

Committee	Date
The City Bridge Trust Committee	6 th February 2017
Subject City Bridge Trust Draft Strategic Review, 2018-2023	Public
Report of The Chief Grants Officer	For information and discussion
Report Author Sufina Ahmad	

Summary

This paper provides:

- The background to City Bridge Trust (CBT) strategic review;
- An update on progress made on the current review, including details gathered through research; analysis of CBT and its current grant-making; and consultation;
- A ‘straw person’ first draft strategy which will form the basis of a presentation and discussion in the Committee meeting; and
- Detail on proposed next steps prior to the May 2017 CBT Committee meeting when you will consider agreeing a final strategy to recommend to Court in July 2017.

Recommendations

It is recommended that you:

- a) Note the background and progress update, review and discuss the information and raise any questions;
- b) Receive a short presentation from the Head of Strategic Review and discuss the ‘straw-person’ strategy, providing feedback to shape the next iteration;
- c) Review the proposed next steps and consider if they need amendment or addition – in particular how you would like to engage with/be updated on the refining of the strategy in the coming weeks

Background

1. The City of London Corporation (CoLC) is the Trustee of the charity Bridge House Estates (Charity No. 1035628). In 1995, the decision was taken to create CBT. The surplus income available was to be applied for charitable activities, in accordance with a governing Scheme brought into effect on the 20 April 1995 (by Statutory Instrument 1995/1047).
2. The Scheme requires the Trustee, where there is applicable income (i.e. income surplus to the requirements to maintain and support the 5 Bridges which is the primary object of the charity), to settle a policy for the application of that income and to consult such persons as the Commission may direct. The Commission, by Order dated 10 July 1997, has directed the Trustee *inter alia*:

“consult with such persons, bodies corporate, local authorities, government departments and agencies, voluntary organisations and other bodies as the Trustee might think appropriate from time to time, having regard to the purposes, functions and interest of the consultees, and to inform the Commission in writing of the consultation process it progressed from time to time”.

3. Since 1995, in accordance with this scheme, reviews involving considerable consultation have been conducted every five years. At your May 2016 Committee meeting, you agreed the resources to support your current review. In August 2016, a Head of Strategic Review, Sufina Ahmad, came into post on secondment for 12 months from the Big Lottery Fund’s London team. In August 2016, the review commenced, with an official public launch by your Chairman in October 2016. The Charity Commission has been informed that the current review is underway.
4. The review includes commissioned research, analysis of your current grant-making and a consultation exercise with a range of stakeholders in line with the above Order and in pursuit of fulfilling the broad charitable purposes expressed in the Scheme. This consultation is fundamental in developing CBT’s funding strategy for 2018-2023, to be implemented so that the available funds can be applied most effectively to address the changing needs of Londoners.
5. The intention is for the strategy to be formally agreed by the Court of Common Council in July 2017.

Progress Update

6. Below is an update on progress made on the current review, including detail of the key inputs: research; analysis of CBT and its current grant-making; and the on-going consultation:

Research

7. To support the development of this review, the following research has been commissioned:
 - a) A London Needs Analysis – Literature Review, *Olivia Dix*.
This was published in October 2016, and circulated to the Committee, as well as forming the basis of a presentation and discussion at your Strategic Review Half Day meeting in October 2016 – the write-up from that session is included at Appendix 1 and the Literature Review is included at Appendix 2.
 - b) Grantee Perception Survey, *Center (sic) for Effective Philanthropy*.
In December 2016, the survey findings were finalised and in your January 2017 CBT Committee, a top-line summary was reported to you. That summary and a full copy of the survey are included at Appendix 3.

- c) Funding Best Practice, *Rob Bell*.
In October 2016, initial findings from this work were shared with you at your strategic away half-day. The write up from that session is included at Appendix 1 and the final report will be completed by mid-February 2017.
- d) Mapping the London Funding Ecology, *Collaborate CIC*.
The concept of a funding ecology relates to research commissioned by the Big Lottery Fund and the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (UK Branch), which was delivered by Collaborate CIC. The research explored the theory that funders should consider themselves as operating within an ecosystem, and then provided suggestions of how this could be successfully applied. For this strategy, CBT has discussed the concept of mapping the London funding ecology, in order to benefit both funders and the organisations that seek to work with them. To begin the process of defining the London funding ecology, CBT has initially requested that Collaborate CIC completes a market scoping exercise of CBT, and reports back on its findings. This exercise will be completed by mid-February 2017.
- e) Social Investment Scoping Report, *Eva Varga*.
This is an options paper exploring the potential role of social investment in CBT's work in the future. This report will be finalised by mid-February 2017.

Analysis of CBT and its Current Grant-Making

- 8. The Grantee Perception survey, referred to above, and the consultation (see below) both draw heavily on organisations' experience of CBT and its existing Investing in Londoners grants programmes. Your Head of Strategic Review led group S.W.O.T. (Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats) analysis sessions and one to one sessions with CBT staff to gather their feedback on its Investing in Londoners programmes. Summaries are provided of the staff feedback below:

Staff S.W.O.T of Investing in Londoners strategy

Strengths

- Diversity is explored through the portfolio
- Giving of time, talent and money is pursued with ambition
- Will fund a variety of different approaches within some funding streams
- Some long-term commitments are being made to social causes
- Supporting great organisations with expertise
- Some of CBT's funding improves the sustainability of organisations
- Some opportunities in the current portfolio to distribute unrestricted funding
- Some opportunities in the current portfolio to work with new organisations
- Some opportunities to do deep-dive/thematic work, as well as place-based work
- CBT has track-record, expertise and links to networks in certain areas, e.g. inclusion
- CBT funds a diverse range of organisations

- The evidence base behind why CBT supports certain groups, e.g. Older Londoners, is irrefutable
- CBT recognises that cost per beneficiary varies depending on the intervention, and is willing to pay more where needed
- Some parts of the strategy show real clarity as to the kinds of things CBT will fund in pursuit of the aims identified
- In times of austerity and state retrenchment, approaches like social investment and encouraging giving offer strong platforms through which organisations can generate income
- Using all of CBT's assets, such as social investment, is positive for civil society and builds the robustness of the sector

Weaknesses

- Clearer outcome metrics are needed to determine the benefits of these investments
- The value added by some of the funding approaches pursued could be researched and understood further
- CBT does not make full/effective use of all of its non-monetary assets currently
- The team is at risk of operating in silos in terms of its approaches (social investment, philanthropy, grant-making and influencing public policy)
- Demand for funding across the strategy is very variable
- Success rates for funding across the strategy can be very variable
- Sometimes there are multiple target audiences per priority, and there will be fewer applications from certain audiences, despite knowing the need exists
- Outcomes could be interpreted as outputs in some cases
- Some outcomes are perhaps too specific, and result in CBT potentially preventing groups with other well-evidenced ideas applying
- Some outcomes are too broad
- Some outcomes are difficult to measure/assess the impact made
- Some funding streams lack a clear vision or purpose
- Some lack of clarity on how some of CBT's priorities link to the strategies of others working in the same/similar policy areas
- CBT potentially needs to consider systems-based approaches for some of its work, placing the person and not the issue or the organisation applying at the heart of the process
- Some terminology used in the programmes needs updating
- Some of the strategy focuses on the manifestation of an issue, rather than dealing with the root causes
- Sometimes specialist knowledge is required to make assessments, and more could be done to cultivate this knowledge
- Some parts of the funding programmes only fund a few projects, meaning that it is hard to develop expertise in that area or derive massive amounts of learning
- Sometimes CBT lacks oversight of its overall funding portfolio, making it harder to consider the best ways in which to fulfil the ambitions set out in its strategy

Opportunities

- To consider multiple approaches to grant making, including longer term investments, core funding etc.
- To consider more joined up approaches within the team, i.e. using grant making, social investment and encouraging more giving to tackle identified social problems in partnership with a range of different players
- To consider a funder plus offer that links to the vision being pursued by CBT
- To do more to support groups CBT funds – a more relational approach to funding
- Some funding streams link to one another, which suggests that there could be an opportunity to adopt a less programmatic approach when supporting Londoners
- To use the assets CBT possess as a funder more effectively, e.g. its links to the private and public sector through the CoLC
- To work in ways that are more proportionate and representative, thus making our work more accessible to a greater range of civil society organisations
- To be a more strategic funder in some areas where it has track-record and expertise
- To fund early action (root cause focus), and short and long term interventions
- To work more collaboratively to fund gaps and emerging/identified needs
- To consider the role of tech in the future of our funding, as well as the potential to learn from the ‘tech for good’ and tech industry ways of working
- To consider asking other funders/partners with the required expertise to distribute funding on our behalf
- Via CBT’s work and networks (including national funders) to can show London benefits all, and not just itself, whilst also gathering learning from a diverse range of non-Londoners
- Opportunities for CBT to be more strategic in its thinking on various issues, making use of all of its assets

Threats

- Some of the things CBT aims to fund are not well-understood, and more awareness raising is needed too
- Sometimes need to consider how CBT can link the strategy/portfolio together
- The level of statutory cuts is unprecedented in some areas, and changing at a fast pace – both geographically and in terms of a thematic need, meaning demand for funding could change
- The unprecedented statutory cuts could also mean that the added value of CBT funding is at risk of becoming diminished
- The impact of some of the social issues CBT seeks to support is not fully understood, e.g. an ageing population, planned changes to the benefits system
- Some issues of organisations become over-reliant on CBT funding, and more could be done to support these groups
- Need to consider if CBT always has the track record and expertise to assess applications appropriately

- The impact of changing demographics, and movement of poverty to outer-London boroughs needs to be understood further in terms of inequalities and poverty experienced
- Hard to prioritise workloads when there are so many funding priorities
- Some civil society organisations are really struggling in the current funding climate, despite doing vital work – CBT should be as much of a support to these organisations as it can be, hence the need for variety in its approaches

Summary of Staff One-To-One Discussions

9. In addition, staff were asked for feedback in groups and one to one discussions relating to CBT as an organisation. The overarching feedback is presented below, along with a S.W.O.T summary:

Staff Roles and Skillset

10. Staff shared insights into the experience they have gained prior to joining CBT, and some colleagues continue to work or volunteer in a variety of roles alongside their CBT work.
11. Colleagues have worked in civil society, funding, non-departmental public bodies (NDPB), private and public sector organisations. Some colleagues have managed grant programmes of varying sizes, including grant making to individuals. They are linked to a wide range of stakeholders, listed in the longer report.

Staff Perspective on CBT

12. *CBT's mission to 'tackle disadvantage in London through grant making, social investment, encouraging philanthropy and influencing social policy'* was a main driver for colleagues choosing to work at CBT. The CBT brand and its links to various networks such as London Funders, CASS Business School, BAMER Funders Alliance, Corston Alliance etc. was considered positive too. Reference was made to colleagues valuing the fact that CBT bridged communities and strengthened the sector, often backing interesting ideas and organisations with its funding.

Staff Workload

13. The grant portfolios are mixed in terms of size, location and theme. There was some discussion as to whether or not portfolios should be distributed differently, and this is an area that needs to be explored further.
14. Staff were seeking as much flexibility, consistency and clarity as possible in terms of the internal processes used to distribute CBT's assets.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analysis of CBT

Strengths

Grant making best practice:

- Independent, but linked to the Corporation
- Flexible grant-making: nine priorities are akin to gateways
- Can fund other kinds of groups, not just charities
- Core funding and multi-year funding available
- Consistent levels of grants made annually
- Fairly clear themes labels, definitions and criteria for grant making
- Improved website has led to improved applications
- CBT listens to grant holders and stakeholders
- Funding also committed to research and strategic investments
- Consistency in grant making as one person filters the initial applications and coordinates paperwork submitted to committee

Staff team:

- Diverse skill set
- High retention rates
- Staff have pushed against some of the more conservative values within the Corporation
- Good levels of communication and teamwork
- Strong ability to maintain relationships with stakeholders and grant holders
- Staff are well linked to a wide range of stakeholders

Weaknesses

Purpose and role of CBT:

- Lack of clarity on if the funding is for the sector, for Londoners or for both
- Improvements in capability and capacity building offer from CBT are needed

Data and information:

- Data is collected but unclear on its use
- GIFTs (CBT's grants management software) is not used effectively to support with workflow
- Filing systems need to be implemented fully and too much paperwork is generated currently

Policy and influencing:

- Data is not used to influence the funding priorities fully
- CBT should reach out more to local, regional and national policy makers, including unusual suspects
- CBT has highlighted some thorny issues, but perhaps at time has erred towards caution in doing so

Effectiveness of current funding:

- Priorities range between being too ambitious/not ambitious and too specific/vague

- Is there a duplication of effort amongst CBT's work and that of other funders?
- Nine priorities are too many
- Social investment and grant making is too disconnected
- Policies need reviewing regularly to ensure they reflect the processes being used and enable effective working practices
- Assessment process is possibly too long
- One size fits all approach to grant making means that work for small/larger grants can feel disproportionate
- Consistency in how a matter is managed within a grant isn't guaranteed
- Grants Officer (GO) portfolios are generic
- GO roles are expanding, but admin function is not expanding accordingly

Opportunities

- More could be done to showcase the work of grant holders
- CBT could be more 'strategically responsive'
- CBT could be engaging with a wider range of stakeholders
- CBT could use others to distribute its funding or promote its work
- The role of the Corporation in CBT's work needs to be more fully understood
- Consider more proportionate approaches to grant making, including possibly a small grants programme
- More joint working between CBT and the Corporation to review the best possible internal processes are implemented

Threats

- The Corporation and CBT should work hard to ensure its operating principles are better aligned
- The relationship between the Corporation and CBT requires further development to elicit the best possible outcomes for all
- CBT can become lost in the wider Corporation brand, and within the Corporation it can become lost as it has a separate website etc.
- In some cases, staff characterised as being not self-reflective enough, negative and operating in a bubble
- Is there enough staff capacity to take on work, and can the levels of disparity in the portfolios/workloads be sustained?

Consultation

Summary of Stakeholders Involved To-Date

15. CBT has been building the evidence base for its next strategy through working collaboratively with Londoners and key stakeholders linked to its work. Stakeholders have been engaged through face-to-face group and one-to-one meetings; attending and contributing to various conferences, workshops and meetings; commissioning an independent grantee perception survey through the Center for Effective Philanthropy (227 anonymous responses received – see above); launching an online survey open to all; and

through our social media hashtag #BridgingLondon. This is a conversation that will continue until the next strategy is agreed, and beyond.

16. The details of the Strategic Review were also promoted at the following events, but no lists exist of the exact people in attendance:
- a) **London Conference, 16.11.16** – A large number of people engaged with us directly at our exhibitor stand, and through the social media hashtag for the event #LonConf2016. The conference was attended by mostly private sector organisations, as well as a good range of civil society and public sector colleagues.
 - b) **Greater London Volunteering Conference, 18.11.16** – CBT co-hosted a workshop on funding and CBT's Strategic Review, and 50 people mainly from the civil society sector, attended the session.
 - c) Since August 2016, CBT have engaged with over 500 people to help inform its thinking. Appendix 4 outlines the details of over 300 named people who have contributed to the review, and briefly summarises how they have been engaged.

Summary of External Meetings

17. Formal 'conversations' have been convened with a range of external audiences, broadly categorised as:
- a) Londoners
 - b) Grantees
 - c) Civil society organisations – charities, sector support (infrastructure) bodies, CICs, not for profits, housing associations etc.
 - d) Policy makers – with a focus on London and communities of interest
 - e) Local Government – at an individual borough level, but also at a GLA and London Councils level
 - f) Funders – national, local, regional and sector support bodies for funders like ACF and London Funders
 - g) Social Investment Market
18. The notes from these meetings have been published on the CBT website www.citybridgetrust.org.uk/strategic-review.
19. The common themes emerging from these discussions included:

Funders

20. The power imbalance between funders and those they fund was considered a real issue facing many of those engaged in the review process. Whilst many agreed that some form of imbalance will exist, due to the involvement of an exchange of assets, the imbalance could be addressed through funders exhibiting the following behaviours:

- a) **Being more transparent and proportionate in their approaches** – Funders should thoroughly examine what they are asking for, and why, from groups. If they are not using information then it should not be requested. Funders need to be acutely aware that they do not place unrealistic and unnecessary demands and pressures on the groups they fund, resulting in them becoming both helpful and unhelpful to an organisation's survival.
- b) **Having a clarity of vision and purpose** – Funders should have a clear vision and mission that they are pursuing, which is clearly expressed and to which they ensure that they hold themselves accountable in terms of measuring the impact that they are having through their investments. It was felt that funders should work more collaboratively and pursue an ambition to operate more effectively as an ecology/ecosystem – in order to make it easier for other stakeholders to work with them.
- c) **Knowing your asset base** – Funders should make better use of their monetary and non-monetary asset base, in order to create change in pursuit of their vision.

Future of Civil Society

21. There were frequent discussions on the financial burdens civil society organisations currently face; exacerbated further due to the rising levels of demand on their services. Many felt that the growing levels of inequality and poverty that disadvantaged and marginalised communities face is resulting in the sector facing a crisis/tipping point. Some common themes linked to these discussions included:

- a) **Innovation and the 'tried and tested'** – Many agreed that a better balance needs to be struck between the desire to fund innovation and the desire to fund proven models that have worked over many years. Stakeholders explained that they understood the need for innovation, as the same needs manifest themselves differently over time. However, in order for innovation to be done well, it was felt that it required headspace, collaboration, time and real leadership in the sector, and that the notion that this does not require intensive resourcing is incorrect.

It was also felt by the majority that supporting tried and tested methodologies, with a clear evidence base and learning that has been built up and applied over time should be celebrated more. Whilst it was understood that this work would always need to be open to adapting in response to its environment, it was agreed by most that a seemingly dismissive attitude to tried and tested approaches by funders was inappropriate.

- b) **A Community and Voluntary sector that thrives** – There was passion and ambition throughout so many of the discussions, with stakeholders making it clear that they were committed to ensuring the survival of the sector. Many felt that this could be best achieved through better collaboration within the sector, as well as the need for the sector to reach out to and better connect to

other sectors (private and public) – thinking of itself as an equal partner, rather than an adversary.

- c) **Support to civil society organisations** – Many expressed their concerns about the sector's ability to thrive, particularly due to the continued reductions in the availability of civil society support, predominantly through local infrastructure organisations such as volunteer centres etc. The need for support to be agile and multi-disciplinary was prioritised, but many felt that this could be best pursued by funders, civil society organisations, local authorities, communities etc. working in partnership over a sustained period of time.

Life for Londoners

- 22. London and Londoners were spoken about in a myriad of positive ways, with many referencing the breadth of communities represented within the city, London's history and its future. Expressions of anxiety and fear about the future of London following the political and economic unrest in 2016 were cited in most meetings.
- a) **Speaking truth to power** - The need to support Londoners and those supporting them to use their voice and to take on leadership roles, in order to express their experiences and to strive for change to happen was discussed regularly. This was often linked to discussions on the need to develop a more positive narrative about being a Londoner, and living in London, both for those living in the city, as well as for those outside of London in other parts of the UK and globally. Whilst most stakeholders took pride in living or working in London, many expressed their concerns that the city was becoming inaccessible to many (including its current inhabitants) in terms of access to jobs, housing, affordable transport, public services etc.
- b) **The most unequal city in the world** – London was regularly described as being a city of divides between the 'haves' and 'have nots'; resulting in the need for Londoners to be supported to pull together in order to create more community cohesion and resilience. Many stakeholders referred to the fact that London has the highest concentration of billionaires than anywhere else in the world. The economic inequalities were considered to be the cause for many parts of London changing dramatically and becoming inaccessible to those that were born and raised here. Changing demographics within communities were seen as positive, but many agreed that the confidence they had felt that London was incredibly positive in embracing its diversity had been eroded by the increase in hate crime in 2016.
- c) **Understanding systems** – Much of the stakeholder feedback centred on the need for the complex systems in which Londoners exist to be more joined up. This was expressed in many different ways, and most agreed that if those within the system took a more collaborative and person-centred approach they would be able to elicit the best possible outcomes for Londoners. Many felt that simply seeking to support someone through the arbitrary label that is applied to them, e.g. older person, LGBTQ person, someone in debt, a minority etc. results in a lack of joined-up approaches, a higher likelihood of

those in need cycling in and out of crisis situations and failing to reach their goals and potential.

CBT's Approaches

23. CBT was discussed in positive terms in many of the meetings held to-date, and was seen as a much-needed part of the London funding landscape. Some of the discussion points relating to CBT's approaches that were commonly referred to included:

- a) **What CBT does well** - There was lots of positive feedback relating to CBT's application and funding processes, transparent strategic review processes and its staff etc. CBT was considered supportive and generous as a funder by many stakeholders.
- b) **CBT in the future** - CBT was encouraged to have a clearer vision about its work going forwards, ensuring that the vision is clear, ambitious and measurable. Many also felt that in times of crisis/near crisis, the need to utilise CBT's links to other funders and sectors etc. was considered essential. There was also criticism of some of CBT's processes in terms of the application process, the number of themes, and the lack of awareness of the breadth of CBT's work in terms of grant making, social investment, encouraging giving and influencing public policy.

CBT was encouraged to support London and London's civil society to thrive, and that in order to achieve this, CBT must exercise: a commitment to helping organisations thrive/sustain themselves with confidence and flexibility; a commitment to capability and capacity building; a resolution to be more pragmatic and realistic in its approaches; and a promise to lever its non-monetary and monetary assets more effectively. The need to build collective voice and leadership within the funding ecology, civil society, London and its communities was regularly referred to also.

- c) **Opening doors** - Many felt that CBT's links to other sectors was something that needed to be considered carefully, in order to ensure that it benefits Londoners and civil society organisations. It was also felt by many that CBT should renew its ambition to herald a new age of giving in London and to increase the overall levels of giving - which have remained static for some time.

'Straw Person' First Draft Strategy

24. Since the beginning of this year, your Head of Strategic Review has spent time reviewing the above inputs and connecting with a variety of stakeholders including researchers, the Strategic Review Project Steering Group, the CBT officer team, and your Chairman and Deputy Chairman for their feedback and guidance. This work has informed a 'Straw Person' first draft strategy which is attached at Appendix 5.

25. This draft strategy will form the basis of a discussion in the CBT Committee following a short presentation. The intention is that it will evolve through feedback from you, CBT and CoLC officers and a wide range of external stakeholders from multiple sectors. The feedback will be gathered in a transparent and collaborative way. It is hoped and expected that the feedback will be rigorous and robust as it is through this that the final strategy will be developed to be the best that it can be.

26. The key points to highlight are:

- a) At its heart this draft strategy's vision can be simply described as 'Bridging Divides'. The vision set out proposes that CBT's belief should be a London where disadvantaged and marginalised individuals and communities are supported to not just survive, but to thrive too. It asserts that CBT wants to reduce the inequalities that they face too. The mission proposed is that CBT uses all its knowledge, networks and assets to champion London's biggest asset – its people. The draft strategy proposes that this city can only work for everyone once the divides are bridged and the inequalities tackled.
- b) The proposed strategy enables CBT to take a vision and values led approach to its funding decisions. This means that CBT is looking to partner with organisations who share our vision and values. CBT has funded incredible organisations over the years, and the strategy expresses CBT's desire to work more equally with organisations it supports in order to find the solutions to the divides that it hopes to bridge.
- c) The strategy that CBT sets out for 2018 will have changed by 2023. There is so much uncertainty ahead, in terms of: Brexit, a general election, a mayoral election and the overwhelming feedback from stakeholders is that there are communities and civil society organisations that are in crisis. It is important therefore to have a strategy that is flexible and committed to adapting and learning: which looks at where it is making progress and where it needs to change.
- d) This proposed strategy provides CBT's partners with a toolbox of different funding approaches, and a 'funder plus' programme which should help its partners to thrive too. The approaches proposed will be diverse, using both CBT's monetary and non-monetary assets in a way that is fair, representative and proportionate.
- e) It is proposed that CBT considers funding through the following funding priorities:
 - Place based funding
 - Addressing inequalities
 - Transitions
 - Fairness and voice
- f) It is proposed that ideas that could be supported through these areas will be broader and less defined than CBT are currently used to. However, by adopting a values and vision led approach to funding our partners, CBT can

be sure that it will work with great organisations doing great work. Over time CBT will learn from the ideas it is supporting linked to these themes and use these to inform more tightly defined areas of support it may wish to consider supporting too.

Proposed Next Steps

27. The proposed next steps planned for the Strategic Review are set out below. It is recommended you review the proposed next steps and consider if they need amendment or addition – in particular how you would like to engage with/be updated on the refining of the strategy in the coming weeks?

28. The intention is to work with the CBT Committee and officers, CoLC staff and external stakeholders to develop the next iterations of the strategy shared with you today. A final strategy will be submitted to the CBT Committee for approval in May 2017.

29. Proposed Next Steps for the Strategic Review (SR):

January	
30th	Draft strategy shared with CBT Committee, via board papers
31st	Update the Communications Strategy for the SR, to prepare for: Work in February aimed at internal communications campaign, and CBT committee engagement, via: Committee meeting, Member's Briefing and Member's Breakfast event.
February	CBT Committee to review and feed back on the draft funding strategy. Taking on board the discussion from CBT Committee, the next iteration of the draft to be prepared and consulted on with external and internal audiences. The priority will be to initially connect with the CBT Committee, CoLC Member's, CoLC staff and then begin engaging face-to-face externally with external stakeholder audiences.
6 th	Activities will include, but are not limited to: CBT Committee Meeting – with a date agreed as to when the draft strategy can be published online
9th	Youth Sector 2020 Panel (Organised by London Youth)
10th	Publishing Rob Bell and Collaborate CIC research on to SR website pages
March	Sufina to continue testing draft funding strategy with external and internal audiences.
7th	Work to be undertaken to engage Member's via a Member's Breakfast (7 th), as well as through Member's Inductions (following the March elections).

April	Sufina to amend strategy following results of CBT Committee feedback, Member engagement, and wider consultation process, and to publish this on to CBT website.
May	Sufina to work with the CBT Committee and your Chief Grants Officer to agree resource needs to deliver new funding strategy, and to then seek approval from the CBT Committee to agree the strategy. The strategy will exist as one version which can be used with all stakeholders, both internally and externally.
11th	CBT Committee Meeting
June	Sufina to continue working with CBT Committee and CoLC staff to prepare to take the strategy to the CoLC Court of Common Council Plans to be finalized in terms of timeline for implementing the strategy, as well as consideration given as to the actions needed from June 2017 onwards to help prepare the team/others for the next strategy.
20 th July	Agreement of CoLC Court of Common Council
August	Contingency

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Away day write up

Appendix 2: Literature review, by Olivia Dix

Appendix 3: Grantee perception survey summary

Appendix 4: Named stakeholders engaged in Strategic Review, as at January 2017

Appendix 5: 'Straw Person' first draft Strategy