

Contents

Section 1	ChangeUp and the Surrey Infrastructure Development Plan	3
Section 2	Project Background and Methodology	4
Section 3	Background to Surrey	6
Section 4	Summary of Voluntary & Community Sector Support Needs	8
Section 5	Existing Infrastructure Support	13
Section 6	The Way Forward	15
Section 7	Surrey Infrastructure Development Plan Action Plan	22

Annexes

Additional Support Programme 'Towards an Infrastructure Development Plan for Voluntary and Community Organisations working with Diverse Communities in Surrey'. (For consultation) Research and Report by North Harbour Consulting Limited. March 2006.

Additional Support Programme 'Gypsy Traveller Research Report'. (For consultation) Gypsy Media Company. March 2006.

Contact details for the Surrey Infrastructure Consortium:

Chair: Jean Roberts Jones

Chief Executive
Surrey Community Action
Astolat
Coniers Way
Burpham
Guildford
Surrey
GU4 7HL

Tel: 01483 459292

Email: jeanr@surreyca.org.uk

This document is also available in large print and on tape

Section 1: ChangeUp and the Surrey Infrastructure Development Plan

In June 2004 the Government published 'ChangeUp' which outlined its expectations for VCS (voluntary and community sector) infrastructure development. Within the document it recognised that voluntary and community activity is a crucial part of public life, connecting people and helping them to shape their communities.

ChangeUp has a 10-year vision (to 2014), focusing on how capacity building support and infrastructure (see definition on next page) for the VCS should develop. Its aim is that by 2014 the needs of frontline voluntary and community organisations will be met by support which is available nationwide, structured for maximum efficiency, offering excellent provision which is accessible to all whilst reflecting and promoting diversity and is sustainably funded.

The level of investment ring fenced by Government for this work is unprecedented.

- £125m through FutureBuilders
- £80m through ChangeUp to the end of March 2006
- £70m for ChangeUp 2006/8 delivered through Capacity Builders

There was also significant investment from Defra to support specialist rural VCS support. ChangeUp funding is available until 2008 and the focus of the funding will be targeted *'at encouraging strategic change that will benefit the voluntary and community sector long after the funding programme has come to an end. A key aim of ChangeUp is to develop a stable sustainable infrastructure which uses a range of income and funders, of which Government is only one, to support its work'* (ChangeUp document).

A key element of the initiative is to help develop a broader and more sustainable funding base, moving beyond the traditional reliance on local authority funding. A particular challenge is around the issue of change management: in order to make progress and to use limited resources more effectively. Resources are required to support the change process and it is important that funders are supportive of this investment approach.

Whilst ChangeUp has a clear aim to improve and develop the infrastructure support services for frontline organisations involved in the delivery of commissioned services, this work has also focused upon the work of those organisations which are not commissioned to provide services. These organisations, making up in excess of 80% of the voluntary and community sector in Surrey, make a major contribution to preventative work. By addressing issues of concern these organisations do, indirectly, reduce the strain on commissioned services and make an enormous contribution to the quality of life for many communities.

Surrey Infrastructure Development Plan (SIDP)

To oversee the ChangeUp process in Surrey the Surrey Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure Consortium was established in 2004 to guide and support the development of VCS infrastructure in Surrey. Membership of this multi agency consortium was open to any VCS organisations based or working in Surrey and public sector partner organisations. Following the publication of the SIDP the consortium will review its membership and terms of reference at a meeting in April 2006. Jean Roberts-Jones, Chief Executive, Surrey Community Action, was elected as Chair with Surrey Community Action also acting as the Accountable and Lead Body.

A Steering Group was also established who were responsible for the development and delivery of the best possible infrastructure development plan for Surrey. A working group, who reported to the Steering Group, was also established that met on a monthly basis and who were responsible for recruiting and managing the consultants, Gardiner & Saunders Consultants.

Three major projects related to ChangeUp were initiated in Surrey:

- the development of a countywide 10 year Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP)
- the addition of a Rural Community Development Worker
- research and recommendations on the development of infrastructure provision in the borough of Waverley

Additional Support Programme

Alongside this, work has been undertaken through the Change Up Additional Support Programme to consider the engagement and infrastructure needs of black and minority ethnic, faith, refugees/asylum seekers and gypsy and traveller communities.

This work began late in 2005, when the Surrey VCS infrastructure consortium commissioned North Harbour Consulting to conduct research into the support needs of black and minority ethnic, faith and refugees/asylum seekers and Jake Bowers, a Romani journalist, to research the support needs of gypsy and traveller communities in Surrey. Two separate reports summarise the findings of this research, which make recommendations and suggest actions to improve infrastructure support to these diverse community groups. These reports, for consultation between April and June 2006, are now available to be read in conjunction with this Infrastructure Development Plan. Following the consultation period a final agreed action plan will be produced for improving support to these ASP community groups. However, the findings of the ASP research have been integrated into this Infrastructure Development Plan with the interim recommendations and suggested actions, though they may be subject to change.

Surrey Compact

The Surrey Compact was launched in 2004, setting out principles to help Surrey's public bodies, voluntary and community organisations to work more effectively in partnership. The Funding Code of Practice has been published and the Volunteering Code is currently in draft version with consultation ending on 31st March 2006. Five members of Surrey Compact Working Group are also on the Surrey Infrastructure Development Plan Steering Group ensuring that the development of both areas of work is appropriately integrated.

Section 2: Project Background and Methodology

Communication

A key issue identified at the outset of the work was the need to ensure the widest possible involvement, both with the VCS and public sector. A Communications Strategy was developed to help develop a structured and strategic approach to communications related to the work. The Strategy set out four key purposes:

- To build ownership, engagement and support for the process of developing a Surrey Infrastructure Development Plan
- To promote inclusivity and the widest possible involvement in the development of the plan, encouraging and valuing the contribution of all stakeholders

- To ensure all stakeholders have the opportunity to contribute to the development of the plan, through the involvement and consultation of a representative sample of the Voluntary and Community sector in Surrey
- To ensure that efforts are made to engage hard to reach and emerging groups so they can contribute to the development of the plan

Project Methodology

The development of the Surrey Infrastructure Development Plan was seen as a complex and challenging project and it was important to base the work around a clear definition of key terms. These were, according to ChangeUp guidance, as follows:

Infrastructure *'The physical facilities, structures, systems, relationships, people, knowledge and skills that exist to support and develop, co-ordinate, represent and promote front line organisations thus enabling them to deliver their missions more effectively'*

Infrastructure organisations *'... often called 'second tier', intermediary or umbrella organisations, provide support to frontline organisations. They are usually **generic** (support all frontline organisations within a particular geographical area) or **specialist** (supporting a particular sub-sector of the VCS or offer a particular area of expertise)'*

The work included a broad range of activities and approaches designed to address the challenges. An overview of the key areas of work and the methodologies used were:

Infrastructure provision research

To capture comprehensive information on the current infrastructure provision within the county through a survey, follow-up interviews with key staff and a number of development sessions.

Identification of needs

A survey was distributed through the databases held by local infrastructure organisations, which produced an initial response rate of about 17%. Interviews were then undertaken to ensure that the survey returns reflected the range of organisations and was representative of the nature of the sector. Throughout the life of the project a range of focus groups, awaydays and Consortium meetings were held. In total it is estimated that around 700 voluntary and community organisations in Surrey were consulted. Two workshops were organised in rural communities to research specialist rural community support needs.

Work with statutory agencies

Work was undertaken to inform the statutory sector partners regarding voluntary and community sector infrastructure issues, needs and concerns. Surrey County Council took a lead role in supporting consultation with the public sector on ChangeUp, organising three consultation events.

Activities included:

- Face to face meetings with key officers and members across agencies
- involvement in 3 workshops/presentations (to discuss issues, raise concerns, build consensus and support)
- Production of targeted communication material (both printed and electronic)

Development work

Work was carried out with three key groups: Chief Officers of generic infrastructure organisations, Trustees and Management Boards of those organisations and Officers of existing organisations who either view themselves as infrastructure providers or had expressed an interest in becoming involved in infrastructure provision.

Consultation was also undertaken with key national and regional bodies such as NACVS, Volunteering England, and RAISE. The views and concerns of statutory agencies in the county were also fed in to the process. Links to other relevant projects were established, including the research work and report on Funding Information & Advice to the Voluntary Sector in Surrey and the Additional Support programme.

Consultation

Following the survey of frontline organisation needs, the information collected was collated and analysed (see Section Four). In late summer 2005 a consultation report, based on this survey and the other information collected was widely circulated to all stakeholder groups, accompanied by invitations to respond. Responses were encouraged via a variety of ways, including written responses, focus groups, the report being made available on local websites and feedback sessions 'piggy-backed' on to existing meetings or events enabling participants a further opportunity to not only raise concerns but also to listen to the issues raised by others.

Key findings of the consultation process were collated and made available to all of those participating in the process. In total 55 responses were received, 36 from voluntary and community sector organisations and 19 from public sector organisations.

Section 3: Background to Surrey

- The population of Surrey in 2001 was 1,059,015, the most densely populated shire county in England.
- 19% of Surrey's population (198,525) was over retirement age.
- 2.3% of the population (23,896) was over 85, an increase of 5,000 (27%) since 1991. The ethnic minority population has grown by 45% and now accounts for 5% of the population (2.8% in 1991) although this figure does not include the Gypsy and Traveller population in the county.
- The unemployment rate in Surrey is 3.0%, lower than national figures.
- Surrey is perceived as a prosperous county. The average gross annual earnings in Surrey are £30,873: this compares to £26,669 in the South East.
- The average price of all houses in the county is currently £301,163.
- The county is predominantly made up of green belt land (70%) with only 16% being urbanised. 22% of the county is wooded.
- The roads within the county are busy with more cars per mile of road in Surrey than any other shire county in England.
- 64.5 % of the population use the car to get to work, with a further 27.7% using bus or rail bus or rail transport.
- Approximately one in twenty (5%) of the Surrey workforce is disabled.
- 17,399 households in Surrey are lone parent households.

Work undertaken through the Additional Support Programme estimated that there were up to 10,000 Gypsies and Travellers in the county. They live on council Gypsy sites, private Gypsy sites and in housing, with large concentrations in Runnymede, Guildford Borough and Waverley.

The 2001 Census shows that 5% of Surrey's population in 2001 (53,000 people) were from non-white ethnic minorities. A further 60,000 people across the county were Irish or classified as 'Other White'. More than 110,000 people (10.7% of Surrey's 2001 population) therefore belong to one of the Additional Support Programme (ASP) communities as defined for this project.

The ASP research has identified concentrations of non-white ethnic minorities in Epsom and Ewell, and Woking. There are also concentrations of people of Irish origin in Runnymede and Spelthorne; and of people described in the Census as 'Other White' in Elmbridge. There are also clusters of people from particular communities at a more local level. Clusters of this kind are in the minority, however. The Census data also show that, at borough and district council level at least, the diverse community populations are widely distributed across the county. The numbers in any particular parish, ward or village may actually be quite small. Yet in total, the number of people from diverse communities is significant and growing with new economic migrants entering the county from Europe and other parts of the world.

Surrey's voluntary and community sector

Existing infrastructure organisations estimate that there are between 3,200 – 3,500 VCS organisations in the county. The sector is incredibly diverse in terms of its funding, staffing, size, age, area of activity, services provided and beneficiaries. The sector is fragmented consisting of many small and informal groups who often work in isolation.

The majority of existing generic infrastructure organisations are members of the CVS/VB Network, a network working to build and sustain the current levels of support to the sector and ready to move forward through the development of a longer-term strategic approach. There are supportive relationships within this network, reinforced through effective working relationships with local district and borough authorities and the County Council. Most CVSs have traditionally worked with the voluntary and community health and social care sector.

Those severely under represented are sports and leisure groups, the majority of which are not members of local CVS'. It is impossible to speculate how many organisations there are but we do know there are 1000 football teams and 800 cricket teams.

An email survey sent to an estimated 600 organisations via Sport/Leisure officers in Boroughs and Districts had a poor response rate. However, those that did reply said they seek support directly or indirectly from Sport England and Surrey Sports Partnership. All reported concerns about funding and lack of information about how to attract sponsorship. These concerns will be followed up by Surrey Community Action's social enterprise team.

As well as poor links between the infrastructure organisations and sport groups there are also significant weaknesses between existing infrastructure organisations and organisations who deal with the arts and environmental issues.

There are also faith-based activities and sports groups, often with large membership, as well as other organisations providing infrastructure support to frontline organisations.

The fieldwork undertaken for the ASP research, which drew on earlier work undertaken by PS Consultants and Navarro Training and Consultancy, identified the names and details of 102 community groups and individuals from the diverse

communities. Of these: 83 are groups from diverse communities based in Surrey; 10 are groups from diverse communities based outside Surrey in adjacent local authorities that have members or that work in Surrey; and 9 are individuals said to have good contacts within their communities – all of whom are based in Surrey.

The charitable status of all the diverse community organisations that were identified was checked against the list of registered charities on the Charity Commission website. Out of 93 community groups on the list, only eleven were identified as registered charities. Three of these are based in neighbouring local authorities but operate in Surrey. Seven of the eleven groups registered as charities fall below the threshold laid down by the Charity Commission for the submission of audited accounts. The ChangeUp programme nationally and regionally focuses on the infrastructure support needs of front line voluntary and community organisations that are providing services or running activities for their members and the wider community in the areas where they work. Yet it quickly became apparent that, in Surrey at least, there are relatively few community groups and voluntary organisations serving diverse communities – either specific communities or more generally.

Public sector

Surrey County Council's approach to the VCS is recognised by those within the sector and infrastructure organisations as moving towards a 'unified' approach. The links and connections to the VCS within the eleven boroughs and districts vary dramatically; some organisations have established good working relationships with their local authority whilst for some, relationships are less developed.

ChangeUp is occurring at a time of rapid change for the public sector. The 5 PCTs and the Learning and Skills Council are undergoing major change. The 'Local Vision' strategy for local government, Local Area Agreements, the Governments cross departmental strategy 'Together We Can' and the Home Office's 'Firm Foundations' are all key issues for the sector, along with the promotion and development of the Surrey Compact, Community Strategies and Local Strategic Partnerships. As noted elsewhere, the County Council is undergoing a Business Delivery Review, a radical programme to re-shape and improve services, and at the time of publication of this report, it is unclear as to what impact this will have on voluntary and community sector infrastructure provision.

Section 4: Summary of Voluntary and Community Sector Support Needs

It was essential to identify the support and advice needs of the frontline organisations in Surrey, to identify where they were currently accessing help from and to identify what advice and support needs they might have in the future. A survey was distributed to over 2,400 organisations by post and by email. By the due date 476 surveys were returned, a return rate of 19.8%, however a further 51 were received after the deadline for return and their which brings the reply rate to 21.9%. Late replies reinforced earlier responses. A summary of results is as follows:

Main activities of groups

The range of activities that the organisations were involved in was wide ranging. The most popular activities for the groups to be involved in were self help and support (23%), followed by advice (21%), social care (14%), faith (13%) and fundraising (13%).

Main groups they work with

The most popular groups the organisations worked with were older people (37%), adults (21%), young adults (14%), children (14%) and people from a specified area

(13%). 9% Of the organisations commented that they work with all groups, '*We work with anyone in our community*' said one organisation. Research showed that there were very few voluntary or community groups working with or representing the Gypsy and Traveller community.

This research found that 9% of the 476 VCOs that responded to a survey undertaken as part of the main ChangeUp programme in Surrey said they provide services to people from the diverse communities. However, it is not entirely clear whether these responses indicate a willingness to provide services as part of an 'open door policy' or whether they have actually done so. On the basis of this survey it is clear that the number of VCOs that provide services to people from the diverse communities is limited.

Location of organisation

The organisations that responded were scattered across Surrey. The largest response was from Guildford (11%) followed by Woking (8%). 6% of the organisations who returned the survey had a Middlesex postal address but sought help and advice from infrastructure organisations based in Surrey.

Activities that organisations would like to develop over the next 3 years

43% of the organisations left this section blank and a further 6% said they had '*no plans*' to develop activities. We have therefore calculated that 49% of the organisations have no plans to develop any activities over the next 3 years. Of those with plans for development, groups working with people with disabilities, children and the elderly were well represented.

Type of group

The majority of the organisations (63%) were registered as a charity. 13% were registered as a charity and a company limited by guarantee. None said they acted as a co-operative and only 1% said they traded as a community business or social enterprise.

Identified problems

The organisations were asked to tick boxes to identify the issues that represented current problems for their organisation in meeting its objectives. The issues that scored the highest under the '*significant problem*' were funding advice and support (29%), recruiting, managing and keeping volunteers (28%) and recruiting, retaining trustees or board members (13%). Many organisations said they had '*no problems*' relating to many of these issues. 44% said they have no problems with accounts and book keeping, 42% with child protection. 39% said they have no problem accessing forums and support networks and 38% said they have no problems with governance or legal issues.

Surprisingly 33% reported that they had no problems regarding HR and a further 29% said they had no problems regarding recruiting and managing paid staff. However when looking at these figures we need to remember that only 53% of the organisations have paid staff: so therefore recruiting and managing staff is not a problem to the majority of them. Of the groups that identified problems with IT (17%) many commented on the need for '*friendly support*' and '*trouble shooting maintenance*'. Many commented that these issues did not cause them any problems as they were part of a national organisation and '*all matters are dealt with at a national level*' another commented '*we look to our head office for guidance*'.

Generally, it was felt by Black and Minority Ethnic, minority Faith and Refugee, Asylum Seeker, groups that mainstream voluntary and community organisations are

not doing enough to promote their services to diverse communities, so that many people do not know they exist. Indeed, the distinction between a voluntary organisation and the local authority is not understood by a significant number of people who took part in the ASP research. Access to services is difficult for some communities. Refugees and asylum seekers who are not entitled to stay in this country have no entitlement to public services. This is also an issue for economic migrants who do not currently have access to certain public services. There are similar problems for people in the Gypsy and Traveller community who are not settled. Access to services for women and girls from some communities is difficult because the services available may not be culturally appropriate.

The Additional Support Programme identified advocacy, housing support, improved communication and campaigning for more sites as key support needs for the Gypsy and Traveller community. Research undertaken through the Additional Support Programme examined the Gypsy and Traveller community's experience of the voluntary sector and their use of voluntary services.

The research also consulted voluntary and community sector organisations (front line groups and infrastructure providers) about their level of contact with and awareness of the Gypsy and Traveller community. This indicated an acute gap between the Gypsy and Traveller community and the voluntary and community sector and highlighted the need for a Gypsy and Traveller-led voluntary organisation. The research (published separately by Surrey Community Action) made a number of recommendations, listed on page 17 of this document.

Income levels for 2003/04

The range of incomes was wide ranging. 25% of the organisations received an income of less than £20,000. Many within this category said their income was '*negligible*' with several commenting it was under £1,000. However 10% of the organisations reported income levels over £250,000. 32% of the organisations left this part of the survey blank. Some not wanting to disclose their income but many commented along the lines of '*we do not have an income as we are part of a national organisation*'.

Number of paid staff

53% of the organisations employed paid staff, either part time or full time; however 47% reported they had no paid staff. Of those with staff the majority had 3 or fewer staff. However there were 8 organisations that between them employed 1,400 staff. 34% of the organisations employ full time members of staff and 46% employ part time staff. The use of sessional staff is small with only 10% of the organisations using them.

Volunteers

With almost half the organisations having no paid staff, volunteer time and skills are essential to the well being of Surrey's VCS. 90% of the organisations have volunteers (although all organisations have voluntary trustees). The average number of volunteers per organisation was 29. The functions the volunteers undertake was wide ranging with the most popular help being in the form of a trustee (21%), administration (16%) and driving (12%).

Monitoring performance

The majority of organisations (65%) said they did monitor their work using a wide variety of methods. The most popular methods used were statistics (7%) and of feedback and questionnaires (7%). Some of the descriptions of the methods used were vague with comments like '*undertaken in a variety of ways*'. One organisation monitored their work '*by awards given*' another '*by how profitable an event is*'.

Quality standards

The majority of the organisations (65%) do not have and are not working towards a quality standard. A further 10% left this answer blank so if we assume they also do not have a quality standard this figure rose to 75%. Only 1% of organisations said '*they were working towards having one*'. Of those who had a quality standard 4% had undertaken Investors in People (IIP) and 3% PQASSO.

Accessing resources

Organisations were asked if accessing certain types of resources (meeting and office space, office and IT equipment, storage, internet access and transport), were a problem. In all areas the majority of groups said they had no problem accessing these resources. 9% of the organisations commented that this question was not applicable to them. However access to storage was noted as a significant problem by 16% of the organisations. Many of these were groups involved with children and young adults where play and outdoor equipment needed to be stored.

Action or business plan

46% of organisations said they had a business plan and 45% said they did not. However 8% of organisations left this blank indicating that over 50% do not have a business plan. Of those that said they did not currently have a plan only 12% said they would like help to develop one with 75% saying no. A further 12% left this blank.

Skills areas required by organisations

Care needs to be taken in analysing these results as some were clearly confused by the question. Some said they were not sure if they were being asked which skills they required or which ones they already had within their organisation. From the results the skill that most organisations 'strongly agreed' as needing was fundraising (22%) followed by publicity (20%) and finance (17%). Under the 'agree' column publicity scored highest (32%), followed by legislation changes (29%), media (28%), fundraising (27%) and managing volunteers (25%).

Training needs

Only 15% of the organisations said they would like help to identify future training needs. 72% said they would not and 12% left this answer blank. If the 'no' answers are added to the ones who did not respond, 84% of the organisations are not interested in identifying the training needs of their staff, volunteers or trustees.

Getting advice and support

During the past year 69% of the organisations had sought advice from a variety of sources. 23% had not sought help and a further 8% left this answer blank. Of those that had asked for help 28% had turned to a their national body, 24% to Surrey Community Action, 19% to Surrey County Council, 18% to a CVS. 17% had turned to a Volunteer Bureaux, Local Council, Accountant, Solicitor and the Charity Commission for help.

The purpose of this question was to try and establish how many of the organisations had sought help for work in specialised areas of work – working in rural area, social enterprise, community development and working with Black and Minority Ethnic Groups (BME). Only 5% of the organisations had sought help with matters arising from Community Development work, 4% with rural work, 2% with matters relating to Social Enterprise and 2% relating to work undertaken with BME organisations and communities. 88% of the organisations had left this section of the survey blank.

On the evidence provided by Black and Minority Ethnic, Faith, Refugee, Asylum Seeker, Gypsy and Traveller VCOs as part of the ASP programme, socialising for

many people within the diverse communities takes place within quite close family groups or within defined community-based meeting places such as Mosques or community associations. Most of those interviewed say that they also turn to family, friends and their own community to find out where to get information, advice or support for their personal needs. Even when they had heard of an organisation to which they could turn for help, only a minority said that they had actually used one of the organisations that they had named. This reinforces the impression that people are often getting support from family, friends and their own community rather more than from public or voluntary sector services.

For Gypsy and Traveller communities, the Surrey Traveller Community Relations Forum and some CAB's were identified as sources of support.

Working with other organisations, agencies and communities

45% of the organisations had worked with another organisation, agency or community during the past year. Of those organisations some had worked with a wide range of groups varying from small local groups to countywide and national organisations. 41% left this answer blank and a further 10% answered no.

Support networks, partnerships and forums

71% of the organisations said they were members of a support network. 19% said they were not and 9% left the section blank. The number of networks, partnerships and forums identified by the organisations was extensive with 200 being identified, some being very small and local some seeking support from national bodies.

Surprisingly only 2% of organisations mentioned RAISE, the South East Regional infrastructure support body for the VCS. Many networks and partnerships were only mentioned by one or two organisations. However some were more popular: Local Strategic Partnerships were mentioned by 4% of the organisations, Surrey Council for Voluntary Youth Service 6%, PCT 11%, Volunteer Bureaux 15%, CVS 16%, Surrey Compact 18% and Surrey Community Action 25%.

Barriers to networking and partnership working

This question asked them to identify what were the barriers that prevented them from networking and working in partnership. 30% said they had no barriers to such working. 40% of the organisations left this section blank. The majority of the comments made related to the lack of capacity within the organisations. 21% of the organisations simply answered 'time'.

The following are quotes taken from the many comments made:

- *'All our current volunteers are already very busy people and cannot give up more time for all these groups, however useful; they may be'.*
- *'Networking is not perceived as relevant to our well being'.*
- *'Not knowing what partnership work is happening...'*
- *'Our commissioners do not expect us to divert resource from direct service delivery to networking and partnership working'.*
- *'A lack of awareness of opportunity and network contacts'.*
- *'We are unlike other organisations in that we are totally voluntary'.*
- *'We have not seen the need for this so far'.*
- *'We are a stand alone organisation'.*
- *'The competition in fundraising is immense - our skill levels need to be on a professional basis now!'*
- *'Most issues come back to money. We began 12 years ago and have expanded hugely however our core statutory funding is still at the original level'.*

- *'We have only been operating since February 2005 and already we are quite busy. I can see the time will come when we will need to be able to employ some office support'.*
- *'SCA provides valuable networking opportunities. Local volunteer bureaux could do more if they had more resources, but they do what they can'.*
- *'As a branch of a national organisation we are able to call upon HQ for some guidance, promotional work, legal matters and training'.*
- *'We would like to see more developments that allow voluntary groups to combine under one roof to share some of the core costs'.*
- *'We have difficulties in engaging PCT members to fully recognise the importance of supporting carers and involving them in meaningful consultation'.*
- *'Our biggest problem is how to sustain and develop ourselves with so few volunteers and to help with fundraising, accounts, administration, publicity etc'.*

Findings from rural workshop

To ensure the voice of the voluntary and community sector in the rural areas of the county was heard a Rural Focus Group was arranged in July 2005.

Key challenges identified were:

- Recruiting volunteers/committee members/individuals with specific skills
- Cash flow made available for community halls
- Difficulties in bringing in people from all across the community – from commuters to those living on council estates
- Breaking down barriers between long-standing residents and newcomers
- Legal/health and safety advice for community groups – contracts, insurance, health and safety, etc.
- Need for grants and help with fundraising

Section 5: Existing Infrastructure Support

Infrastructure provision in the county is currently complex and varied. There is a 'patchwork' of district or borough-based organisations (many of which are CVS/VB combinations), providing generalist infrastructure support. Alongside this, there are some locally-based countywide infrastructure providers (Surrey Community Action being the largest) and a number of locally-based national organisations, serving the needs of their branches in the county, often providing both specialist and generalist support. In addition there are a number of usually specialist local and countywide organisations, some of which deliver some infrastructure support to some elements of the sector.

Specialist infrastructure support is provided in a number of key areas, with organisations such as SID (Social Information on Disability) supporting groups working on disability issues, Age Concern working with older people, Surrey Council for Voluntary Youth Services (SCVYS) working with young people and Surrey Welfare Rights.

Surrey Community Action, as the county Rural Community Council (RCC), does deliver substantial support to rural communities across the county, working with a range of smaller organisations. Although most CVSs do have a strong urban focus to their work, some do look to support rural community work: other organisations working in rural areas include SCVYS. The key issues in rural provision are the limited resources available along with limited level of joint planning and integration, with a heavy reliance on provision by Surrey Community Action.

Specialist support for BME, minority faith, refugee and asylum seekers groups is very limited. There are no specialist BME, minority faith, refugee and asylum seeker infrastructure providers. For Gypsy and Traveller communities, the Surrey Traveller Community Relations Forum and some CAB's were identified as sources of support, but are not providing a full range of specialist infrastructure services. A survey of generic and other specialist infrastructure service providers was carried to establish what services they provide to diverse community groups. The results show that:

- there is very little support available from either the mainstream VCS or the Faith sector for Gypsies and Travellers;
- support from the mainstream VCS and Faith sector for refugees and asylum seekers is limited, as is support for people from BME communities and minority faiths; and
- support for any of the diverse communities located outside Woking is limited or non-existent.

It is clear that only a limited amount of generic infrastructure support is available to diverse community groups if it is needed. The number of infrastructure providers working with these communities appears very limited. These findings tend to reinforce the conclusion that where people from the diverse communities do not have access to support from any formal source, they draw heavily on their own communities.

Infrastructure support may be provided by the CVS/VB Network, by specialist providers or by businesses outside the sector and this range of potential service delivery needs to be effectively integrated. One crucial issue is the limited level of links developed between the generalist and specialist infrastructure organisations. It is important that any development of infrastructure provision in the county is built on a greater degree of integration between infrastructure providers.

At the moment, specialist infrastructure providers do not network in the same way as the CVS/VB Network and this has, to some extent, put these specialist organisations at a disadvantage as they are inevitably less able to 'speak with a single voice' in the way that the CVS/VB Network can.

Community development support is at an interesting stage in the county, with the Surrey Social Inclusion Network recently re launched, bringing together those working in this area to share ideas, good practice and support as well as raising the profile of the activity and promoting a more strategic approach in Surrey.

Services for social enterprise are also limited: Surrey Community Action provides support with no other specialised infrastructure organisations currently delivering this work in the county. They are the lead body for the Surrey Social Enterprise Network and provide the link to the Regional Social Enterprise Network.

There are strong regional and national links at the county level (with groups such as SERCC, RAISE, ACRE and NACVS) but at district level these links are less developed. The research clearly identified that partnership working and links to organisations and groupings outside the county was limited.

A key element of the structure of infrastructure provision in Surrey is the Surrey CVS/VB Network based around the 'Surrey Model' of an integrated CVS/VB. Whilst this does not relate to every organisation providing infrastructure support to the VCS in the county, it is relevant to many (for example, Surrey Community Action does not receive tripartite funding). This is based on rolling, three-year tripartite funding

through a Partnership Funding Agreement, involving Surrey County Council, Borough/District Councils and Surrey-based Primary Care Trusts. The agreement sets out a shared rationale for the future core funding of a borough or district CVS/VB and the model is working in most Surrey Districts and Boroughs. Waverley Borough currently does not have a borough-wide integrated CVS/VB but recent work in the borough has helped move forward the process of the development of this type of organisation.

All infrastructure organisations working in the county were identified and invited to participate in a detailed programme of research, aimed at identifying the range and nature of infrastructure support delivered across the county. Research was largely on an 'organisation by organisation' basis, with limited opportunities for benchmarking performance across those participating. In addition, organisations were analysed on a self assessment basis, again making it difficult to compare results.

Waverley

The lack of a borough wide CVS in Waverley had been recognised as a challenge in previous work and a ChangeUp research project has recently been undertaken in the borough. The work had a clear focus to identify the most effective way of delivering infrastructure support to the many voluntary and community sector organisations working in Waverley. However, initial analysis of the research results indicated that too little was known about the needs of the majority of the 600+ organisations that are based or work within the Borough.

The research indicated significant gaps in the current provision of infrastructure support, particularly in terms of support offered from Borough-based voluntary sector organisations. The level of capacity to deliver specialist infrastructure functions was particularly weak, with almost no sources of support for organisations working with, for example, Black and Minority Ethnic communities or social enterprises. There were clear weaknesses in involvement in partnerships and networks, in capability to represent and be accountable to the wider sector, in development work and in liaison across the sector.

A developmental approach was recommended in setting up an infrastructure organisation such as a Council for Voluntary Service. This was seen as essential to ensure that any outcomes were appropriate, sustainable and effective. The full report outlined a range of actions that this developmental project would undertake, structuring the work around the 5 core CVS functions of services and support, liaison, representation, development work and strategic partnerships.

The research recommended that the project is delivered by a Project Officer over a limited period of time (no more than two years), based within the voluntary and community sector in a supportive environment, exploring the possibility of linking with existing services such as GAVS. This approach would enable a more robust understanding of local needs to be developed and to ensure that any development was based on these needs and had local ownership.

This development stage would also allow the ChangeUp county infrastructure research to make significant progress. The adoption of any model for the delivery of infrastructure support services in Waverley can then be influenced by the direction and findings of the county research.

Section 6: The Way Forward

Following extensive analysis of the results of the research and consultation the Steering Group decided that IDP Action Plan should adopt a co-operative 'brokerage

model' approach to tackle the identified infrastructure support needs over the next 10 years. The Steering Group recognised that adoption of such a model would allow infrastructure services to be developed and delivered in a cost effective way which would be welcomed by existing and potential funders.

Definition of Brokerage model

Surrey Voluntary and Community Sector Consortium exists for the benefit of not-for-profit organisations and communities working in Surrey.

Members will respond to requests for help, support, information and other services from voluntary and community organisations, taking into account the need for specialist knowledge where necessary by maximising the resources available and reducing duplication.

- Members will work towards an agreed set of minimum standards for all service delivery
- It will establish protocols for sharing information and signposting to others within or outside the consortium
- All members will monitor, evaluate and record data in the same way
- Members will work together to raise standards within the sector
- Members will work together to improve the engagement of the sector with statutory and private agencies
- Members will work in partnership with others to identify and address gaps in provision and work with all providers to address those gaps

2. Aims and objectives

a) Aim

Promote and support the development and sustainability of Surrey's voluntary and community sector through the provision of effective, efficient and inclusive infrastructure services

Objectives

- Have a clear understanding of the current baseline of infrastructure provision. Have implemented monitoring, evaluation and review the mechanism
- Effective and efficient support provided to organisations to help them achieve their aims (future proof actions)
- Better working relationships built between the current generalist, and specialist infrastructure providers and other 'external' sources of support to ensure efficient delivery of infrastructure support
- The value and worth of the voluntary and community sector in Surrey promoted widely

b) Aim

To ensure that all parts of the Surrey's voluntary and community sector have a voice in responding to the needs and interests of their communities and are efficient in engaging with key stakeholders

Objectives

- A strong and representative structure built and maintained
- The engagement of the voluntary and community sector is strengthened with appropriate stakeholders
- The engagement of the voluntary and community sector with a range of robust, creative and proactive partnerships is supported

Key support needs of the VCS

In the research 22 different areas of support and advice were identified. Using the survey and other feedback, these have been grouped and ordered in terms of their priority.

Funding advice and support	Recruiting & retaining volunteers
Finance	Legal
HR	Training
Knowledge management and ICT	Business planning
Social Enterprise	Networks/forums
Representation	Quality Standards
Brokerage/signposting	Marketing
Workforce development	Organisational development
Community Development	Links with national/regional bodies
Bulk purchasing and Procurement	Environmental issues

The IDP has taken these issues into account to develop an integrated and effective approach to address them, building on existing good practice. In order to achieve appropriate progress a co-ordinated and agreed approach is required, that takes into account the fact that many of the required actions are not exclusive or carried out in isolation. It is also important to recognise that specialist infrastructure support around faith, BME, sport, rural, older people, younger people, disability, welfare rights etc. groups is required. The attached Action Plan sets out the proposed steps to be taken for development of these identified support areas (with some having been grouped where appropriate).

Local Area Agreements and the Rural Social and Community Programme

A number of other initiatives have also been developing alongside the ChangeUp process. The first of these are Local Area Agreements (LAAs). LAAs set out the priorities for a local area agreed between central government and a local area (the local authority and Local Strategic Partnership) and other key partners at the local level. LAAs simplify some central funding, help join up public services more effectively and allow greater flexibility for local solutions to local circumstances.

The Rural, Social and Community Programme (RSCP) is designed to develop the capacity of the rural Voluntary and Community Sector and parish councils to address important rural social issues and tackle the causes of rural social exclusion. It will provide £13.5M nationally on an annual basis. The programme is intended to help rural communities shape and enhance their own futures.

In Surrey, the accountable body for the Rural Social and Community Programme will be Surrey Community Action and the fund will be aligned with the Surrey LAA, with linkages to (1) Workforce development, (3) Broader range of housing, (4) Improved Health, (6) Safer Stronger Communities and (7) Changing attitudes.

The RSCP business case has been produced by Surrey Community Action on behalf of the Surrey ChangeUp VCS Infrastructure Consortium, the partnership. A sub group of this partnership will oversee the monitoring and delivery of this business case. The sub group overseeing the work of the 8 strands identified (see list below) will itself be overseen by the ChangeUp VCS Infrastructure consortium, which will ensure that appropriate links are made to the ChangeUp delivery plan, the Surrey Strategic Partnership and LAA. This group will also align its work through the new Community Engagement programme to the LAA and PSA work undertaken in Surrey.

RSCP priorities

- Rural Community Development Worker
- Rural Housing Enabler
- Joint work with Surrey County Association of Parish and Town Councils
- Rural Youth Capacity Building Programme
- Small Grants Programme
- Rural Community Development Training
- Rural Information Workshops
- County Wide Rural Forum

(Elements of the Action Plan which relate directly to the RSCP priorities have been marked with a *).

Options

The research identified a number of possible models for the development of infrastructure provision in Surrey. In developing the infrastructure there are two competing factors:

- The need to strengthen **local** access and ensure that local and sectoral distinctiveness is not lost. This identifies the need for effective local infrastructure bodies with a reach in the communities which they serve.
- Conversely, there is a gap between the demand for support from frontline organisations and the capacity of infrastructure to deliver that support to the depth that is required.

Certain issues are of concern and do need swift action: the development of an agreed and shared VCS database is important. These findings move us towards recommending a centralisation of services to create economies of scale and to use resources more effectively. The key is to be clear about which services require local contact and which would benefit from economies of scale and so are best provided at a county level. The research indicated a broad acceptance of the idea of 'two layer' approach.

Local delivery

Healthcheck process

It was considered that many of these common needs were best addressed through local infrastructure organisations offering expertise and support in the form of a VCS organisational 'healthcheck'. This would use a common 'framework' offering appropriate guidance, advice and support. Local infrastructure organisations could work together to develop the 'healthcheck' mechanism, ensuring that staff and procedures are in place to ensure a consistent approach was taken across Surrey.

The 'healthcheck' would provide local organisations with a range of support and advice services which would enable them to set up, recruit and support volunteers and to run and manage their organisation. It would not provide detailed or extensive support on issues but form a sound foundation for the running of a group.

It also focuses resources and development on a clear set of local infrastructure priorities: infrastructure organisations are not attempting to 'do it all' and expectations can be more easily managed and agreed levels of quality can be defined and tested more effectively.

Second layer provision: developing areas of expertise

Some of the areas of support identified by the VCS organisations require significant resources and expertise to deliver e.g. HR, legal advice, IT support, training complex

fundraising, social enterprise and income generation. The second layer would encourage the development of hubs of expertise within the county.

Support for rural communities

The following represents a set of appropriate standards for rural provision: at least one representative and inclusive forum or network (e.g. a tenants and residents association or a parish council)

- at least one representative and inclusive forum or network (e.g. a tenants and residents association or a parish council)
- at least one physical 'hub' or base for individual collective community activity (e.g. a community centre, school or village hall)
- access to generic community capacity building workers (e.g. long term community development workers or others with an explicit capacity building brief)
- easier access to small grants to stimulate and support grass roots community activity, capacity building and income generation
- a local action plan, developed on an inclusive basis through the engagement of the local community

Support for Black and Minority Ethnic, minority Faith, Refugee, Asylum Seeker, Gypsy and Traveller VCOs

The ASP project asked volunteers from the diverse community organisations that were contacted what infrastructure support services their groups need. The top priorities for infrastructure service development to support diverse community groups were:

- information, advice and support for people starting up a new group, and on 'growing' the group once it was formed;
- advice and information on sources of funding, where to apply and how to make an application;
- access to premises and facilities;
- employing and managing paid staff;
- advice and support on information and communication technology (ICT);
- guidance on policy, good practice and the law;
- specific training including organisational development, health and safety, risk assessment and similar issues.

It is noticeable how similar this list is to the 22 priorities above listed by mainstream VCOs in their responses to the main ChangeUp survey. Community groups based in Woking said that they had been able to obtain some of the support they needed. However, groups from other parts of the county appeared to have been less successful.

The issue of community development is not a central feature of the ASP programme, regionally or within Surrey. Nevertheless, there is evidence that tends to support the need for some form of community capacity building within and between the diverse communities in Surrey. There is a broad consensus across representatives of diverse community organisations, voluntary and community organisations and statutory bodies that community development support is needed within and between the diverse communities to achieve four basic aims:

- to help get communities to start the first stages of organising themselves;

- to help informal groupings to become more formal so that they can begin to play a more prominent role in service delivery and representation;
- to support inter-community networking on common issues of concern;
- to facilitate partnership with the wider network of voluntary sector and statutory bodies.

The ASP research also identified a general lack of 'diversity awareness' among VCOs. In the course of the survey of leading infrastructure and service providers, organisations were asked to say what steps they take to address issues of diversity and social inclusion. A majority of the organisations that responded said that they have adopted policies and procedures promoting equality and diversity, and have adopted the relevant codes of practice. Yet on closer examination, only a minority of those taking part undertake:

- specific training on cultural awareness relating to the needs of particular ethnic or faith communities;
- ethnic monitoring of their service delivery;
- focus their services on the needs of minority communities;
- offer interpreting and translation services to assist non-English speakers to access their services; or
- consult people from minority communities about the services they offer.

The Additional Support Programme identified the need to develop a Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Group for the county in order to address community needs and to address the identified gap between the community and the voluntary and community sector in the county. Research undertaken through the Additional Support Programme made the following recommendations.

- A local or regional Gypsy and Traveller-led voluntary organisation should be set up in order to deliver services directly to the Gypsy and Traveller community. This could cover the county of Surrey only or have a wider regional focus. The organisation would deliver community development, information, representation and advocacy services directly to the community.
- Feasibility work should be undertaken into the employment (by the voluntary and community sector) of a Gypsy and Traveller outreach worker, drawn from the community itself, to actively promote the use of voluntary services to the Gypsy and Traveller community.
- Gypsy and Traveller cultural diversity training should be delivered and widely marketed to voluntary and community organisations across Surrey from 2006/07, potentially in partnership with the public sector.
- A working group within the Surrey voluntary and community sector should be formed (including members of the Gypsy and Traveller community) to develop a communication strategy to inform the Gypsy and Traveller community about the services available.
- All voluntary and community sector service providers should be encouraged to include the Gypsy and Traveller community in ethnic monitoring for volunteers and service users with the results being used to help develop engagement. This recommendation reflects recommendations from the Commission for Racial Equality about Gypsies and Travellers being more visible in all ethnic monitoring.

(Elements of the Action Plan which relate directly to recommendations identified through the ASP work they have been marked with a +)

Support for Social Enterprise

There is still a huge lack of awareness and understanding of Social Enterprise, plus the sustainable benefits of unrestricted funding from business trading with a social purpose. However, there is a realisation amongst a varied and diverse group of stake holders that to improve sustainability and social inclusion, there is a growing need for income generation, plus the potential that Social Enterprises will play in the future.

The support identified, was for a broad approach, which included;

- Specialist advisors/trainers
- Business advice tailored to the sector
- Funding at all levels from Government, including pump priming
- Education on and changes to the restraints within public procurement
- Proactive and innovative use of networks and partnerships across the county
- Sharing and improving best practice
- Use of networks and learning sets within the county, region and nationally

Support for other specialist groups

There are some areas of work for which the generic support provided by infrastructure organisations may not be sufficient to cover all needs. These may include challenges such as complex legal matters or issues related to disability or mental health, etc. The provision of support in areas such as IT may also require specialist support. The intention is that this specialist support will be sought firstly from providers within the Consortium but if not available or appropriate, other, external providers will be identified.

Section 7: SURREY IDP ACTION PLAN

Definition of Brokerage model

Surrey Voluntary and Community Sector Consortium exists for the benefit of not-for-profit organisations and communities working in Surrey. Members will respond to requests for help, support, information and other services from voluntary and community organisations, taking into account the need for specialist knowledge where necessary by maximising the resources available and reducing duplication.

- Members will work towards an agreed set of minimum standards for all service delivery
- It will establish protocols for sharing information and signposting to others within or outside the consortium
- All members will monitor, evaluate and record data in the same way
- Members will work together to raise standards within the sector
- Members will work together to improve the engagement of the sector with statutory and private agencies
- Members will work in partnership with others to identify and address gaps in provision and work with all providers to address those gaps

2. Aims and objectives

a) Aim

Promote and support the development and sustainability of Surrey's voluntary and community sector through the provision of effective, efficient and inclusive infrastructure services

Objectives

- Have a clear understanding of the current baseline of infrastructure provision. Have implemented monitoring, evaluation and review the mechanism
- Effective and efficient support provided to organisations to help them achieve their aims (future proof actions)
- Better working relationships built between the current generalist, and specialist infrastructure providers and other 'external' sources of support to ensure efficient delivery of infrastructure support
- The value and worth of the voluntary and community sector in Surrey promoted widely

b) Aim

To ensure that all parts of the Surrey's voluntary and community sector have a voice in responding to the needs and interests of their communities and are efficient in engaging with key stakeholders

Objectives

- A strong and representative structure built and maintained
- The engagement of the voluntary and community sector is strengthened with appropriate stakeholders
- The engagement of the voluntary and community sector with a range of robust, creative and proactive partnerships is supported

Development

This Action Plan is a document which will evolve and change over time and therefore has been developed using a structure that can respond to changes as communities and groups grow and develop: the Plan needs to reflect future as well as existing needs of the sector. A vital element is that the IDP Action Plan is recognised as a central document for the voluntary and community sector and becomes the key strategic document for the development of infrastructure support in Surrey. Wide support and ownership in the voluntary, community and public sectors is an important goal and those involved in the IDP Action Plan should work to achieve this.

As has been noted elsewhere, the IDP Action Plan will continue to grow and change over its ten-year lifespan and will continue to be informed by ongoing consultation with frontline organisations to ensure that it addresses the needs of this group of key stakeholders. Following the publication of the SIDP the consortium will review its membership and terms of reference at a meeting in April 2006.

The Action Plan focuses on the early stages of the work, the short term developments planned over the next three years (2006 – 2009) and outlines aims, objectives and actions for this period in a detailed and comprehensive way. Medium term actions, taking place during years four to six of the IDP have been outlined but in less detail, reflecting the likelihood that many other changes and developments will need to be taken into account. The context of this work (changes in needs, in partner organisations, in structures and in the nature and range of funders) are all likely to have an impact and it is important to ensure that the Plan remains flexible and able to take into account the changing context in which it functions. It is difficult to plan in any detail for the final four years of the lifespan of the Plan but areas of work for the long term have been identified and indicative aims, objectives and actions have been highlighted.

The pace of change is likely to be rapid over the next few years, and it is likely that communities may have different needs and requirements. The Action Plan is a document which sets out a clear direction, provides a structure but also remains flexible and responsive to change: it will be reviewed and developed in response to those changing circumstances. Currently, a number of significant changes are occurring which are likely to have significant impacts on the development of infrastructure provision in Surrey and the Infrastructure Development Plan.

Context

The County Council is undergoing a Business Delivery Review, a radical programme to re-shape and improve services, while further increasing its efficiency. The Review was commissioned in anticipation of a further shift of Government grant away from Surrey and the South East of England. At the time of publication of this report, it is unclear as to what impact this will have on voluntary and community sector infrastructure provision.

Alongside this, a new Surrey wide PCT is likely to be formed in October 2006, with a new Chief Executive in post by June. No major changes to the way services are run and managed are likely to take place within the financial year 2006/7, as the new PCT settles down and management structures take shape. A Surrey wide PCT will need to have a strong locality structure and this is likely to be based on the existing PCT boundaries in the short-term: but possibly reducing to a total of four localities over a period of time.

Costings

The early spend projects that will be tackled by March 2008 have been costed. This will provide approximate figures to help the VCS and potential funders to make informed decisions on priorities if there is a limited budget available. Once the initial projects are underway a revised costed action plan can be produced with fuller costings to support future funding applications.

In order to develop outline costings the following guidelines have been followed. For actions which require additional staffing the following costings have been used:

Salary	£25,000
Pension & NI (5%)	£3,750
Materials/ equipment	£3,000
Travel	£3,000
Office rental & costs	£4,000
Management costs	£7,500

A full post has been costed at £46,250, with a 0.5 post therefore being £23,125 and 0.25 post being £11,562. A daily rate of £200 per day has been used where these are more appropriate. In the Action plan only the priority and short term actions have been costed.

It has been assumed that the current core funding to infrastructure organisations will remain the same for the next three years, and where appropriate the tripartite agreement between County, Boroughs and Districts and Health will remain in place.

Evaluation

Resourcing to allow for independent evaluation to take place of the action plan will need to be built into overall project costs.

Risks and challenges

To tackle such a wide ranging and long term work the Consortium and Steering Group are aware of the risks associated with the implementation of the IDP. These are:

- Lack of capacity within VCS to engage widely
- Lack of ambition
- Capacity of existing infrastructure organisations to manage change
- Managing raised expectation with the frontline services
- Maintaining trustees engagement and necessary levels of skills and expertise
- Adequacy of engagement from range of Statutory Authorities
- Lack of funding to resource change processes and work identified

It is the responsibility of all members of the Consortium to try to mitigate these risks.

The following action plan has been developed as a realistic and pragmatic approach to the significant long-term challenges of making a step change in the provision of infrastructure services in Surrey. Priority short term actions have been identified and costed in order to make swift progress, building on the current base of provision. The key aim is to build an effective, efficient and sustainable model base on the tripartite funding model as already implemented in the county.

Whilst acknowledging that infrastructure provision in the county is 'patchy' there are a number of organisations providing high quality services and being effective in meeting the infrastructure needs of frontline organisations. This provides a substantial base on which to build and develop. It is therefore important to be clear that this Action Plan has been developed on the assumption that the resources required to support this 'base' of infrastructure provision will be maintained: any reduction will be likely to impact on all or some of this plan.

The Action Plan is a working document: monitoring is built into all of the identified actions and as such, it will be reviewed as progress is made. It is expected that a major review of the plan will take place on an annual basis, making revisions and adjustments to take into account what has been achieved and the new challenges that will inevitably arise over the implementation period.

Equality and Diversity

All of the action and services described in this action plan, and future updates, will be Equality and Diversity proofed to ensure that they are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including but not exclusive to the ASP groups. The ASP proposes a series of actions that are designed to energise the VCS to engage with the diverse communities, and in a mirror image of the need to undertake capacity building with these communities, to develop the capacity of the VCS to provide appropriate and culturally sensitive services to these communities. At the completion of the project, the Surrey Additional Support Programme has identified five broad themes with a number of specific actions that need to be taken in support of them. It is proposed that these themes and actions should all be grouped in this Local Infrastructure Development Plan Action Plan, of which the ASP forms part, under the heading of Equality and Diversity. Within this heading, the five ASP themes are:

- Equality and Diversity;
- Infrastructure Services;
- Community Development
- Representation and Self-advocacy; and
- Marketing and Signposting VCS services.

(Where actions relate directly to recommendations identified through the ASP work they have been marked with a +)

(Where actions relate directly to priorities identified in the Rural Social Community Programme they have been marked with a *)

Where no name is given under the responsibilities column the Consortium will either nominate or oversee the task directly, working on current staffing levels and work loads for the next 2 years. Should these change, e.g. withdrawal of free venue etc. additional resources will be needed and these will be based on the above costs.

Timescale used: Short term – April 2006 – March 2009 Medium term - April 2009 – March 2011 Long term - April 2011 – March 2014

Funding advice and support

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To improve the skills and knowledge of the voluntary and community sector to acquire funding and to work towards sustainability	Build links to social enterprise work	Raise awareness in the voluntary and community sector of the need to develop funding strategies	Funding Advisors Network-FAN	Up to 2 days a wk across the network	Short
	Define and adopt a set of standards for the provision of funding advice within Surrey	Develop standard Surrey funding template	FAN		Short
		Establish protocols for securing feedback on successful and unsuccessful bids	FAN		Short
	Simplify voluntary and community sector access to appropriate funding advice	Ensure that funding advice training is available	SCA		Short and on going
		Identify gaps in local provision/ensure appropriate signposting	FAN		Short
		Ensure local authorities to ensure they can signpost enquiries appropriately	FAN		Ongoing
		Develop a Web-based 'database' of funding advisers	SCA		Short
		Develop Funding 'Chat Room'	SCA		Short/Medium
		Develop Funding Alert network	SCA		Short/Medium
		Develop a network approach to Funding advice	SCA		Medium
Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to, the ASP groups					

Volunteering

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
<p>To increase the profile and effectiveness of volunteering in the county</p> <p>To increase the levels of volunteering in Surrey</p> <p>To improve the quality of the volunteering experience for all concerned</p>	To provide appropriate and effective support to volunteers	Identify additional resources to promote and extend outreach and surgeries	CVS/VB Network	(£138k 06/08 from SCC Pump Priming Grant)	Short
	To offer an enhanced volunteer experience	Identify additional resources to promote and extend volunteering for those with extra support needs	Volunteer Dev Officer (in post Spring 2006)		Medium
		Explore opportunities for joint working to undertake VE accreditation	SCA		Ongoing
	To offer high quality support for all organisations supporting or involved with volunteering	Research accredited training available	CVS/ VB Network for all the following		Ongoing
		Devise and implement joint approach to the marketing of volunteering			Ongoing
		Develop best practice and an agreed approach to managing volunteers			Medium
		Set up employee volunteering project			Short
		Policy response and campaigning – more joint work undertaken to ensure awareness of local, county, regional and national initiatives			Short/medium
		Strategic development of volunteering to ensure that regional and national initiatives fully benefit the county			Medium
	To offer activities and opportunities to raise the profile and understanding of the importance of volunteering	To identify, support and encourage the contribution of volunteers to the rural community*			Ongoing
To share best practice in recruiting and retaining volunteers between community			Ongoing		

		development workers and volunteer centres*			
		Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups			

Finance

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To provide Surrey's VCS with a range of high quality and affordable financial services	Mapping of current provision undertaken	Undertake mapping of current provision and capacity	SCA & WAVS		Short
	Range of finance training and workshops delivered in Surrey	Deliver a range of training and workshop opportunities	SCA		On going
		Develop a financial healthcheck toolkit	SCA/WAVS		Medium
	Various support mechanisms for Treasurers and Finance Officers explored	County forum (or other suitable support mechanisms) developed for Treasurer's and Finance Officers	Infrastructure network		Medium
		Develop VCS's understanding of full cost recovery	SCA		Medium/on-going
	VCS helped to understand Full Cost Recovery (FCR) model	Monitor finance hub	CVS/VB Network		Ongoing
		Develop payroll and finance services for smaller organisations	SCA/WAVS		Short/medium
Work of finance hub monitored	Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups				

Legal

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To ensure that Surrey's VCS has access to effective, affordable and up to date legal services	Provide appropriate opportunities for VCS organisations to receive appropriate up to date legal advice	Investigate current legal information that is available	Consortium	10 days (£2,000)	Short
		Identify key issues of concern (Property etc)	Consortium		Short
		Develop basic legal toolkit	Consortium		Short
		Identify and promote areas of help (e.g.-bono, VCS expertise)	SCA/ Social Enterprise		Short
		Link to work of governance hub	CVS/VB Network		Short
		Ensure VCS is kept informed of changes relating to legal requirements	Consortium		Short
		Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups			

Human resources

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To improve the HR support offered to VCS organisations in Surrey	Create HR specialist hub in Surrey	Create HR specialist hub in Surrey. Publicise development and work	Consortium	10 days (£2,000)	Short/ medium
	Develop basic HR toolkit	Develop basic HR toolkit from employing through to termination of contract) Signposting on to key contacts and Websites. Research to see what is available nationally/ regionally	SCA		Short
	Identify what held exists already and promote it				
	Monitor work of national HR hub	Make better use of what advice does already exist	Infrastructure Network		Short
	Raise awareness within VCS of the need to HR advice		CVS/VB Network		Ongoing
			CVS/VB Network		Ongoing
		Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups			

Training (see HR)

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To increase the effectiveness of VCS in Surrey through appropriate training opportunities	To provide high quality affordable training opportunities in the county	Secure long term funding for SCA to continue training work and continue to allow expertise to develop	SCA	2 full time posts £90k, plus trainers, revenue costs	Short
	To support the identification of local training needs	Form training providers network (and email group). Work required to identify who should be invited			Short
		Identify ways of making better use of existing training opportunities			On going
	To develop and deliver a comprehensive training programme targeted on identified VCS needs	Develop and implement training needs analysis assessment tool			Short
		Survey sector to identify HR training and workforce development +			Short
		Develop training web page with key links to existing websites (all training providers to have own page)			Short/medium
		Identify long term needs of sector e.g. changes in legislation, Social Enterprise etc +			On going
		To further develop and deliver community development training to urban and rural communities (<i>*RSCP Rural Community Development Training</i>)			On going
Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups					

Knowledge Management and IT

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
<p>To increase the effective collection, analysis and use of key information on the work, needs and issues of the voluntary and community sector in Surrey</p> <p>To increase the effectiveness of Voluntary and community sector work through the appropriate use of ICT</p>	<p>To support the effective collection and collation of VCS information</p> <p>To run key priority projects gathering useful information on needs</p>	<p>Database Research and follow up work to ensure all infrastructure organisations have 'base level' equipment/software</p>	SCA	10 days (2,000)	Short
		<p>Agree protocols, structure and approach to information management database</p> <p>Create database in sustainable form</p>	Wider infrastructure network	None	Short
	<p>To set up systems to bring together and integrate information collection and analysis</p> <p>To provide an effective structure of ICT provision and support, based on a clear understanding of the needs of the sector, delivered in a way which suits those needs</p>	<p>Scope/identify links to other databases</p> <p>Improve ICT skills – benchmark and ensure all infrastructure organisations have capacity</p>	Database working group	Unknown at the time	Short/medium
		<p>Ongoing mechanism for database development agreed</p>	CVS Dev Worker	SCC	Short/medium
		<p>Ensure database is inclusive of community sector and diverse organisations</p>	Database working group	SCC	Ongoing
		<p>Information 'Effective Information' working group set up</p>	Database working group	SCC	Short/medium
		<p>Work undertaken on structuring, ordering and linking information</p>	Database working group	SCC	Short/medium
		<p>Knowledge management lead contacts network identified across the</p>	Database working group	SCC	Short/medium
			Infrastructure network		Short/medium
			Infrastructure network		Short/medium
	Infrastructure network		Short/medium		

		sector		
		Develop common approach to work recording	Infrastructure network	Medium
		Work with funders to develop common approach to monitoring of work recording	Infrastructure network	Medium
		Monitor national ICT hub	CVS/VB Network	Ongoing
		Deliver rural information workshops to rural community groups*	SCA	Short/medium
		ICT Investigate possibility of IT Officer (role, remit, management, resources and funding)	SCA	Short/medium
		Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups		

Business Planning

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
<p>To increase the profile and effectiveness of business planning in the voluntary and community sector</p> <p>To increase the level of business planning volunteering in the voluntary and community sector</p> <p>To improve the quality of the work of voluntary and community sector</p>	<p>To provide effective business planning support for all voluntary and community sector organisations</p>	Infrastructure organisations to ensure they are working appropriately and have business plans in place	Wider infrastructure network	10 days consultancy (£3,500)	Short
		CVS/VB Network to ensure an appropriate business plan is in place	CVS/VB Network		Short
		Create Business Planning healthcheck tool	Consortium		Short/medium
	<p>Deliver targeted training and development in business planning</p>	<p>Deliver appropriate activities to support business planning development in the sector</p>	Promote sources of training and advice in business planning	SCA	Short/ongoing
			Awareness-raising undertaken in the sector	Consortium	Short/ongoing
			Mentoring /Action Learning sets / Buddying / Workforce Development programme set up	SCA	Medium
			Follow up work provided to organisations requesting help (from survey)	SCA/CVS/VB network	Short
			Provide Business Planning assistance to groups setting up Trading Arms	SCA/SENT	Short
			Ensure that all services are promoted to and accessible to diverse VCOs, including rural, BME, minority faith, gypsy, traveller and refugee and asylum seekers.	Infrastructure network	On going
			Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups		

Social Enterprise

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To increase the profile and awareness of social enterprise and income generation in the county	To provide appropriate and effective support to social enterprises	Identification of local groups either working as social enterprises or with the potential for doing so	SCA for all this section	1 full time post £45k	Short
	To offer activities and opportunities to link social enterprises	Local promotion of social enterprise case studies			Short
To increase the levels of social enterprise and sustainability in Surrey	To provide opportunities to raise the profile and understanding of the importance of social enterprise outside the sector	Development of co-ordinated specialist advice and support for social enterprise			Short/medium
	Improve the opportunity for public comment	Development of social enterprise forum/partnership			Medium
		Promote local, regional and national funding opportunities for social enterprises			Ongoing
		Capacity building for forum/partnership members			Medium
		Develop pump priming fund to encourage social enterprise activity			Medium
		Investigate how social corporate responsibility could be developed under the provision of services linked to SE			Medium
		Share learning and good practice			Short/medium
		Ensure SE models are included in economic strategy and promoted to			Medium

		<p>key decision makers</p> <p>Develop links and joint activity across VCS, businesses and the public sector</p> <p>Help Social Enterprises gain access to commercial support networks</p> <p>Link all infrastructure providers including BLS and generic VCS</p> <p>To encourage and support the delivery of rural services through social enterprise</p> <p>Provide specialist support to community and village hall committees to develop these enterprises as hubs for community activity</p> <p>Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups</p>			<p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Short/medium</p> <p>Short/medium</p> <p>On going</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---

Networks and Forums (see representation)

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To improve the opportunities Surrey VCS organisations have to work together, share experience, knowledge and best practice	Create opportunities for developing links between local VCS organisations	Mapping exercise to identify what already exists, role, terms of reference, contact, accountability, resources available, representation, how often meet etc +	CVS/VB Network and specialist infrastructure orgs	25 days £5k	Short
	Create, support and nurture a comprehensive and inclusive range of networks and forums which reflect the needs and priorities of the VCS in Surrey	Understand the relationships between existing forums and networks. Review what works well. Identify gaps and duplications (such as Waverley) and work with local organisations to address these. Identify good practice models (* <i>RSCP priority county wide rural forum</i>)	SCA		Short
	Ensure that Surrey's VCS has a voice nationally, regionally and within the county with all relevant stakeholders	Publicise findings of above work. Create network directory in format that's easily updated	SCA	10 days £2k	Short
		Form working group to develop Surrey VCS forum to explore format, role, elections, budget required, How to engage sector, promote. Explore good practice elsewhere in country +	SCA		Short/ medium
		Promote benefits of partnership working and networking	Infrastructure network		On going
	Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups				

Representation

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To increase the capability of the voluntary and community sector to work collectively and to make its views known	Provide opportunities for local VCS organisations to participate in a democratic process which enables them to raise issues of concern	Map current representative networks and partnerships*	Wider infrastructure network	10 days (£2k)	Short
To improve the ability of the VCS to engage with and influence policy	Run a well-structured mechanism for ensuring that the voluntary and community sector in Surrey has an effective voice	Assess the level of engagement and appropriateness of current networks and partnerships*	SCA for the rest of actions	£35,000 pa	Short
To empower the VCS and to ensure that its voice is heard		Develop an agreed structured and costed strategy for representation			Short/medium
		Develop approach to training in representation			Ongoing
		Raise awareness of the value and importance of representation			Ongoing
		Research actual costs of representation activities			Short
		Produce 'role description' for representatives			Short
		Produce 'representation tips': guidance on making representation more effective			Short
		Develop a forum and mechanisms to improve the representation of rural VCO / Community issues*		£5k	Short
		Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups			

Quality Standards

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
<p>To increase the profile and understanding of the value of the quality standards approach</p> <p>To increase effectiveness of the voluntary and community sector in Surrey</p>	<p>To provide appropriate and effective quality standards support to voluntary and community sector organisations</p>	<p>Develop initial healthcheck/basic guide to quality standards for organisations +</p>	SCA	1 full time post £45k	Medium
	<p>To offer activities and opportunities to raise the profile and understanding of the importance of effective quality standards</p>	<p>Continue to raise awareness of and promote benefits of quality standards (best practice examples, etc) +</p>			Ongoing
		<p>Continue delivery of training and workshops in key quality standards systems</p>			Ongoing
		<p>Monitor national hub and signpost</p>			Ongoing
		<p>Work with funders and those procuring services on agreeing appropriate quality standards +</p>			Medium
	<p>To provide the sector with indications of future QS requirements</p>	<p>Understand and inform the sector on future changes to QS standards and help them understand the impact of the changes</p>			Medium
	<p>To ensure standards and practices are appropriate to the size of the organisation and diversity of the sector +.</p>	Medium			
	<p>Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups</p>				

Brokerage and Signposting

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
<p>To improve the opportunities for Surrey's infrastructure organisations to work together, share experience, knowledge and best practice</p> <p>To improve frontline organisation's access to infrastructure support services</p>	<p>Build clear and effective signposting mechanisms</p>	<p>Set up working group to undertake audit of services available +</p>	<p>Consortium</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Short</p>
		<p>Review range and reach of current infrastructure services +</p>			<p>Short</p>
	<p>Build the wider understanding of the key strengths and support services offered across the county</p>	<p>Agree approach to signposting and brokerage mechanism +</p>			<p>Short</p>
	<p>Set up working group to develop and implement signposting and brokerage mechanism +</p>	<p>Short</p>			
	<p>Develop proposals to develop and implement signposting and brokerage and consult across the sector +</p>	<p>Short</p>			
	<p>Develop costed implementation plan and bid for required resources +</p>	<p>Medium</p>			
	<p>Set up mechanism for monitoring and review of signposting and brokerage +</p>	<p>Medium</p>			
		<p>Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups</p>			

Marketing

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
<p>To increase the 'visibility' of the voluntary and community sector</p> <p>To improve the perception of the Voluntary and Community sector as a professional and effective grouping</p> <p>To increase the levels of understanding of the work and importance of the voluntary and community sector</p>	<p>To provide a range of appropriate and effective marketing 'packages' for use by voluntary and community sector organisations across the county</p> <p>To provide a clear and succinct message about the strength and importance of the voluntary and community sector in the county</p> <p>To provide information and support for groups trading or selling activities</p>	<p>Infrastructure organisations Research target groups and audience + Raise awareness of roles, developing a joint approach between specialist providers and the CVS/VB Network – set up working group + Research best practice elsewhere + Build on VB Network good practice work</p> <p>Frontline groups Research target groups and audience + Develop basic marketing toolkit, good practice/'how to' guide Carry out audit to identify those with marketing experience</p> <p>Voluntary and community sector Research target groups and audience + Set up multi-agency group to develop an approach to marketing the sector</p> <p>ChangeUp Consortium Promote work, aims and objectives of the Consortium</p> <p>Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups</p>	<p>Wider infrastructure network</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Short</p> <p>Short/medium</p> <p>Short</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Short</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Short</p> <p>Short</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

Workforce Development (see Training and HR)

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To improve the support and advice available to the VCS in Surrey relating to workforce development	Promote use of national occupational standards	Promote use of national occupational standards within sector	Wider Infra. Network	None	Short/medium
	Set up workforce dev. working group	Set up working group to develop workforce toolkit to help develop core competencies within sector. Target particular areas of work e.g. H&S	Wider Infra network	10 days (£2k)	Short/medium
	Develop phased programme of work	Develop phased rolling programme of work	SCA		Short/medium
	Submit funding bid for learning bursaries	Identify funding for learning bursary. Submit bids			Short
	Develop and pilot workforce health check for infrastructure organisations	Develop and pilot workforce health check for infrastructure organisations to implement + Sensitively collate and summarise results			Short
		Develop VCS workforce strategy +			Medium
	Develop VCS workforce strategy	Signposting system developed to ensure appropriate training available and utilised effectively +			Medium
	Signposting system developed for training	Consortium to monitor development of national workforce hub			Short/medium
	Monitor national workforce hub	Research good practice of mentoring, shadowing, action learning sets			Ongoing
	Research other mentoring, shadowing and Action Learning sets	Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups			Short/medium

Community Development

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To improve the delivery of community development and rural community support in the county	To offer a support service promoting a unified and integrated approach to community development	Develop existing Community Development Forum/network – part time co-ordinator employed, mapping and updating of e-mail group undertaken +	Consortium		Short/medium
		Marketing of role and purpose of existing network – information and marketing materials +			Short
		Support provided for CDWs to understand and engage with policy changes/development, share resources +			Ongoing
		Need to raise awareness of CD work with many different audiences* +			Short
		Influence SCC and local community strategies and LAA projects to ensure they are socially inclusive and promote best practice			Short/medium
		Training needs analysis within network and then training undertaken – should be accredited* +			Short
		Briefing sessions for new members of the network +			Short
		Promote national occupational standards			Short
		Ensure community engagement in the LAA process is tied in to this approach.			Short/medium
		To provide and develop specialist rural community development support.			Ensure rural communities have access to community development workers (* <i>RSCP priority Rural Community Dev Worker</i>)
Further raise awareness of the support provided by all infrastructure organisations +				Short/ongoing	

		<p>To encourage all rural communities to produce a parish plan or healthcheck and encourage community strategies to link to parish plans/healthchecks*</p>			Short/ongoing
		<p>Support the development of a rural forum to improve representation of rural community issues*</p>			Short/medium
		<p>Ensure Surrey Strategic Partnership activities, LAA projects, district and borough community strategy and local service delivery plans are rural proofed*</p>			Short/ongoing
		<p>Increase the standard of local community governance by encouraging greater interest from the community in standing for election to parish and town councils and greater take up of the Quality Parish Status scheme*</p>			Short/Medium
		<p>To support rural communities to identify and meet their affordable housing needs*</p>			Short/Medium
		<p>To improve services through the Small Rural Towns Programme*</p>			Short/Medium
		<p>To make effective use of the provision of mobile outreach facilities* +</p>			Short/Medium
		<p>To promote the development of youth clubs, facilities and activities*</p>			Short/Medium
		<p>Also see the other action plans for other specialist rural actions</p>			
		<p>Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups</p>			

Procurement and Bulk Purchasing

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To explore opportunities for Surrey's VCS to purchase goods through bulk purchase or procurement arrangements	Develop and promote effective systems to encourage Surrey's VCS to consider purchasing goods through procurement / bulk purchasing	Investigate possibility of establishing a network of interested parties to explore possible areas e.g. insurance			Medium
		Draw together a countywide group to investigate opportunities for larger and smaller organisations			Medium
	Market opportunities to VCS	Medium			
	Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups				
	Ensure the VCS is aware of developing areas for potential bidding eg. Social Enterprise bidding for contracts				

Environmental Issues

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
To explore opportunities for Surrey's VCS to work in a way which minimises damage to the environment and encourages sustainable practices	Undertake a review of environmental impact in key service areas	Identify key areas for review			Medium
		Plan environmental audit			Long
	Deliver audit, report and publicise findings	Long			
	Develop action plan to address issues	Long			
	Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups				
	Publicise findings highlighting key issues				
	Promote joint approach to address key issues				

Infrastructure organisations

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
<p>To increase effective partnership working and collaboration between infrastructure organisations (both generic and specialist) in identifying and meeting the needs of Surrey's voluntary and community sector</p> <p>To increase the effectiveness of voluntary and community sector infrastructure organisations working in the county</p>	To provide a strong network of generic and specialist infrastructure organisations	Review role and functions of the CVS/VB Network	CVS/VB Network	5 days £1k	Short
	To develop a broader network of infrastructure providers and improved understanding of 'who does what'	Plan development of network for specialist infrastructure organisations	Specialist infra. Org	5 days £1k	Short
	To provide an effective structure of infrastructure support for all frontline organisations across the county	Identify key areas of skills and expertise within the network	Wider infra. network	5 days £1k	Short
		Develop costed proposals for the development of key skills and expertise to broaden access across the county +			Short
		Submit funding bids for the development of key skills and expertise to broaden access across the county +			Medium
		Set up working groups to develop protocols for integrated provision of key infrastructure services across the county +			Short
	Provide infrastructure support in Waverley			Short	
	Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups				

Consortium and Steering Group

Aims	Objectives	Actions	Responsibilities	Costs	Timescale
<p>To ensure that Surrey's Infrastructure Development Consortium and Steering Group are effective and accountable</p>	<p>Establish an accountable and transparent process to elect a Chair for both groups</p>	<p>Review of Chair, membership, structure, and future review dates</p>	<p>Steering Group</p>	<p>5 days £1k</p>	<p>Short</p>
	<p>Develop Terms of Reference for both groups</p>	<p>Develop terms of reference for both groups. Consider setting up various short term sub groups to undertake various pieces of work</p>			<p>Short</p>
	<p>Undertake research to identify good practice on other counties</p>	<p>Research other Consortia and examine how they are established, identify good practice elsewhere</p>			<p>Short</p>
	<p>Develop a communication strategy</p>	<p>Establish web page on existing infrastructure websites giving bulletin on progress of work, key contacts etc</p>			<p>Short and on going</p>
	<p>Promote work of both groups on existing Websites</p>	<p>Produce a communication strategy for both Consortium and Steering Group</p>			<p>Short</p>
		<p>Ensure that diverse groups are represented and involved in action plan delivery</p>			<p>Ongoing</p>
		<p>Equality and diversity proofing to ensure that the above actions and services are appropriate, accessible and promoted to diverse VCOs including, but not exclusive to the ASP groups</p>			

Equality and Diversity

This action plan summarises the recommended actions from the ASP research into the infrastructure support needs of BME, minority faith, refugee and asylum seeker and gypsy and traveller groups and communities in Surrey. These actions are as laid out in the two ASP reports, focussing on the needs of BME, minority faith and refugee and asylum seekers produced by North Harbour Consulting and a separate report on the needs of gypsy and traveller communities in Surrey by the Gypsy Media Company. Both have been submitted to GOSE as an annex to the Surrey Local Infrastructure Development Plan. However, these reports are still subject to the full twelve week formal consultation period with the diverse communities, the Surrey VCS and statutory partners. Details in the reports and action plan below may be changed as a result of feedback from the consultation process. Responsibility for taking forward the actions listed below, and a costed action plan, will be decided following consultation. It is recognised that any action plan that focuses on equality and diversity awareness will need to include actions which provide support to other potentially socially excluded groups. Further work may need to be carried out to identify these actions.

Aims

All VCS front-line and infrastructure services need to be available and accessible to people from the diverse communities. This requires the development of accessible and culturally appropriate services, promotion of these services, and other means such as interpreting and translation services to make the services genuinely accessible. Steps also need to be taken to bring diverse community organisations into partnership with the mainstream VCS.

ASP report reference	Description of the issue to be addressed	Action	Short, medium, long term	IDP action cross-reference
Para 5.9	Conventional ethnic monitoring does not capture information about some communities e.g. Gypsies and Travellers.	Develop a new ethnic monitoring format and promote among Surrey VCOs	Short	Quality Standards;
Para 8.7	The experience of racism is one of the barriers that discourage people from diverse communities from using front-line and infrastructure services from voluntary organisations and others.	VCS should develop and promote a Diversity and Equality Protocol setting out principles and standards as a public signal of their commitment to celebrating diversity and upholding equality of access to all services. See also next action.	Short	Quality Standards

ASP report reference	Description of the issue to be addressed	Action	Short, medium, long term	IDP action cross-reference
10.8 to 10.10; 13.1 & 13.2; 15.8	There is evidence that people from some diverse communities are finding access to front-line services blocked by a lack of awareness of their needs among VCS service providers.	CVSs should co-ordinate the development of diversity awareness and equality training programmes for the VCS, in collaboration with statutory and other partners. This programme should be rolled out to infrastructure organisations first, then cascade outwards through other VCOs.	Short to medium	Workforce development; Training.
		There is a need to promote community champions in Surrey. This might include training and equipping people to sign-post in the diverse communities; or recruiting and training 'appropriate adults' from within the communities to work with statutory and VCS organisations. The business community should be involved	Medium	Training
10.13	Inability to speak and read English is a significant barrier that prevents access to a wide range of VCS services and infrastructure support.	Interpreting and translation services provided by agencies such as WITS should be available at reasonable cost to service providers across the county. Further work needs to be done to establish the reasons for non-take-up of this service by statutory and voluntary agencies at present.	Short to medium	Quality Standards
		A review is needed of the barriers that prevent English as an Additional Language classes being made available to people who do not speak and read English. Projects similar to those in Woking that have successfully linked language tuition with other activities such as business development, cultural and arts activities, and women's activities should be rolled out to other parts of the county .	Medium	Training

ASP report reference	Description of the issue to be addressed	Action	Short, medium, long term	IDP action cross-reference
11.10; 13.3	It is not clear from the survey responses whether front line VCS services and infrastructure providers are actually providing services to ASP people and community groups, or whether this is an 'open door' policy that signals that such services are available.	CVSs should consult national and regional bodies (CRE, NCVO, NACVS, RAISE etc) on the development of an 'Equality and Diversity Self-Evaluation Check List' that could be promoted with appropriate training as an adjunct to PQASSO and other quality systems.	Medium	Quality Standards
13.5 & Table 7; 15.7	Although most VCS infrastructure providers say that they have taken steps to address issues of diversity and social inclusion, Tables 4, 5 and 6 shows that only a small minority have adopted policies and practices that would put such a commitment into practice	Diversity awareness needs to be built into job competency training, goal-setting and job appraisal as an ongoing part of performance management rather than as an occasional training requirement.	Short to medium	Workforce development; Quality standards
14.5	There is a need to establish some form of diversity and equality forum as a beacon, and as a vehicle for developing strategy and practice among mainstream organisations on the basis set out in the Navarro report. If it is not possible in the short term for a cross-sector partnership between statutory and voluntary organisations to come together, then the voluntary sector, and in particular the network of CVSs in Surrey – should take a positive lead in establishing a county-wide Diversity Forum to offer leadership and direction	The VCS through its infrastructure bodies should take steps to establish a VCS Diversity and Equality Forum. The Forum would become the basis for partnership between the VCS and the statutory sector. The Chair of the VCS Diversity Forum would become the VCS Diversity Champion for Surrey.	Short to medium	Networks/Forums

Infrastructure Services				
ASP report reference	Description of the issue to be addressed	Action	Short, medium, long term	IDP action cross-reference
10.18; 13.6	A number of infrastructure providers say they are providing support services to all the diverse communities, yet fewer say which services they have actually provided, and to how many groups or individuals	The network of generic infrastructure providers should undertake a joint review to establish whether an 'open door' policy on service provision is being translated into actual service delivery, and how any gaps can be overcome.	Short	Marketing
11.1	The list of infrastructure services prioritised by the diverse community groups is comparable to the prioritised list given by 'mainstream' VCOs. Some groups said that there were additional activities that they would like to carry out but they need information and advice to get them going.	Infrastructure providers should undertake a needs assessment and market research among diverse communities and community groups in their areas to establish which communities and groups currently need advice and support, and agree with them how this is best delivered. The services are already listed under the 22 IDP headings.	Short	Marketing; Service Development
11.7; Table 3	There is currently very little support being provided by VCS infrastructure providers for Gypsies, Travellers, Refugees and Asylum seekers. There is also little infrastructure support available in some parts of the county. Few if any VCS infrastructure providers provide some of the key support services for diverse community groups	A feasibility study and option appraisal is needed that will investigate the best means of providing infrastructure support to the diverse community-based groups that already exist in Surrey, and how to help new groups to come into existence where there is a need and support from one of the communities.	Short to medium	Service Development

Community Development				
ASP report reference	Description of the issue to be addressed	Action	Short, medium, long term	IDP action cross-reference
Para 7.4	There is more information about the diverse communities in Epsom and Ewell and Woking than in other boroughs.	Further mapping is required. Generic infrastructure providers in other boroughs will be given contact details of the diverse community groups in their area for follow up.	Short	Community Development
Para 7.5	There is little available information about the support needs of Refugee, Asylum Seeker and Economic Migrant communities and whether there is a need for VCOs to support these communities.	Generic and specialist infrastructure providers should join with agencies working with these communities to establish their support needs	Short to medium	Community Development
		In areas and diverse communities where no VCO currently exists, a local infrastructure provider should seek to engage with members of these communities to establish whether there is a need for community-based groups to be promoted.	Medium	Community Development
10.9	Meeting the support needs of older people, women and young girls from the diverse communities is a priority as these groups are socially excluded.	The need to develop new services or to adapt existing services so that they are culturally sensitive to the needs of these groups is a priority. Infrastructure providers have a role to play in investigating needs and in sponsoring new services.	Short to medium	Community Development
12.6	Diverse communities need help to achieve four basic aims: to get to the stage where they can start organising themselves; to help informal groupings become more formal; to support inter-community networking; to facilitate partnership with VCOs and others.	County and district generic infrastructure providers should discuss with local authority and other partners the need for community capacity building by diverse communities, and consider whether this work would best be achieved through collaboration between existing agencies (a diverse community development 'hub') or whether a dedicated agency led by people from the diverse	Short to medium	Community Development;

		communities is preferable (along the lines of Sompriti – the BME community development agency working in East Sussex, sponsored by South Downs CVS).		
Representation and self-advocacy for the diverse communities				
ASP report reference	Description of the issue to be addressed	Action	Short, medium, long term	IDP action cross-reference
12.3 to 12.5	Diverse communities need help in developing a collective voice.	VCS infrastructure providers should discuss with diverse community groups and community leaders whether there is a need to promote and support a network or forum led by and for the diverse communities. Work on promoting the network should be supported by any community development agency or hub initiated under the previous proposal.	Medium	Community Development
Marketing and Signposting				
Para 9.2, 9.4, 10.3 to 10.6; 10.8; 10.16, 15.6	Many of Surrey's ASP populations are widely dispersed. There are relatively few diverse community groups and these tend to be concentrated in particular areas. Many of these groups are not aware of the VCSs role and the services on offer. Many individuals are unaware of what the VCS offers and have not	The VCS should develop a marketing strategy for promoting the VCS to the diverse communities. If resources are short, then a joint approach could be adopted.	Short	Marketing
		Local infrastructure providers should seek to engage with diverse community groups in their areas to open dialogue, assess their support needs and promote their services.	Short to medium	Marketing

	used VCS services or infrastructure support.	Leaflets and posters in the main minority languages publicising the names of organisations where information about a range of services is available should be available in places where people from minority communities are likely to see them such as GP's surgeries, schools, hospitals, public buildings, shops etc.	Short	Signposting.
ASP report reference	Description of the issue to be addressed	Action	Short, medium, long term	IDP action cross-reference
10.12 & 10.13	Assistance is needed for people from diverse communities in checking eligibility for benefits, and in completing claim forms. Language and lack of basic literacy in the mother tongue are barriers here.	More signposting to existing services is needed using translated literature and interpreted advice.	Medium	Signposting.
		A DVD raising awareness of entitlement to basic services and where to get independent help locally is needed to address the literacy, language and take-up issues. Production of the DVD should be co-ordinated by the CVSs to ensure the widest possible dissemination.	Medium	Signposting
10.8	People newly arrived in the UK as Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Economic Migrants need information about where to go for basic services – housing, employment, health care etc.	Generic infrastructure providers should co-ordinate the production of a directory or directories listing the services that VCOs in their area provide.	Medium	Signposting; Marketing
		In due course information about VCOs should be available on-line at borough or county level.	Medium to long	Signposting; Marketing

		Local infrastructure providers should ensure that front-line agencies working with new arrivals are provided with and are briefed on the information available in directories and online	Medium	Signposting; Marketing
		A welcome pack containing basic information about UK public services, voluntary sector services, benefits etc., and where to go for advice should be available, translated into the languages used by incoming groups.	Medium	Signposting; Marketing
Recommendations from Gypsy and Traveller research report				
Report reference	Description of the issue to be addressed	Action	Short, medium, long term	IDP action cross-reference
1	Establishment of a Gypsy and Traveller-led voluntary organisation	Explore the feasibility of the establishment of a Gypsy and Traveller-led voluntary organisation which could deliver services to the Gypsy and Traveller community either covering just Surrey, Surrey plus neighbouring counties or the southeast region depending on the conclusions of the Change Up Additional Support Programme work in other counties in the South East.	Short/medium	Infrastructure organisations
2	Potential linkages to promotion of public sector services	Feasibility work should be completed to explore potential linkages to promotion of public sector services and to explore funding for such a post and/or look at how to make better use of existing workers who are trusted by and have contact with the gypsy and traveller community.	Medium	Marketing

Recommendations from Gypsy and Traveller research report				
Report reference	Description of the issue to be addressed	Action	Short, medium, long term	IDP action cross-reference
3	Gypsy traveller cultural diversity training	Gypsy traveller cultural diversity training should be delivered and widely marketed to voluntary and community organisations across Surrey from 2006/07, this could be done in partnership with the public sector.	Short/medium	Training
4	Communication strategy	A working group should be established within the voluntary and community sector, involving public sector partners as appropriate, which includes members of the Gypsy and Traveller community to develop and deliver a communication strategy. Its work should be focused on a practical project to inform the Gypsy and Traveller community about the wide variety of services available to them in Surrey.	Short	Marketing (see also ASP report para 11.1)
5	Ethnic monitoring for volunteers and service users	All voluntary and community sector service providers should be encouraged to include the Gypsy and Traveller community in ethnic monitoring for volunteers and service users, the success of this should be monitored. This recommendation reiterates recommendations from the Commission for Racial Equality about Gypsies and Travellers being more visible in all ethnic monitoring.	Short/medium	Quality standards (see also ASP report para 5.9)