University of Brighton

Community University Partnership Programme

On our doorsteps

Seed Funded Projects Self-evaluation Report

Hastings Community Planning Resource

Length: Up to 3 sides of A4, with additional income and expenditure sheet. Please include direct quotes where applicable in sections 3, 4 and 6.
FINAL VERSION 24 FEBRUARY 2015

1.   Brief Description of Project

The creation of a physical and digital resource on community planning in Hastings and St Leonards. Aims (as agreed by Steering Group):

- To stimulate more and better community engagement in local planning and regeneration.
- To improve local library and internet resources on community engagement in local planning and regeneration (past, present and future) by pooling local knowledge and information.
- To create a model for a generic local resource about community engagement in planning and regeneration.

2.   Project Progress

2.1   *What did the project partners and stakeholders plan to do?*

As stated in the application form:
a.   Establish a steering group;
b.   Establish communication networks to keep people informed and obtain feedback;
c.   Survey of needs of community and voluntary sectors;
d.   Liaison with CRRC/CUPP researchers in order to establish more precisely the research needs of the community;
e.   Begin assembling a physical resource at UCH;
f.   Scoping and feasibility work on an internet resource;
g.   Production of draft development plan and consultation on it with Steering Group, network of contacts and others.

2.2   *What did they actually do?*

As above although d and g only partly completed as yet.

2.3   *How were volunteers involved?*

All partners undertook more work than they were paid for. Some received no payment at all. Attempts to get student volunteers involved in the project have not yet been successful.

2.4   *Please describe the evolution of the project and reasons for any changes to the plan/timeline*

The initial phase during the summer was spent refining exactly what the project was and this was crystallised in a flyer distributed to over 700 members of the Hastings Community Network; including councillors, community organisations and interested individuals. A conference organised by Hastings Voluntary Action with the Gensing & Central St Leonards Forum called 'Making Planning Work' on 20 November 2010 emerged as an ideal opportunity to launch the project and to engage with many of the target groups. Helping to organise and participate in this event became an integral and beneficial part of the project. But it also delayed work on the feasibility and business planning phases resulting in the project overrunning. (Contact HVA for the Making Planning Work conference report.)

3.   Partnership working

3.1   *Which partners and stakeholders were involved?*

Initial partners:
a.   Nick Wates Associates (NWA) – project management, feasibility work, editing documents.
b.   Hastings Trust (HT) - Steering Group
c.   Hastings Voluntary Action (HVA) – Steering Group, networking, conference.
d.   Samer Bagaeen and Frank Rallings – liaison with town planning course, conference
e.   Peter Ambrose – Steering Group, liaison with University Centre Hastings (UCH)
f.   Sarah Friend – Steering Group, physical resource at UCH library

Additional partners:
g.   Jo Bevan - student volunteering
h.   Hastings Borough Council (HBC), Jane Jackson – Steering Group
i.   Green IT Company - digital resource feasibility

3.2   *How did the partnership work?*

Coordinated by NWA. Three Steering Group meetings provided direction. (see Notes on meetings)

3.3   *What knowledge was exchanged and developed?*

Knowledge about planning in general, Hastings planning, Hastings communities, UCH facilities and capabilities, neighbourliness, archive management, website architecture, volunteering.

3.3   *What did On Our Doorsteps contribute? What other support would have been useful?*

Contributions: Seed funding; Helpful series of networking events, one hosted by HCPR project; Useful templates (e.g. this one for a Self- evaluation report) Other support: Dedicated IT support e.g. facilitating group emails and uploading material to UoB internet

4.   Neighbourliness

In what ways did the partnership promote an exchange between university and community that connects to themes and ideas of neighbourliness as set out in your original application? What were some of the challenges to this?

Useful exchanges – participation in the planning conference, accreditation visit, workshops at Falmer, training events at UCH.
Challenges include meshing project with course needs.

5.   Outputs

5.1   *What did the project produce? (eg conference papers, articles, book, film, new courses/modules, community outputs such as training sessions and questionnaires)*

The project output can be downloaded from
www.communityplanning.net/Hastings

It comprises:
- Application to On our Doorsteps
- Notes on Steering Group meetings (06, 09, 12)
- Series of Information sheets: Project information (01); website brief (02); Steering Group members (03), network (04), archive sources (13), archive digitization pilot.
- Categories for archiving (10)
- Digitising pilot (Hastings Pier competition 1990)
- Powerpoint presentations made at the Planning conference and the third Steering Group Meeting
- Development plan and Business Plan

6.   Outcomes

6.1   *What impact do you think the project had on:*

the community organisation/s and stakeholders;

Assisted with a general surge of interest in planning locally, in part stimulated by the Coalition government's Localism agenda. Awareness of need for the proposed resource.

the university
(see Appendix below for some possible indicators)

Realisation of the potential for the Town Planning course to engage with local communities.

7.   Longer term knowledge exchange work

7.1   *Please describe what your partnership plans to do next. How will the project and/or relationships develop at the end of this seed funding?*

Completion of business plan. Approach funding sources. Proceed if and when resources are available.

7.2   *How will the role of volunteers be developed to support future work?*

UoB Active Student Volunteering Opportunity form to be completed. Keep in touch with relevant course leaders. Assessment needed of ability of partners to continue volunteering.

8.   Statement of Income and Expenditure

Please explain any discrepancies between the budget in the project plan and actual income and expenditure.

Information to 31/3/2011 (corrected 24/2/2015)

Budget estimates (as application) (£):	Estimates (£) (as application)	Actual (£)	Note
Hastings Trust:			
- Project management - 1 day @ £400	400	0	1
Hastings Voluntary Action			
- Project management - 1 day @ £400	400	0	2
- Honoraria for groups and individuals			
compiling resources - 10 days @ £100	1,000	160	3
Nick Wates Associates:			
- Project management and editing - 4 days @ £400	1,600	2,966.43	4
- Graphic and web design - 5 days @ £200	1,000	1,440	5
- Compiling resources - 4 days @ £100	400	100	6
Expenses eg scanning, printing, travel	200	333.57	7
TOTAL - initial grant	**5,000**	**5,000**	
Metrics admin (extra grant)	1,000	1,000	

TOTAL	6,000	6,000	

1. Allocation not required.
2. Exchange of Fran McKeown time on HCPR (16 hours) with Nick Wates time on planning conference (17 hours). No money exchanged.
3. Compiling resources by groups stage not reached. Budget used in part for feasibility work by Green IT Company and on training course in Drupal organised by the Media Enterprise Centre.
4. More project management and editing than anticipated.
5. More graphic and web design than anticipated.
6. Only sample material processed to date.
7. More printing then anticipated due largely to planning conference.

9. Quantitative evaluation

Please give an estimation of:

9.1 *The number of people involved in the partnership*

Steering Group - 12, Green IT Co - 1, Network – 24, Total 37

9.2 *The number of people involved in events/workshops you have run*

Planning conference participants – c.100

9.3 *The numbers of people who have benefitted from the activities you have undertaken*

As above

9.4 *The numbers of hours the partners have worked on the project and please indicate by how much this number was more or less than initially planned for.*

Information to 31/3/2011   Paid and unpaid hours tbc

Role	Total hours	Paid hours	Unpaid hours	Notes
Steering group (uni and community)	To come	To come	To come	
Project Manager	104	58	46	Unpaid hours not initially planned
Graphic designer	79	48	31	Unpaid hours not initially planned
Web consultant	5	3	2	Unpaid hours not initially planned
Network members	To come	To come	To come	

9.5 *Where more hours were spent on the project than planned, please indicate how this time was paid for, or whether it was voluntary*

Unpaid hours by University and Voluntary Sector Steering Group members were mostly undertaken as part of work in salaried positions. Other unpaid hours were voluntary.

APPENDIX

Suggested Impact Indicators

1.   University

1.1.   Staff

- training of tutors
- staff promotion
- networking within university
- interdisciplinary connections and connections across the administrative divide

1.2.   Teaching

- influence on teaching methods
- new course content on existing modules
- development work on new modules/courses
- validation of new modules/courses

1.3.   Research

- RAE submission/facilitation
- influence on colleagues' research base

1.4.   Student Learning

- student opportunities and experience in community practice
- student dissertations
- enrolment on new modules/courses

1.5.   Dissemination

- conferences
- papers
- books
- email influence
- invitations to disseminate (eg as keynotes speakers)

2.   Community

2.1.   Staff

- experience teaching on university modules
- continuing professional development
- skills development support
- increased job satisfaction
- increased staff/volunteer competence, credibility, employability & promotion

2.2.   Service users

- benefits to local economy and quality of life for individuals
- improved access to services
- developed understanding of user need

2.3.   Organisation

- savings to service providers
- organisational change
- increased funding
- increased ability to articulate and promote work

3.   Joint

- Joint funding submissions
- Influencing local and national practices, strategies and policies
- Development of new services
- Ongoing relationships with project partners
- Community of practice development