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# Introduction

This document provides a practical guide and road map for building community wealth via an Anchor Institution Strategy in Doncaster, and is based on the experience of CLES’ work across the country and internationally, with a particular focus on work undertaken with anchor institutions over the past 10 years in Manchester, Preston, Birmingham and most recently in Oldham. This document is intended as a companion document to the Doncaster Inclusive Economic Growth Strategy, which highlights anchor institutions as a vehicle for delivering more inclusive growth in Doncaster.

## Community wealth building as a concept

Places across the UK are striving to find new ways of attracting wealth while simultaneously addressing poverty. This ‘inclusive growth’ agenda has gained significant currency in recent years, with evidence of growing inequality and an increasing recognition that the economy is not working for everyone. For the Centre for Local Economic Strategies (CLES), the attraction of new wealth is important; but of equal importance is understanding and harnessing existing wealth for the benefit of local economies and communities.

Problems of poverty and inequality result from deep systemic causes, only made worse by austerity and a receding welfare state. Today’s economic growth is creating a low pay, low skill economy that means work is not necessarily a direct route out of poverty, so we need to fundamentally rethink growth itself.

The inclusive growth agenda offers an opportunity to pursue a system wide change in which we simultaneously invest in people and places to attract new wealth and deliver growth which addresses the inequality and exclusion which drives poverty. The concept of community wealth building however, focuses on wealth rather than poverty, and looks to leverage existing wealth and build good local economies and a good local society from within. Community wealth building is therefore an important part of any inclusive growth strategy, contributing to more co-operative, collaborative and social economy.

##### Community Wealth Building is NOT zero sum

Shifting the geography of spend is about bringing jobs to where they are needed most. It’s rationale is socio-spatial as well as economic. The value of an additional unit of jobs is higher in a deprived area than it is in a non-deprived area. In our work, an analysis of spend takes in a robust assessment of ‘leakage’, ‘gaps’, and ‘influenceable’ spend. In this we only identify scope for local spending where there a potential market is evidenced and where there is opportunity for spend to contribute towards clear outcomes. Progressive procurement is about bringing economic activity where it produces the highest social return without reducing the productivity of the economy. In short, it is about increasing the social efficiency of economic activity. This work is an example of Pareto improvement[[1]](#footnote-1) – whereby for the same productivity we get more social and environmental benefits. A crucial achievement in times of massive socio-spatial inequalities and austerity.

##### Community Wealth Building will raise productivity and living standards

National and international scale competition is not the only way to increase the productivity of businesses. Smart homegrown strategies can also deliver this objective. We should see Community Wealth Building as a long-term strategy of increasing the productivity of businesses through reducing information asymmetries (where one party in an economic transaction holds more information than the other), opening markets to SMEs and engaging with suppliers. These activities make the market more competitive, not less, as they enable access to more local SMEs and not just to a few big corporations. Community Wealth Building is therefore business development policy. This is crucial in areas where the economy has been hollowed out through years of neglect and under-investment.

##### Community Wealth Building is about the national economy

Progressive procurement is not just about increasing the extent to which anchor institutions spend in a defined local geographical area; it is also about shifting the behaviour of supply chain organisations (regardless of where they are based) so that they contribute to wider economic, social and environmental challenges. This is relevant for the national economy. Developing local businesses, with more jobs, reduces spend on out of work benefits and other national public services and it increases the skills and competitiveness of UK business, generally. In addition, there are national and international environmental benefits to progressive procurement in that it can shorten the supply chain and enable firms to produce wider environmental value. Again, this highlights the integrity of the approach. We get higher environmental sustainability – and shorter supply chain – by keeping the same productivity levels or increasing it in the medium to long term. It optimises the system for environmental efficiency and at the same time, it does not decrease economic performance. It is a win-win approach.

##### We should avoid framing Community Wealth Building as free market vs. protectionism

Markets are socially regulated entities that always favour certain types of firms over others. Currently, procurement markets are undergoing deep regulatory changes. Through the Public Services (Social Value) Act, public authorities can embed social value into the design of services, into decision-making criteria and weighting, and into delivery. As a result, the whole nature of procurement is changing: it is no longer just about cost and efficiencies, but also about considerations of quality and social value. As evidenced, particularly in CLES’ work in Preston, this opens up the opportunity to utilise public procurement strategically, as a lever to address the challenges places face and promote a different type of market. This market would not be dominated by large corporate multinationals, but informed by greater worker ownership, social responsibility and affinity to place.

##### Community Wealth Building is for all administrations regardless of political persuasion

Many shades of political thought across the UK and Europe have an interest and are advancing Community Wealth Building activities. Given the structural and spatial inequalities of the UK, the spatial benefit is central in proving the need for progressive procurement in the UK context. As such, an area with significant disadvantage would be ill-advised to ignore this on any perceived ideological grounds.

## What we mean by anchor institutions

An anchor institution is one that, alongside its main function, plays a significant role in a locality by making a strategic contribution to local economic life. Anchor institutions are characterised by a spatial immobility (highly unlikely to move) and their size & scale (be that in terms of spending, employment, land, or assets). Anchor institutions typically include local authorities, universities, colleges, schools, hospitals, prisons, airports, religious institutions, utility companies, large corporate institutions with strong local links, and sports teams/venues.

Every place has a range of these institutions, and they are therefore central to the concept of community wealth building. As a result of the scale of the jobs they provide, the scale of their spend through procurement, their land and assets, and the fact that they are unlikely to leave a place, cements them as vital actors in any approach to develop a good local economy and society from within.

## An anchor institution strategy

An anchor institution strategy should at its heart seek to build greater commitment from these institutions in understanding the needs of local places and local people. Maximising social, economic and environmental goals should be central to an anchor institution strategy, leveraging on existing abilities via local and social purchasing; through local employment; or as incubators for start-ups and community organisations. Local government can play a lead role in creating ‘anchor networks’ and building partnerships between anchors and public-sector bodies, local businesses and community groups.

The key to building community wealth via anchor institutions is ensuring that the capital and the benefits of general activity associated with the day to day operation of these anchor institutions is retained within the local economy as much as possible, and their power to influence, shape and support the local supply chain is maximised to deliver a good local economy.

Community wealth building is however broader than any narrow economic definition of success and anchor institutions need to examine how their actions can create more successful places, promote greater social inclusion and community cohesion, while supporting anti-poverty initiatives and supporting underserved communities. In achieving this, anchor institutions need to create more inclusive governance structures which allow for a redefining of the relationships between the local state, citizens and business, a rekindling of a local social contract with equality of opportunity at is heart.

### The role of anchors in delivering inclusive governance

The unprecedented challenges facing the public sector and local communities mean that traditional models of ‘top-down’ governance and service delivery are no longer fit for purpose. The traditional approach of using a strong central and local state to deliver services in a top down fashion is increasingly criticised for its inherently paternalistic attitude, and no longer considered viable in light of severe cuts experienced by local authorities.

Public sector institutions that are committed to finding better ways of working for, and with, local people for the benefit of their local community are exploring collective action, co-operation, empowerment and collaboration with communities to create more social value and pro-social growth. Local institutions around the UK are exploring innovative new models of service delivery, with citizens increasingly viewed as partners, rather than service users, in a new participatory approach which values the lived experience of local people.

Anchor institutions can re-evaluate their relationships with citizens and business to co-produce a local economic development approach. The Co-operative Councils’ Innovation Network[[2]](#footnote-2) is an example of a grouping of local authorities committed to transforming the way they work with local business and communities.

### The role of anchors in delivering good local economies

Creating good local economies which are more inclusive, in which as many people and businesses as possible can contribute to, and benefit from, local economic success, will be critical to achieving more inclusive growth.

A strategy for more inclusive growth should start with a deep examination of local assets across the public, private and third sector to ensure all assets (capital, land, employment, goods and services) are working for the benefit of the local economy. A resilient local economy requires strong commercial, public and social economies working together and feeding into and supporting each, in other to thrive.

Publicly funded institutions can cooperate through an anchor institution network approach to support each other to contribute to local basic needs, such upskilling communities, creating employment, supporting progression and reducing the cost of living.

### The role of anchors in delivering successful places

Dynamic, resilient places require economic strategies that not only bring together the economic sphere with the social, but consider people and places jointly. For many years, place-focused economic regeneration initiatives were a key feature of attempts to resolve the problems of poverty in poor areas. Successive governments implemented numerous programmes to address economic and social disparities between affluent and deprived neighbourhoods but they did little to address the root causes. In contrast, today’s productive people-based approach is neither place-based, or focused on the poorest. Only by considering people in place can we develop the sustainable, dynamic and inclusive place-based growth that benefits all.

Anchor institutions are firmly rooted in local places, they both recruit from and serve their local communities; they have a profile in that area and working together they can clearly contribute to wider social outcomes (including better health and crime reduction for example). This wider role is however not always well understood by all institutions, who have often not been able to find the space to think beyond their organisational remits, this has been exacerbated by the massive pressures caused by austerity. It is however exactly because of these added pressures to deliver more for less, that anchor institutions should come together to explore the synergies they can create for the benefit of local places.

# Setting the foundations

## Understanding the drivers

Key to developing an anchor institution approach to building community wealth is understanding the drivers for doing so. The impact of austerity on local services and the resulting public-sector reform programmes have led a rapid evolution in thinking at a local level about how we best support and develop people and places. Around the country, places are grappling with this challenge and emerging are innovative approaches characterised by a deeper level of integration and co-working than seen previously.

In Preston, an early focus centred around Preston City Council becoming the first formally accredited Living Wage local authority in the North of England and a wider campaign encouraging other institutions and organisations in Preston to become Living Wage employers. The council recognised that it was essential to widen the impact of the Living Wage policy and to encourage contractors and others in the supply chain to pay the Living Wage. In 2011 the Council embedded the payment of a Living Wage in their procurement processes.

Elsewhere, the Oldham Plan has recognised the continuous squeeze to public sector budgets has made it impossible to make further efficiency savings without there being visible changes in the services available to residents. The plan promotes an increase in the pace and scale of collaboration within and between organisations, sectors and communities to ensure support is there for the people that need it most and nobody is left behind.

Similarly, the scale of the challenge facing Birmingham City Council in terms of shrinking budgets and continued austerity called for a new approach. Through our work in Birmingham, supported by Barrow Cadbury Trust, we aim to break down the siloed key institutions based in the city and begin to build a collaborative culture working towards the common objective of progressing the local economy.

In Doncaster, the refresh of the Economic Growth Plan 2013–18 has prompted wider thinking about more inclusive growth. The Brexit vote highlighted the extent of disillusionment, with 2 to 1 voting to leave the EU in Doncaster, with immigration and pressure on local jobs attributed to the outcome. The Team Doncaster approach embeds an ethos of collaboration, progress and positivity and welcomes all to play a role in growing Doncaster together, with a partnership of organisations across the public, private and community & voluntary sector coming together to deliver the borough strategy.

## Setting a vision

Efforts to tackle social and economic exclusion over the past 30 years have often failed to address the root causes of poverty, with certain communities persistently failing to adapt to each successive round of economic restructuring. In setting the foundations for an anchor institution strategy it is critical to build upon the drivers for intervention and a need for greater collaborative working, with a clear rationale for intervention.

Without a locally shared vision for supporting and developing people and places, the potential for a bringing together of all institutions will be diminished. To increase the pace and scale of collaboration within and between organisations, all need to be able to buy into an ultimate vision for their place and see clearly their role in realising that vision. Local government play’s a coagulant role and can steward and foster a direction for a place, and it therefore has a key role to play in developing this shared vision.

## Setting the wider strategy

Doncaster has seized the opportunity with the refresh of its economic strategy to embed more inclusive approaches to economic growth. The Doncaster Inclusive Economic Growth Strategy sets the platform for a more inclusive growth trajectory, provides a strategic frame to direct local economic development over the next 5 years (2018-22) and opens the door for an anchor institution strategy with a community wealth building focus.

Through its Team Doncaster approach, Doncaster is on a path to developing more inclusive models of governance and it will be critical to work with the public, private and community & voluntary sectors to deliver more inclusive growth from within.

|  |
| --- |
| **Team Doncaster**Team Doncaster has an ethos of collaboration, progress, and positivity. "Team Doncaster" is the name and ethos behind Doncaster’s Local Strategic Partnership. It brings together organisations and individuals from the public, private, voluntary and community sectors to take shared ownership and responsibility for Doncaster's vision, leadership and direction. From this strong foundation of committed anchor institutions there is an opportunity to build an anchor institution strategy by engaging Team Doncaster members, introducing the concept of community wealth building, understanding individual anchors priorities and promoting co-operation between institutions. Having the Chamber of Commerce and the Enterprising Doncaster board embedded in the approach can support a balanced approach to demand and supply, making the most of opportunities locally.Team Doncaster members include: * Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
* Doncaster Bassetlaw Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
* Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust
* Doncaster Clinical Commissioning Group NHS
* Health and Wellbeing Board
* South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service
* South Yorkshire Police
* Doncaster Chamber of Commerce
* Doncaster College and University Centre
* Enterprising Doncaster Board
* Children and Families Board
* Safer and Stronger Communities Board
* St Leger Homes
 |

# Building an Anchor Institution Network

## Identifying public and private institutions

Doncaster, as all places do, hosts many significant public and private sector institutions which are rooted in the locality. The collective spend and influence of these organisations can play a significant role in shaping local fortunes. Doncaster’s anchor institutions include, but are not limited to, the following:

* Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council;
* Doncaster College;
* National College for High Speed Rail;
* Institute of Technology;
* Doncaster and Bassetlaw Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust;
* Doncaster Prison;
* St Leger Homes;
* Doncaster Race Course;
* PGA European Tour at Rossington Hall;
* Robin Hood Doncaster-Sheffield Airport/Aero Centre;
* Robin Hood Airport Business Park (Enterprise Zone);
* Large employers:
	+ iPort;
	+ Project Unity;
	+ DFS Furniture Ltd;
	+ Trackwork;
	+ Polypipe International.

Additional institutions that may have a presence in Doncaster and beyond would include organisations such as South Yorkshire Police and public transport providers. Further, the school estate across Doncaster comprises of 99 junior schools, 17 secondary schools and 5 special schools who will collectively be significant employers and purchasers of local goods and services.

At the outset of developing an anchor institution strategy, it will be important to map these anchor institutions against a set of criteria, and from this, select a core group to target. Criteria to map may include:

* Scale - Sufficient size e.g. by spend, by employment, by assets;
* Sector - Even sectoral distribution, selecting institutions across domains;
* Ethos - Aligned with shared vision;
* Existing data – Availability and ability to share;
* Engagement - Project buy-in and commitment;
* Existing relationships - A warm introduction.

We are currently working with a range of institutions across Preston, Birmingham and Oldham, with local authorities, educational institutions, housing associations, health institutions, the police and a private institution in the form of Birmingham Airport, coming together to explore how they can collaboratively build greater community wealth by working together with a focus on local people and places. The table overleaf details the organisations we are collaborating with through our work.

***Key anchor institutions engaged to date***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Preston** | **Birmingham** | **Oldham** |
| Preston City Council | Birmingham City Council | Oldham Council |
| Lancashire County Council | Birmingham Airport | Royal Oldham Hospital |
| Preston College | Pioneer Group (HA) | Oldham College |
| Cardinal Newman College | West Midlands Police | Oldham Community Leisure |
| Lancashire Constabulary | Bmet College | First Choice Homes Oldham |
| Community Gateway (HA) | Queen Elizabeth Hospital |  |
| University of Central Lancashire (UCLAN) | University of Birmingham |  |
|  | West Midlands Housing |  |

## Engaging local institutions

Prior to engaging local institutions, it is useful to consider a communications plan to target the key messages at the audience you wish to reach. This may involve press releases, articles, blogs and social media to communicate the objectives across all levels of the anchor institutions, with open events to explain the concept of anchor institutions facilitating wider community wealth and creating better local economies.

In our experience of developing anchor institution networks, it is critically important to engage at a strategic level to ensure that the principles of community wealth building are embedded at the very top of each institution, this will involve engaging with Chief Officers or political leaders to ensure their institutions buy-in to a shared vision and are engaged over the long term.

It is however equally important to engage middle management level stakeholders in each institution, to ensure that the behaviour changes required to achieve the shared vision are embedded by shifting institutional processes. Engaging delivery staff on the ground is just as important, as the people charged with implementing change need to have an awareness of the wider objectives of delivering an anchor institution strategy and understand the benefits of being part of an anchor institution network.

Delivering an anchor institution strategy should be a practice focused exercise, so while it requires strategic buy-in, the majority of energy should be focused on changing practice and institutional behaviour on the ground.

## Understanding the priorities of local institutions

## Developing an anchor institution strategy cannot be a prescriptive process, each institution will have differing interests and differing priorities. Initial discussions need to reflect that different wealth building activities will work differently dependent on the place and the institution.

Part of the engagement process therefore requires an understanding of each individual institutions priorities, and which areas they feel they can progress. In Preston for example, each institution has focused on slightly different areas:

* Preston Council placed a focus on localising procurement spend, for Lancashire Constabulary the development of social value indicators has helped them to think through how they impact on the communities they work in;
* For UCLAN, their engagement with the Preston Cooperatives Network allows them to bring social and economic benefit to Preston;
* Preston College have sought to ensure that whatever they do strategically, and particularly in terms of physical development brings maximum benefit for their students and the wider community. They have linked students undertaking courses related to the built environment to the re-development of buildings on the College’s premises, working collaboratively with UCLAN on the transition of students and working closely to deliver the Work and Skills plan for Lancashire.

In Oldham, the anchor institution approach has brought together the local hospital and the local college, with the former noting an increasing caseload of elderly BME males from specific areas in Oldham, and a nursing and care staff which does not adequality reflect this community. Working with the college they are now exploring how to promote healthcare courses in targeted areas of Oldham to provide career path opportunities to underrepresented groups.

In essence, an anchor network needs to follow the energy from within institutions and provide a space for creating linkages and joining up thinking that had previously been siloed.

## Promoting cooperation across institutions

An anchor institution network will vary in the extent to which it is formalised. The activities undertaken in Preston brought different anchor institutions through a relatively loose arrangement at the outset and institutions have attended activities, events, and groups where appropriate. Over time, this has started to develop into a more formal learning and co-operation network and CLES is supporting strategists in each anchor institution to come together to share learning and undertake collaborative activities which go beyond the remit of the initiative; while ensuring that the various components of community wealth building are at the forefront of activities. The Preston Procurement Practitioners Group was developed to promote co-operation across institutions in relation to procurement practice.

***Preston Procurement Practitioners Group***

A key component of activities in Preston has been upon progressing the way in which procurement is undertaken across the anchor institutions. Previously, procurement has often been done on the basis of cost, with partial emphasis on quality. It has also been done on a silo-ed basis, so little engagement internally between procurers and those commissioning services and no cross-anchor institution engagement.

The Preston Procurement Practitioners Group was developed to overcome these barriers. It brought together procurement officers from across the anchor institutions to meet together quarterly and to develop a common priority of shifting procurement behaviour so that it not only provided efficiencies, but also so it was used to address wider local economic, social and environmental challenges.

The Group has been operating for 3 years and is now the Local Group for the Procure Network, which is seeking to develop an action plan which will fundamentally shift the way in which procurement is undertaken in Preston and wider Lancashire.

In Oldham, the Oldham Leadership Board brings together proactive and engaged public, private, voluntary and community organisations in Oldham. All the partners share the common vision ‘to make Oldham a place of ambition’ and are committed to working with each other and with the people of Oldham to create a productive place with healthy, aspirational and sustainable communities. CLES have been invited to work alongside the Leadership Board to embed a community wealth building approach with emphasis on collaboration, alignment, joint commissioning and investment.

# Developing an Anchor Institution Strategy

In Doncaster, the refresh of the economic strategy has provided the impetus to explore the role of anchor institutions. However, a formalised anchor institution strategy would only be expected to emerge once collaboration had reached an extent to which a network was evident and when anchor institutions had firmly bought into the concept of community wealth building.

## Setting a statement of intent / memorandum of understanding

In Preston, one year into developing the anchor institution network, we developed a statement of intent, an overarching vision for the anchor institution strategy which was agreed by all institutions and sets out the objective to develop:

‘A long-term collaborative commitment to community wealth building in Lancashire for influenceable spend’[[3]](#footnote-3)

This overarching vision was complemented by a set of six associated objectives:

1. To simplify the process of procurement in order to encourage a diversity of organisations to bid for opportunities;
2. To actively reduce levels of spend leaking out of the Preston and Lancashire economies with consideration given on an anchor to anchor basis as to the scale of this reduction;
3. To understand the Preston and wider Lancashire business base in more detail and collectively encourage businesses and social enterprises to bid for opportunities;
4. To develop the capacity of Preston and Lancashire based businesses to bid for opportunities;
5. To collectively raise awareness of procurement opportunities amongst Preston and Lancashire based businesses;
6. To identify goods and services where there is potential for cooperative models of delivery.

This was subsequently formalised into a memorandum of understanding, signed by Chief Officers and political leaders in Preston.

## Developing an anchor institution action plan/toolkit

Where a more formal anchor institution network is established there is an opportunity to frame and direct activities in an action plan. In Preston we are now looking to develop a concrete set of collective actions to be developed across institutions which will effectively inform anchor institution activities going forward.

Given the time we have been working in Preston, it is inevitable that some of the key individuals who have been involved in the work have either changed job roles or have moved on from the organisation, meaning a new person needs to come in and pick up the activities. This has often meant that the process and journey of the community wealth building needs to be explained again.

In response to this, CLES, collaboratively with Preston City Council are developing an anchor institution toolkit which will summarise the community wealth building initiative to date. It will also explain what individuals and organisations need to do to remain engaged in the process of enhancing and maximising community wealth.

# Maximising the potential of Anchor procurement

## Analysing procurement spend

CLES have analysed procurement spend across many anchor institutions, in various localities, using different levels of detail. However, a typical analysis involves first identifying the top 300 suppliers (by the value of contract) for a given financial year.

### Mapping spend

The first stage of analysis requires an understanding of where the supply chain is based in terms of geographical areas of focus, and levels of spend within these geographical areas. These areas are typically split out into local authority level (i.e. Doncaster) and regional or sub regional (i.e. South Yorkshire). To undertake this analysis, CLES cross references spending totals for the analysis period with suppliers and their postcodes, against a list of postcodes for each of the geographies of focus. Where a supplier’s main postcode is not in the geographies of focus, further research is undertaken to determine if the supplier has a local branch or office.

Once the supplier geography has been mapped, analysis is then conducted to establish the ward and Lower Super Output Area (LSOA) in which each supplier is based within the local authority or wider region. This allows us to report the amount of spend with suppliers in areas of deprivation, typically the 20%, 10% and 1% most deprived neighbourhoods in the country (as defined by the Indices of Multiple Deprivation). Further analysis is then undertaken of spend with small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) based within the local authority or wider region.

This analysis provides institutions with a baseline position and an understanding of where their procurement spend goes, and importantly, the extent to which this spend is currently leaking out of the local economy.

### Identifying influenceable spend

In addition to mapping spend, we seek to develop an understanding of constraints on spending. In this we are interested in establishing the non-local spend that the anchor institution would have a realistic opportunity to influence (i.e. procure locally). Much of the non-local spend by anchor institutions may be locked into national procurement frameworks, and/or products and services not necessarily available in the local economy (e.g. a hospital will have limited supplier options for specific medical equipment), or be subject to long-term contracts. Spend in these categories would be considered as non-influenceable.

To determine the scale of influenceable spend in practice involves deep engagement with individual procurement teams to understand more about the spending which is directed outside of the local economy.

The scale and nature of influenceable spend varies according the anchors we work alongside. However, by way of an example, the six participating anchor institutions we worked with in Preston spent £98million with suppliers based outside of the Lancashire; of this we estimated that £59m (60%) was potentially influenceable.

### Gap analysis

Bringing together the mapping of spend with an understanding of the extent to which this can be influenced provides a gap analysis, identifying the value of goods and services which could potentially be localised. This gap analysis is conducted along industrial sector lines to highlight the sectors of the economy that can be targeted for potential suppliers and allows institutions to understand where they could be doing more to procure locally and through particular types of businesses, such as SMEs.

## Identifying local businesses as potential suppliers

After the gap analysis, the next stage involves mapping the local business base to identify local businesses (including social enterprises and cooperatives), which could potentially deliver the goods and services which are currently being procured from outside the local economy. Again, this analysis is undertaken across industrial sectors to allow for an understanding of where businesses may be able to diversify their offering to meet local supplier needs.

In Preston, CLES developed a supplier database, which was linked to the gaps and influenceable spend, as described above. This has been used as a means of raising awareness of amongst potential local suppliers of upcoming opportunities. For example, Lancashire Constabulary used it to identify the business which now delivers all its printing activities.

## Developing pre-procurement engagement

The analysis of non-local procurement spend against the local business base allows procurers to develop a far greater understanding of potential organisations to engage with prior to a good or service going to formal procurement. This analysis supports the development of pre-procurement engagement strategies, allowing institutions to build greater awareness of upcoming supplier opportunities locally, which then provides a route to understanding of the local business base in terms of capability, skills and capacity to bid, and also an avenue for engaging local businesses in business support programmes.

By developing a better understanding of the local business base within anchor institutions, procurement process can then be developed in a way in which local business has a greater opportunity to bid for and win contracts, keeping spend in the local economy. This can also involve breaking contracts down into smaller lots to enable SMEs in particular to bid. For example, Lancashire County Council’s fresh produce contract was previously in one large lot and delivered by a provider which could demonstrate economies of scale, because they could produce, package and deliver the produce. Upon re-tendering the contract, it was split into three lots to enable SMEs to bid for activities which met their specialism. There are now local providers delivering each of the individual lots.

# Maximising the potential of Anchor land & assets

It is important that a good local economy is democratised. By this we mean a plurality of ownership of public sector assets and activity, and anchor institutions can play a key role in creating more successful places by reviewing how their asset portfolios can stimulate the local economy and create social good. Doncaster has a significant public estate which can be utilised strategically to stimulate a more inclusive local economy via collaboration between anchor institutions, the private sector and the community and voluntary sector.

## Identifying underutilised assets

The Office of National Statistics estimates the total value of public sector estates to be £380 billion, with local authorities accounting for almost £170 billion of the overall figure. Since it launched in 2013, the One Public Estate initiative has seen the Cabinet Office work closely with local government to sell off unwanted land to housing developers, slash maintenance bills for institutions and pool resources to make more efficient use of public facilities.

While there are clear pressures on local authorities to dispose of underutilised assets, an enterprising public sector can however utilise a rationalising of the public estate as a catalyst for stimulating the local economy, by freeing up underused property and land for housing and new businesses, or community and voluntary sector activity.

In Birmingham, we are seeking to understand and change the behaviour of anchor institutions in relation to wider issues beyond procurement, including how they utilise their assets. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital in Birmingham (QEHB) for example is making good use of their space within the hospital to provide a food and clothing bank service – the service is coordinated by a small local charity and staffed with an army of volunteers to provide for patients that may otherwise go hungry or have no clothes other than what is on their back. This partnership between the food and clothing bank and QEHB has made supplies available to people in the most need when they are often at their most vulnerable.

## Planning for community-led development

East Cambridgeshire District Council supports community-led development and has a special planning policy (Growth 5) that encourages this. The planning policy lets communities bring forward sites in areas close to village or town boundaries which might be outside the normal development envelope. The community decides itself what is appropriate. These sites could include affordable housing, workspaces, community buildings and other amenities. And the project could also include some ‘market housing’ for sale to help pay for the community development if it would otherwise not go ahead. The Council also provides support to anyone thinking of setting up a Community Land Trust with a grant to get started, a loan to provide pre-development finance and a CLT adviser to give advice, guidance and specialist help.

The ‘community right to bid’ is part of the localism act 2011. Under this piece of legislation communities have the right to nominate a community asset (any local building or land important to them) as ‘an asset of community value’ and if it ever comes up for sale they are given six months to raise the funds to buy it. This allows communities the opportunity to protect locally important community assets such as libraries, community centres and even parks and football stadiums, but could equally be used to create space for new social or community business activity.

## Asset Based Community Development

In Birmingham, CLES are supporting Queen Elizabeth Hospital and West Midlands Housing with a review of their asset portfolio‘s. CLES are reviewing the asset base of Queen Elizabeth Hospital to map and determine the extent to which the hospital is embedded within the local community, to select strategically significant assets to take into the next stage of analysis. CLES are also reviewing West Midlands Housing Group’s asset portfolio with a view to identifying and mapping those that have had recent investment. In conjunction with WM Housing Group, CLES will then select a series of improved assets to take into the next stage of analysis.

In Preston, there has been a movement to use underutilised assets to support cooperatives. One such example is the Birley, this is an exhibition space and artist studios in Preston City Centre. The space is operated as a not for profit, with the space rented from Preston City Council. This space has allowed 12 artists to base themselves locally, and the exhibitions held at the venue are popular with residents and visitors. The development of this project has been aided by collaboration between anchors, the Council (who were keen to see the space utilised) and UCLAN (who recognised that there was a need for a cultural space locally).

### Third sector service delivery

South Tyneside Council is in the midst of a major programme of community asset transfer which is empowering communities and charity groups to take over the running of local public assets[[4]](#footnote-4). 12 formerly Council-run community associations are currently being supported to draw up business plans and begin the process of being transferred directly into the hands of the local people who use them.

A community interest company was formed at South Tyneside Gymnastics Centre which has more than 500 regular users and has seen investment in the building as well as an expansion of activities. Mortimer Community Network Community Interest Company (CIC), which took over Mortimer Community Centre, has improved the facility, maintained and developed the childcare facilities, extensively renovated the childcare room, created their own entrance and café and created ten new jobs.

## Community Land Trusts

As house prices grow faster than incomes, the cost of subsiding affordable housing continues to grow. Community Land Trusts (CLT’s) are an innovative way of developing affordable housing that remains affordable in perpetuity. A CLT will often receive an initial subsidy in one form or another; be it free land, or financial grants from government, charities or benefactors. Once properties have been built, the land on which they are built is protected from fluctuations in land market valuations by a legal ‘asset lock’. CLTs act as long-term stewards of housing, ensuring that it remains genuinely affordable, providing housing based on what people actually earn in their area.

CLT’s operate in both urban and rural areas, and can work in areas of high or low housing demand. Granby 4 Streets[[5]](#footnote-5) in Toxteth, inner city Liverpool was established by residents living in houses set for demolition. They began sweeping the streets and putting out pot plants to prevent their streets from falling into decline in the midst of increasing property vacancy. Then they formed a group, set up a street market, and eventually created a CLT to take over ownership of the houses themselves.

Homes for Holsworthy Community Land Trust[[6]](#footnote-6) in the village of Holsworthy, Devon was established to help people to stay in the village and enable them to contribute to preserving the communities rural way of life. Pressure for retirement and second homes has helped push up the average price in the area to nearly 13 times the typical local family earnings. They have built or renovated 15 homes in the village of Holsworthy and surrounding areas and use a shared equity model when selling homes to young people; which means that they provide an equity loan that covers a percentage of the property value.

# Maximising the potential of Anchor training and employment

Anchor institutions are often significant local employers, with each institution potentially employing a workforce of thousands. When this is scaled up across all anchor institutions in an area, anchor institution employment can represent a significant share of the local labour market. The extent to which the collective power of recruitment, training and employment can contribute to more inclusive growth has been relatively under explored. A co-ordinated approach to anchor institution training and employment has played a limited role in supporting those excluded from the labour market, however the increasingly localised approaches to employment support offer an opportunity to leverage the influence of anchor institutions in shaping local labour markets for local people.

## Developing opportunities for local people

CLES are working with the University of Birmingham to conduct a staff and student mapping exercise, overlaid with the index of multiple deprivation, to explore the extent to which the university as an employer reflects the diversity of the city. There is an intention to examine how pre-recruitment and recruitment policy may be developed to promote more inclusive growth.

Similar work is taking place in Oldham where the council have mapped their staff base (location and earnings) against the index of multiple deprivation. This has helped the council to understand their staff demographics far better than before and will help them begin to investigate why particular parts of the borough may be unrepresented among their staff and take action to make their workforce more reflective of their community.

## Progressing staff

Burnley Borough Council has been identified as a public sector good practice example of an organisation focused on the progression of its employees.[[7]](#footnote-7) There is a strong commitment to developing talent internally, and progressing it through the organisation. The Council has created several trainee and apprenticeship roles that combine learning and progression opportunities for new recruits. The existence of several corporate groups that bring together different staff levels and functions to undertake specific project work (for example, preparing for Investors in People) offers an important progression route.

Increasing staff engagement and satisfaction as a result of the provision of training and development, mentoring and coaching and access to professional career guidance has had a positive impact on the institution and its relationship with the wider population.

## Developing progression routes across anchors

Career ladder programmes, which have been developed in the US, link skills provision for low-wage workers with structured progression opportunities within an organisation, sector or local area. The Tri-County Job Ladder Partnership is a collective of 34 employers and six community colleges in the Seattle area who have created career and educational pathways across four sectors: manufacturing, customer relations, information technology and health services.

In a UK context, an anchor institution network could be leveraged in a similar way, with collaboration across local anchors to develop a local ‘skills escalator’. A cohesive progression strategy could allow people – from work experience students to graduates – to move around and across anchors as part of a defined skills development programme.

In Barnsley, CLES have supported the development of the ‘more and better jobs’ strategy, which includes a priority to explore the scope for working with larger public and private employers to create a progression strategy and develop a skills escalator programme from work experience to graduate intakes across larger public and private employers.

# Maximising the local impacts of local business

An anchor institution approach provides an opportunity to not only develop a deeper understanding of the local business base, and specifically the anchor institution supply chain in terms of the social value this generates locally, but also provides a new avenue to reach out to local businesses and engage them via business support activities.

## Analysing supplier social value and local re-spend

It is too simplistic to assume that benefit will automatically be derived by utilising local suppliers. Therefore, CLES frequently conducts surveys with supply chain businesses (typically the top 300 by value) to explore the local social value they create. This analysis varies in scope and content, but is informed by a measurement framework which contains indicators that reflect the priorities of the institution(s) involved.

The survey will often consider indicators such as job and apprenticeship creation, support for the voluntary and community sector, staff volunteering, environmental impact, ensuring that employees are paid a fair or living wage, and the extent to which suppliers are themselves re-spending in the local economy, for example. This analysis provides a springboard for pursuing activities with the local business base which promote more inclusive growth.

## Developing business citizenship

In CLES’ work we engage and work with businesses—large and small. In this, we perceive a growing desire to do local social good. Many businesses already give and play a significant in role in the social and cultural welfare of places (e.g. local business support for a kids’ football team, or support for local art festival). But we need to find more effective ways of getting business to do even more social good. In work conducted for Preston City Council we defined business citizenship as ‘a recognition that a business, corporation or business-like organisation, has social, cultural and environmental responsibilities to the community in which it seeks a licence to operate, as well as economic and financial ones to its shareholders or immediate stakeholders’.

Our research in this area included recommendations around developing a consistent approach to the language of social value; the production of a social value ‘how to’ guide; and developing a local business mentoring scheme. The core recommendation was around the development of a ‘Preston Pledge’ and CLES are working collaboratively with Preston City Council to develop the pledge whereby businesses agree to:

* Optimise the social, environmental and economic well-being of Preston and its people across all activities of the business;
* Shape decision making to think long-term – by focusing on local investment to create long-lasting outcomes;
* Work in partnership across and within sectors across Preston to provide social value outcomes;
* Commit to a set of concrete values which include inclusion, openness, honesty, and social responsibility.

## Local employment charters

In Oldham, a Fair Employment Charter now sets out the council’s expectations around what constitutes fair employment and is seen as a means to increase the number of good jobs available to residents. The Charter is a voluntary initiative that aims to engage businesses that employ people living in the borough. A key route for employer engagement has been the Get Oldham Working programme as well as inclusion in the Council’s social value procurement documents, which encourages its suppliers to sign up to the charter. Employers can sign up to the charter by completing an online application form which is then reviewed by the council. Employers tick boxes to identify the fair employment practices that they undertake across six key areas. They are then asked to provide further information to evidence their commitment. The six types of commitment are:

* Paying the living wage to all employees;
* Offering fair contracts and stable employment;
* Offering access to training and support;
* Supporting membership of trade unions;
* Enabling and encouraging employees to contribute to the community;
* Supporting local people into work through Get Oldham Working.

The council is looking to link the charter to the business support offer that will be made available through the European Regional Development Fund as a way of incentivising a shift in business behaviour.

## Promote take-up of business leadership and management skills

CLES worked in partnership with Barnsley Council to prepare a local Employment and Skills Strategy for ‘More and Better Jobs’.[[8]](#footnote-8) The extensive research and analysis produced a concise, credible and action oriented strategy to deliver sustainable business growth and better skills, employment and progression opportunities for local people.

The strategy focuses on the quality as well as the quantity of job opportunities, looking at how the economy benefits people through more and better jobs, as well as how skilled people support the economy. Outside of the public sector, the important employment sectors in Barnsley are manufacturing, logistics, construction, but also wholesale, retail and business services – more of the foundational economy.[[9]](#footnote-9) Low wage sectors dominate the economy, with nearly half of all employed residents working in lower level occupations.

A key priority therefore within the strategy is for businesses to be encouraged to grow, develop their employees skills and raise their ambitions. For Barnsley’s economy to achieve its full potential for growth, it is critical that more businesses recognise the value of skills, especially at higher levels, communicate clearly which skills they need and invest in the development of their staff. The strategy sets out the following priorities for investing in business leadership and management skills:

* Promote the business case for investing in skills and development to stimulate progressive career opportunities and long-term business growth;
* Work with businesses in priority sectors to make the case for progression and to explore practical solutions such as sector-based skills escalators, progression pathways and learning tie-ins/future job guarantees;
* Work across sectors to share best practice and embed business-to-business peer support;
* Proactively promote take-up of business leadership and management skills.

# Stimulating new local social business

The development of an anchor institution strategy which brings together a detailed understanding of local procurement spend, combined with local land and assets, and the training and employment opportunities available across institutions, offers huge potential to stimulate the development of new approaches to creating more virtuous local economies from within.

## Developing social business models

While community wealth building provides greater opportunity for local private businesses to grow, it also provides an opportunity to stimulate the development of social business models which retain rather than extract the wealth created. There are a wide range of social business models including social enterprises, co-operatives, community businesses, credit unions, charities, and community interest companies. These models of business typically give their workers a greater stake in the wealth generated. They also help to create more resilient communities than conventionally owned businesses through a co-operative emphasis on employment, human interaction and social ends rather than financial profit. As hybrid forms of business organisation, they provide a mechanism for linking the social economy to the wider marketplace and therefore can contribute to more inclusive growth.

Mondragón in the Basque region of Spain is best known as the birthplace of the Mondragón Cooperative Corporation (MCC)[[10]](#footnote-10), the world's largest worker cooperative. This model is based around the notion of developing from within, through the creation of worker led cooperatives to deliver key aspects of public services and provide other goods for the local population; creating jobs and enterprise in the process.

In Cleveland, Ohio a similar notion of developing from within has been combined with the engagement of anchor institutions and encouraging them to think about their procurement practices: firstly in terms of utilising local suppliers; and secondly in terms of the scope for newly formed cooperatives to deliver services and provide goods. The Cleveland Evergreen Co-operatives[[11]](#footnote-11) model has successfully supported new cooperatives which are now delivering laundry, energy and catering services for a number of anchor institutions, including universities and hospitals.

Preston committed to supporting the development of a Preston Cooperatives Network[[12]](#footnote-12) in 2011. Working alongside CLES, Co-operatives UK, Co-operatives NW, Preston aim to promote co-operative development and support new worker owned businesses to fill gaps identified, while also supporting business owners to sell their business to their employees when the owner retires.[[13]](#footnote-13) The Guild Money Credit Union was created in November 2015 to facilitate affordable and ethical loans for the local economy and support new cooperative businesses.

Elsewhere, Glasgow City Council has established a Cooperative Development Unit (CDU).[[14]](#footnote-14) An executive role responsible for ‘Cooperative Glasgow’ was created to oversee the CDU and provide political leadership. This commitment to a Cooperative City was underwritten with a £500,000 annual budget to set up the Glasgow Business Development Fund which gives transformational grants to cooperatives, mutuals, social enterprises.

## Building entrepreneurship in deprived communities

Community wealth building approaches provide an ability to steer opportunity towards places which have been excluded from growth. Community wealth building can help stimulate local economies, create jobs and attract private investment in areas with little economic activity.

Local people are the best people to shape the businesses and services which will benefit their area. By harnessing the combined forces of all the key players in an area, we believe that social businesses can start up, thrive and achieve positive change for their neighbourhoods, helping to reduce the inequalities between communities.

Over the past few year CLES has worked closely with organisations such as Co-operatives UK,[[15]](#footnote-15) Locality[[16]](#footnote-16) and Power to Change,[[17]](#footnote-17) all of whom champion enterprising community-led organisations, working to help deprived neighbourhoods thrive, create more connected and inclusive communities and improve the lives of the people who live there.

Between them, these organisations run numerous support programmes, provide grants, advice and resources that can help deprived communities take control of their futures, and when combined with an active anchor institution network, opportunities can be linked to the communities that need them most, creating more inclusive growth from within.

# Measuring impact

In measuring the impact of an anchor institution strategy, it is critical to first set a baseline against which progress can be measured, develop an impact measurement framework to direct how you measure the value of changes in institutional behaviour and build in monitoring and evaluation to the process to iteratively shape it as it moves forward. Harnessing the full potential of anchor institutions takes time – it can, and will take years for desired activities to be fully implemented and outcomes maximised.

## Setting an evidence baseline

In exploring procurement spend, land and asset portfolios and the training and employment practices of anchor institutions we set a baseline for each individual institution against which future impacts can be measured. In our mapping of anchor institutions activities, we can provide a detailed picture of the role they currently play in their local economy, providing signposts to increasing the local impact of their operation. This baseline is presented for individual institutions and collectively for local places, highlighting the scale of potential.

## Developing an impact measurement framework

Organisations need to understand the types of outcomes they want to achieve, which can then be developed into an impact measurement framework.

In 2014, CLES worked with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) to develop the Greater Manchester Social Value Procurement Framework. The Framework was designed to serve the dual purpose of providing a common means through which the 10 Greater Manchester authorities could consider social value when commissioning and procuring public services; and also as a way of demonstrating the impact of spending choices on an ongoing basis. The framework is based around six key outcomes:

* Promote employment and economic sustainability;
* Raising the living standards of local residents;
* Promote participation and citizen engagement;
* Build capacity and sustainability of the voluntary and community sector;
* Promote equity and fairness;
* Promote environmental sustainability.

The 10 local authorities in Greater Manchester have organically started to utilise the Greater Manchester Social Value Procurement Framework in their decision-making processes, particularly in terms of the themes or outcomes of what they should be looking for around social value.

A similar framework has also been developed in Lancashire and is being utilised at all stages of the procurement process: commissioning, tendering, decision-making, and delivery and monitoring.

## Evaluating impacts

Having set a baseline and agreed the types of outcomes to be achieved, organisations need to continuously monitor the impact and behaviour change community wealth building activities lead to, and learn from this to amend the approach accordingly. Evaluation therefore should be built into any anchor institution strategy. This includes measuring and analysing the changes in spend by the anchor themselves (see the Preston and Manchester examples below). However, it is also vital to continually monitor the social value generated by the supply chain and track the progress made in this regard, as previously mentioned, it is not enough to assume that benefit will be derived through the use of local suppliers.

In Manchester we have regularly conducted surveys with the supplier base of the city council since 2008, in 2015/16 we recorded 1,481 new jobs and 262 apprenticeships created in the supply chain, with opportunities for 334 individuals considered ‘hard to reach’. Over 20,000 hours of staff volunteering was recorded and over 47,000 hours of support given to the Community and Voluntary sector by businesses themselves. The local supply chain clearly has a role to play in creating more inclusive growth and massively contributes to community wealth.

***Manchester City Council social value through the supply chain 2015/16***



In addition, CLES have been tracking local spend in Preston and Lancashire since 2012/13. The focus on community wealth building in Preston has seen spending by the six anchor institutions with Preston based suppliers increase from just 5% to 18.2% in 2016/17, which has brought an additional £75m into the local economy. Spending within Lancashire has increased from 39% to over 79%, bringing an additional £200m into the Lancashire economy, demonstrating the potential of an anchor institution approach to building community wealth.

***Localising spend in Preston***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
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