

Evaluation of the Community Champions Fund

Andrew Watson, Glyn Owen, Mary Crowder
and Brian Ellis

ASW Consulting

Research Report

No 550

Evaluation of the Community Champions Fund

*Andrew Watson, Glyn Owen, Mary Crowder
and Brian Ellis*

ASW Consulting

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education and Skills.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2004. Published with the permission of DfES on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to The Crown Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ.

ISBN 1 84478 267 0

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
I: BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY	9
Introduction	9
Background	9
Aim and objectives	10
Methodology	10
Report structure	11
II: DELIVERY MODELS	12
Introduction	12
Planning and funding	12
Roles and timing	14
Marketing and outreach	16
Applications and selection process	18
Support for Champions	20
Monitoring	22
III: COMMUNITY CHAMPIONS AND THEIR PROJECTS	24
Introduction	24
Geographical coverage	24
Grant size	27
Projects	27
Ethnic origin	28
Gender	29
Age range	30
Disability	30
Qualification level and prior involvement in community activities	30
Concluding comment	31
IV: IMPACT ON INDIVIDUALS AND COMMUNITIES	32
Introduction	32
Personal outcomes	32
Benefits for local communities	37
Sustainability	43
Critical success factors	46
V: COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS	49
Introduction	49
Costs	49
Benefits	49
VI: PATHFINDER YOUNG COMMUNITY CHAMPIONS FUND	53
Introduction	53
Take-up of PYCCF	53
Delivery models	58
Early impact	61
Concluding comment	62

Tables

Table 2.1:	How respondents heard about the Community Champions scheme	17
Table 2.2:	Ease or difficulty of the application process	20
Table 2.3:	Satisfaction with support received whilst a Community Champion	21
Table 3.1:	Breakdown of Champions by region	25
Table 3.2:	Summary analysis of regional and in-region distribution of Champions	26
Table 3.3:	Grant values in the larger sample frame and amongst respondents to telephone survey	27
Table 3.4:	Analysis of larger sample frame and of respondents to the telephone survey by ethnic origin	29
Table 3.5:	Highest qualification held by Community Champions	31
Table 4.1:	Champions obtaining, or beginning to study for, qualifications	34
Table 4.2:	Champions obtaining, or beginning to study for, qualifications - analysis by group	34
Table 4.3:	Estimated number of volunteers involved	38
Table 4.4:	Analysis of volunteers by group	38
Table 4.5:	Estimated number of beneficiaries involved	41
Table 4.6:	Ways in which communities have benefited from Community Champions	43
Table 4.7:	Community Champions using additional sources of funding	45
Table 5.1:	Benefits from the Community Champions scheme per £1m expenditure	51
Table 6.1:	Take-up of PYCCF by region	54
Table 6.2:	Breakdown of PYCCF awards by amount	55
Table 6.3:	Breakdown of Young Champions by ethnic origin	56
Table 6.4:	Breakdown of Young Champions by age range	57
Table A.1:	Summary of fieldwork by interviewee type and region	

Appendices

A:	Methodology
B:	Individuals interviewed during fieldwork
C:	Fieldwork checklist
D:	Summary of issues raised in telephone survey
E:	Sample frame of Community Champions, analysed by geographical area
F:	Beneficiaries and nature of benefits in 48 projects

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

1. This Executive Summary reports the key findings of a study undertaken by ASW Consulting for the Department for Education and Skills (DfES), to evaluate the impact of the Community Champions Fund (CCF). The study was undertaken between October 2003 and March 2004.
2. The aim of CCF (budget £3m per year) is:-
 - to increase the skill levels of individuals to enable them to act as inspirational figures, community entrepreneurs, community mentors and community leaders;
 - to increase the involvement of communities in regeneration and learning activity.
3. The national CCF is temporarily supported by two other funds which were also evaluated, namely:-
 - the Community Champions Support Fund (CCSF), established to offer a range of support for You and Your Community Award winners in the period from April 2002 to March 2004 (budget £350k);
 - the Pathfinder Young Community Champions Fund (PYCCF), established to respond to the challenges of the community cohesion agenda. PYCCF is funded by the Home Office but administered by the DfES and encourages more young people to become involved in community activities in the 14 Community Cohesion Areas (budget £675k between February 2003 and December 2004).

METHODOLOGY

4. The main components of the study were:-
 - consultation with those involved at the national level. This was to ensure the study was informed by an awareness of the broader policy, strategy and funding context (5 interviews);
 - fieldwork in all nine English regions, including discussions with Government Office (GO) staff, intermediaries, and local community organisations. The main purpose was to explore the key issues around the effectiveness of the models and the impact of CCF on individuals and communities (47 interviews);
 - a telephone survey of 402 Community Champions. The main purpose was to secure data from a cross-section of Champions on the key issues of impact and additionality; a subsidiary objective was to obtain feedback on the effectiveness of the scheme from users;
 - face-to-face interviews with 48 Community Champions and 9 Young Community Champions to explore their individual experiences in greater depth, thereby adding 'colour' to the quantitative data.

DELIVERY MODELS

5. Key points from the feedback on delivery models include the following:-

- most intermediaries have been appointed as a result of an approach from the GO. There is a risk that there may be other potentially effective intermediaries who have not been able to make their case;
- there is scope for greater discussion on budgets and contracts between GOs and intermediaries. Performance is measured almost entirely by spend against budget and attainment of specific targets, with insufficient focus given to issues of impact and quality;
- where the CCF allocation is larger and/or where the infrastructure for small grant administration is already in place, the 15% fee seems adequate. However, in the reverse situations, the fee becomes almost negligible in terms of its impact on intermediaries' income and infrastructure;
- making payments up front wherever feasible (i.e. as opposed to claims in retrospect) gives positive signals about trust and is especially welcomed where the organisation acting as banker does not have a strong cash flow position;
- 'fast track' payments (made exceptionally where a Champion needs to incur expenditure before their grant has been formally approved) provide much needed flexibility;
- there was some confusion in the field as to whether awards need to be spent by the end of the financial year in which they are awarded. This would benefit from clarification;¹
- intermediaries - and word of mouth - are the main ways in which Champions hear about CCF. The general sense was that CCF was a 'well kept secret'. At the local level, it was not unusual for marketing efforts to be turned on and off like a tap, depending on the extent of funding available at any particular time;
- the local application process is generally straightforward, with support available from intermediaries. However, the national website has given rise to criticisms, especially when used for on-line applications;
- there is wide variation in approaches to recruitment and selection. In some areas all applications are approved for as long as the budget allocation lasts, unless they are ineligible in some way; in others, panels make genuine selections between a large number of ostensibly suitable applications;
- at present the number of current or previous Champions on panels is less than ideal. Securing a better balance between interests represented on panels is an area for development;
- support during the life of the projects is typically on an ad hoc basis, unless help is sought specifically. Similarly, monitoring is carried out with a light touch in almost every instance. Whilst funding levels are adequate for management and administration, they seem insufficient to support a more proactive regime;
- there is scope for more local networking between Champions, and more dissemination of good practice.

THE CHAMPIONS

6. Analysis of management information and contextual data revealed that:-

¹ We understand that this has since been addressed in the 2004/5 guidance to GOs.

- CCF operates across all of the English regions in a way that, allowing for its small absolute size, is reasonably uniform, but with a slight emphasis on deprived areas. On average, there are 33 Champions per million of population. The average grant awarded was around £1,250;
- the overall gender balance was 56% (women) and 44% (men). Data on age ranges was not robust but suggested that as many as 40% of Champions were over 50. Around 40% of Champions were from black and minority ethnic (BME) communities;
- around 14% of Champions had a self-reported disability;
- Champions were typically more highly qualified than the average levels across the population as a whole - 44% had qualifications at Level 4 or higher. 85% of Champions had some prior experience of community activities.

IMPACT ON CHAMPIONS

7. In terms of outcomes for the Champions themselves:-

- 7.0% of those in the telephone survey had found employment (including self-employment) since starting their project. However, attribution was low (i.e. Champions did not necessarily link their job with their CCF experience);
- a much higher proportion of Champions (21 of 48) from the face-to-face interviews reported employment outcomes, although these included anticipated future outcomes, and indirect (employment-related) benefits for those associated with the project, as well as direct employment outcomes for themselves;
- 140 respondents to the telephone survey (34.8%) had either achieved a qualification or begun studying while in receipt of CCF. In 11 cases both situations applied. Attribution here was at a medium to high level;
- learning outcomes from the face-to-face group were more numerous, although the sample is too small for statistical conclusions to be drawn. Examples included ICT courses, training related to the law on domestic violence, tennis coaching, certificate of Cub Scout leadership, and NVQ courses (e.g. motorcycle maintenance);
- 78% of respondents to the telephone survey said they felt more confident as a result of CCF - the attribution was also medium to high;
- as many as 18 (of 48) Champions in the face-to-face interviews said they had greatly improved their skills and knowledge in relation to community and voluntary activities – for example, leadership skills, organisational, management and administrative skills, understanding of how to move projects forward.

IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY

8. In terms of outcomes for the communities:-

- almost all of the respondents to the telephone survey (93.5%) said that they had involved others in their project. In terms of *volunteers*, the average was 8.8 per project. Similarly, most Champions in the face-to-face discussions had involved others, whether from their own family, local community, or community of interest;
- 103 respondents (25.6%) to the telephone survey said they had encouraged others to apply for a CCF award. In total there were 138 'induced' applicants, an average of 1.4 per respondent;

- in terms of *beneficiaries*, the raw data from the telephone survey suggested that the average number of others benefiting from the activities of CCF funded projects was 376 per project, equating to a 'cost per beneficiary' of £3.30. A second, more conservative, calculation was undertaken which produced average figures of 56 beneficiaries per project at a cost of £22.20 per beneficiary. The latter appear the more reliable figures;²
- there is rich data from the qualitative research on numbers of beneficiaries and types of benefits. It suggests that large numbers of beneficiaries does not *necessarily* imply that beneficiaries are passive or that benefits are *necessarily* negligible; nor would it be true to say that those projects with small numbers of beneficiaries *always* achieved a higher intensity of benefit. In short, generalisations on this aspect are dangerous.

SUSTAINABILITY

9. Findings on sustainability (i.e. the extent to which the projects become embedded and continue to have an effect) include the following:-
- it was clear that the whole package of CCSF support tools and activities could be used to extend and enhance activities and to build capacity. However, it was equally clear that many Champions were unaware of CCSF, and a few of those who have participated in it were somewhat critical;
 - 190 respondents to the telephone survey (47.3%) had accessed further funding to supplement their award. On average, Champions accessing additional funding had received income from 1.64 other sources;
 - the clear majority of respondents to the telephone survey (61.5%) said they planned to increase their level of participation in community activities, whilst a further 34.2% indicated the level would stay the same. These findings were supported by the qualitative data.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

10. One of the key findings from the study is that every project is different (e.g. in terms of scale, duration, involvement of others, stage at which CCF is awarded, community being targeted, and intended beneficiaries). With so many intervening variables - and complex interactions between them - it becomes almost impossible to identify common success factors through statistical analysis.
11. However, our observations (as opposed to evidence-based conclusions) suggest that the most influential success factors are:-
- personal commitment, especially in terms of amount of time and energy put in;
 - passion for the particular issue/community/sector/hobby or whatever;
 - getting others involved and the interpersonal skills to motivate and support them;
 - access to additional funding;
 - adaptability and flexibility.

COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

² The two calculations are abbreviated to 'raw' and 'truncated' in the cost benefit analysis table below.

12. Our calculations suggest that the 402 Champions in our sample for quantitative analysis received a total of £488,167 in grants. However, intermediaries retain approximately 15% of their grant allocation for their expenses; GOs can hold back up to 10% of their DfES funding for administration; and central costs need also to be added in (say, 5%). We, therefore, estimate the total cost of 402 awards to be approximately £670,033; this equates to an average of £1,667 per Champion.
13. Our assessment of quantifiable benefits from this investment is summarised in the table below.

	Employment outcomes	Learning outcomes	Volunteers	Beneficiaries	
				'Raw'	'Truncated'
% of Champions	7.0%	34.8%	n/a	n/a	n/a
No per Champion	0.07	0.348	8.8	376	56
Attribution	Low	Med / high	Med / high	Very high	Very high
Number per £1m of CCF expenditure	42	209	5,280	225,600	33,600

PATHFINDER YOUNG COMMUNITY CHAMPIONS

14. Data was available on 83 Young Champions. Of these:-
- the largest numbers were in London, the North East and the West Midlands. Nationally the average grant size was £1,249;
 - the gender split was 41% (female) and 59% (male). Around 50% were White or White British, 43% from BME communities, with the balance not known;
 - in terms of ages, around a quarter were under 18 with the majority being in the 18-25 range. However, there were some older participants in London.
15. Delivery models were similar to those adopted for the national CCF. Those intermediaries with good contacts at grass roots level with agencies dealing specifically with young people – and with direct access to young people themselves - seemed to be more successful at marketing and recruitment.
16. In general, recruitment had been slower than anticipated. Several intermediaries were only just making their first awards at the time of fieldwork.
17. Insufficient Young Champions had completed their projects to undertake a robust cost benefit analysis. However, six of the nine Young Champions interviewed were able to identify personal outcomes from their involvement; some mentioned more than one. Increased confidence was the most common benefit, although three mentioned potential employment outcomes and four said they had improved their skills.

I: BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

- 101 This report presents the findings of a study entitled “Evaluation of Community Champions Fund”. It has been prepared by ASW Consulting (ASW) for the Department for Education and Skills (DfES).
- 102 This opening chapter:-
- sketches in the background to the study;
 - sets out its aim and objectives;
 - summarises the methodology adopted;
 - describes the structure for the remainder of the report.

BACKGROUND

- 103 The rising tide of prosperity in Britain has brought numerous benefits, but less welcome changes as well: less ‘neighbourliness’, and less sense of ‘community’ and of personal responsibility for the community in which people live. In many areas, these changes are reinforced by adverse economic circumstances, caused by the decline of traditional industries.
- 104 In some areas, it is fair to refer to a breakdown of civic society. Such areas typically face multiple disadvantages, scoring badly on economic, educational, health, housing, crime and other measures. There is general agreement that the *combination* of disadvantage on these various measures produces particular difficulties, and can produce a downward spiral of decline. ‘Social exclusion’ is a convenient shorthand for this phenomenon, and many communities do indeed feel ‘excluded’ from the mainstream of society.
- 105 Many government policies aim to break the spiral of decline, focusing sometimes on individuals in particular forms of difficulty (e.g. through New Deal for Young People) and sometimes on geographical areas (e.g. through New Deal for Communities). But whatever the merits of such programmes, the willingness of individuals from within communities to ‘take a stand’, to take the initiative in tackling some problem, can be the critical factor in helping the community to reverse the trend and, indeed, to help ensure the success of mainstream programmes.
- 106 The Community Champions Fund (CCF), together with the Community Champions Support Fund (CCSF) and the Pathfinder Young Community Champions Fund (PYCCF), offers an opportunity for local people to take the initiative. In assessing whether CCF is worthwhile, the fundamental questions are how much is added to the sum total of individual-led activity, what the benefits are of that additional activity - both to the individual and to his/her community, and how the benefits compare with the financial costs.
- 107 Evaluating CCF brings a number of challenges. These arise from the fact that it is relatively *small scale* (compared to many government policies and initiatives), heterogeneous (in that there is wide flexibility for Community Champions to ‘do what it takes’), *of limited intensity* (grants are comparatively small), and has *many possible outcomes, some of which are hard to define*. Whilst its characteristics may

make evaluation difficult, this is all the more reason for methodological rigour. This study has therefore applied the principles set out in HM Treasury's Green Book.

AIM AND OBJECTIVES

- 108 CCF was set up by DfES. The stated objectives are:-
- to increase the skill levels of individuals to enable them to act as inspirational figures, community entrepreneurs, community mentors and community leaders;
 - to increase the involvement of communities in regeneration and learning activity.
- 109 CCF also contributes to the Home Office-led target of increasing voluntary and community activity, including increasing community participation by 5% by 2006. The combined funding is currently £3m per annum.
- 110 The Community Champions Support Fund (CCSF) was established to offer a range of support for You and Your Community Award winners. Funding of £350k was identified for the period from April 2002 to March 2004, top sliced from the main CCF. It was originally intended that 20% of the 1500 You and Your Community Awards would go to existing or previous Community Champions who would also receive CCSF support to enable them to build on their activities. In the event, Scarman Trust Regional Offices tended to make elements of CCSF available to all current and past Community Champions, whether or not they had received a You and Your Community award.
- 111 PYCCF operates within the 14 Community Cohesion Areas and is funded by the Home Office (but delivered through DfES). The budget £675k is to be spent between February 2003 and December 2004. Its stated aims are:-
- to encourage more young people to become involved in community cohesion and regeneration activity by supporting those who can drive forward projects and pass on their expertise to others;
 - to enable young people to be better able to support others (e.g. through mentoring, linking them to appropriate training, helping to manage small projects);
 - to support youth involvement in the community, ensuring focus upon their priorities (e.g. the creation of a local cohesive society, skills development, crime and safety).
- 112 The above paragraphs briefly define the aims and objectives of CCF and its supporting funds. Turning to this *evaluation study*, the aim is defined as:
- “to assess the added value of CCF, and its benefits to both individuals and local communities, in order to inform the future shape of the fund.”

METHODOLOGY

- 113 A detailed description of the methodology adopted is provided in Appendix A. The main components of the study were:-
- consultation with those involved at the national level. This was to ensure the study was informed by an awareness of the broader policy, strategy and funding context (5 interviews);
 - fieldwork in all nine English regions, including discussions with Government Office (GO) staff, intermediaries, and local community organisations. The main

purpose was to explore the key issues around the effectiveness of the models and the impact of CCF on individuals and communities (47 interviews). A list of those interviewed is provided as Appendix B and the checklist used during fieldwork is added as Appendix C;

- a telephone survey of 402 Community Champions. The main purpose was to secure data from a cross-section of Champions on the key issues of impact and additionality; a subsidiary objective was to obtain feedback on the effectiveness of the scheme from users. A summary of issues covered during telephone interviews is added as Appendix D;
- face-to-face interviews with 48 Community Champions and 9 Young Community Champions to explore their individual experiences in greater depth, thereby adding 'colour' to the quantitative data.

114 Champions in the 2002/03 cohort were the principal focus for the study, on the grounds that their awards would be recent enough still to be recalled with accuracy, but on the other hand long enough ago for progress to have been made with their project and its impact assessed.

REPORT STRUCTURE

115 The structure for the remainder of this report is as follows:-

- Chapter II describes delivery models and comments on their effectiveness;
- Chapter III provides an overview of Champions participating in the scheme and the types of projects supported;
- Chapter IV assesses the impact of CCF both on individuals and their communities;
- Chapter V steps back from the detail and provides our overall assessment of costs and benefits;
- Chapter VI provides an early review of progress with PYCCF.

116 Material on CCSF is integrated with the main presentation of findings in the remainder of this report. Findings on PYCCF are less robust than those for CCF, reflecting the fact that is a much newer programme, with lower take-up, and insufficient time to assess impact in depth. For this reason, our comments on PYCCF are presented separately from the main material on CCF – see Chapter VI.

117 A self-standing Executive Summary has also been prepared. This summarises the main findings but obviously cannot rehearse the complexities behind the conclusions reached.

II: DELIVERY MODELS

INTRODUCTION

- 201 Before turning to the Community Champions themselves - and the impact of CCF on individuals and their communities - we discuss first the delivery models adopted and comment on their effectiveness.
- 202 The stages in the delivery models discussed below are:-
- planning and funding;
 - roles and timing;
 - marketing and outreach;
 - applications and selection process;
 - support for Champions;
 - monitoring.
- 203 The material for this chapter is derived principally from fieldwork with GOs, intermediaries and other community organisations, and also from the face-to-face interviews with Community Champions. This is supplemented by data from the telephone survey where relevant.

PLANNING AND FUNDING

- 204 National resource allocation is managed by DfES on a formula basis. The main variable taken into account is the number of people aged 25 to 65 unemployed for more than six months. Take-up between regions has been variable and DfES is able to exercise virement if an underspend is anticipated in one region whilst there is unmet demand in another. In practice, profiling the spend through the financial year is complex for GOs, as the cycles adopted by intermediaries vary, as do the robustness of their projections.
- 205 DfES prepares guidance for GOs on administration of the fund. The final version had still not been issued for 2003/4 at the time of our fieldwork, although a near final draft had been widely disseminated and used.
- 206 The basis of resource allocation within regions is a matter for GOs. In some regions this is a 'broad brush' approach (e.g. split between the former county council areas on an equal basis), whilst in others it is based more on intermediaries' previous performance. In practice, there seems little negotiation on budgets allocated to the various intermediaries; indeed, several indicated they would welcome more of a dialogue on this point. Some GOs retain up to £1k for publicity and £3k for regional events, although not all take up this option.
- 207 Intermediaries are allocated a management and administration fee, the former is typically 15% of their CCF budget. This is not clawed back if the targets are not reached and so the fee is sometimes in excess of 15% of the budget allocated to Champions. Intermediaries often criticise the level of the fee; several argue that 20% would be more realistic.
- 208 Our sense is that, where the CCF allocation is larger and/or where the infrastructure for small grant administration is already in place, the 15% fee is perfectly adequate;

however where the budget is small and/or the administration of grants to individuals is not part of the core business, the fee becomes almost negligible in terms of its impact on intermediaries' income and infrastructure. Clearly some of an intermediary's responsibilities (e.g. marketing) have a similar cost irrespective of the throughput of Champions, whilst other activities (e.g. processing of applications) incur more of a pro rata cost.

- 209 We note in passing that the importance attached to CCF among the lead officials in both GOs and intermediaries varies greatly. It would not be an exaggeration to say that, for some, CCF is a low key add-on to an otherwise demanding portfolio, whilst for others it represents a significant element of their day-to-day work.
- 210 The actual grants are paid by intermediaries to local community groups acting as the host or banker on behalf of the Champion. Exceptionally, where there is no relevant group, or it does not have a suitable bank account, grants are retained by the intermediary and payments are made direct to the supplier on behalf of the Champion. In at least one instance, the GO issues payments direct, rather than one of the intermediaries which lacks the appropriate infrastructure.
- 211 There is a divergence of practice over funding 'up front', as opposed to reimbursement of payments already made. Several intermediaries feel it is important to give positive signals about trust by authorising payments up front, especially where the organisation acting as banker does not have a strong cash flow position. Other intermediaries take a more cautious approach - but this is often the subject of criticism.
- 212 'Fast track' payments are made exceptionally where a Champion needs to incur expenditure before their grant has been formally approved (e.g. where they need to attend a residential training event which is only run once per year). These payments are typically only authorised up to a fixed ceiling (typically in the range £250 to £500), and subject to approval by the relevant GO and/or the trustees/management committee of the relevant intermediary. This facility provides much needed flexibility.
- 213 Grants awarded later in the financial year sometimes give rise to difficulties over the effective spending period. Some intermediaries indicate that projects must be completed - and payment claimed - during the same financial year; others take a more relaxed attitude, managing the carry forward in partnership with the GO. This would benefit from clarification and some 'freeing up'.³
- 214 As the data in Chapter III confirms, intermediaries are effective in assessing the actual level of grant needed and certainly do not approve applications for £2k unless there is a cogent case for that being the right amount. Several intermediaries indicated they were comfortable with a nominal limit of £2k since:-
- higher awards could be made exceptionally, with GO approval;
 - smaller scale awards encouraged innovation, creativity and the willingness to take a calculated risk;
 - there was the suspicion that higher average levels would require a more intrusive system of approvals and monitoring.

³ We understand that this has since been addressed in the 2004/5 guidance to GOs.

- 215 A minority of intermediaries argued for a small increase (say, to £2.5k), on the grounds that the current limit had been in place for 3 years and there was scope for a minor upward adjustment.
- 216 One intermediary, exceptionally, does not issue grants at all. Instead, the budget is spent on capacity building among Champions from black and ethnic minority (BME) communities and facilitating attendance at conferences with themes relevant to community development.
- 217 Comments provided by Champions themselves, either during face-to-face interviews or as responses to open questions in the telephone interviews, suggest that most were very satisfied with the administration of their award. Those reporting most favourably on this tended to be those whose award – or segments of it – had been paid up front, with receipts submitted at a later date; however, those who received payment in arrears were also generally content with the way this had worked.
- 218 At the next level of detail:-
- systems in which intermediaries paid suppliers direct were popular in the sense that Champions were neither having to fund expenditure ‘up-front’ nor having to deal with claims. Some intermediaries, however, argued that making the purchases and processing the administration were valuable experiences for Champions in their own right;
 - payment in arrears did cause difficulties for some Champions (7 out of 48) and several felt that they should have been trusted to spend the money as stated, particularly when the sums involved could be as little as £100;
 - a few Champions (6 out of 402) argued that larger projects should be able to bid for larger amounts;
 - 4 out of 48 felt there was insufficient flexibility in the system (e.g. timing restrictions, or requests to spend savings on items not specified in the original application being turned down).

ROLES AND TIMING

- 219 Regions vary in the number and disposition of intermediaries. In London and the South West there is just one; at the other extreme, there are 8 in the North West and 11 in the South East. The arguments in favour of fewer are:-
- easier for GO to manage;
 - an identical ‘process’ for applicants across the region;
 - a more substantial management and administration fee, enabling economies of scale and deployment of dedicated resources.
- 220 The arguments in favour of a larger number are:-
- less risk for the GO (one poor performing intermediary does not dent performance across the entire region);
 - better coverage of local patches;
 - easier to target communities of interest (i.e. by contracting with smaller, niche organisations).
- 221 Subjectively, a number of around three or four may be optimal in rural and mixed areas. An example from one region illustrates the strategy adopted by several GOs

of bringing in new intermediaries to target 'cold spots'. Here, there are four contrasting intermediaries:-

- one is the regional arm of a national organisation which has an established annual cycle for recruitment and selection of Champions;
- one is a regional regeneration organisation which accepts applications on a rolling basis (until the budget is spent);
- one is a specialist provider with excellent links to BME communities;
- one targets a rural area which previously had attracted very few champions.

222 Most intermediaries have been appointed as a result of an approach from the GO; exceptionally, the approach has been the other way round. We are not aware of any regions where open tendering has been adopted.⁴ Given the size of the CCF budget and the comparatively small scale of operations, this appears a common sense, pragmatic arrangement. Nevertheless, there is clearly a risk that there may be other potentially effective intermediaries which have not been able to make their case.

223 All GOs pass on the priorities set by DfES to their intermediaries (e.g. for applicants aged 50+). However, at least one GO does not convert this to specific targets for individual intermediaries, on the grounds that their response (to continue with the target age range example) might be to favour older applicants with weaker cases disproportionately, to the detriment of younger candidates with stronger cases. Intermediaries seemed generally well briefed on the sub-groups recommended for support (e.g. from BME communities).

224 Some intermediaries had priorities of their own which were either central to their mission (e.g. a rural community council) or reflected a current objective (e.g. to support those recovering from drug dependency). GOs seemed relaxed about this, provided the broader regional (and national) targets were also being met.

225 In at least two regions with small numbers of intermediaries, the lead intermediary sub-contracts some of their functions to specialised local organisations. In one region, a small fee (£500) is paid from the lead intermediary's management and administration budget to buy in services such as pre-application support or collation of MI; in the other, the lead intermediary works with two partner organisations which have particularly good links with BME and rural communities, effectively subcontracting the majority of intermediary functions in these instances. Both these arrangements appeared to be working effectively, although they do lengthen the contracting lines from GOs to Champions.

226 In another region, the GO contracts direct with a third party (not an intermediary) to provide additional support, both to intermediaries and Champions. This was also working effectively, not least as a result of the partnership approach adopted between all the key players. Without this, there would have been a danger of roles becoming blurred and sensitivities being raised. It is also pleasing to record that the two individuals providing the consultancy support are themselves ex-Community Champions.

227 Another key variable concerns timing. Many intermediaries have clearly defined recruitment points – in some instances a single annual cycle. Other intermediaries

⁴ Under the European Procurement Directive it is not necessary for GOs to go out to open tender for CCF. However, we understand that one GO is adopting this approach to identify a new intermediary for 2004/5, thereby supporting the Compact agreement between Government and the voluntary and community sectors.

accept applications throughout the year, although in practice the greater emphasis is during earlier months in order to stimulate sufficient demand to meet local targets and spend the budget as allocated.

- 228 The former approach enables a much more structured approach to marketing and selection; nevertheless, it can be constricting and results in those missing the cut-off date having to wait until the next cycle – and this can be demotivating for applicants approaching ‘the system’ for the first time. The optimal approach might be to have a mixed economy, with at least one intermediary still having awards available later in the financial year.

MARKETING AND OUTREACH

- 229 There was a degree of ambivalence over awareness raising, marketing and outreach. Several intermediaries regretted there was not more national promotion of what they felt to be an excellent product. Others were nervous about stimulating demand that they knew could not be met through existing levels of funding. Indeed, at the local level, it was not unusual for marketing efforts to be turned on and off like a tap, depending on the extent of funding available at any particular time.

- 230 By far the most common approach used to outreach and marketing is working through an extended network of local contacts. The effectiveness of intermediaries’ interaction with partner organisations of all types and size is widely accepted as a significant determinant of their effectiveness in the role.

- 231 Local partners include:-

- local authorities and parish councils. One intermediary reported direct marketing to no less than 335 parish councils;
- volunteer bureaux, community councils, community foundations, rural community councils;
- libraries, including mobile units in rural areas;
- BME organisations and networks;
- community development workers, SRB projects, neighbourhood renewal teams;
- charitable organisations (e.g. Age Concern);
- housing associations.

- 232 Some of the more effective marketing via these organisations has been through attending members’ meetings, network events and surgeries at the invitation of the host organisation. Informal one-to-one conversations in a local setting can prove very effective with local people who might be nervous about making approaches to agencies based outside their community. Feeding articles into local newsletters has also proved effective.

- 233 Word of mouth is another powerful medium (and see paragraph 240 below). The visible examples of local people who have made a difference – the Can Doers, to quote the Scarman Trust – send out a powerful message.

- 234 Interestingly, two different intermediaries in different regions both remarked that it took about two years to transform a local area from a ‘desert’ to an ‘oasis’, in terms of numbers of Champions. Often it was extremely difficult to generate any interest at all, but once there had been 3 or 4 success stories, applications multiplied dramatically. This was particularly the case among local BME communities.

- 235 All regions mentioned local media, including radio and newspapers, often without much enthusiasm. There were exceptions, however. One of the regional newspapers is an enthusiastic and active supporter of Community Champions, regularly featuring good news stories and, in previous years, operating a free helpline service for those interested in applying. Events - whether national, regional or local - also generated good publicity, as well as promoting networking between previous, current and potential future Champions.
- 236 Several intermediaries produce their own leaflets and flyers – indeed surprisingly few use national materials. One large intermediary has contracted with a specialist marketing company to produce professional standard CD ROMs and videos. However, distribution of simple promotion materials was by far the most common - distributing thousands (literally) was not unusual. One intermediary had e-mailed their leaflet to partner organisations, thereby saving time and both distribution and printing costs, although running the risk of the product remaining in recipients' in-boxes!
- 237 Several organisations have their own websites and feature CCF among the available products. DfES also hosts a national website although this has given rise to criticisms, especially when used for on-line applications (see paragraph 244 below).
- 238 At the micro level, a current strategy adopted by one intermediary has been to lay down a challenge to seven ex-Champions and three Housing Associations to recruit ten new Champions each. This is a potentially powerful approach to *outreach*, as opposed to *marketing*.
- 239 Data from the telephone survey indicates how respondents said they had heard of the scheme - see Table 2.1 below. The question was asked unprompted at first, but the possibilities in the table were then used as prompts where necessary.

Table 2.1: How respondents heard about the Community Champions scheme

	White (%)	BME (%)	All (%)
Outreach (described as being 'through someone in your local community')	4.8	3.7	4.3
Through an agency such as Job Centre Plus or a community group	49.4	32.1	43.1
By word of mouth	24.1	43.3	31.1
Through the media	5.6	5.2	5.4
In other ways	16.1	15.7	16.1

Note: The percentages in the first two columns of figures are of the 134 CCs known to be from ethnic minorities and of the 249 CCs known to be white and who responded to this question (there were nine white non-respondents and one BME non-respondent). The percentages in the final column are of all 392 respondent CCs including the nine whose ethnicity was unknown. The difference in base explains seeming minor inconsistencies between the first two columns and the third column of figures.

- 240 The table makes clear that agencies - and in practice this may have meant intermediaries - and word of mouth are the dominant means of hearing about the scheme, with outreach and the media being much less important. There are marked differences, shown in the table, between the methods used by white and

BME Community Champions. BME Champions rely relatively more on word of mouth, whilst white Champions rely relatively more on agencies. We also examined age and gender differences, but these were not significant.

- 241 Face-to-face interviews with Champions revealed some fascinating stories behind the bare bones presented in Table 2.1. Often the actual circumstances straddled both 'word of mouth' and 'through an agency'. For example, one BME Champion applied as a result of her husband sitting on a panel for a different community fund and hearing about CCF.
- 242 It was striking that, when asked an open question at the end of the telephone interviews, as many as 19 out of 402 commented on marketing. The general sense was that CCF was a 'well kept secret'. Champions suggested that more general advertising was needed.

APPLICATIONS AND SELECTION PROCESS

- 243 Many intermediaries use the model application form set out in the DfES guidelines, although several have adapted it for local use. It is sometimes criticised for being complex to fill in; our own view is that it is towards the user-friendly end of the spectrum. Nevertheless, *any* form of this type is likely to constitute a challenge for individuals unused to making applications for funding. In nearly every case intermediaries – or other local development workers – are willing to help with completing the form.
- 244 Mention has been made already of difficulties with the on-line application form on the DfES CCF website.⁵ In more detail, the points are these:-
- applicants are unable to print out a version for their own reference, once the 'submit' button is pressed;
 - the on-line form does not collect monitoring information;
 - there have been instances of clearly ineligible applications being passed on down the line, rather than being dealt with at an early stage;
 - there is a delay between applications being made, DfES picking them up, details being emailed to GOs, and then finally passed on to the relevant intermediaries. Delays in receiving any feedback at this stage can be damaging with applicants who may lack confidence already;
 - there have been instances of applications being passed on to the wrong intermediaries. This is usually as a result of confusion over post codes, but the net result is further delay.
- 245 The precise sequence of the application process varies widely, often within the same GO region. The typical components are:-
- scrutiny of application form;
 - informal discussion with applicant;
 - selection by a panel;
 - taking up of references.
- 246 However, there are wide variations in points of detail. For example:-

⁵ We understand that improvements to the website are currently being incorporated.

- some intermediaries take up references prior to the panel. Others do so only for applicants for whom an award has been recommended;
- some panels interview nearly every applicant, seeing this as a crucial process and giving the candidate a chance to promote their project. Others interview very few (or none), relying instead on notes from the grants officer who has met the candidate (or basing decisions solely on information supplied on the form);
- some panels meet formally and take a joint decision. Others rely to a considerable extent on panel members scoring applications individually and sending them back by post or e-mail;
- some panels make their assessments using a numerical scoring, whilst others simply use narrative-style comments;
- some panels are established specifically to advise on CCF applications. Others have a more general role, considering CCF applications among other items of business;
- some panels meet on a regular basis (e.g. monthly, assuming there are relevant applications to consider), whilst others meet only during a pre-determined application period;
- one intermediary operates *without* the assistance of a panel. Instead, a ‘third party administrator’ undertakes an initial ‘scoring’ of the application and makes a recommendation to the lead intermediary. The latter then verifies the recommendation and (usually!) approves the payment of the grant;
- one intermediary has a two-tier panel. An *assessment* panel puts forward recommendations to the *decision-making* panel.

247 Intermediaries vary even on the most basic point as to whether there is genuine ‘selection’ at all. In some instances, the impression given is that all applications are approved for as long as the budget allocation lasts, unless they can be demonstrated to be ineligible in some way (e.g. on the grounds of the applicant being an existing worker paid to fulfil that role). In other scenarios, panels make genuine selections between a large number of ostensibly suitable applications.

248 To cite an actual example of the latter pattern, 300 applications were received by one large intermediary in the current year (2003/4), of which 150 were interviewed and grants were awarded to 100 (with a further 20 held in reserve). In situations where actual choices are made, ‘softer’ criteria such as innovation, ownership and commitment become more important, although weightings are sometimes applied which are derived from regional or national priorities (e.g. linked to age, rurality or ethnicity).

249 We did enquire about the percentage of applications which were approved – but, in truth, the answers were misleading (albeit provided in good faith). In most areas, unsuitable applications are already sifted out before they reach the panel and thus notional success rates of 90% are not unusual. One intermediary made a point of saying that ‘poor’ applications (in the sense of the quality of the written case) were certainly *not* discounted, as one of the key objectives is to encourage people new to the community development scene. As such, they would be given support and advice as to how to improve their case, not rejected out of hand (provided they met basic eligibility criteria).

250 At present the number of current or previous Champions on panels is less than many intermediaries accept to be ideal. Indeed, securing a better balance between interests is an area for potential development and improvement.

- 251 Several intermediaries stress how important it is to let applicants know as soon as possible the outcome from Panel meetings; some telephone the next morning. Where decisions are to reject or defer, most intermediaries take pains to give full reasons and offer support so that a successful outcome will be more likely on a future occasion. Where appropriate, unsuccessful applicants are referred to alternative sources of funding.
- 252 As with the previous section, we asked Champions themselves what their views were. In particular, we asked them to assess the ease or difficulty of the application process on a scale ranging from 1 (very difficult or off-putting) to 5 (very straightforward). The results are shown in Table 2.2 below.

Table 2.2: Ease or difficulty of the application process

Five point scale	Percentage of respondents
1 Very difficult or off-putting	0.5
2	2.5
3	15.7
4	42.4
5 Very straightforward	38.8

- 253 It is evident from the table that views of the application process are very favourable overall. We asked a follow-up question in the telephone survey about how the application process might be improved, but this attracted few responses, perhaps not surprisingly given the high level of satisfaction with the overall process.
- 254 It was a similar picture among the 48 Champions we met face-to-face. Several (12) commented on the ease of the application form by comparison to applications for other funding streams. A small but significant number (6) received help with the application, in relation either to the presentation of ideas, or provision of information.
- 255 Among the other comments made:-
- three had experienced delays in receiving approval;
 - two had felt nervous – not to say terrified(!) – of being interviewed by a panel, although one said the experience had in fact turned out to be quite enjoyable;
 - one said that, although the application form itself was straightforward, there was far less clarity over what the award could be used *for*.

SUPPORT FOR CHAMPIONS

- 256 During the life of the projects most intermediaries offer on-going support, but this is typically on an ad hoc basis, unless help is sought specifically. Often, opportunities to have an informal word arose naturally (e.g. dropping in a cheque by hand rather than putting it in the post). Intermediaries pointed out that, whilst funding levels are adequate for management and administration, they are insufficient to support a more proactive regime.
- 257 The sort of topics on which support is sought include:-
- fund raising;
 - making presentations;

- serving on committees – and constitutional matters affecting community groups.

- 258 Relatively few opportunities appear to have been created for networking between Champions, and for identifying and disseminating good practice - although there are notable exceptions. Presentation evenings are often effective in this respect. At least one intermediary organises a residential event for Champions, an idea perhaps worth exploring elsewhere, too.
- 259 In some regions, GO staff are themselves visible and active in the field, although this was not the case in every region. It was quite usual for GO staff to sit in on Panels and we have already noted that some regions organise high profile awards events.
- 260 Intermediaries themselves welcome the opportunity to network with their peers at regional workshops and meetings. Similarly, both GO staff and intermediaries welcome the opportunity to meet with DfES policy leads at periodic national events.
- 261 We asked respondents to the telephone survey about the support they received as a Community Champion, using a five point scale. Their views are summarised in Table 2.3 below.

Table 2.3: Satisfaction with support received whilst a Community Champion

Five point scale	Percentage of the 301 respondents who had received support
1 Support is inadequate	1.7
2	3.7
3	17.6
4	45.8
5 Support is outstanding	31.2
Percentage of 402 respondents who had received <i>no</i> support	25.1

- 262 Those who had accessed support were, typically, very satisfied, but a substantial minority (25%) had apparently not received any support. This minority cited reasons that are hard to categorise. Some said that support had never been offered; others that they were aware of its existence but chose not to access it; still others were not aware of this resource or did not respond at all.
- 263 Among the Champions we interviewed face-to-face, 20 (of 48) reported they had not received any support, although this had not been 'a problem'; indeed, several commented that it had been good to know that the intermediary was there, if needed. A significant minority (9) were experienced volunteers or community activists, bringing significant skills to the projects. Where they needed support, they were often able to access it through their own networks of contacts, or by tapping into the skills and resources of the wider community.
- 264 Very few (3) had sought more than general advice and information from the intermediary. However, it is possible that the sample of 48 is not typical of the larger cohort. The data in Table 2.3 is probably the most reliable in this instance.
- 265 We also asked Champions whether they had experienced support needs that had not been met - or had suggestions as to how support could be improved. The

following are some of the responses given, in each case by just one or two respondents.

266 Champions would welcome:-

- regular monitoring visits, with the opportunity to check out ideas and discuss progress;
- consultancy support and advice. One interviewee suggested that each Champion should be offered two days of such support;
- a mentor to give specialist support and help deal with the pressures of the project;
- advice on how to influence the local council;
- help with press releases for the project and for CCF more generally (e.g. by providing a pro forma for Champions to complete and return to intermediaries);
- surgeries to help with securing further funding;
- 'more money' (!);
- opportunities to meet with other Champions;
- legal advice in relation to renting premises for the project.

MONITORING

267 Monitoring of Champions and projects by intermediaries is carried out with a light touch in almost every instance. A few intermediaries seek to visit every project at least once, but in most instances the arrangements were ad hoc. Telephone calls were often used to 'keep in touch', but this falls short of monitoring per se.

268 Nevertheless, similar points apply here to those made in the previous section (i.e. funding being adequate for management and administration, but insufficient to support a more proactive regime). Intermediaries also point out that their antennae in the communities would alert them to any major problems and the fact that they control the payments against the agreed award minimises the potential for fraud.

269 Several intermediaries ask for a brief report to be submitted at the end of the funding period. The word 'report' perhaps gives the wrong impression; it typically takes the form of a letter describing progress against the original plan or a brief paper (1 side of A4). Some intermediaries give out pro formae with headings designed to simplify the process.

270 Those Champions lacking facility in the English language, or with basic skills needs, are encouraged to give feedback in other ways. There was at least one example of the 'report' taking the form of a video illustrating progress made; elsewhere, Champions are invited to give brief verbal inputs to network meetings.

271 We are not clear about the use made of the written reports. A few intermediaries supply annual reports to GOs with narrative and case study material, over and above the financial breakdowns and MI on Champions, as required by the contract – but reporting in this depth is unusual.

272 Monitoring by GOs also seems generally to be applied with a light touch. We are aware of only two or three evaluation reports commissioned by GOs or the larger intermediaries; these were very much the exception rather than the rule.

273 We also note in passing that the performance of intermediaries is measured almost entirely by spend against budget and attainment of specific targets (e.g. recruitment

of over 50s). Some interviewees were a little critical of DfES/GO in this respect, feeling that insufficient focus is given to issues of impact and quality.

- 274 Turning to the feedback from Champions during our face-to-face discussions, the consistent response was that there had been little or no formal monitoring of their projects by the intermediary. Many, but by no means all, had submitted a short end of project report and/or financial monitoring information; others reported informal visits and/or telephone contact at some point during their project. However, several reported that they had not been aware of their projects having been monitored at all.
- 275 Most appeared content with this and one or two commented that they liked the emphasis on delivery, rather than bureaucracy; however, one or two indicated they would have liked the intermediary to make a monitoring visit or follow-up call, whether for reassurance, an opportunity to get advice, or simply some evidence that others were interested in their project. Finally, one Champion in both the telephone survey and the face-to-face discussions felt there was a need to monitor the programme more effectively in order to ensure the money was well spent.

III: COMMUNITY CHAMPIONS AND THEIR PROJECTS

INTRODUCTION

- 301 This chapter provides some facts and figures on the Community Champions in our sample. Essentially this is descriptive, rather than evaluative. Nevertheless, it enables us to build a picture of Community Champions: who are they? what are their personal characteristics? what type of projects have they undertaken?
- 302 The reference to *sample* in the previous paragraph should more accurately be in the plural, as we refer sometimes to the larger database of 1,703 Champions for whom we have at least some records, and sometimes to the sample of 402 who participated in the telephone sample and for whom we have more complete MI, supplied by GOs and intermediaries. We also comment from time to time on a subset of 48 Champions whom we interviewed face-to-face.⁶
- 303 Response rates to questions in the telephone survey were generally very good, usually exceeding 97%. When commenting on this data, therefore, we have not drawn attention in the text to trivial shortfalls from 100%: response rates are reported specifically only where they are below 97%.⁷
- 304 The material in this chapter is structured as follows:-
- geographical coverage;
 - grant size;
 - projects;
 - ethnic origin;
 - gender;
 - age range;
 - disability;
 - qualification level and prior involvement in community activities.

GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE

- 305 It was our intention that respondents to our telephone survey should reflect very broadly the distribution of Champions between the English regions. Table 3.1 overleaf shows the respective breakdowns for the larger sample frame and for the telephone survey, and reveals a close match between the regional proportions.
- 306 We also analysed the penetration of CCF at area level within regions. Usable data on location was available for 1,654 Champions i.e. 97.1% of the 1,703 Champions in the larger sample frame. First, we allocated them to counties, metropolitan districts and London boroughs ('areas'), as appropriate.⁸ We then compared the population of each area and region with the number of Community Champions living there and calculated the number of Champions per million of population.

⁶ Further details of the samples – and methodology in general – are given in Appendix A.

⁷ This point applies to all passages where references to quantitative data are made.

⁸ However, no account was taken of the last round of local government reorganisation and the resulting formation of unitary authorities. Thus, for example, we included Derby in 'Derbyshire', even though the former is now a unitary authority separate from the county.

Table 3.1: Breakdown of Champions by region

Region	Larger sample frame		Telephone respondents	
	Number	%	Number	%
Eastern	164	9.6	31	7.7
East Midlands	109	6.4	32	8.0
London	259	15.2	61	15.2
North East	147	8.6	32	8.0
North West	302	17.7	76	18.9
South East	124	7.3	34	8.5
South West	157	9.2	35	8.7
West Midlands	262	15.4	57	14.2
Yorkshire & the Humber	179	10.5	44	10.9
Total	1,703	100	402	100

307 The full results are shown in Appendix E. We also summarised our analysis and this is set out in Table 3.2 overleaf. It shows that the Community Champions scheme operates across all of the English regions in a way that, allowing for its small absolute size, is reasonably uniform, except for an intentional, though not very marked, emphasis on deprived areas and regions. The benchmark figure is that the 1,654 Champions represent 33 Champions per million of England's population.

308 We suspect, though we have no firm evidence, that some Champions may have been (mis)classified to the nearest large city. For instance, Birmingham is recorded as having many CCs, whilst Walsall, Dudley, Sandwell and Solihull have hardly any. We have not attempted to make any adjustment for this factor.

309 It must also be remembered that numbers per area are very small. The Hackney 'hot spot', for instance, has 18 Champions, whilst the Derbyshire 'cold spot' has two. Small absolute changes can radically change an area's position in such a 'league table'

Table 3.2: Summary analysis of regional and in-region distribution of Champions

Region	CCs per million population	Comment on region	'Hot spots'	'Cold spots'
East Mids	28		Northamptonshire (92 CCs per million population)	Derbyshire (2 per million)
Eastern	28	CCs widely distributed across the 6 counties, each of which has 19 to 39 CCs per million population		
London	35	Most boroughs have 20-60 CCs per million population	A group of inner London boroughs with over 50 CCs per million population, including Hackney, Haringey and Southwark (about 90)	A group of boroughs in South-West London with fewer than 10 CCs per million population
North East	54	Highest average of the English regions	Newcastle (154 per million population), Hartlepool (98) and Middlesbrough (90)	Redcar & Cleveland (no CCs)
North West	43	Clear split between hot spots and cold spots	Manchester, Lancashire, Cumbria, Cheshire, Rochdale and Liverpool (all with 48 to 79 CCs per million)	All other areas (4-27 CCs per million)
South East	15	Lowest average of the English regions; fairly evenly distributed across the 7 counties		Hampshire (5 CCs per million)
South West	30	Fairly even spread (Devon and Wiltshire aside)	Devon (59 CCs per million population)	Wiltshire (5 CCs per million)
West Midlands	48	Huge differences from one urban area to another	Birmingham (165 CCs per million population) and Wolverhampton (108)	Walsall, Coventry, Warwickshire, Dudley, Sandwell and Solihull with scarcely any CCs
Yorks & Humber	34	Fairly even spread	Sheffield (81 CCs per million population), Calderdale (67)	Doncaster (7 CCs per million)
England	33	Good spread across areas and regions, with some focus on disadvantaged areas	Large urban areas, plus a seemingly random selection of other areas (particularly effective intermediaries?)	Gaps where the scheme does not seem to be working effectively

GRANT SIZE

- 310 We obtained MI on grant size for 397 of our 402 respondents and from 1,596 of the 1,703 Champions in the sample frame. The data is compared in Table 3.3 below.
- 311 In general, there is a fairly good correspondence between respondents and the sample frame. For example, telephone survey respondents received an average grant of £1,230, whilst the sample frame average was £1,258. The most marked discrepancy was at the top end of the grant range, where our respondents include only one Champion with a grant of over £2,500, whilst the sample frame contained 30 such grants.
- 312 There is a fairly marked distinction between Champions receiving a 'full' grant (£2,000) or something close to it (over £1,500), and those receiving smaller grants. Respondents on large grants received £1,907 on average, with 59% of this group receiving £2,000 exactly, whilst respondents on small grants received an average of £791.

Table 3.3: Grant values in the larger sample frame and amongst respondents to telephone survey

Grant range (£)	Number		%		Total value (£)		Average (£)	
	LSF*	TR**	LSF*	TR**	LSF*	TR**	LSF*	TR**
0-500	274	85	17.2	21.4	93,288	25,953	340	305
501-1,000	323	71	20.2	17.9	258,272	55,518	800	782
1,001-1,500	313	85	19.6	21.4	400,449	109,149	1,279	1,284
1,501-2,000	625	148	39.2	37.3	1,117,447	277,334	1,788	1,874
2,001-2,500	31	7	1.9	1.8	49,552	15,213	1,598	2,173
>2,500	30	1	1.9	0.3	89,132	5,000	2,971	5,000
Total/average	1,596	397	100.0	100.0	2,008,140	488,167	1,258	1,230
'Small grant' 0-1,500	910	241	57.0	60.7	752,009	190,620	826	791
'Large grant' >1,500	686	156	43.0	39.3	1,256,131	297,547	1,831	1,907
Total/average	1,596	397	100.0	100.0	2,008,140	488,167	1,258	1,230

Notes: 1 *LSF = larger sample frame, **TR = telephone respondents.

2 92 grants to respondents were for £2,000 exactly.

PROJECTS

- 313 The projects supported through CCF vary widely. In order to give a feel for the range, we provide below a summary of the activities funded in the projects discussed during our face-to-face interviews⁹:-
- thirteen projects were increasing the activities available to members of the local community, six of which were targeted at children and/or young people, four at adults, and three at all ages;

⁹ The substantive discussion of community benefits is provided in Chapter IV; see also Appendix F.

- eight projects were working on community cohesion (including inter-generational relationships, links between ethnic groups, and between schools and their pupils);
- five projects have helped develop support services for communities of interest. These included services for the homeless, parents of children with special needs, victims of domestic violence and their families, and people with HIV;
- five projects were working towards the establishment of a new community resource (e.g. a model-boat lake, a skate park, a community centre, an information and advice service re sustainable building technology);
- five projects were increasing the capacity of community workers and volunteers;
- four were producing newsletters to engage and inform the community in relation to local activities and issues;
- three projects were raising awareness of health-related behaviour with a view to achieving long-term benefits;
- two projects were providing opportunities for disadvantaged families to take holiday breaks, whilst a third looked to extend an existing holiday service by encouraging other groups to follow their lead;
- two projects have made local history projects more accessible to the wider community.

314 In addition to variations in the type of activities funded by the award, there was also considerable variation in the stage at which CCF was applied for. In some instances the application was right at the beginning of the process, when the project was still an idea; in other cases the project was in an early stage of establishment; in still other examples the project was already well established – but with plans for expansion or development in a new direction.

315 The duration of projects also varied widely, although CCF funding must usually be spent within 12 months or less. Thus, some awards have been used to fund one-off, one day events in the community; others have funded a programme of activities (e.g. workshops or classes) over a fixed period; at the other extreme, several projects involved starting new groups with long term aims, or setting up a service with plans to operate indefinitely.

ETHNIC ORIGIN

316 Analysis is provided by ethnic origin in Table 3.4 overleaf of the 1,376 Champions on our sample frame, and the 393 respondents to our phone survey, for whom data on ethnic origin is available. These numbers represent 80.8% of the sample frame and 97.8% of respondents respectively.

317 The categories used in the table are by no means unambiguous. For instance, the 18 individuals describing themselves simply as ‘British’ have been categorised with the ‘White’/‘White British’ group when, of course, the descriptor ‘British’ says nothing about ethnicity; and although our judgment on this point was influenced by the fact that none of the 18 names were indicative of a BME origin, names are far from being a reliable guide.

318 Respondents to the telephone survey were not wholly representative in that people identifying themselves as ‘white’ formed 66% of respondents but only 58% of the sample frame. In particular there were slightly fewer people classifying themselves as ‘African’ or ‘Asian’ among the telephone survey group.

319 For the purposes of further analysis, we have distinguished between the 258 individuals identifying their ethnicity as White/White British/British and the 135 individuals choosing other descriptors.

Table 3.4: Analysis of larger sample frame and of respondents to the telephone survey by ethnic origin

	Larger sample frame		Telephone respondents	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
African	166	12.1	28	7.1
African Caribbean	94	6.8	22	5.6
Black	14	1.0	4	1.0
Black British	12	0.9	3	0.8
Caribbean	61	4.4	18	4.6
Total for groups above	347	25.2%	75	19.1%
Asian	89	6.5	14	3.6
Bangladeshi	7	0.5	1	0.3
Indian	12	0.9	5	1.3
Pakistani	28	2.0	9	2.3
Total for groups above	136	9.9%	29	7.4%
Chinese	8	0.6	4	1.0
Irish	17	1.2	4	1.0
Mixed race	26	1.9	7	1.8
BME	22	1.6	11	2.8
Latin American	5	0.4	1	0.3
Jewish	3	0.2	-	-
Traveller	3	0.2	1	0.3
Other white	11	0.8	3	0.8
Total for groups above	95	6.9%	31	7.9%
Total for all groups above	578	42.0%	135	34.4%
British	53	3.9	18	4.6
White or White British	745	54.1	240	61.1
Total for groups above	798	58.0%	258	65.6%
Grand total	1,376	100.0%	393	100.0%

Note: African includes Black African, Somali and Sudanese; Asian includes Middle East, Sri Lankan and Black Asian; White includes 'not BME'

GENDER

320 The larger sample frame contained information on the gender of 1,671 award holders (98.1% of the 1,703 award holders for whom we had any information). The 1,671 comprised 934 women (55.9%) and 737 men (44.1%).

321 Respondents to the telephone survey matched this pattern exactly, comprising 225 (56.0%) women and 177 men (44.0%).

AGE RANGE

- 322 The MI relating to age varied greatly in quality. The MI identifies positively that 164 (40.8%) of respondents to the telephone survey were aged 50 or over and that a further 182 respondents were not aged 50 or over, but provides no information on the age of the remaining 56 respondents. We understand, however, that this is because the MI requirement was only to record the 50+ group; silence, therefore, simply implies that the Champion was *not* 50 or over. On this assumption, 40.8% of our respondents were aged 50 or over and the balance of 59.2% were not.
- 323 On the same basis, i.e. counting as 50 or over only those positively identified as such, 25.0% of the larger sample frame were aged 50 or over. We would note, however, that only 13.9% (56 out of 402) of respondents to our survey were in the 'no information' category, whilst 39.6% of the sample frame were in this category. We are therefore unable to say whether the 50 and over group is genuinely over-represented in our telephone survey, or under-recorded in the sample frame.
- 324 The MI also recorded that 22 of the respondents to the telephone survey were aged under 25, but was silent on this point about a large number of other respondents. Apart from the fact that 22 is too small a group for reliable analysis, we have no confidence that this is indeed the whole group of under-25s in our sample. We have not, therefore, conducted any analysis of this group.
- 325 The larger sample frame was silent for over half of respondents, but positively identified 6.8% of all Champions as aged under 25. This is somewhat higher than the 5.5% (22 out of 402) observed in the phone survey, but weaknesses in the sample frame data mean that we do not know whether this approximate equivalence means that we have a representative share of younger Champions amongst our phone sample.
- 326 Leaving points of detail to one side, it is clear that recruitment of Champions aged 50 or over was particularly successful during 2002/3. Attracting older applicants had been identified as a priority for that year.

DISABILITY

- 327 The larger sample frame of 1,703 award holders specifically identified that 155 had a (self-reported) disability, whilst 942 did not. No information was provided on the remaining 606 award holders. Reckoning the percentages on the 1,097 people for whom we have positive data, 14.1% had a disability whilst the remaining 85.9% did not.
- 328 Our 402 respondents to the telephone survey included 54 (13.4%) with a self-reported disability, a similar proportion to that observed in the sample frame.

QUALIFICATION LEVEL AND PRIOR INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

- 329 Unlike other contextual variables reported to date, we identified qualification level through the telephone survey, rather than through MI. The clear picture is that Champions are well qualified on the whole, as shown in Table 3.5 overleaf.

Table 3.5: Highest qualification held by Community Champions

Qualification level	Number	Percentage of 380 respondents to this question
No qualifications	24	6.3
Level 1	17	4.5
Level 2	81	21.3
Level 3	89	23.4
Level 4	143	37.6
Level 5	26	6.8
Non-response	22	[n/a]
Total	402	100

- 330 In Spring 2001, the Labour Force Survey¹⁰ revealed that 15.7% of working age adults in England had no qualifications, whilst 27.0% held a qualification at Level 4 or above. These figures compare with 6.3% and 44.4%, respectively, for Community Champions and illustrate how much better qualified Champions are than the national average. This also confirms the conclusion from an earlier study.¹¹
- 331 We raised this question with intermediaries and GOs during our fieldwork. Often the initial response was that there may be highly qualified Champions elsewhere but that this was not the case in their area.
- 332 When the point was pressed, there were three further comments made with some regularity:-
- current MI does not cover qualifications levels and so the factual position may genuinely not be known;
 - Champions may be highly qualified, but they may not have participated in community activities before and still be in need of help to support a new direction;
 - some Champions (e.g. refugees and asylum seekers) may be highly qualified from educational institutions in other countries but still be experiencing significant disadvantage in their current local circumstances.
- 333 We also asked Community Champions, as part of the telephone survey, whether they had been involved in community activities before their award. 85.3% said that they had, whilst the balance (14.7%) said that they had not.
- 334 We comment further on the relevance attached by Champions to qualification levels and prior experience in Chapter IV; see paragraphs 484 to 488.

CONCLUDING COMMENT

- 335 This chapter has essentially been descriptive – helping to set an informed context for the evaluative material in Chapters IV and V. Nevertheless, it has demonstrated firstly that Champions are a diverse group and secondly that the sample used in the telephone survey is broadly representative of the larger cohort.

¹⁰ Available at www.statistics.gov.uk

¹¹ See paragraph 2.2 of Skills for Regeneration: Learning by Community Champions, Derrick Johnstone and Claire Campbell-Jones, DfES, Research Report 441.

IV: IMPACT ON INDIVIDUALS AND COMMUNITIES

INTRODUCTION

401 In this chapter we discuss the impact of CCF on individuals and their communities. Impact is discussed by reference to:-

- personal outcomes (i.e. for Champions themselves);
- benefits for local communities;
- sustainability (i.e. the extent to which the projects become embedded and continue to have an effect);
- critical success factors.

402 This chapter draws on a broad spectrum of primary data from our research. The principal sources are:-

- quantitative and qualitative data from the telephone survey of 402 Champions;
- qualitative data from face-to-face interviews with 48 Champions;
- interviews with 38 intermediaries and other local community organisations.

PERSONAL OUTCOMES

403 Personal development for the Community Champions themselves is an important outcome, albeit within a community development context. Thus, for example, Champions may secure employment, or take up a learning opportunity, or benefit in some other way as a result of their experience. Benefits of this type are considered first.

404 Champions tended to have more difficulty in identifying personal outcomes for themselves, than in reporting on their projects. Indeed, in some instances we suspect the interview was the first time the Champion had been asked to reflect on what they personally had gained from their experiences with CCF.

Employment - quantitative

405 Twenty-eight (7.0%) of the 399 Champions who responded to this question in the telephone survey had found work (including self-employment) since receiving their grant. This number is too small for detailed analysis, but the 28 were spread across ethnicities, ages and grant sizes. It is, however, almost certainly significant that only three people aged over 50 had found employment, even though this group accounts for just over 40% of all respondents.

406 The figure of 7.0% into employment, though subject to a wide margin of uncertainty, could represent a significant side benefit of CCF. This finding is, however, weakened by low 'attribution' - only seven of the 28 said that their participation in the scheme was a major factor in securing employment (i.e. responding with a 4 or 5 on our five point scale). On the other hand, this outcome was irrelevant to the many Champions already in employment so the proportion of *those who could have achieved it* is substantially higher than 7%. Unfortunately, neither the MI nor our survey records the employment status of Community Champions.

Employment - qualitative

- 407 A similar picture was discernible among the face-to-face sample. As many as 27 of the 48 could discern no outcomes linked to employment. Those that could tended to fall into three groups, namely:-
- those reporting employment outcomes for themselves;
 - those anticipating *future* employment-related outcomes;
 - those perceiving indirect employment related benefits for those associated with the project.
- 408 Examples from the first group (direct benefit) include the following:-
- one Champion had turned the project into a community business, thereby becoming self-employed and taking on a small number of employees;
 - two Champions had gone on to obtain employment, attributing their success in part to their involvement in CCF.
- 409 The second group (potential future employment-related outcomes) include the following:-
- one project has grown and developed to the point that it is now creating employment opportunities and is on the point of recruiting at least one paid employee;¹²
 - one project is in the process of reconstituting the organisation with a view to employing young people with special needs;
 - one Champion is planning to use her CCF-funded training to set up a community co-operative and another is looking into establishing a community business as a way of supporting and extending the project and providing employment;
 - two Champions have been instrumental in gaining support and raising funding for major leisure resources (a skate park and a lake for model boats with disabled access). When built, both these facilities will require paid employees and both have the potential to generate jobs through their contribution to local tourism.
- 410 The third (indirect employment related benefits for those associated with the project) included the following:-
- six Champions reported that volunteers and/or beneficiaries had developed skills that would help with future employment or had led to career-related learning;
 - in two projects small numbers (1-3) of beneficiaries were actively researching and pursuing self-employment opportunities;
 - four projects were helping people to develop employability skills (e.g. English as a Second Language, self-development of young people).

Study and qualifications - quantitative

- 411 We asked whether respondents to the telephone survey had obtained a qualification and/or started a course of study *since becoming a Champion*. In both cases we tried to establish the qualification level, though this was possible for only a minority of Champions. In all cases we asked respondents to attribute their achievement to their participation in the Community Champions scheme on a scale ranging from 1 (CCF was not relevant) to 5 (CCF was crucial). The headline results are summarised in Table 4.1 overleaf.

¹² It should also be noted that this was 4 years after the original CCF award.

Table 4.1: Champions obtaining, or beginning to study for, qualifications

	Number	% of 402	Attribution
Obtained a qualification (Level known)	14	3.5	3.8
Obtained a qualification (Level unknown)	52	12.9	3.3
Obtained a qualification (Total – see note)	65	16.2	3.4
Began studying for a qualification (Level known)	29	7.2	2.8
Began studying for a qualification (Level unknown)	58	14.4	3.3
Began studying (Total – see note)	86	21.4	3.1
Grand total (see note)	140	34.8	3.3

- Notes: 1 'Overlaps': one Champion obtained a qualification in both categories (hence first sub-total is 65 not 66); one Champion began studying for a qualification in both categories (hence second sub-total is 86 not 87); 11 Champions obtained a qualification *and* began studying for another (hence grand total is 140 not 151).
- 2 'Levels': qualifications obtained were 5@L1, 3@L2, 4@L3, 1@L4 and 1@L5; qualifications begun were 4@L1, 4@L2, 7@L3, 9@L4 and 5@L5.
- 3 'Attribution': respondents were asked how much help CC had been in getting/starting a qualification on a scale of 1 (not relevant) to 5 (crucial). The attribution column shows the average response. There were 144 responses (94.1%) from a possible 153.

412 Remembering that 140 respondents (34.8% of all respondents) had either achieved a qualification or begun studying (or, in 11 cases, both), we have analysed the proportions between different sub-groups. These are shown in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: Champions obtaining, or beginning to study for, qualifications - analysis by group

	Available sample size	Attaining or starting a qualification	
		Number	%
Small grant	241	95	39.4
Large grant (>£1,500)	156	45	28.8
BME	135	42	31.1
White	258	98	38.0
Women	225	82	36.4
Men	177	58	32.8
Over 50	164	52	31.7
Under 50	238	88	37.0
Disability	54	24	44.4
No disability	348	116	33.3
All	402	140	34.8

413 The main conclusions from the table may be summarised as follows:-

- larger grants do not appear to be associated with a greater influence on take-up of learning or attainment of qualifications. Indeed holders of smaller grant awards were more likely to take up education and training than holders of larger grants;
- Champions from BME communities are somewhat less likely to study than their 'white' counterparts;¹³
- women are somewhat more likely to study than men;
- younger people are more likely to study than people aged over 50;
- people with disabilities are more likely to study than others.

Study and qualifications – qualitative

414 More Champions reported learning outcomes in face-to-face interviews than employment outcomes. Indeed, only 7 of the 48 discerned no learning outcomes.

415 However, further analysis indicates that:-

- much of the individual development has been in the field of 'soft skills' (reported in the next section), rather than accredited learning;
- many of the learning outcomes were for volunteers, beneficiaries and others involved, rather than the Champions themselves – and hence are reported in the 'community outcomes' later in this chapter.

416 Among the exceptions:-

- increased ICT skills were the main outcome for four Champions. Of these, two had received training paid for by CCF, one had sought out training from a drop-in IT centre and one had developed their skills informally;
- for one Champion the qualification she will achieve is the main outcome (i.e. a masters degree in Sustainable Architecture - Energy and Environmental Studies - at the Centre for Alternative Technology). Her longer term intention is to set up a community cooperative;
- four people had gained accreditation (or were working towards it) for training funded through their CCF award. One had achieved a tennis coaching certificate, one had gained a certificate of Cub Scout leadership, one had become a trained acupuncturist, and one was working towards a NVQ Level 2 in motorcycle maintenance;
- four Champions specifically mentioned the completion of learning events (but with no specific mention of accreditation) paid for by CCF. These included training in self confidence, equality and diversity, work with young people, and a business start-up course;
- four Champions described formal learning activities connected to their projects but not funded by the CCF award:
 - one had started an NVQ in engineering
 - one had attended training courses relating to the law and domestic violence
 - one was organising a training course for the project steering group – including the Champion – on aspects of project management, such as health and safety and risk assessment

¹³ This is a striking reversal of the findings in our interim report, resulting from the different characteristics of the second – larger - phase of the telephone survey.

- one had been regularly involved in training related to the project and now holds no less than 29 certificates in the disability/special need arena and is also undertaking business training to help the project develop in a sustainable way;
- two said that CCF involvement had increased their commitment to on-going learning, one in a non-specific way, and the other with a future course in mind.

417 As part of the telephone survey, we also asked some open questions inviting respondents to give further information on points of interest. Our notes reveal additional examples of CCF-related learning from this source. These include courses attended in English as a Second Language, parenting, first aid, and child protection.

Soft skills - quantitative

418 In the telephone survey, a straightforward, yes/no question was asked about whether respondents felt more self-confident as a result of having been a Community Champion. 78% of those who responded said that they did and the balance (22%) said that they did not.

419 We asked the 78% who had become more self-confident about the extent to which they attributed this to the Community Champions scheme, using our five point scale. The level of attribution to the scheme was medium to high, with an average score of 3.7.

420 We have analysed the responses by ethnicity (BME and white), age (over-50 and under-50), gender and grant size (large grant and smaller grant). However, in all cases, the results were close to the overall average figures reported in the previous paragraph.

421 We asked a similar yes/no question about awareness of opportunities for learning, jobs and volunteering. 82.2% of those responding said that they had become more aware of such opportunities since becoming a Community Champion, whilst 17.8% said that they had not. The attribution statistic here (3.5) was at a medium level, slightly lower than the corresponding statistic for self-confidence reported above.

422 These generally encouraging results were widely spread across ethnic groups, ages, genders, and grant sizes.

Soft skills - qualitative

423 Several comments were made about personal development in the field of soft skills, including self confidence, from both the face-to-face interviews and the responses to open questions in the telephone survey. Many Champions were able to cite more than one type of impact.

424 As many as 18 Champions in the face-to-face interviews said they had greatly improved their skills and knowledge in relation to community and voluntary activities – for example, leadership skills, organisational, management and administrative skills, and understanding of what is involved in community activity and how to move projects forward. Within this group, four felt their project had generally opened up ideas and opportunities for their on-going involvement and five stated it had given their community involvement impetus and direction.

425 Other examples from the face-to-face interviews are as follows:-

- nine said that their confidence had increased in general;
- six reported increased confidence and skill in making funding applications;
- increased contacts and networks were important outcomes for four Champions;

- nine mentioned a sense of achievement and pride as important personal outcomes.
- 426 Similar themes were picked up in the open questions in the telephone survey. For example:-
- as many as 31 commented further on the self confidence question, often giving examples from their own experience (one had gone on to become a parish councillor);
 - six gave examples of raised awareness of other groups active in the area which was leading to improved networking and generally becoming better organised.
- 427 There were exceptions, however. Thirteen of the group of 48 reported very little impact in terms of personal development. These Champions tended either to have a long history of involvement with voluntary and community activity or to have undertaken a relatively contained and straightforward project that was already in hand and simply needed additional funding.

BENEFITS FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES

- 428 The primary purpose of individual grants is to support the activity for which it is provided. The activity will benefit the community in some way, for instance by promoting activities for young people. As a result, there will almost always be identifiable *beneficiaries* from the grant (i.e. as well as the Community Champions themselves). Given the nature of the projects, it is almost certain that delivery of the activity will involve *other volunteers* as well, working alongside the Community Champion.
- 429 We now turn to material which explores the impact on communities. It should be stressed that the term 'community' was interpreted widely. It certainly includes communities of interest (e.g. parents and carers of children with Aspergers Syndrome), as well as local geographical communities and particular BME communities.
- 430 The discussion is structured as follows:-
- involvement of others as volunteers;
 - encouragement of others to apply for CCF awards;
 - beneficiaries;
 - ways in which communities have benefited.

Involvement of others as volunteers

- 431 We asked respondents to the telephone survey whether they had involved others in their projects. Almost all (93.5%) said that they had. We made a distinction between the involvement of *volunteers* and that of *beneficiaries*. The results for volunteers are shown in Table 4.3 overleaf. Beneficiaries are considered separately below.

Table 4.3: Estimated number of volunteers involved

	Number of CCs	Number of volunteers	Attribution (1-5)
1-2	88	132	3.7
3-5	103	412	3.8
6-10	75	600	3.8
11-20	50	775	3.5
21-50	18	639	3.6
51-100	3	227	3.0
>100	2	200	3.5
Total	339	2,985	-
Average	-	8.8	3.7

Notes: 1 Numbers of volunteers have been estimated using mid-points of ranges and 100 for the 'over 100' category. Although 93.5% of CCs said that they had involved others, only 339 (84.8%) of CCs quantified their involvement with volunteers.

2 Attribution uses the five point scale described in the text. The attribution figures for the two largest size groupings are based on very small sample sizes (3 and 2 respectively).

432 When we analysed the numbers of volunteers involved using the contextual variables, we found considerable variation between groups, as indicated in Table 4.4 below. The main features of the table are as follows:-

- recipients of small grants engaged somewhat more volunteers than recipients of large grants. It is unlikely that there is any cause and effect at play here – but at the very least it suggests that within the overall grant range, paying larger rather than smaller grants does not raise volunteer numbers;
- BME Champions, female Champions, Champions aged under 50 and Champions with disabilities engaged somewhat fewer volunteers than the respective comparator groups.

Table 4.4: Analysis of volunteers by group

Group	Number of CCs	Volunteers	
		Number	Average
Small grant	198	1925	9.7
Large grant (>£1,500)	139	1096	7.9
BME	119	915	7.7
White	213	2096	9.8
Women	189	1441	7.6
Men	152	1595	10.5
Under 50	195	1636	8.4
Over 50	146	1400	9.6
No disability	295	2739	9.3
Disability	46	297	6.5

- 433 The involvement of others is one factor where the face-to-face interviews shed additional light on the overall position. It is clear from the sample of 48 that averages of volunteers mask huge variations. This is linked both to the personal style of individuals and the needs of the project – but especially the latter.
- 434 In some instances increasing the involvement of others was the primary objective of the project (e.g. trips to gain the commitment of volunteers and to engage young people in a user group). Such activities did lead to increased involvement of others – and resulted in additional momentum for the project as a whole. Debatably, however, participants in such exercises were both beneficiaries and volunteers.
- 435 Six Champions noted how difficult it was to find suitable and willing volunteers (e.g. getting others to take on responsibility for aspects of a newsletter). Indeed for all but one of this group (i.e. five), securing the involvement from others – both individuals as volunteers, and groups as partner organisations/contributors – had been the most challenging aspect of their entire project.
- 436 Similar comments were made in response to open questions in the telephone survey. Training was another issue raised here: even if potential volunteers could be identified, they still needed training and support before they could take up the role with any degree of confidence and effectiveness.
- 437 Despite these difficulties, involving others had been an important part of the process of developing and delivering projects in most instances.¹⁴ Often, Champions gathered together a small core group of around 3-8 people to share the running of the project. This was in addition to seeking to involve the wider community in a variety of other capacities.
- 438 Examples of the latter included:-
- contributing ideas;
 - actively involving local politicians;
 - securing sponsorship and/or in kind support from local businesses and sports clubs;
 - inputs to events from health professionals;
 - engaging professionals (e.g. an architect) on a voluntary basis.
- 439 Some Champions involved only friends and family. These tended to be ‘contained’ projects, involving a series of set activities or an on-going activity of fixed scale.
- 440 Often it was as the project grew that others became involved. For example, a Champion providing an information service first drew on her family for support; she then started a user group with a committee; and then went on to involve users in the collection of information for the service; in time, several beneficiaries themselves acted as volunteers. Another Champion began with a small core group and has gone on to involve beneficiaries as volunteers, as well as working in partnership with other voluntary sector and statutory service providers. Other Champions have developed a volunteer network as the project has increased in scale, with one now having a volunteer base of 47 people.

¹⁴ This was explicit in 17 of the 48 face-to-face interviews but implicit in many others.

Encouragement of others to apply for CCF awards

- 441 Respondents to the telephone survey were asked whether their involvement as Community Champions had encouraged other individuals to apply for an award. One hundred and three respondents (25.6%) said that this was the case.
- 442 Almost all (98) of this group of 103 responded to a follow-up question asking how many had applied as a result. In 71 cases, the response was that one other person had applied to become a Community Champion. In the other 27 cases, the number of applicants ranged from two to five. In total there were 138 'induced' applicants, an average of 1.4 per respondent. All of these figures exclude one respondent who said that 'lots' of people had applied as a result of his experience.
- 443 Among the 48 Champions whom we met, there were at least six who specifically mentioned encouraging others, among the beneficiaries and/or volunteers associated with their project, to apply for CCF. Indeed, one 'sponsored' as many as twelve applications, which resulted in eleven successful bids. We suspect that there may have been other examples of this but it was not an aspect we raised specifically in every discussion.

Beneficiaries

- 444 The telephone survey asked respondents to quantify the number of people that had benefited from their projects and to indicate the extent to which their ability to help these beneficiaries was attributable to the CCF award. 372 Champions (92.5%) were able to report on, or make an estimate of, the number of beneficiaries. However, analysing these responses has proved to be more challenging than reporting on numbers of volunteers.
- 445 The majority of Champions (280) gave the number of beneficiaries as between one and one hundred and these responses were categorised without difficulty. However, ninety-two respondents reported involving over 100 beneficiaries, sometimes by quoting a range (e.g. '4 to 500') and sometimes by saying 'hundreds' or even 'thousands'. Indeed, one Champion claimed to have benefited no less than 24,000 people through his activities, and 26 reported having more than 1,000 beneficiaries.
- 446 The analysis of these ninety-two responses requires some careful consideration. The large numbers involved have the potential to distort the overall analysis of beneficiaries: in short, there is a danger of overestimating the number of people who benefit from CCF. Equally, however, it is important that cautiousness does not lead to an overly negative assessment of the impact of CCF.
- 447 To minimise the risk of overestimating the number of beneficiaries, we have coded responses of over one hundred beneficiaries by taking the *minimum* points of ranges and translating 'hundreds' and 'thousands' into 'one hundred' and 'one thousand', respectively. When calculated in this way, the total number of beneficiaries reached by these 92 Champions is approximately 128,000. The total number of beneficiaries reached by the remaining 280 Champions was calculated by taking the *mid* points of ranges, giving a sub-total of 11,600 beneficiaries and a grand total of 140,000 from 372 Champions. Only 26 respondents said that the number of beneficiaries was fewer than ten.
- 448 Attribution of these benefits to CCF was very high - averaging 4.3 on our five point scale; indeed, no fewer than 173 Champions gave the highest possible attribution

response (a '5'). We would emphasise that it is unusual, in this type of survey, to find attribution figures as high as this.

- 449 We are thus dealing with some 140,000 beneficiaries from the activities of 372 Champions who, in the main, attribute their ability to help beneficiaries to CCF. Grants to these 372 Champions totalled £462,000, resulting in an average grant cost per beneficiary of approximately £3.30, and an average of 376 beneficiaries per Champion.
- 450 On this basis, it seems reasonable to conclude that the contact between the Champion and each beneficiary must be limited and that the level of benefit received by the 'average beneficiary' is very small. However, this is more complex than it may appear: it would be possible for a major benefit to be obtained from the most minimal of interaction between a Champion and beneficiaries. For example, a newsletter drafted by a Champion might contain information that was life changing for a couple of its readers, even if the individuals never actually met.
- 451 All this having been said, claims that thousands of people have benefited from a grant of £2k (or less) still appear implausible. In the absence of further detail of the nature of the benefits delivered by Champions, and in keeping with our generally conservative approach to the estimation of benefits, a second calculation has therefore been made based, using a 'truncated' version of the results. This method restricts the number of beneficiaries to a *maximum* of 100 per Champion.
- 452 Even on this truncated basis, there are 20,810 beneficiaries in all, converting to a grant cost of £22.20 per beneficiary and an average of 56 beneficiaries per project. Although much higher than the (non-truncated) £3.30 quoted above, this figure of £22.20 is still very low. The results of both the 'truncated' and the unedited analyses are presented in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5: Estimated number of beneficiaries involved

	Number of CCs	Number of beneficiaries		Attribution (1-5)
		Not truncated	Truncated	
1-2	6	9	9	4.5
3-5	4	16	16	4.3
6-10	16	128	128	3.9
11-20	58	899	899	4.4
21-50	106	3,763	3,763	4.3
51-100	90	6,795	6,795	4.1
>100	92	128,287	9,200	4.3
Total	372	139,897	20,810	-
Average	-	376.1	55.9	4.3

- Notes: 1 Numbers of beneficiaries have been estimated using mid-points of ranges. CCs reporting 'over 100' beneficiaries were asked to supply an actual number. Where, rather than a precise number, an estimate was provided we have treated the estimates conservatively, taking the bottom points of ranges supplied and taking 'hundreds' and 'thousands' to mean 100 and 1,000 respectively. The 'not truncated' column summarises the actual numbers reported. The 'truncated' column restricts beneficiaries to a maximum of 100 per CC (see text).
- 2 All CCs are required to have beneficiaries (and we identified none that did not), but only 372 (92.5%) were able to quantify their number.
- 3 Attribution uses the five point scale described in the text.

- 453 The complexity of defining the number of beneficiaries and the nature of the benefits generated was already apparent by the time the interim report for this study was drafted. We therefore placed special emphasis on exploring this aspect in the face-to-face interviews and have generated some rich data.
- 454 The analysis of discussions with Champions does shed light on these issues in a number of ways. An important general caveat is that many Champions found it difficult to differentiate between *direct beneficiaries of CCF funding* and *beneficiaries of a wider project for which CCF was only one of several sources of funding*. For example, we found projects which had attracted additional funding following a CCF award, thereby extending the activities and/or reaching larger numbers of beneficiaries over time; logically, the subsequent beneficiaries should not be attributed to CCF alone.
- 455 However, several Champions demonstrated the same high levels of attribution that were recorded in the phone survey, by stressing that it was the CCF award that had kick-started the project and therefore it was CCF that had led to the benefits. This reinforces the concern that some telephone respondents may have inadvertently over-reported the number of beneficiaries reached as a direct result of the CCF award. We also found examples of projects where large numbers of people received benefits as a direct result of CCF funding; but where the extent of the contact was minimal and hence the notion of 'passive recipients' may be an accurate description (e.g. the number of people with access to a new community resource, whether or not they choose to use it).
- 456 However, we did identify projects delivering direct benefits for large numbers of beneficiaries (e.g. a programme of workshops attracting 4-500 participants). Other projects delivered benefits on several levels. For example a website may reach a large number of people in an indirect way (in the sense of having no direct personal interaction with the Champion) but also stimulate a much smaller group of users to join a support group and become actively involved – but both groups could legitimately be described as beneficiaries.
- 457 What is clear from the face-to-face interviews is that large numbers of beneficiaries does not *necessarily* imply that beneficiaries are passive or that benefits are *necessarily* negligible; nor would it be true to say that those projects with small numbers of beneficiaries *always* achieved a higher intensity of benefit. In short, generalisations on this aspect are dangerous. We have, therefore, included (as Appendix F) our notes on beneficiaries and benefits on a project-by-project basis. Our sense is that this material will be of interest to policy makers and other researchers in seeking to understand the issues around beneficiaries at a deeper level.
- 458 The qualitative data may reveal little that can be used to increase the accuracy of our estimates of beneficiaries but they do offer considerable reassurance in relation to the *robustness of the methods of calculation*. In Chapter V we have focused on the numbers of beneficiaries, and on the cost per beneficiary, rather than attempting to cost the benefits achieved.

Ways in which communities have benefited

- 459 Respondents to the telephone survey were asked to indicate how their local communities had benefited more widely. The results are summarised in Table 4.6 overleaf. Although each award is different, some clear themes emerge.

Table 4.6: Ways in which communities have benefited from Community Champions

Scale of Benefit	Percentage of respondents identifying benefits on the scale indicated									
	Learn- ing	Jobs	Advice	Env't	Crime	Health	Hous- ing	Other bldg	Comm activity	Children & youth
Major	11.4	0.7	12.2	3.7	5.2	12.7	1.7	1.7	12.4	27.9
Considerable	28.4	2.5	31.3	6.7	14.4	23.6	6.0	2.7	33.8	19.2
Small	28.4	6.0	22.4	10.2	14.2	22.1	5.7	3.7	30.1	15.7
Total identifying some benefit	68.2	9.2	65.9	20.6	33.8	58.5	13.4	8.2	76.4	62.7

460 The table suggests that many CC awards produce benefits for:-

- community activity;
- learning (the focus of this question was on promoting the take-up of learning opportunities);
- advice;
- children and young people;
- people's health.

461 In contrast, benefits are much less usual for:-

- jobs;
- the environment, especially the built environment (including housing);
- crime reduction.

462 We reviewed responses relating to Table 4.6 across the contextual variables and found few differences between men and women, between large grant and smaller grant holders, between white Champions and those from ethnic minorities, and between the over-50s and younger people.

463 In terms of qualitative data, material on community benefits has already been discussed in the 'beneficiaries' section above. We would also draw readers' attention to the project by project material in Appendix F.

SUSTAINABILITY

464 Next we consider sustainability. The specific points reviewed are:-

- additional help secured from CCSF;
- other funding secured by Champions;
- likelihood of future participation in community activities.

Community Champions Support Fund

465 Respondents to the telephone survey were asked whether they had applied for a You and Your Community Award. Fifty five (13.7%) said that they had, with a further five being unsure. Six of the 55 were still awaiting a decision on funding. Of the 49 whose applications had been decided, 41 (84%) had been accepted and eight (16%) rejected.

466 Those obtaining You and Your Community Awards are eligible to access the Community Champion Support Fund - a package of tailored support services and delivery tools, managed by the Scarman Trust. In at least some regions, elements of

the CCSF were also offered to Champions who had not received a You and Your Community Award. The CCSF package includes-

- access to a resource sharing website ('Can Do Exchange');
- the Millennium Fact Bank or the Power Tool Kit;
- coaching from experienced community volunteers and teleconferencing training;
- networking events.

467 The 41 successful applicants said that they had received the following benefits:-

- nineteen (46%) had benefited from networking;
- fifteen (37%) had benefited from attending workshops;
- twenty (49%) had received learning or other materials;
- eight (20%) had benefited in some other way, of whom three mentioned mentoring or similar support.

468 Many of the 41 successful applicants had only just received their award, and the final tally of benefits will doubtless be substantially greater than shown above.

469 Among the 48 Champions whom we met face-to-face in Phase 2:-

- thirty were simply recorded as not having received any CCSF nor having any views about it;
- one had not heard about CCSF but would have liked the opportunity to participate in networking events;
- three were recorded (either on the original MI or from the phone survey) as having received CCSF but in practice had either not yet applied, or had no recollection of having received this support (but see paragraph 471 below);
- four had been sent information about CCSF but had decided it was not for them;
- one had been encouraged to apply for a You and Your Community Award but had been told there was no funding left.

470 The remaining ten¹⁵ had applied for and received CCSF, of whom seven had received their original CCF award through the Scarman Trust and three from other intermediaries. Among this group:-

- one had been encouraged to apply for an award and had been on a training course (training the trainers), involving single days, a residential and extended assignments. Whilst recorded as CCSF it seems more likely that this training was funded by the You and Your Community Award, rather than being delivered as part of CCSF support;
- six had attended networking events, with a variety of views expressed;
- one is participating in a course, along with 7 others, to become a 'Can Doer';
- two had undertaken teleconferencing training, again with contrasting views.

471 We think it likely that some of the Champions had benefited from CCSF without necessarily knowing. For example, the various network events and briefing days organised by the Scarman Trust in one region were attended by as many as 50% of all Champions from that region; nevertheless, it would not have been apparent to all that the events were funded via CCSF.

¹⁵ It should be recalled that some of the Champions included in the sample for face-to-face interviews had been selected on the grounds of having received CCSF, so the proportion should not be taken as indicative of the broader cohort – for which see the data from the quantitative survey.

- 472 One of the Champions who had been on the teleconferencing training was really enthusiastic and had received a variety of other CCSF support through the Scarman Trust. To be specific:-
- she had asked to be trained in the use of the Power Toolkit which she considers to be excellent and is now using it to help the beneficiaries of her project who are in the process of setting up their own support groups;
 - she had attended a two-day Millennium Awards networking event where she made good contacts and is still in touch with several of the other participants;
 - she is aware of the Can-do Exchange and attended the launch event for this resource. She will certainly be using the exchange in future.
- 473 The small sample size, and the widely differing views of participants, makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the impact of CCSF. It is clear from one Champion's experience that the whole package of CCSF support tools and activities can be used to extend and enhance activities and to build capacity within and beyond 'host' groups or organisations. However, it is equally clear that many Champions are unaware of CCSF, and a few of those who have participated in it are somewhat critical.¹⁶

Additional funding

- 474 One hundred and ninety respondents (47.3% of those responding to the telephone survey) had accessed further funding to supplement their award. Those 190 had obtained funding from 311 distinct grants; thus, on average, Champions accessing additional funding had received income from 1.64 sources (or 2.64 if CCF itself is included). Further details of the sources accessed are summarised in Table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7: Community Champions using additional sources of funding

	Number	% of respondents
Single Regeneration Budget or European Social Fund	17	4.2
Central government	44	10.9
Lottery	39	9.7
Charities	43	10.7
Local government	60	14.9
Other local sources	63	15.7
Other sources	45	11.2
Total	311	

Note: Percentages given here are of the total 402 telephone respondents. These figures do not add up to 100% as some CCs accessed more than 1 additional source of funding, whilst others accessed none.

- 475 It is perhaps surprising that so little use was (apparently) made of SRB or ESF funding, but it may be that some Champions were simply unaware of the ultimate source of funding that they accessed through local intermediaries. Where Champions indicated specific funds (e.g. Community Chest) we then allocated it to the correct group in the table. However, where Champions cited local organisations (e.g. Community Foundations), the precise source of the award would often not have been apparent.

¹⁶ We note in passing that two Champions (from the same region) were very critical of the administration of CCSF, describing the response to their applications as slow and bureaucratic.

476 Many Champions among the 48 we met face-to-face have gone on to access additional funding from a variety of sources. This seems to support the view, put forward by many Champions, that the CCF award acts as a trigger or gateway to further funding.

477 At the next level of detail:-

- twenty had obtained additional funding for their project specifically and a further seven had accessed additional funds for their 'host' organisation or for a new/separate activity;
- one reported that they had tried for further funding but without success and a further two had yet to obtain additional funding but were in the process of applying;
- one project relies on member subscriptions and in-kind contributions and a further three reported that their only on-going funding was from small scale fundraising activities (e.g. raffles);
- fourteen Champions had received no further funding. In many cases this was because the project had been fixed term or one-off in nature. However, in some cases, the wider organisation continued to receive funding.

Future community activity

478 We asked respondents to the telephone survey whether they planned to participate in more community activities. 61.5% said they would increase their level of participation, 34.2% indicated the level would stay the same, 3.3% thought it would go down, and just 1.0% said that they planned to cease community activity altogether.

479 With very few exceptions, the Champions whom we met during fieldwork are planning to maintain a lead role in their on-going projects or, where specific projects have ceased, to maintain their involvement in a range of community activities. For the majority of interviewees, their experience as a Community Champion has been positive and they remain highly committed to community involvement and action.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

480 Finally, we consider critical success factors. This material is structured as follows:-

- perceived importance of grant to success of projects;
- importance attached to prior qualifications and experience;
- barriers to success;
- general comments.

Perceived importance of grant to success of projects

481 Respondents to the telephone survey were asked about the importance of the funding to the success of their projects. All of the 99% who responded felt that it was 'crucial' (63.6%), 'important' (32.3%) or at least 'of some importance' (4.0%). None at all said that it was 'not very important' or 'not important at all'.

482 Similarly, in the face-to-face interviews, the majority indicated that the award had been crucial to the achievement of the project outcomes; or that it had been crucial in kick-starting a project, giving it the impetus to get off the ground; or that it had enabled them to undertake new activities that would not otherwise have happened.

483 The only balancing comments were these:-

- three Champions said that although CCF funding had been essential for the project activity, they would have sought alternative funds had the award been turned down;
- three Champions stated that, without CCF, they would probably have still gone ahead but on a smaller scale or less quickly;
- two Champions (one publishing a book and the other taking a training course) said they would have undertaken the activity eventually but only when personal funds permitted.

Importance attached to prior qualifications and experience

- 484 Participants in the telephone survey were asked a similar question as to whether they felt that their prior qualifications and experience had contributed towards the success of their projects. Three hundred and forty-one respondents (84.8%) answered in respect of their *qualifications*. Non-response to this question was most common among those with no – or very few - qualifications.
- 485 Sixty-one per cent of the respondents said that their prior qualifications had helped in their work as Community Champions, whilst the balance of 39.0% said that their qualifications had been of no help. Further comments made around qualifications to telephone interviewers included the following:-
- specific qualifications helped with specific projects (e.g. boxing qualifications for a boxing club, health qualifications for a health club) – 14 examples cited;
 - qualifications helped in more generally applicable and transferable ways (e.g. organising work schedules, analytical skills) – 15 examples;
 - prior qualifications helped to give confidence and recognition – 2 examples.
- 486 The number of respondents in respect of *prior experience* (338 or 84.1%) was similar to the number responding in respect of qualifications, though the groups were distinct.¹⁷ But many more (89.6%) of those responding to the ‘experience’ question said that their experience had helped in their work as Community Champions, against only 10.4% who said that their experience had not helped.
- 487 Further comments made around prior experience to telephone interviewers included the following:-
- experience with previous community projects was invaluable (e.g. knowledge of the local area, experience as a volunteer) - 40 examples cited;
 - prior professional experience (e.g. as a teacher, community health worker) had also been very beneficial – 19 examples;
 - current work experience was mentioned by 7 respondents;
 - others mentioned ‘life experiences’, a passion for the sector/topic (e.g. sport), or ‘coping with people’.
- 488 The conclusion from the telephone survey is that qualifications are of considerable importance in helping Champions to be effective - but that experience is of still greater value. This was generally supported by fieldwork discussions.

Barriers to success

- 489 There were relatively few Champions we spoke to, either through the telephone survey or face-to-face interviews where the projects could be said to have ‘failed’; we

¹⁷ Only 17 (4.2%) of respondents answered *neither* in respect of qualifications nor experience.

estimate 10 and 4 respectively. However, this should not be taken as an accurate reflection of failure rates overall as presumably some of the projects where no money had been drawn down would not even have been included in the national MI.

- 490 Similarly, although we made a point of including some projects in the face-to-face sample where difficulties had been experienced, these were in the minority. In retrospect, it may have been helpful to visit a few more 'problem projects', as lessons learned from failure can be as valuable as those drawn from success.
- 491 Of those where we have some information, a few were attributable to 'the system' (e.g. slowness in awards being confirmed, insufficient funding being approved). However, most were for 'external' reasons, such as:-
- closure of centre where project was to be based;
 - vandalism of premises;
 - illness or stress.
- 492 Other Champions had encountered barriers but had nevertheless persisted in taking forward their projects. In one example, progress had been hampered by what was described as unsupportive and jealous behaviour on the part of another voluntary organisation with which the Champion tried to work in partnership. Other projects had experienced delays (e.g. due to weather conditions where outside work was involved), but were still hoping to complete in due course.
- 493 Sometimes it was failure to secure follow-on funding that prevented the continuation of otherwise successful projects. The substantive discussion on this point is under 'sustainability' above.

General comments on critical success factors

- 494 One of the key findings emerging from the analysis of face-to-face interviews with Champions is that every project is different e.g. in terms of scale, duration, involvement of others, stage at which CCF is awarded, way in which the grant is spent, community being targeted, and intended beneficiaries. With so many intervening variables - and complex interactions between them - it becomes almost impossible to identify common success factors through statistical analysis.
- 495 Moreover, as we have seen, the overwhelming majority of Champions, in both the telephone and face-to-face samples, deemed their projects to be a success.¹⁸ We do not, therefore, have access to data from a tenable comparator sample against which the features of successful projects could be assessed in any meaningful way. The following comments are added simply as observations, therefore, and not evidence-based conclusions.
- 496 In our judgement, the most influential success factors are:-
- personal commitment, especially in terms of amount of time and energy put in;
 - passion for the particular issue/community/sector/hobby or whatever;
 - getting others involved and the interpersonal skills to motivate and support them;
 - access to additional funding;
 - adaptability and flexibility.

¹⁸ The only general definition of 'success' that could be applied is the extent to which the stated aims for each project were met.

V: COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

501 This chapter stands back from the detail and presents our overall findings on costs and benefits. The analysis is based primarily on the 402 Champions responding to our phone survey. This group is, of course, only a fraction of all Champions and accounts for a correspondingly small fraction of total costs and benefits. We are, however, concerned primarily with the *ratio* of benefit to cost.

COSTS

502 Community Champions receive taxpayers' money that could otherwise be spent on education, health or other forms of public expenditure - or not levied at all. As with all forms of public expenditure, it is important to assess whether the benefits of expenditure on Community Champions are commensurate with their cost.

503 We noted earlier¹⁹ that the 402 Champions received a total of £488,167 in grants; that intermediaries retain around 15% of their grant allocation for their expenses; and that GOs can hold back up to 10% of their DfES funding for administration. These figures imply that the cost to DfES of the 402 grants was around £638,127. In addition, there is the cost of DfES central administration, which we estimate at 5%, making a total of approximately £670,033 or £1,667 per Champion.

BENEFITS

504 The benefits of having Community Champions are, in our view, substantial but difficult to assess. We have used two methods. The first relies primarily on our phone survey; the second on qualitative descriptions, provided both by intermediaries and Champions themselves. We place greater reliance on the results of the first method (due to the larger sample size) than on the second, but the second method provides important corroborative information.

505 Community Champions receive their awards on the basis of proposals. In effect, these proposals, as agreed, form a quasi-contractual arrangement between the Champion and the government. CCF produces numerous benefits, as reviewed in Chapter IV, but in this chapter we focus on four, as follows:-

- employment;
- skills and qualifications;
- volunteer involvement;
- beneficiaries.

Employment

506 Twenty-eight (7.0%) of the Champions that we surveyed found work whilst Champions. Although some of our interviewees (in intermediary organisations and elsewhere) expected this benefit to be more substantial, we did not find it to be widespread and, moreover, found that, when it did occur, attribution was low i.e.

¹⁹ See Table 3.3 for data on grants awarded and Chapter 2 for description of models and funding.

respondents were unlikely to attribute their success in finding work to participation in the scheme. On the other hand, many Community Champions - and unfortunately there is no management information on how many - were already employed or retired and so could not be expected to achieve this outcome.

- 507 The face-to-face interviews suggested that, in addition to a few direct employment outcomes for Champions, many of the projects were able to identify indirect employment outcomes resulting from increased employability skills of beneficiaries and/or volunteers, or by contributing to the creation of actual or potential local employment opportunities.

Skills and qualifications

- 508 Some 35% of respondents to our phone survey said that they had completed, or begun, a course of study leading to a qualification. In a minority of cases, we were able to determine the level of the qualification, but in most cases the data was insufficiently precise to enable us to do so. Attribution was medium to high in this instance i.e. many Champions said that they would not have undertaken the course in question without having had their award.
- 509 The face-to-face interviews also revealed that, in addition to formal qualifications, many participants had developed a range of skills as a result of their experience as a Champion. These included improved skills in communication, organisation, project management, negotiation and handling meetings, as well as increased understanding of funding sources and of how to 'make things work'.
- 510 Given the government's commitment to lifelong learning, we consider this to be a substantial benefit from CCF. It would not, on its own, be sufficient to justify the scheme in cost-benefit terms, but by the same token the attainment of qualifications is not the only intended outcome from CCF.

Volunteer involvement

- 511 Community Champions involved considerable numbers of other volunteers in their work - an average of 8.8 volunteers per Champion - and were likely to say that this would not have been possible without their award.
- 512 The qualitative data indicates that, in addition to engaging friends, family and members of the local community as volunteers, a small number of projects have been successful in securing the support of professionals in a voluntary capacity (e.g. an architect to produce plans for a leisure facility; health professionals to provide an input to a community conference).
- 513 This expansion of volunteering is in line with government policy and, indeed, is a specific focus for the Home Office contribution. We conclude it constitutes a major benefit of the scheme.

Beneficiaries

- 514 All CCF awards have intended beneficiaries and most (92.5%) of the Champions we surveyed were able to quantify the number of actual beneficiaries, at least approximately. The number of beneficiaries is very large and is unequivocally attributed by Champions to CCF (i.e. respondents say that they would not have been able to produce the benefits in question without the scheme).
- 515 The great diversity of the benefits obtained from the awards means that, in reality, each award is a unique project. Our conclusion, from the analysis in Chapter IV, was

that assessing the benefits reached at the level of local beneficiaries – and discounting other factors influencing outcomes from each project – was fraught with complexity and lay beyond the remit of this study; we have, however, provided a description of the raw material in Appendix F. Here, we focus on the aggregate data on numbers of beneficiaries and the cost per beneficiary.

- 516 Ninety-two Champions said that they had over 100 beneficiaries, including three who had over 10,000 each (one of the three reported 24,000); we do not doubt that these figures were provided in good faith. However, our conclusion in Chapter IV was that some beneficiaries included in this total were ‘passive’, in the sense that they had the *potential* to benefit from the output of the project (e.g. read a newsletter or access a community facility) - but may not, in practice have done so. There is a clear difference between these ‘passive’ beneficiaries and those who actually engage in the activities that are the subject of awards. That having been said, the qualitative analysis in Chapter IV also concluded that generalisations were dangerous on this point.
- 517 In reporting the average number of beneficiaries we have therefore shown two figures. One uses the average number of beneficiaries per Champion as reported; this gives a large figure (376), but most are generated by the 92 Champions with over 100 beneficiaries. The second uses the ‘truncated’ version which caps the number of beneficiaries per Champion at 100; this gives a perhaps more realistic average figure of 56 beneficiaries per Champion.²⁰

Benefits overall

- 518 The table below summarises our overall assessment of the benefits of CCF. As well as the data discussed above, it presents figures for outcomes per £1m of expenditure, on the assumption that respondents to our phone survey are typical of Champions as a whole.

Table 5.1: Benefits from the Community Champions scheme per £1m expenditure

	Employment outcomes	Learning outcomes	Volunteers	Beneficiaries	
				As reported	‘Truncated’ (see text)
Percentage of Champions	7.0%	34.8%			
Number per Champion	0.07	0.348	8.8	376	56
Attribution	Low	Medium to high	Medium to high	Very high	Very high
Data quality (as judged by ASW)	Poor	Good	Good	Poor	Fair
Number per £1m of CC scheme cost (given a cost of £1,667 per CC)	42	209	5,280	225,600	33,600

²⁰ See Table 4.5 and accompanying text.

- 519 The benefits in the table may be summarised as follows:-
- there may be modest employment benefits from CCF;
 - sizable numbers of learning outcomes result from CCF. This is an important benefit, though it would not be possible to justify the scheme on this ground alone;
 - CCF is a cost-effective way of raising volunteer involvement in communities - each £1m of expenditure generating some 5,280 volunteers as well as supporting 600 actual Champions;
 - there are many beneficiaries from CCF - we estimate over 33,000 per £1m spent. Community Champions report seven times more than this number, but many of these will be 'passive' beneficiaries for whom actual benefits are zero or negligible.
- 520 The analysis above concentrates on quantitative results from the phone survey. There is, however, a subsidiary basis for cost-benefit analysis represented by the process of becoming and being a Community Champion. As we noted earlier in this report, awards are made following scrutiny - often very intensive scrutiny - of applications by experienced, locally-based, panels of assessors. Those assessors are well-placed to judge the value for money that is on offer.
- 521 There is, subsequently, a careful control over expenditure to ensure that money is actually spent for the purposes for which the award is made. Although monitoring is described as 'of a light touch' and intermediaries are thus not always in a good position to judge the *effectiveness* of expenditure, Community Champions work with numerous volunteers in their own communities, and, in those circumstances, peer pressure will work in favour of cost effectiveness.
- 522 In summary, therefore, the data from our phone survey, supported by qualitative evidence relating to the process of becoming and being a Community Champion, indicate substantial levels of benefit, especially in terms of volunteer involvement and direct benefit for members of the communities served, per pound of public expenditure.

VI: PATHFINDER YOUNG COMMUNITY CHAMPIONS FUND

INTRODUCTION

- 601 As noted in Chapter I, PYCCF is operating for a fixed term period between February 2003 and December 2004 in the 14 Community Cohesion Areas.²¹ It is a similar scheme to the national CCF but targeted primarily at young people aged 18 to 25.²² It is funded by the Home Office but administered by the DfES.
- 602 The stated aims are:-
- to encourage more young people to become involved in community cohesion and regeneration activity by supporting those who can drive forward projects and pass on their expertise to others;
 - to enable young people to be better able to support others (e.g. through mentoring, linking them to appropriate training, helping to manage small projects);
 - to support youth involvement in the community, ensuring focus upon their priorities (e.g. the creation of a local cohesive society, skills development, crime and safety).
- 603 At the time of our fieldwork (January to March 2004), insufficient Young Champions had completed their projects to undertake a robust cost benefit analysis. We have therefore written up our work on PYCCF as a self contained chapter.
- 604 The first section gives some headline facts and figures about those accessing PYCCF, derived from MI on 83 Young Champions. The second and third sections are based on our face-to-face interviews with nine Young Champions and visits to GOs and intermediaries.²³ They describe the models adopted and comment on the early impact of PYCCF.

TAKE-UP OF PYCCF

- 605 As with the national Community Champions Fund, we began by trying to build up a picture of participants, in terms of their personal characteristics. We therefore contacted all PYCCF intermediaries in the Community Cohesion Areas to compile some summary MI. This was difficult as:-
- there is less consistency in the way PYCCF MI is collected than there is with CCF (although it will be recalled that the current position with the latter has only been achieved recently);
 - the position was changing constantly as local panels were approving new awards. The data is therefore a reasonably accurate snapshot as of early 2004, but will become out of date very quickly.

²¹ These are: Bury, Charnwood, Lancashire, Kirklees, Leicester, Mansfield, Middlesbrough, Peterborough, Plymouth, Rochdale, Sandwell, Stoke-on-Trent, Southwark and West London

²² Exceptionally, applications from young people aged 16 and 17 are approved where benefits in terms of cohesion, regeneration and skills development can be demonstrated. Age eligibility is defined more flexibly in London – see paragraph 613 and Table 6.4.

²³ Participants in PYCCF were not included in the telephone survey, although it will be recalled that some participants in the main CCF were aged under 25.

606 Our enquiries revealed a national total of some 83 Young Champions. The MI we were able to obtain is now summarised, as follows:-

- geographical coverage;
- grant size;
- ethnic origin;
- gender;
- age range;
- disability;
- type of projects.

Geographical coverage

607 The table below shows the breakdown of Young Champions for whom at least some record was supplied.

Table 6.1: Take-up of PYCCF by region

Region	No of Community Cohesion Areas	No of Young Champions	Comment
East	1	7	
East Mids	3	2	MI from 1 of the 2 intermediaries
London*	2	22	MI from 1 of the 2 areas is in summary form only
North East	1	19	
North West	3	10	MI from 2 schemes only – the 3rd had made no awards to date
South East	-	-	
South West	1	1	Only 1 award made to date – no MI provided but he is a member of the traveller community
West Mids	2	17	
Y & Humber	1	5	
TOTALS	14	83	

Note: * One of the Community Cohesion Areas in London consists of no less than six boroughs (West London) and receives funding equivalent to two Community Cohesion Areas elsewhere.

Grant size

608 The table overleaf shows the number of awards made to date in four grant ranges. The average was £1,249 – almost exactly the same as that reported in Chapter III for the main CCF. No PYCCF awards thus far have exceeded £2k.

Table 6.2: Breakdown of PYCCF awards by amount

Grant range (£)	No of awards	% of 83 awards	Total value (£)	Average (£)
0-500	15	18.1	2,124	142
501-1,000	7	8.4	5,815	831
1,001-1,500	18	21.7	23,464	1,304
1,501-2,000	34	41.0	61,073	1,796
Not known	9	10.8	-	-
Total	83	100	92,476	1,249

Note: 11 grants were for £2,000 exactly.

Ethnic origin

609 The table overleaf sets out the ethnic mix among the PYCCF cohort, in so far as details are known. The caveat about definitions made in paragraph 317 applies equally here.

610 There is considerable variation between regions in relation to the proportion of BME award winners:-

- in the North East and East regions, all Young Champions for whom ethnicity is recorded are White British;
- in London, the balance varies between schemes. Young Champions in West London boroughs are predominantly from BME communities, whereas all but one of the Young Champions in Southwark are described as White;
- in the West Midlands and Yorkshire & Humber (where information is available) Young Champions are predominantly from BME communities;
- the North West has a mix of BME and White British Champions.

Table 6.3: Breakdown of Young Champions by ethnic origin

	Number	Percentage
African	10	
African Caribbean	2	
Black	1	
Black British	2	
Caribbean	-	
British African	1	
Total for groups above	16	19.3%
Asian	1	
Asian British	1	
Bangladeshi	2	
Indian	3	
Kashmiri	1	
Pakistani	7	
Pakistani/British	1	
Total for groups above	16	19.3%
Chinese	-	
Middle Eastern/Arab	1	
Irish	-	
Mixed race (W/B Caribbean)	1	
BME	-	
Latin American	-	
Jewish	-	
Traveller	1	
Other	1	
Total for groups above	4	4.8%
Total for all groups above	36	43.4%
British	1	
White or White British	41	
Total for groups above	42	50.6%
Not known	5	6.0%
Grand total	83	100%

Note: Percentages for individual groups are not given as the numbers in each cell are small.

Gender

611 The gender split of Young Champions was 34 (41%) female: 49 (59%) male.

Age range

612 The table overleaf shows the age range of Young Champions. Around a quarter are under 18.

613 Age limits were applied particularly flexibly in London where eligibility in Southwark was defined as 14 to 25, and in West London as 18 to 28.

Table 6.4: Breakdown of Young Champions by age range

Age Group	Number	Percentage
Under 18	21	25.3
18 – 25	32	38.6
Over 25*	7	8.4
Under 25 – no details available	23	27.7
Total	83	100

Note: *4 of the 7 Young Champions aged over 25 are from London. Of the remainder, one is the age of the *named contact*, although the bid was actually submitted by two young people (ages unknown). Nothing is known about the other two Young Champions who are simply recorded as 'aged over 25'.

Disability

614 There was no information available for 48 of the 83 Young Champions. Where information was available, 2 were recorded as having as a disability, with the balance (33) not having a disability.

Type of projects

615 The MI includes very little information on the nature of projects funded by PYCCF. Sometimes the only information supplied was the name of a local group, the precise role of which was not always apparent.

616 The following provides our best guess at the nature of the 63 projects for which some information is recorded:-

- sports clubs/activities (football, riding) – 18 awards;
- attendance at a National Youth Conference - 14;
- art groups/activities - 3;
- music related - 4;
- drama/theatre related - 3;
- book/poetry groups - 2;
- talent shows - 2;
- cultural awareness raising - 2;
- video projects - 3;
- 1 award was for each of the following:
 - environment project
 - leadership training for refugee volunteers
 - workshops for Somali young people
 - research with elderly Somali people
 - Asian young women's forum
 - urban youth magazine
 - community event
 - welcome pack for new arrivals from the African continent
 - start up costs for community action group
 - 'beauty and babysitting for youths'
 - workshops on racism (raising awareness, challenging attitudes)
 - Christmas party.

DELIVERY MODELS

617 The basic models for administration of PYCCF are similar to those adopted for CCF. The following notes adopt the same structure as the more substantive discussion in Chapter II, focusing only on where practice with PYCCF is different.

Planning and funding

618 Planning and introducing PYCCF had taken longer than anticipated almost without exception. The first panels had only met towards the end of 2003 and awards were still available in all regions. Marketing and spreading the word through local networks had taken time, although once momentum was created, word of mouth was ensuring interest was maintained.

619 Several intermediaries expressed concern that the fixed duration for PYCCF would cause problems later on. Frustration would arise if applications were received after the scheme had been ended (or budget allocated, if sooner). Raising awareness, interest and aspirations would be counter-productive if they could not be sustained.

620 Several regions had either already targeted – or were intending to target shortly – young people from the refugee and asylum seeker community. In practice, this had proved difficult. Not only were there the usual challenges of breaking down barriers (perceived or actual); but there was a sense that encouraging young people in this group to engage in community projects was a step too far for many. Their first priorities were far more basic, such as language provision, housing, learning and employment.

621 Several interviewees commented on the target age range. We have already noted that older applicants were approved in the London region. But it was the ‘entry’ age that prompted more debate. All were convinced that DfES had been right to add some flexibility, as regards eligibility for 16 and 17 year olds.²⁴ These were ages at which behaviour and attitudes were being firmed up; thus the more opportunities there were to encourage positive engagement with community activities, the better. Indeed, one intermediary argued for the lower age to be extended further to 14 and 15 year olds. Clearly their involvement would need to be supported by youth and/or community workers, but it would provide another means of keeping young people (especially those at risk) in the fold.

622 The Young Champions we met were generally satisfied with the administration of their awards. Many drew on the active support of mentors or youth workers; indeed not all were aware of the details of the process. Often the funding was released up front, but held by a local organisation (typically a youth organisation) to be released as needed.

Roles and timing

623 GOs were divided in the extent to which they were contracting with the same intermediaries for both CCF and PYCCF. There were tenable arguments for doing so, not least familiarity with the grant regime, confidence from delivering existing contracts satisfactorily, and a good range of contacts.

624 However, our sense is that the argument may lie in favour of targeting different organisations for this role. This is because:-

²⁴ The stated target age range is 18 to 25.

- eligibility for PYCCF is restricted to Community Cohesion Areas, whilst coverage of 'mainstream CCF' intermediaries is often defined by different boundaries;
- those organisations with convincing access to young people tend to be specialist agencies, often with young people themselves actively involved (e.g. Youth Services and Connexions Partnerships); this is particularly pertinent when seeking to reach those at the younger end of the target age range. The culture of organisations such as community foundations can be subtly different.

625 Fieldwork also suggested that it was organisations active at grass roots level (as opposed to those with a more strategic role) which were more effective with PYCCF. Visibility and credibility were both important factors.

Marketing and outreach

626 The consensus was that PYCCF needed a very different type of marketing and promotion. The messages and triggers to stimulate interest among young people were different from those effective with older people. There was also a difficulty in using general advertising approaches since PYCCF was only available in defined areas; it was recognised as being counter-productive to stimulate applications from young people who were ineligible on purely geographical grounds.

627 Whilst national posters and other marketing materials had been used, the most effective channels were interagency networking and word of mouth. One PYCCF intermediary with good contacts had convened a launch event, inviting 120 organisations. On the day, 55 people attended and each was given a PYCCF pack. Planting 'good news stories' in the local media also helped to raise awareness and create a positive image, although it is not always clear how many actual applications are generated by this route.

628 Overall, recruitment had been slower than anticipated and some intermediaries were only just making their first awards at the time of fieldwork. As noted earlier, there is a real concern that, having made strenuous efforts to 'get the word round', interest may hit a peak just as funding is coming to an end.

Application and selection

629 Those intermediaries covering both CCF and PYCCF sometimes hold joint panels but the typical pattern was for PYCCF-specific panels to be convened. Typically there were around 6 to 10 in each panel, with geographical - as well as sectoral - coverage.

630 Involvement by young people was an important element; one panel, for example, included a young woman (16) and a young man (17). Other participating organisations included the Youth Service, Community Police, local (adult) residents, Youth Offending Service, Asylum Seekers Unit, Neighbourhood Renewal Task Group, local authority, schools, Community Safety Partnership and training providers.

631 There were very few applications turned down among the intermediaries we visited. The typical pattern was for ineligible applicants (e.g. on age or geographical grounds) to be 'let down gently' at an early stage, often with practical suggestions for other avenues to explore.

632 Those panels whose processes we reviewed tended to score applications against predetermined criteria (e.g. those used to assess Community Cohesion Areas themselves), but we understand this is not always the case: others operate in a more informal way, discussing each application on its own merits. 'Rejections' nearly

always resulted in applications being resubmitted, as panels strove to give positive feedback and keep avenues open.

- 633 Among the nine Young Champions we met, eight said the application process had been straightforward; the ninth could not remember! Five had received help from adult workers. One commented that she had been surprised and a bit nervous when the intermediary contacted her by telephone to discuss the project. However, she relaxed as the conversation progressed and found the process fine.

Progress with projects

- 634 A brief overview of the 83 projects for which we have some data was given in paragraph 616 above. Among the nine Young Champions we met, the funding was being spent on activities such as:-
- venue hire, catering, materials, transport and volunteer tutors' out of pocket expenses for workshops and team building events;
 - editing equipment (software) and specialist training, linked with a community video project;
 - sports activities such as volleyball, snooker and swimming;
 - participation in a National Youth Conference.
- 635 The projects were at different stages of development at the point at which PYCCF was accessed. These varied from a new project idea - worked up after it became known that funding may be available - to projects already underway that needed funding to support new or different activities; more fell into the latter group.
- 636 As most had only been approved relatively recently, progress against stated aims was at an early stage in six of the nine. Two had completed the activities for which funding had been awarded and one was well on the way.

Support for Champions

- 637 All but one of the nine Young Champions we met recalled receiving support from intermediaries and other workers. This appeared to be working well.
- 638 Six of the nine were unable to identify any unmet support needs. Of the other three:-
- one said the only additional support needed was more money;
 - one would have preferred the launch event she attended to have been at an earlier stage in the project (hers was an early award in a region that took some time to get going properly);
 - one would have liked more practical help (e.g. with organising activities – she has had trouble involving others from within the community).

Monitoring

- 639 As with the main CCF, monitoring of PYCCF is with a light touch. Most Young Champions already have close links with youth workers and so any difficulties would tend to be picked up informally, outside of any monitoring undertaken by the intermediary.
- 640 One intermediary is intending to visit all Young Champions about three months into the project in order to compile a summary of projects and outcomes achieved. This will be useful in future marketing, as well as for evaluation purposes.

641 Among the Young Champions whom we met, seven were not aware of any monitoring. Of the other two, one is compiling a photo record of the event being funded, and the other is canvassing opinions about the project in order to be able to report back on residents' views.

EARLY IMPACT

642 Although PYCCF is still at an early stage, we sought views from those we met on its current and anticipated impact. These are presented under the headings of:-

- impact on participants themselves;
- impact on communities;
- sustainability.

Impact on participants themselves

643 Six of the nine Young Champions we met were able to identify personal outcomes from their involvement in PYCCF; some mentioned more than one. The other three had not begun to deliver their projects as yet.

644 Increased confidence was the most common benefit. Five Young Champions mentioned this specifically, although for some this was as a result of a wider process of which PYCCF was only a part. A more positive attitude was a further outcome noted by two of these young people. Four had improved their skills in aspects such as participating in meetings, negotiation, communication, organisation, self awareness and assertiveness.

645 Three participants mentioned employment-related outcomes as follows:-

- one Young Champion has already gained employment with an association of detached youth workers. Her project was influential in enabling her to demonstrate her abilities as a youth worker and this undoubtedly helped with the job application. She intends to pursue a career in this type of work and is continuing to develop skills for future employment;
- two young people have been encouraged (by PYCCF and other experiences) to become trained project workers with the Youth and Community Service. One of these young people is intent on a career in youth work.

Impact on communities

646 Where projects have made significant progress, impact on the community is beginning to emerge. For example, in one project, young people who were once perceived as a 'nuisance' are now regarded more positively and are involved in helping to shape a new leisure complex that is being planned for the local area. Another project has had a positive impact on morale and cohesion within the local Arab community, where morale had been low following the events of September 11th 2001.

647 Other projects are in the early stages and have yet to make an impact on the community. However many have the potential to do so. For example:-

- one project will build the capacity of young community activists/leaders;
- three projects aim to increase cultural awareness within the wider community and to help bring cultural harmony and reduce tensions between different ethnic groups;
- one project will produce a video which will be used to facilitate discussions on crime, career and learning issues in schools and youth clubs.

648 There is a great deal of variation in the number of beneficiaries and in the ways in which they are benefiting from the PYCCF projects. Examples from projects that are well underway include the following:-

- 15-20 young people involved in a new group now have a drop-in centre, are engaged in activities, and have been given a voice. The Council and other agencies are more willing to listen now that a group has been formed with an identifiable base;
- over 40 people have participated in sports activities, giving them the opportunity to try new activities, become familiar with local leisure resources, and to meet other members of the community;
- 250 young people attended a youth conference, to which PYCCF made a small contribution, and were able to meet others and explore issues. The 14 young people involved in the planning of the event gained additional skills in organisation and logistics, as well as increasing their self-confidence.

Sustainability

649 Sustainability was not an issue relevant to all Young Champions we met, either because their project was only ever intended to be a 'one off' (e.g. a workshop) or because it was too soon to look at issues beyond implementation of what was already planned.

650 However, three Young Champions identified factors that would contribute to sustainability, as follows:-

- one believed the enthusiasm of participants and the pleasure they have gained would ensure activities would continue after the financial subsidy had ended;
- one participant thought her own commitment was the best guarantee of sustainability;
- the sustainability of another project will be achieved partly through the model adopted (a cascade through which young people in the core group will influence their peers) and partly through making the equipment available to other groups.

651 Only one Young Champion identified a specific barrier to the success and sustainability of his project. The biggest difficulty for this young person has been the negative attitude, from some of his peers, towards the project and its aims. Lack of practical support from others has also made the process more stressful and difficult than anticipated.

652 Overall, it seems that few of the young people are actively involved in seeking further funding at this stage. Indeed, it seems that funding issues in general are mainly handled by employed youth and community workers.

653 The majority of the Young Champions indicated that they intended to remain involved with their project and/or community activities more generally.

CONCLUDING COMMENT

654 This chapter has attempted to provide an overview of progress with PYCCF as at the beginning of March 2004. It is, however, early days in the life of the projects funded to assess the impact with any degree of authority. Material from this chapter was not included, therefore, in the main cost benefit analysis, presented in Chapter V.

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

- A1 This appendix describes the methodology adopted for the study. The main components were:-
- consultation with those involved with policy and funding at the national level;
 - fieldwork in all nine English regions, including discussions with Government Office staff, intermediaries and local community organisations;
 - a telephone survey of 402 Community Champions;
 - face-to-face interviews with 48 Community Champions and 9 Young Community Champions.
- A2 These are described in turn. We also add comments on coverage of:-
- Community Champions Support Fund;
 - Pathfinder Young Community Champions Fund.

NATIONAL INTERVIEWS

- A3 National interviews were included to ensure the study was informed by an awareness of the broader policy, strategy and funding context. Discussions were held with the lead officials in the relevant Government Departments and also with the Scarman Trust which, in addition to fulfilling the intermediary role in some regions, is the national lead agency for administration of CSSF. Several of these individuals joined a Steering Group for the project which met three times in Sheffield.
- A4 Details of individuals consulted at national, regional and local level are provided in Appendix B. The only participants not identified in this latter appendix are the individual Community Champions. In some senses this is disappointing as their contributions were especially valuable. However, assurances of confidentiality were given and have been honoured to the letter.
- A5 Towards the end of the study a joint meeting was held with members of the Steering Group and Government Office officials. This provided an opportunity to rehearse the emerging findings with a knowledgeable audience prior to completing the final report.

FIELDWORK IN NINE REGIONS

- A6 The purpose of the regional fieldwork was to explore, in greater depth than was possible in a telephone survey, some of the key issues around the effectiveness of the models and the impact of CCF on individuals and communities. During Phase 1, a subsidiary – although important – objective was to secure the help of regional and local players in making good gaps in the management information (MI).²⁵
- A7 Discussions were held with individuals from three main types of organisation:-
- Government Offices;

²⁵ MI was used to structure the sample for the telephone survey, as well as being analysed in its own right.

- intermediaries actively involved with administering CCF and supporting Champions;
- local community organisations.

- A8 A total of 109 interviews were carried out over the project, of which 102 were face-to-face and 7 were by telephone. Table A1 at the end of this appendix provides a breakdown by type of interviewee and by region.
- A9 The checklist used in fieldwork sessions is reproduced as Appendix C. In practice, not all the points listed were covered with every interviewee. Discussions were tailored to the particular role and experience of the individuals involved.

TELEPHONE SURVEY

- A10 The main purpose of the telephone survey was to secure data from a good cross-section of Champions on the key issues of impact and additionality. A subsidiary objective was to obtain feedback on the effectiveness of the scheme from users, in order to supplement the qualitative data from fieldwork with GOs, intermediaries and others.
- A11 A summary of points raised by telephone interviewers is added as Appendix D. The main areas explored were:-
- application process;
 - support received;
 - outcomes and impact on individuals;
 - outcomes and impact on local communities;
 - next steps, including other funding accessed.
- A12 The target number of completed telephone interviews with Community Champions overall was 400, with a subsidiary target of 160 to have been undertaken by 7th November 2003.²⁶ Both targets were met, the final total comprising 402.
- A13 The sample overall included a good cross-section in terms of both individual and contextual variables (e.g. level of award, gender, region). Champions in the 2002/03 cohort were the principal target, on the grounds that their awards would be recent enough still to be recalled with accuracy, but on the other hand long enough ago for progress to have been made with their project and its impact assessed.
- A14 The sample was compiled by the research team from MI supplied by GOs and intermediaries. In practice, this was a challenging exercise, as data was supplied in Word, Access or Excel and exceptionally on paper; there were also gaps in key fields, most often for ethnicity, age or disability. Wherever possible, these were made good, with help from intermediaries.²⁷
- A15 In effect, two databases were created. The first included a full list of all Champions for whom at least some data was supplied. This larger sample frame comprised 1,703 Community Champions across all regions.
- A16 The second (a subset of the first) contained just those Champions for whom comprehensive – or near complete – data was held. The latter was the source used for the telephone survey in order to be able to carry out cross-tabulations at a later

²⁶ This was to enable an interim cost benefit analysis to be fed into the Government's Spending Review. The analysis in Chapter V of this report updates this material.

²⁷ A requirement for greater consistency in monitoring data was introduced for 2003/4.

stage (e.g. to explore whether impact was influenced by size of award or gender of the participant). Names in the second database were randomised in order to minimise the risk of accidental bias in the sample. However, notional targets were set for each region to ensure the sample reflected very approximately the distribution of Champions between regions.

- A17 The larger sample frame (1,703) contained a few Champions who received their awards outside the 2002/03 window used for the phone survey, and many for whom no phone number was available.²⁸ Inevitably, too, some of the phone numbers had changed, and some Champions could not be contacted after a reasonable number of attempts.
- A18 Allowing for these factors, and for the requirement to contact Champions in numbers broadly pro rata to those in each region, the survey almost exhausted the sample frame. However, the response rate from those Champions whom we were able to contact was almost 100% i.e. only a handful refused to participate in our survey.²⁹ We are grateful to them for this excellent level of co-operation.

FACE-TO-FACE INTERVIEWS WITH COMMUNITY CHAMPIONS

- A19 The purpose of the face-to-face interviews with Champions was to explore their individual experiences in greater depth, thereby adding 'colour' to the quantitative data. A total of 48 discussions were held across all regions.³⁰
- A20 Champions were selected in three main stages:-
- telephone interviewers suggested a short list of Champions they had spoken to who appeared to 'have a story to tell'. In many instances these were for positive reasons (e.g. enthusiasm, innovative project, large number of others involved). There were others, however, who had frustrations to report or negative experiences that appeared to be worth pursuing;
 - the initial list was then assessed from the perspective of key variables. Where there were under-represented groups, additions were made using the MI in the database;
 - additions were also made to ensure reasonable coverage of Champions who had accessed CCSF.
- A21 Originally, the intention had been to visit Champions in their homes or at their local projects. However, it was recognised that some Champions would be nervous about meeting strangers, especially in isolated areas and/or after dark. The resolution, agreed with the Steering Group, was for intermediaries to host the discussions.³¹ As this involved Champions in having to travel, an allowance of £20 was paid per session, to cover travel subsistence and other costs (e.g. childcare). The assistance of intermediaries in this matter – often at short notice – is much appreciated.

²⁸ This was not a data requirement for Champions in the 2002/3 cohort.

²⁹ Letters had been sent out to Champions in advance by intermediaries (or, exceptionally, by GOs), advising them of the evaluation, assuring them of confidentiality and encouraging them to participate. Those who felt strongly that they did not wish to be contacted were given an opportunity to opt out at that point. A few others were also excluded on the advice of intermediaries (e.g. where a Champion was known to be seriously ill, very nervous or have language difficulties)

³⁰ Regional breakdowns are given in Table A1. It will be seen that the minimum in any one region was 3 and the maximum was 7.

³¹ In the sense of providing a safe, neutral venue: they did not sit in on the interviews, mainly for reasons of confidentiality but also to minimise the risk of Champions holding back from making critical remarks.

A22 A separate checklist was prepared for these discussions; this was based loosely on the research instrument used in Phase 1 (Appendix C). Emphasis was placed, however, on aspects where the interim report indicated a dearth of data or where early findings seemed superficially surprising and would benefit from a closer look. Such aspects included the impact on local communities, numbers and types of beneficiaries, and the contribution of CCSF.

COMMUNITY CHAMPIONS SUPPORT FUND

A23 The distinctive contribution of CCSF was explored in four main ways, as follows:-

- the telephone survey included a few questions on take-up of, and feedback on, CCSF;
- general fieldwork interviews in Phase 1 also covered CCSF (Appendix C);
- some Champions in Phase 2 were selected in part on the criterion of having received CCSF (see Table A1);
- discussions were held with those involved from the Scarman Trust.

PATHFINDER YOUNG COMMUNITY CHAMPIONS FUND

A24 It was too soon in the life of PYCCF to include current participants in the main telephone survey. Nevertheless, coverage was achieved as follows:-

- PYCCF questions were included in the general fieldwork checklist (Appendix C);
- three 'specialist PYCCF' intermediaries were visited. Similarly, two of the 'other community organisations' visited had a specific PYCCF focus;
- MI was obtained on those Young Community Champions with grants approved and these were analysed for headline findings on key variables. Cut-off dates for inclusion varied between regions but was between mid December 2003 and the end of February 2004;
- nine Young Community Champions were interviewed in Phase 2. Sessions were convened in 6 of the 8 English regions with Community Cohesion Areas (see Table A1).

Table A.1: Summary of fieldwork by interviewee type and region

Regions	GOs	Intermediaries	Other local com orgs	Champions (without CCSF)	Champions (with CCSF)	PYCCs	Govt & other nat orgs	Totals
East	1	1	3	5	-	1	-	11
East Midlands	1	3 (of 6)	1	3	2	-	-	10
London	1	1	2	4	2	1	-	11
North East	1	3 (of 5)	2	4	1	2	-	13
North West	1	5 (of 8)	2	6	1	2	-	17
South East	1	4 ³² (of 11)	1	2	1	-	-	9
South West	1	1	1	7	-	-	-	10
West Midlands	1	3 (of 6)	2	4	2	2	-	14
Y & Humber	1	3 (of 6)	-	3	1	1	-	9
National	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5
Totals	9	24	14	38	10	9	5	109

³² Including a meeting with all intermediaries in the South East, giving a presentation on the evaluation and taking informal comments.

INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED DURING FIELDWORK³³ (excluding individual Community Champions³⁴)

Eastern

- Claire Witcombe, Government Office for the East of England
- Emma Heley, Community and Voluntary Forum – Eastern Region (COVER)
- Pam Hinds, Community and Voluntary Forum – Eastern Region (COVER)
- Ila Chandavarka, Minority Ethnic Network – Eastern region (MENTER)
- Gary Hutchison, Peterborough Association of Detached Youth Workers
- David Wood, Rural Action East

East Midlands

- Sally Stone, Government Office for the East Midlands
- Mary Walker, Community Council of Lincolnshire
- Kirsty Sullivan, Northamptonshire Community Foundation
- Lynn Williams, Nottinghamshire Community Foundation
- Edeltraud Freund, Victoria Centre - Wellingborough

London

- Helen Barry, Government Office for London
- Dorothy Newton, Scarman Trust
- Claire Codling, West London Alliance
- Adele Lindner, Scarman Trust (as co-ordinator of PYCC)

North East

- Gwyneth Jones, Government Office for the North East
- John Main, Government Office for the North East
- Anita Heskett-Saddington, Ark 19
- Monica Saddington, Ark 19
- Justine King, Kemet
- Betty Weallans, Regeneration Exchange
- David Fallon, Scarman Trust
- Linda Gibson, Burnopfield Community Association

³³ Whilst all those named have made valuable contributions to the study, they do not necessarily endorse any of the views expressed or conclusions reached in this report. Responsibility for the latter rests unequivocally with ASW Consulting.

³⁴ The decision to exclude the names of individual Champions was taken reluctantly as their inputs were particularly important. However, assurances of confidentiality were given at the outset and these have been honoured as a matter of principle.

North West

- Pauline Morgan-Williams, Government Office for the North West
- Tony Durrant, Council of Ethnic Minority Voluntary Organisations (CEMVO)
- Jim Edge, Cheshire Learning Partnership
- Helen George, Liverpool Learning Partnership
- Nigel Bacon, West Lancashire Council for Voluntary Service
- Isabel Foster, Rochdale Learning Partnership
- Gwen Lightfoot, Warrington Council for Voluntary Service
- Jane Leffman, Wirral Council for Voluntary Service

South East

- Julie Wootton, Government Office for the South East
- Laurie Johnson, Buckinghamshire Community Action
- Wendy Dacey, Community Council for Berkshire
- Jonathan Blackburn, Oxford Council for Voluntary Action
- Katherine Semlyen, Oxford Council for Voluntary Action
- John Holley, Kent Community Foundation
- Seven South East intermediaries at a joint meeting

South West

- Mike Frost, Government Office for the South West
- Steve Woollett, South West Forum
- Andrea LePlae, Community Council of Devon

West Midlands

- Mike Lennon, Government Office for the West Midlands
- Nazneen Amin, Government Office for the West Midlands
- Claire Carter, Community Council of Shropshire
- Derek Douglas, Scarman Trust (Birmingham)
- Elaine Jones, Age Concern (Birmingham)
- Stan Mutch, Chell Heath Estate Community Association (Stoke-on-Trent)
- Jude Hawes, Citizens Advice Bureau (Stoke-on-Trent)

Yorkshire and the Humber

- Harvinder Chaggar, Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber
- Alison Haskins, Scarman Trust
- Gerry Johnson, Voluntary Action North East Lincolnshire (VANEL)
- Jan West, Voluntary Action North East Lincolnshire (VANEL)
- Sam Lofts, Voluntary Action Kirklees
- Val Johnson, Voluntary Action Kirklees

National

- Alison Solomons, Department for Education and Skills
- Bev Swaby, Department for Education and Skills
- Steven Knight, Scarman Trust
- Charles Woodd, Home Office
- Helen Whinham, Tricia Schofield and Gerry Lynch, Neighbourhood Renewal Unit

FIELDWORK CHECKLIST

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- Purpose of research
- Overview of research activities
- Name of organisation
- Job title of interviewee
- Interviewee's role re:
 - Community Champions Fund (CCF)
 - Pathfinder Young Community Champions Fund (PYCCF)

A: DELIVERY MODEL

- 1.1 How is CCF delivered in this region? (Overview of model)
- 1.2 How is funding allocated in the region?
- 1.3 What is the role of the GO?
- 1.4 What are the roles/responsibilities of intermediaries?
- 1.5 What other agencies are involved with CCF? In what capacity?
- 1.6 How effective is the model from the perspective of the GO? What works well?
- 1.7 Does the delivery of PYCCF differ from CCF with respect to A1 – A6? What are the differences?

B: MARKETING AND OUTREACH

- 2.1 How is CCF marketed in the region? Who is responsible for marketing CCF?
- 2.2 Is the Fund targeted at specific groups? (E.g. geographic area, ethnic minorities, older adults)
- 2.3 Who is responsible for outreach and what activities are involved?
- 2.4 How important is outreach for creating demand, particularly amongst key target groups?
- 2.5 In what ways do outreach workers support CCF applicants? What additional support could be provided to applicants?
- 2.6 What are the factors that contribute to effective outreach work? (and what detracts from its effectiveness?)
- 2.7 Do marketing and outreach activities differ for PYCCF? What are the differences?

C: APPLICATION PROCESS

- 3.1 What are the eligibility criteria for CCF?
- 3.2 What is the application process for CCF in this region?
- 3.3 What level of demand has there been for CCF (Growing/steady/decreasing? over/under subscribed)?
- 3.4 What is the selection process for CCF? (Who is on the panel? What are the selection criteria? How long do applicants wait between application and decision?)
- 3.5 What proportion of applicants are successful?

- 3.6 How is the size of the award determined? (e.g. what proportion of successful applicants receive the full amount applied for? Under what circumstances are applicants offered a reduced award? Under what circumstances are awards made that exceed the stated maximum for the initiative?)
- 3.7 Is funding given at the right time?
- 3.8 What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current application process?
- 3.9 Does PYCCF differ from CCF with respect to C1 – C8? In what ways?

D: INTERMEDIARIES

- 4.1 How were intermediaries identified/selected? Why?
- 4.2 Has the role of intermediaries changed/evolved over time? In what ways? Why?
- 4.3 How effective are your intermediaries? How is the effectiveness of intermediaries measured?
- 4.4 What makes an effective intermediary? What is working well and not so well? Why?
- 4.5 Are there ways in which the effectiveness of intermediaries could be increased? How?
- 4.6 Does PYCCF differ from CCF with respect to D1 – D5? In what ways?

E: IMPACT AND ADDITIONALITY

- 5.1 How are individual Community Champions monitored? Over what period?
- 5.2 Overall, what progress has been made in meeting needs identified in original applications for CCF?
- 5.3 How is the *impact* of CCF monitored/evaluated? What information is collected and how is it used?
- Impact on individual?
 - Impact on local community?
 - Impact on GO (operations, links with other organisations etc.)?
- 5.4 What is the impact of CCF on recipients (e.g. improved employment opportunities, increased skills, progression to formal learning, success in securing other funding)? What is the evidence for this? Would any of this have happened without CCF support?
- 5.5 What benefits have occurred within the local community as a result of CCF (e.g. increased facilities/activities, increased participation in learning, increased community involvement/cohesion, economic benefits such as improved employment opportunities)? What is the evidence for this? Would any of this have happened without CCF support?
- 5.6 Has CCF impacted on levels of volunteering within the local community? What is the evidence for this? Would any of this have happened without CCF support?
- 5.7 In what ways has involvement with CCF impacted on the way in which GO works with local communities (e.g. increased understanding of needs, improved links with intermediaries and other community organisations)?
- 5.8 Does PYCCF differ from CCF with respect to E1 – E7? In what ways?

F: SUSTAINABILITY

- 6.1 What other sources of funding are available to Community Champions (including CCSF)?
- 6.2 Do other funding sources (including CCSF) complement the aims of CCF?

- 6.3 What proportion of Community Champions are successful in securing additional funding?
- 6.4 Is CCSF effective in helping Community Champions to sustain their involvement in community activities? What are the strengths/weaknesses of CCSF?
- 6.5 What other support is available to help Community Champions to sustain their involvement in community activities?
- 6.6 Are there gaps in funding that prevent Community Champions from continuing their activities?
- 6.7 How does the GO/intermediary ensure links between CCF and other regeneration initiatives?
- 6.8 What are the factors that impact on sustainability? Is sustainability related to the success with which Champions have involved other people?
- 6.9 Does PYCCF differ from CCF with respect to F1 – F8? In what ways?

G: FUNDING/FUTURE OF CCF

- 7.1 Is the overall pot of funding right for the programme? Should this be higher or lower? If yes, how much higher or lower and why?
- 7.2 Is the grant ceiling set at the right level for individual awards? Should this be higher or lower? If yes, how much higher or lower and why?
- 7.3 How effective is the top slice (both GOs and intermediaries) in terms of the impact it has on delivery (e.g. support and outreach)?
- 7.4 Can the support offered to Champions be strengthened? What key features are needed to do this?
- 7.5 If the target audience of the programme was changed (e.g. to not target those that are highly qualified), what effect do you think this would have on the programme? Where should it be targeted at if there were to be changes?

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED IN TELEPHONE SURVEY

A: FRONT-END

- Introductions
- Confirmation call is convenient; if not, agree another time
- Assurances on confidentiality
- How first heard about CCF
- Any prior involvement in community activities
- How user-friendly was application process
- Suggestions for how application process could be improved

B: SUPPORT FOR CCs

- Satisfaction with support received
- Suggestions for how support could be enhanced

C: OUTCOMES AND ADDITIONALITY

- Personal outcomes achieved (e.g. learning-related, confidence, awareness of opportunities)
- Involvement of other people – either as volunteers or beneficiaries
- Whether any others have applied for CCF as a result
- Benefits to communities – both geographical and ‘communities of interest’ (benefits might include crime reduction, improved advice services etc)
- Extent to which funding was *crucial* in outcomes achieved
- Whether ‘You and Your Community Award’ accessed - if so, views on support received (e.g. Power Tool Kit)

D: NEXT STEPS

- Likelihood of participating in future community activities
- Whether additional funding accessed - if so, type (e.g. NRF, charitable trusts)

E: CONCLUSION

- Level of qualifications held *prior* to CC
- Whether prior qualifications and/or experience made a significant difference
- Any other comments from CC
- Thanks for helpful contribution and close

Appendix E

SAMPLE FRAME OF COMMUNITY CHAMPIONS ANALYSED BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

The table is based on data relating to the 1,654 Champions (97.1% of the 1,703 Champions about whom we had any information) that we were able to allocate to counties, metropolitan districts and London boroughs ('areas'), as appropriate. We took no account of the last round of local government reorganisation and the resulting formation of unitary authorities (e.g. we included Derby in 'Derbyshire', even though it is now a unitary authority separate from the county).

Calculations of 'Community Champions per million of population' are somewhat misleading when the area has a small population (say, below 200,000). Arithmetic calculations for all areas are included in the table below, but those where the ratio is least meaningful are shown in square brackets.

Area	Number of Community Champions	Population in millions	Number of CCs per million pop
Eastern Region			
Norfolk	31	0.796	39
Suffolk	26	0.675	39
Cambridgeshire	26	0.725	36
Bedfordshire	15	0.562	27
Essex	36	1.618	22
Hertfordshire	20	1.043	19
	154	5.419	28
East Midlands			
Northamptonshire	57	0.621	92
Lincolnshire	21	0.629	33
Nottinghamshire	22	1.033	21
Leicestershire & Rutland	14	0.935	15
Derbyshire	2	0.974	2
	116	4.192	28
North East			
Newcastle upon Tyne	42	0.273	154
Hartlepool	9	0.092	[98]
Middlesbrough	13	0.144	[90]
Gateshead	11	0.198	[56]
Sunderland	15	0.291	52
North Tyneside	8	0.183	[44]
Durham	32	0.789	41
South Tyneside	4	0.153	[26]
Northumberland	6	0.310	19
Redcar & Cleveland	0	0.137	[0]
	140	2.570	54

London			
City	2	0.006	[333]
Hackney	18	0.199	[90]
Haringey	20	0.224	89
Southwark	21	0.236	89
Camden	12	0.196	[61]
Lewisham	15	0.246	61
Lambeth	16	0.273	59
Enfield	14	0.268	52
Brent	12	0.252	48
Greenwich	10	0.215	47
Newham	10	0.236	42
Waltham Forest	9	0.219	41
Redbridge	9	0.233	39
Barking & Dagenham	6	0.156	[38]
Wandsworth	9	0.268	34
Kensington & Chelsea	6	0.179	[34]
Tower Hamlets	6	0.185	[32]
Merton	6	0.187	[32]
Islington	5	0.176	[28]
Ealing	8	0.309	26
Westminster	6	0.232	26
Croydon	8	0.338	24
Barnet	8	0.340	24
Hillingdon	5	0.254	20
Sutton	3	0.178	[17]
Richmond	1	0.098	[10]
Harrow	2	0.213	9
Hounslow	2	0.213	9
Havering	2	0.231	9
Bromley	2	0.301	7
Hammersmith & Fulham	1	0.163	[6]
Bexley	1	0.219	5
Kingston upon Thames	0	0.150	[0]
	255	7.193	35
South East			
Oxfordshire	18	0.626	29
Berkshire	23	0.801	29
Surrey	21	1.078	19
Kent	26	1.587	16
Buckinghamshire	8	0.689	12
Sussex	15	1.515	10
Hampshire	8	1.653	5
	119	7.949	15

North West			
Manchester	34	0.431	79
Lancashire	98	1.426	69
Cumbria	32	0.492	65
Cheshire	57	0.983	58
Rochdale	12	0.209	57
Liverpool	22	0.458	48
Salford	6	0.225	27
Wirral	7	0.327	21
Tameside	4	0.219	18
St Helens	3	0.179	[17]
Wigan	5	0.311	16
Sefton	4	0.287	14
Stockport	4	0.292	14
Oldham	3	0.219	14
Knowles	1	0.153	[7]
Bury	1	0.183	[5]
Trafford	1	0.220	5
Bolton	1	0.267	4
	295	6.881	43
South West			
Devonshire	63	1.075	59
Somerset	18	0.493	37
Cornwall	14	0.495	28
Bristol & surrounding area	25	1.008	25
Dorset	16	0.693	23
Gloucestershire	8	0.582	14
Wiltshire	3	0.610	5
	147	4.956	30
West Midlands			
Birmingham	167	1.013	165
Wolverhampton	26	0.241	108
Shropshire	16	0.432	37
Herefordshire	6	0.168	[36]
Staffordshire	28	1.061	26
Worcestershire	8	0.540	15
Walsall	1	0.262	4
Coventry	1	0.304	3
Warwickshire	1	0.508	2
Dudley	0	0.312	0
Sandwell	0	0.289	0
Solihull	0	0.206	0
	254	5.336	48

Yorkshire & the Humber			
Sheffield	43	0.531	81
Calderdale	13	0.193	[67]
Rotherham	12	0.254	47
Humberside	31	0.882	35
North Yorkshire	21	0.748	28
Kirklees	11	0.392	28
Leeds	20	0.727	28
Bradford	13	0.484	27
Wakefield	5	0.320	16
Barnsley	3	0.228	13
Doncaster	2	0.290	7
	174	5.049	34
England	1654	49.545	33

BENEFICIARIES AND NATURE OF BENEFITS IN 48 PROJECTS

INTRODUCTION

- F1 Chapter IV of the main report discusses the impact of projects funded by CCF on their local communities. The point is made in that passage that the number of beneficiaries and the nature of the benefits received vary widely between projects. Simple aggregations and averages are, therefore, potentially misleading.
- F2 As part of our internal data synthesis and analysis exercise following the face-to-face discussions, we wrote up notes on a project-by-project basis on the number of beneficiaries and types of benefit received. We thought this material might be of interest to policy makers and other researchers and therefore reproduce these notes here.
- F3 There are two sections. The first describes the position in the projects which have now been completed. The second describes those where developments are ongoing.

COMPLETED PROJECTS

- F4 Ten of the projects were one-off events or fixed programmes of activities that were completed within the timescale of the CCF award. For many of these projects it is possible to determine the number of beneficiaries (usually participants in activities or classes). However, the *nature* of the benefits received is often harder to determine. Brief details are now given of each of these.
- F5 On the smallest scale, one project helped to develop the IT skills of five residents in sheltered housing.
- F6 Three projects involved workshops or a community conference on health issues that are of particular relevance to the community e.g. heart disease, diabetes. The emphasis was primarily on prevention (e.g. diet, exercise, stress management). The two workshop programmes each reached about 60-70 participants, while the conference attracted 250 members of the community. There were, therefore, approximately 380 direct beneficiaries who, in the short-term, can be assumed to be better informed in relation to healthy lifestyles. However, these events have the potential to influence the health-related behaviour of the *families* of participants, as well. There may be longer term impacts on behaviour, therefore, with the potential to contribute to major savings in NHS spending.
- F7 Two projects used CCF awards to fund short breaks for single parent families (about 50 parents and children) or for carers (contribution to about 50 holidays in the year funded by CCF). Such activities doubtless have an immediate and strong impact on the individuals involved who otherwise have few opportunities to take a break.
- F8 One further project was also concerned with the provision of holiday breaks. Each year they provide camping holidays for about 60 families on low incomes. However, the CCF award funded presentations to other areas about family camping. This has

been slow to take off but in the longer term, other family camping groups may become established, thereby considerably extending the number of beneficiaries in future.

- F9 Three projects delivered workshops, classes or sports activities. Two of these were aimed at children and young people only, while the third was aimed at all ages:-
- one provided art workshops which benefited 20-30 children. Parents also derived a knock-on benefit from their participation;
 - another involved 100 young people from one school in sports activities, although eight further schools benefited from participating in the tournament;
 - a third organised music classes for about 60 adults and children.

ONGOING PROJECTS

- F10 The majority of the projects visited are still operating, with the number of beneficiaries often continuing to grow. *However, it is frequently difficult to distinguish beneficiaries/benefits of the CCF award, from benefits/beneficiaries of the wider operation of the group and/or additional funding accessed by the CC.*
- F11 Four Community newsletters, funded by CCF, had been circulated to approximately 2,400 households each. Three newsletters supported an established community organisation, whilst one was a stand-alone publication. These CCs described the benefits as informing the community of local issues and activities, raising awareness of community resources and engaging support for the wider activities of the group.
- F12 Several projects were narrowly targeted with a small number of beneficiaries. The Champions involved in the projects are often actively involved with an existing club or organisation, with existing members as beneficiaries. In more detail:-
- ICT equipment and training for 12 sheltered housing residents not only increased their IT skills but also facilitated access to internet shopping, information (e.g. on health issues) and communications with family and others;
 - specialist weighing scales were being accessed regularly by 12 wheelchair users to monitor their weight. This has potential health benefits for these 12 users, and potential to increase the number of users accessing the equipment;
 - CCF enabled a boxing club to extend access to girls. Five girls have since joined the club (with potential for more in future). In addition, the on-going work of the club continues to benefit many young people who are in danger of becoming disengaged or excluded;
 - a CCF award that paid for Cub Scout leader training has directly benefited the 20 cub scouts under his leadership. In the longer term, his training has increased the capacity of the scout movement to support young people's activities;
 - training of the CC has increased the motorcycle maintenance skills within the club. It will contribute to the long term success of a club that engages many young people who are, or are at risk of becoming, disaffected and excluded;
 - one CCF project has benefited two musicians by helping to develop skills and opportunities to progress as professional musicians.
- F13 Many projects have established community centres, classes, workshop programmes and sports activities that are open to members of the community. There is considerable variation in the numbers of participants and the nature of the benefits.

F14 In more detail:-

- an artist's charity has involved 4-500 participants from a wide variety of ethnic backgrounds in workshops. Artists gain skills in working with the community and participants are able to develop art and craft skills. Social cohesion between ethnic groups is also seen as a benefit for all involved. The group is also being asked to provide workshops to other organisations and therefore has the potential to contribute to reaching a much greater number of beneficiaries in future;
- two projects designed to increase access to the outcomes of local history projects have reached hundreds of interested individuals through talks and exhibitions. In addition, one project has rekindled interest in building a new theatre in the community, while the other has benefited a whole village by easing tensions between the older established and the 'incomer' populations;
- capacity building training for committee members in one project benefited the seven members of the committee directly but also has a knock-on effect for the wider community, as the group becomes established and activities are extended and developed. Approximately 75 people participate in activities at present;
- one CCF project has helped to engage 25 women and their children (50-60) in activities. Participants benefit from social and learning-related activities, as well as becoming engaged with the wider community;
- one Champion continues to work towards the establishment of a community centre. 30 adults and 20 children have already participated in the centre which, if successful, will provide a new community resource for the whole community and contribute to community cohesion;
- one Champion has involved about 1,000 young people in cricket coaching and fixtures. The main benefits are seen as engaging young people in healthy activities;
- one Champion has established a community centre with approximately 50 regular users, with about 12-15 using the centre on any one day. Participants benefit from learning and social activities;
- one Champion is involved in establishing a youth club that has reached all the young people in the village to some extent and has an attendance rate of 12-17 young people. The young people benefit from increased activities in the village, whilst intergenerational activities improve relationships and challenge stereotypical views;
- one Champion reaches 500 people in a year by providing opportunities for children, and adults with special needs, to observe (and handle) newly hatched birds, giving them positive learning experiences.

F15 Three projects demonstrate ways in which the impact on the direct beneficiaries of the CCF award can have a knock-on effect that leads to the long-term development of major new community resources. These are described in more detail.

F16 One Champion had, for several years, led a solitary campaign to persuade the council to provide a lake, with access for wheelchair users, for use by model boat enthusiasts. Still unable to obtain support for the project, the Champion decided to organise a model boat show, expecting to attract around 60 exhibits and 100 spectators. He was offered a venue at no cost and was awarded £100 by CCF to produce flyers to publicise the event. The show was a huge success attracting 200 exhibitors and 800 spectators on the day.

- F17 The show had two crucial outcomes: it brought the Champion together with like-minded others willing to support his campaign for a local lake, and it provided clear evidence of demand for such a facility. Two years later the funding package for a lake is coming together and the council has identified a site and is conducting a feasibility study. The new facility will benefit hundreds of model boat enthusiasts, particularly those with disabilities, and has the potential to attract significant tourism to the town. The Community Champion is adamant that much of what has been achieved can be attributed to the first £100 that set the ball rolling.
- F18 One project used CCF funding to take 45 young people on a trip to an established skate park and to host an event, attended by 165 people, to promote proposals and engage young people in plans for a local facility. These individuals benefited directly, in the short-term, from the funding and an on-going user group was developed with 147 members. The longer term benefits are yet to be fully realised but many of the young people have been actively involved in promoting plans for the new skate park, organising events, and participating in meetings - generally gaining skills and confidence as a result. The success of the group will lead to long term benefits for the whole community as, once the new facility is complete, there are plans to develop it as a social enterprise, run by young people and contributing to the area's tourism.
- F19 One Champion obtained funding to streamline the administration of an Action Group that was campaigning to convert a local building into a resource centre for young people. The CCF award paid for the computerisation of the group's administration systems and some clerical support. This has been extremely beneficial, allowing the co-ordinator to concentrate on organising activities for the campaign; major strides have been made. If all continues to progress as planned, there will be a new resource for all local young people in three years' time. In the meantime, it is arguable that the campaign itself is benefiting the whole community by bringing it together in pursuit of the resource.
- F20 Four Champions have driven the development of new support services, with CCF as their first source of funding. Four of these projects have grown to the extent that they have thousands of beneficiaries each year, while two operate on a smaller scale but provide intensive support to a small number of beneficiaries. These are now described in more detail.
- F21 One Champion with personal experience of having a child with special needs increasingly found herself providing information and support to others in a similar position. She set up a website and was inundated with enquiries. CCF funding enabled her to produce 500 hard copies of an information book about rights and services for children with special needs and their parents. The demand for the service is such that a local support group has been established; the website attracts 3,500 unique visitors each month; there are nearly a thousand families on the database (repeat users); and hundreds of families get involved in events. Users come from all over the country, and even the world; the Champion is now helping others to establish similar services for their own areas. The Champion attributes much of the growth to that first CCF award; it has also been a gateway to other funding streams.
- F22 One Champion used his CCF award to rent a house from where to provide hot meals for homeless people. The project has grown to the point that it is now reaching a staggering number of beneficiaries. There are 91,000 visits a year to the Centre (for hot meals); 6,500 new visitors a year; and around 5,000 people undertake short courses each year. Significant additional funding has been found but the Champion is

quite clear that the project would have been unable to proceed without the original £2,000 from CCF.

- F23 One Champion used CCF to purchase administration equipment and pay for room hire to set up a support service for victims of domestic violence and their families. Over three years, the project has provided intensive support to 15 women and their families, enabling them to remain free of violent relationships, to gain new skills and to begin building a future for themselves and their families. The number of beneficiaries is relatively small but the benefits are huge, although resource-intensive to achieve. The project has now reached a point where it is providing training and awareness raising, as well as supporting individuals and their families. It is also receiving referrals from the police and social services. This long term project has the potential to help many more women and is potentially (literally) life-saving.
- F24 One Champion has managed his chronic health problems (HIV+ and Hepatitis C) for 20 years using alternative therapies and without the use of drugs. He used his CCF award to train in acupuncture and to set up a support group for other HIV sufferers. He offers acupuncture and passes on his own experiences of alternatives to drug treatments. His aim is to empower others to take control of their own treatment, and to offer an alternative to NHS drug therapy. He works regularly with 10 HIV+ individuals and intermittently with 10 others. Again, the number of direct beneficiaries is fairly small but the benefits can be great; there are plans to reach many more people, with other chronic illnesses in future.
- F25 The remaining projects each demonstrate unique ways in which CCF projects are benefiting their users. In brief:-
- one Champion developed, from scratch, an environmental recycling 'project' that has grown into a network of not-for-profit companies, one for each function (e.g. scrap car collection, composting scheme, fact packs for schools). The project has nearly 400 members and hundreds of people benefit from the support and infrastructure for recycling, with longer term benefits for the local (and global) environment;
 - one project has established a crèche and is benefiting about 10 parents per session by enabling them to participate in a range of learning and social activities;
 - one CCF award helped towards the cost of a trip (with a training focus) for volunteers. 50 people benefited directly from the trip, but it was so successful in engaging volunteers that the association has grown enormously following the event. It has increased activities and services to the whole community of 500 Pakistani Muslim families in the area;
 - one project has helped both to train help-line volunteers and develop a children's cemetery. 800 people use the bereavement help line each year and 30 families have benefited from the special facilities at the cemetery;
 - one CCF award was used to purchase a computer to improve the administration of a well established charity. The direct beneficiary was the organisation's secretary who gained IT skills and access to a computer. However, there is a small knock-on benefit to the 3-400 Parkinson's disease sufferers that the charity supports. The computerisation of membership records has resulted in the availability of improved information that can now be provided to potential funders;
 - one CCF award was used to fund the development of a sensory garden that will benefit the local community in general, and children and the disabled in particular.

OTHER

- F26 In three CCF projects, the Champion was the only direct beneficiary. However, these Champions participated in training and all intended to remain involved in community activity. There are many groups and individuals who may benefit in future from the increased capacity of these individuals.
- F27 The two remaining projects were terminated before they began to impact on intended beneficiaries.

Copies of this publication can be obtained from:

DfES Publications
P.O. Box 5050
Sherwood Park
Annesley
Nottingham
NG15 0DJ

Tel: 0845 60 222 60
Fax: 0845 60 333 60
Minicom: 0845 60 555 60
Online: www.dfespublications.gov.uk

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2004.

ISBN 1 84478 267 0
Ref No: RR550

www.dfes.go.uk/research