

## **Theme 1: Children, Young People and Families**

### **Theme Summary**

This theme identified raising attainment and support for vulnerable and excluded children, young people and families as its priority areas.

### **Raising attainment**

Much of the evidence relating to tackling underachievement for specific groups demonstrates that traditional school effectiveness programmes have very limited impact for some children and young people. This suggests that different approaches need to be explored so that we are confident we are meeting the needs of all children and young people and address barriers to achievement comprehensively.

### **Vulnerable and excluded children, young people and families**

Services are required that complement existing provision as part of a comprehensive system of care and support along with those that provide a range of social and leisure opportunities.

Specific activities include: Out of school provision that supports improved educational attainment, targeted at those at risk of not achieving expected levels; Services for vulnerable/excluded children, young people and/or their families to prevent problems escalating delivered as part of a comprehensive and co-ordinated system of care; Children's adventure play, sport and indoor/outdoor recreation; Multi-disciplinary arts provision and Youth development and support services.

### **Available funding for each element of the programme**

#### **Raising attainment:**

- £15,500 for innovative programmes aimed at raising attainment for those at risk of not achieving expected levels for each ward cluster.
- £31,500 for community language programmes for each ward cluster
- £52,250 for provision of a range of inclusive universal and targeted, cultural, environmental and leisure opportunities, which meet the needs of all children and young people, including those with disabilities reaching people within and across the ward clusters.

#### **Vulnerable children, young people and families:**

- £45,250 for services that provide targeted interventions for children, young people and/or families to prevent problems escalating for each ward cluster.
- £60,500 for targeted youth services with a grant value of £15,000 per application per annum to deliver 2 evenings minimum between 6pm to 9pm and to engage 100 young people minimum for each ward cluster.

### **Response to Specification:**

#### **Raising Attainment**

## **Raising Attainment**

There were 36 applications for out of school provision aimed at raising attainment. The majority of the bids were for standard study support/homework clubs and did not respond to the specific request for the innovative approaches specified. The specification stated that bids were sought for the delivery of inclusive services available to all children and young people and that a small number of projects would be funded that meet the needs of targeted groups. The majority of submissions however were for targeted groups of children and young people, predominantly BME. Children and young people with the lowest levels of attainment are white British, black Caribbean and white/black Caribbean young people however there are a sufficient number of programmes who will deliver to all children and young people who will meet the needs of these groups.

Recommendations have been based on quality of submissions, identified need, geographical spread and the funding envelope available. The total annual funding available for out of school provision is £62,000 and the total funding requested per annum is significantly higher and is in the region of £386,183. 11 projects have been recommended for funding in order to ensure viable services that can meet specified outcomes.

## **Community Languages**

There were 26 applications for MSG for mother tongue community language classes in after-school settings. 7 fell below the moderated qualifying score of 45. 10 of the 26 projects have been recommended for funding. Overall quality of applications – 30% were good, 50% satisfactory and the remaining 20% inadequate.

Responses to specification priorities were detailed and appropriate in the 'Good' applications; included realistic targeting of raising educational attainments and understanding of culture and language; some included raising attainment in core areas, i.e Maths and English alongside the 1<sup>st</sup> language. Some good ones included among other specifications – reduce anti-social behaviour and drugs, improved communication skills, social inclusion and cohesion, Improvement of basic learning skills and creating friendly learning environment and improved community engagement. Partnership bids were only a few – 4 out of 26.

All applications included the Constitution and some form of Child safeguarding and Health & Safety and other policies required but a number of them didn't have audited accounts.

All applications focused more or less around raising educational attainment and enhancing students' cultural and learning experience and some mentioned that these skills gained can be transferred to mainstream school learning. Some added, skills and knowledge gained in GCSE classes can be useful for admissions to universities and future jobs. "The volunteers gain valuable professional skills which will help them in securing future jobs, develop interpersonal skills, communication skills, support to children with special needs, promote positive integration and reject and resist anti-social behaviour and bullying."

Most applications, however, failed to mention the use of modern technology for learning as almost no applicant mentioned the use of IT and smart-board or learning through the positive use of the INTERNET.

Lessons for the sector – organisations need to be realistic in setting targets and should include parental involvement as well. Third sector organisations should also try to diversify their learning tools, i.e look at other ways of learning rather than just traditional methods.

### **Targeted Cultural, Environmental & Leisure**

This element of the theme has an annual budget of £209,000 which over the 3 year period equates to £627,000. This allocation has been split equally, an annual budget of £104,500, between Culture (arts) and Environment and Leisure (sports).

#### **Cultural and Environmental**

Thirteen applications were received for arts and play based activities, one including an element of an environmental project. Of these two were not eligible for this strand and one scored below 50 and is not recommended for funding. The total applied for by the remaining 10 projects for full 3 years was £582,351 against available budget of £313,500. The total recommended for these 10 projects for the 3 year period is £313,500.

Recommendations are based on scores (minimum 50 up to 92), value for money and coverage of ward clusters. North West cluster is covered by six projects, North East by five, South West by seven and South East by four. Three of the projects have borough wide coverage and two of these are strategically important building resources for the borough.

#### **Leisure**

Twelve applications were received for Sport & Physical Activity with a total annual funding request of £216,416, compared to a total sport allocation of £104,500 per annum. This illustrates that funding requests for sports related projects were extremely oversubscribed. There are 7 projects recommended for funding at a total of £313,500 for the 3 year period, against a budget of £313,500.

Recommendations were made on the basis of the overall quality of the submissions which evidenced value for money, additional provision which avoided duplication and sufficiently demonstrated meeting strategic priorities.

### **Targeted Interventions for Children, Young People and Families**

There were 21 applications submitted to deliver targeted interventions for children, young people and families. The quality of submissions overall was good and will meet a range of identified needs. There is also good geographical coverage as most programmes will deliver borough wide.

Recommendations have been made on the basis of the overall quality of the submissions, strategic priorities for children, young people and families, geographical spread and the funding envelope available.

The total annual funding available for this provision is £181,000. The level of funding requested per annum is £704,139 which means only a small number of projects can be funded to ensure we have a viable programme that delivers specified outcomes. 6 of these projects have been recommended for funding.

## **Targeted Youth Services**

There were 32 applications submitted to deliver targeted youth services under the theme of children, young people and families. The total annual funding allocation for targeted youth provisions is £242,000 per annum.

Decisions were made on the basis of the overall quality of the submissions and strategic priorities for children, young people and families. Recommendations were brought forward through local needs analysis and by identifying key priorities for engaging young people in positive diversionary activities.

A total of 17 out of 32 applications have been approved. Based on assessment scoring, the highest 4 applicants in each ward cluster have been recommended for funding. For the North-East cluster, there was only one application, the remaining funds were allocated to the 4 next highest scoring applicants across the borough where it has been identified that there is no duplication of services and additional value was recognised.

The response to specification priorities has been positive, a significant proportion have agreed to offer a minimum of 2 evenings of youth work per week based on a £15,000/annum grant award. For those receiving the full allocation of £15,000/annum we would recommend the organisations achieve the following outputs; 100 Contacts - young person attending project at least once 60 Participants (60% of contacts) - young person attending at least on five separate occasions 36 Recorded Outcomes (60% of participants) – Recorded Outcomes can be defined as an enriched journey which demonstrates the personal progress of a young person as a result of a youth work intervention 18 Certified or Accredited Outcomes (30% of participants) - As a result of undertaking certified learning, a young person obtains a nationally recognised certificate in a specific area of work. For those organisations receiving less than £15,000/annum, a pro-rata amount for outputs should be agreed.

In terms of addressing priorities that applications covers a good geographical spread, caters for girls and young women and provide an array of fun and engaging informal learning activities.

There has been a few consortium based applications, with some proposals overly ambitious in their funding requirements. To ensure uniformity and transparency of services all projects will be required to apportion their KPI targets accordingly.

## **Budget and Recommendations**

The total funding available for Theme 1: Children Young People & Families is £820,000 per annum. This equates to a total of £2,460,000 over the 3 year period. The Raising Attainment budget is £62,000 per annum and over 3 year £186,000.

The Community Language budget is £126,000 per annum and over 3 years £378,000.

The Targeted Cultural, Environmental & Leisure budget is £209,000 per annum and over 3 years £627,000. This budget is split equally between Culture & Environment (£313,500) and Leisure (£313,500). The Targeted Interventions for Children, Young People and/or Families is £181,000 per annum and over 3 years £543,000 and the Targeted Youth Service budget is £242,000 per annum and £726,000 over 3 years.

The recommendations over the 3 years in respect of the 11 projects for Raising Attainment total £185,949. The recommendations over the 3 years in respect of the 10 projects for Community Language total £163,146. The recommendations over the 3

years in respect of the 10 projects for Cultural & Environmental projects total £313,500 over the 3 years. The recommendations in respect of the 7 Leisure projects total £313,500 over the 3 year period. The recommendations over the 3 year period in respect of the 6 projects for Targeted Interventions for Children, Young People and/or Families total £542,997 and the recommendations over the 3 years in respect of the 17 supported projects for Targeted Youth Service total £726,000. The recommended amounts totalling £2,245,092 are within the available theme budget.

## **Theme Summary**

There are two specific strands under this theme, covering Route-ways to Employment for those furthest from the labour market, and access to Social Welfare Advice Services (SWAS) for those on low income. We want to support voluntary and community sector projects that can contribute to the Council's Employment Strategy and Community Plan priorities.

The focus of the Route-ways to Employment specification is on engagement and integration of pathways to employment for those residents who face specific barriers to accessing the labour market. This includes long-term unemployed or economically inactive residents, including people from BME communities; people whose barriers relate to age, gender, sexuality, health or disability particularly mental health; people most likely to be adversely affected by the impacts of recent and proposed welfare reform. The specification is designed to complement the existing public and private sector access to employment support provision

The focus of the Social Welfare Advice stream is on promoting access to integrated quality assured advice and representation for low income residents; through strong partnerships/networks of providers at both locality and borough wide level. This stream includes a number of different specifications for both generalist and specialist legal advice services. The specifications are primarily focused on provision in the following areas of law Debt and Money Advice, Welfare Benefit and Tax Credits, Housing and Employment Rights and other social welfare legal issues. The focus is on high quality accessible universal services that can meet the needs of all residents regardless of age, gender, ethnicity or disability, through effective referral routes and partnership working.

Advice services play a key role in promoting social and financial inclusion and in advocating for vulnerable residents. Strong referral links have developed in recent years between the statutory sector and local voluntary sector advice agencies in response to the impact of various social, economic and policy changes on residents. Demand on advice services therefore remains high due to the pressures on other services and the nature of the population in the borough including the high levels of poverty, ill health and disability. Ongoing welfare reform changes to both in work and out of work benefits have created additional pressures on advice services in recent years. Changes to disability and work related benefits, as well as changes to housing and employment security and rights will continue to have an impact on ongoing demand for advice services.

## **Response to Specifications:**

### **Strand 1 - Route-ways to Employment Specification**

A total of 55 applications were received for Route-ways to Employment strand and 10 of these are recommended for funding. There were 2 applications that were assessed as ineligible.

The applications with the top 10 scores provide a reasonably broad range of projects to address the requirements of the specification in terms of target groups having considered the internal and external scoring, value for money and target groups. Officers consider that the highest scoring projects is sufficient to identify the successful applicants. Whilst there are other applications under this strand that officers consider viable, the finite funding does not allow all of them to be supported. Officers would not

recommend reducing the amounts of funding requested in order to support more projects across the theme as this would mean a significant amount of additional time being spent on negotiation and re-assessment which would delay awards, and for which no rationale has been defined as part of the original process; it would also open up the council to challenge and may effectively render currently viable projects unviable.

The assessment table does highlight further projects which officers would recommend, in order of scoring, should additional funding become available, with the exception of two relatively high scoring projects: *Seeds for Growth: Enterprising Tower Hamlets*, and *Splash Play: Volunteer Project*, which respectively are considered by officers to duplicate existing programmes, and to not offer value for money.

Should any adjustments be required to the Route-ways to Employment awards, officers would recommend that this is done purely on the basis of the scoring and the above considerations that have already been incorporated into the assessments.

## **Strand 2 - Social Welfare Advice Services Specification**

A total of 18 applications were received for Social Welfare Advice Strand and 11 of these are recommended for funding.

The specifications for the Social Welfare Advice service has a strong emphasis on partnership working, demonstration of how advice quality assurance standards were implemented and that organisations were linked to appropriate referral networks to help deal effectively with demand and avoid duplication. In line with the recommendations of the 2014 Advice Services Review, the specification was based on a lead provider partnership model where the lead provider works with other local or smaller providers to coordinate provision and oversee the quality, effectiveness and accessibility of the provision

The specification included provision for locality bids, plus a borough-wide generalist services, a specialist benefits and housing advice service, and a specialist money and debt advice service. The specifications also included the provision of an advice training and network coordination project to help ensure that the quality and coordination of services is maximised. An indicative budget for each area of provision was included in the specifications and all of the proposals recommended for funding fall within this range

The quality of applications was generally high, with a number of competing bids for provision of services at locality level and also competing bids for the provision of a specialist debt and money advice service. A value for money exercise was undertaken to assess average unit costs on key outputs in order to identify any excessive or unrealistic costs. Each application was considered under the relevant element of the SWAS specification that they applied for (locality, borough wide and specialist) and officers consider that the scoring itself was sufficient to identify the successful applicants under each of the individual SWAS specification. The only exception is for the south west cluster (LAP 3 and 4) locality provision where two high quality competing bids were received. Officers have therefore recommended that the budget for this locality area is split between the two competing bids to help maximise and sustain provision in the area.

## **Budget and Recommendations**

The standard of applications was reasonably high, although some proposals did not appear to have given much consideration to the details of the specification particularly in relation to the requirements to demonstrate approaches to providing integrated services.

A value for money exercise has been undertaken to assess average unit costs on key outputs in both strands, in order to identify any excessive or unrealistic costs. As anticipated costs varied considerably; depending on the target group and level of support /intervention required

Under the employment strand, for example the unit costs of supporting people with mental health problems to move closer to the labour market and into sustainable work can range from between £2,000 to £11,000, but are between £1,500 and £5,000 for those with less chronic barriers to work. Under the Welfare Advice strand, reasonable costs vary from £20 - 25 per unit for general help advice to £125- £150 per unit for complex casework depending on the client group, and level of advice provided. The projects recommended for funding have been assessed by officers against these parameters and are considered to provide value for money, whilst ensuring quality and viability.

The total funding available for Theme 2: Jobs, Skills and Prosperity is £1,220,000 per annum. This equates to a total of £3,660,000 over the 3 year period. The Route-ways to Employment budget is £320,000 per annum and over 3 year £960,000 and the Social Welfare Advice is £900,000 per annum and over 3 years £2,700,000.

The recommendations over the 3 years in respect of the 10 projects for Route-ways to Employment total £995,478. The recommendations in respect of the 11 projects for Social Welfare Advice over the 3 years total £2,646,819. The recommended amounts totalling £3,642,296,000 are within the available budget.

### Theme 3: Prevention, Health and Wellbeing Services

#### Theme Summary:

The aim of this theme is to bring about improved health and wellbeing outcomes for vulnerable adults, including older people, and those with disabilities including mental ill health, and carers living in Tower Hamlets. We encouraged applications that sought to:

- enhance the lives of people, who may be at risk of, or are already experiencing, social isolation or gradually losing their independence
- address low levels of participation in sport and physical activity and associated health risks in some parts of the borough
- support their wellbeing through healthy lives activities including healthy eating and health promotion/awareness sessions
- retain a knowledge of other services supporting the above target groups in order to provide basic information, advice and signposting and facilitate access to other relevant services
- increase community cohesion
- encourage the engagement of local residents, particularly vulnerable and hard to reach groups, to participate in lifelong learning and to develop local residents to become learning champions in their communities and deliver the following outcomes:
  - Improved health, (including mental health and dementia), and wellbeing in adults, including older adults by, for instance, Increasing the number of vulnerable residents leading healthier lifestyles through improved diet, regular exercise and related activities, including attending lunch clubs (for those aged 50+)
  - Reduced loneliness and social isolation and improving emotional health and wellbeing through access to events and activities
  - Greater sense of community cohesion through volunteering, intergenerational activity, and access to advice and information, to good quality, accessible sports clubs

#### LunchClubs

LunchClubs were assessed in line with a “heat map” developed by Public Health outlining where our older residents (55 and over) live in the borough, and ensuring that, as much as possible, there is equity of service available to all our communities. We have applied a consistent approach to “unit” cost based on amount applied for, days open, weeks of the year and number of proposed attendees, and taken into account an anticipated income from charging the users of the service. There will need to be some negotiation around the outcomes with some of the providers which will be a condition of grant and robustly monitored.

## **Prevention Health & Wellbeing & Sports & Lifelong Learning**

Prevention Health & Wellbeing & Sports & Lifelong Learning have been assessed broadly based on the overall quality of the applications, consideration of value for money, the spread of activities, avoidance of duplication and which have sufficiently demonstrated strategic priorities, identified in the Specification document, such as reducing loneliness and social isolation and improved health and wellbeing. In Sport, priorities specifically looked for under-represented groups such as women, disabled people, BAME communities and young adults across the borough.

### **Response to Specification:**

- applications statistics – total received, number ineligible etc
- Overall quality of applications received It is unfortunate that a number of organisations did not take advantage of the support offered by Tower Hamlets CVS to help them consider their strategy to bid for MSG funding. Applications were received that:
  - requested double the amount they received in the previous MSG round for the same outcomes;
  - had clearly not read the service specification
  - were requesting funding for services already provided through other funding streams
  - were not of sufficient quality to get through the process
  - were not able to deliver the service they applied to deliver as is not part of their Constitution

Response to specification priorities and requirements including targeting, partnership bids etc. Lunchclubs, in particular, did not consider partnerships or other mechanisms for working together. Older residents have benefitted from an over-provision of lunchclubs in some parts of the borough due, in large part, to additional funding made available to them in the last couple of years. There is not enough funding available to enable this concentration of provision and some organisations will lose out. This situation may have been mitigated had organisations considered alternative models. A “Big Lunchclub Conversation” was held in 2013, jointly with THCVS, Public Health and Strategic Commissioning, to encourage these conversations.

Other key issues positive and negative It would be beneficial for the Theme leads to have the “final say” in the prioritisation which would enable better planning and less versions of key documentation.

Lessons for the sector: We were disappointed in the failure to attract partnership bids. There were clear examples where organisations, who provide the same or similar services, could have bid together to provide the service. There may have cost efficiencies around training, volunteer “banks” or other shared resources as well as benefits to our communities by services being more “streamlined”. We have examples of contractual arrangements where this model has worked extremely well. However, we recognise that the timescales involved in this process limited the development of formal consortia or partnership arrangements.

### **Budget and Recommendations**

The total funding available for Theme 3: Prevention Health & Wellbeing is £806,000 per annum. This equates to a total of £2,418,000 over the 3 year period. The Lunch Club budget is £355,000 per annum and over the 3 year period £1,065,000. The Prevention Health & Wellbeing budget is £242,000 per annum and over 3 years amounts to £726,000 and for Sports & Lifelong Learning is £209,000 per annum and over 3 years £627,000.

The recommendations over the three years in respect of the 12 lunchclub projects total £611,640. The recommendations in respect of the 14 projects for Prevention Health & Wellbeing over the three years total £1,052,940 and the recommendations in respect of the 9 projects for Sports and Lifelong Learning over the three years total £626,400. The recommended amounts totalling £2,290,980 are within the overall available budget for this Theme.

## **Theme Summary**

This theme supports the aim of the Voluntary and Community Sector Strategy which is to 'Support the sector's role in achieving One Tower Hamlets and providing excellent services which will improve the quality of life of local people'. The following five key objectives emanate from this.

1. VCS shaping strategy and services
2. Building strong community leadership and social capital
3. VCS resilience and financial sustainability
4. Strategic commissioning and co-production
5. Monitoring evaluating and demonstrating impact

Local Voluntary and Community Sector Organisations provide extremely important areas of service to local residents. It is essential therefore, that these organisations are capable of delivering to the highest possible standards. To this end we were looking for 3 consortium projects under the following priorities.

### **Priority 1 - Supporting organisations in receipt of Council grant**

This project will primarily focus on supporting organisations to improve their project management skills and expertise including ensuring that related governance systems are in place and being adhered to.

### **Priority 2 - General support to front line delivery groups**

This project will be free to support any local VCS organisation but with a focus on those regarded as small/medium size groups

### **Priority 3 - Strategic partner project**

An organisation is required to undertake the role of a prime strategic partner, working closely with the Council to support the delivery of key Third Sector policies, strategies and action plans.

This work is also likely to include the design and delivery of a range generic cross-sector services designed to develop and maintain a vibrant and impactful sector going forward. It is envisaged that such services will comprise among other things, aspects of the following.

**Services and support** - to promote the effectiveness of local voluntary and community groups;

**Liaison** - acting as the focal contact point for the local sector at large disseminating and the 2-way cascading of information;

**Representation** - encouraging and championing the involvement of voluntary and community groups in shaping and delivering services;

**Development work** - to support the local voluntary and community sector agencies;

### **Response to Specification:**

We received 1 application in response to Priority 1, 9 applications in response to Priority 2 and 2 applications in response to priority 2, a total of 12 applications. Whilst a number of the applications were very good, the overall quality was extremely disappointing.

From an analysis of the applications received, it becomes increasingly clear that some applicants have either not read the specification document, or they have read it but do not understand it.

More worryingly however, a picture which emerged during the assessment process and which was more prevalent in some Themes than others, is that some organisations chose to ignore the requirements of the specification and submit an application to do their own thing and simply request funding for a project to continue funding their 'business as usual' activities.

For example, where this theme made it clear that support would need to be provided across the full spectrum of voluntary and community organisations, some applications were targeting relatively small sub-sectors.

Additionally, this theme specifically called for consortia or partnership bids and some applicants ignored this fundamental requirement.

### **Budget and Recommendations**

The total funding available for Theme 4: Third Sector Organisational Development is £260,000 per annum. This equates to a total of £780,000 over the 3 year period. The Priority 1 budget is £70,000 per annum and over 3 year £210,000,000. The Priority 2 budget is £90,000 per annum and over 3 years £270,000 and the Priority 3 budget is £100,000 per annum and over 3 year £300,000.

The recommendations over the 3 years in respect of the 1 project within Priority 1 totals £210,000. The recommendation in respect of the 1 project for Priority 2 over the 3 years totals £300,000 and the recommendation in respect of the 1 project for Priority 3 over the 3 years totals £270,000. The recommended amounts totalling £780,000 are within the available budget.

## **Theme 5: Community Engagement, Cohesion and Resilience**

### **Theme Summary**

Tower Hamlets is a very diverse borough, with a particularly large young population. Whilst we succeed in around 80% of the borough saying that people from different backgrounds get on well together flashpoints in community tensions do arise.

This theme invites applications focussed on work on local community issues and involving residents in them and developing community citizenship and leadership to reduce tensions. It particularly seeks initiatives that bring people from different backgrounds together, celebrating different identities, cultures and generations.

Generating sustainable outcomes and building social capital must be an integral part of the applications in this area that we will fund. We also require all successful applicants to participate, alongside others funded under this theme, in 3 specific workshops – at the beginning of the project, mid-way and at the end.

### **Response to Specification**

There were 41 applications that were received under this theme, of which 5 were ineligible, leaving a total 36 for consideration.

We were pleased to receive and be able to support applications from wide sections of the community and geographical spread. Many organisations had considerable experience of working in this area.

Whilst a range of projects will have some effect community engagement, cohesion and resilience, the strongest projects were those that had started with this as their purpose and focussed on how to bring this about. Thus projects that, for example specifically target different parts of the community and bring them together to work on community issues were stronger than those which were primarily focused on other activities such as sport, training, health or employment.

In order to maximise value for money it was crucial that the projects produced outcomes that were sustainable beyond the timetable of the projects themselves, for example by creating social capital. The projects we have recommended do this to some extent, and there is potential for the rest of the sector to learn from their ideas around this.

It was necessary to select projects that fitted both with the budget available (£166,250 for 19 month) and also with the wider aims in terms of the theme. The applications were then further considered by a wider group of Senior Managers including the Service Head Corporate Strategy & Equality, in relation to the following criteria.

- Sustainability and building social capital
- Primary purpose is to build community Cohesion, engagement and resilience
- Benefits of the project are to the wider community rather than only to individuals
- Bringing people from different backgrounds together e.g. intergenerational projects, different races, faiths, economic groups etc.

Rationales for all judgements were recorded.

## **Budget and Recommendations**

In order to verify that our funding recommendations had not led to any unintentional disadvantage to particular parts of the borough, we considered the successful and unsuccessful applications (from the eligible cohort) on the basis of two key factors

- Communities of Interest served
- Geographical Areas

The idea was to ensure that those recommended for funding represented a broad spread in terms of the communities they serve, and in particular that there was no unconscious bias in any that were unsuccessful. For simplicity, the information was considered on the basis of information given in the sections of the application where the applicants were asked “primary beneficiary target” (communities of interest) and Geographical area Served (not geographical area based).

In regards to communities of interest served it was noted the projects recommended for award would work with a diverse range of residents which broadly reflected the profile of the borough.

In regards to geographical coverage as was clear from our funding criteria, we were more likely to support borough wide funding applications, hence five (half) of the projects recommended for award provide borough wide coverage. Of the remaining six projects recommended for award, four cover multiple wards despite not being borough wide and all wards except Bromley South and St Peters are covered by at least one project that is local to them (not borough wide).

The total funding available for Theme 5: Community Engagement, Cohesion and Resilience Jobs, Skills and Prosperity is £105,000 per annum. This equates to a total of £315,000 over the 3 year period.

As this programme will run for 19 months (September 2-015 to March 2017) the available prorated budget is £166,250. The recommendations in respect of the 11 projects over the 19 month period total of £165,522 which is within the available budget. The remaining budget of £149,478 will be re-commissioned to be effective from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017 until 31<sup>st</sup> August 2018, the remaining 17 months of the programme.