

Evaluation of the **fair share** initiative

Report on phase 1 of evaluation, August 2005

SALLY DOWNS CONSULTING
with ALISON MILLWARD ASSOCIATES & INTERACT

1 Introduction to the evaluation

Introducing the initiative

- 1.1 Fair Share is a UK wide initiative of the Big Lottery Fund, started by its two predecessor organisations, namely the Community Fund and the New Opportunities Fund. It is designed to target lottery money at some of the UK's most disadvantaged communities. In part it addresses apparent inequities in lottery distribution, with a particular emphasis on reaching into areas that have not been getting their 'fair share' of lottery money.
- 1.2 The initiative has three strands:
 - a £92 million 'pot' focussed on designated Fair Share areas, delivered through the then open grants programme of the former Community Fund
 - a £50 million expendable endowment, managed by the Community Foundation Network (CFN) on behalf of the former New Opportunities Fund (now BIG) and delivered through local delivery agents in focussed areas of special needs within the Fair Share areas
 - a closed grant programme of £38.75 million, known as Transforming your Space, for locally-identified 'liveability' projects to improve the local environment and amenities in designated Fair Share areas in England, delivered through local authority partners.
- 1.3 Transforming your Space is the subject of a separate evaluation.
- 1.4 In total, 77 areas were identified for the Fair Share approach, but not every area was eligible for all three parts of the initiative. Annex 1 gives details of the areas and their programme strands.
- 1.5 What is important about the two parts of the programme being evaluated here is that they both sought to 'break the mould'. Hitherto, whilst the former Community Fund had sought to reach out to communities in greatest need, it was not a community development organisation. However, at the time of the Fair Share initiative, staff were invited to go out and innovate, enabling them to take new approaches. Meanwhile, the community and voluntary sector had looked for continuity of funding in the past and, through the expendable endowment model, the former New Opportunities Fund has been able to offer them that for a period of 10 years.

Aims of the evaluation

- 1.6 Based on the brief and the aims and objectives for the Fair Share initiative (discussed in chapter 2), the key matters for the evaluation revolve around the extent to which it has helped to:
 - strengthen the capacity of the voluntary and community sector (and how that capacity has changed as a result of Fair Share)
 - secure the sustainability of the voluntary and community sector
 - ensure the engagement of individuals (in public life)

- build the capacity of communities (especially in terms of getting funding)
- make a lasting impact on people's lives (i.e. improvement)
- improve quality of life in the community
- ensure disadvantaged people are running and benefiting from projects
- meet the needs of those at greatest disadvantage in society.

1.7 The evaluation of the Fair Share initiative is being done over a five year period, though the life of the expendable endowment will extend beyond that for a total period of ten years. This round of evaluation has examined the approaches taken to the open grants part of the initiative, and the impacts that can be observed. It also explores progress to date with the endowment which is sometimes also described as the annuity scheme elsewhere in Lottery and other literature.

1.8 Later rounds of the evaluation will look at:

- how far benefits from the approach taken to the open grants programme have been translated into durable projects, that is, projects with lasting effects, and into benefits in terms of new skills in groups, their ability to bid for other funds, and impacts in the community, and
- how the endowment approach develops.

Evaluation methodology

1.9 The evaluation methodology was developed in conjunction with the Fund and a number of external partners. The principal components involve:

- *a review of money flows into Fair Share areas*: notwithstanding a number of concerns, the inflow of money from relevant lottery distributors is to be explored across all 77 Fair Share areas; this will be supplemented by a qualitative assessment of money flows into the case study areas
- *investigation of in-depth case studies*: the principal plank of the empirical work is 10 case studies, where progress, processes and outcomes with respect to Fair Share are to be explored
- *making use of indicators to assess outputs and outcomes from the initiative*: indicators which have been explicitly linked to the aims of the initiative are being used to provide a consistent core of investigation across all the case study areas, and are set out in Annex 2 (methodology)
- *sharing findings and good practice*: the aim is to produce a mix of practical outputs for practitioners with policy implications which will be developed for policy staff in the Fund.

Report structure

1.10 This report sets out findings from the first phase of evaluation:

- on the open grants programme which has now drawn to a close, and which has been the principal area for investigation in this evaluation phase
- on the setting up of the expendable endowments.

1.11 It is structured into 8 further chapters as follows:

- *chapter 2: background to the evaluation* looks at the aims of the initiative in more detail, and at how the merger of the Community Fund and the New Opportunities Fund into the Big Lottery Fund has impacted on the context of the initiative
- *chapter 3: overview of spend and progress to date* examines progress with the initiative to the end of this phase of the evaluation
- *chapter 4: the selected case studies* sets out how the case studies were chosen and examines the characteristics of the relevant areas
- *chapter 5: Fair Share and the open grants scheme: chosen approaches* examines the ways that this part of the initiative has been delivered, that is, it is process oriented
- *chapter 6: Fair Share and the open grants scheme: the results* explores what has been achieved, who has benefited, and what the observable impacts are in the case study areas
- *chapter 7: lessons to date from the open grants scheme* draws out conclusions from the preceding two chapters
- *chapter 8: Fair Share and the endowment scheme: progress so far* investigates achievements to date with respect to the endowment scheme
- *chapter 9: lessons learned so far* sets out the issues emerging from the evaluation so far, and draws initial lessons for future practice.

2 Background to the evaluation

Origins of the initiative

- 2.1 The Fair Share initiative was announced in summer 2001, and formally started in March 2002. It came about in part as a result of pressure on government and Lottery distributors to address concerns about the equity of distribution of lottery money, and a sense that many areas were missing out on their 'fair share'.
- 2.2 The reasons why some areas had not benefited as much as they should have from Lottery funding were thought to be complex, and it was clear that changes in approaches to distribution would be necessary (Background to Fair Share, 10 October 2003, internal Lottery paper). Three elements of existing Lottery approaches were considered:
- the need to widen access to Lottery funding, and invest in the capacity of poorer communities to take advantage of what is available;
 - the effects of an application-driven system which benefits those areas containing people who understand how to 'work the system' to make successful applications and thereby exacerbates disparities, and instead to target specific areas and provide sustainable funding;
 - an emerging view that communities should be given more say over what was funded in their area (following experience in regeneration programmes such as New Deal for Communities), which put pressure on Lottery distributors to consider their own involvement in encouraging and stimulating good quality applications from communities.
- 2.3 In addition to these concerns about equitable access to and distribution of Lottery funding, and community involvement, there were also concerns about its short term, ad hoc nature, including that:
- each Lottery grant was dealt with in isolation, so Lottery funding was not being used strategically; the investment of Lottery funding was not contributing to significant long term change in spite of significant spending
 - Lottery funding was always short term (in spite of potential for funding new projects that extended lines of work), which reduced its contribution to sustainable funding for voluntary and community infrastructure investment and, in turn, effective capacity building.
- 2.4 The former Community Fund and New Opportunities Fund were charged by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport with the task of developing a Fair Share initiative. Both the Funds had a pre-existing focus on having sustainable impacts on the lives of disadvantaged people, and the initiative sat comfortably with their corporate aspirations. The Fair Share initiative had an overall set of aims which was common to both (see section 2.6), as well as separate aims reflecting the different nature of the two funding strategies.
- 2.5 Fair Share was intended to be a single initiative between the two Funds, and the two distributors chose to:

- jointly announce, brand, promote and evaluate Fair Share, but
- use different ways to identify Fair Share areas, one based on median levels of Lottery funding from all Lottery distributors except the Community Fund (used by the New Opportunities Fund) and one based on median levels of Community Fund funding (used by the Community Fund); this means that some Fair Share areas have been getting funding only from the Community Fund, some only from the New Opportunities Fund, and some from both Funds, and
- use different approaches to the distribution of the funds, with Community Fund funding available through its normal processes over three years, and New Opportunities Fund funding through an expendable endowment over ten years (five years in Scotland).

2.6 In summary, therefore, Fair Share operates through two quite distinct strands:

- Community Fund: an open grant system, using existing Community Fund application assessment methods, but with greater emphasis on outreach and development to reach and support those groups that have not had the capacity to make successful applications in the past
- New Opportunities Fund: a lump sum to be invested to provide an expendable endowment over a number of years, with greater emphasis on local organisations setting priorities and developing strategic programmes of funding support; Transforming your Space has operated in those Fair Share areas which have an expendable endowment.

2.7 Fair Share has been seen internally as an important step change in Lottery fund distribution, and not just in terms of the value of the financial contribution (Fair Share - One Year On, Update for DCMS June 2003). The aim of the initiative was seen at this stage as being "to combine the equity of distribution with local decision-making and sustainability of funding", plus tackling the 'vicious circle' of the "lack of capacity within communities to work up projects and prepare bids" which therefore fails to increase capacity and confidence. Fair Share funding was seen as a "means to an end, acting as a catalyst for communities to access further Lottery money and other sources of funding".

2.8 Notwithstanding all the additional complexities from having two separate streams to the initiative (three if Transforming your Space is counted), it was anticipated that, once the Fair Share processes were underway, there would be benefits from having an initiative which provided short term funding quickly to Fair Share areas, and helped to prepare the ground for the subsequent Fair Share Trusts (where these coincide). It was expected (Background to Fair Share, 10 October 2003) that this combination would allow:

"local communities to experience some immediate impact, as well as an element of long-term planning and sustainability, which has previously been unattainable. Indeed, an important part of the approach is to deliver some quick wins and boost local confidence while encouraging organisations to take a longer-term view of how the expendable endowment can be used to sustain local initiatives".

- 2.9 Lottery distributors recognised that the identification of the Fair Share areas was 'complex and politically charged' (Background to Fair Share, 10 October 2003). However, the basic characteristics of the Fair Share areas were agreed early on to be that the initiative would focus on local authority areas, would mirror other area-based regeneration programmes and would take advantage of existing structures. In Northern Ireland, this was complicated by the very localised areas of deprivation that had not had their 'fair share' in the past, and here the decision was made to work at a ward level.

Parallel internal and external developments

- 2.10 Fair Share was developed within the context of changing thinking among Lottery distributors which clearly affected its development. The Brass for Barnsley pilot (with its targeted and outreach based approach to grant making with a target and ring-fenced budget) had been a clear precursor to Fair Share, but other developments also fed into the thinking about new approaches.
- 2.11 *Developments within the Community Fund* There were developments within the Fund during 2002 to focus its work where it was needed most, and to seek to maximise the impact of grants by achieving long term changes in the communities where funding has been awarded (An Evaluation of Community Fund Grant Making to Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Organisations, Sheffield Hallam University / University of Brighton, January 2003).
- 2.12 These developments included a focus on key priority groups and communities (for 2002-7: children and young people, disabled people and their carers, black and minority ethnic communities, refugees and asylum seekers, older people and their carers, and people living in rural and urban areas disadvantaged by social and economic change).
- 2.13 The Fund also sought to increase emphasis on the **outcomes** of projects, and in particular the possibilities of adopting an 'investor' approach to grant making, which can be defined as:
- "funding organisations with not only financial resources, but also management and technical support. This support is focused on enabling nonprofits to build greater organisational capacity and infrastructure via long term, engaged relationships with investees" (Carrington 2002, quoted in previous reference).
- 2.14 *DCMS led Lottery review* The lead-up to the Lottery review raised a number of issues (and subsequent consultations with the voluntary and community sectors and others) including the Lottery's responsiveness to the needs and priorities of communities, fair distribution of funding, the 'distinctive challenge' of Lottery funding, and how to make delivery more efficient and effective.
- 2.15 The subsequent White Paper focused on three themes which reflected many of the themes of Fair Share:
- increased openness, accessibility and public involvement
 - transformation and inspiration at both national and local level
 - innovation in thinking, in action and in mobilising voluntary effort.

- 2.16 *Other changes to working methods* Other changes were filtering through to working methods in the Community Fund. For example (Overview of Community Fund Delivery of Fair Share to May 2004, internal paper):
- certain geographical areas and communities of interest had been identified since 1998 as being of strategic importance and thus requiring more outreach activity to enable these target groups to access Lottery funds equitably
 - feedback had started to be given to unsuccessful applicants, to enable Lottery staff to redirect applicants and ensure good projects from strategic priority areas that had not been presented well could be funded; this allowed Lottery staff to undertake development work, discuss projects and renegotiate outcomes
 - new approaches to strategic values, priorities and direction, which resulted (among other things) in consideration of the types of staff required, including the potential for taking on staff in the new roles of Development and Communications Managers (DCMs) and Regional Outreach Officers (ROOs).
- 2.17 *Other external developments* External developments relevant to the context within which the Lottery operated also fed into planning for Fair Share, particularly work by HM Treasury on the Role of the Voluntary and Community Sectors in Service Delivery; work by the Home Office Active Communities Unit on the infrastructure of the voluntary and community sectors, and capacity building across the sector; and changes to regeneration funding (such as the phasing out of the Single Regeneration Budget etc).
- 2.18 All these trends, concerns and changes clearly influenced the aims and design of the Fair Share programme, and the methodology that that has been adopted.

Fair share aims and objectives

- 2.19 Aims and objectives were agreed for the Fair Share programme overall, and for the two elements of the programme (see Table 1).

Table 1: aims and objectives for the Fair Share initiative

Statement of aims	
overall aims for Fair Share	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all targeted Fair Share areas will have received a larger share of the total funding from the good causes (i.e. lottery); • awards made under Fair Share have a sustainable impact on the lives of disadvantaged people in the areas it targets; • projects funded by Fair Share should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be run by and for disadvantaged people; - develop the capacity of communities to seek, obtain and manage funding for projects that reflect local priorities and needs.
aims for the open grant component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • help meet the needs of those at greatest disadvantage in society • improve quality of life in the community.
aims for the endowment component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build capacity and sustainability in local communities, including support for community assets and planning, and involvement in regeneration; • build social capital, including support for social enterprises, local time banks, Intermediate Labour Market schemes and training; • improve local environments, enabling communities to make them safer, healthier, greener, cleaner, better designed, more welcoming and accessible to all groups (the liveability agenda); • to support these goals by involving local people in decision-making.

Why Fair Share is different

- 2.20 Fair Share was not seen as being able to make up for the shortfall in Lottery funding that the 77 areas had experienced over time. However, it was hoped that, by working in co-ordination with other government and funding strategies, it could make a significant contribution to that wider effort. Partnership became a key element of the new approach from the beginning of Fair Share.
- 2.21 The Fair Share contribution therefore focused as much on 'how' it worked as on getting the additional funding delivered to the 77 areas. Fair Share was designed to ensure that the Lottery no longer worked in isolation from other funders, and was much more knowledgeable about the needs and abilities of local communities, and thus about the funding they needed and could realistically make use of. This partnership approach became central to Fair Share operations.
- 2.22 In principle, Fair Share, from the outset, had a number of features which made it very different from previous Community Fund and New Opportunities Fund programmes, particularly:
- *Short and long term funding programmes* Fair Share explicitly aimed to provide both immediate support to community groups, through Community Fund funding, and establish a new mechanism (the endowment funds) to enable longer term and more strategic funding to be undertaken. This was a unique package of funding, and remains one of Fair Share's most innovative experiments.

- *Explicit spend target* Lottery published spend targets for identified geographical area for the first time with, in some cases, ring-fenced funding.
- *Geographical targeting* Although some regions/ countries had prioritised certain localities before, and both the Community Fund and the New Opportunities Fund had identified priority groups before, Fair Share was the first instance of the Funds explicitly identifying specific localities across the UK, providing a target spend figure, and targeting additional development resources.
- *Additional funding for outreach and development work* Again, although some CF / NOF regions / countries had undertaken some outreach activity, Fair Share was the first time a comprehensive UK-wide programme of outreach and development had been undertaken, with additional funds for new staff.
- *Support for risk and innovation in working methods* There was high level support for innovation in approaches to Fair Share. The new Chief Executive for the Community Fund visited each region and country early in 2002 and explicitly promoted the need for Fair Share to try out new outreach methods. In some ways, Fair Share was seen as the opportunity to extensively pilot a whole range of new ways of working, building on some of the innovative practice previously tried in some parts of the Fund and giving 'permission' for innovation to be extended. There were also other internal developments to support Fair Share, including the establishment of a national network of Fair Share Co-ordinators which enabled these regional staff to share information about Fair Share in their regions / countries.
- *Use of an external Award Partner to deliver a complex initiative* The former New Opportunities Fund had already been experimenting with the use of external Award Partners as a mechanism, inter alia, for securing a grant making process which is able to:
 - make multiple awards of small grants
 - work alongside community groups pre- and post application to ensure high quality applications and appropriate outcomes
 - provide support where it is needed, and work with the most disadvantaged.

Fair Share goes one step further in asking the Award Partner to deliver a process which involves local communities in agenda setting and in the decision making process on grant applications.

- *Proactive grant making* Fair Share went beyond outreach (in the sense of raising awareness through publicity and promotion, and then responding to demand). Fair Share development staff were expected to spend much more time out of the office, meeting community groups, local authorities, new partnerships (e.g. Local Strategic Partnerships in England/ Community Planning Partnerships in Scotland), and other funders, and developing new relationships, providing in depth support and encouragement, and bringing people together to discuss applications. For some, this has challenged the ethos of Lottery funding which did not 'interfere' with applications, but simply assessed them on their merits when they came through the door.

Definitions and concepts

- 2.23 The potential difficulties for Fair Share in taking these new approaches to development work did not affect Fair Share alone. Many organisations in the public, voluntary and community sectors have been grappling with the nature of community development, capacity building and development work, as community engagement has become much more mainstream to government and to funders' policy and practice.
- 2.24 Development work is rarely defined in detail, and very often it develops as a result of the skills and experience of development workers, and the context they find themselves working in. However, there are two (overlapping) concepts which underpin development work of all kinds in many organisations: community development and capacity building.
- 2.25 In order to address the extent to which these concepts impacted on the practice and outcomes of Fair Share, some definitions of the various terms are needed.
- 2.26 *Community development* One widely used definition of community development is that used in the Achieving Better Community Development Handbook (Barr and Hashagen 2000). This proposes that community development is:
- "an activity which confronts disadvantage, poverty and social exclusion, and promotes values of active citizenship, learning and community participation. It is about change based on empowerment, leading to a better quality of community life. While community development is usually local, it needs to be located within broader policy frameworks that recognise its role and understand its contribution."
- 2.27 The ABCD Handbook suggests there are two overarching dimensions to community development: one concerned with community empowerment, and one concerned with quality of community life. Together, these are seen to help to create a healthy and strengthened community which is liveable, sustainable and equitable.
- 2.28 The National Occupational Standards for Community Development Work suggest (quoted in Home Office Firm Foundations, 2004) that the key purpose of community development work is "collectively to bring about social change and justice, by working with communities (those that can be defined geographically and/or those defined by interest) to identify their needs, opportunities, rights and responsibilities; plan, organise and take action; evaluate the effectiveness and impact of action; all in ways which challenge oppression and tackle inequalities".
- 2.29 *Capacity building* The most up to date and widely used definition of capacity building was published recently by the Home Office (Firm Foundations, Home Office, December 2004). This defines capacity building as being about:
- "activities, resources and support that strengthen the skills, abilities and confidence of people and community groups to take effective action and leading roles in the development of their communities".
- 2.30 Capacity building is most often used to describe detailed work with local communities (e.g. Skinner 1997), but is increasingly also being used to describe training for public and voluntary bodies (e.g. local authorities, councils for

voluntary service) and others who are themselves working with communities (Home Office 2004). In this way, capacity building is understood as increasing the capacity of all parties concerned with community development, so they can work more effectively together.

- 2.31 Capacity building tends to relate to particular learning methods including formal training but more often other approaches such as workshops, study tours and visits, small grants to help groups get started and thus learn from experience (e.g. funding for postage, telephone, copying), distance learning, secondments, internships, mentoring and coaching from experienced people, community service and volunteering (adapted from Deri 2001 and Home Office 2004). The Home Office, 2004, suggest that community capacity building requires a community development approach.

Role of community development and capacity building in Fair Share

- 2.32 Essentially, community development is about a method of achieving social change and capacity building is usually focused on skills and learning (to similar ends), and the overlaps between them are clear. Community development *methodologies* can link the two.

- 2.33 For the Community Fund, their approaches to Fair Share were "based on a set of values and principles related to community development and civil society development through partnership working" (Fair Share Outreach and Development Principles and Practice, 2004). The original Fair Share brief for the Community Fund was very clear about the role of the programme and the extent to which it could undertake community development (quoted in the internal Overview of Community Fund Delivery of Fair Share to May 2004):

"We are not a development agency, the aims set and approach taken must relate to that which we can achieve through our grant-making."

- 2.34 For the New Opportunities Fund, building capacity and sustainability in local communities is one of the overall aims. This is to be done, inter alia, through the development of local panels, and through their involvement in setting priorities, seeking applications, and reviewing them.
- 2.35 The approach to delivery is one step removed from the Fund, being through a number of local agents. These agents are contracted to make grants within terms of reference (such as eligibility criteria) agreed with the Fund. What is much more open is the extent to which the agents will involve themselves in the process of supporting and enabling local groups from within the community to come forward with applications, and agents have the opportunity to innovate and explore in accordance with their own charitable objectives.
- 2.36 It was made clear that Fair Share's own development work does not seek to replace local community development or capacity building organisations, but rather to focus on delivering its own contribution through outreach, access and partnership working:

"By involving community stakeholders in key decisions on priorities and working to build local capacity in collaborating and applying for funding, the two distributors aim to make a visible, if small-scale impact through Fair Share." (Fair Share - One Year On. Update for DCMS, June 2003).

- 2.37 The focus is very firmly on supporting community involvement in priority setting (essentially through the panels established for the endowment areas funded by New Opportunities Fund) and capacity building for improved applications for funding (essentially the outreach and development work funded by the Community Fund, and possibly also through the local agents in endowment areas). The outreach and development work undertaken by the Community Fund was also clearly expected to feed into longer term community involvement on the endowment panels, explicitly linking the short term and long term funding goals.
- 2.38 Fair Share was never intended to act either as a neighbourhood community development organisation, or to provide in depth capacity building. Its focus was on the strategic level of capacity building and development that has been recognised by the Home Office as an essential element of community development in its broadest sense - working with and through the development agencies that already exist (where they exist), and the other bodies that provide support for local communities.

3 Initiative overview: spend and progress to date

Introduction

- 3.1 Part of the genesis of Fair Share was an inequity in funding. As a consequence, achievement of spend has been seen, in part, as a measure for success of the initiative. From the evaluation perspective, there are important caveats to be attached to this, not least the observations that a capacity building initiative such as Fair Share takes time to be effective, with three years being a relatively short period, and that quality outcomes and rapid spend are not necessarily the same thing.
- 3.2 The following paragraphs explore the issue of spend in so far as it indicates progress with the programme.

Spend and the open grant programme

- 3.3 Data for the open grant programme aspects of Fair Share shows that over 90% of target spend has been achieved in the three years of the programme. It is summarised in the table below.

Table 2: Spend through the open grants programme to end March 2005

Country	no of local authority areas	no achieving full spend or more	%
England	26	21	81
Northern Ireland	all NI	all NI	100
Scotland	6	1	17
Wales	5	2	40
TOTAL no of areas	38	25	66
Country	target spend (£'000)	spend to date (excl overspend)	%
England	68,253	65,711	96
Northern Ireland	333	333	100
Scotland	16,715	13,263	79
Wales	6,783	5,584	82
TOTAL spend	92,084	84,891	92

Source: Community Fund Fair Share spend vs targets, up to 31 March 2005, Big Lottery Fund

- 3.4 The end date of this part of Fair Share is now passed. Applications in Fair Share areas continue to be accepted until the end of May 2005 which is the last date for applications for the Medium and Large Grants Programme (source of Fair Share open grant funding). Whilst there will be changes at the margins, the picture to the end of March 2005 is close to the final picture for the open grants part of Fair Share.

- 3.5 The data in Table 2 addresses the issue of spend up to the targets. In practice, that spend has been significantly exceeded in very many of the Fair Share areas. Altogether spend exceeds the target by 25% or more in 13 of the areas, and in four them, their spend is more than double their target. One interpretation of this is that interventions designed to increase the number of successful applications can be very effective.
- 3.6 *England* When judged by spend, performance across the English Fair Share authorities has been good, with 96% of the target achieved. Five authorities of the 25 Fair Share areas in England are affected by underspend. Three of these (Luton, Enfield and North Somerset) have spent more than 95% of their target sum. Dudley has achieved an 88% spend and, at the time of writing, awards were still being made.
- 3.7 Solihull (50% of target spend) has proved to be a very difficult area. Discussions with the Fund's Regional Office for the West Midlands suggest that considerable outreach work was carried out in the Borough in the early days of Fair Share, with a number of awards being made. However, the area has very little in the way of volunteering or of relevant infrastructure in the VCS. The LSP is not reflective either of the area of deprivation in the borough or of the voluntary sector. Whilst applications will be accepted up to the final deadline, development work is no longer being done since the deadline is so close. Solihull is being carried over as a priority area, but future funding is dependent on the nature of future funding programmes. Precisely what this will mean in practice is therefore currently unclear.
- 3.8 An interesting dimension of spend in England is the extent to which the Fund has continued to fund projects in Fair Share areas after the target has been reached. Altogether spend in the period has exceeded the target by more than 10% in 11 areas (42% of English Fair Share areas). In Burnley, for example, a target of £1.11 million has turned into a spend of £1.714 million, in Thanet a target of £1.325 million has become a spend of £2.28 million, and in Ashfield, a £1.002 million target has turned into £3.177 million. Awards have been possible in these areas in ways that were not being achieved before Fair Share.
- 3.9 *Northern Ireland* In Northern Ireland target spend was only £333,000, whereas achieved spend is in excess of £3million. In part this is a reflection of the way that spend was recorded in Northern Ireland (for instance, it includes Awards for All money). Overall, the Fair Share approach did not accord well with local conditions and priorities in Northern Ireland, and the very limited target meant that there were no special efforts to do outreach work.
- 3.10 *Scotland* Whilst only one of the six Scottish Fair Share areas fully achieved its target, overall spend has still been ~~been~~ fairly good, at 79% of target. One other area effectively got there, reaching 97% (North Lanarkshire). Two others achieved over 80%, and only two were below 80% (South Ayrshire at 79% and South Lanarkshire at 59%).
- 3.11 South Lanarkshire requires particular comment. It had the second highest target spend in the UK (£5.415 million). It spent £3.192 million, which places it 14th out of the 77 areas across the UK in terms of overall spend. Taking this bigger picture, therefore, South Lanarkshire's spend performance has not been as poor as the 59% result seems to suggest. However, there is disappointment locally that the target spend was not achieved, and that this has impacted on Scotland levels of spend overall. Essentially, the problems seem to have been that, in

spite of strenuous efforts by all involved (Community Fund outreach staff and local agencies), the VCS in South Lanarkshire still has very low capacity (with lots of very small groups often with little or no history of applying for funding at all), a VCS infrastructure that has been through major restructuring over recent years (mergers, closures etc), and the availability of numerous other grant programmes which seemed to more closely match the capacity of local groups (i.e. easy to access small local grants). This may have been exacerbated if such activity as there was ~~was~~ directed to sectors precluded by the legal eligibility requirements.

- 3.12 One Fair Share area in Scotland reached well over its target (Dundee, which spent £1.338 million compared to a target of £150,000).
- 3.13 *Wales* When judged by spend, performance across the Welsh Fair Share authorities has also been good. At the end of March 2005, 82% spend of the target had been achieved. Two out of the five Welsh Fair Share areas had achieved their targets, and a further one had achieved 95%, with the expectation of achievement of full spend. At that time, two authorities were affected by significant underspend (Caerphilly at 63% and Anglesey at 77%), though this situation has since improved.
- 3.14 Caerphilly has been a difficult area from the beginning, a historic shortage of fundable projects being one of the reasons why the area became a Fair Share area). The first two years saw very few applications but last year there was a major effort (with Gwent Association of Voluntary Organisations) and over £800,000 of grants were awarded. Development work continued post March 2005 with applications being accepted until June 2005 for processing up to December 2005 when the former Community Fund's Voluntary and Community Sector programme is wound up. It is expected that spend will substantially be achieved.
- 3.15 In Anglesey there are different problems stemming from the polarisation of the area into urban deprivation (mainly in Holyhead) and rural areas with different issues. Two very large grants totalling £567,967 were made in the first year, since when no large or medium grants have been awarded. Since April of this year, one award of £33,000 has been made, plus one award of £286,000 to enable continued development of the voluntary and community sector on Anglesey.
- 3.16 Two authorities have achieved a significant overspend beyond their targets (Blaenau Gwent, which spent £850,940 compared to its target of £471,000, and Wrexham which achieved £1.598 million compared to the target of £887,000).

Spend and the endowment scheme

- 3.17 At the time of writing, there are no published figures on spend in the endowment areas. Our anecdotal understanding is that progress to date has been slow. This is supported by data on operational progress which looks at receipt and approval of relevant documentation by the Community Foundation Network (Fair Share Programme Management Report, February 2005). The number of Priorities Documents received by the Community Foundation Network (CFN) is 45 (end Feb 2005), compared with a target of 67. Since the early task in endowment areas are, to an extent, sequential, delay in finalisation of Priority Documents necessarily results in delays in funding.

- 3.18 The case studies confirm this slow progress, and specific progress in those Neighbourhoods is discussed in chapter 7, along with some of the reasons for the delay in so far as they have emerged. It should be noted here that, from the evaluation perspective, slowness in achieving spend will not necessarily equate with poor quality outcomes from the initiative and, indeed, may prove to be better. The greatest concerns with respect to spend are likely to arise from the Lottery's own need to meet target spends.

Overall lottery spend in endowment areas and elsewhere

- 3.19 The study brief sets out a requirement that one part of the evaluation should be a review of all lottery funding going into Fair Share areas. This has been discussed with the Fund, and it has been agreed that the skills and capabilities being targeted through the Fair Share initiative are different from those required from, say, Primary Care Trusts who have bid for money under the Five-a-Day initiative or the Heart Failure Support Network Initiative. The only strict comparator is the Awards for All programme. These are awards of between £500 and £5,000 aimed at local communities. Not least, the outreach and development work in the Fair Share areas could be expected to impact on these Awards because awareness of Lottery monies has been raised and applications too small for Fair Share get referred to Awards for All.
- 3.20 Data for England on spend for the year preceding the start of Fair Share, and for the three years since the start of the initiative is summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: A4A awards 2001-05 (provisional data, England only)

		Total A4A spend	A4A spend in FS areas	A4A spend in FS x CF areas
2001-02	£ value	£39,864,000	£6,738,000	£3,663,000
	% of total	100%	17.0%	9.0%
2002-03	£ value	£44,663,000	£9,692,000	£5,369,000
	% of total	100%	22.0%	12.0%
2003-04	£ value	£42,767,000	£9,481,000	£5,212,000
	% of total	100%	22.0%	12.0%
2004-05	£ value	£35,713,000	£6,596,000	£3,208,000
	% of total	100%	19.0%	9.0%

Source: Merlin data base, Big Lottery Fund

It suggests that there was an early surge in applications in Fair Share areas, though this appears not to have been sustained through into year 3 of the initiative, with evidence of a falling back.

Does spend matter?

- 3.21 Clearly spend does matter, but it is a very poor metaphor for real success, particularly within the timescale (three years since commencement) that is being explored in this report.
- 3.22 First, we have reservations about some aspects of data reliability with respect to the open grants programme. Fair Share has been defined by specific local authority areas, the unit of accountability in which the absence of a 'fair share' was judged (other than Northern Ireland where a finer level of disaggregation

was used). It might have been expected therefore that awards would relate to that local authority area; that is to say, that they were for that area's benefit. However, there is some evidence to suggest that this is not necessarily the case. For example:

- in one of the case study areas, an award specifically targets a group with very little representation in the fair share area and where it therefore appears hard to justify funding it through Fair Share, though it does have wider relevance
- elsewhere, there are examples where one award is covering a number of areas, but it is being accredited to one area only; in these cases, a proportional attribution would have given a more accurate picture.

3.23 Secondly, spend is the mechanism by which the Lottery is frequently judged. However, too much emphasis on spend can create a situation where "getting money out the door" takes precedence over quality. Particular concerns in this respect have been raised in Scotland where the very large amount of money allocated for spend in South Lanarkshire had the effect of diverting resources from elsewhere, with good projects for very disadvantaged people being refused outside South Lanarkshire, and less good ones approved inside. This issue is returned to in a later chapter.

3.24 The more important aspects of Fair Share are the extent to which it achieves its objectives, in terms of reaching out to disadvantaged people and building capacity, and the extent to which its lessons, both at the VCS level and at the Fund level, are transferred into appropriate future practice. Ultimately, it is this that determines the long term success of Fair Share, rather than detail over spend, particularly given the relatively high levels of success achieved overall in that respect.

4 Selected case studies

Case study selection

- 4.1 At the outset of the study it was agreed that ten case studies would be done, made up of seven in England, and one each in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. In order to work most effectively, it was decided that these should be drawn primarily from areas where there was both an open grants programme target and an endowment scheme.
- 4.2 The approach to the choice of case studies was set out in an earlier report to the Fund (Evaluation Year 1: six month report, March 2004) and is summarised in Annex 2.
- 4.3 In summary, the first step in case study selection was to determine the key variables amongst the Fair Share areas. Early discussions with Fund staff in all four countries and in the English regions revealed a number of soft variables thought to have influenced an area's past success in securing Lottery funding, and likely to play a role in future outcomes. Most important of these were the responsiveness of the local authority to partnership working and the maturity of the voluntary and community sector. Information on this was collected by telephone for all Fair Share areas. Relevant factual background information was also assembled on matters such as the size (population) of their endowment areas, the size (£'000) of the Community Fund target spend, and available information on deprivation.
- 4.4 *Case study selection in England* In England, the selection was made using seven key variables, with the sample being structured and reiterated to give a representative spread of the variables (see annex 2). The choice was subsequently amended to replace part of one case study (the open grant programme) by the open grant programme in Kirklees where interesting work was being done with ethnic minority communities. This did not affect the representativeness of the sample. The resulting list of case studies is Ashfield, Basildon, Bolton, Dudley, Ellesmere Port, Enfield, Kirklees and Rotherham.
- 4.5 *Case study selection in Northern Ireland* Relatively small amounts of money in Northern Ireland, and the fact that these are to be spread relatively thinly on the ground, pose difficulties in using a case study approach. A limited approach was initially agreed based on one funding area, namely Craigavon, and subsequently Coleraine and Ballymena have been included to provide a fuller picture. Through these areas, it will be possible to explore the Northern Ireland approach of 'consensual grant making'.
- 4.6 *Case study selection in Scotland* A particular feature of Fair Share in Scotland is that the Scottish Executive asked for inclusion of rural areas, reflecting their national priorities, and it was interesting to include a rural dimension in the case study work, which had not been fully achieved through the English case studies. From four rural options, South Lanarkshire was chosen.
- 4.7 *Case study selection in Wales* A number of practical local factors strongly influenced the choice. Finally, because the Fair Share programme is voluntary sector-led in Neath Port Talbot, this was selected as potentially the most interesting case study,

Characteristics of the case study areas

4.8 The following table summarises key characteristics of the Fair Share areas.

Table 4: characteristics of Fair Share areas

Fair Share area	Characteristics at time designated as a Fair Share area
Ashfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • former coal-mining area in Nottinghamshire, devastated by mine closures in 1980s and loss of textiles and other traditional manufacturing • 2 wards in worst 10%; population is 99% white¹, with poor health, a low skills base, and below average incomes • much of the deprivation is dispersed, reflecting settlement pattern which is a legacy of coal mining • traditional, paternalistic, controlling coalfield Labour authority • LSP dominated by local authority • VCS relatively under-resourced and unaccustomed to joint working
Basildon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a generally prosperous post-1945 New Town in Essex, plus surrounding areas • 1 ward in worst 10%; areas of deprivation are pockets (specific estates or neighbourhoods); population is 97% white, with low educational attainment and qualifications • traditional Labour authority, with a service-providing rather than service-enabling culture, and vestiges of New Town paternalism • LSP emerged out of pre-existing partnership, and is dominated by the local authority plus statutory sector/bodies • emphasis on individualism and self help in the community, with many local groups operating independently of each other
Bolton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lancashire textiles and other traditional manufacturing town, with a legacy of environmental, social and economic problems linked to industrial restructuring • 7 wards in worst 10%, plus deprived estates within less deprived wards; culturally diverse, with some wards having very high BME group representation • high death rates, poor health, low birthweight, high unemployment in BME communities, high incidence of poor housing • long history of Labour leadership by powerful local Council and Councillors • large VCS, with good networks and organisation; strong CVS.
Dudley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black Country town with history of ironworks, engineering, coal mining and glass making industries, now moving towards service industries and tourism • highly parochial communities with poor community infrastructure in pockets, which have not been eligible for or received regeneration funding in the past • educational attainment low, preventing access to emerging service economy • predominantly white, with pockets of mainly Asian Muslim communities in some wards • 6 wards in top 10% of most deprived • long time Labour authority switched recently to Tory control • good VCS infrastructure and high level of interest in third sector activity by Local Authority • view exists that VCS is unlikely to grow much at grass roots level because of a lack of aspiration • key issue is for medium sized organisations to find continuation funding for services they have already developed
Ellesmere Port & Neston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mix of post industrial Merseyside and leafy Cheshire, linked by history, industry and economic structures to Merseyside • 5 wards in worst 10%; areas of deprivation dominated by white communities with relatively high unemployment, drugs and youth problems • traditional Labour authority, slow to addressing modernisation agenda • LSP dominated by statutory sector/bodies • voluntary sector infrastructure very weak with core funding issues for 2 umbrella bodies, and conflict between them • VCS resource starved and poorly developed

Kirklees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> historically dominated by woollen industry and other textiles; now has thriving service industries, plus is in commuter belt for Manchester and Leeds very divided, with large towns, small towns and rural areas high concentrations of deprivation in built up areas; rural areas affected by rural exclusion 3 wards in worst 10% nationally; low incomes, low levels of employment, poor educational attainment, poor health, high barriers to services mixed ethnicity, with Asian and Black Caribbean communities, and some areas predominantly White was a traditional Labour authority; now pragmatist Liberals; embracing new local government agendas, funding community development; addressing social exclusion and community cohesion LSP developing slowly but bringing on board people from across sectors, including business and strong BME representation VCS go ahead and dynamic; large but not well developed
Rotherham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> former coal and steel town in South Yorkshire, devastated by massive industrial restructuring and job losses in 1980s 6 wards in worst 10%; unemployment remains above national average, with poor health and comparatively poor educational achievement much of the deprivation is dispersed, reflecting settlement pattern which is a legacy of coal mining 'Old Labour' authority, historically viewed as very paternalistic dependency culture (resulting from Coal Board and then the LA) few community groups and relatively undeveloped VCS infrastructure
Craigavon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> rural area with small towns and villages significant investment in community development, including through peace and reconciliation money, EU funding etc Council seen as a barrier to change rather than a gateway strong sectarian loyalties; nationalists in the minority
South Lanarkshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> divided area with north formerly heavy industry especially mining and weaving / textiles (still some opencast) and south very rural with parts becoming commuter belt for Glasgow and Edinburgh Communities / villages very parochial and divided (sometimes hostile); sectarianism is a difficult local issue, not always openly discussed. traditional controlling and paternalistic LA, seen by community as provider of services very low capacity in VCS, with lots of small inexperienced groups with few wider connections or support (exception is training / community enterprise); previously 5 - 7 CVSs (now merged into 3 main ones)
Neath Port Talbot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> coastal heavy industry (chemicals, oil refining, steelworks) and port; recent disinvestment by BP has left area vulnerable economically severe deprivation in several wards (12 wards in the National Assembly's Communities First Programme) LA traditional (S Wales) Labour controlled but switched on to new agendas and community-based regeneration CVS strong, active and growing, and has been given the responsibility by the LA of delivering the FS programme in the area VCS relatively active with new groups coming forwards; some worries about 'gatekeeping' by the CVS

¹ compares to an average of 91% across England

Why they hadn't had their 'fair share'

4.9 The evaluation has not explored the technical background to the designation of particular local authority areas as Fair Share, taking that as a given at this stage. Rather, the interest has been in considering why the selected locations had not been getting their share of lottery funding and, hence why they needed to be Fair Share areas.

- 4.10 In all of the areas, there appears to be some combination of low levels of applications and relatively weak applications, which in turn produced high failure rates amongst the applications received. Evidence about grant applications to the former Community Fund from two of the case studies is set out in Table 5.

Table 5: evidence from Community Fund Delivery Plans re funding

Fair Share area	Synopsis of funding through the medium and large grants programme of the then Community Fund		
Ashfield	1996-2002:	total applications	122
		success rate	26%
	Reject reasons	management capacity - insufficient mgt capacity - poor financial health - poor project planning	55%
		information/resources - group ineligibility - outside CF funding policy	27%
other reject reasons - insufficient funds - no disabled access - etc		18%	
Bolton	1999-2002	total applications	62
		Success rate	35%
	Reject reasons	insufficient funds	11%
		not well costed	20%
		not well planned	13%
		inadequate property info	11%
		no business plan	2%
		does not respond to need	2%
		unlikely to lead to outcomes	13%
		outside policy areas	7%
		constitution	2%
		ineligible	9%
		unmanaged deficits	2%
		not additional	2%
outside programme	2%		
insufficient information	2%		
re-application in < 12 months	2%		

Source: Ashfield Fair Share Local Delivery Plan, 2004
Bolton Fair Share Local Delivery Plan, 2004

- 4.11 Bolton and Ashfield make a useful comparison because Ashfield is like many of the Fair Share areas (relatively weak partnership working and under-developed infrastructure in the VCS) whereas Bolton is different in that it had had a low level of lottery funding despite having strong local partnerships and a relatively vibrant VCS (and was chosen as a case study so as to provide a contrasting perspective). In table 5, however, we can see that there are significant parallels between the two areas when it comes to pre-Fair Share funding. Both have a low success rate, and the spread of reject reasons suggests that the symptom of under-funding is in some way linked to lack of knowledge within communities about the awards and the requirements of the funder, combined with lack of capacity to develop appropriate applications. The legal eligibility requirements of the Community Fund may again be a contributing factor.

4.12 Anecdotal evidence from Rotherham's case study suggests that, there, the situation became self-reinforcing. Because of the inexperience and lack of skills of community groups, there was a history of failed applications. This in turn put groups off making applications because, based on past experience, they thought it wasn't worth the effort of applying. Relatively low levels of applications may also in some instances be due to a genuine lack of aspiration to make applications for funding from the Lottery, for example because of extensive availability of other funding sources (which may also be a causal factor in Bolton).

4.13 However, further evidence from the case studies suggests that many of the reasons why areas have been low achievers in terms of lottery funding are more far reaching. A number of other, sometimes interlinked, factors have emerged through the case studies, though not all the reasons are observable in all the areas. They include, variously:

- lack of capacity and aspiration of local groups to produce applications of sufficient quality (so low success rates), or to deliver and report on projects funded; lack of capacity is seen as due to lack of structural support, especially lack of local authority investment
- a long term history of dependency, stemming from the paternalistic approach of the Coal Boards, and later the local authority, which in some areas has inhibited the community sector, combined with an absence of infrastructure support for the VCS
- a resource-starved and poorly developed voluntary and community sector with poor networking, parochialism, suspicion and mutual hostility, together with weaknesses in the voluntary sector infrastructure and a local authority slow to shift to partnership working
- a service-oriented local authority that operated totally separately from a network of fragmented community and voluntary groups with a tradition of self help that made them unlikely to seek grant aid, rather than necessarily being poor at applying
- lack of applications at all (as opposed to failed applications) due to traditions of self help (making seeking awards at all unlikely) and a fragmented VCS
- a relative lack of local authority interest in lottery funding, in a context of substantial funding streams from other sources.

4.14 The Brass for Barnsley (B4B) evaluation (Sheffield Hallam University, 2000 and 2003) reviewed factors which might potentially contribute to the generally low level of applications from, and awards to, the sorts of deprived communities which were eventually encompassed within the Fair Share initiative. They cited work by the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) of the Charities Board and their conclusions that lack of knowledge within communities about the availability of grants was only part of the picture. They summarised:

‘the reasons for under-achievement in disadvantaged areas like Barnsley were more likely to lie in the interactions amongst the various agencies involved in local development: local voluntary and community groups;

voluntary sector infrastructure organisations; local development agencies; the local authority; and funders.'

- 4.15 Altogether, five key factors were thought to be constraining access to Charities Board funding in Barnsley, namely:
- lack of partnership working across organisations
 - an ambivalent relationship between statutory and voluntary sectors
 - fragmented infrastructure support
 - general lack of capacity
 - a small number of prominent organisations benefiting from regeneration funding.
- 4.16 We have therefore examined the characteristics of the chosen case study areas for clues relating to the above. Given that case studies were specifically chosen to reflect the spread and characteristics within Fair Share areas, the areas we are looking at are not all alike. However, a number of themes stand out.
- 4.17 First, most of the areas were, at the time of declaration of Fair Share, ones characterised by a dependency culture, for example on the coalfields, on Merseyside and in Basildon New Town. This can create additional problems for Fair Share and other initiatives targeting capacity building. Thus, for example, one of the coalfield authorities there is a concern that dependency on the Coal Board and subsequently on the local authority is at risk of now being replaced or paralleled by dependency on development workers from both voluntary and statutory sectors.
- 4.18 Secondly, there appears to be a very high representation of local authorities which can be characterised as delivery oriented, with under-development of the new partnership agenda. Frequently this is accompanied by relatively paternalistic values.
- 4.19 Thirdly, in the majority of the case studies, at the time that Fair Share was getting established, there was relatively under-developed voluntary sector infrastructure, and either a small community sector or one which does not have a history of collaborative working. In addition, many of the areas had stories to tell about troubled relationships which hampered overall partnership development in the sector, including unresolved 'competition' between organisations. Thus, for example, in one of the case study areas, change in the voluntary sector has been impeded by the existence of two umbrella organisations, both reportedly weak at that time, in conflict, and unwilling to work together, combined with a local authority that supported first one, then the other, and then wanted an entirely new organisation. In consequence, both organisations were in further decline and there was no leader or facilitator of joint action in the VCS.
- 4.20 In general, the case studies confirm the findings of the B4B initiative with respect to underlying factors in Fair Share areas, and also our own initial analysis at the time of case study selection, namely that there are clear links between the reasons for low levels of success in obtaining funding and both local authority partnership working and levels of development in the VCS.

4.21 One case study does not fit comfortably within this overview. There is a relatively strong and vibrant community sector with an active CVS, and the local authority is ranked as excellent by the Audit Commission (a measure which tries to take into account partnership working). Whilst the authority has been defensive about the evaluation, there is no evidence of 'hidden problems'. The VCS is open and candid. Our interpretation is that, in this area, a number of causes contribute:

- the low success rate in applications for medium and large grants to the then Community Fund prior to Fair Share suggests weaknesses in the systems associated with grant applications (lack of understanding of eligibility requirements, weak financial planning)
- the relative disinterest of the local authority in the lottery, and its overall small impact given the many other funding streams going into the Borough
- notwithstanding a strong VCS overall, weakness amongst the smaller groups with a lack of capacity to make applications
- poor understanding of, and a relatively negative attitude to, the former Community Fund.

4.22 In seeking to understand the reasons why areas didn't get their 'fair share', we are looking back at a time when Lottery Funds were not so concerned with an equitable spread of funding. Open grants programmes were looking for good projects to fund, and weren't set up to find and target areas where applications were not forthcoming or were weak. Whilst the Lottery was not amongst the causal factors, the way it worked didn't challenge the underlying factors until now. Evaluation of Fair Share provides an opportunity to see if the initiative being taken have a long term effect on distribution of funding.

5 Fair Share and the open grants scheme: approach adopted

A new approach

- 5.1 Fair Share was designed to pilot new approaches to outreach and development, as well as (and to help ensure) an increase in the spend of Lottery funding (CF and NOF) in the Fair Share areas. Increased *spend* and *innovation in approach* were thus of equal importance in the operation of the open grants scheme part of Fair Share.
- 5.2 Section 2 of this report has outlined the level of innovation that was encouraged in the new approach to outreach and development in the open grants programme (and the endowment areas). The community development methodology and capacity building approaches often used to underpin the new approach to outreach and development was also outlined in that section, and the limits to the use of community development methods in the Fair Share open grants scheme.
- 5.3 Section 3 outlined the spend patterns throughout the UK Fair Share areas, and identified implications from those findings.
- 5.4 This section outlines the forms the new approaches took in relation to the open grants scheme initiated by the then Community Fund (CF), and identifies some of the issues that arise from the new approaches. It is based primarily on research undertaken specifically for the evaluation, but also draws on internal Lottery papers, particularly the Fair Share Legacy Community Fund Approach, which provided a region by region summary of strategic and outreach approaches in some of the English regions.

Outreach and development activities

- 5.5 The Evaluation Year 1 report (2004) identified four principal strands of activity for CF staff working on Fair Share, based on analysis of the evaluation of the Brass for Barnsley initiative, and found that Fair Share workers continued these activities. These four strands were:
 - raising awareness through *publicity and promotion*
 - *partnership working* with key organisations and interests in the local area
 - *outreach work* including presentations, briefing sessions, surgeries etc
 - *support for the development of the voluntary sector infrastructure.*
- 5.6 Although these activities are continuing, the detailed case study work has identified two points of change from the initial analysis in the report of the evaluation at the end of year 1:
 - support for the development of the voluntary sector infrastructure is best analysed as part of a category of activity called *networking and partnership activities*, as it very often involves bringing a range of bodies together to create new structures of support (e.g. the local authority and the CVS and others)
 - two additional activities can be added:

- *pre-application advice and support* to potential applicants (often one to one), and
- *links to Lottery grant assessment processes* (including working closely with Grants Officers to give advice).

5.7 There is no single model of how the CF outreach and development work was undertaken throughout the UK, but there are various activities that many staff undertook. Table 6 overleaf outlines the range of different types of activities undertaken by CF outreach and development staff within the five categories summarised above.

Local outreach work

5.8 Similarly, there is no single framework for the development of Community Fund outreach work in the Fair Share localities over time, but a broad pattern of the steps taken in local outreach work can be discerned across the board:

- additional staff were appointed
- national guidance on delivery issues
- Local Delivery Plans were prepared
- key local partners were identified, and relationship building commenced
- publicity, promotion and outreach was undertaken
- internal management processes were adopted
- individual advice and support was provided to applicants.

These are discussed in turn below, and the issues arising are identified further on in this section.

5.9 *Additional staff were appointed* Once Fair Share started (April 2002), additional funding was made available to allow every regional office to employ more staff to undertake the outreach and development work identified as crucial to reaching those groups and communities that had not made successful Community Fund applications in the past. Levels of funding were linked to the size of awards in a region, which in turn influenced what a region could achieve.

5.10 Most regions took on at least one new regional outreach officer (ROO), brought in to support the strategic work that had already been started to some extent by the Fair Share Co-ordinators (mainly Regional Managers or Development and Communications Managers - DCMs). However, in Scotland no additional staff were taken on, and the outreach work was undertaken by Grants Officers (grants assessments were passed to different Grants Officers).

Table 6: events, tools and techniques in use in Fair Share areas by the CF ROOs

Publicity and promotion	Outreach work	Individual pre-application advice and support	Networking and partnership working	Links to grants assessment processes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FS launch events and regular briefing events • Presentations by CF staff at events organised by others bodies (e.g. regeneration or CVS events) - piggybacking on their events • Newsletter • Leaflets, inc brochures with specific local identity • Press releases, and ads in local papers for events • Regular contact with local news-papers, including on successful applications • FS publicity in libraries, medical centres and community centres • Info sent to partners and other development workers to go into their newsletters or to signpost potential applicants directly • Attendance at events organised by others, eg Funding Fairs • Use of local radio and TV • Briefings for MPs, councillors etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various events and meetings throughout local FS areas to be seen on the ground • Set up base in local organisation e.g. one day a week • Regular funding surgeries (e.g. monthly) held at local venues • Grants awareness training days • 'Before you apply' training events • Medium grants awareness training days • Conferences / training for target groups eg older age groups, and on key issues eg property • Contact with previous applicants (successful and unsuccessful) to encourage new applications • Attendance at other people's events, to be seen to be active in locality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One to one support to groups on request (by phone, letter, email or face-to-face meetings) • Targeted one to one support on initiative of CF • Applicant health checks • Use of outline proposal forms as basis for one to one advice • Advice particularly on project planning, proving need, showing outputs and outcomes, management and budgeting. • Workshops for unsuccessful applicants (potential for future successful applications) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial individual & group mtgs with relevant partners (e.g. leader of council, CVS, Lottery officers etc.) • Development of Local Delivery Plan with local partners • Formal agreement with key partners on their roles in FS • Local steering group with public, private & vol sectors • Regular update mtgs with key strategic partners to review FS progress & barriers to applications • Regular mtgs with key local bodies (e.g. LSP / CPP, SRB teams) to ensure up to date with local developments • Partner training & seminars on FS so they could advise to groups • Joint working with other funding initiatives (e.g. working with Obj 1 prog managers) • Briefing / training sessions for community development workers and funding advisors • Working with local funding groups • Enabling information sharing & networking between funders • Providing a neutral hub to enable joint working by bringing people tog to discuss local funding priorities • Facilitating development of a partnership agreement bet VCS groups and local statutory agencies • Assisting LSP & others to facilitate emergence of new networks <u>plus</u> support for vol sector infrastructure through funding projects, inc rev funding & capital works to enable joint premises 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants Officers taking responsibility for planning outreach • Grants Officers attending outreach events and surgeries to provide detailed advice • CF staff trained in assessment processes in order to provide accurate advice to applicants • Grants Officers attending meetings with key local partners (e.g. leader of the council, or LSP) • Informal briefings for Grants Officers when application passed for formal assessment

- 5.11 *National guidance on delivery* Briefing papers were produced, by the National Initiatives Manager, which provided a series of tools and techniques for Fair Share including Local Delivery Plan templates, budget templates, marketing and communications, local engagement issues, and establishing formal working relationships with NOF/CFN colleagues (to ensure links to the development of the endowment areas).
- 5.12 *Local Delivery Plan* The first step in most localities was the drafting and agreement of a Local Delivery Plan. These plans varied enormously in detail, and in the extent to which local partners were involved in the drafting process - from detailed involvement through to the plans being devised and agreed internally by the Community Fund with no local partner involvement at all.
- 5.13 By the end of 2002, all regions / countries had agreed their own Fair Share Local Delivery Plans (one for each Fair Share area). Each Delivery Plan outlined proposals for researching local need, designing and delivering appropriate outreach, and delivering pre-application support to local groups.
- 5.14 In the East Midlands region, the Local Delivery Plan was revised for at least one Fair Share area during the Fair Share period but few, if any, others were revised, and in many cases the Local Delivery Plan was no more than an initial statement of how the situation looked at the launch of Fair Share and work proceeded on the ground in response to local circumstances rather than adhering to those initial plans.
- 5.15 *Identify key partners and start relationship building* Once the overall strategy was in place (particularly agreeing the Local Delivery Plan), outreach staff started to identify key partners and meet with them in order to gain greater understanding of the local situation, identify key opportunities for joint working and start to establish relationships. New partners were identified over time, but the key external partners tended to be:
- the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP)
 - the local authority
 - the CVS or other umbrella body providing infrastructure support to the VCS locally
 - the VCS itself (individual groups and networks, where they existed).
- 5.16 This was always going to be an iterative process, with what would prove to be the most productive relationships not always being the most obvious or the first one tried. Various approaches were used. In one area, the CF officer brought the key partners together for initial meetings. In another, a three-way agreement was negotiated between the CF, the council and the CVSs, which clarified and formalised the roles of the different parties and identified the key local priorities for funding (subject areas / issues) and the key problems for applicants that needed to be tackled. In yet another, one to one meetings were held between the CF staff and the council, the CVS and the LSP.
- 5.17 Providing information to other development workers, so they could promote Fair Share themselves, was important in many areas. This type of 'training' (sometimes called 'induction') was designed to enable Fair Share workers to 'cascade' information through other organisations, which was seen as both a more efficient

use of Fair Share officer time, and more effective in reaching local community groups. The extent to which this was used depended on the capacity of these other bodies to work in this way, so success in using this approach relied on good local knowledge by the Fair Share officer.

- 5.18 Relationships with LSPs and local councils varied enormously. In some areas the LSP was seen by the local VCS as synonymous with the council and, depending on how the council was perceived by the local VCS, that could be either an advantage or disadvantage. In two areas, the councils were initially very interested when they thought they could control the Fair Share funds themselves (especially seeking to match external funding from elsewhere), and their interest faded when they realised that was not possible. In some cases, the council became obstructive after initial contact and the CF worker had to find alternative ways of working.
- 5.19 In one of the areas where the CF officer did try to work with the LSP to shape a more strategic approach to funding in the area, the attempts floundered when a key person left. However, the FS worker did then do a mapping exercise of funding going into the area, which showed far greater disparities between the north and south of the area, and provided much needed evidence for targeting those specific areas. This has been seen locally as a real contribution by Fair Share, which can be built on in the long term, and shows that there are opportunities for independent, external players to come in and help to bring about change.
- 5.20 One of the themes to emerge from the evaluation so far is the need for the outreach worker to find their niche - to fit into the right place in the local 'system', which requires a good understanding of the local context.
- 5.21 Another emerging theme has been the difficulties experienced by a number of staff in partnership working, and the pressures that such approaches put on individual outreach staff (including being time-consuming, but also dealing with personal pressures from sometimes very difficult individuals). It takes considerable skill and confidence, that come from experience and training, to deal effectively with these difficult situations.
- 5.22 *Start publicity and promotion and outreach* In most areas, publicity, promotion, awareness raising and outreach started in parallel with the partnership working. Almost all areas had launch events organised by CF staff to publicise Fair Share in the area.
- 5.23 Some areas did not have these events. For example, in one, the CF worker was warned that a single launch event would be counter-productive as many of the communities and groups in the area were in conflict, so a much softer promotional approach was taken focusing on outreach through CVSs (such as leaflets or piggybacking on their events), and through low key meetings with tea and biscuits, but no presentations.
- 5.24 In several areas, there was a reaction against 'glossy' leaflets, high profile events and formal presentations, and these tended to be reduced over time in favour of more targeted advice, piggybacking on other events, individual surgeries (sometimes at events, sometimes separately) etc. In addition, Fair Share / Lottery promotional events, including 'Before you Apply' workshops tended to be used at the beginning of Fair Share, but were used less as time went on, as Fair Share

- staff found that potential applicants preferred one-to-one advice on their specific application.
- 5.25 Other feedback included that groups did attend these initial workshops, launches etc but did not apply as they were overwhelmed by the information they were given on the 'responsibilities' they would have if they were given a grant, and the complications of the application and assessment procedures. One-to-one advice and surgeries allowed development staff to reveal these complexities to applicants more gradually, which had a more positive effect and did not put them off at the outset.
- 5.26 Similarly, media coverage was considered important at the beginning although some found that they had absolutely no follow-up enquiries from using mainstream media (local papers etc).
- 5.27 Several Fair Share workers were based (e.g. one day a week) in local CVSs or other local organisations, to make it easier for local groups to come to them for advice and information, though again this route did not always lead to successful outcomes.
- 5.28 One of the discernible patterns from Fair Share was the extent to which many Fair Share staff started off the process with a huge flurry of activity (promotion and outreach etc), and then stepped back to some extent in the hope and expectation that grant applications would start to flow in. By the time it became apparent that not as many good/ appropriate grant applications were being received as hoped for, time had passed, relationships had cooled and local profile had dropped. Where staff maintained a high level of pressure locally, through continuous levels of activity, the resulting level and quality of applications seems to have been higher.
- 5.29 *Internal management processes* Once the Local Delivery Plans had been approved by CF managers, internal management processes tended to focus on keeping managers informed of progress through regular meetings, and close working with Grants Officers to exchange information, support applicants, defer and/or negotiate assessments and follow-up rejects, and with compliance staff to contribute to monitoring.
- 5.30 *Individual advice and support to applicants* As Fair Share went on, individual advice and support to applicants became more and more important. This was the type of support groups themselves really wanted, so other forms of outreach and promotion became less important, although they remained an essential element of the work (to reach new groups, maintain profile etc).
- 5.31 Advice usually focused very specifically on the application form and process, and often used the outline proposal form (piloted during Fair Share, and since become a compulsory part of the formal application and assessment process) as the basis for the advice. Some Fair Share workers required an outline proposal form to be completed before advice was given.
- 5.32 Advice sought was generally around project planning, proving need, outputs and outcomes (many groups found it difficult to differentiate between these), and budgeting.
- 5.33 Feedback from project groups themselves suggests that the learning they gained from the advice on these types of issues was invaluable - not just in making a

successful application but also in managing their projects better in the long term. They mentioned huge 'learning curves' and the importance of changing their mind set from "give us some money to do something good" to thinking through exactly what they wanted to achieve, and why someone else should give them the money to do it.

- 5.34 This was significant capacity building work, and essential with the sorts of groups targeted in Fair Share. However, it is also likely to work equally well with groups in many other areas, few of which will have the levels of expertise some Fair Share groups now have as a result of this support.

Issues arising from the approaches adopted

- 5.35 Fair Share was piloting a whole range of approaches that were new to Community Fund staff, and there were inevitably some that worked better than others. It will be interesting to see what impact some of these new approaches have after Fair Share open grant funding has stopped completely, both in terms of internal impacts on Big Lottery Fund processes and external impacts on the organisations and processes in the Fair Share areas. In the meantime, some initial issues can be identified based on experience to date.
- 5.36 *Staff skills and experience* Numerous new staff were taken on by the Community Fund to undertake the detailed outreach and development work required by Fair Share - often called Regional Outreach Officers (ROOs). Many of the ROOs came from a community development background, which gave them a detailed understanding of how to work effectively with local communities, and how to enable those communities to increase their capacity.
- 5.37 The new staff and approaches did raise difficult issues for the Fund. There is a wide spectrum of activities involved in development work, and a shared understanding of what was required (or involved) for Fair Share was not made entirely explicit.
- 5.38 As a result, some of the new Fair Share staff saw the new outreach and development work as based on publicising funding programmes in new ways, and inspiring new or different groups to apply. Others took a much more developmental and strategic role which involved activities ranging from working with individual groups to help them think through their project planning, budgets etc through to brokering new local partnership working, and supporting local development agencies in the support those agencies could give to local groups. Others again saw themselves essentially as community development workers, continuing the neighbourhood work they had done before joining Fair Share.
- 5.39 The lack of explicit and detailed guidance on what development work in Fair Share meant in practice allowed a whole range of different approaches to be tried across the Fair Share initiative. But it also meant that some of the new skills (especially on community development) brought into CF were not always valued and made use of as much as they could have been.
- 5.40 As important, some staff were completely out of their depth with the new approaches, and were unable to deliver the hoped for results. Several felt they had been "chucked in at the deep end" and completely "at sea" (watery metaphors appeared throughout).

- 5.41 It will be essential, in any sort of replication of the approaches of Fair Share that, not only should development skills and experience be valued more highly in appointing to posts such as these, but also that workers should be provided with adequate support and training to enable them to continue to build their skills, alongside gaining experience on the ground.
- 5.42 *Challenges to internal priorities* The new approaches introduced through Fair Share were challenging to conventional Community Fund practice and staff expectations. There was one area, however, where internal processes did not change. Although there was clearly very early and explicit support from the highest level in the Fund for the new approaches to be used in Fair Share, all the formal performance measures remained focused on 'spend'. Although it is very difficult to measure the other, often intangible, outcomes of development work (e.g. trust, confidence, capacity), this emphasis on spend focused some of the early effort on getting the money out of the door rather than the longer term capacity building processes.
- 5.43 The drive for spend also may have affected the levels of funding made. In at least one case it is known that groups were advised to ask for less money than they felt they needed (specifically two years rather than three years funding) because it was more likely to be approved quickly if a lower amount was sought. Although advice was always welcomed by groups if it was going to help make the application successful, there is a concern that this approach may have been taken simply to accomplish spend, rather than ensuring the sustainability of the project itself.
- 5.44 This suggests that further thinking is needed about success criteria (and performance measurement) internally, which may need to take into account the importance placed by Fair Share on process outcomes (e.g. getting groups and institutions to work better together, improving local relationships, increasing the capacity of local groups, providing training) as well as product outcomes (spend).
- 5.45 In addition, there was apparently a hierarchy of status between different Community Fund activities (grants assessment, outreach, promotion), with grant assessment seen as the most important, outreach and promotion next and (possibly) advice and support to individual groups as least important. To the applicant groups themselves, this hierarchy of importance is likely to be reversed, which calls into question the extent of customer focus in delivery of the open grants part of Fair Share, and possibly in current Lottery services.
- 5.46 An example of this is where Grants Officers (there were no specific Fair Share outreach staff in this instance) were responsible for identifying (with local partners) what was needed in terms of outreach, and enquiries officers actually delivered the events or workshops or advice identified, even though enquiries officers knew least about the local context and were least likely to have the skills or knowledge (even about assessment processes) to provide high quality support. Even outreach officers were not always as familiar with assessment processes as they might have been, and some demanded (and received) training on assessment eventually - which they felt made the advice they gave much more authoritative and accurate.
- 5.47 If the approaches taken in Fair Share are likely to be replicated elsewhere in the Lottery, the status of outreach and development work need to be reviewed so that this work is seen as being as important as other internal processes.

- 5.48 A further complication is that there were mixed messages emerging from Fair Share. Fair Share was targeting the least capable groups who had not been able to make applications before, and was stressing how the funds were for them - but the assessment process was as demanding and bureaucratic as ever. Several projects said that if they had known how difficult it would be, they would never have started it. It may be that, if future programmes target similarly disadvantaged groups, this issue of the complexity and demands of the application and assessment procedure needs to be addressed. This is clearly not about reducing the rigour or objectivity of the process, but simply to enable groups to get through it with less trauma.
- 5.49 *Roles of partners* The ways in which Community Fund workers engaged with partner organisations is one of the most successful elements of the Fair Share process. New relationships have been forged between Lottery staff and local organisations, and a far greater understanding of the local context for grant-making has been achieved.
- 5.50 The initial expectation that Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) or Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) would be the key point of contact has proved variable. When Fair Share started, LSPs and CPPs were only just starting and, indeed, several had barely been established. They were finding their feet at the same time as Fair Share was hoping for a new strategic relationship. In some places, LSPs/ CPPs have now become an important focus for local strategic thinking that bring together all key local institutions in a real partnership; elsewhere, these bodies are no more than an offshoot of the local authority and have little relevance to the local VCS. But these are highly dynamic circumstances, and will continue to change over the next few years.
- 5.51 The clear implication for any future Lottery programmes wishing to make relationships at the local level is that simply identifying one type of local institution, and expecting that to work in the same way in each place, is not realistic. Some local bodies, such as the LSP, the local council and the CVS, will always need to be contacted, but the contribution they can make will depend on how things work locally, and any outreach worker needs discretion to make that judgement in the particular local circumstances.
- 5.52 The role of the CVS (or similar independent umbrella / infrastructure body) is also particularly important. In some places, the CVS was almost running Fair Share - doing promotion, making initial contact with groups and potential applicants, giving detailed one-to-one advice, providing premises for CF staff, running events etc. CVSs often see this work as part of the services they provide for the groups in their area, but the extent to which they can provide the services depends on their resources. Most CVSs are relatively small organisations with relatively vulnerable sources of funding. Some CVSs and other umbrella bodies were funded by Fair Share but (as far as we know) none were funded specifically to help with Fair Share in spite of undertaking quite considerable amount of work.
- 5.53 This has been a cause of problems at some locations. Not only were some CVSs not able to provide as much support to Fair Share (and their client groups) as they would have liked, but also that they will always (because of scarce resources) tend to promote and service those grant schemes which are easiest for their groups to access and for the CVS themselves to provide advice on - which will often not be medium and large Lottery grants. Furthermore, in some instances they have been doing work which they see as the Lottery's responsibility without having dedicated funding for the purpose.

- 5.54 *Timing and exit strategies* One of the missing elements in planning for Fair Share at local levels has been planning for the longer term, and the closure of CF funding.
- 5.55 At local community level, word of mouth and rumour play a central part in local knowledge, and rumours that the Lottery was changing, and that Fair Share was finishing, seems to have resulted in groups in some places feeling they could no longer make applications some time before the closing date had been reached. Meanwhile, groups were being advised by some Fair Share staff not to rush, and to get the application right rather than getting it in quickly, on the basis that funding would be available in the long term even if FS as a separate programme had finished.
- 5.56 Fair Share was designed to provide both long and short term funding, with the endowment providing the long term element. We need further evidence to assess how this works out over the following years of the evaluation. However, it is clear even now that:
- there is often little continuity between the open grant and the endowment areas, even geographically
 - projects that had expected to move from open grant funding programmes to endowment funding have been disappointed because of the time lag in getting the endowment funding operating
 - the relatively small sums available through the endowment funds, and the much more strategic approach to funding in the endowment areas (including commissioning in some cases), will reduce the potential for such continuity of local funding
 - restructuring of the main Lottery funds means that groups in the Fair Share areas that took advice about going slowly and had expected access to Lottery funding even when Fair Share stopped, are being disappointed.
- 5.57 In the short term, the most important of these is the last one. Three years to make an application is not unusual for local community groups with limited capacity and experience and, although there was no guarantee that future funding would be available to continue where Fair Share has stopped, there was a general expectation that something would be there. In the absence of the continuing availability of funding, it may be necessary (even now) to consider a more strategic exit strategy for the CF element of Fair Share, to ensure that the good relationships, goodwill and positive changes that have been achieved are not lost.
- 5.58 In summary, Fair Share has shown a wide range of outreach and development approaches, some of which worked remarkably well in supporting groups in disadvantaged areas to make successful applications. The key determinants of success have seemed to be two-fold:
- the skills and experience of the outreach worker, and their ability to work confidently and professionally in difficult local circumstances
 - the ability of the outreach worker to learn about, and work with, the local context - identifying the most relevant, acceptable and capable local partners

and finding ways of working with them that met their needs as well as ensuring that Lottery objectives were met.

- 5.59 The coming years of the evaluation will provide much more detailed data on the longer term impacts of Fair Share on the voluntary sector infrastructure, the sustainability of local groups and projects etc after funding has stopped (numerous projects are still being funded from applications approved at the end of Fair Share). The next chapter starts to explore evidence on the outputs and outcomes at this stage in the evaluation.

6 Fair Share and the open grant scheme: outputs and outcomes

Sources of evidence

6.1 The evidence we have used is drawn from information provided by the former Community Fund, from projects we have evaluated, and from discussions with a wide range of others in each case study area.

6.2 In this, the way that the projects were chosen for evaluation is important. Projects were selected at the case study level in order to give a representative picture of projects being funded at that location. Evaluators examined spread of projects in terms of size of award (£), type of group (local or national), and target beneficiaries, plus relevant local factors (for instance, in a coalfield community we would try to choose a project which reflected particular coalfield characteristics). The chosen projects reflected that spread. To date, 56 projects have been selected (NI projects have yet to be chosen).

6.3 The range of projects includes things as varied as:

- *Glespin Community Centre – (South Lanarkshire) £82,671.* Glespin is a remote village of 72 households in rural South Lanarkshire; 90% are council tenants and most are receiving benefits / tax credits. Glespin was feeling swamped by an expanding opencast mine, and residents were thinking it could be lost completely (like nearby Douglas West where all local residents left). There had been a miners welfare hall since the 1980s, rebuilt in 1997 by Scottish Coal and donated to the village in 1999, but they had never had the resources to do much with it. Fair Share funded the employment of a full-time worker for three years, and improvements to the hall. Now there is a youth club, and lots of other activities for young people (3-18) including dance classes and shows, painting, a teenagers group (including drug and alcohol education through the Healthy Valleys initiative). There is badminton and other sports for adults, Citizens Advice Bureau sessions once a week, adult literacy and numeracy, first aid, and computer courses. Crafts have emerged as a popular activity since an International Women's Day event, and residents are learning and sharing skills using knitting machines, tapestry, embroidery etc. The centre has also acquired an international reputation as a centre for story-telling, with weekly sessions and theme days - this year the themes include ecology and environment (linked to the opencast mine), and heritage and archaeology. The Centre worker feels that none of this would have happened without Fair Share. They didn't expect the success they have had and are going on to plan even bigger projects in the village. They hope their success encourages more funding to be given to 'no-hopers' like them.
- *Dudley Asian Women's Centre – Kaash Project £59,777* This project has used its Fair Share award to employ a project worker for three years to reach and involve disengaged and vulnerable Asian women in Dudley. The project worker has trained 15-20 volunteers per year to provide befriending, translating and interpreting services, a youth project and training, and self-development events. Work with Asian female single parents and a girls group has been a particular focus. There is evidence to suggest that some individuals that have used this service have been motivated to undertake training that has helped them to develop their own careers, for example by gaining teaching certificates. The Project Worker was herself a volunteer

with the Centre before joining the Kaash Project and school girls are welcome to undertake work experience here too. The Centre is run by and for Asian women of any or no religious background. Its work is characterised by the sensitivity it can apply to the delivery of its services and the confidence users can have in it because of that.

- *Hucknall and District Voluntary Sector Partnership - 'Under One Roof Project', Ashfield £353,000* This award has meant that the Partnership has been able to purchase and furnish a building which provides low cost user space for groups in the voluntary and community sector. It provides permanent accommodation (for instance, for Home Start, CAB, Furniture Project, Credit Union, Night Stop, and many more) and meeting rooms for other groups from within the local area. There is a full time centre manager, and the centre is increasingly involved in the provision of work related skills (such as training in the use of IT, food hygiene, first aid) for occupiers of the building and for people from the local community who come in to the building to use its services. A café currently operates part time to help provide a community focus. Under One Roof is run by and for the voluntary sector, and potentially is a very meaningful Fair Share legacy for the VCS and its infrastructure in this part of Ashfield.
- *Bolton Association & Network of Drop-ins (BAND) - project worker at Mission Café £211,558* BAND is a local group run for adults with mental health issues, largely by people who are ex service users themselves. The Fair Share funded project is a revenue project to employ additional staff to work in an existing town centre based and user-led Mission Cafe. The cafe is the focus for work-related training, for life and work skills development and confidence building, for providing a route back into wider society, and work for people with a wide range of mental health problems. Since project inception in August 2004, the project has supported 40 clients. It offers supplementary one-to-one support and guidance in job search and job application skills.

6.4 Projects are mainly about providing a range of activities and support for the hard to reach, for the vulnerable, and for isolated groups in society. Importantly, this is at locations and venues within their local communities. Not surprisingly, therefore, the projects are strongly dominated by use of revenue funding, particularly to employ support workers in various capacities including advocacy services, advice and counselling services, outreach to isolated people and communities, and centre managers for a wide range of community buildings. However, there have also been a significant number of applications for capital expenditure on buildings such as community centres. These tend to be the largest of the applications in terms of £ spent.

6.5 In order to learn from the projects, our approach has been to look at performance against the indicators developed for the purpose and listed in Annex 2. The indicators make direct links back to the aims and objectives of Fair Share.

Funding in Fair Share areas

- 6.6 Evidence that **Fair Share case study areas have got more lottery funding** is an indicator of change relevant to Fair Share. Table 7 shows spend in relation to Fair Share targets.
- 6.7 With the exception of Dudley and South Lanarkshire, all have totally or largely achieved their targets, and in Dudley awards are still being made. Reasons for underspend in South Lanarkshire have already been discussed in paragraph 3.11, and appear to be principally due to lack of capacity in the VCS and availability of other funds, plus the very large size of the target.

Table 7: lottery spend in Fair Share case study areas

Fair Share area	FS 3 year Target £'000	FS 3 year spend £'000	% of target (exc overspend)
Ashfield	£1,002	£3,178	100%
Basildon	£3,110	£3,458	100%
Bolton	£3,564	£4,061 ¹	100%
Dudley	£4,037	£3,556	88%
Ellesmere Port&Neston	£766	£975	100%
Kirklees	£4,221	£4,421	100%
Rotherham	£4,046	£4,350	100%
Northern Ireland	£333	£3,371	100%
South Lanarkshire	£5,415	£3,192	59%
Neath Port Talbot	£2,196	£2,093	95%

Source: Big Lottery Fund

¹ includes £1million delegation

- 6.8 From the case studies, a real variability in the size of awards between areas can be observed (see table 8 on following page). Nearly three-quarters of the projects in Neath Port Talbot are of a value of less than £100,000 whereas in Bolton, this category accounts for only 14% of projects. In Ashfield, a single project exceeded £350,000, and in Bolton a specially negotiated project gave just under £1million to a local organisation for delegated grant making.

Table 8: % of projects awarded Fair Share money by value (£) of awards

Fair Share area	£0-50k	£51-100k	£101-150k	£151-200k	£210-250k	£251-300k	£300k++	Total projects	Total value £'000
Ashfield	19% (4)	24% (5)	14% (3)	19% (4)	10% (2)	10% (2)	5% (1)	100% 21	£3,178
Basildon ¹	40% (6)	13% (2)	-	-	27% (4)	13% (2)	-	100% 15	£3,458
Bolton	7% (1)	7% (1)	13% (2)	20% (3)	27% (4)	27% (4)	-	100% 15	£4,062
Dudley	19% (6)	26% (8)	16% (5)	26% (8)	10% (3)	3% (1)	-	100% 31	£3,556
Ellesmere Port&Neston	25% (2)	25% (2)	13% (1)	25% (2)	13% (1)	-	-	100% 8	£975
Kirklees	18% (5)	25% (7)	11% (3)	14% (4)	4% (1)	29% (8)	-	100% 28	£4,421
Rotherham	26% (9)	14% (5)	23% (8)	17% (6)	9% (3)	11% (4)	-	100% 35	£4,350
South Lanarkshire	23% (9)	35% (14)	13% (5)	15% (6)	5% (2)	5% (2)	3% (1)	100% 39	£3,192
Neath Port Talbot ¹	40% (8)	30% (6)	10% (2)	5% (1)	10% (2)	-	-	100% 20	£2,093

Source: data obtained through case studies

1 denotes case studies where information currently missing on one project

6.9 Notwithstanding the great variability, it is evident that, in these Fair Share areas where previously performance with respect to accessing medium and large grants had been weak, groups have been receiving awards across a wide spectrum of project sizes.

6.10 An interesting dimension is whether this is due to a change in success rates or an increase in applications, or both. Success rates are particularly important because improved success is an indication that the capacity building work that has been done has been effective, and has hopefully developed skills which will be applicable in a range of future situations. Evidence from the case studies provides illumination.

6.11 In South Lanarkshire, it is clear that there has been a real change in terms of enabling disadvantaged groups to get access to lottery funding:

- there was a 70% success rate in 2002/3, compared to a 49% success rate pre-Fair Share
- in September 2004, there had been 33 successful projects, and 21 rejects since 2002; five of those rejects then went on to be successful, so only 16 failed completely

- the Council's perspective is that Fair Share has helped with this improved performance because groups in South Lanarkshire hitherto had a very poor track record of getting money in the past.

6.12 In Ashfield, an update of the Local Delivery Plan after two years showed a decline in the number of applications per year, but an increase in success rate, resulting overall in a higher number of successful applications and a larger average award size (table 9).

Table 9: changes in patterns of awards in Ashfield Fair Share area

Period	Average no of applications per annum	Average no of successful applies p/a	Average success rate per annum	Average size of award
1996-2002	20.3	5.3	26%	£60,984
2002-2004	13.5	7.0	51%	£156,785

Source: Ashfield Local Delivery Plan update

6.13 The decline in numbers of applications and increase in success must represent, at the very least in part, an improved understanding of Community Fund funding and of its requirements, and also an improvement in the quality of applications. The Development Team's advice records for the period 2002-04 show a drop in the number of groups applying before they have spoken to the Fund.

6.14 The lesson is that intervention and support can make a difference. However, achieving this is not easy. We already know that achieving spend has been very difficult in some areas. Basildon, for example, had real problems achieving their target, and so did Ellesmere Port. South Lanarkshire in particular still has some way to go.

6.15 Sticking with the issue of funding as an indicator of Fair Share performance, case studies also explored the extent to which Fair Share funding has enabled **disadvantaged groups to get access to other funding**. The starting point is that all projects are addressing disadvantage to some extent, and evidence on this is presented in a later set of paragraphs. For now, we take that as given, and the evidence that is being sought is the extent to which projects have been able to access other funding.

6.16 In Kirklees, the six case study awards had a combined value of £946,640 and their combined matched funding was £518,522 (see table 10). One of these projects (number 5) has access to a lot of financial resources and used the Fair Share funding as part of a mix and match approach, with Fair Share (though numerically larger) no more important than other sources of funding. For the others, Fair Share was the starting point of these particular projects, even when they accessed significant amounts of other money, and it is safe to say therefore that Fair Share has assisted with enabling groups to get access to other funding.

Table 10 : additional funding coming in through Fair Share Kirklees

Project no	New or existing group	Size of award £	Size of match £	Follow on funding facilitated by Fair Share
1	New	51,980	28,540	5 new projects at planning stage by project worker funded through FS
2	New	180,409	16,500	3 pieces of funding since; not evidence that linked in any way to FS
3	Estab	143,642	144,131	none
4	Estab	25,700	-	none
5	Estab	257,143	149,351	none
6	Estab	287,766	180,000	3 pieces of funding since; not evidence that linked in any way to FS

- 6.17 An important qualifier here is that only two of the projects are by new (less than five years old) groups. This suggests that, whilst Fair Share is helping with access to other money, it is doing so principally for well established organisations who are already familiar with funding regimes.
- 6.18 The picture is different in each case study area. In Bolton for example, the eight case studies had a combined value for their Fair Share awards of £1,945,364, and total matched funding was £606,789. In fact, only four out of the eight had any match, with two of them getting very substantial sums from elsewhere. In both these cases, the funding from Fair Share was just part of the funding cocktail and was not the starting point for the funded project.
- 6.19 The overall message is that Fair Share funding has enabled disadvantaged groups to get other funding. The caveat to this is that many of these groups have had funding in the past. Across all the Kirklees awards, 72% went to established groups, and only 28% to new groups.
- 6.20 Other evidence of impacts of Fair Share on the ability of disadvantaged groups to access funding has come from the Coal Fields Regeneration Trust in the East Midlands. The Trust reports that they have experienced a considerable improvement in the quality of applications they have been receiving, which they attribute to Fair Share. They are intending to do a formal analysis of this, and will share their findings when they are available.

Engaging disadvantaged people and meeting their needs

- 6.21 At the outset, it is important to be satisfied that Fair Share projects are addressing disadvantage. Table 11 sets out a breakdown of the case study projects by type. It shows that some projects address disadvantage in a relatively generic way, for example by providing community facilities or revenue funding for support staff. Others target specific sections of the community who are recognised to have particular needs, and aim to meet those.

Table 11: types of disadvantage targeted by projects¹

Fair Share area	General disadvantage ²	Children and YP	Older people	BME groups	Disability	Women	Other
Ashfield	62% (13)	24% (5)	-	-	13% (3)	- ³	-
Basildon	6% (1)	29% (5)	12% (2 ⁵)	-	18% (3)	-	35% (6 ⁵)
Bolton	6% (1)	20% (3)	-	20% (3)	-	48% (7)	6% (1)
Dudley	-	19% (6)	10% (3)	26% (8)	29% (9)	-	16% ⁴ (5)
Ellesmere Port & Neston	25% (2)	25% (2)	13% (1)	13% (1)	13% (1)	13% (1)	-
Kirklees	32% (9)	14% (4)	3% (1)	18% (5)	25% (7)	7% (2)	-
Rotherham	25% (9)	21% (8)	16% (5)	3% (1)	-	-	34% (12)
South Lanarkshire	33% (13)	21% (8)	8% (3)	-	23% (9)	-	15% (6)
Neath Port Talbot	40% (8)	15% (3)	20% (4)	10% (2)	25% (5)	-	10% (2)
% of all projects	26%	19%	9%	13%	15%	6%	12%
Provisional total	42	31	14	22	25	10	20

1 data for Northern Ireland projects will be available following completion of the case study

2 general projects serving disadvantaged neighbourhoods eg community centres, community radio

3 one projects which includes women is under children and young people as the principal target group

4 includes 2 x not a local priority (Groundwork and Lye Regeneration Alliance)

5 this includes one project targeted at another specific group (lesbians and gays), four targeted at whole areas but not necessarily picking up the disadvantaged, and one not addressing disadvantage at all

6.22 Given that the starting point is that Fair Share areas are characterised by high levels of deprivation, and that many of the projects target sub groups known to be affected by disadvantage within this, then it appears to be unarguable that projects are, largely, tackling disadvantage, though most case study areas have exceptions to that 'rule'. In one, out of a total of 17 projects, four are targeting whole areas and not necessarily picking up the disadvantaged, and one is not addressing disadvantage at all.

6.23 Through the case study work, there has been considerable discussion about the extent to which the funded projects are really addressing disadvantage, with a wide spectrum of views from the various commentators. Essentially, much of this discussion is about whether Fair Share could have done better. The comments (brackets show their origins) include:

- there has been too much funding for larger organisations and projects and for 'usual suspects' (LAs and VCS)

- impacts could have been much more beneficial in terms of reaching out to real pockets of deprivation through more funding in the £5-60k bracket (VCS)
- impacts could also have been helped by providing additional points for new/bottom up organisations (VCS)
- there has been too much funding of organisations (however legitimate) that are able to get money from elsewhere (VCS and LAs)
- some awards appear to be related more to achieving targets than anything else (VCS and LAs)
- there has been too much funding of projects that would have been eligible for more conventional funding streams such as Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (LAs)
- whilst applications are going to needy areas, (such as for the provision of facilities), they are often propping up the status quo (servicing the dependency culture) rather than challenging it (VCS)
- projects are not making a difference to experience, to culture, to doing things differently (LA).

6.24 So there are reservations, particularly a clear perception that improved targeting would have further improved outcomes. Accepting, however, that the majority (but not all) are projects which are seeking to tackle disadvantage, the first indicator is whether, as a result of Fair Share, **more disadvantaged people are involved in starting/running projects**. The starting point for the evidence comes from who is running the projects. In one of the case studies, out of the five projects we have been able to visit:

- one is run by paid staff, but with significant involvement from the target group (young people and children at risk of exclusion) in creative direction and content
- one is run by a development worker plus volunteers and trustees, and is largely run by the target group, though this target group is not well represented in the area, and the work is largely outside the Fair Share area
- one is run by paid staff and volunteers, with most volunteers coming from the user group (people with mental health problems and learning difficulties)
- one is run for the entire community rather than being targeted at disadvantage; it is run by paid staff and volunteers, mostly drawn from the local area, so there is considerable involvement of the beneficiary community; the project provides advice, and disproportionately serves those in financial hardship or with other welfare, health and benefits issues
- one is an extension to the above project, and the same argument applies.

6.25 Out of these five projects, most were in existing organisations or were started by outsiders. There is, however, significant involvement in some by local residents and user groups. Most projects here can provide evidence of new or more disadvantaged people being brought into the projects over time.

- 6.26 Overall, our observation is that very few of the projects are actually started by and run by disadvantaged people, though there are very good exceptions. The great majority are run for people affected by disadvantage.
- 6.27 The indicator asks if more disadvantaged people are involved in running projects. Currently we have no evidence to suggest that this is the case. Overall, the extent to which those running projects have been able to involve the user groups in the development, governance and running of the projects is disappointing.
- 6.28 The question then is whether **more disadvantaged people/areas benefit from funded projects?** There is clear evidence that disadvantaged people and areas are benefiting. In so far as more activity is taking place in areas of disadvantage, it can reasonably also be assumed that more are benefiting. This does raise issues of additionality: are these projects which would not otherwise have happened, and this is something which we have not yet addressed?
- 6.29 Finally, with respect to the theme of engaging disadvantaged people and meeting their needs, there is the issue of whether **more funded projects benefit all sectors of society** (social cohesion and inclusion).
- 6.30 There are some projects without a specific target on disadvantage. For instance, in one area Fair Share has funded the Women's Institute, and in another the Citizens' Advice Bureau. Such projects aim to benefit all who seek to make use of them. The majority of the projects funded are specifically hoping to have benefits for wider social cohesion. One, for example, brings a range of partners together (such as Sure Start, community police), and stimulates the only significant examples of Muslim and white communities in their local town coming together. Given that they have increasing number of people attending their events, they argue that this is on a growing scale.

Skills and learning

- 6.31 From all the case study areas except one, there is significant evidence of growth in skills and learning from the projects examined. The first indicator is **whether group members gain skills, confidence, new aspirations and/or raised morale?** It should be noted that the most frequent beneficiaries in these sense are found amongst the management group and the paid workers, but that there are also significant benefits for volunteers. The scope of such benefits includes:
- upgrading of IT skills
 - increase in self confidence
 - improved capacity for effective communication with people whose first language isn't English
 - increased knowledge about how organisations function, and a range of relevant requirements (such as constitution, business plans, health and safety requirements, child protection issues)
 - management and supervision of staff and volunteers
 - development of entrepreneurial skills as projects seek self sustainability

- doing presentations
 - dealing with the press, public, and local/national politicians
 - fund raising generally, and also money raising events
 - decision making and problem solving
 - project management.
- 6.32 A follow on to this is the issue of whether **group members are parts of networks which give access to more learning and training**. There was no general evidence of this, though some groups are tapping in to organisations which provide specific training, and this is drawing them further into the VCS in their area. In one, for example, reference was made to the fact that Fair Share has created opportunities for groups to come together and learn from one another. Celebratory events where groups have been able to meet up have happened in at least one region, and one project raised the benefits of such events, saying that they would welcome a forum (even a web-site) where information could be exchanged.
- 6.33 In some situations, skills development will be through training which may also lead to specific qualifications. The case studies have investigated whether **group members have completed training and/or gained qualifications**. There is substantial evidence of this, done on a 'needs basis' to reflect the needs of the projects as they develop. Much of the training is therefore related to the demands of the particular role that any individual is performing. Examples cited include:
- accounting and book keeping
 - child protection
 - driver training
 - IT and clerical skills development
 - managing conflict
 - supervision.
- 6.34 In some projects, there is evidence that people would like to do more training, with workshops related to community work being cited. There is also evidence of people involved in projects changing their current direction, and going on to new work which in itself requires skills. Thus, for example an admin/support worker on one project is now getting training to enable him to be a youth worker.
- 6.35 Finally, projects were asked if they feel that they can go on to **do more, or different, or bigger projects**. In most areas, there are some groups (typically around a third) who are up for the challenge. In one area, for example, two groups report that they have already gone on to new things, in both instances by extending the scope of their target groups. In another area, one group is very positive about tackling new things. In yet another, there is clear evidence that three out of the seven case study projects (and probably more as well) are developing and extending their work already, and will go on to do more. Here

they tend to feel that they haven't got a choice because they are acutely aware of the need to become more self sustaining, and are looking for ways to achieve this.

Lasting impacts on the groups

- 6.36 By way of introduction, it is important to recognise that many of the projects say that what they have done has been a huge learning curve. This has made a big difference to the strength of the organisation, and they "feel like a proper organisation now". In particular, many can recognise that they do have more capacity, and feel it is not beyond their reach any more to get funding – though it might not be through the lottery in future, and they are starting to look elsewhere.
- 6.37 The indicators for change are ones which are relevant over time (longevity of group, total funding over time, number/ size/ types of projects and how it changes, awards/ press coverage, and numbers of people involved in the group in different ways), and we will be accumulating evidence through the period of the evaluation.
- 6.38 Of these, the information that we have collected to date on **awards, press coverage and other recognition** is interesting. Normally awards etc are evidence of a project which is genuinely important to the group and for which they want recognition. Generally we have found that many of the groups are very good at handling the press and at getting appropriate publicity. One project (for young people with special needs and their carers) has been an exemplar. They have created a high profile in the local and national press and on television. Their local MP and others have been visitors. They have a Queen's Award for the Voluntary Sector, plus other awards. They have become a resource for other groups wanting to raise their own profiles who come to them for advice. In contrast, in another area none of the projects have achieved publicity beyond the stage of the award being granted.
- 6.39 Clearly, this issue of lasting impact is of fundamental importance to the success of Fair Share, and it will be an area of great importance in later stages of the evaluation. We are aware, however, that it will be difficult to disentangle Fair Share impacts from those of a wide range of other impacts, and that there will be inevitable qualifications to what we say.

Impact on quality of life and social capital

- 6.40 We have been asking questions about quality of life and social capital (neighbours, safety, isolation, facilities, harmony). However, these have proved to be largely irrelevant to many of the projects that are being funded. In some instances project workers will know more local people as a result of their work, but overall the projects are not ones which are addressing quality of life in neighbourhoods, but are more about capacity building and support.
- 6.41 It is anticipated, however, that they may well be relevant with respect to the endowment areas.

Impact on capacity of the VCS

- 6.42 Impact on the capacity of the VCS is again a question where greatest illumination will come over time. However, we are starting to get glimpses of what our findings might be. Effectively, we anticipate a spectrum of impacts, between two very stark extremes.
- 6.43 In one case study area, all the case study groups saw Fair Share as just another source of funding and did not highlight any significant distinguishing features of it. Nobody there really thinks they are better prepared for life in the VCS after Fair Share. They simply see themselves as being back where they were at the start and having to hunt the next funding source. Here this is combined with a poor response from the local authority, a fragile CVS, and the fact that Fair Share has not yet really helped to build a more coherent community infrastructure. The general conclusion is that this case study area could well become eligible for another 'fair share' priority treatment in the future, though the impacts of the endowment scheme may soften this harsh judgement.
- 6.44 In contrast, in a different area, which was very troubled at the start of Fair Share, people in the voluntary sector and community development workers are starting to see changes, which they trace, in part, back to Fair Share. The source of the change is the Local Strategic Partnership. Through the Partnership, community groups have access to service providers, and the potency of this is becoming apparent. Those changes are linked to Fair Share. The Fair Share outreach worker was seen as impartial and without an agenda. She played a positive role in changes to the working of the LSP. In addition to the LSP legacy, she helped to strengthen the role of the organisation most likely to have the role as the lead VCS infrastructure organisation.
- 6.45 Elsewhere, there is lots of evidence of people feeling that impacts on capacity of the VCS have already been positive. Examples include:
- the Fair Share approach used in the open grants programme has helped groups to make better applications in the future, by having been through the process on an assisted basis, and in turn this is enabling groups to make better bids to other funders
 - evidence that it has enabled groups to come forward who would not otherwise have done so
 - improved links between lottery and local organisations (LA, CVSs, community groups etc) has raised awareness of the lottery, with the outreach work creating a better understanding, and a human face; there are benefits to the sector of access and communications.
- 6.46 A number of commentators have raised the issue that such changes may well prove to be transient, given that the timescale for support through the Fair Share open grants programme has been so short.

Impact on capacity of the community

- 6.47 Like impact on the VCS, impact on the community is a long term issue, and it is too soon to say what the outcome will be. This will be a major focus of the next round of evaluation.

7 Fair Share and the open grant scheme: interim conclusions

Aims of the initiative

- 7.1 Fair Share was designed to pilot new approaches to outreach and development, as well as (and to help ensure) an increase in the spend of Lottery funding (the former CF and NOF) in the Fair Share areas. Increased *spend* and *innovation in approach* were thus of equal importance in the operation of the open grants scheme part of Fair Share.
- 7.2 This section summarises some of the key issues arising from the ways in which the programme has been delivered, and some lessons for the future.

Fair Share targets and timescales

- 7.3 The size of the targets for the open grant programme (in England, Scotland, Wales) were related to an arithmetical calculation which reflected a consistent application of an agreed principle. The targets were not adjusted through reference to local operating circumstances and opportunities, some of which changed dramatically since Fair Share was first planned.
- 7.4 For example, the overall amount of funding available for the Community Fund reduced dramatically during the period 2001 (when Fair Share was being planned) to 2005. This meant that Fair Share took a much larger slice of the overall budget at regional and country level. This would not have been a problem on its own, but in many cases the quality of the projects coming forward for funding through Fair Share was not always as high quality as some projects from other areas, some of which were for far more disadvantaged groups. This did then begin to cause problems internally as staff saw poor quality projects in Fair Share areas being funded while excellent projects elsewhere, serving very disadvantaged groups, were not getting anything.
- 7.5 There are clear lessons here for geographical targeting. It has been well known for many years that not all disadvantaged people live in anything that could be classified as disadvantaged neighbourhoods. While this has always been taken account of in rural areas, it is beginning to be more widely understood in urban areas as well, especially as the boundary problems of regeneration programmes are becoming better understood (e.g. funding on one street not available on another because outside the regeneration boundary, resulting in the excluded area declining over time and then itself needing regeneration). The Lottery may wish to avoid geographic concentrations of disadvantage in the future and find other ways of targeting disadvantage and the equitable distribution of funds.
- 7.6 Fair Share has also experienced problems with changes to the wider funding context. In some Fair Share areas, although Lottery spend may have been low in the past, the evaluation has found evidence that there has been significant other funding available. Fair Share may have been seen as a 'drop in the ocean', and that lack of demand for Fair Share funding may have been because groups had so many other options for accessing funding. In these cases, Fair Share was simply another pot of money and was not always making the distinctive contribution that had been hoped for.
- 7.7 In addition, Fair Share grants were sometimes actually too much money for groups with low capacity, confidence and ambition. They did not want to take the

step of employing someone, or taking on responsibility for a major project. And they may also have found what they saw as the very complicated application and assessment process too much to take on, even with support.

- 7.8 Groups cannot be forced to grow and take on more or bigger projects. They may actually be entirely happy with the role they currently have, and they may be serving the needs of the people they are set up to serve entirely adequately. The important element of funding for these types of groups is that funding sources are around in the long term so that, if they do decide they want to do something given the availability of funding, they can think about it in their own time, and make the application when they are ready.
- 7.9 Fair Share had the problem of dealing with areas and groups which for years had been unable to achieve high lottery spend, and were then expected to turn their performance around in under three years. A more tailored approach, plus a longer timescale, would have created a more realistic framework which was less disruptive to the work of the Fund and equally, if not longer, lasting in its beneficial impacts.

Capacity building and community development

- 7.10 It will be essential to return and review the impact of Fair Share on its longer term aims in the following years. At this stage, it is clear that Fair Share has been achieving a measure of capacity building among some very disadvantaged groups, within the community development methodology (and values of social change) chosen.
- 7.11 The success of Fair Share has been in working at a small-scale, targeted, low key way with individual groups to provide them with the support they want. It has focused on supporting groups to complete application forms themselves and has aimed to avoid the syndrome of less experienced support organisations who simply take over the process, get the funding and then have to deal with the problems of the group not being able to manage the project.
- 7.12 At its best, Fair Share outreach has been very responsive to the demand from groups for individual help, and has resisted simply continuing with traditional Lottery approaches of outreach and promotion which can sometime focus on speed of delivery, number of meetings and numbers attending, and numbers of applications. This has proved both popular and effective.
- 7.13 Although it is not glamorous or high profile, feedback from groups suggests that this is the approach they value most highly, and several groups have identified the huge 'learning curve' they have gone through, which has helped them feel more confident about running major projects. As a result, the reputation of the Community Fund (now the Big Lottery Fund) workers has risen significantly. As has been mentioned before, word of mouth (or gossip) is a very important part of establishing or undermining a local reputation.

Inconsistency of performance

- 7.14 A review across the case study areas, however, shows a very wide range of performance. from areas where the Community Fund's approach seems to be having a strongly positive impact through to areas where it appears to have made little difference. The reasons for inconsistency in performance between case studies are many. Not least, there were variations in resources available.

However, it appears likely that this is linked in part to lack of clear guidance on what was expected of outreach workers. It would have been better to accompany the invitation to innovate with a minimum set of expectations for the Fund's workers to follow.

Funding for projects

- 7.15 The evaluation team has not obtained data from all funded projects from all the Fair Share open grants areas, so cannot undertake a full analysis of the types or size of projects across the UK.
- 7.16 From the evidence available to us, there are signs that, in some areas, there was a whiff of "if it moves, fund it" as a result of pressure to achieve target spend within the timescale given. Some of the negative ways that this pressure has been manifested include:
- spending on projects that have more than 50% of their beneficiaries outside the Fair Share area
 - poor quality applications that would not have been funded in non-Fair Share areas
 - several groups getting 2-3 grants for different aspects of their work
 - projects not specifically serving disadvantaged groups
 - duplication of facilities very close to each other.
- 7.17 These issues are not necessarily major causes for concern, but they are likely to cause resentment against an initiative like Fair Share when other high quality projects cannot gain funding (as mentioned above) in an era when overall spending budgets are much smaller than when the initiative started.
- 7.18 There have been particular dilemmas for Fair Share in funding voluntary sector infrastructure projects (e.g. CVS work). In some localities it is far from clear what the main infrastructure organisation is, with several bodies competing for the role. Specific examples from the evaluation case studies include:
- Fair Share funding all 3 CVSs in one Fair Share area (plus another rural umbrella and servicing body), when the council now appears to feel that only one is needed and that the Fair Share funding has complicated the situation
 - the CVS wanting to apply for Fair Share funding but the LSP not supporting it, so it got nothing.
- 7.19 Fair Share has resulted in CVSs often doing a lot of work, for which they got no additional resources (even if they got funding for other projects). In some areas, the CVS or similar organisation has been absolutely central to the work of the FS programme, which would have achieved far less without their involvement. However, there are questions about the extent to which the voluntary sector infrastructure organisations have come to rely on Fair Share money, and what impact that will have on their long term sustainability.
- 7.20 There is also an associated issue, which is the extent to which spending in Fair Share has focused on 'enabling' projects (such as CVSs) and those which are

providing direct services to disadvantaged people locally, and how this may roll out to future Lottery funding programmes.

- 7.21 Another issue on funding for projects is the extent to which the Fair Share funding has been integrated with local priorities. Although the Local Delivery Plan was intended to ensure compatibility with local priorities, these often got lost in the local projects that simply emerged through the outreach and development (and promotion) work at local level.
- 7.22 The issue of integration with local policy priorities therefore remains largely unresolved. Three of the local authority partners would have liked to address this issue by simply taking control of the funding available themselves, so as to allocate grant aid to those projects that fit in with the community plan / strategy (that they often wrote). Such an approach would clearly have conflicted with the potential for Fair Share money to support an independent and diverse voluntary sector (as well as breaking the legal requirements not to directly fund public sector bodies).
- 7.23 Another approach, taken in East Midlands region, was for the CF worker to take the role of neutral facilitator and try to ensure that the VCS worked more effectively together, and with the local authority, to come to joint conclusions about funding priorities. It is still very early to assess the success of this approach, but it could provide a useful model for balancing independent neutral funding with a diverse and independent VCS and the priorities agreed by the LSP / CPP for the community plan or strategy.
- 7.24 Finally, with respect to funding, is the extent to which the projects that were funded were by and for disadvantaged people, and how disadvantage is defined. Although the sense we have from the case study areas is that most of the projects were run for, rather than by, disadvantaged people, certainly some projects were run by disadvantaged people for themselves and their peers.
- 7.25 Defining disadvantage in this context is extremely difficult. Is the woman who is now running the community centre as a paid worker disadvantaged, even though she was until recently just another local resident active in her very deprived local community; Or the man who has chaired the miners welfare committee for the past 25 years, a miner himself, but now running a project costing hundreds of thousands of pounds - both are leading Fair Share projects? Do people move out of disadvantage by virtue of running a Fair Share project? And what about the impact on disadvantaged people of having a new project that provides services for them and which enables them to take a new role in their local community as a user of those community services, which may lead to closer involvement and eventually to a role in running the project (as very often happens)?
- 7.26 These issues will require further attention over the coming years of the evaluation, as will their implications for the indicators currently in use for the evaluation, some of which have already proved more useful than others.

What makes a difference?

- 7.27 There are several large and small factors which have clearly made a difference to the success of Fair Share on the ground. In no particular order, these include the following.

- 7.28 *The importance of context in planning outreach and development work.* It has been mentioned by several respondents that Fair Share could have been seen as 'parachuting' in to the area about which they knew little. Where Fair Share development workers have been most successful, they have found a specific 'niche' for their activities, so they worked with existing local organisations, and filled gaps where these existed. They have recognised the importance of context in identifying appropriate partners, methods etc. This has been a key skill for the development workers, which has made the local work much more successful.
- 7.29 *Use of community development approach* When starting this evaluation, it was not entirely clear to what extent Fair Share outreach workers were using community development methods and capacity building expertise to meet the initiative's objectives. It has become clear that what has been most successful is where a community development methodology is used to articulate the values of the approach (social change and tackling disadvantage) and ways of working (supporting, enabling, listening, delivering what is required locally according to local circumstances, working in partnership, bringing people together, etc).
- 7.30 This is not about in depth neighbourhood work, which is (and should be) done by existing local organisations. Even where these did not exist, Fair Share workers could not possibly have undertaken such work given the timescale of open grants parts of the initiative. So, instead, they worked with existing organisations and made the best use of those, and supported and strengthened the organisations that needed that. This seems to have been the most effective approach to date, and it will be very interesting to revisit the case study areas in the coming years to see how sustainable this approach has been.
- 7.31 *Skills of the workers.* Both the previous points rely on the skills and experience of the workers. This has worked well where staff have come in with the appropriate skills, but there have been problems for staff appointed without these skills. There has apparently been insufficient training and support for these inexperienced workers who have found the partnership working in particular both difficult and challenging, and have not gained the experience and confidence that would have grown with the right support.
- 7.32 It has become clear that the skills of outreach and development workers are very valuable in a funding programme which aims for any sort of capacity building, and that they are very different from (although as important as) other skills needed in grants assessment and monitoring. It may therefore be worth considering further the extent to which the roles of grants assessment and outreach and development can or should be merged at any point in the future. At present, it seems more appropriate for the two roles to remain separate.
- 7.33 *Outline proposal form.* Although not always used, an outline proposal form has been very useful. Despite criticisms from some quarters about its current contents and size (too short for complex projects, too demanding for simple projects), it has been a tool for encouraging groups to start the formal process of application. There do remain questions about whether the form should be compulsory, as it does add in another layer of bureaucracy for those projects that do not need detailed advice and support, and this may benefit from some further consideration.
- 7.34 *Support for the voluntary sector infrastructure.* The support provided for the VCS infrastructure organisations has been very valuable for their own development and survival, and has demonstrated to local groups an understanding that such services are valuable and needed. Some of the dilemmas of this strategy are

outlined above, but for Fair Share the investment in these bodies has clearly been an important element of local success.

- 7.35 *Internal success criteria.* There have been problems in the pressures on Fair Share staff to achieve spend at the expense of capacity building, and it may be important in future to consider revising performance measures for outreach and development work. This had a number of negative consequences, including that an initial flurry of activity was not followed up, in the expectation that it would generate sufficient applications and there was then a hiatus until it was realised that input needs to be constant in these disadvantaged areas.
- 7.36 In practice, Fair Share has been a very short term initiative, with most outreach workers only in post from the end of 2002 and expecting to generate major grant applications for some of the most disadvantaged areas in the country, which had not done so before, in less than three years. Funding has been similarly short term, usually three years maximum. For projects in disadvantaged areas, starting from scratch, that is very little time - with what is usually seen as one year to get going, one to do the work and a third year to either wind down (and workers leave) or desperately seek alternative funding.
- 7.37 The timing of changes to the Lottery overall have been very unfortunate for Fair Share. Apart from the rumours putting groups off from making applications as a result of the uncertainty, applications that result from the development work will continue to come forward and there will be no funding stream to which they can easily apply, leaving them high and dry. This will need careful handling in the coming months to ensure that the reputation of the Lottery is not damaged by the apparent insensitivity to the needs of local groups.

After the Fair Share open grant scheme

- 7.38 The absence of an effective exit strategy has already been noted, beyond informal links to the endowment area funding (with its discontinuities of geographical area etc). It will be important for the evaluation to assess the final contribution of Fair Share to all the relevant indicators that are designed to show longer term change (including sustainability of projects and development of groups).
- 7.39 It will also be particularly important for the learning from the Fair Share initiative to be fed into appropriate internal development processes, sharing lessons from the workers with direct experience. An evaluation and its report can only be part of that process and it is hoped that any future similar programmes involving capacity building, outreach and development, will build sharing learning effectively into the ongoing management of the programmes.

8 Fair Share and the endowment scheme: progress so far

Introduction

8.1 The endowment scheme is the initiative of the former New Opportunities Fund (NOF). This chapter looks at how the scheme has been developing. As the following sections show, much of the work that has been done so far is putting in place building blocks which will enable local communities, through their Panels, to determine how the money in their areas will be spent. At this stage, therefore, we are largely chronicling what has happened, with a commentary on issues that have emerged so far.

Appointment of the award partner and local agents

8.2 The Fund's Board agreed that the Fair Share initiative should be established on a UK wide basis through the appointment of a single award partner, able to defer to national and local regeneration policies. The chosen model is founded on the achievement of two principles:

- the establishment of a single Fair Share fund to be invested over time to generate a sustained source of income for the nominated Fair Share communities
- delivery of that funding to the areas through local structures managed by a network of local agents, appointed by the chosen award partner.

8.3 The Fund identified the Community Foundation Network (CFN) as the partner to deliver this model. The Network works under its own name in England, through Sefydliad in Wales which is the Welsh Community Foundation, through the Scottish Community Foundation, and through the Community Foundation Northern Ireland.

8.4 The first step in the expendable endowment areas has been the appointment of the local agents to undertake and manage the task of local grant making.

8.5 In England, the CFN has identified local Community Foundations and, where a local Community Foundation is not available or is too immature, other local grant making organisations. Of the English endowment areas, 37 are being done by member organisations of the CFN network and 8 by others. These latter are Great Yarmouth Community Connections, Peterborough CVS, Suffolk Acre, the Scarman Trust in Enfield, Blackpool, Wyre & Fylde CVS, Cheshire Community Council, Burnley, Pendle & Rossendale CVS, and the West Lancashire CVS. In Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, the relevant Community Foundation is itself acting as the local agent, there being no local partners under their umbrella.

8.6 The case studies have shown that the process of appointing the local agents has caused problems in some areas of England. For example:

- in one, the local authority feels that it should have been the grant making organisation rather than the nominated agent
- in another, the local authority would have preferred a local agency that could make use of existing networks and infrastructure (Community Volunteer

Service) rather than the nominated agent which is regarded as having little connection with the local area and needing to set up a new structure for the purpose; in addition, to the practical concerns, there is disquiet that this important decision was top down and was not vested in the local authority

- elsewhere, the whole process has been exceedingly protracted, with many local problems.

8.7 In England, therefore, this part of the Fair Share process has therefore currently created a legacy which, in a number of areas, includes bruised feelings and local authority alienation. There appear to have been unclear messages in that the importance of links in to local regeneration policy and initiatives was emphasised at the outset of Fair Share, yet local authority partners feel excluded from the key role of grant giver. However, the chosen approach of independent local agents creates, amongst other things, the potential for this local initiative to be separate from the local authority with the opportunity to explore the benefits that this might bring.

8.8 In Scotland, the appointment of the Scottish Community Foundation does not appear to have been widely questioned, although it is a relative newcomer to the field in Scotland, and has not been seen to date as having extensive experience of detailed development work at community-level.

8.9 In Northern Ireland. Community Foundation Northern Ireland has operated as the sole local agent under a Service Level Agreement with the Community Foundation Network. The choice of CFNI as the award partner and local agent in NI seems to have been uncontroversial. CFNI regards itself as more than a grant giver. The organisation has traditionally sought to work face to face with grant applicants, enabling it to provide something of a capacity building function as well as a grant assessment function, by encouraging groups to become more accountable, representative and inclusive. CFNI is perceived within Northern Ireland as an impartial, apolitical and non-partisan organisation.

Selection of Fair Share Trust Neighbourhoods

8.10 The Fair Share Neighbourhoods are those areas within the Fair Share local authority areas that have been selected to receive money from the Fair Share Trust. They are also referred to both as the expendable endowment areas (EEAs).

8.11 When issuing guidance to local authorities, the Fund said that it considered it *'prudent to focus this long term (but limited) funding on a particularly deprived neighbourhood in your area'* (source: form sent to local authorities asking them to nominate neighbourhood(s) as a beneficiary of the Fair Share endowment fund). It is therefore inferred that, from the outset, the Fund decided that the Fair Share neighbourhoods should be smaller than whole local authority areas so that the size of the award would be sufficient to have an impact within the area. Whilst responsibility for the nomination of the areas was sometimes devolved to people in the local area (see later), including the local authority, approval of that nomination appears to have been with the Fund.

8.12 The picture that emerges from the case studies in England, Wales and Scotland is somewhat confusing. In four, the process of choosing the areas has been straightforward and apparently without dissent. Elsewhere the situation is less happy:

- in one area, the LSP wanted to choose three discrete areas, but that was vetoed and they were told to choose one; the choice was then delegated to a subgroup of the LSP, but their choice was not accepted by the main LSP who replaced it; the local agent did not like this choice and suggested another, but the LSP would not accept that one, and ultimately both the Fund and the Community Foundation Network had to get involved to secure a choice
 - in another, the choice was effectively made by the Borough's Regeneration Officer since there was no effective and widely inclusive LSP at that time; the local agent had a peripheral role, but is unclear about the reasons for the choice
 - in another, the original choice of wards has later been expanded, and there is on going conflict
 - in yet another, the local agent is very unhappy with the choice, feeling that the boundary should be redrawn around only one part of the area which is very deprived and has no other regeneration funding, though having to accept the choice that has been made
 - finally where, notwithstanding general acceptance of the choice of areas, the chosen area doesn't see itself as a neighbourhood but rather as four separate villages, and resents being lumped together as one 'neighbourhood'.
- 8.13 Overall, it is clear that in at least half of the case studies in Wales, Scotland and England, the initial choice of area has resulted in ill feelings which need to be dealt with as part of the on-going process.
- 8.14 The approach taken to selection of Fair Share Neighbourhoods in Northern Ireland was more complex than elsewhere in the UK, partly because the two lottery bodies had already been relatively successful at targeting disadvantage – 63% of their grants having been awarded to the third most disadvantaged areas in Northern Ireland. Reaching the remaining deprived areas that had not had their fair share therefore demanded that the funding be targeted at ward rather than district council level.
- 8.15 The approach identified a total of 49 wards (from the top 100 most deprived in NI) in 14 Council Districts with lower than the median spend of all lottery grants. As the total funding for the endowment scheme in NI amounted to only £2.25m, each ward could only hope to access a relatively small amount of money (generally between £15 - £125k). The combination of a large number of wards, relatively small amounts of money, but the desire of CFNI to maximise the strategic impact of the money by ensuring that it was spent on what those deprived communities felt was a priority in their area, has created some significant problems for CFNI but also the opportunity to pilot what it has termed 'consensual grant making'.
- 8.16 Consensual grant making has required the involvement of many local stakeholders at district and ward level, to determine how the small pots of endowment funding should be spent. This is a resource intensive approach which has required CFNI to develop partnerships with local authority and VCS enablers and independent facilitators who have provided the face to face

support to the individual community groups involved. Consensual grant making represents an attempt to break away from the traditional 'competitive' approach amongst funders as well as grant applicants, to spend monies from what has been a relatively large pool of funding, but over short timescales and within very low capacity and often divided communities.

- 8.17 Over and above the detail of the process described above, CFNI also identified three particular groups within NI society which had not received their fair share of lottery and other grant aid in recent years. These are lone parent families, young people (aged 14-21) and older people, and they are a particular focus of Fair Share spending.

Characteristics of Fair Share Trust Neighbourhoods

- 8.18 Relevant guidance to local authorities in England provided the following criteria for the choice:
- a neighbourhood is defined as a community identified by a geographical area rather than a community of interest (such as older or younger people)
 - the choice should be limited to one or two neighbourhoods
 - recommendations should be made on the basis of need, preferably corresponding with wards being amongst the 10% most deprived (judged by IMD2000)
 - funding should be targeted at a neighbourhood that requires support to become engaged in district-wide strategies, as an investment in the cohesion of your local community
 - the neighbourhood can be either one that has failed to attract regeneration funding to date, or one which requires further public funding to complete a local strategic action plan
 - any recommendations for neighbourhoods should build on work already completed to target public resources, such as that related to the preparation of a Community Plan or Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy
 - local stakeholders should be made aware of the decision, with a view to gaining a consensus for the recommendation.
- 8.19 From the case studies, it is possible to build up a picture of what the chosen endowment Neighbourhoods are like. Table 12 on the following pages summarises the key characteristics. From this, a number of interesting features can be identified.

Table 12: characteristics of Fair Share Trust neighbourhoods

Size of area	Other regen funding	Deprivation IMD 2000	Key characteristics
<p>Ashfield: Sutton One Partnership Action Zone (2 wards) 17,800 total pop</p>	<p>NRA; value £2.1 million for all three NRAs + many other funding sources eg ESF Obj 2, ESF Obj 3, CRT, Sure Start</p>	<p>Part in worst 10% of deprivation; part in worst 15%</p>	<p>3 very distinct areas. 2 x council estates; 1 x private ownership and private rental. All characterised by multiple social problems, partic crime, health, substance abuse, education/skills. Shortage of community facilities.</p>
<p>Basildon: Estate 1: Pop c.2,300</p>	<p>none</p>	<p>• in worst 10%</p>	<p>• 1960s estate of 4 storey social housing; poor environmental quality; few and poor quality facilities</p>
<p>Estate 2: Pop c 7501</p>	<p>none</p>	<p>• not in worst 10%</p>	<p>• 1980s social housing; social isolation + social problems</p>
<p>Bolton Area based on Great Lever (4 wards) Pop c 20,000 Made up of 2 distinct areas: west with past/present funding + community infrastructure; east no funding history + no community infrastructure</p>	<p><i>West:</i> NRF, NM Pathfinder (£5m), ERDF, small CVS administered pot <i>East:</i> none</p>	<p>1 ward in worst 5%; others have considerable levels of deprivation</p>	<p><i>West:</i> significant social housing with some private. High BME population, but mixed with white majority. Active white run residents associations <i>East:</i> more private, terraced housing. Large Pakistani population. Few facilities</p>
<p>Dudley Old electoral ward of 3 discrete areas, plus parts of 2 others; population 12,400</p>	<p>None specifically</p>	<p>In worst 20% nationally; amongst most deprived in Borough</p>	<p>Multiple deprivation. Second and third generation unemployment. Isolated housing estates. Poor infrastructure of youth and community facilities.</p>
<p>Ellesmere Port Originally 5 wards with 28,000 population; has since grown to 8 wards</p>	<p>Objective 2</p>	<p>Some are in worst 10%</p>	<p>Mostly poor housing estates in central EP near to heavy industrial areas and oil refinery</p>
<p>Rotherham Kimberworth Park Pop c7,000 2 wards</p>	<p>acute problems in parts of area masked by relative affluence of rest; has missed out on all regen funding in past</p>	<p>Not in worst 10%</p>	<p>1950s housing estate; 30% owner occupied; remainder social housing. High levels of income support claimants, lone parents and those on incapacity benefits. Underdeveloped community infrastructure.</p>

Table 12 continued

Size of area	Other regen funding	Deprivation IMD 2000	Key characteristics
Northern Ireland			
• Coleraine	Multiple funding sources	In worst 100 wards on Noble index	Strong conflicts between participating groups in a very deprived area
• Ballymena	Area of funding saturation	In worst 100 wards on Noble index	History of groups not working together
• Craigavon	Multiple funding sources	In worst 100 wards on Noble index	
South Lanarkshire			
2 areas:	<i>Larkhall</i>		<i>Larkhall</i>
• Larkhall pop 10,000	A significant regeneration programme		Very disadvantaged area not previously in receipt of regeneration funding (eg not a SIP). Area of population decline; becoming in part a commuter area for Glasgow. Made up of a town (Larkhall), plus 3 industrial villages. Town quite 'tribal and insular'; villages insular. Little interchange between them. Some sectarianism and other conflicts.
• rural area pop 9,500	<i>Rural area</i> All 4 villages within the Leader Plus area and part of the Rural Partnership for regeneration		<i>Rural area</i> 4 small isolated villages with parochial interests and tensions/competitiveness between them. Resistant to change. Underdeveloped VCS.
Neath Port Talbot			
Whole of Borough Pop 135,500	Communities First area, Objective 1 area. In receipt of multi-million funding	9 wards in worst 10% in Wales, + a further 9 in worst 10-20%	Area of population decline. Decline in young people and those of working age. Increase in elderly. High unemployment. High proportion of working age population on invalidity benefits.

- 8.20 The Neighbourhoods are far from homogeneous. In terms of population, they range in size from just under 3,000 to over 135,000. Not surprisingly, therefore, their geographical coverage is very different. In the case of Port Talbot, which is the largest, the whole of the borough is covered by the Trust. In many others, the Trust area, or areas, is made up of discrete housing estates. It is not uncommon for the chosen area(s) within one authority to include communities who regard themselves as separate. Thus, in Ashfield for example, the Trust area covers three very distinct areas, and Basildon covers two in different towns. In South Lanarkshire there are two, one of which can be further subdivided into four.
- 8.21 Already the implications of such sub-division are becoming apparent as areas move towards grant giving, and concerns are being raised about each area getting its own 'fair share'. This is a particular problem in Lanarkshire where the two areas are being separately treated, and the pot of £1.1 million has had to be divided between them.
- 8.22 Whilst deprivation is, by definition, a characteristic of Fair Share areas when looked at in whole local authority terms, there appear to be significant variations

between the chosen neighbourhoods, reflecting different approaches to their choice. In some, taking an area of worst deprivation has been the priority. In Rotherham the choice is an area with pockets of acute problems which have been masked by the relative affluence of the rest of the area. In consequence not only are there social problems, but the area has missed out on all regeneration funding in the past. Whilst it is not amongst the most deprived areas in Rotherham, it is regarded as deserving. In Basildon, one of the areas does not figure highly on main deprivation statistics but is regarded as particularly socially isolated.

- 8.23 Deprivation has a further dimension in Northern Ireland in that some of the endowment wards suffer from inter community tensions.
- 8.24 In the majority of the case studies, the neighbourhoods are large housing estates, principally of social housing. The most significant exceptions are Neath Port Talbot, where choice of the whole area means that the whole gamut of residential areas is represented, South Lanarkshire where again there is a whole spread of areas, and Ashfield where one of the three parts of the endowment area is a mix of private build owner occupation and private rented housing.

Progress in the Fair Share Trust Neighbourhoods

- 8.25 With agents in place and the areas chosen, the scene is set for development work on the endowment schemes to proceed. This is an early stage in the endowment process. The focus is still on getting in place the necessary infrastructure before grant making can happen. Progress is set out in Table 13 below.

Table 13: progress in Fair Share Neighbourhoods, August 2005

	Panel appointed	Neighbourhood Assessment completed	Neighbourhood Priorities completed	Intermediate steps underway	Grant applications approved
Ashfield	✓	✓	✓	✓	x ¹
Basildon	x	✓	x	x	x
Bolton	x	✓	x	x	x
Dudley	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ellesmere Port	x	✓	✓	x	x
Enfield	x	?	x	x	x
Rotherham	✓	✓	✓	✓	x
Northern Ireland	✓	✓	in part	in part	✓ ²
S Lanarkshire:					
- Larkhall	✓	✓	✓	✓	x
- rural areas	✓	✓	✓	✓	x
Neath Port Talbot	✓	✓	✓	✓	x ¹

1 spend has been achieved, but through other means

2 some areas only

- 8.26 Notwithstanding hiccups along the way, in Ashfield, Dudley, Rotherham, South Lanarkshire and Neath Port Talbot, substantial progress has been made, with Dudley having begun the task of making awards, and both Ashfield and Neath Port Talbot achieving spend by other means.
- 8.27 Again, Northern Ireland is rather different. Here a phased programme with four separate phases is being rolled out which leaves those wards currently saturated with funding, or riven by too much conflict or lacking in community infrastructure or local authority commitment, to the later phases. The consensual grant making process marks a significant shift in practice from the norm, and its impact on the stakeholders involved will need to be fully evaluated if it is to be applied again in the future.

Appointment of Panels

- 8.28 One of the responsibilities of the local agent for each Fair Share Neighbourhood is to establish and service a locally based advisory committee known as the Panel. The Panel is to:
- determine local priorities for their Neighbourhood and set these out in a Neighbourhood Priorities Document
 - endorse all applications for grants made to the Trust in their area and ensure they meet the priorities set out in the Neighbourhood Priorities document
 - where appropriate, provide local knowledge on how relevant proposed projects are to their Neighbourhood and its community.

The Panel does not have powers to approve grants, award money or change payment details or levels. It is therefore advisory rather than executive, though its role is expected to be one of significant influence. Only where the local agent considers that an award would be inappropriate (for instance, because it is not a priority or not a realistic project) should they overrule recommendations made by the Panel.

- 8.29 Terms of Reference for the Panels (such as who should be on it, how large it should be, what its powers are etc) have been supplied to the local agents by the award partner. The local agent takes responsibility for procuring an appropriate mix, and the local agent's Board is responsible for agreeing the Panel membership.
- 8.30 Table 14 on progress shows that, to date, Panels have been confirmed in six of the case study areas. An additional one (Ellesmere Port), is working as a probationary Panel at present. The remainder are yet to be appointed.
- 8.31 Beginning with England, in Rotherham, Neath Port Talbot and Dudley, the process of appointing the Panel appears to have been smooth and appropriate to the circumstances of the area. In Rotherham, the local agent worked with 24 active local members of the community who have engaged with the idea of Fair Share from the outset. These 24 together reached a consensus on who should be on the Panel, with a strong emphasis on ensuring that those on the Panel were representative of the community. No negative views on this have reached the evaluator. In Neath Port Talbot, the choice of Panel was left to the local Fair Share Partnership, and again there are no reported problems. In Dudley, the

local agent spent several months using leads in the LSP organisations to identify contacts within each of the five local areas within the ward and finding enough local people with the time (as well as the commitment) to give to the Panel. He has been successful in all but one of the local areas. A conscious decision was made to exclude elected members from the Panel to avoid it becoming a mini version of the LSP. However, representatives from the VCS and statutory providers with knowledge and involvement in the ward, such as the local Priority Neighbourhood Manager, were included.

- 8.32 Overall, there have been a number of approaches to the task, including inviting local committees or organisations to nominate people, collaborative working amongst key local partners, targeting of key local VCS organisation, and avoiding appointment of the 'usual suspects'.
- 8.33 At some locations it has proved difficult to achieve an appropriate Panel. In one area, for example, an open approach of soliciting applications was used, including public meetings, use of local media, and work with some groups. It has been very hard work to achieve the minimum size of Panel required, and there are still half the places to fill. In addition, there is concern from some observers with respect to the composition of the Panel, with allegations that it is in part made up of 'usual suspects' who have their own agendas and priorities. The local agent is sanguine about this, believing that it is better to proceed, accepting meanwhile that the composition of the Panel is likely to change over time. In another area where the Panel has yet to be formed, the local agent anticipates problems very similar to these.
- 8.34 In Northern Ireland, there is only one Fair Share Panel for the whole of the expendable endowment programme. Members have been drawn from a range of strategic level third sector organisations (most of them linked with one or more of the target groups) and the statutory sector.
- 8.35 In South Lanarkshire, two contrasting situations apply. In Larkhall, progress in getting representatives from all four geographical areas (vital given the parochialism/ conflicts) was slow, but has now been achieved. In the rural area, where the rural CVS has been assisting, the problem has been to get people on to the Panel, and those who have agreed to undertake the task are relatively inexperienced. The most difficult aspect of the Panels, however, is conflict over the split of the South Lanarkshire pot of money between them. At the suggestion of South Lanarkshire Council, the division has been £750,000 to Larkhall and £350,000 to the rural area. In contrast, in North Lanarkshire where a split was also necessary, it was done on a 50:50 basis. Whilst the basis of the recommendation was on criteria from the Fund that focus on population, deprivation, and previous Lottery investment, it is seen partly as a party political issue as South Lanarkshire is solidly Labour and some of the rural councillors are Scottish Nationalist Party. There has been a lot of protest about the rural areas not getting much when Larkhall itself is the subject of massive regeneration spending plans.
- 8.36 In some locations, the local agent is putting considerable effort into the task of appointing the Panel, seeing the creation and development of an appropriate Panel as part of overall capacity building. One English Agent feels that, like South Lanarkshire, it may eventually prove necessary to set up a separate Panel for each of the two very different areas.

- 8.37 Where the process of appointment of the Panel has been fraught, it appears to have created a legacy of difficulties which are having to be resolved as Fair Share gets fully underway.

Neighbourhood Assessment Documents

- 8.38 The aim of the Neighbourhood Assessment Documents (NAD) is to provide a framework document from which to set local priorities. A pro forma for the document specifying its scope was provided by the Community Foundation Network. It should cover a neighbourhood history, summary of key demographic and deprivation data, local issues/problems, current activity in the area, links between the area and the wider community, and key stakeholders in the neighbourhood. This document is commissioned by the local agent from the Local Strategic Partnership (or other appropriate organisation). The Documents have to be endorsed by the local agent's governing body.
- 8.39 The approach taken in each case study area is summarised in Table 14. An interesting mix of approaches can be observed.

Table 14: preparation of Neighbourhood Assessment and Priorities Documents

Fair Share area	Neighbourhood Assessment Documents	Neighbourhood Priorities Documents
Ashfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • produced by an LA officer working alone; agreed and signed off by LSP • constructed out of information previously put together for Neighbourhood Renewal assessment; lacks local flavour or distinctiveness • local agent found that it took a very long time to produce • resulting document not found to be useful; work now being done to establish local needs by the Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prepared by the local agent using a range of approaches including a facilitated development day with the local community, and workshop sessions with the Panel and key others • is constantly referred to by the Panel • priorities are very wide which may make it difficult as a decision making tool • has been signed off
Basildon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • produced by an LA officer working alone; very LA focused with no input re other services, eg health/police, despite known estate problems • local agent found it difficult to secure even this level of response • resulting document limited in scope and does not lead into next steps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not yet produced • as of now (summer 2005) , it is likely to be produced by local authority officers and the agent alone • two may be needed, one per area
Bolton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • produced by LA officer • weak on some matters, particularly stakeholders • local agent finds resulting document not particularly helpful • situation exacerbated by ward boundary changes which mean that the boundary used in NAD is not now the endowment area boundary so there are holes in coverage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not yet produced; being delayed until the boundary issue over the endowment area is resolved (effectively the choice of the area) • will be prepared by local agent and the Panel acting together

Table 14 continued

Fair Share area	Neighbourhood Assessment Documents	Neighbourhood Priorities Documents
Dudley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • produced by LSP and approved before agent was appointed • considered useful to keep Panel focused on needs of area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • produced by local agent following discussions with Panel and local residents + specific consultation with young people • been useful in identifying priorities for first three years
Ellesmere Port	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • various people have produced various reports (effect has been to enlarge area); in some instances local groups have produced own reports • in view of local agent process has been useful, if long winded • not unanimously supported (by community, and possibly by parts of LA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prepared by the Panel, assisted by the local agent • has involved much argument and bargaining; has the buy in of the Panel
Rotherham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prepared independently by Rotherham MBC; local agent played no part • based on neighbourhood statistics + a survey that had been carried out by the local Community Partnership • agent sees as useful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prepared by the Panel, facilitated by the local agent • workshop sessions held with 20 active residents to identify priorities; split selves into sub-groups and researched particular themes • draft was published in community newsletter, but no responses received • has very strong linkages to the community strategy prepared by the Community Partnership • good working document on which to build
Northern Ireland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a NAD has been prepared for all 49 areas • done by local stakeholders, including local councils • seen as very demanding of stakeholder time eg where there are 6 wards in one district council area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • only one NPD prepared for all of the neighbourhoods in each phase (ie four in all)

Table 14 continued

Fair Share area	Neighbourhood Assessment Documents	Neighbourhood Priorities Documents
South Lanarks	<p><i>Larkhall</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepared by local authority, in consultation with the CVS <p><i>Rural areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepared by local authority; South Lanarkshire Rural Partnership had a conference to input ideas 	<p><i>Larkhall</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepared by local agent in conjunction with Panel made use of visioning exercise through visioning, 16 volunteers came forward to form a community engagement network to identify priorities for area (part of wider regeneration programme) emerging material tested against ideas of Panel, and reiterations <p><i>Rural areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepared by agent in conjunction with Panel numerous mtgs of Panel to discuss drafts; consensus reached quickly
Neath Port Talbot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepared local agent working around a long established need, and therefore consider that no need to draw up a wide ranging NAD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepared by local agent and has been signed off

8.40 In a number of the case studies, the Neighbourhood Assessment Document is regarded as not particularly useful, largely because of lack of real local detail and absence of community involvement. The exceptions are Rotherham (where there was a survey to draw on which had been carried out by the local Community Partnership), Ellesmere Port, where there has been community involvement (though there is not unanimous support for the results), South Lanarkshire where the local authority involved others (including a conference in the rural areas) and Dudley where it has served to keep the Panel focused on the needs of the area.

8.41 The most common model is for their preparation by the local authority, though frequently this is by one officer rather than by the authority in any corporate sense. For some, there is evidence of delay, with one agent taking the view that this was a deliberate attempt by the authority to derail the whole process.

Neighbourhood Priority Documents

8.42 Neighbourhood Priority Documents (NPD) are prepared in the endowment areas according to a pro-forma provided by the Community Foundation Network. Approaches being taken are set out in the preceding table (table 14). All the case studies show that the work is being undertaken by a varied mix of the local agent, the local community and the Panel. There is a consensus emerging that the critical thing is to get the buy-in of the Panel at this stage since they will be using the Document as a tool in their decision making processes.

8.43 In many areas, there is satisfaction with what has been achieved. There is a recognition that Neighbourhood Priority Documents may need to be revisited as knowledge of the area and confidence of the Panel grow.

Grant making to date

- 8.44 In theory, approval of the NPD should be the green light for a Neighbourhood to move into the grant making phase. Amongst the case studies, Dudley is the first to reach this stage.

Thoughts and issues

- 8.45 Notwithstanding an apparently slow performance, a number of interesting intermediate steps are being taken. These include:
- additional investigative work to better define the nature of local service deficiencies so that projects funded are genuinely offering additionality
 - building knowledge and capacity in the Panel through workshops, visits, role playing etc
 - development of an approach akin to 'commissioning' as opposed to open grant making as a tool to better ensure that grants made properly reflect the priorities of the local community/area, and as a mechanism for building capacity in the community/area because the first preference in commissioning will be for local agencies/groups
 - appointment of a community development worker or area champion to do capacity building which will help to ensure that the impacts of the Fair Share endowment are long lasting
 - utilising established partnership working where partners know each other well and have positive relationships
 - from the outset, targeting approaches which help to ensure lasting impacts, for example potentially through leaving a legacy of a viable social enterprise
 - there have been advantages in the process having gone slowly even though the Panel have found it frustrating; in particular it has enabled work to be done with the Panel really identifying problems and thinking about how to resolve them, rather than rushing at pre-determined (initially preferred) solutions
 - bringing added value by targeting funds from the Community Foundation's Local Network Fund to show the community that money was available to spend in their area.
- 8.46 Overall, it is our observation that many of these approaches may prove to be very valuable in terms of achieving final positive outcomes, and lack of speed is not something that is of concern when a whole programme perspective is taken.
- 8.47 The intermediate steps are encountering problems. In South Lanarkshire, for example, intermediate capacity building has currently ground to a halt in a complex web of actions and differences. The Panel has felt 'bounced' into action before they were ready, and when they had not actually officially launched the grants process. An opportunity to 'join up' the two aspects of the Fair Share initiative has been missed, and the practical difficulties in so doing have been amply demonstrated.

- 8.48 During case study visits, a number of other matters of importance have been raised by participants in the process. These include:
- the task to be performed in the endowment areas is essentially one of building capacity and relevant knowledge in the Panels; as an extension to this, there is a perspective in some areas that the whole endowment approach is about people learning how to work together and act together for the common interests of their area; terms of reference are having to be developed for Panels as they develop
 - for those still struggling to reach this stage, questions are also arising about the eventual effectiveness of Panels in situations where there is no genuine support, and perhaps even resistance, from the LSP or the local authority
 - even for those starting up on more 'fertile ground', the task that needs to be done cannot be achieved within the budget provided for in the contract for local agents, and this appears to fall far short of being an appropriate budget where there is resistance or apathy; the options therefore are to not do the capacity building and act in accordance with the contract, commit own resources in the wider interests of testing and developing this new approach to funding, secure additional capacity (such as through funding a development worker through the endowment or another source), or some combination of the last two
 - funders should be prepared to fund the process of capacity building, and recognise that it isn't an overhead but is an essential part of the empowering/ community development process
 - Fair Share creates a major development opportunity for those local agents who choose to see it as such; it has the potential to enable organisations acting as agents to build their own capacity, to develop new approaches to their work, to test out new ideas, to be in the forefront of a new approach to funding, to take them from an organisation running grants programmes on to something much larger and more significant. Notwithstanding this, there are problems if there is already an organisation – such as a CVS – that thinks it is already doing this in the neighbourhood.
- 8.49 The endowment approach creates opportunities to do something special, by giving the community real influence over how the endowment money is spent, and by targeting lasting effects. Already there is evidence from the case studies of commitment, exploration and innovation. In the best case studies, it can be anticipated that opportunities created by the endowment and the Fair Share Neighbourhood way of working will be taken up and pursued with enthusiasm and vigour. There are potentially very real benefits from increasing stakeholder involvement in decision making in ways that ensure that monies get prioritised locally and are spent on real needs.
- 8.50 From the outset, however, it needs to be recognised that the chosen Fair Share endowment areas are difficult areas to work in. By definition, they are affected by deprivation. Too often, they are also characterised by a weak voluntary and community sector, often under-invested in by local authority partners. These are relatively neglected communities, with scars to prove it.
- 8.51 The initiative has run into a number of 'teething problems' This is probably not surprising since it is testing out new ground. Whilst the principles of the

endowment are excellent, delivery hasn't matched up. A number of the problems appear to derive from lack of clarity over whether this is a top-down initiative with decisions either being made at national level or by strategic organisations, or bottom up, with powers vested in the local community. A number of mixed messages have gone out, and this has led to confusion. There is potentially an issue around the powers vested in the Panels. They tend to see the endowment money as theirs, and decision making over it as their right. In practice, the relevant local agents are the accountable bodies and have ultimate responsibility.

- 8.52 In those areas where there is a seriously under-developed formal partnership of the local authority and its strategic partners, a lack of genuine partnership working, and a local authority that is not properly signed up to the modernising local government agenda, the approach that is needed is resource intensive, almost resembling a community development approach, for which the local agents are not being properly resourced and may not always be relevantly skilled.
- 8.53 In too many case studies, the selection of the endowment areas was not transparent and/or was weakly communicated to local communities, to the voluntary and community sector, and even to the local agent. A lack of understanding appears to have been translated into ill-feeling. There is also a problem in some areas with the choice of the local agent, with others either wanting the role or feeling that they should have been more involved in the choice. In consequence there is a legacy of misunderstanding to be overcome which creates an additional challenge for the local agents.
- 8.54 Different agents see their roles very differently, with some seeing themselves as challenged by the fact that they are not a community development organisation, and others relishing the new challenge that this creates to work in an integrated way with other enabling organisations from the VCS, which may have better local contacts and understanding of the history of an area.
- 8.55 There is evidence of problems in the relationship between the Panels and relevant staff from the local agent organisations. In one case, a member of staff at the agent organisation has left their job because of the treatment they received from the Panel. In another, the Panel have complained about the support they are getting and asked for a replacement. Some staff have found the demands of working with the Panels difficult professionally, as Panel members can be angry and suspicious, and staff may lack the training and support to enable them to deal effectively with such pressures.
- 8.56 An important determinant of success will be the capacity of the Panels. Where they are challenged by thinking and acting strategically without sufficient support, they are unlikely to be proactive. If they are simply being responsive, they are less likely to be able to secure projects which really meet identified needs. Those Panels who are investigating a commissioning approach are potentially moving onto very fertile territory. There is, however, great difficulty for the Panels to understand the proactive, strategic role they are being asked to undertake. They may want 'just' to make grants (sometimes to organisations they already know). This specific area of capacity building is also difficult for local agents' staff.
- 8.57 There is as yet no clarity about the relationship between priorities, targets and grant making for projects and programmes funded through the endowments and

priorities for other funds that several chosen areas are receiving or are due to receive. Is there a structure that can enable all such funding to be considered coherently (without introducing the sort of stifling bureaucracy that the whole approach aims to avoid)?

9 Thoughts and issues

Overview

- 9.1 In the wider funding context of Fair Share areas (that they are deprived and therefore mostly have access to many funding sources), Lottery funding is not seen as particularly large overall, given all the other sources that are available. As a general rule, authorities and communities were not pleased to have been earmarked as Fair Share areas (though this may prove to be different when we develop deeper understanding of the endowment areas). On the other hand, grants through these other funding sources are quite big and daunting for smaller, less experienced groups to manage (even should they be eligible), and some categories of groups are thereby excluded from many funding processes.
- 9.2 So, in practice, even though the Fair Share fanfare rang rather hollow, the individual grants have proved to be both big enough and (given appropriate support) accessible enough to do important things. Where local authorities may have taken the view that Fair Share money is just a drop in the ocean, it isn't that for the projects that get funded and, where projects are well chosen, is potentially a huge influence for the good.
- 9.3 It is clear that some of the projects that we are visiting would not have been funded without Fair Share. Given the extent to which they are serving and, to a lesser extent, are embedded in, local communities, this is a powerful contribution to change in local areas. However, the power of awards in areas and for groups who have not previously been accessing funding is not the only message emerging from this stage of evaluation of Fair Share. It appears that there can be transforming effects that derive from a willingness (and authority) on the part of a suitably qualified person to get involved in local structures to make things happen.
- 9.4 So far, the case study evidence appears to suggest that part of this derives from independence. In other words, where a Fair Share outreach worker had the time, the skills and the authority to get properly linked in to local structures and activities, they were able to be a positive influence. Projects were willing to take advice from the Community Fund because they were seen to be disinterested, were independent from local infrastructure, and were willing to help make appropriate applications. In addition, local institutions are similarly able to listen to someone from outside.

Led by money or led by process?

- 9.5 Fair Share is a politically sensitive programme in that it is addressing perceived disparities (inequalities) in Lottery distribution. The evidence presented in this report shows that it has been getting money into areas that hadn't previously had it on such a scale. In drawing conclusions for the future, however, it is important to reflect on the fact that the money alone would have been unlikely to be successful, and that it is the process that appears to matter. However, it is also true that the process wouldn't have worked without having the money attached. Thus, for example, Community Fund outreach workers could get people together because they had got a pot of money to discuss which would enable groups to do things that might otherwise be beyond them. What appears to be special about Fair Share to date is the fact that it combined availability of money with a process which helped to facilitate its access, and even its use. It

will be instructive to see how the endowment phase of Fair Share is able to work in this respect.

Sustainability of projects

- 9.6 The evaluation has shown that there has been a big emphasis on revenue funding, in part keeping going projects that already existed and in part enabling new ones to be developed. There has also been capital expenditure, with new facilities being provided. However, it is very difficult for new projects to achieve self sustainability in three years. Furthermore, projects that have had 'continuation funding' from the Lottery are sometimes no further forward in terms of self financing as a result of their Fair Share monies. There appears to be a major issue over how projects will continue to fund themselves in the future, and this will be an important area for exploration in the following rounds of the evaluation.
- 9.7 A particular concern arises in those areas where communities are very fractured and each (relatively small) community wants its own facilities, such as on coalfields. Capital projects need on-going revenue funding. Whilst many of the projects may be aiming for self sufficiency, they know that they will be competing for the same pool of potential users to help with self funding (for instance, competing to get local colleges to use their facilities for IT training, or attracting other groups to use their premises). There was no evidence that funders (including the Lottery) seek to secure a strategic benefit from their investment by addressing issues of duplication in advance.

Integration with local policy and initiatives

- 9.8 The principle of focusing funds on geographical areas has presented some problems for the Lottery in terms of quality (and type) of project funded. In particular, there has been concern about opportunity cost, with good applications targeting deprivation outside Fair Share areas being refused, whilst weak ones inside the target areas were accepted. Given that there is an element of adjustment in this initiative, this is perhaps not surprising. Furthermore, funding relatively weak groups will help, in part, to develop their capacity which is part of the objective of Fair Share. However, the issue has been of concern to Fair Share staff.
- 9.9 In turn, this links to the wider issue that, to date, there has been little evidence of integration with local policy priorities and other area based initiatives. This is not necessarily bad (as it creates an opportunity for funding to go to groups who fall outside an externally determined set of parameters), but it does bring into question the assumptions which underpinned Fair Share about making use of local structures and priorities.
- 9.10 The follow up evaluation of the expendable endowment fund may shed additional light on this matter.

Badging of Fair Share

- 9.11 The evaluation is showing that many people do not know what Fair Share is, even if they have had an award from it. This makes evaluation difficult when the questions are based around the difference that Fair Share has made. It is also important because it means that the Lottery is not getting all the credit that it could, and is not adequately communicating the message that it is trying to

redress a past imbalance, and is listening to what local communities and the local VCS wants.

Joining up and moving on

- 9.12 Fair Share was intended to be a joined up initiative delivered by two separate organisations (now one). The Community Fund made its own grants. These helped to redress past imbalances in funding and were intended to prepare the ground for the New Opportunities Fund's Fair Share Trusts which followed on behind. The combination was expected to encourage local organisations to take a longer term view of how the expendable endowment can be used to sustain local initiative. However, there have been weaknesses in the way that the initiative has been declared and managed. In practice, the two strands were very different and, because they were initiated by different organisations, they were not effectively promoted or managed as a linked programme. This has led to a mix of confusion about what is going on and apparent indifference to the concepts underpinning Fair Share.
- 9.13 It appears that, in the interests of responding to a political imperative to achieve early spend in the areas that had not been given their 'fair share', the two distributors were involved in a programme without having an opportunity to sit back and think about what would work best, and how to make it meaningful at a local level. In reality there have been two programmes.
- 9.14 Problems in securing a joint, coherent approach can be illustrated by:
- the timing of the announcements about the two strands and the relative lack of local linkages; this has led to uncertainties about what Fair Share is, and even resentment about "when are we going to get our Fair Share?"
 - the absence of an effective exit strategy from the open grant programme in Fair Share areas, which leaves a legacy of disappointment in some areas and a confused platform for the endowment
 - the overall lack of continuity between the two strands of the initiative; dislocation in terms of timing between the two funding streams has effectively prevented substantive links, and this is reinforced by the fact that the geographical areas are different, and it is not necessarily the case that any of the open grant projects are relevant in the Fair Share Neighbourhood area
 - delays in getting funding onstream in the Fair Share Neighbourhoods; whilst this is not necessarily a problem in itself, it has caused mistrust and confusion in the endowment areas.
- 9.15 Much of this comment is about how Fair Share has been handled. In a sense, the Lottery has not capitalised to the extent that it could on an interesting and innovative way of funding. One interesting idea to emerge from the West Midlands, based on their observations of Dudley and Solihull, is to suggest that establishing an endowment style programme in a low spending area first might be an effective 'seed corn' approach, before making an open grants programme available to selected areas through a ring fenced programme.
- 9.16 Notwithstanding this, the evaluation shows that Fair Share has, to date, produced a wide range of outreach and development work, it has got funding to

groups in disadvantaged areas, it has helped with infrastructure building in the most successful Fair Share areas, and has commenced the challenging task of running an endowment scheme. There is much to learn from this, and much more to come in the future, but it is clear that innovation has led to new approaches to delivering the Lottery which are relevant amongst the most deprived communities.

ANNEX 1: THE FAIR SHARE AREAS

REGION	FAIR SHARE AREA	CF	NOF
ENGLAND			
East Midlands	Ashfield	✓	✓
	Bolsover	✓	✓
	Derby		✓
Eastern	Basildon	✓	✓
	Great Yarmouth		✓
	Luton	✓	✓
	Peterborough		✓
	Tendring		✓
	Waveney	✓	✓
London	Barking & Dagenham		✓
	Brent		✓
	Enfield	✓	✓
	Waltham Forest	✓	
North East	Blyth Valley		✓
	Darlington	✓	✓
	Stockton-on-Tees	✓	✓
	Wansbeck		✓
North West	Blackpool		✓
	Bolton	✓	✓
	Burnley	✓	
	Ellesmere Port & Neston	✓	✓
	Hyndburn		✓
	Knowsley		✓
	Oldham		✓
	Pendle		✓
	Rochdale		✓
	Salford		✓
	Sefton		✓
	St Helens	✓	✓
	Tameside		✓
	Trafford		✓
	West Lancashire	✓	✓
Wigan	✓	✓	
Wirral		✓	
South East	Portsmouth	✓	
	Thanet	✓	
South West	Bournemouth	✓	✓
	North Somerset	✓	✓
	Swindon		✓
West Midlands	Dudley	✓	✓
	Sandwell		✓
	Solihull	✓	✓
	Telford & Wrekin		✓
	Walsall	✓	✓
Yorkshire & the Humber	Barnsley		✓
	Doncaster	✓	✓
	Kingston-upon-Hull		✓

	Kirklees	✓	
	North East Lincolnshire		✓
	Rotherham	✓	✓
	Wakefield	✓	
NORTHERN IRELAND			
SCOTLAND	Dundee	✓	✓
	Glasgow City	✓	✓
	North Lanarkshire	✓	✓
	Renfrewshire	✓	✓
	South Ayrshire	✓	✓
	South Lanarkshire	✓	✓
WALES	Anglesey	✓	✓
	Blaenau Gwent	✓	✓
	Caerphilly	✓	✓
	Neath Port Talbot	✓	✓
	Wrexham	✓	✓

ANNEX TWO: STUDY METHODOLOGY AND USE OF INDICATORS

Study brief

- 1 The study brief sets out two main areas of investigation:
 - ‘an assessment of the capacity and sustainability of the voluntary and community sectors (VCS) in Fair Share areas with measurements at baseline, at the end of the period of the CF’s input in 2005, and again in 2007’, and
 - ‘the effectiveness of the initiative in engaging individuals, especially the most disadvantaged, in the management of and wider participation in funded projects, as well as in the funding process itself’ (study brief, para 34).
- 2 Again taking guidance from the study brief, the evaluation has to:
 - measure change in the capacity of the VCS in Fair Share areas (including their ability to apply for and win other funding) (para 36),
 - assess the role of Fair Share in building and sustaining capacity and promoting locally controlled strategic development (para 36), and
 - identify approaches and models of delivery and support that have proved particularly successful in strengthening the voluntary and community sectors at the local level (which will require quantitative assessment, comparison and the use of case studies) (para 36), and
 - assess the extent of the involvement of people who have experienced disadvantage and/or social exclusion, and the impact of such involvement on the programme, on projects and on the individuals (for instance, by developing skills or networks) (para 37).
- 3 In its consideration of the scope and potential methods to be used in the research, the brief made reference to the use of indicators (study brief, para 40). In particular:
 - the proposed indicators for assessing the capacity and sustainability of local voluntary and community sectors, and the data used to operationalise these
 - the relationship between data, indicators and initiative aims.

An objectives led evaluation

- 4 The approach is an objectives-led evaluation, using the Funds’ own objectives for the initiative (see table 1 overleaf) to provide the framework for evaluation.

Table 1: aims and objectives for the Fair Share initiative

Source	Statement of aims
Overall aims for Fair Share	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all targeted Fair Share areas will have received a larger share of the total funding from the good causes (i.e. lottery); • awards made under Fair Share have a sustainable impact on the lives of disadvantaged people in the areas it targets; • projects funded by Fair Share should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be run by and for disadvantaged people; - develop the capacity of communities to seek, obtain and manage funding for projects that reflect local priorities and needs.
CF aims for Fair Share	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • help meet the needs of those at greatest disadvantage in society • improve quality of life in the community.
NOF aims for Fair Share	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build capacity and sustainability in local communities, including support for community assets and planning, and involvement in regeneration; • build social capital, including support for social enterprises, local time banks, Intermediate Labour Market (ILM) schemes and training; • improve local environments, enabling communities to make them safer, healthier, greener, cleaner, better designed, more welcoming and accessible to all groups (the liveability agenda); • to support these goals by involving local people in decision-making.

5 The key matters revolve around the extent to which the initiative has helped to:

- strengthen the capacity of the voluntary and community sector (and how that capacity has changed as a result of Fair Share)
- secure the sustainability of the voluntary and community sector
- ensure the engagement of individuals (in public life)
- build the capacity of communities (especially in terms of getting funding)
- make a lasting impact on people's lives (i.e. improvement)
- improve quality of life in the community
- ensure disadvantaged people are running and benefiting from projects
- meet the needs of those at greatest disadvantage in society.

There are local additions to these objectives in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. The case studies in those areas take that into account.

- 6 The use of indicators linked to these objectives has formed the framework for the evaluation.
- 7 Key determinants of the ways of working in the evaluation include:
- the need to be flexible with respect to timing in individual case study areas;
 - the need to be responsive to local situations; whilst working within the overall study framework deriving from the study aims and objectives will be important, it will also be necessary to explore what is important locally
 - the need to work in depth; it will not be sufficient merely to describe what we find, and whenever possible we must be trying to identify why things have happened as they have
 - the need to respect the great importance of process in the evaluation; how things have been done and what the outcomes have been will be more important than considering the scope and outputs of individual projects, however interesting these might be.

Proposed work streams

- 8 There are four main streams of work.
- 9 *Overview of money flows into Fair Share areas* Relevant streams of lottery funding across the 77 Fair Share areas will be examined to explore longer term impacts of Fair Share on the abilities of these areas to access funding.
- 10 In the detailed case study areas (see below), both lottery money and other monies either levered in using Fair Share money, or awarded to groups subsequent to their involvement in Fair Share will be explored. It will be accompanied by an analysis of who has got the awards, and whether they have been used to help meet the needs and priorities of those who are disadvantaged.
- 11 *Use of in-depth case studies* The most substantial stream of work is a series of case studies. This approach received strong endorsement at the peer group workshop held to discuss indicators. In particular, regard was had at that workshop to the value of (indeed, preference for) in-depth qualitative work, as opposed to quantitative work, in circumstances where causal relationships still remain to be identified and tested, as is the case with respect to building capacity and social capital.
- 12 The case studies are structured around the indicators which in turn link to the study objectives. This ensures a consistent core of investigation across all the case study areas.
- 13 *Possible whole programme investigation through self-completion* The option has been left open to explore aspects of the whole programme through self completion questionnaires to provide a 'snapshot' of activity across all Fair Share areas.
- 14 *Sharing findings and good practice* In the reporting of our work, the aim is to produce a mix of practical outputs for practitioners with policy implications which will be developed for policy staff in the Funds. It is a requirement of the study

brief that we also produce material suited to the project participants and professionals involved in community regeneration and related fields.

Proposed indicators

- 15 The indicators can be used to establish the baseline position and measure change in these elements over the period of the evaluation. They are structuring information collection through the various qualitative discussions which underpin the case studies, to ensure proper coverage and consistency between case study areas with respect to the core content of the evaluation.
- 16 It is important to recognise, however, indicators do not address certain sorts of changes, for example in institutional links such as with businesses and schools, or process changes such as new ways of working in the support infrastructure of the area. They therefore need to be supplemented to cover other outcomes.
- 17 The selection of indicators was iterative and involved:
- desk research of existing indicators (especially around community involvement and quality of life); this had drawn substantially on work done by the Community Development Foundation (2003) as part of the Quality of Life set of indicators recommended to local authorities and local strategic partnerships by the Audit Commission and IdeA, but is supplemented by others
 - team discussions
 - ideas generated at the initial evaluation workshop with CF and NOF staff
 - ideas generated at the peer group workshop on indicators held in December 2003
 - a final drawing together of ideas from these sources.
- 18 The choice (see table 2 below) reflects the aims and objectives of the Fair Share programme and of the evaluation. In response to this, they are categorised under the following headings:
- funding
 - engaging disadvantaged people and meeting their needs
 - skills and learning (individual capacity building)
 - group and project sustainability (longevity/success)
 - quality of life, including social capital
 - capacity and sustainability of the voluntary and community sectors
 - community capacity and sustainability
 - community engagement and participation.

Table 2: indicators for use in evaluation of Fair Share

Theme	Proposed indicators
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair Share areas have received a larger share of total funding from the Lottery good causes • Fair Share funding has enabled disadvantaged groups in Fair Share areas to get access to other / new funding (matching or additional funding).
Engaging disadvantaged people and meeting their needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of management groups of funded projects coming from disadvantaged sectors of the community / disadvantaged neighbourhoods [need to have agreed definitions of disadvantaged sectors / people / neighbourhoods] • % of beneficiaries of funded projects are disadvantaged (e.g. from disadvantaged sectors / neighbourhoods) • % of local Fair Share projects focused on meeting the needs of disadvantaged people • % of local Fair Share projects which have been initiated and/or are run by disadvantaged people to meet their own local needs and/or needs of wider community • increase in activities in the area which work with excluded groups • benefits of project apply equally to all sections of the community (so no-one is disadvantaged by the project).
Skills and learning (individual capacity building)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase in skills, confidence, morale, optimism, aspiration, self-esteem, self-respect of key members of the group running the project • numbers of group members who have gained more access to local formal and informal networks which provide opportunities for individuals and groups (e.g. contacts and networks for training, work etc) • numbers of group members who have done some training and/or gained a new qualification as a result of their experience • more group members feel they can do more and/or bigger projects as a result of their experience.
Group and project sustainability (longevity / success)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how long the group has been going • growing numbers of awards, press coverage etc (recognition) • increasing funding being gained • group is doing and planning more / bigger / better projects • the group is getting more people involved (eg in management of the group or project, or as volunteers).
Quality of life (including social capital)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people know more neighbours, trust them, provide mutual help (helped others or been helped by others - not relatives) and have fairly frequent contact as a result of their experience with the fair share project (social capital) • how much people feel the area they live in is improving (e.g. feel safe from crime, clean streets, housing conditions, quiet) • easier access to and from disadvantaged areas, especially public transport links (e.g. cost, availability, timing, safety) • improving quality and availability of local facilities (e.g. GP surgery, police station, leisure and play facilities, education) • more people feel their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds can get on well (community cohesion).

Capacity and sustainability of the voluntary and community sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • numbers of voluntary and community organisations functioning in the specified locality • range and status of community and voluntary groups in the area (in terms of size, formality, issue etc) • wider range, greater quantity, more innovation in services and activities provided by the voluntary and community sectors in the past year • increase in funding available to the voluntary and community sectors in the fair share area • more local people volunteered / played an active role in a community or voluntary organisation at least 3 times in the past year • more community and voluntary organisations feel they have adequate access to local decision-making, and adequate influence.
Community capacity and sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new and/or strengthened community-led / run projects to provide services or facilities for local people • new mechanisms and structures to enable local people to participate in the regeneration of their areas • greater amounts of funding coming into the community.
Community engagement and participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more people feel they can influence decisions that affect them • new structures and opportunities have been developed for local people (especially disadvantaged people) to influence decision-making • public and community consultations, and community decisions, lead to changes to public policy and plans, and changes are implemented • communities and disadvantaged groups have as much influence and access to decision-making as other local stakeholders • there is greater understanding among all sectors of the community of the decision-making processes in public institutions • there is growing demand for involvement by local people (e.g. waiting lists for citizens panels).

Selection of case studies

- 19 The first step in selecting the case studies was to understand in more detail how the initiative is being taken forward, and the factors contributing to its likely success (or otherwise). This involved:
- visits to five Fair Share areas (all in England and Wales) to meet variously with representatives from the two Funds, the local agent, relevant local infrastructure organisations from the voluntary and community sector (eg the CVS), and representatives of the local authority
 - visits to Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales to discuss the delivery of the initiative with the lead officers for the two Funds; these provided valuable early insights relevant to case study selections in these countries (eg the importance of the rural agenda to the Scottish Parliament.
- 20 Based on these visits to the five areas and the three nations, a number of key soft variables were identified which are thought by Fair Share administrators to greatly influence likely outcomes. Without exception, these include the

responsiveness of the local authority to partnership working and the maturity of the voluntary and community sector. To collect such information on all Fair Share areas, telephone calls were then made to the remaining Fair Share areas in England, Wales and Scotland, and discussions were held with the two Funds in Northern Ireland.

- 21 In addition, relevant factual background information was assembled on the 77 areas. This included matters such as the size (population) of their annuity areas, the size (£'000) of the Community Fund target spend, past funding patterns, and available information on deprivation.
- 22 Together these provided a tantalising mix of facts and issues. To assist with the task of selection, we also added in a number of practical constraints (eg need to cover Local Agents other than just members of CFN).
- 24 In England, seven areas had to be selected out of the 51. Using the information from the phone interviews, the voluntary sector/local authority infrastructure was categorised as well-developed, less well-developed, and relatively under-developed. This categorisation encapsulated a number of factors such as the strength of the voluntary sector and its umbrella organisations (CVS's etc), the current ability of the local authority to develop an effective partnership with the voluntary sector, and the resources of the sector, as reported to us in our phone interviews (which we recognise may be subjective). It was the prime determinant of the case study selection.
- 25 Other key variables were:
- the size of the CF target spend: important because the best opportunities to see a range of approaches and impacts are likely to be in areas with a larger pot, but it would be useful to also look a small target spend to see how it can be used to maximum effect
 - the population of the annuity area: important because it would be helpful to get a spread of different size of areas because large areas are likely to raise different issues from small ones
 - status of the area (joint, CF only or NOF only): important because, with only a limited number of case studies, it has seemed to prudent to choose areas which both Funds have targeted since this creates opportunities to look for synergies between the two strands of the initiative and to carry out cost effective work as there will be some communality in history of the area etc
 - the local agent (Community Foundation or others): important because we want to ensure that the evaluation includes local agents other than those affiliated to the Community Foundation Network (CFN) since this is an evaluation of an approach and not the Network
 - ethnicity: important because ethnicity was raised in our discussions about the 77 areas as an important determinant of ways of working
 - region: our aspiration was to achieve some spread around the regions even though not all can have a case study
 - rural, coastal and coalfield: our aspiration here was to try to achieve some coverage of each of these.

- 26 The decision to focus on joint English Fair Share areas reduced the options to 20 potential areas, the categorisation of which is shown in table 3 below.

Table 3: classification of infrastructure in joint Fair Share areas in England

Fair Share areas with relatively under-developed infrastructure	Fair Share areas with middling infrastructure	Fair Share areas with relatively well-developed infrastructure
Basildon	Stockton	Wigan
Bolsover	Bournemouth	Bolton
St Helens	Darlington	Luton
Ellesmere Port & Neston	Doncaster	
Enfield	Dudley	
Waveney	Rotherham	
Ashfield	West Lancashire	
Walsall		
North Somerset		
Solihull		

Two of these were rejected because their current (and possible future) circumstances could make working in them on this particular evaluation very difficult. These are Walsall and Solihull. This left a potential 18 areas to choose from.

- 27 The selection deliberately focussed on those areas where the CVS infrastructure is less well developed, on the grounds that the Fair Share impact ought to be greater in these areas. Accordingly, to get seven case studies, four were selected with relatively under-developed infrastructure, two with middling infrastructure, and only one where it is relatively well-developed.
- 28 The selection, bearing in mind the need to cover a range of the other variables such as size, agent, ethnicity and (if possible) such geographical variables as rurality, coalfield location, and coastal location AND to achieve a reasonable regional balance, is shown in table 4 below. It is not a perfect fit, but provides good coverage.

Table 4: English case studies and their characteristics

Fair Share area	Ethnicity % white	Rural Coastal Coalfield	Size of annuity area	Size of CF target	Agent	Region
<i>Underdeveloped</i>						
• Basildon	95-98	No	Large	Large	CFN	E
• Enfield	<87	No	Large	Large	Non-CFN	GL
• Ashfield	>98	Rural/coal	Middling	Middling	CFN	EM
• Ellesmere Port	>98	No	Large	Small	Non-CFN	NW
<i>Middling</i>						
• Dudley	87-95	No	Large	Large	CFN	WM
• Rotherham	95-98	Coalfield	Small	Large	CFN	Y&H
<i>Well developed</i>						
• Bolton	87-95	No	Middling	Large	CFN	NW

- 29 The decision to focus on joint areas had the effect of removing the possibility of looking at some very interesting practice. Subsequently, the Community Fund work in Enfield was excluded and replaced by Kirklees (a Community Fund only Fair Share area) where innovative work was undertaken amongst ethnic minority communities.

- 30 In Northern Ireland the two funds agreed that they definitely want the case study to be in a jointly funded area, and proposed Craigavon.
- 31 A particular feature of Fair Share in Scotland is that the Scottish Executive asked for inclusion of rural areas, reflecting their national priorities, and it is potentially interesting to include a rural dimension in the case study work, particularly since this has not been achieved very satisfactorily with the provisional selection of English case studies. Following discussion with the two funds and with the Scottish Community Foundation, South Lanarkshire was selected.
- 32 In Wales, a number of practical local factors influenced the choice. Two were excluded on the grounds of being too atypical. Ultimately, Neath Port Talbot was chosen because the initiative is voluntary sector-led and is thought to be potentially the most interesting case study.