

Committee: <b>GRANTS PANEL</b>	Date: <b>25 March 2010</b>	Classification: <b>Unrestricted</b>	Report No: <b>(GP 09/091)</b>	Agenda Item:
Report of: <b>Helen Taylor, Corporate Director (Interim), Adults Health and Wellbeing</b>  Originating officer(s) <b>Barbara Disney, Commissioning Manager – Older People</b>		Title: <b>Mainstream Grant 2009-10 Project Progress Report – as at Quarter 3 2009/10 – Older People Lunchclubs</b>  Wards Affected: <b>ALL</b>		

## 1. **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The report presents Members with details of the progress of funded Older People lunch club projects for the period to the end of Quarter 3 (December 2009)
- 1.2 The report details where organisations are underperforming against the outputs of the Service Agreements and makes recommendations to address the lack of performance and value for money.
- 1.3 The report requests that Officers are delegated to take forward the recommendations.

## 2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Grants Panel is recommended to:-

- 2.1 Continue funding, as per Service Agreements, to the twelve organisations which are achieving agreed targets and outputs.
- 2.2 Delegate authority to Officers to negotiate proportionate reduced funding for the duration of the service agreement, if St Hilda's does not achieve full outputs by the end of Quarter 1 (June 2010),
- 2.3 Delegate authority to Officers to decommission RADICLE at St James the Less.
- 2.4 Delegate authority to Officers to negotiate proportionate funding to Toynbee Hall, and review progress against targets at the end of Quarter 1 (June 2010)

- 2.5 Delegate authority to Officers to renegotiate outputs and funding with Women's Health and Family Services with a variation in the Service Agreement being in place by the beginning of Quarter 2 (July 2010)

---

**Local Government Act, 1972 Section 100D (As amended)  
List of "Background Papers" used in the preparation of this report**

Brief description of "back ground papers"	Name and telephone number of holder and address where open to inspection.
---	---

None

**3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Cabinet in August 2007 took a decision to adopt a commissioning approach for the allocation of Mainstream Grant funding to the third sector. There are two funding streams within the Grant programme for Adults Health and Wellbeing: lunch club provision and non lunch club provision.
- 3.2 Lunch club provision was the first of the two funding streams to adopt the new commissioning approach and a 3 year funding arrangement from April 2009 was agreed by the Grants Panel on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2009. This report is about lunch club provision funded through Mainstream Grants only. The report notes the progress and achievements of the lunch club projects as outlined in Section 5 below.
- 3.3 Non lunch club provision is the subject of a separate report to the March Grants Panel.

**4. FUNDING STREAMS AND PROJECTS**

- 4.1 The overall budget for the provision of lunch clubs is £483,000 of which the Directorate contributes £135,700 from the mainstream commissioning budget to the sum of £347,300 from the mainstream grant.
- 4.2 16 organisations are currently providing lunch club services to older people across the borough through the MSG programme. Providers were asked that their services were holistic, delivering additional opportunities for older people to become more active in their community, promoting healthy eating, exercise and

activities to improve general wellbeing and promoting lifelong learning and volunteering opportunities.

## **5. PROJECT PROGRESS**

- 5.1 At the Grants Panel held on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2010, Officers reported that, of the 16 funded lunch clubs, 10 were GREEN (performing well), 2 AMBER (underperforming by less than 15% in relation to key deliverables) and 4 RED (underperforming by more than 15% in relation to key deliverables) at the end of Quarter 2.
- 5.2 At the end of Quarter 3 (December 2009) both of the lunch clubs identified as AMBER have moved to GREEN and 1 lunch club previously RED has moved to AMBER. This has resulted in 12 lunch clubs being GREEN, 1 AMBER and 3 RED. (See Appendix 1)
- 5.3 Officers recommend to Members that the Council continue funding, as per Service Agreements, to the twelve organisations which are achieving agreed targets and outputs as identified in Appendix 1. For the remainder:
- 5.4 St Hildas have achieved a slight increase since last reported and Officers anticipate a move to GREEN for the next Quarter. However, it is recommended that Officers are delegated to negotiate proportionate reduced funding for the duration of the service agreement if the lunch club does not achieve desired outputs by the end of Quarter 1 (June 2010)..
- 5.5 RADICLE at St James the Less, have been unable to achieve their targets despite Officer support and their own endeavours to publicise the service and have maintained their RED status. Being on the border with LB Hackney, they do have 2-4 Hackney residents attend the lunch club but do not receive any funding from them. Hackney residents are not counted in their outputs. Discussion with RADICLE has established that they are most unlikely to achieve their targets. It is recommended that Officers are delegated authority to decommission the service. RADICLE have indicated that they will need four months to give notice on their lease and to introduce the service users to other providers. Tapered funding during this period may be negotiable.
- 5.6 Toynbee Hall have had ongoing staffing issues and have not been able to attract the numbers of new attendees that they had hoped, although there is some increase and new referrals in progress. The manager of Toynbee's other Older People's Services (LinkAge Plus, Dignify and Surma Bangladeshi Pensioners Group) has now taken the lead for this service and has developed a robust Business Plan. It is recommended that Officers a review progress against targets at the end of Quarter 1 (June 2010) and are delegated authority to negotiate proportionate funding to Toynbee Hall

- 5.7 Women's Health and Family Services did not open the commissioned four days a week for the first two quarters this year, but this situation has now been addressed. However, the average attendance is still very low. It is recommended that Officers are delegated authority to renegotiate proportionate reduced funding and outputs with a variation in the Service Agreement being in place by the beginning of Quarter 2 (July 2010).

## **6. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER**

- 6.1 The review proposals set out in this report ensure that the financial support given to these organisations is intrinsically linked to outcomes. This is an important element in determining that grants not only address local need, but provide value for money.

## **7. CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL)**

- 7.1 The officers must confirm that in the current contractual arrangements grant funding can be terminated under our standard agreements. If this is the case then funding can be reduced where necessary.

## **8. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS**

- 8.1 The purpose of the Council's Third Sector grants programmes is to tackle a broad range of deprivation-related issues within the borough. All commissioned projects and activities are designed to ensure that services contribute to delivering the Council's agreed policies, strategies and action plans in relation to One Tower Hamlets by reducing inequalities between the different sections of the community.
- 8.2 The monitoring of, and support given to organisations is designed to ensure that the Council maximises the potential benefits to the local community from funded projects.

## **9. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT**

- 9.1 Where appropriate, Service Agreements with funded projects include requirements to ensure compliance with the Council's agreed sustainability action plans.

## **10. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 A number of different risks arise from any funding of external organisations. The key risks being:

- Funding not fully utilised and therefore allocations remain unspent;
- Funding used for purposes other than those agreed;
- Organisations not able to secure all the necessary funding required to deliver the project as planned; or,
- Organisations failing to deliver the agreed outputs/outcomes.

10.2 Part of the appraisal process evaluates and takes into consideration the above and other related risks in relation to both the organisation and the project.

## **11. EFFICIENCY STATEMENT**

11.1 All funded projects are monitored to ensure that they are delivering agreed outputs and benefits which contribute measurably to meeting local targets including efficiency and value for money.

## **12. APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX 1 – Mainstream Grants Project Monitoring Report: Quarters 1, 2 and 3 – April to December 2009. Older People – Lunchclubs.**