

Communities Select Committee  
23 July 2014

**Full year outcomes-based performance report on voluntary,  
community and faith sector infrastructure in Surrey**

**Purpose of the report:** Policy Development and Review

- (i) To provide the Committee with the full year, 2013-14 outcomes-based performance information for voluntary, community and faith sector (VCFS) infrastructure organisations, co-commissioned by the County Council, Boroughs and District Councils and Clinical Commissioning Groups.
- (ii) To update on the broader strategic development and relationship building with the wider VCFS in Surrey.

**Introduction:**

1. There are over 5,700 VCFS groups in Surrey. Infrastructure organisations enable these groups to run effectively, by providing access to a range of targeted advice and support services. The County Council is committed to ensuring there is a strong VCFS infrastructure in place to support a vibrant and active civil society in Surrey and gives grant funding of £450,000 to the infrastructure organisations to achieve this outcome (see **Annex A** for the funding per organisation).
2. The Communities Select Committee was last updated at its 21 November meeting where half-year information about the outcomes-based performance of infrastructure organisations was shared. The information primarily related to the locally based Councils for Voluntary Service (CVS) and the county wide infrastructure organisation, Surrey Community Action. This information was made available as a result of implementation of the performance management framework in April 2013, which continues to provide current and useful information that demonstrates delivery of the outcomes the County Council commissions.
3. This report provides the Committee with a full year's performance information. The data is presented in the form of a scorecard, similar to the format of how the County Council presents its own performance information. The information has been gathered through quarterly returns from the infrastructure organisations and the results of a survey of all frontline VCFS organisations, which took place in September 2013.

4. This report also provides an update on the wider work the County Council is engaged in to strengthen the Council's relationship with the VCFS, to improve the ways we work together on priority areas for the Council and to enhance the wellbeing and lives of Surrey's communities.

#### 2013-14 full year performance information

5. The performance framework was co-designed with commissioners in districts and boroughs and health, infrastructure organisations and frontline VCFS groups to reflect delivery of the agreed outcomes (attached at **Annex B**), rather than outputs or processes. Commissioners explicitly challenged themselves to ask only for data that would be used, and that was integral to the infrastructure organisations' own performance management. This was to ensure that the reporting remained proportionate and to minimise reporting burdens.
6. There are 11 performance scorecards attached at **Annex C**. Scorecards 1 to 9 provide a summary of performance information relating to volunteering and capacity building support (outcomes 1, 2 and 3). The first scorecard provides a Surrey-wide composite picture of the performance scorecards, with 2-9 giving breakdowns for each of the eight local CVSs.
7. These scorecards are composed of two sources of data. The top section focuses on quarterly reporting on volunteering activity that takes place through volunteer centres located in each CVS. Data collated shows the number of volunteering opportunities, how many volunteers were referred and placed, how long it took to place a volunteer, the demography of the volunteers and the sectors in which they volunteered. This is information that is already collected by each volunteer centre. Further analysis of the volunteering data is provided in paragraphs 13-18.
8. The second element of this scorecard reflects the results of the annual survey of the users of infrastructure organisations – the frontline VCFS groups. The survey took place in September 2013 and analysis of the survey results was presented to the Committee in November. There has been no change in information since that period, however, a summary of information about the survey and next steps is provided in paragraphs 19-21.
9. Scorecard 10 has Surrey-wide performance information relating to how well the VCFS understands the needs of Surrey residents and how effectively the sector is able to influence strategic decisions (outcomes 4 and 5). The data source for this information was from the annual survey and remains unchanged from the November Committee meeting.
10. The final scorecard 11 is the full year performance scorecard for Surrey Community Action. It is the organisation's own assessment of work undertaken and the impact this has had, with particular focus on delivery of outcomes 4 and 5.
11. Looking at all of this information together, it demonstrates good delivery of outcomes that are being commissioned through the infrastructure organisations by the County Council and co-commissioners. This information has been shared on an ongoing basis with co-commissioners and the organisations themselves and the report highlights below how the performance information has been used by partners.

12. This report will also focus on the wider work the County Council has been involved in over the year, to strengthen both strategic and practical working with the VCFS. This work has primarily been led by David McNulty in direct engagement with the Surrey Charities Chief Executives' Group. More information about this is provided in paragraphs 28-32.

### **Analysis of volunteering data**

13. Volunteering is a core element of local CVS functions, and one that is pivotal in fostering social capital and ensuring better outcomes for the communities of Surrey. CVSs have provided a full year of data from April 2013 to the end of March 2014 on a quarterly basis. Whilst the data was already being collected by the CVSs, it was in a slightly different format so some of the detailed information was not collected by a few of the organisations in the outset. As the year progressed, the information collation and sharing became much easier and part of the business as usual for the organisations.
14. When implementing the performance framework, the original intention was to demonstrate delivery of the outcomes but to also help develop baselines, an understanding of trends and to look for areas of best practice or need for improvement. Having access to a year's data, the County Council is confident that this has been both successful and useful for us and partners in providing this information. The County Council has been approached by a number of counterpart councils wanting to learn about what has been seen as innovative and best practice, referring to performance management framework.
15. Officers from the County Council are currently meeting with the CVSs, along with co-commissioners to talk through the full year data and what we have learned from the first year. So far, the meetings have told us that organisations are largely comfortable and happy to use the scorecard. There are slight modifications that have been suggested (such as a separate counter to capture one-off volunteering events) that would enhance the performance scorecards and a meeting to focus on this will take place in July to continue with the co-design approach. Generally the information has been well used, in a variety of ways:
  - Management Boards have used the data to set targets and percentage increases for this year ahead, based on the previous year's baseline;
  - Commissioners and infrastructure organisations are working together to implement targeted projects and pieces of work to meet particular needs and priorities;
  - Where placement levels are low, discussions are taking place between the commissioners and the organisations to understand the reason and devise an action plan to drive improvement;
  - Officers have used the scorecards to engage and inform local councillors.
16. Analysis of the full year volunteering data shows:
  - In total, the eight local CVSs placed 2,310 volunteers 2013/14 through their volunteer bureaux. This was augmented by another 1,408 volunteers who participated in one-off corporate events. The number placed by each CVS varied considerably over the quarters, but it is useful to note that the organisations are separate entities, the resources they allocate and the

number of volunteer centre bases they have is variable. Some of the CVSs run projects that specifically support volunteers with special needs, where the number placed may not be high but the resource that is required is greater.

- Conversion rates of ‘volunteers registering to volunteers placed’ and ‘volunteering opportunities to volunteers placed in those opportunities’ varied somewhat over the year. In quarter 1, four volunteers registered for every one volunteer placed and there were 10 volunteering opportunities for each volunteer placed. These ratios improved over Quarter 2 and 3. This could relate to possible peak areas of volunteering activity, with summer fetes and an increase in volunteering closer to Christmas. This will be an interesting area to monitor in future for developing trends however, it is important to note some opportunities are never removed because they are ongoing and this can confound the data.

| <b>Conversion</b>                 | <b>Quarter 1</b> | <b>Quarter 2</b> | <b>Quarter 3</b> | <b>Quarter 4</b> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Registrations : placements</b> | 4 : 1            | 1.5 : 1          | 2.5 : 1          | 2 : 1            |
| <b>Opportunities : placements</b> | 10 : 1           | 6.5 : 1          | 7.5 : 1          | 10 : 1           |

- The demographic profile of volunteers (gender, ethnicity and age) diverges notably from the Surrey population profile. Women are more prevalent as volunteers than they are represented in the population; people from black and ethnic minorities and younger people (under 45s) appear to be volunteering in greater proportion to the Surrey population that these groups make up although this data is not complete and varies from locality to locality.
- Another key point to note is the overall conversion rate from registration to placement of volunteers who have stated they have a disability. For every 2 volunteers registering, at least 1 was placed. This varies between volunteer centres but is very positive when taken as a whole as the time, support and outcomes for these individuals may often be much greater than for volunteers placed who do not have disabilities.

17. Volunteering is just one core function of the CVSs. Whilst the performance management framework has enabled a useful insight and up-to-date information on all relevant aspects of volunteering taking place through the VCs, there are other aspects of the service that are not as easy to capture in this graphical form. This has been particularly highlighted by some co-commissioners who require more detailed activity updates from the organisations. To meet this need, organisations have provided commissioners with their business plans and any annual or quarterly reports produced for their management boards. These have been helpful in demonstrating the wider value the infrastructure organisations bring and helped in identifying some cases of individual best practice in place to meet local needs.
18. The County Council and co-commissioners are taking the opportunity through the review meetings with individual infrastructure organisations to consider how the resources are being used. There are no proposals to change the funding to infrastructure organisations for 2015-16 at present but to focus on ensuring the money invested drives greater value and is better aligned to priority areas of work, such as supporting achievement of Family, Friends and Community Support, whilst maintaining the core functions of the CVS.

## Annual survey results

19. The annual survey took place in September 2013 and was reported to the November Committee. In summary, 654 frontline groups had responded comprising 11.5% of the sector. Seventy two percent of the respondents highlighted they used the funded infrastructure organisations and where they had used services, there was a high satisfaction rate. There were areas of the service provision that appeared to be used less, such as developing business plans and individual organisations and commissioners had the opportunity to use this information to think about their service provision and priorities.
20. Since then, it has been useful to hear from infrastructure organisations and their management boards that they have used this information over the year to target specific work areas. This is in line with the original intention of the performance management framework. In some instances, the infrastructure management boards have looked at where there may be low activity against a service and tried to increase awareness about the service. They have found that sometimes the result of the survey was a reflection of the actual need of that service but importantly, it has enabled them to think about where to focus resources.
21. The survey will be repeated in autumn this year. It will be of interest to compare the surveys and if as intended, they are repeated year on year, the information may start to identify real trends or anomalies.

## Surrey Community Action

22. Surrey Community Action is primarily working to support the VCFS in Surrey through the delivery of outcomes 4 and 5 (**Annex B**). This entails ensuring the sector has an evidence-based understanding of needs, is able to respond effectively by adapting services and innovating and is informed by and informing partners in the public sector.
23. The organisation's scorecard is attached at **Annex C**. It outlines the actions undertaken and impact made over 2013-14. There is a great deal of activity that has taken place over the year to deliver the outcomes. Work has varied from working with the Local Enterprise Partnerships in both provision of information on needs and working on specific projects, to enhancing service provision in rural areas, such as setting up car schemes.
24. Surrey Community Action also continues to administer and manage the Community Buildings Grant Scheme and support services. In 2013-14, twelve community buildings were supported through the scheme widening the access to local communities through basic refurbishments and improved facilities. The County Council invested £142,000 which was matched by the District and Borough Councils and applicant organisations, leveraging in an additional £470,000 to the county. The scheme can make a real difference to the communities of Surrey, as a community building is often at the centre of a thriving community.

## Communities Engagement Team and Community Foundation Surrey

25. The Communities Engagement Team (CET) and Community Foundation for Surrey (CFS), both also funded through the infrastructure budget, have reported on delivery

of the outcomes outside this performance framework. This is due to the nature of their infrastructure activity.

26. A large part of the CET work is based on linking organisations, capacity building and community cohesion. Over the year, they have worked with the County Council in key priority areas such supporting families with complex needs amongst other things. The CET also works with District and Borough Councils through the Community Connectors, with Surrey Police and the Clinical Commissioning Groups, developing innovative responses linked to different faiths and communities. This has included setting up thematic work programmes on key and targeted areas of work improving understanding of faiths and community issues. For example, developing a Surrey-wide Muslim Network and facilitating workshops on raising dementia awareness and foster care.
27. The small grant that the Community Foundation for Surrey receives from the Council goes toward their core funding. The outcomes they deliver are far reaching and of a wide scope, often targeting the most vulnerable people in Surrey. Over the last financial year, approximately 250 grants were distributed, worth over £735,000 to the community and voluntary groups in Surrey. The grants they provide help support and strengthen local communities and are often the seeds for much greater value and social benefits.

9

#### **The County Council's strategic relationship with the VCFS**

28. The County Council has been consulting the VCFS as part of its budget setting processes for a number of years. As part of these discussions the Surrey Charities Chief Executives' Group (SCCEG - a network of approximately 40 chief executives of VCFS organisation in Surrey including some of the infrastructure organisations), highlighted an opportunity to begin reviewing the strategic relationship between Surrey County Council and the sector. The objective was to drive improved partnership working and to proactively maximise any opportunities that this may present, with a view to improving outcomes for residents. This work has been led by the Chief Executive of the County Council, jointly with the Chairman of SCCEG, and demonstrates the Council's commitment to making this work.
29. A number of planning sessions and workshops have been held over the year to enable this. The workshops have provided an opportunity for the County Council and VCFS colleagues to reach a shared understanding of current financial pressures and each other's positions, look for practical and strategic ways to drive a partnership that is working to its full potential and to develop a set of strategic principles to guide partnership working. The principles are attached at **Annex D** and build on the Compact principles but were designed to be relevant to the current environment and priorities, for example, focusing on interventions to promote social capital.
30. The workshops have been seen as very useful, open and honest engagement opportunities. Partners have worked together to identify areas of best practice, where things are working well and similarly particular areas where the Council can drive improvements. As a result, work is underway to review and redress highlighted areas. For example, the workshop identified a real need to improve understanding around the e-procurement processes and in response the Procurement team have been carrying out training for the VCFS to support the sector positively and proactively.



31. Feedback from SCCEG colleagues also highlighted the need to improve engagement with the new health structures. To this end, the County Council held a second workshop in April and extended the invitation to Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) creating a platform to encourage wider collaborative working, tying in to a whole systems approach to service design and delivery.
32. Over the coming months, the County Council will build further upon this work to create a collaborative, efficient and consistent approach on key areas of work with the sector. This work will look to support wider agendas and priorities of the Council such as Family, Friends and Community Support and driving up social capital, through continued collaboration with the VCFS, partners in the Boroughs and Districts and health and through an internal network of relevant County Council officers covering all service areas.

### **Conclusions:**

33. The County Council, with all partners, has successfully implemented the new outcomes-based performance management framework. By collecting the data this way, a strong evidence base is being built about the delivery of the outcomes for Surrey residents and, as originally intended, areas of best practice are starting to be identified, alongside areas that need intervention and change.
34. Organisations and commissioners are using this data to collaboratively drive improvements, to consider how the resources are being used and continue to drive value for money services. There is a focus on building on what is working well, whilst maintaining the core functions of the infrastructure organisations and ensuring resources are better aligned to priority areas that meet the needs of the Surrey communities.

### **Recommendations:**

35. That the Communities Select Committee:
- a) Notes the outcomes-based performance management framework information provided in the report covering the 2013-14 period;
  - b) Supports the direction of travel with the performance management framework and continuation of current arrangements and
  - c) Agrees the Committee would like to review performance framework information going forward on an annual basis.

### **Next steps:**

- County Council officers meeting with the Volunteer Centre Network and CVS managers – 15 July 2014
- Continue review meetings with infrastructure organisations – up to August 2014
- Officers to attend an Infrastructure Trustee meeting – September 2014
- Annual survey of frontline VCFS organisations – September 2014

**Report contact:** Rachel Crossley, Lead Manager, New Models of Delivery

**Contact details:** 0208 5419993, rachel.crossley@surreycc.gov.uk

**Sources/background papers:**

**Annex A:** 2014/15 VCFS infrastructure funding profile.

**Annex B:** Co-designed outcomes for VCFS infrastructure.

**Annex C:** Scorecard 1 is the Surrey-wide summary scorecard for outcomes 1, 2 and 3; scorecards 2-9 relate to individual CVS organisations for outcomes 1, 2 and 3; scorecard 10 is the Surrey-wide summary scorecard for outcomes 4 and 5; scorecard 11 relates to Surrey Community Action primarily for delivery of outcomes 4 and 5.

**Annex D:** Partnership principles devised with SCCEG.