



National Evaluation of the Local Enterprise Growth
Initiative Programme
Appendices



National Evaluation of the Local Enterprise Growth
Initiative Programme
Appendices

This research was commissioned by the previous Government.

The findings and recommendations in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Department for Communities and Local Government.

© Crown copyright 2010

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.communities.gov.uk

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email:
alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Any enquiries regarding this document/publication should be sent to us at:

Department for Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

December 2010

ISBN: 978-1-4098-2645-3

Contents

Appendix 1: Methodology update	5
A. Econometric modelling	5
B. Value for money	6
Appendix 2: Key indicators in the LEGI areas	11
Appendix 3: Management and delivery arrangements	19
Appendix 4: LEGI area programme data	24
Appendix 5: Feedback from programme managers and key partners in the case study areas	26
Appendix 6: Case Study Area Data	31
A. Partner feedback	31
B. Case study projects – summary	50
C. Beneficiary Survey Information	78
Appendix 7: Local area evaluations	100

Appendix 1

Methodology update

A. Econometric modelling

Our approach to the evaluation of Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI) is grounded in a Difference-in-Difference framework that has been used in a number of policy evaluation frameworks, though not significantly so in terms of Area Based Initiatives.

The basis of the approach is that a group of Lower Super Output Areas are matched to the LEGI 'treatment' group and act as a control group against which performance can be referenced. Allowing for performance status prior to introduction of LEGI, the Difference-in-Difference framework provides a basis on which to assess differential performance of the groups after LEGI onset and, controlling for a range of underlying area features, facilitates assessment of policy impact.

Defining the control group

Control group Lower Super Output Areas are defined through a process known as propensity score matching. This starts by estimating the probability that any individual Lower Super Output Area will be defined as being in the treatment group. The probability, or propensity score, is calculated on the basis of a range of data including worklessness, population churn, ethnicity, tenure, skills, house prices, crime and working age population.

Difference-in-Difference analysis

Difference-in-Difference approaches operate in a series of steps. In the first instance, the outcome or performance measure of interest is estimated for the target group before and after intervention. The same procedure is adopted for the control group and the difference between these differences is calculated by subtracting the control group estimate from the treatment group estimate. The latter is the 'raw' Difference-in-Difference estimator and is expressed as:

$$\text{Difference-in-Difference} = E(P_{t1} - P_{t0} \mid \text{LEGI}=1) - E(P_{t1} - P_{t0} \mid \text{LEGI}=0)$$

where P_{t1} represents the performance outcome in the policy-on period and P_{t0} represents the performance outcome in the policy-off period. The policy on period is defined as post 2006, consistent with the introduction of the LEGI programme and the performance variable is defined in terms of annual average growth.

The raw Difference-in-Difference estimator is then adjusted to reflect differences in background characteristics of the LEGI and control group areas. This helps to isolate the impact of intervention more accurately and is expressed as:

$$\text{Difference-in-Difference} = E(P_{t1} - P_{t0} \mid \text{LEGI}=1, X) - E(P_{t1} - P_{t0} \mid \text{LEGI}=0, X)$$

where X is a vector of variables representing different attributes of the areas.

In common with other Difference-in-Difference analyses, the Difference-in-Difference estimator is incorporated into a multivariate linear regression model of the form:

$$P_t = \alpha + \beta_0 \cdot \text{LEGI} + \beta_1 \cdot \text{LEGI} \cdot T + X_t + \alpha_t + \varepsilon$$

where α is a constant, LEGI is a binary variable indicating whether or not an area is part of the LEGI Programme, T is a binary variable representing the post-policy period, β_1 is the Difference-in-Difference estimator for the impact of the LEGI programme, X_t represents area characteristics, α_t is a set of year binary variables and ε is a random error term. The analysis is undertaken for all LEGI areas as well as for two different phases of the LEGI programme.

B. Value for money

The LEGI programme presents some significant methodological difficulties for the assessment of value for money. The main challenges, and our response, are summarised in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Methodological issues	
Issue	Response
The availability of data on the full diverse range of impacts that the LEGI programme is potentially generating and the (varying) delays before which impacts become apparent. Data needs to be available at Lower Super Output Area level (to enable aggregation to the diverse LEGI area geographies) and to be as up-to-date as possible.	Area data analysis has focused on two key potential impact areas – business formation and worklessness. Public sources have been supplemented with bespoke data sourced via the Beta Model.
The lack of a consistent performance management framework across all 20 areas for the identification and reporting of programme and project outputs and outcomes.	A common framework for analysis of performance management data has been developed.
The identification of the additional impacts, which are genuinely attributable to LEGI interventions. The analysis of project-level additionality needs to consider leakage, displacement, substitution, multiplier and deadweight effects as well as any unintended consequences.	A combination of top-down and bottom-up methodologies has been used. Top-down econometric modeling isolates any statistically significant LEGI effect (see below). The bottom-up assessment is based on triangulated evidence from extensive beneficiary survey, case study project analysis and partner interviews.
Quantification of the full range of costs. LEGI is not a discrete programme. Although certain interventions are new and solely funded by LEGI resources, the programme has also been used, for example, to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • co-fund new services/initiatives; and • purchase additional capacity from existing programmes. 	Project management information has been used to analyse leverage and to identify the total public sector costs associated with projects.
Valuing the diverse benefits is potentially complex.	The analysis has focused on those aspects of the programme where the economic costs and benefits can be more readily measured and has used the net additional Gross Value Added/Net Value Added* generated as the measure of benefit. Use of the former is consistent with that applied in the evaluations of Regional Development Agency projects.

*The approach used by the Regional Development Agencies is to focus on Gross Value Added. However, this ignores the associated private sector capital costs and therefore a Net Value Added based analysis is also included in this Paper.

The starting point for the assessment of value for money for any programme or area based initiative is to establish the 'counterfactual', i.e. identify what would have happened in the absence of the intervention. There are a number of ways in which a view on the 'counterfactual' can be developed.

One way is to seek people's views (the bottom-up analysis). In the current evaluation, this is being provided through the case study research and the beneficiary survey. There is, however, an obvious risk of bias and lack of a fully informed view, so results need to be considered in the light of other evidence and, where appropriate, allowance made for optimism bias.

A second approach is to track beneficiaries and identify 'matched' non-assisted comparators to examine the extent of differential performance. However, this is resource intensive and requires sophisticated monitoring systems to be established at the start of a programme.

A third approach to developing the counterfactual view is to use 'top-down' data analysis to track the performance of 'assisted areas'; to identify comparator non-assisted areas; and to examine reasons for differential performance. However, areas can vary substantially, in terms of their economic and social attributes, and some of these attributes may operate to enhance policy intervention and some may hinder it. It is therefore important that the 'mix' of local attributes is taken into account in establishing the 'counterfactual'. It is also not uncommon for different policy initiatives to be operating simultaneously which creates a problem of policy 'attribution'. As described earlier, our approach to resolving these issues has been through use of econometric modeling.

We have established a Difference-in-Difference framework to examine changes in two performance variables over time at neighbourhood level (Lower Level Super Output Area) in LEGI and non-LEGI areas:

- (i) Worklessness (2000-2009): Department for Work and Pensions
- (ii) Gross Business Formation (2003-2009): Betamodel

The framework includes a series of socio-economic 'context' variables and policy variables such as:

- spatial/functional area controls
- working age population
- length of residency
- tenure type
- ethnicity profile
- skills
- house prices
- crime levels
- unemployment rates
- company size
- commercial rateable values
- industry structure
- Neighbourhood Renewal Fund/New Deal for Communities/Working Neighbourhood Fund status.

Areas that statistically match each of the LEGI Lower level Super Output Areas were identified to serve as a control group. The matching was based on worklessness rates, residency patterns, ethnicity, social renting, skills, house prices, crime and working age population.

The Difference-in-Difference analysis takes account of the different 'starting positions' of the LEGI areas and the control group and the differential trends in each group prior to the onset of LEGI programme. By controlling for the preceding range of contextual features, it can isolate the net impact of the programme intervention.

The above methods have been used to derive estimates of the net additional impact of the LEGI programme. Where these are assessed as being statistically significant, they have then been used as the basis for assessing Value for Money. Value for Money is defined as being determined by the relationship between total costs (the resources a project uses up) and total benefits (including, in particular, the outputs and outcomes it is anticipated to achieve). For a project to offer Value for Money its benefits must exceed its costs.

There are two main approaches to assessing Value for Money:

- (i) Cost-benefit analysis based approach – quantification in monetary terms of as many of the costs and benefits of the LEGI programme as possible. The costs and benefits are then compared to determine whether benefits exceed costs and the project/programme is Value for Money. In order to be comparable with other evaluations, it is convenient to express the results in the form of a benefit:cost ratio.
- (ii) 3Es analysis – this technique focuses on public sector funding and involves an assessment of the:
 - ratio of costs to inputs (economy) – in other words, is the required specification being delivered at an appropriate price and have overall costs – including administrative costs been reasonable?
 - ratio of public sector costs to outputs (efficiency, or sometimes referred to as cost effectiveness)
 - delivery of objectives or key outcomes (effectiveness).– the extent to which the project will achieve the desired objectives.

The evaluation of LEGI encompasses both of these approaches. Cost-benefit analysis is used to determine the total net economic value created by the initiative (and its effect on overall net welfare). In addition, a 3Es analysis has been undertaken to examine the relative economy, effectiveness and efficiency of the LEGI investment and the contribution of the programme to meeting its objectives.

Appendix 2

Key indicators in the LEGI areas

Table A2.1: LEGI funding allocations and key indicators

LEGI Areas	Total LEGI funding allocated	Working age population 000's (2006)	No of businesses (2006)	Employment in the business base (2006)	Worklessness rate (2006)	Average IMD	No of LSOAs in worst 10% IMD
Croydon	40.33m	134,616	6,543	55,796	9.5	12,034	4
Bradford	37.97m	128,262	7,661	96,833	16.7	2,364	93
Pennine Lancs	29.95m	89,829	7,628	96,004	20.9	3,147	52
Liverpool & Sefton	28.40m	54,312	3,009	31,903	26.3	1,398	52
South Tyneside	27.03m	92,373	3,710	40,584	14.6	9,068	20
NE Lincs	23.26m	28,968	2,705	36,687	18.9	2,793	25
Sheffield	23.24m	116,760	8,032	120,521	17.2	2,747	78
St Helens	22.99m	108,924	5,043	66,188	14.5	9,866	30
Coventry	22.53m	70,788	4,619	74,448	16.8	4,351	33
Doncaster	21.12m	101,841	4,173	40,078	11.8	8,361	11
Barking & Dagenham	21.71m	36,603	2,886	40,304	21.9	1,713	40
Leeds	19.94m	31,155	1,417	19,340	20.9	391	31
Durham	18.72m	89,043	3,670	35,731	21.7	3,560	51
Wansbeck	16.47m	37,800	1,591	16,134	14.6	10,318	7
Blackpool	14.76m	38,292	4,619	40,872	23.9	2,840	25
Redcar & Cleveland	13.65m	63,183	3,420	47,219	16.1	8,565	25

Table A2.1: LEGI funding allocations and key indicators (continued)

LEGI Areas	Total LEGI funding allocated	Working age population 000's (2006)	No of businesses (2006)	Employment in the business base (2006)	Worklessness rate (2006)	Average IMD	No of LSOAs in worst 10% IMD
Great Yarmouth	12.67m	54,450	3,966	37,431	13.1	12,020	11
Norwich	11.11m	40,536	4,122	56,198	13.8	6,576	9
Alliance	6.68m	60,636	3,965	43,670	18.7	3,687	28
Hastings	6.15m	22,827	2,407	20,514	22.0	3,541	12
Total	£419m						

Source: DCLG; ONS; DWP; BETA Model

Table A2.2: Net commuting flows			
LEGI Areas	Out	In	Net In
St.Helens	52,649	20,213	-32,436
Croydon	60,148	29,581	-30,567
Barking & Dagenham	41,683	28,453	-13,230
South Tyneside	25,643	12,893	-12,750
Durham	31,689	21,923	-9,766
Wansbeck	13,826	6,308	-7,518
Great Yarmouth	9,110	7,913	-1,197
Redcar & Cleveland	16,835	18,375	1,540
Hastings	6,205	10,213	4,008
Hastings	7,333	11,916	4,583
Blackpool	10,770	16,220	5,450
Alliance	22,550	29,317	6,767
Leeds	10,530	17,913	7,383
Liverpool & Sefton	39,750	48,126	8,376
NE Lincs	6,647	25,232	18,585
Doncaster	11,091	30,678	19,587
Pennine	25,989	54,085	28,096
Coventry	17,685	48,181	30,496
Bradford	25,735	60,654	34,919
Norwich	10,329	47,870	37,541
Sheffield	23,603	95,537	71,934

Source: 2001 Census

Table A2.3: % change in business formation rates 2006-2009					
LEGI Areas	2006	2007	2008	2009	% Change in Formation Rates
Great Yarmouth	8.7	7.9	10.1	3.3	16.2
Leeds	8.2	6.9	9.5	2.4	14.6
Redcar & Cleveland	7.8	8.3	8.3	2.0	6.7
Norwich	13.9	14.7	14.8	4.5	6.1
Bradford	10.3	10.0	10.9	3.0	5.4
Liverpool & Sefton	8.8	7.5	9.2	2.4	4.2
Blackpool	14.8	13.8	15.1	4.7	2.0
Sheffield	10.5	9.6	10.6	3.4	1.6
Alliance	10.7	10.6	10.6	2.9	-0.4
Durham	8.1	6.8	8.0	2.1	-1.5
All LEGI areas	10.2	9.5	9.9	2.9	-3.0
Doncaster	13.9	13.6	13.3	4.5	-4.3
Coventry	10.5	9.7	9.9	2.9	-5.0
St Helens	8.4	8.0	7.9	2.6	-6.4
South Tyneside	6.5	5.5	6.1	2.1	-6.4
Barking & Dagenham	9.4	9.1	8.7	2.4	-7.0
NE Lincs	14.6	13.6	13.3	4.8	-8.8
Hastings	18.0	14.2	16.2	4.2	-9.9
Pennine	15.1	13.9	13.6	4.2	-9.9
Wansbeck	7.8	7.8	6.8	2.0	-13.1
Croydon	10.0	8.6	8.1	2.4	-18.8

Source: BETA Model

Table A2.4: % Change in worklessness rates 2006-2009					
LEGI Areas	2006	2007	2008	2009	% Change in Worklessness rates
NE Lincs	19.4	18.9	18.6	23.3	20.5
England	9.3	8.8	8.9	10.7	15.5
Hastings	22.0	21.2	21.7	25.4	15.4
Croydon	10.1	9.2	9.3	11.6	15.2
Doncaster	22.3	21.4	21.5	25.6	14.9
Alliance	18.6	18.1	18.4	21.0	13.1
Barking & Dagenham	12.3	11.7	11.5	13.9	13.0
Coventry	17.2	16.8	16.4	19.1	11.1
St Helens	14.5	14.2	14.4	16.1	10.8
Great Yarmouth	13.3	13.1	13.0	14.8	10.7
Pennine Lancs	21.3	20.7	20.8	23.5	10.3
Bradford	17.4	16.4	16.4	19.0	9.6
All LEGI Areas	17.3	16.5	16.4	18.9	9.5
South Tyneside	15.4	14.7	14.5	16.8	9.3
Leeds	22.3	20.7	20.5	24.4	9.2
Blackpool	24.1	24.1	23.8	26.1	8.3
Redcar & Cleveland	16.7	15.9	15.8	17.8	6.5
Norwich	14.3	13.2	13.3	15.1	6.1
Sheffield	18.5	16.9	16.6	19.5	5.8
Liverpool & Sefton	27.3	26.3	26.2	28.7	5.4
Durham	22.7	21.6	21.4	23.9	5.2
Wansbeck	15.5	14.4	14.4	15.9	2.8

Source: DWP/ONS

Table A2.5: Working age population							
LEGI Areas	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Alliance	57,612	57,735	58,494	59,439	60,195	60,636	61,053
Barking & Dagenham	100,023	101,298	101,805	101,565	101,679	101,841	102,546
Blackpool	37,050	37,176	37,512	37,905	38,157	38,292	38,520
Bradford	119,148	120,327	121,563	123,513	126,660	128,262	130,098
Coventry	64,548	65,280	67,011	67,305	69,195	70,788	70,986
Croydon	130,995	131,706	132,363	133,317	133,557	134,616	136,065
Doncaster	34,494	34,944	35,403	35,841	36,171	36,603	36,447
Durham	87,738	87,465	87,747	88,167	88,689	89,043	89,865
Great Yarmouth	53,160	53,676	54,234	54,567	54,507	54,450	54,396
Hastings	21,948	22,182	22,578	22,659	23,046	22,827	22,851
Leeds	26,340	27,039	27,852	28,650	30,036	31,155	31,941
Liverpool & Sefton	54,270	54,453	54,483	54,099	54,174	54,312	54,096
NE Lincs	27,492	27,519	27,900	28,260	28,764	28,968	28,917
Norwich	35,130	36,033	36,786	37,803	39,099	40,536	42,060
Pennine	88,542	88,320	88,494	88,917	89,718	89,829	89,490
Redcar & Cleveland	62,883	62,811	62,805	63,117	63,324	63,183	63,063
Sheffield	107,898	108,450	108,783	110,715	114,018	116,760	120,492
South Tyneside	90,501	90,987	91,185	91,257	91,740	92,373	92,691
St Helens	107,574	107,709	107,946	108,459	108,933	108,924	108,471
Wansbeck	37,404	37,377	37,602	37,614	37,767	37,800	37,737

Source: ONS

Table A2.6: Business stock									
LEGI Areas	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Alliance	3,126	3,158	3,476	3,614	3,872	3,965	4,115	4,323	4,376
Barking & Dagenham	3,143	3,205	3,559	3,685	4,108	4,173	4,460	4,794	4,976
Blackpool	4,327	4,237	4,475	4,416	4,630	4,619	4,618	4,493	4,470
Bradford	6,322	6,383	6,907	6,974	7,487	7,661	7,852	7,870	7,995
Coventry	3,718	3,744	4,017	4,036	4,545	4,619	4,640	4,736	4,712
Croydon	4,913	4,865	5,549	5,619	6,466	6,543	6,642	6,916	7,080
Doncaster	2,243	2,239	2,458	2,512	2,833	2,886	2,955	3,074	3,070
Durham	2,597	2,741	3,045	3,210	3,546	3,670	3,951	4,181	4,181
Great Yarmouth	3,089	3,159	3,537	3,670	3,902	3,966	3,982	4,096	4,163
Hastings	1,921	1,925	2,103	2,190	2,421	2,407	2,440	2,464	2,468
Leeds	1,157	1,172	1,271	1,262	1,391	1,417	1,411	1,467	1,532
Liverpool & Sefton	2,575	2,625	2,762	2,805	2,968	3,009	3,033	3,052	3,096
NE Lincs	2,367	2,370	2,508	2,541	2,674	2,705	2,762	2,810	2,789
Norwich	3,430	3,447	3,731	3,784	3,956	4,122	4,142	4,268	4,336
Pennine	6,576	6,575	7,071	7,140	7,591	7,628	7,923	7,943	8,102
Redcar & Cleveland	2,441	2,567	2,963	3,088	3,373	3,420	3,522	3,673	3,617
Sheffield	6,529	6,728	7,398	7,487	7,990	8,032	8,131	8,193	8,186
South Tyneside	2,870	2,854	3,147	3,289	3,563	3,710	3,815	3,975	4,050
St Helens	3,822	3,961	4,319	4,492	4,984	5,043	5,273	5,530	5,646
Wansbeck	1,260	1,260	1,384	1,449	1,575	1,591	1,686	1,821	1,869

Source: BETA Model

Appendix 3

Management and delivery arrangements

Table A3.1: Management and delivery arrangements in the LEGI areas

Area/LA's	LEGI Target Area	Steering Group/ reports to	Management arrangements	Delivery – in house/ contract out	Delivery agencies
Ashfield (Alliance): Ashfield Bolsover Mansfield	LSOAs in the IMD 20% most deprived	Alliance for Enterprise Board reports to Ashfield District Council	Initially the 3 District Councils managed but has been handed over to 'Local Enterprise Organisation (LEO) Ltd – a new social enterprise for the delivery of the programme	Delivery – mix of in house (3 District Councils) and contracted out (Groundwork)	District Councils and Groundwork
Barking & Dagenham	Local authority area	Barking and Dagenham Enterprise (BDE) Board – own constitution (serviced by Regen dept) – reports to 4th Block LSP Group	Independent – Barking and Dagenham Enterprises (Bold and Dynamic)	BDE (Bold and Dynamic) and contracted out delivery	BDE; Chamber, CVS, Robert Clack School, Lifeline, UEL; LBBD; Platinum Links; CEME (Co's Ltd by Guarantee)
Blackpool	LSOAs in the IMD 20% most deprived	Enterprise Board reports to sub group of the LSP. Business Leadership Group provides private sector endorsement	Management Team – part of Blackpool CC	Delivered through named delivery partners on a grant basis.	Colleges; Blackpool. unlimited

Table A3.1: Management and delivery arrangements in the LEGI areas
(continued)

Area/LA's	LEGI Target Area	Steering Group/reports to	Management arrangements	Delivery – in house/ contract out	Delivery agencies
Bradford	LSOAs in the IMD 20% most deprived	Enterprise and Investment Partnership – provides advisory role and reports to 4TH Block LSP Group.	Bradford City Council	Contracted out	Bizz Fizz, Sirolli, Camberwell Grids; local community groups; Young Enterprise.
Coventry	14 MSOAs covering LSOAs in the 10% and 20% most deprived nationally. Widened to LA.	LEGI board is a sub group of the LSP's Jobs and Economy theme group.	The chair of the Jobs and Economy group has responsibility for overseeing the delivery of the programme on behalf of the LSP.	Mix of Local Authority, Chamber, CVS partners.	Voluntary Action Coventry; Probation Service; JCP; Amazon; WBDA (Womens Business Development Agency)
Croydon	Approx 60% of local authority – including most deprived areas plus wards targeted by City Growth. Widened to LA	Croydon Enterprise Advisory Board – reports to CE Cabinet Committee; EDP; LSP	Croydon Enterprise – within the Local Authority	Delivery – mix of in house and contracted out	Croydon Business; Council; College; CVA; SLB; GLE; Croydon Business Venture
Doncaster	LSOAs in the IMD 10% most deprived	'Success Trackers' (Advisory) Board reports to LSP – Enterprise in Doncaster	Programme Team – within the Council	Delivery – mix of in house and contracted out	Deloittes; Community Development Trusts; College; Business Link; Social Enterprise Unit.
Durham: Derwentside Easington Sedgefield Wear Valley	96 LSOAs in the 10% most employment-deprived in England	BeEnterprising Board reports through to County Durham Economic Partnership (LSP sub group)	Programme Team – within Durham County Council	Local authority and contracted out	RTC North; Business Link NE; BSupplied

Table A3.1: Management and delivery arrangements in the LEGI areas
(continued)

Area/LA's	LEGI Target Area	Steering Group/reports to	Management arrangements	Delivery – in house/ contract out	Delivery agencies
Great Yarmouth	Local authority area	Enterprise GY reports to LSP	Enterprise GY Programme Team	Contracted out	Banking sector, accountants, Business Link, Enwest
Hastings Hastings Rother	24 LSOAs in IMD 20% most deprived (21 in Hastings; 3 in Rother)	Hastings and Bexhill Economic Alliance – management group provides advisory role and reports through to Cabinet.	Hastings Borough Council	Local authority and contracted out	1066 Enterprise; Hastings Voluntary Action; University of Brighton; Tressell Training; Hastings Trust; HBC
Leeds	LSOAs in the IMD 3% most deprived	Sharing the Success Board reports through to Leeds City Council.	Management Team in Leeds City Council	Contracted out	ATL Yorkshire Ltd; Bradford Enterprise Agency; Education Leeds; Leeds Chamber of Commerce; Leeds Voice; West Yorkshire Enterprise Agency etc
NE Lincs	12 target neighbourhoods comprising 32 LSOAs (majority in worst 10% nationally)	Local Steering Group	Programme Team in NE Lincs Council	Loan Fund delivered In house, majority contracted out/managed by E-Factor Ltd	E Factor Ltd – social enterprise responsible for delivery of the programme; Education Business Link Organisation; JCP; Grimsby Institute of FHE
Norwich	6 most deprived wards in Norwich	LEGI Advisory Board	Programme Team based in Norwich CC	Sub contracted to 12 organisations	Bizz Fizz, Princes Trust; We2

Table A3.1: Management and delivery arrangements in the LEGI areas
(continued)

Area/LA's	LEGI Target Area	Steering Group/reports to	Management arrangements	Delivery – in house/ contract out	Delivery agencies
Pennine Lancs: Blackburn Burnley Hyndburn Pendle	LSOAs in the IMD 20% most deprived (population – 152,000)	Chief Executive Group (an existing group from the Local Authorities)	Programme Manager (from Elevate)	Contracted out	Private sector, Chamber of Commerce, voluntary sector, Elevate
Redcar & Cleveland	16 most deprived wards (approximately 75% of borough)	Programme Management Board reports through to the LSP	Programme Management Team employed by the Council as part of the Regen team	In house and contracted out	Schools, private sector, Development Trust, R2E, Council
Sefton Liverpool	6 wards in North Liverpool/ South Sefton (all in 1% most deprived wards nationally)	StepClever Board reports to 4th Block LSP Group	Local Authority Team	Delivery contracted out to Liverpool Vision and InvestSefton	Sub contracts held by range of agencies – e.g. Merseyside Expanding Horizons (Social Enterprise Project)
Sheffield	LSOAs in the IMD 20% most deprived. Widened to all LA	Generation Enterprise Board (advisory) reports through to 4th Block LSP Group	Local Authority Team	Local authority and contracted out	Sheffield Community Enterprise Development Unit; SENTA;
South Tyneside	Local authority area	Spirit of Enterprise Partnership reports through to 4TH Block LSP Group	South Tyneside Council Team – not dedicated but assigned.	Contracted out and in house	TEDCO (Local Enterprise Agency); Business Link; Council; Durham Business School
St Helens	Local authority area	St Helens LEGI Board reports through to the LSP	St Helens Chamber of Commerce	In house delivery largely – St Helens Chamber and St Helens Council	Some outreach provision

Table A3.1: Management and delivery arrangements in the LEGI areas
(continued)

Area/LA's	LEGI Target Area	Steering Group/reports to	Management arrangements	Delivery – in house/ contract out	Delivery agencies
Wansbeck	Local authority area	LEGI Board reports through to Wansbeck and Northumberland LSPs.	GO Wansbeck – team part of Wansbeck District Council	In house delivery.	Wansbeck Business Forum.

Appendix 4

LEGI area programme data

Table A4.1: Share of spending by target beneficiary in the LEGI areas up to December 2009 (%)					
LEGI Areas	Residents	Business	Start ups	Place	Other
Ashfield	12	24	22	29	13
Barking & Dagenham	10	58	18	4	10
Blackpool	39	17	37	3	4
Bradford	19	31	25	19	6
Coventry	32	26	24	2	16
Croydon	21	29	22	7	21
Doncaster	22	27	33	0	18
Durham	8	19	52	5	17
Great Yarmouth	15	39	30	6	10
Hastings	27	35	22	1	15
Leeds	17	11	17	46	8
NE Lincolnshire	7	9	56	19	9
Norwich	35	21	22	11	11
Pennine Lancs	7	32	57	0	5
Redcar & Cleveland	18	59	6	8	9
Liverpool & Sefton	14	51	25	0	11
Sheffield	29	16	22	16	17
South Tyneside	23	43	23	3	8
St Helens	22	34	34	5	4
Wansbeck	16	32	25	19	7
All LEGI areas	20	31	29	10	11

Source: LEGI Partnerships performance management data

Table A4.2: Key outputs and outcomes

LEGI Areas	Jobs created/safeguarded	Businesses created	Businesses assisted	Individuals engaged by the programme	Individuals assisted (excluding school projects)
Ashfield	1,087	306	2,246	4,186	808
Barking & Dagenham	192	438	2,075	12,310	12,310
Blackpool	598	527	1,627	15,426	3,376
Bradford	5,363	1,837	2,995	42,493	22,244
Coventry	712	624	925	4,471	4,471
Croydon	746	625	5,182	5,648	5,648
Doncaster	1,732	915	6,332	3,450	0
Durham	n/a	2,343	n/a	2,527	0
Great Yarmouth	544	445	517	3,199	3,199
Hastings	298	202	1,670	2,745	2,745
Leeds	1,222	650	2,082	924	924
NE Lincolnshire	510	477	650	273	273
Norwich	465	331	2,134	11,324	7,718
Pennine Lancs	3,520	1,021	2,135	23,989	n/a
Redcar & Cleveland	n/a	363	511	6,511	n/a
Sefton Liverpool	626	211	908	25,099	3,825
Sheffield	361	312	722	11,621	11,621
South Tyneside	1,646	516	3,747	6,452	6,452
St Helens	2,548	1,289	7,356	41,143	3,825
Wansbeck	594	276	1,085	28,468	2,596
TOTAL	22,762	13,708	44,899	252,259*	92,035*

Source: LEGI Performance Management Information
 * Figure includes 13,708 into employment (outcomes)
 n/a denotes LEGI area does not monitor this indicator

Appendix 5

Feedback from programme managers and key partners in the case study areas

The following tables present feedback from face to face interviews with programme managers and key partners in the case study areas and telephone interviews with programme managers in the non case study areas. In total 54 interviews were conducted – 20 programme managers and 34 key partners. The results below present responses from consultees – they exclude ‘don’t know’ replies.

Relevance	
	Total
Highly relevant	72%
Relevant	28%
Partially relevant	0
Not relevant	0
Appropriateness of spatial targeting	
	Total
Yes	72%
In part	25%
No	4%
Appropriateness of targeting to achieve LEGI objectives	
	Total
Yes	69%
In part	27%
No	4%
Has LEGI met local needs?	
	Total
Very well	64%
Well	19%
Somewhat	17%
Not much	0

Has the programme changed priorities to respond to economic circumstances?	
	Total
Yes – significantly	7%
Yes – partly	79%
No	14%

What proportion of LEGI activity would have taken place without funding?	
	Total
0%	7%
<25%	77%
25-50%	12%
50-75%	5%
75-100%	0

To what extent is the programme creating benefits it set out to achieve?					
	Better than expected	As expected	Under-performing slightly	Under-performing significantly	Not relevant
Generally	43%	55%	0	2%	0
In creating businesses	61%	35%	2%	2%	0
In supporting existing businesses	36%	55%	10%	0	0
In attracting new investment (including franchises)	5%	37%	25%	25%	7%
In improving entrepreneurial awareness (including enterprise education activities)	63%	25%	6%	6%	0
In improving the skills base and employability	30%	49%	5%	0	16%
Other	70%	20%	5%	5%	0

To what extent is the programme achieving its targets for particular groups?

	Better than expected	As expected	Under-performing slightly	Under-performing significantly	Not relevant
BME	26%	26%	0	2.6%	46%
Women	32%	24%	5%	0	38%
Workless	24%	41%	3%	0	32%
Older people	0	23%	3%	0	74%
Young people	41%	28%	6%	0	25%
School children	44%	29%	3%	0	24%
Other	25%	0	25%	25%	25%

Have there been any unintended negative consequences of the programme as a whole?

Yes to a significant extent	4%
Yes but minor/insignificant	57%
No	39%

To what extent have the benefits of the programme accrued to businesses and residents outside your target area?

	Businesses	Residents
Significantly	5%	5%
Partly	28%	19%
Insignificantly	51%	44%
Not at all	16%	33%

Management processes				
How efficient has the administration of the programme been?				
	Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor
Resource allocation procedures	18%	48%	27%	7%
Project approval mechanisms	24%	33%	29%	13%
Monitoring procedures	19%	31%	42%	8%
The use of monitoring data	18%	27%	42%	11%
Overall	24%	37%	31%	8%
How well has the partnership worked?				
	29%	35%	33%	4%

Are there relevant agencies or organisations with which you have found it difficult to work or establish links?	
Yes	73%
No	27%

Has LEGI influenced the approach taken by other agencies or organisations?			
	Yes	Yes, partly	No
Local Authority	40%	50%	10%
Business Link	19%	36%	44%
JobCentre Plus	9%	47%	44%
Other	67%	33%	0

Long term impact			
Do you feel your programme has developed any specific examples of innovation or good practice?			
	Yes	Partly	No
Activities/projects	100%	0	0
Partnership processes	77%	0	23%
Joint working	83%	0	17%
Have you attempted to disseminate/transfer any of the above?			
	79%	0	21%
Have any of these been taken up by other agencies?			
	57%	0	43%
Do you think that your LEGI programme has organised and delivered things in such a way that will make long term changes in the way in which enterprise and economic growth are thought about and tackled in the future?			
	81%	17%	2%
Is your LEGI programme addressing the fundamental underlying causes of the problems that it is seeking to tackle?			
	67%	31%	2%

Appendix 6

Case Study Area Data

A. Partner feedback

Croydon

- Longevity and design of LEGI was relevant to changing the culture in areas.
- Scale of the funding also important – to enable ‘comprehensive packages of support to be offered’ – required to change the business base (through diversification of the existing stock – particularly in some of the district centres etc). Significantly increased the capacity to support new enterprises in the area.
- Enabled an holistic programme to be developed (marrying up the supply and demand).
- The area had already developed a City Growth Strategy – LEGI provided funding for some of the activities within it.
- Tried to do everything – then streamlined activity – other agencies in place to address other agendas (e.g UKTI – inward investment).
- Recognised that some targeting was needed in terms of engaging with hard to help groups and disadvantaged areas – only appropriate in terms of marketing and outreach. However, for a lot of people in the deprived areas, business is not the most appropriate route (75% of those engaged don’t start up) – they need other forms of support to move them into employment and training and become economically active again. Targeting is more relevant for certain types of LEGI activity – but not others.
- Unrealistic expectations from the business community (and the third sector regarding their role in delivery) about the funding available. Politically the authority was under a lot of pressure to spend given the amount of resources ring-fenced for the area.

Partner feedback – Croydon								
Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice	Conclusions/ recommendations moving forward
Very limited entrepreneurial culture – but this takes time to address hence reason why 10 year programme welcomed. 'Design was relevant'. Needed a programme to stimulate business and enterprise to drive the area forward. Very little activity prior to LEGI. Programme could have done more to support SMEs – particularly growth sectors (BL territory though).	Business Focus for Croydon delivered the Business London Programme (small scale) – LEGI significantly increased scale of activity. Loan fund – substituting for what banks would have funded previously. 5% – 30% of activity would have taken place anyway.	Croydon Business (main business support delivery organisation) and Croydon Enterprise co-located which worked well. Advisory board very strong with good private sector input from individual companies and South London Business – both challenged projects coming forward. Employment and training agencies less engaged. Not strategic enough in first instance – too operational – sharpened up as programme went on. LEGI improved cross referrals between CB/CE and BL.	Sharpened the focus on economic development and enterprise in the area – development of a strategy and the new economic development company. Outreach provision wrong in the first instance so not achieved as many start ups as they were anticipating – anecdotally programme thought to be effective in assisting existing businesses...	Programme initially tried to break down north/south divide – broadened out to stimulate enterprise dev across borough. Outreach delivered in some deprived areas – needed to engage hard to help groups. Struggled to engage people with disabilities.	Business Link and Croydon Business – much closer working primarily as a result of Croydon piloting the BSSP process. Linkages at a strategic level were possibly stronger than the operational level. CB and BL worked well, but BL didn't really work with many of the other projects. Equally CB didn't. Linkages across the programme weren't as strong as they could have been. Some themes more joined up than others.	EDC. Culture change in the Local Authority. More effective approaches and partnership working is now in place in the area.	Linked to retention: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCMs • Business Friendly planners • Loan fund • Skills Fund • EOC. 	More strategic planning needed in the first instance. Tried to do too much too quickly. No strategy for the programme. Greater clarity and management required at the start of the project. Some political interference. Services need to remain flexible – no one size fits all.

Partner feedback – Croydon (*continued*)

Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice	Conclusions/recommendations moving forward
Focus shifted to existing businesses as a result of the recession.		<p>LA procedures 'very laborious'.</p> <p>Monitoring systems ineffective until CRM system introduced.</p> <p>Good evaluation panels & procedures – (questioned by some).</p> <p>Some political interference.</p> <p>Communications not as strong as they should have been – BID board; LEGI advisory group etc.</p> <p>Council won Beacon Award status in 2009/10 for raising economic prosperity through partnership working.</p>	Inward investment and franchising not worked out.		<p>College, Chamber, LDA have been difficult to work with.</p> <p>Improved links with intermediary organisations – banks; accountants; legal companies etc.</p>			<p>Engagement is critical but also understanding that self employment is not right for many groups – employability support more appropriate.</p> <p>Enterprise needs to link with the BSSP using existing resources and other funding/ ongoing support – coaching and mentoring/ ACCBA model – community based advisors.</p>

St Helens

- LEGI filled gap left by Business Link.
- Infrastructure and good partnership arrangements in place prior to LEGI (joined up chamber and local authority) – City Growth Strategy.
- Recession – shift resources to existing businesses (new markets team to promote diversification) and extend Co support period; and business growth opportunities (low carbon businesses/co's addressing climate change).
- Programme was designed to ensure that it did not duplicate the services of other agencies – skills (Learning and Skills Council); inward investment (The Mersey Partnership).
- 'Social Enterprise' – not a big part of the bid. Put in as it was what the partnership thought DCLG wanted to see (there are only a handful in the area).
- LEGI addressing 'symptoms' rather than the cause of the problem in deprived areas – generational issues, culture change required.

Partner feedback – St Helens

Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/ partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice	Conclusions/ recommendations moving forward
<p>Culture change programme.</p> <p>CGS scoped the need – LEGI provided funding to deliver activities.</p> <p>Supply chain project developed very relevant to the area – post recession split into business task force and new markets team – promote diversification.</p> <p>Recession – business support period extended.</p>	<p>Opportunity to fill gap in enterprise delivery that business link failed to achieve.</p> <p>10-20% would have taken place anyway – some elements were in place at a reduced scale.</p>	<p>Chamber leads – infrastructure in place prior to LEGI.</p> <p>Community based infrastructure used to deliver – facilitating better engagement.</p> <p>Chamber manage programme; LA acc body. Little scrutiny/ challenge by the board.</p>	<p>Generally achieving outputs – effective in delivering business stock/ formations but employment gone down due to recession.</p> <p>Unable to get robust self employment rate.</p>	<p>Spatial targeting works at LA level – not too small.</p> <p>Aimed to close gap by focusing on deprived areas – to complement the activities of DAF.</p>	<p>JCP; LSC; Connexions; College.</p> <p>Liverpool City Region Partners work well.</p> <p>NWDA difficult – but good BL relationship.</p> <p>Merseytravel – new bus route.</p> <p>Not enough private sector involvement.</p>	<p>Long term changes – need a long term programme.</p> <p>Need time to implement activity, learn from experience and adapt.</p> <p>Legacy – capital investment.</p>	<p>Business winning business has influenced local procurement.</p> <p>LEGI has enabled the place to be more enterprising and able to withstand recessionary pressures.</p> <p>Transfer through Beacon Status award.</p>	<p>Improved linkages with other agendas – unemployment (engaging people through enterprise).</p> <p>LEGI forum not worked as effectively as could have done/ needed greater focus on sharing best practice.</p> <p>CLG monitoring returns would have been helpful and greater clarity on what the programme was for – but this was also a strength of the funding.</p>

Partner feedback – St Helens (continued)							
Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice
	Programme was at risk of displacing existing businesses – but issue was managed and programme refocused to support growth and innovation (market research pre-requisite).		No's into employment – exceeded targets (but there should be more support for the businesses to ensure the sustainability of the jobs).				
							Education & enterprise need to be aligned. Tension – between educationalists and businesses – businesses should be asked what they need.

Wansbeck

- LEGI viewed as a programme aimed at generating increasing amounts of economic activity rather than addressing worklessness per se. Area was a property development cold spot. Team argued for capital spend as well as revenue as felt that had to do something about the capital base to attract investment into the area. Felt that initially government had felt the programme should be just on soft employment support. LEGI also gave a very wide scope to do a variety of activities.
- Got a recognisable brand at a very low cost – enabled people to get behind that brand and feel part of it. Very clever positioning – more about the people in the area seeing Wansbeck on the telly – ‘made people sit up and take notice.’ Also generated some enquires from outside the area as to what had been achieved to warrant a TV advert! All good publicity.
- First round bid failed as didn’t have enough private sector involvement in it. Philosophy is that business needs to be part of the community to meet local need – this has been achieved with second bid.

Partner feedback – Wansbeck								
Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice	Conclusions/recommendations moving forward
Highly relevant – used to missing out on such types of regen funding given small scale. Multi-stranded programme to meet the local needs.	Less than 25% of activity would have happened without LEGI.	Lot of trust developed – e.g. county council education dept and LA worked together well on WEEN project. Good public private sector joint working.	Very quickly had start ups registering for support – better than expected. Overall – performance exceeded targets. Also invested in developing town centre to create perception of success/ infrastructure – townscape heritage initiative. Increased confidence of existing small businesses.	Targeted the whole area so that no-one excluded.	Worked closely with BL with a rep on the Board. Tried to use some BL services (e.g. the local start up grant initially channelled applications through BL – thought their diagnostic would act as a filter) but not really matched needs of community. Nevertheless, it is a 'pretty good' relationship. V good relationship with LA/County Council – particularly at an operational level.	Team cut back at early stage 2010.	WEEN – schools enterprise programme – to transfer culture change into families – link with Think Family policy approach. Community finance initiative – finance recognized as a key barrier to enterprise. Community Coaches.	LEGI has started to tackle the economic structure – still a way to go in attracting medium sized employers onto the area. Successful in starting to change the culture of the area. Area has the confidence to bid for further pots of money, and has maintained the support of County Council who can see the benefits such an approach has brought.

Partner feedback – Wansbeck (continued)

Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/ partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice	Conclusions/ recommendations moving forward
			Community coaches – generated a lot of interest and enthusiasm.		Some criticisms of LEGI from BL – they see business coaching as their project, but it's about definitions. LEGI coaches are very different to BL coaches.			LEGI shown how economic programme can bring about social and cultural benefits.

Coventry

- Flexibility of the programme is demonstrated by the diverse range of LEGI programmes nationally. Good links with the central LEGI team helped.
- Coventry LEGI always aimed to see enterprise in widest sense – i.e. residents being enterprising in accessing work and establishing businesses. They have developed this through the funnel model which sets out the client journey/ pathway and recognises that the choice is not about employment or enterprise – but the importance that both may play in individuals' journeys. Learning and adapting interventions (through very rigorous monitoring, evaluation and reporting) is central to the approach.
- Coventry unusual in that has both employment and enterprise strands – the big story here is the way in which partners have tried to match supply and demand at the local level.
- There has been a substantial building of capacity for Coventry CC in terms of culture, workforce capacity and buy-in and management approaches – this has led to benefits for the overall service delivery in relation to enterprise and employment.
- The key to the LEGI bid was the need to match up the needs of low value businesses (i.e. those in low cost start ups) with those who wanted to work – both of these groups occupied the same deprived neighbourhoods but each failed to find the other, for example, those needing work (and needing to work locally because of barriers such as travel costs/childcare/family commitments) needed to get work with local companies – which were struggling with skills shortages – and they were located in these deprived neighbourhoods as the premises didn't cost too much.
- To match these two groups up was a key objective of the LEGI programme i.e. very local labour markets, community regeneration and recognition of the complex barriers to working. A place based approach which provided a much more customised approach to Business Link (a contract which the Chamber delivered up to April 2007). Business Link offered a shorter term intervention – LEGI was to build a longer term relationship with clients – employees, employers/ entrepreneurs, and workless.
- “The model has been one of input and output into deprived communities and not just about giving grants away to individuals and employers...of working with people over the longer term.....of being enterprising about employment”.
- Social Return on Investment assessments – this methodology has been adopted to track the impact on families and communities and “the benefit to the person...so that we can start to unpick the dependency culture”. A lot more awareness amongst partners of the need to challenge the family unit and be aware of the ways in which benefit dependency has led to various survival strategies amongst families in local communities.

Partner feedback – Coventry

Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/ partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice	Conclusions/ recommendations moving forward
<p>3 Phases – feasibility to work up what was needed; phase 2 (2007-9); phase 3 – review and decommissioning to focus in on areas of need & communities of interest and reduce duplication.</p> <p>Overall flexibility – very positive experience for most of the partners – key concern has to monitor, evaluate and adapt very carefully right from the outset & to ensure no duplication with existing programmes.</p>	<p>Strategically LEGI has been seen as mainstream funding, not additional. Difficulties attached in relation to the LPSB allocation decision making process – lost capital allocations for the remaining years.</p> <p>25% – 50% of impact wouldn't have happened without LEGI.</p>	<p>As a result of LEGI flexibility & the way in which the bid developed originally, the commissioning process was well established and worked well.</p> <p>Good partnerships built so able to test new approaches.</p> <p>Managed to devise LEGI management approach which has benefitted all involved – made it as streamlined as possible – which was enabled by light touch from CLG. Approach has informed Regen team approaches overall.</p>	<p>Overall most partners believe they have done well or exceeded expectations.</p> <p>Initial outreach through Workmates failed and made recruitment for other programmes such as Local Employment Opps – difficult – issue has been progression of along the client journey/ pathway.</p>	<p>Focused on worst 20% initially – broadened out so only partly agree with spatial targeting – after 18 months this moved from priority LSOAs to city wide – but still with focus on those most in need.</p>	<p>Excellent joint working between LA and Chamber – operationally very successful.</p> <p>Improved public sector working with sectors i.e. retail sector – SMEs and new investors such as Primark/IKEA.</p>	<p>LEGI programme rebranded under 'Enterprising Coventry' – to bring other enterprise and employment activities together.</p> <p>Continue delivery with the multi agency approach – to align funding together.</p>	<p>Probation/ ex-offenders project.</p> <p>Monitoring & evaluation – shared management info system.</p> <p>V high level strategic involvement within the LA</p> <p>Regen Dept and the CoC.</p> <p>LEGI changed culture amongst LA employees – improved understanding of the role of social inclusion and approach to employment.</p>	<p>Lot more discussion around process/ partnership working rather than individual programmes.</p> <p>Improved understanding and partnership working around social inclusion agenda – getting partners to buy into local supply/ demand models and SI within the LA employing and procuring local people/ firms.</p>

Partner feedback – Coventry (continued)								
Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice	
<p>Key managers see the development of the funnel model as key success and viewing 'enterprise culture/' approach in the broadest sense.</p> <p>National model didn't prescribe local mechanisms so it has been successful.</p> <p>Coventry has become 'enterprising about employment' –has a big worklessness element to the approach.</p>	<p>Chamber had the contract to deliver BL until it went regional. A lot of research carried out into where BL wasn't able to reach and that prompted the local LEGI approach.</p>		<p>Moved away from Workmates to use intermediary routes such as Sure Start and Libraries.</p> <p>Despite meeting targets – still a way to go to make this a transformational approach.</p>	<p>Claim that done well re targeting women and BME through sub-contracting to local community based providers WBDA and Amazon Initiatives – both previously working in delivering enterprise programmes.</p>	<p>Vol sector joint working key challenge – strategically and operationally. Involved in the LEGI board commissioning new innovative approach to engagement e.g Workmates. V. challenging in delivery stage – limited capacity in Coventry Voluntary Action – lack of understanding re distance from the labour market and barriers to moving them into enterprise.</p>		<p>New commissioning approaches – developed with LA – in terms of procurement.</p> <p>Focus on client pathway –input and output rather than being target driven – this was reflected in commissioning programmes such as the barrier breaking support.</p>	<p>This has led to detailed discussions with the PCT re supporting people with long terms health conditions and to the health sector corporate citizenship role (ie think local).</p>

Partner feedback – Coventry (continued)

Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice	Conclusions/ recommendations moving forward
			LEGI has high sustainability rate – 68%, 12 months +. Due to intensive support provided by business coaches, focus on 1:1 support not on grants. Targeted retail, catering and service sectors. Culture change for inward investment team – linked into the neighbourhood renewal agenda and the overall LSP objectives.		Good eg of working with group of most marginal retail businesses in same localities to develop/salvage them – also good e.g. of working with industrial estate businesses which needed to relocate. Very high levels of trust between partners which ‘we couldn’t have dreamed of before LEGI’.		Emphasis was on the approach being customer driven and on benefits to clients and communities – supported by use of SROI and indirect outcomes for families in deprived communities as well as the direct outputs of jobs and business set ups.	

Blackpool

- Key perceived success has been the HERO programme – changing entrepreneurial awareness amongst young people 14-19 years – recognition by some of the need for effective evaluation of these programmes in the longer term.
- Also big successes around worklessness and hard to reach groups (construction training activity; employability support).
- LEGi is highly relevant – especially for start ups and for encouragement of enterprise culture – as start up support has not previously been available in Blackpool.

Partner feedback – Blackpool

Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/ partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice	Conclusions/ recommendations moving forward
Focus on residents rather than businesses. Highly relevant given that no support for start ups at all.	Generally wouldn't have taken place – there is slight overlap with some recent RDA business support programmes for start ups and high growth. Less than 25% activities would have taken place without LEGI. Would have been some enterprise activity through ERDF funding.	Could have been better integration with other business support activities inc Business Link. 20% LSOA spatial targeting is too restrictive as economic opps generated outside which could be supported for benefit of socially excluded in the target areas. Overall management approach/reporting perceived as weak in addition to resource allocation procedures. Better communication between partners required and senior/ strategic buy to communicate the LEGI messages.	Performed better than expected esp around creation of new businesses e.g. through Get Started. Refocused support to existing businesses. Availability of grants has generated a grants culture.	Focus on hard to reach groups e.g. BUILD Up. Issue re spatial targeting on 20% worst SOAs and practical implications for supporting new and existing businesses. Widened out geographical area.	Not much focus on partnership approach. Better linkage with private sector secured through establishment of the Business Leadership Group. Limited involvement of voluntary sector apart from Social Enterprise Development Project.	Key focus on building an enterprising culture amongst young people – building local capacity. Given grants culture – question about sustainability.	Fostering of enterprise culture = excellent outcome. e.g. HERO (7000 beneficiaries 2007-09). Hard to reach social inclusion approach – Build It.	Some political interference and funding of 'pet projects'. Big investment in education and enterprise awareness programmes – HERO but approach requires effective evaluation. Area has benefited from provision of intensive, focused support to address worklessness and start ups. Big increase in social enterprise work.

Partner feedback – Blackpool (continued)							
Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/ partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice
							<p>Question mark around involvement of Chamber locally – more involved recently.</p> <p>Has put economy on the agenda – receives higher priority within council – need for long term involvement/ understanding.</p> <p>Better understanding of how Blackpool economy works required by partners.</p>

Bradford

- Been able to utilise LEGI to change attitudes and it has acted as a tool to influence mainstream e.g. Enterprise in Schools was very fragmented, low adoption, led only by a few enthusiasts. LEGI has enabled the team to pilot, pump prime, action learn and demonstrate need and impact of Enterprise in Schools and now they have a legacy, for example. “reasonably coherent partnership” to manage Enterprise in Schools which will be mainstreamed. To develop a project quickly and effectively and demonstrate need requires resources and flexibility as demonstrated by LEGI.
- Length of programme is an issue. Question re the exclusion and enterprise agenda and whether LEGI can tackle such a huge agenda, “this is a big agenda but LEGI is well funded to work on that agenda. Cash isn’t an issue but time and the ability to build knowledge of the issues and barriers can be”.
- ‘More than enough money into skills via the Learning and Skills Council so LEGI has concentrated on skills relating to enterprise and business’. Test trading developed with Jobcentre Plus. Jobs achievement is huge but this is because LEGI helped to fund the Council Job Brokerage Team and so take a pro-rata proportion of their outputs.
- LEGI innovative, bespoke and bottom up – applaud DCLG for launching the programme as it was. Issue with funding timescale: 2 years, then 3+, but need 10 years from the outset as was originally envisaged.
- LEGI is a good programme it ‘scratches where the itch is’.

Partner feedback – Bradford								
Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/ partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice	Conclusions/ recommendations moving forward
<p>LEGI focus on people and businesses highly relevant – as council focus has always been physical.</p> <p>The national programme has proved relevant 'like nothing else has in the past – innovative, flexible, brave and able to respond to needs & circumstances following mid term review....the programme is hands off, it allows creativity and bespoke delivery'.</p>	<p>Overall – no previous focus on enterprise – business support was 'the poor relation'.</p> <p>2007 the business start up rate was + 1 % higher than the previous year – the Regional figure had declined by – 1%.</p> <p>Survival rates 1year + = 80%.</p>	<p>High level private sector involvement.</p> <p>50% EIP members are private sector.</p> <p>Private sector also heavily involved in Enterprise and Schools.</p> <p>Very difficult to get strategic involvement of the voluntary sector.</p> <p>Identified the need to invest more resource into monitoring and evaluation arrangements – been addressed.</p> <p>Took time to set up transparent management – could have done with having some delivery in place to hit the ground running.</p>	<p>Overall better than expected.</p> <p>LEGI provides significant funding to Invest in Bradford who are now working on a more strategic level to attract inward investment e.g. the new M&S distribution centre which will offer 2000+ jobs.</p> <p>Franchising Fair held recently – attracted 400 + people.</p> <p>Enterprise Coaching.</p>	<p>LEGI linked to cohesion agenda – Bradford Economic Strategy written on back of LEGi principles that if want cohesion – then need to offer people opps.</p>	<p>Need to be able to influence BSSP. Issues around BSSP wanting to deliver enterprise coaching but in reality this was advice – not coaching.</p> <p>Some views that RDA were 'holding back' in Bradford.</p> <p>After initial BL suspensions, programme established good links with BL.</p> <p>Good links with Bradford College in setting up the new Retail Academy in Keighley and with Bradford University School of Management – for the Micro Business Network.</p>	<p>Enterprise in schools has been mainstreamed.</p> <p>Some views that without long term funding then the changes underway will tend to collapse, & revert back to the way it was before.</p>	<p>Extended Test trading with JC+ – transferred to other areas after clearance from Treasury.</p> <p>Enterprise Island – presentation of business ideas in a Dragons Den type format.</p> <p>New Retail Academy which LEGI also funded.</p> <p>Professional services is not a grant but does provide expertise to young companies.</p>	<p>Enterprise as an activity and outcome embedded into as many institutions and organisations that deal with people as possible.</p> <p>Partnership and co-operation seen as "normal" activity – institutions and organisations used to working in partnership.</p> <p>Council have enterprise activity high on their agenda.</p>

Partner feedback – Bradford (continued)

Relevance	Additionality	Effectiveness of management/ partnership arrangements	Impact/ Performance Contribution to change in the areas	Equity	Synergy and Linkages	Sustainability	Best Practice	Conclusions/ recommendations moving forward
	VAT registrations had increased in relation to a rising adult population – faster than the regional and national average. Employment (up to the recession) had increased faster than the regional and national average and even through the recession, Bradford has not been as badly affected as some areas.	Strategic partnership changed has lost focus since inclusion of Invest in Bradford. Meant to be about the economy but not clear and lost a lot of people.	Intensive assistance for under-represented groups and access to finance.	LEGI attempted to engage with people of all ages and backgrounds on assumption that the underlying cause of the 'enterprise gap' is poverty which tends to drive poor education and lack of aspiration and opportunity to achieve. Developed outreach methods to engage specific groups e.g. BME, women.	Consortium for business support worked well. Lack of targets for BizzFizz and Sirrolli (inc referrals) didn't help build relationships.		LEGI has assisted in legitimizing some 'grey economy' activity.	Main product areas which LEGI can influence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enterprise Coaching • Intensive assistance for under-represented groups • Access to finance.

B. Case study projects – summary

Within the case study areas a number of projects across the intervention types were chosen for closer analysis. In total 39 projects were chosen and the relevant project manager interviewed for each project. A list of the projects and feedback from the interviews is given in the following tables.

Case Study Projects	
Place Management	
Croydon	Business-friendly Planning Service
Croydon	District Centre Managers
Wansbeck	Vibrant Town Centres
Investor Development	
Bradford	Build and Engage
Bradford	Better Environments
Coventry	Inward Investment
St Helens	Promoting St Helens as a Business Location of Choice
Animation – awareness raising in schools and the community, engagement ...	
Blackpool	Holistic Enterprise Realising Opportunities (HERO)
Wansbeck	Enterprise In Education Network (WEEN)
Wansbeck	Young Enterprise Skills
St Helens	Enterprising St Helens
St Helens	Get a New Start
Coventry	LEGI Workmates
Training	
Croydon	Building Enterprise
Blackpool	Blackpool Aviation Academy
Local Employment Opportunities	
Coventry	Local Employment Opportunities
Blackpool	Positive Steps

Case Study Projects (continued)	
Advice/Coaching/Mentoring/Business Support	
Blackpool	Get Started
Bradford	Become an enterprise
Bradford	Business Engagement
St Helens	Business Start up
Coventry	Business Mentors
Coventry	Business Coaches
Croydon	Business Growth Services – Generic Services to Business
Premises	
Croydon	E-Commerce
Croydon	Park Place
Wansbeck	Buildings for Business – Gap Fund
Wansbeck	Community Incubation Space
St Helens	Graduate Greenhouse
Finance	
Croydon	Finance for Enterprise
Wansbeck	Flexible Finance
Wansbeck	Flexible Fund SMES
Bradford	Barriers to new enterprise – access to finance
Procurement and supply chain development	
Bradford	Benefit the local economy
Coventry	Supply2Cov
St Helens	Business Winning Business
Networking	
Blackpool	Leadership Enterprise Reassurance
Wansbeck	Wansbeck Business Forum
St Helens	Streetwalkers

Barriers and successes

	Barriers	Successes
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity and/or awareness regarding the roles, responsibilities and expectations of partners. • Recession – impacts across the board (new business opportunities; survival rates; willingness to take risks; access to capital; etc). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocols for joint working and referrals. • Suitable and suitably located premises. • Flexibility and longevity of LEGI funding. • Use of effective tracking systems and performance management to ensure projects deliver against outputs. • Use of intermediary organisations for engaging with potential clients – particularly hard to reach groups. • Effective operational networking between projects.
Advice, etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring advisors are aware of full range of support available for referral of clients – maintaining up to date systems. • Access to bank finance. • Ensuring all mentors/advisers are of right calibre. • Ensuring consistent quality across a range of sub-contracts. • Grant culture. • Lack of clarity about roles and relationships with other providers – poor referral mechanisms/protocols. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful as it is seen as local support for local people – rather than council delivery. • Proactive approach to securing new clients. • Effective marketing – including use of a referral network. • Also need to use out-reach – through relevant orgs (including sub-contractors) and venues. • Recognition that need longer lead-in times to address barriers of particular groups. • Need to avoid ‘numbers game trap’ i.e. be clear that business start-up is the right option. Need effective assessment at the start of the process. • Need quality measures (e.g. sustainability of the enterprise). • Need consistent quality business planning – variable at present. • Need impact assessment and follow up with businesses. • Preparedness to take risks in supporting proposals.

	Barriers	Successes
Animation etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some difficulty engaging parents. • Securing recognition that enterprise education is valuable part of the curriculum. • Low work ethic and lack of (formal) entrepreneurial tradition in area. • Lack of capacity to engage with some hard to help groups e.g. looked after children. • Lack of realism (within the central LEGI team) with regard to engaging the hard to help client groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piloting the approach in primary schools. • Committed team of professionals. • Schools buy in. • Embedding enterprise across the curriculum. • Incorporating team into the School Improvement Service – able to access schools more effectively. • Use of innovative, tailored forms of engaging the client group e.g. Facebook; Twitter. • Flexibility of support and provision offered. • Time needed to build up the trust in neighbourhoods rather than ‘parachuting in’. • Effective and realistic quality IAG.
Place management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political interference and sensitivity. • Conservation pressures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to tailor the service and offer businesses more time than standard. • Ability to ‘join up’ different agendas. • Local knowledge of partner activities. • Need for capital and revenue funding – including resources to carry out public realm type improvements. • Links into existing regeneration initiatives and council departments. • Consultation with businesses.
Investor development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrealistic expectations. • Recession. • Different culture within the Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive approach to identifying opportunities. • Availability of grant support.
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attracting teaching staff. • Levels of numeracy/literacy. • Criminal records. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand-led provision – close liaison with employers regarding requirements. • Intensive support designed to address employability as well as vocational skills issues.

	Barriers	Successes
Local employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inability to track and monitor clients. • Staff turnover. • Low motivation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective referral arrangements. • Effective marketing and communication. • Dedicated resources to fund provision not available through mainstream resources. • Access to same adviser. • Clear progression plan for each individual. • Use of evaluation feedback to ensure training is responsive to clients.
Premises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of coordinated central marketing – wasteful competition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear market analysis and needs assessment. • Links with mainstream agencies and other business support organisations. • Ability to offer clients flexibility and tailored solutions.
Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size of funding. • Ineffective (wrongly-structured) board. • Lack of quality business planning support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide as part of holistic package of support (with e.g. mentoring and aftercare support and dedicated sectoral support where required). • Linkages with intermediary organisations (including banks, accountants, other professional organisations) as a source of referrals and support. • Loans (as opposed to grants) can tease out those who are very committed to starting up. (On the other hand they are more complex and costly to administer and in Coventry have a default rate of 60%).

	Barriers	Successes
Networking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement & Supply Chain. • Public expenditure restraints will limit opportunities and reduce the relative importance of local benefits as a consideration. • Recession means greater competition for contracts. • Requirements to demonstrate environmental sustainability can be a barrier for SMEs. • Procurement team attitudes are often a barrier. • Contract sizes often too big. • Apathy of businesses – difficulty getting through the door. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong private sector involvement in project design and delivery – including micro-businesses as well as SMEs and large corporates – requires meaningful role to be identified.
Procurement and supply chain		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authority (and other public sector agency) commitment to using procurement as a vehicle to achieve wider local economic benefit – often needs a culture change to be cascaded through the organisation. • Access to quality business support essential to enable local businesses to achieve tender thresholds. • Need to identify sub-contract as well as main contracting opportunities.

Processes

Management of programme – effectiveness in terms of resource allocation procedures						
	Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor	Don't know	Total
Programme Managers	2	10	4	2		
Advice and business support	2	1	3	0	1	7
Animation	2	2	0	1	3	8
Finance	2	1	0	0		3
Investor Development	3	0	0	0	1	4
Local Employment	0	1	1	0	0	2
Networking	0	3	0	0	1	4
Place management	1	1	1	0	2	5
Premises	0	1	1	1	2	5
Procurement	1	2	0	0	0	3
Training	1	1	0	0	0	2
Total Project Managers, etc	12	13	6	2	10	43

Management of programme – effectiveness in terms of project approval mechanisms						
	Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor	Don't know	Total
Programme Managers	4	5	7	3	0	
Advice and business support	2	1	1	1	2	7
Animation	2	2	0	1	3	8
Finance	2	0	1	0	0	3
Investor Development	2	0	2	0	0	4
Local Employment	0	1	1	0	0	2
Networking	0	3	0	0	1	4
Place management	1	1	1	0	2	5
Premises	1	1	1	1	1	5
Procurement	1	2	0	0	0	3
Training	1	0	0	0	1	2
Total Project Managers, etc	12	11	7	3	10	43

Management of programme – effectiveness in terms of monitoring procedures						
	Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor	Don't know	Total
Programme Managers	3	7	6	3	0	
Advice and business support	2	1	3	1	0	7
Animation	1	3	1	0	3	8
Finance	1	0	1	1	0	3
Investor Development	3	0	1	0	0	4
Local Employment	0	1	0	1	0	2
Networking	1	1	1	0	1	4
Place management	0	1	1	1	2	5
Premises	1	1	2	0	1	5
Procurement	1	2	0	0	0	3
Training	1	0	0	1	0	2
Total Project Managers, etc	11	10	10	5	7	43

Management of programme – effectiveness in terms of monitoring data						
	Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor	Don't know	Total
Programme Managers	3	5	6	4	0	
Advice and business support	2	1	2	1	1	7
Animation	1	3	1	0	3	8
Finance	1	0	1	1	0	3
Investor Development	2	0	1	1	0	4
Local Employment	0	1	0	1	0	2
Networking	1	1	0	1	1	4
Place management	0	1	0	1	3	5
Premises	0	0	1	1	3	5
Procurement	0	1	1	0	1	3
Training	1	0	0	0	1	2
Total Project Managers, etc	8	8	7	7	13	43

How well the LEGI partnership worked					
	Very well	Well	Poor	Don't know	Total
Programme Managers	4	5	10	1	
Advice and business support	3	2	0	2	7
Animation	5	0	1	2	8
Finance	2	0	1	0	3
Investor Development	3	1	0	0	4
Local Employment	0	2	0	0	2
Networking	3	0	0	1	4
Place management	1	4	0	0	5
Premises	3	0	2	0	5
Procurement	0	2	0	1	3
Training	1	0	0	1	2
Total Project Managers, etc	21	11	4	7	43

Views regarding the efficiency of the project application and approval processes					
	Very good	Good	Poor	Don't know	Total
Advice and business support	2	4	1	0	7
Animation	2	0	0	6	8
Finance	1	0	1	1	3
Investor Development	2	1	0	1	4
Local Employment	0	0	0	2	2
Networking	0	0	0	4	4
Place management	2	1	0	2	5
Premises	0	2	0	3	5
Procurement	1	1	0	1	3
Training	1	0	0	1	2
Total	11	9	2	21	43

Views regarding the speed of the project application and approval processes					
	Very good	Good	Poor	Don't know	Total
Advice and business support	3	2	1	1	7
Animation	1	1	0	6	8
Finance	1	0	1	1	3
Investor Development	2	0	1	1	4
Local Employment	0	0	0	2	2
Networking	0	0	0	4	4
Place management	2	1	0	2	5
Premises	0	1	1	3	5
Procurement	0	2	0	1	3
Training	1	0	0	1	2
Total	10	7	4	22	43

Views regarding the support provided during the project application and approval processes

	Very good	Good	Poor	Don't know	Total
Advice and business support	3	3	0	1	7
Animation	2	0	0	6	8
Finance	1	1	0	1	3
Investor Development	3	0	0	1	4
Local Employment	0	0	0	2	2
Networking	0	0	0	4	4
Place management	1	1	0	3	5
Premises	1	1	0	3	5
Procurement	1	1	0	1	3
Training	1	0	0	1	2
Total	13	7	0	23	43

Additionality (and added value)

The origin of the projects

	New provision		Enhanced existing provision		Continuation of existing
	Capital project	Activity/service	Capital facility	Activity/service	
Advice and business support	0	2	0	5	0
Animation	0	7	0	1	0
Finance	0	2	0	1	0
Investor Development	0	2	2	0	0
Local Employment	0	0	0	0	2
Networking	0	2	0	0	2
Place management	1	1	1	3	0
Premises	1	1	0	2	0
Procurement	0	2	0	2	0
Training	2	2	0	0	0
Total	4	21	3	14	4

If LEGI funding had not been received the project would:						
	Definitely not have happened	Possibly wouldn't have happened	Definitely would but slower/smaller/poorer	Possibly would but slower/smaller/poorer	Definitely would but with other money	Possibly would but with other money
Advice and business support	3	0	4	0	0	1
Animation	5	1	2	2	1	1
Finance	2	0	2	0	0	0
Investor Development	2	0	2	0	0	1
Local Employment	1	0	1	0	0	1
Networking	0	2	1	3	0	0
Place management	2	2	1	1	1	0
Premises	4	1	1	1	0	1
Procurement	0	1	1	2	0	0
Training	1	0	0	1	0	1
Total	20	7	15	10	2	6

Project funding – LEGI and other sources			
	100% LEGI	LEGI and other sources	Other sources
Advice and business support	6	1	ERDF
Animation	6	2	ESF
Finance	2	1	RDA
Investor Development	1	3	Arts Council, RDA, ERDF, Local Authority, Health Service
Local Employment	1	1	WNF
Networking	4	0	
Place management	2	3	Local Authority, RDA, private sector
Premises	2	3	Croydon Business Ventures, RDA Single Programme
Procurement	2	1	ERDF
Training	0	2	FE College
Total	26	17	

Extent to which benefits of the programme accrued outside of the target area/group								
	Businesses				Residents			
	Significantly	To some extent	Not at all	Don't know	Significantly	To some extent	Not at all	Don't know
Advice and business support	1	2	3	0	2	1	3	0
Animation	1	3	1	0	1	3	4	0
Finance	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	1
Investor Development	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	0
Local Employment	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0
Networking	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	0
Place management	0	0	4	0	0	0	5	0
Premises	0	3	2	0	0	2	1	0
Procurement	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
Training	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
Total	4	17	15	2	3	11	20	1

Projects	Added Value
Advice, etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More proactive than the mainstream (BL) in offering business support services and offers a different scale/intensity of support to a wider clientele (especially start-ups and residents of deprived areas). • Has had a social benefit as well as economic and helped to motivate people to become economically active. • It has also raised the profile of self employment within the Council as a means of driving economic growth. • In Bradford very little enterprise support activity prior to LEGI – programme clearly additional. • LEGI led to increased demand for suppliers of professional services (took on additional staff). • Less money would have impacted on ability to reach target groups. • Providers now have accredited staff and better monitoring systems.
Animation, etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very small amount of enterprise funding available for KS4 from DCSF – non-existent offer for young people. • LEGI facilitated the development of a new approach of sufficient scale to change the culture within schools re enterprise education. • In house development has kept costs to a minimum compared with private sector provision. • Project displaced a private/third sector provider – as teachers doing it themselves. • Added value includes interest from parents and new styles of learning in the classroom (realistic), keeping kids engaged.
Place management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved customer care approaches within Council.
Investor development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More effective working relationships between local and regional delivery agencies. • Stimulated area improvements.
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helped strengthen the position of the college by developing new links with business that led to new work for other departments.
Local employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEGI provided support for hard to help target group who were very far removed from employment and needed more intensive support (not available through JCP).
Premises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some leakage of benefits outside area where business part of a larger group (e-commerce project). • Projects also delivering jobs, impacting on residents perceptions of their environment and providing facilities for improved local services (e.g. retail).

Projects	Added Value
Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds attempted to fill a gap in the market for those businesses unable to access commercial lending. • Added value created through running LEGI projects closely e.g. in Wansbeck it is envisaged that loan defaults would have been higher without the support of the community coaches. • Funding on loan schemes (e.g. Bradford) re-cycled.
Networking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opened up new channels of communication for public sector partners with businesses. • Displacement of other (fee-based) networks. • Increased business co-operation (knock-on benefits e.g. business watch schemes and reduced crime).
Procurement and supply chain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some leakage of benefits with businesses from outside area seeking to benefit e.g. Bradford – (companies setting up virtual office in area to take advantage of LEGI).

Synergy and linkages

Benefits been achieved as a result of linkages				
	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Advice and business support	7	0	0	7
Animation	8			8
Finance	3			3
Investor Development	4			4
Local Employment	2			2
Networking	3	1	0	4
Place management	5	0	0	5
Premises	5			5
Procurement	3			3
Training	2			2
Total				43

The effectiveness of the involvement of the business sector in the project management

	Very good	Good	Poor	Don't know	Total
Advice and business support	1	3	2	1	7
Animation	4	2	0	2	8
Finance	2	0	0	1	3
Investor Development	1	0	1	2	4
Local Employment	0	2	0	0	2
Networking	4	0	0	0	4
Place management	2	1	1	1	5
Premises	2	0	0	3	5
Procurement	1	0	0	2	3
Training	2	0	0	0	2
Total	19	8	4	12	43

The effectiveness of the involvement of the voluntary/community sector in the project management

	Very good	Good	Poor	Don't know	Total
Advice and business support	0	5	0	2	7
Animation	2	0	0	6	8
Finance	0	1	1	1	3
Investor Development	1	1	0	2	4
Local Employment	1	0	1	0	2
Networking	1	1	0	2	4
Place management	1	2	1	1	5
Premises	0	1	0	4	5
Procurement	0	0	0	3	3
Training	0	1	1	0	2
Total	6	12	4	21	43

The effectiveness of the involvement of local residents in the project management					
	Very good	Good	Poor	Don't know	Total
Advice and business support	0	0	0	7	7
Animation	2	0	0	6	8
Finance	0	0	0	3	3
Investor Development	1	1	0	2	4
Local Employment	0	0	0	2	2
Networking	0	0	0	4	4
Place management	0	1	0	4	5
Premises	0	1	0	4	5
Procurement	0	0	0	3	3
Training	0	0	0	2	2
Total	3	3	0	37	43

The effectiveness of the involvement of the public sector partners in the project management					
	Very good	Good	Poor	Don't know	Total
Advice and business support	2	5	0	0	7
Animation	6	1	0	1	8
Finance	0	0	2	0	3
Investor Development	1	0	1	2	4
Local Employment	0	2	0	0	2
Networking	3	0	0	1	4
Place management	2	2	0	1	5
Premises	3	2	0	0	5
Procurement	2	0	1	0	3
Training	2	0	0	0	2
Total	21	12	4	5	43

Synergy and Linkages	
By area:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wansbeck – very strong links between projects due to co-location at Go Wansbeck; also strong strategic partnership – thought to be one of the key success factors for the Wansbeck programme. • Croydon – some good working relationships between projects in related themes, but not necessarily attributable to the LEGI partnership forging these links, i.e. place management/ environment projects; Loan fund; e-commerce, Enterprise Opportunity Centres. Links with Croydon Business not so good (some resentment about the organisation delivering the business support). Private sector engagement patchy, although good use of intermediary organisations (banks, accountants, etc) for referrals to projects. Fairly good CVS engagement. • Bradford – LEGI honed delivery arrangements between partners. Facilitated greater linkages with other council departments and partners outside the Local Authority. Very good cross referral from other LEGI projects and linkages with CVS sector. • St Helens – LEGI programme provided a continuum of support, so strong links between the projects in the programme. Established working relationship between the Chamber and the Local Authority in existence prior to LEGI. Private sector engagement not strong. • Coventry – poor relationship between the LA and the third sector in general. • Blackpool – very good private sector engagement (primarily through the establishment of the leadership group) which went across the programme.
Place management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very strong links between other place management type projects – e.g. district centres managers; property grants; business friendly planners. • Strengthened links between council departments – and complemented Council funding on public realm etc.
Investor development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved relationships across council departments – inward investment, planning, marketing, business support services in terms of putting investor packages together; and links between the relationship managers and the employment teams.
Animation and awareness raising in schools and the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools projects benefited from links with business forums and private sector groupings and the enterprise start up advice projects (4 projects out of 8 reported v good relationships with private sector and 2 good). • Enterprise awareness in the community projects – good working relationships on the ground with CVS and public sector organisations (Connexions; JCP) particularly in terms of referrals.

Synergy and Linkages (continued)	
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong links with local businesses in the sector has helped ensure courses are driven by demand. • Both projects improved linkages between the college and the local authority. • Projects engaged the relevant agencies for referral mechanisms e.g. Connexions for NEET clients; Local Schools.
Local employment opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good relationships with JCP forged to deliver the projects and good use of CVS organisations and outreach facilities (e.g. Children's Centres) to engage with client groups. • Potential loss of opportunities through under-developed Council linkages (social services; housing etc).
Advice, coaching, mentoring, business support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong linkages with public sector partners (JCP, BL, Connexions); and CVS organisations (Princes Trust; CAB) 5/7 projects reported good relationship. • Linked to follow on support projects – access to finance; professional services premises etc. • Business Link engaged for growth companies. • Some coaches worked with sectoral organisations e.g. design institute; retail groupings and specific agencies dealing with particular client groups e.g. women. • Less engagement of the business sector.
Premises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong links with place management projects. • Good links with supporting projects e.g. finance. • Very poor referrals from Business Link (not eligible for support – quality of the advice?). • Good use of private sector intermediary organisations – banks; accountants; financial brokers.
Procurement and supply chain development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better and new networking relationships e.g. RSLs. • Improved relationships between council departments.
Networking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good private sector working and improved relationships with forums outside the Local Authority area. • Projects facilitated links to improve 'business friendly agenda' – e.g. community safety, planning, traffic, and other town centre/ environmental management.

Sustainability

What will happen to the project once LEGI funding comes to an end:						
	It will cease			Continue with other funding		
	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know
Advice and business support	1	2	4	2	0	5
Animation	1	3	4	3	4	1
Finance	1	2	0	2	1	0
Investor Development	1	0	3	0	0	4
Local Employment	2	0	0	0	0	2
Networking	0	1	3	0	0	4
Place management	0	1	4	3	0	2
Premises	1	1	3	1	1	3
Procurement	1	0	2	1	1	1
Training	0	1	1	1	0	1
Total	8	11	21	13	7	23

Has an exit strategy developed for the project?			
	Yes	No	Don't know
Advice and business support	2	5	0
Animation	6	2	0
Finance	2	1	0
Investor Development	1	3	0
Local Employment	2	0	0
Networking	3	1	0
Place management	3	1	1
Premises	2	3	0
Procurement	1	2	0
Training	1	1	0
Total	23	19	1

Have attempts been made to secure mainstream/and or other regeneration funding?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	
Advice and business support	4	2	1	Local Authority core funding, ISUS programme, private sector, ABG, ERDF
Animation	5	2	1	ESF, Coalfields Regen, DAF, Young Enterprise Grants, RDA, Council core budget (e.g. education)
Finance	2	1	0	RDA, banks, capital investors
Investor Development	3	1	0	ERDF, RDA, local authority,
Local Employment	0	0	2	–
Networking	0	2	2	–
Place management	3	2	0	Local businesses, Townscape Initiative bid, LAGBI
Premises	1	4	0	Local Authorities, RDAs
Procurement	1	1	1	RDA
Training	1	1	0	S106
Total	20	15	8	

Are there plans to replicate the project, or aspects of the project elsewhere?			
	Yes	No	Don't know
Advice and business support	4	2	1
Animation	7	1	0
Finance	1	2	0
Investor Development	1	3	0
Local Employment	0	2	0
Networking	1	3	0
Place management	2	3	0
Premises	2	3	0
Procurement	1	2	0
Training	1	1	0
Total	20	22	1

Performance

Project lead organisation						
	LA – Regen/ Ec Devt	Educa- tion	Other public sector	CVS	Private	Partner- ship
Advice and business support	0	0	1	1	5	0
Animation	4	1	0	1	2	0
Finance	0	0	2	0	1	0
Investor Development	3	0	0	0	1	0
Local Employment	2	0	0	0	0	0
Networking	1	0	0	0	3	0
Place management	5	0	0	0	0	0
Premises	1	0	0	1	3	0
Procurement	1	0	0	0	1	1
Training	0	1	1	0	0	0
Total	17	2	4	3	16	1

Has the project succeeded in creating the benefits that it set out to achieve?			
	Performed better than expected	Performed as expected	Under- performed
Advice and business support	6	0	1
Animation	7	1	0
Finance	3	0	0
Investor Development	4	0	0
Local Employment	2	0	1
Networking	3	0	0
Place management	3	2	0
Premises	3	2	0
Procurement	3	0	0
Training	2	0	0
Total	36	5	2

How effective do you think the project has been in:				
Meeting its objectives				
	Very effective	Effective	Ineffective	Don't know
Advice and business support	5	2	0	0
Animation	7	1	0	0
Finance	3	0	0	0
Investor Development	4	0	0	0
Local Employment	1	1	0	0
Networking	4	0	0	0
Place management	5	0	0	0
Premises	5	0	0	0
Procurement	3	0	0	0
Training	2	0	0	0
Total	39	4	0	0

Delivering anticipated outputs/outcomes/impacts at a local level:				
Advice and business support	5	1	1	0
Animation	7	1	0	0
Finance	2	1	0	0
Investor Development	3	1	0	0
Local Employment	1	0	1	0
Networking	4	0	0	0
Place management	4	1	0	0
Premises	5	0	0	0
Procurement	3	0	0	0
Training	2	0	0	0
Total	36	5	2	0

Relevance of the national LEGI programme to local circumstances and needs:						
	Highly relevant	Relevant	Partially relevant	Not relevant	Don't know	
Programme Managers	14	6	0	0	0	20
Advice and business support	5	0	0	0	2	7
Animation	6	1	0	0	1	8
Finance	1	2	0	0	0	3
Investor Development	3	1	0	0	0	4
Local Employment	1	1	0	0	0	2
Networking	4	0	0	0	0	4
Place management	5	0	0	0	0	5
Premises	4	1	0	0	0	5
Procurement	2	0	0	0	1	3
Training	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total Project Managers etc	33	6	0	0	4	43

How relevant has the project been in meeting the needs of the client group/ area?				
	Met real need	Partially relevant	Not very relevant	Don't know
Advice and business support	6	1	0	0
Animation	7	1	0	0
Finance	3	0	0	0
Investor Development	4	0	0	0
Local Employment	1	1	0	0
Networking	4	0	0	0
Place management	5	0	0	0
Premises	5	0	0	0
Procurement	3	0	0	0
Training	2	0	0	0
Total	40	3	0	0

Has the project delivered good value for money?				
	Very Good	Good	Poor	Don't know
Advice and business support	2	4	0	1
Animation	5	2	1	0
Finance	2	1	0	0
Investor Development	3	0	0	1
Local Employment	0	2	0	0
Networking	4	0	0	0
Place management	0	2	3	0
Premises	3	2	0	0
Procurement	3	0	0	0
Training	1	1	0	0
Total	23	14	4	2

Could the project have been delivered at a lower cost?			
	Yes	No	Don't know
Advice and business support	3	4	0
Animation	3	5	0
Finance	0	3	0
Investor Development	2	2	0
Local Employment	1	1	0
Networking	0	4	0
Place management	2	3	0
Premises	2	2	1
Procurement	0	3	0
Training	0	2	0
Total	13	29	1

Equity

Where beneficiaries are residents is the project explicitly targeted on a particular group or community of people? If so, rate the effectiveness of targeting (3= v good; 2= good; 1 = poor)							
	Ch/YP	Old	Workless	BME	Disabled	Lone Parents	Other
Advice and business support	4/6	4/6	12/15	12/15	10/15	9/12	7/9
Animation	17/18	3/3	6/6	4/6	5/6	5/6	3/3
Finance	–	–	3/3	3/3	–	–	–
Investor Development	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Local Employment	–	–	3/3	–	3/3	3/3	1/3
Networking	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Place management	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Premises	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Procurement	–	–	–	3/3	–	–	–
Training	3/3	–	2/3	–	–	–	3/3
Total	24/27	7/9	26/30	22/27	18/24	17/21	14//18

Where beneficiaries are businesses is the project explicitly targeted on a particular business type or sector? If so, rate the effectiveness of targeting (3= v good; 2= good; 1 = poor)

	Pre start	Start up	Existing business – SME	Existing business – inward investor	Social enterprise	Sector
Advice and business support	7/9	8/9	10/12	4/6	4/9	2/3 (key growth)
Animation	–	–	3/3	–	–	–
Finance	5/6	9/9	9/9	6/6	2/3	–
Investor Development	2/3	3/3	6/6	8/9	–	–
Local Employment	–	–	2/3	2/3	–	2/3 (retail)
Networking	–	–	6/6	6/6	–	–
Place management	–	2/3	5/6	2/3	2/3	6/6 (retail)
Premises	2/3	8/12	4/6	2/3	–	2/3 (retail)
Procurement	3/3	3/3	6/6	3/3	3/3	–
Training	–	–	–	–	–	5/6 (aviation)
Total	19/24	33/39	54/57	33/39	11/18	17/21

Is the project explicitly targeted at a particular area?					
	LSOAs	Neighbourhoods	Wards	Local Authority	Multi-LA
Advice and business support	6	–	1	6	–
Animation	1	–	–	8	–
Finance	2	–	–	2	–
Investor Development	2	–	–	2	–
Local Employment	2	–	–	2	–
Networking	–	–	–	4	–
Place management	3	3	–	2	–
Premises	2	–	–	4	–
Procurement	–	–	–	3	–
Training	2	–	–	–	–
Total	20	3	1	33	–

C. Beneficiary Survey Information

Introduction and company information

Introduction

Telephone interviews with 600 start-up and existing businesses covering six targeted areas:

Blackpool

Bradford

Coventry

Croydon

St. Helen's

Wansbeck

Where results do not sum to 100 this may be due to multiple responses or computer rounding.

Where base figures are lower than 10, responses are depicted in numbers only.

An asterisk (*) denotes a value of less than one percent, but greater than zero.

Geographical region				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A260,B309)	No.	%	No.	%
Blackpool	38	15	39	13
Bradford	39	15	61	20
Coventry	11	4	89	29
Croydon	52	20	47	15
St. Helen's	55	21	51	17
Wansbeck	65	25	22	7

Existing business or start up?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A260,B309)	No.	%	No.	%
Existing business	–	–	309	100
Start up	260	100	–	–

What date was the company established?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A256,B303)	No.	%	No.	%
Earlier	–	–	3	*
1930s – 1950s	–	–	4	1
1960s – 1980s	–	–	34	11
1990s	–	–	37	12
2000	–	–	12	4
2001	–	–	12	4
2002	–	–	15	5
2003	1	*	10	3
2004	3	1	14	5
2005	4	2	32	11
2006	6	2	33	11
2007	39	15	51	17
2008	93	36	36	12
2009	98	38	10	3
2010	11	4	–	–
N/A	1	*	–	–

What would you describe as the principal activity of your company at this establishment?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A252,B307)	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	–	–	2	*
Banking and Finance	5	2	8	3
Building and Construction	14	6	10	3
Business Services	25	10	21	7
Chemical and Pharmaceutical	–	–	–	–
Engineering and Electronics	7	3	14	5
IT and Telecoms, Communications	17	7	11	4
Manufacturing	13	5	35	11
Media	20	8	21	7
Mining and Quarrying	–	–	–	–
Real Estate and Property	7	3	11	4
Retail	51	20	59	19
Tourism, Leisure and Hotels	7	3	19	6
Transport	7	3	6	2
Utilities	1	*	2	*
Wholesale	2	*	6	2
Other	76	30	82	27

How many branches or sites does the company have in the local area and overall?

	Start Up (A)				Existing (B)			
Base: (A260,B309)	No.		%		No.		%	
No other branches/sites	172		66		164		53	
	In the local area				Overall			
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)		Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	4	2	1	*	5	2	11	4
1	80	31	127	41	1	*	8	3
2	3	1	7	2	1	*	2	*
3	1	*	3	*	–	–	1	*
4	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	*
5	–	–	–	–	1	*	1	8
6	–	–	1	*	–	–	–	–
12	–	–	1	*	–	–	–	–
18	–	–	1	*	–	–	–	–
80	–	–	1	*	–	–	–	–

Including you, how many full-time and part-time staff are employed in your business?

This establishment	Full-time staff (30 hours or more)				Part-time staff (less than 30 hours)			
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)		Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A260,B309)	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
53	–	–	1	*	–	–	–	–
80	–	–	1	*	–	–	–	–
200	–	–	1	*	–	–	–	–
500	–	–	1	*	–	–	–	–

Including you, how many full-time and part-time staff are employed in your business?

All establishment's in the area	Full-time staff (30 hours or more)				Part-time staff (less than 30 hours)			
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)		Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A260,B309)	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	1	*	–	–	3	1	2	*
1	1	*	4	1	1	*	1	*
2	1	*	2	*	1	*	2	*
3	1	*	1	*	–	–	1	*
5	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	8
6	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	*
7	–	–	2	*	–	–	–	–
8	–	–	1	8	–	–	–	–
9	–	–	1	*	–	–	–	–
15	1	*	1	*	–	–	–	–
17	–	–	2	*	–	–	–	–
40	–	–	2	*	–	–	–	–

Can you please let us know your past and future performance in terms of:**Existing (B)**

	Staff Two years ago		Staff One year ago		Staff Next year		Staff in two years	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Base: (309)	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	7	3	3	1	2	*	2	*
1 – 5	140	54	191	73	171	66	167	64
6 – 10	5	2	12	5	28	11	29	11
11 – 20	1	*	6	2	9	3	8	3
Over 20	–	–	1	*	2	*	3	1
Other/N/A	–	–	–	–	1	*	–	–

Can you please let us know your past and future performance in terms of:**Existing Businesses (B)**

	Staff Two years ago		Staff One year ago		Staff Next year		Staff in two years	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Base: (309)	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	3	3	2	*	1	*	1	*
1 – 5	251	81	190	61	168	54	143	46
6 – 10	32	10	50	16	58	19	61	20
11 – 20	16	5	16	5	27	9	30	10
Over 20	15	5	16	5	16	5	18	6
Other/N/A	–	–	–	–	2	*	1	*

What was the establishment's turnover and operating profit in the most recent year's trading?

	Turnover (A230,B273)				Profit (A223,B268)			
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)		Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Loss	4	2	6	2	19	9	28	10
Under £50,000	53	23	39	14	54	24	76	28
£50,001 – £100,000	18	8	27	10	6	3	18	7
£100,001 – £150,000	3	1	17	6	–	–	5	2
£150,001 – £250,000	2	*	17	6	3	1	2	*
£250,001 – £500,000	4	2	29	11	–	–	6	2
£500,001 – £1,000,000	7	3	12	4	–	–	2	*
£1,000,001 – £10,000,000	1	*	11	4	–	–	1	*
£10,000,001 – £50,000,000	–	–	1	*	–	–	–	–
£50,000,001 – £100,000,000	–	–	2	*	–	–	–	–
Over £100,000,000	–	–	3	1	–	–	1	*
Prefer not to say	28	12	51	19	29	13	53	20
Don't know	110	48	58	21	112	50	76	28

Can you please let us know your past and future performance in terms of:**Start Up (A)**

	Turnover Two years ago		Turnover One year ago		Turnover Next year		Turnover in two years	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Base: (260)	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Loss	–	–	2	*	1	*	–	–
Under £50,000	12	5	29	11	18	7	11	4
£50,001 – £100,000	9	3	13	5	12	5	9	3
£100,001 – £150,000	2	*	3	1	2	*	2	*
£150,001 – £250,000	2	*	2	*	2	*	2	*
£250,001 – £500,000	2	*	2	*	5	2	4	2
£500,001 – £1,000,000	2	*	6	2	3	1	4	2
£1,000,001 – £10,000,000	–	–	–	–	3	1	3	1
Other/N/A	15	6	1	*	–	–	–	–

Can you please let us know your past and future performance in terms of:**Existing (B)**

	Turnover Two years ago		Turnover One year ago		Turnover Next year		Turnover in two years	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Base: (309)	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Loss	1	*	–	–	–	–	–	–
Under £50,000	20	6	38	12	28	9	14	5
£50,001 – £100,000	7	2	16	5	20	6	11	4
£100,001 – £150,000	7	2	11	4	8	3	8	3
£150,001 – £250,000	12	4	11	4	9	3	10	3
£250,001 – £500,000	11	4	20	6	17	6	11	4

Can you please let us know your past and future performance in terms of:

Existing (B)

	Turnover Two years ago		Turnover One year ago		Turnover Next year		Turnover in two years	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Base: (309)								
£500,001 – £1,000,000	4	1	7	2	11	4	7	2
£1,000,001 – £10,000,000	10	3	12	4	13	4	11	4
Over £10,000,000	1	*	1	*	1	*	1	*
Other/N/A	11	4	4	1	3	*	2	*

Can you please let us know your past and future performance in terms of:

Start Up (A)

	Profit/Loss Two years ago		Profit/Loss One year ago		Profit/Loss Next year		Profit/Loss in two years	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Base: (260)								
Loss	1	*	2	*	–	–	–	–
Under £50,000	18	7	39	15	29	11	19	7
£50,001 – £100,000	4	2	6	2	6	2	2	*
£100,001 – £150,000	–	–	4	2	3	1	3	1
£150,001 – £250,000	1	*	1	*	2	*	2	*
£250,001 – £500,000	1	*	–	–	1	*	4	2
£500,001 – £1,000,000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Other/N/A	17	7	1	*	–	–	–	–

Can you please let us know your past and future performance in terms of:								
Existing (B)								
	Profit/Loss Two years ago		Profit/Loss One year ago		Profit/Loss Next year		Profit/Loss in two years	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Base: (309)								
Loss	2	*	5	2	–	–	–	–
Under £50,000	36	12	65	21	55	18	33	11
£50,001 – £100,000	8	3	9	3	15	5	13	4
£100,001 – £150,000	3	*	4	1	1	*	2	*
£150,001 – £250,000	3	*	3	*	4	1	–	–
£250,001 – £500,000	3	*	3	*	3	*	6	2
£500,001 – £1,000,000	–	–	2	*	2	*	2	*
Over £1,000,000	1	*	1	*	3	*	2	*
Other/N/A	12	4	1	*	6	2	3	*

Approximately what percentage of the Company's turnover is spent on the following?

Start Up (A)

	None		1-9%		10-24%		25-49%		50%		51-75%		76-90%		91-99%		100%		Don't know		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Materials, components and services (255)	5	2	22	9	37	15	43	17	27	11	24	9	14	6	7	3	7	3	69	27	
Wages and salaries (256)	58	23	15	6	37	15	17	7	18	7	24	9	12	5	8	3	2	*	65	25	

Approximately what percentage of the Company's turnover is spent on the following?

Existing (B)

	None		1-9%		10-24%		25-49%		50%		51-75%		76-90%		91-99%		100%		Don't know		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Materials, components and services (301)	3	1	13	4	54	18	60	20	32	11	43	14	35	12	4	1	6	2	51	17	
Wages and salaries (298)	40	13	16	5	59	20	54	18	32	11	31	10	12	4	2	*	-	-	52	17	

What percentage of your goods and services are sold within 10 miles of the business, within 30 miles and beyond?

Start Up (A)

Base:	None		1-9%		10-24%		25-49%		50%		51-75%		76-90%		91-99%		100%		Don't know	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Within 10 miles (234)	11	5	18	8	23	10	12	5	12	5	24	10	40	17	18	8	66	28	10	4
Within 30 miles (178)	20	11	23	13	62	35	17	10	12	7	8	5	11	6	5	3	10	6	10	6
Beyond (155)	57	37	21	14	14	9	9	6	8	5	5	3	13	8	5	3	14	9	9	6

What percentage of your goods and services are sold within 10 miles of the business, within 30 miles and beyond?

Existing (B)

Base:	None		1-9%		10-24%		25-49%		50%		51-75%		76-90%		91-99%		100%		Don't know	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Within 10 miles (278)	19	7	29	10	22	8	24	9	21	8	26	9	39	14	21	8	65	23	12	4
Within 30 miles (226)	32	14	39	17	64	28	34	15	14	6	12	5	8	4	2	*	8	4	13	6
Beyond (207)	58	28	12	6	24	12	12	6	14	7	13	6	27	13	9	4	21	10	17	8

Enterprise and business support received

What type of support did you access?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A259,B307)	No.	%	No.	%
Mentoring	42	16	54	18
Enterprise coaching	22	9	11	4
Business/Enterprise advice	114	44	139	45
Training	33	13	50	16
Workshops	26	10	25	8
Funding (Grants or loans)	187	72	140	46
Premises support	2	*	3	1

Did you also seek funding support for the project from another source?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A177,B167)	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	25	14	18	11
No	136	77	141	84
Don't know	16	9	8	5

When was this?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A260,B309)	No.	%	No.	%
Scheme 1				
Earlier	7	3	7	2
2007	32	12	30	10
2008	89	34	104	34
2009	119	46	31	10
2010	14	5	33	11
N/A	1	*	1	*

When was this?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A260,B309)	No.	%	No.	%
Scheme 2				
Earlier	–	–	1	*
2007	1	*	1	*
2008	4	2	2	*
2009	3	1	6	2
2010	2	*	1	*
Scheme 3				
2008	1	*	–	–

Why did you apply for support?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A258,B250)	No.	%	No.	%
Enable start up	213	83	14	6
Help expand business	37	14	148	59
Help protect business in current location	2	*	5	2
Help protect employment	2	*	19	8
Support development of products and services	23	9	116	46
Other	–	–	–	–

Did you seek advice about applying for support?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A255,B301)	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	185	73	195	65
No	69	27	105	35
Don't know	1	*	1	*

Who did you seek advice from?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A184,B201)	No.	%	No.	%
Job Centre Plus	8	4	3	2
Local Authority	41	22	57	28
Business Link	47	26	55	27
Chamber of Commerce	51	28	62	31
Federation of Small Business	4	2	1	*
Professional Services i.e accountant, solicitor	8	4	4	2
Don't know	1	*	2	1
Another employment and training/enterprise support provider	24	13	17	9
Other	–	–	–	–

Overall how would you rate the advice that you received?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A259,B308)	No.	%	No.	%
Very good	174	67	185	60
Good	52	20	75	24
Neither good nor poor	18	7	20	7
Poor	7	3	17	6
Very poor	8	3	11	4

Overall how relevant or irrelevant was the support to the needs of your business?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A259,B308)	No.	%	No.	%
Very relevant	153	59	146	47
Relevant	70	27	108	35
Neither relevant nor irrelevant	20	8	11	4
Irrelevant	7	3	24	8
Very irrelevant	9	4	19	6
Don't know	–	–	–	–

How easy or difficult was it to access support from the LEGI programme?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A259,B308)	No.	%	No.	%
Very easy	125	48	129	42
Easy	121	47	155	50
Neither easy nor difficult	5	2	9	3
Difficult	5	2	8	3
Very difficult	3	1	7	2
Don't know	–	–	–	–

Company performance since programme support

Overall how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the support that your company has received through the LEGI programme?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A258,B308)	No.	%	No.	%
Very satisfied	163	63	154	50
Satisfied	67	26	100	33
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11	4	22	7
Dissatisfied	7	3	16	5
Very dissatisfied	10	4	16	5
Don't know	–	–	–	–

What would have happened to your company in the absence of this support?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A234,B279)	No.	%	No.	%
Would not have started	76	33	8	3
Remained in a similar situation	134	57	197	71
Reduced the size of the business	15	6	42	15
Ceased trading	2	*	16	6
Expanded	–	–	2	*
Moved elsewhere	–	–	–	–
Don't know	9	4	14	5
Other	–	–	–	–

Without this support, would your business have employed?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A257,B308)	No.	%	No.	%
A similar number of staff	213	83	239	78
Fewer staff	37	14	54	18
More staff	–	–	10	3
Don't know	7	3	5	2

What proportion of fewer staff would your business have employed without support?				
	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A38,B56)	No.	%	No.	%
1-9%	1	3	4	7
10-24%	8	21	18	32
25-49%	5	13	17	30
50%	5	13	9	16
51-75%	–	–	–	–
76-90%	–	–	–	–
91-99%	1	3	–	–
100%	17	45	7	13
Don't know	1	3	1	2

What proportion of additional staff would your business have employed without support?			
	Start Up (A)	Existing (B)	
Base: (A4,B12)	No.	No.	%
1-9%	1	3	25
10-24%	–	1	8
25-49%	–	3	25
50%	2	2	17
51-75%	–	–	–
76-90%	–	–	–
91-99%	–	–	–
100%	–	2	17
Don't know	1	1	8

To what extent did the grant contribute to any change in your business?

Start Up (A)

	Major decrease		Minor decrease		No impact		Minor increase		Major increase		Don't know/ no opinion	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Base:												
Sales/turnover (259)	-	-	-	-	116	45	91	35	40	15	13	5
Profit (258)	-	-	-	-	132	51	85	33	30	12	12	5
Productivity (258)	-	-	-	-	105	41	96	37	46	18	11	4
Cost (258)	2	*	6	2	169	66	55	21	12	5	14	5
Investment (258)	-	-	3	1	166	64	60	23	15	6	14	5

To what extent did the grant contribute to any change in your business?

Existing (B)

	Major decrease		Minor decrease		No impact		Minor increase		Major increase		Don't know/ no opinion	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Base:												
Sales/turnover (304)	-	-	2	*	159	52	91	30	46	15	6	2
Profit (304)	-	-	1	*	177	58	80	26	40	13	6	2
Productivity (304)	-	-	2	*	151	50	102	34	44	15	5	2
Cost (303)	-	-	10	3	221	73	50	17	17	6	5	2
Investment (304)	1	*	3	1	222	73	58	19	16	5	5	2

Has your business received any wider benefits, e.g. image, recognition or wider customer base that would not have been received without the grant?

	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A259,B303)	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	112	43	117	39
No	145	56	180	59
Don't know	6	2	6	2

Which of the following statements best describes the impact that this support has had on your business?

	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A258,B304)	No.	%	No.	%
Would definitely have achieved similar results in a similar time	36	14	70	23
Would probably have achieved similar results in a similar time	23	9	46	15
Would have achieved the similar results but over a longer period of time	138	54	139	46
Would not have achieved the same level of results	42	16	39	13
Would not have achieved any results at all	19	7	10	3

To what extent have the future prospects of your business been enhanced?

	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A259,B305)	No.	%	No.	%
Enhanced a great deal	103	40	85	28
Enhanced a little	94	36	129	42
Not enhanced at all	64	25	93	31

Has your business received any other business support in your local area, outside of that already discussed?

	Start Up (A)		Existing (B)	
Base: (A258,B307)	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	35	14	64	21
No	223	86	242	79
Don't know	–	–	1	*

Appendix 7

Local area evaluations

LEGI area	Evaluations/Annual Reports	Organisation
Durham	Baseline assessment (Y1 final) Two interim impact tracking evaluations	PACEC Public and Corporate Economic Consultants
Pennine Lancashire	Mid-term evaluation (July 2009) Yr1 and 2 annual reports	EKOSGEN Elevate East Lancashire
Hastings	Individual project evaluations and overall programme evaluation to follow	Hastings Borough Council Commenced in house.
Croydon	Summary of First Phase Evaluation (Sept 2008) Key Issues from Phase 2 and 3 Evaluations (March 2009)	Russell Webster – 2 reports
Alliance	Mid-term evaluation (Nov 2008)	URS Corporation Limited
Redcar and Cleveland	Ongoing evaluation	PhD student
Norwich	Mid-term evaluation (currently underway)	CLES
Leeds	Baselining (Oct/Dec 07) to be repeated autumn/winter 09 Mid-term evaluation – covering the first two years of the programme. A phase two evaluation report will be prepared in March 2011	Market research company Hall Aitken
Bradford	Mid-term evaluation	Bradford Kickstart/ Bradford District Council
Coventry	Two Social Return on Investment assessments – ‘Workmates’ engagement programme; ‘Jobs Broker’ service Interim evaluation (Dec 2008) An overview report	New Economics Foundation Coventry Council and Meridien Pure
South Tyneside	Interim evaluation	Durham Business School

LEGI area	Evaluations/Annual Reports	Organisation
Liverpool and Sefton	Mid term evaluation (Jan 09)	Regeneris
Great Yarmouth	Evaluation report	In – house
Sheffield	Baseline and Evaluation Strategy Interim report	West Midlands Enterprise Regeneris
North East Lincs	Mid-term evaluation on implementation and impact	Hall Aitken
Blackpool	Interim report	Not undertaken to date.
St Helens	Interim report	Regeneris
Doncaster	Independent evaluation	Completed in house
Wansbeck	Go Wansbeck: Mid Term Evaluation (March 2009)	Hall Aitkin
Barking and Dagenham	Interim Evaluation (March 2008)	ANCER SPA Ltd

ISBN: 978-1-4098-2645-3

ISBN 978-1-4098-2645-3



9 781409 826453