

**Review of Locality Based Voluntary and Community
Sector Infrastructure Services in Leicestershire**

**Voluntary and Community
Sector Infrastructure Review
Leicestershire**

6th January 2011

Martin Honeywell.

m.honeywell@ntlworld.com

Martin Honeywell

Martin Honeywell works as a Local Improvement Advisor and previously as a Neighbourhood Renewal Advisor, consulting on the complex and changing relationships between the Voluntary and Community Sector and the Statutory Sector. This work has coincided with a period of major growth and change within the VCS as expectations on its representational, support and service delivery roles have escalated.

He was involved for many years in the voluntary sector mainly in international development and community conflict resolution. He worked for six years in community empowerment projects in Central America and was later appointed as Deputy Director of Oxfam, with responsibility for finance, organisational development and personnel.

He originally studied economics and worked as Lecturer in Business Finance in the School of Business at Liverpool University. More recently he has studied the dynamics of organisational change and development, first at the Tavistock Institute in London and latterly for a Masters Degree at City University, London.

Review of Locality Based Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) Infrastructure Services in Leicestershire

INDEX

Executive Summary		4
Recommendations		6
Sections		
Section One	The Review Purpose	8
Section Two	Background	8
Section Three	The Workshop Review Process	11
Section Four	Further Outputs from First Workshop – Review of Service Principles and Roles	13
Section Five	District Workshops and VCS Priorities	15
Section Six	Infrastructure Negotiations	16
Section Seven	Agreement Reached at the Final Workshop	18
Section Eight	Review of Current Performance and Performance Management Framework	19
Section Nine	Conclusion	21
Footnotes		22
Appendices		
Appendix One	Terms of Reference	24
Appendix Two	Contract Outcomes	27
Appendix Three	First County Workshop - Note for Participants	30
Appendix Four	Notes on Principles, Roles and Performance Management Framework	33
Appendix Five	Progress Report on District Negotiations	35
Appendix Six	Agreement	40
Appendix Seven	Funders Guidance to District Negotiations	41
Appendix Eight	Performance Charts for VAL, Community Hubs and Local Resource Centres	44
Appendix Nine	Project Document Database	49

Executive Summary

ES 1. This document is the report of the Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure Review, commissioned by Leicestershire County Council and partner agencies.

- This Section summarises the Report
- Recommendations follow the Executive Summary
- Section One outlines the purpose of the VCS Infrastructure Review.
- Section Two is a summary of the situation prior to the Review
- Section Three outlines the process agreed for the Review and relates that process to the situation prior to the Review
- Section Four summarises discussions on the Principles that guide the present arrangements, the roles of different organisations and opinions on the Performance Management Framework(s) (PMFs)
- Section Five summarises the District Workshops views on VCS infrastructure priorities
- Section Six summarises the outcomes of the Infrastructure provider Negotiation Meetings
- Section Seven discusses the Agreement made at the final Countywide Workshop
- Section Eight analyses the results obtained so far (as measured by the PMF(s)) and an assessment of the quality of the PMF(s) themselves.

ES 2. Against the background of on-going unresolved discussions about how best to deliver VCS infrastructure services in Leicestershire, this Review established a participative process to help stakeholders to engage in dialogue and to build trust and confidence.

ES 3. There are two distinct and contradictory narratives running through all the debates;

- One that centres on a Countywide Infrastructure Organisation (CIO) model of infrastructure service delivery, which sees Voluntary Action LeicesterShire (VAL) as the organisation responsible for delivering all infrastructure services and coordinating Community Hubs (CHs) and Local Resource Centres (LRCs) to that end
- The other that sees the model as a hub-and-spoke model, with independent CHs and LRCs operating in coordination with VAL but not under contractual obligation to do so.

ES 4. These two narratives reflect different positions held by Leicestershire County Council and Partner agencies. These differences, informed and promoted by the different interests of the various VCS organisations involved, have led to the present situation.

ES 5. The LCC VCS Infrastructure Contract, awarded to VAL, does not

clarify the situation. While it talks of the CIO model, it issues separate and distinct contracts to VAL and to CHs/LRCs for the provision of infrastructure services. These contracts do not enforce the CIO model of operations nor hold all parties jointly accountable for its provision.

ES 6. Overall the performance of infrastructure services in the County is good. However, the lack of a coordinated structure of service delivery leads to some duplication of effort and some inefficiencies. This is compounded by on-going debate about precisely which services fit within the Contract definition of infrastructure services (as against direct service delivery).

ES 7. The Principles outlined to guide working relations between infrastructure service providers are interpreted differently by those who align themselves to the different narrative positions outlined above. Thus they have become the context for debate rather than points of clarification.

ES 8. Although the implications of the Big Society present many challenges to the VCS, it also offers opportunities. These include taking on new service delivery roles and new infrastructure support roles. This will involve seeking new sources of funding and an increase in the self-funding activities of the sector.

ES 9. There is little clarity about the roles assigned to the different organisations involved in the delivery of infrastructure services. These again have become points for debate rather than points of clarification.

ES 10. There is no unified Performance Management Framework that reports in a coordinated way on all infrastructure service providers. The PMF(s) that exist are good and provide much useful data. However, they report separately on the activities of CHs/ LRCs and the activities of VAL (both their central and District activities).

ES 11. There is confusion (probably studied confusion) and much rhetoric about the relative merits of locally based organisations delivering local services and Countywide organisations delivering local services. Logically, this is a false dichotomy. The real debate is about the quality and efficiency of services delivered rather than the organisational arrangements behind those services. Centralised organisations can effectively deliver local services and local organisations can (in theory) work in partnership with one another to effectively deliver a regional service. In Leicestershire, given the history of relations between the various CHs and LRCs, the latter (i.e. local organisations working together to deliver regional services) is probably not possible.

ES 12. During District negotiation sessions with VAL, some progress was made. This progress points the way to the future. In addition, at the final workshop an important agreement was reached. All stakeholders committed themselves to;

- Develop one single contractual model for infrastructure service delivery; and

- Bring VAL and the CHs into one virtual delivery vehicle

Recommendations

“Change needs to be managed in a time scale, and transition needs to be fair, flexible and forgiving.” (1) Sheffield Hallam University. October 2005.

Recommendation One

On balance, evidence points to the need for more coordinated infrastructure service delivery across Leicestershire. This report recommends therefore that the Countywide Infrastructure Organisation model be adopted. This is in line with the commitment made by all stakeholders at their last workshop to develop one single contractual model and one virtual delivery vehicle. This will lead to more effective services and more efficiency as;

- Funds will only be used for delivery of services defined as “infrastructure” by the single contract (as opposed to being used for example for “core” funding in some Districts)
- Services will be delivered by the organisation best skilled and able to deliver
- The holder of the single Contract will be held responsible for all delivery.

Recommendation Two

It is recommended that LCC works with DCs (and other funders) to agree how this model will work. It is recommended that, on behalf of all funders, LCC signs one contract with VAL, for the total funds available for infrastructure services across the County.

Recommendation Three

It is recommended that LCC Funders and VAL be requested to establish a unified Performance Management Framework, covering all contracted infrastructure work undertaken by all organisations contracted or sub-contracted to provide that work.

Recommendation Four

It is recommended that in deciding how best to deliver infrastructure services, VAL should be guided by the principle of subsidiarity. This is defined as

“An organising principle that matters ought to be handled by the smallest, lowest or least centralized competent authority.” (Wikipedia)

In the case of VAL’s relations with CHs and LRCs this means that;

- Where CHs or LRCs show themselves to be competent and cost efficient to deliver some of the infrastructure services, delivery of those services should be sub-contracted to them. (This includes any infrastructure services, including volunteering support, capacity

building and support to VCS organisations and Co-ordination, Engagement and Representation.)

- Sub contracts will include the need to participate in the unified PMF.
- Where VAL staff delivering any infrastructure services can efficiently and effectively be located to work within CHs or LRCs, this should be done. While such staff would remain under VAL's management, management arrangements with local host organisations would be needed. Some form of Matrix management arrangement may be needed.

Taken together, these recommendations will leave VAL with the overall responsibility for the delivery of all infrastructure services under this Contract, but with the responsibility for making delivery arrangements (including sub-contracting) that place service provision as near to service users as possible.

Recommendation Five

It is recommended that 2011 be seen as a transition year, and that organisations that are required to change their modes of operation (which included CHs, LRCs and VAL) have the time and funds needed to achieve those changes.

Recommendation Six

It is recommended that the District negotiation process that has started under the Review be completed, and that by the end of January 2011, and within the context of the Agreement made at the Second County Review Workshop, arrangements for the delivery of the unified service be agreed.

Recommendation Seven

It is recommended that the quarterly review of performance by all Funders should continue and that they should review the output of the unified PMF, covering the main contract and all sub-contracts under the unified contract.

Recommendation Eight

It is recommended that a Peer Review Body be established, with an independent Chair the function of which is to adjudicate in situations of disagreement between VAL and any of the CHs or LRCs. That Peer Review body would

- Be made up of agreed representatives from all stakeholders
- Would make decisions that are binding on all parties

Recommendation Nine

If these recommendations are implemented, it is recommended that the provision in the current Contract for a two year extension should be exercised. This will give sufficient time for the system to embed itself and illustrate its strengths and weaknesses before Infrastructure Services are re-tendered.

REPORT

1.0. The Review Purpose

1.1. The Terms of Reference for the VCS Infrastructure Review **(2)** are reproduced in Appendix One. They require a review of the effectiveness of the present arrangements (based on Performance Management Framework (PMF) results.) Specifically, they seek a review of;

- the working principles that govern the arrangements,
- the respective roles of Voluntary Action LeicesterShire (VAL), the Community Hubs (CHs) and Local Resource Centres (LRCs) and the degree to which these roles are understood;
- the Performance Management Framework(s)
- the changes that might be needed in order to adjust both to a reduced budget and to the policy changes implicit in the Big Society.

The budgeting reality for 2011/12 meant that finding ways of accommodating falling budgets and changing policies became a higher priority as the Review got underway.

1.2. The agreement between Leicestershire County Council and Voluntary Action LeicesterShire (VAL) for the Provision of a Countywide Infrastructure Organisation (CIO) for the Voluntary and Community Sector in Leicestershire is the core document regulating the delivery of infrastructure services across the County. **(3)** Appendix A to that agreement, “Outcomes to be achieved by Countywide Infrastructure Organisation” is reproduced at Appendix Two.

2.0. Background

2.1. Despite many positive results (as indicated by local and regional performance management frameworks- see Section 8 below) the history of Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) infrastructure arrangements in Leicestershire is one of unresolved issues and on-going debate. In recent years much time and effort has been expended on the reorganisation of the infrastructure delivery arrangements.

2.2. The present arrangements are the result of competing political and organisational priorities and as such represent a compromise.

2.3. The arguments for and against a Countywide Infrastructure Organisation (including or excluding the City of Leicester) as against a “hub and spoke” type arrangements are summarised by LCC in the Cabinet Paper of November 2007 **(4)**. This opts for a CIO approach (option C in the VCS Infrastructure Working Groups Report) while noting that this was not the preferred option of some District Councils and Community Hubs. As the

main funder for VCS infrastructure services, LCC sought to use its influence to promote the CIO approach based on its view of the efficiency and effectiveness of this model.

2.4. LCC subsequently tendered the Contract **(3)** which was won by VAL. The competitive tendering process, with competing bids from within the Leicestershire VCS infrastructure community, illustrated the differences that existed (and continue to exist) between those supporting a CIO approach and those supporting a Hub and Spoke approach.

2.5. For 2010/2011, the pooled funding for VCS Infrastructure support totalled £1,462,398, being the original £920k LCC grant, £122k other LCC funding, and the rest from the Police (£20k,) the PCT (£210k,) Connexions (£10k) and District Councils (£189K.) This funding was distributed;

- £979K to VAL (under the Contract already mentioned **(3)**),
- £68k to each of 7 CHs under different contracts (totalling £476K)
- £10k to each of three LRCs under different contracts (totalling £30K.)

2.6. Thus the concept of one CIO was not implemented in these arrangements. Rather a compromise emerged which on the positive side reassured the CHs and emphasised their infrastructure role, but on the negative side has led to lack of coordination in allocating resources to the delivery of infrastructure services as defined in the Contract **(3)**. This lack of coordination has inevitably led to some duplication and loss of efficiency in meeting the Contract.

2.7. This compromise leads to several fault-lines which continued to feed unresolved debates and challenges;

- while there may be agreement on the headline definition of “VCS infrastructure services” there is continued debate about which programmes of work of the different organisations involved fall within that definition. This leaves some organisations feeling undervalued.
- LCC would argue that the present arrangements lead to duplication and inefficiency in the delivery of the services. Many at District level would contest this position.
- It leaves the respective roles of VAL, CHs and LRCs unresolved and an area for constant debate and disagreement
- It leaves the working principles open to different interpretations and constant discussion.
- It has led to confusion in discussion between “locally delivered services” and “locally based organisations” delivering services.
- It means that when funding cuts are needed there is no agreed basis on which to proceed.

2.8. Some of these recurring areas of disagreement have been illustrated previously. In her review of Stronger Communities funded projects an external Local Improvement Adviser reported
“ Relationships could be improved if there was a clear articulation of the respective responsibilities and accountabilities of the Stronger Communities

Partnership Board, the Co-ordinating team at VAL, the host organisations e.g. the VAs and ultimately with the county LSP and Partnership Support Team.”(5)

2.9. The Effective Partnership Project Peer Review in July 2010 reported; *“A lack of trust, openness and constructive challenge between partners, largely attributed to a perceived conflict of interest between the delivery role of partners, and the commissioning function of the board has prevented the Board from moving forward and given rise to a widely held view that the Chair of the Board should be independent.*

Finally, the individuals and organisations within the partnership need to have a clearer understanding of their respective roles, responsibilities and accountabilities. There is a lack of clarity concerning the relationship between VAL and the Board. Our view is that VAL’s role should be to support the work of the Board and that the Board should be accountable to Leicestershire Together.” (6)

2.10. The current estimate of funds available for 2011/12 for direct infrastructure support is £1,254,878, a 14% decrease on the current year. However, the final figure may well be less than this estimate.

2.11. The situation at the beginning of this VCS Infrastructure Review could be summarised as follows;

- There were a series of easy and uneasy alliances between VAL and the Districts. In some places these were working well but in many places they worked poorly.
- The debate between a CIO and a hub and spoke arrangement had not been resolved. It occurs in many other Counties across the Country. It has its roots in different philosophical, political and technical opinions about the development of social capital, effective community development and different ways to measure the impact of social programmes.
- Differences in opinion existed both within and between District Councils and the County Council and between VAL and District CHs and LRCs.
- There was no clear unified infrastructure delivery mechanism
- There was no unified PMF to which all parties were contributing
- It is inevitable that some of the £1.4m funding was not being efficiently dedicated to generating infrastructure outputs as defined by the Contract.
- Major funding challenges for 2011 were putting pressure on an already insecure delivery mechanism.
- There was funding and role competition between different organisations involved in delivering infrastructure services.
- Some organisations and some individuals felt their work was undervalued and that the value of local organisations was not fully

recognised.

- Some personal animosity existed between those trying to deliver infrastructure services and between some senior players involved in the different organisations
- The Contract had one more full year to run. Issues needed to be resolved if they are not to be repeated.
- Finally, there were those arguing for a District organisational presence (undertaking a range of activities including direct service delivery and infrastructure work) as against those who needed to show effective and evidenced infrastructure outputs which might have been more effectively achieved within other organisational arrangements.

3.0. The Workshop Review Process

3.1. Against this background, the Review Steering Group agreed an approach to the Review that would do more than confront the technical issues laid out in the Terms of Reference. The aim was to put in place a process that would

- Build dialogue between all parties
- Be based on the real (and different) needs in the different Districts of the County
- Recognise the different strengths and opportunities in each District and that a “one size fits all” approach may not be useful
- Recognise that those most involved in the delivery systems were most likely to have the skills and experience to find ways forward.
- Slowly to confront the lack of trust and confidence that had grown up over the years, to strengthen existing relationships and to build new relationships.

3.2 The Project Plan for the Review of Locality Based VCS Infrastructure Services in Leicestershire **(7)** had three stages;

- An initial County wide workshop, that brought together all the key individuals and organisations involved in infrastructure work.
- Five workshops bringing Voluntary Sector agencies together to consider the Review themes and input to solutions.
- A final County wide workshop to discuss proposals and agree a way forward.

In addition it included a review of performance based on the data in the Performance Management Frameworks and the building of an agreed Database of past publications to inform the work.

3.3. At the first County Workshop **(8)** (reproduced at Appendix Three) 36 participants from CHs, LRCs, DCs, other funders, VAL and LCC discussed

- the key elements of the new political and economic reality and how they will impact on VCS infrastructure in Leicestershire into the future

- A review of the principles that were agreed for the operation of the Community Hubs:
- The roles of the respective organisations and the differentiation of those roles; and
- The performance management framework(s) and understanding of the performance to date.

3.4 That Workshop agreed that participants would *“work together to understand the infrastructure priorities in each district, to agree how those priorities would be best met and to agree how we might work together to best deliver services to meet those priorities. This work would be carried out;*

- *In a process that brings together CHs, LRCs, VAL, other VCS organisations and County and District Councils,*
- *In a process that is based on mutual trust and understanding*
- *Making full use of our collective skills, our professionalism, our competencies, our experience, our learning from existing service delivery models and our understanding of local priorities.*
- *In the light of Big Society and other policy changes;*
- *In the light of the budget reality as we know it*
- *Within the context of the existing infrastructure service contract(s)*
- *Within the context of our understanding of the three part definition of “infrastructure,” that is*
 - *Co-ordination, Engagement and Representation*
 - *Capacity Building and Support to VCS*
 - *Volunteering*

We understand that in undertaking this work to identify local priorities and build our collective response to the present situation, we will need to confront differences between ourselves. We agreed to confront those differences and seek to build a consensus way forward for each District.

We agreed that this work would be undertaken both using the already planned District Workshops and in seven subsequent District level discussions that would include the CEO and other VAL staff, the CEOs of CHs and LRCs, District Council representatives (as appropriate) and other relevant VCS organisations.” (8)

3.5 Thus the work was framed as a participative exercise based firmly on the needs that infrastructure services were aiming to meet in each District. Also, a fourth stage was added to the process, being a set of District level discussions and negotiations looking at how best VAL and the District CHs and LRCs might work together.

4.0. Further outputs from the first workshop - Review of Service Principles and Roles

4.1. The First Workshop looked in detail at the following issues;

- The agreed principles (Appendix A of the Terms of Reference for the Review, reproduced here at Appendix One) for Community Hubs to check whether they are being applied, and are still valid and affordable in the light of the new financial climate and experience of the new structure in practice.
- To ensure that there is a clear and agreed differentiation and understanding between the roles of VAL and the CHs and LRCs by those bodies and how they work effectively together;
- To assess the extent to which those roles are understood by key funders and stakeholders;

4.2. Review of the Principles

During the first Workshop, participants discussed the question “are the principles working?” (9) Comments were collected and analysed. Of 19 comments recorded,

- Two were positive
- Three were neutral
- 13 were negative or mentioned shortcomings in the principles.

The positive comments suggested that the principles were correct but the column indicating how the principles were secured was not necessarily linked to the principle. The neutral comments suggested that not all principles were yet working, that some of the principles are more important than others and that there needs to be more options so that locality work can be targeted to local priorities. Most of the comments were either negative or highlighted shortcomings in the principles. They ranged from “principles are too general and do not adequately tackle specific local issues,” “terminology has confused readers/community,” “need to be recast in light of changes,” “drawn up in times of plenty, how to achieve in current times?” to “principles suggest continuation of previous with no change.” The full comments are attached at Appendix Four.

4.3. The Principles themselves represent a positive attempt to guide and encourage the relationship building process between the CHs and VAL. However, the situation that exists is a compromise between two positions which do not appear to be evolving towards each other. On the one hand the narrative is of one Countywide Infrastructure Organisation. On the other the narrative includes having a range of “*existing, District based, Voluntary Actions continuing as independent and locally accountable Community Hubs*” (9)

4.4. The Principles were drawn up at a time when the reality of the situation required a compromise approach. It was reasonable to hope that the different organisations, working together in a positive way, might have enabled the situation to evolve and that the Principles would have supported

that process. If that had been the case, we would have expected to see a range of positive comments about the Principles. However, that is not the case and overall the Principles are not viewed in a positive light. This indicates that the contradictions in the present arrangements, while being overcome in some localities, are in general still present.

4.5. Review of the actual roles and the understanding of the roles (by key stakeholders and funders) of VAL, CHs and LRCs

Participants were asked “are the respective roles clear and understood.” (9) The 20 comments highlight two sets of issues;

- Some comments illustrate an understanding of the respective roles but they either do not agree with them or they have different “clear” understandings of what the roles mean,
- Most comments (15 of the total) indicate that the roles are not clear.

Comments on the CH role include; “the hub role was not well thought through as done at the last minute,” “are CHs about infrastructure support or more community development,” and that they “are operating differently across the CHs.” Comments of the role of VAL include “The Hub (VAL) is not serving all the spokes (the CHs) in the sector.” Other comments include “the sector customer is confused as to who does what and” “not clear-overlap, duplication, competition and confused customers.” One comment suggested that “definition was evolving based on need” and another asked “would a single contract to the CIO with sub contracts work better?”

4.6. Overall it must be said that there is disagreement about the respective roles of VAL and the CHs. This disagreement is manifest either in “confusion” about roles or suggestions for changes in those roles. There are different ideas about the ways those roles should evolve over time.

4.7. Is the Performance Management Framework Working?

Finally participants were asked if they felt that the Performance Management Framework (PMF) was working. Their discussion was about the efficacy of the PMF not the results that it was indicating about the performance of infrastructure services. (Section eight of this report contains an analysis of the performance of infrastructure services as reported by the PMF.) From the 20 comments recorded from the discussions, it is difficult to identify any positive comments about the PMF. It is criticised for

- Both undervaluing District work and failing to give a clear picture of what is being done locally,
- Failing to provide measures that evidence impact
- Not being integrated across VAL and the CHs
- Being of unclear quality and with no scrutiny of its findings

4.8. As Section Eight illustrates, at present there is no integrated PMF system for infrastructure services across the County. This indicates again the contradiction between the two competing narratives that are running; the CIO narrative and the Hub and Spokes narrative. From a technical point of view there is much debate about how best to measure the generation of social capital. These include

- The debate between the respective value of qualitative and

quantitative data

- The debate between summative and formative evaluation systems
- The difficulty of linking impact to specific inputs in a system that has multiple and overlapping inputs.

As will be indicated in the Section Eight, the Performance Management Frameworks that are currently being used are developing well. (Suggestions are made for their continued development.) However, it is clear that the perceptions of stakeholders of those PMFs are overall quite negative. This negativity is another illustration of the internal contradictions that continue within the infrastructure delivery system.

5.0. District Workshops and VCS Priorities.

5.1. Between the 8th and 15th of November, five District Workshops were held at Charnwood, Melton, Harborough, NW Leicestershire and a joint workshop for Blaby, Hinckley and Bosworth and Oadby and Wigston. These Workshops were held against the background of the substantial changes being designed and implemented by the new Coalition Government. These include;

- Major reductions in budgets
- Developing support for volunteering
- Building the capacity of the VCS
- Commissioning additional services from the VCS
- Increasing community engagement under the Big Society policy

In relation to all these changes, both County and District Authorities needed to reassess their relationships with the VCS in the light of the needs being expressed by communities.

5.2. Against this background, workshops

Were informed of the purpose of the VCS infrastructure Review

- Were updated on the output from the County Workshop
- Gave an opportunity for the needs of each District to be discussed

Participants were asked;

- What they considered to be working well in relation to infrastructure support
- What were the priorities for support
- What opportunities there were for doing things better or differently into the future

5.3. In each area, the workshops were facilitated by colleagues from a different area. This both provided unbiased facilitation and enabled colleagues to get to know more about the work in other areas.

5.4. There were a total of 149 attendees at these workshops.

5.5 The District Workshops were informed by the presentations and discussions from the County Workshop. The District Workshops fed into the subsequent discussions and District level negotiation meetings, at which

VAL, CHs, LRCs, DCs (and others as appropriate) discussed how to meet the priorities indicated for the District in the face of budget constraints.

5.6 District discussions were wide ranging but some priorities were common across several Districts;

- Many felt that more support for the recruitment of volunteers would be needed
- That services would need to adjust to the changing types of volunteers being recruited
- That generating more volunteer placements was a priority
- That more effective support was needed for new groups
- That support with commissioning and income generation was a high priority
- Three Districts prioritised the need for supporting local voice in influencing policy discussions
- Some felt the need for improved information and communication flows
- Several felt the need to protect local services delivery and the role of communities in that service delivery.

6.0. Infrastructure Negotiations.

6.1. Prior to the District Negotiation Meeting, Funders met and issued a set of notes to provide guidance to those negotiations. **(10)** These are reproduced at Appendix Seven. This guidance included;

- The need to be proactive, reaching hard to reach communities, early intervention and to initiate and lead
- The need to be mindful of the Big Society Policy and its implications
- The need to consider priorities as defined in District Workshops
- The need to consider new and existing funding opportunities
- The need to work in a coordinated way as one team. The need to concentrate on the three infrastructure priorities specified in the Contract, (co-ordination, engagement and representation, capacity building and support to VCS volunteering.)
- The need for CHs and LRCs to transform themselves to take advantage of other funding and Big Society opportunities. These include for example: the National Citizens Service, Neighbourhood Grant Programme, the Big Society Bank, the Transition Fund. In the longer term they include more joint working, on-line service provision and better service targeting for priority communities.

6.2. Seven District Negotiation Meeting then took place. In the light of the discussions at both the Countywide and District Workshops, VAL and the CHs, LRCs and DCs met to negotiate a possible way forward for each District. At each workshop, the CHs, LRCs, DCs and VAL outlined their position. A report of those discussions, as recorded by VAL **(11)** is attached at Appendix Five. This document was later discussed by all the CHs and LRCs at the final County Workshop. While all agreed that the positions were

correctly expressed, this report does not necessarily present them as they would be presented by the CHs.

6.3. This report shows that;

- In one case, **Hinckley and Bosworth**, a partial agreement was reached (subject to agreement of the District Council). The CH sees it future as a service deliverer and a regeneration social enterprise. VAL will deliver infrastructure services in the Borough. Thus the funding currently received by the CH will cease from April 2012 and full time VAL District based staff will provide all infrastructure services. In 2011, transitional funding will be available to the CH.
- In two cases, **Harborough** and **Melton**, a partial agreement was reached and further discussions are taking place. In Harborough, the CH did suggest that if the payment to the CH at the existing rate of £68k was made for three years in line with the possible extension of VAL contract, it would be followed by a new model of infrastructure delivery that would be tendered. In Melton, the ambition is for the CH to operate as a social enterprise specialising in community development and delivery of direct services working alongside VAL staff. Further discussion is needed around the transition period and the distribution of any cuts.
- In four cases, **Blaby, Charnwood, NW Leicestershire** and **Oadby and Wigston**, agreements were not reached. CHs felt either that all funding cuts should be taken by VAL or that there should be an equal sharing of the 14% funding cut. VAL feels that *“local groups would be best served by investing all of the infrastructure funding into a single CIO contract that delivers through locally based staff supported by central teams.” (11)*

6.4. Subsequently, the CEO at Voluntary Action Charnwood circulated a paper **(12)** outlining a new funding arrangement that

- reflects the hub and spoke model, prioritising local based provision and leaving funding to VAL much reduced.
- Changes the District Funding Formula to ensure that the distribution of funding for infrastructure services should reflect District populations.

The paper illustrates how this approach is in line with the Principles and how those Principles are secured in 2011/12.

6.5. In the course of the District negotiations, different District Councils proposed;

- The need for a joined up VCS service
- The need for local delivery, identity and accountability
- The need for a single PMF with joint responsibility for achieving outcomes
- The need for a lean central CIO
- An increase in funding to local CHs
- The need for high quality and value for money services however they might be delivered

- The need to win political approval for whatever is decided and the difficulty of achieving that if all cuts are sustained by the CHs.
- The need for all parties to work together positively.

7.0. Agreement reached at the Final County Workshop on 8th December

7.1. Following the District negotiation sessions, stakeholders came together again to;

- Consider the priorities as identified in the District Workshops
- Consider the outcomes of the District negotiations to date
- Consider a proposal for a Peer Review process for those Districts that had not reached agreement.

7.2. District negotiations had led to some progress;

- The agreement in Hinckley and Bosworth
- The need for transition funding to give organisations losing money time to adjust to the new reality
- The part agreements in Harborough and Melton, which give an in-principle way forward but which need to agree on transition funding and time-scales.

7.3. However, in the other Districts, the recurring and unresolved debates of the relative merits of one CIO versus those of the hub-and-spoke model were played out once again.

7.4. However, having considered the situation, the Workshop did reach an important agreement. **(13)** It is reproduced at Appendix Six. This agreement commits stakeholders to;

- Develop one single contractual model
- Bring VAL and the CHs into one virtual delivery vehicle

This would be done in order to achieve value for money savings and efficiency and this model would be the basis on which future infrastructure contracts would be based. Negotiations to this end would be completed by the end of January 2011, in time to inform the distribution of the funding available under the Infrastructure Contract for 2011/2012.

8.0. The effectiveness of the new structure based on the performance information currently available and an evaluation of the Performance management Framework.

8.1. This part of the Review looks in more detail at

- The Community Hub Temperature Check for quarter two 2010/2011 **(14)**
- The VAL Performance Temperature check from Oct-Dec 2009 to July-Sept 2010. **(15)**

Much effort is dedicated to managing the performance of infrastructure services across the County. Overall the system of performance management generates a great deal of narrative information and some degree of quantitative data against a set of indicators and targets which are evolving and becoming more coordinated over time.

8.2. Performance to date.

The performance, as described by these frameworks, is to be commended.

- Of the 30 indicators in the VAL Performance Temperature check, Table One (all tables are in Appendix Seven) shows that 29 are consistently good or improving. Only one (number 28, percentage of volunteer groups that are confident or very confident in their ability to recruit and manage volunteers) has moved in a negative direction (and that is probably because the results of the VAL annual survey are awaited.)
- Table two shows performance against 20 indicators is well evidenced and is good. Performance against another 9 indicators is presented in narrative form and it is therefore difficult to assess. Performance against one indicator (number 15, amount of funding that diverse groups have been supported to raise) appears to be short of target.
- Table three shows the RAG ratings for the Temperature check from CHs and LRCs for the second quarter of the current year. LRCs reported against two variables each and CHs against five variables each. Therefore of a total of 41 variables across all localities, 26 (or 63%) were reported as green, two (or 5%) was reported as amber and 13 (or 32%) was not reported upon.
- For most of those not reported, either targets had not been set or they were marked not applicable. Not reported does not imply poor performance. Indeed although not RAG rated, data illustrates good performance.
- In all the CHs and LRCS reports and the VAL report, narrative illustrates high levels of activity and (while this assessment is subjective) good levels of performance.

8.3. Overall therefore, this brief review of performance, based on the evidence from the existing PMFs, shows that performance remains good. However, from talking to many stakeholders, the following opinions were expressed;

- Despite the evidence from the PMF, many people are not convinced that performance is improving
- Some are not convinced that the new structures are a factor in improving performance
- People remain concerned that it is difficult to compare performance across Districts. Many feel that different Districts perform differently.

8.4. Review of Current Performance and the Performance Management Framework

A great deal of effort is being put into the PMF. Measuring performance is a priority and overall the quality of the Leicestershire PMF is good.

- There is a process underway to more closely align the Community Hub Quarterly Temperature Checks and the equivalent VAL Temperature check.
- The CH Temperature Checks format is evolving and a new format is being used for the first time in the current quarter. All CHs and LRCs have used the new format. Over time this will give a basis for making performance comparisons across localities.
- The VAL Performance Temperature check is evolving with some changes made for 2010-2011. There were 8 changes to the 30 indicators. Of these, three changes (16, 18 and 21) moved away from measurable targets to being more process focused. Another three (1, 4 and 14) were simplifications in wording. The final two (12 and 29) updated or made targets sharper. This shows that the PMF is evolving and is a living process.
- VAL produces seven locality reports which provide more data by localities.
- Table Two shows that of the 30 indicators in the VAL PMF, 18 have a quantitative target, in three the target is to achieve a one-off event, four have narrative type targets and five have no targets. It is difficult to set quantitative targets for infrastructure type work. Having 18 in place is an achievement.
- Table three shows that all LRCs and CHs are using the same indicators for their five quantitative targets. In addition there are narrative sections that add detail to these and other targets.
- There is a quarterly process coordinated by LCC, to consider performance in localities and across the County.
- Districts report performance using the material generated by the above processes.

8.5. Challenges.

In reading the respective VAL and CH quarterly reports, it is difficult to obtain an integrated view of performance across the County or in specific localities. While the formats are converging, the reports clearly come from different perspectives. While both provide very useful information there would appear to be some duplication of effort and some lack of clarity of the targets for each locality. The following issues are not clear;

- It is not clear where the interface lies between successes recorded

locally and successes recorded at a County level.

- It is not clear how some of the indicators used in the different reports interface with each other; e.g. the concept of “number of volunteers referred to VAL for support” and “volunteers recruited for direct support” in the reports from the Hubs and the Volunteer Support section of the VAL report.
- It is not clear where the credit (or distribution of credit) for different successes should lie. Indeed it is often difficult to distinguish the outcomes of the work of VAL from the outcomes of the work of the CHs in each locality. In many ways there is an integrated strategy being managed and reported upon in different ways.
- It is not clear how to compare the performances of different localities. Looking across all the locality reports (from both VAL, the CHs and LRCs) it is not easy to compare performance between localities. In addition, it is not easy to compare the outcomes of the work VAL undertakes in the different localities.

8.6. There is a great deal of PMF reporting. An integration of the PMF system and some more focusing of the number of indicators could make PMF data easier to understand, cheaper to produce and more effective in measuring value for money.

9.0. Conclusion

The Voluntary and Community Sector and its relationship with the Statutory Sector, face many changes in the coming years. The Big Society policy presents both opportunities and challenges in achieving its goals of;

- Devolving power to communities
- Increasing the role of the VCS as a deliverer of public services
- Supporting a thriving and growing voluntary and community sector

Having in place effective, efficient and well coordinated infrastructure support is vital if the sector is to meet these challenges.

9.1. New opportunities will also become available which will require the infrastructure support system to operate and present itself as both local and regional, combining the benefits of both in one coordinated system. This will

- Ensure good coordination between local and regional work
- Enable information to be made available quickly and effectively
- Ensure that the authentic VCS voice is heard at decision making points
- Ensuring fund raising success for the sector
- Contribute to the delivery of effective and efficient public services
- Ensure that training, one to one support and organisational development is provided extensively and intensively

- Support the development of volunteering both quantitatively and qualitatively
- Support the development of social enterprises and other new types of organisational structures (networks, consortia, community interest companies etc)

A vibrant and thriving VCS is a major factor in supporting the statutory sector to reorganise the delivery of public services and to restructure itself to meet the challenges of the years ahead.

Footnotes

(1) *“Looking Ahead.....Visions of Voluntary Sector Infrastructure In Leicester Shire.”* **Sheffield Hallam University.** October 2005.

(2) *“Terms of Reference for the VCS Infrastructure Review.”* **Leicestershire County Council.** Issued with Contract Letter, September 2010.

(3) *“Agreement between Leicestershire County Council and Voluntary Action Leicester for the Provision of a Countywide Infrastructure Organisation for the Voluntary and Community Sector in Leicestershire.”* **Leicestershire County Council.** 2009/10 to 2011/12.

(4) *“Review of Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure.”* LCC Cabinet; Report of the Chief Executive. 23 November 2007

(5) *“Evaluation of Leicestershire Together’s Stronger Communities funded Projects.”* **Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership.** Helen Dawson. June 2010.

(6) *“Effective Partnership Project Peer Review.”* **Stronger Communities Board.** July 2010.

(7) *“Review of Locality Based VCS Infrastructure Services in Leicestershire Project Plan. Final”.* **VCS Infrastructure Steering Group.** Martin Honeywell. September 2010

(8) *“First County Workshop. A note for participants. (Final Version.)”* Martin Honeywell. 26th October 2010.

(9) *“Notes from Workshop One on Principles, Roles and Performance Management Framework.”* VCS Review. 26th October 2010.

(10) *“Guidance for those involved in District Negotiation Meetings.”* VCS Review. 16 November 2010.

(11) *“Progress Report on Locality Negotiations 6th December 2010.”* Voluntary Action LeicesterShire. December 2010.

(12) *“A New Funding Arrangement 2011-2012; A Brief Outline.”* Neil Lambert; Voluntary Action Charnwood. 5th December 2010.

(13) *“An Agreement; Reached at the VCS Infrastructure Review Workshop 8th December 2010.”* VCS Review. 8th December 2010.

(14) *“Temperature Check for Quarter Two 2010/2011 for Three LRCs and 7CHs.”* Authors Various. Available from both the CHs and from LCC.

(15) *“VAL Performance Temperature Check from Oct-Dec 2009 to July-Sept 2010.”* VAL. Dates various.

Appendices

Appendix One

Terms of Reference for the VCS Infrastructure Review

Assignment Title: Review of Locality based VCS Infrastructure Service in Leicestershire

Main Theme: Leadership and partnership development

Assignment Outcomes: ...To provide independent external advice on the effectiveness of the current locality based VCS infrastructure based on performance information currently available, and in discussions with partners within the localities receiving services propose recommendations for improvement that would help support locality working.

Summary

- To revisit the agreed principles (Appendix A) for Community Hubs(CHs) to check whether they are being applied, and are still valid and affordable in the light of the new financial climate and experience of the new structure in practice. The principles are as provided by the appendix to this briefing.
- To ensure that there is a clear and agreed differentiation and understanding between the roles of Voluntary Action LeicesterShire (VAL) and the CHs/ Local Resource Centres (LRCs) by those bodies and how they work effectively together;
- To assess the extent to which those roles are understood by key funders and stakeholders;
- To review the Performance Management Framework, governance and approach for CHs/LRCs and VAL to ensure that it is fit for purpose and can demonstrate that the extent to which outcomes required by funders are being achieved and enable VAL/CH/LRCs to demonstrate value for money;
- To provide independent external advice on the effectiveness of the new structure based on the performance information currently available, and discussions with partners within the localities receiving services, in order to identify any recommendations for improvement;
- In the light of potential public sector funding reductions to provide a clear rationale, principles (in accordance with the first bullet point in Appendix A) and approach to managing any reductions in order to protect priority voluntary sector infrastructure services to the sector and communities.
- To consider CH/LRC structure in relation to the review of locality working being undertaken across the county and whether the current structure lends itself to supporting locality working and what changes to the structure would help support locality working.

- To do the above in the context of the Government’s Big Society concept and the most effective ways that the public sector can support the VCS to help communities help themselves.

Management Arrangements: Andy Brown, Team Leader Performance & Improvement; Anjana Bhatt, Performance & Improvement Manager reporting to VCS sub-regional group

Experience Required: To have an understanding of delivery of VSC infrastructure services

Number of days of assignment: 10 to 15 days

APPENDIX A

Principle	Principle secured by...
Local accountability and independence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The CIO will have a membership covering all of the County and City, and be governed by Trustees elected by that membership 2. The existing, District based, Voluntary Actions are continuing as independent and locally accountable Community Hubs 3. The CIO will provide monitoring and performance information <i>on it’s broader activities</i> directly to District Councils on a quarterly basis – demonstrating the support and outcomes delivered in each District
Local service delivery which reflects and responds to local needs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Community Hubs will be providing <i>services to the public</i> on a local level – responding to local needs. 2. There will be access to the CIO services in every District via the Community Hub – staffed by CIO staff. 3. <i>Informed by Community Hubs</i> CIO staff will ‘outreach’ direct to groups, volunteers and networks in each District – providing <i>targeted</i> services at the grassroots where required. 4. <i>In collaboration with Community Hubs</i>, CIO District Development Officers will develop and maintain a picture of the local needs in each District. 5. CIO Districts Manager <i>informed by Community Hubs</i> will be tasked with strategically developing district services based on VCS needs and stakeholder requirements.
The ability to influence wider strategy beyond a District focus	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The CIO will, alongside the Community Hub, support a local VCS forum to collectively identify needs and respond as a District to wider issues. 2. The CIO Districts manager will be responsible for sharing best practice across Districts, and ensuring the Districts VCS voices are heard at the County level. 3. The CIO policy team will ensure local voices are heard at county, sub-regional, regional and national levels 4. The CIO countywide database will enable effective targeting of local groups for involvement in wider strategy and policy.

Principle	Principle secured by...
Commitment to sustainable funding by all funders for the Community Hubs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The County Council has reserved a level of funding for the Community Hubs as part of the tender process. 2. The Leader of the County Council has extended this funding to <i>an additional £70,000 core funding</i> p.a. for the Voluntary Actions with <i>£10,000 core funding</i> p.a. for the independent Volunteer Centres <i>on an ongoing basis</i> 3. VAL as the CIO is committed to supporting the Community Hubs in securing sustainable funding and developing excellence. 4. It is hoped that the current discussions will result in ongoing funding support from each District

Appendix Two

Appendix A – Outcomes to be achieved by Countywide Infrastructure Organisation

Co-ordination, Engagement and Representation. *Taken From “Agreement between Leicestershire County Council and Voluntary Action Leicester for the Provision of a Countywide Infrastructure Organisation for the Voluntary and Community Sector in Leicestershire.” Leicestershire County Council. 2009/10 to 2011/12.*

The voices of the diverse frontline voluntary and community groups will be heard by all appropriate strategic bodies and partnerships through identified representatives.

There will be a range of communication strategies for Leicestershire Together partners to engage effectively with the VCS to enable them to influence future strategies, policies and practices at county, district or sub-regionally as required by the funding partners.

Outcome 1: There are effective (two way) communication channels that enable a dialogue between the VCS and LTp (Medium).

Outcome 2: The CIO enables diverse voluntary and community groups across Leicestershire to be involved in consultation on planning and developing policy as required by funding partners and partnerships (Medium).

Outcome 3: A fair, agreed and transparent system of supported, trained and effective VCS representation is established and co-ordinated in order to communicate the diverse ‘voices’ of VCS in multi-agency partnerships and provide an agreed (by VCS) representational mandate for the CIO (High).

Outcome 4: VCS representatives are facilitated and supported through training and development to effectively participate in a range of partnerships including Leicestershire Together, LAA theme partnerships and cross cutting partnerships (High).

Outcome 5: An integrated database of frontline VCS groups by type of interest and service provided in the sub-region is established and maintained from which information will be available on request (Medium).

Outcome 6: The value and work of the VCS and its potential positive impact on sustainable service delivery is effectively promoted with key stakeholders (Medium).

Outcome 7: Provide support for groups to develop and promote stronger communities and good relations across and between communities, particularly in relation to new communities (Low).

Outcome 8: The Leicestershire Compact and associated local compacts and their codes of good practice are implemented (Medium).

Outcome 9: There is flexibility in meeting the changing requirements from funding partners and emerging needs of the voluntary and community sector (Low).

Capacity Building and Support to VCS

The diverse frontline voluntary and community organisations are supported to work more effectively and efficiently by developing their capacity, quality and reach to deliver public services in partnership with Community Hubs and local communities.

A range of high quality and accessible support mechanisms will be available for the diverse frontline groups in Leicestershire. These will be focused on improving sustainability, raising quality, and becoming outcome focussed.

Outcome 10: Gaps in existing VCS service coverage in terms of areas of interest, community needs and locality are identified through work with local community hubs and communities.

New services are developed to meet identified needs in partnership with local partners and Leicestershire Together (High).

Outcome 11: A wide range of support services including training are provided to new and existing groups to allow the voluntary and community sector to work more efficiently and effectively (High).

(NOTE: Support services are such as: Human Resource advice; ICT support; governance advice; funding advice including income generation; business planning; commissioning and procurement including developing outcome focused approaches; leadership and management development; equality and diversity; changes in legislation, policy and practice; communications and marketing)

Outcome 12: Voluntary and Community organisations receive support to help them to strengthen their internal policies and procedures (Medium).

Outcome 13: Support, professional advice and good practice guidance is provided on a range of specialist services to the diverse frontline VCS as required by funding partners (High).

Outcome 14: Diverse frontline VCS groups have access to consistent, quality and integrated services at times and in ways that suit them (Low).

Outcome 15: VCS groups that are delivering public services are supported to implement performance management systems, including the single performance system for the county where required (Medium).

Outcome 16: VCS groups are informed about changes in legislation and policy that affect them, their volunteers and their service users (Medium).

Outcome 17: VCS groups are supported to deliver their services effectively and efficiently to provide maximum impact (Medium).

Outcome 18: Where appropriate and cost effective, CIO services are delivered locally in partnership with community hubs and community groups (High)

Volunteering

The six core functions of a volunteer centre as defined by Volunteering England are delivered to the standard required to achieve Volunteering England quality accreditation. Accessible support for volunteers and volunteering is developed that meets local needs and increases the number of people volunteering across the private, public and voluntary sectors

Outcome 19: People wanting to find out about volunteering and volunteer opportunities are able to access information and support in a variety of ways, including local face-to-face support and the use of new technologies

Detailed information about a diverse range of local volunteer opportunities is held, kept up to date and made widely available (High).

Outcome 20: Potential volunteers across all sectors including specialist sectors are provided with support, advice, guidance and learning to match their motivations to volunteer with appropriate volunteering opportunities (Medium).

Outcome 21: Interest in volunteering is stimulated through promoting positive messages to all sectors of the community about the diverse nature and benefits of volunteering (Medium).

Outcome 22: Good practice in volunteer management is actively promoted to all organisations that involve volunteers through the provision of information, advice and support appropriate to the relevant work (High).

Outcome 23: The development of new volunteering opportunities will be stimulated and supported in response to community needs and the motivations and needs of volunteers themselves (Medium).

Outcome 24: Maintain awareness of local, regional and national government proposals and policies which may impact on volunteers. To provide appropriate information and training that impacts on volunteering organisations and volunteers (Medium).

Appendix Three

Review of Locality Based VCS Infrastructure Services In Leicestershire

First County Workshop

A note for participants

26th October 2010(3).

Final Version

Purpose

This note does not give a full report on the workshop. It briefly outlines some of the discussions held. Its main purpose however, is to share the approach that was identified for building a shared response to the challenges presented by the changed circumstances we face. These changed circumstances include

- changing local needs and priorities,
- changing Government policies and
- changing budgets.

Summary

The first workshop in the VCS Infrastructure Review took place at Marlene Reid Centre, Coalville. It brought together 36 key participants from all parts of the infrastructure delivery system across the County. They included;

- Twelve people from Local Hubs and LRCs.
- Six people from other VCS organisations
- Four people from Voluntary Action Leicestershire
- Seven people from District Councils
- Five people from Leicestershire County Council
- Two people from other funding bodies.

The workshop had four parts;

1. Inputs and a discussion on the key elements of the new political and economic reality we face and how they will impact on VCS infrastructure in Leicestershire into the future. Discussion and inputs included;

- An outline of the present budget situation and the best estimates of the likely budget for 2011/2012.
- Consideration of changing Government policy (including consideration of the Big Society,)
- The need to base the future on a thorough understanding of local needs and priorities.
- Working in partnership and working to build trust between all parts of the infrastructure system.
- The need for change, for vision, for leadership, for an entrepreneurial approach. Things will not stay the same.
- The recognition that services are delivered locally and need to reflect and respond to local needs (while recognising that for example, a body like LCC, delivers local services.)

2. A review of existing structure and performance.

Three discussions took place under this heading;

- A review of the principles that were agreed for the operation of the Community Hubs:
- The roles of the respective organisations and the differentiation of those roles;
- The performance management framework(s) and our understanding of the performance to date.

A summary of the points raised under each heading will be circulated in due course. In general, most people felt that more work was needed on all three topics in the light both of a need for more clarity and the need to reconsider them in the context of the changed circumstances we face. However, it was agreed that undertaking this further discussion at this workshop was not key to developing a shared response to the issues we collectively face.

3. Building a consensus around a clear rationale and principles for an approach to managing the future.

A range of suggestions were made. It was agreed that while it is for the LCC (and other funders) to specify the terms of any contract they wish to place (or changes to any terms in existing contracts) it is appropriate for all stakeholders are consulted as part of the process. We know that in its deliberation, Leicestershire County Council will give very close attention to any consensus views that are presented.

We agreed that we would work together to understand the infrastructure priorities in each district, to agree how those priorities would be best met and to agree how we might work together to best deliver services to meet those priorities. This work would be carried out;

- In a process that brings together CHs, LRCs, VAL, other VCS organisations and County and District Councils,
 - In a process that is based on mutual trust and understanding
 - Making full use of our collective skills, our professionalism, our competencies, our experience, our learning from existing service delivery models and our understanding of local priorities.
 - In the light of Big Society and other policy changes;
 - In the light of the budget reality as we know it
 - Within the context of the existing infrastructure service contract(s)
 - Within the context of our understanding of the three part definition of “infrastructure,” that is representing the voice of the sector, training and development of the sector and the promotion of the sector.
- Co-ordination, Engagement and Representation
 - Capacity Building and Support to VCS
 - Volunteering

We understand that in undertaking this work to identify local priorities and

build our collective response to the present situation, we will need to confront differences between ourselves. We agreed to confront those differences and seek to build a consensus way forward for each District.

We agreed that this work would be undertaken both using the already planned District Workshops and in seven subsequent District level discussions that would include the CEO and other VAL staff, the CEOs of CHs and LRCs, District Council representatives (as appropriate) and other relevant VCS organisations. As time is short, it would be most useful for both the respective CHs/LRCs and VAL to plan them as quickly as possible following the District workshops.

Finally, we agreed that at our next County workshop on 8th December, we would consider together the results of those District discussions and feed them into building an overall consensus view on how we move forward together.

4. Agreeing how District Workshops fit into this approach.

A series of District workshops have been planned as part of this Review process. We agreed that these workshops would be the first stage of identifying local priorities for each District. This would include such questions as;

- Sharing understanding of the present reality and the challenges it presents locally,
- The implications of the Big Society and other policy changes for infrastructure work in Districts.
- How are infrastructure services working for participants, what is your experience of the services as they are at present? What is working well, where are the challenges?
- What ideas are there for improving infrastructure services in each District?
- How might infrastructure services be adapted in the light of possible budget reductions?
- What are the priorities for the District?

It was agreed that at the meeting of District workshop facilitators on 4th November (at 10.00am at VAL) we would design together both the agenda for the District workshops and the format in which feedback would be most useful.

After the District workshops, feedback would be written up by the facilitators and used to inform that District discussions between VAL, CHs/LRCs and others.

The output from those District discussions would then come for consideration to the final County Workshop on 8th December.

Workshop26Output (3).doc
Martin Honeywell
m.honeywell@ntlworld.com
07785-995613

Appendix Four

Notes on Principles, Roles and Performance Management Framework

Notes from Flip Charts, County Workshop, 26 October 2010.

Q1 Are the Principles Working?

P1

- Not yet all working – communication needs to be better between VAL & HUBS.
- Concern that were set up very late in the process
- Influence of agendas not working as well – Forums not all set up and running – needs further development.
- Principles suggest continuation of previous with no change
- Terminology has confused readers/community
- Recommend principles need to be recast in light of changes.
- Clarity on respective roles and delivery

P2

- Left Hand column correct
- Prioritise funds to district based delivery if cuts are required – **smaller** CIO, strengthen the spokes! To deliver the principles effectively
- “Making a difference” – outcomes are implied – if we deliver the principles and the monitoring and evaluation should be against the principles.
- Local voice – very important principles
- “Principles” drawn up in a time of plenty! – Now austerity! How to achieve in current times?

P3

- roughly fine, but ‘secured by’ not linked (necessarily)
- Funding issue muddled waters
- Can’t be seen as ‘franchise’ – District level negotiation

P4

- Principles are too general and do not adequately tackle specific local issues
- Need to have option to enable locality work to be targeted to local priorities / difficult issues which need focus
- The measurement of groups to volunteers does not help identify the differences being made on difficult issues i.e. obesity
- Understanding of need does not feed into the commissioning based on evidence

Q 2 Are Respective Roles Clear and Understood?

R1

- Concern that hub role not well thought through as done last minute following late political decision.
- Would a single contract to CIO with sub contracts work better? Or would this cause reduced resources at a local level
- Clarity about what VAL doing, but not meshing with what hub is doing
- Are the hubs about infrastructure support or more community development

R2

- Definitions – evolving based on need
- Room for Improvements, specifically communication, trust
- Operating differently across community hubs
- What do we want to achieve and then define the roles

R3

- Some do, some don’t understand their roles – each district distinct – little consistency of roles
- The sector customer is confused as to who does what?

- The HUB is not servicing all of the spokes in the sector. The money is concentrated in a fat hub in the centre and therefore reduced frontline activity in the districts.
- R4
- Community developments not clear
 - How do you sustain local initiatives
 - There are distinct roles for the centre and localities
 - (C) Sharing good practice
 - (L) identifying need
 - Lack of trust as some activities one being delivered by centre/local
 - Need complementary roles
 - Need seamless service
- R5
- NOT CLEAR
 - Overlap
 - Duplication
 - Competition
 - Confused customers
 - History
 - Money
 - POTENTIAL NOT REALISED - Not Creative
 - ARGUMENT NOT MOVED ON

Is the Performance Management Frame Working?

Performance Framework – Is it About Measuring Community Hubs Value to VAL?

PMF 1

- Integrated framework is required
- Are the measurements what we need to record to evidence IMPACT
- Difficult to standardise a traffic light system locally that is Fit For Purpose?
- Limited qualitative evidence
- No scrutiny of the figures submitted – Self rated

PMF 2

- Too many different PMF to report on by each organisation
- Projects are interdependent and difficult to keep outcomes separate
- Not sharing or evidencing good practice
- PMF does not give information about what has made a difference on a specific issue.

PMF 3

- Hub PMF is very nebulous – not as clear as VAL PMF
- Not everyone knew the PMF)
- PMF not good at capturing local value added by Hubs
- Members in Districts struggle to get clear picture of what being delivered for local contributions.
- Not sure the PFM's are effective at collecting outcome information
- Risk that if too prescriptive we lose innovation

PMF 4

- Finances not clear
- No – not clear
- City / County split/economies
- Quantity not quality –linear | input | output not outcome | dialogue with customers
- Who are the customers?
 - What do they need / Want?
 - Do they know?
 - What does success look like?

Appendix Five

Progress Report on Locality Negotiations 6th December 2010.

District	Status	Comment
Blaby	Not Agreed	<p>Note – it was not possible to met with Blaby District Council present in the timescale allowed (bad weather)</p> <p>Hub Proposal: CABD are a 'big' part of the community in Blaby District and are active in community development and local policy influence – the current £68,000 pays for the policy and partnership work in the District. They would like the VAL staff to be based at CABD to encourage more joint working and remove public confusion. The Hub believe VAL is too centralist – too much is based at Newarke Street, they believe the group support and volunteering roles should be at the Hub, and policy centrally at VAL, though also saw the need for 'higher level' group support centrally and a central Helpline.</p> <p>District Council Position: Seek a joined up VCS service, whilst ensuring local delivery/identity and accountability. This service to have a single performance framework with joint responsibility for achieving outcomes for example, number of volunteers recruited in the District etc. A possibility that VAL staff are seconded (using VAL funding) to the community hub to aid District delivery using the local infrastructure imbedded within CABD and policy support etc from VAL. A sharing of funding cuts with a focus on protecting local delivery/local outcomes.</p> <p>In summary there remains a commitment to a lean central infrastructure organisation linked to Community Hubs with an overall purpose to support and promote a vibrant local voluntary sector in Blaby District. Both organisations collaborating to achieve shared outcomes around volunteering and the Big Society agenda.</p> <p>VAL position: VAL sees that CABD have a wide range of community-based services, and deliver small grants on behalf of the District Council. Therefore they have a strong connection to their local community. VAL considers there is value in basing staff at CABD, though it is a poor location for volunteer recruitment. VAL believes there needs to be much more discussion on the relative merits of Central staff and District based staff in terms of overall benefit and service priority. Equally VAL considers there to be clear benefits for Blaby groups in centrally managing the VAL District based staff as this provides consistency across the County, easy management and sharing of best practice, and a seamless link to the vital central support provided by the CIO. VAL feels that local groups would be best served by investing all of the support services funding into a single CIO contract that delivers through</p>

		locally based staff, supported by central teams.
District	Status	Comment
Charnwood	Not Agreed	<p>Hub Proposal: The Hub proposes a change to the District funding formula to make the distribution of funding reflect the District Population. The Hub appreciates the work of the VAL staff in the District and wishes to retain this delivery. The Hub proposes that all of the funding cuts be found from the VAL central support (shifting the balance of support to localities) and that the change in formula increases the Hub funding to £120,000 p.a. This funding to be used to line manage VAL staff (giving local identity and governance), provide access to VAL services and co-ordinate District views into policy.</p> <p>Local Resource Centre Proposal: The LRC feel they are an essential element of support service to their local community and should continue to be funded.</p> <p>District Council Position: The District Council would like to see an increase in funding to Charnwood using the population formula, and would like to see an effective blend of support service provision.</p> <p>VAL position: VAL believes it has shown effective delivery to Charnwood groups under the existing mechanism. VAL has based two full time staff in the District who have quickly built up knowledge and recognition from local groups and are demonstrably delivering clear benefits to the District under the CIO contract. An excellent example is the VCS Forum with 65 local groups at the launch. VAL considers there to be clear benefits for Charnwood groups in centrally managing the VAL District based staff as this provides consistency across the County, easy management and sharing of best practice, and a seamless link to the vital central support provided by the CIO. VAL considers the entire savings should come from the Hub funding as there remains no clear explanation of what the Hub funding actually achieves, and no clarity on what the Hub funding is spent on. VAL considers the LRC role to be entirely based on direct service provision to the community and therefore not part of support services delivery to local groups. VAL feels that local groups would be best served by investing all of the support services funding into a single CIO contract that delivers through locally based staff, supported by central teams.</p>

District	Status	Comment
Harborough	Part Agreed	<p>Hub Proposal: The Hub feel they are a key part of the local community and are able to effectively connect to local groups. The Hub are actively involved in local partnership working with the District Council. The Hub feel they currently offer value for money for the £68,000 they get (it pays for the Chief Officer and building costs) and they feel VAL should absorb all the cuts. It would be better to join up the VAL staff with the Hub. There was a difference of view between VAL and the Hub on where the cuts would fall. The Hub offered to manage the VAL District staff and to manage the whole of the VAL Districts team (for a fee). At the very end of the meeting the Hub suggested they would be happy with 3 years transition funding at £57,000 pa – with VAL then taking on support services directly.</p> <p>Local Resource Centre Proposal: The LRC feel they are an essential element of volunteering for their local community in Lutterworth and should continue to be funded.</p> <p>District Council Position: The District Council want to have clear locally based support service delivery for volunteering, communities and groups in Harborough. They are keen to maintain bases in Lutterworth and Harborough. The District Council do not feel an across the board 14% cut is valid – there needs to be prioritisation on a needs basis.</p> <p>VAL position: VAL believes it has shown effective delivery to Harborough groups under the existing mechanism. VAL has based two part time staff in the District delivering clear benefits to the District under the CIO contract. VAL considers there to be clear benefits for Harborough groups in centrally managing the VAL District based staff as this provides consistency across the County, easy management and sharing of best practice, and a seamless link to the vital central support provided by the CIO. VAL considers the entire savings should come from the Hub funding as there remains no clear explanation of what the Hub funding actually achieves, and no clarity on what the Hub funding is spent on. VAL considers the LRC role to be entirely based on direct service provision to the community and therefore not part of support services delivery to local groups. VAL feels that local groups would be best served by investing all of the support services funding into a single CIO contract that delivers through locally based staff, supported by central teams.</p> <p>Further discussion needed on the possibility of transition funding – how much and for how long.</p>
Hinckley & Bosworth	Part Agreed	<p>Agreement made subject to confirmation by the District and other Funders. The Hub see their future as a Service Delivery/Regeneration social enterprise and do not see themselves having a continuing role in support services. Therefore the agreement is that VAL will deliver support services in the Borough, the entire proposed cut to the budget will come from the Hub funding element, that the remaining cash in the Hub funding element should be used for supporting the Hub transition in 2011-12 (subject to funder approval), and</p>

		from April 2012 the remaining Hub funding be used to make the VAL District-based staff Full Time in Hinckley and Bosworth.
District	Status	Comment
Melton	Part Agreed	<p>Hub Proposal: The long term ambition in Melton is to have the Community Hub still in place operating as a social enterprise specialising in community development and delivery of direct service. The Hub would be part of a delivery model of voluntary sector provision working alongside VAL staff. VAL staff would deliver universal volunteer brokerage and group support. The Hub will focus on improving volunteering and group support in those areas where there is evidence of most need and where interventions will have most impact on identified outcomes. In order to attain this, the Hub would need a level of transition funding in the next financial year that would enable it to be sustainable and as close as possible to the existing level of provision.</p> <p>District Council Position: The District Council are keen that whatever support delivered in Melton it is able to focus on key priorities as well as delivering a District-wide baseline service.</p> <p>VAL position: VAL considers it is delivering well in Melton, and in particular has an excellent relationship with the Funds and Figures project. VAL has two part time staff covering the District who have built up knowledge and recognition from local groups and other stakeholders. VAL would like to use the remaining Hub resources to increase this staff level once the transition period is over.</p> <p>Further discussion is required on funding – especially distribution of any cuts, and transition periods.</p>
NW Leicestershire	Not Agreed	<p>Hub Proposal: The Hub proposes the cuts should be found by an equal 14% reduction to all parties. People see the Hub as a ‘destination organisation’ and therefore it has an ongoing role in providing support services. The Hub feels it has reported on its delivery and been accountable. The Hub felt there was no hinderance to being a support service as well as a service delivery organisation. The Hub is a locally embedded organisation with 25 years history.</p> <p>Local Resource Centre Proposal: The LRC feel they are an essential element of support service to their local community and should continue to be funded.</p> <p>District Council Position: District wished to see all parties working together and felt the VAL proposal would not be acceptable politically.</p> <p>VAL position: VAL have two part-time staff members based at the Hub who are delivering effective support services. VAL considers the entire savings should come from the Hub funding as there remains no clear explanation of what the Hub funding actually achieves, and no clarity on what the Hub funding is spent on. VAL considers the LRC role to be entirely based on direct service provision to the community and therefore not part of support services delivery to local groups. VAL feels that local groups would be best served by investing all of the support services funding into a single CIO contract that delivers</p>

		through locally based staff, supported by central teams.
District	Status	Comment
Oadby and Wigston	Not Agreed	<p>Hub Proposal: The Hub sees itself continuing to be involved in community development in the District despite the loss of Stronger Communities funding. They have an number of projects ‘under threat’ but will still be running even if those projects do not survive. The Hub feel it would be a good idea for VAL staff to be seconded to the Hub – to increase the ‘attachment’ of VAL staff. The Hub is open to working together with VAL.</p> <p>District Council Position: District were unable to attend the meeting</p> <p>VAL position: VAL has carried out some excellent development work in Oadby and Wigston, both with local groups and with the District Council. VAL’s two part-time staff cover the District from a City Centre base as there was no room available at the Hub. VAL feels that local groups would be best served by investing all of the support services funding into a single CIO contract that delivers through locally based staff, supported by central teams. VAL considers there to be clear benefits for Oadby and Wigston groups in centrally managing the VAL District based staff as this provides consistency across the County, easy management and sharing of best practice, and a seamless link to the vital central support provided by the CIO.</p>

Appendix Six

Review of Locality Based VCS Infrastructure Services in Leicestershire

VCS Infrastructure Review Workshop Two.

Agreement

Reached at the Workshop which took place on Wednesday 8th December 2010, at the Rothley Centre, 12 Mountsorrel Lane, Rothley, Leicestershire, LE7 7PR.

The following agreement was reached at the workshop attended by representatives of Leicestershire County Council, Voluntary Action Leicestershire, Community Hubs and Local Resource Centres and District Councils.

“It is agreed that by the end of January 2011, there will be a single contractual model that brings together VAL and the Community Hubs and Local Resource Centres into one virtual delivery vehicle.

Separate discussions will take place between VAL and each Hub and LRC about what is done by VAL and what is done by the Hub and LRC in each locality.

This model would then be used as a model for future contract negotiations.

This agreement is made in the light of value for money and effectiveness principles.”

Appendix Seven

Meeting of Infrastructure Funders

County Hall, 16 November 2010

Guidance for those involved in District Negotiation Meetings.

Revised Draft Completed after the Review Steering Group- Meeting on 16 November (pm)

Introduction.

As part of the VCS Infrastructure Review, negotiation meetings are about to take place in each District. In their meeting of 16th November Funders drafted guidance notes for those involved in these negotiations. These guidance notes express funders' views about both the immediate negotiations for 2011/12 and longer term discussions about how infrastructure services might develop into 2012 and beyond.

These notes were discussed and edited following the Review Steering Group Meeting on 16 November (pm.) Changes were not made to the Funders draft but one or two clarifying notes were added. They have been circulated to Funders for their approval and use by District negotiators.

Guidance Notes.

On the policy context to the negotiations.

- In line with overall VCS policy, those providing VCS infrastructure services need to be proactive, looking to develop links with hard to reach communities, looking for early interventions with those most in need and looking to initiate and lead.
- Negotiators need to be mindful of the Big Society and other relevant Government policies and the opportunities they offer (e.g. the National Citizens Service, Neighbourhood Grant Programme, the Big Society Bank, the Transition Fund etc.)
- Negotiations will take into account the priorities defined in the District Consultation Meetings.
- Negotiators will take account of existing and new funding opportunities available to support the infrastructure work and in related direct service work.

On the assumptions that will guide the negotiations.

- Funders recognize the need to work together at District and County levels in order to maximize the effectiveness of Infrastructure services offered.

- Funders look for the development of cooperation and enhanced corporate working between District and County wide organizations.
- Funders look for innovation in building infrastructure arrangements, pooled resources, efficient deployment of resources to meet specific needs, joint working, staff secondments etc.
- Funders would like to see the negotiations tackling any duplication of service and building cooperation and systems of joint working built on trust and professionalism.
- Funders feel that competition between organisations involved in delivering infrastructure organisations is hindering the development of a well integrated District and County wide delivery system.
- Funders work on the assumption that there will be a local infrastructure presence in communities, maximizing the opportunities for delivering services to priority communities and building on the support of committed local people.
- In undertaking the District negotiations, and starting from the priorities as defined by the District Workshops, there is logic in defining what services are needed, defining how those services can be best delivered and then agreeing which organisation or combination of organisations would best be able to do that delivery. (This would be based on an assessment of the skills available in different organisations in order to allocate work accordingly.)
- Funders expect the negotiations to be successful. They look to all those involved in delivering VCS Infrastructure services across the County to embrace the challenges and opportunities presented by the present situation and to work cooperatively to find solutions that will ensure efficient and effective service delivery locally, at District level, and County wide.
- If District negotiations do not result in agreement being reached, Funders will offer mediation support and Peer Assessment if that is seen as a useful contribution for any District.
- Funders view the delivery of infrastructure work as a “one-team” effort, in which different organisations work together to provide a seamless service to communities.

On the longer term perspectives.

- Funders are minded to put in place one integrated Performance Management Framework for all VCS infrastructure work for 2011/12. This will build on the existing frameworks, simplify the measures used and be based on objective evidence. It will assume joint working by VAL and CHs and LRCs. Part of the PMF will be a

process of Peer Reviews in order to bring more objectivity into the process and to develop better efficiency measures.

- The negotiations will be looking at the way services can best be delivered. There are many opportunities for service redesign that are being discussed. These negotiations provide the opportunity to develop those discussions to provide a framework for strategies for 2012 and beyond.
- Funders would like to see the development of longer term strategies and plans for the delivery of infrastructure over the next three to five years. Such plans will need to be developed over the next year, both in the context of changing local priorities and National policy and the infrastructure contract for 2012 and beyond.
- Funders are committed to working with all those involved in delivering infrastructure services to help them to access other funding streams that, while supporting direct service delivery, impact on organizations ability to deliver infrastructure services.
- Funders are committed to working with infrastructure service providers to develop a longer term external funding strategy enabling all those providing infrastructure services to maximize the funding available. That strategy will build on the fundraising strategies of all those organizations involved and look to develop larger coordinated bids to national and other funders.

What is expected from the negotiations?

- Funders would like negotiators to agree the percentage of the total infrastructure budget that will be used to fund CHs and LRCs to provide local infrastructure services.
- Funders would like negotiators to agree the percentage of that figure that will go to each CHs and LRCs.
- Funders would like negotiators to agree the percentage of the VAL budget that will be used to provide front line (i.e. District based) infrastructure services, specifying the percentage used for funding District Volunteering Assistants and District Development Officers.
- Funders would like to see an agreed short summary of the District plans that lie behind the agreed budget percentages.
- Funders would like to see a short summary of how VAL will support Districts following the negotiations. This could include how policy work can feed into local customer insight work.

Appendix Eight

Table One. Performance Charts for VAL, Community Hubs and Local Resource Centres.-

TABLE ONE		
VAL PERFORMANCE TEMPERATURE CHECK		
Indicators	Amendments for 2010/2011	Oct/Dec 2009 to July/Sept 2010
1. Single communication plan implemented together with action plans that include support for specific communications needs identified by key partners.	Wording change (simplification) Not under VAL complete control	Amber to green
2. Percentage of VCS groups that say they are "well informed" or "very well informed about strategies, policies and partnerships. (Target = Majority)		Amber to green
3. An integrated database of VCS organisations by area of interest and the service/s provided is established and maintained from which information will be available on line and on request.		Green to green
4. VAL database shows a diverse range of groups reflecting the population	Possible change/ not implemented	Amber to green
5. Diverse VCS representatives are actively involved in Partnership activities particularly in delivering LAA, MAA, Sustainable Community Strategy outcomes and priorities. (Membership of theme partnerships / working groups)		Amber to green
6. Increase in VCS groups signed up to the Compacts		Red to green
7. Percentage of VCS groups and public agencies that think the Compact has improved relations between them. (Target = majority)	Not under VAL complete control	Red to amber
8. There is evidence of open methods used to select / elect VCS representatives	Not under VAL complete control	Amber to green
9. Percentage of VCS representatives that feel they are able to effectively represent the sector.		Amber to green
10. Percentage of partners and VCS groups that feel VCS representatives have effectively represented the sector.		Red to amber
11. NHS Leicestershire County and Rutland social marketing strategy is successfully implemented within the relevant VCS day to day activities	Not under VAL complete control	Red to green
12. Percentage of public sector commissioners and other relevant staff that have an excellent or good understanding of the potential of VCS to deliver services	Change from "agencies" to "commissioners and other relevant staff" Not under VAL complete control	Amber to green
13. Evidence of contribution to creating more cohesive and stronger communities.		Green (county) to green
14. Gaps in VCS coverage by area of interest and community of interest are identified annually and prioritised for action. An analysis of gaps and plan for development included in annual plan.	Wording change (simplification)	Green to green
15. Amount of funding that diverse groups across Leicester and Leicestershire have been supported to raise		Green (city) Amber (county) to green
16. Evidence of work to increase the value of service delivery contracts through the local VCS	Indicator change (from "increase in the value of...." to "evidence of work to...") Not under VAL complete control	Amber to green
17 Evidence of take up of types of VAL support, including one-to-one consultancy, training and workshops accessed by diverse groups.	Clearer wording	Green to green

18. Evidence of work with the VCS and public agencies to increase the number of groups that have plans (project, business or strategic)	Indicator change (from "percentage of..." to "evidence of work with...")	Amber to green
19. Percentage of VCS groups receiving advice or training report that they have increased their capacity to run their groups or services more effectively. (Contract Target = majority)		Amber to green
20. Percentage of groups found services easy / very easy to access services (broken down by type of group).		Green to green
21. Evidence of work with the VCS and public agencies to increase the number of groups that have performance management systems	Indicator change (from "percentage of ..." to "evidence of work with...")	Amber to green
22. Percentage of key local commissioners and funders of VCS groups are satisfied with capacity building services provided .(Contract Target = majority		Green to green
23. Percentage of local groups that are well informed or very well informed about District developments (Contract Target = majority)		Amber (county) to green
24. Percentage of volunteers that find it easy or very easy to access services (broken down by location). (Contract Target = majority)		Green to green
25. Number of volunteer enquiries (Annual Target -3,327)		Green (City) Amber (County) to Green
26. Percentage of volunteers that take up volunteering opportunities.		Red to green
27. Percentage of volunteers that are happy or very happy with their placement.		Amber to green
28. Percentage of volunteer involving groups that are confident or very confident in their ability to recruit and manage volunteers. (Contract Target = majority)		Green to amber
29. Development of a Leicester and Leicestershire volunteering strategy by March 2011.	Wording to be changed (from "development of..." to "implementation of...") Not under VAL complete control	Green to green
30. Volunteer opportunities developed annually.		Green to green

Table Two.
VAL Performance Temperature Check
Indicator and Measurement Quality

TABLE TWO		
VAL PERFORMANCE TEMPERATURE CHECK		
Indicators	Indicator Quality	Measurement quality
1. Single communication plan implemented together with action plans that include support for specific communications needs identified by key partners.	Indicator is a one off event. Could be dropped as now achieved. ONE OFF.	Discrete event has taken place.
2. Percentage of VCS groups that say they are "well informed" or "very well informed about strategies, policies and partnerships. (Target = Majority)	Good indicator (percentage of groups) Q.	Good evidence of performance Target 50%, actual 75%. Good performance
3. An integrated database of VCS organisations by area of interest and the service/s provided is established and maintained from which information will be available on line and on request.	Database of 3085 organisation, analysed by area and key interest. ONE OFF	Good. Reports updates. (but not quality of data.)
4. VAL database shows a diverse range of groups reflecting the population	Database does not classify by BME. No indicator to measure growth in VAL membership. NAR.	Cannot be measured by database.
5. Diverse VCS representatives are actively involved in Partnership activities particularly in delivering LAA, MAA, Sustainable Community Strategy outcomes and priorities. (Membership of theme partnerships / working groups)	No target or measurement criteria X.	Narrative report.
6. Increase in VCS groups signed up to the Compact.	New Compact being signed off. No indicator set. X.	Not measured.
7. Percentage of VCS groups and public agencies that think the Compact has improved relations between them. (Target = majority)	Good indicator. No target set. Q.	Not measured
8. There is evidence of open methods used to select / elect VCS representatives	Good indicator. Existence of processes and their use. NAR.	Evidence presented.
9. Percentage of VCS representatives that feel they are able to effectively represent the sector.	Good indicator. Q.	Good evidence presented. Target 50% actual 84%. Good performance
10. Percentage of partners and VCS groups that feel VCS representatives have effectively represented the sector.	Good indicator Q.	Good evidence presented. Target 50%, actual up from 27% to 42%. Solid improvement.
11. NHS Leicestershire County and Rutland social marketing strategy is successfully implemented within the relevant VCS day to day activities	No indicator defined. X	Not measured.
12. Percentage of public sector commissioners and other relevant staff that have an excellent or good understanding of the potential of VCS to deliver services	Good indicator. Q.	Good evidence Target 90% actual 100%. Strong performance.
13. Evidence of contribution to creating more cohesive and stronger communities.	No indicator defined X.	Narrative evidence. Hard to assess performance.
14. Gaps in VCS coverage by area of interest and community of interest are identified annually and prioritised for action. An analysis of gaps and plan for development included in annual plan.	No indicator defined X.	Narrative to report that gaps are currently being identified. No evidence of work to close gaps as yet.
15. Amount of funding that diverse groups across Leicester and Leicestershire have been supported to raise	Good indicator, number of £s raised Q.	Target for period not clear. Appears underachieved.
16. Evidence of work to increase the value of service delivery contracts through the local VCS	Indicator changed. Now more process than	Narrative evidence presented. Not clear if VCS winning more

	outcome. NAR.	contracts.
17 Evidence of take up of types of VAL support, including one-to-one consultancy, training and workshops accessed by diverse groups.	Good indicator. Not clear what performance target set. Q.	Good evidence presented. Good performance.
18. Evidence of work with the VCS and public agencies to increase the number of groups that have plans (project, business or strategic)	Indicator changed. Now more process than outcome. NAR.	Narrative evidence presented. Not clear how many groups using training and publications available.
19. Percentage of VCS groups receiving advice or training report that they have increased their capacity to run their groups or services more effectively. (Contract Target = majority)	Good indicator. Clear target. Q.	Evidence presented. Good performance.
20. Percentage of groups found services easy / very easy to access services (broken down by type of group).	Good indicator. Clear target. Q.	Evidence presented. Good performance.
21. Evidence of work with the VCS and public agencies to increase the number of groups that have performance management systems	Indicator changed. Now more process than outcome. NAR.	Narrative evidence presented. Good performance.
22. Percentage of key local commissioners and funders of VCS groups are satisfied with capacity building services provided .(Contract Target = majority	Good indicator. Clear target Q.	Evidence presented. Good performance.
23. Percentage of local groups that are well informed or very well informed about District developments (Contract Target = majority)	Good indicator. Clear target. Q	Evidence presented. Good performance.
24. Percentage of volunteers that find it easy or very easy to access services (broken down by location). (Contract Target = majority)	Good indicator. Clear target Q.	Evidence presented. Good performance.
25. Number of volunteer enquiries (Annual Target -3,327)	Good indicator. Good target. Clarify split between City and County. Q.	Evidence presented. Good performance.
26. Percentage of volunteers that take up volunteering opportunities.	Good indicator. Good target. Q.	Evidence presented. Good performance.
27. Percentage of volunteers that are happy or very happy with their placement.	Good indicator. Good target Q.	Evidence presented. Good performance.
28. Percentage of volunteer involving groups that are confident or very confident in their ability to recruit and manage volunteers. (Contract Target = majority)	Good indicator. Good target Q.	Evidence presented. Good performance.
29. Development of a Leicester and Leicestershire volunteering strategy by March 2011.	Indicator is a one off event. ONE OFF.	Achieved.
30. Volunteer opportunities developed annually.	Good indicator. Good target Q.	Evidence presented. Good performance.

Q. A quantitative target is set.

NAR. A narrative assessment of a non quantitative target.

X. No target set.

ONE OFF. Target is the achievement of a one off event.

Table Three.

Temperature Check for Quarter two, CHs and LRCs.

LRCs reported RAG ratings for two indicators.

CHs reported RAG ratings for five variables.

LRCs	Red	Amber	Green	Not reported	Total
Castle Donington VC/LRC				2	2
Lutterworth LRC			2		2
Syston LRC			2		2
CHs	Red	Amber	Green	Not reported	
VASL			5		5
CABD			5		5
MRC CA		1	4		5
O and W CA			2	3	5
VAC			2	3	5
VAH and B			2	3	5
VAM		1	2	2	5
Total		2	26	13	41

Appendix Nine

Review of Locality Based VCS Infrastructure Services in Leicestershire **Project Document Database. 2010**

The 2010 Review of Locality Based VCS Infrastructure Services in Leicestershire is building on a body of learning that has developed over many years. This Project Database is being built to ensure that all those involved in the process start from a shared understanding of the debates that have taken place to date.

All participants are invited to review this growing list and to add documents to it. Please add documents by forwarding them to Anjana Bhatt (anjana.bhatt@leics.gov.uk) The list will be reviewed regularly during the process of the Review.

1. Looking Ahead.....Visions of Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure in Leicestershire. Sheffield Hallam University. October 2005.
2. Infrastructure Investment Plan. Leicester and Leicestershire Infrastructure Review Consortium and Greengage Consulting Ltd. September 2004.
3. Leicestershire Third Sector Infrastructure Support Plan. Business Plan 2008-2011. Leicestershire Third Sector Infrastructure Support Services Consortium. February 2008.
4. Power-point Presentation. Taking Steps. How Volunteer Centres can support the Volunteer Journey. Institute for Volunteer Research. Date?
5. Revised Community and Voluntary Sector Infrastructure. Report to Members (post "summit" version.) October 2009.
6. Appendix B. Further Paper on the Development of Community Hubs. Author???. January 2009.
7. Appendix C. Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Review. Single Countywide Infrastructure Organisation and Community Hubs. Funding arrangements 2009-2010.
8. Appendix D. Review of Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure. Relationship Protocols.
9. VAL Information and Performance Report; April-June 2009 and July-September 2009.
10. Hub Reporting Format; May 2010. (Volunteering and Group Support; definitions; guidance and monitoring.)

11. Community Hub/ Local Resource Centres- Performance Monitoring; Three Quarters for 2009/10; Two Quarters for 2009/10.
12. Sub-Regional Quarterly Monitoring Meeting- VCS Support Services; 1 February 2010 Agenda and papers.
13. Sub-Regional Partnership on VCS Support Services; Terms of Reference (January 2010.)
14. VAL Information and Performance Report; October-December 2009.
15. VAL Performance Monitoring Report; (including Policy Team Report, District Support Comparisons and Activities; Volunteering Report; VAL Group Support Leicester City; seven District Reports) for periods; July to September 2010; April to June 2010; January to March 2010; October to December 2010.
16. VAL Performance Indicators; Proposals for Changes for 2010-2011.
17. VCS Sub-Regional Quarterly Meeting- Monitoring VCS Support Services; 26th April 2010; including Community Hubs Reports; VAL reports on Policy and Networks, Group Support; Volunteering and Communications.
18. Temperature Check for Quarter 2 2010 to 2011 for three Local Resource Centres and seven Community Hubs.
19. Compact Leicestershire; A Guide on the relation between the Leicestershire Public Service Agencies and the Voluntary and Community Sector in Leicestershire.
20. VAL Strategic Plan 2010-2013.
21. State of the Sector Scoping Study. Interim Report. Cadence Works; May 2010.
22. "Evaluation of Leicestershire Together's Stronger Communities funded Projects." Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership. Helen Dawson. June 2010.
23. "Agreement between Leicestershire County Council and Voluntary Action Leicester for the Provision of a Countywide Infrastructure Organisation for the Voluntary and Community Sector in Leicestershire." Leicestershire County Council. 2009/10 to 2011/12. (Includes Appendix A – Outcomes to be achieved by Countywide Infrastructure Organisation.)
24. "Review of Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure." LCC Cabinet; Report of the Chief Executive. 23 November 2007