

Appendix One: Table of beneficiary involvement at BIG

The following table provides information regarding the 12 programmes identified through this research that involved beneficiaries in funding processes.

Programme	Beneficiaries	Beneficiary involvement activities	Stage of grant-making	Scale of programme	Country
<p>Advantage A programme across Wales working with older people. The aim of the programme is to improve the quality of life of older people by providing access to befriending or advocacy services.</p> <p>Advantage is currently at the project delivery stage.</p>	Older people	Older people were asked for their views and to fill in a questionnaire at a national event, Eisteddfod - a festival of literature and arts. An older person served on the award-making committee.	Needs assessment Programme award	Up to £20 million available	Wales
<p>Bright New Futures A programme across Wales working with young parents and young disabled people aged 14-25. The aim of the programme is to build the emotional resilience of beneficiaries to manage key transitions in their lives.</p> <p>Bright New Futures awards process will commence in April 2013.</p>	Young parents and young disabled people	A number of one-off focus group meetings with young people to discuss needs and priorities.	Needs assessment	Up to £12 million available	Wales
<p>Fulfilling Lives: Ageing Better An older people's investment to fund projects that will tackle social isolation and establish a Centre aimed at building and sharing evidence about effective interventions.</p> <p>The investment will launch in 2013.</p>	Older people	A core group of 14 older people were involved for approximately six months throughout the programme design and development. BIG intends to involve beneficiaries at the programme award stage.	Needs assessment Programme design	Up to £120 million available	England

<p>Fulfilling Lives: Supporting People with Multiple and Complex Needs A programme for partnerships of local organisations and statutory bodies working together to improve blended services for people with multiple and complex needs.</p> <p>Fulfilling Lives: Supporting People with Multiple and Complex Needs is currently at the assessment stage. Funding awards will be announced by the end of March 2013.</p>	<p>People with multiple and complex needs</p>	<p>A series of focus group meetings with people with multiple and complex needs to set programme outcomes and criteria.</p> <p>An intermediary organisation undertook facilitation of the beneficiary group.</p>	<p>Programme design</p>	<p>Up to £100 million available</p>	<p>England</p>
<p>Empowering Young People A programme for 'at risk' young people aged 8-20. The aim of the programme was to ensure young people 'at risk' have the necessary support structures, capacity and personal development skills to help them negotiate the transitions in their life.</p> <p>Empowering Young People has ended.</p>	<p>Young People</p>	<p>Consultation events were held to design and develop programme. This included young people attending consultation activities across a four month period. This involved half-day or shorter events. In total 400 young took part.</p> <p>Four 'at risk' young people served on the award-making committee.</p> <p>An intermediary organisation undertook facilitation of the beneficiary group.</p>	<p>Needs assessment Programme design Programme awards</p>	<p>Up to £20 million available</p>	<p>Northern Ireland</p>
<p>Life Changes Trust (an independent trust) The trust aims to transform the life chances of young people leaving care; and improve the lives of older people with dementia and their carers.</p> <p>Life Changes Trust is due to launch in 2013.</p>	<p>Young people leaving care; and older people with dementia and their carers</p>	<p>One-off focus group meeting with older people with dementia and their carers.</p> <p>An intermediary organisation undertook facilitation of the beneficiary group.</p>	<p>Programme design</p>	<p>£50 million investment into the independent trust. This is a 10 year programme</p>	<p>Scotland</p>

<p>Investing in Communities: Life Transitions This programme aims to support people at key times of change, helping them make their lives better for the future. Projects focus on offering supported employment and creating new jobs, encouraging mentoring, befriending and peer support, building financial literacy, financial capability and financial inclusion, or developing basic and softer skills such as communication skills.</p> <p>Investing in Communities: Life Transitions is currently at the project delivery stage.</p>	<p>Broad group of beneficiaries</p>	<p><i>The following two strategic interventions are part of Investing in Communities: Life Transitions</i></p> <p>Becoming a Survivor A programme supporting people affected by domestic violence. A one-off focus group was held to consult young people on programme development plans.</p> <p>Joining a New Community A contract with Scottish Refugee Council focused upon integration and improved access to service for refugees and asylum seekers. A one-off focus group with asylum seekers and refugees on programme development plans.</p> <p>An intermediary organisation undertook facilitation of the beneficiary group.</p>	<p>Programme design</p> <p>Programme design</p>	<p>The approximate indicative budget is £160 million from 2012-2015</p> <p>Awards of approximately £6.5 million were made for Becoming a Survivor</p> <p>Joining a New Community is a £2 million contract with the Scottish Refugee Council</p>	<p>Scotland</p>
<p>Millennium Now A programme to fund five different project types; helping disadvantaged families to live healthy lives; helping different generations share their skills; encouraging communities to volunteer to address environmental issues; bringing communities together to tackle local issues; and helping disadvantaged young people to learn</p>	<p>The general public</p>	<p>The public participated in decision-making through The Big Decision, a public poll carried out by Ipsos Mori and Channel 4. The public selected areas to fund from pre-established general funding themes: encouraging environmental sustainability; investing in education; places; connecting communities; promoting science, technology and health.</p>	<p>Programme design</p>	<p>Up to £10 million available</p>	<p>UK</p>

<p>new career-based skills.</p> <p>Millennium Now is currently at the project delivery stage.</p>					
<p>The People's Millions This programme fund a wide range of projects</p> <p>The People's Millions public involvement programme with ITV was launched in 2005. Annual rounds of this programme, which includes a televised public vote, have taken place every year, except 2012 when the focus was on promoting project openings to mark the Queen's Diamond Jubilee.</p>	The general public	The public vote annually through a televised vote on ITV to award project funding.	Programme award	To date a total of 463 awards made worth over £24.5 million	UK
<p>Silver Dreams A programme funding projects that pioneer ways to help vulnerable older people deal more effectively with life-changing events. Up to 30 projects were funded for 12-18 months. Following this period five projects will be chosen to receive up to £1 million to carry their ideas forward.</p> <p>Silver Dreams is currently at the project delivery stage.</p>	Older people	In association with the Daily Mail, a panel of older people were recruited to serve on the award-making committee.	Programme award	Up to £10 million available	England
<p>Talent Match A programme supporting young people aged 18-24 who have been out of work, education or training for over 12</p>	Young People	A core group of 20 young people were involved for approximately seven months throughout the programme design, development and	Needs assessment Programme design Programme award	Up to £100 million available	England

<p>months. This programme will fund innovative ways to help young people find work or start their own enterprises.</p> <p>Talent Match is currently at the project delivery stage.</p>		<p>launch. Three young people were involved for a further period of time as part of the award-making committee.</p>			
<p>Young People's Fund A collection of programmes to improve the lives of young people. Each country set its own aims and outcomes and developed its own programme, in line with national policy contexts.</p> <p>Young People's Fund has ended.</p>	<p>Young People</p>	<p>Young people served on award-making panels for grants to: national organisations; local organisations; individuals.</p>	<p>Programme award</p>	<p>Over £200 million spent</p>	<p>UK</p>

Appendix Two: Framework for thinking about involving beneficiaries in funding processes at BIG

This is a framework for thinking about and planning for beneficiary involvement in funding processes at BIG. It is based on BIG's accumulated experience of involving beneficiaries and is designed to help BIG embed a flexible approach to beneficiary involvement across the organisation using its existing funding development framework.

A. Considerations for programmes

This section poses questions that BIG might consider when deciding whether and how to involve beneficiaries in specific programmes or other funding processes. Decisions about whether or not to involve beneficiaries will depend on the investment or programme being developed and the kind of beneficiary group being targeted.

Planning – part of the Funding development framework

For each programme there will need to be a discussion about whether beneficiary involvement is appropriate and necessary. This needs to take place at the earliest stage of the planning process and could be integrated into *Stage 1: Strategy, policy, approach and finance* of BIG's *Funding development framework*.

There are three questions to consider at this point:

1. What stages of grant-making will beneficiaries participate in?
2. Are the stages and activities in programme development sufficiently linked with beneficiary involvement activities?
3. How will you ensure the pace of grant-making is appropriate for the beneficiary group involved?

Having made the decision to involve beneficiaries in a programme or investment, there are three further areas to be considered: purpose and focus, intensity and method, support and resources.

Purpose and focus

- What is the overall purpose and focus of the programme? Why will it benefit from involving beneficiaries?
- Does the programme aspire to hand over control of decisions about spending to beneficiaries (e.g. Big Local, Fair Share)?
- Would the programme benefit from having 'legitimacy' with the general public?
- Would the programme benefit from having beneficiaries as its 'public face'?

- Does BIG have sufficient knowledge (internally or through existing networks) and experience of the proposed programme theme or beneficiary group?
- Which point(s) in the funding process would most benefit from beneficiaries' knowledge and experience: needs assessment, programme design, programme award?
- Which point(s) in the funding process might beneficiaries most want to influence: needs assessment, programme design, programme award?

Intensity and method of involvement

- Who will be involved? Do you know what kind of support they are likely to need and what kind of methods might suit them best?
- Will the beneficiary group be involved in all stages of grant-making, or within specific stages (for example within the award decision-making committee)?
- Do we have the necessary resources to involve beneficiaries throughout the funding process?
- Will the funding development process be able to proceed at a pace that is suitable for beneficiary involvement? Will other time constraints make this difficult to maintain?
- What are the relevant experiences and skills required of beneficiaries? How will you convene a beneficiary group with the necessary range of experience regarding an issue or theme?

Support and resources

- Does the beneficiary group include vulnerable people or people with complex and multiple needs? What might this mean for the method and intensity of involvement?
- Does BIG need to work with an intermediary organisation e.g. to advise BIG, to make contact with beneficiaries, to facilitate their participation and support them? This level of support will have resource implications.
- Is there a budget, staffing and other resources to pay for beneficiary involvement? How will BIG manage, support and remunerate staff who work evenings and weekends to make this happen?

B. Considerations for practice

BIG staff have gained knowledge and understanding regarding the implementation of beneficiary involvement including challenges and how to address them. This section builds on that experience and suggests areas for thinking about the implementation of beneficiary involvement in funding processes.

Roles and expectations

- **Recruitment:** Instigating a formal process for recruitment (application forms and informal interviews) can mean beneficiaries feel more valued because they were selected to participate.
 - How much time is required for the recruitment and induction process to ensure an appropriate group membership and dynamic is established?
 - How will you ensure contact is established with harder to reach groups?
 - How can the recruitment process usefully prepare beneficiaries for their specific role within BIG's grant-making process?
- **Terms of reference for beneficiary involvement:**
 - Will the creation of terms of reference usefully support beneficiaries' involvement in funding development?
 - Are the aims and objectives of beneficiary involvement for the particular programme clearly described in the terms of reference?
 - Do the terms of reference clearly explain roles and expectations, set out a timeline for involvement including the intended end point and outline provision of payment and expenses?
 - Do the terms of reference sufficiently clarify what is required of beneficiaries, the activities they will undertake and any particular focus to their role?
- **Payment:**
 - Is payment for beneficiaries important to confirm beneficiaries' commitment and demonstrate their role is valued by BIG?
 - Is the rationale and procedure for paying beneficiaries clear across the organisation?
 - How will beneficiaries be paid (e.g. vouchers or cash)?
 - Have procedures for payment been set up with the finance department and communicated to programme staff?

Planning

- **Preparing beneficiaries:**
 - Are you clear about how beneficiaries' roles fit in the wider context of grant-making at BIG?
 - How will you ensure beneficiaries are clear about their roles and BIG's expectations from their involvement?

- What background information about BIG will be provided to beneficiaries?
- What is the most effective way to explain BIG's funding development framework to beneficiaries?
- **Preparing BIG staff:**
 - How will you ensure that the staff and committee members who will be part of beneficiary involvement, are clear about their roles?
 - Do committee members need to adapt processes to enhance beneficiary involvement?
 - Do the finance and communications department require information or further support to accommodate beneficiary involvement activities?

Support

- **Support needs:**
 - What practical support do beneficiaries need? E.g. travel, accommodation and other logistical arrangements.
 - What are the beneficiaries' emotional or pastoral support needs? Think about the issues being addressed and the depth of their involvement.
 - Are there sufficient resources to meet these practical and emotional support needs? Think about staff time as well as money.
 - Does BIG have the skills, expertise and/or capacity to meet these practical and emotional needs? Is it advisable to involve an intermediary organisation to ensure beneficiaries' support needs are met?
- **Materials:**
 - How can grant-making processes be presented to ensure they are accessible for the beneficiary group?
 - How should materials be adapted to ensure they are accessible for the particular beneficiary group?
 - Is there a shared location where examples and templates from previous beneficiary involvement activities can be accessed?
- **Momentum:** These questions are especially relevant when a beneficiary group is to be involved throughout several stages of grant-making.
- **Plan sessions around key stages:**
 - Have you scheduled beneficiaries' meetings and activities so they align with key stages in the overall funding development process?
- **Beneficiary group membership:**
 - What mechanisms will you put in place to recruit new members at key times to rejuvenate the group, or when an existing member can no longer continue?

Appendix Three: Case Studies

- **Empowering Young People**
- **Fulfilling Lives: Ageing Better**
- **Millennium Now**
- **Talent Match**

Four programmes were selected that dedicated a significant amount of time and resources to beneficiary involvement, reflected a range of approaches and involved different groups of beneficiaries. The case studies explored beneficiary involvement within specific programmes including methods, motivations, benefits and challenges of beneficiary involvement; as well as learning for future beneficiary involvement activities.

Material for the case studies was collected through interviews with a range of individuals who were involved in developing and/or managing programmes or who could offer insights into beneficiaries' perspectives on involvement. Interviews took place with seven BIG staff, one BIG committee member, three beneficiaries and one intermediary organisation.

Empowering Young People

Empowering Young People targeted young people aged 8-20 in Northern Ireland who were 'at risk' during transitions in their lives, for example those leaving care who were at risk of engaging in criminal activity. The aim of the programme was to ensure young people at risk have the necessary support structures, capacity and personal development skills to help them negotiate the transitions in their life. BIG was keen from the outset to ensure that young people were involved in the programme design and development.

BIG used intermediary voluntary organisations to consult with young people about the broad focus of the programme. Once this information had been gained and the programme was further established, BIG recruited four 'at risk' young people to the *Empowering Young People* award-making committee. These young people were recruited via public advertisement and interviews.

BIG involved young people in all three of the grant-making stages: needs assessment; programme design and award-making.

- **Needs assessment:** A range of methods were used to consult with young people: websites and online quizzes; participatory work in which young people created a drama that reflected their priorities and others produced a film; focus groups.
- **Programme design:** Here BIG used focus groups to consult with young people about their desired priorities for spending and the appropriate target age range for the programme.
- **Award-making:** The four young people recruited to the award-making committee were carefully inducted and provided with on-going mentoring support by the committee Chair to ensure they were able to participate effectively in making decisions.

Benefits of involving beneficiaries in *Empowering Young People*

- The involvement of beneficiaries enhanced the quality of the evidence on which BIG based the design of the programme. BIG staff felt this helped make the programme more '*robust*'. Having successfully involved beneficiaries themselves, BIG staff also thought they were better able to assess grant applications in this area and were less willing to accept excuses from applicants as to why they could not involve beneficiaries.
- The presence of the young people on the award-making committee meant they were able to provide their views about 'what works' with young people which enhanced the quality of the debate on decisions.

Challenges of involving beneficiaries in *Empowering Young People*

- It was sometimes difficult to access young people in order to involve them in the programme. In these cases, BIG worked closely with intermediaries who could broker access or, where this did not work, used public advertisements in order to recruit.
- Jargon was often an issue for the young people so staff prepared a 'jargon-buster' or glossary to help them.
- The amount of staff time required for the consultation phase created pressure on staff who were keen to invest the amount of time needed for the involvement to work well.
- There is an issue of the equality of status of beneficiaries with others in the decision-making process. The young people understood that they were expected to communicate knowledge about aspects of their own or their peers' lives to the Committee; this was the reason they were present. However, this was not expected of the other members.

Learning from the *Empowering Young People* experience

- It might be necessary to require applicants to demonstrate to a greater degree the ways in which they involve beneficiaries in their work.
- Involving beneficiaries is time-consuming and requires careful coordination. To this end, it is helpful to have a degree of flexibility in the programme e.g. to enable meetings to be rearranged in order to bring beneficiaries into the process in a way which suits them.

Fulfilling Lives: Ageing Better

Fulfilling Lives: Ageing Better is an investment for older people in England that will launch in 2013. The programme aims to use a holistic approach to fund projects to tackle social isolation amongst older people and establish a Centre aimed at building and sharing evidence about effective interventions. BIG involved older people to help shape the programme's design to real needs and support the aim of empowering older people.

Using their existing networks, stakeholders and regional teams, BIG recruited a group of 15 beneficiaries who had experience of sitting on boards and/or life experience that would make a useful contribution to the programme. The group later reduced to 14 members.

The group was involved for approximately six months in needs assessment and programme design.

- **Needs assessment:** The group attended five sessions as well as undertaking tasks between meetings. The focus of the programme had been broadly established by BIG before beneficiary involvement began. However, the group was able to affirm BIG's initial plans through their own assessment and consultation activities. For example, the group's first meeting identified social isolation as the number one need; this reflected BIG's existing thinking on the needs of older people in England. Following the identification of priorities, the group undertook consultation with older people in their local areas. In doing this they were able to 'test' needs with a larger audience across England.
- **Award-making and launch activities:** Following their involvement in programme design, some members of the group have been offered the opportunity to continue with the programme, specifically regarding programme awards and the launch of the investment.

Benefits of involving beneficiaries in *Fulfilling Lives: Ageing Better*

- The direct experience of the group was seen by BIG staff as critical for the development of the investment: *'As a funder it is easy to think you know the best way to proceed with an investment and beneficiaries provide important perspectives based upon experience and knowledge'*. In particular, at the needs assessment stage the group was able to articulate what social isolation looks like in a very powerful way. A number of the group members sit on older people's panels or are involved in local neighbourhood activities; this meant they were able to offer knowledge and experience about services as well as represent the views and experiences of a much larger group.
- The group provided a steer regarding the organisation of the programme, for example, they felt strongly that older people should have a role in the governance of the Centre.
- The existing work undertaken by BIG helped beneficiaries to understand where they could best add value to the programme. It was felt that the information provided by BIG had enabled the group to place their individual experiences in a wider context: *'The kinds of information they gave us helped shape and sort our relevant experiences'*.

Challenges of involving beneficiaries in *Fulfilling Lives: Ageing Better*

- At the beginning, some members of the group struggled to understand BIG's language. This raised the need to spend time at the outset setting the context for beneficiary involvement; explaining BIG's role; and checking that this is understood by all participants.
- During involvement it was necessary to clarify beneficiaries' role as one part of a wider funding development process at BIG. Staff explained the different stages of programme development, and how BIG continued work developing the investment in between sessions with beneficiaries.
- Beneficiary involvement is a great deal of responsibility for BIG staff. The coordination of involvement is time consuming and requires care to ensure that the travel and accommodation arrangements meet each person's specific needs.
- Social isolation is a complex issue and in sharing their experiences beneficiaries sometimes told the group quite sensitive information about themselves. BIG staff felt that it was important to be aware of this and the fact that beneficiaries are potentially vulnerable during their involvement.

Learning from the *Fulfilling Lives: Ageing Better* experience

- On some occasions the structure of involvement was felt to be '*too fluid*'; here a clearer '*job description*' may have been useful. Study participants also reflected that terms of reference for the group could have helped provide clarity about roles and expectations.
- Timing the involvement of beneficiaries requires careful planning to ensure that it is linked to key stages of programme design.
- It is important to think in advance about the size of the group in relation to the resources available; a large group of beneficiaries (like that of this programme) requires a substantial degree of coordination.

Millennium Now

Millennium Now includes five projects across the United Kingdom which tackle different social problems. The programme started in 2012 and is due to run for a period of two years. It was the first programme to involve the general public in the design and development of a grant programme. Part of the reason BIG chose to involve the public was a sense of accountability: as BIG is funded by the public it is therefore reasonable that the public should have a say in what it funds.

Initially BIG developed a range of general funding themes (including, for example, connecting communities and investing in education) for the public to comment upon and develop further. Public opinion was sought using a UK-wide campaign – the ‘Big Decision’. The campaign included:

- Short films based upon the general themes which were produced by Channel 4 and hosted on their website. The public was invited to provide feedback and share ideas using free texts and online comments.
- A public poll carried out by Ipsos Mori, which used the general funding themes as prompts to ask respondents about the kind of areas they wanted funded. Around 2,000 people responded to the poll.

The consultation then formed the basis for project funding criteria.

Benefits of involving beneficiaries in *Millennium Now*

- Involving the public led to greater general awareness of the programme before programme award and delivery. In particular, it was helpful to build interest in the programme at an early stage and establish an audience for BIG to return to and share project activity and learning with.
- It helped BIG to demonstrate public accountability.
- BIG staff felt that working with the general public had been a useful prompt in encouraging the use of accessible, jargon-free language. Members of the public also tested these new materials.
- *Millennium Now* was used to trial a simplified application system which has subsequently been adopted by BIG.
- The use of national media and large-scale campaigns has improved public understanding of different social and economic issues.

Challenges of involving beneficiaries in *Millennium Now*

- The development process was long with a considerable period of time between the public consultation process and programme delivery. This may have meant some people involved in the initial consultation, lost interest in the programme.
- Running such a large-scale and open consultation made the results challenging and time-consuming to analyse. In particular, it was difficult to summarise the findings into key themes.

Learning from the *Millennium Now* experience

- BIG staff working closely with media and marketing partners is viewed as a contributor to the programme's success so far.
- The development of user-friendly materials has been a benefit of the project and awareness of these could be promoted further internally at BIG.

Talent Match

Talent Match supports young people aged 18 to 24 who have been out of work, education or training for over 12 months. This programme aims to fund innovative ways of helping young people find work or start their own enterprises. BIG wanted to involve young people in the development of Talent Match to ensure the programme addressed issues that were important to this audience.

Drawing on their network of stakeholders, BIG sought to recruit a diverse group of young people (in terms of geographical location, ethnicity, gender and life experiences) to support the development of *Talent Match*. Applicants were asked to demonstrate their experience of decision making and communication skills, as well as general suitability for the role. BIG received 80 applications, from which a group of 20 were recruited.

The group were involved for approximately seven months at a number of different stages of programme development, including: needs assessment; programme design; launch activities; and award-making.

- **Needs assessment:** The group were asked to identify three top priorities facing young people in England via a process of consultation. They each consulted with young people in their local areas; in total the group spoke to 2,000 young people in a two week period. A range of methods were used during consultation, including using local networks, visiting youth centres, producing short films. The young people presented their findings at a group meeting and identified three priorities for young people's investments; unemployment, health and wellbeing, and the portrayal of young people in society. Following this, the group undertook a range of tasks through the programme development to research the priority areas identified.
- **Programme launch:** Young people chaired and gave presentations at launch events for Talent Match.
- **Award-making:** Four members of the group served on the award-making committee; making up 50% of the total composition.

Benefits of involving beneficiaries in *Talent Match*

- The young people understood the issues '*on the ground*' and their networks enabled BIG to engage with harder to reach young people. One BIG staff member reflected: '*we don't have the credibility to do that*'. The group was also able to continually draw in views from a wider audience of young people using social media.
- The programme's credibility and legitimacy was improved by involving young people. From both the perspective of stakeholders who attended launch events and beneficiaries:

'They provided a human face rather than a corporate BIG face.'

'Their involvement set a tone for the programme, it was aspirational.'

'The feedback from our presentation was that Talent Match really was designed by young people.'

- At the award-making stage, beneficiaries were perceived as helping the committee to focus on key issues and *'injected vigour at this stage'*.
- BIG staff found it helpful to share and discuss ideas with beneficiaries, describing them as a useful *'reality check'*.
- The role of the young people in programme communication activity (the launch and other media coverage) was described as *'powerful'* and *'brilliant'*.
- A beneficiary who was involved in *Talent Match* felt the experience increased her self-confidence.

Challenges of involving beneficiaries in *Talent Match*

- Involvement of young people in programme design was perceived by some staff as challenging. In particular, involvement in setting outcomes; as one study participant explained the requirement to follow BIG procedure here, meant this process was *'a bit rigid'*.
- Ensuring the perspectives of beneficiaries on the award committee were treated as equal to other members was challenging. Some study participants felt that improvements could be made to help beneficiaries to participate more fluidly within the committee. For example, by providing training on the format of BIG decision-making committees, though this has resource implications.
- Maintaining young people's engagement during quieter periods of *Talent Match's* development was sometimes hard.
- Some of the young people required a lot of personal support with their travel and general coordination. In addition, some members of the group were dealing with complex personal situations which meant that their participation fluctuated throughout the programme development. A BIG staff member explained: *'you need to be aware if you're going to recruit young vulnerable people they require a lot of personal support'*. In relation to this, it was thought to be important to manage expectations and clearly outline beneficiaries' roles at the outset.

Learning from the *Talent Match* experience

- It is important to spend time planning for beneficiary involvement activities; ensuring that sufficient time and resources are allocated for different stages of beneficiary involvement.
- There is a need to manage expectations carefully and an informal agreement setting out roles and expectations may be helpful here.
- Beneficiary involvement is just part of a wider grant-making process at BIG – the experience of *Talent Match* helped BIG staff understand that it is not possible for beneficiaries to *'fully design'* a programme.
- Frequent contact with a beneficiary group throughout the development of *Talent Match* was very useful and could be beneficial to other programmes.