

Partners in Training:

An evaluation of the Black and Minority Ethnic
Fundraising Training Project



LONDON
DEVELOPMENT
AGENCY

01	Foreword by Mary Reilly, LDA Chair
02	Executive summary
04	Section 1: Introduction
05	The partnership
05	The evaluation
06	Section 2: The project approach
07	Origins
07	A new kind of partnership?
08	The service delivery model
09	Selection
09	Implementing the model
10	Section 3: Achievements and impacts
10	Achievements
10	Key statistics
14	Impacts
16	Section 4: The lessons
19	Section 5: Conclusion

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

LONDON
DEVELOPMENT
AGENCY

BTEG
Black, Minority & Ethnic Training & Employment Group

Institute of
Fundraising

LVSC
London's Network
of Networks

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

Roehampton
University

LSE

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

The Black and Minority Ethnic Fundraising Training (BME FT) Project is a public-voluntary and Third Sector partnership between four organisations: the London Development Agency (LDA); Black Training & Enterprise Group (BTEG); the Institute of Fundraising; and London Voluntary Service Council (LVSC).

The project was commissioned by the LDA in 2002 and aims to build the organisational effectiveness of London's BME voluntary and community sector by providing professional fundraising training for 75 individuals from BME-led organisations. Over a three year period it aims to raise individual skills levels and stimulate the development of a mixed economy of income generation.

The evaluation of the project was conducted by Roehampton University and the London School of Economics and took place from December 2004 to April 2005.

The project has achieved a number of practice, policy and funding impacts at a regional and national level and has also been recognised internationally.

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.
- The partners should look for additional ways of supporting the work of the Black Fundraisers Network, and use networking as a method of supporting the continued development of project participants and any successor models to build organisational effectiveness in the BME sector.
- The National Council for Voluntary Organisations (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 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 intense support 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.

- This would involve conducting a 'health check' of BME organisations in order to assist them to develop their effectiveness; identifying what resources – including training – they need to accomplish this and help arrange appropriate access.
- 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.

Funding recommendations

- 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.

Introduction



1

The partnership

The Black and Minority Ethnic Fundraising Training Project (BME FT) is a public-voluntary and community sector partnership between four organisations:

- The **London Development Agency** (LDA) which is the Mayor of London's agency sustainable economic development and the Regional Development Agency for London. The LDA commissioned the project at a total cost of £711,249.
- The **Institute of Fundraising** (IoF) - the national professional body for fundraisers. The IoF arranged the training programme for the project.
- The **Black Training and Enterprise Group** (BTEG) – a national agency formed by representatives from the black voluntary sector to promote the economic development of black communities and organisations. BTEG had the primary responsibility for recruitment of the trainees and provided them with mentoring, advice and support.
- **London Voluntary Service Council** (LVSC) is the leading pan-London infrastructure body for the voluntary and community sector. Its contribution was to provide participants in the project with access to a wider range of information and advice services.

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.

The aims of the study were to:

- assess the impact and evaluate the effectiveness of the BME Fundraising Training Project
- use the learning to be gained from the experience of the project to make recommendations about future provision.

From December 2004 to March 2005 we carried out semi-structured interviews with fifteen key informants from the four partner organisations. We also conducted an e-mail survey of the trainees who took part in the first two years of the BME FT Project and undertook in-depth case studies of six participating organisations.

The project approach

2

Origins

The BME FT 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.

The need to address these concerns had been highlighted by research undertaken for the BME Sustainability Project; the lack of successful applications from BME voluntary and community sector organisations to the LDA's funding programmes and a training needs analysis carried out by BTEG.

The design of the project was informed by the experience of an earlier initiative which it superseded. Also funded by the LDA, this took the form of a training and mentoring programme provided by the IoF and offered to those working in BME-led organisations identified by BTEG. Take-up and completion rates were low and three key lessons were drawn from this experience:

- the importance of providing trainees with one-to-one support, encouragement and advice in tackling the training and completing the assignments
- the need to develop and apply robust selection criteria (for organisations as well as individuals) to maximise the possibility of successful completion of the training
- the need to develop a better understanding of diversity issues and 'intercultural competence' among the non BME trainers and staff working on the project.

A new kind of partnership?

The three-year project commissioned by the LDA in October 2002 was based on a distinctive model of collaboration between a government agency and its voluntary sector partners developed by the LDA's lead officer. This was the result of research undertaken at the LSE for an MSc dissertation. It identified the following pre-requisites for successful collaboration: similarity or shared experience on either side of the partnership and a common vision not only of the aims of the collaboration but also of the means by which they would be pursued. On this basis, inter-organisational trust could be developed and maintained through frequent and open communication and an understanding of interdependence among the partners.

The LDA's representative laid the foundations for the project through a series of bilateral dialogues with the prospective partners. This led to the development of a shared view of the purpose and design of the project and a clear understanding of the contribution to be expected from each organisation. This paved the way for an initial meeting of the partners in September 2002 which was described as 'intense' and 'difficult' but which produced a frank discussion in which each partner was able to be clear about 'what are we going to get out of' our involvement as well as 'what are we going to contribute' to it. This discussion also highlighted the extent to which the collaborating organisations needed one another's contributions if the aims of the project were to be achieved.

On an 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.

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 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'.

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'.

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'.

The service delivery model

The BME FT Project is made up of three key elements; training, one-to-one support and mentoring, and access to high quality information and advice.

The **training**, which was organised by IoF, was designed to lead to a formal qualification – the Certificate in Fundraising Management and Membership of the Institute of Fundraising (Cert) (MinstF). A total of fourteen days of training was provided over the course of a calendar year. There were three parts to the programme.

- A four-day Foundation Course on *Fundraising Practice*. This led 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*. This involved 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 *Fundraising and the Law* (two days).

One-to-one support, advice and mentoring was provided by two full-time Funding Development Officers (FDOs) employed by BTEG. The FDOs 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. They were also expected to provide a conduit for the views of participants about how the training and the conditions under which it was delivered could be better tailored to their needs.

Access to a wider range of advice and information services and resources was provided by LVSC. Their advice and support service offered an assessment of information and support needs; the provision of information about relevant LVSC services, strategic fundraising support and links to appropriate second-tier support and capacity building networks across London. LVSC was also able to offer an alternative approach to organisational development for those who did not meet the BME FT Project criteria for eligibility.

Selection

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. at least 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.

Implementing the 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 recruitment process and the application of the eligibility criteria; the lack of time between the commissioning of the project and the start of the first training module and the inevitable delay in appointing project staff mean that the selection process was less rigorous for the first intake
- the level and reliability of the support given to trainees by BTEG; the need to replace a key member of staff at an early stage led an undesirable hiatus during which some participants felt unsupported
- the delivery of the training itself; 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 development of the LVSC's role; changes of staff and a period of restructuring meant that this role has been slow to develop
- 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 became operational at the Institute's Convention in the Summer of 2005.

Achievements and impacts

3

Achievements

Attendance 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:

- a major improvement in the attendance and completion rates of the 2004 cohort compared with those recruited for 2003, and the expectation that improvement will be maintained in year three of the project
- a significant minority of participants have taken part in the training but have not completed the assignments that lead to accreditation
- the project's expectation that the programme of training and accreditation could be completed in one year was over-ambitious, as none of the trainees who started their training in January or February 2004 had achieved full accreditation by March 2005.

Key statistics

Table 1

	Year one	Year two
Numbers recruited	26	25
Module One – attendance	85%	98%
Module One certificate awarded	42%	64%
Managing Fundraising – attendance	55%	82%
Award of MInstF	19%	–
Grant Making Trusts and Foundations – attendance	81%	88%
Identifying and Researching Supporters – attendance	81%	96%
Fundraising and the Law – attendance	48%	96%

Levels of participant satisfaction

16 participants in the programme responded to our e-mail survey – a response rate of more than a third. They were equally divided between the 2003 and 2004 cohort. Five of them had obtained the full award of MinstF and a further seven had been awarded a certificate for successfully completing the module one assignment. Overall they expressed high levels of satisfaction with the training and support they had received.

Modules

Participants were asked to rate each training module on a scale of 5 (high) to 1 (low) on three dimensions – content, teaching and usefulness.

- **Foundation Module:** 46 of the 48 possible 'scores' were allocated to 5 (29) or 4 (17)
- **Managing Fundraising:** 40 of the 45 scores were allocated to 5 (26) or 4 (14)
- **Grant Making Trusts and Foundations:** 37 of the 48 scores were allocated to 5 (25) or 4 (12)
- **Identifying and Researching Supporters:** 40 of the 48 scores were allocated to 5 (22) or 4 (18)
- **Fundraising and the Law:** 37 of the 48 scores were allocated to 5 (23) or 4 (14).

The assignments

- All of the 14 respondents who answered this question reported that they had found the assignment for module one either very useful (8) or useful (6) to themselves personally. While 12 rated it very useful (8) or useful (4) to their organisations.
- 11 of the 12 who answered a similar question about the assignment for the Managing Fundraising Module had found it very useful (7) or useful (4) to themselves personally. 10 had found it very useful (8) or useful (2) to their organisations.

Support

- 13 of the 16 respondents were very satisfied and three were satisfied with the quality and scale of support received from BTEG.

Meeting expectations

- 10 of the 16 respondents reported that the programme had exceeded their expectations of its value to them personally to a great extent (3) or some extent (7). While five felt it had matched them and one that it had not met them.
- Five of the 16 respondents reported that the programme had exceeded their expectations of its value to their organisations to a great extent (3) or some extent (2) while nine felt it had matched them and two that it had not met them.

Commentary

The bare statistics paint a clear picture of high levels of satisfaction overall. Qualitative data from the case studies and the questionnaires (where respondents were invited to give reasons for their 'scores' and other opportunities to make 'free-hand' comments) suggest, however, that the reality is rather more complex.

- Some interviewees who had expressed high levels of satisfaction with the programme nonetheless could be highly critical of them. For example, the staff of the project partners combined a high regard for the project with a clear-sighted view of how its design and delivery could be improved.
- Critical comments were often contradictory, 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.

It is thus difficult to synthesise or aggregate these responses. At the same time, the observations of some of the participants offer some useful learning for the project and its future.

These included views about 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.
- There was less enthusiasm about the value of the Managing Fundraising Module and assignment.
- 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).

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.
- 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 tended to act on the assumption that they were training full-time professional fundraisers rather than people for whom fundraising was one of a number of responsibilities they needed to juggle.
- The project had failed 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 drew attention to the 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 challenges.

- 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.
- 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.

Impacts

Impacts on the individual participants

- The project had enabled participants '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.
- It had also given them a great deal more confidence in their ability to undertake the fundraising role.
- They had been able to develop a 'more strategic' approach to the role and one which was 'better organised' and 'more professional'.
- Some participants had gained improved access to networks.
- Others felt that their professional status had been enhanced – they received 'more recognition' within their organisations and, in some cases, their career prospects had been enhanced.

Impacts on the participating organisations

- There was 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.
- Some organisations had developed better ways of conducting research into sources of funding and had made applications to a broader range of funding bodies.
- 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. In a number of cases, fundraising had become a higher priority for the organisation and been increasingly recognised as a core function.
- Elsewhere, the efforts of the trainees to put what they had learned into practice had produced wider 'knock-on' effects on the governance and management of the agency. For example, The acceptance 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 fund-raising 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.

Impacts on the BME voluntary and community sector

- Participants had provided advice and support on fundraising and organisational development to a number of other BME organisations. Mechanisms for this included existing involvement with other agencies as a trustee, incorporating the new knowledge in the ongoing capacity building work within a sub-sector of the BME community, or arranging events for other local groups to disseminate learning from the programme.
- Less tangible impacts of the project on the health of the BME voluntary sector included a significant contribution to the development of a 'more professional' sector, a higher level of self-confidence within the sector reflected in a 'higher profile' and the development of effective networks by the new generation of professionally trained fundraisers.
- The 'Celebration Event' organised by the project partners in October 2004 was both evidence of this growing self-confidence and a contribution to it. 126 people assembled in the Haberdashers' Hall for an occasion which combined 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 project paved the way for the development of the Black Fundraisers Network. The project paid for participants to be members of the Institute of Fundraising and they were also enabled to take part in the IoF's annual convention at no cost to themselves. 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 in March 2005.

The lessons

4

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 role of LVSC as a pathway to other resources and support has been largely unrecognised and undeveloped.

The project has attracted a variety of individuals from 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'.

Future provision 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 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. On the other hand, some participants were strongly of the opinion that it was the training that mattered to them and not the qualification while few of them had achieved full accreditation at the time of our study. 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.

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 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. 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.

Conclusion

5

The BME FT Project represents a new and distinctive approach to partnership between a major statutory agency and three voluntary and community sector organisations which offers a template for successful government-voluntary and community sector collaboration.

Its experience and the lessons to be learned from it have made a convincing case for continuing investment in fundraising training for people working in BME-led voluntary and community sector organisations both in London and nationally.

They have also pointed the way to further developments in the design, content and delivery of the programme. The project has also taught us that the impact of training of this kind will be greatly enhanced if it is accompanied by a parallel commitment to further work on organisational development in the BME sector.

The effective model of inter-organisational collaboration developed by the project when allied to this double-pronged approach to developing individual competences and strengthening organisations is a potent recipe for building a more professional and effective BME voluntary and community sector.

The BME FT Project has achieved a great deal and has had a significant impact in its short life but it may well be that its most important contribution is as the architect of future provision.

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:

Bengali

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

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

Greek

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

Gujarati

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

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।

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:

Turkish

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

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.

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