



Community Resilience Fund: Decision Making Meeting Resources

Contents

Introduction.....	2
Glossary.....	3
Facilitator Canvas	9
Themes, Posters & Flashcards	12
Proposal Summary Poster.....	14

Introduction

The Community Resilience Fund was a citywide project. There were 7 decision-making groups; 6 neighbourhood groups and 1 city-wide, equalities group. They were made up of diverse groups of residents, VCSE representatives and Councillors who came from different backgrounds and experiences. Each group met 4-6 times for 3 hours. To ensure that everyone felt equipped to make informed decisions, we developed several resources for participants to use as a guide and reference throughout the process.

Our approach to decision-making was based on reaching consensus. Decisions were not confirmed until everyone in the group was in agreement on which proposals proceeded and were selected for funding. Participants were guided through the process by collectively exploring key considerations and deliberating on each proposal through different 'lenses' such as equity, resilience and preparedness. The deliberations were nuanced and complex, so we developed facilitation tools to capture thoughts and questions of each group. This allowed us to summarise the discussions at the end of the set of meetings and aided final decisions.

Our key learnings

The various tools we used such as a glossary, guide to the fund's themes and canvas for recording facilitators notes were key to guiding participants through the decision making process, making the process as accessible as possible and building people's understanding. This method of decision-making was new to participants and to our team, so having a variety of tools for people to use was helpful for both decision-makers and facilitators.

There were times where there were a large number of resources for participants to consider in meetings. For future processes, it would be worth considering which paper resources are completely necessary for each stage of the process to avoid overwhelming people with information.

Glossary

We created a bespoke glossary, which included explanations of words relating to the process. We understood that many people taking part had not been involved in a similar process before, and we wanted to make language and setting as accessible as possible.

We printed these on A4, laminated paper and put copies on all tables at each decision-making meeting for participants to use as a reference.

Our key learnings

These were useful to have in earlier meetings, but perhaps less necessary in later meetings once participants were familiar with the process and language.

Accessibility

the practice of making information, activities, and/or environments sensible, meaningful, and usable for as many people as possible.

Bias

the tendency to show positive or negative preference to something or someone based on information which could be inaccurate or incomplete. Bias can be intentional or unintentional and might result in unfair judgement, decisions or an unfair advantage or disadvantage. For example, someone you personally like applies for a job you're recruiting to and because of your positive relationship, you ignore the fact their answers are not the strongest and give them a very high score, meaning they're likely to get the job.

Capital

funding for physical things rather than services or activities. It's a substantial, one off investment on something which will last several years like equipment or premises.

Charity

an organisation which exists to provide public benefit. It is run by a board of trustees who are volunteers and it is regulated by a governmental body called the Charity Commission.

Consensus

when everyone reaches an agreement about a decision.

Deliberate

to consider information and discuss, before making decisions

Deprivation

deprivation is a lack of something - this could mean low income, poor health, low education outcomes. In the UK we measure this with the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) to rank neighbourhoods from the most to the least deprived.

Environmental sustainability

avoiding over using natural resources or damaging the environment so that it can be protected for the future.

Equity

recognises that each person has different circumstances and allocates the exact resources and opportunities needed to reach an equal outcome.

Equality

each individual or group of people is given the same resources or opportunities.

Systemic inequality

the bias built into our institutions, government, organisations and society that creates inequality. These structures negatively impacts wealth, employment, housing, health care, politics and education for people experiencing inequality.

Equalities community

groups of people that have, historically, experienced inequality in society. These groups include, disabled people, older people (55+ years), young people (16-24 years) Black, Asian and Minoritised Ethnic people, women, LGBT+ people.

Equalities-led groups

organisations where the majority of trustees, staff or members identify from an equalities group.

Facilitator

the person who guides and helps the group to make decisions.

Grant

money given to an organisation for a specific purpose, which doesn't have to be repaid.

Inequality

not equal, fair or just, especially related to people and communities and their rights, access to resources and services and status in society

Infrastructure

the basic physical and organisational structures and facilities (e.g. buildings, roads, power supplies) needed for the operation of a society or enterprise.

Key considerations

things you need to think about when you are discussing proposals in small groups. The facilitators will ask questions related to these considerations or themes to help focus conversations.

Lease

to use or allow someone else to use land, property, etc. for an agreed period of time in exchange for money.

Positive action

doing something to encourage and support people from underrepresented groups to take part in something or access something they might otherwise not be part of. E.g. attending schools in neighbourhoods with low education rates to encourage students to go to university. Taking positive action is legal if people with a protected characteristic:

- are at a disadvantage
- have particular needs
- are under-represented in an activity or type of work

Protected Characteristics

It is against the law to discriminate against someone because of:

- [age](#)
- [disability](#)
- [gender reassignment](#)
- [marriage and civil partnership](#)
- [pregnancy and maternity](#)
- [race](#)
- [religion or belief](#)
- [sex](#)
- [sexual orientation](#)

These are called protected characteristics.

LSOA - Lower Super Output Area

a small geographical area, smaller than a ward - one ward might have 5 or 6 Lower Super Output Areas. Indices of multiple deprivation are measured at LSOA level. To be eligible for this fund organisations needed to be based in a Lower Super Output Area with high levels of deprivation - they needed to be in the 30% most deprived in the country.

Resilience

ability to survive and thrive for the long term, through challenging times.

Restricted/ unrestricted funding

money which has been given to a charity or social enterprise for a specific purpose and cannot be used for anything else. For example a charity could bid for grant funding to run an after school club for 10 weeks, they can only use the money for that purpose and not for fixing the roof or the boiler.

Unrestricted money is money a charity or social enterprise can spend on anything they choose (provided it doesn't conflict with their charitable purpose)

Revenue

costs of the day-to-day running of the organisation and its projects. It can be general overheads or direct project costs including stationery, rent, heat and lighting, phone bills and materials and staff costs.

Social enterprise

businesses whose primary purpose is addressing a social or environmental challenge rather than creating profit for owners or shareholders.

Social model of disability

a way of viewing the world, developed by Disabled people. The model says that people are disabled by barriers in society, not by their impairment or difference. Barriers can be physical, like buildings not having accessible toilets. Or they can be caused by people's attitudes towards difference, like assuming Disabled people can't do certain things. The social model helps us recognise barriers that make life harder for Disabled people. Removing these barriers creates equality and offers Disabled people more independence, choice, and control.

Sustainable

able to be kept at the same state/ the same level.

Unrestricted funding

money that organisations can use for anything they need within their charitable objectives.

VCSE - Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise

These are types of organisations which can apply for funding and have been involved in the Community Resilience Fund process. This could include charities and community groups.

Themes Posters & Flashcards

We created a poster and flashcards explaining the CRF themes. These were printed on high quality A1 card and stuck on walls around the room, and on A5, laminated paper to be put on tables.

Why did we do this?

It was important that decision makers always knew and understood the themes and aims of the CRF during decision making meetings. By always having explanations and examples clearly visible, it allowed decision makers to use these as a quick reference if needed.

Themes



Accessibility

Make their facilities more accessible to everyone in the community. **For example**, by putting in ramps, a hearing loop, or an accessible toilet.



Environmental Sustainability

Make their facilities more environmentally friendly and/or cheaper to run. **For example**, by upgrading to renewable energy or heating systems or improving energy efficiency with insulation, building controls or double glazing.



Financial Resilience

Increase their income or sources of income, or save money. **For example**, by making physical improvements to their building, allowing them to rent out more space, put on more activities, or sell more services or products.



Digital Infrastructure

Pay for new or improved digital equipment. **For example**, by installing smart technology, or a new IT system.



Equipment

Pay for things they need to run their organisation well. **For example**, audio visual equipment for their facilities.

Facilitator Canvas

We designed a worksheet for facilitators to record participant comments and questions. The canvas was split into sections for notes on the CRF's key considerations:

- Organisational Resilience
- Elevating communities experiencing inequalities
- Community Context
- Ability to Deliver Project
- Value for Money

We called this a 'Facilitator Canvas'. We printed one Canvas per project proposal on A3 sheets of paper.

Why did we do this?

Facilitators used these to capture and record participants thoughts on each of the key considerations of the fund. They were used to distil the thoughts of the decision-making groups in a structured, clear way, for participants to refer back to throughout the decision-making meetings.

Key learnings

The same Canvas was used for each proposal throughout the set of meetings. Notes were added at each stage, to build a full picture of the discussions. This meant that it was essential for facilitator notes to be clear and concise, to avoid confusion in later meetings.

PROPOSAL

Org

AREA/GROUP

ORGANISATIONAL RESILIENCE

To what extent will this funding support the continuation and success of the community organisation?

Should this proposal progress to the next step?

EQUALITIES

- This org is led by an equalities community
- This proposal supports an organisation to include more people who have been traditionally excluded
- This proposal invests in communities that have been overlooked and excluded
- This proposal helps a group to more effectively self-organise **or** help an organisation bring diverse groups together and increase community cohesion

COMMUNITY CONTEXT

How will this organisation thriving benefit the wider community? What happens if we don't fund this proposal?

Should this proposal progress to the next step?

EQUALITIES NOTES

What impact will this proposal have on strengthening equalities communities? What evidence is there?

Should this proposal progress to the next step?

PROPOSAL

Org

AREA/GROUP

ABILITY TO DELIVER PROJECT

What support is needed to deliver this proposal? Can the organisation reasonably deliver within the timeframe?

We are satisfied that the proposal can be delivered



VALUE FOR MONEY

Are we confident that this is a fair and reasonable cost? Do we have any concerns? Any further checks are needed to give us confidence in investing in this proposal?

We agree this proposal is value for money

NOTES ON FINAL DECISION

Do not fund

Fully fund

Part fund _____

Proposal Summary Poster

We created a proposal summary of each project proposal and printed these out on A3 paper in the final meetings and stuck on walls to aid large group discussions. These included a brief description of the project proposal and summarised the key positive and negative points from the group, what type of expert input the project may need and any funding priorities. They also used a 'heat map' method which captured the levels of support for each proposal against the key considerations.

Why did we do this?

Over the course of several meetings, participants were asked to consider and digest lots of information. The proposal summary posters provided a snapshot of each of the applying organisations and captured key thoughts of the group. Time was limited, so showing this information in a visual and condensed way streamlined final decisions.

This is a fictional example of a project.

CRF115

Charity Trust

£45,000

<p>Who for: Excluded older adults in disadvantaged areas</p>	<p>Project summary Digital equipment; laptops and printer and a new website with increased accessibility.</p>			<p>Org type: Community hub</p>
<p>Positives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good plan for delivery • Supports intersectional equalities community to be self sufficient • Tackle digital exclusion 		<p>Negative comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community voice could be more involved • Request for equipment need to be of good, durable quality • Lack of clarity around budget 		
<p>Resilience</p>	<p>Equity</p>	<p>Community Context</p>	<p>Ability to deliver</p>	<p>Value</p>
<p>Expert input:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend working with an IT partner to select appropriate software and hardware • If funded, they would benefit from support from a data protection specialist 		<p>Funding priorities/notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website updates need to improve accessibility; suitable for people with disabilities, to include translate function, photos/videos to be representative. 		

Organisation name

£ project amount

Who for:		Project summary			Org type:	
Positives			Negatives			
Resilience	Equity	Community Context	Ability to deliver	Value		
Expert input:			Funding priorities/notes:			