

Report

Resilient Communities

July 2020

Sinéad Fitzsimons



Patron

Her Majesty The Queen

Board of Trustees

Chairman

The Rt Hon the Baroness Prashar of Runnymede CBE

Vice-Chair

Baroness Pitkeathley of Caversham OBE

Honorary Treasurer

Simon Pearce

Trustees

Charles Anson CVO DL

Sir Malcolm Evans KCMG OBE (until January 2020)

Jane Furniss CBE

Alan Gemmell OBE (from October 2019)

Paul Hampden Smith

John Lotherington

Baroness McGregor-Smith CBE

JP Rangaswami (from January 2020)

Chief Executive

Canon Dr Edmund Newell

Visiting Fellows

Baroness Chakrabarti CBE

Sir Stuart Etherington KT

Lord Anderson of Ipswich KBE QC

Professor Tariq Modood MBE

Dame Sara Thornton DBE QPM

The Most Rev and Rt Hon the Lord Williams of Oystermouth

Resilient Communities

Author

Dr Sinéad Fitzsimons

Research Officer in Education and Development, Cambridge Assessment, University of Cambridge

Research Associate (freelance), Cumberland Lodge

Editors

Dr Jan-Jonathan Bock

Programme Director, Cumberland Lodge

Helen Taylor

Head of Communications, Cumberland Lodge



Foreword



Launched in the summer of 2020, amidst the COVID-19 pandemic, this Cumberland Lodge Report presents key findings and recommendations from our recent work on 'Resilient Communities'. We have been examining ways of helping communities to become more resilient, and to reconfigure more effectively in the aftermath of disruptive events and developments, as part of our 2019–20 series on pressing issues of 'Inclusion & Opportunity' facing the UK today.

To inform our discussions, we commissioned Dr Sinéad Fitzsimons as a freelance Research Associate. Sinéad is the author of this report. At the outset of the project, she prepared an interdisciplinary review of the existing research and literature on community resilience in the UK, which has subsequently been updated and is now presented in Part I of this report. Part II of *Resilient Communities* presents a summary of key themes and practical recommendations that emerged from the cross-sector conversations we convened at our roundtable conference in February 2020, in partnership with The Young Foundation. We drew on the collective experience and ideas of policymakers, academics from a range of disciplines, young people, business representatives, civil society and community practitioners. In May 2020, we held a 'virtual' consultation, involving conference representatives and further experts in the field, to review key themes from the conference, paying particular attention to the COVID-19 pandemic and its wide-ranging implications for communities.

Resilient Communities provides a timely analysis of how social cohesion can be fostered in ways that support community resilience. We hope that it proves useful for guiding and informing policy and practice, both now and in the future.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Edmund Newell". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly informal style.

Canon Dr Edmund Newell, Chief Executive

About the author



This report is written by Dr Sinéad Fitzsimons, who was commissioned by Cumberland Lodge to support its work on 'Resilient Communities', as a freelance Research Associate. Sinéad is Research Officer in Education and Development at Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. Sinéad's research focuses primarily on the role of education in improving the well-being of individuals, communities and wider societies. Her work has involved a range of national and international development projects, including curriculum projects with UNICEF and the Ethiopian Ministry of Education.

Prior to joining the University of Cambridge, Sinéad was a doctoral student and research assistant at Queen's University Belfast. During her time at Queen's, she conducted and contributed to several research projects relating to education in divided societies, which focused on contexts such as Northern Ireland, the Balkan region and Belgium.

Before entering academia, Sinéad taught History for over ten years in four different countries. Her experiences of teaching in a range of contexts sparked her passion for community development work, especially pertaining to the role of education as a transformative force worldwide.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to our partner, [The Young Foundation](#), for their support and contributions to this project.



Contents

Executive summary	I
--------------------------	----------

Part I: A review

1. Introduction to Part I	10
----------------------------------	-----------

2. Key definitions	15
Resilience	15
Community	15
Social cohesion	16
Social capital	16

3. Challenges to community cohesion and resilience	18
---	-----------

4. Strengthening community resilience through collaborative and active citizenship	20
Community resilience policies in the UK	22
Community resilience policies in the Northern Ireland	24
Community resilience policies in the Wales	26
Community resilience policies in the Scotland	28
Supporting and developing leadership of local citizens	30

5. Strengthening community resilience through faith-based communities	32
--	-----------

6. Strengthening community resilience through the arts and culture	36
Art as therapy	36
Community-based arts projects	37
Skills transfer and economic development	37
Increased sense of pride	37
Funding issues	38

7. Strengthening community resilience through sports and community leisure	40
The power of boxing	42
Avoiding conflict	43
8. Strengthening community resilience through business and entrepreneurship	44
Measuring well-being	44
Contributing to the social economy	45
Changing the way we work	46
9. Strengthening community resilience through education	48
Compulsory schooling	48
Training and skills development for adults	50
Partnerships with higher education institutions	52

Part II: Key themes and recommendations

10. Introduction to Part II	56
11. Foster stronger community leadership and decision-making	58
Structural change	59
Leadership support and training	60
Increased funding	61
Recommendations	65
12. Widen the circle, to hear more voices	66
Recommendations	68

I3. Develop and increase community spaces and local ownership	71
Local ownership to support a community's economic stability	73
Local ownership to support a community's environmental stability	75
Recommendations	76
I4. Focus monitoring and evaluation on meaningful impact	78
Recommendations	80
I5. Build on shared wisdom, to create a better future	82
Recommendations	84
Contributors	86
Notes	90

Executive summary

Over the past five years, the resilience of the United Kingdom's (UK's) communities has been tested in extraordinary ways. Events such as the COVID-19 pandemic, the Black Lives Matter movement, the Grenfell Tower fire, the Windrush scandal, and the escalation of the climate crisis and the refugee crisis have all affected UK communities. In some cases, these events have brought communities closer together and illustrated solidarity and camaraderie. However, in other cases, these events have emphasised and intensified inequalities, community tension and systemic injustices.

Whilst the challenges faced by communities are complex and always changing, the desire to improve community life is a shared one. Individuals, groups and institutions can all initiate and drive transformative change, aimed at improving places and the lives lived therein through social action, campaigning, grassroots work and local leadership. Although local funding is necessary, it is only one part of the answer: funding alone will not lead to long-lasting developments of community resilience. Funding and support structures must be reconfigured in a more collaborative way, to foster positive and lasting change for all community members. In short, resilience emerges from a complex interplay between funding, resources, public services and community actors. Alone, these elements will have a limited impact; but, working together, they can result in transformative power to ensure that communities thrive.

Resilient Communities considers how community resilience can be further developed and strengthened through cross-sector collaboration, involving the public, private and social sectors. It presents key research literature as well as real-life case studies, to illustrate viable opportunities and models for fostering greater community resilience across the UK.

An overview

Part I of this report outlines an overview of ‘community resilience’ and how this term can be applied in the UK context. Six avenues for strengthening community resilience are considered, along with related case studies:

- Collaborative and active citizenship
- Partnerships with faith-based communities
- Arts and culture initiatives
- Sports and community leisure activities
- The role of business
- Education and partnerships with educational institutions.

These areas are interconnected, and work must be done collaboratively across groups and across time in order to bring about effective change. Examples explored in this report demonstrate that effective community programming promotes inclusivity, generosity and shared goals – rather than exclusivity, rivalry and competition for resources. Resilience-building initiatives must also take into consideration that each community possesses complex power structures. Those who hold the least amount of power in a community are often those least likely to be consulted or promoted – and the most likely to be forgotten. In order for holistic community resilience to emerge, inequalities, exclusions and hierarchies must be considered and deconstructed.

Key themes

Part II of *Resilient Communities* addresses cross-cutting themes that emerged from collaborative discussions with community stakeholders and experts, convened by Cumberland Lodge in February 2020, in partnership with The Young Foundation, an independent centre that helps communities thrive, through research, community-led innovation, and social innovation, ventures and investment.

Conversations at the conference focused on how the findings of Part I could be put into action effectively, to best support UK communities. These key findings and draft recommendations were reviewed at a virtual consultation, involving conference representatives and further experts in the field, in May 2020, during the UK's COVID-19 lockdown.

Five key themes emerged through this process, each of which is presented in detail, with corresponding recommendations. The key themes are:

- Foster stronger community leadership and decision-making
- 'Widen the circle', to hear more voices
- Develop and increase community spaces and local ownership
- Focus monitoring and evaluation on meaningful impact
- Build on shared wisdom, to help create a better future.

Findings from Part II show that supporting and further empowering UK communities must become a social priority for the public and private sectors. Although, individually, UK communities represent a relatively small locality, together communities are the social foundation of the UK. Therefore, the health, happiness and prosperity of the UK depend on the health, happiness and prosperity of its communities.

Recommendations

This report makes the following recommendations for policymakers, community leaders and practitioners:

- I. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government should lead and publish a clear mapping of the current decision-making processes related to local infrastructure (transport, services, education, housing, urban/rural planning, and so on). Once mapped, this should be reviewed and revised by a joint taskforce involving stakeholders from across UK society. Revisions should be made to empower local communities in the shaping of their localities.

2. Small-scale charities and social-purpose organisations must be supported in order to survive and transition during the period of financial hardship caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Funding should prioritise areas in which poverty and inequality are entrenched, and should focus on supporting community-based, mission-driven charities.
3. Leadership training should be made freely available in every locality. This training should be offered in a way that promotes accessibility and flexibility, so all community members interested in the training can take part, regardless of ability, status or personal circumstance.
4. The Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) should mandate Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) contributions and an evaluation of Social Return on Investment (SROI), especially for large companies and businesses. The size of the contribution (equated in financial and human resources) should reflect the net worth of the business or corporation. These contributions should also be monitored and scrutinised by BEIS.
5. The Government should introduce mandatory community stakeholder engagement and participatory processes for all infrastructure and policy changes occurring in a locality. A minimum level of engagement must be introduced, with the responsibility being placed with the group leading the consultation process to reach out proactively to all groups within the communities impacted.
6. Proactive measures should be put in place to raise the status of Black, Asian and minority ethnic voices within UK communities. A critical appraisal of systemic racism should be conducted from the local to the national level, followed by actions to listen to, learn from and empower Black, Asian and minority ethnic members of society at all levels of government and community structures. Similarly, efforts must be taken to actively include other community members who have been historically excluded in participatory decision-making processes.

7. Public institutions and publicly funded third sector organisations should be required to undergo an 'anti-racism inspection' of their daily practices, work structures, services, policies, hiring and promotions. This should be done in collaboration with an external anti-racism specialist, selected from a list composed by the Government's Race Disparity Unit. As with an OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills) inspection, the process should follow a clear framework, and result in a rating as well as recommended steps for improvement. Results should be published, and appropriate actions taken, to ensure that all publicly funded bodies and organisations are at a level of 'good' or 'outstanding.'
8. To overcome primary digital exclusion, the government must ensure that all individuals who wish to have digital access are provided with it. This may involve ensuring that broadband coverage is extended or improved, or providing universal broadband to ensure that all individuals – regardless of socio-economic status – can access the same digital opportunities. This support should be delivered swiftly, to ensure that individuals are not left behind in the increasingly digitised world.
9. To overcome secondary digital exclusion, digital training and support should be made freely available to all community members. If members of the community do not wish to, or are unable to, participate, a community service should be made available to assist these members in accessing services online, such as a community digital support drop-in desk.
10. Local authorities should be stripped of the ability to sell or repurpose community assets – such as public and communal spaces – without a thorough participatory decision-making process with the local community.
11. A public space threshold should be introduced, to ensure that public space is available to community members in all boroughs, districts and counties in the UK. The amount of public space should be proportional to the total land/population of the local authority. If an area does not currently have the minimum amount required, then spaces should be created or repurposed

for public use. The cost of creating these spaces should not be taken from pre-existing community development funds.

12. The Government should commit to ensuring active business growth hubs in England (across all 39 business growth areas), Scotland (working with Business Gateway Scotland), Wales (working with Business Wales) and Northern Ireland (working with Invest Northern Ireland), and support the growth of communities and social businesses.
13. The Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy should increase grants and incentives for local business development, business mentorships and skill development opportunities for local business owners and co-operatives.
14. The government should commit to introducing a minimum threshold of voluntary community and social enterprises (VCSEs) on each high street. Financial support or business rates incentives should be introduced, to encourage VCSE occupancy. High street occupancy will assist these organisations to thrive and increase their visibility to the community.
15. Central and local government authorities should introduce a 'right to operate' model, which demands that all businesses strive to promote environmental sustainability and community support initiatives in their business plans.
16. Local authorities and those in the economic development sector should read, learn from and implement the Rescue, Recover, Reform framework from the Centre for Local Economic Strategies, which offers clear, practical and community-prioritised recommendations for local economic development in a post-COVID society.
17. Public funding and monitoring bodies should implement participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) processes that assess meaningful impact, rather than applying standardised metrics.
18. Local community members should be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of community projects in their local area.

19. Funding and monitoring bodies should work with project teams, when devising evaluation processes, to ensure that the processes accurately assess impact.
20. Public monitoring and evaluation methods should be published and subject to a regular review cycle. The review cycle should seek to consult relevant government bodies, policy experts, civil society organisation leaders, community development specialists and community members.
21. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government should fund the development of a community project database of community projects and initiatives that receive public funding. Private funders or non-funding groups should be invited to contribute to the database, to enhance community awareness, increase collaboration and provide guidance for community leaders.
22. Public funding schemes should use streamlined funding applications and a central database for funding opportunities and should have access to a sample of completed applications with a streamlined structure.
23. Research and policy analysis groups in the public sector should conduct further research into the impact of local community development initiatives.
24. Tax reductions or other incentives should be offered to research groups, think tanks and higher education institutions, to encourage pro bono research supporting local charities and civil society organisations that lack the resources to conduct or fund such research themselves. This valuable research would help these groups to further develop their work and to illustrate their contribution to funders, local government and community members.

I. A review





Introduction to Part I

Communities today are faced with unprecedented degrees of change and uncertainty. Although change is inevitable, the changes occurring in the UK across all areas of life have resulted in feelings of instability and uncertainty for many. The COVID-19 pandemic, climate change, Brexit, unemployment, housing shortages, economic uncertainty, terrorism, the migration crisis, increasing inequality and systemic racism are examples of social realities that are testing the resilience of individuals and their communities. Supporting communities to not only survive but also to prosper during periods of uncertainty and change is necessary. However, deciphering the most effective method for building community resilience is not an easy task, especially since what is required to build resilience in one community may not be effective in another.

Supporting communities to not only survive but also to prosper during periods of uncertainty and change is necessary. However, deciphering the most effective method for building community resilience is not an easy task, especially since what is required to build resilience in one community may not be effective in another.

The 'Resilient Communities' project at Cumberland Lodge began in November 2019. The project was motivated by the recognition that UK communities, particularly the most deprived, were becoming increasingly vulnerable to economic and social difficulties. At the time, people in the UK could not have predicted that community life was about to change significantly. In March 2020, the rapidly spreading COVID-19 pandemic forced UK communities into lockdown, with many losing income and support services, partnered with an intense pressure on care and health providers. This was followed by the death of George Floyd in the United States in May 2020, which mobilised communities across England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland to unite

in solidarity against systemic racism in the UK and around the world.

These two tidal waves of social change have shown the strength of UK communities, but they have also exposed pre-existing social inequalities and created new ones. For example, more than 400,000 individuals registered to volunteer for the National Health Service (NHS) in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, which shows a strong sense of community. However, a Public Health England report¹ acknowledges that COVID-19 has highlighted social inequalities. For instance, people living in the most deprived areas of the country are twice as likely as those living in the most affluent areas to be diagnosed with COVID-19, and the pandemic is having a disproportionate effect on Black, Asian and minority ethnic people.

The anti-racism protests have also shown community strengths and weaknesses. For example, the number of anti-racism protests across the UK has illustrated a strong sense of solidarity in many communities. However, the movement has also brought increased attention to the systemic anti-Black racism that exists in the UK, which proliferates into all areas of society, including community structures.

In many ways, the timing of *Resilient Communities* is fortuitous, since the good practices as well as challenges discussed provide valuable insight into building community strength during periods of change and uncertainty. *Resilient Communities* highlights that, although there are many strengths within UK communities, the system to support them must change. These recent events have further stressed this. Decision-making structures, funding structures, monitoring structures and service provisions are no longer functioning efficiently and effectively to support all communities.

In many ways, the timing of *Resilient Communities* is fortuitous, since the good practices as well as challenges discussed provide valuable insight into building community strength during periods of change and uncertainty.

Geoff Mulgan, Professor of Collective Intelligence, Public Policy and Social Innovation at University College London (UCL), believes that the world is currently experiencing a deficit of social imagination. He argues, '[Society] finds it easy to imagine apocalypse and disaster; or to imagine new generations of technology. But we find it much harder than in the past to imagine a better society a generation or more into the future.'² Mulgan's 2020 report *The Imaginary Crisis (and how we might quicken social and public imagination)* highlights the way that UK communities are struggling to see how things can improve, and how many individuals feel powerless. A recent Nesta survey in the UK found that a majority (62 % of a pan-UK sample of 3,838 participants) feel they have little to no opportunity to influence the long-term future of the country.³ Mulgan attributes the decline of social imagination to a variety of factors, including the rise of individualistic culture, the push for policies and strategies to rely exclusively on rationality and science, power shifts that have resulted in weakening the impact of collective action, and a lack of funding and brainpower going towards groups working to promote radical social ideas.⁴ Moving forward, social imagination must be reinvigorated in order to envision and actively work towards more community-focused and community-driven approaches to democracy, the economy, property, care and health.

'[Society] finds it easy to imagine apocalypse and disaster; or to imagine new generations of technology. But we find it much harder than in the past to imagine a better society a generation or more into the future.'

This intense period of disruption from normal life poses an opportunity. A new social contract is needed that promotes greater equality, increased opportunities and wider collective action to create a more secure and sustainable future. UK society must be reorganised and restructured, so that it highlights the importance of social connection and moves away from defining

a successful society as one focused on growth, wealth and consumption. Individuals, groups and institutions can all initiate and drive this transformative change, aimed at improving places and the lives lived therein through social action, campaigning, grassroots work and local leadership. Although local funding is necessary, it is only one part of the answer. Funding alone will not lead to long-lasting developments of community resilience. Community empowerment and collaboration are essential for ensuring that funding is applied in effective ways.

Funding alone will not lead to long-lasting developments of community resilience. Community empowerment and collaboration are essential for ensuring that funding is applied in effective ways.

Community-focused and community-driven approaches are at the core of developing community resilience. A 2019 study on factors contributing to community resilience led by academics at the University of Stirling found that developing resilience is a complex endeavour that requires both local/informal activity and national/strategic structures.⁵ The complexity of the resilience-building process highlights that collaborative and innovative thinking is needed, to achieve sustainable progress. Even though the process may be bespoke to each community, considering what strategies have succeeded or failed offers a valuable insight into the resilience-building process.

Resilient Communities provides an overview of current theories and approaches to building community resilience. The report is divided into two sections. Part I establishes working definitions for the key concepts that are pertinent to discussions of community resilience, such as ‘resilience’, ‘community’, ‘social cohesion’ and ‘social capital’. These terms are then used throughout the report. Part I also presents six avenues for strengthening community resilience. These are: collaborative approaches to local citizenship and local government; arts and culture initiatives; partnerships with faith-based

communities; sport and community leisure activities; business and entrepreneurship programmes; and education and skills development.

Part II of *Resilient Communities* addresses cross-cutting themes that emerged from collaborative discussions with community stakeholders and experts regarding how the findings of Part I could be put into action effectively, to support and further strengthen UK communities. Part II also presents practical recommendations for positive, sustainable and community-minded change.

2

Key definitions

Resilience

The term 'resilience' derives from the Latin root *resilire*, which means to spring back.⁶ The term was first used by ecologists referring to an ecological system persisting through changes of state,⁷ and by engineers referring to stability and resistance of external shocks.⁸ Today, the term 'resilience' is frequently used throughout the social sciences.

According to the Stockholm Resilience Centre, one of the leading think tanks on resilience research, social resilience should be seen as the 'ability of human communities to withstand and recover from stresses, such as environmental change or social, economic or political upheaval.'⁹ Keck and Sakdapolrak¹⁰ further develop this idea, arguing that resilience involves the capacity of individuals, communities or regions to cope with, adapt to and transform risks, threats and hardship through absorptive, reactive, preventative and proactive community measures. In this way, resilience is positioned as a process or capacity, as opposed to a fixed quality.¹¹

These two compatible definitions position resilience as a broad, multi-level concept that incorporates social, economic and environmental dimensions. It should be stressed that *Resilient Communities* does not place resilience-building as the responsibility of communities alone. Instead, this report positions resilience-building as a combined effort of the public, private and social sectors working alongside communities, to develop their strength, cohesion and future success.

Community

Like 'resilience', the term 'community' is a contested concept that can be defined and applied in a variety of ways.¹² For this report, a community will be defined as a place-based entity that can be as small as a neighbourhood or as large as a county.¹³

However, communities must also be seen as dynamic and without definitive boundaries or members. In line with the 2018 Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper,¹⁴ communities in the UK should be seen as places ‘where people – whatever their background – live, work, learn and socialise together, based on shared rights, responsibilities and opportunities’.¹⁵

Social cohesion

Social cohesion is a characteristic of society that shows the interdependence between individuals of that society characterised by the absence of underlying social conflict and the presence of strong social bonds.¹⁶ However, some academics argue that this definition no longer encapsulates the multiplicity of values and cultures found through contemporary social analysis.¹⁷ Taking this into consideration, social cohesion can be defined as: ‘the ongoing process of developing well-being, a sense of belonging and voluntary social participation of all members of a society’. At the same time, the process should develop communities that tolerate and promote a multiplicity of values and cultures, and that grant equal rights and opportunities to all.¹⁸

Social capital

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) defines social capital as ‘the links, shared norms, values and understandings in society that facilitate co-operation within or amongst groups’.¹⁹ A key principle of this is the idea that the goodwill that individuals have towards others in their family or community is a valuable resource – and thus a form of capital.²⁰ The OECD divides social capital into three types:

- **Bonds:** links to people based on a sense of common identity (‘people like us’) – such as family, close friends and people who share our culture or ethnicity
- **Bridges:** links that stretch beyond a shared sense of identity, for example to distant friends, colleagues and associates

- **Linkages:** links to people or groups further up or lower down the social ladder.²¹

As a characteristic of communities, social capital consists of group attributes such as trust, reciprocity, collective action and participation. Such social capital can be a strong resource for resilience-building. However, social capital can also lead to harm. For example, the tight bonds and deep trust within criminal gangs constitute a form of social capital, but this may not improve individual or community well-being.

3

Challenges to community cohesion and resilience

Challenges facing UK communities today are diverse and complex. Some challenges have existed for centuries. For example, tensions relating to class structures have been documented from as early as the 4th century AD during the time of Roman Britain.²²

Other challenges have emerged more recently, such as the economic deprivation caused by COVID-19 and divisions related to Brexit. Some challenges, such as climate change and the refugee crisis, are experienced globally, whilst others affect specific areas, such as sectarian violence in parts of Northern Ireland. Challenges overlap with one another and cannot be approached separately. For example, systemic racism and increased inequality relate, in part, to employment opportunities and access to education. Some challenges to community emerge over time, such as urbanisation and rural depopulation, whereas others emerge quickly and unexpectedly, such as the Grenfell Tower fire in 2017.

The wide variety of challenges and uncertainties facing communities today highlights the importance of ensuring that resilience-building initiatives are equally varied. A one-size-fits-all approach to developing community resilience is inappropriate; each community's unique strengths and resources need to be considered.

A one-size-fits-all approach to developing community resilience is inappropriate; each community's unique strengths and resources need to be considered.

Resilience-building initiatives can draw on a range of partnerships and can be delivered in variety of ways. The *Resilient Communities*

project looked specifically at resilience-building opportunities pertaining to:

- Collaborative and active citizenship
- Partnerships with faith-based organisations
- Arts-based and cultural initiatives
- Sports and community leisure activities
- Local business development
- Educational programming.

To examine further the potential of each of these avenues, relevant research, policies and real-life examples are explored below.

4

Strengthening community resilience through collaborative and active citizenship

Meaningful collaboration between local government and communities can promote constructive forms of political participation and civic engagement which, in turn, can increase community resilience. However, research has shown that areas of government are failing to meet the needs of local populations across the UK. For example, numerous studies have shown that social work across the UK is in a funding crisis, with families living in poverty being the most neglected.²³ One study found that: ‘high caseloads and frequent staff turnover, scarce support services, and an increasingly narrow, time-limited and risk averse focus characterise much of children’s social work in local authorities’.²⁴

Examples such as this illustrate that the severe discrepancy between supply and demand of public services is exacerbating inequality and reducing community hopes for the future.²⁵ In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic required rapid-response funding allocations, such as funds to support the NHS and to create national furlough schemes. This has led to a decrease in funding available to the charity and social organisation sector, which will have implications for UK communities – especially the most vulnerable.

...the severe discrepancy between supply and demand of public services is exacerbating inequality and reducing community hopes for the future.

The inequalities in investment across the UK have come under scrutiny over the last five years. Many academics, politicians, community leaders and people in the media have raised awareness regarding communities that have been 'left behind'.²⁶ Looking closer at inequalities in community investment across England, the 2019 Young Foundation report entitled *Flipping the Coin: Two sides of community wealth in England* provides evidence that there is an inequitable distribution of public, charitable and philanthropic funding across different communities. The report explains that, even though a lack of funding greatly disadvantages communities, community groups can draw strength and resilience from other sources. Researchers at the Young Foundation found that:

*Draw[ing] from years of immersive work in cities, towns and villages across the UK, that often regardless of traditional economic indicators of prosperity, places can be rich with community life. Across the country we see communities taking control of assets and resources, stepping in and up to provide the activities, services and opportunities local residents want, and creating informal ways to build social connection and support.*²⁷

This is not to say that funding is irrelevant. Funding is undoubtedly a fundamental aspect of supporting community resilience, especially as UK communities recover from COVID-19. However, the report illustrates that despite lack of funding, communities are finding ways to connect, to belong and to resource themselves. Therefore, when looking for solutions and further understanding of community resilience, we must look at a whole range of cross-sector resources, including financial resources.

Before considering community resources such as local businesses and faith-based organisations, we will look at government policies from the national to the local level that integrate community resilience as a policy aim.

Community resilience policies in the UK

Historically, UK government policies related to community resilience have been inconsistent regarding who is primarily responsible for supporting and ensuring community resilience. In the 1970s and 1980s, many references to community resilience focused on increased community responsibility and a decrease in state intervention.²⁸ For example, in 1987 the then Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, remarked, 'people must look to themselves first. It is our duty to look after ourselves, and then to look after our neighbour'.²⁹

From this period onwards, successive UK governments conceptualised citizens as being chiefly responsible for themselves, their families and their neighbours.³⁰ This focus on individual responsibility was accompanied by cuts to government funding for social services. For example, between 1975 and 1977, the Labour Government cut back housing and education spending.³¹ In 1979 and 1980, the Conservative Government made additional cuts to education, housing and personal social services.³²

This focus on individual responsibility is still apparent in the 21st century. For example, a 2009 government-funded report on community resilience argued that: 'if the Government takes greater responsibility for risks in the community, it may feel under pressure to take increasingly more responsibility, thereby eroding community resilience'.³³ Similarly, the 2011 Strategic National Framework on Community Resilience stressed that citizens must take 'responsibility for their own resilience and recovery'.³⁴ The latter government report was released in the same year that the Coalition Government made significant cuts to public services, which ushered in the beginning of 'the new age of austerity'.³⁵

However, the discourse around community resilience within government policies and reports has, in some ways, started to shift. Criticism from the media, academics and politicians has brought necessary attention to communities struggling with high deprivation and the corresponding disengagement of local

governments. Recognising the need to investigate the issue further, the House of Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement published in 2018 its report *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and civic engagement in the 21st century*. The report acknowledged that events such as the European Union (EU) referendum and the fire in Grenfell Tower have focused public attention on divided and isolated communities and highlight the rising levels of anti-political sentiment amongst British citizens.³⁶ The Committee acknowledged that civic engagement programmes are often affected by government reshuffling, resulting in shallow roots and lack of follow-through for many initiatives. The report also critiqued the government's efforts to increase community integration and participation, because it focused primarily on minority ethnic groups and rarely mentioned challenges faced by citizens with disabilities, LGBTQI+ communities, rural and coastal communities, working-class communities and others who feel marginalised in UK society.³⁷

Criticism from the media, academics and politicians has brought necessary attention to communities struggling with high deprivation and the corresponding disengagement of local governments.

In response, the UK Government released the *Integrated Communities Action Plan*³⁸ and the *Community Resilience Development Framework*³⁹ in 2019. Unlike previous government reports, the framework positions the government as an equal partner in supporting community resilience. The report stressed the need for collaborative and participatory approaches that include a range of stakeholders:

*The UK's resilience depends on all of us – the emergency services, local and central government, businesses, communities and individual members of the public... We will expand and deepen the government's partnership with the private and voluntary sectors, and with communities and individuals, as it is on these relationships that the resilience of the UK ultimately rests*⁴⁰.

This document marks a shift in rhetoric, attributing responsibility as much to individuals as to local government, businesses, communities and emergency services.⁴¹ This view of a shared responsibility for resilience-building allows for wider discussions of how community resilience can be developed and assessed. Although the report provides guidance for building community resilience and links to example initiatives, it fails to mandate any obligatory action by local government leaders. The only government legislation that the framework draws from is the 2004 Civil Contingencies Act, which states that local authorities are under a duty to provide advice and assistance to the public in times of emergency.⁴² The vagueness of this legislation means there is very little legal obligation on local governments to support community resilience.

These government policies and reports represent the extent of community resilience policies put forward by the UK government and within England. However, the devolved governments of Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland have developed community resilience strategies specific to their own country. These are outlined below.

Active citizenship and civic participation initiatives in Northern Ireland

In Northern Ireland, the concepts of citizenship and civic participation remain contested. Although Northern Ireland is part of the UK, the 1998 Good Friday Agreement ensures that the people of Northern Ireland can identify themselves as Irish, British, or both, and retain the right to hold both British and Irish citizenship.⁴³ Although the Good Friday Agreement enabled progress in terms of peace-building, the process also raised questions about community structure and cohesion. For example, academics such as Hargie, Dickson and Nelson argue that in several areas across the province there are 'fault lines' dividing nationalist and unionist groups, which create strong homogenous communities, but weak cross-community

relations.⁴⁴ These fault lines traverse many social institutions, including sport and work.⁴⁵

Although the Northern Ireland Executive strives to ensure equal funding across all communities, these fault lines can lead to a ‘separate but equal’ approach to community building, which can perpetuate divisions across the broader society.⁴⁶

One example of a government programme aimed at supporting peaceful community participation and active citizenship is the Peace IV programme, which runs from 2014 to 2020.⁴⁷ The Peace IV programme, which is jointly funded by the EU, the Northern Ireland Government and the Republic of Ireland Government, has been designed to foster participation and active citizenship. It explicitly promotes integration, by supporting a range of activities that build positive relationships amongst people from different communities and backgrounds, including integrated education and the provision of shared spaces and services.⁴⁸ Projects that received funding were deemed to be of a sufficient scale to have a transformative effect on local and regional areas and incorporated high-quality design and sustainable development principles.

One example of a government programme aimed at supporting peaceful community participation and active citizenship is the Peace IV programme, which runs from 2014 to 2020.

Phase I Evaluations of the programme, released in 2018, revealed that there was a positive impact in terms of increased respect for diversity and a positive predisposition towards others from different communities or cultural backgrounds. However, no change was evident for participants’ understanding of their own identity and in-group identity.⁴⁹ The findings also showed that young people who participated in the programme reported a significant increase in their sense of personal agency; however, no change was evident regarding their sense of community agency.

Although these findings are only preliminary, they illustrate that developing and facilitating community resilience programmes effectively is not a simple task. Strategically planned initiatives to support community resilience may not have the predicted outcome, regardless of the efforts and funding that are put in place beforehand.

Active citizenship and civic participation initiatives in Wales

Unlike in England and Northern Ireland, the Welsh Government has elevated community resilience building into law. In 2015, the Welsh Government passed the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act, which required public bodies in Wales to work better with all people, communities and each other; and to prevent persistent problems, such as health inequalities and poverty.⁵⁰ The Act identifies seven well-being areas, which public bodies must ensure that their work is supporting. Several of the well-being areas connect directly with community life, including supporting resilience in all Welsh communities, and supporting community cohesion, equality and a vibrant culture across Wales. The Act requires public bodies to publish annual mission statements and reports illustrating their progress in each of the well-being areas.

Unlike in England and Northern Ireland, the Welsh Government has elevated community resilience building into law.

Although the Welsh Government's ambition to bring community resilience-building into law is an exciting and innovative development, the strength of the Act in ensuring that this is achieved is questionable. This limitation is largely related to the monitoring and policing process linked to the legislation. The progress reports written by the public bodies are assessed by the Future Generations Commissioner and the Auditor General for Wales.⁵¹ The Auditor has said that, 'while bodies

most commonly indicated that they did some or several things differently, they often failed to give a detailed explanation or provide specific examples'.⁵² In response, the Welsh media have questioned whether the legislation has the power to make systemic change, since the Future Generations Commissioner is only able to 'name and shame' public bodies that do not behave within the spirit of the Act.⁵³ The environmental law specialist Haydn Davies argues that in order for the Act to be successful, specific enforcement and accountability measures must be consistently implemented.⁵⁴ The Act has yet to be amended in order to ensure that the legislation effectively delivers what was initially intended.

Although the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 has not been updated, the Welsh Government has released other policies and reports that have addressed community resilience issues. In line with the 2018 report published by the House of Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement,⁵⁵ Social Care Wales (commissioned by the Welsh Government) released a report in the same year entitled *Approaches to Community Resilience*. This report presented 11 recommendations for government and public bodies. These included consulting local community groups and leading practitioners, establishing a cross-sector working group, working with health and housing partners, developing an assessment tool for resilience, supporting community infrastructure, and establishing a collaborative approach to community development.⁵⁶

In response, the Welsh Government published its National Action Plan commitments for 2019-21. The commitments include the ambition to be more responsive and accountable to citizens, by increasing engagement and collaboration with a wider range of stakeholders. The plan also outlines the Welsh Government's aim to take a more collaborative approach to local governance.⁵⁷

Part of this objective involves strategically supporting rural communities with the Rural Community Development Fund.⁵⁸ Under this Fund, the Welsh Government offers grants,

primarily aimed at local action groups and other community-based organisations. Its regional interventions are designed to prevent poverty, mitigate its impact in rural communities and improve conditions for future growth.⁵⁹ Although this action plan represents government commitments as opposed to legal obligations, the Welsh Government has budgeted funds to support the various initiatives outlined in the plan. This funding allocation illustrates the Welsh Government's intention to be actively involved in supporting the initiatives (unlike the Community Resilience Development Framework for England, which only offers guidance to local government and does not specify targeted funding).

Active citizenship and civic participation initiatives in Scotland

The Scottish Government released the Scottish National Performance Framework in 2018.⁶⁰ The framework does not dictate any legal obligations or strict monitoring strategies. Unlike the Welsh Government's requirements, public bodies do not need to publish progress reports for how their work is embodying the framework. The Scottish framework outlines specific national outcomes, including one focusing on inclusive, empowered, resilient and safe communities where:

*[Citizens] live in friendly, vibrant and cohesive communities which value diversity and support those in need. [Citizens] are encouraged to volunteer, take responsibility for our community and engage with decisions about it. Communities are resilient, safe and have low levels of crime.*⁶¹

Over the next ten years, the Scottish Government pledges to work with local government and community groups to deliver initiatives and funding that will help to achieve this vision of communities.

To track progress, the Scottish Government has identified eight national indicators that can be measured and monitored including:

- Perceptions of local area
- Loneliness
- Community ownership (number of assets, such as a community garden, in community ownership)
- Perceptions of local crime rate
- Crime victimisation
- Places to interact
- Access to green and blue space (described in the Scottish Household Survey as comprising 'public green or open spaces in your local area – for example a park, countryside, wood, play area, canal path, riverside or beach')
- Social capital (using the Social Capital Index, this considers social networks, community cohesion, social participation, trust and empowerment).

Identifying these indicators is a valuable step in ensuring monitoring and evaluation. However, since public bodies are not required to complete their own self-evaluation through progress reports, the responsibility of monitoring progress falls exclusively to central government. Since this 2018 framework was introduced, no updated data pertaining to these indicators have been released.

Like Wales, the Scottish Government has allocated designated funding to support community resilience through an Investing in Community Fund. The fund is designed to: 'empower communities... to tackle poverty, inequality and disadvantage on their own terms'. The fund promotes a more responsive, community-led, place-based approach.⁶²

Like Wales, the Scottish Government has allocated designated funding to support community resilience through an Investing in Community Fund.

This fund aligns with the ambitions of community growth and development as set out by the National Performance Framework, focusing on deprived communities and disadvantaged rural and coastal areas.⁶³ Projects supported by the Investing in Community Fund have yet to release monitoring and evaluation reports.

Supporting and developing leadership of local citizens

A further example of an intervention that supports active citizenship, whilst strengthening community resilience across the UK, is leadership training. Local leaders can shape the success or failure of community programmes and are integral in fostering social cohesion and community resilience. Developing the ability of local leaders to advocate for, and to achieve, community goals can be an effective means of developing community resilience.⁶⁴

Developing the ability of local leaders to advocate for, and to achieve, community goals can be an effective means of developing community resilience.

One such project is Civic Futures, a joint initiative by Dark Matter Labs, Korea, The Young Foundation and the Greater London Authority.⁶⁵ The aim of the programme is to work with 25 community leaders, to facilitate a collective knowledge-exchange and learning experience focused on peer relationships, enquiry and exploration, systems thinking and co-operation across London's civil society. Participants are a mixture of activists, artists, educators, organisers, connectors, technologists, carers,

archivists and others, bringing a wide range of perspectives to discussions about transformative social change.⁶⁶

Initiatives such as Civic Futures foster collaborative and active local communities, enabling individuals to build capacity in order to bring about positive, sustainable change in their local areas. Similar programmes are offered in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, however they are not always funded or developed in partnership with local government. For example, the Inspiring Leaders programme, funded by Queen's University Belfast, offers young people, who are currently volunteering in a position of leadership, the opportunity to participate in a four-day residential leadership programme.

It is worthwhile reflecting on whom leadership programmes are accessible to – whether that be in terms of eligibility criteria, availability stipulations or travel expectations. Although empowering and training community members to lead effectively is a positive and commendable mission, barriers exist for certain individuals to participate, which has an impact on who is given a platform to lead change. In addition, there is an underrepresentation of Black, Asian and minority ethnic community members in community leadership positions.⁶⁷ Leadership programme co-ordinators must reflect on how more individuals from these communities can be encouraged and supported to acquire such positions.

...there is an underrepresentation of Black, Asian and minority ethnic community members in community leadership positions. Leadership programme co-ordinators must reflect on how more individuals from these communities can be encouraged and supported to acquire such positions.

5

Strengthening community resilience through faith-based communities

Faith-based organisations and groups historically provided care, education, health provision and social support for communities, long before public services were introduced.⁶⁸ In fact, many long-standing social service programmes and organisations in the UK originated from a faith affiliation.⁶⁹ Today, faith-based groups continue to fill the gaps in social support, especially for communities whose needs are not being adequately met by public services.

For many of these faith-based groups, caring for and supporting communities is an integral part of their ethos and mission. Studies have shown that faith-based groups in the UK have often focused their efforts on the most marginalised and most vulnerable in society including: ‘destitute migrants and refugees, asylum seekers, adults with mental health, drug or alcohol problems as well as homeless people and those living in, or on the margins of, poverty’.⁷⁰ Faith-based groups may also offer more ‘mainstream’ services, such as play groups, youth provision and fitness activities. In short, the role that faith-based groups play in communities is complex and increasingly diverse.⁷¹

In some areas, faith-based groups play a central part of their community network and may be the first point of contact for a community member in distress. In addition, faith leaders may serve as leaders in their wider community. Given the status of some faith leaders, their support may have a significant impact on a community’s willingness to engage with a programme.⁷²

In some areas, faith-based groups play a central part of their community network and may be the first point of contact for a community member in distress.

Faith-based groups can also offer access to community networks.⁷³ This could be especially valuable in areas with a history of religious tension. Connecting with faith-based groups in this way, when developing resilience-building initiatives, can help to ensure success.⁷⁴ However, faith-based groups also occupy a complex position in community-building discourse, and some individuals and groups are in strong opposition to interventions involving faith-based groups.

...faith-based groups occupy a complex position in community-building discourse, and some individuals and groups are in strong opposition to interventions involving faith-based groups.

Some of this opposition has derived from acts of violence and terrorism carried out by religiously motivated individuals, which has led to stigmatisation and discrimination of entire religious communities.⁷⁵ Consequently, some funders view faith-based groups as problematic or ineffective in building social cohesion. A 2016 study on faith-based charities in the UK found that:

Conflicting views on the role of faith in our society, and a high public awareness of a small number of negative impacts of faith and religion, can result in an attitude that is suspicious – and even hostile – towards religion and faith in some parts of the population, and in sections of the media.⁷⁶

Others oppose interventions from faith-based groups, based on the fear that their services are a means of proselytising rather than serving community needs.⁷⁷ Furthermore, some view the funding of faith-based initiatives as a hindrance to inclusive communities. Groups such as Humanists UK claim that:

The UK Government is increasingly encouraging religious groups to take on a role in local communities and pressing local government to welcome such religious groups as ‘partners’... However, there is strong evidence to suggest that what the Government intends amounts to new privileges for religion... In terms of social cohesion initiatives, religious groups and

*communities have been singled out by government as having a special importance and being in need of special attention and assistance, mostly in isolation from other communities and almost always to the exclusion of the non-religious.*⁷⁸

Criticisms such as this overlook the internal variability of faith-based groups and their initiatives. Faith-based groups vary substantially with regard to how openly they promote their beliefs and, in some cases, faith-based groups are not very different from secular organisations working in the same area.⁷⁹ Nevertheless, it is important to consider whether individuals would disengage with resilience-building initiatives led by faith-based groups – and what steps could be taken to ensure that resilience is developed across the community.

In some areas of the UK, government leaders and funding bodies have shown a renewed interest in faith groups' activities in providing local services and in neighbourhood regeneration.⁸⁰ In some cases, local government and community groups have welcomed faith-based community interventions, particularly with young children and with older people.

Case Study: St Ethelburga's Centre for Reconciliation and Peace

An example of a faith-based organisation that is working towards peace and reconciliation across faith communities is St Ethelburga's Centre for Reconciliation and Peace. St Ethelburga's is a Christian charity, based in London, which promotes social cohesion, understanding and peace through a wide programme of events.

The Centre's work addresses three key social challenges: climate breakdown, refugee integration and community polarisation.⁸¹ Although the centre is not funded by local government, it does receive funding from the Big Lottery Fund, the National Lottery Heritage Fund and over 20 other groups, associations and trusts.

In addition to offering a weekly church service, the Centre organises workshops, training, community gatherings, refugee-run cooking classes, conflict coaching, leadership training, resilience training and spiritual ecology workshops that are all open to the public.⁸² It also offers a space where community members can host their own community-development initiatives regardless of their faith background or beliefs. Although the Christian faith is a driving force behind the initiative, the work is inclusive of everyone regardless of their religious backgrounds.

Organisations such as St Ethelburga's (see case study above) serve as valuable and inclusive actors in promoting community resilience. However, in order to ensure that partnerships with faith-based groups are effective, an understanding of their values, commitments, resources and limitations is required.⁸³

6

Strengthening community resilience through the arts and culture

Some 20 years ago, arts and culture-based initiatives were perceived to be on the periphery of the community development process.⁸⁴ This has changed. Evidence has shown that art, as a medium, can enable individuals and groups to be more confident, more skilled, more employable and more active in the development of their local communities. In this way, arts and culture initiatives can make a significant contribution to enhancing community resilience.⁸⁵

The arts – which encompass performing, visual, literary and media arts – can address a broad range of civic concerns in creative, refreshing and cost-effective ways.⁸⁶ The arts have the power to connect cognitive reasoning, emotions and the senses, so that new perspectives and interpretations become possible. In addition to promoting resilience on an individual level, the arts can strengthen a community – for instance, by enabling the reconstruction of a group narrative after a tragic event and mobilising a community to take back control of their lives.⁸⁷

Art as therapy

From a therapeutic perspective, the creation of art has been found to enable the retrieval and reprocessing of traumatic events, which allows individuals to express themselves and thereby to progress their rehabilitation.⁸⁸ This can be an effective way for children and adults to develop strength and resilience. In particular, adults who find it challenging to express their emotions verbally may find participating in the arts a source of relief from emotional stress.⁸⁹

Community-based arts projects

One way in which arts-based projects can strengthen community resilience is by promoting interaction in public spaces, such as the Open Studio method. Open Studio is a community-based arts practice, in which a publicly accessible space is provided for the purpose of community engagement through art-making, which is often led by an experienced artist. It can create a positive and safe space for dialogue through drop-in classes for all levels, community showcases and peace-building workshops.

The Open Studio strategy originates from a community-based therapy, inspired by the 'Crucial Cs' play therapy framework, which involves: feeling *connected* to others, feeling *competent* in our skills and abilities, feeling that we *count* and are valued, and possessing *courage* to cope with challenges.⁹⁰

Skills transfer and economic development

In addition to opening a social space to strengthen community relationships, Open Studio and other similar arts-based initiatives have been found to develop skills that transfer to increased employability in areas such as software development, engineering and audio-visual industries.⁹¹

Arts-based and cultural initiatives can also foster economic development within communities. For example, art created from arts-based initiatives, such as paintings, murals, music, theatrical performances and jewellery, may create new local industries and encourage local tourism.⁹²

Increased sense of pride

Arts and culture-based community initiatives can also increase individuals' pride of place. By involving community members in the design, creation and upkeep of community places, exhibitions or performances, community members develop a vested interest in maintaining and celebrating these spaces. This can lead to an increased sense of pride and of responsibility. Research has

found that if community members develop this communal sense of ownership, then they will also develop stronger bonds to the wider community.⁹³

Case Study: The Stove Network

An example of a transformative arts-based organisation is the Stove Network.⁹⁴ Based in Dumfries, Scotland, the Stove Network has been acknowledged as a national leader in using arts and creativity to involve communities in shaping their own futures.

The organisation's work merges three core areas: the arts, community development and social impact. The Stove engages the community, policymakers and creative workers, with the aim of using the arts to mobilise individuals to be agents of change.

The projects put on by The Stove are welcoming and incorporate almost all artistic mediums. For example, the Reel to Real Cinema is a monthly screening of films outlining innovative ideas to initiate dialogue about positive social change.⁹⁵

The Lowland Project, another initiative from The Stove, uses creative writing in the form of poetry, fiction, diaries and illustrations to create opportunities for a rich exploration of connection and belonging in Dumfries.⁹⁶ The resulting community repository of creative writing, which is still in progress, will hopefully be a valuable community asset that will foster a pride of place and of community for generations to come.

Funding issues

Although arts and culture-based initiatives have many strengths, there are also obstacles. Availability of funding and trained experts is a significant challenge for arts-based community development projects, since public funding for arts-based initiatives has significantly declined across the UK.⁹⁷ Many

community groups are unable to access the materials and, in some cases, the expertise.

In some cases, local artists are being forced to relocate away from their communities in order to sustain their trade. This has meant that in addition to a decrease of funding for arts-based initiatives, there has also been an 'artistic brain drain.'⁹⁸ Brexit will potentially worsen this brain drain, since the UK creative industries are set to lose more than £40 million per year of EU funding.⁹⁹

Some artists have expressed frustration about the expectation that they should work for free and that their creativity and skills are being positioned as voluntary social work.¹⁰⁰ For example, after Derry/Londonderry was awarded the UK City of Culture status in 2013, local artists reported that they had been asked to work for little or no pay, and that organisers had urged artists to support their local community voluntarily.¹⁰¹

In order to truly capitalise on the transformative powers of the arts and culture, additional funding must be secured, and expertise respected, appropriately compensated and supported.

7

Strengthening community resilience through sports and community leisure

Like art, sport can help to tackle social divisions, encourage community unity, raise confidence and improve physical and mental well-being. In addition, sport and leisure activities can foster a shared sense of purpose, accomplishment and effective management of conflict and pressure.¹⁰² Physical activities and endurance can also support individuals to handle emotions effectively under stress, deal with anger and frustration, and increase self-efficacy.¹⁰³ For young people in particular, participation in team sports can lead to positive peer relationships, a declining rate of anti-social behaviour, a stronger sense of belonging and higher self-esteem.¹⁰⁴ Sport can also serve as a catalyst for social and economic regeneration.¹⁰⁵ These benefits can significantly strengthen community resilience since, in addition to increased local community health, social networks and economic opportunities are likely to increase.

For young people in particular, participation in team sports can lead to positive peer relationships, a declining rate of anti-social behaviour, a stronger sense of belonging and higher self-esteem.

This transformative power of sport has been recognised by policymakers across the UK.¹⁰⁶ Sport policy is often interlinked with cultural, health and education policies and crime prevention.¹⁰⁷

Research emerging from Sport England has shown that being active leads to benefits in five key areas: physical well-being; mental well-being; individual development; economic development; and community development.¹⁰⁸ Their research provides evidence that sport can help to build more resilient

communities, by bringing people together regardless of age or identity, developing community pride and increasing social capital.¹⁰⁹ These positive effects also extend to volunteers, spectators and the wider friends and families of participants.

In addition to these social benefits, sports and community leisure activities are also a cost-effective medium for building community strength and resilience.

Case Study: parkrun UK

parkrun UK has been described as a ground-breaking ‘sustainable community lifestyle initiative’,¹¹⁰ and as a transformative social movement.¹¹¹ parkrun began as a weekly 5k time trial for runners in Paul Sinton-Hewitt’s running club, Ranelagh Harriers, in west London’s Bushy Park.¹¹² Today, the event has evolved into a global force, with 577 parkrun and junior parkrun events in the UK and over 460 events across 22 countries.¹¹³

To be as inclusive as possible, parkrun organisers strive to minimise participation barriers. There is no upper age limit and children as young as four can participate. No special clothing is required, and there are no direct costs.¹¹⁴

Studies have found that parkrun has positive effects upon the physical and mental well-being of participants, and leads to a strengthened sense of identity and a widened social network.¹¹⁵

Sport and leisure activities also contribute to positive, welcoming community spaces, such as parks and community centres. This can foster social cohesion, positive interaction and shared investment. For example, sports centres are often multi-functional hubs that add to community empowerment and community pride, and serve as a potential source of community tourism and revenue. Interactions with family, friends and neighbours create a stronger social network, increase the cultural capital of participants and provide community support.¹¹⁶

Therefore, even if community members are not personally participating in sport or leisure activities, the shared space within the community enables the strengthening of resilience.

The power of boxing

Another example of a community-building sport that is having a positive impact on communities across the UK is boxing. Boxing is seen in many areas as a sport that has the power to bring people together, especially young people, and teach about health, discipline and respect.¹¹⁷ Boxing clubs are also credited with promoting positive social behaviour and belonging, and in some cases preventing young people from entering into anti-social or even criminal activity.¹¹⁸

The Dale Youth Amateur Boxing Club, for instance, served as the ‘social glue of the community’ in the area surrounding the Grenfell Tower.¹¹⁹ Since the club was based in the basement of the Grenfell Tower, it was destroyed in the fire. The club subsequently relocated to a nearby car park, in order to continue its work with the hundreds of young people and adults who were members of the club. Recognising the rehabilitating role that the boxing club had for the community, the architecture studio Featherstone Young offered to build the Dale Youth Boxing Club a new gym (documented by the BBC show *DIY SOS*).¹²⁰ The club was reopened in September 2018 by London’s mayor, Sadiq Khan – a vocal advocate for the community-building power of boxing. He said at the opening:

What boxing does is give you life skills: how to be magnanimous in victory, dignified in defeat, and a healthy lifestyle – how to keep you fit and active. But also, it gives you a family you can be part of, a sense of belonging. You cheer each other on and let’s be frank, you stay out of trouble.¹²¹

The new space also includes a multipurpose community centre, offering a platform for other types of creative engagement by local residents and a public space to come together.

The Dale Youth Amateur Boxing Club, for instance, served as the 'social glue of the community' in the area surrounding the Grenfell Tower.

Avoiding conflict

Although sport can foster positive community experiences, it can also become a source of conflict between groups and can lead to further divisions,¹²² as emotions can be heavily charged in competitive atmospheres.

To ensure that community sport programmes have a positive impact, specialists encourage participatory community involvement throughout the planning process. Although sports have transformative potential, initiatives must be planned strategically and involve the perspectives of a variety of local stakeholders, in order to succeed.

8

Strengthening community resilience through business and entrepreneurship

Businesses form an integral part of communities. They serve as employers, trainers, investors and creators of community social space. Businesses can promote a cohesive and resilient local community, but they can also hinder community developments, if community engagement is ignored. In order to promote community resilience, it is important that businesses co-operate and compete, as this keeps money circulating. Circulation of money enables more community businesses, increases employment and boosts community assets in spaces, services and expertise available.¹²³

Importantly, a diversified local economy is also an essential characteristic of a resilient community. Locally rooted organisations also have valuable insight into what the needs of the community are and how they can best be met.¹²⁴

Small and large businesses serve an important role in supporting community programmes and initiatives, by providing funding, resources and expertise.

Measuring well-being

Businesses can support targeted development projects and research. For example, the Young Foundation partnered with the Co-Operative Group to develop the Community Well-being Index, which maps how people across the UK conceptualise well-being within their communities.¹²⁵ These findings were combined with data relating to access to education, community public spaces, transport links, housing, employment levels and other indicators for the strength and resilience of a community.

By entering a postcode, users can access a community's well-being score and a breakdown of various sub-categories.¹²⁶ The Index is a powerful tool for community members, businesses and local government to analyse the needs of their localities.

Contributing to the social economy

Businesses are also being called upon by local communities to be more conscious of the environment and to actively contribute to the social economy.¹²⁷ Social economy refers to organisations that engage in economic activities with social and ethical goals. Businesses following this model attempt a synergy between economic and social aims.¹²⁸ Social economy models create a strong engagement with local values and resources that supports physical and mental well-being.¹²⁹

Community markets, community gardens and community farming practices also contribute to place-based culture and identity.¹³⁰ The social economy also supports knowledge-transfer and increases cohesion and social capital.¹³¹ By relying more upon local assets, local expertise and local consumers, community enterprises have become financially self-sustaining and more resilient.¹³²

Case Study: Growing Together

'Growing Together' is a Welsh initiative that supports community groups to access income, land and skills in order to make their community growing projects financially self-sustaining.¹³³ Between 2013 and 2018, over 70 training events were held, with over 600 people attending; 38 groups received support from businesses with a total value of £234,655; and 295 groups generated alternative forms of income and increased their sustainability.¹³⁴

In Northern Ireland, 'Growing Resilience' is a five-year project aimed at increasing social capital and resilience in the community growing sector.¹³⁵ The programme supports volunteers to connect, share skills and strengthen their ability to work sustainably in a challenging financial landscape. Patricia Wallace, the Northern Ireland Development Co-ordinator of Social Farms and Gardens, says:

*Community gardening makes a unique contribution to community development. It provides a communal space for people to come together to socialise and enjoy growing healthy fresh food. When we slow down to the pace of nature, we relax; giving real health benefits to our physical and mental wellbeing. When we grow food in a community space there are huge social benefits for ourselves and our community... This programme nurtures and sustains these groups, helping them to thrive into the future.*¹³⁶

Another initiative to support communities through business is Business in the Community's 'arc' programme, in partnership with Social Enterprise UK. The arc programme supports businesses to connect with social entrepreneurs to collaborate, share skills and create sustainable benefits for the wider community.¹³⁷ Inspired by the business development that emerged from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and the need to create a lasting legacy for some of London's most deprived communities, arc was created to deliver in-depth business support and upskilling opportunities to help social enterprises grow. To date, arc has supported more than 150 social enterprises, creating more than 5,000 jobs for local communities.

Changing the way we work

The way people work is also changing, which is having implications for the strength of place-based communities. A recent trend in the UK, which has increased exponentially since the COVID-19 lockdown, is homeworking. For some, homeworking provides increased flexibility. For example, people

have greater scope to live in more rural areas, whilst working for an urban employer.¹³⁸ Homeworking can also be a cost-effective and environmentally friendly option for employees and employers, as it decreases the amount and cost of travel, and the need for relocation or the provision of workspace.

Although improved technology is broadening the communication opportunities for homeworkers, this trend can have a negative effect, by diminishing the social networks that are created through the workplace and excluding people whose access to broadband is limited, or who have lower digital literacy levels. This may render certain individuals more vulnerable to social isolation and unemployment, which can have a negative impact on community resilience.¹³⁹

...although improved technology is broadening the communication opportunities for homeworkers, the trend can have a negative effect, by decreasing social networks that are created through the workplace and excluding those with broadband accessibility limitations or who have low digital literacy.

The 2019 Cumberland Lodge *Working Identities* report¹⁴⁰ investigated the theme of the changing world of work. The report highlights that, in addition to the nature and location of work changing, employment contracts have also changed since the late 20th century, witnessing an increase in 'more precarious, less secure and more flexible work, leading to the growth of the working poor and an increase in the number of people in need of multiple jobs.'¹⁴¹ This shift is not conducive to building community resilience, since it leads to increased uncertainty and potentially inconsistent economic and social circumstances for individuals and wider communities.

9

Strengthening community resilience through education

Schools and other education partners play an important role in supporting community development, increasing social engagement and strengthening community resilience.¹⁴² Educational institutions can prepare communities for change and can promote peace, reconciliation and collaboration across groups. In addition, educational spaces can serve as community hubs and provide a neutral space for discussion.

The role of educational institutions in supporting community resilience can be divided into three areas:

- Compulsory schooling
- Training and skills development for adults
- Partnerships with higher education institutions.

Compulsory schooling

Compulsory schooling has an influential role in a young person's life. Although the home is usually positioned as the most influential learning environment, the school is often second, since it plays a vital role in shaping a child's future.¹⁴³ A child's school experiences have a lasting impact upon their development and future success as adults.¹⁴⁴

In addition, communities with high levels of social capital tend to have stronger school–community relationships. Improving school–community relationships can, in turn, increase community social capital. Examples of community building services include: out-of-school-hours care; school information nights; and school events that are open to the wider community.¹⁴⁵

Research has shown that school–community partnerships can support distressed urban and rural areas effectively. In this case, ‘distressed’ refers to area-based deprivation, poverty and high levels of social exclusion.¹⁴⁶ With this method, schools expand beyond delivering academic and social support to also providing health and social services to children, families and the wider community.¹⁴⁷ For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, schools have provided food, meal vouchers or equivalent bank transfers to the parents of vulnerable pupils, to help ensure that pupils registered on the Free School Meals scheme are still provided with a healthy daily meal during the school term and during the summer months.¹⁴⁸ Schools are an important link that can connect families to other support services. As well as supporting young people’s academic development, compulsory education nurtures motivation, confidence and social well-being. All of these elements can help to foster community resilience.

Schools are an important link that can connect families to other support services. As well as supporting young people’s academic development, compulsory education nurtures motivation, confidence and social well-being.

Having high levels of young people who are not in education, employment or training (often referred to as ‘NEET’) can have detrimental effects on a community. They are more susceptible to social exclusion, decreased self-esteem and increased depression.¹⁴⁹ In addition, a high number of young people who are NEET can lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour and to a shrinking population, due to people relocating in search of education, training or employment opportunities.¹⁵⁰

Between July and September 2019, there were 800,000 young people (aged 16 to 24 years) in the UK who were classed as NEET.¹⁵¹ Evidence has shown that high populations of ‘NEETs’ tend to be concentrated in particular towns and cities.¹⁵² There appear to be two factors that have a significant correlation with the likelihood for young people becoming NEET: poor

educational achievement; and low socio-economic status, especially among those growing up in communities marked by poverty and underperforming schools.¹⁵³ This highlights the fact that inequality experienced by deprived communities across the UK is being perpetuated.

In 2018, the government published analysis of NEET data by ethnicity. The data set considered NEET data from 2012 to 2016. The report shows that 82% of the NEET population in the UK during those years were young Black, Asian and minority ethnic people, the largest sub-category of which was young people of Pakistani ethnic origin (16.2%).¹⁵⁴ Although this data-set is no longer current, it highlights the existence of social inequalities that have links to race, but there has not been any more recent analysis of this.

Training and skills development for adults

Supporting community members, both young and old, to secure employment and continue development is a common strategy to increase community cohesion and resilience. The UK Commission for Employment and Skills found that strengthening an individual's skills and experience can support individual and community resilience, by increasing the probability of finding and maintaining employment.¹⁵⁵ Therefore, to foster individual and community resilience, support should include initiatives that enable adults to return to education and to develop the specialist knowledge and skills that enhance their employability.

To foster individual and community resilience, support should include initiatives that enable adults to return to education and to develop the specialist knowledge and skills that enhance their employability.

One way in which the UK Government has tried to increase employment opportunities is through the apprenticeship levy that was introduced in 2017.¹⁵⁶ The apprenticeship system forms a key part of the UK's youth employment policy.¹⁵⁷ The success of the apprenticeship system has been heavily debated. Many argue that the government programme (predicted to overspend by millions of pounds¹⁵⁸) is an unfair tax on large employers that is rarely used for apprenticeships; and that a large number of the apprenticeship statistics are deceptive, because of 'fake apprenticeships'. This refers to some employers and universities mis-labelling training courses as apprenticeships, in order to use up the allocated funding.¹⁵⁹

Skills centres across the UK also contribute to greater resilience through educational opportunities.

Case Study: The Southwark Construction Skills Centre

The Southwark Construction Skills Centre is a shared strategic and developmental partnership driven by the Skills Centre, Southwark Council and Lendlease, a multinational construction company.

The main aim of the centre is to increase employment and development opportunities for local people, by providing training for those who either wish to enter or to progress within the construction sector.¹⁶⁰

The centre partners with local employers, community groups, industry leaders, further and higher education organisations, and local stakeholders to drive industry improvement. It also runs school engagement activities.

Partnerships with higher education institutions

Higher education (HE) institutions can play an important role in supporting and developing community resilience. This involves taking down barriers that inhibit students from participating in HE, as well as encouraging HE–community partnerships to share expertise, services and resources.

In many countries where HE requires tuition payments, students from a lower socio-economic background are less likely to attend, compared with their more economically advantaged peers. Over the last 20 years, the UK has moved to close this gap.¹⁶¹ In 2016, the Office for Fair Access (now the Office for Students) reported a 65% increase in the number of students from the most disadvantaged areas entering higher education over the previous ten years, which has led to the lowest-ever difference in entry rates between students in England from the most disadvantaged and most advantaged areas. Despite this progress, socio-economic inequalities remain in participation rates at selective universities, particularly those in the Russell Group.¹⁶²

An example of an HE institution that is working against access barriers to support learning and community development is the Open University (OU). Established in 1969, the OU offers flexible and distance learning across the UK and in 157 countries worldwide.¹⁶³ A central part of the OU's mission is to promote inclusion, diversity and development.¹⁶⁴ The OU has over 168,000 students across the world, and has also had over 27,000 students with disabilities. This type of flexible and distance learning is enabling more individuals to access higher education and to develop their expertise and employability, which is further strengthening their individual and wider community resilience.

HE–community partnerships also enable groups to share expertise, services and resources, in order to develop local communities. Research collaboration frequently takes place between universities and groups in their neighbouring community. For example, the Community-University

Partnership Initiative (CUPI)¹⁶⁵ was established by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and Power to Change, to support these research initiatives. The CUPI supports community organisations and HE institutions to pursue research collaboration that benefits all partners and communities involved. Funding is available to support meetings, to support public engagement and to access required services. Such connections develop innovative insights and solutions to improve community life, whilst widening the skills and knowledge of those involved.

Other HE institutions support community resilience by offering grants and expertise to fund local community projects and social development initiatives.

Case Study: Having a Bevy

The University of Brighton supports the Bevy Community Pub,¹⁶⁶ a community-owned pub that reinvests all profits back within the community.

The pub opened its doors in 2014 in the deprived area of Moulsecoomb and Bevendean, just outside the centre of Brighton. The pub runs charity movie nights, a Dementia café for local residents, a 50+ activity club, a running club, photography and printing courses, singing groups, local food delivery to counter social isolation and various volunteer opportunities. With the University of Brighton, it is also conducting a research project on how to tackle loneliness effectively.¹⁶⁷

The partnership builds upon the experience of the Bevy in tackling loneliness and social isolation through their various community initiatives and the university's expertise in developing digital health solutions. The project will involve the Bevy and the University of Brighton working together with local communities to strengthen community resilience in the area, which could later be applied to other areas facing similar social challenges.

2.

Key themes and recommendations



10

Introduction to Part II

Part I of this report presented an overview of key areas of community life that can help to support and build community resilience. It also discussed a range of challenges that communities face as they seek to develop greater strength within the wider UK system.

In February 2020, a cross-section of community experts gathered for a two-day conference at Cumberland Lodge, to explore opportunities and challenges in relation to community resilience. Participants included heads of civil society and charity organisations, government representatives, community liaisons, policy advisors, business strategists, social entrepreneurs, faith leaders, academics, journalists, well-being specialists and practitioners involved in community projects linked to the arts, sports and education. A full list of contributors can be found on pages 86–89.

These experts discussed examples of good practice as well as pressing challenges facing UK communities. The group also devised practical solutions to help support local communities across the UK. At the core of these discussions was the acknowledgement that, even though there are many examples of communities showing great strength and resilience, the wider system to support communities is not functioning effectively. Decision-making structures, leadership structures, funding structures, monitoring structures and service provisions need to be transformed. A new social contract is needed that focuses on community-centred and community-empowered approaches.

Part II of this Cumberland Lodge Report presents five key themes and related recommendations for transforming the UK's approach to community development that emerged from open dialogue and debate with community experts and stakeholders. After the conference, the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated many of the developments identified by participants at the initial event. Cumberland Lodge thus convened a consultation, to follow up with previous contributors and other stakeholders,

in order to discuss the impact of the pandemic and to include recommendations that would respond to new challenges and trends.

Within each key theme, short case studies of initiatives are presented to illustrate positive models. The five themes are:

1. Foster stronger community leadership and decision-making
2. Widen the circle, to hear more voices
3. Develop and increase community spaces and local ownership
4. Focus monitoring and evaluation on meaningful impact
5. Build on shared wisdom, to create a better future.



Foster stronger community leadership and decision-making

Increasing levels of community leadership are pivotal for creating positive, inclusive and resilient communities. Community leaders empower their fellow community members to initiate and mobilise assets as well as individual potential, in order to further empower and develop community strength. Unlike elected leaders, community leaders build their legitimacy through various forms of collective popular consent and acquire their status through local connections and local understanding.¹⁶⁸

Community leaders occupy a powerful position in bringing about effective change in their local areas, because they often display forms of active leadership. Active leaders are highly engaged, personally invested, collaborative and proactive in finding solutions. Active leadership leads to:

- The effective identification of objectives and relevant stakeholders
- The efficient management of stakeholder engagement
- A robust understanding of the socio-cultural context.¹⁶⁹

These three elements significantly increase the likelihood of a community initiative's success, since they incorporate strategies of collaboration, co-creation and social innovation.

It has also been found that community leaders tend to be more likely to practise asset-based, community-led development (ABCD), whereas leaders situated outside the community tend to focus on a needs-based approach.¹⁷⁰ Needs-based approaches tend to focus on community deficiencies, needs and problems. Focusing on these areas can lead to disempowerment, dependency and marginalisation.¹⁷¹ In contrast, ABCD, a term created in 1993 by Kretzmann and McKnight,¹⁷² refers

to an approach to community development that is driven by community members and focuses on strengths and assets within the community. These assets are identified and mobilised, in order to respond to community recognised challenges. This approach to community development and community leadership involves collective decision-making and action, fostering beneficial relationships, and promoting community self-reliance based on trust and positivity.¹⁷³

Several strategies can be used in order to foster and increase this type of sustainable and effective community development.

Structural change

Firstly, structural changes must occur, so that there is more decision-making power at the local level.

Structural changes must occur, so that there is more decision-making power at the local level.

Social regeneration can be triggered by patterns of collective community leadership promoted by public administrators and politicians. These individuals must ensure that democratic structures incorporate participatory approaches that are focused on social justice and social innovation.¹⁷⁴

Dr Diana Whitney, a leading figure in the fields of positive community change and large-scale organisational change, argues that when government leaders, service providers and non-local civil society organisations (CSOs) representatives engage with community members in a participatory, positive and caring way, the approach will collectively and effectively transform their organisation and the communities that they are aiming to support.¹⁷⁵ In this way, community leadership is relationship driven and relies on building trust, respect and understanding amongst those situated within the community and with those working from outside it.

Leadership support and training

Secondly, leadership support and training must be made more available to community members.

It is widely accepted that providing community leaders with leadership and project management training can increase the success and sustainability of the community development projects that they are involved in. Although a local understanding and a strong network can be developed through life experiences, certain technical skills and management strategies are less likely to be naturally acquired. Equipping community leaders with training can further empower them to work effectively and efficiently within the wider social, legal, political and economic system.

It is also important that all members within the community are offered the opportunity to develop their leadership skills. Particular effort must be put in to supporting Black, Asian and minority ethnic leaders, especially in the charity and social sectors. Currently, the institutional composition of UK charities is predominantly white and middle-class.¹⁷⁶ A 2019 report from the Association of Chief Executives of Voluntary Organisations (ACEVO) also reveals that only 9% of charity employees are Black, Asian and minority ethnic, and only 6% of chief executive officers.¹⁷⁷ A community is strengthened if their leaders represent a wide range of ages, genders, backgrounds, languages, faiths, interests and identities.

Particular effort must be put in to supporting Black, Asian and minority ethnic leaders, especially in the charity and social sectors.

Case Study: Toynbee Hall's 'Community Change Makers'



'Community Change Makers' is a leadership programme run by Toynbee Hall, a charitable institution based in East London that focuses on eradicating poverty and inequality. The aim of the programme is to empower young Londoners to bring about change in their local communities and beyond. The programme is open and free to all young people, and efforts are taken to ensure that as many local young people as possible hear about the programme.

Through a series of workshops, discussion groups and idea-sharing initiatives, the developing leaders learn how to constructively participate in an argument, compel others to listen, work effectively in teams and campaign for issues that are important to them. The programme culminates in a community event, where participants share their ideas for decreasing inequality and increasing opportunities and support for all members of their community.

Through this leadership programme, Toynbee Hall hopes to equip young people with the confidence and skills to turn their ideas into campaigns for positive social change that will lead to lasting impact. These young leaders can then apply to be part of Toynbee Hall's 'When We Speak' programme, which provides grant money, training and coaching for young people aged 15 to 25, who aspire to run their own local community project.¹⁷⁸

Increased funding

Thirdly, more funding must be made available to support ABCD projects during their incubation stages.

In the UK, only a minority of grassroots organisations have a direct financial relationship with the Government.¹⁷⁹ Figures from the 2019 *UK Civil Society Almanac* show that, in 2019, 82% of the civil society organisations had an income of less than £100,000, which highlights that the majority of civil society organisations are small. However, organisations that receive more than £1 million (roughly 3%) receive over 80% of the sector's annual income.¹⁸⁰ This trend is echoed when nation-specific data is considered. For example, in 2018, Scotland had more than 20,000 grassroots community groups, but the majority of funding was given to a small number of large charitable organisations.¹⁸¹

Currently, the typical decision-making structure used by central government does not proactively seek to involve the perspectives of specific communities when decisions are made that directly influence them. For instance, there are many examples of local council decisions to support community initiatives being overruled by central government,¹⁸² especially in terms of housing.¹⁸³ These reversals can lead to community tension, disempowerment and increased community inequality. Therefore, in addition to increasing funding for local community groups and CSOs, more fiscal autonomy should be allocated to local councils, so that they can decide how best to allocate financial support to meet specific community needs.

COVID-19 has highlighted the importance of grassroots community-based groups, because of the role many of these organisations have played to support community members throughout the pandemic. However, many of these charities are now facing financial pressures, due to an increase in demand and a contraction of their traditional funding sources. In April 2020, the Government announced a £750 million package to support the charity sector in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. In recognition of the importance of grassroots community groups, the government has allocated £370 million of this package to specifically support small and medium-sized charities.¹⁸⁴

Despite the inconsistent public funding for community development initiatives in recent years, private funding for community projects has expanded across the UK.¹⁸⁵

The development of the Social Return on Investment (SROI) framework has helped to encourage companies and businesses to evaluate the extent to which their actions and activities create or destroy 'social value'.¹⁸⁶ The SROI framework measures a broad concept of social value, which incorporates how businesses and organisations seek to reduce inequality and environmental degradation, as well as how they seek to contribute to social, economic and environmental development in their local areas. This process of evaluating SROI cannot be done by companies and organisations alone: it must involve a range of stakeholders and a thoughtful investigation of the social cost and benefits associated with a business's actions.¹⁸⁷ It is vital that this type of community support and business accountability continues, following the economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

It is important to acknowledge that these partnerships are generally only successful when they are delivered with communities, as opposed to being done to communities, for example, as a tokenistic marketing campaign. Therefore, businesses should consult and work with local communities before, and whilst, investments and support strategies are devised. It should also be recognised that valuable support is not necessarily limited to financial transfers: businesses can also share skills, knowledge, networks, materials and physical space with community groups, in order to help them to achieve their community aims.

Case Study: The Hummingbird Project



The Hummingbird Project is a social enterprise based in Northern Ireland that was set up in 2016. It works with communities to develop resilience and to aid recovery from mental health issues, using its unique 3U model to create person-centred, sustainable outcomes. Its aim is to harness lived and learned experiences, in order to give people the tools and support they need to improve their emotional health.

In 2019, the Project was selected as the PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) Challenge Partner. The purpose of the PwC Challenge programme is to seek solutions for a genuine community issue from organisations within the community. For example, Northern Ireland has the highest rate of suicide in the UK, so the PwC Challenge programme issued an open call to organisations based in north and west Belfast to collaborate and create an innovative response to the issue. As a result, The Hummingbird Project's winning proposal received £40,000 from PwC Northern Ireland. The relationship between the Project and PwC NI went further than funding. PwC NI supported the Project through skills development, and by sharing expertise and contacts.

This kind of funding approach introduces meaningful resilience initiatives into the community that are led by community members, which supports the success and sustainability of the project.

Recommendations

- 1. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government should lead and publish a clear mapping of the current decision-making processes related to local infrastructure (transport, services, education, housing, urban/rural planning, etc.).** Once mapped, this should be reviewed and revised by a joint taskforce involving stakeholders from across UK society. Revisions should be made to empower local communities in the shaping of their localities.
- 2. Small-scale charities and social-purpose organisations must be supported in order to survive and transition during the period of financial hardship caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.** Funding should prioritise areas in which poverty and inequality are entrenched, and should focus on supporting community-based, mission-driven charities.
- 3. Leadership training should be made freely available in every locality.** This training should be offered in a way that promotes accessibility and flexibility, so all community members interested in the training can take part, regardless of ability, status or personal circumstance.
- 4. The Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) should mandate Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) contributions and an evaluation of Social Return on Investment (SROI), especially for large companies and businesses.** The size of the contribution (equated in financial and human resources) should reflect the net worth of the business or corporation. These contributions should also be monitored and scrutinised by BEIS.

12

Widen the circle, to hear more voices

Not all community members may wish to take on a leadership role within their locality. However, their opinions, experiences and ideas are still valuable. A prerequisite for effective community collaboration is the inclusion of different perspectives, backgrounds and experiences. Local authorities and community leaders must strive to engage the whole community in devising inclusive solutions.

The metaphor of ‘widening the circle’ proposes increasing the range of voices and stakeholder groups that help to shape community development strategies. This can also involve outside perspectives, such as those of relevant specialists or representatives from neighbouring communities.

Case Study: The Big Iftar



Since 2012, the Big Iftar has been widening the community circle in towns and cities across the UK. The aim of the Big Iftar is to open up Ramadan and Iftar (the meal eaten after sunset during Ramadan) to people of all faiths and those who are not religious.

Individuals, organisations and groups are encouraged to host their own Iftar or to attend one within their community. These community-led events enable people to meet and enjoy food in an atmosphere of friendship and hospitality. This leads to new connections and encourages communities to ‘widen the circle’ of those they trust, respect and engage with collaboratively.

In order to harness different perspectives and their potential contributions, CSOs and local authorities need a thorough understanding of the community, including key leadership roles, central businesses, clubs, common spaces, languages used, values and priorities. In order to achieve such an understanding, community development teams must strive to include relevant local representatives from the initial planning phases of any community project. This helps to ensure that community members are seen as valued partners and not as powerless benefit recipients.

Widening the circle successfully is not a simple process: merging perspectives, concerns, objectives and realities is challenging. Collaboration can entail tension and conflict, which, if not handled properly, can intensify community divisions. This means it must be done thoughtfully, with careful consideration of potential obstacles.

Collaboration can entail tension and conflict, which, if not handled properly, can intensify community divisions. This means it must be done thoughtfully, with careful consideration of potential obstacles.

In addition, community groups, CSOs and government bodies must proactively seek to include those who are often excluded, such as: non-English-speaking immigrants or refugees; Black, Asian and minority ethnic people; the LGBTQI+ community; those with physical and learning disabilities; and those with mental health issues. It is not enough for groups to be open to widening the circle: there must be a conscious and proactive effort to include, empower and raise the status of the previously silenced voices within UK communities.

The COVID-19 pandemic and the Black Lives Matter movement have highlighted the urgent need to rethink what voices are involved in community consultations and in wider decision-making processes.

The COVID-19 pandemic has also stressed the importance of digital inclusion. The All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Social Integration has found that in response to the crisis, many services and public health details are only accessible online. However, there are groups in society that are unable to access the information or the support opportunities available.¹⁸⁸ This is due to primary or secondary digital exclusion, defined as:

- **Primary digital exclusion:** individuals do not own the required devices or do not have access to Wi-Fi or data.
- **Secondary digital exclusion:** individuals do not have the skills or abilities to manage online communication or they may have limited literacy or fluency in English.¹⁸⁹

The shift to home-schooling has also meant that young people with more devices at home and can access reliable internet bandwidth are able to more easily keep up with their studies than students who are struggling with either primary or secondary digital exclusion.¹⁹⁰ This situation has highlighted that if community provisions are going to be offered digitally, all community members must be ensured equal access and support.

The Black Lives Matter movement has elevated the reality that systemic racism does exist. More work must be done to ensure that Black community members are included, respected and listened to in decision-making processes and in all areas of everyday life. This is the responsibility of everyone in a decision-making position in the UK and should be modelled by local and national leaders.

Recommendations

5. **The Government should introduce mandatory community stakeholder engagement and participatory processes for all infrastructure and policy changes occurring in a locality.** A minimum level of engagement must be introduced, with the responsibility being placed with the

group leading the consultation process to reach out proactively to all groups within the communities impacted.

6. **Proactive measures should be put in place to raise the status of Black, Asian and minority ethnic voices within UK communities.** A critical appraisal of systemic racism should be conducted from the local to the national level, followed by actions to listen to, learn from and empower Black, Asian and minority ethnic members of society at all levels of government and community structures. Similarly, efforts must be taken to actively include other community members who have been historically excluded in participatory decision-making processes.

7. **Public institutions and publicly funded third sector organisations should be required to undergo an ‘anti-racism inspection’ of their daily practices, work structures, services, policies, hiring and promotions.** This should be done in collaboration with an external anti-racism specialist, selected from a list composed by the Government’s Race Disparity Unit. As with an OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills) inspection, the process should follow a clear framework, and result in a rating as well as recommended steps for improvement. Results should be published, and appropriate actions taken, to ensure that all publicly funded bodies and organisations are at a level of ‘good’ or ‘outstanding.’

8. **To overcome primary digital exclusion, the government must ensure that all individuals who wish to have digital access are provided with it.** This may involve ensuring that broadband coverage is extended or improved, or providing universal broadband to ensure that all individuals – regardless of socio-economic status – can access the same digital opportunities. This support should be delivered swiftly, to ensure that individuals are not left behind in the increasingly digitised world.

9. **To overcome secondary digital exclusion, digital training and support should be made freely available to all community members.** If members of the community do not wish to, or are unable to, participate, a community service should be made available to assist these members in accessing services online, such as a community digital support drop-in desk.

I3

Develop and increase community spaces and local ownership

Another way of empowering communities is to increase community ownership of public spaces, such as high streets, public markets, shopping areas, community centres, parks, playgrounds, trails and other neighbourhood areas. This can empower local communities and foster collaboration, unity, local responsibility, employment, economic development and pride.¹⁹¹ These spaces play a vital role in the social life of communities and help to cultivate the development of resilience.

Community development and social innovation do not happen in closed venues; they typically occur in cafés, parks and open spaces, where people meet, discuss, deliberate, share and plan. However, community members will only feel comfortable and confident to participate in these collaborative discussions if they are in spaces where they feel welcome and comfortable, and that they feel they have a right to occupy.

Providing open spaces leads to local empowerment and enables individuals to shape new ideas and responses to community challenges. Shared community spaces strengthen and unite a community's collective power, which can, in turn, influence and change the vertical power structures that influence local and national decision-making. The opportunity to influence vertical power structures (e.g. local economic plans or urban planning strategies), can help to reduce the social inequalities that often lie at the root of problematic community issues.

Shared community spaces strengthen and unite a community's collective power, which can, in turn, influence and change the vertical power structures that influence local and national decision-making.

Case Study: Collaboration Station



Collaboration Station is a community initiative in Coventry that was introduced by Grapevine, the Coventry and Warwickshire charity that supports local citizens to develop the skills and confidence to take power into their own hands and regenerate communities.

Collaboration Station is an open-ideas night that takes place once a month in public spaces, bringing together community members of different ages, abilities, gender identities, races, beliefs and sexual orientations. This regular event serves as an informal evening to generate ideas that are focused on connecting people in Coventry, reducing isolation and developing a better city for everyone. It provides an occasion for people who want to support their community to come together and get behind an initiative they believe in.

Many projects have been developed through the discussions sparked by Collaboration Station, including Lads and Dads, which supports the mental health and well-being of local Black men.

Since 2010, public spaces have increasingly disappeared across the UK, particularly in urban areas, as a result of privatisation.¹⁹² There are now fewer places where people can openly congregate for free and without surveillance. This disappearance of public spaces can have a negative impact on community connections and can increase rates of social isolation.¹⁹³ This decrease has occurred alongside an increase in foreign investment in the UK housing market and on UK high streets. This decrease in public spaces and in local ownership has taken a toll on UK communities.

Local ownership to support a community's economic stability

Whilst the personal wealth of some UK citizens continues to grow, issues of wealth distribution are becoming a bigger problem with inequality on the rise.¹⁹⁴ More families are falling below the poverty line.¹⁹⁵ As the sixth largest economy in the world, the UK has no shortage of wealth. However, the money created and/or spent within the community does not always remain there. For example, shops, building schemes and private enterprises owned by non-local or foreign companies or investors, are less likely to reinvest funds in the local community, and their success does not necessarily support the success of community members. The key, then, is to get more people and local communities to have more say over – and a stake in – wealth creation.

...shops, building schemes and private enterprises owned by non-local or foreign companies or investors, are less likely to reinvest funds in the local community, and their success does not necessarily support the success of community members.

Local community and social groups, and individuals, should be encouraged to play more of a role in the local commercial/private economy. Establishing a democratic economy is one way of achieving this. A democratic economy refers to an economic system whereby individuals share ownership over their community resources, and ethical financing and sustainability are prioritised.¹⁹⁶ A more community-based and democratic economy fosters more financially stable communities. For example, increasing the number of social enterprises and locally developed business ventures can lead to increased local engagement, a greater number of job opportunities and more ethical business practices.

This is a growing movement across the UK and business support schemes have already been established at a national level

to support it. For example, in 2014, the Government set-up a Growth Hub Network, dividing England into 39 localised business areas.¹⁹⁷ Its intention is for each Hub to provide specific advice, support and resources to support local businesses.¹⁹⁸ Each Growth Hub also sits within a Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), which works at the strategic level, determining local economic priorities and devising strategies for overcoming local challenges and boosting economic performance.¹⁹⁹ At present, the Growth Hub network is specific to England, because business support is a devolved responsibility.

Meanwhile, the Centre for Local Economic Strategies (CLES) has identified these five principles for community wealth-building:²⁰⁰

- Fair employment and just labour markets
- Plural ownership of the economy
- Making financial power work for local places
- Progressive procurement of goods and services
- Socially just use of land and property.

Although these principles can be applied across the UK, the CLES highlights that their relevance differs from community to community. Therefore, a targeted economic strategy should be devised by local government and community leaders, so that the resources and needs of the community can be appropriately utilised and accounted for.

The CLES has recently advocated for an enhanced role for community wealth building in light of the COVID-19 pandemic and the economic and social recovery.²⁰¹ Also, Rebecca Trevalyan, co-founder of the social enterprise Library of Things, argues that the COVID-19 pandemic presents an opportunity to bring positive change into local economies, specifically in relation to the high street.²⁰² The economic impact of COVID-19 means that many high street retailers will not be reopening their doors. Although this exemplifies the economic hardship brought on by the pandemic, it also creates a moment for change. Instead of these spaces being used to promote consumerism and foreign

investment, they can instead be used as community spaces to support development, cohesion and economic regeneration, led by communities for the benefit of communities.

For this to happen, communities need to be able to access and gain ownership of these spaces, which can be challenging when high-street landlords are increasingly located outside of the UK.²⁰³ Community asset transfers may be one part of the solution. These involve the transfer of the ownership (or leasehold) of property or land, from local authorities to the hands of community groups.²⁰⁴ Increasing the presence of locally minded voluntary community and social enterprises (VCSEs) would also be a potential solution for transforming high streets into more community-minded spaces.

Local ownership to support a community's environmental stability

Providing community groups with the space and resources to lead their own local renewal projects is seen as the most cost-effective way to ensure that cities, towns and villages can thrive ecologically and sustainably. Drawing on their vested interest in the future of their local area, community members – alongside environmental specialists – are best placed to drive change for local infrastructure to be more environmentally and financially efficient.²⁰⁵

This includes rethinking transport networks, housing options, health services, green spaces, employment opportunities and business structures. Prioritising more environmentally friendly initiatives is important for building community strength and sustainability, but it is also urgently needed to combat the climate crisis. The Association of Chief Executives of Voluntary Organisations (ACEVO) has warned that every charity or CSO will be impacted by the climate crisis, and it will soon become necessary for all groups to prove to their communities and their funders that their initiatives are showing leadership – and action to slow the threat of the climate crisis.²⁰⁶

Prioritising more environmentally friendly initiatives is important for building community strength and sustainability, but it is also urgently needed to combat the climate crisis.

Recommendations

- 10. Local authorities should be stripped of the ability to sell or repurpose community assets – such as public and communal spaces.** Such steps should only be taken with a thorough and participatory decision-making process, involving diverse representation from the local community.
- 11. A public space threshold should be introduced, to ensure that public space is available to community members in all boroughs, districts and counties in the UK.** The amount of public space should be proportional to the total land/population of the local authority. If an area does not currently have the minimum amount required, then spaces should be created or repurposed for public use. The cost of creating these spaces should not be taken from pre-existing community development funds.
- 12. The Government should commit to ensuring active business growth hubs in England (across all 39 business growth areas), Scotland (working with Business Gateway Scotland), Wales (working with Business Wales) and Northern Ireland (working with Invest Northern Ireland), and support the growth of communities and social businesses.**
- 13. The Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) should offer greater support for local business, to support community resilience.** This should include increased grants and incentives for local business development, business mentorships, and skill development opportunities for local business owners and co-operatives.

- I 4. The Government should commit to introducing a minimum threshold of voluntary community and social enterprises (VCSEs) on each high street.** Financial support or business rates incentives should be introduced, to encourage VCSE occupancy. High street occupancy will assist these organisations to thrive and increase their visibility to the community.
- I 5. Central and local government authorities should introduce a ‘right to operate’ model.** This would demand that all businesses strive to promote environmental sustainability and community support initiatives in their business plans.
- I 6. Local authorities and those in the economic development sector should read, learn from and implement the Rescue, Recover, Reform framework from the Centre for Local Economic Strategies.²⁰⁷** This offers clear, practical and community-prioritised recommendations for local economic development in a post-COVID society.

14

Focus monitoring and evaluation on meaningful impact

The work of CSOs and community groups is often stifled by a funding culture driven by marketisation and the desire for quantifiable outputs.²⁰⁸ Under the austerity policies introduced from late 2008 onwards, funding bodies adopted increasingly business-like management systems and accounting regulations in response to having limited resources to allocate.²⁰⁹ This resulted in projects increasingly being assessed according to metrics that could be easily quantified and (supposedly) objectively tracked. This approach continues today.

These structural regulations can detract from the more informal, family-style culture of community groups. Encouraging groups to neglect this culture can affect their ability to connect and adapt to local needs and circumstances.²¹⁰ The focus on quantifiable impact can also result in mission drift, since organisations have to focus their resources on satisfying monitoring and evaluation regulations, rather than on directing more resources to support community initiatives.

The focus on quantifiable impact can also result in mission drift, since organisations have to focus their resources on satisfying monitoring and evaluation regulations, rather than on directing more resources to support community initiatives.

Naturally, monitoring is important. Like any public service or allocation of public funds, it is vital that community projects are monitored, and that funding allocation is transparent. In order to meet such requirements, funding bodies and local authorities need effective monitoring processes that go beyond simplistic assessment. For example, a community event that attracts a

small number of people can still have a meaningful impact, if it connects people and initiatives that lead to new ways of thinking, supporting and collaborating. In order to understand this distinction, monitoring bodies must engage more deeply with CSOs and community groups, and develop an understanding of meaningful impact for specific projects.

Case Study: Art for Reconciliation

Art for Reconciliation

Researchers from the University of Liverpool, Ulster University and Queen's University Belfast are investigating whether the Art for Reconciliation (AfR) model of cultural policy in Northern Ireland is achieving conflict transformation, and how its values might be promoted and improved in practice.

Early findings relate to the ineffectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation processes in place. Impersonal and easily quantifiable metrics focus on economic impact, participation rates, employment opportunities and other tick-box measures.²¹¹ In short, the evaluation processes are more focused on public accountability than on genuine community development.

This model has created areas of tension between funders and artists which, ultimately, inhibit the contribution of AfR. The model does not foster opportunities to learn from practice, and a vast amount of the evaluation data is not further analysed after the initial collection.

More specific to the Northern Ireland context, the research team found that funding requirements to balance participation between Catholic and Protestant communities served to reinforce the binary divisions that the AfR projects intended to dismantle, since the first question asked of participants was whether they identify as one or the other.

The AfR research team hopes that, through their work, they can bring together the voices of artists and funders, in order to think of ways to reshape funding and assessment that will capture and support the arts in all their distinctiveness and diversity.

One way of doing this is to introduce more participatory and deliberative approaches to the monitoring and evaluation of community projects and initiatives. Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) is a process that involves stakeholders at various levels engaging collaboratively, and with equal status, in the monitoring and evaluation of a particular project, programme or policy. Together, stakeholders can then actively engage in identifying areas requiring improvement and developing effective approaches for corrective action.²¹² PM&E methods increase the reliability of the review system and create more trust between community members and government bodies. To be effective, PM&E needs a skilled facilitator, to ensure that everyone is involved equally. It also requires more time to ensure that the participatory process is genuine. The investment of time and skills, however, is worthwhile, as PM&E fosters projects, programmes and policies that are genuinely and effectively serving the groups for which they are intended.

Recommendations

- 17. Public funding and monitoring bodies should implement participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) processes.** These should assess meaningful impact, rather than applying standardised metrics.
- 18. Local community members should be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of community projects in their local area.**
- 19. Funding and monitoring bodies should work with project teams when devising evaluation processes, to ensure that the processes accurately assess impact.**

20. Public monitoring and evaluation methods should be published and subject to a regular review cycle. The review cycle should seek to consult relevant government bodies, policy experts, civil society organisation leaders, community development specialists and community members.

15

Build on shared wisdom, to create a better future

Collaboration amongst those who share a passion to build better, healthier and wealthier communities is the starting point for any rewarding community initiative. The UK boasts many active, creative and tenacious CSOs and community groups that are making a positive impact within their communities. Much can be learned from successful community actors. At the same time, however, there are many individuals and groups with great ambitions, who struggle to secure the resources or who lack important practical insights that are needed to implement new initiatives or projects.

To support and strengthen communities effectively, it is pivotal that communities collaborate and share their wisdom regarding what makes initiatives successful and what makes them more likely to fail. Whilst every context is unique, lessons can be learned from across communities.

Collaborative initiatives that bring together leaders from cross-sector groups have a higher chance of success and longevity. Cross-sector collaboration leads to a growth of knowledge, skills and resources, which in turn increases the chances of overcoming obstacles and achieving community aims. However, challenges exist around the sharing of best practice across the community sector. For example, there is a need for more spaces – both physical and digital – to be created, in order to support collaboration and cross-community partnerships.

Cross-sector collaboration leads to a growth of knowledge, skills and resources, which in turn increases the chances of overcoming obstacles and achieving community aims.

Cross-sector collaborations can also engage more community members, by reaching out to different groups of people with

diverse interests and backgrounds. Communities are not monolithic: various micro-groups need to be brought together, if substantial change is to occur. For example, if an initiative combined faith communities, sports clubs and drama groups, it could reach a wider network of individuals, many of whom might not have engaged with one another before.

Cross-sector collaborations also reflect community diversity and the coming together of different people to support one another. One example of an organisation that is effectively using a cross-sector approach is You Press.

Case Study: You Press



You Press is an award-winning social enterprise that runs projects empowering young people from underrepresented communities to find their voices and contribute to sustainable community development. Its initiatives incorporate elements of the creative arts, media and business training.

Since its formation in 2009, You Press has been built on collaboration and the sharing of expertise and wisdom. To date, this social enterprise has collaborated with musicians, theatre centres, journalists, advocacy groups, photographers, writers, trainers, educators and hundreds of community actors. Through partnerships, You Press shares expertise and derives inspiration from the expertise of others.

An additional challenge to collaboration and the sharing of wisdom relates to terminology. Community group leaders need to be aware that terminology influences possibilities for best practice sharing as well as opportunities for collaboration. For example, different groups with similar aims may use different terms to describe and conceptualise their work, and this could inhibit avenues for collaboration. At the same time, shared terminology does not guarantee shared objectives. For example,

projects using the terms ‘tolerance’ or ‘acceptance’ may have similar aims or they may be significantly different.

It is also important to recognise that language is political. A nuanced understanding of how language shapes society is essential, in building resilient communities. For example, some groups may connect the term ‘tolerance’ to the idea of recognising and respecting the beliefs or practices of others. However, other groups may interpret ‘tolerance’ more negatively and connect the term with the idea of ‘putting up’ with something or someone.

It is important that community groups and local authorities use language that is welcoming and inclusive of the community, and avoid creating further community division. In short, language matters: it is important to reflect on the terminology that is being used and how it is interpreted.

Effective collaboration is also threatened by the limited amount of funding available for community projects. When funding and resources are limited, competition may trump collaboration. If CSOs are working within an overly competitive environment, then communities lose out, since the focus may shift towards winning funding bids, as opposed to sharing expertise.²¹³

Recommendations

21. **The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government should fund the development of a community project database of community projects and initiatives that receive public funding.** Private funders or non-funding groups should be invited to contribute to the database, to enhance community awareness, increase collaboration and provide guidance for community leaders.
22. **Public funding schemes should use streamlined funding applications and a central database for funding opportunities, and have access to a sample of completed applications with a streamlined structure.**

- 23. Research and policy analysis groups in the public sector should conduct further research into the impact of local community development initiatives.**
- 24. Tax reductions or other incentives should be offered to research groups, think tanks and higher education institutions, to encourage pro bono research.** This would help to support local charities and civil society organisations that lack the resources to conduct or fund such research themselves. Such valuable research would help these groups to further develop their work and illustrate their contribution to funders, local government and community members.

Contributors

The following is a list of the people who have contributed to the development of this report, by participating in our conference and/or consultation discussions. We are grateful to everyone who offered their time, experience and expertise to this project. We sought, throughout, to involve representatives from a wide range of ages, backgrounds and perspectives, to enrich our findings and recommendations.



Ali Amla
Solutions Not Sides

Stephen Arnott
Beats Bus Records

Sophie Besse
PSYCHEdelight Theatre
Company

Jeffrey Boakye
Trinity House Academy

Victoria Boelman
The Young Foundation

Dr Heather Buckingham
Trussell Trust

Georgina Bye
Mitzvah Day

Radhika Bynon
One Newham

Leigh Carey
The Hummingbird Project

Rachel Carlill
University of East Anglia
(Cumberland Lodge Scholar)

Helen Carroll

The Co-operative

Kristina Gavran

Loughborough University

Rosie Carter

HOPE not Hate Charitable Trust

Jessica Gibbons

Wiltshire Council

Emily Clark

Future Foundations

Wendy Gill

Durham University

Sarah Clowry

Durham University
(Cumberland Lodge Scholar)

Mark Gordon

Power to Change

Ruairi Cousins

Loughborough University London

Jude Habib

Sounddelivery

Tahirih Danesh

The Foreign Policy Centre

Pauline Hadaway

University of Liverpool

Poulomi Desai

Usurp Art

Professor Dennis Hayes

University of Derby

Matt Dickinson

University of Oxford
(Cumberland Lodge Scholar)

Rebecca Holt

Battersea Arts Centre

Dr Julian Dobson

Urban Pollinators

Dr Justine Huxley

St Ethelburga's Centre for
Reconciliation and Peace

Farah Elahi

Greater London Authority

Dr Martin Johnson

Cambridge Assessment, University
of Cambridge

Dr Omolade Femi-Ajao

University of Manchester

Professor Mihaela Kelemen

Nottingham University

Nikki Kennelly

Northern Devon Healthcare Trust

Jennie King

Institute for Strategic Dialogue

Lyndsey Kramer

University of York

Michelle Lawrence

Link Up (UK)

Sarah Lennard-Brown

Green Christians

Aida Maaz

University of Bath
(Cumberland Lodge Scholar)

Rosemary Macdonald

UK Community Foundations

Noel Mathias

WEvolution

Colm McDaid

Supporting Communities

Neil McInroy

CLES

Jim Minton

Toynbee Hall

Simeon Moore

DATS TV

Grace Moronfolu MBE

Crown Prosecution Service East
Midlands

Dr David Muir

University of Roehampton

David Okwesia

Beats Bus Records

Elizabeth Oldfield

Theos Think Tank

Patricia O'Lynn

Queen's University Belfast
(Cumberland Lodge Scholar)

Timm Oshodi

Downham Dividend Society

Gitanjali Patel

Shadow Heroes

Nick Pearson

parkrun Global

Linamaría Pintor Escobar

Edge Hill University
(Cumberland Lodge Scholar)

Sheena Ramkumar

Durham University

Dr Jose Reis

Greater London Authority

Hannah Rich
Theos Think Tank

Dr Angus Ritchie
Centre for Theology and
Community

David Robinson
The Relationships Project

Dr Grace Robinson
University of Leeds

Mark Rotherham
Green Christians

Lucie Russell
StreetDoctors

Kay Scorah
HaveMoreFun Ltd

Rebecca Scotter
Ministry of Housing, Communities
and Local Government

Jack Shenker
Freelance journalist

Julie Siddiqi
Sadaqa Day

Robert Simpson
University of Manchester

Nigel Taylor
Beats Bus Records

Philip Treleven
The Duke of Edinburgh's Award

Jess Walker
The Bromley by Bow Centre

Pam Warhurst
Incredible Edible Ltd

Clare Wightman
Grapevine Coventry and
Warwickshire Ltd

Stephen Wordsworth
Council for At-risk Academics

Susan Wylde
West Midlands Police

Notes

1. Public Health England (2020) *Covid-19 Review of Disparities in Risks and Outcomes*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-review-of-disparities-in-risks-and-outcomes> [Accessed 3 June 2020].
2. Mulgan, G (2020) The Imaginary Crisis (and how we might quicken social and public imagination). *UCL Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Public Policy Working Paper*, April 2020. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/steapp/sites/steapp/files/2020_04_geoff_mulgan_swp.pdf [Accessed 10 June 2020].
3. Nesta and Britainthinks (2020) Is the UK getting innovation right? A survey of perceptions of the impact of innovation and technology. February 2020. [https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/Is the UK Getting Innovation Right.pdf](https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/Is_the_UK_Getting_Innovation_Right.pdf) [Accessed 10 June 2020].
4. Mulgan, G (2020) The Imaginary Crisis (and how we might quicken social and public imagination). *UCL Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Public Policy Working Paper*, April 2020. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/steapp/sites/steapp/files/2020_04_geoff_mulgan_swp.pdf [Accessed 10 June 2020].
5. Engstrom, S, Docherty, P and Robertson, T (2019) *Building a Movement: Community development and community resilience in response to extreme events*. University of Stirling report. <https://extremeevents.stir.ac.uk/files/2019/12/Community-Resilience-to-Extreme-Events-Final-Report-Dec-2019.pdf> [Accessed 1 February 2020].
6. Davoudi, S (2016). Resilience and Governmentality of Unknowns. In *Governmentality after Neoliberalism*, M Bevir (Ed.), 210-249.
7. Holling, C (1973) Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 4(1), 1-23.
8. Davoudi, S (2016). Resilience and Governmentality of Unknowns. In *Governmentality after Neoliberalism*, M Bevir (Ed.), 210-249.

9. Stockholm Resilience Centre (2018) *Stockholm Resilience Centre Annual Report 2018*. https://www.stockholmresilience.org/download/18.8620dc61698d96b190d62/1554365822326/SRC%20Annual_Report_2018_WEB_NY.pdf [Accessed 20 December 2020].
10. Keck, M and Sakdapolrak, P (2013) What is Social Resilience? Lessons learned and ways forward. *Erdkunde*, 67(1), 5-19.
11. White, R and Bennie, A (2015) Resilience in Youth Sport: A qualitative investigation of gymnastics coach and athlete perceptions. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 10(2-3), 379-393.
12. Mulligan, M, Steele, W, Rickards, L and Fünfgeld, H (2016) Keywords in Planning: What do we mean by 'community resilience'? *International Planning Studies*, 21(4), 348-361.
13. Sharifi, A (2016) A Critical Review of Selected Tools for Assessing Community Resilience. *Ecological Indicators*, 69, 629-647.
14. UK Department of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2018) *Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper: Building stronger, more united communities*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/696993/Integrated_Communities_Strategy.pdf [Accessed 10 December 2019].
15. UK Department of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2018) *Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper: Building stronger, more united communities*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/777160/Integrated_Communities_Strategy_Government_Response.pdf [Accessed 27 June 2020].
16. Durkheim, E (1951) *Suicide: A study in sociology*. Spaulding J, Simpson G, trans. Glencoe: The Free Press.
17. Fonseca, X, Lukosch, S and Brazier, F (2019) Social Cohesion Revisited: A new definition and how to characterize it. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 32(2), 231-253.
18. Fonseca, X, Lukosch, S and Brazier, F (2019) Social Cohesion Revisited: A new definition and how to characterize it. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 32(2), 231-253.

19. Keeley, B (2007) *OECD Insights Human Capital: How what you know shapes your life*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
20. Adler, P and Kwon, S (2002) Social Capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 17-40.
21. Keeley, B (2007) *OECD Insights Human Capital: How what you know shapes your life*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
22. Gardner, A (2002) Social Identity and the Duality of Structure in Late Roman-period Britain. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 2(3), 323-351.
23. Gupta, A (2017) The Impact of Austerity on Children's Social Care and Practice. ATD Fourth World. <https://atd-uk.org/2017/02/01/the-impact-of-austerity-on-childrens-social-care-and-practice/> [Accessed 1 January 2020].
24. Gupta, A (2017) *The Impact of Austerity on Children's Social Care and Practice*. ATD Fourth World. <https://atd-uk.org/2017/02/01/the-impact-of-austerity-on-childrens-social-care-and-practice/> [Accessed 1 January 2020].
25. Baranard, H, Kumar, A, Wenham, A, Smith, E, Drake, B, Collingwood, A and Leese, D (2017) *UK Poverty 2017: A comprehensive analysis of poverty trends and figures*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation Research Report. https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/files-research/uk_poverty_2017.pdf [Accessed 28 December 2019].
26. Tauschinski, J, Sogomonian, T, Boelman V (2019) *Flipping the Coin: The two sides of community wealth in England*. Young Foundation Report. November. <https://youngfoundation.org/publications/flipping-the-coin/> [Accessed 4 December 2019].
27. Tauschinski, J, Sogomonian, T, Boelman V (2019) *Flipping the Coin: The two sides of community wealth in England*. Young Foundation Report. November, p.9. <https://youngfoundation.org/publications/flipping-the-coin/> [Accessed 4 December 2019].
28. Harrison, E (2013) Bouncing Back? Recession, resilience and everyday lives. *Critical Social Policy*, 33(1), 97-113.

29. Thatcher, M (1987) Speech: Interview for Woman's Own. Margaret Thatcher Foundation. 23 September 1987. <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/106689> [Accessed 21 December 2019].
30. Thatcher, M (1987) Speech: Interview for Woman's Own. Margaret Thatcher Foundation. 23 September 1987. <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/106689> [Accessed 21 December 2019].
31. Gough, I (1980) Thatcherism and the Welfare State: Britain is experiencing the most far-reaching experiment in 'new right' politics in the western world. *Marxism Today*, July, 7-12.
32. Gough, I (1980) Thatcherism and the Welfare State: Britain is experiencing the most far-reaching experiment in 'new right' politics in the western world. *Marxism Today*, July, 7-12.
33. Risk and Regulation Advisory Council (2009) *Building Resilient Communities: From ideas to sustainable action*. London: RRAC.
34. UK Cabinet Office (2010) *A Strong Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: The national security strategy*. London: The Stationery Office, p.7. https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20121003075714/http://www.direct.gov.uk/prod_consum_dg/groups/dg_digitalassets/@dg/@en/documents/digitalasset/dg_191634.pdf?CID=PDF&PLA=furl&CRE=sdsr [Accessed 11 December 2019].
35. Cameron, D (2009) *The Age of Austerity*. Conservative Party Speeches: Cheltenham Party Forum. <https://conservative-speeches.sayit.mysociety.org/speech/601367>; <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2009/apr/26/david-cameron-conservative-economic-policy1> [Accessed 10 December 2019].
36. Morris, D, Wylie, R and Wilson S (2018) *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and civic engagement in the 21st century*. London: House of Lords. https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201719/ldselect/ldcitizen/118/11804.htm#_idTextAnchor005 [Accessed 25 November 2019].

37. Morris, D, Wylie, R and Wilson S (2018) *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and civic engagement in the 21st century*. London: House of Lords. https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201719/ldselect/ldcitizen/118/11804.htm#_idTextAnchor005 [Accessed 25 November 2019].
38. Cabinet Office (2019) Integrated Communities Action Plan. HM Government. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/778045/Integrated_Communities_Strategy_Govt_Action_Plan.pdf [Accessed 11 December 2019].
39. Cabinet Office (2019) Community Resilience Development Framework. HM Government. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/828813/20190902-Community_Resilience_Development_Framework_Final.pdf [Accessed 11 December 2019].
40. Cabinet Office (2019) *Community Resilience Development Framework*. [Accessed 11 December 2019].
41. Cabinet Office (2019) *Community Resilience Development Framework*. HM Government. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/828813/20190902-Community_Resilience_Development_Framework_Final.pdf [Accessed 11 December 2019].
42. Cabinet Office (2019) *Community Resilience Development Framework*. HM Government, p.3. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/828813/20190902-Community_Resilience_Development_Framework_Final.pdf [Accessed 11 December 2019].
43. McCrudden, C (2017) *The Belfast-Good Friday Agreement, Brexit, and Rights*. Royal Irish Academy-British Academy Brexit Briefing Paper Series, Forthcoming, 2018-04.
44. Hargie, O, Dickson, D and Nelson, S (2003) Working Together in a Divided Society: A study of intergroup communication in the Northern Ireland workplace. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 17(3), 285-318.

45. Hargie, O, Dickson, D and Nelson, S (2003) Working Together in a Divided Society: A study of intergroup communication in the Northern Ireland workplace. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 17(3), 285-318.
46. Knox, C and McCrory, S (2018) Consolidating Peace: Rethinking the community relations model in Northern Ireland. *Administration*, 66(3), 7-31.
47. Belfast City Council (n.d.) *Belfast PEACE IV Programme*. <https://www.belfastcity.gov.uk/community/goodrelations/peaceIV.aspx> [Accessed 16 January 2020].
48. Special EU Programmes Body (2019) *PEACE IV Programme Overview*. <https://www.seupb.eu/piv-overview> [Accessed 16 January 2020]
49. Centre for Identity and Intergroup Relations Evaluations Team (2018) *Impact Evaluation of Peace IV, Objective 2.1 Children and Young People*. Belfast: Queen's University Belfast Publications. <https://seupb.eu/sites/default/files/styles/PEACEIV/Phase%20I%20Executive%20Summary%20for%20PRINT.pdf> [Accessed 29 December 2019].
50. Future Generations Commissioner for Wales (2015) *Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015*. <https://futuregenerations.wales/about-us/future-generations-act/> [Accessed 6 December 2019].
51. Welsh Government (2015) *Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 – The Essentials*. <https://futuregenerations.wales/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/150623-guide-to-the-fg-act-en.pdf> [Accessed 6 December 2019].
52. Wales Audit Office (2018) *Reflecting on Year One: How have public bodies responded to the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015?*, p.17 www.audit.wales/system/files/publications/reflecting-on-year-one-2018-english.pdf [Accessed 6 December 2019].
53. Dickens, S (2018) What has the Future Generations Act done for Wales? BBC News, 10 May 2018. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-44073725> [Accessed 20 December 2019].

54. Davies, H (2017) The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 – A step change in the legal protection of the interests of future generations? *Journal of Environmental Law*, 29(1), 165-175.
55. Morris, D, Wylie, R and Wilson S (2018) *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and civic engagement in the 21st century*. London: House of Lords. https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201719/ldselect/ldcitizen/118/11804.htm#_idTextAnchor005 [Accessed 25 November 2019].
56. Communities Connected Consultancy Ltd (2018) *Approaches to Community Resilience*. https://socialcare.wales/cms_assets/file-uploads/SCW-Approaches-Report-ENG02.pdf [Accessed 5 December 2019].
57. Welsh Government (2019) *UK Open Government National Action Plan 2019-2021*, Welsh Government Commitments. <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2019-05/welsh-government-commitments-2019-2021.pdf> [Accessed 8 December 2019].
58. Welsh Government (n.d.) *Rural Community Development Fund: Guidance and services*. <https://gov.wales/rural-community-development-fund> [Accessed 8 December 2019].
59. Welsh Government (n.d.) *Rural Community Development Fund: Guidance and services*. <https://gov.wales/rural-community-development-fund> [Accessed 8 December 2019].
60. Scottish Government (2018) *National Performance Framework*. <https://nationalperformance.gov.scot/> [Accessed 17 January 2020].
61. Scottish Government (2018) *National Performance Framework*. <https://nationalperformance.gov.scot/> [Accessed 17 January 2020].
62. Scottish Government, Housing and Social Justice Directorate (2019) *Fund to Empower Communities: Equalities impact assessment*. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/investing-communities-fund-equalities-impact-assessment-results/> [Accessed 28 December 2019].
63. Scottish Government, Housing and Social Justice Directorate (2019) *Fund to Empower Communities: Equalities impact assessment*. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/investing-communities-fund-equalities-impact-assessment-results/> [Accessed 28 December 2019].

64. Davoudi, S (2016). Resilience and Governmentality of Unknowns. In *Governmentality after Neoliberalism*, M Bevir (Ed.), 210-249.
65. Greater London Authority (2019) *Civic Futures*. <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/civil-society/civic-futures> [Accessed 22 December 2019].
66. Greater London Authority (2019) *Civic Futures*. <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/civil-society/civic-futures> [Accessed 22 December 2019].
67. ACEVO (2020) *What Are the Barriers to Increased Racial Diversity Within the Third Sector?* ACEVO blog post. <https://www.acevo.org.uk/2020/01/what-are-the-barriers-to-increased-racial-diversity-within-the-third-sector/> [Accessed 10 June 2020].
68. Duff, J F and Buckingham, W W (2015) Strengthening of Partnerships Between the Public Sector and Faith-based Groups. *The Lancet*, 386(10005), 1786-1794.
69. Cloke, P (2010) Theo-ethics and radical faith-based praxis in the postsecular city. In P. Cloke (Ed.) *Exploring the Postsecular*, 223-241.
70. McCabe, A, Buckingham, H, Miller, S and Musabyimana, M (2016) *Belief in Social Action: Exploring faith groups' responses to local needs*. Third Sector Research Centre Working Paper 137, p.20. <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/social-policy/tsrc/working-papers/working-paper-137.pdf> [Accessed 3 February 2020].
71. McCabe, A, Buckingham, H, Miller, S and Musabyimana, M (2016) *Belief in Social Action: Exploring faith groups' responses to local needs*. Third Sector Research Centre Working Paper 137, p.20. <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/social-policy/tsrc/working-papers/working-paper-137.pdf> [Accessed 3 February 2020].
72. Johnsen, S (2014) Where's the 'Faith' in 'Faith-based' Organisations? The evolution and practice of faith-based homelessness services in the UK. *Journal of Social Policy*, 43(2), 413-430.

73. Duff, J, Battcock, M, Karam, A and Taylor, A R (2016) High-Level Collaboration between the Public Sector and Religious and Faith-Based Organizations: Fad or trend? *The Review of Faith & International Affairs*, 14(3), 95-100.
74. Mantovani, N, Pizzolati, M and Edge, D (2017) Exploring the Relationship Between Stigma and Help-seeking for Mental Illness in African-descended Faith Communities in the UK. *Health Expectations*, 20(3), 373-384.
75. Wharton, R and de Las Casas, L (2016) What a Difference Faith Makes: Insights on faith-based charities. New Philanthropy Capital Research Report, November, p.6. <https://www.thinknpc.org/resource-hub/what-a-difference-a-faith-makes/> [Accessed 27 June 2020].
76. Wharton, R and de Las Casas, L (2016) *What a Difference Faith Makes: Insights on faith-based charities*. New Philanthropy Capital Research Report, November, p.6. <https://www.thinknpc.org/resource-hub/what-a-difference-a-faith-makes/> [Accessed 27 June 2020].
77. Wharton, R and de Las Casas, L (2016) *What a Difference Faith Makes: Insights on faith-based charities*. New Philanthropy Capital Research Report, November, p.6. <https://www.thinknpc.org/resource-hub/what-a-difference-a-faith-makes/> [Accessed 27 June 2020].
78. Humanists UK (n.d.) Government and 'Faith' Communities. <https://humanism.org.uk/campaigns/secularism/government-and-faith-communities/> [Accessed 11 February 2020].
79. Johnsen, S (2014) Where's the 'Faith in 'Faith-based' Organisations? The evolution and practice of faith-based homelessness services in the UK. *Journal of Social Policy*, 43(2), 413-430.
80. McCabe, A, Buckingham, H, Miller, S and Musabyimana, M (2016) *Belief in Social Action: Exploring faith groups' responses to local needs*. Third Sector Research Centre Working Paper 137. <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/social-policy/tsrc/working-papers/working-paper-137.pdf> [Accessed 3 February 2020].

81. St Ethelburga's Centre for Reconciliation and Peace (n.d.) *About our Work*. <https://stethelburgas.org/who-we-are/about-our-work> [Accessed 16 December 2019].
82. St Ethelburga's Centre for Reconciliation and Peace (n.d.) *Training*. <https://stethelburgas.org/training/> [Accessed 16 December 2019].
83. Duff, J F and Buckingham, W W (2015) Strengthening of Partnerships Between the Public Sector and Faith-based Groups. *The Lancet*, 386(10005), 1786-1794.
84. Kay, A (2000) Art and Community Development: The role the arts have in regenerating communities. *Community Development Journal*, 35(4), 414-424.
85. Skippington, P A and Davis, D F (2016) Arts-based Community Development: Rural remote realities and challenges. *Rural Society*, 25(3), 222-239.
86. McHenry, J A (2011) Rural Empowerment Through the Arts: The role of the arts in civic and social participation in the Mid West region of Western Australia. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(3), 245-253.
87. McHenry, J A (2011) Rural Empowerment Through the Arts: The role of the arts in civic and social participation in the Mid West region of Western Australia. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(3), 245-253.
88. Huss, E, Kaufman, R, Avgar, A and Shuker, E (2016) Arts as a vehicle for community building and post-disaster development. *Disasters*, 40(2), 284-303.
89. Huss, E, Kaufman, R, Avgar, A and Shuker, E (2016) Arts as a Vehicle for Community Building and Post-disaster Development. *Disasters*, 40(2), 284-303.
90. Lewis, L B, McLeod, H and Li, X (2018) The Open Studio: Exploring immigrant and refugee youth experiences of belonging through community-based arts practice. *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry*, 10(1), 5-21.

91. Phillips, R (2004) Artful Business: Using the arts for community economic development. *Community Development Journal*, 39(2), 112-122.
92. Davis, D (2008) *First We See: The national review of visual education*. Canberra: Australia Council for the Arts and the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
93. Borrup, T (2009) *5 Ways Arts Projects Can Develop Struggling Communities*. Project for Public Spaces. <https://www.pps.org/article/artsprojects> [Accessed 30 January 2020].
94. The Stove Network (n.d.) *About*. <https://thestove.org> [Accessed 17 December 2019].
95. The Stove Network (n.d.) *Reel to Real Cinema*. <https://thestove.org/portfolio/reel-to-real-cinema/> [Accessed 17 December 2019].
96. The Stove Network (n.d.) *Lowland*. <https://thestove.org/portfolio/lowland/> [Accessed 17 December 2019].
97. Jennings, M, Beirne, M and Knight, S (2017) 'Just About Coping': Precarity and resilience among applied theatre and community arts workers in Northern Ireland. *Irish Journal of Arts Management and Cultural Policy*, 4, 14-24.
98. McCrae, P (2019) UK Creative Sector Fears Brexit Brain Drain. *The New European*, 26 October. <https://www.theneweuropean.co.uk/top-stories/brexit-stiffling-creative-industries-uk-1-6339326> [Accessed 30 January 2020].
99. McCrae, P (2019) *UK Creative Sector Fears Brexit Brain Drain*. *The New European*, 26 October. <https://www.theneweuropean.co.uk/top-stories/brexit-stiffling-creative-industries-uk-1-6339326> [Accessed 30 January 2020].
100. Jennings, M, Beirne, M and Knight, S (2017) 'Just About Coping': Precarity and resilience among applied theatre and community arts workers in Northern Ireland. *Irish Journal of Arts Management and Cultural Policy*, 4, 14-24.
101. Jennings, M, Beirne, M and Knight, S (2017) 'Just About Coping': Precarity and resilience among applied theatre and community arts workers in Northern Ireland. *Irish Journal of Arts Management and Cultural Policy*, 4, 14-24.

102. Johns, A, Grossman, M and McDonald, K (2014) 'More Than a Game': The impact of sport-based youth mentoring schemes on developing resilience toward violent extremism. *Social Inclusion*, 2(2), 57-70.
103. White, R and Bennie, A (2015) Resilience in Youth Sport: A qualitative investigation of gymnastics coach and athlete perceptions. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 10(2-3), 379-393.
104. White, R and Bennie, A (2015) Resilience in Youth Sport: A qualitative investigation of gymnastics coach and athlete perceptions. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 10(2-3), 379-393.
105. Coaffee, J (2008) Sport, Culture and the Modern State: Emerging themes in stimulating urban regeneration in the UK. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(4), 377-397.
106. Coaffee, J (2008) Sport, Culture and the Modern State: Emerging themes in stimulating urban regeneration in the UK. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(4), 377-397.
107. Coaffee, J and Shaw, T (2005) The Liveability Agenda: New regionalism, liveability and the untapped potential of sport and recreation. *Town Planning Review*, 76(2), i-v.
108. Sport England (n.d.) *Outcomes Driving our Strategy*. <https://www.sportengland.org/active-nation/outcomes-driving-our-strategy/> [Accessed 16 January 2020].
109. Sport England (n.d.) *Social and Community Strategy*. <https://www.sportengland.org/active-nation/outcomes-driving-our-strategy/social-and-community-development/> [Accessed 16 January 2020].
110. Watson, J (2013) Encouraging Participation in Health Initiatives: Parkrun. *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*, 20(6), 277.
111. McAnena, F (2017) Parkrun. Lessons from the ultimate start-up. *Market Leader*, 3, 38-41.
112. Hindley, D (2020) 'More Than Just a Run in the Park': An exploration of parkrun as a shared leisure space. *Leisure Sciences*, 42(1), 85-105.

113. Parkrun (2019) *Our Countries*. <https://www.parkrun.com/countries/> [Accessed 12/12/2019].
114. Hindley, D (2020) 'More Than Just a Run in the Park': An exploration of parkrun as a shared leisure space. *Leisure Sciences*, 42(1), 85-105.
115. Hindley, D (2020) 'More Than Just a Run in the Park': An exploration of parkrun as a shared leisure space. *Leisure Sciences*, 42(1), 85-105.
116. Hindley, D (2020) 'More than Just a Run in the Park': An exploration of parkrun as a shared leisure space. *Leisure Sciences*, 42(1), 85-105.
117. Taylor, M and Skinner, N (2012) "It's Nice to Belong": Boxing, heritage and community in London. In *Sport, History, and Heritage: Studies in public representation*, edited by J Hill, K Moore and J Wood. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
118. Taylor, M and Skinner, N (2012) "It's Nice to Belong": Boxing, heritage and community in London. In *Sport, History, and Heritage: Studies in public representation*, edited by J Hill, K Moore and J Wood. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
119. Watson, J (2018) How Boxing is Helping the Grenfell Community Fight Back. *The Independent*. 1 October. <https://www.independent.co.uk/sport/general/boxing/grenfell-tower-boxing-dale-youth-club-sadiq-khan-a8563361.html> [Accessed 29 December 2019].
120. British Broadcasting Corporation (2018) DIY SOS: Grenfell Boxing Club. BBC. 20 September 2018. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b0bjdsw4> [Accessed 28 November 2019].
121. Watson, J (2018) How Boxing is Helping the Grenfell Community Fight Back. *The Independent*. 1 October. <https://www.independent.co.uk/sport/general/boxing/grenfell-tower-boxing-dale-youth-club-sadiq-khan-a8563361.html> [Accessed 29 December 2019].
122. Partridge, J A and Knapp, B A (2016) Mean Girls: Adolescent female athletes and peer conflict in sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 28(1), 113-127.
123. Steiner, A and Atterton, J (2014) The Contribution of Rural Businesses to Community Resilience. *Local Economy*, 29(3), 228-244.

124. Steiner, A and Atterton, J (2014) The Contribution of Rural Businesses to Community Resilience. *Local Economy*, 29(3), 228-244.
125. The Young Foundation (n.d.) *Community Wellbeing Index*. <https://youngfoundation.org/community-wellbeing-index/> [Accessed 3 December 2019].
126. The Young Foundation (n.d.) *Community Wellbeing Index*. <https://youngfoundation.org/community-wellbeing-index/> [Accessed 3 December 2019].
127. Sonnino, R and Griggs-Trevarthen, C (2013) A Resilient Social Economy? Insights from the community food sector in the UK. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25(3-4), 272-292.
128. Podnar, K, Lah, M and Golob, U (2009) Economic Perspectives on Public Relations. *Public Relations Review*, 35(4), 340-345.
129. Cox, E and Schmuecker, K (2010) *Growing the Big Society*. London: IPPR, 9-10.
130. Amin, A, Cameron, A and Hudson, R (2002) *Placing the Social Economy*. London: Routledge.
131. Sonnino, R and Griggs-Trevarthen, C (2013) A Resilient Social Economy? Insights from the community food sector in the UK. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25(3-4), 272-292.
132. Sonnino, R and Griggs-Trevarthen, C (2013) A Resilient Social Economy? Insights from the community food sector in the UK. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25(3-4), 272-292.
133. Social Farms and Gardens (2018) *Growing Together*. <https://www.farmgarden.org.uk/growing-together> [Accessed 8 December 2019].
134. Social Farms and Gardens (2018) *Growing Together*. <https://www.farmgarden.org.uk/growing-together> [Accessed 8 December 2019].
135. Social Farms and Gardens (2018) *Growing Resilience: Digging deeper*. <https://www.farmgarden.org.uk/growing-resilience-digging-deeper-northern-ireland> [Accessed 08/12/2019].
136. Social Farms and Gardens (2018) *Growing Resilience: Digging deeper*. <https://www.farmgarden.org.uk/growing-resilience-digging-deeper-northern-ireland> [Accessed 8 December 2019].

137. Business in the Community (n.d.) arc. https://www.bitc.org.uk/post_tag/arc/ [Accessed 15 December 2019].
138. Steiner, A and Atterton, J (2014) The Contribution of Rural Businesses to Community Resilience. *Local Economy*, 29(3), 228-244.
139. Hislop, D, Axtell, C, Collins, A, Daniels, K, Glover, J and Niven, K (2015) Variability in the Use of Mobile ICTs by Homeworkers and its Consequences for Boundary Management and Social Isolation. *Information and Organization*, 25(4), 222-232.
140. Selenko, E (2019) *Working Identities*. Cumberland Lodge Report. <https://www.cumberlandlodge.ac.uk/read-watch-listen/working-identities-cumberland-lodge-report> [Accessed 27 June 2020].
141. Selenko, E (2019) *Working Identities*. Cumberland Lodge Report. p.12. <https://www.cumberlandlodge.ac.uk/read-watch-listen/working-identities-cumberland-lodge-report> [Accessed 27 June 2020].
142. Brooks, J E (2006) Strengthening Resilience in Children and Youths: Maximizing opportunities through the schools. *Children & Schools*, 28(2), 69-76.
143. Explore Learning (2018) *The Importance of Reception Year*. Explore Learning Blog, 23 August 2018. <https://www.explorelearning.co.uk/blog/the-importance-of-reception-year/> [Accessed 13 December 2019].
144. Durham University (2017) Why the Best Teachers Should be in Reception Class. *Durham University News*, 15 December 2017, <https://www.dur.ac.uk/news/newsitem/?itemno=33210> [Accessed 13 December 2019].
145. Edwards, C and Kutaka, T (2015) Diverse Perspectives of Parents, Diverse Concepts of Parent Involvement and Participation: Contrasts between Italy and the United States. In *Foundational Aspects of Family-school Partnership Research*, edited by S Sheridan and E Kim. New York: Springer, 35-53.
146. Deakin, M (2009) A Community-based Approach to Sustainable Urban Regeneration. *Journal of Urban Technology*, 16(1), 91-112.

147. Valli, L, Stefanski, A and Jacobson, R (2014) Leadership in School-Community Partnerships. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 110-114.
148. Department for Education (2020) Providing free school meals during the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. Updated 25 June 2020. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-free-school-meals-guidance/covid-19-free-school-meals-guidance-for-schools> [Accessed 27 June 2020].
149. Sadler, K, Akister, J and Burch, S (2015) Who Are the Young People Who Are Not in Education, Employment or Training? An application of the risk factors to a rural area in the UK. *International Social Work*, 58(4), 508-520.
150. Sadler, K, Akister, J and Burch, S (2015) Who Are the Young People Who Are Not in Education, Employment or Training? An application of the risk factors to a rural area in the UK. *International Social Work*, 58(4), 508-520.
151. Office for National Statistics (2019) *Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET), UK: November 2019*. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peoplenotinwork/unemployment/bulletins/youngpeoplenotineducationemploymentortrainingneet/november2019#total-young-people-who-were-not-in-education-employment-or-training> [Accessed 10 December 2019].
152. Crowley, L and Cominetti, N (2014) Report: The Geography of Youth Unemployment: a route map for change. *Children & Young People Now*, 2014(12), 28.
153. Sadler, K, Akister, J and Burch, S (2015) Who Are the Young People Who Are Not in Education, Employment or Training? An application of the risk factors to a rural area in the UK. *International Social Work*, 58(4), 508-520.

154. UK Government Race Disparity Unit (2018) *Ethnicity Facts: Young people not in employment, education or training (NEET)*. <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/work-pay-and-benefits/unemployment-and-economic-inactivity/young-people-not-in-employment-education-or-training-neet/latest#:~:text=Summary%20of%20Young%20people%20not%20in%20employment%2C%20education%20or%20training,at%2014.0%25%20and%2011.9%25%20respectively> [Accessed 10 June 2020].
155. UK Commission for Employment and Skills (2014) *The Labour Market Story: Skills for the future*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/344441/The_Labour_Market_Story-_Skills_for_the_Future.pdf [Accessed 14 January 2020].
156. Apprenticeships (n.d.) *Apprentice: What is an apprenticeship?* <https://www.apprenticeships.gov.uk/apprentice/what-is-an-apprenticeship> [Accessed 11 December 2019].
157. Greig, M (2019) Factors Affecting Modern Apprenticeship Completion in Scotland. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 23(1), 27-50.
158. Richmond, T (2020) Why the Apprenticeship Levy is Broken and How to Fix It. *Further Education & Apprenticeship News*. <https://www.fenews.co.uk/fevoices/40130-1-2-billion-wasted-on-fake-apprenticeships-sector-response> [Accessed 10 June 2020].
159. Carson, B (2020) 3 Years in – Is the Apprenticeship Levy still working? *Further Education & Apprenticeship News*. <https://www.fenews.co.uk/fevoices/47407-3-years-in-is-the-apprenticeship-levy-still-working> [Accessed 10 June 2020].
160. Southwark Construction Skills Centre (n.d.) *Real Training. Real construction sites. Real jobs*. <https://southwarkconstructionskillscentre.com/> [Accessed 15 December 2019].

161. Wiseman, J, Davies, E, Duggal, S, Bowes, L, Moreton, R, Robinson, S, Nathwani, T, Birking, G, Thomas, L, Roberts, J (2017) Understanding the change gaps in higher education participation in different regions of England. Department for Education research report. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/604393/Higher_education_understanding_participation_gaps.pdf [Accessed 28 June 2020].
162. Thiele, T, Pope, C, Singleton, A, Snape, D and Stanistreet, D (2017) Experience of Disadvantage: The influence of identity on engagement in working class students' educational trajectories to an elite university. *British Educational Research Journal*, 43(1): 49-67.
163. Open University (n.d.) About. www.open.ac.uk/about/main/ [Accessed 20 December 2019].
164. Open University (2019) *Annual Report 2018/2019*. www2.open.ac.uk/about/annual-report-2018-19/ [Accessed 20 December 2019].
165. National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (n.d.) Community-University Partnership Initiative. <https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/nccpe-projects-and-services/nccpe-projects/community-university-partnership-initiative> [Accessed 20 December 2019].
166. The Bevy (n.d.) Who we Are. <https://www.thebevy.co.uk/who-we-are/> [Accessed 1 July 2020].
167. University of Brighton (n.d.) Working with our Community. <https://www.brighton.ac.uk/business-services/community-partnerships/working-with-our-community/index.aspx> [Accessed 20 December 2019].
168. Bénit-Gbaffou, C and Katsaura, O (2014) Community Leadership and the Construction of Political Legitimacy: Unpacking Bourdieu's 'Political Capital' in post-Apartheid Johannesburg. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(5), 1807-1832.

169. Lin, Y, Kelemen, M and Kiyomiya, T (2017) The Role of Community Leadership in Disaster Recovery Projects: Tsunami lessons from Japan. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(5), 913-924.
170. Nel, H (2018) Community Leadership: A comparison between asset-based community-led development (ABCD) and the traditional needs-based approach. *Development Southern Africa*, 35(6), 839-851.
171. Green, GP and Haines, A (2008) *Asset Building and Community Development*. London: SAGE Publications.
172. Kretzmann, JP and McKnight, JL (1993) *Building Communities From the Inside Out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets*. Evanston: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research.
173. Nel, H (2018) Community Leadership: A comparison between asset-based community-led development (ABCD) and the traditional needs-based approach. *Development Southern Africa*, 35(6), 839-851.
174. Sancinco, A and Budd, L (2018) City Leadership and Social Regeneration: The potential of community leadership and the new roles for public managers and politicians. In *Social Regeneration and Local Development: Cooperation, Social Economy and Public Participation*, edited by S Sacchetti, A Christoforou and M Mosca. New York: Routledge, 17-185.
175. Whitney, DK, Trosten-Bloom, A and Rader, K (2010) *Appreciative Leadership: Focus on what works to drive winning performance and build a thriving organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
176. Mohideen, A (2020) What Are the Barriers to Increased Racial Diversity Within the Third Sector? ACEVO blog. <https://www.acevo.org.uk/2020/01/what-are-the-barriers-to-increased-racial-diversity-within-the-third-sector/> [Accessed 10 June 2020].
177. ACEVO (2019) *Pay and Equalities Survey 2019*. <https://www.acevo.org.uk/publications/pay-and-equalities-survey-2019/> [Accessed 10 June 2020].

178. Allsey, D (2019) *Toynbee Hall Community Change Makers*. <https://www.toynbeehall.org.uk/26/11/2019/community-change-makers/> [Accessed 3 June 2020].
179. Alcock, P, Butt, C and Macmillan, R (2013) *Unity in Diversity: What is the future for the third sector*. Third Sector Futures Dialogue. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press.
180. NCVO (2019) UK Civil Society Almanac 2019: Data, trends, insights. <https://almanac.fc.production.ncvocloud.net/executive-summary/> [Accessed 30 June 2020].
181. Scotland Funders' Forum and ACOSVO (2018) *Funding the Future: A briefing on the funding environment in Scotland*. First edition, March 2018. www.acvo.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Funding-for-the-Future-briefing-First-Edition-March-2018.pdf [Accessed 29 June 2020].
182. Sandelands, D (2020) Glasgow City Council Overruled on Controversial Thornliebank Housing Plan. *Glasgow Times*, 10 March. <https://www.glasgowtimes.co.uk/news/18292933.glasgow-city-council-decision-overruled-controversial-thornliebank-housing-plan/> [Accessed 1 April 2020].
183. Williams, R (2020) *Swansea Council Concern as Bid to Limit Shared Houses Overturned*. BBC News, 27 February 2020. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-51647336> [Accessed 2 April 2020].
184. The Charity Bank (2020) COVID-19 Emergency funding for charities and social sector organisations. <https://charitybank.org/news/covid-19-emergency-funding-for-charities-and-social-sector-organisations> [Accessed 29 June, 2020].
185. Hyndman, N (2017) The Charity Sector – Changing Times, Changing Challenges. *Public Money & Management*, 37(3), 149-153.
186. The SROI Network (2012) *A Guide to Social Return on Investment*. Social Value UK. <http://www.socialvalueuk.org/app/uploads/2016/03/The%20Guide%20to%20Social%20Return%20on%20Investment%202015.pdf> [Accessed 30 June 2020].

187. The SROI Network (2012) A Guide to Social Return on Investment. Social Value UK. <http://www.socialvalueuk.org/app/uploads/2016/03/The%20Guide%20to%20Social%20Return%20on%20Investment%202015.pdf> [Accessed 30 June 2020].
188. All-Party Parliamentary Group on Social Integration (2020) *Social Connection in the Covid-19 Crisis*. British Future. www.britishfuture.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Social-Connection-in-the-COVID-19-Crisis.pdf [Accessed 4 June 2020].
189. All-Party Parliamentary Group on Social Integration (2020) *Social Connection in the Covid-19 Crisis*. British Future. www.britishfuture.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Social-Connection-in-the-COVID-19-Crisis.pdf [Accessed 4 June 2020].
190. Feldman, P (2020) *Barriers to Online Learning Must be Removed to Tackle Covid-19 Crisis*. Jisc. <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/blog/barriers-to-online-learning-must-be-removed-to-tackle-covid-19-crisis-27-apr-2020> [Accessed 8 June 2020].
191. Joseph Rowntree Foundation (2007) *The Social Value of Public Spaces*. <https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/2050-public-space-community.pdf> [Accessed 3 April 2020].
192. Shenker, J (2017) Revealed: The insidious creep of pseudo-public space in London. *The Guardian*, 24 July. <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2017/jul/24/revealed-pseudo-public-space-pops-london-investigation-map> [Accessed 2 April 2020].
193. Baker, L and Taylor, M (2018) *The Future for Communities: Perspectives on power*. https://localtrust.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/local_trust_the_future_for_communities_perspectives_on_power.pdf [Accessed 4 May 2020].
194. Kidd, C (2018) *Total Wealth in Great Britain: April 2016 to March 2018*. Office for National Statistics. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/incomeandwealth/bulletins/totalwealthingreatbritain/april2016tomarch2018> [Accessed 3 April 2020].

195. Chamberlain, E (2016) *Wealth in Great Britain Wave 5: 2014 to 2016*. Office for National Statistics. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/incomeandwealth/bulletins/wealthingreatbritainwave5/2014to2016> [Accessed 4 April 2020].
196. Kelly, M and Howard, T (2019) *The Making of a Democratic Economy: Building prosperity for the many, not just the few*. California: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
197. The Business Finance Guide (n.d.). *What are Growth Hubs? And what can they do for me and my business?* <https://thebusinessfinanceguide.co.uk/what-are-growth-hubs/> [Accessed 28 July 2020].
198. Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2016). *Full Network of 39 Growth Hubs Boost Support Across the Country*. 14 May. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/full-network-of-39-growth-hubs-boost-business-support-across-the-country> [Accessed 28 July 2020].
199. LEP Network (n.d). *The 38 LEPs*. <https://www.lepnetwork.net/about-leps/the-38-leps/> [Accessed 28 July 2020].
200. CLES (n.d.) *The Principles of Community Wealth Building*. <https://cles.org.uk/what-is-community-wealth-building/the-principles-of-community-wealth-building/> [Accessed 2 April 2020].
201. CLES and The Democratic Collaborative (2020) *Owning the Future*. <https://cles.org.uk/publications/owning-the-future/> [Accessed 4 June 2020].
202. Trevalyan, R (2020) *Life After Coronavirus: A new high street is waiting – if we're brave enough to reimagine access to property*. Medium. <https://medium.com/@rebecca.trevalyan/life-after-coronavirus-a-new-high-street-is-waiting-if-were-brave-enough-to-reimagine-access-9b123875d6f> [Accessed 3 June 2020].
203. Trevalyan, R (2020) *Life After Coronavirus: A new high street is waiting – if we're brave enough to reimagine access to property*. Medium. <https://medium.com/@rebecca.trevalyan/life-after-coronavirus-a-new-high-street-is-waiting-if-were-brave-enough-to-reimagine-access-9b123875d6f> [Accessed 3 June 2020].

204. Smith, J (2011) The Potential of Community Land Trusts in Forging Resilient Communities. *Local work: Centre for Local Economic Strategies*, 94. <https://www.cles.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/LW94-CLTs.pdf> [Accessed 26 June 2020].
205. Sustainable Development Commission (n.d.) *Empowering Communities*. www.sd-commission.org.uk/pages/the-future-is-local.html [Accessed 6 June 2020].
206. ACEVO (2020) *Climate Change is Everyone's Business*. <https://www.acevo.org.uk/2020/02/climate-action-is-everyones-business/> [Accessed 6 June 2020].
207. CLES (2020) *Rescue, Recovery, Reform*. <https://cles.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Rescue-recover-reform-FINAL.pdf> [Accessed 7 June 2020].
208. Harris, M (2018) UK Civil Society: Changes and challenges in the age of new public governance and the marketized welfare state. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 8(4), 351-368.
209. Harris, M (2018) UK Civil Society: Changes and challenges in the age of new public governance and the marketized welfare state. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 8(4), 351-368.
210. Milbourne, L (2013) *Voluntary Sector in Transition: Hard times or new opportunities?* Bristol: Policy Press.
211. Coupe, C (2020) *Moving from Conflict to Coherence: Practitioners and funders on reconciliation, art and evaluation*. <https://www.artforreconciliation.org/resources/understanding-the-impact-of-art-on-reconciliation-in-post-conflict-societies-3> [Accessed 8 June 2020].
212. The World Bank (2010) *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation, Topics: Participation and Civic Engagement (a)*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
213. Ware, A (2014) Exploring Grassroots Groups and Local Government Relationships: Benefits and challenges for current times. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 5(3), 391-397.

Cumberland Lodge empowers people to tackle the causes and effects of social division.

Since 1947, we have been breaking down silo thinking and building interdisciplinary, cross-sector networks that make a difference. We are an incubator of fresh ideas that promotes progress towards more peaceful, open and inclusive societies.

We actively involve young people in all aspects of our work, and our educational programmes nurture their potential as future leaders and change-makers.

Our stunning facilities are available to hire for residential or non-residential conferences, meetings and special events. Every booking helps to support our charitable work.

Cumberland Lodge
The Great Park
Windsor
Berkshire SL4 2HP
cumberlandlodge.ac.uk
enquiries@cumberlandlodge.ac.uk
01784 432316
    @cumberlandlodge

Cumberland Lodge is a company limited by guarantee.
Company number 5383055
Registered charity number 1108677
© Cumberland Lodge 2020. All rights reserved