



# **The DIVA Survey 2007 Update**

## **The strength of the Voluntary and Community Sector in the Bradford District**

rev 071102

Building Communities Partnership  
C/O Keighley Voluntary Services  
135 Skipton Road  
KEIGHLEY  
BD21 3AU



# ***DIVA Survey Update 2006-7***

This is a report of the second year of an annual survey of all voluntary and community sector groups within the Bradford District. The 2005-6 survey was the broadest and most detailed one of the sector undertaken to date. To read more about the purpose of DIVA and the Survey and the comprehensive results from the first year see the DIVA Report 2005-6 which can be accessed at: <http://www.divabradford.org.uk/survey06.pdf>

Many of the findings from 2005-6 remain valid for 2006-7. To reduce repetition between the two surveys this report focuses on the following three points:

1. Identifying significant changes that have occurred since the previous year, with special attention to the Stronger Communities Local Area Agreement (LAA) performance indicators that are based on this survey's findings.
2. Making comparisons between the experience of organisations with financial turnovers below £25k and those above £50k.
3. The results of new questions included for the first time in the 2006-7 survey.

Readers wanting more details of findings from the survey should contact [Mick.Charlton@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:Mick.Charlton@bradford.gov.uk) in the first instance. If statistical data is already available we will ensure you get access to it and if not we will consider including questions in future DIVA Surveys.

## **Additional questions included in 2006-7**

1. **Learning services:** Question carried out on behalf of Working Together in Bradford – Learning Partnership.
2. **Number of VCS employees:** A question was included on the number of employees within the Voluntary and Community Sector
3. **Funding issues:** A series of new questions emerged out of comments made in the 2005-6 survey

## 2. Survey findings 2006-7

This section contains a summary of key findings from the 2006-7 Survey.

### 2.1 Assessment of changing size of the Voluntary and Community Sector in the Bradford District (2006-7)

**Key finding:** Although the number of groups on DIVA has increased, the number of groups that have become defunct in the year leads DIVA to estimate that there are approximately **30 fewer groups this year than last** within the Bradford District. There are approximately 2,700 groups in the District.

**LAA Stronger Communities Performance Indicator: 2LAA2.3.7: Increased numbers of VCS groups on DIVA** has grown from 1591 groups in 2005-6 to 1640 groups at the end of 2006-7. This is slightly lower than the 2006-7 target of 1680. The number of new groups on DIVA has actually been greater than expected - however there have also been more groups going defunct, leading to the overall increase being marginally less than targeted.

**Why this matters:** Generally if the number of groups in the District are falling then it indicates there are fewer community organisations where active citizens can get involved to improve the communities and environments where they live, work and play. The number of groups registered on DIVA matters as it increases the potential networking within the sector and promotion of services and activities.

#### Management committee membership

Table 1: Estimate count of management committees members	Estimate 2005-6	Estimate 2006-7
Active members of management committees	9,089	<b>9,333</b>

**Key finding:** The 2007 DIVA Survey reveals that there has been a **small increase** in the number of members of the public taking on responsibilities within management committees.

**Why this matters:** For VCS groups to deliver successful outcomes they must have strong governance structures. Generally fewer members of management committees will lead to weaker governance.

## VCS groups and numbers of volunteers

<b>Table 2: Estimate of numbers of volunteers with VCS groups within the Bradford District</b>	<b>Estimate 2005-6</b>	<b>Estimate 2006-7</b>	<b>If Based on cohort<sup>1</sup></b>
Number of volunteers under 25	5088	4,800 (-6%)	2,800 (-44%)
Number of volunteers over 50	12,700	17,100 (21%)	12,700
<b>Total number of volunteers</b>	<b>28,800</b>	<b>31,200 (8%)</b>	<b>27,200 (-3%)</b>

**Key finding 1:** Table 2 displays an **unclear picture** on the changing numbers of volunteers during 2006-7. In terms of the total numbers of volunteers in the District, the 'All Respondents' comparison of all VCS groups suggests a considerable increase of volunteers. However the cohort set estimates the converse - an actual overall decrease of volunteers within the timeframe.

**Key finding 2:** DIVA estimates that there has been a **decrease** in the number of volunteers under the age of 25 during the past 12 months. This decrease is evident through either the 'All respondents' or 'Cohort' comparison methods.

### LAA Stronger Communities and LPSA Stretch Target Performance

**Indicator:** (2LAA2.3.6a *Number of people volunteering for organisations signed up to volunteering Good Practice Statement*). The **target** for this Stretch is **1,000 extra volunteers** between 2005-6 and 2008-9. The delivery of this target is joint between the Voluntary and Community Sector, Health, the Police and Bradford Council.

DIVA estimates (based on an average increase of 2.5%) that the **VCS** will achieve an **increase** of about **400 extra** 'eligible' volunteers. However there is scope to increase this substantially by increasing the number of VCS organisations prepared to implement the Good Practice Statement.

Volunteering in **Health** is projected to **increase** by over **200** extra volunteers based on increases in the previous 12 months.

The number of volunteers linked to the Police is not expected to increase and may fall (due to guidance on reducing risk).

Volunteering in Bradford **Council reduced** by **50** from the baseline to end of the second quarter of 2007-8

**Why this matters:** The effective engagement of volunteers in VCS groups is critical to the delivery of the services these groups provide. Evidence shows that volunteers who have clear roles and who are valued are more effective.

**DIVA recommends:** BCP and the Volunteering Strategic Partnership address issue by having clear targets that individual partners are seeking to achieve.

<sup>1</sup> See Method Appendix for explanation of Cohort

## Numbers of staff employed by the voluntary and community sector (NEW in 2006-7)

<b>Table 3: Estimated numbers of staff employed by the VCS</b>	<b>Actual count respondents</b>	<b>Estimate whole VCS</b> (Low figure based on x2 high on x3)
Full time members of staff	1,077	2,150 – 3,200
Part time members of staff (below 30hrs weekly)	1,048	2,100 – 3,100
<b>Numbers of paid staff</b>	<b>2,125</b>	<b>4,250 - 6,300</b>

**Key finding:** DIVA estimates the number of paid members of staff employed by VCS groups within the District to be between 4,250 and 6,300<sup>2</sup>.

**Why this matters:** Demonstrates that VCS collectively is a major employer within the Bradford District and as such makes a significant contribution to the economy of the District.

**Verifying this finding:** Information from Bradford Community Payroll and Accounts (BCPA) corroborates the estimate of paid VCS staff within the District. Currently BCPA support 280 organisations employing 2,200 members of staff. Many of the larger VCS organisations within the District are large enough to have their own payroll and therefore are not administered by BCPA.

## Estimating the financial turnover of the voluntary and community sector within the Bradford District

<b>Table 4: Change in financial turnover of Bradford District VCS Groups 2005/6 to 2006/7</b>			
Level of funding	Count of groups in 2006/7	Estimate 2005/6	Estimate 2006/7
£0-500/ No response	130	£108,000	<b>£97,500</b>
£501-3000	88	£470,000	<b>£462,000</b>
£3001-10000	51	£1,745,714	<b>£1,731,195</b>
£10001-25000	32	£2,050,000	<b>£1,680,000</b>
£25001-50000	27	£3,750,000	<b>£2,875,500</b>
£50001-75000	20	£2,321,429	£2,500,00- <b>£3,750,000</b>
£75001-100000	10	£4,250,000	<b>£1,750,000-£2,625,000</b>
£100001-150000	16	£7,500,000	<b>£4,000,000-£6,000,000</b>
£150001-200000	11	£3,500,000	£3,850,000 - <b>£5,775,000</b>
£200000-250000	13	£5,142,857	£5,850,000- <b>£8,775,000</b>
£250001-500000	16	£17,142,857	£12,000,000- <b>£18,000,000</b>
Over £500000	14	£28,571,429	£28,000,000 - <b>£42,000,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>£76,552,286</b>	<b>£64,800,000-£89,800,500</b> 14% increase overall

<sup>2</sup> See Method Appendix for explanation of two figures.

**Key finding 1:** Table 4 reveals the whole VCS within the Bradford District had a turnover in 2006-7 of between £64 million and **£90 million** compared with an already substantial estimate of **£76 million** in 2005-6. This represents an overall **increase of 14%**.

**Key finding 2:** There was an increasing disparity between the relative turnovers of smaller and larger organisations. Overall the turnover of smaller organisations actually shrank.

**Key finding 3:** Some of the smaller groups that faced falls in funding are likely to be groups employing one member of staff. Many of these are likely to be emerging groups that could have very innovative ideas but little or no track record of delivery.

**Why this matters:** Again the overall turnover of the VCS demonstrates that in financial terms the resources that the sector command are significant and important to improving the quality of life of Bradford District citizens. The turnover of small groups is also important in terms of contributing to outcomes, especially given a much higher proportion of voluntary contribution within smaller groups. It is also important that innovative new groups are able to find a way to develop, including the support of a paid member of staff.

**Verifying finding:** The figure of 14% is consistent with both the 'Cohort' and 'All respondents' analysis methods.

**DIVA recommends:** BCP to promote the value and contribution of all voluntary sector groups and the importance of having appropriate funding tailored towards the following:

- i) Small grants for groups that want to remain 100% voluntary.
- ii) Funding for innovative newly emerging groups
- iii) Funding for voluntary sector service delivery

## 2.2 Strength and effectiveness of voluntary and community groups

The table below is based on an index based performance indicator. The index based on data from the DIVA Survey includes the categories in column one.

<b>Table 5: Strength and effectiveness</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>Net change</b>	<b>Value for index</b>
a) Active members (A1 actual count)	36,995	40,428	9.3%	<b>109.3%</b>
b) Management committee members (A4 actual count)	3,117	3,473	11.4%	<b>111.42%</b>
c) % achieving most of the objectives set themselves (B2 actual percentage)	57.4%	58.1%	0.7%	<b>100.7%</b>
d) Total turnover of groups with turnover below £25k (F1 estimate)	4,587,030	3,970,695	-16.2%	<b>83.8%</b>
e) Total turnover of groups with turnover over £25k (F1 estimate)	75,577,500	89,800,500	16.0%	<b>116%</b>
f) % groups reporting adequate funding (F3 actual percentage)	34%	41%	7%	<b>107%</b>
Indices (average change across all indicators)			4.6%	<b>104.6%</b>

**Key finding:** There was a significant increase in the strength and effectiveness of the voluntary and community sector in 2006-7 based on the indicators used in the above index.

**LAA Performance: 2LAA2.3.8a Groups reporting increased strength and effectiveness** (Expressed as an index: Where baseline was 100 for 2005/2006).

Achieved the target set.

**Why this matters:** Strong and effective VCS groups are a prerequisite for delivery of the types of community based services that can produce outcomes for all within the Bradford District.

**Notes on this indicator:** At the time of the original Local Area Agreement, negotiations in 2004-5, Government Office encouraged the development of an indicator that measured the strength and effectiveness of the voluntary and community sector. It was widely agreed that one single measure would be unable to encapsulate the necessary complexity, and this index was developed to bridge this gap.

**DIVA recommends:** BCP promotes the value of this key indicator within future Local Area Agreements.

## 2.3 VCS delivery of services

The 2005-6 DIVA Survey Report has a number of pages related to services delivered by the Voluntary and Community Sector. It was decided not to repeat these questions in the 2006-7 survey to allow space for new questions. There remains scope for new service specific questions to be included in future DIVA Surveys. The only question related to services in 2006-7 related to Learning Services delivered by the VCS.

### **New question to 2006-7: VCS learning providers within the Bradford District.**

DIVA - in partnership with the Working Together in Bradford project - included in the survey some questions that will be the key to further research into VCS learning providers. Working Together in Bradford undertook further work using the data from the responses. Table 6 includes both the actual count and an estimate of the number of both direct and indirect Learning VCS providers within the District:

<b>Table 6</b>	Response to survey	Estimate district wide
Not formal training but activities provide learning opportunities	<b>234</b>	<b>702</b>
Directly deliver training (employ staff for this purpose)	<b>81</b>	<b>243</b>
Directly deliver accredited training	<b>56</b>	<b>168</b>
Indirectly delivery training (e.g. a college delivering training in a community center)	<b>54</b>	<b>162</b>

Further information is available from the Working Together in Bradford project

## 2.4 Voluntary and community groups and community engagement

Table 7: Extent to which groups have a say	2005/6	2006-7
Our group gets no or few opportunities to have a say	53%	47%
Our group gets opportunities to have a meaningful say but we never get any feedback	10%	8%
Opportunities and feedback but doesn't make a difference	15%	20%
We get a say and we know this makes a difference	23%	<b>24%</b>

**Key finding:** Overall there is evidence that there have been some improvements in the way VCS groups have been consulted in the previous twelve months. Table 7 indicates that groups that were being engaged are now more likely to receive feedback. However, whilst a higher percentage of groups are now receiving feedback there has also been an increase in the numbers that perceive that their involvement is not making a difference. There was also a slight increase in the numbers of groups that believe their involvement is making a difference.

**LAA Performance Indicator: 2LAA 2.3.3b Percent of VCS groups who feel they can significantly influence decisions around concerns of their group.** This target is being met. (note the indicator is based on the fourth choice above but does not exclude 'no responses' and hence a different number to the one within the PI Database).

**Why this matters:** The many groups that make up the District's Voluntary and Community Sector are uniquely placed to be able to provide expertise in terms of the views and opinions about wide ranging issues and developing effective consultations with the VCS could greatly enhance service and policy development within the statutory sector.

Table 8: Should groups like yours be targeted for consultation and participation?		
Less than now	The same as now	More than now
4%	40%	55%

**Key finding:** VCS groups continue to express an interest in contributing to well organised and relevant consultation exercises. Table 8 shows the potential for greater engagement of VCS groups. However whilst it remains the case that the majority of groups would welcome more consultation, it is important to stress that they are specifically asking for targeted consultations that are of high relevance to the purpose of their groups.

**Why this matters:** This shows that VCS groups are willing to be more involved in consultation processes than at present – albeit these need to be specific to their group.

**DIVA recommends:** BCP promotes with their partners the valuable contribution that the VCS groups can make to targeted consultations.

## 2.5 The support and development needs of voluntary and community groups

Table 10: The support VCS Groups say they require <sup>3</sup>	Ranking 2005-6	Ranking 2006-7	
Recruitment of volunteers/active members	2	1	Up
Access to more funding	1	2	Down
Improved marketing / promotion of your group	3	3	No Change
Recruitment and retention of management committee members	4	4	No Change
Evidencing the Impact and Outcomes of work	New question	5	New
Better access to practical resources	5	6	Down
Access to training for groups	6	7	Down
Help with finding and using information	7	8	Down
Good quality policies developed	12	9	Up
Specialist support for management committee	10	10	No Change
A developed business plan/plan group priorities	11	11	No Change
Campaigning	New question	12	New
Development volunteer placements	9	13	Down
Support doing accounts	13	14	Down
Support developing quality system	16	15	Up
Better retention of paid Staff	14	16	Down
Support around crisis management	15	17	Down
Support resolving employment issues	17	18	Down
Help designing constitutions	18	19	Down

Table 10 compares the main support priorities for groups between 2005-6 and 2006-7.

**Key finding 1:** The number one priority for ALL groups (i.e. small and large) is the **recruitment of new volunteers and active members**. This represents a change from 2005-6 when it was access to more funding.

**Why this matters:** VCS groups are aware that it is becoming increasingly difficult to recruit and maintain volunteers and active members who are vital to the sustainability of groups.

**Key Finding 2:** Evidencing the impact and outcomes of work – asked for the first time in 2006-7 – is the fifth priority for ALL groups (combined).

**Why this matters:** This indicates that groups are looking at how to increase their capacity to become more effective and deliver services that maximise impacts and outcomes.

<sup>3</sup> See method appendix for words of caution on the use of this table

**Key finding 3:** Developing good quality policies also became a priority for an increasing number of ALL groups (combined) in 2006-7.

Further analysis of the priorities of small and large groups found a deviation between the priorities of smaller and larger organisations.

### Key priorities for small groups

- Recruitment of volunteers/ active members
- Improved marketing and promotion of group
- Help with finding and using information
- Specialist support for management committees
- Support doing accounts

### Key priorities for large groups

- Access to more funding
- Evidencing the Impact and Outcomes of work
- Access to training for groups
- Support resolving employment issues
- Better retention of paid staff

**Why this matters:** This information will help commissioners of VCS support services to identify the services to prioritise. The information will also help infrastructure support organisations (ISOs) to plan the support they provide.

**DIVA recommends:** BCP promotes these results to commissioners of support for VCS groups. BCP ensures these findings are used in the planning of ISO services within the ISO Group.

## Percentages of groups who are receiving support

**Key finding:** In 2005-6 **thirty four percent** of Bradford groups that responded to the survey reported that they had **received support** around at least one of the areas in table 10 during 2005-6 (This finding at the time was seen as a surprise as it would mean over 500 groups would have received support in the previous year). **The numbers reporting that they have received support in 2006-7 have fallen to seventeen percent.**

**LAA Performance Indicator:** (2LAA3.8b) **Percentage of groups accessing at least one form of capacity building support in the last year.** This was previously a performance indicator within the LAA but was removed as part of a LAA refresh. If still included it would be failing.

**Verifying the finding:** The cohort analysis of groups responding to both years' survey reveals a similar magnitude in terms of reduced support. There are a number of factors that need to be considered in explaining the dramatic fall.

- The Council's Community Development Service was effectively wound up in 2006-7, resulting in reduced capacity building support for groups. Some of this drop in capacity was taken up through the Neighbourhood Support Service who commissioned VOSOs (Voluntary Organisations Support Officers) but there was a time delay and the work of this new resource only began towards the end of 2006-7
- When asked 'have you received support in the last year' it is feasible that respondents go back beyond 12 months and this could mean that the views expressed in the 2005-6 table related to much of 2004-5.
- A former Infrastructure Support Organisation – Community Work Training Company – closed its operations in 2006-7 and this could have had a large impact on numbers as they delivered training related to many aspects of table 10.
- Bradford Council's Community Funding Unit who monitor Council funded ISO activity reveals that more groups received support from commissioned ISOs in 2006/7 than in the previous year.
- The strength and effectiveness of voluntary and community groups increased in 2006-7 and this suggests that whilst the number of groups receiving support may have dropped, the actual support received is more effective than in previous years.

### Access to meeting, activity and office space

Table 11	2005-6	2006-7
Office space	41%	47%
Activity space	57%	67%
Meeting space	81%	90%
Public events	52%	60%
<b>Average</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>66%</b>

**Key finding:** DIVA developed a room finding tool within the DIVA website during 2006-7. The result would suggest that the room finding tool contributed to this improvement. There is still an issue for groups that require office space.

**LAA Performance Indicator: 2LAA Percent of groups with adequate access to buildings.** This was a performance indicator but it has been removed from the refresh of the LAA. The target for next year has already been achieved.

**Why this matters:** Access to buildings is critical to the ability of voluntary and community groups to deliver their desired outcomes.

## 2.6 *New question to 2006-7* Funding issues

### Length of funding agreement too short 2006-7

Table 12: F4 Length of funding agreement too short	Numbers	Percent
Small groups	26	8%
Large groups	71	64%
<b>All groups</b>	109	23%

**Key finding:** The results in table 12 reveal that larger groups are much more likely to desire longer funding agreements than small groups. This relates to the fact that larger groups deliver services that require staff to be employed. The insecurity made by late decisions on continuation funding and short term agreements are adversely affecting these groups' ability to hold onto valued members of staff, with negative consequences for service delivery. Small groups, on the other hand tend to be delivering short term projects without employing staff and therefore longer funding agreements are of less significance to these organisations.

### The priorities that funders set are different to those of your group 2006-7

Table 13: F4 Funders priorities and group priorities	Numbers	Percent
Small groups	60	19%
Large groups	43	39%
<b>All groups</b>	111	24%

**Key finding 1:** 24% of groups felt that the priorities of funders were often very different to their own and this often created a tension between the funders and groups' priorities.

**Key finding 2:** The proportion falls in the case of larger groups who are twice as likely to believe that there is a disparity between their own priorities and those of funders.

**Why this matters:** The unique selling point of VCS delivery of services is that they are much more able to deliver appropriate support because of their direct involvement with their client groups. This figure could reflect problems in current funder priorities.

### Concerns regarding the likelihood of continuation funding in 2007-8

Table 14: F4 Unlikely to get continuation funding in 2007-8	Numbers	Percent
Small groups	31	10%
Large groups	36	32%
<b>All groups</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>16%</b>

**Key finding:** Table 14 illustrates that one in three of larger groups believed it was unlikely they would have continuation funding for 2007-8. Given that the survey was sent out in January this means that groups were concerned that they may not have sufficient funding to continue the services they deliver only two months into the future.

**Why this matters:** This is clearly a highly significant issue. The concerns of smaller groups are likely to be less because, again, as they do not employ staff then the uncertainty of funding is less likely to have immediate detrimental effects.

### Insufficient knowledge of current funding streams

Table 15 F4 Group is unaware of existing funding streams	Numbers	Percent
Small groups	82	26%
Large groups	18	16%
<b>All groups</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>23%</b>

**Key finding:** 23% of groups responding to the 2006-7 Survey felt they were unaware of potential funding streams until after the funds had been fully allocated. Small groups in particular appear to have a lack of knowledge of where they can find funding opportunities.

**DIVA recommends:** BCP promotes these funding issues as issues faced by VCS groups to partners.

## 2.7 VCS and Community Cohesion

	2005-6		2006-7	
	Numbers	Percent	Numbers	Percent
Decreased a lot	6	1.3%	7	1.6%
Decreased a little	62	13.5%	60	14%
Remained the same	161	35.2%	160	37.4%
Increase a little	81	17.7%	83	19.4%
Increased a lot	33	7.2%	26	6%
Total believing decreasing		14.8%		15.6%

**Key finding:** The survey suggests that members of voluntary and community groups believe that tensions are reducing.

**LAA Performance:** 2LAA2.4.2 *Percentage of VCS groups who report reduced tensions.* Slightly below target

	2005-6		2006-7	
	Numbers	Percent	Numbers	Percent
Very poor	16	3.5%	22	4.7%
Poor	75	16.4%	75	16.1%
OK	201	43.9%	226	48.6%
Well	41	9%	47	10.1%
Very well	3	0.7%	5	1%

**Key finding:** There was a slight increase in the number of groups that believe Bradford District is responding effectively to tensions.

	2005-6		2006-7	
	Numbers	Percent	Numbers	Percent
Positive response	194	42.5%	207	45%

**Key finding:** There is an increasing number of voluntary and community groups who would like to participate in community cohesion related activities with groups from other parts of the District.

**Why this matters:** Shows increasing number of VCS groups that want to engage in cohesion type activities.

## Building Communities Partnership Actions in response to DIVA Survey Recommendations

**Action 1:** BCP is to circulate this report widely to partners to raise awareness of the overall successful performance of the sector in 2006-7.

**Action 2:** BCP to suggest that the Volunteering Strategic Partnership divide the 1,000 total up between partners (based on what reasonably can be achievable) to ensure that each partner has responsibility for achieving an agreed part of the stretch.

**Action 3:** BCP will promote the value and contribution of all voluntary sector groups and the importance of having appropriate funding tailored towards the following:

- i) Small grants, primarily for groups with no staff
- ii) Funding for innovative, newly emerging groups
- iii) Funding for voluntary sector service delivery.

**Action 4:** BCP is to promote the value of the DIVA Survey in relation to measuring the effectiveness and strength of the voluntary and community sector and specifically as the proposed mechanism within which to include the question on the **Environment for a thriving Third Sector** (NI 7 of the National Indicator Set).

**Action 5:** BCP will promote with their partners the valuable contribution that the VCS groups can make to targeted consultations.

**Action 6:** BCP is to promote to partners, the funding issues faced by groups identified in this report.

**Action 7:** BCP is to encourage partners to use the DIVA database as a communication mechanism with the voluntary and community sector.