

Partners in Training:

An evaluation of the Black and Minority Ethnic
Fundraising Training Project



LONDON
DEVELOPMENT
AGENCY

The Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Fundraising Training Project was delivered through a partnership of:

LONDON
DEVELOPMENT
AGENCY

BTEG
Black, Tackling, Ethnic, & Gender Equality

Institute of
Fundraising

LVSC
London's Network
of Networks

And the evaluation of the project was achieved in collaboration with:

Roehampton
University

LSE

01 Foreword by Mary Reilly, LDA Chair

02 Section 1: Introduction

- 03 The project
- 03 The partners
- 04 The evaluation
- 05 The report

06 Section 2: The origins and development of the project

- 07 The need for the BME FT Project
- 07 The partners' interests
- 08 Learning from past experience
- 09 Putting the project together

10 Section 3: The model

- 11 The service model
- 12 Eligibility
- 12 Other models
- 14 The partnership

15 Section 4: Implementation

- 16 The service model
- 17 The partnership

18 Section 5: Achievements

- 19 Outputs: Training hours and awards
- 20 Levels of participant satisfaction
- 20 The training courses
- 21 The assignments
- 21 Support
- 22 Meeting expectations
- 23 Commentary

25 Section 6: Impacts

- 26 Impact on the individual participants
- 26 Impact on the participating organisations
- 27 Impact on the BME voluntary and community sector

29 Section 7: Lessons learned from the experience

33 Section 8: Recommendations

- 34 Policy recommendations
- 34 Practice recommendations
- 35 Funding recommendations

The London Development Agency is proud of the achievements of the partners and participants in the pioneering Black and Minority Ethnic Fundraising Training Project, which we commissioned in October 2002 to develop individual skills and organisations in the BME Third Sector.

The project has achieved a number of positive impacts regionally and nationally in practice, policy and funding and has been recognised internationally.

For the LDA, the evaluation of the project conducted by Roehampton University in association with the London School of Economics is part of our own journey to excellence, learning from and, in this case, working with others to develop best practice in partnership working. We know that we need to work across sectors to deliver on economic development objectives that provide concrete benefits to individuals, businesses and communities in the capital.

At the LDA we recognise that the contribution of the Third Sector, together with those of the private and public sectors, is vital if we are to achieve healthy, inclusive and sustainable economic development in London.

We also know that partnership is vital if we are to achieve our aims and objectives and that we need to harness the energies of individuals, business, the Third Sector and other agencies if we are to make a real and lasting difference to the lives of those who visit, live and work in London.

The Third Sector has many roles to play, as a sector of the economy and significant employer; an agent of service design and delivery; and a route to those who are most at risk of social and economic exclusion.

The sector is also a powerful advocate and innovator within communities, especially communities of interest, and has a role in reflecting the concerns of those who have most to gain from economic development and regeneration in London being successful.

Therefore, it is a particular pleasure to recommend to you a model of partnership working that has application not only with regard to the Third Sector and public sector partnership working in terms of the LDA but also more broadly across Government agencies. The basis of the model in establishing shared objectives and working together to deliver them has equal resonance in private sector relationships with the public sector and with the Third Sector itself and I hope that it will find wide application.



Mary Reilly, LDA Chair

Introduction



The project

The Black and Minority Ethnic Fundraising Training (BME FT) Project was commissioned by the London Development Agency in 2002 at a cost of £711,249. The aim of the project is to build the capacity of the BME voluntary and community sector in London by providing training opportunities to people from BME-led organisations which enable them to qualify for the Institute of Fundraising's Certificate in Fundraising Management. It also provides support for the trainees and provides access to information, advice and assistance for them and their organisations.

Within the overall aims of building capacity in London's BME, voluntary and community sector and developing its workforce the project seeks to increase the sustainability of BME-led organisations through more effective fundraising from more diverse sources. Opportunities for 25 individuals have been provided in each of the three years of the project.

The partners

The project is a partnership between the London Development Agency (LDA), the Black Training and Enterprise Group (BTEG), the Institute of Fundraising (IoF), and the London Voluntary Service Council (LVSC).

The **LDA** is the Mayor of London's agency for sustainable economic development. It is responsible for implementing the Mayor's Economic Development Strategy. Its role is to mobilise the support and resources of hundreds of partner organisations to help build a thriving economy for London's people, businesses and communities. The LDA is dedicated to improving sustainability, health and equality of opportunity for Londoners.

The **Black Training and Enterprise Group (BTEG)** is a national organisation, established in 1991 by representatives from the black voluntary sector. It is a national advocacy, policy and research agency, which promotes and supports the economic development of black communities and organisations. As well as a national policy team, BTEG has a London Network which offers training, support, advice and advocacy to black voluntary sector organisations on a variety of organisational development issues.

The **Institute of Fundraising (IoF)** is the professional body that seeks to represent all fundraisers. Its mission is to improve and promote the highest standards of fundraising. To achieve its mission, it seeks to promote the profession of fundraising at every applicable level and opportunity. The Institute strives to support and develop the knowledge and standards of all those who undertake fundraising.

The **London Voluntary Service Council (LVSC)** aims to strengthen organisations by providing services and a strong voice on policy issues. Services and support are targeted towards second tier organisations and all marginalised groups, particularly black, minority ethnic and refugee groups. The LVSC Support and Advice team offers direct advice and support to small, new and marginalised organisations and support to development and funding advisors working across London to support these communities.

The evaluation

This evaluation was commissioned by the LDA and undertaken by a research team drawn from Roehampton University's Centre for Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Management and the Centre for Civil Society at the London School of Economics and Political Science.

A. Aims

It had two broad aims.

The first of these was to assess the impact and evaluate the effectiveness of the BME Fundraising Training Project. This involved:

- reviewing the experience of the individuals who had taken part in the first two years of the programme and assessing the impact on them of the training and support received from the project
- assessing the impact of the project on the organisations with which the trainees were involved
- assessing its wider impact on London's BME voluntary and community sector
- evaluating the effectiveness of the partnership between the LDA, BTEG, the IoF and LVSC through which the project was delivered.

The second broad aim was to use the learning to be gained from the experience of the project to inform future approaches to the development of capacity in the BME voluntary and community sector. This entailed:

- identifying what had been learned from this approach to workforce development which could have a wider application for London's BME voluntary and community sector
- analysing the strengths and limitations of the project and the partnership arrangements in order to develop a model for the future delivery of capacity building in the BME sector.

B. Methodology

The methodology for the evaluation was shaped by three main considerations.

- *The importance of qualitative data;* while the study employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods the emphasis was on the former. The key to understanding the strengths and limitations of the BME FT Project and learning lessons from it for the future was seen as the evidence to be collected from participants in the programme and the partnership about their experiences of it and their reflections on it.
- *A collaborative approach;* the evaluation was seen as part of an exercise in achieving organisational change. Those who would be responsible for enacting that change would be closely involved with the researchers in developing the understanding needed to plan for it.
- *The pressure of time;* the study had to be completed within a five month period which included both the Christmas and Easter holiday periods.

Data was collected in three overlapping phases:

- Semi-structured interviews with key informants from the four partner organisations who were involved in managing or delivering the project. This provided data about (a) the context for the research; (b) the aspirations of those involved in the establishment and implementation of the project and their views of what has been achieved (including unexpected impacts); and (c) a variety of perspectives about the way in which the partnership has operated. We conducted 14 face-to-face interviews and one by telephone.
- A survey of the trainees who took part in year one and year two of the BME FT Project, conducted by e-mail. This was designed to provide data about the quality of the trainee's experience; their motivation and expectations and the extent to which these were met; the impact on the individuals and their organisations; and the extent to which what they had learned was shared with others within and outside the organisations with which they were principally involved.

The report

16 completed questionnaires were returned out of a possible total of 44 – more than a third.

- In-depth case studies of six participating organisations which involved interviews with a senior member of staff or trustee as well as the trainee and, where possible, a funder or other external figure. These enabled us to explore issues raised by the survey in more depth and to identify difficulties and challenges experienced in undertaking the training and applying the learning.

C. Strengths and limitations

These three approaches yielded a rich harvest of data which was supplemented by a variety of written documents. Despite the fact that participants in the project were busy people with more pressing concerns the research team was disappointed that the effort we put into chasing responses to the survey did not produce a better return.

We would also have preferred to have had more time to digest each body of data before having to move on to the next phase. However, despite these cavils, the researchers are confident that within the limitations of the study we have the data on which we can base robust findings and well-founded recommendations for the future.

There are, however, two very significant limitations to the kind of study we have undertaken. The first is that it is, in the time-hallowed phrase, 'a snapshot of a moving target'. Furthermore, the snapshot was taken part way – about two thirds of the way – through the BME FT Project.

In the great majority of cases, this meant that it was premature to attempt to measure the project's impact on the participating organisations let alone the BME sector more generally. There simply had not been enough time, for example, for new approaches to fundraising to bear fruit in the form of additional resources from new sources of funding.

Similarly, we can discuss the ways in which what was learned in the first year of the project was used to change the ways in which year two was delivered but cannot demonstrate how the project continued to develop in year three.

In this report we discuss in turn:

- the origins and genesis of the BME Fundraising Training Project
- the model – the approach to service provision and the organisational framework of the project
- issues of implementation – how the service provision model was delivered and refined and how the partnership worked
- the project's achievements and impacts
- the key lessons to be learned from the experience
- options and recommendations for the future.

The origins and development of the project

2

The need for the BME FT Project

The project was devised as a means of addressing two related but somewhat different concerns – the failure of BME voluntary and community sector organisations to raise substantial funding and the lack of professionally qualified black and minority fundraisers.

Research undertaken for the BME Sustainability Project had highlighted the issues and difficulties faced by BME organisations in accessing funds and, among its many recommendations, identified a need for more qualified and experienced fundraisers.

The LDA itself had noted the lack of BME voluntary and community sector organisations among successful applications for its own funding programmes, while BTEG had carried out a training needs analysis which identified funding and fundraising as major areas of need. There was also anecdotal evidence that many BME organisations were heavily dependent on one major funder and needed to diversify their funding sources.

The relationship between the twin goals of developing organisational capacity on the one hand and providing individuals with professional training on the other was not straightforward. Training individuals can be seen as the means of building fundraising capacity in the BME-led organisations with which they are involved – and a number of our interviewees made this connection. But this will only happen if they share what they have learned with other people in the organisation (and, possibly, in other BME-led organisations). In the words of one of our informants it was ‘a bit risky because people could leave the... BME sector. They would be fully trained fundraisers and free to go wherever they wanted’. Although building a better base of BME fundraisers was a legitimate aim it did not necessarily lead to greater capacity in the sector.

The partners’ interests

The four partners who came together to run the project had rather different perspectives on where the balance should be struck between building the capacity of organisations and developing the expertise of individuals. While the LDA’s representative and the chief architect of the project is herself committed to the idea that BME organisations need to be ‘enterprising, effective and high performing’, the LDA’s targets for the project are clearly located in the workforce development area and are expressed as learning opportunities for individuals. The IoF has a similar focus on the training and accreditation of individuals and has enthusiastically embraced the project as a means of advancing its aspiration to build a more inclusive membership, which is a more adequate reflection of the voluntary and community sector as a whole. BTEG and LVSC, by contrast, can be seen as putting capacity building at the centre of their agendas and viewing training as one of a number of ways of pursuing this goal.

Participation in the project brought other kinds of rewards for three of the partners. LVSC received much needed investment in its support and advice team; the two BTEG members of staff funded by the project were trained in fundraising management and thus became an in-house fundraising resource for the organisation itself; and the IoF could look forward to working with black fundraisers with whom it could form positive relationships.

Learning from past experience

The design of the project was informed by the experience of an earlier initiative which it superseded. Funded by the LDA, this involved a collaboration between the IoF and BTEG in an attempt to offer training in fundraising to people working in BME voluntary and community sector organisations. In retrospect this was seen by the partners as a pilot for the main project. It ran for one year (2002) although, because of its limited success, the IoF continued to deploy a consultant to work with some of the trainees until 2003. The Institute arranged a programme of training for people contacted through BTEG's database of contacts. It also mobilised a number of its members who volunteered their services as mentors to those undertaking the training. This was not a success; in all but a very few cases the disparity in experience and culture between members of the professional fundraising community and the trainees from relatively small BME organisations produced a gulf that was too wide to bridge. As a result, the Institute employed a consultant to provide support to the trainees on a one-to-one basis. While the 'pilot' project was seen by some of the partners as a largely unsuccessful initiative and unhappy experience, a number of the participants successfully completed all or part of the training. And a good working relationship was established between key individuals in BTEG and the IoF that was one of the building blocks of the partnership for the BME FT Project.

A number of lessons were drawn from the experience of the earlier project. In the first place, it highlighted the importance of providing trainees with one-to-one support, encouragement and advice in tackling the training and completing the assignments. It also underlined the value of providing networking opportunities for participants.

Secondly, it identified the need to develop and apply robust selection criteria in order to maximise the possibility of successful completion of the training. These included an assessment of the capacity of the organisation involved to provide a setting in which trainee could devote enough time to the project and would stand a good chance of putting what s/he had learned into practice. 'Buy-in' from the participants' organisations was crucial. Thirdly, the experience of the pilot project emphasised the need to develop a better understanding of diversity issues and 'intercultural competence' among the non BME trainers and staff working on the project.

Putting the project together

Despite the modesty of the achievements of the initial project, the LDA was still committed to an investment in fundraising training for the BME sector. During the Summer of 2002 the LDA officer who had taken on responsibility for this area of work held a series of discussions with the two organisations involved in the pilot and a new partner – the LVSC – in which the new design of the project was developed and the contribution of the different organisations defined. By September these negotiations had reached the stage at which the parties could meet and agree their respective roles and contributions. This was described as an ‘intense, difficult’ meeting but, following an open discussion in which each of the partners was able to ask not only ‘what are we bringing to the project’ but also ‘what are we going to get out of it?’, agreement was reached and the revised project was commissioned in October 2002.

The model

3

The service model

The revised three-year project commissioned in October 2002 had three principal elements, each delivered by one of the operational partners. These were:

- training leading to the Certificate in Fundraising Management and Membership of the Institute of Fundraising (MinstF, Cert)
- one-to-one *support and mentoring* provided by BTEG
- access to high quality *information and advice* from LVSC.

Training

The IoF undertook to provide training for 25 individuals in each of the three years of the project. The training programme consisted of three main elements and involved a total of 14 to 15 days of training. The three elements were:

- a four-day Foundation Course on *Fundraising Practice* which provided participants with the competencies needed to function as a fund-raising practitioner. This leads to a written assignment which took the form of a practical exercise such as a funding application to a grant making trust
- a five-day course on *Managing Fundraising* which equipped participants to undertake the role of a fundraising manager, involving a second written assignment with a strategic purpose (such as a fundraising strategy)
- additional core courses on *Identifying and Researching Supporters* (two days); *Grant Making Trusts and Foundations* (one day) and one selected from *Creating and Implementing a Fundraising Plan*; *Fundraising and the Law*; *Leading an Effective Fundraising Team*; or *Problem Solving and Decision Making* (each of two to three days length).

Support and mentoring

BTEG agreed to employ two full-time Funding Development Officers (FDOs) who would provide one-to-one support, advice and mentoring to the trainees and their organisations. As well as offering encouragement to help the trainees complete their training and advice on tackling their assignments the FDOs were also expected to support them in their endeavours to apply what they had learned to the work of their own organisations.

Access to information and advice

LVSC's key role was seen as providing access to a wider range of high quality information and advice services and resources on fundraising and funding for BME voluntary and community sector organisations in London. Referral to LVSC's advice and support would involve an assessment of information and support needs, provision of information about relevant LVSC services, strategic fundraising support and links to appropriate second-tier support.

Other roles for BTEG

BTEG and its Funding Development Officers played a pivotal role in the project. They were its 'public face' – the initial point of contact and the doorway to participation in the training. They were well placed to promote networking among the trainees. And they were also expected to provide a conduit for the views of participants about how the training and the conditions under which it is delivered can be better tailored to their needs.

Another role for LVSC

LVSC's participation in the project also provided access to capacity building networks across London and it was also able to offer alternative means of organisational development to those who did not meet the eligibility criteria for the Fundraising Training Project.

Eligibility

The criteria for participation in the project applied to both the organisation and the individual involved. Organisations were required to:

- be registered as a charity or an otherwise formally constituted organisation
- have a turnover in excess of £100,000 per year
- be BME led – i.e. 51% of trustees
- provide evidence of commitment to the programme and specifically, of its ability to ensure the trainee has space to meet the demands on his/her time and the opportunity to take what has been learned from the training back into the organisation.

Individuals needed to be:

- a paid or unpaid employee of the organisation
- able to study with minimum supervision using English as the teaching language.

Other models

We have not interpreted our brief to include a comparative study of the various training and capacity building initiatives alongside which the project was established. In any case, we have not been able to draw on evaluations of these activities; with one exception these had not been completed, did not exist or were not available to us. We did, however, compare the approaches adopted in these initiatives with the Fundraising Training Project model in order to assess the extent to which it was a unique or unusual approach. For this purpose we looked at:

- the Council for Ethnic Minority Voluntary Organisations (CEMVO) Capacity Building Programme
- the First Steps Programme run by Community Links
- the work of the Evelyn Oldfield Unit
- LVSC's Ready Steady Start training programme
- the capacity building programme of the Migrant Organisations' Development Agency (MODA)
- the Progress through Partnerships project run by the British Association of Settlements and Social Action Centres (BASSAC) and BTEG
- the Governance Project (Voluntary Action Camden).

These projects did not all share the Fundraising Training Project's choice of target organisation. The CEMVO and BASSAC initiatives are aimed at BME organisations while two of the others (Evelyn Oldfield and MODA) work with refugees' or migrants' organisations and three of them focus on small organisations (among whom BME groups are well represented; in the case of Ready Steady Start they provide 90% of participating organisations). First Steps and Ready Steady Start set the maximum size for participating organisations at two full-time staff or their equivalent or an annual income of £50,000 a compared to the FTP's minimum of £100,000.

Four of the projects concentrate on working with organisations to develop their capacity or increase their effectiveness. CEMVO and the University of East London have developed a specialist MBA geared to the needs of the BME sector and the capacity building project deploys graduates from this programme to work as Capacity Building Officers with BME voluntary sector organisations.

MODA employs outreach development workers to provide capacity building support to small migrant and minority ethnic organisations which includes immediate advice and long-term support.

The Governance Project worked with small organisations to explore with them the issues and challenges they faced and develop a 'tailor made' package of advice, support and training to help them address the issues.

The joint BASSAC/BTEG project aims to develop local partnerships between BME and mainstream voluntary and community sector organisations in order to reduce isolation and increase long-term sustainability and develop a greater understanding of equality and diversity issues.

Two projects place a greater emphasis on training. First Steps developed a one-year programme leading to the development of a resource strategy and the presentation of a development plan to funders. While the emphasis is on strengthening the organisation, individual participants can qualify for a certificate from the University of East London.

The Ready Steady Start programme is aimed at new and emerging organisations and covers setting up a sustainable organisation; governance, project development and an introduction to fundraising. The programme is completed by a 'follow-up' session through which participants are put in touch with an adviser from their local CVS or another appropriate second tier organisation for continuing support.

Finally, the Evelyn Oldfield Unit has a three-pronged approach involving consultancy, training and the organisation of forums for networking.

The fundraising training project like the CEMVO programme, involves the development of a cadre of trained and professionally qualified leaders for the BME sector but, unlike CEMVO, has concentrated on a specialised set of competencies.

Unlike CEMVO but like First Steps and Ready, Steady Start it is based on the expectation that the participating organisations will benefit directly during and after the training. Like them, too, it aspires to link the organisations with other sources of advice, information and support. Similar to the Evelyn Oldfield Unit, it recognises the importance of developing opportunities for networking. In summary, we can recognise some of the elements of the BME FT Project approach in these other initiatives but the specific combination used by the project is distinctive, if not unique.

The partnership

The partnership created in September 2002 was the product of a particular view about the way in which government agencies and voluntary sector organisations could collaborate successfully.

The key pre-requisites for this co-operative partnership model include a degree of similarity or shared experience among the key individuals on either side of the partnership and a common vision not only of the collaboration's aims but also of the methods by which it will be pursued.

Given these favourable conditions partnership involves the development and maintenance of inter-organisational trust based on frequency and openness of communication, the 'multiplexity' and open-ended nature of the relationship, a balance between autonomy and dependence or an understanding of interdependence and the synchronisation of ends and means.

Relationships in the partnership across the statutory-voluntary sector boundary were clearly helped by the LDA representative's long experience of working in the voluntary sector while two of the voluntary sector partners were represented by people with experience of working in statutory agencies.

There were also some pre-existing relationships; the Institute of Fundraising had worked with BTEG on the earlier pilot project, BTEG and LVSC had some history of collaboration and one of the LVSC's support and advice team joined the staff of BTEG around the start of the project.

Other relationships needed to be developed from scratch. These were based on the identification of common purpose and interdependency.

Individual conversations between the LDA representative and the other partners were used to develop a shared view of the purpose and the appropriate design for the project as well as the contribution to be expected from each organisation. These paved the way for a frank discussion at the meeting held in September 2002 at which each partner made explicit not only what they would contribute to the project but also what they expected to gain from their participation.

This discussion also highlighted the extent to which the collaborators needed one another's contributions if the aims of the project were to be achieved – they were indeed interdependent.

On a more operational level, the arrangements called for an unusually high degree of involvement by the LDA's representative in the management of the project. In the first place the LDA had separate relationships with each of the voluntary sector bodies – 'three sets of claim forms, three different sets of monitoring reports, three different sets of grant expenditure forms'.

While this had the desirable effect of establishing an equality of status among them, it meant that the LDA had to take on the role of ensuring that their activities were co-ordinated. This function was performed by means of the LDA's representative's active chairpersonship of the quarterly partners meetings, which was also combined with the role of secretary.

Implementation

4

The service model

There was a high level of agreement among the staff of the partner organisations interviewed that they had learned from their early efforts to put the model into operation, that the second year of operation had been more successful than the initial period and that 2005 would see a further improvement. Five specific areas where the delivery of the project had been or was being enhanced were identified.

The first of these was the recruitment process and the application of the eligibility criteria. In the first year, the shortness of time between the commissioning of the project and the start of the first part of the training together with the need for BTEG to appoint key staff to take responsibility for its contribution to the project meant that the process of recruitment and selection was less rigorous than it became in the second and third years of the training programme.

It was confidently expected that this development would improve the rates of retention and completion of the programme. Alongside the improved recruitment process, the project has also begun to develop its marketing efforts to ensure that the full range of BME voluntary and community sector organisations across London are made aware of what it has to offer.

The second area of improvement has been in the level and reliability of the support given to trainees by the BTEG staff. During the first year of the project the resignation of one of the development officers and the time needed to appoint a replacement meant that some participants felt that they had not received the support they had expected.

Once that early setback had been overcome, however, the extent and quality of the support provided by the FDOs has been recognised by the partners and by the trainees as a fundamentally important contribution to the success of the project. The one-to-one support has been critical in maintaining interest and participation in the training events and ensuring that written assignments were completed.

Lessons have also been learned about the delivery of the training itself. For the third year, there will be a change in the content of the programme as a result of feedback from the participants.

The course on fundraising from trusts and foundations has been replaced by one which concentrates on contracting with local authorities, this was seen as more relevant and useful for the BME voluntary and community sector organisations involved with the project. More attention has also been given to culturally appropriate arrangements; events are no longer scheduled for Fridays and greater care is being taken to ensure that the dietary needs of participants are fully met.

The area in which the implementation of the model has moved most slowly has been the development of the LVSC's role. Changes of staff and a period of restructuring at LVSC clearly limited its ability to play a more proactive role in the early stages of the BME FT Project and this has meant that some staff in its partner organisations as well as participants in the project have had little awareness of its role and contribution. This is, however, changing.

The application of strict criteria for participation in the programme highlights the need for provision to be made for those organisations which do not meet them; LVSC's Ready Steady Start programme and its network of second tier advisers are key elements in such a response.

At the same time, closer collaboration between the staff who are responsible at an operational level for the delivery of the programme has led to a better understanding of the kinds of resources that LVSC can offer to the trainees over and above what they gain from the training itself and the advice and support of the BTEG staff.

The fifth area of interest has been the development of opportunities for networking between members of the emerging group of BME fundraisers. A new special interest group of the Institute of Fundraising has been developed and is expected to become operational at the Institute's Convention in the Summer of 2005.

The partnership

The consensus among those involved in the partnership is that it has worked well both at the strategic level of the partners' meetings and at the operational level. The great majority of those interviewed felt that the quarterly meetings had been well planned and conducted and the representatives of the partner organisations had treated them seriously; they attended regularly and contributed fully to the discussions.

There were some suggestions about how meetings might have been more useful. Some interviewees felt that they should have been attended by representatives of the users. Others thought that the chair should have been rotated from meeting to meeting and one felt that meetings should have been held at shorter intervals. Generally, however, the view was very positive.

There was also a good deal of communication between meetings, face-to-face but, more often, by phone and, especially e-mail; 'everyone was always at the end of a phone or an e-mail'. This was generally welcomed, interviewees liked being 'kept in the loop' and felt that it was 'great to have everyone's feedback and input into everything'. On the other hand, it could be taken to excess – 'heavy, prolific email use, good sometimes and sometimes it got excessive'.

Interviewees felt that the partnership had worked on both levels largely because the roles of the different organisations were clearly defined and complementary; 'each of us has a clear purpose within the partnership' and 'we all had something to bring to the table'.

While it was true that some informants were not entirely clear about the LVSC's contribution, generally speaking they praised the work of their partner organisations and were unable to suggest how they might have contributed more.

Interviewees also felt that the personal and professional relationships between key individuals had been important. These underpinned the relationship between the co-deliverers of the programme as well as those between them and the LDA as funder. This enabled them to 'put their concerns on the table and work them out in honest and open discussion'.

This combination of recognising the interdependence of organisational roles and developing good interpersonal relationships also informed working relationships at operational level. It was very interesting to learn that the operational staff from the three co-deliverers had begun to meet as a group on a regular basis.

Achievements

5

Outputs: Training hours and awards

An analysis of the statistics for attendance at the various courses and achievement of the Module One Certificate and the full MinstF award leads to three major findings.

The first of these is the significant improvement in the attendance and completion rates of the 2004 cohort compared with those recruited for 2003, following the introduction of a more rigorous approach to selection. We can expect that improvement to be maintained in year three of the project. Only two of the 2005 intake of 25 failed to achieve a 100% attendance for the first module, an overall participation rate of 98%.

Secondly, it is clear that a significant minority of participants have taken part in the training but have not completed the assignments that lead to accreditation. Even in year two the proportion achieving the module one certificate was a little less than two thirds. While we expect the rate of completion to improve markedly on the 19% achieved by the first cohort It is too early to assess how many will gain the full award of MinstF.

Thirdly, it is clear that the project's expectation that the programme of training and accreditation could be completed in one year was over-ambitious. None of the trainees who started their training in January or February 2004 had achieved full accreditation by March 2005.

Table one:

Module one (4 days)

	Number of trainees	Attendance Numbers (per cent)	Certificate Module 1 (per cent)
Year 1 (2003)	26	22 (85%)	42%
Year 2 (2004)	25	25 (98%)	64%

Table two:

Managing fundraising (5 days)

	Number of trainees	Attendance Numbers (per cent)	Certificate MinstF (per cent)
Year 1 (2003)	26	18 (55%)	19%
Year 2 (2004)	25	20.5 (82%)	–

Table three:

Other courses

Course	Year	Number of trainees	Attendance Numbers (per cent)
Trust Training 1 day	2003	26	21 (81%)
	2004	25	22 (88%)
Research Training 2 days	2003	26	21 (81%)
	2004	25	24 (96%)
Fundraising and the Law 2 days	2003	26	12.5 (48%)
	2004	25	24 (96%)

Levels of participant satisfaction

Sixteen participants in the programme completed the questionnaire, eight from year one (2003) and eight from year two (2004). All 16 trainees attended the Foundation course in full but only nine attended every day of the Managing Fundraising course, however the remaining seven all attended at least three days of this.

Of the eight year one trainees, five had, by April 2005, achieved the full MinstF (Cert) qualification, while two others had obtained Certificates for Module 1.

One trainee attended all of the training but has not undertaken the assignments and has therefore obtained no certificates.

Of the eight in year two, five have obtained their Certificates for Module 1. Apart from the person from year one already mentioned, those who have not yet fully qualified remain involved with the programme. Overall – with a few exceptions – the trainees reported high levels of satisfaction with the training and support they received from the project.

The training courses

Table four:

Levels of satisfaction with training modules

Module and attribute		5	4	3	2	1
Foundation Module N = 16	Content	9	7			
	Teaching	11	4	1		
	Usefulness	9	6			1
Managing Fundraising N = 15	Content	8	6	1		
	Teaching	8	6		1	
	Usefulness	10	2	2		1
Researching Support N = 16	Content	7	7	2		
	Teaching	8	6	2		
	Usefulness	7	5	2	1	1
Grant Making Trusts N = 16	Content	8	5	3		
	Teaching	8	6	4		
	Usefulness	9	1	5	1	
Fundraising and Law N = 16	Content	8	6	2		
	Teaching	8	3	4	1	
	Usefulness	7	5	2	2	

Score: 5 = very satisfied; 1 = very dissatisfied

The assignments

Table five:

Levels of satisfaction with assignments

		5	4	3	2	1
Foundation N = 14	Useful Personally	8	6			
	Useful to Organisation	8	3	3		
Managing Fundraising N = 12	Useful Personally	7	4		1	
	Useful to Organisation	8	2	1	1	

Score: 5 = very satisfied; 1 = very dissatisfied

Support

Table six:

Levels of satisfaction with support received

		5	4	3	2	1
BTEG N = 16	Quality	13	3			
	Scale	13	3			
LVSC N = 7	Quality	1		3	3	
	Scale			4	3	
IoF N = 12	Quality	4	3	5		
	Scale	2	3	5	2	
Projects Company N = 14	Quality	6	5	1	2	
	Scale	4	7	1	2	

Score: 5 = very satisfied; 1 = very dissatisfied

Meeting expectations

Participants in the survey were asked to indicate what benefits they expected to gain from the BME FT Project both as an individual and for their organisation and the extent to which these expectations had been met.

Table seven:

Expectations for self

Expectation	
Expand knowledge of fundraising	15
Build practical experience of fundraising	15
Help organisation raise funds	13
Learn specific skills (e.g. strategic planning)	13
Develop network of contacts	12
Boost self confidence and self respect	11
Enhance career	8

N = 16

Table nine:

Expectations for organisation

Expectation	
Development of a fundraising strategy	12
Growth in funds	12
Better position to share learning in community	12
Build organisational capacity	11
Better able to convince funders	9
Access to new funders	9
Increased organisational credibility	9

N = 16

Table eight:

Degree to which expectations for self were met

Much more	3
More	7
Same	5
Less	1
Much less	0

N = 16

Table ten:

Degree to which expectations for organisation were met

Much more	3
More	2
Same	9
Less	1
Much less	1

N = 16

Commentary

The qualitative data collected by the questionnaire asked respondents to provide reasons for their 'scores', and highlight the projects strengths and weaknesses as they had experienced it. These results coupled with six in-depth case studies of participating organisations presents a much more complex picture.

In the first place we found an apparent paradox; some of the interviewees who had expressed high levels of satisfaction with various aspects of the training programme nonetheless could also be highly critical of them. Like some of the representatives of the partner organisations, they were able to combine a high regard for and commitment to the work of the project with a clear-sighted view of where and how its design and delivery could be improved.

A second issue was the often contradictory nature of the critical comments; for every respondent who identified an aspect of programme delivery as a weakness it seemed there was another who thought it a strength.

Clearly, participants in the programme had different prior experiences and thus different starting points and expectations. They may have also had different experiences of the training depending on the identity of the trainer and the premises used.

One extreme example is the 'odd person out' among the 16 who completed questionnaires; his low levels of satisfaction with the programme (and especially its usefulness to his organisation) become more understandable when we know that his purpose in taking part was purely instrumental – he wanted to gain the qualification.

These factors mean that it is difficult to aggregate or synthesise responses in a way that can be seen as representative of the views of the participants as a whole. Nonetheless the observations of some of the participants, even if they are few in number and not unanimous, offer some useful learning for the project and its future.

In the first place, those interviewed for the case studies identified what they saw as the strengths of the programme.

- There was a high degree of agreement about the value of the Foundation Module and with some reservations, about the assignment for this part of the training.
- There was an equally strong view that the one-to-one support provided by BTEG was a vital ingredient and key strength in ensuring that participants completed and benefited from the training. Two of those interviewed emphasised the importance of this component of the programme by reference to the period between the resignation of one of the original BTEG team and the appointment of a successor when they had missed the support they had expected.
- There was a general view that the additional courses made a valuable contribution to the training but there were also some specific criticisms about the relevance of the content to BME voluntary and community sector organisations.
- The opportunities for informal networking provided by the BME FT Project were highly valued by some but not all of our informants (some of them were already involved in appropriate networks).
- There was less enthusiasm about the value of the Managing Fundraising Module and assignment.

Respondents also highlighted areas where they thought the design and delivery of the project needed to be improved.

- Greater care should be given to defining the target audience for the training programme. The group within which they had trained had included both people who were new to fundraising as well as those with considerable experience. A more homogeneous group would have made for a more effective learning experience.
- There were issues about the content of the courses. Some considered that the design of the training meant that there was too much repetition while others suggested that some of the ground covered was of little relevance to the kind of organisations they were involved with. Grant-making trusts and foundations were less important to them than local government sources of funding while legacies were unlikely to form a major strand in their fundraising strategies.
- Interviewees also thought that the approaches adopted by some trainers had been inappropriate and insensitive but noted that there were opportunities for learning about diversity issues from the BTEG staff.
- Some trainers had also misjudged the organisational roles played by trainees; they tended to act on the assumption that they were training full-time professional fund-raisers rather than people for whom fundraising was one of a number of responsibilities they needed to juggle.
- A further weakness in the project had been the failure to secure genuine commitment from the organisations for whom the trainees worked: while this had been a requirement at the point of recruitment, it had not been followed through.

Finally, interviewees highlighted the kinds of challenges and difficulties they faced in undertaking the programme and applying the knowledge and expertise they had gained from it. There were three kinds of challenge.

- The first of these was lack of time. Some of those interviewed were undertaking the programme 'in their own time' and one had curtailed a holiday in order to complete an assignment. Even those who had been given study leave by their organisations were still trying to fit the demands of the project into a busy life which not only involved a highly pressured job but, in many cases, involvement with other BME organisations as a trustee or volunteer. Where the trainee was the chief executive or director of an agency, there were key tasks and meetings which could not be delegated to anyone else.
- Secondly, participants were faced with a lack of understanding and support from within their organisations. Often trustees did not understand what was involved in fundraising – they tended to see it as a separate activity apart from the mission of the organisation – and staff who were fully committed themselves could be resentful at a colleague's absence from the organisation especially if it were the chief executive.
- Thirdly, they faced the challenge of introducing what they had learned into organisations which very often lacked the resources of staff and trustee time that were needed to make it happen.

6

Impact on the individual participants

The case study interviews we carried out and the range of comments made by respondents to the survey highlighted the different ways in which each individual experienced their participation in the programme. When we look at the ways in which it affected the individual trainees and their approach to the fundraising task, we can identify some common threads.

In the first place, the project did a great deal more than equip participants with knowledge and skills; it enabled them 'to look at fundraising in a new light'. They had gained a better understanding of the process of fundraising, of the environment in which it took place and of the relationship of fundraising activities to wider issues of organisational effectiveness.

Secondly, there was a consensus that trainees had gained a great deal more confidence in their ability to undertake the fundraising role.

These two key impacts had enabled them to develop a 'more strategic' approach to the role and one which was 'better organised' and 'more professional'.

Other impacts mentioned by some participants were improved access to networks and enhanced professional status – they received 'more recognition' within their organisations and some felt that their career prospects had been enhanced.

Impact on the participating organisations

The acid test of the success of the project was, of course, the extent to which it enabled participating organisations to access more funds from a wider range of sources.

At the stage at which we undertook our study (about two thirds of the way through a three year project) making an assessment of the extent to which those goals had been achieved was premature. We did find some evidence of increased income in a small number of cases – including one spectacular example of an increase of 25% - but, for most and especially for those who had started training in January or February 2004, it was too early for their new approaches to fundraising to have borne fruit.

In some organisations the project had actually had an adverse impact on funding in the short term; time spent by participants on attending training courses and preparing assignments was time that could not be devoted to raising funds.

We also found, however, some evidence of organisations which had developed better ways of conducting research into sources of funding and had made applications to a broader range of funding bodies.

More commonly, participating organisations had laid some of the foundations for a more effective approach to fundraising. More than half of those who responded to the survey had made progress in developing a fundraising strategy or a business plan – and sometimes both.

Some participants had successfully involved trustees and other staff in subcommittees or working parties devoted to fundraising and had provided them with some basic training. In a number of cases, fundraising had become a higher priority for the organisation and been increasingly recognised as a core function. In some cases, too, the efforts of the people who had undertaken the training to put what they had learned into practice had produced wider 'knock-on' effects on the governance and management of the agency.

Impact on the BME voluntary and community sector

The acceptance, for example, that management committee members could and should play an active role in fundraising could change the way they saw their contribution to the agency as a whole. Similarly, serving alongside paid staff on fundraising working parties could change the relationship between trustees and employees.

Some organisations had also experienced an impact on the status or profile of the organisation and changes in its relationship to the outside world. A trustee of one of the case study agencies reported that the increase in confidence gained by the trainee had enhanced the credibility and legitimacy of the organisation:

‘Since the training he has... established credibility among funding bodies especially public sector. It is a competitive environment. He has gained confidence because of his knowledge and insight. And ... he is able to move easily with LDA, Business Link, GOL, Home Office, etc. That is quite something.’

As well as ‘cascading’ the knowledge and expertise provided by the training programme within the organisations participating in the project, the partners intended it to have a wider impact in the BME voluntary and community sector as a whole.

While it is again very early in the life of the project to expect to find evidence of that kind of impact, it was clear from the case studies that participants had provided advice and support on fundraising and organisational development to a number of other organisations.

In some cases, the mechanism for this was the existing involvement of the individual with other agencies as a trustee. In at least one other case, the participating organisation had a capacity building role within a sub sector of the BME sector and could incorporate the new knowledge in its ongoing work.

Elsewhere, the project stimulated a specific set of responses; one of the participants who worked for a Tamil organisation in south London brought together people from other organisations in the area to disseminate what he had learned about the need to develop a strategy and take a longer term view of fundraising.

A number of respondents identified less tangible impacts of the project on the BME voluntary sector. In their view it has contributed to the health of the sector in three ways.

In the first place, the training programme has made a significant contribution to the development of a ‘more professional’ sector. In turn, this has led to a higher level of self-confidence within the sector which is reflected in a ‘higher profile’. In other words, the effect we noted at the organisational level – in which the enhanced confidence of the individual participant leads to greater credibility for the organisation – may also operate at sector level.

Thirdly, the BME sector will be strengthened by the development of effective networks by the new generation of professionally trained fundraisers.

The limitations of scope and the timing of our study means that we cannot assess the extent and influence of these 'soft' outcomes but, given the extent to which those involved with the project as partners, trainers, trainees and their organisations believe that these changes are happening it could be seen as something of a self-fulfilling prophecy. In the meantime, however, we can point to one significant piece of evidence that supports the case.

In October 2004 the partners organised an event which combined a celebration of the project's achievements with the award of certificates to trainees who had completed all or part of the Institute of Fundraising qualification. The event which brought 126 people to the Haberdashers Hall was a very impressive demonstration of the growing self-confidence of the BME sector and some of its future leaders.

The development of the Black Fundraisers Network could be seen as an unexpected or unplanned impact of the project but it might be more accurate to describe the project as paving the way for this potentially important development.

Participants in the BME FT Project had their subscriptions to the Institute of Fundraising paid for by the project and were also enabled to take part in the IoF's annual convention as volunteers and thus at no cost. They could thus contribute to and provide support for the development of the Network as a special interest group of the Institute.

The project has paved the way for two other initiatives for the BME sector – a collaboration between the institute of Fundraising and BTEG's counterpart in Scotland, Black Minority Infrastructure Scotland, and a Lottery funded project involving Camden Council of Voluntary Service and the Projects Company. Another sign of external interest in the work of the project has been a presentation about its experience made to the annual conference of the US based Association of Fundraising Professionals in Baltimore, March 2005.

Lessons learned from the experience



This discussion of the BME FT Project's achievements and impacts explains why those responsible for designing and delivering it felt a marked degree of pride in what they had done and why those who participated in it expressed high levels of satisfaction with the experience.

The evidence is that the individuals who took part in the programme gained a variety of benefits from their involvement. This not only gave them enhanced skills and confidence with which to tackle the challenge of fundraising but also enabled them to have an impact on way their own organisations and – to a lesser extent – other BME organisations went about their business.

On the other hand, staff in the partner organisations considered that there was room for further improvement in the model and its implementation and, for their part participants in the programme expressed a number of views about how it could be developed and improved.

In the first place it is clear that the project has been more successful in training individuals and developing their competences than in building organisational effectiveness. The work of BTEG's Funding Development Officers has been focused on ensuring that people attended courses and completed assignments rather than helping them to bring about change in their organisations. The selection criteria have been developed to maximise the likelihood of the participant being able to complete the programme of training.

The role of LVSC as a pathway to other resources and support, and, in particular, that of second tier advisers, has been largely unrecognised and undeveloped. There are a number of explanations for this bias towards training individuals.

The LDA as funder of the project sees itself as having a major role in workforce development and the outputs for the project against which progress is monitored are expressed in terms of training hours provided and qualifications achieved. Concrete measures of success of this kind are very attractive and simpler to address than the more complex issues involved in assessing greater organisational effectiveness.

Another factor was the scale and scope of what was expected of the trainee. Given the pressures under which most participants worked, the programme of training to be completed within a year was too ambitious. Furthermore, the development of LVSC's role in the early stages of the project was also impeded by its own organisational difficulties.

Next, the project has attracted a variety of individuals from a range of different kinds of organisation who have gained a diverse range of benefits from their participation. This diversity is not reflected in the training provided by the project which is essentially based on the principle of 'one size fits all'. The implication for future provision is that the training should either be targeted much more carefully to those who would benefit from the full package or delivered as a menu of options from which participants would select those which best met their needs. Another, apparently more radical, option would be to provide 'tailor-made' or 'customised' training for each organisation.

The experience of the project also raises questions about accreditation. On the one hand, participants have argued that it is extremely important for the individuals concerned and for the BME sector as a whole to have the clearly defined learning objectives, standards of achievement and recognition that are associated with a formal qualification. This was seen as an important contribution to a BME sector which was, and was seen to be, 'more professional'.

The sense of pride and self-confidence witnessed at the celebration event was clearly associated with a long line of participants queuing up to receive certificates.

On the other hand, some participants were strongly of the opinion that it was the training that mattered to them and not the qualification and few of them had achieved full accreditation at the time of our study, it might well be that pursuing a qualification might be one of a range of options on future programmes.

Consideration should also be given to the level and kind of accreditation on offer; as well as an Institute of Fundraising qualification it might also involve accreditation through, for example, the Open College Network or a university. This might be an attractive option for some participants as a way of finding a point of entry to a wider educational experience.

Some participants in the project felt strongly that the individuals and organisations who took part should have been more clearly targeted to provide a more homogeneous group of trainees. This raises questions about the choices this would involve.

One option would be to pursue a 'narrow and deep' strategy of working with a comparatively small number of organisations and/or individuals and provide them with intensive and long-term support. Another version of this would be concentrate on infrastructure organisations and those involved in building capacity in other organisations.

The opposite 'broad and shallow' strategy would be to provide less training and support to a larger number of organisations and/or individuals. The popularity of the foundation module among participants suggests a possible model. A trustee in one of our case study organisations proposed an ingenious response to the issue: a comparatively large number of people could be recruited for the basic training and a small proportion of them would select themselves for further study.

The value of a strategic approach to targeting provision where it would have the greatest impact on the BME sector as a whole is self-evident. Unfortunately this will remain an aspiration until and unless we know a great deal more about the BME voluntary and community sector – in London and nationally. We simply do not have basic data about the number, kind, size and distribution of organisations within the BME voluntary and community sector. This information is an essential precondition for an adequate assessment of impact.

A further set of lessons from the experience of the project concern the delivery of the training programme. On the plus side, it has highlighted the key role of support, encouragement and tutorial help provided by BTEG's Funding Development Officers.

The experience is less positive when we look at issues of course design and content. Basically, this is a programme of training originally developed for people working in organisations which are very different from those typically found in the BME sector.

As a result, the courses do not adequately meet the need to be both size-specific and BME specific. In the light of the project's experience and with the help of those who have been through the training it should now be possible to design courses which are better tailored to the needs of future participants. Alongside this, there remain problems of a lack of awareness of diversity issues and shortage of 'intercultural competence' on the part of some of the trainers involved in the programme. This is not a surprising finding: the voluntary and community sector is not immune from the institutional racism that permeates British society.

Another area of interest is the nature of the 'contract' between the project, the individual participant and his/her organisation. One suggestion which is worthy of consideration was to require the organisation, as a condition for participation, to develop a strategy for 'cascading' what was learned within the organisation. Another was to ask individuals to commit themselves to acting as mentors to people in other organisations, once they had completed their training. Others were concerned about the need for mentoring and continuing professional development for participants beyond the end of the training.

The importance of networking was highlighted and needs to be given rather more consideration than it has received during the life of the project to date. The new Black Fundraisers Network is potentially a very important initiative, although it is too early to judge just how useful a role it will be able to play. And, of course, there are a number of other networks which would offer an appropriate place for many of the graduates of the BME Fundraising Training Project.

Ensuring that trainees find their place in a suitable network or networks might become an explicit objective of any future project.

Most of this section to date has been focused on what has been the primary focus of the project – training individuals and developing their competences. Yet, there is a strong argument that the key lesson from the project is that 'training is not enough'.

From this angle, the ability of BME organisations to raise more funds from a wider range of sources depends on more than individual expertise; it requires organisational effectiveness. This is, to be fair, a key message which is delivered by the training programme. As we found in the case studies, however, the knowledge that the organisation needs to change is not, of itself, sufficient to bring it about.

The alternative approach is that of the Governance Project, which starts from an analysis of the needs and circumstances of individual organisations in order to identify a range of appropriate 'tailor-made' interventions, involving both organisational consultancy and training for individuals.

This approach would address many of the concerns we have identified. Organisations would be fully signed up to a process of change and would appreciate the full value of the individual's training. As a result, the trainee ought to be able to complete a course of training without feeling under the acute pressure felt by many of the participants in the project.

Finally, the project has demonstrated a remarkably effective form of collaboration between a government agency and three voluntary and community sector organisations.

Unlike many such relationships the partnership was based on a well-developed model and careful preparation of the ground. Each of the partners had a clear role and specific function which contributed to the achievement of a common purpose and thus a clear understanding of their interdependency. (There was a very high level of consensus about these roles in the interviews we conducted with the staff of the partner organisations). This provided the foundation for a relationship in which trust was maintained and developed by frequent and open communication.

Recommendations

8

Policy recommendations

- The LDA should take the lead in disseminating the model of public-voluntary and community sector collaborative working widely within the Agency; to the other Regional Development Agencies; and to other Government Departments and agencies.
- The case for fundraising training for people in the BME voluntary and community sector has clearly been made. Government should take the lessons learnt on board and ensure that such provision continues to be made in London and in other regions.
- More specifically, fundraising training for people in the BME voluntary and community sector should be seen as an essential part of the ChangeUp process.
- Given the importance of networking as a method of supporting the continued development of project participants and any successor model to build organisational effectiveness in the BME sector, the partners should look for additional ways of supporting the work of the Black Fundraisers Network.
- NCVO and its sister organisations within the UK should, with BTEG, explore the possibility of raising funds for a comprehensive national exercise to map the BME sector.
- This evaluation which took place – for good and sufficient reasons – at a time when it was too early to assess the longer-term impacts of the project should be followed up by the partners with a further evaluation in one or two years' time.

Practice recommendations

- Provision in the London area could continue to be delivered through a partnership of BTEG, the Institute of Fundraising and LVSC.
- BTEG and the Institute of Fundraising should seek to involve the appropriate regional CVS in partnership to develop provision outside London.
- With the withdrawal of the LDA from the partnership, consideration should be given to appointing a Chair who is not connected with any of the three remaining partners. This position could be paid.
- Provision should continue to involve training courses arranged by the Institute of Fundraising; one to one mentoring and tutorial support provided by BTEG; and access to additional information resources supplied by LVSC.
- The content and delivery of the training programme should be reviewed in order to ensure that it is relevant to the needs of those working in the BME sector and that those delivering it are aware of issues of diversity. This process should involve some of those who have been trained during the project as well as trainers.
- The partners should also review the options for the future targeting of the programme – concentrating its efforts on intensive support for a small number of individuals and organisations or on providing less to a greater number.
- The partners should conduct a small scale market research exercise to help them decide what options should be developed in the programme in terms of size of modules and courses; their contents; and the means of delivery (including the use of distance learning and action learning sets).
- The partners should consult one or more universities and/or further education colleges about the options for additional accreditation for the courses.
- Given our clear finding that 'training is not enough' BTEG and LVSC should develop an additional joint project aimed at building the capacity of the BME voluntary and community sector and based on the model of the Governance Project.

Funding recommendations

- This would involve conducting a ‘health check’ of BME organisations in order to assist them to develop their effectiveness; identify what resources – including training – they need to accomplish this; and help them to access them.
- This service would be delivered in collaboration with local infrastructure and capacity-building organisations.
- The experience of the project would be used to inform the development of the fundraising training project recommended above.
- In the long run the partners should look to the statutory sector for funding for the training programme. It should be seen as a crucial contribution to workforce development and, as such, falls within the remit of the Learning and Skills Councils.
- In the short-term, major charitable trusts should be approached for support for the training model recommended here.
- Given our clear finding that ‘training is not enough’ BTEG and LVSC should also seek funding for the joint project aimed at building the capacity of the BME voluntary and community sector and based on the model of the Governance Project recommended above.
- This project would take its place alongside other initiatives as part of the Government’s ChangeUp strategy. It could also be the subject of a proposal to one or more charitable trusts.

Bibliography

- 1 A Little (2001) *Making Friends and Influencing People: Partnership, Advocacy and the Impact of the Voluntary Sector On National Government Policy* (Unpublished MSc Dissertation, LSE).
- 2 Needham and Barclay’s report on Infrastructure for BME Organisations in London.
- 3 Milestone Research Report for the LDA (2003) *Reaching Multicultural Britain*.
- 4 P. Jas et al (2004) *UK Voluntary Sector Almanac 2004* (NCVO).
- 5 M. Taylor and I. Hoyle (2003) *Finding the Funds* (BME Sustainability Project).
- 6 S. Kumar and K. Nunan (2002) *A Lighter Touch: An evaluation of the Governance Project* (Joseph Rowntree Foundation/YPS).

This document is also available in large print, braille, on disk, audio cassette and in the languages listed below.

For a copy, please contact the LDA Communications Team:
London Development Agency,
Devon House,
58-60 St Katharine's Way,
London E1W 1JX.

Tel: 020 7954 4500
Email: communications@lda.gov.uk

Arabic

إذا أردت نسخة من هذه الوثيقة بلغتك، الرجاء الاتصال برقم الهاتف أو الكتابة الى العنوان أدناه:

Hindi

यदि आप इस दस्तावेज़ की प्रति अपनी भाषा में चाहते हैं, तो कृपया निम्नलिखित नम्बर पर फोन करें अथवा दिये गये पता पर सम्पर्क करें।

Bengali

আপনি যদি আপনার ভাষায় এই দলিলের প্রতিলিপি (কপি) চান, তা হলে নীচের ফোন নম্বরে বা ঠিকানায় অনুগ্রহ করে যোগাযোগ করুন।

Punjabi

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ ਤੁਹਾਡੀ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ ਹੈ, ਤਾਂ ਹੇਠ ਲਿਖੇ ਨੰਬਰ 'ਤੇ ਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਹੇਠ ਲਿਖੇ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਰਾਬਤਾ ਕਰੋ:

Chinese

如果需要此文檔的您的母語拷貝，請致電以下號碼或和下列地址聯係

Turkish

Bu broşürü Türkçe olarak edinmek için lütfen aşağıdaki numaraya telefon edin ya da adrese başvurun.

Greek

Αν θα θέλατε ένα αντίγραφο του παρόντος εγγράφου στη γλώσσα σας, παρακαλώ να τηλεφωνήσετε στον αριθμό ή να επικοινωνήσετε στην παρακάτω διεύθυνση.

Urdu

اگر آپ اس دستاویز کی نقل اپنی زبان میں چاہتے ہیں، تو براہ کرم نیچے دیئے گئے نمبر پر فون کریں یا دیئے گئے پتے پر رابطہ قائم کریں۔

Gujarati

જો તમને આ દસ્તાવેજની નકલ તમારી ભાષામાં જોઈતી હોય તો, કૃપા કરી આપેલ નંબર ઉપર ફોન કરો અથવા નીચેના સરનામે સંપર્ક સાધો.

Vietnamese

Nếu bạn muốn bản sao của tài liệu này bằng ngôn ngữ của bạn, hãy gọi điện theo số hoặc liên lạc với địa chỉ dưới đây.

London Development Agency

Devon House

58-60 St Katharine's Way

London E1W 1JX

Tel: 020 7954 4500

Fax: 020 7680 2040

www.lda.gov.uk