



PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION MEETING

THURSDAY 30 JULY 2009

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

AGENDA - PART I

- KEY 7. **Changes to Grants Programme for 2010/11:** (Pages 1 - 92)
Report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment.

[Note: The above report replaces items 7/8/9 – Review of Grant Criteria and Results of Grants Consultation/Funding Arrangements for 2009-10 and 2010-11/Review of the Grants Application process – listed on the previously circulated agenda.]

AGENDA - PART II - NIL

Note: In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda item has been admitted late to the agenda by virtue of the special circumstances and urgency detailed below:-

Agenda item

Special Circumstances/Grounds for
Urgency

7 – Changes to Grants
Programme for 2010/11

Due to the need to consult, the report was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated. The Leader is being asked to consider the report, as a matter of urgency, to allow the decisions to be implemented at the earliest opportunity.



Meeting:	Leader
Date:	30 th July 2009
Subject:	Changes to Grants Programme for 2010/11
Key Decision:	Yes
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills – Corporate Director (Community and Environment)
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Chris Mote, Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Appendix 1: Grant advisory Panel (GAP) recommendations Appendix 2: Summary of Officer's recommendations presented to GAP on 5 th July 09 Appendix 3: GAP reports

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out the recommendations for the Grants programme 2010/11 that were agreed at the Grant Advisory Panel meeting on 5 July 2009.

Recommendations:

The Leader is requested to approve the recommendations as set out in Appendix 2.

Reason: (For recommendation)

- 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

Section 2 – Report

2.1 Introductory paragraph

2.1.1 The approval of these recommendations will contribute to the delivery of the following priorities:

- **Build stronger communities**
Greater clarity and transparency of the grants criteria and process has the potential to strengthen the Voluntary and Community Sector's relationship with the Council
- **Local Area Agreement Priorities**
The alignment of the grants funding priorities to those of the Local Area Agreement will ensure that the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) deliver services that contribute to the achievement of partnership agreed targets.

2.2 Options considered

2.2.1 The Grant Advisory Panel (GAP) met on 2 July 2009 to consider the officer's recommendations.

2.3 Current Situation

2.3.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Review: 'Delivering a strengthened community and voluntary sector for Harrow' interim report (8th July 2008 and 9th December 2008) recommends:

"For the Grants Advisory Panel to engage with the VCS to consider the criteria for 2010/11 grants round and take account of the concerns raised through this scrutiny review about the current system." (Recommendation 15)

2.3.2 The VCS were consulted on the proposed changes to the grants programme during a 6-week period, which closed on 5 June 2009. The proposed changes were presented to GAP on the 8th June 2009 and the Scrutiny Challenge Panel on 22nd June for consideration. The findings from the consultation with the VCS and GAP, set out in appendix 3, were discussed on 9th July.

2.3.3 GAP agreed the recommendations set out in Appendix 1.

2.4 Why a change is needed

2.4.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Review reported that there was a lack of confidence and trust in the current grant arrangements; and the following concerns were therefore expressed:

- Lack of clarity about what the process is actually for
- Lack of priorities in awarding grants
- Concerns about the transparency of the process
- Concerns about the appropriateness of criteria
- The application process

2.4.2 Appendix 2 sets out the officer's original recommendations and highlight where they agree or disagree with GAP's. Some of the officers' recommendations were revised by GAP to clarify or improve the original

proposal. However, there are concerns that some of GAP's recommendations do not reflect the outcome of the grants consultation with the voluntary and community sector, which may lead to criticism from the sector and greater mistrust.

2.5 Implications of the Recommendation

2.5.1 Staffing/workforce

If all of the officer's recommendations were to be approved this would improve clarity and transparency during the next grants round. If the officer's proposed timescale were to be approved, this would enable the grants team to assess grant applicants and write robust summary reports in a timely and efficient manner.

However if GAP's recommendations were to be approved this would mean that Overview and Scrutiny's recommendations and the findings from the grants consultation would be ignored; and the lack of clarity and transparency that exists would remain. It would also mean that the grants team would not have sufficient time to receive, clarify and assess grant applications during the assessment process.

This will be noted by the VCS and will lead to greater mis-trust of the grants process.

2.5.2 Equalities impact

An Equality Impact Assessment has revealed that the recommendations set out in this report will not have an adverse effect on any one section of the community. Although, it is acknowledged that a couple of current grant recipients would be affected by the proposed different sized grants and funding priorities, all current applicants will need to re-apply for financial support for 2010/11, stating the size of grant they require and demonstrate how they meet the new funding priorities during the next funding grants round.

2.5.3 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.

2.5.4 Financial Implications

Implication of allocating unspent funds for 2009/10 and 2010/11

If these recommendations were approved, this would ensure that the entire budget is allocated within the financial year and therefore reduce the risk of under spent funds.

Implications of clarifying arrangements for supporting sports activities

If these recommendations were approved, this would ensure that council funds are used appropriately and therefore reduce the risk of losing money. The grants team will be taking action to retrieve any unspent funds from Harrow Sports Council.

Implication of agreeing funding priorities for grants round 2010/11

If this recommendation was approved it would ensure that grants will be awarded to activities that meet the Harrow Strategic Partnership priorities.

Implication of agreeing to bring forward the approval of grant to January in the next grants round

If this recommendation were approved, this would mean that grants for 2010/11 could only be agreed in-principle subject to budget approval in February. Under the current process, grants are not agreed until March and payments are delayed until after agreements are signed, therefore grants are not released until May. This decision would enable the council to sign off grant agreements and process payments for the beginning of the financial year thus enabling grant recipients to deliver services as soon as possible.

2.5.5 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 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 recommendations in this report have the potential to contribute to improving performance against this indicator by:

- Encouraging innovation within the sector
- Clarifying the eligibility criteria
- Improving the application process so that it is clear, transparent and easier to access
- Improving the speed and effectiveness of the grant decision-making process

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%.

2.5.5 Risk Management Implications

Risk included on Directorate risk register? No

Separate risk register in place? No

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: ...Jennifer Hydari	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: ...21 July 2009		
Name: <u>Linda Cohen</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 23 July 2009		

Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name: Alex Dewsnap	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Divisional Director Partnership Development and Performance
Date: ...17 July 2009		

Section 6 - Contact Details and Background Papers

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

Background Papers:

Appendix 1: Grant advisory Panel (GAP) recommendations

Appendix 2: Summary of Officer's recommendations presented to GAP on 5th July 09

Appendix 3: GAP reports

This page is intentionally left blank

Chairman:	* Councillor Chris Mote	
Councillors:	* Ms Nana Asante * Don Billson * G Chowdhury * Ashok Kulkarni * Mrs Myra Michael	* Joyce Nickolay * Asad Omar * Mrs Rekha Shah * Mrs Sasi Suresh
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].

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 2

Summary of Officer's Recommendations

The Leader is requested to consider and approve the following recommendations:

1. Arrangements for the allocation of unspent funds for 2009/10 (4.1.2, pg 28)

GAP agreed to support the officer's recommendation to top up the grants of current grant recipients who received less than the amount recommended by officers in the recent grants round, but had however demonstrated the need for an increase.

Therefore it is requested that this recommendation is approved for 2009/10 only.

2 Arrangements for the allocation of unspent funds from 2010 onwards (para 4.1.3.1, pg 28)

GAP agreed to support the officer's recommendation to establish a reserve list of successful applicants so that unspent funds can be allocated within the financial year. When funds become available during the year, the panel can consider increasing the grants of those on the reserve list to the level originally recommended by officers.

Therefore it is requested that this recommendation is approved.

3 Funding Sports Activities (para 4.3.2, pg 29)

GAP agreed to support the officer's recommendation, as Harrow Sports Council's management committee has failed to meet their targets and have continued to under spend their allocation of £27,540 for the last few years, it is recommended that:

- HSC's SLA is not extended when it expires in March 2010
- £27,540 remains in the grants budget and is made available to sports organisations as part of the overall grants programme
- The wording: "the Council will not support organisations seeking match funding" be removed from the guidance document and sports organisations are invited to apply directly to the grants programme for funding.

Therefore it is requested that this recommendation is approved.

4 The eligibility criteria

Officers recommended that the new criteria should 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 in Harrow" (paragraph 2.4.1.2, pg 5)

GAP's recommendation to revise the criteria, reads as follows:

“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”

Therefore it is requested that the above statement is approved as the grants criteria for 2010/11.

5. The availability of different size grants

GAP agreed with the officer's recommendation to make three different sized-grants available (**paragraph 2.4.2.3, pg 6**). However GAP agreed to increase the upper limit of the large-sized grant, seen below, from £100,000 to £110,000.

Officer's recommendation:

Small Grants – value - £500 - £2000

Medium Grants – value - £2001 - £10,000

Large Grants – value - £10,001 - £100,000

Leader is requested to consider the following options:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommendation, so that the large-sized grant remain between £10,001 and £100,000 as set out in the grants consultation.**
2. To consider GAP's recommendation to increase the upper limit of the large-sized grant from £100,000 to £110,000.

This option is being recommended by GAP, to accommodate one organisation (who currently receives £104,349) whose service level agreement expires in March 2010. All current grant recipients, including those with service level agreements (SLAS) will be required to re-apply during the next grants round for financial support. As all applications will be judged on their merit and not on historical factors or officer or member bias, there is no guarantee that any of the current grant recipients will receive funding in 2010/11. Although an equality impact assessment revealed that only one current grant recipient would be affected by this proposal, the recent consultation with the VCS demonstrated support for the proposal to have clearly defined sizes of grants that could be applied for, as this would help to manage expectations. If the large-sized grant were increased to accommodate one organisation, this would go against the consultation feedback from the voluntary and community sector and suggests that the current status quo is being retained.

The officer's recommendation is in response to concerns raised through the Overview and Scrutiny Review on 'Delivery a strengthened community and voluntary sector for Harrow' (November 2008); and based on the grants consultation findings. It aims to ensure greater transparency and address the lack of trust, which exists within the VCS towards the grants process.

Therefore it is requested that option 1 is approved, so that the upper-limit of the large-sized grant remains at £100,000 as set out in the grants consultation.

6. Dividing the grants budget

GAP agreed to support the officer's recommendation to reject the proposal to proportion the grants budget to the different sized grants. It is recommended that GAP take a more flexible approach and monitor the allocation of funds each year to ensure that the budget is not disproportionately allocated to a particular sized grant and to ensure that there is a shift towards allocating more medium-sized grants. **(paragraph 2.4.2.3, pg 6)**

Therefore it is requested that this recommendation is approved for the next grants round.

7. The Funding Priorities (para 4.2.4, pg 29)

GAP agreed to support the officer's recommendation to match the LAA national indicators (2008 – 2011) against the themes of the Sustainable Community Strategy and agree these as funding priorities for the next grants round.

Therefore it is requested that this recommendation is approved for the next grants round.

8. The Conditions of Grant Approval

GAP agreed to support the officer's recommendation that supporting documents should only be requested from successful applicants once the grant has been agreed. **(Para 2.4.4.3, pg 7)**

Therefore it is requested that this recommendation is approved for the next grants round.

9. The Revision of the Grants Application Process

GAP agreed with the officer's recommendation to adopt the revised application form for the next grants round and suggested amendments for consideration.

Therefore it is requested that the revised application form be approved for the next grants round. (paragraph 2.4.3.2, pg 47)

10. The timescale for grants round 2010/11 (paragraph 2.4.4.2, pg 47)

GAP agreed to support the officer's recommendation to shorten the application timescale, from 9 months to 5months, as seen below.

Proposed grants programme timescale:

Mid August	Grants application round launched
Mid October	Grants application round closing date
Mid October – End of November	Applications assessed and draft report completed
Early to mid December	Copy of draft report sent out to applicants for comments
Early January	Report deadline and GAP meeting to consider applications

However, GAP did not agree that officers should send a copy of the draft grants report to applicants for comments before it is presented to the Panel and reminded officers that it was agreed at the GAP meeting on 19 January 2009 and subsequent meetings, that the panel 'unanimously requested that no applicant should be written to in advance of the relevant Panel meeting and that all applicants should be recorded in the report'. It was agreed that this condition should be enforced during the next grants round and it was also requested that officers should present the first draft of the grants report at the November GAP meeting, so that members would be given an opportunity to comment on the report before the recommendations are published.

The Leader is requested to consider the following options:

Option 1:

To approve the timescale as recommended by officers, to enable officers to clarify information with applicants and assess grant applications without member involvement prior to the formal grants meeting (proposed for January) where grants would normally be considered and agreed. Once information has been clarified with the applicant and the necessary checks undertaken, applications are assessed and a report containing a summary of all the applications, along with grant recommendations are presented to the Panel. These grant

reports provide an objective assessment and representation of the proposed project. Officers routinely contact grant applicants throughout the assessment process to clarify and gather additional information. This is an important part of a fair and transparent process.

Option 2

The Leader is also requested to consider GAP's recommendation, which would mean that officers would not be allowed to contact applicants as requested by GAP:

“no applicant should be written to in advance of the relevant Panel meeting.”

If GAP's recommendation were to be approved there are concerns that:

- Member bias would be introduced into the process, that should be transparent and fair
- Officers may be pressured by members to amend the grant application reports
- The VCS's lack of trust in the grants programme will remain
- The assessment process will continue to be viewed as non-transparent
- There will be unfair treatment of new applicants, who are not known to members
- Officer's will not be able to fulfill their role effectively
- New and emerging groups, particularly those from black and ethnic minority communities would be adversely affected by this recommendation. As these groups are not always familiar with grant application processes and may need support to express their proposed project, it is right and proper that officers contact applicants to clarify details in their form to ensure that the officer's report is a fair representation of the proposed project.

The Panel has also requested that officers present the first draft of the grants report to GAP on 19th November 2009. With the grants application process closing at the end of October, officers would not have time to produce a report by the 6th November. It will not be possible for officers to prepare reports from potentially 100 applications within 5 working days. There would be no opportunity for officers to assess and clarify information received from applications and produce robust summary reports.

It is requested that the officer's proposed timescale is approved for the next grants round. This would ensure that there is sufficient time for officers to receive, clarify and assess grant applications without member involvement during the assessment process.

Meeting:	Grants Advisory Panel
Date:	2 July 2009
Subject:	Review of grant criteria and results of the grants consultation
Key Decision: (Executive side only)	Yes
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills – Corporate Director (Community & Environment)
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Chris Mote, Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Appendix 1 – Grants Programme – Proposal for change 2010 -11 Appendix 2 – Grants Programme – Proposal for Change Consultation 2010 – 2011 Appendix 3 – A breakdown of the grants budget 2009/10

SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report sets out proposed funding arrangements for 2009/10 and 2010/11.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Grants Advisory Panel to agree to make the following recommendations to the Leader of the Council for approval:

1. Changes to the eligibility criteria. – Please see paragraph 2.4.1.3.
2. The availability of different types of grants. Please see paragraph 2.4.2.3.
3. That the grants budget should be divided and a percentage allocated to different size grants. Please see paragraph 2.4.1.3
4. That any supporting documents can be submitted after a grant has been agreed. Please see paragraph 2.4.4.3.

REASON:

1. To clarify the grant eligibility criteria.
2. To provide clarity of information to applicants on how much funding is available.

SECTION 2 - REPORT

2.1 Introductory Paragraph

This report sets out the findings from the Grants Consultation with the voluntary and community sector and feedback from the GAP meeting on 8th June 2009 and makes recommendations based on this feedback, for consideration.

2.2 Brief Background

2.2.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Review in the interim report on 8th July 2008 and 9th December 2008, recommended that the Grants Advisory Panel consult with the Voluntary and Community Sector, to address the concerns raised by the sector, in preparation for the grants round 2010/11.

2.2.2.1 The voluntary and community sector (VCS) were consulted on the proposed changes to the grants programme during a 6-week period, which closed on 5 June 2009. During the same period a discussion paper was presented to the Grant Advisory Panel (GAP) on 8th June 2009, outlining the proposed changes for consideration.

2.2.2.1 Suggested changes to the Grants Programme:

See appendix 1 for Grants Programme – Proposal for change 2010.

- Change 1 – considers options for the statement regarding eligibility criteria for grant aid. (See pages 1 and 2 of Appendix 2 for details).
- Change 2 – considers the size of grants available and whether the grants budget should be divided and a percentage allocated to the different size grants. (See pages 2 and 3 of Appendix 2 for details.)
- Change 3 – considers whether funding priorities should be restricted to a few selected themes each year that reflect Harrow Strategic partnership priorities. (See page 4 of Appendix 2 for details.)
- Change 4 – considers at what stage applicants should be asked to submit supporting documents and whether the amount of supporting documents requested should reflect the amount awarded. (See pages 4 and 5 of Appendix 2 for details).

2.3 Current Situation

2.3.1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Review found that there was a lack of confidence and trust in the current grant arrangements; and the following concerns were expressed:

- (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) The application process
- (g) The need to strengthen monitoring arrangements

It is recommended that the proposed changes address improvements to concerns (a), (b), (c) and (d), in the interim. Proposals to address items (e), (f) and (g) will be presented at the Grants Advisory Panel meeting on 2nd July 2009.

2.3.1 Proposed Changes:

2.3.1.2 **The current grant eligibility criteria** states:

“The applicant must be a voluntary group based in Harrow with 80% of its beneficiaries either living or working in Harrow”.

This condition requires organisations to demonstrate that they are both based in Harrow, and deliver services to 80% of beneficiaries living or working in the borough.

This statement is open to interpretation, therefore it is suggested that the grant qualifying condition be stated more clearly by splitting it into the following two statements:

(1) “Grant aid will be available to support voluntary and community organisations to deliver services, where this resource is used solely for the benefit of people living in Harrow”

The second part could read as follows either:

“The service provider can be based outside of Harrow but must deliver services in the borough”

or

“the organisation must be based in Harrow”

2.3.1.2.1 **Size of grants:** Each year the council agrees a grants budget for allocation to the voluntary and community sector. Last year, the total grants budget was £769,310 of which £550,987 (72%) was committed to extending the current SLAs for one year and £218,323 (28%) was available for ‘one-off’ projects for the year. Prospective applicants are not informed of the size of the grants budget available or the minimum and maximum grant sizes available. Therefore a number of organisations unwittingly make unreasonable requests for excessive amounts of funding; and are rejected on the basis that the grants budget has insufficient funds to meet these demands. The Overview and Scrutiny also identified this as an issue by stating that:

“...the majority of the grants budget is not actually ‘up for grabs’ each year as it has been committed to SLAs”.

It is suggested that three sizes of grants are made available:

- Small grants – value - £500 - £2000
- Medium grants – value - £2001 - £10,000
- Large grants – value - £10,001 - £100,000

The breakdown of the grants budget presented in Appendix 3 shows that this year’s funding was allocated in the following way:

- Small-sized grant – 2%
- Medium-sized grant – 25%
- Large-sized grant – 73%

This would ensure that applicants are aware of the minimum and maximum grant aid available for each award.

As agreed in 2004, grants with a value of over £10,001 will continue to be issued as SLAs.

To improve transparency, it is also suggested that a percentage of the total grants budget is allocated to the different grant sizes. (See appendix 2 for options.)

2.3.1.3 Funding priorities: Grant aid enables the council and the voluntary and community sector to work in partnership to provide services that contribute to the delivery of Harrow's corporate priorities and address the needs of its diverse community. Since 2004, applicants have been asked to demonstrate how their proposed project addresses funding priorities outlined in the Sustainable Community strategy. The Scrutiny review found that these priorities were considered to be too high level and too broad to properly inform the grants decision-making process and stressed the need for clearer objectives.

The Review also found that the sector believed, that in practice, these priorities had very little influence on the final funding decisions, as historical factors tended to override current priorities, thus restricting applications from new and emerging groups. Evidence from the 2009/10 grants round showed that 10 out of the 15 new applicants were not awarded funding.

It is suggested that the Panel agrees a limited number of funding priorities in advance of the next grants round that are in line with corporate and partnership priorities. See page 3 of appendix 1 for priorities, for consideration.

This approach is similar to other boroughs, for example: Brent Council targets their grants budget on one of the themes from their corporate strategy in a 3-year funding cycle; and during the 2009-12 funding round, the children and young people theme was the focus of the main grants programme.

2.3.1.4 Conditions for approval of grant: Currently applicants are required to provide supporting documents to demonstrate that they have the required structures and policies in place at the point of application. This forms the first stage of the assessment and applications will not be considered for funding if any of these documents are not submitted. The checking of documents is an administrative burden at the point of assessment of applications taking up valuable time that could be spent assessing applications against funding priorities. This requirement also presents challenges to new, emerging organisations who may not have all the required policies in place, and maybe applying for relatively small amounts of grant. It is therefore suggested that applicants be asked to provide this evidence, **only after** the grant has been agreed by Cabinet.

Currently, all applicants are required to submit the same number of supporting documents regardless of the level of funding requested. For example, an applicant requesting £500 would be expected to provide the same amount of information as someone applying for £10,000. It is therefore suggested that the amount of supporting documents required be proportionate to the amount of grant aid requested. (See page 4 of appendix 1 for details of the supporting documents required for each suggested type of grant.)

2.4 Why a change is needed

Findings from the Grants Consultation:

Of the 51 responses received – 75% have previously received funding through the grants programme.

2.4.1 Proposed Change 1: Who will be eligible for Grant Aid?

2.4.1.1 Findings from the Grants Consultation:

61% agreed that the ‘grants qualifying conditions’ should be replaced with the following:

“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”

However, when asked if recipients should be based ‘in’ or ‘outside’ the borough: 53% of respondents stated that organisations receiving grant ‘must be based in Harrow’, whereas only 41% stated that they could be ‘based outside of Harrow’.

Some of the comments received included:

“Too many external applicants other funding streams for other boroughs, e.g. NEG”

“2% of members are residents outside Harrow. They were registered 3 years back and they continue to be members. They should not be rejected. However, new recruitment could be solely people living in Harrow.”

“... if a service user has not got a service in the borough they live in then we should not victimise that person as it is not their fault.”

“Could be based in another borough and use grant money just for Harrow people - but also delivering the service in the neighbouring borough. Otherwise Harrow residents choice will be denied”

82% of respondents agreed that the proposed changes to the eligibility criteria would “make it easier to understand”.

2.4.1.2 Comments from GAP members

There was a consensus amongst members that a more general and inclusive eligibility criteria should be adopted and it was suggested that the following statement be adopted:

“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 playing) in Harrow”

It was suggested that the second part of the proposed statement should not be adopted as it ruled out organisations that were based outside of Harrow but could provide valuable services to the borough’s residents.

2.4.1.3 Recommendation - It is therefore recommended that the above statement be adopted as the eligibility criteria for grant aid. The panel should consider however, that 53% of respondents wanted to restrict applications to organisations based in

Harrow.

2.4.1.4 **Proposed change 2: Type of grants available**

2.4.2.1 **Findings from the Grants Consultation:**

96% of respondents agreed that it would be 'useful to know the minimum levels of grants available' as it was felt that this would "manage expectations"

80% of respondents agreed that the "grants budget should be divided and a percentage allocated to the different sizes of grants"

However, those that disagreed with this proposal stated that grants should be allocated in a more flexible way, as good projects should be supported regardless of size and that it may be difficult to manage the demand for one pot. It was also suggested that applications should be considered "on their merit and what the organisation can deliver".

When asked to choose an option for dividing the grants budget the following responses were given:

Responses (%)	Options
20%	1: 20% - Small Grants; 30% - Medium Grants; 50% - Large Grants
35%	2: 30% - Small Grants; 50% - Medium Grants; 20% - Large Grants
8%	3: 50% - Small Grants; 20% - Medium Grants; 30% - Large Grants
12%	4: Remain as it is
25%	Did not select an option

The responses to this question were varied and the following concerns were raised:

"... award should be based on the benefits , not some arbitrary split?"

"Priority to where there is proven need and funding is realistic to meet that need - then priority to piloting new areas of work where outcomes significant not sure of benefits of split."

2.4.2.2 **Comments from GAP members**

Although there was consensus amongst members about the principle of offering different sized grants; there was disagreement with regards to dividing the grants budget amongst the different types of pots. Some members were concerned that this would affect currently funded organisations, whereas other welcomed a fresh approach.

2.4.2.3 **Recommendation:** As there is general consensus that the size of grants to be awarded is clarified, it is recommended that applicants are invited to apply for three different sized grants.

As the Grants panel did not select the option for dividing the grants budget; and there were mixed responses and strong opposition to this proposal from some respondents, it is recommended that this proposal be rejected.

As 73% of organisations currently supported through the grants programme receive over £10,000, this proposal would have an adverse affect on those organisations. Therefore it is recommended that the Grants Advisory Panel take a more flexible

approach and observe the allocation of funds during each grants round to ensure that the grants budget is not disproportionately allocated to a particular sized grant.

2.4.3 Proposed change 3: Funding priorities

Please see separate report.

2.4.4 Proposed change 4: Conditions of Grant Approval

2.4.4.1 Findings from the Grants Consultation:

57% of respondents agreed that supporting documents should only be requested once grants have been agreed.

However there was a misunderstanding amongst some respondents who disagreed with this proposal, as they were concerned that these documents would not be requested and that accountability was being reduced, when in fact the proposal is:

“... that applicants would not be required to provide this evidence until after the grant has been agreed.”

The following suggestions were made:

- Supporting documentation should be submitted at the beginning so that "non-starters" could be “weeded out” and “to highlight where the documentation is insufficient to save overall time and effort by the committee”
- “Time could be wasted if a grant is awarded and then an organisation is unable to provide supporting evidence.”

An overwhelming 92% of respondents agreed that ‘amount requested should reflect the amount of funding granted?’

2.4.4.2 Comments from GAP members

The panel agreed that the following amendment should be made so that all organisations receiving under £2,000 should have:

- A constitution/memorandum or article of association/deed of trust

2.4.4.3 **Recommendation:** As there is general consensus regarding this proposal it is recommended that this proposal be adopted.

3. Implications of the Recommendation

3.1 Resources, costs

The aim is to provide improved clarity and transparency in the grants process that will lead to better use of existing resources. For example, by providing information on the size of grants available and the way that the total budget will be divided provides clear and transparent information to applicants.

3.2 Staffing/workforce

3.2.1 There are no staffing/workforce implications in relation to this proposal.

3.3 Equalities impact

3.3.1 See attached equality impact assessment.

3.4 Legal comments

3.4.1 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.

3.5 Community safety

3.5.1 There are no legal implications for the Council in relation to this report.

3.6 Financial Implications

3.6.1.1 There are no financial implications for the Council in relation to this report.

3.7 Performance Issues

3.7.1 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 recommendations in this report have the potential to contribute to improving performance against this indicator by:

- Encouraging innovation within the sector.
- Clarifying the eligibility criteria;
- Improving the application process so that it is clear, transparent and easier to access;
- Improving the speed and effectiveness of the grant decision-making process

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%. This will be achieved 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 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'.

3.8 Environmental Impact

3.8.1 There are no environmental implications as this report is only a discussion paper at this stage.

3.9 Risk Management Implications

3.9.1 There are no risk management implications as this report is only a discussion paper at this stage.

Section 4 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Sheela Thakrar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 19 June 2009		
Name: Jessica Farmer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: 19 June 2009		

Section 5 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name: Alex Dewsnap	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Divisional Director (Partnership Development and Performance)
Date: 19 June 2009		

Section 6 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: John Edwards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Divisional Director (Strategy and Improvement)
Date: 19 June 2009		

Section 7 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Audrey Salmon, Interim Service Manager – Community Resources and Projects
Kashmir Takhar, Interim Head of Service – Community Development

Background Papers:

Appendix 1: Grants Programme – Proposals for Change: 2010 - 2011

Appendix 2: Consultation questionnaire – 2010 – 2011

Appendix 3 – A breakdown of the grants budget 2009/10

Grants Programme - Proposals for Change 2010 – 2011

Harrow Council has a responsibility to deliver services to meet the needs of a diverse community, and recognises that in some cases the voluntary and community sector may be best placed to provide responsive services. The council would like to encourage innovative community projects and therefore welcomes requests for grant aid from the wide and diverse voluntary and community sector.

During 2008, Harrow Council undertook a scrutiny review to examine its relationship with the voluntary and community sector. Through this review, a number of concerns were raised about the current grants process. The scrutiny review made a number of recommendations, some of which will be further explored through the development of a Third Sector Strategy. The scrutiny review also recommended a review of current grant criteria to be made in the interim to the grants process for the 2010/2011 round.

We are currently seeking the views of the voluntary and community sector (VCS), particularly those of you who have received grant aid, on the proposed changes to the main grants programme.

It is important to stress that this is a proposal and that this consultation will inform the final decision. Your responses will be collated and presented to the Grants Advisory Panel meeting in 2nd July 2009, where the final decision will be made.

As we would like to ensure that the views of the VCS are reflected in this review, we would appreciate it if you could take the time to read the following proposal and complete the attached consultation questionnaire.

Please respond by Friday 5th June 2009

Proposed Change 1: Who will be eligible for Grant Aid?

Currently the grant qualifying conditions state that:

“The applicant must be a voluntary group based in Harrow with 80% of its beneficiaries either living or working in Harrow”

This condition requires organisations to demonstrate that they are both **based** in Harrow, and **deliver** services in Harrow. To make the grant qualifying condition clearer it is proposed that this statement is split in to two parts, as follows:

*(1) “Grant aid will be available to support voluntary and community organisations to deliver services, where this resource is used **solely** for the benefit of people living in Harrow”*

The second part could read as follows:

Either

- The service provider can be **based outside of Harrow** but **must** deliver services in the borough

OR

- the organisation **must** be **based in Harrow**

Please answer questions 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Proposed change 2: Type of grants available

It is proposed that three types of grants are made available:

Small Grants – value - £500 - £2000

Medium Grants – value - £2001 - £10,000

Large Grants – value - £10,001 - £100,000

This will ensure that applicants are aware of the minimum and maximum grant aid available for each award.

It is also proposed that a percentage of the total grant budget is allocated to these different grants.

Please answer questions 5, 6 and 7.

Proposed change 3: Funding Priorities

Currently applicants need to demonstrate that they support one of the six key themes for Harrow as detailed below. (Harrow’s Sustainable Community Strategy, March 2009).

<p>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN HARROW</p> <p><u>Jobs Demand More Highly Skilled Employees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are practical opportunities available to prepare people for work • Harrow residents are supported to relearn and retrain <p><u>No large industrial or commercial employers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harrow continues to attract and support small businesses • Local work opportunities continue to be available • There is provision and access to outer borough employment opportunities • Harrow continues to have a strong retail and service sector 	<p>AN IMPROVING ENVIRONMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Environmental Issues</u> • Harrow has attractive, sustainable and accessible transport • Open space and environmentally sensitive areas are protected • Harrow is well designed, with sustainable buildings, public spaces and transport • Harrow is clean with high standards of waste recycling and reuse • The effects of climate change and adverse air quality are mitigated • <u>Growing Population</u> • Harrow’s environment is sustainable • Implications of overcrowding and increased density are minimized • There is better access to a range of appropriate housing
<p>EVERY HARROW CHILD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children and young people continue to have access to education opportunities • Social opportunities are available • Children and young people are healthy and safe • Children and young people are heard and consulted • Children and young people are supported to make a positive contribution and take responsibility 	<p>CULTURE, COMMUNITIES AND IDENTITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harrow’s diverse community is celebrated and valued • Communities work together to help themselves • There is a balance between universal and separate services for our communities • People feel safe • Individuals are treated with dignity and respect
<p>HEALTH, WELLBEING AND INDEPENDENCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health inequalities are reduced ▪ There is an increase in preventative services ▪ Independent living is promoted and supported (choice, control and empowerment) ▪ Recognition and improved support to carers ▪ Isolation and marginalisation is reduced ▪ There is increased involvement in sport and art activities 	<p>THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC SERVICES AND DEMOCRACY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harrow has a strong and respected partnership • Services are personalised and neighbourhood focused • The community is engaged in the development and delivery of services • Residents and stakeholders have the ability to have real influence • The Voluntary and Community Sector is strengthened

With a restricted grants budget and the availability of funding through other sources to support some of these themes – it is proposed that the grants programme would support a select number of themes each year from Harrow’s Sustainable Community Strategy, which would be agreed by the Grants Advisory Panel.

Please answer question 8.

Proposed change 4: Conditions of Grant Approval

Currently applicants are required to provide the following supporting documents to demonstrate that they have the required structures and policies in place and will only be considered for funding if everything is in place. It is proposed that applicants would **not** be required to provide this evidence until **after** the grant has been agreed. The evidence required will depend on the amount of grant aid requested.

Supporting documents required for grants under £2,000

- A bank account in the organisation’s name
- Policies for the protection of children and vulnerable adults (if relevant)
- Health and safety procedures (if relevant)
- Appropriate insurances and indemnities (if relevant)
- A written statement of commitment to equal opportunities

Supporting documents required for grants between £2,001 - £10,000:

(In addition to the above requirements)

- A constitution/memorandum and article of association/trust of deed
- Certified or audited accounts from the previous year (by an independent person). If your organisation has been running for less than 15 months, you may not be able to give us this so in these cases we will accept a 12-month financial projection for the year when you will spend the grant

Supporting documents required for grants over £10,001:

(In addition to the above requirements)

- Employment and staffing policies and procedures, which address the recruitment and selection, and training of staff and volunteers
- Systems to monitor the quality of services delivered

Please answer questions 9 and 10.

**Grants Programme – Proposal for Change
Consultation 2010 - 2011**

We are currently seeking the views of the voluntary and community sector (VCS), particularly those of you who have received grant aid, on the proposed changes to the grants programme. Please see attached.

It is important to stress that this is a proposal and that this consultation will inform the final decision. Your responses will be collated and presented to the Grants Advisory Panel meeting in 2nd July 2009, where the final decision will be made.

As we would like to ensure that the views of the VCS are reflected in this review, we would appreciate it if you could take the time to read the attached proposal and answer the following questions.

Proposed Change 1: Who will be eligible for Grant Aid?

Please see page 2 of the enclosed proposals for details.

1. Have you ever received grant aid through the Council’s grant programme?

Yes

No

2. Do you agree that the current ‘grant qualifying condition’ should be replaced with the following:

*“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”*

Yes

No

If no, please state why:



3. In addition, can you indicate which of the following statements you think should be included in the criteria:

*“The service provider can be **based outside of Harrow** but **must** deliver services in the borough”*

*“The organisation **must** be **based in Harrow**”*

4. Will this make it easier for you to understand who is eligible to apply?

Yes

No

If 'no' please state why:

Proposed Change 2: Type of grants available

Please see page 2 of the enclosed proposals for details.

5. Do you think it is useful to know the minimum and maximum levels of grants available?

Yes

No

If 'no' please state why:

Appendix 2

Consultation



6. Do you think the grants budget should be divided and a percentage allocated to the different sizes of grants?

Yes

No

If 'no' please state why:

7. Please tick, which one of the following percentage allocations that you think would be accepted?

- | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>Option 1:</i> | <i>20% - Small Grants;</i> | <i>30% - Medium Grants;</i> | <i>50% - Large Grants</i> |
| <i>Option 2:</i> | <i>30% - Small Grants;</i> | <i>50% - Medium Grants;</i> | <i>20% - Large Grants</i> |
| <i>Option 3:</i> | <i>50% - Small Grants;</i> | <i>20% - Medium Grants;</i> | <i>30% - Large Grants</i> |
| <i>Option 4:</i> | <i>Remain as it is</i> | | |

If you do not agree with the above, please suggest an alternative.

Appendix 2

Consultation



Proposed Change 3: Funding Priorities

Please see page 3 of the enclosed proposals for details.

- 8. As there is funding available through other sources to support some of the themes, do you agree that the funding priorities should be restricted to a few themes from Harrow’s Sustainable Community Strategy?**

Yes

No

If 'no' please state why:

Proposed Change 4: Conditions of Grant Approval

Please see page 4 of the enclosed proposals for details.

- 9. Currently, applicants are required to submit supporting documents with their applications; do you agree that this should only be requested once a grant has been agreed?**

Yes

No

If 'no' please state why:



10. Do you think that the amount of information required should reflect the amount of funding granted?

Yes No
If 'no' please state why:

Optional

This questionnaire has been completed by:

Name:

Name of Organisation:

Appendix 2

Consultation



Equality of Access to services: monitoring information

Harrow Council is committed to achieving equality of opportunity and freedom from discrimination in the services it provides. We ask you for your cooperation in providing the following information, which will only be used to monitor responses to this consultation.

I consider my ethnic origin to be:

<p>Asian or Asian British</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Afghani Bangladeshi Indian Pakistani Sinhalese Sri Lankan Tamil Any other Asian background – please specify 	<p>Black or Black British</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caribbean Ghanaian Nigerian Somali Any other Black background – please specify
<p>Mixed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> White and African White and Asian White and Caribbean Any other Mixed background – please specify 	<p>White</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Albanian British Gypsy/Roma Traveller Irish Irish Traveller Polish Romanian Serbian Any other White background – please specify
<p>Other Ethnic Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arab Chinese Iranian Iraqi Kurdish Lebanese Any other ethnic group – please specify 	

Appendix 2

Consultation



Thank you for taking the time to complete the consultation questionnaire.

Please return completed questionnaire to the Grant Team at one of the addresses below by Friday 5th June 2009

Forms can be obtained from:

Grants Team, Harrow Council
Room 227, Civic Centre
Station Road, Harrow, HA1 2XF

Community.development@harrow.gov.uk

www.harrow.gov.uk

Post to:

Grants Team, Harrow Council
Room 227, Civic Centre
Station Road, Harrow, HA1 2XF

By hand:

Civic Centre Reception,
Station Road
HA1 2XY

HAVS
64 Pinner Road
Harrow
HA1 4HZ

Community Premises
27 Northolt Road
South Harrow
HA2 0LH

Any local library in Harrow

By email:

Community.development@harrow.gov.uk

If you have any queries please contact the **Grants Team on 020 8424 1335 or 020 8424 7625**

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 3

A BREAKDOWN OF GRANTS BUDGET 2009/10

Small grants (£500 - £2,000)

<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Funding 2009/10</u>
Harrow Public Transport Users' Assoc.	£400
Harrow Over 50's Club	£960
Youth United	£980
Harrow Bangladeshi Association	£1,000
Multiple Sclerosis Society – Harrow Branch	£1,000
Navalar Tamil School	£1,000
Russian Immigrants Association	£1,000
Special Connection	£1,000
UK Asian Women's Conference	£1,200
Wealdstone Active Community	£1,200
Harrow Gingerbread	£1,400
London Kalibari	£1,557
12 organisations	£12,697

Medium grants (£2,001 - £10,000)

<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Funding 2009/10</u>
Association of Senior Muslim Citizens	£2,040
Harrow Tamil Association	£2,040
Asian Elderly Group	£2,400*
Carramea	£2,400
Parkinson's Disease Society – Harrow Branch	£2,500
Harrow Interfaith Council	£2,710
Harrow Bengalee Association	£2,729
Ashiana	£3,060
Headway North West London	£3,487
Harrow Anti-Racist Alliance	£3,750
Whittlesea Life Skills Association	£3,920
Angolan Civic Communities Alliance	£4,000
National Autistic Society – Harrow Branch	£4,040
Bentley Priory Nature Reserve	£5,000
Harrow Talking Newspaper	£5,000
Homestart Harrow	£5,000
St. Luke's Hospice	£5,000
Harrow In Europe Association	£5,100
Harrow Somali Women's Action Group	£5,100
Hestia Housing & Support	£5,295**
Harrow Iranian Community Association	£5,500
Community Link Up Limited	£5,650
Harrow Agenda 21 Environmental Forum	£5,730
Harrow Association of Somali Voluntary Organisations (HASVO)	£6,500**

APPENDIX 3

Harrow African Caribbean Association	£6,732
Pakistan Society of Harrow	£6,775
Middlesex Association for the Blind	£6,800
Harrow Refugee Forum	£7,000
Mind in Harrow	£7,722
Harrow Mencap	£8,080
Harrow Heritage Trust	£8,100
Harrow Community Transport	£8,840
ADHD Support Group	£9,000
Harrow Bereavement Care	£9,500
Kids Can Achieve	£10,000***
Sangat Advice Centre	£10,000***
36 organisations	£196,500

Large grants (£10,001 - £100,000)

<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Funding 2009/10</u>
Harrow Association of Somali Voluntary Organisations (HASVO)	£10,200
Ignite Trust	£10,379
Age Concern Harrow	£12,663***
Harrow Shopmobility Scheme	£15,121
Victim Support Harrow	£16,740
Welldon Activity Group	£22,988
Relate	£24,063
Harrow Sports Council	£27,540
Harrow Weald Common Conservators	£28,500
Hestia Housing & Support	£31,136
Harrow Association of Disabled People	£46,722
Harrow Women's Centre	£59,045
Harrow Council for Racial Equality (HAVS)	£59,765
Harrow Association of Voluntary Service (HAVS)	£94,439
Harrow Citizens Advice Bureau	£104,349
15 organisations	£563,650

* Asian Elderly Group also carried forward an under-spend of £1,800 from last year's grant therefore total funding for 2009/10 is £4,200.

** In addition to SLA funding.

*** Not an SLA.

How the budget is currently divided:

- Small-sized grant – 2%
- Medium-sized grant – 25%
- Large-sized grant – 73%

Meeting:	Grants Advisory Panel
Date:	2 July 2009
Subject:	Funding Arrangements for 2009/10 and 2010/11
Key Decision: (Executive side only)	Yes
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills – Corporate Director (Community & Environment)
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Chris Mote, Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Appendix 1 – Funding awarded in 2009/10 less than recommended by Officers Appendix 2 – Sustainable Community Strategy, March 2009 Appendix 3 - Mapping Local Area Agreement priorities and national indicators against the Sustainable Community Strategy

SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report sets out proposed funding arrangements for 2009/10 and 2010/11.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Grants Advisory Panel is requested to agree the following recommendations to the Leader of the Council for approval:

1. Arrangements for allocating unspent funds for 2009/10. See paragraph 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 for details.
2. Funding priorities for 2010/11. See paragraph 4.2.4 for details.
3. Arrangements for supporting sports activities through the grants programme. See paragraph 4.3.2 for details

REASON:

1. To establish a process to allocate any unspent funds within the financial year to reduce the risk of losing funds.
2. To clarify what activities will be funded through the grants programme.
3. To clarify how the grants programme will support sports activities from 2010 onwards.

SECTION 2 - REPORT

2.1 Introductory Paragraph

- 2.1.1 This report recommends options for the allocation of unspent funds for 2009/10; recommends funding priorities for 2010/11; and changes to the way that sports activities are funded through the grants process.

2.2 Brief Background

- 2.2.1.1 **Allocating unspent funds** - 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 currently no arrangements for managing these unallocated funds in the grant-making cycle.
- 2.2.1.2 **Funding priorities** - It was agreed at the GAP meeting in July 2006 that "... the priorities of the Council's Community Strategy should be embedded in the grants processes" (Priorities agreed through Harrow Strategic Partnership)
- 2.2.3 **Supporting sports activities**
Currently, the grants programme does not support sports organisations, because an SLA (Service Level Agreement) was established over 3 years ago with the Harrow Sports Council to distribute funds to this part of the voluntary and community sector.

3.3.1 Current Situation

- 3.3.1.1 **Allocating unspent funds** - There is a current underspend of £3,110 for 2009/10, which will need to be allocated before the end of March 2010, and there is currently no process for doing so.
- 3.3.2.1 **Funding priorities** - Since 2004, applicants have been asked to demonstrate how their proposed project addresses funding priorities outlined in the Sustainable Community strategy. The Overview and Scrutiny review found that these priorities were considered to be too high level and too broad to properly inform the grants decision-making process and stressed the need for clearer objectives.
- 3.3.2.2 The Review also found that the sector believed, that in practice, these priorities had very little influence on the final funding decisions, as historical factors tended to override current priorities, thus restricting applications from new and emerging groups or new applicants. Evidence from the 2009/10 grants round showed that 10 out of the 15 new applicants were not awarded funding.
- 3.3.2.3 There are approximately 1500 voluntary and community groups operating in Harrow and under 4% of the sector is currently supported through the grants programme. There are limited funds available through the grants programme and therefore an effective and transparent way of managing the potential demand for this resource has to be agreed, whilst ensuring that it addresses agreed partnership priorities.
- 3.3.3 **Supporting sports activities** –
- 3.3.3.1 Harrow Sports Council (HSC) has been funded via a Service Level Agreement for a number of years, to the value of £27,540.

3.3.3.2 The SLA requires HSC to:

- Provide grants to local sports clubs and individuals for local sports development initiatives
- Provide support to the Council with the development and administration of Borough teams and associated costs for a number of events, e.g. London Youth Games
- Secure entry for local teams (through the payment of annual entry fees) for the London Inter-Borough Swimming Championships.

3.3.3.3 Monitoring of the funding received for 2006/07 highlighted a number of issues. Some of the targets set out in the SLA have not been met and there have been concerns raised about the grants process and how grants were considered and agreed. A number of suggestions were made as a result of this monitoring but were not implemented. The monitoring of the funding received in the following year, 2007/08, highlighted the same issues as well as concerns that the management committee, apart from the Chairman, was not active and the post of Treasurer was vacant. Also, HSC no longer have involvement in the events outlined in the SLA as these are either now dealt with directly by the Council's Sports & Leisure Development Team or they are no longer taking place. There was also an under-spend of the funding of £4,077.50 for the financial year 2007/08. The organisation's balances at 31st March 2008 were £15,863.45, which had accumulated due to underspends over the past few years.

3.3.3.4 As all SLAs were extended for 2009/10, officers from the Grants Team met with all SLA providers to review and update service specifications. Members of the Sports & Leisure Development Team and Grant officers met with the Chairman of HSC in April 2009 and the SLA was amended. It was agreed that HSC would:

- Lead a sub committee of the CSPAN (Community Sports & Physical Activity Network), co-ordinated through the Council's Sports & Leisure Development Team, to distribute grants to local sports groups and initiatives, as an interim arrangement for 2009/10
- Continue to distribute grant aid to individuals through it's own bi-monthly meetings
- Ensure that all the positions on the management committee were filled
- Actively promote the role of HSC by producing and widely distributing promotional literature.

3.3.3.5 To date, despite verbal agreements to the revised SLA, it has not been signed by the organisation and they have not responded to requests to hold a meeting to monitor the funding received during 2008/09.

4. Why a change is needed

4.1 Arrangements for allocating unspent funds

At the end of 2008/09, £11,034 of the grants budget was unallocated at the Grants Advisory Panel meeting held in March. In accordance with the Council's financial regulations these funds would not be available for rolling forward in to the new financial year. After the deadline for receiving grant applications had closed a late request for financial support was received from the Welldon Activity Group. Although there was no precedent for allocating these unspent funds, Grant Officers in agreement with the Portfolio Holder prepared a report for the allocation of these funds and presented this to the Grants Advisory Panel. It was agreed at the meeting in March 2009 that £10,000 be awarded to the organisation to meet an unexpected increase in rent. Subsequently however, a compact complaint was submitted stating that "there was no process for seeking applications for unallocated sums". The investigation that arose 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 dealing with unspent funds. As there is a need to establish a clear and transparent process for allocating un-spent funds, it is recommended that the panel adopt the following:

4.1.2 To be adopted for 2009/10 only

To consider 'topping –up' grants for organisations, where officers had recommended increased funding because they had demonstrated an increase demand for their service. Appendix 1 provides a list of organisations that were recommended for increased funding in the last round, with a copy of the original grant report. 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 un-spent funds. The panel should also agree to allocate the under spend of £3,110 to the grant recipients listed in appendix 1.

4.1.3 To introduced from 2010 onwards

The entire grants budget should be allocated at the beginning of the financial year to avoid the need to distribute funds within the year. The following recommendation would only be necessary if funds were returned to the grants budget from organisations that have:

- been dissolved
- under spent their allocation
- not provided supporting documentation after their grant had been agreed. (If this recommendation is adopted by panel)

4.1.3.1 It is recommended that from 2010 a Reserve List of successful applicants be established to allocate unspent funds within the financial year. Due to the restricted budget, it may not always be possible to award organisations the amount requested or recommended by officers and therefore by establishing a reserve list, when funds becomes available, the panel can consider increasing the funding to grant recipients at a later date. Such organisations would have been subjected to the grants process and would have been assessed alongside other applicants during the same grants round. This would be a fair and transparent way of allocating un-spent funds within the grants budget.

4.2 Funding priorities

4.2.1 As part of a recent grants consultation, the voluntary and community sector were asked if they agreed that:

“Funding priorities should be restricted to a few themes from Harrow’s Sustainable Community Strategy”

4.2.2 Although 32 out of 49 (65%) respondents stated that they agreed with this proposal, counter arguments received from those that opposed this suggestion should also be considered. The following comments represent the objections to this proposal:

“Danger of being exclusive”

“Harrow’s Sustainable Community Strategy is a good specific identifier of need, but should also be open to provide for the themes showing greatest needs within Harrow and therefore fund organisations willing to tackle those problems.”

“The Voluntary Sector is very diverse and much of what is delivered is through innovation, by restricting to Community Strategy services will be restricting innovation plus change taken away”

“ ... all groups that offer a service should be given careful and full consideration”

- 4.2.3 At the GAP meeting in June 2009 members, also, did not support this proposal, as they believed that it would exclude a large proportion of the sector and would have an adverse affect on currently funded organisations.
- 4.2.4 The priorities in the Sustainable Community Strategy and the Local Area Agreement have resulted from extensive consultation through the Harrow Strategy Partnership and wider local networks and therefore reflect the proven needs of the borough. Therefore it is recommended that the panel match the ‘national indicators’ from Harrow’s Local Area Agreement (2008 - 2011) against the themes of the Sustainable Community Strategy and agree these as priorities for the next grants round. See appendix 2 for Sustainable Community Strategy Priorities.
- 4.2.5 This would clearly define the funding priorities for the voluntary grants programme and enable officers and panel members to be clear about what activities the grants programme will support and how the sector could contribute to agreed partnership objectives. Successful applicants would need to demonstrate how their project addresses the funding priorities; and as a consequent it would be possible to align the activities funded through the grants programme to these priorities.
- 4.2.6 Currently funded activities have been mapped against national indicators in Appendix 3. The panel should bear in mind however that 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. In such cases, the organisation may need to adapt their activities or revise their application to address the priorities or seek funding from elsewhere. It is apparent that most of the grant activities address the following themes: ‘Culture, Communities and Identify’ and ‘Health, Wellbeing and Independence’; and there are very few organisations contributing to the ‘Economic Development in Harrow’, ‘Improving the Environment’, ‘Every Harrow Child’ and ‘The Future of Public Services and Democracy’ themes. This is worth noting, as the panel may want to address this imbalance, by actively encouraging applications from organisations that have not been considered for funding to address these themes.

4.3 Funding Sports Activities

- 4.3.1 The panel agreed that grants would not support sports organisations requesting grant aid or sponsorship for individuals as a service level agreement was established with Harrow Sports Council to distribute grants to this part of the sector.
- 4.3.2 However due to the concerns raised in this report, it is recommended that:
- This arrangement does not continue and that Harrow Sport Council’s SLA is not extended when it expires in March 2010
 - The funding of £27,540, which has been allocated to the HSC for the last few years, should remain in the grants budget and be distributed to sports organisations as part of the grants programme.
 - The wording in the guidance notes that states that the Council will not support “sports organisations seeking match funding” be removed.

- 4.3.3 This would mean that sports organisations who have received grant aid through HSC would be subject to the same application and monitoring process as other applicants to the grants programme, which would ensure a consistent and transparent approach in the distribution of grants to the sector and greater accountability in the use of council resources.

5. Implications of the Recommendation

5.1 Staffing/workforce

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

5.2 Equalities Impact

See attached equality impact assessment for details.

5.3 Legal Implications

- 5.3.1 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.

5.4 Community Safety

- 5.4.1 There are no community safety implications for the Council related to this report.

5.5 Financial Implications

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

5.6 Performance Issues

- 5.6.1 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%.
- 5.6.2 The recommendations in this report have the potential to contribute to improving performance against this indicator by:
- Encouraging innovation within the sector.
 - Clarifying the eligibility criteria;
 - Improving the application process so that it is clear, transparent and easier to access;
 - Improving the speed and effectiveness of the grant decision-making process
- 5.6.3 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%. This will be achieved 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.

5.6.4 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'.

5.7 Environmental Impact

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

5.8 Risk Management Implications

5.8.1 There are no risk management implications for the Council in relation to this report.

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

Separate risk register in place? **No**

SECTION 6 - STATUTORY OFFICER CLEARANCE

Name: Sheela Thakrar	<input type="checkbox"/>	On behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 19 th June 2009		
Name: Jessica Farmer	<input type="checkbox"/>	On behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: 19 th June 2009		

Section 7 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name: Alex Dewsnap	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Divisional Director (Partnership Development and Performance)
Date: 19 th June 2009		

Section 8 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: John Edwards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Divisional Director (Environmental Services)
Date: 19 th June 2009		

SECTION 9 - CONTACT DETAILS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

Contact:

Audrey Salmon, Interim Service Manager – Community Resources and Projects (ext. 5332)
Parveen Vasdev, Principal Grants Officer (ext. 7625)
Charlotte Clark – Senior Grants Officer (ext. 2335).

Background Papers:

Appendix 1 Funding awarded in 2009/10 less than recommended by Officers
Appendix 2 – Sustainable Community Strategy, March 2009
Appendix 3 Mapping Local Area Agreement priorities and national indicators against the Sustainable Community Strategy

APPENDIX 1

FUNDING AWARDED IN 2009/10 LESS THAN RECOMMENDED BY OFFICERS

NAME OF ORGANISATION	FUNDING IN 2008/09 £	FUNDING REQUESTED 2009/10 £	FUNDING RECOMMENDED 2009/10 £	FUNDING AGREED 2009/10 £
ADHD Support Group	8,910	24,000	10,080	9,000
Harrow Anti-Racist Alliance (HARA)	3,750	9,500	5,000	3,750
Harrow Bereavement Care	9,500	9,800	9,800	9,500
Russian Immigrants Association	1,000	4,600	1,800	1,000

ORIGINAL GRANT REPORTS PRESENTED TO GRANTS ADVISORY PANEL ON 4TH MARCH 2009

ADHD SUPPORT GROUP HARROW

Grant requested: **£24,000**
Current grant: **£8,910**
Grant recommended: **£10,080**

Background

The ADHD Support Group Harrow provides support, information, respite and parenting education to all parents, carers and sufferers of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and related conditions within the London Borough of Harrow. The aim of the organisation is to work with ADHD sufferers to help build their self-esteem, self-awareness and self-respect, as well as respect for others and to build on their goal setting skills and strategies to empower them to fit into society.

Services provided include advice and information through twice-weekly coffee mornings and one to one parent support/surgery time held 4 times per week, drama therapy once a week, various parenting and anger management courses, educational support within schools, Whytry programme (a 10-week course specifically designed for teenagers), a life coaching service working with young people and adults who have been diagnosed with ADHD or autism, respite through play schemes and a lending library. The Group also provides a service at a monthly clinic at Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) at Northwick Park Hospital where CAMHS refers families to enable them to access support in areas that they are unable to provide. In addition, a workshop for young female sufferers of ADHD and related conditions has recently been developed to help with all aspects of sexual health to alleviate unwanted sexual advances, teenage pregnancies and STDs. The Group does not charge for its services but asks for one-off donations for the parenting and drama therapy courses.

Grant Request

APPENDIX 1

The organisation is requesting funding to increase the current Project Manager's hours from 15 to 30 per week for 48 weeks per year. The organisation has stated that the Project Manager is expected to manager volunteers, co-ordinate services, manage projects and provide outreach to families, sufferers and outside agencies both over the telephone and face-to-face. As the organisation is developing new services, which need to be managed and co-coordinated, the Project Manager's workload is expected to increase.

The organisation is also requesting funding to enable the Group to complete Level 2 of the PQASSO Quality Mark. The organisation has been working towards Level 2 but is unable to fund the peer review required.

In addition to the above, the organisation is requesting funding to enable them to carry out CRB checks on any new members of staff and volunteers they employ during 2009/10. It has estimated that they will require 10 new volunteers and 5 new members of staff during 2009/10.

Salary costs

Full time Project Manager for 30 hours per week @ £12.50 per hour x 48 weeks per year	£18,000
12% National Insurance contribution/holiday and sick pay	£2,160
Total salary	£20,160

Other costs

PQASSO Quality Assurance Level 2	£1,355
CRB checks for 2009/10 based on new volunteers/ staff (babysitters/playscheme/youth workers)	
Employees – 5 @ £45.95 each	£229.75
Volunteers – 10@ £9.95 each	£99.50
Total other costs	£1,684.25

10% management fee for central costs (Management, supervision, monitoring & evaluation, overheads)	£2,184
--	--------

Total	£24,028.25
--------------	-------------------

Funding Priorities Met

Safer Harrow – The organisation receives referrals from the YOT and the YISP and it believes that, by working with these young people, their services help to improve their quality of life and thus reduce the chance of them committing further offences.

Young Harrow – The organisation states that it supports schools in developing their provisions for young people suffering from ADHD and related conditions. It offers behaviour management strategies, increases awareness and a better understanding of the impact of ADHD on a young person's personal and social development. Some of the services provided, such as the workshop for young female sufferers mentioned above, promote the health of children and young people.

APPENDIX 1

Evidence of Need

The Group has stated that it is the only service in Harrow that offers support, information, respite and training to sufferers and carers of people affected by ADHD, and partnership working enables the group to provide a service, which has been highlighted by ADDISS (Attention Deficit Disorder Information and Support Services), in being unique as it is a life-span service (an email has been received from ADDISS to confirm this statement).

The organisation has stated that it works closely with and receives referrals from the Youth Offending Team (YOT) and the Youth Inclusion Support Panel (YISP), and long-term criminology studies show that 90% of those with early pre-pubertal conduct disorder, which increases the chance of anti-social behaviour, have associated ADHD. It has also stated that recent studies by the Youth Justice Board have shown that up to 50% of young offenders have ADHD and other related conditions.

During 2007/08, the Group had an overall 436 service users across all projects.

Funding received from other sources in 2008/09

£18,898 from Harrow Carers Grant for coffee mornings, babysitting, playscheme places and parenting/anger management courses

£10,921 from BBC Children in Need for drama therapy

£9,648 from Awards for All for 16-25 year olds project

£1,500 from West Harrow Cluster for the WhyTry programme

£9,635 from Harrow PCT for one-to-one support, surgery time and CAMHS clinic

£13,183 from Connexions to support young people in education

Comments and Recommendations

Officers from Special Needs Services, Children's Services state that they are aware of the contribution that the organisation makes to this area of work.

It is recommended that funding of £10,080 is awarded to the ADHD Support Group Harrow for 2009/10 for the Project Manager's salary and on-costs to enable her to continue to work for 15 hours per week.

HARROW ANTI RACIST ALLIANCE

Grant requested: £9,500

Current grant: £3,750

Grant recommended: £5,000

Background

Formed in 1993, Harrow Anti Racist Alliance (HARA) is a multi-ethnic organisation, which supports people who have been subjected to racial discrimination/harassment. They run anti-racist training courses, offer work experience and volunteering opportunities and organise youth, arts and media events and projects.

APPENDIX 1

Services provided include:

- Casework on racial harassment/discrimination and crime reduction.
- Guidance and support to people and families experiencing social exclusion and racial harassment/discrimination.
- Participation in existing crime reduction initiatives such as third party reporting, CASWORKS and MAF.
- Encouraging the inclusion of people of minority- ethnic heritage, refugees, the elderly and young people in a range of Harrow Council initiatives including the Arts Festival and Black History Month.
- Drama sessions held weekly during term time.

Grant Request

The grant will be used to expand the part time Community Support Coordinator's (CSC) post from 2 mornings to 5 mornings per week. The post holder will coordinate services provided by HARA supporting individuals who are subject to racial and religious discrimination and/or hate crime by undertaking frontline casework 5 days a week and inputting hate crime cases into the caseworks database. The organisation states that the CSC effectively liaises with other frontline statutory or voluntary agencies within the Harrow Strategic Partnership, Community Cohesion Management Group and Safer Harrow Management Group, as well as other agencies as appropriate to provide a cohesive standardised, effective response to victims of Hate Crime and provide victim support.

A breakdown of the grant request is as follows:

Running costs	£2,000
Community Support Co-ordinator salary	£7,500

Funding Priorities Met

Sustainable Communities - HARA state that they meet this priority by promoting inclusion, helping to create a safer environment, and by increasing equality of opportunity through increased access to services.

Safer Harrow - The organisation states that they meet this priority by tackling crime and anti-social behaviour and by addressing the fear of crime. HARA also states that they are represented on the Harrow Police and Community Consultative Group and the Harrow Health and Race Forum.

Stronger Communities in Harrow - The organisation states that they meet this priority by providing refugees and BME community a voice and channel of communication to Harrow Council and other agencies. They state that they work to provide an environment where the most disadvantaged are valued and where people from different cultures and backgrounds get on well together.

Healthier Harrow - The organisation states that they meet this priority by helping people to overcome the barriers to accessing services through advocacy.

APPENDIX 1

Young Harrow - The organisation states that they meet this priority by offering a range of arts initiatives that young people can participate in. This has included the organisations involvement in Black History Month, Words Live, Under One Sky, Words Live and Refugee Week.

Evidence of Need

The organisation has stated that in 2007/08 it dealt with 105 cases and provided consultancy 2 mornings a week in term time to people subject to racial and religious harassment or discrimination. HARA states that it had an overwhelming demand for all its frontline services, which resulted in many cases being turned away or referred elsewhere. It further reports that between April – July 2008 it dealt with 67 cases compared with 42 cases during the same period of the previous year.

Funding received from other sources in 2008/09

£885	Edward Harvist Trust	Laptop computer for casework and presentations
£500	HPCCG	Strengthening communities event

HARA currently occupies an individual office at the Community Premises building, 27 Northolt Road.

Comments and Recommendations

Although sufficient evidence has been provided by the organization to expand the service, however due to the restricted budget, it is recommended that funding of £5,000 be awarded to Harrow Anti-Racist Alliance for 2009/10 to enable the organisation to increase the salary cost by approximately 33%.

HARROW BEREAVEMENT CARE

Grant requested:	£9,800
Current grant:	£9,500
Grant recommended:	£9,800

Background

Harrow Bereavement Care (formerly Harrow Churches Bereavement Visiting Scheme) was set up in 1981 to relieve the suffering and distress caused by bereavement amongst the residents of Harrow and surrounding area.

Services provided include:

- Support through the grieving process
- Raising public awareness of the need for effective bereavement support to be available in the community
- Training and supervising suitable volunteers in visiting and listening skills for working with the bereaved
- Support to bereaved children
- Cooperating with and offering training to other agencies engaged in similar work

APPENDIX 1

These are offered on a totally voluntary basis to all residents and are for as long and often as each recipient needs.

The organisation consists of a number of groups each with a leader, the office co ordinates the work. Calls for help are received either through the office or within the groups and includes referrals from GPs, Northwick Park Hospital, Palliative Care Team and the Probation Service.

In effort to improve diversity they have volunteers who speak different languages and leaflets include translations into Hindi, Urdu, and Gujarati. Training now includes a session on how different faith groups approach death.

CRB checks are made for those visitors who visit children.

Grant Request

The grant is to be used to fund the core activities of the Charity including primarily the salary of the Office Manager and the costs of maintaining the office. This includes normal office expenses and rent.

The total cost of the project is £26,678.

Equipment, premises	£ 3,378
Running costs	£ 2,800
Salaries	£20,500

Funding Priorities Met

Safer Harrow

No evidence has been provided as to how this priority would be met.

Stronger Communities

The organisation states that they meet this priority by empowering individuals to resume participation activities.

Healthier Harrow

The organisation states that it meets this priority by training volunteers in listening skills. They also state that this service is particularly important their elderly clients. The drop-in centres also offer a source of companionship for users of the service.

Young Harrow

The organisation states that it meets this priority by providing specialist support to children and young people, as it recognises that bereavement affects children differently to adults. Some volunteers are specially trained to visit children and a development manager has a remit to extend bereavement work to schools across the borough.

Evidence of Need

Harrow Bereavement Care state that they receive frequent daily phone calls and referrals from the community, usually a place of worship.

The latest figures available are for 2007.

APPENDIX 1

Visits to bereaved	487
Conference participants	90
Volunteers trained	
Initial training	90
2 nd tier	71

Funding received from other sources in 2008/09

£500 from Fellowship of St. John's Trust for children's visitor training

£200 from Hillside Trust for office equipment

£11000 - The Development Manager is currently funded by Emmanuel Church, Northwood

Comments and Recommendations

A requirement of the grant for 2008/09 was that all visitors have appropriate CRB checks and that the service be more inclusive to diverse communities. There is evidence that these CRB checks have been made and the organisation states that it has made attempts towards making its service more inclusive.

It is recommended that the organisation be awarded £9,800 for 2009/10 to cover 50% of the services salary costs.

RUSSIAN IMMIGRANTS ASSOCIATION

Grant requested:	£4,600
Current grant:	£1,000
Grant recommended:	£1,800

Background

The Russian Immigrants Association was set up in 1999. It's main aims and objectives are:

- To assist in the integration process for refugees and new residents including the provision of information and advice, job seekers' training, assistance in further education and sporting activities;
- To support community involvement, particularly among Russian-speaking people who are at greatest disadvantage and fully excluded, such as minority ethnic community, asylum seekers, refugees, people on low income, unemployed people and lone parents;
- To provide services for Russian-speaking refugees and asylum seekers;
- To develop strong relationships with other ethnic communities;
- To provide necessary information about British law, culture, traditions, health service, and education system among Russian-speaking people.

The Association has stated that provides information, advice and support to Russian speaking people in their native language and accompany and represent them to different institutions. It also provides a club for over 50s, work experience for volunteers, job seekers' support, assistance with the English language and I.T. training. It has also stated that it provides sporting activities, children's music studio, environmental activities and children's holiday activities.

Grant Request

APPENDIX 1

The organisation is requesting a grant of £4,600 as a contribution towards the overall running costs of the Association as follows:

Volunteer's expenses (30-40 volunteers)	£1,800
Telephone/fax/internet	£400
Stationery & postage	£200
Meetings/seminars/training/refreshments	£600
Advertising	£500
*Office equipment	£1,100

* This equipment cannot be funded through this grants programme as it is deemed as capital expenditure.

Funding Priorities Met

Sustainable Communities in Harrow – the job seekers' support provided could assist the long-term unemployed with funding employment within the Borough.

Young Harrow – the organisation has stated that it provides children's activities including art lessons and music concerts.

Evidence of Need

The organisation has stated that there is no other organisation in Harrow, which specifically assists the Russian speaking community. It states that the majority of Russian-speaking people do not speak English very well and are unable to access services directly. The organisation has further stated that it collects information on its community's needs by a number of different methods.

Funding received from other sources in 2008/09

£15,500 from City Parochial Foundation for salaries
£12,000 from BBC Children in Need for children's activities
£5,840 from Awards for All for Drama Club
£4,400 from Comic Relief for Club 50+ (expected)
£1,800 from Sports Relief for sports activities (expected)
£5,000 from Bridge House Estates for work with elderly people (expected)
£878.50 from Edward Harvist Trust towards Heritage Club for the Elderly (agreed February 2009)

The Russian Immigrants Association currently occupies an individual office at the Community Premises building, 27 Northolt Road.

Comments and Recommendations

It is recommended that funding of £1,800 be awarded to the Russian Immigrants Association for 2009/10 to be used for volunteers' expenses.

Appendix 2

Themes from Harrow’s Sustainable Community Strategy (March 2009)

<p>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN HARROW</p> <p><u>Jobs Demand More Highly Skilled Employees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are practical opportunities available to prepare people for work • Harrow residents are supported to relearn and retrain <p><u>No large industrial or commercial employers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harrow continues to attract and support small businesses • Local work opportunities continue to be available • There is provision and access to outer borough employment opportunities • Harrow continues to have a strong retail and service sector 	<p>AN IMPROVING ENVIRONMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Environmental Issues</u> • Harrow has attractive, sustainable and accessible transport • Open space and environmentally sensitive areas are protected • Harrow is well designed, with sustainable buildings, public spaces and transport • Harrow is clean with high standards of waste recycling and reuse • The effects of climate change and adverse air quality are mitigated • <u>Growing Population</u> • Harrow’s environment is sustainable • Implications of overcrowding and increased density are minimized • There is better access to a range of appropriate housing
<p>EVERY HARROW CHILD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children and young people continue to have access to education opportunities • Social opportunities are available • Children and young people are healthy and safe • Children and young people are heard and consulted • Children and young people are supported to make a positive contribution and take responsibility 	<p>CULTURE, COMMUNITIES AND IDENTITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harrow’s diverse community is celebrated and valued • Communities work together to help themselves • There is a balance between universal and separate services for our communities • People feel safe • Individuals are treated with dignity and respect
<p>HEALTH, WELLBEING AND INDEPENDENCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health inequalities are reduced ▪ There is an increase in preventative services ▪ Independent living is promoted and supported (choice, control and empowerment) ▪ Recognition and improved support to carers ▪ Isolation and marginalisation is reduced ▪ There is increased involvement in sport and art activities 	<p>THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC SERVICES AND DEMOCRACY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harrow has a strong and respected partnership • Services are personalised and neighbourhood focused • The community is engaged in the development and delivery of services • Residents and stakeholders have the ability to have real influence • The Voluntary and Community Sector is strengthened

This page is intentionally left blank

SCS themes	LAA priorities	National Indicators	Currently funded projects
Economic Development in Harrow	Improve economic well-being	NI 152 Working age people on out of work benefits	Carramea Harrow Refugee Forum Harrow Citizens Advice Bureau
	Increased provision of affordable housing	NI 155	
An Improving Environment	Increase environmental sustainability	NI 198 Children travelling to school - mode of travel usually used NI 197 Improved local biodiversity - active management of local sites	Bentley Priory Nature Reserve management Committee Harrow Heritage Trust Harrow Agenda 21 Harrow Weald Common Conservators Harrow Public Transport Users' Association
	Combat Climate Change in Harrow Improve street and environmental cleanliness Increase domestic waste recycling	NI 186 Per capita CO2 emissions in the LA area NI 195 Improve street and environmental cleanliness NI 192 Household waste recycled and composted	
Every Harrow Child	Safeguard and protect young people Improve Child Safety Improve attainment	NI 63 Stability of placements of children looked after: length of placement NI 60 Core assessments for children's social care that were carried out within 35 working days of their commencement NI 88 Number of extended schools	Kids Can Achieve Ignite Trust Harrow Bengalee Association Harrow in Europe
Culture, Communities and Identify	Improve the sense of cohesion in Harrow	NI 108 Key stage 4 attainment for black and minority ethnic groups NI 1 % of people who believe that people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area	Wealdstone Active Community Harrow Inter Faith Council Harrow Sports Council Harrow Tamil Association Ashiana
	Increase participation in cultural services	NI 8 Adult participation in sport NI 11 Engagement in Arts	
	Tackle Exclusion	NI 17 Improve public perception of crime and ASB in Harrow NI 140 Fair treatment by local services	Angolan Civic Communities Alliance HASVO Harrow Community Transport Harrow Over 50s Harrow Talking Newspaper Middlesex Association for the Blind Harrow Iranian Community Association Mind in Harrow Russian Immigrants Association Sangat Advice Centre Special Connection
	Reduce domestic violence in Harrow Build safer communities Substance misuse by young people	NI 32 Repeat incidents of domestic violence NI 35 Building resilience to violent extremism NI 40 Number of drug users recorded as being in effective treatment NI 115 Substance misuse by young people	Harrow Women's Centre Hestia Housing

Health, Wellbeing and Independence	Increase independent living for older people	<p>NI 136 People supported to live independently through social services</p> <p>NI 135 Carers receiving needs assessments or reviews and a specific carers service or advice and information</p> <p>NI 130 Social care clients receiving self directed support (direct payments and individual budgets)</p> <p>NI 146 Adults with learning disabilities in employment</p> <p>NI 149 Adults in contact with secondary mental health services in settled accommodation</p> <p>NI 57 Children and young people's participation in high-quality PE and sport</p> <p>NI 39 Alcohol Harm related hospital admissions</p> <p>NI 51 Effectiveness of Child and Adolescent mental health services</p> <p>NI 53 Prevalence of breastfeeding at 6 - 8 weeks from birth</p> <p>NI 126 Early access for women to maternity services</p> <p>NI 6 Participating in regular volunteering</p> <p>NI 13 Migrants English Language skills and knowledge</p> <p>NI 7 Environment for a thriving third sector</p>	<p>Age Concern</p> <p>Asian Elderly Group Harrow</p> <p>Association of Senior Muslims Citizens</p> <p>Harrow African Caribbean Association</p> <p>Harrow Shopmobility Scheme</p> <p>Headway North West London</p> <p>Multiple Sclerosis Society</p> <p>National Autistic Society</p> <p>Parkinson's Disease Society (Harrow)</p> <p>St. Luke's Hospice</p> <p>Welldon Activity Group</p> <p>Whittlesea Life Skills Association</p> <p>ADHD Support Group</p> <p>Harrow Association of Disabled People</p> <p>Community Link Up Limited</p> <p>Harrow Gingerbread</p> <p>Harrow Mencap</p> <p>Harrow Bereavement Care (for children part of service)</p> <p>HomeStart Harrow</p>
The future of public services and democracy	<p>Promote citizenship and civic renewal</p> <p>Strengthen the voluntary and community sector</p>		<p>Pakistan Society of Harrow</p> <p>HAVS</p> <p>All of the above</p>

Meeting:	Grants Advisory Panel
Date:	2 July 2009
Subject:	Review of the Grants Application Process
Key Decision: (Executive side only)	Yes
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills – Corporate Director (Community & Environment)
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Chris Mote, Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Appendix 1 – Revised application form

SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report sets out proposed changes to the current grants application and assessment process for 2010/11.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Grants Advisory Panel is requested to agree to make the following recommendations to the Leader of the Council for approval:

1. The application process is revised in line with the recommendations of this report. See paragraph 2.4.3.2 for details.
2. Grant applications are presented to the panel in January and recommendations made to Cabinet in February subject to budget decisions for 2010/11. See paragraph 2.4.4.2 for details.
3. The application timescale is shortened. See paragraph 2.4.4.3 for details.
4. The appeals process is abolished. See paragraph 2.5.3 for details.

REASON:

1. To address concerns raised by the voluntary and community sector through the Overview and Scrutiny Review about the current grants application process
2. To clarify and improve the application and assessment process
3. To 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 for 2010/11.

SECTION 2 - REPORT

2.1 Introductory Paragraph

2.1.1.1 This report sets out proposed changes to the current grants application process and timescale for 2010/11. It will also review the appeals process and make recommendations for change.

2.2 Brief Background

2.2.1 Grant Application Process: The current grants application process was last reviewed and revised in July 2006 for the 2007/08 grants round.

2.3 Current Situation

2.3.1 During 2008, Harrow Council undertook a scrutiny review to examine its relationship with the voluntary and community sector. Through this review, a number of concerns were raised about the current grants process. The scrutiny review made a number of recommendations, some of which will be further explored through the development of a Third Sector Strategy. The scrutiny review also recommended a review of current grant criteria to be made in the interim to the grants process for the 2010/2011 round.

2.4 Why a change is needed

2.4.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Review 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 relate to the application process.

2.4.2 **Application Form** - The revised application form, which can be found in Appendix 1, has been divided into 10 sections. Each section has been designed to obtain, as much information as possible from applicants, particularly if supporting documents will not be available to officers and the panel for consultation at this stage. Guidance on how to complete the application form will be given via briefing sessions and guidance notes during the next funding round.

2.4.3.1 **Section 1 - Organisation Contact Details**
Section 2 - About the organisation – applicants are asked to state their **legal status** and to describe the activities of the organisation
Section 3 - Policies and procedures – if the proposed changes to the conditions of grant approval are agreed, applicants will be asked to confirm that they have the required **policies and procedures** in place and are informed that they will be expected to submit this evidence if a grant is agreed.
Sections 4 - About the proposed project/service - applicants are asked to describe the proposed project and to demonstrate how it meets council priorities and local needs.
Section 5 - Project Delivery – applicants are asked to state how and where the project will be delivered and how it will address the needs of Harrow's diverse community
Section 6 - Who will benefit from the project? – applicants are asked to state how many users they anticipate and how they will benefit from the project.
Section 7 - Project Cost – applicants are asked to provide a proposed budget breakdown and to state the outcome of their fund-raising efforts.
Section 8 - Professional references – applicants are asked to provide the contact details of two referees.

Section 9 - Future of the Project – applicants are asked to explain how they plan to continue the project once the funding has ceased.

Section 10 - Declaration - If there is no longer a requirement for applicants to submit supporting documents with the application form, it will be even more important for applicants to sign a declaration to confirm that the information provided 'is correct and complete to the best of their knowledge'.

2.4.3.2 It is recommended that the panel agrees for the revised application form to be used during grants round 2010/11.

2.4.4 The Application Timescale

2.4.4.1 For the last few years the grants application round has opened at the beginning of July and has closed at the end of September. However, the panel do not make their recommendations to Cabinet until March as the budget for the coming year is not agreed until February. As the 3-year service level agreements (SLAs) of 15 organisations expire in March 2010, it is imperative that the panel give an indication of what the funding arrangements will be for the next year at least 3 months in advance of this date, so that these organisations can plan effectively. Although the Council's budgets will not be agreed by Cabinet until February, organisations may need assistance in making the necessary arrangements to meet their legal obligations, and therefore **it is recommended that:**

2.4.4.2 Grant recommendations be brought forward to the GAP meeting in January, subject to budget decisions for 2010/11. This would mean that organisations would have an indication of potential funding and the likely implication that this may have on them in the following year, albeit subject to budget decisions at the Cabinet meeting in February. This proposal would also have financial implications because if recommendations for funding are not made until January, SLA may need to be extended for another month until April 2010 to meet the 3 months notice requirement.

2.4.4.2 Recent grants rounds have been too long, lasting 9 months from the beginning of the process to the date when recommendations are made to Cabinet. If the panel were to support this recommendation, the **grants round timescale would be reduced** from 9 to 5 months from start to finish.

Proposed grants programme timescale:

Mid August	Grants application round launched
Mid October	Grants application round closing date
Mid October – End of November	Applications assessed and draft report completed
Early to mid December	Copy of draft report sent out to applicants for comments
Early January	Report deadline

2.4.4.3 It is hoped that the proposed changes to the application form and the conditions of grant approval (see results of interim grants review consultation report) will simplify the application process thus making it more manageable for officers and the panel to assess applications forms within a shorter timescale. Therefore it is recommended that the above proposed timescale is adopted for grants round 2010/11.

2.5 Appeals Process

2.5.1 At the moment the officer's report is sent to applicants for information only, before it is presented to the Panel. Although comments are not invited, a small number of applicants comment on the content of the report and occasionally send in additional information, if they feel that the officer's report doesn't adequately represent their proposal.

2.5.2 In September 2008, a Compact Monitoring Form was received from AWIND “relating to the way in which their grant application and a subsequent appeal against the Council’s decision were handled”. The organisation appealed against the panel’s decision not to award them funding for 2008/09. However the panel upheld their original decision, as the organisation did not meet the grounds for appeal, which was that: “the information contained in the officer’s report submitted to the Panel was incorrect or incomplete, and therefore had a material affect on the decision”. Their complaint was investigated by a council officer and it was noted that there were some discrepancies in the officer’s report that were not acknowledged through the appeals process. As a consequence it was recommended that: “summary reports are sent to applicants for comments before submission to the Grants Advisory Panel and that any comments are included in the final report to that Panel”.

2.5.3 Therefore, it is recommended that

- (a) Applicants are formally invited to comment on the accuracy of the officer’s report and provide additional information before it is submitted to the Panel. Once the Panel has agreed their recommendations for funding, applicants will not be able to appeals on the grounds that: “the information contained in the officer’s report submitted to the Panel was incorrect or incomplete, and therefore had a material affect on the decision”.
- (b) As there is currently only one ground for appeal, and applicants cannot appeal against the Panel’s recommendations or subsequent Cabinet decisions; the above proposal (if agreed) negates the need for an appeals process. It is therefore recommended that the appeals process be abolished. This proposal would be in line with other council’s grant programmes and large funding bodies, who do not operate an appeals process.

3. Implications of the Recommendation

3.1 Staffing/workforce

3.1.2 The aim is to provide improved clarity and transparency in the grants process that will lead to better use of existing resources. For example, if officers are no longer required to gather and collate supporting documents as part of the first stage assessment, they will have more time to ensure that each application is assessed against the criteria and funding priorities.

3.2 Equalities Impact

3.2.1 See Equality Impact Assessment for details.

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.

3.5 Financial Implications

3.5.1 There could be a financial implication if the panel agrees to recommend grant awards in advance of the Cabinet agreeing the budget for 2010/11, particularly if it is below the 2009/10 funding level.

3.7 Performance Issues

3.7.1 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 recommendations in this report have the potential to contribute to improving performance against this indicator by:

- Encouraging innovation within the sector.
- Clarifying the eligibility criteria;
- Improving the application process so that it is clear, transparent and easier to access;
- Improving the speed and effectiveness of the grant decision-making process

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%. This will be achieved 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 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'.

3.7 Environmental Impact

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

3.8 Risk Management Implications

3.8.1 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

Name: Sheela Thakrar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 22 nd June 2009		
Name: Jessica Farmer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: 22 nd June 2009		

Section 5 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name: Alex Dewsnap



Divisional Director
(Partnership Development and
Performance)

Date: 22nd June 2009

Section 6 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: John Edwards



Divisional Director
(Environmental Services)

Date: 22nd June 2009

SECTION 7 - CONTACT DETAILS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

Contact:

Audrey Salmon, Interim Service Manager – Community Resources and Projects (ext. 5332)
Parveen Vasdev, Principal Grants Officer (ext. 7625)
Charlotte Clark – Senior Grants Officer (ext. 2335).

Background Papers:

Appendix 1 – Revised Application Form

Appendix 1

Voluntary Grants Application Form

Please ensure that all relevant sections of this application form are completed. If you are applying for more than £2,000 you need to complete the whole form, however if you are applying for less only complete the section indicated in this form.

1. Organisation Contact Details

Name of organisation			
Organisation address			
	Post code:		
Address for Correspondence (if different to above)			
	Post code:		
Contact Person(s)		Position in organisation	
Telephone number(s)			
Fax number			
Email address(es)			

2. About your organisation

All applicants to complete this session

a. What is the legal status of your organisation? Please tick which ones of the following applies to your organisation. You may need to tick more than one.

Company limited by guarantee

Friendly society

Registered charity

Housing Association

Partnership (please describe)

Part of a regional or national organisation

Other (please describe)

Please see guidance notes on page.....

b. When was organisation set up?

Briefly describe the aims and objectives of your organisation.

3. Policies and Procedures

All applicants to complete this section

Please note that you are not required to submit supporting documents at this stage. Successful applicants will be required to submit the following information once a grant has been agreed at the Cabinet meeting in March.

The Grant will be withdrawn if the supporting documents are not submitted by the agreed deadline. See covering letter for details.

Please see guidance notes on page.....

Please confirm that you have all of the following policies/statements and procedures in place?

Required policies/statements and procedures for grants awards under £2,000

A constitution/memorandum and article of association/trustees/deeds of trust

A bank account in the organisation's name

Policies for the protection of children and vulnerable adults (if relevant)

Health and safety

Appropriate insurances and indemnities (if relevant) procedures (if relevant)

Written statement of commitment to equal opportunities

Additional requirements for grants awards between £2,001 and £10,000

All of the above including:

Certified or audited accounts from the previous year (by an independent person). If your organisation has been running for less than 15 months, you may not be able to give us this so in these cases we will accept a 12-month financial projection for the year when you will spend the grant

Additional requirements for grants awards over £10,001

All of the above including:

Employment and staffing policies and procedures, which address the recruitment and selection, and training of staff and volunteers

Systems to monitor the quality of services delivered

4. About the Proposed Project/Service

All applicants to complete this section

Please see guidance notes on page For details.

a. Name of proposed project/service

b. Is this a new project/service? YES NO

c. How do you know that there is a need for this project/service?

d. What are the main aims and objective of the project/service?

e. Which one of the funding priorities will your project/service address?

f. Please explain how you project/service meets this priority?

5. Project Delivery

All applicants to complete (a) and (b) in this section

a. How will your project/service be delivered?

b. Where will it be delivered?

Only answer the following questions in this section if you are applying for more than £2,000

c. Who will it be delivered by:

Volunteers

Paid staff

Both

d. If the service is to be delivered by a paid member of staff, are they

New

Existing

e. How will your project/service address the needs of Harrow's diverse community?

d. Please indicate which of the following groups will benefit from your activities:

<p style="text-align: center;">Asian or Asian British</p> <p>Afghani Bangladeshi Indian Pakistani Sinhalese Sri Lankan Tamil Any other Asian background – please specify</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Black or Black British</p> <p>Caribbean Ghanaian Nigerian Somali Any other Black background – please specify</p>
<p>Mixed</p> <p>White and African White and Asian White and Caribbean Any other Mixed background – please specify</p>	<p>White</p> <p>Albanian British Gypsy/Roma Traveller Irish Irish Traveller Polish Romanian Serbian Any other White background – please specify</p>
<p>Other Ethnic Groups</p> <p>Arab Chinese Iranian Iraqi Kurdish Lebanese Any other ethnic group – please specify</p>	

e. How will you know that the project has made a difference to their lives?

7. Project Cost

All applicants to complete this section

What is the total cost of the proposed project?

How much funding are you requesting?

Please complete the proposed project breakdown below.

Proposed Project Breakdown			
Expenditure Categories	Item Description	Qty	Costings (£)
Staffing Cost			
	Sub Total		
Volunteers expenses			
	Sub Total		
Overheads (e.g. utility bills/ maintenances/ repairs)			
	Sub Total		
Legal and professional fees insurance			
	Sub Total		
Venue			
	Sub Total		
Project Costs (e.g. Materials/ stationery/ printing/ refreshment)			
	Sub Total		
Other Expenses			
	Sub Total		

Total Project Cost	
---------------------------	--

Only answer the following questions in this section if you are applying for more than £2,000

Does your organisation have plans to raise funds from other sources for this or similar projects for the benefit of Harrow residents?

Yes

No

If yes please complete the table below:

Fundraising category	Purpose	Projected annual income	Funding Confirmed Y/N
Fees and charges			
Donations			
Sponsorships			

Funding Body (please list names below)			

8. Professional References

Please provide the contact details of two organisations that you currently provide services to, work with or receive funding from.

Please note that this should not be from the following:

- A personal reference – from a friend or relative
- A political reference – from a councillor or a member of parliament
- A member of the Grant Advisory Panel

Reference 1	
Name of contact	
Organisation	
Address	
Telephone number	
Email address	
Connection with the organisation	

Reference 2	
Name of contact	
Organisation	
Address	
Telephone number	
Email address	
Connection with the organisation	

9. Future of the Project

All applicants to complete this section

Please explain how you plan to continue with this project when this funding has ceased.

10. Declaration

We declare that all the information provided in this application form on behalf of the organisation is correct and complete to the best of our knowledge and acknowledge that if a grant is awarded to you organisation, it will be used exclusively for the purposes described.

Please ensure that two members of your trustee/management committee sign this below:

Print Name:	Signed:
Position in Organisation:	Date:
Print Name:	Signed:
Position in Organisation:	Date:

Please return the completed form to:

Grants Team, Harrow Council
Room 227, Civic Centre Station Road,
Harrow, HA1 2XF

Email: ????????

Closing date:

LATE OR INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

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 move 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

<p>7 What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy?</p>	<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. 		
<p>8 What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</p>	<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. 		
<p>9 Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy?</p>	<p>Voluntary and Community Sector Community Members</p>	<p>10 Who implements the function/policy and who is responsible for the function/policy?</p>	<p>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.</p>

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 1541 778 2123">Letter</td> <td data-bbox="703 114 778 1541"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="778 1541 821 2123">Meetings</td> <td data-bbox="778 114 821 1541">✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="821 1541 865 2123">Interviews</td> <td data-bbox="821 114 865 1541"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="865 1541 908 2123">Telephone</td> <td data-bbox="865 114 908 1541"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="908 1541 951 2123">Workshops</td> <td data-bbox="908 114 951 1541"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="951 1541 994 2123">Fora</td> <td data-bbox="951 114 994 1541"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="994 1541 1037 2123">Questionnaires</td> <td data-bbox="994 114 1037 1541">✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1037 1541 1080 2123">Other</td> <td data-bbox="1037 114 1080 1541"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table> <p>Consultation information was available mid April 2009</p> <p>A discussion paper was presented to the Grant Advisory Panel on the 8th June 09</p>	Letter		Meetings	✓	Interviews		Telephone		Workshops		Fora		Questionnaires	✓	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Letter																	
Meetings	✓																
Interviews																	
Telephone																	
Workshops																	
Fora																	
Questionnaires	✓																
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>																
<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>

90

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