



Evaluation of the South Yorkshire Social Infrastructure Programme

Report C: Programme Wide Assessment

Report submitted to:
Yorkshire Forward

November 2010

Report C: Programme Wide Assessment

Yorkshire Forward: South Yorkshire Social Infrastructure
Programme

Peter Wells
Chris Dayson

*Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research
Sheffield Hallam University*

SYSIP Evaluation Team

*Contact: Peter Wells
Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research
Sheffield Hallam University
Unit 10, Science Park
Howard Street
Sheffield, S1 1WB
email: p.wells@shu.ac.uk
tel: 0114 225 3073*

November 2010

Contents

Executive Summary	i
1. Introduction	4
2. About SYSIP and the Evaluation	6
3. Achievements: analysis of financial and output monitoring data	9
4. Programme Reach	19
5. Sustainability	29
6. Strategic Added Value	33
7. District Reports	38
8. Conclusion: Programme Wide Assessment	44



Executive Summary

Introduction

The aim of this report is to make a programme wide assessment of the performance of the South Yorkshire Social Infrastructure Programme (SYSIP).

The SYSIP Programme included the following projects:

- Academy for Community Leadership
- Barnsley Community Infrastructure
- Doncaster Social Infrastructure
- Rotherham Social Infrastructure
- Sheffield Community Infrastructure
- Sheffield Community Action Plan Programme.

The design of the SYSIP programme from 2004-2006 was against a policy context of regeneration funding being substantially reduced, something termed the funding 'cliff edge'. A strong emphasis of the funding was therefore placed, in design at least, in increasing the sustainability of the *sector*.

The two recurring themes of SYSIP were the search for sustainability and the added value it provided to the achievement of local policy agendas.

It must be stressed that this report is based on research which was undertaken from 2007 to 2009: it does not consider the impact of a change in government or the prospect of significant cuts to public expenditure.

Achievements

The following table provides an overview of output achievement for the Yorkshire Forward Single Pot resources of £21.4 million.

Table: Summary of Main Output Target Performance (YF Single Pot)

	Targets	Actual	% Achieved
Jobs created/safeguarded	209.5	224	107%
Assisted to get a job	3884	4596	118%
No of businesses assisted to improve performance	1289	1950	151%
No of new businesses created	1	1	100%
No of people assisted in their skills development	5323	6961	131%

Source: Yorkshire Forward Artemis Database (May 2010)

We have not included the following targets in the above table: hectares of land reclaimed (3 ha in Barnsley) or additional private sector investment levered in. However, the programme as a whole supported 3,517 volunteers - something not captured in monitoring returns - but an area we find has contributed to very positive GVA returns.

Reach and Sustainability

Using the financial accounts of the Charities supported by SYSIP it has been possible to analyse various characteristics of the organisations supported. The analysis points to what a 'typical' SYSIP beneficiary looked like:

- they were operating at a community level
- they provided a range of information advice, services and training, particularly to people with disabilities and from minority ethnic groups
- their income was between £100,000 and £1 million although this may have decreased slightly during the preceding years
- their operating margin was tight with only small annual surpluses generated.

Our findings suggest that other factors operating on the sector (notably the end of major funding streams, recession and the prospect of public funding cuts) means that the organisations supported are now less sustainable and smaller than three years ago.

In terms of added value from SYSIP to local and regional policy agendas, the evaluation concludes that the Programme failed to anticipate changes which have driven the sector. It was therefore to some extent a missed opportunity.

Nonetheless, the evaluation did find very positive examples of how SYSIP has enabled some key developments. These include:

- *volunteering* the greater profile for volunteering through investments in three district volunteer centres
- *assets and place making*: both neighbourhood (e.g. SOAR) and district (e.g. VAR and VAB) investments have led to capital projects which have served to complement place making agendas. They have also provided physical infrastructure which has increased income streams to the sector and confirmed its role at neighbourhood and local levels
- *core infrastructure services*: the support provided by the local infrastructure organisations (VAB, VAR, DCVS and VAS) show that support is most likely to reach organisations working at a community level and with disadvantaged groups.

Strategic Added Value

Strategic Added Value was assessed as follows:

- *Strategic: Leadership and Catalyst*: evidence of strategic leadership and acting as a catalyst is modest. Substantial parts of SYSIP funding were continuation funding.
- *Strategic: influence*: evidence of this is largely through the stipulation that SYSIP funding is to enable organisations to change. However, its primary benefit has been as a funding source.
- *Leverage*: Where data exist on the additional funding secured against these projects, they suggest that £17.6 million has been leveraged as additional funding.
- *Synergy*: in most cases, it has been seen as a funding source rather than a strategy to drive changes.
- *Engagement*: the area where SYSIP has probably had greatest benefits is in its promotion of citizen engagement in economic development at a neighbourhood level and through voluntary and community sector organisations.

Overall our findings suggest a critical assessment of Strategic Added Value, with opportunities missed and policy drivers not fully anticipated.

District Reports

In many respects this plurality of delivery models was a strength of the Programme. It recognised that the configuration of infrastructure varied across South Yorkshire, its objectives and roles varied, and it had different support needs. Nonetheless, the findings around Strategic Added Value suggest that some opportunities were missed.

Counterfactual Arguments: what would have happened without SYSIP?

The design of the programme through 2005-2006 and subsequent agendas, for instance the Sub-National Review in 2007, weakened the case for a strong regionally focused programme. SYSIP was therefore very much the product of an ongoing dialogue between local authorities, the third sector and Yorkshire Forward.

Nonetheless, the findings around the net additional impact of the programme are relatively positive. These programme-level findings will of course mask considerable within programme variation.

Conclusion: economic impact or social equity?

Our estimates suggest that SYSIP contributed to the South Yorkshire economy through job creation, through the development of VCS organisations, through skills development and through volunteering.

Summing lower and upper range estimates together, respectively, we estimate that the economic benefits derived from SYSIP was between £21.4 million and £33.7 million of GVA against an investment from Yorkshire Forward of £21.4 million (returns of between £1 and £1.60 for every £1 invested). These figures provide an order of magnitude of SYSIP's impacts.

It is worth noting however that the SCAP elements of the Programme, costed at £6.5 million, were widely spread and in no area would have been equivalent to more than £50 per resident per year of the Programme. By comparison, the New Deal for Communities Programme over a ten year period are valued at £550 per resident per year of the programme and public expenditure in deprived communities estimated at around £5,500 per resident.

This intensity and duration of aid highlights the relative insignificance of SYSIP in this regard in combating what are deep seated levels of deprivation in South Yorkshire.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background to SYSIP

The South Yorkshire Social Infrastructure Programme (SYSIP) was supported by Yorkshire Forward, the South Yorkshire Objective 1 Programme and the South Yorkshire Learning and Skills Council which committed investment funds of around £35m to voluntary and community sector infrastructure in South Yorkshire between 2006 and 2009. This funding has now ended. A key aim of the programme was to increase the sustainability of the organisations supported.

This report presents a programme-wide assessment of the Programme. It analyses monitoring data, explores the reach of the Programme to different parts of the sector and considers its impact on issues of sustainability.

1.2. Scope of the Evaluation

The scope of the evaluation was wide ranging reflecting the diversity of interventions under SYSIP. The evaluation considered activities under the following themes:

- investment in volunteering
- acquisition and utilisation of assets
- core infrastructure services
- AfCL
- neighbourhood infrastructure
- partnership: voice, engagement and influence.

Consultation with stakeholders undertaken in 2007 highlighted that the Programme had two overarching objectives to increase the sustainability of the voluntary and community sector, and to support the sector in adding value to local policy agendas. This report focuses on addressing a series of **core questions**. These are outlined below.

- have projects met their contracted output and outcome targets?
- what impact has the project had on the development of VCS organisations?
- what is the net social and economic impact?
- what is the strategic added value of the project?
- how has the project met the needs of hard to reach groups?
- how sustainable are the activities supported?
- is there evidence of good practice?
- what recommendations for future programmes can be made?

1.3. Structure

The report is structured around the following sections:

- section 2: About SYSIP and its Evaluation
- section 3: Achievements: analysis of financial and output monitoring data
- section 4: Programme Reach
- section 5: Sustainability
- section 6: Strategic Added Value
- section 7: Conclusion: programme wide assessment.

2. About SYSIP and the Evaluation

2.1. Introduction

The **aim of SYSIP** is to increase the sustainability of the voluntary and community sector (VCS) in South Yorkshire through support to infrastructure organisations. Through helping frontline VCS organisations become more effective, this is intended to bring wider economic and social impacts. The Programme consists of six elements, each with complementary aims:

1. Barnsley Community Infrastructure
2. Doncaster Social Infrastructure
3. Rotherham Social Infrastructure
4. Sheffield Community Infrastructure
5. Sheffield Community Action Plan Programme
6. Academy for Community Leadership.

The Programme was **evaluated** by researchers at Sheffield Hallam University, working in partnership with consultants mtl and COGS, in order to:

- estimate the impacts of the activities over time on VCS infrastructure and the economic regeneration of South Yorkshire
- help build monitoring and evaluation capacity in South Yorkshire
- capture learning and inform future action during the course of the Programme.

The evaluation ran in three phases from **March 2007 to June 2009** and involved:

- reviewing the context, development and delivery of the Programme
- assessing the impacts of the Programme on the development of VCS organisations in South Yorkshire
- considering whether the Programme is effectively meeting the needs of VCS organisations - particularly those from 'hard to reach' groups
- identifying good practice developed by the Programme and individual elements
- assessing the sustainability of activities developed by the Programme
- making recommendations for the future development of social and community infrastructure building programmes.

2.2. Rationale for SYSIP

The core costs of the SYSIP projects were met by Yorkshire Forward, South Yorkshire Objective 1 Programme, and the Learning and Skills Council. The

investment in the SYSIP projects was made jointly by these organisations and funding from each (largely) runs concurrently.

The funding provided was in a range of voluntary and community sector 'infrastructure' activities and associated projects. Investment in VCS 'infrastructure' has been part of economic development programmes in the region since 1995 (as part of the EU Objective 2 programmes and linked SRB programmes of this period). Investment under the South Yorkshire Objective 1 programme extended investment, by seeking to invest funds more equitably in deprived neighbourhoods, through the support of communities of interest (e.g. organisations working with black and minority ethnic groups, and people with disabilities), as well as support to district and sub-regional level infrastructure organisations (e.g. local infrastructure organisations such as Councils for Voluntary Service - CVSs and to groups such as the AfCL and the South Yorkshire Open Forum).

Funding under SYSIP was made at a time when VCS organisations faced a reported 'funding cliff edge' with significant declines in UK and EU regional and regeneration funding going to VCS organisations. The **rationale** for SYSIP was therefore very much to provide support for a transitional period which allowed VCS infrastructure to be supported at an appropriate scale (for the funding available) and to seek sustainability without EU Structural Funds and SRB funding. Such sustainability it was suggested would be through VCS organisations attracting funding locally through new commissioning and procurement opportunities, through charging for services, and in some cases reconfiguring the scale/scope of organisations, through for example merger.

Under BERR (now BIS) appraisal guidance, RDAs may intervene for the following rationales: market failure (including provision of public goods, externalities, imperfect information and market power) and equity. The SYSIP projects can be seen to address these in different ways, as outlined in the following table:

Intervention	Equity failure	Market Failure			
	Equity	Public goods	Externalities	Market Power	Information asymmetries
	Main rationale for SYSIP – helps to reduce disparities between areas or different groups	Investment in VCS organisations working in deprived areas and with disadvantaged groups can be seen to be seeking to address myriad market failures including public good elements (e.g. advice and guidance available to all residents of a community), externalities (e.g. neighbourhood effects prevent employment or well being) etc.			
Investment in volunteer centres (continuation of these centres benefits disadvantaged communities or hard to reach groups, including those without work)					
Acquisition and utilisation of assets. This covers asset management and purchase of buildings.					
Core infrastructure services					
Neighbourhood infrastructure					
Partnership					

These issues are considered further in the thematic sections and more extensively in the section on impact.

2.3. Undertaking the Evaluation

The evaluation proceeded in three phases in 2007, 2008 and 2009 respectively. The research in 2007 focused on the development of an evaluation framework, interviewing stakeholders and an initial review of data. The research in 2008 undertook to complete the substantive research tasks around five separate themes and to run a programme of masterclasses. The research in 2009 focused on the primary fieldwork around core infrastructure services, an extensive round of stakeholder interviews, analysis of final monitoring data, and analysis of an array of other data sources (notably the NSTSO and financial account data). Judgements to inform the estimate of impact have also been made.

3. Achievements: analysis of financial and output monitoring data

3.1. Introduction

This section outlines the progress the projects have made in terms of expenditure and contracted output targets. The data have been gathered from two main sources: from Yorkshire Forward and the five accountable bodies. The end date for the output data has been taken as 31st March 2009 – the formal end date for expenditure and outputs by the Programme. Where possible we have attempted to reconcile data against original contracted targets contained in the evaluation Programme documentation, although in some cases there appear to have been subsequent contract variations agreed between the accountable bodies and Yorkshire Forward or the Objective 1 Programme Directorate. In our analysis we have sought to consider the outputs resultant from the total expenditure but also the outputs and impact which can be attributed to Yorkshire Forward's Single Pot funds.

The following table outlines the intended expenditure contained in the SYSIP evaluation project documentation. It provides the basis for subsequent work around estimating the contribution of Yorkshire Forward to project outputs.

Table 3.1: Summary of Intended SYSIP Expenditure

	Original Budget	Yorkshire Forward	Objective 1	LSC	Yorkshire Forward (%)
AfcL ¹	£4,000,000	£1,000,000	£2,000,000	£1,000,000	25.0%
Barnsley ²	£4,900,000	£3,500,000	£1,400,000	£0	71.4%
Doncaster ³	£3,303,000	£3,303,000	£0	£0	100.0%
Rotherham ⁴	£5,740,000	£5,300,000	£440,000	£0	92.3%
Sheffield CAPs	£12,770,000	£6,420,000	£6,350,000	£0	50.3%
Sheffield CI	£6,100,000	£4,600,000	£1,500,000	£0	75.4%
SYSIP Total	£36,813,000	£24,123,000	£11,690,000	£1,000,000	

Where accountable bodies have subcontracted elements of the projects we have attempted to collect data on the performance of these individual contracts. This, however, has not always been possible.

As noted above, and to meet BIS IEF requirements we have separated out the Yorkshire Forward funded elements of SYSIP and estimated the impact of this expenditure.

3.2. Expenditure

The following table sets out the performance of expenditure to the end of March 2009. The table shows the money and percentage variance against the profiled budget to the end of March 2008. The main findings are that expenditure by the AfCL and Barnsley Community Infrastructure were significantly below target - the latter primarily due to the BBEMI Multi Cultural Centre not proceeding. The

subsequent sections explore this in more detail, although the main reasons are around agreed changes in the profile of expenditure.

Table 3.2 SYSIP Expenditure until end March 2009 Total Planned Expenditure and Yorkshire Forward Elements

	Original Total Budget (£)	Original YF Budget Elements	Re-Profile (YF) (£)	Actual (YF) (£)	Variance (YF) (£)	Variance (YF) (%)
AfCL ¹	4,000,000	1,000,000	790,000	790,129	-129	-1.6%
Barnsley ²	4,900,000	3,358,000	2,954,077	3,173,000	-218,923	-7.4%
Doncaster ³	3,303,000	3,303,000	3,241,281	3,295,000	-53,719	-1.7%
Rotherham ⁴	4,195,000	4,112,000	4,061,999	4,061,999	0	0.0%
Sheffield CAP ⁵	12,770,000	6,417,200	6,517,200	6,517,200	0	0.0%
Sheffield SCI	6,100,000	3,506,000	3,463,000	3,491,000	-28,000	-0.8%
SYSIP Total	35,268,000	21,696,200	21,027,557	21,328,328	-300,771	-1.4%0

Notes:

1. The AfCL contract with the Northern College is comprised of £1m Single Pot, £1m LSC and £2m ESF. The data provided by AfCL appears only to relate to the Single Pot element of the funding which is only taken up until the end of March 2008 – further data requested.

2. The project budget is £4.9m comprised of £3.5m Single Pot and £1.4m ERDF. However, additional funding has been secured since the contract was awarded.

3. Total budget for Doncaster is £10.991m which includes DMBC and NRF funding (DMBC records). For the purposes of SYSIP, the project is assumed to relate solely to Yorkshire Forward funding.

4. Total budget for Rotherham comprised £4.112m from Yorkshire Forward and £0.083m from ERDF. This is a variation from the original project budget (outlined in Table 3.1)

5. Total budget for Sheffield is comprised of £6.1m for Sheffield Community infrastructure and £12.77m for Sheffield Community Action Plans – although these appear inconsistent with actual expenditure.

The subsequent sections on expenditure at a project level consider total eligible project funding (typically Yorkshire Forward Single Pot funding, Structural Funds and LSC).

Sheffield

One of the requirements of SYSIP contracts is that sponsors secure additional funding to deliver their project activities (over and above Single Pot and Objective 1 funding). For the purposes of SYSIP this is termed leverage. The following tables explore the extent and where possible the source of leverage for the different projects. For Sheffield's two SYSIP projects, overall expenditure was three per cent below target at the end of March 2009.

Table 3.3: Expenditure for Sheffield SYSIP Projects (end 2008/09)

	Fund Type	Profile (£)	Actual (£)	Variance (£)	% Variance
SCAP	Public (inc SYIP)	2,392,254	2,178,927	-213,327	-9%
	ERDF (O1)	1,668,830	1,649,892	-18,938	-1%
	Private	16,568	30,079	13,511	82%
	Total	4,077,652	3,858,898	-218,754	-5%
SCIP	Public (excl SYIP)	5,499,687	5,338,235	-161,452	-3%
	SYIP	3,422,248	3,417,081	-5,167	0%
	Private	670,879	614,170	-56,709	-8%
	Total	9,592,814	9,369,486	-223,328	-2%
Total		13,670,466	13,228,384	-442,082	-3%

Rotherham

The following table shows overall expenditure in the delivery of VAR's projects. This is broken down between capital and revenue income streams to reflect the construction of VAR's new building. It shows that the projects delivered to budget, with a £34k capital overspend offset by an equivalent under spend on revenue.

Table 3.4: Expenditure for the SYSIP Rotherham Social Infrastructure Project (end 2008/09)

Fund Type	Profile (£)	Actual (£)	Variance (£)	% Variance
Capital	1,985,000	2,019,000	34,000	2%
Revenue	2,034,999	2,000,999	-34,000	-2%
SYSIP Total	4,091,999	4,019,999	0	0%

Doncaster

The following table shows overall expenditure in the delivery of the Doncaster projects. It is broken down between Single Pot capital and revenue income streams and match funding levered from other public and private sources. This shows that in Doncaster SYSIP funding accounted for only 23 per cent of total expenditure with 74 per cent from matched public sector funding and 3 per cent from matched private sector funding.

Table 3.5: Expenditure for Doncaster SYSIP Projects (end 2008/09)

	Fund Type	Profile (£)	Actual (£)	Variance (£)	% Variance
Single Pot	Capital	100,000	99,973	-27	0%
	Revenue	3,203,000	3,141,308	-61,692	-2%
	Total	3,303,000	3,241,281	-61,719	-2%
Match	Public		10,412,372		
	Private		412,682		
	Total		10,825,054		
SYSIP Total			13,966,362		

Barnsley

The following table shows overall expenditure in the delivery of the Barnsley SYSIP Programme. This shows that the Barnsley Programme was under spent in terms of capital expenditure. However, this is due to delays with major capital projects (e.g. VAB's new building) and £597k of capital was reprofiled to be spent in 09/10.

Table 3.6: Expenditure for the SYSIP Barnsley SYSIP Projects (end 2008/09)

Fund Type	Profile (£)	Actual (£)	Variance (£)	% Variance
Capital*	2,414,842	1,992,532	-422,310	-17%
Revenue	1,144,000	1,156,948	12,948	1%
SYSIP Total	3,558,842	3,149,480	-409,362	-12%

* An additional £597,475 SYSIP capital spend is forecast in 09/10

Academy for Community Leadership

As reported above the financial data on the AfCL does not relate to its total funding, including LSC support. The following data relates to the period up until the end of financial year 2007/08. Some financial expenditure was reprofiled into the 2008/09 year. The reasons for this are explored in more detail in the separate report on the AfCL.

Table 3.7: Expenditure (ESF & YF) for AfCL SYSIP Projects (end 2007/08)

	Profile (£)	Actual (£)	Variance (£)	% Variance
Main Projects	998,813	856,585	-142,228	-14%
Pilot Projects	57,306	44,860	-12,446	-22%
SYSIP Total	1056119	901445	-154674	-15%

3.3. Outputs

We have collected output data on the six projects although the level of detail in this data varies from project to project. This section also relates to total output claims - a later section extracts those outputs which are attributable to Yorkshire Forward.

Sheffield

The following table shows the performance of the Sheffield CAP projects for each year of the SYSIP Programme (e.g. 2006/07 - 2008/09). What is striking is the wide array (25) of contracted targets used – largely reflecting the funding to Sheffield CAPs from three different ERDF Measures in the Objective 1 Programme. Of the 25 targets reported on:

- 17 were met or exceeded, although this includes some where the initial target appears to have been set inappropriately or misreported: for example, the target for 'number of volunteers' was 78 and the reported figure is 375. This suggests the target was set too low. This also includes significant over achievement against high volume targets set around education and skills
- 5 targets were missed although again there appears no pattern as to why this may have occurred
- Output achievement has been reported for three outputs for which there were no contractual targets.

Table 3.8: Outputs for Sheffield SCAP Projects (2006/08 - 2007/08)

Output Type	Output		2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	Total	% Achieved
Business support	No of businesses assisted	Profile	9	7	7	23	
		Actual	13	8	2	23	
		Difference	4	1	-5	0	100%
Capacity building	No of organisations participating in CED capacity building	Profile	19	8	9	36	
		Actual	25	7	7	39	
		Difference	6	-1	-2	3	108%
	No of plans being implemented	Profile	7	2	0	9	
		Actual	4	7	1	12	
		Difference	-3	5	1	3	133%
	No of capacity building projects	Profile	9	4	2	15	
		Actual	10	11	4	25	
		Difference	1	7	2	10	167%
	No of research/feasibility projects	Profile	3	4	1	8	
		Actual	3	2	1	6	
		Difference	0	-2	0	-2	75%
	No of new community based services	Profile	8	2	1	11	
		Actual	8	6	0	14	
		Difference	0	4	-1	3	127%
Childcare	No of childcare places created	Profile	20	0	0	20	
		Actual	0	0	0	0	
		Difference	-20	0	0	-20	0%
Education and skills	No of employed people helped	Profile	5	0	0	5	
		Actual	0	0	0	0	
		Difference	-5	0	0	-5	0%
	No of people aged 5-13 taking part in leisure/education activities	Profile	355	75	85	515	
		Actual	385	571	378	1334	
		Difference	30	496	293	819	259%
	No of people assisted in their skills development	Profile	42	123	138	303	
		Actual	102	140	135	377	
		Difference	60	17	-3	74	124%
	No of people receiving advice and information	Profile	588	441	589	1618	
		Actual	766	1089	514	2369	
		Difference	178	648	-75	751	146%
	No of people receiving informal training	Profile	265	375	161	801	
		Actual	256	407	149	812	
		Difference	-9	32	-12	11	101%
	No of people progressing from training to employment	Profile	0	5	5	10	
		Actual	1	2	1	4	
		Difference	1	-3	-4	-6	40%
No of adults gaining basic skills	Profile	0	12	8	20		
	Actual	6	16	2	24		
	Difference	6	4	-6	4	120%	
No of adults without a full L2 qualification that gain one	Profile	0	8	5	13		
	Actual	0	6	2	8		
	Difference	0	-2	-3	-5	62%	
Employment	No of people supported to get a job	Profile	34	132	128	294	
		Actual	102	318	70	490	
		Difference	68	186	-58	196	167%
	No of jobs created	Profile	0	0	0	0	
		Actual	42.5	3	7	52.5	
		Difference	42.5	3	7	52.5	N/A
	No of jobs safeguarded	Profile	0	0	0	0	
		Actual	0.5	5	0	5.5	
		Difference	0.5	5	0	5.5	N/A

Table 3.8: Outputs for Sheffield SCAP Projects (2006/08 - 2007/08) (contd)

ICT	No helped to access e-learning/internet	Profile	81	184	172	437	
		Actual	91	284	107	482	
		Difference	10	100	-65	45	110%
	No of ICT capacity building projects	Profile	1	0	0	1	
		Actual	0	1	0	1	
		Difference	-1	1	0	0	100%
	No of new ICT learning centres	Profile	0	0	0	0	
		Actual	1	0	0	1	
		Difference	1	0	0	1	N/A
	No of community based ICT projects	Profile	2	0	0	2	
		Actual	2	0	0	2	
		Difference	0	0	0	0	100%
	No achieving minimum NVQ L2 ICT	Profile	0	1	9	10	
		Actual	0	6	7	13	
		Difference	0	5	-2	3	130%
Transport	No of community transport projects	Profile	1	0	0	1	
		Actual	1	0	0	1	
		Difference	0	0	0	0	100%
Volunteers	No of volunteers	Profile	23	24	31	78	
		Actual	112	152	111	375	
		Difference	89	128	80	297	481%

The following table for Sheffield Community Infrastructure (SCI) shows that five out of six output targets were met or exceeded. Only the 'jobs safeguarded' target was missed and only slightly.

Table 3.9: Outputs for Sheffield Community Infrastructure Projects (2006/08 - 2007/08)

Output Type	Output		2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	Total	% Achieved
Employment	No of jobs safeguarded	Profile	31	2.7	0	33.7	
		Actual	29.1	2	0	31.1	
		Difference	-1.9	-0.7	0	-2.6	92%
Business	Business Support	Profile	380	355	205	940	
		Actual	413	329	480	1222	
		Difference	33	-26	275	282	130%
Education and Skills	Skills Development	Profile	160	250	400	810	
		Actual	200	281	511	992	
		Difference	40	31	111	182	122%
	Personal Development Opportunities	Profile	150	205	203	558	
		Actual	191	314	233	738	
		Difference	41	109	30	180	132%
Capacity Building	Community Organisations Supported	Profile	178	181	179	538	
		Actual	247	214	125	586	
		Difference	69	33	-54	48	109%
Volunteering	Additional Volunteers	Profile	50	50	50	150	
		Actual	75	63	58	196	
		Difference	25	13	8	46	131%

Rotherham

The first table on the following page shows the performance of the Rotherham SYSIP projects throughout the Programme. Of its total target figures, the Rotherham Social Infrastructure project met or exceeded profile for five of nine targets and below for four targets. Significantly it has exceeded the targets for businesses assisted,

skills development and volunteers; however, it is beneath target for additional funding secured and voluntary organisations supported with capacity building. For the outputs identified 69% of output achievement is attributed to the Yorkshire Forward investment.

Doncaster

In contrast to Rotherham, Doncaster had five core output targets and met or exceeded all of them. Again, performance was strong on volunteering (common to all projects) as well as employment support and business assistance.

Table 3.10: Outputs for the Rotherham Social Infrastructure Project (2006/07 - 2007/08)

Output Type	Output		2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	Total	% Achieved
Employment	No of Jobs created or safeguarded*	Profile	15	36	35	86	
		Actual		22	39	61	
		Difference	-15	-14	4	-25	71%
	No of people assisted to get a job*	Profile	100	200	200	500	
		Actual	70	244	200	514	
		Difference	-30	44	0	14	103%
	Public/Private Sector (10%)*	Profile	10	20	20	50	
		Actual	0	14		14	
		Difference	-10	-6	-20	-36	28%
Business	No of new businesses created*	Profile	0	1	1	2	
		Actual	0	1	1	2	
		Difference	0	0	0	0	100%
	No of businesses assisted to improve performance*	Profile	10	25	25	60	
		Actual	49	40	24	113	
		Difference	39	15	-1	53	188%
Finance	Regeneration - Public/private regeneration investment levered (£m/% private)*	Profile	638,000	637,000	642,000	1,917,000	
		Actual	699,120	519,932	490,252	1,709,304	
		Difference					
			61,120	-117,068	-151,748	-207,696	89%
Education and skills	No of people assisted in their skills development*	Profile	12	34	34	80	
		Actual	17	57	9	83	
		Difference					
			5	23	-25	3	104%
Volunteering	No of voluntary organisations supported re volunteer management	Profile	n/a	n/a	n/a	200	
		Actual	50	37	52	139	
		Difference					
	No of volunteer placements	Profile	n/a	n/a	n/a	500	70%
		Actual	108	391	699	1198	
		Difference	n/a	n/a	n/a	698	240%

*69% of output achievement attributable to YF investment

Table 3.11: Outputs for the Doncaster Social Infrastructure Project (2006/07 - 2007/08)

Output Type	Output		2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	Total	% Achieved
Employment	No of jobs safeguarded	Profile	6	2	0	8	
		Actual	6	2	0	8	
		Difference	0	0	0	0	100%
	No of people assisted to get a job	Profile	20	20	10	50	
		Actual	0	86	275	361	
		Difference	-20	66	265	311	722%
Business	No of businesses assisted to improve performance	Profile	30	20	30	80	
		Actual	66	239	226	531	
		Difference	36	219	196	451	664%
Education and skills	No of people assisted in skills development	Profile	100	100	100	300	
		Actual	172	297	530	999	
		Difference	72	197	430	699	333%
Volunteering	Volunteers supported	Profile	n/a	n/a	n/a	493	
		Actual	488	502	758	1748	
		Difference	n/a	n/a	n/a	1255	355%

Barnsley

The following table shows the performance of the Barnsley Social Infrastructure project. The project met or exceeded four of seven output targets. Performance on the 'jobs created' a 'businesses created' targets was particularly low, with no outputs achieved for either. Unlike the other projects there is no reported figure for volunteering, despite funding allocated to the volunteer centre.

Table 3.12: Outputs for the Barnsley Social Infrastructure Project (2006/07 - 2008/09)

Output Type	Output		2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	Total	% Achieved
Employment	No of jobs created	Profile	4	13	13	30	
		Actual	0	0	0	0	
		Difference	-4	-13	-13	-30	0%
	No of jobs safeguarded	Profile	4	4	4	12	
		Actual	9	4	0	13	
		Difference	5	0	-4	1	108%
	No of people assisted to get a job	Profile	168	166	166	500	
		Actual	116	166	166	448	
		Difference	-52	0	0	-52	90%
Business	No of new businesses created	Profile	5	5	7	17	
		Actual	0	0	0	0	
		Difference	-5	-5	-7	-17	0%
	No of businesses assisted to improve performance	Profile	5	5	5	15	
		Actual	26	37	56	119	
		Difference	21	32	51	104	793%
Finance	Public sector funding levered	Profile	833,334	833,333	833,333	2,500,000	
		Actual	0	0	2,555,000	2,555,000	
		Difference	-833,334	-833,333	1,721,667	55,000	102%
	Private sector funding levered	Profile	833,334	833,333	833,333	2,500,000	
		Actual			2,500,000	2,500,000	
		Difference	-833,334	-833,333	1,666,667	0	100%

Academy for Community Leadership

A more detailed assessment appears in Report H which focuses on the AfCL. The data presented here relate to the period up until the end of 2007/08, when the project was substantially concluded.

Table 3.13: Individuals Trained by AfCL SYSIP Projects (end 2007/08)

	Profile*	Actual	Variance	% Variance
Main Projects	2868	1860	-1008	-35%
Pilot Projects	114	47	-67	-59%
SYSIP Total	2982	1907	-1075	-36%

* profiled to end of project

3.4. Conclusion: programme-wide output achievement

The following table provides a simple snapshot of output performance at the end of the SYSIP Programme. Overall, the table indicates that most targets (69 per cent) were met or exceeded, but a substantial number were missed (25 per cent). This is at a Programme (SYSIP level) and aggregates all the bottom-up data collected from Accountable Bodies.

Table 3.14: Summary Performance of Output Targets

	Met	Missed	Target not set at start	Total
S-CAPs	17	5	3	25
S-CIP	5	1	0	6
Rotherham	5	4	0	9
Doncaster	5	0	0	5
Barnsley	4	3	0	7
AfCL ¹				
Total	36	13	3	52

Note: 1. Final Output achievements not available for the AfCL.

The following table provides a summary of overall achievement for the main outputs associated with the SYSIP Programme. This shows that overall, the only Programme wide target which was not met was businesses created, with only two (both in Rotherham) of a profiled 19 to be created.

Table 3.15: Summary of Main Output Target Performance

	Profile	Actual	% Achieved
No of jobs created or safeguarded	136	171.1	126%
No of people assisted to get a job	1344	1813	135%
No of businesses assisted to improve performance	178	786	442%
No of new businesses created	19	2	11%
No of people assisted in their skills development	1493	2451	164%
Public/private sector funding levered (£)	nk	17,589,358	
Volunteers supported	nk	3,517	

Interviews with local project managers revealed that some targets can be seen as core (e.g. businesses assisted, number of volunteers, training places and jobs created). However, project managers also commented that many targets (especially

core targets) were not always exacting and could be easily met. They reported that the target provided an important check on delivery, but did not mean output targets were not so high that service quality, innovation and possibly outcome achievement was lost.

A later section of this report draws together the thematic reports to consider the impact of SYSIP.

4 Programme Reach

4.1. Introduction - An Analysis of Charity Commission Data

This section provides analysis of data held by the Charity Commission on beneficiaries of the SYSIP Programme. It provides comparison between the organisational and financial characteristics of a sample of third sector organisations (TSOs)¹ who benefited from SYSIP interventions between 2006/07 and 2008/09 (n=147) and a sample of third sector organisation based in South Yorkshire, drawn from the wider population of charities, that did not receive support through SYSIP (n=835).

The analysis is in two parts. Part one considers differences between the two samples across a range of categories based on each organisation's registration with the Charity Commission. Part two considers differences between the samples according to their financial characteristics.

Tests of statistical association² are used to determine whether the differences identified are statistically significant (i.e. that they could not be attributed to random chance).

4.2. Analysis Part One: Organisational Characteristics

When a charity registers with the Commission it classifies the nature of its work according to three categories:

- **purposes** - what it does
- **beneficiaries** - who it works with
- **method of operation** - how it works.

This section considers each category in turn, comparing the percentage of SYSIP beneficiaries registered under a particular heading with the percentage of other South Yorkshire third sector organisations registered under the same heading.

Figures are provided for number and percentage of each sample registered under a particular heading, the percentage point difference between the two samples, and the chi-square and Cramer's V test statistics. Statistically significant findings are highlighted in bold.

a) Purposes

The 'purposes' category provides a statement of what an organisation does in pursuit of its charitable objects and is an indication of the broad field in which it operates. Table 4.1 compares the sample of SYSIP beneficiary organisations with the sample

¹ The sample included all SYSIP beneficiaries that are registered charities. It does not include beneficiaries that are not registered with the charity commission - this includes so-called 'under the radar organisations' and other non-charitable organisational forms.

² A positive chi-square test ($p < 0.05$) provides evidence of a statistically significant difference between the two samples. The Cramer's V statistic provides a measure of the strength of statistical association - the closer the statistic is to +1 the stronger the association.

of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities according to their charitable purposes.

Table 4.1: Charitable purposes: comparison between the sample of SYSIP beneficiaries and the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities

Purpose	SYSIP Beneficiaries		Other South Yorkshire TSOs		% point difference	Chi-square	Cramer's V
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%			
Education/Training	96	65.3	464	55.6	9.7	0.028	0.070
Medical/Health/Sickness	31	21.1	161	19.3	1.8	0.610	-
Disability	29	19.7	127	15.2	4.5	0.167	-
Relief of Poverty	41	27.9	135	16.2	11.7	0.001	0.109
Accommodation/Housing	16	10.9	65	7.8	3.1	0.208	-
Religious Activities	11	7.5	128	15.3	-7.8	0.012	0.080
Arts/Culture	35	23.8	150	18.0	5.8	0.095	-
Sport/Recreation	36	24.5	197	23.6	0.9	0.814	-
Environment/Conservation/ Heritage	21	14.3	104	12.5	1.8	0.539	-
Economic/Community Development/ Employment	67	45.6	172	20.6	25.0	0.000	0.208

Source: CRESR, Guidestar UK

This table shows that there were statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between the two samples under four separate charitable purpose headings. Compared to the wider population of charities in South Yorkshire SYSIP beneficiaries were more likely to be working in the field of economic/community development/employment, education/training and the relief of poverty but less likely to be engaged in religious activities. By far the largest difference (25 percentage points) and strongest statistical association (Cramer's V = 0.208) between the two samples was with organisations working in economic and community development or employment, indicating that organisation working in this field were most likely to have benefited from a SYSIP intervention.

b) Beneficiaries

The 'beneficiaries' category provides a statement of who receives the charitable benefits arising from an organisation's charitable activities. Table 4.2 compares the sample of SYSIP beneficiary organisations with the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities according to their charitable beneficiaries.

Table 4.2: Charitable beneficiaries: comparison between the sample of SYSIP beneficiaries and the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities

Beneficiaries	SYSIP Beneficiaries		Other South Yorkshire TSOs		% point difference	Chi-square	Cramer's V
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%			
Children/Young People	83	56.5	474	56.8	-0.3	0.945	-
Elderly/Older People	48	32.7	284	34.0	-1.3	0.748	-
People with a Disability/ Special Needs	67	45.6	276	33.1	12.5	0.003	0.094
People of a particular ethnic group or racial origin	32	21.8	106	12.7	9.1	0.004	0.093

Source: CRESR, Guidestar UK

This shows that there were statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between the two samples under two separate charitable beneficiary headings. Compared to the wider population of charities in South Yorkshire SYSIP beneficiaries were more likely to work with people with a disability/special needs (12.5 percentage point difference) and people of a particular ethnic group or racial origin (9.1 percentage point difference). However, in both cases the strength of association was weak (Cramer's $V = < 0.10$).

c) Methods of operation

The 'method of operation category provides an indication of how an organisation operates to achieve its charitable objectives. Table 4.3 compares the sample of SYSIP beneficiary organisations with the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities according to their charitable methods of operation.

Table 4.3: Charitable methods of operation: comparison between the sample of SYSIP beneficiaries and the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities

Method of Operation	SYSIP Beneficiaries		Other South Yorkshire TSOs		% point difference	Chi-square	Cramer's V
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%			
Provides funding to individuals	6	4.1	101	12.1	-8.0	0.004	0.092
Provides funding to organisations	15	10.2	157	18.8	-8.6	0.011	0.081
Provides human resources (e.g. staff/volunteers)	68	46.3	276	33.1	13.2	0.002	0.099
Provides buildings/facilities/open spaces	65	44.2	321	38.4	5.8	0.186	-
Provides services (e.g. care/counselling)	101	68.7	353	46.2	22.5	0.000	0.189
Provides advocacy/advice/information	97	66.0	250	29.9	36.1	0.000	0.269
Sponsors or undertakes research	26	17.7	76	9.1	8.6	0.002	0.100
Acts as an umbrella or resource body	42	28.6	105	12.6	16.0	0.002	0.160

Source: CRESR, Guidestar UK

This shows that there were statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between the two samples under seven separate charitable methods of operating headings. Compared to the wider population of charities in South Yorkshire SYSIP beneficiaries were more likely to provide human resources, services, advocacy/advice/information, sponsor or undertake research and act as an umbrella or resources body. In comparison the sample of SYSIP beneficiaries were less likely to provide funding to either individuals or organisations.

The largest differences and strongest statistical associations between the two samples were with organisations providing advocacy/advice/information (36.1 percentage point difference; Cramer's $V = 0.269$) and services such as care and counselling (22.5 percentage point difference; Cramer's $V = 0.189$), indicating that organisations operating in these fields were most likely to have benefited from a SYSIP intervention.

4.3. Analysis Part 2: Financial Characteristics

Charities registered with the Charity Commission are required to file annual accounts if their income for the financial year exceeds £10,000. The accounts provide an accurate statement of an organisation's income, its annual operating margin, and a summary of reserves, assets and liabilities. Through this data relatively simple measures of an organisations financial health can be calculated and compared.

The following section compares the financial characteristics of the sample of SYSIP beneficiaries with the sample of South Yorkshire TSOs drawn from the wider

population of charities for the financial year immediately prior to the inception of the SYSIP Programme (i.e. 2005/06)³. The following indicators were measured:

- **income size** - Small (under £100K); Medium (£100k-£1 million); Large (more than £1 million)
- **change in income 2003/04-2005/06** - Large increase (more than 25 per cent); Small increase (up to 25 per cent); Small decrease (up to 25 per cent); Large decrease (more than 25 per cent).
- **size of unrestricted funds (i.e. reserves)** - - Small (under £100K); Medium (£100k-£1 million); Large (more than £1 million)
- **size of fixed assets** - Small (under £100K); Medium (£100k-£1 million); Large (more than £1 million)
- **operating margin (i.e. surplus/deficit)** - Deficit (negative margin); Small surplus (up to 10 per cent); Medium surplus (10 per cent - 25 per cent); Large surplus (more than 25 per cent).

Figures are provided for number and percentage of each sample registered in a particular category, the percentage point difference between the two samples, and the chi-square and Cramer's V test statistics. Statistically significant findings are highlighted in bold.

a) Income

Annual income or turnover provides an indication of the size and scale of an organisation. Drawing on the typology developed by the National Council of Voluntary Organisations (NCVO), a small organisation is defined as having an annual turnover of less than £100 thousand, a medium organisation turnover of £100 thousand to £1 million, and a large organisation turnover in excess of £1 million⁴.

Table 4.4 compares the sample of SYSIP beneficiary organisations with the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities according to the size of their annual income.

Table 4.4: Organisation income size: comparison between the sample of SYSIP beneficiaries and the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities

Income Size	SYSIP Beneficiaries		Other South Yorkshire TSOs		% point difference	Chi-square	Cramer's V
	n	%	n	%			
Small (under £100K)	48	32.7	499	63.3	-30.6	0.000	0.227
Medium (£100k - £1 million)	83	56.5	237	30.1	26.4	-	-
Large (more than £1 million)	16	10.9	52	6.6	4.3	-	-

Source: CRESR, Guidestar UK

³ An evaluative approach (e.g. comparing change during the SYSIP period 2006/07-2008/09) was not possible due to the length of time it takes account data to become available.

⁴ See e.g. Kane, D, et al (2009). *The UK Civil Society Almanac 2009*. London: NVCO

This shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the two samples ($p < 0.05$) and that the strength of the association was comparably strong (Cramer's $V = 0.227$).

Compared to the wider population of charities in South Yorkshire SYSIP beneficiaries were less likely to have small incomes but more likely to have medium and large incomes. The difference was particularly marked within the small and medium income bands. Only 32.7 per cent of SYSIP beneficiaries had small incomes compared to 63.3 per cent of organisations from the wider population - a percentage point difference of 30.6. In comparison 56.5 per cent of SYSIP beneficiaries had medium incomes compared to only 30.1 per cent of the wider population - a percentage point difference of 26.4.

This finding indicates that SYSIP infrastructure interventions were most likely to benefit organisations with medium sized incomes.

b) Change in Income 2003/04-2005/06

The scale of change in an organisation's income in the three years prior to the inception of the SYSIP Programme provides an indication of its development prior to receiving an infrastructure intervention. Organisations which experienced a large growth in income of more than 25 per cent in this period could be said to have undergone rapid development in their operations while those which experienced equivalent decreases may have been through period of retrenchment or even crisis.

Table 4.5 compares the sample of SYSIP beneficiary organisations with the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities according to their income growth/reduction between 2003/04 and 2005/06.

Table 4.5: Organisation income change (2003/04-2005/06): comparison between the sample of SYSIP beneficiaries and the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities

Income Change	SYSIP Beneficiaries		Other South Yorkshire TSOs		% point difference	Chi-square	Cramer's V
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%			
Large increase (over 25 per cent)	38	31.9	228	32.9	-1.0	0.040	0.101
Small increase (up to 25 per cent)	23	19.3	208	30.0	-10.7	-	-
Small decrease (up to 25 per cent)	37	31.1	150	21.6	9.5	-	-
Large decrease (over to 25 per cent)	21	17.6	108	15.6	2.0	-	-

Source: CRESR, Guidestar UK

This shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the two samples ($p < 0.05$) but that the strength of the association was weaker than for income size (Cramer's $V = 0.101$).

Compared to the wider population of charities in South Yorkshire SYSIP beneficiaries were less likely to have experienced a small increase income but more likely to have experienced a small decrease income. 19.3 per cent of SYSIP beneficiaries experienced a small increase compared to 30.0 per cent of organisations from the wider population - a difference of 10.7 percentage points. In comparison 31.1 per cent of SYSIP beneficiaries experienced a small decrease

compared to 21.6 per cent of the wider population - a difference of 9.5 percentage points.

However, the differences between the two samples were limited at the more extreme end of the scale (large increases/decreases). 31.9 per cent of SYSIP beneficiaries and 32.9 per cent of the wider population experienced a large increase while 17.6 per cent of SYSIP beneficiaries and 15.6 per cent of the wider population experienced a large decrease.

This suggests that, overall, SYSIP beneficiaries were more likely than organisations from the wider charity population to have experienced a decline in income between 2003/04 and 2005/06, and were perhaps more likely to be financially vulnerable at the point at which support was received.

c) Unrestricted Funds

The value of an organisation's unrestricted funds is a headline measure of its financial health. It provides an indication of the level of free reserves it can draw on in the event of a financial crisis such as the sudden loss of a key funding stream. Using the same typology as income size, small unrestricted funds are defined as less than £100 thousand, a medium as £100 thousand to £1 million, and large as excess of £1 million.

Table 4.6 compares the sample of SYSIP beneficiary organisations with the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities according to the size of their unrestricted funds.

Table 4.6: Organisations' level of unrestricted funds: comparison between the sample of SYSIP beneficiaries and the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities

Unrestricted Funds	SYSIP Beneficiaries		Other South Yorkshire TSOs		% point difference	Chi-square	Cramer's V
	n	%	n	%			
Small (under £100K)	77	61.6	348	63.7	-2.1	0.630	-
Medium (£100k - £1 million)	37	29.6	163	29.9	-0.3		
Large (more than £1 million)	11	8.8	35	6.4	2.4		

Source: CRESR, Guidestar UK

This shows that there were no statistically differences between the two samples ($p > 0.05$).

d) Fixed Assets

The value of an organisation's fixed assets (i.e. land and buildings) is a further measure of its financial health as it provides an indication of its ability to raise funds quickly in the event of a financial crisis (e.g. through a secured loan or mortgage)

Table 4.7 compares the sample of SYSIP beneficiary organisations with the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities according to the value of their fixed assets.

Table 4.7: Organisations' fixed assets: comparison between the sample of SYSIP beneficiaries and the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities

Fixed Assets	SYSIP Beneficiaries		Other South Yorkshire TSOs		% point difference	Chi-square	Cramer's V
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%			
Small (under £100K)	55	57.9	221	52.6	5.3	0.632	-
Medium (£100k - £1 million)	27	28.4	138	32.9	-4.5		
Large (more than £1 million)	13	13.7	61	14.5	-0.8		

Source: CRESR, Guidestar UK

This shows that there were no statistically differences between the two samples ($p > 0.05$).

e) Operating Margin

An organisation's operating margin (i.e. surplus/deficit) is the difference between its annual income and expenditure streams as a proportion of its total income. A larger operating surplus may be indicative of an organisation in good financial health while an operating deficit might be indicative of a financially vulnerable organisation. However, in some instances a low surplus or small deficit might be indicative of an organisation pursuing an aggressive growth strategy and forgoing short-term financial stability in return for rapid organisational development.

Table 4.8 compares the sample of SYSIP beneficiary organisations with the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities according to their operating margin.

Table 4.8: Organisations' operating margin: comparison between the sample of SYSIP beneficiaries and the sample of South Yorkshire based organisations from the wider population of charities

Operating Margin	SYSIP Beneficiaries		Other South Yorkshire TSOs		% point difference	Chi-square	Cramer's V
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%			
Negative (deficit)	64	43.5	345	43.8	-0.3	0.030	0.098
Small surplus (up to 10 per cent)	48	32.7	183	23.2	9.5		
Medium surplus (10 per cent-25 per cent)	22	15.0	135	17.1	-2.1		
Large surplus (more than 25 per cent)	13	8.8	125	15.9	-7.1		

Source: CRESR, Guidestar UK

This shows that there was a statistically difference between the two samples ($p < 0.05$) but that the strength of the association was comparatively weak (Cramer's $V = 0.098$).

Although there was limited difference between the two samples in terms of negative operating margins (0.3 percentage points) compared to the wider population of charities in South Yorkshire SYSIP beneficiaries were more likely have a small operating surplus but less likely to have a large surplus. 32.7 per cent of SYSIP

beneficiaries had a small operating surplus compared to 23.2 per cent of organisations from the wider population of charities - a difference of 9.5 percentage points. In comparison 8.8 per cent of SYSIP beneficiaries had a large operating surplus compared to 15.9 per cent of the wider population - a difference of 7.1 percentage points.

This suggests that, in general, SYSIP beneficiaries were more likely to operate with tighter financial margins compared to organisations from the wider population of charities. This has implications for their long term financial resilience as their ability to generate significant reserves will be limited.

4.4. Conclusion

The analysis presented above has identified a number of statistically significant differences between a sample of SYSIP beneficiaries that are registered charities and a sample of third sector organisations drawn from the wider population of charities in South Yorkshire. The findings provide an indication of the types of organisation, according to organisational and financial characteristics, that were most likely to have benefited from a SYSIP infrastructure intervention compared to organisations from the wider charity population:

- **purpose** - organisations working in *economic and community development or employment* were most likely to have benefited from a SYSIP intervention, followed by those working to *relieve poverty* and those working in *education/training*
- **beneficiaries** - organisations working with *people with a disability/special needs* and *people of a particular ethnic group or racial origin* were most likely to have benefited from a SYSIP intervention
- **method of operation** - organisations that provided *advocacy/advice/information* were most likely to have benefited from a SYSIP intervention, followed by those providing *services (e.g. care/ counselling)* and those acting as an *umbrella or resource body*
- **income size** - SYSIP beneficiary organisations were more likely to have *medium sized incomes*
- **income change** - SYSIP beneficiaries were more likely to have experienced a *small decrease* in income between 2003/04 and 2005/06
- **operating margin** - SYSIP beneficiaries were more likely to have a *small operating surplus*.

Overall, these findings provide a portrait of what a 'typical' SYSIP beneficiary looked like:

- they were operating at community level, probably in an area of social disadvantage, in support of economic and community development and employment
- they provided a range of information advice, services and training, particularly to people with disabilities and from minority ethnic groups
- their income was between £100 thousand and £1 million and might have decreased slightly during the preceding years
- their operating margin was tight with only small annual surpluses generated.

The aim of the SYSIP Programme was to increase the sustainability of the third sector in South Yorkshire. This was through providing support to infrastructure organisations to expand and improve their help to frontline VCS organisations in order that they could become more effective in their efforts to bring about wider economic and social impacts. Although this analysis cannot provide an assessment of this overall aim, it does suggest that third sector organisations in greatest need of support were more likely to have benefited from the Programme.

5. Sustainability

5.1 Introduction

The overarching objectives of the evaluation of SYSIP are:

- to assess the contribution of SYSIP to the sustainability of the VCS in South Yorkshire
- to estimate the added value of SYSIP, to local and regional objectives.
- this section considers each of these issues in turn.

The notion of sustainability obscures a sub-text relating to finance, value-laden terms like grant-dependency, exhortations to be enterprising so as, amongst other things, organisations earn income from delivering public services or services. In most of our fieldwork, the interpretations put on sustainability do not emphasise finance, preferring organisational resilience. Sector interviewees remarked that no VCS or private sector organisation is innately ‘sustainable’ in that it will last forever.

5.2 Policy Context

The generic policy context covered in the Policy Review (see Report B) is not repeated here. Amongst the sources listed in this document, several are very practical and ought to be required reading for project sponsors and appraisers/funders undertaking building projects. In our general experience, borne out by fieldwork interviews on SYSIP, it is more productive to go round in circles several times from vision, purpose, organisational capability, need, feasibility (supply, financial, demand and technical), concept business plan, specification, draft design, full business plan, back to vision before repeating the process to final specification, costings and financing. Without this iteration, projects lose their way, trustees are not in a position to take informed decisions for the organisation, the executive has not got the management material to carry out the project and external funders cannot appraise the project.

Several of the sources are more related to policy and the potential from third sector owned assets. These too identify some practical and operational issues. The Quirk report exemplifies this set of sources. Interestingly, RMBC and YF are cited as contributing to the review. There is the risk of a tendency to regard buildings as a panacea, citing Quirk as part of a bandwagon effect but without paying full attention to the Review’s contents.

The SYOF Route Map is a breath of fresh air for its realism, method and advice. It contains an interesting rehearsal of sustainability and some research into procurement. The asset based content mainly relates to work in Sheffield relating to LEGI and workspace.

The Route Map expressed sustainability in the down to earth manner of “a self-reliant process of scraping and adapting to get by one day, without compromising your ability to do the same the next day”.

On procurement, the Route Map observed a discrepancy between the rhetoric and the reality, contention over local authority figures and a mixed bag of opportunity relating to the NHS. It does not, however, refer to NHS CPC Trusts in South Yorkshire.

The Route Map invites organisations considering how to sustain their activities to establish if they have anything to sell, follows a thought process through to possibilities like procurement, enterprise, asset-based development, flagging these up as “not end goals or final destinations”. Checklists of considerations for each possibility convey a realistic perspective on their potential, and these too ought to be required reading for sponsors and for appraisers/funders.

The research for this evaluation was undertaken between March 2007 and October 2009. In the separate report on policy agendas we discuss the vulnerability of parts of the sector to a 'funding shock' and highlight key policy trends. However, it should be stressed that primary work was not undertaken after October 2010 and therefore any reflections on the impact of the change in Government, the June 2010 Budget or the October 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review are speculative. The evidence collected through the evaluation suggests that significant parts of the sector will be at greater risk and therefore their sustainability jeopardised. This context must condition the findings presented below.

5.3 Findings

The theme reports and the policy review highlighted the following set of issues with regard to sustainability:

- the discourse of 'grant dependency' which has underpinned the case for SYSIP and other programmes is to a large extent misleading. In practice, funders need to consider a mix of funding which may include grants, loans, service contracts as well as new forms of loan and equity funding (see Report B Changing Policy Agendas and Contexts)
- sustainability has different meanings: it ranges from organisational survival to organisational growth; it ranges from retaining a service for a beneficiary group to considerable service innovation
- the recession and in particular its consequences for public expenditure through this decade will have enormous implications for the voluntary and community sector (see B Changing Policy Agendas and Contexts)
- other terms such as 'resilience' may be more meaningful in terms of considering the long term development of the sector (see B Changing Policy Agendas and Contexts)
- the design of the Programme anticipated a fall in regeneration funding (mainly from Single Pot and EU sources) but largely assumed that public funding (especially in terms of service contracts) would grow. This latter assumption will be proved incorrect.

Given this context, the following sets out the main findings in terms of the sustainability of the Programme:

- key local partners (local authorities and infrastructure organisations) very much saw SYSIP as a Programme about sustainability and a reconfiguration of infrastructure support and the evaluation found examples of how SYSIP was supporting sustainability

- *Volunteer Centres*: in Barnsley, Rotherham and Doncaster the funding had sought to improve and reconfigure services (around the national standards for modern volunteer centres). In Rotherham in particular, with the establishment of a new volunteer centre, there had been the opportunity to more easily align volunteer support with public service agendas (for example with Condition Management Programmes)
- *Assets*: the evaluation found that the construction and configuration of the new buildings at VAR and VAB had been well managed. Critically there was a clear business case which had the support of local partners, notably the local authority. The management of existing assets, particularly the cases of Zest and SOAR was found to be very strong, and again, consideration had been given to the use of these buildings to deliver neighbourhood and local services
- *Core infrastructure services*: the focus here had primarily been on the delivery of services to support local third sector organisations. The support was found to be well received. However, there was a note of caution: the SYSIP funding was often part of a wider portfolio of support and the SYSIP Programme had not necessarily added much beyond being a necessary funding stream. Against this context, we did find local infrastructure organisations engaging far more actively in local policy arenas and working in partnership, notably with local authorities, Jobcentre Plus and PCTs. This was at a level far greater than before SYSIP.

However, the theme reports raised concerns with regard to how sustainability was considered in other parts of the Programme

- *AfCL*: the funding of the AfCL was well managed and outputs achieved. However, it was a project whose role primarily related to the delivery of the South Yorkshire 1 Programme. It was necessary at this time, especially in building community capacity, however support at this scale was not required as the Programme ran down. Although other activities were considered these were did not bring sustainable funding
- *Assets*: the report on assets highlights the limitations of the planned investment in the BBEMI (Multi-cultural centre) building in Barnsley. This building was not realised during the Programme, and as the evaluation highlighted it required a more developed business case and critically greater support from funders. The evaluation also highlighted how the current recession and asset-based bubble has led to some third sector organisations providing assets being undercut by commercial developers
- *neighbourhood infrastructure*: each South Yorkshire district approached the support of infrastructure at a neighbourhood level in different ways. In Barnsley this was through BACP and in Sheffield through the CAPs Programme. In Doncaster, the Council with the CVS sought to develop a small number of area focused development trusts which could lead public service delivery. In Rotherham, which had invested less previously in neighbourhood infrastructure, the approach was largely to provide support through VAR, and recognise that neighbourhood organisations were continuing as volunteer-led organisations. The Sheffield CAP Programme in part put off a decision on neighbourhood infrastructure, something considered in the 2009 VCF Review commissioned by Sheffield City Council.

SYSIP should be considered in the context of Yorkshire Forward's wider array of programmes. For example, the RDA has also supported social investment through the funding of Charity Bank and also invested in projects to assist social enterprises. These will also have a bearing on the sustainability of the sector. Finally,

sustainability is a contested term. In many guises it was taken to consider the sustainability of the sector, but this can be easily confused with the sustainability of individual organisations, whereas perhaps the focus should be on sustaining outcomes for beneficiaries.

5.4 Conclusion

The evaluation finds that SYSIP has had mixed success in achieving its aim of increasing the sustainability of the VCS in South Yorkshire. This is for a series of contextual changes (notably the recession and prospects of public funding cuts) but also because the Programme lacked a strategic focus from the outset. This is not to suggest that local districts had clear and well argued plans for funding, just that it was unclear what strategic benefits Yorkshire Forward would secure from the Programme. Where the Programme worked well and organisations became more sustainable and resilient resources were focused on a small number of strategic projects which were supported by a group of partners (notably including the local authority and CVS/Voluntary Action). However, it is also the case that local partners did not anticipate the shift in regional priorities towards a greater enterprise focus and the attainment of high levels of gross value added' (regional economic activity).

This leads to the second objective for SYSIP - its added value to local and regional objectives. The positive findings above highlight areas where the Programme added value and created capacity for the achievement of local policy objectives. Some in the case of asset development should have a lasting and sustained impact.

It is less clear how SYSIP contributes to current regional objectives. It is unlikely whether a Programme of SYSIP's nature would be funded again. Moreover, the increasing economic focus of regional programmes suggests that large parts of SYSIP appear now to be unaligned. However, it should be stressed that a concern of local Programme partners was to highlight how the VCS could contribute to economic agendas. The evaluation found extensive examples which include:

- *volunteering*: although 'general' volunteer support was funded, there was a growing recognition and evidence of volunteering being part of a welfare - through volunteering - to work approach. However there was variable practice across the sub-region
- *assets and place making*: the asset developments at district and neighbourhood levels were often an intrinsic part of wider economic programmes: whether in terms of improving the attractiveness of a place for investment or more directly through offering a range of workspace (the example of SOAR, VAB and VAR are useful here)
- *core infrastructure services*: the evidence around the 'reach' of the Programme suggested that organisations with an economic remit were more likely to be accessing and benefiting from the Programme.

6. Strategic Added Value

6.1 Ad ded Value

Approach

In contrast to the quantitative assessment of sustainability, we have sought to base our assessment of the added value of SYSIP to local policy agendas on qualitative research involving extensive stakeholder interviews with third sector organisations, local authorities and other agencies.

In these interviews we have reviewed the role of the VCS and infrastructure organisations in each district, what are seen as the prominent drivers for local policy (e.g. enterprise and employment, commissioning and public services), and how and where SYSIP assisted organisations have made a contribution.

6.2. Strategic Added Value

The table on the following pages summarises the four assessments of Strategic Added Value contained in this report. The following summarises the main findings.

- *Strategic Leadership and Catalyst:* evidence of strategic leadership and acting as a catalyst is modest. Substantial parts of SYSIP funding were continuation funding. Where this was not the case, as in Barnsley, Rotherham and Doncaster, its effect has been greater. Through SYSIP Yorkshire Forward made a substantial commitment to the South Yorkshire voluntary and community sector with a stipulation that infrastructure organisations needed to become more sustainable – both financially but also in terms of the quality of the services they offered and partnerships they engaged in
- *Strategic influence:* evidence of this is largely through the stipulation that SYSIP funding is to enable organisations to change. However, its primary benefit has been as a funding source. Opportunities appear to have been missed here in terms of exploring a wider mix of funding options for the sector, understanding the drivers which would affect it, and where it offered most to service delivery
- *Leverage:* Yorkshire Forward, Objective 1 and the LSC contributed around £24 million to SYSIP. Data on the additional funding secured against these projects, where there is data, suggests £17.6 million has been leveraged as additional funding. Given the context of the Programme and the challenges VCS organisations face in attracting funding this is a positive finding
- *Synergy:* as Report B (on Policy Agendas and Contexts) discusses, the voluntary and community sector policy context is complex, with an array of national policy developments and local and regional responses. These include ChangeUp, investment in the Charity Bank, neighbourhood arrangements debates and national support for community anchor organisations. To some extent, SYSIP has anticipated and supported these developments. However, in most cases, it has been seen as a funding source rather than a strategy to drive changes. Elsewhere we argue that Yorkshire Forward and local partners should have developed a clearer investment strategy for the funding. Geographic Programmes and product ranges may help in the long term

- *engagement*: the area where SYSIP has probably had greatest benefits is in its promotion of citizen engagement in economic development at a neighbourhood level and through voluntary and community sector organisations. All projects were found to be committed to wider engagement and had a remit of changing previous models of development and service delivery.

Overall our findings suggest a critical assessment of Strategic Added Value, with opportunities missed and policy drivers not fully anticipated.

Table 6.1: Contribution of SYSIP to Strategic Added Value of Yorkshire Forward (summary table)

SAV Function	Volunteering	Assets	Core Infrastructure Services	AfCL	Neighbourhood Infrastructure
Strategic leadership and catalyst	YF influence quite limited with the exception of Rotherham VC which was a new project. Volunteering England accreditation was a contractual stipulation and beneficial.	YF's leadership has been quite good (beyond PMF stage) in pursuing a clearer focus to SYSIP rationale	Investment in the CVS/Voluntary Action services varied across the four districts: it was unclear whether new activities were needed (Sheffield) or whether existing activities would be continued (Doncaster).	YF support for AfCL followed that from O1 and LSC and was based more on optimising the use of Structural Funds than on the merits of further support to AfCL. The YF role is (in our view) modest on this function	Continued funding from Yorkshire Forward has provided more time for BACP and some of the Community Forums in Sheffield to adjust to new funding regimes and identify opportunities for service income. This is not necessarily the case in all areas – and often the poorest neighbourhoods, where some community forums have ceased.
Strategic influence	Again, the direct influence of YF is quite limited. However, it was reported that all three VCs (Rotherham and Doncaster in particular) are now seen much more as equal partners with statutory agencies. It was noted that greater support may be required in the future.	YF's impact has been moderate; other funding into SYSIP (e.g. Doncaster NRF) can be obscure/token	There was found to be variation between the Districts. In Doncaster, Rotherham and Barnsley stakeholders reported that SYSIP was used to engineer change in CVS/Voluntary Action provision. In Sheffield, change was already underway and funding form part of a wider portfolio	The YF role here in overall management of the contract with AfCL and coordination with and then filling in for O1 enabled AfCL flexibility and supported innovation. In our view this is a moderate contribution	The main influence YF appear to have exerted (beyond its funding) appears to be around its requirement that programmes such as SYSIP would not be funded again – prompting responses from infrastructure organisations and statutory partners to seek alternative approaches. It is arguable however the extent of this influence: many of these agendas were already being set nationally and taken up by local government.

SAV Function	Volunteering	Assets	Core Infrastructure Services	AfCL	Neighbourhood Infrastructure
Leverage	The level of direct leverage is quite limited (mainly the matched Objective 1 funding or NRF resources). This has provided subsequent benefits in enabling organisations to seek additional funding, for instance from V.	Leverage has developed - at the start of the Programme it was more 'influenced' than 'influencer'.	The funding operated as part of the mix of funds CVS/Voluntary Action draw on (ChangeUp, Big Lottery, other programmes, core grants from local authorities). SYSIP was timely because it enabled capacity to be built and new areas to be accessed.	Without the YF funding, at least £1m ESF would not have been available. While financially significant, it is more funding-led than strategy-led, so a moderate contribution is judged	Further research is required to ascertain the full leverage effects of the YF investments.

SAV Function	Volunteering	Sustainability	Core Infrastructure Services	AfCL	Neighbourhood Infrastructure
Synergy	The three volunteer centres operate in different ways: Doncaster VC is highly integrated into the CVS and draws in other support functions (as to Rotherham to some extent); Rotherham VC was established using the SYSIP funding and a key aim has been to develop the VC as the coordinating centre in the district; and in Barnsley, the VC is part of VAB but appears to largely operate on a stand alone basis. Both Rotherham and Barnsley reported potential benefits in the future from being based in new buildings – and improve internal coordination and synergy.	There is a mixed picture here: energy of all involved was exhausted at the development stage. The sector is naturally inclined to knowledge exchange. However, the BBEMI project exemplifies (for BBEMI, BMBC and YF) a synergy shortcoming so far.	We found that synergy varied between the districts. This is largely discussed above under strategic influence. The rationalisation of the sector was further progressed in Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham and there was a clearer case for focusing resources on the core infrastructure body along with a small number of other strategic organisations. In Sheffield the situation was more complex and funds came at a time when levels of infrastructure support were being sustained and new models for reconfiguring support being sought (including community anchor organisations and neighbourhood development organisations). This probably hindered the greatest benefits from synergy.	As with strategic influence, YF made an appropriate and moderate contribution on this factor	YF funding sustained a model and to a large extent a scale of infrastructure beyond previous Objective 1 funding. To some extent this scale of infrastructure may have been inappropriate – in particular around the multiple levels of administration and partnership required to coordinate a relatively small number of projects.
Engagement	Rotherham VC was found to have greatest emphasis on targeting disadvantaged communities – this was also a condition of its NRF funding. The other centres tended to have a more general volunteer coordination remit.	Acceptable; initial (pre SYSIP) YF and Objective 1 development work on good practice was drawn upon. There are different stages of development reached, for historic and cultural reasons, where more engagement to accelerate progress would help.	There was quite strong evidence that core infrastructure organisations became a stronger focus for engagement during this period - through Local Strategic Partnerships and in working closely with empowerment partnerships where they existed. However, there was also recognition that this new role for infrastructure made a call upon it both for greater accountability to the sector but also to consider how it exercised its voice / leadership role more fully.	Previous YF developmental work on community participation, with O1 on community economic development and with SYSIP partners helped create resources and frameworks for progress. But the complexities of SYSIP mean the full sub-regional value is hard to orchestrate. On balance, the YF role here is moderate and had the potential to be significant	Central to the Sheffield CAPs and BACP has been engagement of residents in regeneration. The funding has enabled this.

7. District Reports

7.1. Introduction

District Reports and Actions are a requirement of the final draft of the Interim/Annual Report of the SYSIP evaluation. The findings from the evaluation point to different delivery models for VCS infrastructure being used across the four districts. This section provides a recap of the different delivery models, outlines the main district level findings and a series of actions for discussion.

7.2. Different Delivery Models – a recap

An earlier paper (Review of Delivery Models 2007) summarised these different arrangements as follows.

- ***different Models of Social Infrastructure*** include **community anchor organisations** supporting a range of neighbourhood infrastructure (e.g. SOAR and NUCA in Sheffield), the provision of **general VCS infrastructure support** at a borough and sub-regional level (e.g. around funding advice, quality systems, HR and legal support, but also areas such as procurement commissioning advice); support for **communities of interest** (e.g. BBEMI) as well as geographic communities (e.g. through anchor organisations or community action plans). However, the focus is primarily on the role of infrastructure organisations, and not on community economic development. Cutting across this support is the model for **skills and training** provided by the Academy for Community Leadership, and outside SYSIP, interventions which assist social enterprise (e.g. through Business Link contracts). The implication for the evaluation of this is that there are many more than four delivery models each with differing aims and objectives. Organisations involved in each form of infrastructure saw that they had both a delivery and a **strategic influencing role**
- both **Capital and Revenue** projects have also been supported through SYSIP. For instance SYSIP in Rotherham and Barnsley has funded major capital projects (new buildings) for VAR and VAB. The implication of this for the evaluation is that capital projects are typically appraised and evaluated by looking at their longer term streams of benefits (e.g. over the life of the building). In addition to this division of funding, some of the revenue projects are seeking to attract other funding to develop **community owned and controlled assets**
- **a range of different legal forms and partnership governance arrangements** are being used across the SYSIP Programme and appear to be an intrinsic part of different delivery models. The main two legal forms used are **charities** and **companies limited by guarantee**, with the possibility that some may also become **Community Interest Companies (CICs)**. The implication of these for the evaluation is whether some appear more appropriate to their respective tasks than others. **Partnership arrangements** for the implementation of SYSIP projects also appear critical with a Programme rationale that greater levels of joint working at sub-regional and borough levels be developed between infrastructure organisations and with public sector agencies. In terms of

partnership and governance arrangements at a **neighbourhood level**, something of a change can be detected, with possibly tighter, more focused arrangements emerging (akin to Development Trusts) away from wider, community based partnerships established to coordinate previous grant funding (SRB and Objective 1). Instead, community partnership activities fall to a greater extent under the auspices of LSPs, area arrangements (e.g. Area Panels and Community Assemblies) and neighbourhood management

- **contextual (local) factors** also appear to have a considerable bearing on the delivery of SYSIP and vary across South Yorkshire. Relevant contextual factors include: opportunities from other funding programmes (e.g. **LEGI in Doncaster and Sheffield**); the inter-relationship between infrastructure and local governance arrangements for neighbourhoods (e.g. neighbourhood management and area panels); the development of opportunities to engage parts of the VCS in **procurement and commissioning of service delivery** to deliver LAA objectives; and the **role of public agencies** in engaging the sector (e.g. local authorities, Police, PCTs, LSC and Jobcentre Plus). These factors appear quite crucial to the evaluation
- **contractual, Sub-contractual and Partnership relationships** across the four boroughs and with the Academy vary. The relationships include: direct contracting with Yorkshire Forward by the VCS (e.g. VAR and AfCL), an Accountable Body (Sheffield) which then sub-contracts to infrastructure organisations, sub-contracting to a single organisation (DMBC to DCVS) and a partnership of projects led by a local authority (BMBC). The delivery of SYSIP funding varies further across the partners: for instance AfCL, VAR, DCVS and Community Anchor Organisations (e.g. SOAR) have further levels of sub-contracting (either through procurement processes or partnership arrangements).

7.5. District Level Findings

The main findings for each of the districts are as follows:

Barnsley

Research in Barnsley has focused on the VAB capital project, volunteer support provided by VAB, the intended BBEMI Multi-Cultural Centre and the Barnsley Association of Community Partnerships. These make up the main part of the Barnsley Social Infrastructure Project. Key findings for Barnsley are as follows:

- **expenditure:** £3.2 million of £4.9 million originally profiled was spent. The main difference is explained by the Multi Cultural Centre not being completed
- **outputs:** key outputs achieved included jobs safeguarded, businesses with improved business performance, improved and additional public and private funding secured. Of the targets missed: the targets for jobs created and new businesses created were not reported on and the target for people assisted to get a job missed by 10 per cent
- **project delivery:** research on the Core (VAB's new building), the volunteer centre in VAB and BACP were largely positive. The Core was found to be a high quality building which complemented Barnsley council's wider plans for the regeneration of the town centre. It was noted that the more central location for the building meant that it was far more accessible to people. This was a particular benefit to the Volunteer Centre but also helped in attracting

organisations to rent space in the Core. The co-location of all VAB's services was also seen to be bringing benefits. The work of BACP was found to be making a significant contribution to the transition from grant funded community partnerships to a mix of partnerships - some with assets and staff, and others now operating as volunteer led bodies.

Doncaster

DMBC holds the contract for the SYSIP funding in Doncaster and funding has been delivered through a core contract with DCVS together with a series of commissioned projects, for instance around funding advice which SYFAB deliver. It provides a distinct model and counterpoint to the approaches used elsewhere to secure VCS infrastructure support. Key findings from the research highlighted that:

- *expenditure:* the original budget was £3.3 million and of this £3.1 million was spent
- *outputs:* All output targets were exceeded by a considerable margin, notably for numbers assisted to get a job (exceeded by 722 per cent), number of businesses assisted to improve performance (by 664 per cent), number of people assisted with skills development (by 333 per cent) and number of volunteers supported (by 355 per cent). This is a very positive achievement but also reflected that the targets set were probably too low
- *project Delivery:* as in Barnsley the rationalisation (reduction) of neighbourhood level infrastructure had largely taken place prior to the SYSIP investment. The Council and LSP were focusing much more on area partnerships and saw a select group of area based development trusts as a key part of third sector service delivery in the district. This appeared to be a sustainable model. The SYSIP funding of DCVS was seen as contributing the modernisation of DCVS services and greater alignment with service delivery priorities.

Rotherham

The focal point of VAR's project has been the construction of a new single site building close to the town centre. This building is now complete and occupied by VAR. It provides rental space for VCS organisations on one floor. Research focused on this new build, the delivery of services from it and the work of the volunteer centre. The Volunteer Centre has been operational for three years and has a strong focus on supporting volunteering in deprived communities (formerly using NRF support), working with agencies to highlight the potential of volunteering for individuals outside the labour market, and developing a V project with RMBC Youth Services.

- *expenditure:* £4.2 million was committed to VAR's Social Infrastructure Project and of this just over £4 million was spent
- *outputs:* Output targets for those assisted to get a job, new businesses created, businesses improving performance, and those assisted in skills development have been exceeded. Targets for jobs safeguarded and additional public/private sector funding have been missed. Target levels were largely appropriate and key targets exceeded
- *project Delivery:* VAR's new building was well conceived and delivered to time and on budget (of around £2 million). The building is appropriate to VAR's needs and is fully occupied. It has also brought the co-location of all VAR's activities. In the medium term there are plans to develop further capital projects, notably

around a social enterprise incubator. Of the four South Yorkshire districts, the approach to infrastructure development in Rotherham is the most aligned to local policy agendas. In part the new build and the setting up of many new services has made it more straight forward to achieve such alignment.

Sheffield

The main projects operating in Sheffield are the CAPs and Community Infrastructure projects, including funding for SOAR and NUCA/ZEST. The period of the evaluation has coincided with substantial changes in the development of **neighbourhood infrastructure** in the city. This has included the demise of at least two neighbourhood forums, the completion of most projects, the development of the role of **community anchor organisations** and the emergence of ideas for **neighbourhood economic development agencies**. More recently change in political control of the city council may signal changes to area arrangements with the establishment of **community assemblies** and the demise of area panels. Moreover, there may be moves to delegated budgets and the possibility of participatory budgeting.

The main findings from the evaluation of the CAPs was to understand the role of infrastructure at different levels – from neighbourhoods to larger areas to a city-level – alongside changes to sectoral or community of interest infrastructure. The ‘funding cliff edge’ is most severe for the lowest level of infrastructure organisations. Neighbourhood forums and community action plans were funded under Objective 1 and where these successfully built capacity there now appear greater possibilities under the new policy developments. However, where this was not achieved, forums and associated projects are more vulnerable. Moreover the definition of neighbourhood infrastructure (its capacity, function and purpose) is purposefully fuzzy, recognising differing capacities across the city. This raises issues for sustainability but more critically about continuing to support areas with weaker infrastructure.

Sheffield City Council is the accountable body for the Sheffield Community Infrastructure project and since 2006 has taken on this role for all CAPs projects – the MCDT formerly performed this function for the South Sheffield Partnership projects. A concern raised in many project interviews was that the administrative costs involved in monitoring and managing the SYSIP funding had become disproportionate to the level of on the ground delivery.

In terms of the Sheffield Community Infrastructure project the key findings are as follows:

- *expenditure*: the original £6.1 million budget was increased to £9.6 million and of this £9.4 million was spent. Most additional resources were vired from the Sheffield CAPs project
- *outputs*: all key output targets (around businesses supported, skills development, community organisations supported and additional volunteers) were achieved. The target for jobs safeguarded was missed but only by 2.6 jobs
- *project Delivery*: this project supported VAS, SYFAB, Zest and SOAR. The project had a clear rationale and was similar to the infrastructure projects supported in the other districts, albeit on a much larger scale. The SOAR and Zest projects assisted these organisations at critical stages in their development and were distinctive: SOAR with a greater focus on the HMR and Place Making agenda, and Zest on service delivery within Upperthorpe and Netherthorpe but

also across the city. The delivery of services by SYFAB and VAS were timely and were found, again, to meet needs, primarily for smaller staffed organisations. It was noted that medium sized organisations (for instance with turnover of £500,000) often need to look further afield for support. Nonetheless, core infrastructure services and the provision of what may seem quite simple functions (governance, legal advice, accountancy and payroll) were incredibly important to small organisations which would incur far greater costs if they had to secure the services commercially. This type of support was seen as an important area for grant funding and could not readily be provided through other types of contract.

In terms of the Sheffield Community Action Plan project the key findings are as follows:

- *expenditure*: of £12.8 million originally committed to this project, £3.9 million was spent against a revised budget of £4.1 million
- *outputs*: Sheffield CAP had 26 different output targets, reflecting many from previous rounds of ERDF funding. Of these 16 were exceeded, five missed and five not reported on. Key targets around jobs, capacity building, education and training, employment and volunteering were largely met
- *project Delivery*: the project was intended to sustain neighbourhood infrastructure, through continuing the delivery of Action Plans agreed as a key part of Priority 4 in the South Yorkshire Objective 1 Programme. It was delivered during a period of change and reconfiguration of infrastructure in Sheffield with approaches varying across the city. The Sheffield CAP project covered the South Sheffield Partnership (including over 10 neighbourhoods) and the North East of the city. Other areas were funded through the Sheffield Community Infrastructure project (notably SOAR and Zest) and some areas did not receive funding under SYSIP (notably parts of east Sheffield). The evaluation (see separate report on neighbourhood infrastructure) found that uncertainties of funding in the long term beset delivery with problems - partnership structures in some areas were found difficult to sustain and the main focus was on delivery of outputs.

7.4. Conclusion

The evaluation found that SYSIP has operated very differently across the four South Yorkshire districts. This has probably aided delivery and enabled local partners to shape the funding to local needs. The assessment of SYSIP in Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham is probably most straight forward. Decisions around the appropriate level of third sector infrastructure, particularly at a neighbourhood level, had already been taken. The focus in each was very much on the modernisation of core, district level infrastructure services. These objectives were largely fulfilled, although it was recognised that sustained local partner support, primarily from local authorities, was essential in this process - and it will continue to be so.

The position in Sheffield was found to be more complex, primarily because of the decision to continue funding for neighbourhood infrastructure through the Programme. This decision was understandable at the time, but with hindsight certain changes should have been anticipated - notably that the level of neighbourhood infrastructure was not sustainable with the major sources of regeneration funding. The Sheffield Community Infrastructure project in contrast demonstrated the alternative approach of focusing on district-wide services and in supporting

neighbourhood level activities which were deemed sustainable and were part of longer term agendas.

A final note should be made on innovation in the Programme. SYSIP did not test new models of funding and was a grant programme. However, these grants were found to be important in enabling the reconfiguration of infrastructure - for instance the new VAR and VAB buildings and providing capacity to develop new approaches to service delivery. Indeed, many of the larger organisations supported were using a mix of funding - combining grant, loan and service delivery funds. Without SYSIP, some of the activities supported would not have occurred or would have been on a smaller scale.

8. Conclusion: Programme Wide Assessment

8.1. Introduction

This is the Final Report of the SYSIP Evaluation. In addition to a series of core evaluation questions outlined in the evaluation specification (considered in the theme sections), it was also agreed that the following two issues would be addressed:

- to assess the contribution of SYSIP to the sustainability of the VCS in South Yorkshire
- to estimate the added value of SYSIP, to local and regional objectives.

The next section considers these issues in turn before outlining our approach to the estimation of the net impact of SYSIP. The final section draws a series of conclusions.

It must be stressed that this section of the report relates to research undertaken up to October 2009. It does not consider the change of government or public spending cuts. Some discussion of these issues is contained in the Summary Report (A) and Policy Review (B).

8.2. Sub-regional Programme Wide Assessment

Sustainability of the VCS

The funding 'cliff edge' brought by the end of South Yorkshire's Objective 1 Programme, the end of SRB and the shift from NRF to WNF provided the impetus for SYSIP. Indeed prior to SYSIP, local decisions in Barnsley, Rotherham and Doncaster had been taken to reduce overall funding to VCS infrastructure – notably at the community or neighbourhood level – and to seek to enhance core support. An example of this is the support of BACP in Barnsley. Furthermore, the 2006 *Part of the Picture* study highlighted how funding concerns were identified as the primary concern of the majority of VCS organisations.

The evaluation of SYSIP is largely positive and highlights a 'direction of travel' by many projects to address issues of sustainability. This is occurring in different ways:

- *Volunteering*: greater integration of three volunteer centres into their respective LIOs, bringing some scope for economies of scale and shared systems (e.g. monitoring) and coordinated support to VCS organisations (including volunteer involving organisations)
- *Sustainability*: the identification of new opportunities from public procurement and in service delivery
- *Core Infrastructure Services*: greater integration of service delivery, the confirmation of LIOs as lead infrastructure organisations (at least in Rotherham,

Doncaster and Barnsley) and a focus on delivering services to meet the needs of VCS organisations

- *Neighbourhood Infrastructure*: continued change and reconfiguration of neighbourhood support, through strengthening the role of BACP in Barnsley (and its BASIS project) and the growing focus in Sheffield on community anchor organisations and the possibility of neighbourhood economic development agencies
- *Partnership and engagement*: the rationalisation and refocusing of infrastructure organisations has perhaps given it greater focus for joint working with service providers.

Despite these largely positive conclusions, some concerns must also be raised:

- *infrastructure at a neighbourhood level* is more uneven now than at the outset of the Programme. Neighbourhood forums in Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham have been rationalised and in places are falling back on purely voluntary activity, albeit support by core support provided centrally
- within Sheffield, neighbourhood infrastructure has been strengthened in some areas (for example the six areas covered by SOAR and the area covered by ZEST/NUCA). However, elsewhere in the city concerns were raised that neighbourhood organisations were closing. More generally, concerns were raised over the level of resident support – this varied markedly from area to area
- *BME infrastructure*, with notable exceptions (REMA in Rotherham), has not received the support of neighbourhood or core infrastructure. Plans for the BBEMI building appear stalled and support in Sheffield has been rationalised
- despite the efforts of voluntary and community sector infrastructure, the sustainability of the VCS also depends on the response of statutory agencies. Overall, this was found to be positive. However, this commitment needs to be sustained and funding promises forthcoming.

Although different ingredients are necessary for successful infrastructure organisations (from organisational and individual capacity to partnership working at an effective scale), sustainability beyond the vagaries of individual funding programmes, also depends on the capacity to attract and manage an array of funding. This has been the experience of Zest and SOAR at a neighbourhood level and LIOs at a district level. Where this is not in place, infrastructure can quickly decline and in some cases some of the poorest neighbourhoods left with limited support for voluntary and community activity.

Added Value to Local and Regional Objectives

The Partnership (see Report I) theme of the evaluation explores this issue in more detail. Interviews conducted across all themes suggest that there is an active dialogue between infrastructure organisations and statutory agencies as to how its contribution can develop. Notable contributions here were found around:

- discussions within Sheffield of CAOs and NEDAs holding service contracts (from employment and skills to older people's services)
- the development of procurement strategies to more effectively engage the third sector

- the rationalisation of infrastructure support in Barnsley around key core areas, and forming the case for bids for additional funding
- joint working in both Rotherham and Barnsley between DCVS/VAR and public sector agencies.

This assessment largely reflects current debates and discussions. It does not provide quantitative evidence of the contribution of the voluntary and community sector. Indeed, stakeholder interviews raised concerns that commitment to procuring services from the VCS would only be sustainable if the public sector acknowledged the principles of full cost recovery and allowed the sector to price for services accordingly – as it would private sector providers.

8.3 Programme-Wide Outputs and Impact

The following table provides an overview of output achievement at a Programme-wide level. It draws on the data presented in section 4. SYSIP is funded through Objective 1 Programme, Yorkshire Forward and LSC resources – hence an array of different targets is used. This is mainly the case for the Sheffield CAP (SCAP) projects, which include targets around ICT, Childcare places and Capacity Building. These reflect Programme and Measure-level priorities of this Programme.

However, our focus here is simply in exploring the main outputs and impacts which can attributed to Single Pot funding.

Table 8.1: Summary of Main Output Target Performance (YF Single Pot)

	Targets	Actual	% Achieved
Jobs created/safeguarded	209.5	224	107%
Assisted to get a job	3884	4596	118%
No of businesses assisted to improve performance	1289	1950	151%
No of new businesses created	1	1	100%
No of people assisted in their skills development	5323	6961	131%

Source: Yorkshire Forward Artemis Database (May 2010)

We have not included the following targets in the above table: hectares of land reclaimed (3 ha in Barnsley) or additional private sector investment levered in.

However, the programme as a whole supported 3,517 volunteers - this was not an output target required by Yorkshire Forward and recorded on its Artemis Database but was a key output reported under Objective 1. Nonetheless a proportion of these outputs we argue (see below) should be attributed to Yorkshire Forward and has led to GVA outcomes. This is discussed below.

In the latest BIS guidance on the estimation of impact⁵ there is relatively little comment on the evaluation of third sector or VCS interventions. Those that exist focus on reductions in crime, social return on investment and reductions in those not in education, employment or training (NEETs). The primary outputs (from the list) above are around job creation, business advice, skills development and volunteering.

⁵ BIS (2009), *RDA Evaluation: Practical Guidance on Implementing the Impact Evaluation Framework*, (London: BIS)

Taking each in turn it is possible to use the 'look-up tables' in the BIS Additionality Study⁶ to explore what may have been plausible impacts of the Programme.

Assistance to Find Employment

The Programme was not designed to create jobs. This output was largely achieved through VCS infrastructure organisations providing advisory services, part of which may have been around employment opportunities in the sector.

The following table outline our estimates and assumptions.

Table 8.2 Numbers Supported into Employment

	Additionality Estimate		Number into Employment	
	Low	High	Low	High
Gross Outputs	41%	61%	41%	61%
4596	1884	2804	283	421

The gross output achieved was 4,596 individuals supported. Using the BIS/CEA Lookup tables we have applied high (61 per cent) and low (41 per cent) additionality coefficients. We have then assumed using the AfCL estimates on numbers entering employment (see below for a discussion) that 15 per cent enter employment. This suggests a low net additional jobs estimate of between 283 and 421.

Estimating Additional GVA

The following table outlines the basis for our estimates of additional GVA.

Table 8.3: Estimates of Additional GVA

	Assumption	Estimated Additional Employees		Additional GVA (3 Year Persistence Effect)	
		Low	High	Low £	High £
Full Time Employment	0.5	141	210	8,818,805	13,120,661
Part Time Employment	0.5	141	210	3,527,522	5,248,264
Total Additional GVA				12,346,327	18,368,925

We have made an assumption for the purposes here that half the jobs are full time (40 hours per week) and half the jobs are part time (16 hours per week). We have then assumed an hourly wage rate of £10 per hour (just below UK median hourly wages) and that the job lasts for three years. This gives a low estimate of additional GVA of £12.4 million and a high estimate of additional GVA of £18.4 million.

Businesses Assisted to Improve Performance

1,950 VCS organisations were assisted by the Programme. What evidence exists on the characteristics of these organisations is that:

⁶ BIS (2009), *BIS Occasional Paper No. 1: Research to improve the assessment of additionality*, (London: BIS).

- they were more likely to medium or large organisations (compared to the South Yorkshire average) although all types of organisation (by charitable purpose and by beneficiary group) were represented
- and they were far more likely to be working in the fields of employment, economic development and community development.

Although the Programme did not target a specific group of organisations, this is to some extent a positive finding.

Our comparison between the beneficiary group and the wider sector suggests that SYSIP beneficiaries were more likely to experience a decline in income between 2003/04 and 2005/06, and were perhaps more financially vulnerable at the point when assistance was received. This is reflected in an analysis of operating margins: they were found to be far tighter for SYSIP beneficiaries than for the sector as a whole. Beneficiary organisations from this analysis appear to have been under far greater pressure during the period of the Programme.

In comparison to the analysis of job creation (above) the study has been able to determine a comparison group for the beneficiaries – namely organisations in the wider sector. Two main considerations need to be drawn:

- *deadweight*: the findings suggest the performance (measured by income) has declined in real terms and in relation to the comparison group. The question around additionality is therefore, what would have happened without SYSIP. The evaluation of core infrastructure services suggests that although it was not intensive support, it was nonetheless important to the work of these organisations. A counter-factual position of between 10-15 per cent appears reasonable – put another way, SYSIP contributed to the safeguarding of between 10-15 per cent of the income of these organisations, but in a context of overall declining incomes
- *displacement*: we have assumed that displacement between voluntary and community sector organisations is zero for the purposes of this study. They are typically working with beneficiary groups who would not otherwise access the services provided.

However, perhaps a more critical consideration in estimating the net impact of the SYSIP of VCS organisations is in terms of the source of their income. This is considered below in the estimation of economic impact the relationship between the development of economic units within an area (including the VCS) and overall levels of Gross Value Added).

Applying the versatile power of economic impact analysis to the VCS is useful - it is frequently held that the VCS can significantly increase the size of local multipliers (a process known in economic input-output analysis as internal blocking of the multiplier). Different types of VCS organisation seek to exploit the local multiplier process or else to act in a manner which systematically increases the size of the multiplier. This is by attempting to increase the marginal propensity to consume locally produced goods and services (i.e. replace imports with local production).

In most cases, VCS organisations are operated by the local community and trade on its behalf. Such organisations clearly have potential for raising the local multiplier, by retaining surpluses there, hiring (and paying wages to) local residents, and engaging in activities which retain spending power within local monetary flows. Data

from the Yorkshire and the Humber Northern Rock Foundation Third Sector Trends study can be utilised to illuminate the likely local economic impact of the VCS.

The methodology used here considers, in turn, the components of a local Keynesian multiplier model. It should be stressed that this has been used primarily for the purposes to illustrate the extent to which the VCS may be an effective means of stimulating local economic development. Due to the limitations in our available data it has not been possible to run a full local Keynesian multiplier analysis. Equally, other approaches have needed to be discounted: our research is drawing on a relatively small sample of VCS organisations which are negligible in terms of national and regional economic accounts. There would therefore be limited use in using input-output table based approaches which seek to analyse differences and change in sectoral composition at a regional level. For this reason, more modern economic base multipliers and sophisticated approaches contained in computable general equilibrium models have been rejected in favour of the more traditional Keynesian local multiplier approach.

This section therefore sets out the component parts of the local Keynesian multiplier for the VCS organisations.⁷

Armstrong and Wells (2001) highlight that "genuine multiplier effects can only arise where money is *injected* into the local economy from outside. Orthodox economic theory identifies three main injections into the circular flow of income – exports, investment (from outside investment or autonomous investment) and government spending" (p.263). Strictly speaking, the multiplier formula should only be applied to that part of the multiplicand which is a genuine injection into the local area's circular flow of money.

What is the implication of this for the estimation of the impact SYSIP? The Northern Rock Third Sector Trends study suggests that the income sources of VCS organisations in South Yorkshire are as follows. This is important for estimating what may be the additional money entering a locality.

Table 8.4 Proportion of Income from Different Sources

Income of General Charities (%)					
	Individuals	Statutory Sources	Voluntary Sector	Private Sector	Internally Generated
UK	37.9	36.3	9.2	5.1	11.5
Yorkshire and Humber	29.6	49.7	8.2	6.2	6.2
Sheffield	19.0	65.8	3.9	6.7	4.6
Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham	20.7	58.3	12.2	4.8	4.0

The data highlight the importance of the Statutory Sector in supporting the VCS, both nationally but especially in South Yorkshire. Although grant income is important

⁷ Armstrong and Taylor (2000) show the typical multiplier model for a regional or local area would comprise:

$$Y = (C_0 + I_0 + G_0 + X_0 - M_0) * (1/1-(c-m)(1-t)+g)$$

where

$C_0 + I_0 + G_0 + X_0 - M_0 =$ *multiplicand* (autonomous consumption, investment, government expenditure, exports and imports respectively)

c = marginal propensity to consume

m = marginal propensity to import (from other regions as well as overseas)

c-m = marginal propensity to consume locally produced goods and services

t = marginal tax rate

g = proportion of government expenditure induced by changes in regional income (e.g. welfare payments)

within these statutory sources, contract income has been a growing source. Each main source can be considered in turn:

- individuals (i.e. donations): we do not have evidence from the study to suggest that income is locally (South Yorkshire) generated. For the purposes here we assume that half of the income is from local sources
- statutory Sources (contracts and grants): The NSTSO suggests that local statutory income to the VCS makes up between 30-40 per cent of total statutory income. This is perhaps lower than expected, but may be distorted by the operations of larger charities operating outside the sub-region. Nonetheless it appears a reasonable estimate. We therefore assume 35 per cent to local sources
- Voluntary Sector (e.g. charitable trusts): We have assumed that is overwhelmingly generated from external sources (i.e. major grant makers) and only 5 per cent from local sources
- Private Sector: We have little evidence on where such income is derived and assume that it externally generated.
- internally Generated: We have discounted this income source for obvious reasons.

Adding these together gives a proportion of income which enters the VCS from outside the sub-region. This we estimate to be between 60-65 per cent. This is higher than might be expected but shows that the sector in effect generates net additional funding for the sub-region.

In conclusion, this section considers two forms of evidence to consider the impact of SYSIP on VCS organisations. Firstly using charity account data it shows that SYSIP beneficiary organisations have been supported during a period of decline (compared to the wider VCS). SYSIP has alleviated some of this decline to some extent. Secondly, the targeting of resources on organisations in decline may have been a missed opportunity: overall the VCS can be shown using NSTSO and Northern Rock Third Sector Trends data to generate additional expenditure in South Yorkshire. The implication is that if the objectives had been to grow the sector for economic aims, then the wrong organisations were supported.

Skills Development

The evaluation of the AfCL estimated that of a total 2,730 individuals supported with learning support, 64 per cent were additional, or 1,747 additional learners. This is at the upper end of the additionality ratios for workforce and skills development contained in the CEA/BIS look up tables. However, it is plausible given the characteristics of the beneficiary group (i.e. often hard to reach and less likely to access training).

We estimate that around 6,9611 people have been supported to gain skills and which can be attributed to SYSIP Programme expenditure: many from the AfCL but also through community learning initiatives delivered in the Sheffield CAPs project. To move from this gross output to net outputs and then to impact measurable in additional GVA we have made assumptions set out in the following table.

Table 8.6: GVA Impact of Skills Development

Leavers intention	Proportion	Number	Additionality Estimate	Additional Attributable Job Outcomes	Attributable Additional Salaries (Yr 1)	3 Yr (low)	5 Yr (high)
					£	£	£
Full time employment	17%	757	0.05	38	946,696	2,840,088	4,733,480
		757		38			
Part time employment	17%	0	0.05	0	757,357	2,272,070	3,786,784
Self employed	19%	846	0.05	42	1,058,072	3,174,216	5,290,360
		134		7			
Change Job within the VCS	3%	0	0.05	0	16,706	50,119	83,532
Volunteer	17%	757		0			
FE Course	27%	1203		0			
Additional GVA						8,336,494	13,894,156

Using the student monitoring forms from the AfCL (we do not have equivalent information from other projects) it is possible indicate what the intentions of student completers are and we have assumed that these apply across all training courses; they do not however indicate what the students were doing prior to the course (in particular their employment status). However, the primary rationale for the AfCL and other providers has been around supporting staff of community organisations. Key outcomes from the completed 'where next' forms indicated the intentions outlined in the right column. These are intentions and no tracking evidence was available. Firstly we therefore have only sought to estimate job outcomes for the first four output categories - and not for volunteers and those entering a FE course. We have made an assumption (again from the BIS/CEA lookup tables) of around five per cent achieving their stated goal - this provides the estimates of additional job outcomes. This is a low figure but the course delivery generally involved short courses often completed over blocks of 4 or 6 weeks at most.

The next column converts these to an estimate of additional salaries: assuming £25,000 for a full time position and £20,000 for a part time position; and £25,000 for self employment and a salary increase of 10 per cent for someone changing jobs in the VCS sector. These estimates are derived from national benchmark data for administrative positions in the VCS. We have then provided a range of estimates over a three and five year period. This gives estimates of additional GVA of between £8.3 million and £13.9 million additional GVA.

Volunteering

The monitoring data shows that 3,517 people were helped to access volunteering opportunities. This is clearly different from an estimate of new additional volunteers or what economic opportunities may have stemmed from the volunteering. From April 2006 to March 2009 the number of volunteer clients (in Barnsley, Rotherham and Doncaster) rose from 75 per month to 250 month (with a peak in January 2009 of 340 per month). Discussions with the three volunteer centre managers highlighted the following:

- supply side: the increase in volunteer clients was unprecedented. Causes for the increases were suggested to be: the increase in referrals from other

agencies; the increasing prominence of volunteering as a route into employment; and tied to this the explicit focus of Jobcentre Plus and other employment bodies to signpost clients to the volunteer centres. Monitoring data suggests that some of the increase is from people who are on JSA or sickness related benefits - but that this does not account for a significant proportion of the increase. Increases appear to be across the board in terms of age, ethnicity and employment status

- volunteer centre activities: a greater engagement of volunteer centres in employment support activities, ranging from condition management to more volunteer experience providers, as well as the promotion of volunteering through community organisations working in deprived areas
- demand side: many of the traditional sites for volunteering, in hospices, hospitals and environmental projects reported that they did not need more volunteers or their requirements were for volunteers with specific skills.

Evidence at a district level from the Place Survey 2009 and Citizenship Surveys (up to 2009) suggests that volunteer levels have increased slowly over time. For example data for the three districts for NI 6 - those providing unpaid help at least once a month over the last 12 months - is around 20 per cent.

Case study evidence of the Condition Management Programme in Rotherham shows that where volunteer support is targeted at particular groups there are employment returns; but these are in the longer term and are often marginal. For instance, someone remaining on a sickness related benefit but being able to sustain some paid employment, but where the employer is supportive and flexible in terms of the health needs of the individual.

The monitoring data collected measures the total number of clients seeking volunteer opportunities supported by the volunteer centres. It is not a measure of additionality. However, the SYSIP interviews with the volunteer centres suggest at least a half would have sought a volunteer opportunity elsewhere.

The economic impact of volunteering support occurs on various levels: the value of the time spent volunteering, the additional value generated once volunteers leave arising from an uplift in earning power, the value to partner organisations and savings in welfare benefits. Economic value is generated on a cyclical basis rather than in a single year. Therefore it is best thought of as the value generated during the volunteering period plus the value generated subsequently by improved opportunities and outcomes for the volunteers of that period.

The basis of the impact estimation is the 3,517 volunteers who have passed through the Project during the period of this review. It is assumed that:

- employment Value Equivalent – this represents the value when the volunteers are in ‘employment’ within the Voluntary Partner organisations. They are assumed to be ‘paid’ on the basis of the median wage for South Yorkshire of £441 (source: Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, 2008), an annual salary equivalent of £22,932
- annualised Full Time Equivalent - these volunteers will have been actively engaged in work for a period less than 12 months and therefore it has been

assumed that the 3,517 volunteers are on average employed in volunteering activity for no more than three hours per week.⁸

Overall therefore the total annualised time represents 3,517 x £11.60 x 3 (hours) 48 (weeks) = £5.87million per annum. If the minimum wage is used instead, this provides a lower range estimate of £2.9 million.

Without detailed tracking information it is not possible to determine what happened to the volunteers or whether their career opportunities were enhanced. Research by Roger Tym and Partners in their economic impact evaluation of Project Scotland, suggest that 'structured' volunteering programmes may lead to the following range of outcomes:

- business Start Ups
- employment Impact
- HE/FE Impact through skills up lift
- returners to Volunteering (those entering volunteer activities continue beyond one year)
- supporting Jobs (required to manage volunteer programmes in the volunteer centres and volunteer involving organisations)
- VCS 'bottom line' impact through volunteers contributing to the economic value of VCS organisations
- welfare benefits savings.

Unlike 'Project Scotland', the SYSIP volunteer programmes were not structured around economic activities, rather the focus was on supported volunteering with some work with particular groups and particular projects (e.g. the CMP). Primary objectives were seen as supporting and signposting volunteers to appropriate VCS opportunities. Nonetheless, the volunteer centres also participated through SYSIP in contributing to welfare to work programmes (such as Condition Management Programme). Our focus must therefore be in estimating the net economic impact of the direct volunteering activity, rather than calculating the added value of volunteering to this wider range of outcomes. We have deliberately used low estimates for the value of volunteering. However, we have assumed that:

- deadweight: the proportion of volunteers who would have volunteered anyway or who could not be placed is considered to be low at 25 per cent
- displacement: It is also assumed that volunteers placements through the volunteer centres cause only some displacement, in 5 per cent of cases
- persistence: we estimate this as being as low as 6 months.

This suggests a net additional value of volunteering of £1.0 million (lower range estimate) and £2.1 million over the SYSIP Programme. Given the relatively small sums invested in volunteering (at most one additional staff member per volunteer centre), this appears a very reasonable return on the investment. However, of assuming Yorkshire Forward contributed around 65 per cent of programme resources, this equates to £650,000 (lower range) and £1.4 million (upper range).

⁸ Citizenship and Household survey evidence suggests that volunteers give up around 12.8 hours per month or 3 hours per week. See for example: www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/01/18110338/7

There may be longer term outcomes around job creation but without the tracking of volunteers over time it has not been possible to make estimates around these benefits.

Adding the Impacts Up

The following table summarises our estimates of the possible GVA achievements of SYSIP.

Output	Lower Range GVA (£m)	Upper Range GVA (£m)
Assistance to find employment	£12.4	£18.4
Business assisted to improve performance	0	0
Skills development	£8.3	£13.9
Volunteering	£0.7	£1.4
Total	£21.4	£33.7

For the Single pot investment of £21.4 million the GVA return from SYSIP is in the range of £1 invested to between £1 and £1.6 of additional GVA achieved. These achievements probably appear relatively modest but are not dissimilar to the amounts achieved by other 'people' interventions of RDAs. As we have discussed throughout this report and the companion reports there will have be quite considerable variations across different types of projects, for instance finding what are likely to have been quite significant positive returns from investments in volunteering related support.

Counterfactual Arguments: what would have happended without SYSIP?

As an impact evaluation, this study has to consider what would have happened if SYSIP had not proceeded. To some extent this is done through the estimate of impact which is discussed above. However, it is worth reflecting on the original rationale for the programme and how it sought to address what was perceived to be funding cliff edge for the sector in South Yorkshire.

The SYSIP programme included different aspects which have been considered in this report: it was primarily a large grant programme; it involved different ways of working (notably around accountable bodies); and it was about developing a sector which would be better placed to meet new agendas, for example around public service delivery. As is discussed elsewhere in this report the design of the programme through 2005-2006 and subsequent agendas, for instance the Sub-National Review in 2007, weakened the case for a strong regionally focused programme. SYSIP was therefore very much the product of an ongoing dialogue between local authorities, the third sector and Yorkshire Forward. Each party had different objectives and the imperative upon the sector and local authorities to safeguard investment for the sector should not be under estimated. Under these conditions it was unlikely that SYSIP would be a wholly innovative or catalytic programme: few strings or incentives could be added.

Nonetheless, the findings around the new additional impact of the programme are relatively positive. These programme-level findings will of course mask considerable within programme variation. For instance, where SYSIP entered new areas, for instance in the support of community anchor organisations, setting up a new volunteer centre or funding new assets for infrastructure organisations, the additionality of SYSIP funding could be seen to be high. Many of these investments would not have proceeded without SYSIP. However, weaker evidence was found on

additionality where SYSIP supported the continuity of activities: this is not to suggest that economic outcomes were not additional, just that the value added exerted by the programme was less.

Conclusion: economic outcomes or social equity

Our estimates suggest that SYSIP contributed to the South Yorkshire economy through job creation, through the development of VCS organisations, through skills development and through volunteering. Summing the lower and upper range estimates together, respectively, we estimate that the economic benefits derived from SYSIP were between £21.4 million and £33.7 million. These figures provide an order of magnitude of SYSIP's impacts.

The VAB and VAR buildings funded by SYSIP would not have been constructed on the same scale or to the same specification without SYSIP investment. These are key assets for the voluntary sector which have the prospect to be sustainable over the longer term (i.e. have an economic life of 20 plus years). Analysis of Voluntary Action's Charity Accounts shows that prior to VAR's move to the Spectrum, income from rental was £26,650 and this increased to £44,463 after the move: an increase of £17,813. Although a benefit to VAR, it is likely that this money would have been spent in the district anyway: the benefit comes through the support which is provided through the Spectrum to individual and organisational users of the building.

This section has focused very much on economic benefits and not on the social equity benefits from the Programme – a significant emphasis of the Programme. It is worth however noting that the SCAP elements of the Programme, costed at £6.5 million eventually, were widely spread and in no area would have been equivalent to more than £50 per resident per year of the Programme. By comparison, the NDC programme over a ten year period are valued at £550 per resident per year of the Programme and public expenditure in deprived communities estimated at around £5,500 per resident. This intensity and duration of aid highlights the relative insignificance of SYSIP in relation to the scale of deep seated levels of deprivation.