing. 15 groups written, 14 face-to-face, 13 training, 2 telephone, 2 consultancy,
- Funding understanding: 17 training, 13 written, 13 face-to-face, 2 telephone, 2 consultancy,
- Collaboration: 17 written, 11 face to face, 5 consultancy, 5 training 1 telephone,
- Monitoring & Evaluation: 16 training, 12 written, 8 face to face, 8 consultancy, 3 telephone,
- Volunteering - 21 training, 11 written, 8 face to face, 2 telephone, 0 consultancy,
- Networking activities: 16 face to face, 9 written, 3 consultancy, 3 training, and 0 telephone
- Project management: 12 training, 10 written, 7 face to face, 3 consultancy and 0 telephone
- Strategic leadership: 16 written, 6 training, 5 face to face, 2 consultancy, 1 training

There is a swing, in this income bracket, to being happier with accessing support via training, scoring highest in 4 areas and 2<sup>nd</sup> in one. Written support remains high, too, with 3 ranking it most important and 5 as second most important. Telephone support and consultancy score lowest.

In terms of their ability to pay, 19 said no / possibly (45%), 9 said yes but only for specific purposes (11%) and 30 said yes (37%).

### Conclusion

The results in this category were more-or-less as expected. There is, understandably, a strong correlation between sections C and D with a focus on wanting to know more about income generation and getting alongside funders allied to an interest in improving monitoring & evaluation, presumably to help raise profile and gain new contracts / funds.

As with the smaller groups, a focus on funding was key together with monitoring & evaluation. Groups are beginning to look more at strategic issues, particularly to do with keeping up with changes in policy and attempting to influence funders. Both Sections C and D necessarily provide a future picture of both strategic direction and organisational need. However, this needs to be seen in the context that, in Section B, there was a considerable focus on Finance, Governance and Employment. These inevitably take more of a back seat because they are, perhaps, seen as essential operational needs whilst the questions in Section C and D ask organisations to project their thinking forward strategically to the riskier scenarios they will inevitably face.

What is interesting to note is the number of groups who in one section or another expressed an interest in collaboration, consortium work or even merging. 55 groups said they would consider consortia and 22 were interested in merger. There is quite a lot of generic information available about the benefits of partnership and merger, and some practical work is also taking place in

Leeds. VA-L are delivering a small project in rural areas, that facilitates cluster work and / or encourages closer, working relations. The SLTC project worked with organisations during the Performance Reward Grant bidding process to facilitate joint bids. Some of the loose consortia developed at this time have gone on to bid for other funding. Work is also taking place with Volition, LLDF, PSI Network, OPF and the Health and Wellbeing Network to promote “collaboration workshops” on a thematic approach. Work is also progressing with the Health and Wellbeing Network and NHS Leeds to look at pro-actively forming collaboratives in preparation for GP consortia practice based commissioning. What seems certain is that the current level of support provided in this area is unlikely to match what looks like a significant increase in interest / demand.

It is not surprising to see quite high figures of groups looking to reduce hours of paid staff or make them redundant, allied to the need to take on more volunteers. What was perhaps concerning is the size of the sample with over half of the groups (51%) saying they were looking at redundancy or reducing staff hours, and 7 were considering closure.

### **3. ANALYSIS OF THE £100,000+ RANGE**

A total of 72 groups with an income of over £100,000 responded which is approximately 41% of the total sample. There was a fair split with 24 groups having income between £100k and £250k, 23 with income between £250k and £500k; 6 with an income between £500k and £1m; and 19 with an income over £1m.

Frontline organisations with an income of between £100k and £500k employed 195 full-time staff and 300 part-time staff with a total of 1,032 volunteers and 387 management committee members. Those with an income over £500k employed 1,642 full-time and 964 part-time staff, had a total of 4,490 volunteers and 253 management committee members.

17 out of 47 (36%) organisations in the £100k - £500k category and 19 out of 25 (76%) of the over £500k category say they work on a West Yorkshire, Regional or National basis. However, it is not known what percentage of staff and volunteers are employed solely within the Leeds area. Some organisations had entered more than one category under the area of operation but it is reasonable to assume that over 40% have a remit beyond Leeds

#### **Past Experience of Infrastructure Support**

Section B analysed the support groups had received in the past 3 years. In this income category, the top areas were as follows, with the number indicating the number of groups that ticked having accessed this support. In terms of the most useful type of support, the answers were networking (12 groups), funding research (9 groups) and representation (9 groups). It was perhaps not surprising that some areas scored low – project management (6 groups) and marketing (8 groups) as larger groups tend to have more in-house resources in these areas.

Collaboration – 48 groups  
Networking – 48 groups  
Funding – 41 groups

Contracting & Commissioning – 40 groups  
Strategic leadership – 33 groups  
Employment – 32 groups

From the list of organisations providing support to these 71 frontline organisations, the 5 identified as providing the most useful support, in order of ranking, were:-

- VAL- Payroll and other services (10)
- Volition – Strategic leadership and representation (7)
- LCF – Funding and general advice (7)
- Voice – various (6)
- PERS- Employment advice (5)

However, several organisations may have identified more than one provider and VA-L, with the highest score, was still only referenced by 14% of the respondents.

### Future Needs

Section C asked organisations to **anticipate** future needs in the light of the possibility that they may be different from those in the past. They were asked to rank these as being of high, medium or low importance. We have chosen to combine high and medium together for the purposes of this analysis and look at the top needs which were as follows.

	£100k-£500k	£500k+
Collaboration	44	29
Networking	40	25
Contracting	39	27
Strategic leadership	38	27
Funding: researching sources and preparing applications	37	19
Monitoring and evaluation: impact / outcomes	36	24
Performance / QA	36	21
Funding: understanding fundraising / income generation	36	18
Volunteering	35	19
Project Management	35	18
Representation	34	19

Priority areas for support appear to be largely related to funding and the commissioning and procurement agenda where the emphasis is on partnership working, collaboration and ensuring that appropriate structures are in place to respond to such opportunities.

Groups were asked about their top 3 priorities for the next 3 years and these came out in the £100k-£500k bracket as: Collaboration (20), Funding (18), Contracting & Commissioning (18) and strategic leadership (12) which is similar to above. In the £500k+ bracket the top 3 were also funding (20), contracting & commissioning (15) Collaboration (11), strategic leadership (11)

When looking at this in the context of the support they have received over the past 3 years, there are some interesting comparisons:

- Collaboration, Networking, Funding, Contracting, Strategic Leadership all remained high in terms of past support received, and future needs identified
- Employment was high in terms of past support received, they did not feature in the top 10 for future needs
- The new future needs that were identified was monitoring and evaluation and representation

The Section C responses need to be viewed in context of the Section D responses where groups were asked whether they would need to adopt **new strategies** in the light of forthcoming budget cuts. Here we have added “very likely” and “likely” together

- 77 groups would like to know more about new and emerging strategic priorities (96%)
- 68 groups would need to increase income generation (85%)
- 60 groups would like help with influencing funders and public sector (75%)
- 55 groups were interested in forming a consortium (68%)
- 47 groups would need to recruit more volunteers (51%)
- 41 groups were looking to reducing staff hours / making them redundant (51%)
- 22 groups were interested in merging (31%)
- 7 groups were considering closure (10%)

The emphasis here appears to be on:-

- Income generation and influencing funders
- Consortia (more than mergers)
- Understanding the implications of new priorities
- Recruiting more volunteers (possible reduction in paid staff)

#### How support is provided

In the £100k to £500k category, the preference for provision of information was

- Funding research: 18 written, 8 consultancy, 8 training, 7 face to face, 1 telephone
- Collaboration: 16 face to face, 14 written, 8 training, 8 consultancy, 1 telephone
- Strategic leadership: 21 written, 12 face to face, 8 training, 3 consultancy, 0 telephone
- Contracting: 16 written, 13 training, 9 consultancy, 6 face to face, 2 telephone
- Networking: 18 face to face, 7 written, 5 training, 3 consultancy, 0 telephone
- M & E: 14 training, 11 written, 6 consultancy, 5 face to face, - telephone
- Performance: 13 written, 8 training, 6 consultancy, 4 face to face, 1 telephone

Again the preference is for written (1<sup>st</sup> priority in 4 areas and 2<sup>nd</sup> in 3) or training (1<sup>st</sup> in 1 area, 2<sup>nd</sup> in 2 and 3<sup>rd</sup> in 3), with least interest in telephone support. Consultancy is becoming a bit more of an identified area.

In terms of their ability to pay, 36 said no / possibly (45%), 9 said yes for specific services (11%), and 30 said yes (37%).

#### Conclusions

It is not surprising that interest in traditional areas such as finance, governance and marketing is not high in this category as they tend to be able to provide for this in-house, or access services from larger national providers outside of the district.

It was clear, and understandable, that the larger groups are looking to take part in more strategic discussions, with the top 4 needs in both categories being collaboration, networking, strategic leadership and contracting. These areas are largely related to funding and the commissioning and procurement agenda where the emphasis is on partnership working, collaboration and ensuring that appropriate structures are in place to respond to such opportunities.

Support for contracting and commissioning is being provided by the Commissioning Links project and Fit4Funding. The latter is funded through a Capacitybuilders Modernisation project until March 2011. Without further analysis of their needs, it is not possible to see what gaps there may be in terms of responding to the clear need for more networking and collaboration as the responses would need to be more specific in terms of what the groups want. We believe this may be something that TSL might want to take up directly.

In the next categories of need we find funding, monitoring and evaluation and performance / QA. We anticipate that, at the income levels of some of the larger groups, this would need to be provided on a more bespoke basis though there may be some room for providing more generic support, particularly for groups with an income of between £100k and £500k.

The data from Section D provides an interesting insight in that 55 groups (68% of respondents) would consider a consortia arrangement and 22 might consider merger (27%). This is, perhaps higher than we might have anticipated. As identified in section 2 above, we believe this is a current gap in provision amongst infrastructure providers.

What is more salutary to note, however, is that 41 groups (51%) said they were considering reducing staff hours or making them redundant and 7 were considering closure.

## **APPENDIX 3 - Terms of Reference**

### **Terms of Reference for Review of Leeds VCFO Infrastructure Autumn 2010**

#### **Context of review**

The purpose of Leeds infrastructure / support services is to support and develop frontline voluntary, community and faith organisations (VCFO's), and social enterprises, so that they can provide services effectively to the people of Leeds.

Infrastructure services are provided by organisations that are members of the Leeds Infrastructure Consortium (LIC) and a number of them receive grants from Leeds City Council (LCC) and NHS Leeds to fund their services. It is acknowledged that some infrastructure support is provided by bodies that are not members of LIC, including Leeds City Council. The review is to take place in the context of the new national government, the new local partnership priorities in Leeds, and the rolling out of the Big Society policy, (with its priorities of volunteering, contracting out public services and community organising), potential cuts in grants to support services and the particular challenges facing the sector in Leeds.

#### **Purpose of review**

- To ensure that the work of local infrastructure organisations is targeted towards ensuring a thriving voluntary community and faith sector (including social enterprises) for Leeds
- To check out which support services are highest priority for frontline organisations
- To identify gaps, overlap or un-necessary duplication in support services
- To ensure the priority support needs of frontline organisations are being/will be met in the most effective way addressing efficiencies that could be achieved through collaboration (subject, of course, to funding availability)
- To help inform decisions about funding infrastructure, including funding from LCC, at a time of cuts to public sector budgets
- To take regard, during the review, to equalities impact and, in particular, the need for capacity building in disadvantaged neighbourhoods and communities of interest.

#### **Scope of review**

- The target group for consultation will be organisations on the databases of LIC members and the wider sector in general
- The process and results will be shared with VCFO'S, LCC and other statutory partners including NHS Leeds
- Infrastructure Services needed/provided in Leeds to be reviewed over Sept/Oct 2010 in response to the review and through consultation with frontline organisations and key stakeholders

#### **How the review will be undertaken**

- Terms of reference/questionnaire to be agreed by LIC and LCC by early September
- Task group to be agreed by LIC by early Sept
- Questionnaires to be sent out to wider sector by email in early September
- Questionnaires to be returned to VAL within 3 weeks

#### **How the information is analysed and reported**

- Results to be recorded by volunteers and staff at Voluntary Action Leeds.
- Task group from LIC to undertake analysis and produce draft report. Raw data will be available for reference where appropriate. Officers from LCC to be involved in production of draft report.
- Draft report with main findings to be completed by 22nd October, circulated to LIC members and presented at a LIC meeting at the end of October. Report to be forwarded to LCC. Report to be presented to TSL on 10th November. LIC members and others may use

draft report to review their own provision of support / speak to external funders (not LCC / NHS Leeds).

- Resources Team, LCC to consult with other Directorates in LCC/ NHS about infrastructure support needs moving forward. This will be considered in the context of the Comprehensive Spending Review due on 20<sup>th</sup> October and the response, to it, by local partners.
- Discussions will then take place within LCC and with NHS to consider the report and questionnaire results. This, together with individual meetings with ISF funded projects, will lead to production of a draft specification by LCC outlining the priorities that they are willing to fund. This will be ready by mid November 2011 and will be used as the basis of further consultation with the sector via LIC, TSL and with individual funded organisations. (NB – it should be noted that the draft specification that is drawn up will relate only to work funded directly by LCC and will clearly not relate to work funded by members' own reserves or other external resources).

#### **How the report is to be used, once finalised**

- To inform commissioners and procurers of services in the Leeds area including LCC, NHS Leeds, arts and sport bodies.
- To inform external funders of services in the Leeds area not included in the bullet point above
- To inform the internal, strategic reviews of support providers

*It should be noted that limited resources are available for this study and we are drawing on the goodwill of members of LIC to undertake this activity. Further work maybe required in the future.*

# APPENDIX 4 - QUESTIONNAIRE

## SECTION A – YOUR ORGANISATION

*The person completing this should have responsibility for the strategic development of your group*

Your Name	
Position	
Name of Organisation	
Address	
Email	
Phone Number	

What is your structure?	<input type="checkbox"/> Registered Charity <input type="checkbox"/> Company Limited by Guarantee <input type="checkbox"/> Constituted not-for-profit group <input type="checkbox"/> Branch of a larger organisation <input type="checkbox"/> Other .....
How many staff do you employ?  How many management committee members do you have? How many volunteers do you have? (not including management committee)	Full time .....Part time .....  ..... .....
Income – please indicate your gross income (the total amount of money your organisation receives on an annual basis, perhaps using your last year’s figures as an example)	Under £1,000 £1,001 to £10,000 £10,001 to £20,000 £20,001 to £30,000 £30,001 to £50,000 £50,001 to £100,000 £100,001 to £250,000 £250,001 to £500,000 £500,001 to £1 million Over £1 million
What year did your organisation start?	
What geographical areas do you work in?	<input type="checkbox"/> National / international <input type="checkbox"/> Yorkshire and the Humber <input type="checkbox"/> West Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> Citywide <input type="checkbox"/> East / North-East Leeds <input type="checkbox"/> West / North-West Leeds <input type="checkbox"/> South / South-East Leeds
What are the key areas of your work i.e. advice and information, arts, sports, environment etc.  If you work specifically with a group of people (young people, elderly, BME etc) please also provide details here.	

## SECTION B – SUPPORT RECEIVED

Using the chart below, please indicate if you have had any support from infra-structure organisations in the past three years by writing the name of the organisation(s) that provided it in the space provided (a list of potential providers is found at the end of this chart by way of example). You can complete as many boxes as are appropriate.

Type of support received in the past 3 years including services, advice or training	Name of Delivery Organisation(s)
Collaboration: networking; developing partnerships / consortia, merger	
Contracting and commissioning: gaining contracts to deliver services	
Employment: recruiting and retaining staff; resolving HR and employment issues, redundancy	
Finance: annual accounts preparation/examination, financial management support and book-keeping	
Funding: fundraising and income generation, planning fundable projects, researching funding sources and preparing applications	
Governance: constitutions, legal structures, management committee issues	
IT: technical facilities and support	
Marketing & Promotions: how to write press releases, web development, how to promote your group	
Monitoring and evaluation: demonstrate the impact / outcomes of your work, help with internal systems, project evaluation	
Networking activities to meet other VCFO's, share experiences and identify common issues and approaches.	
Performance: quality assurance and developing quality systems, policies and procedures	
Project Management: business and project planning	
Representation and engagement: how to get your voice heard; strategic representation	
Safeguarding: safeguarding, vetting and barring etc	
Strategic leadership: information about changes in national and local priorities that affect the sector, influencing public sector funders	
Volunteering: recruiting, supporting and training volunteers	
Other (please provide details)	

Listed below are some of the organisations that might have provided you with support.

**National:** ACEVO, Capacity Builders; NAVCA; NCVO; Funding Central website; Volunteering England  
**Local:** Burley Lodge Centre, Business Link Yorkshire, Cardigan Centre, Fit4Funding, Healthy Living Network Leeds, Inform Leeds, Learning Disabilities Forum, Leeds Community Foundation, Leeds Faiths Forum, Leeds Older People's Forum, Leeds Play Network, Leeds Voice, Pay & Employment Rights Service (PERS), Oblong, People in Action, South Leeds Health for All (now Health for All), Volition, Voluntary Action-Leeds, Voluntary Sector Youth Development Team at Re'new, W. Yorks. Community Accounting Service (WYCAS), West Yorkshire Learning Consortium

What has been the most useful support received from these organisations in the past three years?

.....

.....

Have there been any barriers to accessing support? Are any of the above services in need of improvement?

.....

.....

## SECTION C: Future Needs

We believe that your needs in the future might be quite different from those in the past. Imagine we were setting up a new support system from scratch and use the columns below to indicate which services would be more important by placing a tick against each in high, medium or low.

These services can be delivered in a number of ways. Please use the final column to indicate which you would find most useful.

- **Written** (via newsletter, by accessing information on a website, though email)
- **Telephone advice**
- **Face to face** on a one-to-one basis by prior appointment or drop in
- **Services and consultancy:** paying for provision of tailored support
- **Training:** including workshops, events and e-learning

Type of support i.e. areas where you would most value help in the next 3 years	High	Medium	Low	Preferred Support delivery method
Collaboration: networking; developing partnerships / consortia, merger				
Contracting and commissioning: gaining contracts to deliver services				
Employment: recruiting and retaining staff; resolving HR and employment issues, redundancy				
Finance: annual accounts preparation/examination, financial management support and book-keeping				
Funding: understanding about fundraising and income generation, planning fundable projects				
Funding: researching funding sources and preparing applications				
Governance: constitutions, legal structures, management committee issues				
IT: technical facilities and support				
Marketing & Promotions: how to write press releases, web development, how to promote your group				
Monitoring and evaluation: demonstrate impact / outcomes of your work, help with internal systems, project evaluation				
Networking activities to meet other VCFO's, share experiences and identify common issues and approaches.				
Performance: quality assurance and developing quality systems, policies and procedures				
Project Management: business and project planning				
Representation and engagement: how to get your voice heard; strategic representation				
Safeguarding: safeguarding, vetting and barring etc				
Strategic leadership: information about changes in national and local priorities that affect sector, influencing funders				
Volunteering: recruiting, supporting and training volunteers				
Other (please provide details)				

Of those services listed above, which are the top 3 priorities for your group in the next 3 years?

.....

.....

.....

Would your organisation be willing to pay for any of the services listed above? (Please provide details).

.....

.....

**SECTION D: Future Strategies**

In the light of the forthcoming public sector budget cuts, do you think your organisation will require new strategies in order to continue the work you do?

Option	Very Likely	Likely	Neutral	Unlikely	Very Unlikely	Not sure
Increase income generation and rely less on public sector funding						
Merge with other third sector organisations						
Form a consortium with other groups to secure funding / contracts						
Support to influence funders / public sector partners						
Clearer understanding of new and emerging strategic priorities						
Reduce the hours of paid staff or make staff redundant						
Recruit more volunteers						
Closure						
Other strategies – please specify						

With cuts in public sector funding and the emergence of new ideas around Big Society (which appears to prioritise volunteering, contracting out of public services and community organising), there is likely to be a corresponding impact on VCFO's in Leeds. We would love to hear your views and what impact you think the changes might have on your organisation, both positive and negative. Do you think it will affect your funding? Might your service delivery need to change? Please continue on a separate sheet if required.

