promoting effective community action through research

ISSN 1755-1331

arvac BULLETIN

arvac

Issue 122

January 2014

Editorial John Diamond (Chair of ARVAC)

ARVAC: THE YEAR AHEAD AND REAL CHALLENGES FOR THE SECTOR

Looking ahead to the remainder of 2014 there are real and profound changes still to come for the VCS. The news (at the time of writing) from the Institute for Fiscal Studies that there are still more cuts to come across key and so far "protected" services (schools and health) raise a whole set of troubling questions. The Report (The Guardian 6 February) argues that as a consequence of extending the period of austerity to 2018 -19 60% of the cuts are still to happen and that in order to achieve a budget surplus by then (a commitment from the Coalition) cuts of 30% will have to applied to protected areas makes depressing reading. ARVAC members know the immediate impact of these cuts too and we are aware of the continual changes to the sector as a consequences of these decisions. Infrastructure organisations are being scaled back or merged or closed down, the regional networks are weaker (in terms of paid staff and services they can support) and local authority support to smaller groups continue to be cut.

At the same time we know too that there are small examples of resistance and campaigning too. From the National Coalition for Independent Action (NCIA) commission on the future of the VCS (where evidence of the impact is being collated and a thoughtful analysis of the state of the sector is being put together) to the work of the Voluntary Sector Studies Network which brings together academic and practice based researchers there are important steps being taken to capture the impact of change. And we know too that the ARVAC re-

Inside this issue:

sources on undertaking locally based research projects are being used in many places from Rochdale (the work of the Rochdale Community Champions - a network of residents and activists) to the Evelyn Oldfield Unit in London and their work with refugee and asylum seeker organisations developing their skills and capacities.

The role of ARVAC has not, in this sense, changed: we are there to offer practical skills and support to those networks and groups which do not have access to larger organisations. In the year ahead there are some important tasks for us too:

1. To develop and extend our ability to share information and to create a much more active community of practice - and we will be redesigning the web site and extending our reach in terms of using social media - and we hope members will join us in that too;

2. To ensure that ARVAC's resources are maintained and made available to those who need them and that they remain relevant and accessible;

3. To provide a public space for discussion and debate within the VCS - through our Annual Conference and our Annual Public Lecture - we do want to extend our networks and we are open to co-sponsoring events and sharing platforms;

4. To be a critical voice supporting the work of smaller VCS organisations and looking to draw in those larger organisations (universities for example) who have skills and resources which the sector could use;

Our values and mission are not changed. The changes are taking place in such a way that their impact is likely to last for many years to come. If ARVAC has a role then - it seems to me- it is about being both a critical voice in support of smaller VCS organisations and a reflective and informed voice which places these changes in a broader political and social context. We do hope that over the next 12 months you will join in the events and activities we have planned.

John Diamond ARVAC Chair

We want to hear from you. Contribute articles, comments and views on the current state of the Voluntary and Community Sector by email to:

ARVAC Conference Summary

The ARVAC AGM was held at GMCVO offices, Manchester in November 2013. It was a very successful event, both key note speakers delivering interesting and developed discussions on innovative responses to austerity. Barry Knight, from the Webb Trust, delivered an inspiring discussion of the history of the voluntary sector and the Webb Trust. He contrasted an extension ladder model with a parallel bars model of State-VCS working relationships to explain the inter-relationships that have existed since the beginning of the century. Peter Richmond, from Castle Vale Housing Trust, offered a thought-provoking narrative focussing on cycles of regeneration and poverty. He discussed how innovative community partnerships can be used to engender a 'community of chaos' so as to counteract the regeneration cycle. Questions from the floor included "is the Big Society good or bad?" and "does there need to be a more critical debate on the VCS role vs. the role of the state?"

ARVAC Trustees, Fiona Poland and Sharon Clancey, facilitated the conference workshops. These discussed learning from practice and assessing risks, with contributions coming from community members, academics and ARVAC trustees. Workshop Group One concluded that we especially need an independent and vocal voluntary and community sector at the current time. Reasons included; the passion and care that the sector offers, the validity of the sector, the immediacy of voluntary action political perspective of the sector, and the trusted and valid engagement of the sector. Workshop Group Two concluded: that there is evidence of major change within the sector (e.g. Big Society Audit); that we can use this evidence to inform debate about why an independent and vocal voluntary and community sector is needed; that we can, as a sector, combine method with action, developing the relationship between evidence and evaluation. Workshop Group Three felt that partnerships work for community action: by recognising that messy community action is invaluable and relevant; and recognising the role of women in partnership; and by developing support for women in leadership. Workshop Group Four discussed current key risks to the voluntary and community sector that we need evidence to act upon. They felt that there is often pressure from external partners, a tendency to risk aversion; that it is difficult to recruit and retain trustees and sometimes an unwillingness to work together towards longer term strategic planning.

ARVAC chair John Diamond concluded the conference, summarising ARVAC plans for the year ahead. He reminded the conference of the role of ARVAC – to support activists, local regeneration and local organisations. ARVAC is about supporting small organisations for whom research and understanding is key to local level work, sustainability and capacity -building. ARVAC occupies a unique place; not the same as that of VSSN but occupying a space that connects the Voluntary Sector Studies Network (VSSN) with National Coalition for Independent Action (NCIA). ARVAC gives activism a voice while also having good resources from and for research and can draw on university links to enable partnership events such as the AGM. ARVAC is able to support critical engagement with community members and bridging links with academics and policymakers. He concluded with an open invitation to join us at ARVAC.

Why we need a vibrant, independent Voluntary and Community Sector Challenges and Opportunities

Barry Knight

The following talk was given by Barry Knight at the ARVAC AGM on 21st November 2013.

The starting point

As Principal Adviser to the Webb Memorial Trust, the starting point for me in addressing the question of the importance of 'a vibrant, independent voluntary and community sector' is a book written by Sidney and Beatrice Webb in 1916 called *The Prevention of Destitution*. (1)

I am going to use the Webbs' two models of voluntary action described in that book to explain why I think we need a vibrant and independent (the two terms are related) voluntary and community sector. These are 'the parallel bars model' and 'the extension ladder model'. This distinction, it seems to me, helps to clarify the role of the voluntary sector. Only having assessed the role, can we assess its added value.

Ends and means

Before getting into that, I need to distinguish two ways of assessing added value. The first is voluntary action as an end it itself and the second is as a means to some other end. Again, I think we need this conceptual clarity if we are to assess the value of the voluntary and community sector.

As an illustration of the value of voluntary action as an end in itself, I want to cite work I did as part of a team for the Commonwealth Foundation in the late 1990s and early 2000s. (2) We asked some 10,000 citizens in 47 Commonwealth countries about what constituted a good society. This was a participatory research study conducted in a variety of ways in different locations but, notwithstanding variations in the importance of religion, there were three secular factors that stood out in citizens' minds about what constituted a good society in each of the countries studied. These were:

1. Meeting basic needs (e.g. food, security, shelter, clothing)
2. Association (e.g. family relationships, relationships with neighbours, relationships between different groups in society)
3. Participation (e.g. taking part in political activities, lobbying, advocacy)

.The last two of these – association and participation – are the very stuff of voluntary action. Taken together in the public realm, they constitute 'active citizenship' or 'civil society'.

There is very considerable literature on the importance of civil society'– as a

citizen led force to counterbalance the role of the state on the one hand and that of the private sector on the other. Amitai Etzioni was an early proponent of the idea that an active society and a good society are virtually indistinguishable. (3)

Turning now to voluntary action as a means to some other end, I am here concerned with the reduction of poverty and inequality as the end. This is not because other ends are not important, but because that is the content that the Webb Memorial Trust works with. Our goal is to develop original and practical proposals to educate people about what would make a

real difference in alleviating poverty in the UK. This involves developing:

1. A narrative about what a good society free from poverty would look like;
2. A plan about how to achieve it, with guidance for different interests (e.g. government, business, civil society, citizens);
3. Material to enable the blueprint to be implemented.

The thesis we are developing will be (a) normative (b) evidence based and (c) practical.

A poverty focus

The relationship between voluntary action and poverty is hardly a new one. Indeed, the connection goes way back to the Statute of Elizabeth 1601, which still frames the essentials of charity law. When the law was clarified in late Victorian times, one of the four heads of charity was the reduction of poverty. (4)

Starting with Beatrice and Sidney Webb is, I think, the right starting point for thinking about modern voluntary action. In *The Prevention of Destitution*, Beatrice and Sidney introduced their now famous distinction between parallel bars and extension ladder models of voluntary action. The 'parallel bars model' involves state action and voluntary action working side-by-side to reduce poverty. This was the prevalent model during the first decade of the 20th century - when there was a great awakening about the importance of social conditions. The first council for voluntary service, formed in Hampstead in 1906, was designed to ensure that voluntary and state actions were coordinated. This was what lay behind the council for voluntary service model, and led to a raft of similar organisations across the country.

The 'extension ladder model', on the other hand, distinguishes different roles for the state and for voluntary action.

Under this, the role of the state is 'to secure a national minimum of civilised life open to all alike, of both sexes and all classes', by which they meant 'sufficient nourishment and training when young, a living wage when able-bodied, treatment when sick, and modest but secure livelihood when disabled or aged'. Voluntary action should provide an 'extension ladder' that is placed 'firmly on the foundation of an enforced minimum' raising standards of life 'to finer shades of physical and moral and spiritual perfection'. On this model, voluntary action and civil society should not substitute for the state but be additional to it.

Theories of change

The distinction reflects two different models of poverty reduction. In the Minority Report, (5) Beatrice noted that poverty has little to do with any weakness of individual character and more to do with economic mismanagement and social structure. Only the state could deal with the structure and system issues that this implied.

The role of voluntary action, on the other hand, is to deal with what individuals and people working in groups can do to reduce poverty. There is no way that citizens' groups can, on their own, deal with the vast social and economic forces that drive income distributions. That is not to say, however, that they are powerless in this situation. In his book *From Poverty to Power: How Active Citizens and Effective States Can Change the World*, (6) Duncan Green, explains why such active citizenship is important:

'*Active citizenship has inherent merits: people living in poverty must have a voice in deciding their own destiny, rather than be treated as passive recipients of welfare or government action. What is more, the system – governments, judiciaries, parliaments, and companies – cannot tackle poverty and inequality by treating people as 'objects' of government action or other action. Rather, people must be recognised as 'subjects', conscious of and actively demanding their rights, for efforts to bear fruit.'*

Such citizen action is frequently called 'the demand side of governance', complementing 'the supply side of governance', which what the state does. Robert Chambers suggests that states' inability to put citizens at the heart of social programmes is one of the prime causes why they fail to reduce poverty.(7)

Poverty reduction in practice

In the 30 years following the publication of *The Prevention of Destitution*, the extension ladder model of voluntary action gained the upper hand. The turning point was the domestic policy of the wartime coalition government, in which politicians of all parties recognised that the state needed to be responsible for the welfare of its citizens. The Beveridge report was a reflection of this process, and its framing set the terms for the post -war settlement.

Following the war, the state was clearly in the driving seat and much of what had been thought of as voluntary action went into decline or was nationalised. Beveridge himself was furious about this process and wrote a book in 1948 called *Voluntary Action* (8) in which he complained about the 'damage' that the welfare state was doing to what people do for themselves. He suggested that the government should 'encourage voluntary action of all kinds' and 'remove difficulties in the way of friendly societies and other forms of mutuality'.

Beveridge was ignored and voluntary action went into decline for a generation. The 1960s, however, saw a rebirth of new and radical organisations based on the freedom of the age in which the cracks in the welfare state had become all too evident and citizens were no longer willing to be cast in the passive roles that the welfare state assigned to them. Principles of association and participation were much to the fore here. Organisations such as the East London Claimants Union, Gingerbread and CPAG used combined principles of community development and public policy advocacy.

Gradually, the voluntary sector built its influence back. The relationship between the state and the voluntary sector was still based on the extension ladder model. The essence of this relationship was set out in a pamphlet written by the National Council for Voluntary Organisations in 1981 called *Working Together*. The pamphlet suggests that the state and the voluntary sector had different but complementary goals. The state would provide money for voluntary organisations to work on the objectives that the voluntary sector set for itself. As a quid pro quo, the voluntary sector would not take on work that properly should be undertaken by the state.

Enter a third force - commerce

This all changed in the 1980s. In 1985, the Home Office wrote to the National Council for Voluntary Organisations to say that government would only fund voluntary bodies that met government objectives.

Such an approach had been prefigured by the work of the Manpower Services Commission, which used the voluntary sector to deliver its temporary employment programmes. In this relationship the voluntary sector was merely a means and had no part in setting the objectives of the schemes.

Subsequent years have been marked by an ever-increasing contracting relationship in the relationship between the state and the voluntary sector. Public money has been made available, but only under terms and conditions defined by the government. In the 1990s and beyond, such arrangements have threatened the independence of the voluntary sector, a quandary that is still not resolved. A new dimension here is commercialisation, and its mantra 'choice'. This has ushered in the parallel bars model, with the private sector as the key driving force right in the middle, radiating outwards and driving changes both in the public and voluntary sectors.

In 1993, I wrote a book called *Voluntary Action*, (9) which caused a furore because it suggested that state subsidy for voluntary action was distorting the basic ethos of the sector and that to recover its independence, the sector needed to reconfigure itself. I suggested two kinds of sectors. One would be a state subsidised sector, a kind of third sector social economy. The other would be based on private money in which pioneering and campaigning or people based social change were at the heart of the activities.

As a coda to this, I was asked in 2006 by seven charitable foundations to conduct a study of the voluntary and community sector in the light of fears that the government might kill the voluntary sector with kindness. The Labour Governments from 1997 offered panoply of support to strengthen the capacity of the voluntary sector but many were concerned that this threatened independence because much of the support was given so that voluntary organisations could deliver government services, rather than acting on its own agenda.

Actually, we found that the voluntary sector was more independent than we expected. There was no wholesale takeover by the state, though there were many signs of encroachment into objectives, mission drift and a sense of becoming risk averse. We conducted a survey of 120 organisations and found that, according to organisations self-assessments of their own independence, five factors protected organisations from becoming too dependent. These were: having foundation funding, raising some of their own money through

income generation, having a positive attitude towards collaborating with business, a sense of putting their own effectiveness first and being creative in getting around the rules and regulations of funding agencies. (10)

From work on 12 case studies, we found five characteristic features that voluntary organisations possessed that gave them advantages over other kinds of organisations:

- Passionate, risk-taking and persistence so they can speak out and challenge the system
- Knowledgeable with levels of 'cultural competence' so they can help the hardest to reach people
- Holistic, person-centred approach so they can deliver more effective services
- Able to turn 'service users' into agents of social change, a quality that gives them transformative power
- Uniquely placed to work between different government agencies, giving them potential to play important interstitial roles. (11)

At the same time, the study revealed commonly occurring weaknesses in the voluntary sector. Many organisations appeared to be fragile and be living hand to mouth. Their approach to work was often reactive, with organisations tending to follow money, rather than mission. Evaluation was a big issue, as was communication, so that organisations sometimes struggled to explain what they were doing and what they had achieved without lapsing into jargon.

This study, published in 2007, was undertaken at a time when there was a good supply of finance for the voluntary sector, together with a range of officially sponsored measures to build the capacity of organisations within the sector. Now, the climate has changed and, as the title of this conference suggests, we now face 'austerity'.

Although this has meant tough times for many organisations, with redundancies, reduced budgets, or even closure, there are opportunities too. There is now widespread agreement that the state will have to rely more on what people do for themselves, and this offers a way for voluntary organisations to reconfigure themselves to play a significant role in creating an active society, rather than playing second fiddle to the state.

The 'Big Society' may have fallen way down the political agenda, but nevertheless there is much scope for citizens to

backs, there may be little choice.

What matters is how this is done. An active society needs to have moral principles behind it. These include: inclusion, democracy, equality, dignity, respect and so on. Not only that but to fulfil its potential, the voluntary sector needs leadership - better leadership than it has now - and one with a vision of what the possibilities are.

Such a vision must encompass three main practical actions. The first is that we have to recognise that ordinary people, including those on low incomes, are competent to run their own affairs. At present, our thinking is conditioned by two fallacies that E.P. Thompson identified in *The Making of the English Working Class* some 50 years ago. One is what he called the 'the Fabian orthodoxy', in which 'the great majority of working people are seen as passive victims of laissez faire'. The other is the 'orthodoxy of the empirical economic historians', in which working people are seen as 'a labour force, as migrants, or as the data for statistical series'. We have to recognise that people have power and agency.

The second condition is that there is significant reallocation of resources to community organisations, rather than professional organisations that act on behalf of people or treat them as clients. Over the past fifty years, government programmes fostering community involvement have been run by agencies and structures that are impenetrable for local people. The Neighbourhood Renewal Programme, for example, which ran from 2001 to 2007 and was designed to close the gap between the poorest places and the rest, set up complex partnerships of professional agencies with tokenistic participation of people from the community. Similarly, much of the voluntary sector contributes little to civil society because it is highly professionalised, possessing few connections to local people other than through the delivery of services. Resources should instead go to organisations like London Citizens that is composed of citizens themselves and enables them to build their own power. They mobilise thousands of people across religious, ethnic and racial divides. London Citizens thrives in the poorest areas because it works on issues such as the 'living wage' that are central to the survival of families in such areas. We can also learn from international organisations like the Global Fund for Community Foundations, which helps citizens' groups to build their own asset base so that they can be free from the persistent 'projects' demanded by official aid agencies. The third condition is that it is imperative to develop a new

social contract. It is clear that Big Society, plus austerity, plus cuts to public services does not add up to a good society. What is needed is a clear agreement on the role of the state and the role of civil society. On the 'extension ladder' model, civil society should not substitute for the state but be additional to it.

Next Steps

The Webb Memorial Trust, working closely with the All Party Parliamentary Group on Poverty, has commissioned Paul Bunyan and John Diamond of Edge Hill University, to investigate these themes further.

It is intended that a report on this will be available in April 2014. This will be featured alongside other contributions to the debate in a supplement in the New Statesman to be published at the same time. Those interested to follow this should follow the APPG's website

(1) Webb, S and Webb, B 1916. *The Prevention of Destitution* London: Longmans

(2) Knight, B, Chigudu, H and Tandon, R. 2002. *Reviving Democracy: Citizens at the heart of governance*, London: Earthscan

(3) Etzioni, A. (1968) The Active Society: A Theory of societal and political processes, New York: The Free Press.

(4) In Commissioners for Special Income Tax v Pemsel [1891] AC 531, the majority of the House of Lords held that 'charitable purposes' within the meaning of the Income Tax Acts were to be interpreted, not according to their popular meaning, but according to their technical legal meaning. Since it was therefore necessary to arrive at a technical legal definition of charity, Lord Macnaghten categorised charitable purposes under four main heads (at p. 544):

' Charity' in its legal sense comprises four principal divisions: trusts for the relief of poverty, trusts for the advancement of education, trusts for the advancement of religion, and trusts for other purposes beneficial to the community not falling under any of the preceding heads.'

(5) Webb, S and Webb, B. 1909 *The break up of the Poor Law: being part one of the Minority Report, of the Poor Law Commission*. London: Longman.

(6) Green, D 2008 From Poverty to power: How active citizens and effective states can change the world, London: Practical Action and Oxfam.

(7) Chambers, R. 1997. Whose Reality Counts? London: Intermediate Technology.

(8) Beveridge, W. 1948. Voluntary Action London: George Allen and Unwin.

(9) (9) Knight, B. 1993. Voluntary Action. London: The Home Office.

(10) 10) These results were obtained by a multiple regression analysis with self-reported assessments of independence from the state and other organisations as the dependent variable. In combination, the five factors explained 52 per cent of the variance.

(11) Knight, B and Robson, S. 2007. The value and independence of the voluntary sector. Available at http://www.nr-foundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/VCS-full-Report.pdf.

Barry Knight is a social scientist and statistician. Currently he works as an advisor to the Webb Memorial Trust, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Global Fund for Community Foundations, the Greater New Orleans Foundation and the Arab Reform Initiative. He is co-chair of the Working Group on Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace, which is developing a global learning community of practitioners across the globe. He is the author or editor of 14 books on poverty, civil society, community development and democracy.

Peter Richmond: The Castle Vale Experience

Peter Richmond, CEO of Castle Vale Community Housing Association gave a talk at the ARVAC Conference about the Castle Vale experience, based on an article he authored, published in the *Journal of Urban Regeneration and Renewal.* A summary appears below, and the full article can be found here: Richmond, P. (2013) Post-regeneration: Succession and Sustainability, *Journal of Urban Regeneration and Renewal,* **Vol. 6,** 4, 399–403.

Setting the scene

Castle Vale was built in 1960's, and is home to 11,000 people. The area experienced decline in the 1970's and 1980's and a Housing Action Trust was formed 1993- 2005, which with significant public funding (£280m) transformed the estate. Unemployment was reduced from 26% to 6%, life expectancy increased by 5 years, crime fell to make Castle Vale one of the safest neighbourhoods in Birmingham. This may have been inevitable with this level of investment, but the real lesson of Castle Vale is what happened afterwards (post-regeneration) to continue to sustain and transform the neighbourhood.

Castle Vale Community Housing Association owns 2,400 rented homes, providing assets of £90m and rental income of £11m; it operates only in Castle Vale and has a majority of local residents on its board. Castle Vale Housing Association employs 100 people, a third local residents and has a charitable subsidiary, in which it invests £230,000 a year, (additional income is secured externally) to lead on a range on non-housing activity to support the community (health and wellbeing, children and young people, family support, independent living, employment and training) This model has seen Castle Vale celebrate its 20th anniversary of successful, sustained and continued regeneration in 2013.

Regeneration, Transformation, Sustainability

There is an extremely long list of regeneration initiatives in England, typically short term and focused, and with limited or debatable success. Castle Vale was different because community and delivery partners

recognised the need for a holistic approach. Determinants of this approach have been identified as: housing, resources, governance, including leadership and partnerships, community involvement, succession strategy (1-4) Succession planning was key in Castle Vale and involved the setting up of 10 local thematic organisations, which could provide vision, capacity and financial strength.

Breaking the cycle.

There is a recognisable cycle of decline that is experienced by most neighbourhoods: Utopia, (of new urban planning) decline (isolation, lack of facilities, unemployment and wider factors) transformation (regeneration initiatives) leading to a new Utopia, the regeneration is seen as complete, agencies move out, often to be parachuted into another area, and the area falls into decline again because of an on-going failure to respond to current challenges. Castle Vale has recognised the need to break this cycle, and have done this through the strength of community involvement, by establishing successor organisations and strong infrastructure that can respond to local needs, a changing environment and wider challenges.

This is a challenging approach, especially in the current climate of austerity and recession. CVCHA is facing increasing demand as statutory services are cut, and has had to respond to significant changes. But the localism agenda also poses opportunities to secure resources to deliver locally and respond truly to the community's needs (5-7). CVCHA has taken part in a government participatory budgeting pilot through a process of co-production. There will always be lessons to learn, changes to make, new challenges to respond to, Castle Vale is developing a clear vision for the future, and better ways of using available resources- the model of transform and sustain.

1. Atkinson, R. and Moon, G. (1994), 'Urban policy in Britain: The city, the state and the market', Macmillan, London.
2. Yarnit, M. (2006), 'Area regeneration in England: Is there a success formula?', available at http://www.obs-pascal.com, last accessed March 2013.
3. Barnes, M., Beirens, H., Nathur, N. and Skelcher, C. (2006), 'Governance, good practice and service structures: Interim report', University of Birmingham and University of Brighton.
4. Wind-Cowie, M. (2010), 'Civic streets: The big society in action', Demos, London.
5. Fenton, A. *et al*. (2010), 'Why do neighbourhoods stay poor? Deprivation, place and people in Birmingham', Barrow Cadbury, Birmingham.
6. Wind-Cowie, M. (2010), 'Civic streets: The big society in action', Demos, London.
7. Duncan, P. and Thomas, S. (2007), 'Successful neighbourhoods: A good practice guide',

For further information and to register please visit:

http://www.eventbrite.co.uk/o/katy-goldstraw-5870359871?s=21040669

Participatory Research Workshop; Bearing Witness to the opportunities and threats of Coalition policy for Adult Social Care Voluntary and Community Organisations

26th February 12.45-4.30pm @ Room 408, MMU Business School, M15 6BH

This event is part of an MMU research project to bear witness to the effects of Coalition policy on the voluntary sector. It is an opportunity to hear key note speakers that have extensive experience in voluntary sector and to share organisational responses to Coalition austerity policies.

This event is the launch of a PhD research project into the effects of Coalition Austerity Policies on the Adult Social Voluntary and Community Sector organisations in Manchester. The research intends to bear witness to the effects of austerity policies on voluntary sector organisations. The aim of the project is to engage Voluntary Sector Organisations, to ask them the key questions that affect their organisation and to offer up to date research, allowing organisations to improve their strategic response to austerity policies.

The event welcomes two key note speakers from MMU, Dr Sue Baines and Dr Jenny Fisher who will present on the history of the voluntary sector and community perspectives of care respectively. A networking lunch will be provided enabling organisations to make new links and forge organisational partnerships.

EVENT PROGRAMME

- *12.45 -1.30pm Registration & Lunch*
- *1.30pm – 1.45pm Welcome. Introduction to the event.*
- *1.45pm -2pm Setting the Scene. "A History of Adult Social Care" Dr Sue Baines (tbc)*
- *2pm Research Workshop "What are the major themes facing the VCS Adult Social Care Sector today?"*
- *2.30pm Coffee Break*
- *2.45pm – 3pm "The Voluntary Sector; Spaces & Places of care, community engagement and wellbeing" Dr Jenny Fisher*
- *3 -4pm Bearing Witness – Participatory Workshop in small groups.*
- *4-4.30pm Event Summary and Organisations invited to join research project.*

ARVAC Office, c/o
The School of Allied Health Professions
The University of East Anglia
Norwich, NR4 7TJ

promoting effective community action through research

About ARVAC

ARVAC (The Association for Research in the Voluntary and Community Sector) was established in 1978. It is a membership organisation and acts as a resource for people interested in research in or on community organisations.

We believe that voluntary and community organisations play a vital role in creating and sustaining healthy communities, and that research plays an essential role in increasing the effectiveness of those organisations involved in voluntary and community action.

We want to hear from you:

Please send us:

- News items
- Details of new publications, resources or websites
- Information about research in progress
- Meetings or events you would like us to publicise
- Comments or opinion pieces you would like to share with other ARVAC members

by e-mail to

jurgen@arvac.org.uk