

REPORT FOR: Grants Advisory Panel

Date of Meeting:	3 March 2010
Subject:	Grant Funding 2010/11
Key Decision:	Yes
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills – Corporate Director Community and Environment
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Jean Lammiman, Portfolio Holder Community and Cultural Services
Exempt:	<p>No, except for the background papers which are exempt by virtue of paragraph 1, Part1 of Schedule 12 A of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that they contain information relating to individuals.</p> <p><i>[Due to the size of the background papers, they have only been circulated to the Group Offices and the Members' Library for inspection purposes. The background papers have also been published with the agenda. A copy can be made available on request.]</i></p>
Enclosures:	<p>Appendix 1: Funding Priorities</p> <p>Appendix 1a: Small grant recommendations</p> <p>Appendix 1b: Medium grant recommendations</p> <p>Appendix 1c: Large grant recommendations</p> <p>Appendix 2: Funding proposal for the Equalities Body</p> <p>Appendix 3: Funding proposal for Harrow Weald Common</p> <p>Appendix 4: Summaries of grant applications with recommendations</p>

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

1.1 This report sets out the process undertaken to determine the grant allocations for 2010/11. It also sets out proposals for the funding of the Council's commitments to establish a new Equalities Body and maintain Harrow Weald Common.

1.2 Recommendations:

The Grants Advisory Panel (GAP) is requested to agree and recommend to Cabinet:

- Grant awards for 2010/11, subject to applicants submitting the required supporting documents by the agreed deadline, as set out in appendix 1. (Paragraph 2.2.1)
- That authority is delegated to the Corporate Director for Community and Environment to withdraw grant awards from successful applicants that fail to provide the Council with supporting documentation by the published deadline. (Paragraph 2.2.2)
- That unallocated funds are re-distributed to organisations on the reserve list based on score achieved during the assessment process
- That £58,000 is ring-fenced in the grants budget to enable the Council to meet its commitment to establish a new Equalities Body for 2010/11
- That £18,000 is transferred to the Council's Public Realm department to maintain Harrow Weald Common on behalf of Harrow Weald Common Conservators through a service level agreement.
- The approval of a grant of £15,000 to the Harrow Heritage Trust out of the Council's Capital Programme for 2010/11.

1.3 Corporate Priorities

The distribution of grants enables the voluntary and community sector to support the Council in meeting the following corporate priorities:

- Improve support for vulnerable people

Many of the organisations recommended for funding will deliver services to the vulnerable people, such as older people, people with physical, mental or terminal illnesses, children who are at risk of exclusion, etc.

- Build stronger communities

Many of the organisations recommended for funding will deliver services that enhance community cohesion.

Section 2 – Report

2.1 Background

119 grant applications were received by the deadline of 30th October 2009, which is approximately two times the number of applications received last year. The grant budget for 2010/11 is £784,360 and the total value of the grants requested is £2,031,799.

2.2 Main options

Grant awards for 2010/11

- 2.2.1 It is recommended that the applicants set out in appendix 1 be awarded a grant for 2010/11, subject to the receipt of the relevant supporting documentation by the deadline of the 29th March 2010. It was agreed by the Leader of the Council, acting on behalf of the Cabinet in a special meeting held on the 30 July 2009, that supporting documents be submitted after the grant is agreed.
- 2.2.2 Therefore it is requested that Corporate Director for Community and Environment is given delegated authority to withdraw grants from successful applicants that fail to submit the required documents by the published deadline. This would enable officers to implement this action in a speedy and efficient manner.
- 2.2.3 The total value of applications that have met the criteria for funding is in excess of the grants budget, and therefore it is recommended that medium and large grant applicants with the lowest scores be added to the reserve list, as set out in appendix 1. If grants are withdrawn from those that fail to submit the required documents by the agreed deadline or if members do not accept the officers' recommendation, it is suggested that any unallocated funds be re- distributed to those organisations on the reserve list based on score achieved during the assessment process, thus negating the need for another process.
- 2.2.4 Appendix 4 provides detailed grant reports on every eligible application. This includes a brief description of the organisation and what funding is requested for, along with the officers' recommendation for grant. It also sets out the results of the assessment process and other information for consideration. The assessment process that was undertaken during this grants round is described below.
- 2.2.5 Types of grants recommended
Small, medium and large sized grants were introduced for this grants round. In 2009/10, 2%, 25% and 73% of the grants budget was allocated to small, medium and large size grants respectively. On the 24 November 2009, the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services accepted Overview and Scrutiny challenge panel's recommendation (22 June) to 'work towards' allocating 5% of the overall grants budget to small sized grants. If the recommendations in this report are accepted, the budget will be allocated as follows (this excludes the allocations to Harrow Weal Common and the Equalities Body):

- 5% for small-sized grants
- 26% for medium-sized grants
- 69% for large sized grants

2.2.6 Funding Priorities

It was agreed by the Leader of the Council, acting on behalf of Cabinet, in a special meeting on 30 July 2009 that LAA national indicators (2008 – 2011) should be matched against the themes of the Sustainable Community Strategy and adopted as the funding priorities for grants round 2010/11. For the purpose of the application process, the terms 'funding priority' and 'expected outcomes' have been used. If the recommendations set out in this report is accepted the budget will be distributed against the 'funding priorities' and 'expected outcomes' as set out in Appendix 1. Although some priorities have not been selected, this does not mean that they are not being addressed as applicants were asked to select the **primary** 'funding priority' that their project would address. However, it does highlight that the 'Health, Wellbeing and Independence' funding priority was the most popular choice, with 42% of those recommended for funding selecting this as their primary outcome.

2.2.7 Existing versus new applicants

Historically grants have been allocated to the same organisations and therefore the voluntary and community sector requested that this should be addressed in this grants round. The grants team responded to this request by publishing the availability of grants more extensively through the Council's website and a leaflet and poster campaign and presented two information sessions that were well supported by approximately 100 people from the voluntary and community sector. This has resulted in double the amount of applications, with approximately half from organisations that were not funded in 2009/10. Furthermore, approximately 30% of the applicants that are recommended for funding for 2010/11 were not funded in 2009/10.

2.3 **Grant Assessment Process**

2.3.1 The first stage of the assessment process, which took place during the first 2 weeks in November, checked that each applicant was eligible for funding and that their proposed activities could be supported by Harrow main grants programme. The following organisations did not pass the first stage of the assessment process and therefore were not considered during the second stage of the process:

- Harrow Weald Tenants and Residents Association requested a small and medium-sized grant for a capital project, which can not be supported by grants
- Youth United also requested funding for a capital project
- Canons High School and Westminster University are not eligible organisations, as they are statutory organisation and this grant is for voluntary and community organisations
- Home Group Ltd requested £20,000 for a youth project, but is not eligible for funding because they are not a registered charity and have an annual turnover in excess of £230 million.

2.3.2 Second stage of the assessment process

Over a six-week period, during November and December 2009, 114 applications were assessed and scored, using the assessment tool that was approved by Cabinet in July 2009. Applicants were asked to answer a different number of questions to reflect the size of grant requested. Each question response has been scored and weighted as follows:

- Yes = 2 scores
- Partial = 1 score
- No = 0 score

2.3.2.1 Appendix 1 ranks applicants by scores achieved and positions them either below or above the threshold, as described below. Those listed above the threshold were subjected to further tests, as described in the third stage of the assessment process:

- Small grant applicants with a score of 7 out of 14 and above (more than 50% of the overall score)
- Medium grant applicants with a score of 9 out of 16 and above (more than 60% of the overall score)
- Large grants applicants with a score of 11 out of 18 and above (more than 65% of the overall score)

2.3.3 Third Stage of the Assessment Process

2.3.3.1 Applicants that successfully passed the first and second stage of the assessment process were subjected to the following test, and appendix 1 set out the results of this stage of the process. The following criteria were used to determine which applications would finally be considered for funding. Even if the applicant had scored above the threshold, if they did not pass the test described below they have not been recommended for funding.

- If they scored '0' on the following essential assessment questions:
 - "Has the applicant demonstrated the need for this service and how it will be met?"
 - "Does the applicant demonstrate how it will address the funding priorities and expected outcome?"
- If the service is delivered outside the borough and it is not clear how Harrow's community will access or benefit from the service
- If the budget breakdown does not match the activities outlined in the application
- If the organisation received a grant during 2008/09, but did not submit outstanding monitoring information or evidence by the deadline, as agreed by GAP on 19 November 2009

2.3.4 Other considerations

Although the following organisations met the criteria of the assessment process they have not been recommended for funding for other reasons (See individual grant summary report in appendix 4 for details):

- **Middlesex Tamil Academy** - currently receive a subsidy on the hire of school facilities for the same venue that they requested funding for. Once the venue hire costs and capital items (i.e. costumes) were deducted and the principle for funding supplementary school, was applied and the amount remaining was reduced by 70% to reflect their score, as set out in paragraph 3.2.5, the sum was less than the minimum grant available of £500.
- **Aspire** – requested funding for a three-year project, but this funding is only awarded for one year.
- **Harrow Healthy Living Centre** – requested funding for a partnership project, which would duplicate another applicant, which has been recommended for funding, that will deliver a similar well-established project in the same area with a similar target group.
- **Harrow Mencap/ Middlesex Association for the Blind and Age Concern partnership** - requested funding to launch a new capacity building project for the voluntary sector but as this would duplicate another application, which has been recommended for funding, that already has an established track record of delivering a similar service to the same group.
- **Prince's Trust** – plan to contract a provider, who has not yet been identified, to deliver this service on their behalf.

2.3.5 Establishing a funding recommendation

2.3.5.1 As the demand for grants is in excess of the funds available, the challenge is to encourage innovation from new applicants and new emerging organisations and at the same time support the sustainability of established organisations. In order to meet this challenge the proposed recommendations are to be awarded as a contribution to the grant request of the remaining applicants. Therefore, final grant recommendations set out in appendices 1 and 4 are based on the following principles.

The grant criteria stipulates that only revenue costs can be met and therefore all applications for capital have been rejected or these items have been deducted from the grant requested.

The following deductions have been made from each grant request if it includes:

- The cost of capital items
- Where it is not clear if capital costs that are included in a list of items, only 50% of the overall cost of these items will be met
- Insurance and accountancy costs, registration, professional fees

Similar Activities

As a significant number of supplementary schools and youth groups receive a subsidy of 50% for the hire of school facilities, in order to ensure a consistent approach and to recognise that some are already in receipt of financial support the following principle has been applied to these types of activities:

- 50% of venue hire cost will be met

- If they are in receipt of a subsidy for the hire of the same venue and are requesting funding to cover these costs, this has been deducted from the final grant
- 50% of volunteers or tutor costs will be met
- Stationery and postage costs will be met

Elderly social clubs

In order to ensure a consistent approach to funding social clubs for the elderly, grant requests have been reduced by 50% (as venue hire is significant proportion of their budget).

2.3.5.2 Once the above amounts have been deducted, grant requests have been reduced, as follows, to reflect the quality of the application:

Small grant applicants – Their grant requests have been subject to smaller reductions as only small amounts have been requested, therefore those that scored:

- 13 and 14 out of 14 are recommended 90% of their grant request
- 10 – 12 out of 14 are recommended 80% of their grant request
- 8 and 9 are recommended 70% of their grant request.

Medium grant applicants:

- That scored 15 and 16 out of 16 are recommended 80% of their grant request
- That scored 12, 13 and 14 out of 16 are recommended 70% of their grant request
- That scored 9, 10 and 11 out of 16 are recommended 60% of their grant request.

Large grant applicants:

- That scored 17 and 18 out of 18 are recommended 80% of their grant request
- That scored 14, 15 and 16 out of 18 are recommended 70% of their grant request
- That scored 11, 12 and 13 out of 18 are recommended 60% of their grant request.

2.4 Existing commitments

2.4.1 There are two funding commitments to be met from the grants budget; these are for the development of a new Equalities Body and Harrow Weald Common and therefore it is proposed that:

- £58,000 is ring-fenced in the grants budget to meet the Council's commitment to the establishment of a new Equalities Body for 2010/11. (See appendix 2 for the detailed proposal)
- £18,000 is permanently transferred to the Council's Public Realm department to maintain Harrow Weald Common on behalf of Harrow Weald Common Conservators. (See appendix 3 for the detailed proposal)

2.5 Implications of the Recommendation

2.5.1 Financial Implications

The total grants budget for 2010/11 is **£784,360**. However if the recommendation to fund the Equalities Body (£58,000) and the maintenance of Harrow Weald Common (£18,000), as set out in appendices 2 and 3, were agreed, then the remaining budget would be **£708,360**.

Although the total value of successful applicants is in excess of the grants budget, if the recommendation to set up a reserve list, as set out in paragraph 3.1.2, is agreed this will enable the Council to remain in budget. See appendix 1 and 4 for details.

If the recommendation to distribute unallocated funds to organisations on the reserve list were agreed, as set out in paragraph 3.1.3, this would reduce the risk of an under-spend. Therefore the total value of grant recommendations set in appendix 1 is **£706,525** leaving a balance of **£1,835** and there are currently two organisations on the reserve list with a total value of **£21,636**.

2.5.2 Considerations

2.5.2.1 Resources, costs and risks

There are no resources, costs and risks associated with these recommendations.

2.5.2.2 Staffing/workforce

There are no staffing or workforce implications for the Council associated with these recommendations.

2.5.2.3 Equalities impact

The grant recommendations contained in this report support a number of voluntary sector organisations in Harrow that work to address inequalities and disadvantage and to promote equality of opportunity. The proposed grant recommendations will assist organisations serving black and minority ethnic communities, young people, women, people with disabilities, the elderly and carers. The proposal to fund the development of a new equalities organisation for the borough will assist all groups and the council in meeting their statutory obligations regarding equalities.

2.5.2.4 Legal comments

The Council may distribute grants in accordance with its agreed criteria. Agreed policies should only be departed in exceptional circumstances. Due weight must be given in terms of equalities duties, procedural fairness and the statement of intention of the Compact with the voluntary and community sector. Should the Council distribute funds not in accordance with these principles, then it will be at risk of legal challenge by way of judicial review.

2.5.2.5 Community safety

Some of the organisations recommended for funding contribute to community safety through the provision of community safety activities

such as diversionary activities for young people, third party reporting sites and support for victims of crime.

2.5.2.6 Risk Management Implications

The potential risk associated with this decision is that organisations approved for funding may not deliver services as described in their grant applications. This risk is partially mitigated through a process of annual grant monitoring that also aims to support groups to improve their capacity to deliver.

Risk included on Directorate risk register? No

Separate risk register in place? No

3. Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 16 February 2010		
Name: George Curran	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: 15 February 2010		

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Audrey Salmon, Interim Service Manager, Community Resources and Projects

Background Papers

- Appendix 1a: Small grant recommendations for 2010/11
- Appendix 1b: Medium grant recommendations for 2010/11
- Appendix 1c: Large grant recommendations for 2010/11
- Appendix 2: Funding proposal for the Equalities Body
- Appendix 3: Funding proposal for Harrow Weald Common
- Appendix 4: Summaries of grant applicants with recommendations

If appropriate, does the report include the following considerations?

1.	Consultation	YES
2.	Corporate Priorities	YES