



Research Report on Case Studies of Community Organising

Models of Value that Community Organising Generates for its Adopters

Prepared for
Power to Change &
Community Organisers Ltd

Pat McGinn
PMG Consulting
February 2022

Contents

1	Executive Summary	1
2	Background & Methods.....	4
2.1	Introduction.....	4
2.2	Case Studies of Adopters	5
2.3	Sources for Case Studies	6
2.4	Topics Participants Discussed	6
2.5	Analysis of Material.....	7
2.6	Other Data.....	8
3	Findings.....	10
3.1	Overview of Field Challenges	10
3.2	Acorn	12
3.3	Centre4.....	13
3.4	Grapevine	14
3.5	Heart of Hastings.....	15
3.6	High Trees.....	16
3.7	Starting Point.....	17
3.8	Trefnu Cymunedol Cymru / Together Creating Communities	18
3.9	Summary of the Models of Value	19
4	Discussion	21
5	Conclusions.....	26
	Research Participants.....	29
	Interview Topics Guide	30
	References	31

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a qualitative research report on the relationship between the activity of community organising and the value agencies that adopt the approach, and their stakeholders, perceive it to deliver. It is an exploratory study of how adopters of the approach understand the nature of the benefits they derive from it.

Two types of adopters were of interest to the commissioners: social action hubs; and community anchor organisations. Community Organisers Ltd, the membership body and a leading training provider for organising in England, had a focus on the network of social action hubs it has sponsored. Some of these hubs are also community anchor organisations but others are not. Hubs may not have the assets that enable the anchors to carry out their work.

Power to Change supports and develops community businesses through an endowment from the National Lottery Community Fund. It wished the research to explore how organising fits with community business structures. Both commissioners shared an interest in the value community organising generates. The research involved:

- in-depth interviews with sources in seven social action hubs, three of which were also community anchors;
- synthesis of the material the interviews produced for each hub into a community business model of value;
- analysis of these models in relation to field development issues;
- commentary on what the findings suggest are important features of the trajectory of development for the field as a whole.

Findings

The adopters deploy community organising (hereafter 'organising') in richly different ways. Differences in context, in relation to income sources and sectoral relationships, are important alongside adopters' own organisational histories. Some of these histories are relatively short, as the adopter came into existence more recently, often constituted with the express purpose of organising. Others, with longer histories, have come to understand the way in which organising enables a disadvantaged community to locate within itself the social energy that facilitates local people to pose credible challenge to the status quo, taking action to advance their sense of social justice.

While histories and contexts vary, the models of organising that all hubs adopt are similar. All hubs are guided by the [Framework](#) that Community Organisers Ltd developed. All seven adopters are convinced that the practice model 'works' and their counterparts in local third or public sector organisation share this view. For all but one of these adopters, organising is core to their work, it is their 'go to' methodology. Adopters perceive considerable value through organising:

- the primary personal benefit local organisers obtain from the practice is the sense of personal agency they secure through collective action;

- the catalyst effect adopters highlight is the change to collaborative relationships between adopters and other third and public sector organisations; and
- the capacity value for adopters' partners includes greater insight for statutory sector managers into local social needs.

The research makes a strong social value case for organising. The revenue model remains highly reliant on grant-aid to resource the activity. There appears little prospect of surpluses flowing from organising being available for adopters to accumulate. Without such surpluses the scope for the growth of the community organising field remains dependent on resources from outside the field. There is interest among some hubs in developing their own traded income models through tendering for public sector work. The volume of the commissions the hubs have secured are limited. However, there is scope for those hubs that wish to develop such models for the income to make sizeable financial contributions to cover costs.

The research includes examples of where organising:

- offers savings to statutory budgets;
- facilitates community economic development work;
- supports the growth of more inclusive financial services in the local community;
- promotes active civic engagement of local people;
- contributes to the delivery of high-quality public services by local statutory providers; and
- augments community cohesion through its relational work.

A summary of the evidence the research provides for the models of values is in Section 3.9 below.

Implications

The analysis implies that attention to the following issues will strengthen the trajectory of development for the organising field:

- moving towards a more collective framing of funding issues through a learning network approach;
- developing a collaborative learning network for policy influencing work that provides a space for public, philanthropic and practice stakeholders to explore their shared understanding of the field's development needs; and
- deepening the evidence base for the work through a systematic approach to knowledge management and value measurement that enhances the likelihood of success of competitively tendered bids and strengthens the case for continuing grant-aid.

The report concludes that stakeholders' models of value have their cores in how organising generates strong bonds of solidarity between practitioners and the local people with whom they work. The methodology channels a social energy that fosters the sense of agency through which those engaged come to understand their own power and to exercise this in relation to the social issues they identify. The impact narratives the research participants report frequently refers to practitioners connecting with public sector agencies, at both

management and operational levels. While other practice models common in the third sector could make similar claims, the distinctive contribution organising makes (with respect to collaboration across sectors) lies in the insistence that organising maintains its challenge to the structural inequalities that underpin the power dynamic. It is this inequality in power that ultimately governs the ways the public agency manages the issues.

The narratives of those research participants who work inside the public sector relates how it is this challenge that is at the core of the value of organising for them. The learning network proposal seeks to find the route for organising into more upstream parts of the policy process and to extend its practice influencing into additional domains, including those concerned with place-based regeneration. The ways in which organising influences practice models that some public sector organisations adopt is clearest in health and wellbeing.

The research explored in some detail the prospects for organising obtaining financial resources through the trading activities of the hubs. The research did identify some instances where hubs were in a position to develop community business approaches to the financing of organising. However, these were at an early stage of development. It is unlikely that such income streams will replace the revenue that enabled the field to advance during the last decade. It is important that CO Ltd, the hubs and others active in the organising field work together with public and philanthropic funding agencies to formulate a sustainable revenue model for organising.

2 BACKGROUND & METHODS

2.1 Introduction

Power to Change (PtC) commissioned this research to explore what the value of organising is to agencies that adopt the approach. For Community Organisers Ltd (CO Ltd) “community organising is the work of bringing people together to take action around their common concerns and overcome social injustice”¹. Some of the adopters are ‘community anchor organisations’. For Locality (2018: p 6) anchors are “place-based, multi-purpose organisations, which are locally-led and deeply rooted in their neighbourhoods”. Other adopters are Social Action Hubs. CO Ltd defines this “as the term we use to describe local hubs of community organising, which are also quality assured training hubs affiliated to Community Organisers”². Other agencies, neither anchors nor hubs are simply adopters of the organising model of practice.

This research reflects on the ways in which adopters use of organising contributes to their mission. The research reports on seven case studies of how anchors and hubs do this. All of those included in the case studies adopt organising as a methodology to bring about change that addresses social justice issues. A fuller understanding of the ways in which anchors and hubs support organising is important. Through this support organising may access at least some of the financial and other resources it requires, eg networks within and across sectors.

The field of organising has been developed substantially between 2011 and 2020 through two national programmes. The original Community Organisers Programme was a government resourced programme that delivered training to 5,000 community organisers across England between 2011 and 2015. The successor programme, the Community Organisers Expansion Programme ran from 2017 to 2020 and delivered training to an additional 3,500 organisers. CO Ltd was the delivery partner for the quality assured training and nationally recognised qualifications, which it delivered through its affiliated hubs. Securing the resources to grow the volume of organising practice further in domains where actors have yet to become aware of its potential contribution to their work will require substantial additional resources.

In this report I use the term 'field' to refer to the social space in which agencies from across sectors engage with organising, some as practitioners, adopters, hubs, representative membership bodies, including CO Ltd, as well as funders of the work. A field theory perspective provides a lens through which one may clarify the development issues for organising that give rise to the need for field strengthening. An important part of strengthening involves linking organising to governmental and third sector organisations,

¹ CO Ltd define community organising at <https://www.corganisers.org.uk/what-is-community-organising/>.

² CO Ltd define hubs at <https://www.corganisers.org.uk/training/more-about-social-action-hubs/>.

drawing actors in these sectors into relationships with adopters that facilitate influencing, learning, resource sharing, etc. Stachowiak et al (2020) note that field strengthening, network development and practice uptake interventions may serve to advance social change alongside social movement approaches. Following recent work from the Bridgespan Group (2020), they propose that a mature field in the philanthropic social change sector will have five features:

- a knowledge base that is both robust and growing ('evolving'), that facilitates actors to understand the depth and complexity of the issues, while providing access to research that guides actors towards contextually appropriate interventions;
- actors with a common sense of identity and vision about the growth of the field that spans 'on-the-ground' practitioners as well as others in leadership roles;
- a clear and dynamic agenda for the field that actors in leadership roles co-create that guide work across the field on solutions to field development issues;
- an adaptive infrastructure that facilitates knowledge sharing, access to technical assistance, hosting convenings of actors (from this and related fields) and pooling / sharing resources, both financial and other;
- and sufficient and sustainable levels of resources that provide the wherewithal or brokerage for 'on-the-ground' organisations to operate efficiently and effectively.

Drawing on other innovation work, these authors suggest that fields may mature through four stages:

- initial *framing* of the concepts and practices;
- early *networking* among practitioners as a response to the fragmentation of the field;
- *maturation*, characterised by implementation support work for practitioners, and convergence towards common standards and tools;
- *standardisation of practice*, achieved through training, credentialing and certification.

In the longer-term movement towards maturation should deliver field level outcomes including:

- actors being able to act with agility, adapting practices to fit with changing dynamic contexts;
- secure infrastructure that facilitates information-sharing, professional development and 'clearing house' functions in relation to actors in other fields / expressions of interest in joint work; and
- sustained public support for the field both through financial inputs, resources-in-kind and practice champions.

2.2 Case Studies of Adopters

The research applied an in-depth qualitative case study approach to ensure that the analysis reflected the reality of organising by the agencies adopting it. The research draws together interview data with stakeholders in seven of CO Ltd's affiliated hubs. The exception is

Trefnu Cymunedol Cymru / Together Creating Communities (TCC), which because it is in Wales, is outside the geographical boundaries of the funding that resources CO Ltd’s hubs work. The seven included here carry out significant community anchoring functions (two identify as anchors, most of the others include anchoring activities in their work programmes). All seven exemplify at least some of PtC’s four ‘key features’ of a community business (locally rooted, trading to benefit local community, accountable to it and impactful in it).

2.3 Sources for Case Studies

For each case study I sought in-depth telephone interviews with four authoritative sources including: a management source in the adopter agency; an organising practitioner working in the adopter agency; a commissioner or statutory partner of the adopter’s work (likely a public sector organisation (PSO), local government or housing organisation); and a ‘trusted other’ (possibly from a local third sector organisation (TSO). Where I secured interviews with at least two of the four stakeholder groups, I incorporated that case into the main body of material I report on below. Where it was not possible to secure input from at least two stakeholders the case was not included in the sample on which I report below.

The table below shows that six of the seven have at least one external source, working in either public or third sectors. There were interviews with management in all cases, and in six of the seven with a practitioner working through the hub as well. Four cases incorporate input from local TSO and three from public sector agencies.

Case Study & Sources	Manager	Practitioner	Public Sector	Third Sector
Acorn, Newcastle	✓	✓		✓
Centre 4, Grimsby	✓	✓	✓	
Grapevine, Coventry	✓	✓	✓	✓
Heart of Hastings	✓	✓		
High Trees, Lambeth	✓	✓		
Starting Point, Stockport	✓	✓	✓	
TCC, North Wales	✓			✓

Across the seven case studies, twenty stakeholder representatives participated (details and interview topics appended). The design of the interviews provided a full opportunity for our participants to comment on what they considered to be relevant to the topics. On average interviews required just under an hour, although in some cases, second interviews were required.

2.4 Topics Participants Discussed

Participants had a full opportunity to contribute their perspective on the issues that they considered important for the research to address. The topics included:

- how organising enables the adopter address important features of the context in which they work;

- how organising fits with other ways of working the adopter applies;
- the contribution organising makes to delivering the adopter’s mission;
- the nature of the benefits organising delivers for the adopter;
- the changes organising has aided the adopter bring about, internally and externally;
- the financial and other costs associated with organising for the adopter;
- the sources of revenue that the adopter accesses to cover these costs; and
- the potential for adopters to generate income (other than grant-aid) to cover these costs.

Throughout the interviews issues of how adopters do or might secure trading income from organising were introduced where appropriate.

2.5 Analysis of Material

I use the term ‘community business model of value’ to refer to how adopters understand the value they deliver. While the revenue / income models tend not to anticipate surpluses, they do set out to deliver value, not to ‘customers’ per se, but rather to ‘stakeholders’, whether local people or ‘anchors’ that host practitioners or partner agencies, some of which are statutory agencies, others from the third sector.

The template for the analysis of the material builds on the idea of a business model canvas adapted to the features of social rather than for-profit enterprise (Sparviero; 2019). The ‘canvas’ is a table that sets out a limited number of the fundamental building blocks that fit together to summarise the business model. In this case our interest is in how organising delivers value to adopters that contributes to its current or potential capacity to raise revenue, whether through trading or grant-aid.

The components of the template correspond to issues highlighted in the original terms of reference for the research. The canvases, one for each adopter, allow for the comparison of the different business models that the hubs use. In this sense the community business model canvas permits the comparative analysis across different cases. The material below presents the community business value models for each of the seven case studies.

Template of the Model of Value that Organising Generates			
Strategic Issues & Relations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ partners ➤ collaborations ➤ stakeholders ➤ relationships ➤ networks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ within sector ○ cross-sector ➤ management ➤ governance 	‘Fit’ of organising with Adopter’s Context <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ relevance to local social issues ➤ relevance to local economy ➤ contribution to Adopter’s strategy 	Centrality of organising to Adopter’s Work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ mission ➤ fit with other methods ➤ fit with local economy work 	Contribution of organising to Adopter’s community business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ local rootedness ➤ trading for local community ➤ accountability to local community ➤ impact on local community

Template of the Model of Value that Organising Generates			
Value Proposition of Practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ activities to deliver each value proposition ➤ pathways to stakeholders for delivery of value ➤ management of practice 	Benefit Value Proposition of organising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ for local people ➤ for local communities ➤ as agency ➤ as anchor of local economic development 	Catalyst Value Proposition of organising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ performance ➤ governance ➤ profitability ➤ resilience ➤ sustainability 	Capacity Value Proposition of Hub <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ as source of costs ➤ as source of revenue ➤ as reputational / competitive advantage ➤ as generator of revenue
Costs, Revenues & Surpluses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ financial resources ➤ non-financial resources 	Cost Structure for Adopter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ cash costs (organising staff) ➤ organisational costs (management) ➤ opportunity costs ➤ additional costs of trading ➤ payers of costs (Adopter v others) 	Revenue Structure for Adopter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ sources of revenue (actual & prospective) ➤ alternatives to Adopter financing ➤ Adopter's offer to payers ➤ Pricing (subscription, 'brokerage', negotiated) 	Surplus Opportunity for Adopter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ organising's added value for Adopter's offer ➤ advantage Adopter secures from organising ➤ potential to generate additional income for Adopter
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ How hub is similar to, and different from, others 			

At an earlier stage of the research hub leads received fuller write-ups of their models, a reasonably complete summary of the material in a textual rather than tabular form. Comments received from the leads have been incorporated into the tables presented below.

2.6 Other Data

In addition to the interview material, the research included reviews of, firstly, data from PtC on the community business market and, secondly, annual reports and similar documents. I reviewed the annual reports and income and expenditure material on the hubs and anchors that were on the original sampling list of twelve agencies that had adopted organising.

PtC's Annual Survey of the community business market asked respondents to comment on the three 'most important' types of business support that would contribute to their sustainability. In the 2019 survey, a sixth (53 out of 312, 17%), selected community organising support. A sizeable proportion of community businesses have some sense that organising has something to offer them. This implies there is a potential market for organising within the community business sector.

The 2017 survey used a different questionnaire design. This treated organising as one of the possible aids to marketing and communications. The data suggests that around 70% (250) of that community businesses cohort viewed access to support on organising as positive. The 2015 report suggests that organising support appealed to most sectors of the community business market but was infrequently accessed. The data is fragmentary but it suggests there may be some scope for organising to offer additional support to the market, in relation to the engagement of local people with the businesses in ways that enhance the businesses' accountability to their local community.

For the financial accounts data, the research reviewed material in annual reports that hub leads made available or could be sourced from regulatory bodies' sites. The focus here was on the hubs' finances. Of particular interest, was the current or future prospects for any surplus being available for organising activities other than grant-aid. The review of the material suggests the prospects for surplus being available for organising are modest.

3 FINDINGS

In this section, I present the models of value. I preface the models of value with a short comment on the case studies as a whole.

3.1 Overview of Field Challenges

For the most part participants perceive that much of the progress is in practice ‘on the ground’, while emerging challenges that arise for the broader field strengthening work include:

- sustaining the trajectory of growth evident through the 2010s and ensuring that alongside the growing numbers of skilled organisers that hubs and local organising groups generate, the relationships of trust between actors in the field across roles, organisational, sectoral and domain boundaries remain strong and durable;
- facilitating learning among policy audiences, about the pro-change capacity that organising delivers, in particular among those in senior management within the funding community, both governmental and philanthropic; and
- communicating a persuasive narrative of the contribution organising may make to a range of policy domains, while presenting this in ways that protects the core dynamic (social justice action imperative), while upholding the legitimacy of organising, crucially in the challenge it transmits from citizens to statutory agencies.

Implementation / ‘how to’ issues that some of the sources identified focus on capacity building measures:

- how to build capacity among adopters to retain independence from local government and statutory organisations with which they work, while ensuring they are able to collaborate but in ways that does not leave them vulnerable to the perception of being part of these agencies;
- how to develop, maintain and disseminate the capabilities among adopters to communicate the impact of organising, which gives rise to recording, documenting and sharing credible evidence on ‘how we know we are being successful’ and ‘what works for whom in what contexts’. The Youth Endowment Fund provides a clearly set out example of this core issue [here](#);
- locate the contribution organising may make to reducing demand for frontline public services, thus delivering savings in expenditure for statutory services;
- in relation to public expenditure savings the measurement requires careful attention, for example, to the interaction of organising with delayed admission to care;
- for hubs interested in community business models, what approach will make available the requisite support that will enable these adopters develop trading income and become functioning community businesses in the medium term. One possibility would involve hubs becoming eligible for match-funding grant-aid as they secured trading income; and
- more broadly, creating the conditions that facilitates PSOs, from which hubs secure

commissions, to maintain collaborative working while hubs challenge cultural assumptions within the agency that reproduce structural inequalities.

Below are the models of value that organising delivers for each of the case studies. Each canvas is a table that distils the material from the interviews with participants. The material noted in the table reflects the opinion of at least two of the participants in that case study. As only one of the hubs was in a position to offer participants across all four target stakeholders (management, practitioner, public and third sector partners), requiring at least two of the three to reflect a particular entry provides for triangulation to buttress the credibility and validity of the material. It is worth noting that these are models of the way stakeholders perceive a particular hub's organising.

With regard to the interpretation of the material in each canvas, the rows are more relevant than the columns. The row s brings together summary contextual observations in row 1, aspects of the value propositions hubs offer in 2, the elements of the revenue model in 3 and comparison (to other hubs) in row 4.

- 1) The top row covers how the hub fits or aligns with, reading from left to right,
 - aspects of the context in which it works,
 - the strategy of the host organisation within which the hub operates,
 - features of the context in which the hub works that help forms its organising practice,
 - the centrality of organising to the work of the hub and the contribution of organising to the hub's community business credentials;
- 2) The second row summarises the dimensions of the value proposition the hub offers,
 - the value for the interface between local people taking part and the hub's broader framing of its work,
 - the micro-level personal benefits local people obtain from taking part in organising,
 - the way in which the activity serves as a catalyst for other change processes the hub pursues,
 - the greater capacity that the activity provides for the hub, for example, facilitating its access to potential partners;
- 3) The penultimate row draws together the material participants contributed on income and expenditure features of the hub's revenues model,
 - the basic features of how the hub frames its revenue model,
 - the estimate of the costs of organising for the hub,
 - the primary source of revenue for the activity, and
 - a comment on whether the revenue model currently or potentially offers the prospect of a surplus profit for growth; and
- 4) The final row that 'compares and contrasts' the hub to its peers, showing its similarity to, and difference from, other hubs' approaches.

3.2 Acorn

Model of Value that Organising Generates for Acorn			
<p>Strategic Issues & Relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Members have a preeminent decision-making status, managed through 'coordinated autonomy' arrangements that govern local / regional / national campaign design; 	<p>'Fit' of organising with Adopter's Context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising provides route for people experiencing disadvantage to acquire depth understanding of 'serious issues' focussed on power relations & how these frames social injustice they experience; 	<p>Centrality of organising to Adopter's Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Acorn works solely through organising, which it applies to direct external & internal practice; 	<p>Contribution of organising to community business stance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Door knocking sustains rootedness in its neighbourhoods, dues enable members to hold agency accountable, & impact through campaigning, eg for renters, is marked, while gov commissioning is problematic;
<p>Value Proposition of Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Value flows from maintenance of close relations between organisers & members that ensures practice aligns with their interests & provides space for 'coordinated autonomy'; 	<p>Benefit Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Value for members is: 1) discovery by them of the power they have to bring about meaningful social change & 2) the effect on their lives that the intervention secures for them; 	<p>Catalyst Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Acorn has brought about policy change, eg by banks on pro-poor mortgages, through mobilising large protest actions but its 'start with the people & not the issue' makes specifying results difficult; 	<p>Capacity Value Proposition of Hub</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hub status delivers capacity to 1) extend into new places, 2) packages Acorn's quality assured training for new members, 3) enhances credibility of offer to independent funders;
<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Acorn anticipates input from trusts to pay for staff costs until replaced from new members' dues; 	<p>Cost Structure for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Cost per Organiser is c. £30k pa, with 400 members' dues of c. £6 monthly sufficient to cover this cost; 	<p>Revenue Structure for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Revenue model anticipates self-sustaining activity from dues with grant-aid limited to initial 'seed-funding'; 	<p>Surplus Opportunity for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Currently dues are paying for the larger part of costs, trading models may offer a surplus but risks distorting mission;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Acorn shares with others the adherence to tenets of the practice model ('door knocking', 'plan, act, reflect', etc) through which the process delivers personal micro-level benefits; ➤ It differs from others with respect to its revenue model, flowing from the 'members pay dues' tradition, & its local / national structure that frames its work to bring about institutional changes; 			

3.3 Centre4

Model of Value that Organising Generates for Centre4			
<p>Strategic Issues & Relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Relations with local gov are important & advanced through, eg, its work hosting a Forum that provides a space to network agencies across sectors; 	<p>'Fit' of organising with Adopter's Context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising's 'listening' imperative contributes to insight for management on local needs, creating a channel from the Centre to the estate, and onwards to local gov; 	<p>Centrality of organising to Adopter's Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising provides methodology to challenge historical reliance by area on local gov to resolve estate issues through enabling locals to own responsibility & exercise agency; 	<p>Contribution of organising to community business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising staff aid local rootedness, accountability & impact through channelling communication between Centre & estate, while signposting locals to hub supports for community businesses;
<p>Value Proposition of Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Management encourage staff across work streams to engage with organising workers to promote local people's connections to its projects & partners who co-locate in Centre; 	<p>Benefit Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising facilitates locals 1) to access Centre's & co-locating support projects & 2) frame their response to shrinking local gov, in ways that challenge dependency & fosters agency; 	<p>Catalyst Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Feedback on local needs via organising & on TSOs' collaborative interests via Forum enhances scope for local gov to support resource bids for actions x-sectors to meet these; 	<p>Capacity Value Proposition for Local Gov</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Advancing organising across local gov requires critical mass of the practice model across area's TSOs; ➤ This combined with a commercial orientation to funding will aid local gov's uptake;
<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PtC's Empowering Places (EP) Programme paid for costs of 2 part-time organising staff; 	<p>Cost Structure for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Estimated salary plus on-costs are c. £45k per full-time equivalent organiser; 	<p>Revenue Structure for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ After PtC's EP Programme a possible revenue model involves earning income from fees for Social Value Act aligned inputs its organising contributes to collaborative bids with TSOs for local gov contacts; 	<p>Surplus Opportunity for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ As there are pressing demands for social provision to address local needs, eg welfare rights advice, these will likely secure priority over organising for any available surplus;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Centre4 shares with others partnership working with local government; ➤ It differs from many others in deploying organising as one of a suite of comm methodologies; 			

3.4 Grapevine

Model of Value that Organising Generates for Grapevine			
<p>Strategic Issues & Relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Grapevine's organising builds on 25 years tackling isolation, historically of disabled people, now more broadly, across many localities in Coventry & Warwickshire; 	<p>'Fit' of organising with Adopter's Context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Participants 'hold in their own hands' the power & hence the personal agency that the organising process asks them to exercise on an issue, eg 'right to party' of disabled people; 	<p>Centrality of organising to Adopter's Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising is core to its 3 strategic strands, sparking action, strengthening people & shifting power, & blends easily with other approaches it adopts, eg participants 'understanding own narrative'; 	<p>Contribution of organising to community business stance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising enhances Grapevine's local rootedness & accountability through strengthening its engagement capability, & amplifies its impact through contributing to 'shifting power' to participants;
<p>Value Proposition of Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Creating relationships is primary driver of progress, activity specifics are secondary, & through hub mechanism agency channels its organising work to participants; 	<p>Benefit Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Core benefit for local people is a route out of 'loneliness & isolation' fostered through playful practice that enhances personal & agency value participants secure; 	<p>Catalyst Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising serves to catalyse the 'unusual leaders' it helps disabled people to become, channelling their power to 'make' a city-wide 'social movement'; 	<p>Capacity Value Proposition for local Gov</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Local gov perceive organising as pathway to access capacity, commitment & energy untapped by other approaches, which aids Grapevine to enhance its reputation in local gov;
<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Agency secures grant-aid for its 8 staff involved with organising from mix of gov, Community Fund & independent trusts; 	<p>Cost Structure for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Grapevine adopt full cost recovery approach, which gives rise to a nominal estimate of c. £46k per organising staff member; 	<p>Revenue Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Statutory commissioning is problematic as organising, is typically not open to impact specification at outset; 	<p>Surplus Opportunity for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Local gov sources consider a social enterprise vehicle could secure revenues from delivering to it training in organising & consultancy;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Grapevine shares with others a desire to integrate organising with other activities across the agency; ➤ It differs from others in the retention of its heritage mission (isolation that people with disabilities experience) while adapting organising as its go-to skillset to advance its mission; 			

3.5 Heart of Hastings

Model of Value that Organising Generates for Heart of Hastings (HoH)			
<p>Strategic Issues & Relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ HoH is a community land trust that seeks to challenge & reduce the precarity that many experience through developing affordable accommodation in which to live & work; 	<p>'Fit' of organising with Adopter's Context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Value for HoH' context flows from its engagement of intended beneficiaries in the management & practice of the work, acquiring habits, eg self-management, that fosters business start-up, incl social enterprises; 	<p>Centrality of organising to Adopter's Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising serves HoH to advance its place-shaping agenda as through organising it initiates & sustains a form of regeneration that draws people excluded from quality housing & employment into control of public resources; 	<p>Contribution of organising to community business stance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising contributes to HoH' rootedness in (through door knocking), accountability to (through share issue), and impact on local communities (through bottom-up development sites);
<p>Value Proposition of Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ HoH' organising practice addresses 'root causes' through work across domains that reinforce precarity (employment, housing, regeneration, heritage); 	<p>Benefit Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Micro-level benefit flows from the discovery of agency, ('self-power') organising delivers, which serves to foster a vision of community directed regeneration; 	<p>Catalyst Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ HoH developed applications of organising that potentially catalyses changes in Orbit's social housing practice (reframing a complaints procedure as 'intelligence' from tenants); 	<p>Capacity Value Proposition of Hub</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hub forms a structure for HoH & neighbouring CLT to train local organisers, drawing these into comm-led regeneration, supporting other TSOs, resourcing organising work inside HoH;
<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ HoH wishes to secure the resources required to mitigate effects on participants of withdrawal of support from investors who wish to withdraw; 	<p>Cost Structure for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ HoH anticipates multiple sources to cover the circa £75k annually that HoH's current staffing entails; 	<p>Revenue Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Independent trusts are interested in HoH' offer as it has 'proof of concept' for organising applied to community land trust work at-scale; 	<p>Surplus Opportunity for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ HoH envisages potential surplus opportunity through grant-aid Hub participants secure, eg from Awards for All or sales to TSOs & local networks;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ HoH shares with other cases the insistence on the powerful agency effect at the micro-personal level; ➤ It differs from other cases as its mission has given rise to its willingness to make investment in organising 'at risk' (of partner withdrawal), eg its Power Station's Organisation Workshop; 			

3.6 High Trees

Model of Value that Organising Generates for High Trees			
<p>Strategic Issues & Relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Durable relations with local & other gov structures provide channels for organised local voices to exercise agency; 	<p>'Fit' of organising with Adopter's Context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising blends analysis of power & structural inequalities with established suite of community support services amplifies latter's value for High Trees; 	<p>Centrality of organising to Adopter's Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ High Trees uses its Framework (aligned to CO Ltd's & its own theory of change) to guide the work on integrating organising with its services; 	<p>Contribution of organising to community business stance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising serves to equip local people trained through hub with skills to foster community roots, impact & accountability of comm businesses;
<p>Value Proposition of Practice esp Hub</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hub device enhances 1) practice through enabling local people to secure quality assured organising skills & 2) management through facilitating the Framework for organising that guides its integration with work across hub; 	<p>Benefit Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Core benefit for participants is understanding relationship between their personal circumstances & collective issues, combined with imperative to act for greater social justice; 	<p>Catalyst Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Self-assessment toolkit guides organising practitioners to reflect on their support needs in relation to practice, esp in influencing & challenging statutory policy & practice; 	<p>Capacity Value Proposition of Hub</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Added capacity to engage with Borough, City gov & funders flows from the in-depth rooted connections with local people, while still limited by understanding of organising among many in public & third sectors;
<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Costs inside Team are 2 staff, historically staff funded through grant-aid, now moving towards more public sector commission income generation; 	<p>Cost Structure for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Growing income-earning capacity will entail costs for marketing, data system to record practice, reflective learning, management's time spent embedding organising across hub; 	<p>Revenue Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In 2019, has produced income of c. £7k, with greater additional capacity another £25k could have been earned; 	<p>Surplus Opportunity for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Agency is committed to advancing traded income generation services that will create strategic opportunity to fund activities without sole reliance on grant-aid;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ High Trees is similar to other hubs in the rootedness of its work in the local community; ➤ it differs in blending formalised knowledge management & working in-depth across sectoral boundaries; 			

3.7 Starting Point

Model of Value that Organising Generates for Starting Point			
<p>Strategic Issues & Relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 'Place' is important for Starting Point in Stockport as it co-locates with a sister-organisation, a community café / hub in a busy shopping precinct near a GP practice with which it works closely; 	<p>'Fit' of organising with Adopter's Context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising provides the means through which Starting Point draws locals into social justice activism with the senior organiser supporting them to understand the 'power dynamics' driving injustice; 	<p>Centrality of organising to Adopter's Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Starting Point applies organising across its 3 workstreams (organising, wellbeing & digital inclusion), using it to draw younger people into social action, challenge stereotyping of stigmatised people & raise issues of 'power & privilege'; 	<p>Contribution of organising to community business Stance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Listening work by its street champions sustains its roots in local comms in which these organisers work to challenge injustice & 'informal accountability' maintains a responsiveness to local needs;
<p>Value Proposition of Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Take-up of the hub training offer has been uneven, digital inclusion is well-received & local organisers provide the hub with a capacity to support & engage comms; 	<p>Benefit Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Benefits incl: reduced social isolation; increased social interaction; greater confidence in own skills; participation in civic affairs; pathway to local organiser training; 	<p>Catalyst Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hub identifies the necessary condition for securing higher value & more revenue from local gov is its acceptance of hub as a 'strategic' rather than a 'delivery' partner; 	<p>Capacity Value Proposition of Hub</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Local gov receptivity reflects staff experience of hub's training offer, higher among comm engagement staff & some councillors & has secured positive reputation for capability;
<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Local gov resources digital inclusion & Community Fund supports wellbeing work; 	<p>Cost Structure for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Costs are c. £130k pa; 	<p>Revenue Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Café pays Community Team costs c £60k pa & training delivers c. £70k pa in 2019; 	<p>Surplus Opportunity for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising's application to wellbeing workstream could be resourced through access to social prescribing budgets;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Starting Point shares with other cases a flexible usage of organising, adapted & responsive to local contexts; ➤ It differs from other cases through its adherence to its 'informal accountability' approach; 			

3.8 Trefnu Cymunedol Cymru / Together Creating Communities

Model of Value that Organising Generates for Trefnu Cymunedol Cymru / Together Creating Communities (TCC)

<p>Strategic Issues & Relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ TCC operates in North Wales, its governance admits institutions, eg churches, schools & Its influencing relies on durable partnerships with agencies engaged by the social justice issue in question; 	<p>'Fit' of organising with Adopter's Context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising provides TCC with a guide to how it may advance social justice issues through working collaboratively with its member institutions to influence Welsh & local gov policy & practice; 	<p>Centrality of organising to Adopter's Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising is TCC's <i>raison d'être</i>, guiding the process through which it uncovers issues (listening to 'whispers') through mobilising a coalition of influential partners, & articulating winnable asks of gov; 	<p>Contribution of organising to Adopter's community business stance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising contributes to TCC's local rootedness (listening), governance (durable relations between staff & institutions), accountability (to members) & impact (on social justice issues), ➤ does not wish to trade;
<p>Value Proposition of Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ TCC 1) listens carefully to concerns ('whispers') its network communicates, 2) forms these into actionable policy changes that address the issue, & 3) lobbies for the change with responsible gov agency; 	<p>Benefit Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Enabling 'unnatural leaders' to surface issues & align strategies to issues through training for them that enhances confidence, enabling them to acknowledge their own power; 	<p>Catalyst Value Proposition of organising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organising practice legitimises its authority to comment on policy issues in social justice terms & provide insight that relates citizens' experience to gov performance; 	<p>Capacity Value Proposition of Hub</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ TCC has many features that are comparable to those of hub in England, the agency may, eg through expansion, but has yet to identify the advantage it would secure from formal hub status;
<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The challenge of specifying outcomes remains as these are unknown in advance of the organising activity; 	<p>Cost Structure for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are 2 job-sharing experienced organising staff, 2 other job-sharing organising workers & 4 other staff (2019); 	<p>Revenue Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ TCC's funding is a mix of grant-aid, esp from the Community Fund, trusts, members' fees & training; 	<p>Surplus Opportunity for Adopter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Community Fund & trusts are receptive to funding organising & acknowledge value of TCC's use of it;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ TCC shares with other cases adherence to the positions specified in CO Ltd's Hub Framework; ➤ it differs from other cases in its policy position that avoids governmental funding; 			

3.9 Summary of the Models of Value

The personal level benefits that flow from organising are at the core of the value models. Below, the focus is on the broader relevance of these to public and third sectors. The models make credible claims that benefits flow for the local economy and third sector. The range and diversity of the context in which the adopters operate makes generalisation problematic but the participants report that these upstream benefits include:

- generating savings to public sector budgets –
 - in Coventry the savings are expected to accrue through lower levels of demand for services delivered to people with disabilities,
 - in Grimsby through enabling people to become more active in the labour market, thus tackling the level of dependency on social welfare payments and
 - in Stockport through creating opportunities for primary health care / general practice to signal to local people its affinity with the neighbourhood, thus encouraging their uptake of early diagnosis and preventative services;

- promoting community businesses and other social enterprise solutions to local people's needs –
 - in Grimsby through facilitating introductions of local people to the hub's own enterprises, including its ethical recruitment business and to those businesses that PtC's Empowering Places Programme generated through Centre4,
 - in Hastings through providing confidence building and training for self-help business ideas local people generated through the organisation workshop approach, and
 - in Lambeth through the progressive adoption of organising by different parts of the hub including its employment-focussed training and workspace offer to social enterprises;

- increasing the incomes of low paid workers and low income households –
 - in Wales through the organising campaign pursued by the hub working with schools, local councils and the Welsh Government to spread the adoption of the living wage for their employees,
 - in Newcastle through the hub using organising to bring about a pro-poor stance of a bank on its mortgage lending policy,
 - in Grimsby through organisers signposting local people onto welfare rights advice available in the hub;

- channelling people excluded from the labour market into reengagement pathways –
 - in Lambeth through the progressive application of the practice model by management throughout the hub including the work on pre-employment support and skills training for local people experiencing racial inequity,
 - in Grimsby through the hub creating options that facilitate local people experiencing long-term unemployment to access its ethical recruitment

company, with its organisers performing a key role of connecting one to the other;

- mobilising people to exercise their own agency through voluntary action on local issues –
 - in Grimsby through organisers using their 1-1 training from CO Ltd to encourage local people to volunteer in a community shop within the hub, and through this, foster an ethos in the neighbourhood that challenges the longstanding expectation that local government will resolve local needs,
 - in Coventry through organisers with disabilities using ‘intentional listening’ to equip themselves for leadership roles that enable them to advance the social participation rights of their peers, within a social movement framing of the process, rather than, for example, a more traditional perspective of ‘services for disabled people’;

- enabling people to become leaders of their own collective action projects –
 - in Stockport through the hub’s senior organiser supporting its network of ‘street champions’ to understand the ‘power dynamics’ and use this understanding to challenge discriminatory language that serves to reinforce patterns of social exclusion,
 - In Wrexham through the organisers providing the required training for ‘natural leaders’ to work towards government agencies changing their positions on policy, eg wage levels for their employees, or practice, eg access for women experiencing exclusion from public swimming pools;

- expanding the capacity of other parts of the third sector –
 - in Grimsby through the hub providing administrative support for the voluntary and community sector forum that the local council sponsors, which works towards greater collaboration within the third sector and between it and the public sector,
 - in Coventry, Stockport and Wrexham through the fostering of the practical leadership skills among those with whom these hubs work, which skills have a high degree of transferability to other third sector settings;

- the role of organising in promoting belief in the possibility of change in disadvantaged communities was an important theme in the perspectives of participants from outside the hubs,
 - in Grimsby one participant referred to the importance of the hubs work in encouraging local people to develop their own responses to unemployment and its consequences rather than to rely on local government, while accepting the continuing enablement support that such responses would require, and
 - in Coventry a participant noted the corollary of this, ie hubs fostering the belief among statutory providers that it was feasible to leave local leaders equipped with organising skills to deliver on work previously reserved for the public sector.

4 DISCUSSION

In this section I comment on some of the broader questions to which the findings give rise.

Demonstrating savings from organising for public sector

Public sector participants commented on the desirability of hubs being able to present more robust evidence of the savings to statutory budgets that organising delivers. This would help build the case for local statutory agencies to work with hubs and release savings for public services. The potential impact on the field would:

- strengthen the authority with which hubs may comment on public policy;
- contribute to the case for continuing public support for local practice and national infrastructure; and
- extend influence into expenditure allocation bodies, for example, Clinical Commissioning Groups in the health and wellbeing arena.

The capability would require attention to:

- appropriate 'standards of evidence' for these claims of savings;
- access to required data and analysis skills; and
- clarification by hubs of the mechanisms through which the savings flow from organising.

Amplifying organising's voice on local development issues

Strengthening the bridge for organising into local economic development will help connect the field with the outworking of Government's Build Back Better and Shared Prosperity Fund agendas. Organising's depth of work at the local neighbourhood level leaves it well-placed to comment on the implications of the agendas for social justice in relation to:

- labour market policies that address precarious employment, low value-added job growth and low pay among many in work;
- financial inclusion policies that may face pressure to move beyond relatively modest adjustments to the products offered by the financial services sector; and
- the intersection of social and environmental justice and the ways in which local people understand the implications of one for the other and what this implies for public policy that will secure the engagement of disadvantaged groups.

The track record of hubs working on these issues is already substantial. The outworking of Government's policy agendas provides a timely opportunity for organising to channel local people's positions on these into policy debates.

Resources for growing organising

The original Community Organising Programme and its Expansion Programme resourced substantial growth in the numbers of trained organisers and in the infrastructure of hubs through which they organise. While community business and other social enterprise models may have a role in the business planning of some hubs, the viability of the

infrastructure that supports these, currently accommodated by CO Ltd, is uncertain without support from public and philanthropic sources.

Organising's influence on practice and policy

With regard to the range of policy domains in which organising has secured a presence, the case studies include examples of practice influencing work:

- marked progress in health and wellbeing, adult education and training;
- modest progress in housing; while
- little progress was noted in policing and community safety.

The contribution that organising may make to place-based approaches is considerable. Among the ways organising facilitates these approaches are:

- engaging local people in the process, enabling them to define the issues that they wish to address;
- fostering partnerships between public and third sector organisations; and
- creating pathways that enable local people to challenge power, through linking local people with public sector management.

There may be scope for CO Ltd to secure the resources that would permit the network of hubs to inform local agencies developing place-based work of the added value their organisers could make to the approaches. This could involve articulating the ways in which organising:

- fits with the context of local people's lives;
- enables participants to identify opportunities to engage practically with the issue and
- fosters their motivation to become responsible for their role in managing the issue.

In terms of the field as a whole, the more general case for organising will be made stronger by the hubs covering a reduced range of policy domains but each in some depth. The range will facilitate the formation of domain-specific clusters of hubs. The clustering will facilitate sharing of time-costs and provide for a division of labour within the cluster, which in turn facilitate each hub learning from the practice of its peers.

Advancing the influence of organising at the policy level will require action at the different levels of government. At the local government level hubs will already participate in forums in which both policy managers and hubs participate. At the national level the work of CO Ltd has already secured a presence in policy discussions. A point that many sources made during the interviews was the perception that, for the most part, their funders had understood the organising practice model, they 'got it'. The challenge for the field is to shift attention to upstream policy processes.

Hubs and community businesses

The extent of hubs' overlap with community business models is still at an early stage of development:

- While a majority of the adopters have some community business features, for these the early trading activity delivers less income than philanthropic grant-aid and the nature of the trading appears to have some of the features of a grant-aid transaction.
- For some of the adopters, there is a strongly held position, that trading with governmental and statutory agencies is not appropriate. For these, such trading would jeopardise their autonomy to act in the interest of those without power. Alternatively, the purchaser agencies would terminate the arrangement after the power issue became manifest.
- For the two of the three anchors that engage with the community business field, the support they provide is for their user groups to develop a community business, rather than to switch their own income model into a business form.
- Some adopters have considered supporting their local organising groups to secure grant-aid to pay for hub-related activity, while being aware of the time-cost that this produces over repeated grant applications.
- There is some, albeit limited, potential for the hubs to secure income through market-based activities, through trading with TSOs and this should contribute to helping the third sector adopt organising as a practice model.

Making the business case for organising

The difficulties that our case studies experience in raising revenue from market-based activities include:

- its transactional nature;
- the vulnerability to discontinuation;
- risk of termination;
- risk of conformance pressure; and
- time costs of bidding.

All of these require careful management, but where there is scope to secure revenues via trading this would, on the face of it, appear to offer a counterweight to reliance on grant-aid. For the field as a whole, a mix of revenues sources seems to offer the advantage of a diversified portfolio of risks. For the most part the hubs' income flows from grant-aid are arrangements typical of the third sector. What appears to be happening among some of our case studies is the development of relationships with payers, not member institutions paying dues, but rather statutory agencies resourcing local organising. These relationships are qualitatively superior to the transactional / contractual arrangements that many TSOs find themselves in. The statutory payers for organising offer both financial and development support, for example, access routes for influencing work inside local government. Although possibly not instances of trading in the sense of the term used by PtC [here](#), these relationships may mark the emergence of a nascent market for organising, almost as an enablement service for local statutory agencies.

The findings add up to a much stronger argument for the social benefits of organising but the business case is less clear. Adopters were doubtful that any surpluses would be available, from revenue other than dedicated grant-aid, to cover the costs of organising. The accounts reviewed for the anchors that were not in a position to take part in the

research do not suggest much by way of the surplus that would, for example, cover the cost of one full-time organiser. The prospects for adopters absorbing the costs of organising and / or transferring surpluses from other income streams to resource this work seem modest.

Organising challenges structural inequalities

The normative position on differentials in power provides the backdrop to the challenge organising poses to government. This requires public sector officials have mandates to take part in debates with hubs where the issues of power differentials are discussed. The issue will be more acute if there is the perception that public funding is contingent on the conduct of the debate within the boundaries government deem acceptable. Some adopters maintain a position that reject financial aid from government and thus secure their independence of position. CO Ltd propose an endowment for the field as one way to shift the field's access to funding away from government.

Importance of collaborative framing of field issues

The micro-cases that the canvas models convey are strong in themselves. However, leaving resourcing of hubs dependent on separate bids, dispersed across funders and programmes, seems unlikely to foster the development of the field as a whole. From the field perspective, the weakness of this is that the opportunity for joint-working and shared learning between hubs and funders is insufficient. What the field requires is an investment process that:

- enables learning from and about organising, 'what works for whom in which context';
- locates this knowledge in the in the complex networks of relations between stakeholders;
- disseminates understanding about the implications of the insight within policy domains.

Working cooperatively with their peers, adopters have developed pragmatic solutions to policy influencing work. In addition, CO Ltd facilitates exchanges of learning through, for example, the work of its learning partner (Imagine). There is scope for a more collaborative framing of the field issues. The work of Nesta and Collaborate on their [Upstream initiative](#) shows one learning network approach to public services delivered by local government. This draws on Collaborate's '[human learning systems](#)' perspective on innovation in public services. This could involve a learning network that would bring together governmental, the National Lottery Community Fund and independent trusts with hubs and other field actors, including CO Ltd. Such a network could serve to map out the development trajectory for the field as a whole that funding programmes should resource.

The learning network would provide a space for engaged funders, adopters and organisers to learn from peers' work in the field through:

- developing a 'learning lab' in which staff from funders and adopters would work in-depth on issues that are significant for the field, preparing guidance resources for it;
- documenting and archiving learning briefings with regular follow-up on the application of learning among participants; and

- deepening the understanding of the income models that offer the greatest prospect of securing the sustainability of hubs.

As the field matures it will be important that the tacit knowledge practitioners accumulate, on how to apply organising in challenging contexts, becomes part of the knowledge base for the whole field. With careful facilitation, the approach could deliver significant social capital and knowledge management benefits for the field. With regard to the social capital benefit, the process should facilitate communication between actors across the field and across management levels. The case studies suggest that knowledge management is a core area where there is already leadership capability available through the High Trees hub. Putting in place a system that will facilitate the systematic accumulation of knowledge about organising will help to connect the field into citizen-facing public service policy domains.

Strengthening the evidence base

Accessible and media-friendly narratives of impact are available on CO Ltd's and hubs' own sites. These narratives will fulfil important functions for the learning network. Hubs have put in place a variety of methods through which they evaluate their own work. The findings for those hubs that have pursued joint-working with a public sector partner on health and wellbeing work, suggest that there remains uncertainty among some partners about the effectiveness of organising.

Learning network workshops of practitioners and funders could advance the adoption of the appropriate measurement approaches. The learning process itself through which participants secure the common understanding of the causal mechanism will strengthen the field. The adopted standards of evidence should ideally be sufficient to make credible claims for impact and estimate the cost savings to statutory budgets that organising may deliver. An 'evidence gap map' could provide a useful visualisation of the areas in which further measurement work was required on the impact pathway. From the case studies, the pathway to people-level benefits is reasonably clear, while there remains much to learn about the agency-level changes it helps bring about. Of particular interest is the way in which organisers may

- maintain their social justice position,
- engage constructively with statutory providers, and
- through their practice enable the agencies to access the pro-change energy organising releases.

In summary the field's strengthening will benefit from a facilitated learning process through which funders, hubs and practitioners: build the social capital within the learning network that facilitates participants to discuss issues of concern with a view to reaching a shared understanding of these; develop collaborative work programmes that challenge both organising and funding participants to advance the field as a whole while retaining core value positions; and extend the field's influence through championing organising in policy domains that are 'new' to it, and shifts attention upstream in those arenas where the debate on practice value is accepted.

5 CONCLUSIONS

The case studies support the following conclusions. I comment on the findings in relation to four levels:

- relational work ‘on the ground’ organising local people to build the skills they require to bring about social justice on the issues that they prioritise for local action;
- work with agencies in the public and third sectors, bringing the methodology into their practice, working with staff across different management levels;
- policy influencing arena, linking philanthropic and governmental actors into organising, raising awareness of, and facilitating engagement with the contribution of the methodology to policy goals; and
- the broader organising field, what the findings may reflect about the field’s development, its overlap with the community business sector, the funding models to which the findings point.

For the field perspective adopted here, the primary question in relation to the four levels is which actors have access to what assets to enable their strategies to secure broader acceptance in the field.

The findings on the micro-level relational work on organising, points to a process that generates strong bonds of solidarity with, and attachment to, others in their community. These appear marked both in relation to communities of place, interest and identity. The organising supports cohesion within these communities. The social energy that sustains this process flows from the adaptability of the methodology to fit with many contexts and this facilitates its use in many different settings. The narratives of impact that the participants describe suggests that ‘becoming organised’, contributes to guiding participants towards collective strategies to advance social justice. This amplifies their own disposition towards agency. They come to an understanding of their own power and how they may exercise this through engaging with the surrounding institutions controlling access to resources. There is an extensive evidence base for the claims made for agency across domains ranging from the legitimacy of democratic functioning through to emotional health and wellbeing and place-based regeneration. The sense of agency is a necessary condition for the social action that much public policy asks of the citizen.

At the meso-level of the relationship between organising and statutory bodies, the narrative the sources relate is one of organising creating ‘bridging’ relations across sector boundaries that serve to connect participants with statutory service providers. However, this aspect is nuanced, not all hubs, decide to exercise their power through ‘bridging’ with statutory agencies. For those that did, securing access to the appropriate level of authority was not always straightforward. Sometime the organisers wanted change at the operational level and while more senior management accepted the desirability of the proposed change, those with immediate operational responsibility were not part of the discussion.

With regard to macro-level policy and practice influencing through ‘linking’ organisers and public and philanthropic funders, a major learning point made in the Discussion was that there is scope to advance this work for the field as a whole. The narratives from some

participants refer to organising facilitating work between hubs and third and public sector organisations. The adaptability of organising brings much opportunity for the hubs' work in different domains. The application of organising to influencing work more often links to practice issues more often than up-stream policy.

Turning to the organising field as a whole and its overlap with the community business sector, the research points to some but limited engagement by the hubs with the sector. The three community anchors in the sample did offer support and sign-posting for community business formation. The financial models the anchors envisage do not appear to anticipate using surpluses to resource organising. That said, the sample data is weak in terms of coverage of anchors, especially community land trusts with workspace. However, some hubs are interested in growing their income from trading activities. The interviews with statutory partners suggest this is a 'direction of travel' these partners would welcome. Grant-aid project funding seems likely to continue to be the hubs' primary revenue model. Reliance on independent trusts and the Community Fund will grow alongside pressing demands on the same sources to respond to pandemic-related needs. The opportunity for the field is to promote a model of organising practice that:

- offers a proven route to recruit local people into, in the first instance, volunteering for social action that challenges inequalities of power, thus drawing this dynamic social resource into collective action;
- provides pathways through which volunteers may acquire additional in-depth organising skills, within a constructive, experiential, 'learning by doing' academy; and
- strengthens channels of communication between citizens and statutory services that protects the independence of voice for organisers, and provides a source of insight for public agencies on these citizens' needs and perceptions.

Finally, I note the broader set of assets (**in bold below**) that the research suggests will help to secure the foundations of organising that the hubs have already put in place.

- Initiating a meeting of public and philanthropic funders with a view to assessing the interest of the agencies in developing a sustainable source of **financial capital** for
 - 1) hubs' revenue costs,
 - 2) the field's infrastructural investment, and
 - 3) the learning network proposal described in the Discussion section.
- Growing the **cultural capital** of the hubs by
 - 4) communicating the distinctive contribution organising makes to local development goals to those working in other agencies involved with the same goals, on how organising may help connect local people to their place-based regeneration effort,
 - 5) developing the capacity hubs require to demonstrate the added value to public services that organising generates through its engagement of local people as active agents of change,
 - 6) guidance resources for hubs to facilitate organisers working with statutory partners to maintain the integrity of their position on challenging structural inequalities in

- power while collaborating with their partners on the co-design of services and the diffusion of the associated practice lessons across partners' management levels, and
- 7) ensuring the learning on the distinctive contribution is documented and disseminated through the knowledge management and evidence base elements noted in the Discussion section; and
 - Protecting the **social capital** that the hubs have accumulated to date through creating the opportunities that will
 - 8) help maintain the bonds of solidarity formed through the collective action work in their own communities of the existing cadre of organisers, through for example, affirming / celebrating the work of alumni of the CO Ltd's Academy,
 - 9) maintain the relational bridges across sectoral boundaries and links from hubs into statutory management to protect these connections against decay, through hubs championing joint working with PSOs in those third sector forums in which it operates and
 - 10) putting in place an information resource for hubs that would guide their preparation of policy insights into PSOs with which they have worked, where possible promoting joint authorship of the reportage.

In conclusion, I note the markedly high value that all sources across sectors placed on the authenticity of the voice organising enables adopters to articulate as they pursue social justice. It is important that adopters secure the resources to continue this work.

RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Marilyn Taylor, Imagine, Learning Partner of **Acorn**
Nick Ballard, **Acorn**, Newcastle, Organiser, (National)
Tom Scott, **Acorn**, Newcastle, Organiser (Regional)

Helen Issacs, **Centre4**, Grimsby, City Council partner
Paul Gutherson, **Centre4**, Grimsby, Manager
Tanya Subman, **Centre4**, Grimsby, Organiser

Andrea Smith, **Grapevine**, Coventry, City Council partner
Claire Wightman, **Grapevine**, Coventry, Director
Joanne Orchard Webb, **Grapevine**, Coventry, Detectorism, Learning Partner
Juliet Grainger, **Grapevine**, Coventry, Public Sector partner
Mel Smith, **Grapevine**, Coventry, Manager
Stephanie Leonard, **Grapevine**, Coventry, Trusted Other partner

Darren French, **Heart of Hastings**, Trustee and Volunteer
James Leathers, **Heart of Hastings**, Director
Sam Kinch, **Heart of Hastings**, Organiser

Grace English, **High Trees**, Lambeth, Director
Graham Weston, **High Trees**, Lambeth, Organiser

Kay Keane, General Practice Manager, Stockport, Public Sector partner of **Starting Point**
Nicola Wallace Dean, **Starting Point**, Stockport, Senior Organiser
Ryan McMurdo, **Starting Point**, Stockport, Organiser

Sam Rex Edwards, TCC (**Trefnu Cymunedol Cymru / Together Creating Communities**),
Wrexham, Senior Organiser
Steffan Evans, **TCC**, Wrexham, Third Sector partner

Mandy Wilson, Imagine, Learning Partner of **Community Organisers Ltd**
Naomi Diamond, **Community Organisers Ltd**, Programme Manager
Nick Gardham, **Community Organisers Ltd**, Chief Executive Officer

Elaine Flint, Wellspring Settlement, Bristol, Third Sector partner of **Barton Hill Settlement**
Deb Baker, **Community Roots**, Cheltenham, Organiser
Dan Sutherland, Himmat Project, Halifax, Third Sector partner of **Halifax Opportunities Trust**
Hero Austin, **PEACH**, Newham, Organiser
Fergus Arkley, **Power to Change**, Programme Manager
Sacha Bedding, The Annex, **The Wharton Trust**, Hartlepool, Organiser

INTERVIEW TOPICS GUIDE

Rationale for the research; PtC; COLtd; a voluntary interview; anonymity; confidentiality; reminder on sensitive issues; permission to record;

1. **What is your own role / job?** What is your role in relation to Case Study Name? How long have you been working with Case Study Name? **How does your work involve engaging with local economy issues?**
2. **Context: What is the issue for your work, that CO addresses / helps you address?** PROBES: What are the particular features of the context in which you work that leads you to think that CO helps you address these issues? **How do you think this issue bears on the local economy?**
3. How central is CO to the work of your agency? PROBES: How does it fit (align) with other ways of working your agency adopts? How does the work of your agency connect with the local economy?
4. What is your understanding of the **mission** of Case Study Name? **What is the contribution CO makes to enable it to achieve its mission?** PROBES: What is the particular contribution CO makes to it being **locally rooted**? ...its **trading for and benefiting** local people? ... its **accountability** to the local community? ... its **impact**?
5. Benefits; How do you think CO benefits Case Study Name ... as an agency? ... your agency? ... its users? PROBES: expected v unexpected benefits; What are the positive impacts for the local economy? What are the negative impacts for the local economy?
6. **Costs**, not only financial; What are the costs of CO **for your agency**? What are the **opportunity costs** for your agency in working with Case Study Name / through CO? PROBES: expected v unexpected costs; **What additional costs would arise for Case Study Name if it adopted a more trading-orientated stance?**
7. What **changes do you think CO has brought about for your agency**? How do you think CO **served as a catalyst of change** in relation to ... performance, ... governance, ... **business profitability**, ... organisational resilience, ... sustainability;
8. What is **your experience of Social Action Hubs**? PROBES: is your agency one of these? How does this enhance your work? How does it serve as a catalyst of change in your agency's capacity to achieve its mission? **How does it produce revenue? What does it cost?**
9. How does **your agency currently pay for the costs of CO**? What is the size of the financial cost for ... Case Study Name? ... for your agency? ... others?
10. What are the **sources of the revenue** that Case Study Name uses to pay for CO currently? How **feasible / desirable is it for your agency to provide finance for CO** (by Case Study Name) in the future? PROBES: What are the alternatives to self-financing that you anticipate Case Study Name could pursue? **How would Case Study Name make a more attractive / buyable / investable offer to your agency?**
11. In your view does CO enhance the **capacity of Case Study Name to generate income**? How? PROBES: How does CO provide a competitive advantage for Case Study Name's trading activities? **Is their scope for Case Study Name to enhance the income generation aspect of its work?**
12. **Conclude:** What other issues do you think we should consider in the research on CO and community anchors? Are we asking the 'right' questions? clarification comeback;

REFERENCES

Diamond, A., Vorley, T., Mallett, O., Higton, J., Spong, S., Corley, A., & Mulla, I. (2017). *The Community Business Market in 2017*. Power to Change, London.

Higton, J, Archer, R, Steer, R, Mulla, I, and Hicklin, A, (2019), *The Community Business Market in 2019*, Power to Change, London.

Innovation Network for Communities. (2009). *Fields, innovations and places: Three different strategies for social innovators*, INC, Washington.

Locality, (2018), *Powerful Communities, Strong Economies - The final report of the Keep it Local for Economic Resilience Action Research Project*, London.

Percy, C, Swersky, A, Hull, D, and Medley-Hallam, J, (2016), *The community business market in 2015*, Power to Change, London.

Sparviero, S. (2019). "The Case for a Socially Oriented Business Model Canvas: The Social Enterprise Model Canvas." *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 10 (2): 232–51.

Stachowiak, S., Gienapp, A. & Kalra, N. (2020). *Not Always Movements: Multiple Approaches to Advance Large-Scale Social Change*, ORSImpact, Seattle.

The Bridgespan Group. (2020). *Field Building for Population-Level Change: How funders and practitioners can increase the odds of success*, Boston.