

## Voluntary Sector Grant Aid Strategy 2011 - 2015

### Feedback from the Consultation Events: Morning and Afternoon Sessions Monday 28<sup>th</sup> February 2011

#### Attendees:

Andy Findlay	50+ Forum
Moira Findlay	50+ Forum
Belinda Hadfield	Alternatives Activity Centre
Dave Isom	Association for Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus
Richard Quigley	Barnardo's
Ferid Kevrik	Bosnia-Herzegovina Community Adult Social Association
Richard Massey	Business in the Community
Hilary Gibbins	CamTAD
Mary Bayntum	CamTAD
Janet Tristram	St James Centre
Mick Aspinall	Children First
Lynn Patton	Communication Unlimited
John Emery	Communication Unlimited
Margaret Mowles	Community Accountancy Service
Mark Newey	Community Accountancy Service
Matthew Allbones	Community Action Derby
Craig Stubbs	Crossroads Care East Midlands
Raymond Amponsa	Derby African Association
Susan Chan	Derby Chinese Centre
Adrian McNaney	Derby City Council
Andrew French	Derby City Council
Andrew Mellors	Derby City Council
Christine Bell	Derby City Council
Dean Davis	Derby City Council
Ian Chenery	Derby City Council
Julia Jennings	Derby City Council
Kim Harper	Derby City Council
Liz Beswick	Derby City Council
Lynn Daykin	Derby City Council
Marilyn Hambly	Derby City Council

Mike Brown	Derby City Council
Nav Rai	Derby City Council
Sarah Swindell	Derby City Council
Sonia Rafferty	Derby City Council
Vivene McCalla	Derby City Council
Phil Bacon	Derby City Council
Perveez Sadiq	Derby City Council
David Musk	Derby Depression Club
Geoff Wright	Derby Jazz
Kirit Mistry	Derby Racial Equality Council
W Gabbidon	Derby West Indian Credit Union
Aish Palmer	Derbyshire Advocacy Service
Pete Dempsey	Derbyshire Advocacy Service
Deborah Gough	Derbyshire Carers
Helen Robinson	Derbyshire Carers
Angela Kerry	Derbyshire MIND
Wendy Beer	Derbyshire MIND
Sarah Hancock	Derwent Social Club
Janet Holland	Derwent Stepping Stones
Amo Raju	Disability Direct
George Mighty	Derby West Indian Community Association
Nezrine Hudson	Derby West Indian Community Association
Jaz Greer	Enterprise Sinfon
Catherine Cleary	First Steps
Jayne Pearce	Furniture Project
Tony Michael	Hadhari
Cherry Henry	Hadhari Nari
Ruth Richards	Hadhari Nari
Sarah Stuart	Headway
Carol Bloor	Home Start
Sarah Paine	Inspirative Arts
Brian Harris	Live at Home Schemes
David Richardson	Live at Home Schemes
Eirlys Smith	Live at Home Schemes
Yvonne Mackenzie	Live at Home Schemes

Ian Cotter	Lonsdale Swimming Pool
Dawn Longden Whiting	Making Space
Neil Watson	Mental Health Action Group
Niki Rhodes	Mental Health Action Group
Elaine Jackson	Mental Health Carers Forum
Joyce Johnson	Mental Health Carers Forum
Margaret Woodbridge	NACRO – Osmaston Family Project
Peter Deacon	Oaklands
Laura Connolly	Open Centre
Wanda Puczynska	Opieka
Olivia Dean	Padley Group
Pat Zadora	Padley Group
Maureen Burgoyne	Play and Recycling Centre
Keith Jeffery	QUAD
Bev Miller	Relate
Jangir Khan	Sahahra
Fiona Francis	Sight Support Derbyshire
Harminster Banwait	Sinfin & Stenson Fields Asian Over 60's
Sarah Clarke	Sporting Futures
Stuart Felce	Sporting Futures
Magdalena Kupczak	Szkola Polska
Travis Peter	Transcend
Irka Wolociuha	Ukrainian Day Centre
Adrian Dewhurst	Umbrella
Daniel Haslam	Voice UK
Farah Naz Akhtar	Women's Centre
Ann Theobald	Women's Work
Yasmin Nazir	Womens Centre
Betty Morrison	WRVS Darby & Joan

### Agenda for the Consultation Events

The 109 attendees on the day included representatives of 59 local groups/organisations.

The attendees received a presentation that summarised the Grant Aid Strategy and the progress of the consultation to date. This was followed by a question and answer session before attendees split into discussion groups. The discussion groups were arranged so that group members shared similar interests, for example mental health services, arts and culture.

Earlier responses from the online survey were on display at the meeting. Attendees were invited to consider if they wished to comment on any of these responses.

The group sessions then discussed the three questions, as set out below, providing comments on the grant aid strategy process and timescales, the grant aid strategy outcomes and the services that could deliver those outcomes and any gaps in existing service provision.

The groups were also asked to highlight any equality and diversity issues that may need to be considered in the Equality Impact Assessment.

### Summary of feedback – responses made by 3 or more organisations.

#### **Question 1 – Grant Aid Strategy Process and Timescales. What do you think will be the main concerns of local voluntary and community sector organisations?**

- a) It's good that we have a lot of outcomes to choose from, however, smaller groups will **not** have the capacity / skill to write bids. Need to support to those groups e.g. from Community Action Derby for instance.
- b) No mention of a small grants programme – we want that!
- c) Organisations are concerned about losing funding.
- d) How 'value for money' is measured and calculated, especially for new services/ideas/projects. Who are you benchmarking against on value for money
- e) Weighting
- f) How do new groups/projects 'compete' with existing recipients of grants?
- g) Timescales are very tight – the Council should put the form out now to allow people/groups to prepare. Timescales not compact compliant
- h) 35% cut in funding – disproportionate
- i) Worried about how groups will survive if their funding is cut
- j) Local providers for local people
- k) Conflicts of interests – Councillors
- l) Higher demand on Voluntary And Community Sector due to Public Sector cuts – FACS. More people will be assessed and referred back to the Voluntary And Community Sector as ineligible, but Voluntary And Community Sector won't be able to support.
- m) Council needs to be more specific about what it wants
- n) Lack of continuity in service
- o) Transparency – need to know why organisations get funded or not
- p) Concerns about very specific conditions within Mental Health spectrum being

lost/over looked.

- q) Children's Services - Too much bureaucracy during application process e.g. approved provider list – too long and a mismanaged process. However, organisations on list – will it be necessary to resubmit same information?
- r) Will there be an appeals process?
- s) Level playing field in applications need more clarity about what want

**Question 2 – Outcomes in the Strategy. Choose the outcomes in the strategy that you would like to focus on. What do you think the services that support these outcomes should look like? How could these outcomes be delivered?**

- a) Why are community centres a priority outcome?
- b) Outcomes are too narrow
- c) Continuity – maintaining a service or input can ensure that a situation doesn't escalate
- d) Service needs to be person centred, choice and control over what they are doing.
- e) The VCS often fill Council gaps!
- f) Needs are increasing
- g) If FACS recommendations go through, the need for preventative services will increase
- h) High percentages of people are not in receipt of ASS. People don't want to access ASS
- i) Requests for befriending is decreasing. People want to get out of the house
- j) Derby City Council to facilitate bring organisations together / joint Working
- k) Transport

**Question 3 – Gaps in services. Are there any gaps in current services that the Council should be addressing?**

- a) Services for BME communities
- b) Transport is an issue which should be addressed. The current provision is expensive
- c) We do not know what gaps will be created by the cuts
- d) More groups, or work, to support young people through transition and into older groups
- e) Sports – specific sport group – young people?
- f) Music – specific music group – young people?
- g) dementia and lonely/isolated
- h) Activities out of hours
- i) Hydrotherapy services
- j) The Voluntary And Community Sector will have to pick up statutory services that may be cut

## All Feedback from the Group Sessions

### Question 1 – Grant Aid Strategy Process and Timescales. What do you think will be the main concerns of local Voluntary and Community Sector organisations?

- Local services and local organisations have proved they can meet outcomes. Will we use the track record of existing organisations?
- Want transparent assessment criteria up front.
- Online questionnaire concentrates on what services need to be provided to give the outcomes.
- It's good that we have a lot of outcomes to choose from, however, smaller groups will **not** have the capacity / skill to write bids. Need to support to those groups e.g. from Community Action Derby for instance.
- No mention of a small grants programme – we want that!
- Timescale is very short especially for small groups.
- Value for Money – Please use a broad spectrum of criteria frequency, quality, user need etc.
- Equality Impact assessment issues?
- Organisations are concerned about losing funding.
- Would be helpful for groups to have a 'flow chart' to clarify funding streams, text can become overwhelming – more visual aids.
- How 'value for money' is measured and calculated, especially for new services/ideas/projects.
- Opportunity for applicants to show long-term savings versus shorter term costs.
- How do new groups/projects 'compete' with existing recipients of grants?
- Language used in consultation questionnaire – very different for volunteers, service users and for those who's second language is English.
- Timing – especially volunteer run and managed groups may not be able to take part.
- Small groups may not have capacity/time to fill it in (survey) especially if volunteer run and provide generic services across several areas.
- Strategy must address localism bill issues.
- Strategy doesn't mention homelessness – under outcome 1?
- Supporting individuals and their needs can be more costly than 'grouping' people together. So if we are being measured against other organisations, groups could appear costly, will there be recognition of 'quality' and prevention of hospital bed stays.
- A culture change is needed by funders to recognise and support genuine preventative support/services.
- Concerned about diversity of services/projects/applications.
- The month's window for applications includes 4 Bank Holidays.
- Timescales are very tight – the Council should put the form out now to allow people/groups to prepare.
- Further info is needed about the form, process, timescales and deadlines.
- Timeframe post successful applications will be very difficult, for example, where TUPE applies.
- Will funds be ring fenced for specific service areas?

- Will the fund pot be split up for Small grants etc
- Need recognition of infrastructure organisations.
- Concerns about consultation process – responsibility seemed to be on Voluntary Sector organisations to consult. Service receivers say ‘it is your strategy you should have taken some responsibility to consult with the users/public.
- Voluntary Sector grant cut is about double that of overall cut in Council budget.
- How can we be fair with new applicants versus existing providers with proven track record?
- Service users could lose their current provider if new provider is brought in
- More limited resources could prejudice services users
- Some organisations don’t work well according to unit cost and not all work to outcomes
- Need to evidence service user benefit and it’s difficult for service users to sometimes express benefits
- Can find unproven track record simply because not asked to provide that type of information.
- Timescale and amount of cut (£1m cut (30%) 8% of groups will go under before cuts) too much in 1 year.
- Council should be more specific about what they want
- Who are you benchmarking against on value for money
- What is the weighting on various aspects of value for money
- Six monthly monitoring – numbers start/end (death can deplete numbers). If consultation required, it must be specifically requested.
- New applicant could look stronger on paper but could be failing in meeting outputs as against someone with a proven track record
- Delays in clawing back money/ending provider
- New providers would need more support/monitoring
- Over subscription for smaller pot of money
- 35% cut in funding – disproportionate
- Worried about how groups will survive if their funding is cut
- Outcomes – not evidenced. Where did they come from
- Assessment of applications – weighting system? How are outcomes weighted
- Need to map the city and map services
- Local providers for local people
- Councillors who have links with some organisations may be biased.
- Conflicts of interests
- Smaller groups may struggle with the capacity to write bids.
- Timescales not compact compliant – 6 weeks needed
- Decisions have already been made!! This isn’t consultation
- Concerned about ‘who’ will be on panels. Voluntary and Community Sector needs to be involved appropriately
- Voluntary and Community Sector reps who’ve sat on DCP Board don’t talk about the Voluntary and Community Sector – they look at their own organisation.
- Process – compact forum to look at Cabinet report
- Query – BME and small group’s representation on compact forum?
- Fairness, transparency and no conflict of interest!!!

- Why can't the Council spend some of their reserves??
- £90m on the Council House??
- Government want to cut public sector and don't see the impact this has on Voluntary and Community Sector
- What is the breakdown of the Councils reserves? No transparency
- Council constantly says it supports the sector – how?
- £1.87m – clarity required as to whether this is for just grants or for both grants and contracts
- More people may/will need a service if the changes to FACS are approved
- The Voluntary and Community Sector will have to pick up statutory services that may be cut
- Voluntary organisations don't have the same 'resources' as statutory authorities
- Staffing / travelling – transport
- Timescales – too short to be able to put an accurate/valid application in.
- What is the application form going to look like?
- Will groups be able to apply for additional funds?
- Equity issues – equalising access. Clear structure of funding formula or based on track record? How do we ensure slick polished applications which end up being sub-contacted don't succeed over smaller inexperienced applicants?
- Different tiers of applicants with different funding formula for each / outcome / outputs.
- Create level playing field for all applicants i.e. support and information for good solid application
- All organisations run by volunteers will need some co-ordinator / admin support
- Different levels of understanding of jargon and procedures. Smaller organisations don't understand language
- Not clear we know what we want. Document needs to be precise and unambiguous with a clear spec of what we want
- Be more descriptive and definitive in application document
- Timescales hard for new groups
- Removal of grants will impact on Social Services
- More people will be assessed and referred back to the Voluntary and Community Sector as ineligible, but Voluntary and Community Sector won't be able to support.
- Service cost varies between services
- External factors affect prices, e.g. fuel, food (providing transport / account costs)
- Possible 10-15% increase versus reduced funding, exacerbates problem
- 3 months is not enough time to wind down or plan new service
- Affect contracts with clients who are already experiencing difficulties
- Potential loss of employees, loss of skills and services
- Gaps in services will be bigger and different to current gaps
- Baseline for service and gaps – in order to make an inform bid
- Look at links between organisations, make sure core areas are being covered
- What will be the process for organisations who work together and can one organisation submit two bids?



- Need to look at any restructure of organisation based also on other funders
- Ethical concerns around just ending a service, need to manage expectations
- Lack of continuity in service
- What is happening in statutory or private services?
- Need to know how value for money will be defined, will this depend on the level of need, lost at cost and quality
- Demonstrate and evidence quality
- Derby City Council need to use correct language i.e. difference between grant and commissioned services. Some Voluntary and Community Sector are interested in commissioned work via Derby City Council
- How is all the grant aid funding and external funding going to be allocated?
- What is happening with LDDF? Will this funding be part of the grants pot?
- Need to involve neighbourhood managers who know about local groups
- Unclear if existing grant recipients will have extended funding beyond 31/10/2011
- By 31/3/11, many organisations may close due to lack of funding
- Uncertainty and lack of communication from Derby City Council
- Change in leadership after May elections – will this affect the process?
- Too much bureaucracy during application process e.g. approved provider list – too long. However, organisations on list – will it be necessary to resubmit same information?
- Need a simple application form – one page of A4?
- Will the grant continue for those who are currently grant funded?
- Pleased that there is still an emphasis on 3 year funding
- There is a reduction in the pot of money, therefore is there going to be a reduction in voluntary services?
- Unknown as to how money will be allocated
- Timelines for applying for the grant is short especially for new organisations. Not a huge amount of opportunity to make sure that bids are correct. Not much time to receive help.
- Worried that successful applications are more on how it is 'worded', smaller organisations are receiving excellent feedback from their users, but these organisations don't have the skills/experience to make a good application
- Some organisations (especially new ones / or those who haven't applied before) do not have the experience of completing applications
- The balance between value for money and quality is muddy. Groups who have lots of people, but poor quality will lower unit cost, but poor quality service
- Value for money - Isn't all about people in the service.
- The cabinet decisions need to be transparent and open to scrutiny. Will want to know why certain applications were successful, whereas others won't be
- Need to make sure that organisations that are being used are funded – or those which can prove a demand
- Services who get the funding will be free or cheaper, therefore people will go there. However this doesn't mean they are better. Other organisations who charge may not be used even though they are better.
- How does personalisation fit with this? If an organisation has funding (grant) how do they charge? Is it free? – need to know as users start to think its free

- How will it be decided which services should be free? (e.g. advocacy) or should there be a charge? The number of hours an advocate could spend with a user could escalate if there is a big issue – how can they charge for this?
- Cuts to service user groups staged over 4 years.
- Impact on service user groups – when services close – where do they go?
- Should Derby City do contracts – not Grant Aid?
- Grants more flexible to respond changing service user requirements.
- Contracts can be flexible too!
- Voluntary Sector at disadvantage when competing with Council – Voluntary Sector has to meet all its costs.
- Managing of grants and contracts need to be co-ordinated.
- Grants support innovation and get benefit of Voluntary Sector experience and nearness to communities.
- Service Users can get ‘Council funded’ bit of services and ‘Voluntary Sector’ funded bit of services.
- Lose more than is cut due to groups and services becoming unstable and closing. Or lose ability to be responsive.
- Process should reflect experience of current providers.
- Transparency – need to know why organisations get funded or not.
- One month is fine for some larger groups who may have skills and experience in filling out forms!
- Ensure support is available for those with no experience of funding applications/volunteer workers completing
- Useful to know what other services are available around support to women, in order to measure the impact to service.
- large as well as small groups would see benefit of small grants scheme with appropriate paperwork etc
- Price and quality.
- What emphasis is on quality?
- What informs quality? Will we have a measurement for quality as well as satisfaction
- Will there be a structure within the application process that shows how value for money will be triangulated?
- Transparency
- Speed of change – does not take account of the lead time required for delivering activity – uncertainty over funding is severely hampering ability to plan.
- Where is the diversity priority and what is the weighting for each diversity strand and is this compact compliant?
- Query about volunteers working together to manage local community centres. Why are community centres a priority?
- Voluntary work is so broad so focus more on encouraging voluntary and not just specifically for community centres
- Need information in time to be involved. Small groups in particular. Do not receive information with enough time to complete applications
- For small groups timescales can be made difficult by their infrequent meetings
- Does the timetable allow for changes recommended from the consultation to be implemented? This also to include questions/call back from Cabinet.

- Is a one size fits all approach appropriate for handling grants that range between £500 - £300,000 appropriate?
- Questionnaire does not save – this restricts (and will deter) people from giving a serious and considered response.
- Concern that process is filtering out small and newer organisations – needs a level of approach that is appropriate to the organisation.
- How will monitoring of quality and value be measured in the actual activity that takes place?
- What is the assessment process? How is this linked to the application? Who makes decisions? When will this be consulted on?
- Who makes decisions against different criteria? – Is there a smart and joined-up process? Or is it undertaken within different directorates?
- Will services provided by the Council have to demonstrate impact against similar criteria to give evidence of quality and value for money – e.g. libraries and museums?
- Will the results of the questionnaire be published?
- Big Society is being used as a rationale for grant funding – is this appropriate in all cases? What is the Derby City Council's interpretation of Big Society? How is this being promoted/publicised within the Grant Aid Strategy?
- It feels that the process is being driven by the timescale and need for cuts rather than a principle of improved and better value services.
- What is the impact on organisations ability to lower other funding on the back of reduced grant?
- How is the equalities impact assessment informing the process?
- Level playing field in applications need more clarity about what want
- No criteria
- Short timescale
- There are no cognitive outcomes in the 12 outcomes listed?
- Traditionally, Mental Health funding has come from 'health'. Uncertainty about where our funding will come from - 'health' or 'social' services?
- People with Learning Disabilities who are in residential homes will not receive a personal budget, therefore there is a need for free services
- In Learning Disability services, it can take a long time for a person to meet their targets e.g. trying to get 1 person with a Learning Disability into employment can take up a lot of resources, but it's value for money.
- Early intervention – money starts 1 April. Existing run to end October (but only few) many YOPS / children's / extended schools end March. Gap for groups to bid into this grant round April. Some services that may have been successful will fold.
- Concerns about very specific conditions within Mental Health spectrum being lost/over looked.
- Children's Services - Too much bureaucracy during application process e.g. approved provider list – too long and a mismanaged process. However, organisations on list – will it be necessary to resubmit same information?
- MHA Live at Home Schemes has one committee but 9 schemes. Will they have to put in 9 applications or one?
- Why is a revised system being created when a fit for purpose system exists – Arts Grants are accountable and intrinsically linked to the Derby Plan?

- Padley Homeless Day Centre, for example, relies on City Council and PCT funding – concern that they may ‘fall through the gap’. Need to ensure outside partners and City Council directorates co-ordinate.

**Question 2 – Outcomes in the Strategy. Choose the outcomes in the strategy that you would like to focus on. What do you think the services that support these outcomes should look like? How could these outcomes be delivered?**

- Future services – need to give more information and advice in advance would help. More choice now we have moved personalisation.
- Social networking is a goal but people need more basic help with things like texting etc.
- Want people to have choices – services that would provide this include ones provided by the Voluntary Sector. Personalisation will come into this. Needs to be money for information and advice organisations to help organisations. Expert organisations and working in partnerships will be key.
- Opportunity to apply will be for local and voluntary sector organisations – value of this to be acknowledged and explicit
- Derby’s Voluntary Sector gets least support as a unitary authority both locally and nationally. Voluntary Sector already provides value for money
- A very negative outcome (prevention) – emphasis should be on health and wellbeing
- Online survey – too little opportunity to give views on what was required for older people. There is so much to say but not opportunity to say it.
- More opportunity to be given for people to give additional information about their service provision.
- How can they evidence community centres that already are in place – unclear what more they demonstrate here as they are already up and running?
- Be clearer about whether it means finding new innovative places.
- So much emphasis on Children and Young People, what about adults?
- How do we ensure that communities have ownership of services?
- Outcomes are too narrow – specifically 11 and 12
- Lots of work happening at ages 14-19. 14’s too late
- Be cautious about double funding
- Look at match funding opportunities.
- Many organisations work across outcomes
- No evidence that the outcomes are correct!
- Requirements of service users – about actual need not 6 outcomes. Orgs have developed their services to meet actual need.... Now they’ll have to change to meet outcomes. NEED IS IMPORTANT
- After all this consultation, no changes will be made.
- All Voluntary and Community Sector’s should be members of Community Action Derby
- Need more resources not less!!
- Community Action Derby cannot represent all Voluntary and Community Sector’s
- Community Action Derby can support Voluntary and Community Sector to make informed decisions
- Network – can we support them and at what level?

- How can Community Action Derby represent all views? They can't!! Be clear about what they can do.
- Provide Community Action Derby with resources to provide admin support to reduce costs of everyone having employees to do admin.
- Preventing isolation – motioning friendships and links with their community.
- Familiarity – people build trust and friendships that then enhance their well being.
- Continuity – maintaining a service or input can ensure that a situation doesn't escalate
- Prevention – by working with people in a positive productive manner issues can be resolved, family situations helped.
- Service needs to be person centred, choice and control over what they are doing.
- Services are cutting out the 'middle' and enabling people to live independently
- Needs are increasing
- People's needs are changing – reactive services
- Providers are often Adult Social Services with translation and support at hospital appointments
- Linking in with other services
- Services are wanted and needed
- Not enough time to make partnership bids
- If FACS recommendations go through, the need for preventative services will increase
- Personal budgets – may increase demand
- High percentages of people are not in receipt of Adult Social Services. People don't want to access Adult Social Services.
- Current services users don't want personal budgets
- Groups combat isolation. Reduces mental health issues
- Outreach services – local to people. Delivering services that save Adult Social Services and PCT and hospitals money
- Older people feel safe when accessing services they are familiar with.
- Requests for befriending are decreasing. People want to get out of the house.
- Free bus service is vital – transport costs are high
- Query about a co-ordinated transport service if there aren't enough volunteers to transport services users – become isolated and require home visiting which is more time intensive.
- Many people don't have carers and live alone
- 'Reminding' people to take meds, to eat!!
- People don't know what equipment is available
- Constantly speaking to social services to find out what's available.
- Services that help people know they are carers
- Services that let them know what help is available
- Services that raise awareness
- Services that remove language and cultural barriers
- Services that address communication issues of all kinds
- Services that go out from their own organisation into other
- Collaboration with others and other organisations
- Disbanding of sensory team has lost specialist knowledge and expertise

- Outings and holidays are very popular
- Some people don't leave their house other than to access lunch club
- CamTAD have a BME worker. She translates.
- Asian communities were difficult to access with regard to hearing loss.
- People don't like to admit to their problem
- Language barrier!!
- Sometimes provide the wrong interpreter e.g. Mandarin instead of Cantonese
- People need to be mentally stimulated
- Appeals process? May fund %age of bids
- Taking away early support put greater impact on SS
- Lots of referrals from community mental health services meant voluntary sector had to fill Derby City Council gaps.
- What stage does early intervention take place?
- gaps in professional/ statutory services puts pressure on voluntary sector, which can't be met if voluntary sector services reduced
- Funding formula to be more transparent
- Need info about where need is – nature, numbers
- How provide services differently? Training programme collaborative working
- Collaborating won't always work. Especially as very different cultures in different areas
- Will lose volunteers if ask them to do things differently
- Lots of referrals are people with dementia
- golden age – social but also informed information and advice
- How do you quantify it?
- Mental health also an issue. How do we gather info to prove we are doing a good job? Perhaps collaborate by providing one trainer to be shared
- Negative impacts on groups – harder to engage groups will be lost, e.g. Libraries.
- Key outcomes and then look at additionally
- Opportunity to bring organisation together
- Derby City Council to facilitate bring organisations together or Community Action Derby
- Could work together but retain core services, partnership agreement
- Service users could benefit by joint working
- Do you place greater emphasis on one or two outcomes/or spread across
- Do more together with less available
- Need to know where gaps/ area are in neighbourhoods
- Full cost recovery is important
- Outcome 5 – why is this included when 5 CAM centres are closing and the team supporting them is going?
- Is Derby City Centre going to support infrastructure groups to support the community groups particularly those that may lose support from Derby City Council e.g. community centre associations?
- This was written before the Derby Plan. Has an assessment been done on the Derby Plan outcomes and whether these will be delivered through the VGAS Outcomes?
- Who has made the decision on these outcomes being the right outcomes – are they fit for purpose?

- The 'places' agenda. There is concern that community centres are the wrong approach – and that the infrastructure within communities does not exist to fully manage these outcomes.
- 'Places' goes beyond community centres – also includes libraries, arts venues, etc
- It was felt that the 'prospects' outcomes for the arts do not meet the outcomes and priorities for the sector as laid out in the Derby Plan – what is the process for revising these?
- Outcome 5 – Community Centres - Organisations need them as a meeting place and again partnership working will be key to the success of this strategy. However centres are struggling financially etc. Centres need to provide new services that can help the sustainability of the centres.
- Big Society – people released from hospital but they need access to services from Voluntary Sector. (Funding needs to be there however)
- Social activities/networking and obtaining information and advice this taps into outcome 1.
- Padley – as resource centre and access to support and maintain homeless and nearly homeless.
- If Padley closed, referrals to furniture – knock on effect of what happens if group to fold.
- Furniture project – support people to escape homelessness and get tenancy.
- City should support other community centres – Padley / Furniture / Play and Recycling – that support people at risk – sense of purpose and opportunity to get job skills.
- Learning Disability and Mental Health volunteers who then can move on to jobs and some people can never move on but work as volunteer gives purpose and stability.
- Sports and Leisure. Helps people stay fit and healthy and again are a preventative service.
- Specialist infrastructure organisation for Mental Health
- Definition and shared understanding of advocacy.
- Why are community centres listed as a priority on the basis of the evidence the Council already got re Community Centres.
- Transport is very big problem for getting to community centres. If charged at full rate, people would drop out.
- Only group of its type, elderly Asian people. We need to ask the relevant questions.
- Each organisation should be providing advocacy, support, advice for its members
- Do external candidates know 'people' well enough to provide advocacy? Voluntary groups / community groups should know the person well enough to be able to advocate for the person
- Very important to check quality of support, advocacy, advice
- If an organisation was doing a support plan who would check the quality/strength of the support plan?
- Community centres should be mixing with other community groups to ensure community cohesion, prevent isolation
- Group accessing community centres should also be accessing other community activities/ groups / buildings i.e. trip to local pub

- A service which is aware of what it can offer, but one which is aware of what other services can do. One which doesn't compete with other services but shares information with them
- Services need a directory of resources to signpost people (like current but new one)
- Accessible information
- People don't want to travel for to get this information if they have disabilities
- Need services which are local – not just a one stop shop
- Face to face services, not just online
- A multitude of services who can do this
- Staff who have experience and knowledge of their user group, so that support plans can be of good quality
- Services which are person-centred, and know the individual well
- Easily accessible central which after a range of services, not just traditional
- Those who can signpost to after services, which are readily available to people who want it
- Relaxing friendly environment – social orientated
- People will fall out of service due to FACS so there should be a focus on this for people with Learning Disabilities
- Important to emphasise the 'social' aspect of outcomes to await social isolation
- Should be based in peoples communities
- Should utilise the opportunities available locally
- Why is there no Needs Analysis within this process? Gaps should have been identified early in the process and these should have informed the outcomes and priorities.
- Derby City Council should be informing the Voluntary And Community Sector of the gaps and asking how they can support filling them.
- Equalities impact assessment should be informing the process.
- Was there any research done into models of best practice that already exist?
- Has an audit of provision (both direct by Derby City Council and indirectly by other providers) been undertaken and informed process?
- Role of children's network – give information and comment on strategy
- Children Services marginalised.
- Several outcomes – not money in strategy for children's outcomes.
- If Children & Young People's Social Care money has been spent in first 7 months – what will happen to Children's Grants? Clarity is needed on Children & Young People's intentions. Why do this department spear to be operating differently to the other departments of the Council?
- Voluntary Sector should be part of decision making process.

### **Question 3 – Gaps in services. Are there any gaps in current services that the Council should be addressing?**

- Day services for BME communities needs to be addressed.
- Need to bring all communities together this does not seem to be happening. (Outcome 7)
- Some groups struggle with different forums of communication and they could fall through the gaps.



- Transport is an issue which should be addressed. The current provision is expensive. Some forms of transport are very expensive.
- Concerned about future gaps especially if all the money is committed in first year for next 3 years.
- Brokerage (Specific to Mental Health) missing
- Challenge for organisations to offer individual support (Personal budgets) ad-hoc and intermittent.
- Gaps in crisis and prevention not sufficient different levels and types of support. Compounded for special interest groups.
- Gap in knowledge of statutory services and G.P's of supportive services to refer to.
- Education in Schools/Colleges/Universities about preventative services.
- Concerns about the emphasis of 'Medical' treatment/solutions rather than social and support services/solutions.
- Access to learning/education/training/work/volunteering.
- Community transport itself. Also duration of journey.
- Need flexible transport service. Is the one provided by Disability Direct enough? They co-ordinate shared taxis. Will it be continued when current funding ends? If not need alternative or will lose Service Users.
- Council not met target for Minority Communities. How are they given to ensure these targets are met through this strategy?
- Overload re culture outcome
- We are all one community with different needs. Need to find balance and bringing people together rather than encouraging segregation but should encourage integration.
- Support economic growth by providing jobs. Not culture
- Work together to address issues and needs as they arise or earlier e.g. migrants' integration into the wider society.
- Need more older people's services over next 10 years as Derby City Council is cutting services. By removing services, Derby City Council is creating a big gap.
- Is the council acknowledging the appropriate need of Older People, given that we have an ageing population. Is enough focus being given to their needs as the outcomes seem weighted in favour of Young People and culture.
- More and more people will have dementia. Need to prevent rapid decline. Need groups that identify these needs as soon as possible.
- Older People - over 60's have paid their dues and won't be getting what they have paid for – that they have a right to.
- Derby City Council should make statistics of gaps/areas available so providers know where to develop services
- On the grid provided, Derby Plan headings should be outcomes and outcomes should become outputs.
- Where is health sector contribution to voluntary sector especially as prevention/early intervention have an impact on expensive health care.
- Providers should be meeting Derby Plan priorities, not the person listed.
- New and emerging communities (Iraq, Kurdish, Persian) are not included in the outcomes
- We need to clarify exactly which services are needed.
- We do not know what gaps will be created by the cuts.

- Need more services to pick up FACS
- At what point do services become undeliverable?
- Could cut too much!! Render services unsustainable and cause even more problems.
- This process could destroy organisations.
- Some groups who are currently getting funding will not exist.
- Short breaks – all people have is an evening, day...
- More volunteer groups
- Transport – cheap and accessible transport for people
- Transition – quality information for young people
- Young people to have access to same services
- More groups, or work, to support young people through transition and into older groups
- Age specific groups
- Safe places – somewhere for people with learning disabilities to go and be safe
- Sports – specific sport group – young people?
- Music – specific music group – young people?
- People with Autism and PMLD have no group to access. Essential that these 2 groups of people can access an evening or weekend group.
- More groups needed for most vulnerable, isolated and more guided people in our city. PW LD
- Transport. Difficult to organise because people are located across the city.
- Regularly updated contact list to enable easy referrals. Referral system. Telecare, falls prevented etc
- Difficult for hearing impaired people to use phone
- Staff need to be sensitive to needs – especially language needs
- Chinese ? – Starting Basic English classes – essential lip reading classes also provide interaction.
- Can't develop for future if cuts
- biggest gap is dementia and lonely/isolated
- ageing population so more with mental health/dementia
- Poverty is an issue – pensions – implication of those now in their 50's
- in past people were obliged to pay into pensions people will be poorer
- Are we geared up to cope with different cultures?
- Fear of crime, cutting down expenses for ward/voluntary/organisations will increase crime and therefore fear of crime
- need more information and stats to inform people of where and what need there is
- Avenue for feeding in assessment needs from voluntary sector to JSNA – needs to improve i.e. Better input/communication from voluntary sector
- How is Derby City Council going to be accountable to voluntary sector? i.e. Expectations of voluntary sector, support to voluntary sector, value for money of Derby City Council?
- Transparency of monitoring results
- summarise who's successful and in what areas and purpose of service
- some areas may have intense needs for individuals but only in small numbers so needs might not be much balance i.e. neighbourhoods and citywide

- Children and young people outcomes – need to be more open rather than specific, very limited
- Outcomes need to be more open rather than specific, e.g. Number 7 should just be community or groups
- Council currently selling off buildings rather than offering affordable space for groups to use for day to day operations
- As buildings are closed by the Council, how is the process for future use publicised / communicated to groups that may wish to have an involvement. System should be open and transparent
- What guarantee is there that all views will be taken on board? Is this just a paper exercise to tick the box?
- Drop in centre
- Carers training
- Gap in knowledge of services available for carers in some communities / individuals
- Gap in awareness of identity as a carer in some individuals
- What potential gaps are there which have not yet emerged from funding decisions and current cuts
- Limited appropriate support for carers of high impact drug and alcohol problems
- Children underachieving parental involvement – not carers
- How to complain about their services. How to change their services.
- Who is going to monitor all the contacts – need to manage this otherwise issues will escalate
- Who will monitor how an individual's money is being spent? Need to check otherwise abuse will occur
- Day services is a gap
- Cheap, accessible transport
- Activities out of hours
- Befriending services
- Signpost and early intervention services
- A service user contract/ action plan
- Accessible swimming pools
- Hydrotherapy services
- Encouragement of integrated services (inclusion into mainstream clubs)
- Opportunities for social inclusion
- Safety – initiatives which ensure safety of people with LD – especially considering people will lose their services
- Getting business to recycle lots of household programmes more incentives for business who just use landfill.
- Transportation for disadvantaged e.g. homeless people to access services across city. Can't get free bus fares.
- Polish school – language – culture also supports parents. If we lose funding
- Community loses – people lose contact.
- Lose place to get information.
- Funding rent, train teachers – more children.
- People to act as translators. Language line volunteers. Call and ask for translation on phone.

- Volunteer work can support people to 'stabilise' their lives.
- Recycling – environmental importance – reduces landfill while benefiting other low income people – is this outcome 1? – Is this part of added value?
- Will City Council consider this as added value?
- Small funding yields lots of other funding.
- Lose group and less support and referrals to other groups. Weakens those as well.
- Cut backs in other funding will damage local voluntary sector (regional and national).