



GRANTS ADVISORY PANEL

TUESDAY 8 SEPTEMBER 2009

7.30 PM

PANEL AGENDA (ADVISORY)

**COMMITTEE ROOMS 1 & 2,
HARROW CIVIC CENTRE**

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 3)

Chairman: Councillor Jean Lammiman

Councillors:

**Don Billson
G Chowdhury
Ashok Kulkarni
Mrs Myra Michael
Joyce Nickolay (VC)**

**Ms Nana Asante
Asad Omar
Mrs Rekha Shah
Mrs Sasi Suresh**

**Adviser: Mike Coker, Representative, Voluntary and Community Sector
Representative**

Reserve Members:

**1. Manji Kara
2. Yogesh Teli
3. Narinder Singh Mudhar
4. Jeremy Zeid
5. Susan Hall
6. Julia Merison**

**1. Nizam Ismail
2. David Gawn
3. Thaya Idaikkadar
4. Krishna James**

**Issued by the Democratic Services Section,
Legal and Governance Services Department**

**Contact: Miriam Wearing, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8424 1542 E-mail: miriam.wearing@harrow.gov.uk**

***NOTE FOR THOSE ATTENDING THE MEETING:
IF YOU WISH TO DISPOSE OF THIS AGENDA, PLEASE LEAVE IT BEHIND AFTER THE MEETING.
IT WILL BE COLLECTED FOR RECYCLING.***

HARROW COUNCIL

GRANTS ADVISORY PANEL

TUESDAY 8 SEPTEMBER 2009

AGENDA - PART I

1. **Appointment of Advisory Panel Chairman:**

To note the appointment of Councillor Jean Lammiman as Chairman of the Grants Advisory Panel from 31 August 2009.

2. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.

Reserve Members may attend meetings:-

- (i) to take the place of an ordinary Member for whom they are a reserve;
- (ii) where the ordinary Member will be absent for the whole of the meeting; and
- (iii) the meeting notes at the start of the meeting at the item 'Reserves' that the Reserve Member is or will be attending as a reserve;
- (iv) if a Reserve Member whose intention to attend has been noted arrives after the commencement of the meeting, then that Reserve Member can only act as a Member from the start of the next item of business on the agenda after his/her arrival.

3. **Declarations of Interest:**

To receive declarations of personal or prejudicial interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:

- (a) all Members of the Committee, Sub Committee, Panel or Forum;
- (b) all other Members present in any part of the room or chamber.

4. **Minutes:** (Pages 1 - 6)

That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2009 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

5. **Public Questions:**

To receive questions (if any) from local residents or organisations under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

6. **Petitions:**

To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

7. **Deputations:**
To receive deputations (if any) under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

[Note: The Panel's policy (Minute 60: 28.07.03) in principle is not to receive deputations relating to individual grant applications].

[Note: The Panel's policy (Minute 13: 06.07.06) is to receive deputations annually at its November meeting].

- Key 8. **Proposed Assessment Process:** (Pages 7 - 28)
Report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment.
- Enc 9. **Scrutiny Challenge Panel comments on Grants Programme 2010/11:**
(Pages 29 - 36)
Report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance.
- Enc 10. **Grants Advisory Meeting 4 March 2009:** (Pages 37 - 44)
Report of the Director of Legal and Governance Services.
- Enc 11. **Feedback from the Portfolio Holder Decision meeting of 30 July 2009:**
(Pages 45 - 48)
Report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment.
- Enc 12. **Arrangements for Allocating Unspent Funds for 2009/10:** (Pages 49 - 54)
Report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment.
13. **Any Other Urgent Business:**
Which cannot otherwise be dealt with.
14. **Exclusion of the Press and Public:**
To resolve that the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of confidential information in breach of an obligation of confidence, or of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972:

<u>Agenda Item No</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
12.	Appendix Arrangements Allocating Unspent Funds for 2009/10	to Information under paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, relating to any individual.

AGENDA - PART II

- Enc 15. **Arrangements for Allocating Unspent Funds for 2009/10:** (Pages 55 - 62)
Appendix to the report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment.

This page is intentionally left blank

GRANTS ADVISORY PANEL

2 JULY 2009

- Chairman: * Councillor Chris Mote
- Councillors: * Ms Nana Asante * Joyce Nickolay
* Don Billson * Asad Omar
* G Chowdhury * Mrs Rekha Shah
* Ashok Kulkarni * Mrs Sasi Suresh
* Mrs Myra Michael
- Adviser: * Mike Coker, Representative, Voluntary and Community Sector Representative

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Key Decision - Review of Grants Criteria and Results of Grants Consultation**

An officer introduced a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment, which set out the findings from the grants consultation with the voluntary and community sector. The report also provided feedback from the Grants Advisory Panel meeting held on 8 June 2009 and made recommendations based on this feedback.

A Member referred to the recommendations concerning criteria as contained within the Scrutiny Challenge Panel report on the Grants Programme 2010/11, which was the subject of a separate report on the agenda and whether this should be utilised as the criteria. The Panel agreed that the recommendations contained within the Scrutiny Challenge Panel report be addressed as part of the consideration of that item.

In considering the availability of the different types of grants, a Member suggested that a cover sheet be included with application forms sent to organisations which provided a breakdown of the previous year's grants allocation. The cover sheet should also allude to a principle of moving towards the allocation of more small and medium sized grants. A Member commented that minor changes should not be promoted if potentially these could be viewed as imperceptible to the voluntary and community sector.

A discussion followed on the specific amounts proposed for the small, medium and large sized grants. A Member suggested that the large sized grant ought to have its upper threshold raised from £100,000 to £110,000 in an effort to cover costs of some organisations. The Adviser to the Panel commented that raising the upper threshold would give the impression that no change was taking place to grant allocations, and would appear to suggest that the Grants Advisory Panel favoured accommodating historical grants over new applications.

Members considered the creation of an 'innovation fund' within the budget for those organisations offering a service which fell outside of the traditional functions offered by the voluntary and community sector. A Member added that at present there were no provisions available to consider innovative projects and it was proposed that further legal advice be sought with regards to this suggestion.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Leader of the Council)

That (1) the following statement be adopted as the eligibility criteria for grant aid:

"Grant aid will be available to support voluntary and community organisations to deliver services, where this resource is used for the benefit of people living, working or schooling in Harrow.";

(2) the availability of different types of grants as outlined in the report be approved, with the principle of moving towards a small grants level of 5% being agreed;

(3) the upper threshold of large grants be increased to £110,000;

(4) that the grants budget be divided and a percentage be allocated to different sized grants;

(5) that a flexible approach be taken and to move towards more medium and small sized grants;

(6) any supporting documents could be submitted after a grant had been agreed.

[Reasons for Recommendations: To (1) clarify the eligibility criteria;

(2) to provide clarity of information to applicants on how much funding was available].

RECOMMENDATION 2 - Key Decision - Funding Arrangements for 2009/10 and 2010/11

An officer introduced a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment which set out the proposed funding arrangements for 2009/10 and 2010/11.

With regard to the recommendation regarding the arrangements for allocating unspent funds for 2009/2010, the creation of an 'innovation fund' was discussed. A Member added that by establishing an 'innovation fund' the Panel would be taking on board a recommendation made by scrutiny in 2006 and she believed this could potentially open up eligibility to many previously ineligible organisations. She felt this would demonstrate the Panel was mindful of potentially progressive suggestions from other committees or sectors. A Member replied that the establishment of an 'innovation fund' could be risky in terms of the identification of pertinent and measurable criteria and preferred a move towards the allocation of small grants. The Adviser to the Panel commented that one of the main functions of the voluntary and community sector was to take risks, and it was a function that the sector carried out efficiently and with positive results.

A Member queried who would administer and control the 'Innovation Fund'. A Member replied that the Panel could set parameters to be followed by a community trust with the function of allocation funding falling under the remit of the Panel. The Chairman replied that the Panel had enough difficulty in trying to find equitable solutions for the main grant allocation function without the inclusion of another, potentially complicated, function.

In considering the recommendation relating to the Funding Priorities for 2010/11, Members discussed the problems associated with following narrow national indicators. A Member expressed her view that some groups would not be able to meet the strict appliance of criteria and queried whether these would still be considered for funding. Officers responded that they would consider all applications carefully.

With regards to the proposed arrangements for supporting sport activities through the grants programme, Members agreed that the Harrow Sports Council had been extremely proficient in allocating small amounts of funding but that overall the Service Level Agreements had not operated as well as initially envisaged. A Member suggested that large applications for sports could be handled by the Grants Advisory Panel and that small applications could continue to be handled by the Harrow Sports Council. However, it was considered that if the Harrow Sports Council were not meeting their Service Level Agreements then other organisations within the voluntary and community sector should be given the opportunity to apply to carry out the distribution of sports related grants. The Adviser to the Panel commented that such action could be viewed as commissioning.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Leader of the Council)

That (1) arrangements for allocating unspent funds for 2009/10 be adopted;

(2) funding priorities for 2010/11 be adopted;

(3) arrangements for supporting sports activities through the grants programme be approved.

[Reasons for Recommendations: To (1) establish a process to allocate any unspent funds within the financial year to reduce the risk of losing funds;

(2) clarify what activities would be funded through the grants programme;

(3) clarify how the grants programme would support sports activities from 2010 onwards].

[Note: Councillors Ms Nana Asante, Mrs Rekha Shah, Mrs Sasi Suresh and Asad Omar wished to record as having voted against recommendations (1) and (2) above].

RECOMMENDATION 3 - Key Decision - Review of the Grants Application Process

An officer introduced a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment, which set out the proposed changes to the current grants application and assessment process for 2010/11.

In consideration of the recommendation regarding the revision of the application process, Members suggested further clarification of some of the ethnic categories listed on the application form which officers agreed to incorporate.

A Member questioned why an advice that references should not be sought from a Councillor or Member of Parliament. On being put to the vote it was agreed that this point be removed from the application form. It was also agreed that references should not be sought from Members of the Grants Advisory Panel.

In consideration of the proposal regarding the shortening of the application timescale, Members raised concerns about the proposal to cancel of the November meetings and the likely impact this would have on the deputation process.

A Member suggested that, if the application timescale was to be shortened, organisations' monitoring forms should be provided by post. She referred Members to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Challenge Panel regarding a more transparent application process; therefore the information provided to Members would give them an insight into how officers arrived at funding decisions. She further suggested that a summary report of the applications could be provided at November meetings. Officers replied that it would be difficult to produce summary reports in time for November meetings and would be a duplication of work as summary reports were historically included in the final report. The Chairman added that in his view the Panel should be presented with the completed reports at the relevant time.

A Member referred to the resolution passed at the 8 June 2009 Grants Advisory Panel meeting that no organisation should be written to in advance of the relevant Panel meeting, noting that this decision should be adhered to and that this emphasised the importance of the November summary reports process to inform decision making.

In consideration of the recommendation regarding the appeals process being abolished Members expressed their concerns that the appeals process was an integral part of providing natural justice and that such provision had been requested for by the voluntary and community sector. It was agreed by the Panel that the recommendation would be deferred to a future meeting of the Panel.

It was also agreed that three application forms be developed for the different sized grants in order to avoid confusion.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Leader of the Council)

That (1) the application process be revised in line with the recommendations in the report, subject to the incorporation of amendments agreed by the Panel;

(2) subject to budget decisions for 2010/11, grant applications be presented to the Panel in January 2010 and recommendations made to Cabinet in February 2010;

(3) the application timescales be shortened;

(4) the November meeting of the Panel be retained.

[Reasons for Recommendations: To (1) address concerns raised by the voluntary and community sector through the Overview and Scrutiny Review about the current grants application process;

(2) clarify and improve the application and assessment process;

(3) give applicants an indication before the end of the financial year and within a shorter timescale what the funding arrangements for the following year might be subject to budget decisions].

RECOMMENDATION 4 - Proposed Changes to the way the Panel receive Monitoring Information

An officer introduced a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment, which set out the proposed changes to the way the Grants Advisory Panel received information relating to the monitoring of voluntary organisations in receipt of grant funding in the previous years.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services)

That (1) monitoring reports be sent to Members in easily digestible batches;

(2) monitoring reports be presented at November meetings of the Grants Advisory Panel;

(3) summary reports of applications be presented to the Panel at November meetings of the Grants Advisory Panel.

[Reason for Recommendations: To enable Panel Members to receive detailed monitoring information of grant funded voluntary organisations in order to make decisions on grant allocations based on all available information].

PART II - MINUTES

173. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

174. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following declarations of interest were declared:

- (i) Councillor Nana Asante declared a personal interest in that she was a member of the Scrutiny Challenge Panel. Accordingly, she remained in the room for the discussion of all items;
- (ii) Mike Coker, Adviser to the Panel, declared a personal interest in that he was a member of the Scrutiny Challenge Panel. Accordingly, he remained in the room for the discussion of all items;
- (iii) Councillor Myra Michael declared a personal interest in that she was a member of Harrow in Europe. Accordingly, she remained in the room for the discussion of all items;
- (iv) Councillor Chris Mote declared a personal interest in that he was a member of the Harrow Sports Council. Accordingly, he remained in the room for the discussion of all items;
- (v) Councillor Joyce Nickolay declared a personal interest in that she was a member of the Bentley Priory Nature Reserve Committee. Accordingly, she remained in the room for the discussion of all items;
- (vi) Councillor Jean Lamiman declared a personal interest in that her husband was a member of Harrow in Europe. Accordingly, she remained in the room for the discussion of all items.

175. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 June 2009 be taken as read and signed as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

Recommendation 2 – Community Premises, 27 Northolt Road – Accommodation Usage Categories

That the repetition of the words ‘next meeting’ be deleted from Recommendation (2)

Any Other Urgent Business – (i) Grants Advisory Panel Meeting – 4 March 2009

That the word ‘rational’ be changed to ‘rationale’ in the Resolution.

Minutes 163 – Minute 152 – Grant Applications 2009-10

That the amendment be removed and replaced with:

In the forth line of the second paragraph, the sentence beginning 'A discussion took place.' Should be replaced to read: A discussion took place on the allocation of grants to groups, such as Girl Guiding Middlesex North West, Headway and St. Luke's Hospice. There were similarities, for instance The Willow Tree Centre was based in Hillingdon (outside the borough) and St. Luke's Hospice was based in Brent (outside the borough) but had eight of its eleven shops in the borough. The Willow Tree Centre served guides in Hillingdon and Harrow and St. Luke's supplied services for clients in Harrow and Brent.

The Adviser to the Panel was of the view that these applications were not similar because the applications from these groups were received from the following addresses and for work in the following locations:

- application received from Headway, Bentley Day Centre, Harrow, for work at Wealdstone Baptist Church, Harrow for 100% of the users for the project/service for which the funding was requested who are residents of, or work in the London Borough of Harrow;
- application received from St. Luke's Hospice, Kenton Road, Harrow for people's homes in Harrow for 100% of the users for the project/service for which the funding was requested who are residents of, or work in the London Borough of Harrow;
- application received from Girl Guiding Middlesex North West, The Willow Tree Centre, Breakspear Road, Harefield, Middlesex for work at The Willow Tree Centre, Hillingdon for 50% of users for the project/service for which the funding was requested who are 100% residents of, or work in the London Borough of Harrow.

176. **Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions, petitions or deputations were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 16, 14 and 15 respectively (Part 4E of the Constitution).

177. **Comments from Scrutiny Challenge Panel on Grants Programme 2010/11 Proposals:**

RESOLVED: That the report be deferred to the Grants Advisory Panel meeting scheduled for 8 September 2009.

178. **Review of Grant Criteria and Results of the Grants Consultation:**
(See Recommendation 1).

179. **Funding Arrangements for 2009/10 and 2010/11:**

(See Recommendation 2).

180. **Review of the Grants Application Process:**
(See Recommendation 3).

181. **Proposed Changes to the Way the Panel Receive Monitoring Information:**
(See Recommendation 4).

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.34 pm, closed at 10.17 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR CHRIS MOTE
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



Meeting:	Grants Advisory Panel
Date:	8 th September 2009
Subject:	Proposed assessment process
Key Decision: (Executive side only)	Yes
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills – Corporate Director (Community & Environment)
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Jean Lammiman, Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Appendix 1 – Assessment grid Appendix 2 – Proposed summary report template Appendix 3 – Equality Impact Assessment

SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report sets out the proposed assessment process and the revised summary grants report template that will be used during grant round 2010/11.

Recommendation:

The Grants Advisory Panel is requested to recommend to Cabinet for approval:

- The proposed grant assessment tool
- The revised summary grants report template

SECTION 2 - REPORT

2.1 Introductory Paragraph

This report describes the tool that will be used to assess the grant applications received and sets out the grants report template that will be used to present the grant application summaries during the 2010/11 grants round.

2.2 Current Situation

- 2.2.1 During the 2009/10 grants round, a number of concerns were expressed about the quality of the grant application assessment. Officers' grant report and recommendations have been criticised for being biased and subjective, and have resulted in a number of appeals and compact challenges each year.
- 2.2.2. The proposed assessment tool is linked to the revised application form which was amended and agreed by the Grants Advisory Panel (GAP) and approved by Cabinet in July 2009.

2.3 Why a change is needed

- 2.3.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Review : "Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector for Harrow"(December 2008) found that there was a lack of confidence and trust in the current grant arrangements; and expressed a number of concerns about the grants programme that related to the application process.
- 2.3.2 During the last grants round, all applications were subjected to a 2-stage assessment. The first stage involved assessing the applicant's eligibility against the criteria and checking that the organisation had a constitution, a management committee and a bank account. If the applicant did not meet these requirements they were not recommended for funding, but if they did they were moved onto the second stage of the assessment. The second stage involved assessing the application against the funding priorities and whether the applicant had demonstrated the need for the service.
- 2.3.3 As the new eligibility criteria is less restrictive and more inclusive, it is likely that more applications will be eligible for grant aid. Therefore it will be necessary, during the next grants round, to use a rigorous assessment tool to ensure that grant awards are only allocated to applicants that meet the funding priorities and deliver value for money.

2.3.4 The Assessment Grid

It is proposed that the assessment tool set out in appendix 1 be used during the next grants round. Each application will still undergo the 2-stage assessment process and to ensure a consistent approach the Grants team will use the tool to check that applicants meet the grant qualifying conditions. Only applicants that meet these conditions will progress on to the second stage of the assessment process. The second and third page of the tool will enable the grants team to undertake a thorough assessment of each application form. The questions in the tool have been designed to assist the assessor in analysing the applicant's response to each section in the application form. If the applicant provides sufficient information for the question, the number '1' will be inserted in the 'yes' column; if they provide insufficient information, the number '1' will be inserted in the 'partially' column but if no information is provided, '1' will be inserted in the 'no' column. Each column will be calculated to provide a total score. Each assessment question has been ranked in order of importance; 'E' denotes essential information, whereas "D denotes desirable information. If an applicant receives one mark in the 'no' column for an 'essential' question, they will not be recommended for funding. However, an applicant that provides more than an adequate response for a 'desirable' question will have a stronger application, whereas those who provide no information against these questions will still be considered for funding, if they have not received a mark in the 'no' column for the 'essential' questions. This process will enable officers to provide a clear rationale as to how their grant recommendations have been achieved.

- 2.3.4.1 GAP is requested to endorse the proposed assessment tool, described above with any amendments that GAP considers necessary, for use in the next grants round.

2.3.6 Officer's grants summary report and recommendation

The officers' report provides a summary of the grant applications and recommendations for consideration by the Grant Advisory Panel. It is proposed that a report template is introduced during the next grants round to ensure consistency in report writing. See appendix 2 for details. The project summary will be informed by the application form, whereas the assessment summary will identify the strengths and weaknesses of the application. GAP's comments will be collated at the GAP briefing meeting in January and will reflect their local knowledge and experience of voluntary and community groups.

2.3.6.1 GAP is requested to endorse the revised grants summary report template, as set out in appendix 2, with any amendments that GAP considers necessary, for use in the next grants round.

3. Implications of the Recommendation

3.1 Resources, costs

There are no resources and cost implications for the Council related to this report.

3.2 Staffing/workforce

There are no staffing/workforce implications for the Council related to this report.

3.3 Equalities Impact

3.2.1 See appendix 3 for Equality Impact Assessment.

3.3 Legal Implications

3.3.1 The Council is empowered to make grants to voluntary organisations under Section 48 of the Local Government Act 1985 as well as under other legislation. Having an approved process will ensure that the Council can comply with its legal duties and its statement of intention of the Compact with the voluntary sector.

3.4 Community Safety

3.4.1 There are no community safety implications for the Council in relation to this report.

3.6 Financial Implications

There are no financial implications for the Council related to this report

3.7 Performance Issues

The introduction of a robust and fair assessment process has the potential to contribute to the following national indicators:

National Indicator (NI) number 7, which relates to creating an environment in which the voluntary and community sector can thrive, has been included within Harrow's Local Area Agreement. Results from the national Third Sector Survey (2008) indicate that Harrow's performance against this indicator is 10.4%, which is below the national average of 16.2%. Harrow will be aiming to improve performance by a statistically significant amount, now agreed as an increase of 4.4%.

The provision of grant funding to voluntary and community sector organisations has the potential to contribute to NI 1 ' % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area'. The National Place Survey (2008) indicates that Harrow's performance against this indicator is 76.2%, which is in line with the national and

London average of 76.4% and 76.3%, respectively. Harrow's target for this indicator in 2010/11 is 78%. The improvements to the grants programme will contribute to the achievement of this target by encouraging grant applications from all sections of the wide and diverse voluntary and community sector, so that:

- Different sections of the community can identify and address their own needs, in line with the Harrow Strategy Partnership priorities
- Community cohesion can be developed amongst the same and different communities.

The provision of grant funding to voluntary and community sector organisations has the potential to contribute to NI 6 'Participation in regular volunteering'. The National Place Survey 2008 indicates that performance against this indicator is 24%, which is above national and London average of 23.2% and 20.8%, respectively. Harrow's target for this indicator in 2010/11 is 27.7%.

3.8 Environmental Impact

3.8.1 There are no environmental impacts for the Council related to this report.

3.9 Risk Management Implications

3.9.1 There are no risks management implications in relation to this report.

Risk included on Directorate risk register? **No**

Separate risk register in place? **No**

SECTION 4 - STATUTORY OFFICER CLEARANCE

<p>Name: Sheela Thakrar</p> <p>Date: 25 August 2009</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer</p>
<p>Name: Matthew Adams</p> <p>Date: 25 August 2009</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>on behalf of the* Monitoring Officer</p>

Section 5 – Performance Officer Clearance

<p>Name: Alex Dewsnap</p> <p>Date: 21 August 2009</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Divisional Director (Partnership Development and Performance)</p>
---	-------------------------------------	--

Section 6 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: John Edwards



Divisional Director
(Environmental Services)

Date: 21 August 2009

SECTION 7 - CONTACT DETAILS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

Compiled by:

Audrey Salmon, Interim Service Manager – Community Resources and Projects (ext. 5332)

Background Papers:

Appendix 1 – Assessment grid

Appendix 2 – Proposed summary report template

Appendix 3 – Equality Impact Assessment

This page is intentionally left blank

Voluntary and Community Grants

Proposed Application Assessment Tool

Please use the information provided by the applicants to complete the grid. If they have provided sufficient information insert '1' in the 'yes' column. If insufficient information has been provided insert '1' in the 'partially' column and if no information has been provided insert '1' in the 'no' column. Once the grid has been completed, please add up the scores to obtain a total for each column.

Value: Each question is valued as 'E' for 'essential' or 'D' for 'desirable' information.

Section 1: Background information				
Funding Priority	Expected outcome			
Type of Grant (Small, Medium or Large)	Amount requested			
Name of Organisation:				
Name of Project:				
Section Heading	Supporting evidence and comments			
	Value	Yes	Partially	No
QUALIFYING CONDITIONS - First stage assessment				
Does the applicant meet the eligibility criteria?	E			
Does the activity promote a particular faith or religion?	E			
Does the activity promote or oppose any political parties or cause?	E			
Does the Council have a statutory or legal obligation to provide this service?	E			
Section 2: About the organisation				
Does the organisation have a constitution and a bank account in the organisation's name? (see application form for details).	E			
Section 3: Policies and procedures				
Does the organisation have the relevant policies and procedures in place?	E			
PLEASE NOTE: This section will not be scored. If applicants do not meet the qualifying conditions - their application will not progress to the second stage of the assessment process.				

APPLICATION ASSESSMENT - Second stage assessment

Section 4: About the proposed project/service.

<p>1. Has the applicant demonstrated the need for this service and how it will be met?</p>	E		
<p>2. Does the organisation clearly demonstrate how it will address the funding priorities and expected outcome?</p>	E		

Section 5: About service delivery

<p>1. Does the applicant clearly describe where the service will be delivered and who will it?</p>	E		
<p>2. Has the applicant clearly stated how they will address Harrow's diverse community. Those who are targeting certain communities, will need to explain why.</p>	E		
<p>3. Does the applicant clearly state how it know that the project has been successful? For example, testimonials, evaluation forms, user feedback, attendance registers, etc</p>	E		

Section 6: Who will benefit?

<p>1. Does the applicant clearly state who and how many people will benefit from this project?</p>	E		
--	---	--	--

APPENDIX 1

Section 7: Project Cost			
1. Amount requested	E		
2. Has the applicant provided clear and realistic costings for the proposed project?	E		
3. Will all of the funding be used to cover the revenue costs of the project? (Should not be used to purchase capital items.)	E		
Section 8: Other factors			
Does the organisation have a track record of delivering this or similar services? (This would be informed by references)	D		
Total score			
Will this project duplicate other services provided in the borough?	D		

Assessment carried out by:

Name:
Name:
Name:
Name:
Date:

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 2

Proposed summary report template

Name of organisation			
Project Name			
Funding priority (expected outcome)			
Type of Grant		Funding requested	
Funding recommended			

Project summary

- Brief background information on organisation
- Aim and objectives of project
- Brief description of project
- Information about beneficiaries

Assessment summary

- Strengths and weaknesses
- Score

Grant Advisory Panel's Comments

- Knowledge of organisation

This page is intentionally left blank

HARROW COUNCIL

3.6.2

3.6.3 FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE/CHECKLIST

Directorate	Community and Environment	Section	Community Development	
1 Name of the function/ policy to be assessed	Review of the Grants Programme	2 Date of Assessment	July 2009	3 Is this a new or existing function/policy? Existing

HARROW COUNCIL

4 Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy

The Grants Programme enables the voluntary and community sector to work in partnership with the Council to provide appropriate and responsive services to meet the needs of the borough's diverse community. The proposed improvements to the grants programme will ensure that:

- **The eligibility criteria is clear and unambiguous.** The current grant eligibility criteria is contentious and open to interpretation, therefore it is recommended that the Grant Advisory Panel adopt the following statement:
“Grant aid will be available to support voluntary and community organisations to deliver services where this resource is used for the benefit of people living (or working) in Harrow.
- **This resource is aligned to meet the Harrow Strategy Partnership priorities.**
Although applicants are asked to demonstrate how their proposed project addresses Harrow Sustainable Community Strategy, it is acknowledged that this is too high level and too board to properly inform the grant decision-making process. Therefore it is recommended that the national indicators of the Local Area Agreement be adopted as the grants funding priorities for the 2010/11 grants round.
- **The application process is simplified and easier to access**
The current process is cumbersome and the Overview and Scrutiny Review, which examined the relationship between the Council and the Voluntary and Community Sector (2008), raised a number of concerns about the grants programme that related to the application process. It is recommended that the application process is improved; the timescale is shortened; grants recommendations are brought forward to the January meeting, subject to budget decisions for 2010/11; supporting documents to be submitted after a grant has been agreed; and the appeals process is abolished.
- **The application process is clearer and transparent**
Each year, voluntary and community groups request grant aid without knowing how much funding is available. For the last few years only 27% of the funding has been available for allocation to support ‘one-off’ projects as the remaining budget has been committed to 4-year service level agreements. It is recommended that applicants be invited to apply for three different sized grants and that the Panel should more towards awarding more medium-sized grants and reduce the number of organisations receiving grants over £10,000 each year.

HARROW COUNCIL

<p>5 Are there any associated objectives of the function/policy? Please explain</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Indicator (NI) number 7, which relates to creating an environment in which the voluntary and community sector can thrive, has been included within Harrow's Local Area Agreement. Results from the first national Third Sector Survey indicate that Harrow's performance against this indicator is 10.4%. Harrow will be aiming to improve performance by a statistically significant amount, now agreed as an increase of 4.4%. The recommended improvements to the grants programme have the potential to contribute to improving performance against this indicator. The provision of grant funding to voluntary and community sector organisations has the potential to contribute to NI 1 % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area'. Current performance against this indicator is 48% and target performance is 61%. The provision of grant funding to voluntary and community sector organisations has the potential to contribute to NI 6 'Participation in regular volunteering'. The target increase in numbers volunteering is 300 for 'socially excluded' volunteers and 1,200 for other volunteers. The current position is an achievement against target on 'socially excluded' volunteers and a slight under-achievement against 'other volunteers'. The LAA comprises 34 National indicators and the proposal to align funding with these functions would potentially assist all of them.
<p>6 Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By broadening the eligibility criteria it is hoped that applications will be received from a wider spectrum of organisations and therefore the Grant Advisory Panel will be able to consider awarding grants to organisations that have not received funding before and in turn provide services to sections of the community (such as the BME and other disadvantaged communities) that may have not received support before. By aligning the grants budget to the Harrow Strategy Partnership (HSP) priorities, this will ensure that this resource will meet the needs of sections of the community (such as the BME and other disadvantaged communities) that were identified as in most need of support by the HSP. By simplifying the application process – more organisations, particularly new and emerging grassroots organisations, will be able to access funding. This in turn would mean that communities that have not been previously supported by the grants programme could benefit.

HARROW COUNCIL

7 What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vibrant and responsive voluntary and community sector that provides services that meet the changing and diverse needs of borough • A credible grants programme that has a fair, transparent and clear process. 		
8 What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	<p><u>Contributory Factors:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High levels of support and response from voluntary and community sector during the consultation and the implementation of the policy improvements • The role of the Grant Advisory Panel is essential to the achievement of these outcomes, if agreed <p><u>Factors that could detract from the outcomes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the voluntary and community sector continue to mistrust the process, new and innovative projects will not be developed and supported by the council • If officers and the Grant Advisory Panel do not apply the recommendations in a consistent, fair and transparent way. 		
9 Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy?	Voluntary and Community Sector Community Members	10 Who implements the function/policy and who is responsible for the function/policy?	The council provides grant aid to the voluntary and community sector, which is administered by the Grants Team. The Grants Team make recommendations to the Grant Advisory Panel which if agreed go to Cabinet for final approval.

HARROW COUNCIL

<p>11 What data or other existing evidence have you used to assess whether the function/policy might have a differential impact? (please continue on a separate piece paper if necessary)</p>	<p>The attached documents provide evidence of the assessment that was undertaken to assess the differential impact of this proposal.</p> <p>Attachment 1: "A breakdown of the grants budget 2009/10" – shows that 73% of the budget for the last 4 years has been committed to organisations receiving service level agreements, and therefore a shift towards either 50%, 30% or 20% as suggested in the consultation would have an adverse affect on those organisations in particular.</p> <p>Attachment 2: "Mapping Local Area Agreement priorities and national indicators against the Sustainable Community Strategy". Currently funded activities have been mapped against national indicators as set out in attachment 2. Some organisations meet a number of the indicators, but for the purpose of this exercise have only been linked to one, others have been tenuously linked to an indicator and one organisation does not appear to address any of the priorities or the indicators. For example, there are no national indicators for adult mental health and therefore Relate's current project would not receive funding if this approach were to be adopted</p>				
<p>12 Has the data or other evidence raised concerns that the function/policy might have a differential impact? If so in what area (please circle)?</p>	<p>Race No</p>	<p>Gender No</p>	<p>Disability No</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>(If other please specify)</p>

HARROW COUNCIL

<p>13 What are the concerns? (please continue on a separate piece paper)</p>	<p><u>Race:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If these recommendations were to be adopted there are no concerns that they would have detrimental impact on race related issues. <p><u>Gender:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If these recommendations were to be adopted there are no concerns that they would have detrimental impact on gender related issues. <p><u>Disability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If these recommendations were to be adopted there are no concerns that they would have detrimental impact on disability related issues. <p>It is recommended that activities that do not address the agreed funding priorities should not be supported through the grants programme. However this is not seen as detrimental or discriminatory to any one section of the community as all grant applications will be assessed through the grants process in a fair and transparent way. It is possible to see from the mapping exercise discussed earlier that currently funded projects reflect the borough's diversity and that aligning grants to the HSP priorities would not have an adverse affect on any section on the community.</p>		
<p>14 Does the differential impact amount to adverse impact i.e. could it be discriminatory, directly or indirectly?</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>15 If yes, can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>16 Have you considered ways in which the adverse impact might be reduced or eliminated?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 		

HARROW COUNCIL

<p>17 How have you made sure you have consulted with the relevant groups and service users from Ethnic Minorities? Disabled people? Men and women generally?</p>	<p>Consultation took place during a 6-week period, with a closing date of 5 June 2009.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation documents were distributed to approximately 300 voluntary and community groups on the community development database and through various partnership networks • Posters were displayed at the council's eleven libraries and at community premises • The proposal and the consultation questionnaire was available to complete on-line <p>Respondents were encouraged to use a number of drop-off points in the community to submit their completed questionnaires</p> <p>The views of the Grant Advisory Panel were also sought through this process.</p>				
<p>18. Please give details of the relevant service users, groups and experts you are approaching for their views on the issues</p>	<p>As above.</p>				
<p>19 How will the views of these groups be obtained? (Please tick)</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="703 1379 983 1541"> <p>Letter Meetings Interviews Telephone Workshops Fora Questionnaires Other</p> </td> <td data-bbox="703 1093 983 1379"> <p>✓ ✓ <input type="checkbox"/></p> </td> <td data-bbox="703 678 983 1093"> <p>20 Please give the date when each group/expert was contacted</p> </td> <td data-bbox="703 114 983 678"> <p>Consultation information was available mid April 2009 A discussion paper was presented to the Grant Advisory Panel on the 8th June 09</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Letter Meetings Interviews Telephone Workshops Fora Questionnaires Other</p>	<p>✓ ✓ <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>20 Please give the date when each group/expert was contacted</p>	<p>Consultation information was available mid April 2009 A discussion paper was presented to the Grant Advisory Panel on the 8th June 09</p>
<p>Letter Meetings Interviews Telephone Workshops Fora Questionnaires Other</p>	<p>✓ ✓ <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>20 Please give the date when each group/expert was contacted</p>	<p>Consultation information was available mid April 2009 A discussion paper was presented to the Grant Advisory Panel on the 8th June 09</p>		
<p>21 Please explain in detail the views of the relevant groups/experts on the issues involved. (Please use a separate sheet if necessary)</p>	<p>Please see attached Grant Advisory Panel report: "Review of grant criteria and results of the grants consultation" (July 2009)</p>				
<p>22 Taking into account the views of the groups/experts, please clearly state what changes if any you will make, including the ways in which you will make the function/policy accessible to all service users, or if not able to do so, the areas and level of risk (Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</p>	<p>Same as responses to question 6 and 16.</p>				

HARROW COUNCIL

<p>23 Please describe how you intend to monitor the effect this function/policy has on different minority groups (Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</p>	<p>To monitor the number applications received from different minority groups and to analyse the effect that the revised grants process has had on the proportion of these groups that are awarded or denied funding.</p>	
<p>24 If any elements of your function/policy are provided by third parties please state, what arrangements you have in place to ensure that to ensure that the Council's equal opportunities criteria are met</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>25 Please list any performance targets relating to equality that your function/policy includes, and any plans for new targets (Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>26 How will you publish the results of this Impact assessment?</p>	<p>To accompany the reports, detailing the grants recommendation, to the Grant Advisory Panel in July 09.</p>	<p>27 Date of next assessment</p>

26

Signed:
NAME:

Completing officer Audrey Salmon

Date:

Signed:
NAME:

Audrey Salmon

Date:

Lead Officer

HARROW COUNCIL

Please list actions you intend to take as a result of this assessment. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

IMPROVEMENT PLAN

ISSUE IDENTIFIED	ACTION REQUIRED	LEAD OFFICER	TIMESCALE	COMMENTS
To clarify eligibility criteria	GAP to agree criteria	Audrey Salmon	Mid July 09	
To simplify the application process	GAP to agree to revised application process	Audrey Salmon	Mid July 09	
To align the grant to the Harrow Strategy Partnership priorities	GAP to agree funding priorities	Audrey Salmon	Mid July 09	
To ensure that the application process is clear and transparent	To communicate to the VCS the types and availability of grants for 2010/11	Audrey Salmon	Mid July – Mid August 09	

This page is intentionally left blank



Meeting:	Grants Advisory Panel
Date:	8 September 2009
Subject:	Scrutiny Challenge Panel comments on grants programme 2010/11
Responsible Officer:	Alex Dewsnap, Divisional Director Partnership Development and Performance
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Paul Osborn, Performance, Communication and Corporate Services Portfolio Holder
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	None

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out the observations and recommendations of a scrutiny challenge panel on the proposed grants programme for 2010/11.

Recommendations:

The Grants Advisory Panel is requested:

1. To consider the observations and recommendations of the scrutiny challenge panel
2. To forward scrutiny's recommendations to the Community and Cultural Services Portfolio Holder for consideration and formal response back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Reason: (For recommendation)

1. To address the concerns raised in scrutiny's review 'Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector for Harrow'.
2. To follow up Recommendation 15 of the scrutiny review 'Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector for Harrow'.
3. To ensure that the scrutiny work programme for 2009/10 is delivered.

Section 2 – Report

Background

The scrutiny review of ‘Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector for Harrow’ was conducted over two phases of work between March and November 2008. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed the review’s final report¹ at its meeting in December 2008 and Cabinet provided a formal response to the scrutiny recommendations in March 2009. Of the 22 recommendations, Cabinet accepted 17 for immediate implementation, four for implementation in line with the development of a third sector strategy for the borough and one recommendation was not accepted.

Work throughout the review was undertaken using a variety of methodologies and was focused under four case study headings, identified as key issues to address in a Harrow context:

1. Partnership working
2. Harrow Compact
3. Funding
4. Community assets and premises

Within the funding case study, issues around Harrow’s grants process were explored. From the evidence received, a range of concerns were raised about the current panel-led approach to grants:

- a. Lack of clarity about what the process is actually for
- b. Lack of priorities in awarding grants
- c. Concerns about the transparency of the process
- d. Concerns about the appropriateness of criteria
- e. Lack of effective appeals process
- f. Links with other commissioning processes are weak
- g. Management of information in this area is weak
- h. Short-termism of the grants process
- i. The timeliness of the process
- j. The application process
- k. The need to strengthen monitoring arrangements
- l. Grant awards do not match the amounts bid for

These are explored in more detail in the full report, and wherever appropriate the review group attempted to offer some possible solutions. The scrutiny review concluded that this set of concerns would also provide a good checklist against which to assess any new model of grant-giving or any changes to the grants process.

Current situation

This report presents the findings of the scrutiny challenge panel set up to explore the proposed grants programme for 2010/11. The challenge panel took place on Monday 22 June 2009 and comprised of the following members:

- Councillor Stanley Sheinwald (Chairman)

¹ http://www.harrow.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=688&fileID=5760

- Councillor Nana Asante
- Councillor Margaret Davine
- Councillor Yogesh Teli
- Ramji Chauhan – Parent governor co-optee on Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- Julia Smith – Chief Executive of Harrow Association of Voluntary Service
- Mike Coker – Harrow Community and Voluntary Sector

The primary aim of the challenge panel was to address Recommendation 15 of the scrutiny review ‘Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector for Harrow’:

“Recommendation 15: For the Grants Advisory Panel to engage with the VCS² to consider the criteria for the 2010/11 grants round and take account of the concerns raised through this scrutiny review about the current system. To bring these proposals to a scrutiny challenge panel in preparation for the 2010/11 grants application process.”

We thank Kashmir Takhar and Audrey Salmon from the Community Development Team for attending the challenge panel to answer our questions.

Comments from the Scrutiny Challenge Panel

Comments from the scrutiny challenge panel are forwarded to the Grants Advisory Panel for consideration when discussing the outcomes of the grants 2010/11 consultation, pending formal endorsement from Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 28 July 2009³. The observations and recommendations from the scrutiny challenge panel are given under the headings of the consultation as appropriate. In total we make 10 recommendations.

Proposed change 1: Who will be eligible for grant aid?

Observations

- The most important factor in grant giving is to ensure that outcomes of the grant benefit the people of Harrow – those living and working in the borough. However we recognise the difficulty that the grants process faces in determining the intention of the application in relation to the criteria, namely that the application is for the good of the people of the borough.
- The Community Development Team proposed the grant qualifying condition of: “Grant aid will be available to support voluntary and community organisations to deliver services and activities solely for the benefit of people living in Harrow”. Following consultation, the word ‘solely’ will be removed as it is deemed restrictive.
- Although 53% of the respondents to the consultation⁴ wanted to restrict applications to organisations based in Harrow, we are aware that this represents less than 2% of the local VCS. We recognise the value that some organisations can offer in providing value-for-money services for local people albeit being based outside of the borough. Further, we are of the

² VCS refers to the voluntary and community sector in Harrow.

³ 28 July 2009 is the next available ordinary meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the body which commissions all scrutiny reviews.

⁴ The consultation exercise gathered 51 responses in total.

view that a thriving local third sector (National Indicator 7) should not be restricted in serving people who live, work or are schooled in Harrow.

- The eligibility criteria is only the first stage in the process and there are other mechanisms within the system by which to assess value for money and quality of services, and so the grant conditions need not be restrictive at this first stage so as to exclude potentially valuable service providers.
- The need to invest in the local VCS is recognised in the Council's new Transformation Programme and therefore the changes to the grants system should reflect the wider corporate picture and movement. Within this, support needs to enable VCS groups to become sustainable in the longer-term.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: To assist in the checking and monitoring process, we recommend that all application forms should ask, as applicable, for charity numbers and details of the last time the applicant applied for a grant from Harrow Council.

Recommendation 2: On balance, whilst recognising the arguments against, we prefer the grant qualifying condition to read: "Grant aid will be available to support voluntary and community organisations to deliver services, where this resource is used for the benefit of people living, working or schooling in Harrow. The service provider can be based and/or provide services outside of Harrow but funding must be used to benefit people living, working or schooling in the borough."

Recommendation 3: In line with National Indicator 7 which is included in Harrow's Local Area Agreement, Harrow Council must support the development of the local voluntary and community sector (VCS). With this in mind, whilst its grants processes must demonstrate open criteria, they must nevertheless be supportive toward local VCS organisations. Flexible criteria must be transparent.

Proposed change 2: Type of grant available

Observations

- Harrow has one of the smallest grants budgets in London and annually funds about 60 groups. There are over 1500 VCS organisations in Harrow and therefore Harrow Council directly supports only a small proportion of the sector through its grants programme. Managing expectations in this context is important.
- Although the consultation suggested some splits in terms of the proportionality of grant sizes (small/medium/large) in order to test the appetite for any such shift in the system, there was no discernible consensus from consultation responses. It must be pointed out however that the response pool was relatively small and some respondents have a vested interest in keeping the status quo.
- We are pleased to hear that an equality impact assessment has been conducted in order to assess the possible impacts on the sector of the proposed changes. Any transition must be as smooth as possible.
- There should be equality of access to grants in that all organisations, regardless of size and history, should be able to bid for any grant and they

will be assessed on the quality of their application and the intended outcomes of their bid. This will afford groups the opportunity to grow.

- We believe that the current situation whereby 2% of the grants budget is given in small grants, 25% in medium grants and 73% in large grants needs to change and the balance shifted. The Council needs to show that it is changing and that continuing with the status quo of grant distribution is not an option that should be adopted.
- The Hearsay review⁵, a previous scrutiny review looking at community engagement, recommended that: “a ‘risk pot’ of funding should be identified from the main grants budget for use in supporting new and emerging community groups”. This could be viewed as an innovation fund.
- It is proposed to move the decision making meeting (when decisions are made about which applications for grants are successful) to January. This would be an ‘in principle’ decision pending the budget-setting Cabinet meeting in February 2010. Any changes to the grants process should allow for enough notice to be given to the CVS so that they are aware that they may not get a grant in 2010/11 and can make preparations for any changed circumstances. Again, we assert the need for smooth transitions.

Recommendations

Recommendation 4: All grant applications should be judged on merit and it should be clear that grants cannot be guaranteed on a year-on-year basis. We recommend that the grants budget should include an ‘innovation fund’ which encourages innovative ideas for small grants, based on value for money and quality of service, not historical performance. This fund should be more flexible than the grants budget and accessible throughout the year.

Recommendation 5: The guidance which supports the grant application form should give an indication of previous proportioning of the grants budget, for example stating that historically large grants accounted for 73% of the grants budget so it is very unlikely that new/small groups can access funding however it is not impossible. This should help manage expectations.

Recommendation 6: The grants budget should be ringfenced over a 3-year period, in line with the 3-year government financial settlement to councils, so that funding that CVS organisations can be assured of the minimum funding pot and decisions around grants can be informed in November. If the Council is unable to fit this into the timetable for the 2010/11 grants round, provision should be made for the 2011/12 round.

Recommendation 7: Whilst we recognise the difficulties in setting a definite split for the grant award allocations (percentages for small, medium and large grant awards), we recommend an innovation pot of not less than 1% of the total grants budget and small grants pot of not less than 5% of the overall grants budget. Parameters should be set loosely so that VCS organisations have some indication of the allocations and are able to make an informed decision about whether to apply for a small, medium or large grant. However allocation limits should not be so restrictive so as to exclude borderline grants.

⁵ The Hearsay review was published in January 2006. The report can be found at: http://www.harrow.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?fileID=1405

Proposed change 3: Funding priorities

Observations

- Whilst we recognise the importance of criteria aligned to priorities so as to make assessments and objective judgements against set criteria, aligning funding priorities purely to the priorities of the Sustainable Communities Strategy removes the opportunity for innovative projects that go beyond services already statutorily provided. The grants budget should include scope for funding projects that offer ‘something a little different’.
- Equally there is a need to counteract sometimes rather narrow national indicators by recognising that some good services essential for the well-being of Harrow offered by the VCS do not meet corporate Council or Harrow Strategic Partnership priorities.

Recommendations

Recommendation 8: We recommend that not all of the grants budget should be used to meet the Council’s corporate priorities – a small pot should be set aside for outside ‘innovations’, allowing VCS organisations to pursue needs that are perhaps not on the Council radar yet. We recognise that the VCS is often the first to identify and address needs in the community.

Recommendation 9: The Council must clearly communicate what its grants budget does not fund and signpost VCS organisations to alternative grant-giving bodies as appropriate.

Proposed change 4: Conditions of grant approval

Observations

- The consultation highlighted unanimous support for the changes proposed around conditions of grant approval.
- We welcome the rationalisation of the conditions of grant approval as proposed in the consultation document as they now seem to reflect more accurately the amounts of grant applied for.

Recommendations

Recommendation 10: Any unallocated grant money, for example arising from groups who were awarded grants but were subsequently unable to furnish the Council with the required documentation or any underspends, should be reallocated to the innovations pot within the grants budget which is accessible throughout the year.

Why a change is needed

To improve the grants process

Main options

Not applicable to this report.

Other options considered

Not applicable to this report.

Implications of the Recommendation

Staffing/workforce

There are no staffing/workforce implications arising directly from this report.

Equalities impact

The scrutiny challenge panel welcomes the Community Development Team conducting an Equalities Impact Assessment upon the impact of the proposed changes contained within the consultation document.

Legal comments

The Council is empowered to make grants to voluntary organisations under Section 48 of the Local Government Act 1985 as well as under other legislation. Having an approved process will ensure that the council can comply with its legal duties and its statement of intention of the Compact with the voluntary sector.

Community safety

There are no community safety implications arising directly from this report.

Environmental impact

There are no direct environmental impacts arising from the issues contained within this report.

Financial Implications

There are no implications on the medium term financial strategy as any costs relating to this matter will be met from within the existing budget provision.

Performance Issues

National Indicator (NI) number 7, which relates to creating an environment in which the voluntary and community sector can thrive, has been included within Harrow's Local Area Agreement. Results from the first national Third Sector Survey indicate that Harrow's performance against this indicator is 10.4%. Harrow will be aiming to improve performance by a statistically significant amount, now agreed as an increase of 4.4%.

The findings of the scrutiny challenge panel have the potential to contribute to improving performance against this indicator.

The provision of grant funding to voluntary and community sector organisations has the potential to contribute to NI 1 ' % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area'. Current performance against this indicator is 49% and target performance is 61%. The provision of grant funding to voluntary and community sector organisations has the potential to contribute to NI 6 ' Participation in regular volunteering'. The target increase in numbers volunteering is 300 for 'socially excluded' volunteers and 1,200 for other volunteers. The current position is an achievement against target on 'socially excluded' volunteers and a slight under-achievement against 'other volunteers'.

Risk Management Implications

The potential risk associated with decisions on the grants programme 2010/11 is that they may affect the stability of organisations currently supported through the grants programme. The report to the Grants Advisory Panel 'Review of the

Grants Application Process' (section 2.4) outlines how this risk could be mitigated.

Risk included on Directorate risk register? No
Separate risk register in place? No

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Hasina Shah.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 29 June 2009		
Name: Jessica Farmer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 29 June 2009		

Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name: Tom Whiting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Assistant Chief Executive
Date: 25 June 2009		

Section 5 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: John Edwards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Divisional Director (Environmental Services)
Date: 24 June 2009		

Section 6 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Nahreen Matlib, Senior Professional – Scrutiny
nahreen.matlib@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Final report of the scrutiny review 'Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector for Harrow' which can be found at:

http://www.harrow.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=688&fileID=5760



Meeting:	Grants Advisory Panel
Date:	8 September 2009
Subject:	Grants Advisory Panel Meeting 4 March 2009
Responsible Officer:	Hugh Peart – Director of Legal and Governance Services
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Jean Lammiman – Portfolio Holder, Community and Cultural Services
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Portfolio Holder Rationale for revised allocations

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out the comments of the Director of Legal and Governance Services in response to resolution 172 (i) of the Minutes of the Grants Advisory Panel dated 8 June 2009.

Recommendations:

The Panel is requested to note the report.

Section 2 – Report

2.1 Background

- 2.1.1 At its meeting on 8 June 2009, this Panel considered an item relating to the Grants Advisory Panel Meeting on 4 March 2009 under “Any Other Urgent Business”. The Panel resolved “That the Director of Legal and Governance Services submit a report to the Grants Advisory Panel meeting on 8 September 2009, outlining the rationale for amending the Grants Advisory Report from the meeting of 4 March 2009 submitted to Cabinet on 26 March 2009.
- 2.1.2 At its meeting on 4 March 2009, this Grants Advisory Panel (GAP) considered the Grant Funding applications for 2009/10. The Panel agreed to recommend to Cabinet the allocation of funding to voluntary organisations for the 2009/10 financial year.
- 2.1.3 Prior to the recommendation being submitted to the Cabinet, the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services reviewed the recommendations with a view to ensuring adherence with the Grants criteria. As a result, some of the GAP recommendations were adjusted. The rationale for each of the revised recommendations is set out in the attached Appendix 1. (Recommendation 3 to the Cabinet Report of 26 March 2009).
- 2.1.4 The report to Cabinet on 26 March 2009 included all the recommendations from the GAP meeting of the 4th March, as well as the recommendations which were being put forward by the Portfolio Holder.
- 2.1.5 The recommendations from the Portfolio Holder for funding to the voluntary organisations for 2009/10 as set out in Appendix 2 to the Cabinet report of 26th March were approved.

2.2 Current Situation

- 2.2.1 The allocation of grants is an executive function and decisions can only be made by the Executive or individual Portfolio Holders. However, the Executive may appoint advisory panels to assist in the carrying out of its functions.
- 2.2.2 The functions of GAP are contained in the Allocations of Responsibilities in the Council’s Constitution. This states that the Panel is “To review grant applications annually ensuring that they meet agreed criteria and conditions, and make recommendations for funding to Cabinet or the portfolio holder as appropriate”.
- 2.2.3 As the GAP can only make recommendations, these can be accepted, amended or rejected by the Cabinet.
- 2.2.4 In this case, the Portfolio Holder, who as Chairman of GAP, did not vote on the various applications, undertook a review of the recommendations in order to ensure that these complied with the Grants criteria. As a result, the Portfolio Holder proposed certain

amendments to the Panel's recommendations. These amendments could either have been made orally at the Cabinet meeting, or as in this case by an amended report thereby giving Cabinet and members advance notice of his proposal. It was then open to Cabinet to accept or reject his suggestions.

2.2.5 Cabinet, having considered both the recommendations from GAP and the recommendations and rationale from the portfolio holder, decided to approve the recommendations proposed by the portfolio holder.

Financial Implications

This report contains no financial implications.

Risk Management Implications

There are no risks associated with this report.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Steve Tingle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 26 August 2009		
Name: Hugh Peart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitoring Officer
Date: 21 August 2009		

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Elaine McEachron Assistant Lawyer Corporate
Governance telephone: 0208 424 5414.

Background Papers:

Grants Agenda and Minutes 4 March 2009
Cabinet Agenda and Minutes 26 March 2009

If appropriate, does the report include the following considerations?

1.	Consultation	YES / NO
2.	Corporate Priorities	YES / NO

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix

Portfolio Holder Rationale for revised allocations

AGE CONCERN

As the Panel agreed to support the proposed project, funding should be awarded to ensure that it is viable for the organisation to deliver the service. This would not be achieved if the GAP's recommendation were accepted. An amendment to the original recommendation is suggested based on a representation from the organisation, which was available to members at the meeting, stating that the organisation would not be able to deliver the service unless the salary costs are met. As per the officer's report, it is recommended that the organisation be awarded £12,663 to enable them to deliver the project.

ASIAN ELDERLY GROUP

The panel was informed that the organisation has declared an under-spend of £1,800 for 2008/09, due to a staff vacancy. As per the original officer recommendation, it is suggested that the organisation carry this under-spend forward and in addition be awarded £2,400 so that the total grant available to them will be £4,200. This reduction in funding has taken into account the fact that the organisation has been unable to spend their full grant of £5,500.

HARROW ASSOCIATION OF SOMALI VOLUNTARY ORGANISATION

As the Panel agreed to support the proposed project, funding should be awarded to ensure that it is viable for the organisation to deliver the service. However, this would not be achieved if the GAP's recommendation was accepted. As per the original officer recommendation, it is suggested that £6,500 be awarded to the organisation to cover the salary costs of a part-time advice worker.

HARROW GINGERBREAD

The panel was informed that a reduction in funding was recommended because the organisation had requested funding for a different project. As per the original officer recommendation, it is suggested that a contribution of £1,400 be made to cover the cost of visits/entry fees and travel costs.

HARROW KUWAITI COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Further representation received from the organisation was available for consideration. It stated that the needs of this community have been overlooked. However, as stated in the original officer's report, the organisation has provided insufficient evidence of the need for this service and therefore funding is not recommended. The organisation is advised to access support and advice on fund-raising.

HARROW OVER 50'S CLUB

Further representation received from organisation was available for consideration. It stated that their membership had increased and requested that this be taken into reconsideration. This information was not submitted with their original application, and it was not clear whether all members were also beneficiaries of the services. As per the original officer's report the organisation has provided very little evidence of the need for this project and therefore it is recommended that they be awarded £960 to meet the hall hire cost. It is also advised that they explore other sources of funding.

HARROW PRE-SCHOOL LEARNING ALLIANCE

The organisation had requested £10,724 and therefore an award of £1,000 would be inadequate and would not enable the organisation to pay the rent at Glebe School and the salary costs of the Administrator and the Finance Officer. As per the officer's report, it is recommended that the Alliance is not awarded funding for 2009/10 but is advised that HPSLA re-negotiate their SLA with the Integrated Early Years and Community Services to meet their core costs.

HARROW TAMIL SCHOOL ASSOCIATION

A representation was made by a member of the panel on behalf of the organisation stating that their concessions on lettings will be reduced to 25%. Officers have confirmed that this is incorrect as they currently receive a 50% concession and will continue to do so. As per the officer's report, it is recommended that this organisation is not awarded funding for 2009/10 but is advised to continue to raise funds to support their activities.

INDIAN ASSOCIATION OF HARROW

Further representation provided by the organisation shows that the organisation organises day trips, cultural celebrations and encourages members to access free swimming sessions at Harrow Leisure Centre and free health walks. It was not possible to see from this information how many of their members had accessed these activities. As stated in the officer's report, a full breakdown of how the grant would be used was not provided and there was also insufficient evidence of the need for this service. Therefore it is recommended that the organisation not be awarded funding for 2009/10.

KSIM SENIOR CITIZEN ASSOCIATION

This organisation does not meet the 80% rule. This was supported by a successful compact challenge in 2008/09, which meant that the organisation was not eligible for funding. The officer's report, which is based on evidence recently provided by the organisation, confirms that they are still not eligible for funding as less than 80% of their beneficiaries live in Harrow. Therefore it is recommended that the organisation be not awarded funding for 2009/10.

LONDON KALIBARI

The grant can't be used to support religious activities and the organisation has declared in their application that they will be using the grant to fund a 'social/religious function'; and monitoring information gathered in 2008 showed that the organisation had used their grant to fund religious activities. Therefore it is recommended that the organisation is not awarded funding for 2009/10.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF VANIK ASSOCIATIONS (UK)

Insufficient evidence has been provided as to the need for this service. As per the officer's report it is recommended that the organisation be not awarded funding for 2009/10.

GIRL GUIDING MIDDLESEX NORTH WEST

The organisation does not meet the following grant qualifying condition:

"The applicant must be a voluntary group based in Harrow, with 80% of this beneficiaries either living or working in Harrow"

The organisation is requesting funding to cover the cost of services that are used by girls that live in Harrow that attend the Willow Tree Centre, based in Hillingdon. A representation was received from a member of the panel on behalf of the organisation, stating that the organisation provides an invaluable service to 4,000 girls from Harrow. However the organisation is not based in Harrow and the service is not delivered in the borough and therefore it is recommended that this application be rejected.

Note: There is an outstanding Compact challenge, relating to the above criteria, as the GAP meeting in January 2009 decided to award Edward Harvest Trust funds to the organisation.

This page is intentionally left blank



Committee:	Grants Advisory Panel
Date:	8 th September 2009
Subject:	Feedback from the Portfolio Holder Decision Meeting held on 30 July 2009
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills – Corporate Director (Community & Environment)
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Jean Lammiman, Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Appendix 1: Minutes of the Portfolio Holder Decision Meeting – 30 July 2009

Section 1 – Summary

FOR INFORMATION

Following the Grant Advisory Panel meeting on the 2 July 2009, a Portfolio Holder Decision meeting took place on 30 July 2009 at which the Leader of the Council took a decision (on behalf of the Cabinet) on GAP's recommendations, in time for grants round 2010/11.

Attached is a copy of the minutes of the meeting for information.

Section 2 – Implications

Name: Sheela Thakrar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 25 August 2009		
Name: Matthew Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: 25 August 2009	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Section 5 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Audrey Salmon, Interim Service Manager – Community Resources and Projects (ext 5332)

Background Papers: Minutes of the Portfolio Holder Decision Meeting – 30 July 2009

PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION MEETING

30 JULY 2009

Chairman: * Councillor David Ashton

* Denotes Member present

[Note: Councillor Chris Mote also attended this meeting to speak on the item indicated at Minute 90 below].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**

84. **Declarations of Interest including Declarations of any Dispensations Granted by the Standards Committee:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members in relation to the business to be transacted at this meeting.

85. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2009, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

86. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions had been received.

87. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

88. **Matters referred to the Executive Member:**

RESOLVED: That no matters had been referred to the Executive Member for reconsideration in accordance with the provisions contained in the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 22 (Part 4F of the Constitution).

89. **Reports from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Sub-Committees:**

RESOLVED: To note that no reports had been received.

90. **Review of the Grants Application Process:**

Under the Special Urgency provisions the Leader, acting as the Executive, considered a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment on the recommendations of Grants Advisory Panel in relation to the grants programme for 2010/11.

The report was urgent due to the need to launch the Grants Scheme for the coming year, prior to the next Cabinet programmed for 17 September 2009.

Consideration was given to the recommendations of the Grants Advisory Panel. The Leader further sought the views of officers upon the proposals particularly in relation to the proposed threshold levels of grants and the proposals around the timescale and process for the consideration of grants application.

The Leader commented that the previously identified threshold levels of grants was established historically and supported by a recent scrutiny challenge process in relation to this area. He noted the proposed change in threshold would be relevant, currently, for one organisation and was advised by officers that when a consultation upon the levels was undertaken with applicants for grants no specific comments against the suggested £100,000 had been received from that applicant. He therefore concluded that the proposal to increase the threshold level for grants should not be adopted.

The Leader then raised the issue of the shortened timescale with respect to the grants process. He noted the concerns of officers with regard to the submission of grants reports and appropriate resourcing to achieve the proposals of the Grants Panel. He further examined the initial proposals by officers with regard to operating

arrangements. In deliberating upon the Panel's recommendation the Leader considered the ability of officers to engage with grants applicants in the process to ensure the accuracy of information presented for final consideration by the Panel. He also suggested that arranging an informal working group of officers and Members during January 2010 to consider initial draft applications would contribute to a more effective grants process consideration through gaining Members input at an earlier stage and therefore, create greater transparency with regard to grant approval outcomes. The Leader concluded that an amendment to the recommendation regarding the proposed timescale was required to enable the suggestions he had outlined and that the Panel recommendation should not be adopted, setting out his alternative decision instead.

RESOLVED: That (1) Recommendation 1 (Review of Grants Criteria & Results of Grants Consultation) be agreed subject to the threshold of large grants remaining at £100,000;

(2) Recommendation 2 (Funding Arrangements for 2009/10 & 2010/11) be agreed;

(3) Recommendation 3 (Review of Grants Application Process) be agreed subject to the timescale for grants round 2010/11 be as detailed in the table below:

END August 2009	Grants application round launched
END October 2009	Grants application round closing date
END October – END December 2009	Applications are assessed
Early January 2010	Informal Working Party of Members of Grants Advisory Panel, Independent Adviser and officers of Grants Team held to consider initial grant application submissions.
MID January – February 2010	Copy of draft report sent out to applicants for comments
EARLY MARCH 2010	Final Report presented to GAP to agree grant allocations for 2010/11, subject to Cabinet's decision.

Reasons for Decision:

- To address the recommendations raised in the Overview and Scrutiny Review: "Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector for Harrow" (December 2008).
- To ensure greater clarity and transparency in the grants process for round 2010/11.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 5.30 pm, closed at 5.49 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR DAVID ASHTON
Chairman



Meeting:	Grants Advisory Panel
Date:	8 th September 2009
Subject:	Arrangements for allocating unspent funds for 2009/10
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills – Corporate Director (Community & Environment)
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Jean Lammiman, Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services
Exempt:	No (except for Appendix 1, exempt information under paragraph 1 of Part 1 of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)
Enclosures:	Appendix 1: List of Organisations recommended for increased funding in March 2009, with copies of original grant reports (Part 2).

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report presents proposed arrangements for allocating unspent funds for 2009/10

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Panel is requested to consider the proposed arrangements for allocating unspent funds and make recommendations to the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services for approval of the unspent funds to the groups as set out at Appendix 1.

Reason: (For recommendation) _____

To establish a process to allocate any unspent funds within the financial year to reduce the risk of losing funds.

Section 2 – Report

2.1 Introductory paragraph / Background

2.1.1 This report presents options for the allocation of unspent funds for 2009/10.

2.2 Brief Background

2.2.1 The Council's financial regulations stipulate that council funds cannot be carried forward from one financial year into the next financial year. If the Grants Advisory Panel do not allocate the whole grants budget at their meeting at the beginning of the year, there are no arrangements for managing these unallocated funds in the grant-making cycle.

2.2.2 It should be noted that following the deadline for receiving grant applications in 2008/09, a late request for financial support was received from Welldon Activity Group. Although there was no precedent for allocating unspent funds, Grant Officers in agreement with the Portfolio Holder, prepared and presented a report to the Grants Advisory Panel at its meeting in March 2009 to consider the request by Welldon Activity Group for additional financial support. It was agreed at this meeting to award £10,000 of the total unallocated amount to the organisation to meet the unexpected increase in rent.

2.2.3 A compact complaint was however subsequently submitted stating that "there was no process for seeking applications for unallocated sums". The investigation that followed from the compact complaint recognised that the process for allocating unspent funding was not transparent or compliant with the Compact, and recommended that officers develop a clear process for allocating unspent funds.

2.2 Current situation

2.2.1 There is a current underspend of £3,110 for 2009/10, which will need to be allocated before the end of March 2010. There is no process at this present time to deal with underspends.

2.3 Options Considered

2.3.1 A report was presented to the Grants Advisory Panel at its meeting in July 2009 to consider the options for allocating the underspend of £3,110 in this current financial year. Officers stressed that in accordance with the Council's financial regulations, this amount would not be available for rolling forward into the new financial year, and recommended that this be used to 'top-up' the grants of 4 organisations (listed in Appendix 1 with the original grant report), who had received less than the amount recommended by officers in the grants round in March 2009, but had demonstrated an increased demand for their service.

- 2.3.2 Although the Panel agreed this option in principle, it was however decided to defer the decision to a future meeting, pending the outcome of an outstanding compact challenge as outlined in paragraph 2.2.3 of this report.
- 2.3.3 The Harrow Strategic Partnership (HSP) met in July and agreed not to up-hold the compact challenge as they were assured that measures were being put in place to address the issues raised.
- 2.3.4 The Panel is therefore requested to consider the allocation of the unspent fund of £3,110 to the 4 grant recipients listed in Appendix 1.
- 2.3.5 It is recommended that this option should only be adopted as an interim arrangement for 2009/10, as a fair and transparent method of allocating unspent funds.

2.4 Why a Change is Needed

- 2.4.1 Due to the restricted grants budget, a change is needed to the current process of dealing with grant allocations in order to avoid losing unspent funds, which cannot be rolled forward into the next financial year.

Implications of the Recommendation

2.5 Staffing/workforce

- 2.5.1 There are no staffing or workforce implications for the Council in relation to this report.

2.6 Equalities impact

- 2.6.1 *See attached Equality Impact Assessment for details.*

2.7 Legal comments

- 2.7.1 The Council is empowered to make grants to voluntary organisations under Section 48 of the Local Government Act 1985 as well as under other legislation. Having an approved process will ensure that the Council complies with its legal duties and its statement of intention of the Compact with the voluntary sector.

2.8 Community safety

- 2.8.1 There are no community safety issues associated with the recommendations in this report.

2.9 Financial Implications

- 2.9.1 The financial implications are being negated by the recommendations set out in this report. For example, by establishing arrangement for allocating unspent funds within the financial year, this reduces the risk of an underspend at the end of the financial year.

2.10 Performance Issues

2.10.1

National Indicator (NI) number 7, which relates to creating an environment in which the voluntary and community sector (VCS) can thrive, has been included within Harrow's Local Area Agreement. Results from the national Third Sector Survey (2008) indicate that Harrow's performance against this indicator is 10.4%, which is below the national average of 16.2%. Harrow will be aiming to improve performance by a statistically significant amount, now agreed as an increase of 4.4%. The grants programme has the potential to stimulate the VCS by supporting it to deliver shared outcomes for the benefit of Harrow's diverse community.

The provision of grant funding to voluntary and community sector organisations has the potential to contribute to NI 1 '% of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area'. The National Place Survey (2008) indicates that Harrow's performance against this indicator is 76.2%, which is in line with the national and London average of 76.4% and 76.3%, respectively. Harrow's target for this indicator in 2010/11 is 78%. The improvements to the grants programme will contribute to the achievement of this target by encouraging grant applications from all sections of the wide and diverse voluntary and community sector, so that:

- Different sections of the community can identify and address their own needs, in line with the Harrow Strategy Partnership priorities
- Community cohesion can be developed amongst the same and different communities.

2.9.1 The provision of grant funding to voluntary and community sector organisations has the potential to contribute to NI 6 'Participation in regular volunteering'. The National Place Survey 2008 indicates that performance against this indicator is 24%, which is above national and London average of 23.2% and 20.8%, respectively. Harrow's target for this indicator in 2010/11 is 27.7%.

2.11 Environmental Impact

2.11.1 There are no environmental impacts for the Council in relation to this report.

2.12 Risk Management Implications

Risk included on Directorate risk register? No
Separate risk register in place? No

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Sheela Thakrar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 25 August 2009		
Name: Jessica Farmer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: 25 August 2009		

Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name: Tom Whiting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Divisional Director (Strategy and Improvement)
Date: 25 August 2009		

Section 5 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: John Edwards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Divisional Director (Environmental Services)
Date: 25 August 2009		

Section 6 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Audrey Salmon, Interim Service Manager – Community Resources and Projects, 020 8420 9332;
Parveen Vasdev, Principal Grants Officer, 020 8424 7625

Background Papers:

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank