

Meeting:	CABINET
Date:	21 May 2008
Subject:	Overview & Scrutiny Review of Cultural Services – Beacon Centre Case Study
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	Javed Khan, Director of Community & Cultural Services
Portfolio Holder:	Portfolio Holder for Community & Cultural Services
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	<p>Appendix 1: Scrutiny Review of Cultural Services – Beacon Centre Case Study</p> <p>Appendix 2: Community Use Agreement</p> <p>Appendix 3: Beacon Centre Supporting Statement – Harrow College</p> <p>Appendix 4: Home Group Letter 27/3/08</p> <p>Appendix 5: Extract of Minutes of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee 1/4/08</p> <p>Appendix 6: Home Group Letter 22/4/08</p>

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

Recommendations:

1 Members of Cabinet are asked to note the content and recommendations of this report and refer the report to the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services to inform future cultural services provision.

2 The Council will work to support the Home Group and partners to help develop appropriate services at the Beacon Centre, which reflect local needs.

Reason:

In accordance with Overview and Scrutiny rules, Cabinet must consider reports produced by the Committee or one of its sub-committees.

Overview

- 1.1 A sub-Committee of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee carried out a review of Cultural Services over the period December 2006 to June 2007. This review included:
 - A report to Cabinet in July 2007
 - A further progress review update to Cabinet in November 2007
 - A further case study of the Beacon Centre in March 2008
- 1.2 The review group for the Beacon Case Study included:
 - Cllr Mitzi Green (Chairman)
 - Cllr Husain Akhtar
 - Cllr Ashok Kulkarni
 - Cllr Paul Scott
- 1.3 Three meetings were held to gather evidence:
 - Meeting with 3 officers from Home Group at the Beacon Centre
 - Meeting with community groups / service providers (4 people, including one LBH staff member))
 - Meeting with Harrow Council officers (2 staff)
- 1.4 As the final review element of borough-wide review of cultural provision (2007), the review group undertook to develop this further case study (Appendix 1) to look at the Beacon Centre one year into its operation. The review group looked at core evidence provided by Cultural Services, primarily the Community Use Agreement (Appendix 2), but did not speak with other council staff in areas beyond Cultural Services.
- 1.5 The £330k one-off capital investment at the Beacon Centre was delivered in 2005 as part of a capital investment programme to support enhancement of the sports hall; with no intentions of on-going revenue implications to the Council.
- 1.6 The investment was agreed in order to:
 - enlarge what Home Group was going to provide, improving the offer of services to the local community
 - provide priority access to Harrow residents, measured in terms of outcomes for local people
 - for Cultural Services to become more involved in the overall management committee and encourage expanded use for arts and

sports.

- 1.7 The Scrutiny Panel met with the Portfolio Holder for Community & Cultural Services on 6th March 2008, where factual corrections to the report were provided. However, these have not been incorporated in the final report. An omission was the 'Schedule 1' attachment to the Community Use Agreement, which outlines the key work and performance measures required of Home Group in return for the capital investment.
- 1.8 The Council's Housing department has clear responsibility for many of the relationship complexities with the Rayner's Lane Estate and indeed the Beacon Centre, but no members of its team have provided evidence for this report as it was seen to be a review of one aspect of Cultural Services.
- 1.9 The review group did not interview the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural services or other ward councillors who sit on a Beacon Centre Management Advisory Committee and it is felt that their input would have provided invaluable feedback about the centre.
- 1.10 Consequently, the report's wide-ranging recommendations are based on a limited evidence base and scope, which relates specifically to the one-off investment and Community Use Agreement.
- 1.11 Additionally, the Scrutiny Review Committee Minutes of April 1st (Appendix 5) reaffirm that "...the remit of the Review Group was specific to the operation of sport and cultural services at the Beacon Centre. The wider relationships with the Rayner's Lane Estate, including housing and regeneration issues, were not part of its remit."
- 1.12 Key partners such as the Home Group and Harrow College have expressed concern over the scrutiny review and the lack of evidence gathering and contributor robustness (Appendix 3, 4, and 6). Home Group in particular has challenged the review's assumptions made about the Council's ongoing involvement in the centre, with a lack of further investment.
- 1.13 Council attendance on the committee is hoped to ensure that the Council remains involved in partnership building and coordinated delivery of provision.
- 1.14 Taken in this context, the report's conclusions have been carefully noted by Cultural Services and the Housing department. It should be recorded to that this review has triggered a desire for coordination of the Council's multiple relationships at Rayner's Lane and the Beacon Centre; work has already progressed between teams to review delivery and respond to Recommendation 6 in particular.

Section 2 – Report

The Rayner's Lane Estate is home to the Beacon Centre, which has benefited from investment by the Council through staff time (Cultural Services) and

capital resources (£330k). The centre is managed and run by the Home Group, which has signed a Community Use Agreement with the Council. The Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services and Head of Cultural Services both sit on the centre's Management Committee.

The scrutiny review made 8 specific recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Home and the Council to take effective steps to fundamentally reassess the performance management framework for the Beacon Centre, addressing concerns relating to data quality through an examination of the methodologies used for data collection.

The evidence provided in Schedule 1 (Appendix 2), lists the data that is collected as a condition of the agreed Community Use Agreement. The Council will continue to work with Home Group to explore the provision of data beyond that already agreed.

Recommendation 2: The Council and Home should foster increased liaison between the different stakeholders in the Beacon, to ensure that local needs are being met and that funds and resources are being targeted at the areas of maximum need.

The Council welcomes this recommendation and will continue to develop increased liaison through attendance on the management committee (currently through Cultural Services and the Portfolio Holder for Community & Cultural Services).

Recommendation 3: Home should develop a strategy to engage more effectively with the local community, and to put forward transparent policies reflecting the tension between the community use of the Beacon and the need for it to be financially sustainable, where such a tension exists.

The Council welcomes this recommendation and will endeavour to work with Home Group to determine any action.

Recommendation 4: The proposal to appoint a Community Development Officer for the Beacon should not be pursued.

There has not been nor is there any proposal to appoint a Community Development Officer for the Beacon Centre, and no resources are allocated from within Council budgets for such a post.

Recommendation 5: Steps should not be taken, at present and in the current management and organisational context, to establish a Community Trust.

Home Group would determine any action on this recommendation, but the Council will continue to work with the management committee to ensure its plans are appropriate to the needs of the whole community.

Recommendation 6: In the first instance, the Council should convene a summit to set out a new strategic vision for the Beacon.

The Council contributes to the Beacons Centre's development through its representation on the Centre's management committee, along with other partners. The Council welcomes the recommendation and will work to support the Home Group in determining follow up action.

Recommendation 7: A multi-agency forum, incorporating all the key "professional" stakeholders, should be formed to establish a new performance management framework for the Beacon, and to maintain buy-in to the central principles enunciated by the local community.

Home Group would determine any specific action on this recommendation, but the Council will continue to work with the management committee to ensure its plans are appropriate to the needs of the whole community. However, it should be noted that the centre's Management Committee, chaired by a RLETRA member, is already performing this function. This recommendation is likely to duplicate what already exists.

Recommendation 8: That capacity building needs to be carried out with RLETRA to enable them to operate as an effective representative organisation on the multi-agency forum.

Home Group would determine any specific action on this recommendation, but the Council will continue to work with the management committee to ensure its plans are appropriate to the needs of the whole community.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications with this report.

Performance Issues

Current performance measured against Culture Block key performance indicators on which this report impacts are noted in the table below. Key indicators in the evolving 2008 Local Area Agreement are NI8 Adult Participation in Sport and NI11 Engagement in the Arts. However, this report does not significantly impact performance on any particular indicator.

CPA ref.	Description of Performance Indicator	PI Reference	CPA 2005	CPA 2006	CPA 2007	Lower threshold 2008	Upper threshold 2008	Harrow's data Q1 2007/08	Harrow's data Q2 2007/08	Harrow's data Q3 2007/08
C19	% pop within 20 mins travel time of a range of 3 diff sports facility types - one with QA standard	N/A	N/A	Lower	Lower Threshold	30%	50%	Annual	Annual	Annual
C16	% of 5 - 16 yr olds in school sports partnerships engaged in 2 hrs a week min on high quality PE & school sport within & beyond the curriculum	N/A	N/A	Lower	between thresholds	Below 80% of pupils inschool sportpartnerships	85% of pupils in schoolsports partnerships	Annual	Annual	Annual
C17 ADJ DEP	% adults participating in at least 30 mins moderate intensity sport & active recreation on 3 or more days a week	N/A	N/A	Lower	Lower Threshold	Below 24%	27%	Annual	Annual	Annual
C18 ADJ DEP	% of pop volunteering in sport & active recreation for at least 1 hr per wk	N/A	N/A	Middle	between thresholds	Below 5%	6.50%	Annual	Annual	Annual
C5	Resident satisfaction sport/ leisure facilities	BVPI 119a	Lower	Middle	between thresholds	49%	60%	Annual	Annual	Annual
C7	Resident satisfaction museums / galleries	BVPI 119c	Middle	Lower	Lower Threshold	31%	50%	Annual	Annual	Annual
C8	Resident satisfaction theatres / concert halls	BVPI 119d	Lower	Lower	Lower Threshold	36%	56%	Annual	Annual	Annual

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Jennifer Hydari



on behalf of the*
Chief Financial Officer

Date: May 8th, 2008

Name: Helen White



on behalf of the*
Monitoring Officer

Date: 8 May 2008

Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name Tom Whiting



Divisional Director
(Strategy and
Improvement)

Date: May 7th, 2008

Section 5 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Lesley McConnell, x 8062
Head of Cultural Services (Interim)
lesley.mcconnell@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers: None