



Bristol ChangeUp Consortium

Community Engagement Report Draft - 14 December 2006

Contents:

Acknowledgements	
Executive Summary	
Introduction	
Methodology	
Context	
Levels of Engagement	
Strengths, Barriers and Key Recommendations	
Reports Referenced	
Annex 1 – 4	

Acknowledgements:

Ian Quaife and Aric Lacoste, Bristol City Council Community Development Team
Louise Bale, Bristol City Council Governor Development Service
Billy Forsythe, Bristol City Council School Improvement Service
Anna McDermott, Bristol City Council Corporate Communications
Andy McGrath, Bristol City Council Policy Performance and Equalities Division
Elizabeth William, Bristol Primary Care Trust
Mark Woodcock, Bristol Primary Care Trust
Julie Bowle, Community Safety, Public Contact Inspector, Bristol District

Glossary of Terms:

BCC	Bristol City Council
BDA	Black Development Agency (BDA is also a CVS)
BME	Black and Minority Ethnic
BP	Bristol Partnership
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
CUC	ChangeUp Consortium (Voscur, The Care Forum, Black Development Agency, Social Enterprise Works, Volunteering Bristol)
CVS	Council for Voluntary Services
GOSW	Government Office for the South West
LA	Local Authority
LAA	Local Area Agreement
LLG	Local Leadership Groups
LSC	Learning and Skills Council
NBT	North Bristol Trust
NHS	National Health Service
NR	Neighbourhood Renewal
PCT	Primary Care Trust
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
SEE	Social Economy organisations and Enterprise
SEW	Social Enterprise Works formerly Bristol Area Community Enterprise Network (BACEN)
TCF	The Care Forum
UBHT	United Bristol Health Care Trust
VCSE	Voluntary, Community Sector and Social Enterprise
VCSES	Voluntary, Community Sector and Social Enterprise Sector
Voscur	Council for Voluntary Services (CVS) for Bristol

Definitions:

Social Enterprise	A social enterprise is a business with primarily social objectives who surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholders and owners (Department for Trade and Industry, July 2002)
Social Economy	A generous definition might include all voluntary, not for profit activity taking place in the interstices of the formal market economy including very modest community initiatives such as lunch clubs and after school provision (Social Economy in Bristol Audit 2004-2005)

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT REPORT

1. Introduction

Bristol ChangeUp Consortium (CUC) was commissioned to research the range of activities undertaken by VCSES organisations, as well as local residents' involvement in matters of governance, across the four blocks of the Local Area Agreement (LAA), namely: Children and Young People, Healthier Communities and Older People, Safer and Stronger Communities and Economic Development and Enterprise. To identify capacity building and resident engagement opportunities and challenges that can inform local strategies, public investment strategies and the development and delivery of the LAA.

Information was collated in order to **obtain a snapshot impression** of the capacity of local communities and their involvement in the governance of Bristol and the extent to which people are empowered to participate in local-decision making and/or influence service-delivery.

Overall aims of the mapping:

- To help inform the production of a community engagement plan
- To identify gaps within community engagement and help identify areas for development and capacity building
- To assess community and residential involvement within geographical frameworks, including equalities data where appropriate
- To strengthen and support the unique and added value of the VCSES in building safer stronger communities.

Data was analysed under the following categories:

- Voluntary and community sector groups, societies and organisations who are members of networks facilitated by BDA, Social Enterprise Works, The Care Forum, Volunteering Bristol and Voscur ie Bristol CUC
- Representation of VCSES interests at strategic partnerships and cross sector decision making bodies' (through the representative structures of BDA, The Care Forum and Voscur)
- Bristol social enterprise infrastructures and organisations, including credit unions and cooperatives
- The involvement of residents in matters of local governance eg local neighbourhood partnerships, Neighbourhood Renewal, equalities forums and steering groups for local government
- The involvement of residents in matters relating to Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) and schools
- The involvement of residents in police community engagement and prison visiting
- The involvement of residents in volunteering activities across Bristol.

2. Context

2.1 National Context

The 4th National Outcome of the Safer, Stronger Communities Fund Agreement is “to increase the capacity of local communities so that people are empowered to participate in local decision-making and are able to influence service delivery”. This year, Bristol has undertaken to map the ways that residents and VCSES organisations are involved in decision making structures and how they are able to influence service delivery, in order to inform development of the LAA. “Local people empowered to have a greater choice and influence over decision making and a greater role in public service delivery” is a mandatory outcome for the LAA beginning in April 2007.

2.2 Local Context

As part of the Safer and Stronger Communities ‘neighbourhood and communities engagement outcome’, the Bristol Partnership (BP) Support Team agreed to develop a short plan for future engagement, in order to maximise the benefit in Bristol of the contribution of residents, communities and volunteers. In turn they commissioned the ChangeUp consortium to produce a snapshot outline of current resident, community and volunteer engagement in service planning and delivery. This will inform the development of an outline action plan to set out what needs to be done to develop engagement in delivery of the LAA.

This action plan will need to be linked to other partner work (for example, Bristol Compact action plan, Neighbourhood Management / Local Leadership Groups / multi agency locality work, commitments of individual partner organisations, particularly the investment strategies of public service organisations, and the ChangeUp Consortium plan, etc).

3. Levels of Engagement by VCSES

3.1 Delivery by Voluntary and Community Sector

Membership data was taken from, The Care Forum, Voscur and Social Enterprise Works (formerly BACEN) and a total of 808 organisations recorded on the mapping database. BDA has around 148 Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups on its database in Bristol and 26 of those are also on the mapping database. Analysis of the data identified the following:

- Around 75% of organisations stated that they delivered city-wide services but are very likely to have a high client profile close to where they are geographically located
- An even distribution of organisations across the North and South Wards
- 205 organisations were identified as providing services against the equalities lead type BME in comparison to 10 organisations for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual

Organisations are spread across the four blocks of the LAA as shown below, however, it is important to note that many simultaneously provide services across more than one block and this is reflected in the figures below:

Children and Young People	203
Healthier Communities and Older People	326
Safer and Stronger Communities	321
Economic Development and Enterprise	301

The breakdown for equalities lead types are shown below but they are ambiguous as some organisations, whilst delivering a service to equalities groups may not be equalities lead, therefore the data should be treated as a breakdown for recipients of equalities services:

BME (including BDA organisations)	205
Disabled	102
Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual	10
Older People	54
Women	46
Children and Young People	184

As 75% of organisations stated that they provided a city-wide service the Community Development team were asked to offer anecdotal evidence as to where take up of VCS services was weaker and why this might be:

- In areas where there is no or little regeneration funding eg in Ashton Vale and Speedwell historically there has been limited VCS or BCC community development activity (until recently). These areas are currently having problems with community cohesion with some residents saying, “they don’t see anybody” and feel forgotten. However, some areas that are not regeneration priority areas like Brislington, Shirehampton and Bedminster have strong VCS lead community partnerships which is something to build upon for the future
- Where there has been little coordinated VCS or BCC Community Development activity eg Stockwood or Hengrove
- In Avonmouth where there is little or no VCS presence in an area going through significant demographic change eg a large and growing population of Polish migrant workers and housing stock being converted to flats so there is no room for balanced and sustainable communities – areas are being reengineered to support incoming workers and not to support families.

Key Findings:

- ❑ There is an issue of need versus provision of service eg the geographical location of organisations being driven by the necessity for cheap premises rather than a high client profile in a particular area
- ❑ Organisations based in areas where they have a high client profile but a remit to provide services across the city could have issues in delivering outreach provision

- VCS capacity needs to be addressed in areas where take up of services is weaker to improve levels of engagement
- CUC infrastructure organisation members may not have the resources or capacity to fully utilise membership benefits and this should be further explored to guard against losing sight of what happening down at the grass roots.

The list of key findings is not exhaustive, however, it does indicate a range of issues relating to delivery of services by the VCS.

3.2 Delivery by Social Economy Sector

Social Economy organisations and Enterprises (SEEs) have a vital role in economic development. Audits of the sector undertaken in 1999-2000 and 2004-2005 estimated that the Social Economy had grown faster than the mainstream economy, contributing £275m to Bristol's economy, whilst employing 7,000 staff and 22,000 volunteers. Input to the sector includes the provision of jobs and new routes into employment, capacity building, local democracy and supplying goods and services to local communities:

- Geographical distribution: SEEs are clustered in areas in which the mainstream economy performs poorly and also in the city centre. Ashley, Cabot and Lawrence Hill wards contained a combined total of more than 42% of SEEs that responded to the questionnaire
- Operating areas: social enterprises able to geographically locate their clients tend to see themselves as serving geographically defined local communities e.g. clients of social enterprises are concentrated in the same deprived wards in which social enterprises' cluster. Other social enterprises operate Bristol-wide and have clients throughout the City
- Types of activities: advice, education and training, arts and culture, health and social care, environmental improvement and neighbourhood centres.

(The Social Economy in Bristol Audit 2004-2005).

Social Enterprise Works (formerly BACEN) is a local infrastructure organisation providing business development support to social enterprise organisations and has a membership of 211 SEEs.

Of the 211 SEEs, 128 only provide services across the Economic Development and Enterprise block. 83 simultaneously provide services across more than one block of the LAA as below:

Economic Development and Enterprise	128
Economic Development and Enterprise and Children and Young People	31
Economic Development and Enterprise and Healthier Communities and Older People	25
Economic Development and Enterprise and Safer and Stronger Communities	27

Key Findings:

- Most SEEs are managing an income mix of trading, contracting and grant funding. They are also predominately sited in Neighbourhood Renewal (NR) areas and therefore vulnerable to changes in regeneration funding. This is also true of the support organisations, Social Enterprise Works and Cooperative Development Agency (BRAVE Ltd) that work with them
- The opportunities to engage in procurement with statutory bodies is a key issue and the ability of SEEs to demonstrate their added value and the quality of their services and products is crucial
- The development of an asset base is also important to many SEEs. This will enable them to develop and diversify their income streams and to act as security against which to look at loan financing for service development.

The list of key findings is not exhaustive, however, it does indicate a range of issues relating to delivery of services by SEEs.

3.3 Current Engagement by Networks

BDA, The Care Forum and Voscur are the three citywide representative infrastructure organisations in Bristol. BDA is a BME led CVS whose membership comprises BME VCSE groups in Bristol; The Care Forum's membership comprises VCSE groups working in the Health and Social Care Sector in Bristol and the former County of Avon. Voscur is a generalist CVS whose membership is open to all VCSE organisations in Bristol.

There are 808 VCSES organisations on the mapping database. BDA, The Care Forum and Voscur facilitate a total of 33 networks, 11 of which are E-networks and the number of groups involved in each ranges from 8 to 500 (Annex 2) eg:

- BDA's Faith Network has a total of 8 BME faith groups
- The Care Forum's Older People's Network has a total of 247 VCS organisations on its database with an interest in older people's issues
- Voscur's Central Area Network has a total of 266 members who have stated that they wish to be part of a Central Bristol network.

Analysing the networks facilitated by infrastructure organisations across the 4 blocks of the LAA they are spread as follows:

Children and Young People	4
Healthier Communities and Older People	5
Safer and Stronger Communities	21
Economic Development and Enterprise	3

There are also a large number of networks and partnerships that are attended by the CUC and representatives from the VCSES. 83 networks and partnerships have been identified and 122 officers/representatives, however this list is not exhaustive (Annex 3).

Due to the nature of some partnerships, there is a need for diverse representation and a range of expertise as such some networks are represented by a single infrastructure organisation while others have representation from more than one eg:

- BP Health Delivery Group has an officer from The Care Forum, a nominated representative from Voscur and an elected member from BDA
- Equal C3 Development Partnership has officers from BDA, Voscur and Social Enterprise Works
- Bristol Health Services Plan Strategic Communications and Public Involvement Group has an officer from The Care Forum
- BP Regeneration Delivery Group has an officer and nominated representative from BDA and an officer and elected member representative from Voscur.

Analysing the networks and partnerships attended across the 4 blocks of the LAA, representatives from the CUC are spread as follows:

Children and Young People	20
Healthier Communities and Older People	22
Safer and Stronger Communities	28
Economic Development and Enterprise	13

Key Findings:

- ❑ Representation on networks and partnerships, especially multi-agency/cross sector arrangements, enables an active role in the delivery of the LAA
- ❑ Although not a complete list of networks and partnerships, it does indicate a variety of VCSES representation across a diverse range of groups and programmes
- ❑ Facilitation of and representation on networks and partnerships enables a much wider perspective of the VCSES
- ❑ Supports the flow of information in and out of specialist groups.

The list of key findings is not exhaustive, however, it does indicate a range of issues relating to networks within the VCS.

4. Current Engagement by Residents

This section addresses the engagement of residents across the four blocks of the LAA within governance structures; by definition these are volunteers, service users and residents involved in service planning and governance where they are empowered with the authority to make decisions and are able to influence outcomes.

A variety of approaches to consult, involve and empower local people were identified:

- Bristol City Council (BCC) Local Area Committees - meetings; sub groups; focus groups; local events; local action groups
- Bristol Primary Care Trust (PCT) - public and patient representation; volunteering and lay people's groups
- Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) – governing bodies of schools; parent teacher associations.

In addition, a questionnaire about resident involvement was produced and sent to BCC Community Development, Corporate Equalities and Neighbourhood Renewal teams and Bristol PCT (formerly Bristol South and West and North). A total of 12 were returned to the CUC. The questionnaire consisted of 6 basic questions design to measure influence, inclusivity, (ie whether or not there is equal participation across all communities), communication (clear understandable two-way channels of communication) and capacity building, (developing the skills, knowledge and organisation of those involved in local governance):

- i) How would you describe your organisation? (NR structure, Local Area structure, Local Leadership group, Equalities Forum, Tenants Housing Forum, PCT, Education Sector, Other)
- ii) Does your organisation run meetings, which are attended by residents as elected or identified representatives? Please give details of purpose for meetings with geographical location, number of participants and equalities information recorded
- iii) In the last year has your organisation run meetings to which members of the public are invited? (eg public consultations. Please give details and numbers of where possible)
- iv) What is the average turnout at such meetings over the last year? Where possible please provide numbers
- v) Are you able to measure equalities issues in terms of public attendance at such meetings (eg what is the average age of participants? Do meetings contain a range of people from different ethnic backgrounds? Are disabled persons represented?)
- vi) If you have any other comments about resident involvement in local governance and decision-making that you think would be helpful, please include it here.

The usable responses are included in the relevant sections below.

4.1 Children and Young People Block

a) School Governors

CYPS, recognising that people from a range of backgrounds can make a valuable contribution to the raising of educational standards, has the following categories of governors:

- Parent governors: who are almost exclusively parents or carers of children at the school. They are normally elected by a ballot of parents, but can be appointed by the governing body if not enough people stand for election
- Community governors: who are appointed by the governing body to reflect the interests of the local community. They may bring specific skills and experience to the work of the governing body
- Local Education Authority governors: who are appointed directly by the Local Authority. Local political parties are entitled to select and appoint these governors. "Non-political" appointments can also be made in certain circumstances
- Foundation governors: who are appointed by a school's founding body, church or other organisation, to ensure it's particular character is preserved and developed, and that the school is run in line with the provisions of any trust deed

- Staff governors: who are selected by election from teaching and support staff who are paid to work at the school
- Sponsor governors: who are a discretionary category, appointed by the governing body following nomination by an organisation that has made a significant contribution to the school.

The Governor Development Service confirmed that across the city and throughout 151 schools (excluding the City Academy) at the time of asking there were:

Governor Category	In Post	Vacancies
Parent/Carer Governors	563	121
Community Governors	345	91
Local Education Authority Governors	346	46
Foundation Governors	151	23
Staff Governors	447	40
Sponsor Governors	7	6

The geographical spread of schools by ward is as follows, with the exception of two schools that are outside Bristol:

Bristol North		Bristol South	
Ashley	8	Avonmouth	7
Bishopston	4	Bedminster	4
Cabot	2	Bishopsworth	5
Clifton	1	Brislington West	5
Clifton East	2	Brislington East	4
Cotham	3	Filwood	5
Easton	2	Frome Vale	4
Eastville	2	Hartcliffe	5
Henbury	5	Hengrove	8
Henleaze	4	Knowle	4
Hillfields	6	Southville	4
Horfield	4	Stockwood	3
Kingsweston	7	Whitchurch Park	5
Lawrence Hill	10	Windmill Hill	4
Lockleaze	6		
Southmead	4		
St George East	2		
St George West	6		
Stoke Bishop	1		
Westbury On Trym	3		

It is important to note:

- The data is extremely fluid and therefore only accurate at the time of writing
- Governors do not necessarily always live locally to the school.

The only equalities data available at this time was for ethnicity and of the 1,170 monitoring forms returned, 110 or 9.4% were from Black and minority ethnic (BME) communities. Data for gender, age and disability is being collected but not yet in a format that can be analysed. Data on sexuality and religion will be collected at some point in the future.

Key Findings:

- ❑ Under-representation of BME governors: around 9.4% of governors are from BME communities in comparison to around 23% of pupils. Over the last 18 months, however, the Governor Development Service and Equalities and Inclusion Team in CYPS have been undertaking positive action to address this through training events and a BME governors conference. In comparison around 3.8% of school staff (teaching and support) are BME
- ❑ Young people, disabled people, single/lone parents and asylum seekers and refugees all also under represented but no positive action is planned to address this at this time due to a lack of resources
- ❑ Inconsistency across schools and in some cases the absence of a Governor Expenses Policy, eg childcare costs; single/lone parents need to be able to reclaim reasonable costs and often do not have the cash up front to pay for childcare
- ❑ The Governor role is time consuming and individuals need to be able to assimilate large amounts of information and think strategically
- ❑ For some individuals having English as a second language can affect their confidence to put themselves forward.

The list of key findings is not exhaustive, however, it does indicate a range of issues relating to resident engagement in school governance.

4.2 Healthier Communities and Older People Block

a) Primary Care Trusts

Section 11 of the Health & Social Care Act 2001 places a duty on National Health Service (NHS) Organisations to make arrangements to involve and consult patients and the public in:

- Planning services they are responsible for;
- Developing and considering proposals for changes in the way those services are provided; and
- Decisions to be made that affect how those services operate.

The overall aim of Section 11 is to make sure patients and the public are involved and consulted from the beginning of any process to develop health services or change how they operate.

Section 7 of the Health & Social Care Act 2001 allowed regulations to be made to permit Overview and Scrutiny Committees of a local authority, responsible for social services, to require NHS organisations to consult them on any proposal for a substantial development or variation of the health service. What constitutes a “substantial development or variation” is not defined in the legislation. The Section 11 duty still applies whether or not a proposal constitutes a substantial development or variation.

PCTs in Bristol merged on 1st October 2006 as such the breakdown of lay representatives that sit on committees and working groups is the combined total for what were Bristol South and West PCT and North Bristol PCT.

At the time of asking Bristol PCT had around 39 lay representatives spread across 40 or so committees and working groups:

- Lay representatives on each committee and working group ranges from 1 – 12
- The Expert Patients Programme Steering Group has 12 lay representatives, the highest number for any single committee or working group.

Bristol PCT holds regular meetings, consultations and events to which members of the public are invited but does not collect equalities data:

- Keynsham Hospital consultation: 375 attended 13 meetings
- Kingswood and District Engagement: 498 people took part in meetings
- Cossham Hospital and Kingswood: 1,242 people attended 50 meetings
- South Bristol Community hospital: between 4 and 100 people per meeting
- Walk-in Centre move: between 4 and 100 people per meeting
- Bristol Race Equality Health Partnership event: average number of participants per meeting was 20
- Avonmouth General Practice Practice: average number of participants 20
- General Practice Branch Surgery closures: average number of participants 20.

There are two public consultations underway at this time: Bristol Health Services Plan proposals for Kingswood and District and the review of Neonatal and Maternity Services.

North Bristol Trust (NBT) and United Bristol Healthcare Trust (UBHT) engage patients through a variety of arrangements including patient participant and condition specific groups.

b) Patient and Public Involvement Forums

Patient and Public Involvement Forums exist in NHS trusts (including foundation trusts) and PCTs to give patients and the public more say in how their health services are run. Scout Enterprises confirmed that a total of 23 residents sit on the three main forums: North Bristol Trust (NBT), United Bristol Health Care Trust (UBHT), and the PCT. The full complement would be 20 per forum.

4.3 Safer and Stronger Communities Block

a) Police Community Engagement

Police Community Engagement is collated in annual reports to the Police Authority each summer to inform the following years annual policing plan. Each of the nine Policing Sectors is managed locally by a Sector Inspector responsible for its engagement plans and structures.

Actual engagement is vastly varied across Bristol given the diversity of policing issues faced in/on each Sector (area). At a Sector Management level, Local Action Groups were the overarching local partnership group tasked with addressing local crime and disorder matters with Police, partners, community groups and residents on board in some areas. Neighbourhood Panels are being introduced as part of the sweeping changes being implemented in the Police Service following the Police Reform Act 2002. Locally Neighbourhood Policing is being marketed as Safer, Stronger Neighbourhoods.

Methods of engagement will include:

- Local Neighbourhood Policing model includes a fortnightly community priorities meeting, two-way engagement where police and partners own short term actions and a link into the National Intelligence Model (NIM) allowing community issues to be considered in the District's Policing Tactical Assessment which directs priorities and resources to problem profiles
- Strategic Neighbourhood Panel (Steering Group) to address medium to long term issues, independently chaired with resident representatives
- Beat Surgeries run by Beat Managers and Police Community Support Officers where deployed
- Street Briefings advertised by letter drop in advance and deployment of the Community Contact vehicle (mobile police station) as a platform to engage people on the street
- Public meetings in response to need
- Local Action Group response to developing issues and may be led by key stakeholder. A variety of stakeholders are involved eg police, agencies, community/voluntary groups and residents to drive resolution, many are police led.

The Public Contact Inspector for Bristol is directly involved in partnerships for Hate Crime and Vice strategies involving residents, voluntary and community groups (eg BDA and One 25) and these structures have been instrumental to opening doors for their involvement in developing Bristol's strategies ie Vice Strategy commissioned by the Safer BP as detailed in their 2005-2008 Crime and Drugs Strategy.

Equalities monitoring of residents involved in police community engagement was not available at the time of the draft report being finalised.

b) Citizens' Panel

BCC set up the Citizens' Panel in 1998 to:

- Keep the Council informed about public opinion
- Research how people feel on issues
- Act as a sounding board for future policies and decisions.

After each consultation a report is published and these are distributed to appropriate members, officers, external partners and made available to the public through the Council website.

It is statistically representative of the population of Bristol and currently has a membership of 1,800 people (ideal number 2,000), selected on the basis of age, gender, ethnicity, disability and home address. The membership is constantly refreshed to continue to provide opportunities for people to get involved in local decision-making.

A summary of equalities data is as follows (figures are approximates):

- 88% of panel of members are White and 12% BME
- 7% of panel members consider themselves to be disabled
- 54% of panel members are female and 46% male
- Panel members are evenly spread across Bristol wards between 2-3% for each with two exceptions: Ashley 7% and Easton 5.9%
- The two largest age groups are 35-44 with 20% and 45-54 with 21%.

(BCC Cabinet Corporate Consultation Team, Demographics Data)

Key Findings:

- ❑ Overall it is not difficult to recruit across the selection categories of age, gender, ethnicity, disability and home address but some groups do not respond when invited to sit on a panel
- ❑ Where groups are known not to respond the BCC Cabinet Corporate Consultation team over recruit to try and compensate eg BME communities
- ❑ The Equalities Forum is used to help with recruiting difficulties and application forms are handed out at meetings and other appropriate events.

The list of key findings is not exhaustive, however, it does indicate a range of issues relating to resident engagement on the citizens' panel.

c) Councillors and Local Leadership Groups

Councillors

City Councillors represent one way in which individual members of the public are given the opportunity to involve themselves in local governance. Councillors are there to encourage community participation and citizen involvement in decision-making, represent the interests of their ward, deal with enquiries fairly and without prejudice, meet regularly with local stakeholders and generally to champion the causes which further the interests, quality of life and sustainable development of the community.

BCC has 70 councillors, two for each of the 35 wards and they are contactable by e-mail, post or telephone and also run surgeries.

Turnout for most recent Bristol local government elections:

Ward	Date of Election	Voter Turnout
Ashley (NR)	5 May 2005**	63.57%
	1 May 2003	38.46%
Easton (NR)	5 May 2005**	61.59%
	1 May 2003	35.12%
Fillwood (NR)	4 May 2006	31.73%
Hartcliffe (NR)	4 May 2006	34.67%
Lawrence Hill (NR)	5 May 2005**	49.94%
	1 May 2003	29.91%
Whitchurch Park (NR)	4 May 2006	39.97%
Southmead (NR)	4 May 2006	29.59%
Kingsweston (NR)	4 May 2006	40.05%
Henleaze*	4 May 2006	49.93%
Westbury on Trym*	4 May 2006	53.73%
Stoke Bishop*	4 May 2006	43.67%

Citywide Turnout	Date of Election	Voter Turnout
Citywide average turnout	4 May 2006	39.2%
Citywide average turnout	5 May 2005	63.7% (same as turnout for General Election)
Citywide average turnout	1 May 2003	34.1%

Bristol elects a third of its councillors each year for three years and then has no local government elections in the fourth year.

* Bristol wards with most advantaged populations

** This election was on the same day as a general election and so voter turnout was higher. Included is the next nearest stand-alone local government election turnout.

Local Leadership Groups

Local Leadership Groups (LLGs) are in the early development stage. Three pilots are currently being conducted. The aim is to provide an enhanced opportunity for local communities to have a greater say in the way services and responses to local issues, are managed by BCC (and other service providers):

- Role of local councillors in providing this greater say is at the heart of the intended LLG structure
- LLGs will be rolled out across Bristol based on ward boundaries (probably two or three wards per LLG)
- Up to 13 LLGs are needed to cover Bristol
- Membership will comprise councillors from the relevant ward cluster

- LLGs will provide a mechanism for local people to discuss issues of local concern with the relevant councillors at regular forum meetings
- Service providers will also input in to this mechanism, and be tasked with providing responses or actions to the concerns raised.

In the early stages of development, LLGs will be forums for influencing and scrutinising service delivery and service providers. How this influencing model develops over time will be dependant on the views of councillors and their constituents.

BCC is in the process of embedding the role of LLGs across council departments and the structure has provisional backing from the council's most senior officers. LLGs are likely to be discussed, with a view to full council endorsement, by the BCC Cabinet in the summer of 2007.

Key Findings:

- The Neighbourhood Renewal Partnership review completed in March 2005 suggested that councillor involvement varies a great deal across the NR partnerships
- LLGs are BCCs response to the government's white paper on Stronger and Prosperous Communities as regards enhancing the role of frontline councillors and the proposal that local authorities extend their duty to inform, consult, involve and devolve to local communities:
 - Frontline councillors will be able to exert considerable influence and are at the heart of these improvements
 - The process for referring issues of local concern to the council's Scrutiny Committee will be formalised through the Community Call for Action legislation.
 - For local communities to take an active role in this enhanced function they will need to be provided with the ability to build their capacity.

The list of key findings is not exhaustive, however, it does indicate a range of issues relating to councillors and LLGs.

d) Digital Engagement

Bristol has experienced a huge growth in the number of residents with access to the web. According to the council website, a survey found that Internet access has more than doubled since 1999, with nearly two-thirds (64%) now having web access. This is an important tool for communicating with local people, especially since Bristol is higher than the national average. It is also worth keeping in mind that the under 55's are more likely to use the web than the over 55's. The survey goes on to mention that web access differs depending on which area of the city you are in. For example in Lawrence Hill, (the Bristol ward that is ranked the highest in terms of deprivation), one in three has access to the web. In Henleaze, the Bristol ward that has the lowest deprivation, a majority, (83%) has access to the web.

Information on the digital challenge / connecting communities not available at the time of the draft report being finalised.

4.4 Economic Development and Enterprise Block

a) Neighbourhood Renewal

Bristol was identified as one of the 88 LA areas in greatest need, assessed against a range of indicators including employment, education, health, crime and environmental conditions. As a result it has prioritised ten neighbourhoods for action: Ashley and St Pauls, Barton Hill, Easton and Lawrence Hill, Hartcliffe and Withywood, Hillfields, Knowle West, Lawrence Weston, Lockleaze and Southmead. Each neighbourhood is managed by a steering group or partnership that consists of local residents and delivery agents, both statutory and voluntary.¹

Of 15 initial e-mails, questionnaires and follow-up calls to NR Structure Managers, CUC received 5 responses, 2 from South Bristol wards and 3 from wards in North Bristol:

- All wards reported holding regular community meetings and steering groups that were attended by local residents
- 4 out of 5 responders indicated that while resident involvement was strong in NR structures, the same residents tended to appear at meetings and the majority were over 50
- In one case the average age of participants at meetings was never asked. However the same ward specified that of the attendees at their public meetings in the last year; 51% were female and 49% male, of whom 27% were from BME communities
- One other responder specified that they had 2 members from a BME community and 4 regular members who were disabled
- The average turn out to meetings across the responding wards was specified as being between 4 and 30 residents, with the North Bristol wards slightly better represented.

The following information about the structure of each NR Partnership has been taken directly from the NR Partnership Review March 2005, the report and the tables only reflect who is represented at board level and do not indicate representation at the task group/theme group level.

¹ Neighbourhood Renewal Partnership Review March 2005, Katherine Williams, P2

NR Unit Guidance (no. suggested)	Ashley Coordinating Bodies
Resident Majority	Yes
Elected Residents	Yes
Residents (14)	9
Community/Voluntary (2)	2
Crime (1)	1
Education (1)	1 (currently vacant)
Health (1)	1
Housing (1)	1
Jobs (1)	1 (currently vacant)
Youth (1)	1
Ward Councillors (2)	2 (currently vacant)
Other Organisations (2)	2 Faith Communities 1 RDA 1 Stokes Croft Local Action Group 1 Young People's Rep

NR Unit Guidance (no. suggested)	Southmead Steering Group
Resident Majority	Yes
Elected Residents	No
Residents (14)	14
Community/Voluntary (2)	Southmead Development Trust
Crime (1)	Yes
Education (1)	1 Community Education
Health (1)	No
Housing (1)	Yes
Jobs (1)	No
Youth (1)	Yes
Ward Councillors (2)	1 Voting Member
Other Organisations (2)	1 Community Development

NR Unit Guidance (no. suggested)	Lawrence Weston Community Partnership
Resident Majority	Yes – in terms of voting weight
Elected Residents	No
Residents (14)	6
Community/Voluntary (2)	2 – Barnardos & Barrowmead
Crime (1)	Yes
Education (1)	Yes
Health (1)	Yes
Housing (1)	Yes
Jobs (1)	No
Youth (1)	Yes
Ward Councillors (2)	2
Other Organisations (2)	No

NR Unit Guidance (no. suggested)	Easton & Lawrence Hill
Resident Majority	No
Elected Residents	No
Residents (14)	7
Community/Voluntary (2)	Yes – a range
Crime (1)	Yes
Education (1)	Yes – schools not LEA
Health (1)	Yes
Housing (1)	Yes
Jobs (1)	Yes
Youth (1)	No
Ward Councillors (2)	Dependent
Other Organisations (2)	No

NR Unit Guidance (no. suggested)	Knowle West Partnership
Resident Majority	Yes
Elected Residents	No
Residents (14)	15
Community/Voluntary (2)	Knowle West Development Trust
Crime (1)	Yes
Education (1)	Yes
Health (1)	Yes
Housing (1)	Yes
Jobs (1)	Yes
Youth (1)	Yes
Ward Councillors (2)	2
Other Organisations (2)	1 Sure Start

NR Unit Guidance (no. suggested)	Hartcliffe & Withywood Community Partnership
Resident Majority	Yes
Elected Residents	Yes
Residents (14)	10
Community/Voluntary (2)	2 (currently vacant)
Crime (1)	No
Education (1)	Yes
Health (1)	Yes
Housing (1)	No
Jobs (1)	Yes
Youth (1)	Yes
Ward Councillors (2)	1
Other Organisations (2)	Local Business

Key Findings:

- The NR Partnership Review March 2005, suggests that commitment and involvement of local residents is a strength of Bristol, although it also points how the extent to which information coming out of the BP is not always very clear and uses too much jargon
- Responders felt that monitoring attendance and equalities issues in greater detail at meetings would be desirable.

The list of key findings is not exhaustive, however, it does indicate a range of issues relating to resident engagement in NR.

4.5 Cross Cutting the Four Blocks of LAA

a) Equalities Forums

BCC has four equalities forums: the disability, race and women's forum each have terms of reference and the lesbian, gay and bi-sexual forum has a service level agreement.

The equalities forums examine any policy, operation or aspect of the work of the BCC or any committee or Department in the context of the Council's objective of eliminating discrimination and securing equal opportunities and equal treatment for Disabled people, Women, Black and Minority Ethnic communities and the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual community. Forums meet four times a year and aim to:

- Advise and suggest policies that will act against discrimination and in support of equal opportunities and equal treatment
- Advise on the application of policy
- Act as an arena for consultation on policies and services
- Advise council members and officers on the development of new policies and practices
- Consider and advise on reports
- Examine services and question service providers
- Undertake research, publicity and educational initiatives
- Consider issues of concern raised by forum members
- Elect Advisors

The Women's forum confirmed that it holds evening meetings, half of which are 'open forums' and the other half are for 'advisors'. Turn out varied between 10 and 30. Advisors' represent either themselves or women's groups and are elected by the membership (approximately 230). No equalities data was held, although all are women, but anecdotal evidence suggested members tended to be over 50 and that more 'advisors' came from North Bristol.

This section is incomplete and equalities monitoring of residents engaged in equalities forums was not available at the time of the draft report being finalised.

b) Corporate Social Responsibility

The Government sees Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as the business contribution to our sustainable development goals. Essentially it is about how business takes account of its economic, social and environmental impacts in the way it operates – maximising the benefits and minimising the downsides. Specifically, it is the voluntary actions that business can take, over and above compliance with minimum legal requirements, to address both its own competitive interests and the interests of wider society (www.csr.gov.uk).

Business in the Community has a unique movement of companies committed to improving their positive impact on society.

The Prince's Seeing is Believing Programme provides inspiring leadership by inviting senior business leaders to see for themselves how business can play a role in tackling Britain's most pressing social issues, in some of its most deprived inner city and rural areas. Each event involves visits to community projects, schools or prisons, hosted by a senior business leader on behalf of HRH The Prince of Wales.

Community involvement provides many opportunities to engage employees and to develop a wide range of skills and competences including communication, project management, leadership and team working (www.bitc.org.uk).

Examples of CSR in practice include:

- ProHelp is a national network of 1,000 professional firms committed to providing free professional advice and support to local community groups and voluntary organisations. Bristol ProHelp is one of 33 groups spread throughout England, Wales and Northern Ireland and in October 2006 there were 24 members, including accountants, solicitors, surveyors, architects, printers, PR and IT consultants.
- UBHT Annual Report 2005-06: As a large organisation in the centre of Bristol, UBHT is uniquely placed to have an important positive effect on our neighbours and our city. As such decided to develop a corporate social responsibility programme of work under the banner of UBHT in the community and projects include:
 - Tackling domestic abuse: UBHT is a member of the Bristol Domestic Abuse Forum, working closely with Bristol Social Services and Avon and Somerset Constabulary. The forum has developed a common approach to dealing with domestic abuse and staff have developed a clinical policy and managers' guidance for dealing with this acutely sensitive issue.
 - Recognising tomorrow's talent today: Staff recognise the importance of encouraging and nurturing the next generation's talents and have held a series of events for students and science teachers from local schools and colleges to promote a variety of health professions. Curriculum-linked work experience at Bristol General Hospital for health and social care students in year 11 at Brislington Enterprise College helped to improve one group of students' grades from 0% A* - C in 2004 to 60% A* - C in 2005. All seven students who came to the Hospital achieved two grades above that which they were predicted.

5. Current Engagement by Volunteers

This section addresses the engagement of residents in volunteering activities across the four blocks of the LAA. This includes volunteers involved in both service delivery and on management committees.

A survey was conducted during November 2006 among all the Charity and Not-for Profit organisations registered with Volunteering Bristol, Voscur and The Care Forum. In total more than 500 organisations were invited to take part in the survey. 104 organisations responded, representing a response rate of about one in five.

5.1 Quantitative Data

Respondents were asked to indicate which LAA Block the services they provided supported. 54% of organisations were involved in work supporting Children and Young people; 64% with Health and Well-being and Older People; 45% with Stronger, Safer Communities and 16% with Economic Development and Enterprise. Some 89% of all respondents are involved in supporting at least one of the LAA Blocks.

The 104 respondents between them deployed 13,214 volunteers during the past year (ended 30 September). 57% were deployed in direct service provision by the organisations, 35% in general support and 8% in management and governance tasks.

Many organisations do not keep records that can measure the average length of time volunteers stay with them, and whilst many organisations stated that many of their volunteers remain for years at a time, other organisations only need volunteers for short periods or for specific events.

Nonetheless, 68% of respondents reported that most of their volunteers were deployed for more than 14 days in a year, (The average that is required for a volunteer to be counted in the Quality of Life Survey by BCC is two hours per week/14 days per year). 75% of volunteers are recorded as volunteering most weeks, and 25% every month. 18% undertake volunteering a few times a year and 8% less frequently than that.

Although 61% of respondents record age, gender and ethnicity, further follow-up would be required to gather and analyse data to show what proportion of volunteers are from BME communities. However, just 6% of respondents said that they have volunteers who are refugees although 45% said they would consider recruiting volunteers from among refugees. Some organisations made specific comment about the difficulty in reaching and recruiting BME volunteers, while many were unable to consider people with poor command of English.

The full table of questions and results are in Annex 3.

5.2 Qualitative Research

This part of the Survey sought respondents' views on the advantages their organisations gain by having volunteers involved; what difficulties they experience in recruiting volunteers and in retaining them.

5.3 Advantages of having Volunteers

All respondents highlighted the advantages of having volunteer assistance in their organisations. The vast majority stated that they could not operate without them. Some organisations exist only because they have volunteers, or comprise totally of volunteers. Such dependence on voluntary help is evident in the delivery of key services to the community. Organisations including Bristol Citizens Advice Bureau, Age Concern Bristol, Bristol Crisis Service for Women, Bristol Child Contact Centre, and Lawrence Weston Youth. Life Skills and the Princess Royal Trust for Carers all cited their dependence on volunteers.

Many organisations depend on volunteers to assist with specific tasks already being undertaken by paid staff, enhancing the capacity the organisation has to deliver its service. By utilising the skills and experience that volunteers bring to the organisations they are able to augment and develop service delivery to more service users or wider communities.

However, a small number of organisations stated their main advantage of having volunteers was because they were cheaper or involved no expense compared to paid staff. This attitude could cause tension between paid staff and volunteers within an organisation, as well as reinforcing some people's opinion that using voluntary help is a substitute for paid employees, or for obtaining a service on the cheap.

5.4 Difficulties Recruiting and Retaining Volunteers

Many organisations report that one of the main barriers to both recruiting and retaining volunteers is the necessity and then length of time it takes to obtain CRB checks and keeping the potential volunteer interested during the several months this can take. That delay, added to the time needed to induct and train new volunteers adds considerably to the resources and costs incurred by the charities. The legal issues and the intrusiveness of the CRB checks also deter many enquiries.

Some organisations in the hospice and healthcare sector reported that finding suitably skilled or experienced volunteers, as well as fulfilling their expectations is difficult. Some organisations in this sector also reported their concern to ensure that the assistance and tasks undertaken by volunteers did not in any way replace or substitute the work carried out by the professional staff, but as one hospice reported, "It is humbling to staff (giving us greater incentive to work harder ourselves) when our volunteers come in week after week, rain or shine."

Recruiting volunteers from traditionally marginalised groups and BME communities was reported as a particular difficulty by several organisations representing both mainstream as well as more specialist service providers. Several respondents also highlighted the shortage of volunteers coming forward to be Management Committee members.

Some respondents recognised that some of the problems in retaining volunteers results from their own inability to organise tasks, to properly induct and train their new volunteers, or because they could not meet the volunteers' expectations. One organisation, a national charity, commented that, "almost 90% of volunteers who contact us initially end up not volunteering. We don't always have time to recruit effectively".

Several organisations felt that their inability to offer expenses and other volunteer recognition, or suitable training led to loss of motivation by the volunteer. However, some organisations saw turnover of volunteers as a positive achievement as their volunteers went on to obtain paid work, or retake their place in their communities: as it is part of those organisations' goals.

5.5 Hidden Volunteers

Unseen or informal volunteering covers activities in local communities, including within extended families. Caring for a relative, friend or neighbour on a regular basis, but without doing so through a recognised caring organisation or support group is just as much volunteering as a formally recognised activity. However the carer does not necessarily recognise what they are doing to be volunteering, simply a social or moral duty.

Informal volunteering can be found in other areas: neighbourly acts such as dog walking for an elderly person living in the same street, taking them to the health centre or lunch club. The time expended by the volunteer cannot be measured nor recorded, but nonetheless contributes equally as much to the general wellbeing and cohesion of a community.

Many communities, particularly from new or ethnic communities have a culturally different understanding of volunteering which often results in the considerable contribution they make, to their immediate communities through their "neighbourliness" being unrecognised as volunteering by conventional British definitions.

Key Findings:

- ❑ A small number of organisations stated their main advantage of having volunteers was because they were cheaper or involved no expense compared to paid staff, which could cause conflict between paid and unpaid staff
- ❑ Some organisations exist only because they have volunteers, or comprise totally of volunteers, increasing their vulnerability to closure
- ❑ Recruiting volunteers from traditionally marginalised groups and BME communities was reported as a particular difficult
- ❑ A large amount of volunteering is unaccounted for due to unseen or informal volunteering within extended families and neighbourly acts. New and ethnic communities have a culturally different understanding of volunteering so their contributions also go unrecognised.

The list of key findings is not exhaustive, however, it does indicate a range of issues relating to engagement by volunteers.

6. Levels of Public Sector Investment in the VCSES

The purpose of this section is to get an indication of the pattern of public sector investment in the VCSES to deliver services which contribute to the Community Strategy and more specifically to the delivery of outcomes under the four theme blocks in Bristol's LAA. The mapping of existing investment and potential gaps could help to inform investment strategies in relation to the development and delivery of the LAA.

6.1 Funding Agencies and Departments

Key public sector funding or accountable agencies, together with departments and services within BCC, were contacted to provide data on levels of current funding and number of VCS organisations funded with reference to key priorities in the 5 Aims of the Community Strategy and the LAA Theme Block Outcomes framework. The table below sets out funding bodies contacted and the LAA Block across which VCS organisations are currently funded to provide services.

	Children and Young People	Safer and Stronger Communities	Healthier Communities and Older People	Economic Development and Enterprise
1. BCC Children and Young People's Services	✓			
2. BCC, Chief Exec. Community Development	✓	✓	✓	✓
3. BCC Culture and Leisure Services (Play, Arts and Sports Services)	✓		✓	
4. BCC Chief Exec (Economic Regeneration). Urban2 and S106				✓
5. BCC Neighbourhood and Housing		✓		
6. BCC Chief Exec. Neighbourhood Renewal Funding Programme	✓	✓	✓	✓
7. BCC, Adult Community Care		✓	✓	
8. BCC, Chief Exec, Safer BP	✓	✓		
9. BCC, Children and Young People's Services – CAMHS	✓		✓	
10. Connexions	✓			

	Children and Young People	Safer and Stronger Communities	Healthier Communities and Older People	Economic Development and Enterprise
11. DfES Children's Fund Programme (managed by Barnardos)	✓			
12. Job Centre Plus				✓
13. Learning and Skills Council (LSC)	✓			✓
14. PCTs	✓	✓	✓	
15. Police	✓	✓		
16. Probation Service (awaiting)				

6.2 Social Economy Sector

For the purposes of this report the Social Economy in Bristol Audit (2004-05) has been used as a source for identifying the level of contracts between public sector bodies and social economy enterprises. The Social Economy Sector which, in Bristol, provides goods and services across all 4 blocks of the LAA, derives a percentage of its total income through contracts and SLA's with the public sector including BCC (11.6%), Central Government (9.3%), Health (3%), LSC (3%) and other (2%).

Using the Department of Trade and Industries definition of "actual and emerging Social Enterprises" (ie. trading for more than 25% of their income) the total extrapolated value of income from contracts and SLA's is as follows:

Funder	Estimated value of contracts and SLA's 2004-05
Bristol City Council	£2,230,101
Central Government	£1,787,926
Health	£576,750
Learning and Skills Council	£576,750
Other	£384,500
TOTAL	£5,556,027

6.3 Current Levels of Investment (2006-07)

The **attached appendices** set out in detail the numbers of VCS organisations funded by the funding or accountable bodies listed at paragraph 2 and the total investment for the funding period (2006-07). In the majority of cases these are actual figures sourced from investment schedules, but where investment has been awarded outside of the period April 2005 - March 2006, an estimate has been made for an annual figure to cover that period. **Organisations funded for services that contribute to the outcomes of more than one Block appear more than once.** A Notes column is included in each of the tables to qualify the information where necessary.

6.4 Summary

In summary, current levels of investment by public sector bodies in VCSES organisations are as follows:

Community Strategy Aims	Local Area Agreement Theme Blocks	Current level of Funding (2006-07)
Learning and Achievement	Children and Young People	£6,702,538
High Quality Environment/ Balanced and Sustainable Communities	Safer and Stronger Communities	£4,866,653 (does not include £21.5m to VCS, Charities and Housing Associations under the Supporting People Programme)
Health and Well Being	Healthier Communities and Older People	£8,363,541
Thriving Economy	Economic Development and Enterprise	£3,939,819 (does not include "actual and emerging social enterprises" as this figure is not available for 06-07. For 04-05 the estimated figure was £5,556,000)

The following table gives an indication of the **total investment** by each BCC Department or other accountable body to voluntary and community sector organisations in 2006-07, across all 5 aims of the Community Strategy and the 4 LAA blocks.

Bristol City Council Department/Other Funders	Total VCS Investment in CS aims/LAA Blocks – (2006-07)	Notes
BCC Chief Exec. (Community Development)	£2,092,117.00	
BCC Chief Exec. (Economic Regeneration)	£234,784 (Urban 2 and S106)	
BCC Chief Exec. (Neighbourhood Renewal Funding Programme)	£2,139,953.00	
BCC Chief Exec. (Safer BP)	£923,731.00	(Includes funding from Drugs Strategy Team, Domestic Abuse Co-ordination and Youth Offending Team)
BCC Children and Young People's Services	£2,611,650.29	(Includes Core Services, Early Years & Childcare Service, Ethnic Minority grants and CAMHS)
BCC Culture and Leisure Services (Arts)	£838,960	
BCC Culture and Leisure Services (Play)	£960,203	

Bristol City Council Department/Other Fundors	Total VCS Investment in CS aims/LAA Blocks – (2006-07)	Notes
	£21,500,000	(Supporting People)
BCC Neighbourhood and Housing	£700,000	(Preventing and responding to homelessness)
BCC Adult Community Care	£4,058,240.00	
Connexions	£467,820.00	
DfES Children's Fund Programme (managed by Barnardos)	£531,511.00	
Job Centre Plus	£3,000,000.00	For 8 contracts funded through ESF.
Learning and Skills Council	Not Available	(figure not available for this year for 05-06, £848,627)
PCTs	£1,786,363.74	
Police	£18,000.00	
Probation Service	£70,000	(includes some services in South Gloucestershire). Other funding distributed through Safer BP.
TOTAL	£41,933,333.69	
TOTAL without Supporting People	£20,433,333.69	

8. Strengths, Barriers and Recommendations

8.1 VCSES

<p>Strengths to Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Strong grass route links and takes a bottom up approach to delivering services.❑ Presents good value for money in delivery of services.❑ Good knowledge and expertise but stronger in places.❑ VCS Infrastructure organisations and BCC Community Development have a strong working relationship around LAA and there is potential for City Council and ChangeUp Consortium to build on partnership working around future initiatives.❑ The social enterprise sector is very diverse, innovative and creative and the social benefit brought by these enterprises attracts committed individuals, both volunteers and paid staff and crucially provides a focus for the skills and energies of new communities. These communities are developing social enterprise solutions to tackle the market failure of service provision for their communities.❑ As well as making a significant financial contribution to the economy, social enterprises tackle a wide range of social and environmental issues and operate in all parts of the economy.❑ Representation on networks and partnerships, especially multi-agency/cross sector arrangements, enables an active role in the delivery of the LAA and much wider perspective of the VCSES.
<p>Barriers to Engagement</p> <p>Bristol VCSES Support Services Survey November 2005:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Equalities: 55% of respondents did not have an equalities development plan and 14% were doubtful that their organisations were carrying out the necessary activities to ensure that the equalities groups listed could access their services. 92% expressed an interest in a proposed equalities toolkit and the introduction of this would see a reduction in barriers to engagement❑ Finance: the main barrier in terms of finance is access to funding with 60% of respondents needing funding advice, 59% needing support in implementing sustainability strategies, 56% needing support to develop a strategic approach to securing public funding and 39% wanted advice on bidding for contracts and procurement issues❑ Governance: the greatest difficulty the respondents faced was being able to recruit and retain a skilled and experienced management committee. 56% of respondents needed to be able to co-opt more expert advisers on to their management committee and 51% noted that they needed specified human resources and employment law advice. 49% of respondents indicated a need for more support in recruitment and retention of committee members❑ Volunteering: 57% of respondents indicated a need for additional support in recruiting volunteers with specific skills and 55% need support in recruiting volunteers from minority communities. At least 58% of respondents indicated a desire to work more with volunteers to fulfill organisational objectives❑

Barriers to Engagement continued

- ❑ Staff support: 56% of respondents highlighted the need to address skill shortages among their staff and 45% needed advice on employment and recruitment of paid staff and volunteers. The main barriers to attending training included: cost (36%), lack of time (18%) and lack of staff development programmes (11%)
- ❑ Other major support needs and barriers related to information computer technology.

Other:

- ❑ Could be stronger infrastructure VCS representation in NR working groups, but so many groups and forums that VCS lacks the capacity to be involved in all of them
- ❑ BCC representation and delivery structures convoluted and appear much too complicated and VCS organisations not always sure where decisions are actually made. VCS activity goes on successfully despite existing BCC decision making structures and what's needed is a simpler framework for the city
- ❑ The Social Economy in Bristol Audit 2004-2005 identified a number of barriers to growth within the social enterprise sector including: inadequate premises, lack of new markets and clients and difficulty obtaining contracts
- ❑ Smaller organisations or those with limited resources can't always find the capacity to become directly involved in networks and partnerships.

Key Recommendations

- ❑ More BME representation needed across VCS organisations e.g. management committees and parent governors.
- ❑ Work needs to be done to develop awareness of changing demographic of the City within organisations to improve service delivery to equalities groups.
- ❑ Potential for BCC and VCS to work together around capacity building for new and emerging communities e.g. BCC developing plans to manage population changes within communities e.g. Upper Horfield. Expertise within ChangeUp infrastructure organisations could be offered to support local VCS projects involved in the changes through training opportunities.
- ❑ Room for VCS infrastructure organisation to further develop in terms of accountability to their membership.
- ❑ SEEs to determine opportunities to engage in procurement with statutory bodied and raise the profile of products and services.
- ❑ Identify ways to support SEEs to build an asset base to allow further diversity of income streams and improve opportunities to access loan financing.
- ❑ Look more closely at multi-agency/cross sector networks and partnerships in terms of value added and supporting wider representation from across the VCSES, especially those organisations with limited resources.
- ❑ Strengthen the dissemination of information to member organisations, particularly where infrastructure groups are linking with Senior Officers and elected members of the City Council.

8.2 School Governors

Strengths to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Bristol Governor Development Service offers support and advice to all governors in the city.❑ Wide-ranging training opportunities available (free for all governors if the school makes a one off payment each year).❑ Schools geographically located in almost every community.❑ Dedicated positions on governing bodies for parent and community governors.
Barriers to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Limited links between many schools and the wider communities.❑ It may be unclear to many people what the mechanism/procedure is to become a school governor.❑ Many people are not sure what the role of a school governor is.❑ Parents not always fully informed what a governor is and how you can become one (this varies from school to school).❑ Confusing, differing and poorly publicised expenses (childcare expenses for example).❑ Lack of awareness of equalities issues on many governing bodies (take up of equalities training is low).❑ Lack of support for and available funding to support communities of interest eg ESOL and people with disabilities.
Key Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Clear and easy to read definition of school governor.❑ Simple guide to becoming a school governor distributed to parents and through community organisations.❑ Closer links between schools and other community groups, potentially through the development of neighbourhood management and Community Partnerships.❑ Consistent and well-publicised expenses procedure for governors with expenses paid centrally rather than decided on a school-by-school basis (as it is at present).❑ Booster support for governors of special interest (for example ESOL or people with disabilities).

8.3 Primary Care Trusts

Strengths to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Patients have a front line perspective on the patient pathway.
Barriers to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Not understanding what people's needs are at the time at which you are seeking to engage them eg access and support issues for people with long terms conditions or acute illnesses.❑ Not hearing directly from particular community groups, or seldom heard off groups and inappropriate methods of engaging eg women from some communities not wanting to attend meetings with men.❑ Tension between engaging local people and meeting government targets.❑ Patients and public feeling that their knowledge and expertise is under valued due to a lack of adequate resources to support people's involvement.❑ Harder to access the opinions of adults and younger people.
Key Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ NHS being clear about what patients and the public can actually influence.

8.4 Neighbourhood Renewal

Strengths to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Clearly identified positions for residents with roles, responsibilities within the NR structures/organisation.❑ Support for residents in NR areas in the form of managers and facilitators.❑ Opportunity for direct impact on how money is spent and what services are delivered.❑ Strategic working with other agencies, developing detailed knowledge of services in the area.❑ Direct line to middle management such as the police, parks, waste services, housing etc.❑ Residents are part of decision making beyond NR.❑ Linking up with residents from other areas.
Barriers to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Lack of skills amongst some residents to enable them to participate fully in NR structures.❑ Some residents are unclear what the difference is between NR, New Deal for Communities (Barton Hill) and the council and what different roles they play.❑ Complex processes, long meetings and extensive paperwork can be off-putting for residents who might be interested in engaging in NR.

Barriers to Engagement continued
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ NR funding is nearing an end; some residents are unclear what happens to NR structures after this. ❑ Time commitment is a problem for some residents who might want to be involved with NR structures (a particular issue for residents who work).
Key Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Make it clear to residents what the NR legacy will be and how residents can continue to be involved with ongoing structures. ❑ Ongoing support to build capacity amongst residents to enable them to engage with NR eg the NR Learning Plan.

8.5 Councillors

Strengths to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Democratic election process to elect councillors in each area (ward) of the city. ❑ Contact details easily available for ward councillors online and in most public buildings eg libraries, Council offices and community centres. ❑ Many councillors hold ward surgeries.
Barriers to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Confusing election system and a lack of all out elections. ❑ Confusion amongst residents over who their local councillors are (some people do not recognise the name of their ward with the place they live eg Bedminster ward covers a large part of Ashton Vale). ❑ Some residents are unclear of the responsibilities of ward councillors in terms of what powers they have and what their role is in representing local people.
Key Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Clear statement setting out the responsibilities of ward councillors in terms of engagement with residents sent to each household. ❑ Councillor contact details should be supplemented with a list of the 'sub' neighbourhoods within that ward. Where possible a map should also accompany the councillor contact details. ❑ Continue roll out of LLGs to strengthen the role of the councillor in each area (ward). ❑ Continue roll out of Neighbourhood Management (whether a continuation of pilot schemes or in some form) to each area of the city.

8.6 Volunteers

Strengths to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Provides a community/user perspective.❑ Offers VCSE organisations the ability to utilise the skills and experience of volunteers❑ Volunteers offer peer support, are well-motivated individuals with a diversity of experience.❑ People volunteer because they want to, and they believe in what they do.
Barriers to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ The intrusiveness and timescales involved in obtaining CRB checks and other references deters many volunteers. They also delay the recruitment process during which it is difficult to retain the volunteers' interest and commitment. Consequently many volunteers give up and the organisation incurs the costs of fruitless CRB checks.❑ Organisations' capacity to manage optimum numbers of volunteers.❑ Volunteers' desires and expectations of volunteering roles cannot always be met or accommodated.
Key Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Review and renew advice to all organisations on need for CRB checks. Some organisations may be over cautious.❑ Continue to offer support (including via peer-groups) to organisations, providing examples of best practice for volunteer recruitment and management.❑ Encourage voluntary organisations to provide more detailed information on the roles they seek for volunteers.❑ Develop ways that support voluntary organisations to improve the volunteering experience.❑ Continue and enhance the partnership working between key infrastructure organisations to raise awareness of volunteering among all community groups, but especially among groups of special interest.

8.7 Overall

Strengths to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ VCSES plays a vital role through in delivering a broad range of products and services, acts as an advocate for individuals and groups with specific needs and enables resident engagement in governance structures and through volunteering.
Barriers to Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ Across all sectors residents are unclear about the terminology attached to the LAA, unsure where to obtain some of the information and occasionally confused over the merits of such an exercise.

Key Recommendations

- Local residents need to be further involved in matters of local governance in order to shape the strategic direction of Bristol. This is an important area of research and more work is required in this area.
- In order for local communities to take an active role in LLGs they will need to be provided with the ability to build their capacity to enable them to undertake this enhanced function.
- Any VCSES engagement strategy needs to take into consideration the support needs of organisations putting forward representatives, as identified in the CUC Support Services Survey, relating to equalities, finance, governance volunteering and workforce development. Examples of capacity building areas include:
 - Information sharing and dissemination
 - Accountability structures
 - Roles and responsibilities of management committees
 - One to one support
 - Development of specific skills development programmes
 - Effective use of ICT
 - Volunteer development programmes
 - Providing organisations with sufficient resources (core funding) to identify needs, develop plans and implement solutions.
- To consider how to take forward the need to identify and address the key barriers to engagement by equalities communities. Refugees and asylum seekers are not mentioned as a separate group and this should be considered in that process.

Reports Referenced:

1. The Social Economy in Bristol Audit 2004-2005
2. Neighbourhood Renewal Partnership Review March 2005
3. Neighbourhood Renewal Partnership Evaluation, Hartcliffe & Withywood Community Partnership Feedback (draft) July 2005
4. No Excuses. Embrace partnership now – Third Sector Commissioning Task Force July 2006
5. Bristol VCSE Infrastructure Strategy 2006, Bristol ChangeUp Consortium
6. Bristol VCSES Support Services Survey, November 2005 (Tom Bell)
7. “Excuse me, I want to say something”, Evaluation Report, Neighbourhood Renewal Learning Plan 2006-2006

Voluntary and Community Sector Networks facilitated and supported by Black Development Agency, The Care Forum and Voscur in Bristol

Org.	Network (and brief summary of purpose)	Approx. no. of groups involved	Type of groups involved	Network funded by	Other comments
Black Development Agency (BDA)	Full Consortium of Black Groups	83	Groups that are BME led and/or provide services in areas with high BME populations or target BME clients	SSCF	
BDA	Children and young people's theme group	22	Youth groups and groups providing services for children	SSCF	
BDA	Health theme group	34	Health and social care groups	SSCF	
BDA	Built Environment	19	Housing services	SSCF	
BDA	Faith	8	BME faith groups	SSCF	
BDA	Training and Life Long Learning	33	Training providers	SSCF	
BDA	Crime and Community Safety	33	Groups that provide services to ex offenders and families and work with the police on crime reduction and hate crimes	SSCF	

Voluntary and Community Sector Networks facilitated and supported by Black Development Agency, The Care Forum and Voscur in Bristol

Org.	Network (and brief summary of purpose)	Approx. no. of groups involved	Type of groups involved	Network funded by	Other comments
The Care Forum	Health and Social Care Network	282	Voluntary and Community Sector Organisations (VCSOs) with an interest in health and care issues	BCC Adult Community Care Dept PCT	
The Care Forum	Older People's Network	247	VCSOs with an interest in older people's issues		
The Care Forum	Mental Health Network	128	VCSOs with an interest in mental health issues	PCT	
The Care Forum	Children and Young People's Network	399	VCSOs with an interest in and young people's issues with a focus on health and social care	PCT	
Voscur	Residents' Forum Supports residents involved in regen. structures.	8	Community Partnerships	Neighbourhood Renewal	Closed membership, but may review terms or reference and expand
Voscur	Equalities Network Promotes and raises awareness of equalities issues in the work of the BP and links to the Equalities Action Group	175	Organisations and agencies who support equalities communities	Big Lottery, BP, BCC, Voscur.	

Voluntary and Community Sector Networks facilitated and supported by Black Development Agency, The Care Forum and Voscur in Bristol

Org.	Network (and brief summary of purpose)	Approx. no. of groups involved	Type of groups involved	Network funded by	Other comments
Voscur	BP reps forum Supports VCS reps involved with the BP and its sub-structure.	10 (potential of double that)	VCSE organisations who are part of the BP or its associated groups.	SSCF	This is a support network growing out of need. It doesn't yet have a terms of reference
Voscur	Assembly Support (eg information and consultation) for Voscur members.	500	Voscur full members (Bristol VCSE groups)	BCC, Voscur	
Voscur	Children & Young Peoples Organisations network Support and information, etc. for VCS groups working with C&YP	300	Mainly VCS (some statutory) groups working with C&YP	Connexions and BCC C& YP Services	
Voscur	Central Area Network Support for groups working Central Bristol	266	Voscur members who have stated that they wish to be part of a Central Bristol network	Big Lottery, BCC	
Voscur	East Bristol Network Support for groups working East Bristol	84	Voscur members who have stated that they wish to be part of an East Bristol network	BCC SSCF	

Voluntary and Community Sector Networks facilitated and supported by Black Development Agency, The Care Forum and Voscur in Bristol

Org.	Network (and brief summary of purpose)	Approx. no. of groups involved	Type of groups involved	Network funded by	Other comments
Voscur	North Bristol Network Support for groups working North Bristol	84	Voscur members who have stated that they wish to be part of a North Bristol network	BCC SSCF	
Voscur	South Bristol Network Support for groups working South Bristol	133	Voscur members who have stated that they wish to be part of a South Bristol network	BCC SSCF	
Voscur	Learning Network Information exchange and support for VCSE Sector Learning Providers	104	VCSE groups who deliver learning and training	BCC C3	Evolving into an online forum
Voscur	Crime and drugs E-network Opportunity to communicate with Voscur rep to partnership	9	Voscur members interested in that theme	SSCF	New and developing
Voscur	Children & Young People E-network Opportunity to communicate with Voscur rep to partnership	15	Voscur members interested in that theme	SSCF	New and developing

Voluntary and Community Sector Networks facilitated and supported by Black Development Agency, The Care Forum and Voscur in Bristol

Org.	Network (and brief summary of purpose)	Approx. no. of groups involved	Type of groups involved	Network funded by	Other comments
Voscur	Environment E- network Opportunity to communicate with Voscur rep to partnership	12	Voscur members interested in that theme	SSCF	New and developing
Voscur	Health and Older People E-network Opportunity to communicate with Voscur rep to partnership	15	Voscur members interested in that theme	SSCF	New and developing
Voscur	Equalities Communities E-network Opportunity to communicate with Voscur rep to partnership	8	Voscur members interested in that theme	SSCF	New and developing
Voscur	South Bristol E- network Opportunity to communicate with Voscur rep to partnership	8	Voscur members interested in that theme	SSCF	New and developing
Voscur	Economic Development and Enterprise E- network Opportunity to communicate with Voscur rep to partnership	5	Voscur members interested in that theme	SSCF	New and developing

Voluntary and Community Sector Networks facilitated and supported by Black Development Agency, The Care Forum and Voscur in Bristol

Org.	Network (and brief summary of purpose)	Approx. no. of groups involved	Type of groups involved	Network funded by	Other comments
Voscur	Housing E-network Opportunity to communicate with Voscur rep to partnership	8	Voscur members interested in that theme	SSCF	New and developing
Voscur	Arts and Culture E-network Opportunity to communicate with Voscur rep to partnership	5	Voscur members interested in that theme	SSCF	New and developing
Voscur	Neighbourhood Management Pilots E-network Opportunity to communicate with Voscur rep to partnership	10	Voscur members interested in that theme	SSCF	New and developing
Voscur	Regeneration funds schemes (eg Neigh. Renewal) E- network Opportunity to communicate with Voscur rep to partnership	11	Voscur members interested in that theme	SSCF	New and developing

Networks and Partnerships Attended by Representatives from ChangeUp Consortium and VCSES Representatives in Bristol

Networks / Partnerships Attended	The Care Forum	BDA	Voscur	Social Enterprise Works (formerly BACEN)	Volunteering Bristol
Adult Protection Committee	Officer + Elected rep				
Asylum Seekers & Refugees Education Commissioning Advisory Group	Officer				
BME Regional Infrastructure Group		Officer			
BBCS West of England Consortium		Officer			
BNSSG Children's Clinical Network	Officer				
BRIGHT Consortium		Officer			
Bristol Child Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) Stakeholder Group	Elected rep				
Bristol Children and Young People's Partnership Executive Board	Officer	Officer	Officer		
Bristol Children's Hospital Disabled Children's Group	Elected rep				
Bristol Children's Fund Board		Officer			
Bristol Community Learning Board		Officer	Officer		

Networks and Partnerships Attended by Representatives from ChangeUp Consortium and VCSES Representatives in Bristol

Networks / Partnerships Attended	The Care Forum	BDA	Voscur	Social Enterprise Works (formerly BACEN)	Volunteering Bristol
Bristol Compact Finance Sub-Group	Officer	Officer	Officer		
Bristol Compact Steering Group	Officer	Officer	Officer		
Bristol Cultural Development Partnership			Elected member rep		
Bristol Health Services Plan Strategic Communications and Public Involvement Group	Officer				
Bristol Health Services Plan Public Involvement Forum	Officer				
Bristol Local Area Agreement Education Targets Planning Group	Officer		Officer		
Bristol Local Area Agreement Officers Group	Officer	Officer	Officer		
Bristol Local Area Agreement Steering Group	Officer	Officer	Officer		
Bristol NHS Lift Board	Officer				
BP Board	Officer	Officer	Elected member rep		

Networks and Partnerships Attended by Representatives from ChangeUp Consortium and VCSES Representatives in Bristol

Networks / Partnerships Attended	The Care Forum	BDA	Voscur	Social Enterprise Works (formerly BACEN)	Volunteering Bristol
BP Management Group	Officer	Officer	Officer		
BP Against Racial Harassment		Officer			
BP Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership	Elected rep	Nominated Rep	2 x Elected Rep		
BP Economy Delivery Group		Nominated rep	Elected member rep		
BP Environment Delivery Group		Nominated rep	Elected member rep		
BP Equalities Action Group		Officer + nominated rep	Officer + Elected member rep		
BP Health Delivery Group	Officer	Nominated rep	Elected member rep		

Networks and Partnerships Attended by Representatives from ChangeUp Consortium and VCSES Representatives in Bristol

Networks / Partnerships Attended	The Care Forum	BDA	Voscur	Social Enterprise Works (formerly BACEN)	Volunteering Bristol
BP Housing Strategy Executive Group			Elected member rep		
BP Regeneration Delivery Group		Officer + Nominated Rep	Officer + Elected member rep		
BP Safer BP		Nominated Rep	Elected member rep		
BP Sustainable Development Advisory Group			Looking to elect member rep		
Bristol Primary Care Trust Maternity Review	Officer				
Bristol Racial Equality Health Partnership		Nominated Rep			
Bristol Refugee Inter Agency Forum		Officer			
Bristol Young Parents Partnership	Officer				
Bristol Young People's Drug Training Sub Group	Elected rep				
Children and Young People's Partnership Workstream Group Early Intervention	Interim rep				

Networks and Partnerships Attended by Representatives from ChangeUp Consortium and VCSES Representatives in Bristol

Networks / Partnerships Attended	The Care Forum	BDA	Voscur	Social Enterprise Works (formerly BACEN)	Volunteering Bristol
Children and Young People's Partnership Workstream Group 14-19 Year Olds	Interim rep				
Children and Young People's Partnership Workstream Group Attainment	Interim rep				
Children Looked After Strategy Group	Elected rep				
C21 Partnership			Elected member rep		

Networks and Partnerships Attended by Representatives from ChangeUp Consortium and VCSES Representatives in Bristol

Networks / Partnerships Attended	The Care Forum	BDA	Voscur	Social Enterprise Works (formerly BACEN)	Volunteering Bristol
Children with Special Needs Implementation Group	Elected rep				
Community at Heart		Officer			
Connexions Development Group		Officer	Officer Elected rep		
Connexions VCS sub-regional Advisory Group		Officer	Officer Elected rep		
Easton and Lawrence Hill NR Group		Officer			
Enhance Workforce Development Partnership group		Officer	Officer		
EQUAL (C3) Development Partnership		Officer	Officer	Officer	
Elderly Mentally Infirm Board	Elected rep				
Evercare Steering Group	Elected rep				
Exchange Project Southmead	Officer				
Extending The Voice			Officer		
Hartcliffe and Withywood Community Partnership		Officer			
Hate Crime Strategy group			Officer		

Networks and Partnerships Attended by Representatives from ChangeUp Consortium and VCSES Representatives in Bristol

Networks / Partnerships Attended	The Care Forum	BDA	Voscur	Social Enterprise Works (formerly BACEN)	Volunteering Bristol
Health and Social Care Joint Commissioning Board Stakeholder Forum	Officer + Elected rep				
IAG LSC Strategic Board		Officer			
Independent Providers Forum	Elected rep				
Informal Education Group – Youth Service			Officer		
Joint Declaration of Race Equality		Officer			
Mental Health Board	Elected rep				
Mental Health Local Implementation Team	Elected rep				
Neighbourhood Renewal Learning Plan Steering Group		Officer	Officer		
Older People Local implementation Team	Elected rep				
Parents and Carers as Partners Strategy Group	Interim rep				
Parks and Green Spaces			2 x Nominated reps		
Physical and sensory impairment board	Elected rep				

Networks and Partnerships Attended by Representatives from ChangeUp Consortium and VCSES Representatives in Bristol

Networks / Partnerships Attended	The Care Forum	BDA	Voscur	Social Enterprise Works (formerly BACEN)	Volunteering Bristol
Positive Activities for Young people			Officer		
Power of Partnership		Officer	Officer		
Public Health Forum Planning Group	Officer				
Public involvement and PALS steering Groups for PCT's	Officer				
St Pauls Unlimited			Officer		
Service Planning Advisory Group for Disabled Children (SPAG)	Elected rep				
South West Forum			Officer		
South West Regional Workforce Development Advisory Group			Officer		
Substance Misuse Working Group	Officer				
Tackling Racism Outcome Group C@H		Officer	Officer		
Teenage Pregnancy Partnership	Officer				
UBHT Consumer Advisory Group	Officer				

Networks and Partnerships Attended by Representatives from ChangeUp Consortium and VCSES Representatives in Bristol

Networks / Partnerships Attended	The Care Forum	BDA	Voscur	Social Enterprise Works (formerly BACEN)	Volunteering Bristol
UBHT Involving People Committee	Officer				
W of E BME Learning Consortium		Officer			
W of E Learning Consortium		Officer	Officer		
W of E Strategic Partnership	Officer (on behalf of the ChangeUp Consortium)				

Volunteering Bristol Survey Data Tables – November 2006

Total Respondents –104				
Question		Total answers given	Percentage of all respondents	
	Total respondents to Q5	92	88%	
5:1	Children and Young People	56	54	
5:2	Health and well-being and Older People	67	64%	
5:3	Stronger Safer Communities	47	45%	
5:4	Economic development and enterprise	17	16%	
6	How many volunteers deployed in direct service delivery in last 12 months? (31/10/05 – 30/09/06)	7537	83%	57% of total deployed
7	How many volunteers deployed during the last 12 months involved in the management of organisation? (Management Committee/Governance roles)	1070	63%	8% of total deployed
8	How many volunteers involved in your organisation in the last 12 months? (Apart from those counted in Q6 and Q7)	4607	56%	35% of total deployment
9	How many of your volunteers were recruited through introductions from Volunteering Bristol?		46%	Data for Vol. Bristol reporting only
10	How many volunteers can your organisation manage at a time?	9166	86%	Analysis by VB for internal use
11	How many volunteers are you seeking at present?	628	69%	

Volunteering Bristol Survey Data Tables – November 2006

Total Respondents –104				
Question		Total answers given	Percentage of all respondents	
12	What is the average length of time your volunteers remain with you? In weeks	8165	89%	Average for all respondents 1.6 weeks – For use by Vol.Bristol only
13	Generally, do most of your volunteers attend: <div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;"> Most weeks Every month A few times a year Once or twice a year </div>	<div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;"> 79 26 19 8 </div>	<div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;"> 76% 25% 18% 8% </div>	
14	Do most of your volunteers attend for more than the equivalent of 14 full days in a year?	71	68%	
15	Do you record the age, gender and ethnicity of your volunteers?	64	62%	
16	If you do record such information, would you be prepared to share such information by completing a separate response form we would send to you later?	44	42%	
17	Do you have any volunteers who have Refugee status?	6	6%	

Volunteering Bristol Survey Data Tables – November 2006

Total Respondents –104				
Question		Total answers given	Percentage of all respondents	
18	There are people in Bristol with refugee status who are seeking volunteering opportunities but whose English language skills are limited. Would you be interested/able to accept such applicants as volunteers? (subject to your normal recruitment policies and criteria)	46%	44%	

Views from Respondents:

“All our activities are by volunteers. We are a totally voluntary organisation, so most importantly we exist to provide about 1000 counselling/therapy sessions a year to young people. This structure provides us with the independence to respond to need only directed by professional judgement and to provide a flexible response to presenting clients.”

A counselling service to young people

“Volunteers enable us to deliver our core advice services.”

An advice service

“Volunteers are vital to running the helpline, management group and helping with admin. We could not provide our services as a charity without their support in so many ways.”

A women’s help service

“No expense, variety of experience”

A community association

“Saves us money - we have sometimes been lucky enough to have a volunteer at the right time instead of having to pay for a temp.”

A medical-condition help group

“Financial savings for the organisation.”

A counselling organisation