



CLLD Engagement

North Lincolnshire & North East Lincolnshire

September 2015

FINAL REPORT

Researchers; Carol Thornton, John Mooney, Trudy Norris

Voluntary Action North Lincolnshire
4-6 Robert Street
Scunthorpe
DN15 6NG

01724 845155 / www.vanl.org.uk

VANL Research

Context of the report

The research was commissioned by East Riding of Yorkshire Council on behalf of the HTA Partnership.



Background

Technical Assistance Phase 2 (TA2) has been funded from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) 2007-13 Programme, starting in April 2012 and ending later in 2015. Humber Technical Assistance (HTA) is a joint programme of activity that has an enhanced role to raise awareness and support applications for, and successful delivery of, ERDF funding. The project involves partners from across the Humber, including voluntary and private sector, in order to develop consortia bids and support projects from outline research, through the application process, during project delivery and on to successful project closedown.

A further and significant element of the project has been helping to shape the future of ERDF funding in the Humber and North Yorkshire through support to both the Humber and York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership's to understand and capitalise on the proposals for the 2014-20 European Structural Investment Funds (ESIF) Programme, identify and disseminate existing best practice from across the EU and support the development of the next operational programme.

Community Led Local Development

CLLD is a theme within the 2014-20 ESIF Programme.

For more information on the 2014-20 ESIF Programme see:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/england-2014-to-2020-european-structural-and-investment-funds>

CLLD is a term used by the European Commission to describe an approach that turns traditional "top down" development policy on its head. Under CLLD, local people take the reins and form a local partnership (a Local Action Group or LAG) that designs and implements an integrated development strategy. The strategy is designed to build on the community's social, environmental and economic strengths or "assets" rather than simply compensate for its problems. For this, the LAG receives long-term funding and they decide how it is spent.

CLLD is an approach that requires time and effort, but for relatively small financial investments it can have a marked impact on people's lives and generate new ideas and the shared commitment for putting these into practice.

For more information on CLLD see:

http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/informat/2014/guidance_clld_local_actors.pdf

VANL Research



Methodology used

Each research session followed a similar agenda.

Introductions – where are participants from and what experience of EU funding did they have?

An overview of CLLD – explanation of the term and where it is intended to sit in the LEP structure.

Visioning exercise – participants were asked to think about their experiences of EU funding, then think how it would be “in the best of all possible worlds”. What needs to change to get to that point?

Consultation discussion and Socratic questions that took place around the questions:

What do we have in our local community that is working well?

- To help people develop themselves and their skills
- To enable people to access necessary training
- To enable people to get into work
- To address personal barriers to work and learning?
- To enable communities to grow and develop?

What would we like to change?

To make things better for potential beneficiaries and potentially their community

The Local Action Group

Finally we asked about the LAG – how to enable good representation across all sectors, and how to ensure smooth delivery of the vision/strategy – and we asked people to express an interest #pledge’ if they would like to be involved in the LAG when the process begins.

Limitations of the research

The very short timescale allowed forced the process to be rather hurried. Although there seemed to be plenty of time for discussion, the proposed schedule of visioning and consultation was necessarily run together to allow the process to be completed in the time allowed. This meant that discussion could revert to earlier stages in the process, confusing the outcome, although of course facilitators endeavoured not to allow this to happen.

Both communities identified a need for more research to gain a clear and accurate understanding of community provision, the barriers and enablers and what is ‘working well’.

The useful participatory process of asking participants to write down their own comments to place on charts to guide the discussion was not possible as the movement would have taken up too much time. While this had the effect of concentrating the discussion, it did not allow breathing space to consider what had already been said.



Attendance

Numbers attending the workshops were low but we did have cross sector representation all 4 of the 6 workshops. We did have the people targeted at the workshops both from geographical area and those working with the target beneficiaries.

There was a very short timescale for information distribution and workshop delivery and the information distributed could have given more information about the desired outcomes and content of the workshop (see evaluation), this may have boosted attendance.

Results

All comments recorded at consultations session are detailed at the back of this report.

Themes could be drawn from the resulting lists of comments.

Participants felt that employers are not pulling their weight in the campaign to get more people into work. They expect employees to come fully-formed and are not putting as much effort into supporting and training new staff as might be expected. While schools are not necessarily producing work-ready products, better communication and support for employers was suggested.

Support for people with additional needs to enter the workforce was required, such as encouraging employers to offer supported placements.

A popular idea was to place a key worker in each community needing help to access support – i.e. not necessarily by geographical area, but possibly by area of interest. There was debate over whether these key workers should be paid or expected to do the work out of interest, with payment being mostly favoured. However, this raised concerns over whether small part-time payments would conflict with regulations over benefits, preventing some people ideal for the role from actually doing it. Perhaps an honorarium would be a way to avoid this conflict, but work would need to be done on the proposal.

Some people who are not currently working are prevented from doing so by health problems which mean that they are not always able to work. More supported work environments (Tukes in Grimsby was cited more than once) which allow people to work when they are able were proposed, although these organisations are rarely fully sustainable and would require long-term funding.

Did we achieve our Desired Outcomes?

Participants made good progress towards the outcomes but did not formulate an outline plan. The main limiting factors for this were time and a realisation that more research was necessary. Full notes from workshops are attached to this report.

Report recommendations are on page 20.



Summary

Workshop Findings:

Question 1 - what do we have that is Working Well?

Participants had stories of success from their own communities and services, however people reported different often contradictory experiences and both areas noted a need for a more detailed understanding of what was working well and why. There was general agreement that there were opportunities for people but not enough and that there was a need for more flexibility e.g. opportunities for those with a mental health condition that may mean a prolonged break from a work placement, if this happens they need to be able to reconnect when they are well, feel supported and not stigmatised.

There was a sense that the work programme had produced tick box activities that did not make a real difference too many people but we had no evidence of this. North and North East Lincolnshire identified a need for direct involvement with Job Centre Plus as there were reports of people receiving contradictory information from advisors, this was very difficult for people to respond to and could limit aspiration both in a volunteer opportunity or paid work... It was felt to be crucial that the DWP are involved.

Support

We met universal recognition of the need for support for individuals in the target group, this may be 1:1 as a peer mentor or community champion E.g. All groups may face a lack of real opportunities into employment,

There was also recognition of the need for support or training for employers or people who manage volunteers to be able to offer additional relevant support as needed. The cohort group may need support with a range of things including, transport, confidence, advocacy, life skills, and support for appointments as an examples.

The Community

There was a recognition that proposals need to go to the community and using approach that develops engagement and ownership from the outset would be beneficial in that it could have sustained impact on those communities rather than a short intervention which is then withdrawn. This may be done using a community development worker and /or a participatory approach e.g. YMCA

Collaboration to Maximise Local Assets

It was noted in both areas that there are a lot of existing services across sector for individuals, however, these are underused. NE Lincolnshire very much highlighted a desire to work more collaboratively and less competitively between sectors using the voluntary sector forum and other pathways as a catalyst. It was felt that this could be an innovative element to the proposed bid and would enable the unlocking of community assets that are not being fully utilised.

Pledges to the LAG (membership)

Individuals did pledge to be involved in the LAG but the majority wanted to see what other information is released regarding this work to have a clearer understanding of what the commitment would be. Names have been withheld from this report at the time of publishing we have 6 pledges across the region.



VANL Research

Community Led Local Development workshop at The Ropewalk on 15 September 2015.



Having explained CLLD, participants were asked to envision the experience of applying for EU funding at present:

- What works well?
- What needs to change?

There was a wide-ranging discussion on these questions, including pros and cons of a service led plan versus community led plan.

-oOo-

Points raised in the discussion

The LAG

- Have a steering group from the outset – two or three tiers of representation.
- Decision making transparent, open and fair. Fully auditable. Accountable body doesn't have to agree – leave flexibility for peers.
- Softer outcomes. Measure distance travelled, rather than final achievements. Some people have further to go but improvement can still be measured.

The application process

- Applications are not simple – the process excludes those who find it too difficult. This works well because it picks out those who have the enthusiasm and dedication to deliver.
- Rewarding enthusiastic and tenacious applicants who understand the process.
- Diverse funding works well. Change speed of application for process – eliminate larger organisations from LAG.
- Continuity – sudden changes in the funding streams don't allow projects to reach their potential.
- Time – realistic. Some community projects need time for people to engage and take advantage, especially if the participants have a lot of issues to overcome.
- The LEADER group locally designed their own application form, which worked well with local groups who applied.

The community

- Community picks up the gaps where businesses can't provide.
- Listening to what people in the community say would help them.

VANL Research



- People must be allowed to get it wrong, otherwise how will they learn?
Balancing act. Answer what's needed.
- Need to hear the voices of those with the most complex needs.
- When targeting the hardest to reach, need to bear in mind what is possible and how long it will probably take.
- Peer guidance and mentoring.
- Winterton 2022 offer an incentive to employers to help them take on an apprentice (or HALF an apprentice with another business) to get them started.
- Getting the commitment of participants of training – give them choice and rewards.

What needs to change?

The vision

- The vision needs to enable people to achieve what they want to achieve from the point they are at now.
- Vision – enabling all people to achieve what they want to achieve – with a bit more funding, what more could you do?

The problems

- Bureaucratic barriers.
- Bidding or commissioning? Bidding makes it difficult to plan ahead; commissioning loses the innovation.
- The difficulty of the process risks losing some people with very innovative ideas but less skill and experience of the applications.
- Challenge of engagement – how do we get fair representation? Interest is important, so is spread. How do we help communities want to engage – e.g. childcare?
- The current round, despite being targeted, still gets eaten up by the “usual suspects”, delivering the usual stuff. Innovative projects get weeded out because they are unfamiliar with the jargon, the buzz words and the procedures.
- Larger organisations who deliver tenders and achieve EU funding are by definition not local and don't know what will meet local needs.
- Innovative ideas get filtered through the aims and targets and diluted to the extent that the innovation is lost.
- (Discussion on supplying the skills local industry needs, now and in the future) How do we match needs with what's available? – Childcare / transport / apprenticeships could all release people into the work environment.



- Teaching some people how to write a CV is just going to encourage them to fail, because they haven't achieved work readiness.
- Punishing participants for failure.

What could we do differently?

- Using Facebook to collect evidence – for need.
- Mentor people from all walks of life. – Life skills.
- LEADER has now moved to one nationally-used application form, people locally find it much more difficult to work with. We are unsure of the reality of this statement and what is 'current' for leader.
- Local group's need more of a rolling programme where funding can be used and accessed when needed, and doesn't have to be spent by a deadline, to enable continuity of success.
- Small incentives for lots of people may make a bigger impression. Very few small grant pots in Northern Lincolnshire.
- Incentivise employers to take on the cost of apprenticeship e.g. reduce NI payments?
- Special projects/businesses needed to offer work to people with particular problems, e.g. a mental health condition. Someone on the autistic spectrum. Most businesses don't have the capacity or experience to offer people the support they need.
- LAG needs to encourage people to bring ideas to them. If support is needed, they can be referred to outside organisations who can help them to work through the process.
- Raise awareness of assets and support available.
- There is a need for a support network to help those less aware of EU procedures to get them through the process – support organisations, rather than the LAG itself.
- Lots of help is already available. People don't use it because they don't know it's there. Development of existing groups is needed. MUST NOT displace existing initiatives – community input will ensure that doesn't happen.
- The LAG needs to look at ideas as they come in and react quickly to enable it to happen without losing the impetus.
- Consider role of Town Councils? Could be catalyst.
- Existing "usual suspects" can often extend their work to engage a wider audience – they just don't have the capacity. A little extra funding can be the catalyst to make it happen.



- Can't aim to get 100 people into work. First need to teach life skills, mentoring, etc. Finding out that someone cannot reach a level where they can be employed should be an outcome. Having said that, we must not write people off.
- How do we get the innovator we want to deliver?
- Need a pro-active, passionate, motivated person in each community to help them to achieve what they need to be able to grow.

Questions raised

- What are the timescales after the call is released for delivery?
- Timescale – up and running by October 2016?
- Will the LAG group be brand marketing?
- “BIG Everywhere”
- Is the LAG a signposting organisation also?

(These questions were answered by email).

VANL Research

Community Led Local Development workshop at Central Community Centre on 16 September 2015.



Having explained CLLD, we asked participants to envision the experience of applying for EU funding at present:

- What works well?
- What needs to change?

There was a wide-ranging discussion on these questions, including pros and cons of a service led plan versus community led plan.

-oOo-

The community

- Community picks up the gaps where businesses can't provide.
- Listening to what people in the community say would help them.
- People must be allowed to get it wrong, otherwise how will they learn? Balancing act. Answer what's needed.
- Need to hear the voices of those with the most complex needs.
- When targeting the hardest to reach, need to bear in mind what is possible and how long it will probably take.
- Peer guidance and mentoring for life skills would be beneficial across the community.
- Winterton 2022 offer an incentive to employers to help them take on an apprentice (or HALF an apprentice with another business) to get them started.
- Getting the commitment of participants of training – give them choice and rewards.

What needs to change?

The vision

- The vision needs to enable people to achieve what they want to achieve from the point they are at now.
- Vision – enabling all people to achieve what they want to achieve – with a bit **more funding, what more could you do?**

The problems

- Excessive bureaucratic barriers and requirement.
- Tick box approach that does not necessarily match people's skills deficits.
- Bidding or commissioning? Bidding makes it difficult to plan ahead; commissioning loses the innovation.
- The difficulty of the process risks losing some people with very innovative ideas but less skill and experience of the applications.

VANL Research



- Challenge of engagement – how do we get fair representation? Interest is important, so is spread. How do we help communities want to engage – e.g. childcare?
- The current round, despite being targeted, still gets eaten up by the “usual suspects”, delivering the usual stuff. Innovative projects get weeded out because they are unfamiliar with the jargon, the buzz words and the procedures.
- Larger organisations who deliver tenders and achieve EU funding are by definition not local and don’t know what will meet local needs.
- Innovative ideas get filtered through the aims and targets and diluted to the extent that the innovation is lost.
- (Discussion on supplying the skills local industry needs, now and in the future) How do we match needs with what’s available? – Childcare/transport / apprenticeships could all release people into the work environment.
- Teaching some people how to write a CV is just going to encourage them to fail, because they haven’t achieve work readiness.
- Punishing participants for failure.

What can we do differently?

- Using Facebook to collect evidence – for need.
- Mentor people from all walks of life. – Life skills.
- Local group’s need more of a rolling programme where funding can be used and accessed when needed, and doesn’t have to be spent by a deadline, to enable continuity of success.
- Small incentives for lots of people may make a bigger impression. Very few small grant pots in Northern Lincolnshire.
- Incentivise employers to take on the cost of apprenticeship.
- Special projects/businesses needed to offer work to people with particular problems, e.g. mental health issues. Most businesses don’t have the capacity to take on additional needs.
- LAG needs to encourage people to bring ideas to them. If support is needed, they can be referred to outside organisations who can help them to work through the process.
- Raise awareness of assets and support available.
- There is a need for a support network to help those less aware of EU procedures to get them through the process – support organisations, rather than the LAG itself.
- Lots of help is already available. People don’t use it because they don’t know it’s there. Development of existing groups is needed. MUST NOT displace existing initiatives – community input will ensure that doesn’t happen.
- The LAG needs to look at ideas as they come in and react quickly to enable it to happen without lose the impetus.
- Consider role of Town Councils? Could be catalyst.
- Existing “usual suspects” can often extend their work to engage a wider audience – they just don’t have the capacity. A little extra funding can be the catalyst to make it happen.



- Can't aim to get 100 people into work. First need to teach life skills, mentoring, etc. Finding out that someone cannot reach a level where they can be employed should be an outcome. Having said that, we must not write people off.
- How do we get the innovator we want to deliver?
- Need a pro-active, passionate, motivated person in each community to help them to achieve what they need to be able to grow.
- Innovation could emerge from considering the way sectors work together, how can this become more collaborative and less competitive (this was very much a concern for NE Lincs).

Questions raised

- What are the timescales after the call is released for delivery?
- Timescale – up and running by October 2016?
- Will the LAG group be brand marketing?
- “BIG Everywhere”
- Is the LAG a signposting organisation also?

VANL Research



Notes from the discussion

The session followed a similar format to the previous one. Participants were asked to think about their experiences of applying for European funding and to think about how they would like the experience to be. What needed to change?

Points raised in the discussion

What would improve the experience?

- Better communication and support for employers – enrichment programmes in schools.
- Employers more active in supporting people with needs in the workplace – how to encourage this?
- Services working more closely together to help those in need. Some companies give allocated places, e.g. autism – joint working.
- Key worker in each community to access support needed.
 - Paid?
 - Unpaid?
 - “Slightly” paid? – benefits issues?
 - Honorarium / exemptions from NI as an incentive?
- Need supported individual work options (e.g. Tukes, Grimsby)
 - Homeworking – with support and communication options
 - Individual support e.g. childcare for lone parents
 - Digital options
- Conscious / unconscious bias – change the culture!
- Timescales – need to be able to continue a good project.
 - More than 5 years
 - Flexibility
 - Common sense!
 - Track good projects: share and promulgate.
- Businesses need a clear business reason to employ people / offer opportunities.



Membership of LAG

- Time & energy required to ensure representation is “true”.
- Have a constituted “group” / SE as a structure for LAG:
 - Pros – sustainability
 - Cons – complexity
- Some process for membership required if lots of applications.
 - Person specification for membership?

WORKSHOPS IN NORTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE

Community Led Local Development workshop at St Aiden’s, Cleethorpes on 22 September 2015.

What is working well?

- Person-centred support, e.g. Talent Match – people go forwards on their terms/interests/needs.
- How do we incentivise people, e.g. social aspect that incentivises people / feel supported and a part of.
- Not formal programmes that turn people off.
- Don’t just direct through services.


What would we like to do differently?

- Do not over consult and then do nothing, there was a consensus that lots of work had been done but the communities being discussed had gone backwards.
- Communicate clearly this is a 5 year programme.
- Grassroots community engagement done well as the basis for planning – specific research methods.
- Bottom-up development process adopted, developing communities to help them solve the challenges and create the solutions.
- Define beneficiaries – engage – develop process for strategy growth.
- Use National policy to augment the European process.
- Manage expectation about what £2m can do.
- Change the nature of cross sector working to enable more collaboration and less competition, there needs to be a change of mind set.



- Avoid peeing people off – how can things be sustainable? – i.e. not ‘going into a community’ and then things just ending due to end of funding.
- Bottom tier of hierarchy of needs (Maslow) must be addressed.
- Asset-based personal development and community development.
- Social Innovation between agencies which impact on outcomes.
- Co-operation and partnership.
- ✓ Improve connectivity with different pieces of work / funding.

Need to do research to understand needs.

Pay community organisers 

Have a communication strategy

- To disseminate info about fund and engage people.
- Flexible approach to communications
- Ask people what they want, NB low/no literacy.
- Use of social media – design app?

Process

Local authority could bring forwards funds if necessary, to increase the potential pot that is available.

MATCH FUNDING – ‘match funding can restrict European funds’

➔ Ambition 20m

Do we pull together what is already in the community as assets and match funding to increase the pot?

- “This discussion needs to happen”
- “Who will take it forwards?”

Are there local authority ‘assets’ – venues that could be ‘sold’?

What is the ‘in kind’ contribution from volunteers?

A Strategy is required

- to know where ‘40%’ will come from
- Minimise bureaucracy.

Process

➔ Use existing VCS Forum and pathways.

VANL Research

→ Distribute information from this meeting.



Community Led Local Development workshop at Freeman Street Market Grimsby 24 September 2015.

What do we have that is working well?

Actual comments from discussion

- Issues around 2nd/3rd generation unemployed. No aspiration, no impetus to get up in the morning. Motivation. Support into work for those furthest away.
- Are we failing in schools? At what level? By 18, someone with no aspiration is very hard to change.
- Helping failing families – giving something they feel they can handle – practical work.
- Box ticking for schools. Failure at Ofsted can be a career wrecker. No facility to help those who are failing.
- Intergenerational work – whole family support.
- Set up a family business – whole family benefits if they work together.
- Don't put people or families into silos [ghettoes].
- Highly depressing to be on minimum wage / zero hours contract. No way out. Terrible quality of life, leading to greater demand on mental health services.
- How to pay for support/training? Not a loan situation for people on benefits.
- Human Rights – right to a regular income. Nobody should have that taken away.
- [*Re current system*] You can't polish a turd!!
- Need some kind of supported work, e.g. Tukes in Grimsby who can cope with people who don't know if they'll be well enough to work at any given moment.
- Homeworking? – needs expansion.
- Digital inclusion could enable a wider range of people to join the world of working but the social side must be included – opportunities to network and meet others.
- Conscious / unconscious bias. If the candidate doesn't look like the rest of the staff at interview, they are assumed to be unlikely to fit. Need training on this.
- Have to make a compelling business case as to why employing that person who is "different" could be a Really Good Idea. Change the culture.

VANL Research



- Need help to encourage employers to recruit and retain staff with disabilities. Need more support. Need more information to explain to employers what's available.
- Flexibility. A long-lasting project will need to change to meet society's needs.
- No point running a project for 5 years, then stopping it. If it works it must continue, and projects like this will not make money.
- Bring back Common Sense!
- Track good progress. Share it and promulgate it.
- System is still causing the situation where going into work makes you worse off.
- Benefit change / Sanctions / Credit changes - not working. When you're at the bottom, you can't see the end.
- No one answer. Problems are usually complex and deep seated.
- Joint working across services – work as a team to bring a person in difficulties to the point where they can self-manage.
- Takes the right combination of organisations for Joint Working to work well.
- People who are actually from the area are best placed to help. Need encouragement to help others.
- Look at what's already there and what needs changing. Takes time. Far longer than the current funding schemes allow.
- Softer outcomes and smaller steps.
- Key worker in each 'community' to access support needed and ensure the community gets what it needs. Added value.
- The key worker could perhaps be paid for a few hours per week to enable them to do the job.
- The key worker should probably be of the community – someone who has come through it and has the experience and empathy to help others.
- Many pathways to key worker programme already in place, especially around volunteering. The idea of some payment could encourage those who could to do.
- Build small steps into the programme.
- Worries about being a key worker affecting benefits – like volunteering can. People are not always given the correct information.
- Key workers payments would need to be out of the tax/benefit system. The small payment would need to be exempt.
- Employers more active and supporting people with disabilities in the workplace. Better communication channels.
- Financial incentives for employers often don't work – need to be very carefully targeted. Tax breaks / other incentives.
- Greater Manchester tried an age grant. Minimal take-up. An incentive for targeting those groups might be better.
- There is an award for employers who give opportunities to people with disabilities.
- An employer's primary concern is for their business. Want someone who can do the job in a sustainable way. Need support available.
- Need research of community needs – probably already done – University of Hull, NLC, etc.

- Early intervention. Schools' role – tick boxing.



Further discussion

- There will be a long list of ineligible activities – stuff already done through ESIF.
- Participation on LAG – need engagement with the communities to ensure their views are represented. – Possibly take along someone who is representative of the point under discussion to specific meetings?
- Questions on legal structure of the LAG – company limited by guarantee? / Terms of Reference? / Constitution?
- Total pot will be greater than £3m including match funding.
- Area covered – North Lincolnshire and Goole being discussed (Goole added to bring the population up to the required figure).
- The LAG decides: competitive bids or commissioning.
- Include support for child care to enable, e.g. single mothers to enter the workforce.
- Part-time supported employment – employ community champions.

VANL Research



Report Recommendations

Key Recommendations arising from the Workshops:

- **Be supported**

Support beneficiaries, employers and enablers (e.g. mentors)

Use trained paid and volunteer staff to give people the support they need for a period of time to enable progression.

Consider a community organiser or champion to really connect with the communities identified.

- **Be Flexible**

People with complex needs and barriers benefit from a person centred approach that enables them to grow and aspire, to break through embedded life scripts that may hold them back. They may have chronic health problems and low resilience that needs to strengthen overtime alongside skills development.

Create opportunities for people with particular problems e.g. a mental health condition.

Be realistic when formulating outcomes for people and the bid – use a sliding scale that includes softer outcomes where people may not be ready for ‘harder ‘ones e.g. into work or meaningful activity. Establish a realistic benchmark that is evidence based and measure individual progress against this.

- **Be connected**

There is a need to connect people with the right service. A lot of the resource identified already exists. Signposting people however does not work, people need more than this.

Use connectors already established in the community e.g. Town Councils,

- **Be accessible**

Increase the visibility of the assets in the community such as; front line grass roots services, drop in services in the community, free (to the participant) training and support e.g. wellness recovery action planning, The Recovery College.

- **Be realistic**

What opportunities are available for people; beware of giving people really poor jobs because there is nothing else without managing their expectations. Fund projects that could offer new jobs that people would want to do that would extend their skills.

Manage expectations for the project in the community. Give people ownership.

- **The Local Action Group**

Develop a role description for LAG membership detailing the activities and commitment required.

Organise an event for people who would like to be involved.

Ensure those on the LAG can represent the interests and needs of the target cohort for the bid.

- **Be Innovative:**

Use social media to gain an understanding of community needs.

Use or develop a phone app to support and motivate people.

Use existing structures e.g. CVS forums and networks, business networks, faith based networks, Town Councils, to develop collaborative rather than competitive mind sets.

Ends.



VANL Research