

Funding Social Change

An event organised by the Funding Social Change Working Group formed through attendance at North East Together – Leaders Network for Social Change.

Wednesday 23rd September 2015
Newcastle University Business School

Event Report

November 2015

Compiled by Robert Laycock

Contents

	Page
Session 1: Setting the scene - <i>summary</i>	2
Session 2: Guest speaker - <i>summary</i>	2
Session 3: Open Space - <i>report</i>	2
Session 4: Ideas into action - <i>report</i>	13
APPENDIX – Event purpose and agenda	16

Session 1: Setting the scene

Jane Hartley, Chief Executive of VONNE (Voluntary Organisations' Network North East) provided an overview of the current funding landscape and the issues, opportunities and challenges that we currently face and within the emerging context of devolution of funding to the regions.

Copy of slides attached.

Session 2: Guest speaker

Toby Lowe (Senior Research Fellow at Newcastle University Business School) provided some context to frame what might be possible in terms of funding social change including an overview of trends in the way that funders think about social change and responses that organisations can make.

Copy of slides attached.

Session 3: Open Space

Between 11.10am and 2.45pm a series of Open Space sessions took place as follows:

Session	Theme / topic explored				
1. 11.30am- 12.15pm	<i>1.1 Poverty and stigma – changing the discourse</i>	<i>1.2 Crowdfunding and attracting / retaining individual donors</i>	<i>1.3 Big Lottery Strategic Framework – Putting People in the Lead</i>	<i>1.4 How to persuade corporations to put 1% (of profits) to third sector</i>	<i>1.5 Culture change</i>
2. 12.15- 1pm	<i>2.1 Working collaboratively</i>	<i>2.2 Maximising impact of community funding / trusts from private sector.</i>	<i>2.3 Peer accountability, transparency and trust. New forms of funding models.</i>	<i>2.4 What does the sector want from business (public and private)</i>	<i>2.5 Up skilling sector to survive and thrive</i>
3. 2-2.45pm	<i>3.1 Small Organisations</i>	<i>3.2 Independent donors</i>	<i>3.3 Developing peer accountability and transparency across the North East.</i>	<i>3.4 Shared value – reframing the relationship between the VCS and private sector</i>	

The following pages provide a copy of notes taken and shared by each Open Space group.

Session 1.1: *Poverty and stigma – changing the discourse*

Main points discussed

- We have a responsibility in the youth sector to change people's attitudes.
- Finding ways to describe and evidence the work.
- Changing attitudes at a young age while children are engaged in school. It is a lot more difficult as people get older as they are not necessarily engaged in anything that is consistent.
- Language is the key; it has enabled governments to push through policy changes that in effect make people's lives worse.
- An advocate needs to be found that can be a media voice.
- Reality TV shows that highlight poverty are nearly always the wrong kind.
- Television soap shows are able to hit home with various issues/subjects. Maybe if the attitudes of producers change they could do something on poverty that would create empathy with the audience at home.
- Theatre can tell a story and create empathy causing people to think in a certain way. However scaling this effect up to hit home with more people is difficult.

Thoughts on action that could be taken

- We need a push to get it on the political agenda. Look at business corporate arm etc. to see how they communicate with their own employees and how it can be changed.
 - We need to bring together stories that can change people's views and open their eyes.
 - A bigger louder social media voice, get big influential people on board to support our beliefs and policy. Target those who can influence others.
-

Session 1.2: *Crowdfunding and attracting/retaining individual donors*

Main points discussed

- Can work well for smaller organisations.
 - Good for engaging young people.
 - Range of models available.
 - Appears people engage better with 'experience' rewards rather than 'things' – could fit well with sector.
 - Doesn't always mean money.
 - Earlier you start planning the better – at least 3 months. Social media and celebrity endorsement can help.
 - Ref: Thunderclap <https://www.thunderclap.it/>
 - Aim for more than you need. Factor in costs of campaign and rewards.
 - Donors will likely stay engaged after campaign.
 - Better fit for individuals and small organisations.
 - Should work alongside other sources of funding – not 'all eggs in one basket'.
 - Planning is key.
 - Knowing your network too.
 - Keep it small – up to £5k.
 - Need to be accountable, trustworthy.
 - Good way of enabling individual giving.
 - Good way of getting new/younger donors.
-

Session 1.3: *Big Lottery Strategic Framework – Putting People in the Lead*

Main points discussed

- Big Lottery predicts by 2021 it will be a very different organisation today as a result of their strategic framework.
- They are attempting to simplify their application process to enable more people to access grant funding and want to listen to what experts from the third sector think the third sector needs. Previously they've been very hung up on formalities because their money is public money for which they are liable and that can't change completely.
- Big Lottery is based in Newcastle and Birmingham, so when people say visits are more preferable to paper work based applications it is an issue for Big Lottery who's budget is controlled strictly by government.
- Visiting groups is encouraged by organisations, as they are seen as a benefit to both partners and is likely encourage both increase in quantity and quality of grant applications etc. But it's logistically difficult.
- Accelerating ideas program by Big Lottery was very open and broad reaching but it was felt that this was almost to an extent that there was no clear process in place.
- Facilitation element of the accelerating ideas programme was strong though.
- Local offices do exist and they're the ones most likely to make the visits.
- House share is a pilot scheme that big lottery runs which is more hands on and inter personal.
- Took one organisation three months to fill out a big lottery application. It is felt that that doesn't suit the kinds of small grass roots organisations that are likely to apply.
- New initiatives don't necessarily suit established organisations that are incapable of adjusting their organisation's make-up to suit the grant framework.
- Is there going to be a change in the way grants are going to be assessed? Young people have been involved in deciding who gets funding, but perhaps not to a great extent. Often the same people, e.g. UKYP or BYC rather than less typical young people perhaps from less engaged areas with different social backgrounds.
- Big Lottery 'bringing the outside in' is where Big Lottery invite organisations in to learn from them as an audience. Particularly when applicants are more unique, for example young people or mental health related applicants.
- Big Lottery are looking in to how they can involve local people in making decisions.
- Reaching communities fund, there's a lot of competition in grant applications and people are scared to make joint applications and collaborative bids. Something that needs to be encouraged by the Big Lottery itself, perhaps referring unsuccessful applicants to one another and suggesting their application would be stronger as a collaborative. Important that this is a suggestion and not a forced move, which is likely to improve trust between organisations in the third sector. ALSO the bid itself is so time consuming there is no time to work on a partnership.
- Local forum for liaising with big lottery and developing partnerships.
- Big Lottery is at an advantage as they see the national picture so can advise charities on best practice when they hear similar bids.
- Mutual trust is important, especially if they were to focus on more qualitative bids, there must be honesty to back up the application in the absence of funds. Encourage organisations receiving funding to be confident and capable to admit defeat or problems rather than saving face to secure funding in the next round.

Conclusions reached

Generally people approve of visits/ facilitations, and would encourage big lottery to increase these more regularly.

Thoughts on action that could be taken

How should Big Lottery look in 2021?

- Relationship based funding!
- Second stage visits imperative.
- Higher the amount, the more the engagement. Despite greater risk often being attached to smaller bids by smaller organisations.

- Big Lottery should reduce the focus on paper applications and figures etc and increased focus on the real qualitative story of an organisation
- Continuations funding- long-term commitments.
- Stop rewarding failure. E.g. previously would fund reducing teenage pregnancy and an organisation loses funding for having been successful and having succeeded in their goal.
- Big Lottery should monitor the success of bids in qualitative terms rather than quantitative.
- Bid applications in a Dragons Den style, apply in person to translate the emotive side to the application. Perhaps asking organisations to host their own application meetings so the Big Lottery can see the applicants in their 'natural habitat'.
- Should accept video applications. Big Lottery is already trying to encourage blogs as a grant management method.

All changes are likely to be gradual over the course of a number of years, with existing funds as well as new ones.

Session 1.4 *How to persuade corporations to put 1% (of profits) to third sector*

Main points discussed

- Types of contribution – TAX, grants, partnerships with benefits, sponsorship, PR etc, employee time.
- How – legislation? Culture?
- E.g. Scandinavian company – employee benefits, personal fitness.
- Attitudes change – public, organisational.
- Northern Rock foundation – singular e.g. in North East. Strong example of social impact
- Localism.

Conclusions reached

- % of profits and foundation.
 - Good examples are Northern Rock Foundation, Lloyds Bank Foundation.
 - Need to change attitudes/culture – persuasion of benefits of partnering with charities.
-

Session 1.5: *Culture change*

Main points discussed

- Common ground between sectors? Or are they too different?
- Why is our sector (3rd) seen as not efficient? Not corporate enough/ not professional enough/ fear of professionals to refer to 3rd sector/ particularly in health and social care?
- All need to understand each others needs more to work more efficiently
- Benefit realisation plan – put your benefits in an understandable language across the board – each sector has its own language, so change to enable cohesive conversation.
- Where do values fit in with the call to be more corporate and business like?
- Third sector workers and leaders are doing more with less and having to bat-off these calls and demands from other sectors to improve or change.
- The point of language change is just getting your point across well rather than having to make fundamental changes – sell the benefits you can bring to them in particular.
- Third sector has become so money focussed/ business based that we are becoming more risk averse and suffering yet those corporate sectors are more risky now and flourishing.
- So much change has to still consider the person they are working with, this can become lost and also focus on organisations can be lost. Need to proceed with caution.
- Encouraging more cross fertilisation across sectors- training conversations.
- People from organisations can often be in denial about the relevance now of their function – is the need you meet still needed? This drains time energy and resources. Some kind of mapping required.
- Trusting and taking risks with other organisations is hugely beneficial.

- Local culture can be difficult to break through 'new blood' is maybe required for change to happen.
 - Identify value and expertise at a local level.
 - Local cuts may well show inadequacies, which may open up opportunities. However can also cause defensive actions and attitudes.
 - Often through, people just want someone to do the job and do it well, doesn't matter who.
 - Can be collaborating more and more effectively
 - Direct services for Newcastle – support services – underused and under populated so have become ineffective.
 - If devolution happens will this give access for collaboration?
 - Leader of combined authority?
-

Session 2.1: *Working collaboratively*

Main points discussed

- How to work on ways to work together – not necessarily longer-term partnership and still being mindful of keeping vital knowledge for own use.
- What can we bring to other organisations and look at money issues later – build relationships and trust first.
- There is not much time for services to be open to collaboration because their work is structured to meeting set outcomes. Then you find you have 'sold' an idea for free with no benefit to self. Trust in the first place would help find more appropriate organisations.
- Speed dating style for organisations to meet and collaborate – good as an initial start but not to build partnerships.
- Helpful to know about others who have a collaborated successfully – how did they do it etc.
- A forum for collaboration ideas/requests of needs etc.. also would need a place to meet If your organisation is not appropriate. A wellbeing service etc. .
- All takes time and resources that need to be build into an organisations frame work to be effective.
- How do I start a collaboration?
- Value and principle driven because not enough commonalities means it will not work. What have we learned from the past 5 years or so of collaboration – particularly from negative experiences.
- Public value model doesn't lend itself to collaboration – but if we assess an organisations performance on the effectiveness of the mechanics and governance of its framework, this is better for trusting collaborations.
- There are two levels of collaboration formal and informal. Informal is good for ideas etc.
- Going it alone for funding is simpler but collaboration may often be more effective – can be difficult to convince people of this.
- In an ideal world each person in an organisation holds all the ideas – easier to work with others if each stands for the same things.
- It's the vagueness of collaboration which causes mistrust and lack of risk – divulging 'secrets' for no money in the end – vicious circle.
- Collaboration is hugely beneficial but organisations are often risk averse.
- "local" organisations can tend to have issues around trust of outside agencies/organisations acknowledgement of abilities of others to help them.
- Can development money be kept even if collaboration doesn't work out? This would help a lot and keep trust.
- Money should flow down all the way down to the people delivering the services on the front line.
- Funders have to understand that there has to be a good offer of investment for good collaboration to happen – they are calling for more innovation and ideas and this collaboration is a major way to do it. Collaborations don't just happen at once – they take time.

- It is difficult to enable and empower people in organisations to become who they are in order to impact the work more fully.
 - Collaboration around training, funding, planning – clear about objectives to work efficiently, “who, what why, where, when rather than ‘open to all’ – Base values and aims brings focus to drawn right partners.
 - The relationship needs to be build as an organisational whole but too often relies on one person from each organisation. An organisational relationship takes about 2 years to build.
-

Session 2.2: *Maximising impact of community funding/trusts from private sector.*

Main points discussed

- How can we influence and maximise this spending? Do we gift with no influence or control over the money or do we invest with targets, results etc?
 - Can someone with the skills to spend the money in a more effective way go into these areas to plan effectively for long term improvement?
 - How can you get a community to support maybe a local charity that could improve social wellbeing rather than improve one physical aspect of the community?
 - Why don't the community who get the funding have a panel of community grant givers? People from that community can apply to the panel for financial grants. The panel members could even be given training on becoming grant givers. This training would help allow the business to have influence.
 - It should not be something that one person from the community decides it should be a joint decision from various people who fall into different parts of the community.
 - There are different ways to ask a question. Framing a question is very important.
 - It does not have to be hard gifting it can be a gift of knowledge.
 - A Scandinavian view (national attitude) is that if a wind farm is built on someone's doorstep they should deserve a cut of the company (10%).
 - There is a view in the UK that this would act as a bribe rather than a benefit.
-

Session 2.3: *Peer accountability, transparency and trust. New forms of funding models.*

Main points discussed

Provocation: *Can we create different forms of accountability where we become accountable to one another in addition/instead of more traditional paper trails and formal reports?*

Are charities willing to be transparent about their work in return for trust from funders? If so, how would we go about doing this? Would this be useful?

- Transparency would be easier, less stress of getting a form correct and ticking all the right boxes etc. Safer to get an honest appraisal of activity. Honesty about struggles/problems can be a risk though, where people are nervous about admitting these problems.
- Suggestion that charities ought not to be too transparent as it gives advantage to competitors? Especially showing competitors what you're doing.
- There is some bad practice, for example where private and public gain are confused. Transparency would hopefully eradicate this?
- Honest applications are more believable.
- Systems based approaches - not possible for one organisation to effect this change it needs to be collaborative.
- Without transparency is there a risk that organisations might become self-involved and would actually gain from learning best practice from other organisations.
- Trust equation = credibility + reliability + intimacy ÷ self-interest. Not just about transparency to improve trust.
- Outcomes are competitive, transparency at all levels not only upon completion of projects are likely to improve comfort with one another.

- Trust could be achieved by having organisations assessed by customers / partners. Stakeholders need to be included through every step of the way, all-inclusive transparency for everyone at every level in the organisation.
- Case study: Learning Community. Fulfilling Lives. Working with 5 delivery organisations who work with individuals with severe complex needs. Within the group the 5 delivery organisations are encouraged to report back on struggles not successes, and learn from bad practice. Would the same conversations happen if the funders were present? Perhaps these spaces are only able to be authentic without funders there. Would this work if the organisations weren't working together on a programme, and were instead competitors? Perhaps with a facilitator who is independent?
- Organisations whose funding comes from central government demands a lot of accuracy in reports, especially where funding is competitive. So funders need to be transparent in return.
- Funders should assess applications maturely, assessing how they have learned from mistakes or plan to learn. Is being a member of a learning community an indicator that they are trustworthy?
- There ought not to be so many small schemes that encourage solutions that are unsustainable and ought to be rolled out on a cohesive and fine-tuned scope. Organisations ought to work as a system rather than individuals.
- Funders surely have their own targets and priorities. Applications are regularly trying to tick boxes, and transparency would make this easier. Harder when funders have quite broad aims.
- Organisations need support in facilitating the organisation of grant applications etc., and maybe this support ought to come from infrastructure organisations.
- Transparency between larger and smaller organisations is potentially more complicated.
- Do small organisations have the capacity to invest time, staff or money to join a learning community? Do they need to be carried out by volunteers when dealing with smaller organisations? Again, if so should these communities be exclusive to small organisations?

Conclusions reached

Transparency is a nice idea, but needs to be unilateral to encourage trust and safety.

Thoughts on action that could be taken

Learning communities sounds interesting and it would be a good idea to investigate how organisations can replicate that model.

Session 2.4: What does the sector want from business (public and private)

Main points discussed

- Business sector needs to understand more about what the third sector wants in order to become more sustainable.
- Funders asking more about how VCS organisations will work with business with regards to sustainability.
- Money.
- Skills – marketing, PR, finance.
- One-off (volunteering) not as useful – need longer term engagement. Employees seem to want days out rather than longer term personal development opportunities (time restraints?) Lots of employees want to keep it local/personal (e.g. their child's school).
- Lack of brokers of time – e.g. volunteer willing, organisation needy, no one to pay to train volunteer.
- Trustees – very difficult to get trustees. Is this because of time or responsibility? Or understanding?
- Would it be useful to segment the business sector more for better targeting and matching, etc? Match small with small, for example? SMEs often seem to provide more support than larger corporate ones.
- Also – what does business want from the sector?

Session 2.5: *Up skilling sector to survive and thrive*

Main points discussed

- The evidence base suggests a certain section of sector aren't adapting to the current environment i.e. less public sector funding/grants – not used to planning for longer term. Not just about fundraising skills but about planning.
- Secondments from industry into organisations for 10 months.
- Online resource to raise awareness of benefits of planning with case studies – aimed at trustees.
- Skills development element included in funding packages.
- Commitment of business partner to take an organisation through a complete process to achieve an end product or outcome – not increase strain on organisations capacity.
- Follow up business re- effective marketing and uptake of opportunities.
- Mentoring partnerships that foster organisational matching that provide organisation to organisational support. Whole organisation support not just one individual within the organisation but across staff levels.
- How to counteract trustee perception that 'free' business support may not have the same value/commitment as a paid consultant.
- Promote series of sessions to groups who might not be sure what the opportunities are.
- Summarise key messages of how lack of planning can impact and what can be done to help.
- Manage expectations for the organisation – what is the level of work, what is it for, what will it cost the organisation (e.g. travel expenses) what is that likely to be/where will your volunteers come from.
- Ensure the organisation/charity has the capacity to take forward the plan at the end of the intervention.
- Turn it around – workshops to identify need then to sign post to organisations that can provide training.

Conclusions reached

- Marketing and comms event – get pro bono support working with BIC to stage an event.
 - Website clearly signpost people to different opportunities for sector business support/marketing.
 - Cultivate relationships with business sector.
-

Session 3.1: *Small Organisations*

Main points discussed

- Small groups may not have the time/capacity/knowledge to research and apply for funding or campaigning for support etc. If these go, there will be a terrible effect in communities.
- Training is needed to build this capacity.
- Those who shout loudest seem to get the most – we are restricted and may remain hidden.
- More affluent areas can afford to do small-scale things on their own, areas of poverty can't.
- Why don't funders pay for a funding advice worker working to help and improve small organisations?
- They could get together to pay for someone – it would also improve the quality of applications they receive.
- More of a voice of the service users should be part of the funders panel.
- Grant funding seems to be the only way to generate income however there are other ways.
- Small organisations need to sell themselves, their unique selling points and benefits.
- Small organisations can come together to apply for contracts and funding for projects. E.g. applying for funding for someone from another organisation to deliver a project for you.
- Donations are made (funding etc..) not always on trust but often from an emotional level – the appeal has touched their heart.

- Really small groups doing very valuable work are under the radar but often lack the very basic knowledge of funding/policies etc. and even what they are and mean – it's not stupidity, its simple lack of knowledge – not used to these structures and language. They are often more suited to engagement and meeting the need rather than articulating a fine application.
 - Gateshead council have things in place for organisations setting up to learn about structures, processes, marketing etc.
 - Conversations need to take place as to what exactly is involved in an organisation either set up or carry on and this is often a difficult conversation. Need to look at solutions such as merging with another organisation already under constitution for example. They often don't know what they don't know. Someone to go to them would be more efficient and effective than other way round to seek help.
 - By understanding your market you can adapt to massive changes more easily.
 - There are larger organisations who really want to share their knowledge.
 - Risk taking is very important in order to progress and adapt.
 - The funders questions of outcomes can cause projects to fold.
 - If we map what is going on where we can take the lead people/key people and bring them together – a way to see the whole picture more clearly.
 - However, funders and organisations often don't want to relinquish the power they have over their own finances/knowledge/policies into one big pot.
-

Section 3.2: *Independent donors*

Main points discussed

- Reliance on long term funding.
- Building up quality relationships with people who understand fully what you do and are happy to pay a fee say each month.
- People need to feel like they are investing in something.
- Sending letters asking for help with resources rather than money can give results.
- Looking for people who you can build a long term relationships with, even such as stationary providers.
- How do you approach independent donors?
- Having a pool of volunteers who can arrange fundraising events that would not only raise money but can spread the message about further donations etc (handing out a flyer).
- Highlight what stands out from what you do. How would that appeal to an independent funder. Make the most of being a bit different.

Conclusions reached

- It must be included in a marketing sales plan.
- Target those people who would be sympathetic to your organisation and what they do.
- Create a definite brand and start the ball rolling, you never know who you could reach.
- Look at other organisations who have successful donations from independent donors and ask how they made that link.

Thoughts on action that could be taken

FSI – London based organisation who offer training for the voluntary sector. The training covers corporate donors. www.thefsi.org.uk

Section 3.3: *Developing peer accountability and transparency across the North East*

Main points discussed

- Continuation of previous discussion around the learning community set up as part of the Fulfilling Lives case study.
- Will these networks increase transparency, and is that reason enough for funders to have more faith in organisations who are a part of these networks?
- How would we develop this? How would we involve funders?
- Could an infrastructure organisation host this? Or regulate this? For it to be credible to funders it needs to be regulated.
- Sharing information about good practice can be dangerous and risky, what would make organisations willing to do it? Perhaps if organisations involved are of similar scales or with shared interest they might be more comfortable.
- Consider the resources available to different charities, e.g. large-scale organisations may have a wealth of statistics and data etc. and be working with a volunteer led charity with far fewer resources who are likely to be overshadowed.
- Having an independent review of progress not just by the funder. E.g. service users assessing.
- Would work well where the organisations involved have shared interest but aren't competitors. Or have mixed interests e.g. target audience or geographical area who again aren't competing with one another.
- It might increase transparency and honesty if organisations are asked to share with one another as opposed to report data to funders or head office.
- If funders recognise the learning communities, organisations might be more willing to join.
- Funders know that whilst on paper they may have never delivered an unsuccessful grant they know realistically they must have, and have a need to increase honesty and transparency.
- VONNE have a funders' network for funders to join and share.
- This kind of network would need to be an optional extra and not compulsory. Or else an admissible option where you can engage in this kind of programme and maybe reduce the amount of paperwork needed alongside.
- An alternative place to report findings or problems, other than internally for internal development and lesson learning.
- There must be organisations working together for the same goal, and organisations need to be honest with each other about how they are working together.
- But consortiums are at risk of always having a weak link, who becomes a bit of a scapegoat. How do you avoid that?
- Commercial protectiveness is paramount and is likely to deter people from sharing best practice.
- Seems unhealthy the way organisations compete and exist in a fragmented state, and would be good for them to combine without rendering one organisation irrelevant if overshadowed with a competitor.

Conclusions reached

In order for this to work, learning communities will need to self-govern themselves by including facilitators in the process in order to ensure transparency and best practice.

Thoughts on action that could be taken

- It might work well in the social isolation and older people work, a partnership of systems and delivery organisations with shared interest.
- Need skills sets around new things like facilitation and enabling rather than service delivery, which may need sourcing or developing. Is training in this sort of thing already available? *Agile services? Benefit realisation plan?*
- *Let's see if this model would work in the field of social isolation.*

Section 3.4: *Shared value – reframing the relationship between the VCS and private sector*

Main points discussed

- How do we relate to the private sector?
 - Philanthropy seems one-sided, should be more equal.
 - Harvard report – private sector gone too far looking for growth/money – should have more proper social responsibility.
 - Starting point is to figure out what everyone wants to get from it so everyone gets something.
 - Shared Value becoming a global movement.
 - Could it apply to our sector?
 - Important as public sector support reducing – call for private to pick up the tab. Can we do it differently?
 - Money or resources? Anything of value to you. Example – hire 20 local people. VCS organisations involved in recruiting. Reduces long-term costs as have more likely employee commitment and less recruitment costs, etc. Bottom line improves leading to better surplus to reinvest again, full circle, continued process.
 - Need a stronger skills base for the North East. So businesses would benefit from investing in improving local pool.
 - Aren't there already groups/networks that do this brokering, etc? Employability arena is saturated. But these are government funded and 'classic' employability programmes. This is about doing it differently. Creating relationships between the private sector, VCS and the community.
 - It's about each player having an equal part. But this comes down to attitudinal change, which is difficult.
 - Not sure it will work on a regional level – local could be better, at least initially.
 - Is it a British thing? Other countries seem more 'happy company/happy workers/happy communities living in harmony'.
 - The idea came from the business sector. They came up with the model.
 - Potential – co-operative? John Lewis? Find an organisation who is already part way there?
 - But each model would be different. It's a partnership.
 - Why isn't it happening then? Some partnerships are too ambitious. Lack of understanding between the sectors. Lack of desire to do things differently.
 - Is there a scale to the model? E.g. a mismatch between small organisation going to large (or even giant?)
 - Dating service needed?
 - Has anyone sold to the private sector yet? That would work for both – recognition, etc.
 - To what extent is it a CSR relationship and to what extent is it a commercial relationship?
 - Similar to working to establish a long-term relationship with funders, this would work towards the same with private sector.
-

Session 4: Ideas into action

The purpose of this session was to identify the actions required between now and 2022/23 to make our envisaged future funding models a reality.

Four themes were proposed:

1. *Trust based funding.*
2. *Effective working relationship between funders, policy makers and the social change sector – based on mutual understanding.*
3. *Common voice.* **Note:** Unfortunately the notes from this session have been lost.
4. *An equal and mutually beneficial relationship between the private sector and VCS organisations.*

During this final session participants joined the group exploring the theme most of interest to them. Groups were encouraged to use a simple Theory of Change planning template to capture the outcome of their discussions.

Group 1 chose not to use this template preferring instead to capture their discussions as follows:

Trust Based Funding

- Getting the funders on board with this model helping them understand what they do and why they can find mechanisms to talk to others and also with a higher touch in accountability.
- How can we foster trust and remain balanced across sectors?
- Example given of high trust funding in New Zealand. If the funding or contractor has done their homework up front, you trust them and don't need so much hard copy applications- reduced paperwork.
- This is more effective at local/regional level.
- This approach may still need some way to measure effectiveness.
- The answer lies in good homework and trusting relationship beforehand.
- This then enables difficulties to be openly addressed and also more flexibility for risk taking in a safer way.
- Time frames with measuring would be required to promote longevity.
- The current funding model is frustrating and stunts trust even after relationships are built due to limitations of funding models.
- Trust and relationships are critical: discussed omission of contractors and working purely on trust. Communities thrive on trust.
- Conflict between funding over long term and also letting new organisations breakthrough.
- By only stating to funders the outcomes of needs met and how, there is a lot of work missed out to enable that organisation to demonstrate added value.
- There needs to be a framework for this model/some kind of quality control/criteria for what makes a good and trusted organisation.
- How to do this so as not to stifle /motivate new organisations. Answer may be in different scales of criteria and funding dependent in size of organisation, like the lottery funding. Trust is credibility, responsibility and intimacy – this is a model that can be used to let weaker and stronger aspects of organisations balance out rather than be written off.
- These conversations and trust must also apply from organisation to funder – may want to change approach or end it mid-fund etc.
- Long-term thinking and approaches prove to funders that an organisation has belief in what it does and its effectiveness.

Group 2 chose to use the template as follows:

Effective working relationship between funders, policy makers and the social change sector – based on mutual understanding.

Funders/commissioners/policy makers not only understanding the scope and impact of the VCS, but working collaboratively with us to bring about change in funding and commissioning models

Identifying your ultimate goal	Identifying your intermediate outcomes aka milestones	Identifying your activities	Showing causal links	Examining your assumptions
Build sustainable relationships between funders, VCS and commissioners Use understanding to work with them to create sustainable models that work	1. Year 1 Championing good work		To show variety & context of what is happening – will vary from region to region	
	2. Year 2 Demonstrate co-production	Case study visits	Build confidence & relationships around trust & networks of support	
	3. Year 3 Stronger voice / collective brand	Identify message for different brands	What voluntary sector has to offer	Right across all organisations including smaller organisations

Other notes

- Information exchange
- Policy
- Funding
- Identify what people want, trust to deliver
- Relationships developed for change
- Change to organisational relationship
- Embed to influence at different levels
- Partnership working
- Maintaining good work – where there is no money
- Trust – goodwill – confidence officers and decision makers – who are they
- Take a risk – co-production, develop relationships with key contacts.

Group 4 chose to use the template as follows:

Outcome of final session exploring relationship between private and voluntary and community sectors

Identifying your ultimate goal	Identifying your immediate outcomes aka milestones	Identifying your activities	Showing the causal links	Examining your assumptions
An equal and mutually beneficial relationship between the private sector and VCS organisations	Achieve a critical mass of equal and mutually beneficial relationships between private sector and VCS organisations – <i>demonstrators, champions, leaders</i>	<p>Mapping exercise – <i>where is this working really well? Who's involved?</i></p> <p>Research – <i>what are the qualities of these relationship that deliver mutual benefits?</i></p> <p>Share and celebrate these successes</p> <p>Use these 'exemplars' to stimulate and encourage the formation of new relationships (bringing organisations together, use of databases/networks*)</p>		

*Some specific networks mentioned:

- Responsible Business
- Skill Share
- Business in the community
- Greggs/Sage
- Top 200 businesses in the region

APPENDIX – Event purpose and agenda

This event aims to create space for practitioners, organisations (private, public and charitable) and academics to come together to...

- **Take stock** of the current funding for social change situation: *What are the main issues and opportunities? What and where are the emerging new models?*
- **Imagine the future:** *New models, guiding ethics and principles, the role of governance, competition, collaboration.*
- **Explore what needs to change** to realise better future funding for social change.

By the end of the event, delegates will have ...

- Achieved a clear and shared understanding about the current reality and dynamics of funding for social change.
- Imagined refined, new and alternative future funding models for mid-way through the next parliamentary period 2022/23.
- Determined what actions can be taken collectively to move towards better future funding models.
- Identified how the findings from the event can best be disseminated amongst key stakeholders.

09.30-10.00	<u>Arrival</u> , registration, refreshments
10.00-10.10	<u>Welcome and Introduction to the event</u>
10.10-10.30	<u>Setting the scene</u> - VONNE (Voluntary Organisations' Network North East) will set the scene for discussions throughout the day by providing a short overview of the current funding landscape and the issues, opportunities and challenges that we currently face and within the emerging context of devolution of funding to the regions.
10.30-11.10	<u>Guest speaker</u> - Toby Lowe (Senior Research Fellow at Newcastle University Business School) will be helping us to think about the context which shapes what is possible in terms of funding social change, trends in the way that funders think about social change, and responses that organisations can make.
11.10-11.30	<u>Open Space</u> – Set up and facilitation The primary purpose of the event is to create space for delegates to collectively imagined refined, new and alternative future funding models for mid-way through the next parliamentary period 2022/23. These Open Space sessions will provide opportunities for delegates to pitch, share and develop ideas. If you have a great idea you want to share and develop using this opportunity you can either book an Open Space slot in advance or simply propose your Open Space idea during the event. To Book an Open Space slot in advance, contact Robert Laycock: T: 07766 876471 E: robert@peoplepurposeplanning.co.uk
11.30-12.15	<u>Open Space 1</u>
12.15-13.00	<u>Open Space 2</u>
13.00-13.45	<u>Lunch</u> – As this is an event organised entirely by volunteers and with no budget we are unable to provide delegates with lunch. Lunch will be available to purchase in the building and from other outlets nearby. We will provide refreshments throughout the event.
13.45-14.00	<u>Open Space</u> - Resetting
14.00–14.45	<u>Open Space 3</u>
14.45-15.00	Refreshment break
15.00–16.00	<u>Ideas into action</u> - The purpose of this session is to identify the actions required between now and 2022/23 to make our envisaged future funding models a reality.
16.00– 16.30	Closing Remarks