



Annex E

Original Project Outcomes	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-2013 (mid term)
<p>Outcome 1 Establish an annual learning programme for 40 Funding Advisors in year 1 which responds to their needs. Participation to grow by 20% each year. Monitored by training attended, qualifications gained, knowledge acquired etc and revised in response to FA feedback</p> <p><i>(Key targets amended in 2010)</i></p> <p>Milestones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Database b) Learning programme c) Marketing programme d) Accredited training e) Research f) monitoring 	<p>Database delivered and needs analysis conducted. 180 contacts on database and 111 responded to need analysis</p> <p>Some delays in training. REM ceased trading c-d achieved in part</p> <p>Monitoring achieved but the project wanted higher feedback rates.</p>	<p>Needs analysis repeated in Year 2 month 10.</p> <p>A learning programme was put in place using Fit 4 Funding and adapted to take into account feedback from target beneficiaries.</p> <p>4xday courses (47 participants) 18x1 hour workshops and 2x seminars</p> <p>A range of seminars and workshops were delivered and feedback was collected and evaluated.</p> <p>There was a clear shift towards putting in place improvements and to focus on the changing landscape and the needs of Funding Advice workers.</p>	<p>Revised analysis used to shape the learning programme</p> <p>Learning programme revised and redefined in response to feedback</p> <p>Regular newsletters and some events.</p> <p>Fit 4 Funding programme delivered</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation of events.</p>	<p>New project officer – Nov 2012</p> <p>Programme continues to be shaped to demand with an ongoing learning programme which is responsive to the feedback from groups.</p> <p>Planning to deliver further accredited and specialist training with partners and looking at advanced learning opportunities.</p> <p>Continued monitoring of events and engagement of a reviewer (SWF)</p>

<p>Outcome 2 Baseline of funding applications in terms of quality, eligibility and demand identified by working with EMFF members. Progress tracked over 4 years to monitor improvements. Applicants benefit by improved fund raising skills and higher application success rates.</p> <p>Milestones a)questionnaire b)baseline developed c)FAs to provide information on successful applications d) Improvements in FA skills tracked</p>	<p>The baseline idea was not considered achievable as insufficient funders were willing to participate. Some of the original ideas were amended and alternative approaches adopted (e.g. questionnaires).</p> <p>The ideas around tracking progress of funding applications proved to be more complicated than anticipated.</p> <p>2a not fully achievable due to low funder participation 2b questionnaire used 2c and 2d not achieved and survey to be adopted instead</p>	<p>A number of funding organisations had responded (15) on the request for feedback and it was decided to use BLF data to form the baseline for monitoring.</p> <p>Funding Monitor was developed as a tool to collect information about outcomes and it was launched in the summer of 2011.</p> <p>However the client response rate to FA requests for information about the results of advice given was poor and this affected the ability to fully deliver the outcome.</p>	<p>Continued development of Funding Monitor.</p> <p>18 Funders actively participating in funding monitor.</p> <p>Some evidence of impact – 649 bids valued at £612,000.</p> <p>OEM supporting smaller groups to upload data.</p>	<p>Funding monitor being remodelled in the light of feedback from groups – looking at new ways of evaluating impact.</p> <p>Looking at options such as case studies</p>
<p>Outcome 3 Introduce a regional and 2 sub-regional FAN networks fully operational by the end of Year 2 involving 150 FAs. Benefits include policy/funding/resource updates, peer support/advice, partnership</p>	<p>Steering group successfully established and a communications strategy developed (mainly using email and website).</p> <p>The database was growing and meetings took place with support for two sub-</p>	<p>Steering group met regularly</p> <p>The project tested a variety of communications approaches but there was limited evaluation of their effectiveness.</p> <p>3 regional events delivered</p>	<p>Project steering group ongoing.</p> <p>Monthly newsletter and postcards promoting fanoogle</p> <p>Regional network events in Dec 11 and July 2012</p>	<p>2 steering group meetings in 2012/13.</p> <p>Adapting use of funding monitor in the light of feedback and looking at developing case studies.</p> <p>Regional events continuing.</p>



<p>working etc. Monitored and revised in response to FA feedback.</p> <p>Milestones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Steering group established b) Resources to publicise the programme c) Regional FAWN meetings d) Research demand e) Develop links with key FANs f) Monitor and evaluate 	<p>regional networks.</p> <p>Links were developed with FANs and a BME network and a Village Hall Advisors network.</p> <p>Events were monitored.</p>	<p>and evaluated.</p> <p>Northamptonshire FAN ongoing. Derbyshire also strong (with CC leadership). Support delivered to Leicestershire fan.</p> <p>Ongoing analysis of feedback and changing priorities</p>	<p>although numbers were low in December</p> <p>Sub-regional support stronger in Lincs/Notts and Northamptonshire but less in Derbyshire and Leicestershire.</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation ongoing.</p>	<p>Stepped up support for FANs and increased engagement with all the FANS and support where no FAN is operating.</p> <p>Surveys of funding monitor and fanoogle users completed</p>
<p>Outcome 4</p> <p>Access to 150 FAs by fund seekers by year 2 end through a web based signposting service. Applicants to benefit by higher application success rates. FAs to record their advice to evidence improvements. Impact tracked by application success rates.</p> <p>Milestones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Database 200+ FANs 	<p>The Funding Advisors database was developed with 234 users.</p> <p>The web-based signposting service was more complicated than anticipated and took time to put in place but 33 Funding Advisors were registered by Sept 2010.</p> <p>Ideas around service user reference number developed</p>	<p>260 FAs on the database Fanoogle launched but take-up is slow and only 30 services are listed. Cuts in the sector taking effect.</p> <p>Fanoogle users asked to complete a simple online form.</p> <p>The idea of monitoring applicant success rates is challenging and an alternative approach using a survey is developed.</p>	<p>Milestones complete</p> <p>Database membership over 300.</p> <p>Review showed reduction in numbers of full time funding advice workers. 178 organisations now registered on fanoogle. 66 new sign ups during the year.</p> <p>Funding monitor ongoing.</p>	<p>250 advisors registered</p> <p>94 fanoogle users</p> <p>Remodelling the system according to feedback</p> <p>Funding monitor ongoing</p> <p>Fanoogle survey</p> <p>Engagement of an independent evaluation provider</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Assessment of options for signposting c) Develop a monitoring process to measure impact d) Monitoring of success rates e) Service user monitoring forms f) Review service 	<p>Monitoring applicant success rates was complicated and a number of innovative ideas were developed including the use of service user monitoring forms.</p>	<p>The project is promoting the service and adapting to responses and continuing to encourage people to sign up.</p>	<p>Fanoogle survey – 30 responses.</p>
<p>Unexpected outcomes</p>	<p>New needs identified</p> <p>Lobbying at national level over concerns about on-line applications</p> <p>Links helped a BME network to develop</p> <p>Regional and sub-regional networks sharing knowledge and meetings held which would otherwise not have taken place</p>	<p>Shift from funding advice towards an approach focussing more on sustainable funding.</p> <p>Issue of how to share information with those not able to attend events was raised (but not clearly addressed).</p> <p>Opportunities for experimentation</p> <p>Improved connections between local authority officers</p> <p>Lobbying at national level and influencing the national agenda</p>	<p>Aligning with ERDF project</p> <p>Opportunities to blend programme with OEM activities and make best use of limited resources</p> <p>Focus on changing landscape</p>



		<p>Strong collaboration with others</p> <p>Changing funding landscape with non grant income now a greater focus and training shifted to adapt</p>	
Budget	<p>Initial underspend as not all training delivered</p> <p>Overspend on accommodation</p> <p>Total Costs :</p> <p>Budget 82,175 Outturn 68,238</p> <p>Staff costs – approx 50% of budget</p>	<p>Small underspend</p> <p>Total Costs</p> <p>Budget 89,791 Outturn 86,861</p>	<p>Training went ahead but lower cost. New officer appointed lat 2012. Fewer networking events and less travel. Some confusion over previous year's figures now reporting an overspend. Actual salary costs exceeded budget but OEM absorbed cost.</p> <p>Total Costs</p> <p>Budget 87,822 Outturn 76,051</p> <p>Reconciliation – underspend 6580.</p>