

## **VCS Prospectus consultation exercise conducted by Voscur November 2015 - February 2016**

### **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 People from Bristol City Council and the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) (the working group) have worked together to design a new approach to grant funding. The group has agreed that the council's grant investment will be focused on tackling disadvantage in the city. The new approach has been called a 'prospectus' because there will be one document which tells people what council grant funding is available, what is expected from funded organisations, and what the processes are for applying for and allocating the grants.
- 1.2 The formation of the VCS grants prospectus was one of the most important changes to Council funding for Bristol's Voluntary Sector funding in recent years. It was crucial, therefore, that Voscur played a role in its development.
- 1.3 Voscur was tasked to consult with **150 VCS organisations** to ensure key aspects of the Prospectus are right and early issues were identified before the new system is implemented in April 2017. Since November 2015 Voscur has consulted directly with **155 VCS organisations** (225 individuals) at 7 consultation events.
- 1.4 Voscur hosted two consultation events at the Park, Knowle and Vassall Centre, Fishponds. In addition fringe consultations were held at a further 6 events: CYP & HSC network meetings, Finance and Trustee forums, as well as a specialist workshop at Voscur's Community-led economic regeneration conference. In order to promote the Prospectus to a wider audience, Voscur produced a one hour special on the Prospectus on the community radio station, Ujima Radio CIC that included City Council Service Director Di Robinson and 3 VCSE sector organisations to debate the merits of the new proposals.

### **2.0 What was the consultation focused on?**

- The overall proposal (the 'product')
- Values
- Key Challenges
- Process

### **2.1 What were the questions?**

The working group has stated that the consultation should be kept simple and open:

This is summarised in the statement "*This is our proposition and this is what we are trying to achieve. We would welcome your feedback.*"

- *From the perspective of your organisation:*

Q. *What is your overall impression?*

Q. *Is there anything you think we have missed?*

Q. *How could we improve it?*

Q. *What support would your organisation need to engage with the prospectus grants process?*

Q. *Is there anything else you would like to tell us?*

Plus specific **questions about the process** for the focused sessions:

- *We want to design inclusive and proportionate applications. What have we got right? What have we got wrong? What else could we change?*
- *We want the application questions to allow organisations to tell us what they want to do and how this will support our vision and values. Do the questions work?*
- *What support would your organisation need in order to complete the application form and apply for grant through the prospectus?*
- *Which grant term (length of grant) option do you prefer, or what other options could we consider?*

### **3.0** **Headline Findings**

- There is broad support for the process of co-design and co-production and a view that this process should be adopted in relation to related themes such as Neighbourhoods, Public Health and Arts & Culture.
- There is broad support for the focus on tackling disadvantage.
- There is a strong view that flexibility is needed to ensure issues such as multiple deprivation are effectively tackled, and funding cycles, especially for smaller amounts, were reduced.
- Clarity is needed in relation to the Council's overall strategy in relation to competition and competitive grants versus collaboration.
- There is a need to strike the balance between "Early Intervention" and "Crisis funding".
- How can sustainability of funding be effectively managed (including front loading and tapering)?
- There is a need for more case studies to aid understanding of exactly what the City is seeking to fund.

## 4.0 Results

All of the consultation events focussed specifically on the Values, the Challenges and the Application Process as outlined in the consultation documents. The actual creation of the integrated Prospectus and its link to tackling disadvantage was deemed out of scope for the purposes of this consultation. This is summarised in the table below.

### What is open to change and what isn't:

Open	Not open
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft Key Challenges.</li> <li>• Our two impacts and how we set measures or indicators.</li> <li>• The funding term – best / preferred option.</li> <li>• The grants process – all of it but particularly proportionality.</li> <li>• What support organisations will need in order to work towards our values</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bringing the money together.</li> <li>• The purpose of the money.</li> <li>• Beneficiaries (the most disadvantaged and those most at risk of disadvantage).</li> <li>• The sustainable funding agenda.</li> </ul>

Set out below is a summary of the findings from the consultation events.

### 4.1 Values

- Making a real difference
- Helping the most disadvantaged
- Offering early help
- Building on existing strengths
- Connecting people
- Linking with the city

Overall the workshop groups agreed the values as outlined were laudable, but there was a strong view that they were hard to translate into practicalities.

- There was a strong view expressed these values are in fact really aspirations not values. Participants felt there needed to be more flexibility when describing specific values for example many preferred 'help when you need it' rather than the term 'early help.' There needs to be a better description and understanding of what early help means.
- There were strong views expressed that there needs to be something said about the most disadvantaged - those with complex and multiple needs and a sum of money held to fund 'help when you need it'.
- More expansion on values is needed, perhaps with a value statement which should say something about balancing severe disadvantage and early help.

- There were also strong calls for a split for early help and severe disadvantage in money allocation but at the same time recognising statutory duty in relation to severe disadvantage.
- There were calls for more definition of what “build on strengths” means: Is it empowering people or is it talking about organisations’ ethos?
- A number of participants asked for clearer statements and more case studies to paint a more detailed picture of what the City requires from applicants.
- Many delegates pointed out that “crisis work” is expensive and that fact needs to be recognised. There is a clear role, however, for both crisis and prevention focused services.
- There needs to be a preventative theme in all work, even crisis work, and strong collaborative links to other services.
- Participants asked for more clarity over the request for collaboration. For example; does the City want joint bids? Is this the driver for collaboration or to end the competitive environment? ‘Collaboration’ needs more comment on what it means; is the aim to save money? What sorts of collaboration? Shared learning? Case studies would be good. This does not seem to acknowledge the large amount of collaborative working that already exists.
- There was consensus on introducing ‘flexibility’ as a value as 4 years is a long time in relation to changing needs and community dynamics. Applicants will need to change their approach if the ‘innovation’ is not working.
- There was strong agreement that putting service users at the centre of planning and delivering services is an important value that is missing. Including the needs / wishes of service users must be taken into account and the service users’ voice should be clearly ‘heard’.
- Many felt ‘fair / transparent’ should be included as a key value along with others such as ‘respecting diversity’ and ‘empowering people’.
- Other values that could be considered were ‘respectful and compassionate’, ‘added value’, ‘hope and positivity’, and ‘environmental sustainability’.

## 4.2 Key Challenges

- Participants felt the 8 factors of disadvantage are so broad they are in danger of being meaningless when it comes to helping the applicant to understand how decisions will be made in relation to successful applications.

- In addition, participants felt an alternative phrase to ‘lifestyles’ would be helpful, or an explanation of what this actually means should be provided.
- Many felt that developing strong leadership was a key challenge.
- Participants felt the challenges could become single issue and side-line an acknowledgment that there are multiple issues faced by people and many organisations work towards a number and range of challenges.
- Participants felt housing and homelessness was major challenge. This might be linked to other challenges but it feels important enough to stand alone.
- Many felt ‘emotional ill health’ was not a helpful phrase. There was a suggestion this could be changed to “physical and mental ill-health and emotional distress”.
- There was a consensus that the meanings of the “access to opportunities and services” and “low engagement”: challenges are not clear. There was a call for much clearer language to unpick what these descriptions actually mean.
- In order for these challenges to have impact there is a need for statutory services and the Neighbourhood Partnerships to be part of same process. They can learn from a VCS which is driving change.
- There is a need to rework the focus to be a positive, not a deficit model, with new ways of measuring impact (e.g., not ill health).
- Why is there a more focused challenge area for **victims of hate crime** and yet the other challenges are very broad? If the intention is to have a challenge focusing on crime, then this could usefully be broadened out so that rather than just focusing on ‘hate crime’ it focuses on the needs of victims, others affected by crime and perpetrators of all crime, including the fear of crime. Crime and fear of crime is a key concern of Bristolians responding to the Council’s Quality of Life Survey. There seems to be a gap around the broader crime and ASB issues.
- There was a strong view expressed that some of the challenges are more defined than others e.g. ‘reducing poverty’ is narrower than ‘improving physical and emotional health’. On discussing this, the group agreed that by having three examples of poverty (financial, fuel and food), the diagram probably unintentionally appears to exclude other kinds of poverty e.g. educational, that might be able to broaden this challenge.
- Many asked about the inclusion of a geographic focus. This is not necessarily considered to be a bad idea, but it must be clear what this means. Do we mean we will focus more attention and funding on areas of deprivation (for instance), and if so, which areas?

- There needs to be a more detailed definition of each of the challenges in the diagram so that everyone can be clear what can sit within them.
- Participants felt it is important that we don't develop a league table of disadvantage. Do not rank the various challenges – they are broad enough and also concise enough. One challenge should not be ranked more highly than another.
- Many applauded the inclusion of the challenge on (un)employment, but it needs to refer to 'maintaining people in employment' as well because this is also very important.
- There were a number of missing challenges identified:
  - 'Housing and homelessness' as a stand-alone.
  - 'Drugs and alcohol' (possibly included in crime or ill health).
  - 'Education/learning' should fit into the challenges somewhere – maybe under an expanded 'poverty' section
  - 'Access to justice' (possibly included into 'access to opportunities / services').
  - 'Wellbeing' could replace the reference to 'health' and be added into 'improving physical and emotional wellbeing'.
- There was a strong view that 'voice and influence on decision making' should be a specific focus, and also include 'empowerment' as an aspiration?

### 4.3 Grants Process

- Participants asked for BCC to recognise that there are different starting points when evaluating impact and travel.
- There should be a review of the prospectus half way / after a year: Is it working? Lots of charities suffered through past commissioning regimes that were set in stone.
- Participants asked if there will be reviews to see if there are gaps.
- How will impact be measured? It needs to be measured by 'distance travelled' for families / communities.
- Participants felt the application implies each organisation can have different measures of 'disadvantage' – should there be a theory of change and agreed definition of disadvantage?
- How can BCC ensure micro organisations can benefit from this process, especially those who are committed to field work with little time and or skill base to complete onerous applications?
- Where does the BME VCS fit into the application process? A separate process?

#### 4.4 General Overview

- What is likely to be the order of priorities the council will apply when making decisions? Will each factor be equally weighted or will they be prioritised? If so, how?
- Can BCC adopt a targeted approach: some services attract more funding from other sources than others – maybe not fund these?
- Is there weighting of factors based on BCC's existing priorities e.g. young people or particular areas of deprivation?
- Can commissioned services be required to work with and learn from VCS grant funded groups?
- Will the emphasis on allocation of funding be on early 'upstream' **prevention** e.g. tackling poverty/education and improving wellbeing, or will it be focused on people with very immediate needs e.g. preventing hospital admission or enabling discharge from hospital? (This comment also linked to the reference to 'early help' and was essentially asking for a clearer definition because of the broad spectrum of early intervention and prevention).
- How can the challenges best interlink to provide an opportunity for working in a more holistic way? The Council also needs to be careful not to discriminate against organisations that **ONLY** meet or address one challenge or those that do not (yet?) see their service in that broader light.
- How will the Council support the VCS to think more broadly about the benefits of their work?
- How will geographical anomalies be squared? For example, some organisations and citizens are not resident or working in Bristol: can the focus accommodate this? Some organisations will work with people who live in South Gloucestershire but have a GP in Bristol and if the organisation is linking with the GP to provide support, they will also end up working with South Gloucestershire residents. Will this be a problem?
- In relation to discussions around combined authorities - can Bristol work with its neighbouring local authorities to get alignment of priorities and challenges? This will help VCS organisations who work across our boundaries. South Gloucestershire and B&NES were specifically mentioned and there was a strong request to work with neighbouring authorities on the challenges.

**Appendix A – list of VCS organisations that participated in Voscur consultation activities**

**Attended Consultation meetings / events:**

<b>Organisation</b>
1625 Independent People
Age UK Bristol
Alliance Homes
Alzheimer's Society
Anchor Housing
Ashley Community Housing
Avon & Bristol Law Centre
Avonmouth Community Centre
BAND Ltd
Barton Hill Settlement
BASS
BCfm Radio
Bluebell Care Trust
Brandon Trust
Bristol & Avon Chinese Women's Group
Bristol Ageing Better
Bristol and Avon Chinese Women's Group
Bristol Area Stroke Foundation
Bristol CCG
Bristol City Council
Bristol Community Transport
Bristol Culture
Bristol Drugs Project
Bristol Energy Co-operative
Bristol Initiative Trust
Bristol Labour
Bristol Life centre
Bristol Older People's Forum
Bristol Reconnect
Bristol Refugee Rights
Bristol Shopmobility
Bristol Women's Voice
Bristol Wood Recycling Project
Brigstowe Project
Carers Support Centre - Bristol and South Gloucestershire
Carriageworks Action Group
Centre for Deaf People
Centre for Sustainable Energy
Changes Bristol

Children's Scrapstore
Circomedia
Cities of Service
Coexist
Creative Youth Network
Cruse Bristol
Dance Voice
DCF Premier Workshops
Dementia Wellbeing Service
Developing Health & Independence
Drastic Productions
Driving and Mobility Centre
Easton Community Centre
Easton Energy Group
Easton Families
Elay's Development Network
Family Lives
Freelance Consultant
Gerrard Financial Consulting
Greater Bedminster Community Partnership
Greater Fishponds Neighbourhood Partnership
Hartcliffe & Withywood Community Partnership
Hartcliffe & Withywood Ventures
Hartcliffe Health & Environment Action Group
Hawkspring
Healthwatch Bristol
Home-Start Bristol
Hope's Place
I.Savvie CIC
Imayla CIC
Incredible Edible Bristol
IND
Integrative Saturday School Ltd.
Interculture
IntoUniversity
ITfin
Julian House
Knightstone Housing
Knowle West Health Park Company
Learning Partnership West
Leonard Cheshire Disability
Life Cycle UK
LinkAge

LitterARTI
Manor Farm Community Hub
Milestones Trust
My Future My Choice
NEON
Nilaari Agency
North Bristol Advice Centre
Oasis Community Partnerships
Office of Thangam Debonnaire MP
Old Market Manor
One25 Ltd
Pennywise
Personal Support Unit
Playing Out
Portland Centre for Integrative Medicine
Public Health
Re:work Ltd
Rethink Mental Illness
RSVP Retired and Senior Volunteer Programme
SARI
School for Social Entrepreneurs
Second Step
Self Help HA
Shirehampton Community Action Forum (SCAF)
Shrievalty
Sixteen Cooperative Ltd
Social Access
South West Legal Support Trust
Southern Brooks Community Partnership
Southmead Development Trust
Southmedia Ltd
Southville Community Development Association
Sporting Futures
St Mary Redcliffe Church
St Mungo's
St Pauls Advice Centre
St Pauls Planning Grp
St Werburghs Community Association
StarkeyMatthews
Survive
Sustrans
Talking Money
The Bridge Foundation

The Brigsowe Project
The Care Forum
The Cookery School: Square Food Foundation
The Family Hub
The Green House
The Harbour
The Hive Avon
The Julian Trust
The Park Community Centre
The SWAN Project
Time2Share
TSCG
Ujima Radio CIC
Up Our Street
UWE
Vivid
Volunteering Matters
WECIL
Wellspring Healthy living Centre
West of England Rural Network
Westonworks
Wheels Project
Windmill Hill City Farm
Windmill Hill Community Centre
WISH
Working In Southmead for Health
YMCA Training
Young Bristol
Youth Education Service
Youth Moves

## Appendix B Breakdown of individual responses collated from the evaluation

### Our prospectus values set out how we want funded organisations to work. Do you agree with this approach?

Yes (7 people)
Yes - but collaboration and partnerships carry a cost - project management etc.
Yes. But they are very broad.
The prospectus values great - these values also should be part of all other commissioning/statutory services so that there is alignment across services, e.g. 'offering early help' - access to services needs to be improved across all services to enable these grants to make a difference in people's lives.
Good values - but issue re. What makes a 'real' difference? Relationship between outcomes for individuals and communities balance between desire to innovate and building on /maintaining what works Flexibility to respond to new needs? New value - sustainability and relevance (..?..) for orgs as well as people
1. Would not be better if this funding is allocated to fund Managers i.e. South West Foundation, Quartet, etc. 2. What methodologies to measure outcomes of disadvantage and inequalities
Good - with a few tweaks noted in workshops
I like that it's jargon free! Early help can mean so many things - more discussion needed. Surprised there's nothing about self-determination - people identifying themselves More about the principle for the voice of service users to shape services
More clarity about early help. How does this work with services that have a waiting list. Can this be reconciled with providing services to those who are most disadvantaged? Obviously a brilliant idea that no one would disagree with, but does it conflict with the above
Yes perhaps sustainability and / or added value should be included. Also innovation
Empowerment of beneficiaries as result of VCS activities
Yes - overall all relevant. However need for flexibility to be included? Plus activities vs individual outcome? Sometimes the process and the journey. The activities are as key as individual outcomes in terms of learning and legacy to community? Plus collaboration - how to identify other orgs to collaborate with to benefit both / all?
Resilience. Shared assets/Building Hubs - great ideas. Function - where organisations can advertise for various grants. Various outreach centres for similar projects. How do you equate 'Real' Difference'. What is it?
Yes but they are very broad & projects will span them. Are there priorities within them? Are some more important than others & will this be communicated to applicants?
I didn't look at these before I came so don't feel I know them as well as I should
Collaboration very difficult -Is there a contradiction between targeting 'the most deprived' with early intervention?
They have been well balanced - good ideas.
Very much so. Very helpful.

More clarity and focus on these - bit vague
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recognise different starting points in communities which will impact on outcomes</li> <li>- Need for flexibility to respond to the impact of external factors, e.g. welfare cuts</li> <li>- Flexibility to reflect changes in the communities we are working with</li> </ul>
<p>I feel that the values set out are too woolly and broad currently. I am keen to know how 'Resilience' and 'Strengths' are defined and how these will be scored for funding to be allocated.</p> <p>Will anecdotal evidence be accepted as a means of proving a 'real' difference in communities?</p> <p>The client needs to be at the 'centre' of the values and this is not currently reflected.</p> <p>When supporting the most disadvantaged will this push organisations to work in competition rather than collaboration?</p> <p>I feel more work needs to be completed on values.</p>
On the whole, yes.
Values seem OK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Too broad, a little vague - open to interpretation</li> <li>- There may be other values that are more important e.g. employment</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some of the values seemed to be aspirations rather than values.</li> <li>- Headings are too broad.</li> <li>- Might exclude some areas.</li> </ul>
Could there be more examples of organisations doing this well. What kind of shared values? What kind of resilience? Who is doing these things well?
Yes, although values appear to be aspirations/aims rather than values
<p>Yes, but lots of important values are missing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compassionate support for disadvantaged people</li> <li>- Respectful support</li> <li>- Genuine support - no strings attached</li> <li>- Support that brings hope and positivity to people</li> </ul> <p>Finally - why is there no mention of environmental sustainability - this is the biggest issue for the entire nation and all services/activities must be environmentally sustainable.</p> <p>Be realistic about collaboration! It's good but very time consuming and expensive</p>
Yes - Early help in particular although list feels more like aspirations than explicit values
It needs to be explicit that these values cover all age groups and not just focused on adults
See neighbourhood partnerships - 'wellbeing grant' as also a grant to be disposed. Don't think process there works.
Yes I think it's helpful but they need expanding
<p>Some values perhaps missing e.g. respecting difference and local services that know their communities and are connected to them and involving them.</p> <p>Some values are vague but OK as a general ethos.</p>
L.A's need to collaborate then it will filter down
<p>Early help: include preventative approach and also accessible help when needed if in crisis already</p> <p>Client led services important, both to maximise engagement and deliver the right impact including flexibility of service delivery for the individual</p> <p>Examples of who's doing it well, and how, would be really useful: best practice, e.g. in</p>

collaboration Identifying USPs is useful for collaboration and avoiding duplication
I felt that the definitions are far too vague, especially if these are likely to become performance measurements by which our service quality will be measured. The main focus that should underpin all these aspirations is that charities exist to deliver a service to those in need. Collaboration between charities MUST be encouraged which does not appear to be the case currently and the most important collaboration that needs to take place is within the councils themselves.
I think this is too general. We could all ticked this without doing anything too specific. The respect for differentiation needed to be noted, in order to meet specific needs (i.e. following more person centred approach)

**We are proposing 8 factors of disadvantage as the prospectus key challenges. Are these the right focus?**

Yes (5 people)
Some areas are missing - could be just about articulating better - but I'd add: 'Access to Justice'.
Can you take into account what is easy for organisations to get funding from elsewhere thus helping the most in need. Also need to take into account who struggles for funding the most. Need to know if there will be a higher focus on any of the points or if it will be evenly spread.
Mirrors much of our own focus at Home-Start
Yes with some additional clarity/explanation
Yes but they are very broad - most organisations in the room could make credible applications to address these 8 factors. Balance of funding for new/innovative projects, and maintaining existing (successful) services that meet the needs, needs to be clear.
Yes - But keep some money for targeted/strategic work - Increase wellbeing grants for neighbourhood partnerships - A steer on priorities and proportion of money across focuses would be helpful
The focus encompasses a broad range of issues - good. - 8 factors quite broad- but purposely so? - All aspects are connected - needs to express that but to what extent are they in competition? Or weighted for decision making? - Not sure about 'lifestyle' deprivation - implies a choice
Good list - Housing & Homelessness missing - Is there a priority?
Agreed to be alright but should be more focused and targeted
Exciting - hope the council backs up the idea of supporting disadvantage Will council prospectus also highlight the need to discriminate towards disadvantaged communities
- Missing housing and homelessness - key issue that perhaps merits a separate item - Would be good to unpack further the ideas behind participation in the community & be more specific. Integration, isolation, etc.

<p>Can't argue with the factors Very broad though - everything fits Lots of themes will be cross-cutting for example mental health How will the council balance priorities - for example if all the highest scoring groups are domestic violence? Need clear scoring mechanisms.</p>
<p>What about homelessness, people living in poor housing - renting, sofa surfing</p>
<p>Yes. Could go further to say "tackling growing gap between rich and poor". Vision of more equal society - income, health, access to culture, engagement with others and feeling valued.</p>
<p>Housing and homelessness is missing</p>
<p>Yes but very broad. The devil is in the detail</p>
<p>Suggest housing as basic need, part of poverty?</p>
<p>They are good. But does domestic violence need to be specifically named? Want more clarity on 'Reducing Discrimination' - what will this achieve that others on the list like 'accessing opportunities', 'low engagement' &amp; 'social isolation' don't achieve? Clarity required please.</p>
<p>Yes the values look right. But early intervention is hard. Often it's crisis before people want help</p>
<p>Yes, broadly. A challenge to know what the priorities will be, given how broad they are. Also, would like clarity and transparency around the 'jigsaw' approach.</p>
<p>I think homelessness is missing - and poor quality housing. There needs to be a prioritisation in the factors - hierarchy of need? How should the money be spent - a lot of it on a few beneficiaries or less &amp; wider issues/groups, communities.</p>
<p>Include: Homelessness/Housing &amp; Drug/Alcohol Wording 'physical &amp; emotional ill health', suggest changing this. Need greater clarity on No. 4 and 5. 'Not being able to access' and 'Low engagement'. - Not discussed - but all seem to be very relevant</p>
<p>Crime and violence - does this include both victims and perpetrators?</p>
<p>Need to orient more towards enablement, participation - less on 'disadvantage and exclusion' Need to drive change in service not create access to existing non-functioning service</p>
<p>These are fine</p>
<p>I am concerned that there is not enough focus on the most severely disadvantaged people - those with multiple &amp; complex needs. For example, addiction, homelessness, offending, violence &amp; abuse, poor mental health, poor physical &amp; emotional health. - Supporting victims of hate crime/violence - this is very specific. Why have you picked out these people and no other in need groups? Suggest rewording: 'Tackling hate crime and violence'.</p>
<p>Yes - they are so broad that it encompasses most things. Will the focus be on partnership working? How can this be facilitated by the council? Commissioned services targets include working with voluntary sector organisations and maximising VCS skills and services to enhance opportunities for disadvantaged people making maximum use of all funding available.</p>
<p>Glad to see supporting victims of violence is included. The need for domestic abuse services continue to increase year by year. The statistics that two women a week are killed due to domestic abuse still remain year on year.</p>

Why hate crime and not just crime? Physical and emotional ill health (replace with wellbeing)
We need to think preventative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is there group to be any different focus</li> <li>- needs to be coordination with other services such as infrastructure (transport) to enable efficiency</li> <li>- Measurement important issue would like to see support around outcome/impact measurement</li> </ul>
Yes they are. An extra need is better transport so that disadvantaged people can access services more easily.
Children and young people not explicitly mentioned Need to ensure this is positively framed - e.g. promote health not improve ill health Worried that environmental sustainability is absent through this
8 is very specific unlike 1-7. Why? City council needs to articulate and own strategic priorities from outset Dimensions missing / unclear Crime, community safety (victim, perpetrators and impact) Education Adults and children C/o early help / current crisis
How are we going to evidence our work?
Didn't have the opportunity to discuss today, but broadly right. 'Targeted hate crime' a bit specific, crime and violence more inclusive / broader
It was agreed in our group that these 8 factors are interlinked and we did not want to prioritise any 1 of the 8. One frustration that a lot of charities are experiencing an issue with funding that is council boundary specific. For example, we are unable to deliver services to potential service users in South Glos or BANES because we are funded by Bristol City Council. Yet this need cannot be addressed.
Would like to see language used. Use more positive, empowering phrasing rather than focusing on the deficit model

**We want proportionate grant processes and grant terms that work for a four-year prospectus. How can we get this right?**

Simple and consistent process required for, especially for small grants. Talk to other organisations for ideas (e.g. Quartet). Monitoring and reporting needs to be realistic and relevant without being a burden or a ritual.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Co-assessment for bids proposed</li> <li>2. Non tapering</li> <li>3. Simpler application</li> <li>4. Higher number of small band grants</li> </ol>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Look at grant trust applications e.g. Big Lottery, Quartet, CiN as they are geared up to VCS</li> <li>- Ensure monitors proportionate</li> <li>- Avoid taper - off of money - consider match funds</li> <li>- Avoid new projects set up just for this money, consider existing work</li> <li>- Be wary of orgs coming to Bristol for this &amp; ensure established orgs in city get fair chance</li> </ul>

<p>Slow it down! Too many questions. Have a simple process for uploading key documents once. Don't ask for information you don't need (e.g. dates of birth, charity registration documents, detailed info on salaries if you are funding outcomes)</p>
<p>Please don't make us all film on wobbly phone camera our bids? If you can condense down what you want to say for a film, you can write it. And as you can see writing isn't my favourite.</p>
<p>Well done Scenarios: less money at start, but does not taper off + evaluation costs</p>
<p>- Balance between taking risks and innovating and maintaining good services in the long-term for consistent needs</p>
<p>-Keep it simple and accessible -Put the smaller grant programme on Voscur's website</p>
<p>Staged applications with a reciprocal argument from the funder</p>
<p>What is the financial model around the 8 principles What about organisational inequalities</p>
<p>Difficult to evaluate everything without any idea of the financial model. I.e. if £5m reduce to £4m over 4 years the model works. If £5m reduce to £2.5m the model is overtaken by crisis management.</p>
<p>Accessibility &amp; support for smaller groups to apply Networking &amp; information sharing of similar projects and potential partners</p>
<p>- Have flexibility around tapering - one model won't fit every projector programme - Ensure monitoring requirements are clear from the outset and don't change during project - Support small organisations to jump through the hoops e.g. have formal policies in place, safeguarding, etc.</p>
<p>Some funding retained to meet new and emerging needs Interested in cross border working as an org on the North fringe and managing issues of access to services - people live in one council area/access schools in others One year funding is too short - you need time to establish projects Setting outcomes for 4 years is difficult - need flexibility on 4th year</p>
<p>Feedback given to facilitator. Need clarity around likely success of being awarded a grant in advance of going through the process e.g. if we have reserves of over x month, would we be provided from a grant? What about a pre-grant application process. A one page about what, when, how, why grant level. Who in BCC is to review / approve grants?</p>
<p>The process arrangements are crucial. As are fairness and transparency monitoring procedures need to be clear and decided beforehand. Flexibility about length of project useful. Any lack of transparency or clarity will mean that vol sector (and BCC) will waste their valuable resources in applying. Transparency about the fact that it will not be just a scoring process but also an impact assessment - and how that will work.</p>
<p>Opportunity to fund beyond 4 years or renew funding with review. Support for smaller agencies</p>
<p>Flexibility in grant term 1,2,3,4 years Feedback on unsuccessful grant applications</p>
<p>To facilitate smaller orgs on staged application process with a real person available to advise would be useful</p>

<p>Pre-application process to facilitate community / geographic spread of grants in city. Aim for conversation with VCS about initial application. Small groups will not be disadvantaged by complicated forms / process and will get advice. Standard evaluation of impacts to enable comparisons across city / vcs</p>
<p>Agree that there needs to be more consideration of the implications of 2 year and 4 year funding. What happens after 4 years? What can be offered by the council in terms of supporting sustainability if no further grant forthcoming? Monitoring of what individuals are benefiting from, how and why by the Council</p>
<p>Are outcomes going to be set by BCC or providers? Will outcomes meet public health outcomes because a lot of your £5m is P.H money? Tapering - how can you predict what needs might be in 3/4 years, e.g. change of government or a terrorist incident which raises hate crime. Are all 8 challenges equal? Don't lost orgs who bring ££ into the city in this process, e.g. HLCs. Throw the baby out with the bath water. Forced collaboration - you'll end up with the bigger charities doing it all &amp; picking off the little ones - less innovation and localism - neighbourhood knowledge. Bristol's own bigger charities, e.g. Second Step, don't have a neighbourhood presence - it's just city centre focused.</p>
<p>Simple application process. Phone number for small charities - that will help them to recognise whether the criteria is right for them - stop wasting precious time. Reserves? Will this be a sticking point when allocating grants - will there be a 'calling' on reserves?</p>
<p>The evaluation needs to be proportionate. The outcomes need to be clear and suggest partner workshops pre-bidding for each challenge area.</p>
<p>A variety of grant sizes with proportionality. Enthusiasm and promotion of orgs working together. Money held back for development/innovation on those which feel they can develop.</p>
<p>Tapering - better to have less money for a wide range of organisations than a limited group of well-funded projects.</p>
<p>Needs to be simple and *cannot read this word* Build its resources to support organisations to deal with the application process.</p>
<p>For me this is the most important part and needs to be fair and transparent both in the application process and in the evaluation afterwards - to achieve value for money.</p>
<p>Very good discussion - lots of interest</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include baseline standards for small grants - very important</li> <li>- Insurance levels required - public liability</li> <li>- Tapering grants - not good if paying a salary</li> <li>- Scoring system - needs to be transparent &amp; clear - one saying higher score not funded because of wish to support a level scoring project in a particular geographical area</li> <li>- Need co-assessment of applications - people from VCS.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider the option of 4 years with same amount of grant. Tapering the funding will lead to reduced service/staff in last two years.</li> <li>- Build in funding for collaborations/partnerships - needs funding for project managing for example.</li> </ul>

<p>- Dangers of 'throwing the baby out with the bathwater'</p> <p>- Do we need to recognise org's history in terms of bringing in added value</p> <p>Need to know what tapering means in terms of % - what about flexible responses to emerging needs or innovative ideas.</p> <p>The decision making process given that a large % will meet all baseline requirements etc. seems overwhelming in terms of balancing disadvantage over the city.</p>
<p>More info re tapering i.e. advice on % council 'expects'</p> <p>Advice to small organisations re e-procurement</p> <p>Advice re monitoring of outcomes, social value, etc.</p>
<p>Continue giving information &amp; examples for organisations to work with and contribute feedback on.</p> <p>Have complete transparency - so we can 'pre-empt' any changes that may affect our continuing delivery of services.</p>
<p>A variety of 'points/procedures' for access to non-literate, disenfranchised groups.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for smaller orgs</li> <li>- Clarity over taper</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communication</li> <li>- Clarity</li> </ul>
<p>The process could be adaptable, in terms of collaboration for example: could there be money fenced for new, innovative collaboration where the application process doesn't stop you applying for the main application.</p>
<p>I need to think about this more - not enough time today.</p> <p>Question: One25 currently get a 3-5yr direct grant from BDSA commissioning - commenced in April 2015 - what will happen to this grant?</p>
<p>We would prefer 2 year grants.</p> <p>As this would give organisations to join in the process at different stages.</p> <p>I.e. We are currently funded for a few years, if the grant was for 4 years, we would be unable to apply for a long time.</p>
<p>A 2 year grant term would be better for smaller organisations who have funding which is already receiving funds from other sources.</p>
<p>Are council officers skilled and knowledgeable enough of VCS to make decision?</p> <p>It takes a huge amount of resources to apply for a grant to be turned down when it's high scoring but lower priority when another bid would be wrong. You must identify priority groups &amp; beneficiaries &amp; indicate available grant amounts to stop people wasting their time and yours.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proportionate monitoring and evaluation - consistent with grant level</li> <li>- Option of postal applications - not just online process</li> <li>- Guidance on impact/outcomes (tapered): (Consistent with the level of grant and reduced tapered amounts)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Flexibility - each organisation is different so flexibility in terms of grant length and tapering would be helpful.</li> <li>- Tapering outcomes is aligned to tapering income.</li> </ul>
<p>Yes but front-loaded support pre and during application process is key.</p> <p>Grant tapering is a good helpful idea.</p>
<p>Can there be guidelines/templates for agencies to use if they want to collaborate, how to guides, protecting your organisation whilst still collaborating.</p>
<p>Funding not available for 'statutory' projects - for those working with children of school age, e.g. providing counselling services as a charity, what does 'statutory' mean, i.e. is it core curriculum , all service provided by a school.</p>

Need to work with statutory sectors - leading to shared learning
Training to local residents to apply for grants - support them to do it themselves
Tapering - need of flexibility - support needed on sustainability building - asset sharing
Agree with proposal
Small grants should / may still need safeguarding processes Timing! Need to have plenty of time in advance Taper - a huge issue, needs support to be built in and outcomes tapered too
Is it for existing work or new projects only? Proportionality of monitoring as well as application Greater flexibility in amounts provided each year the better
Small grants - less than 2k? Very light touch process Taper - for all? Some projects have a beginning, middle and end Others need will remain / grow Must minimize costs of processes when £ for delivery is shrinking Upfront early conversation / exp of interest to, assess whether a bid meets strategic 1% and say 'no' early
Can this fund existing work (or expansion of)? Expectations on tapering aspects of the funding? Level of monitoring in relation to grant levels? Scenario 4 seems best option across the board. Scenario 2 would be best for us
Publish details of current provision in the city. Non-funded, to make it clear what gaps need provision across the city. Making all sizes of grant available to all sizes and types of organisation, removing barriers-need for all submissions requested?
Clear measuring impact process / tools same for all
Listen and simplify
Respect for second language users so that the application process and how outcome reports are delivered can happen in different formats and different languages.