

LONDON COUNCILS GRANTS COMMITTEE

21 March 2018

Minutes of the Grants Committee held at London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL on Wednesday 21 March 2018

London Borough & Royal Borough:

Representative:

Barking & Dagenham	Cllr Saima Ashraf
Bexley	Cllr Don Massey
Ealing	Cllr Ranjit Dheer OBE
Greenwich	Cllr Denise Scott-McDonald
Harrow	Cllr Sue Anderson
Havering	Cllr Melvin Wallace
Hounslow	Cllr Candace Atterton
Islington	Cllr Kaya Comer-Schwartz
Kensington & Chelsea	Cllr Mary Weale
Kingston upon Thames	Cllr Hugh Scantlebury
Lambeth	Cllr Paul McGlone (Chair)
Lewisham	Cllr Joan Millbank
Merton	Cllr Edith MacCauley MBE
Newham	Cllr Forhad Hussain
Redbridge	Cllr Bob Littlewood
Richmond	Cllr David Linette
Southwark	Cllr Barrie Hargrove
Sutton	Cllr Simon Wales
Waltham Forest	Cllr Liaquat Ali
Wandsworth	Cllr Paul Ellis

London Councils officers were in attendance.

The Chair congratulated Cllr Dheer on his recent OBE.

The Chair informed the Committee that he would not be standing at the forthcoming elections and therefore would no longer be Chair of Grants Committee. On behalf of the Grants Committee Cllr Massey thanked Cllr McGlone for the non-political way in which he had chaired the Committee. He also thanked other members of the Committee who were no longer to stand at the election.

In terms of the agenda for the meeting, the Chair clarified that item 4 was incorrectly listed as minutes of an AGM. The Chair thanked Cllr Hussain for chairing the previous meeting in his absence.

1. Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Margaret McLennan (Brent), Alderman Alison Gowman (City of London), Cllr Sue Fennimore (Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr Douglas Mills (Hillingdon), Cllr Theo Dennison (Hounslow), Cllr Abdul Mukit MBE (Tower Hamlets) and Cllr Antonia Cox (Westminster).

2. Appointment of Deputy for LB Hounslow

- 2.1 The Chair reported that as the Grants Committee member for Hounslow was not able to attend the meeting and Cllr Atterton, in attendance, was not one of the appointed deputies, it was for Grants Committee to agree her as Deputy for Hounslow for the meeting. This was agreed.

3. Declarations of Interest

- 3.1 There were no declarations of interest declared.

4. Minutes of the Grants Committee – 22 November 2017

- 4.1 The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting, subject to the correction of Councillor Weale's name (spelled 'Wheale' in the minutes). Cllr Comer-Schwartz also mentioned that her name plate had been incorrectly spelled, and the Chair reminded staff to be careful in the correct spelling of members' names.
- 4.2 In response to a question about the 'No Recourse to Public Funds' thematic review and presentation at the previous meeting, Yolande Burgess, Strategy Director (YB) reported that the suggestions for lobbying mentioned were being worked up with Grants and Policy teams within London Councils, with a view to a paper being reported to a future meeting of Leaders' Committee. YB also confirmed that a member briefing on the subject had been distributed.

5. Performance of the Grants Programme 2017-21

- 5.1 The Chair confirmed that the full first year of the programme would be reported to Grants Committee at its AGM in July. He also congratulated those who had contributed to the report and was pleased to see the operation of the performance management framework within it.
- 5.2 Katy Makepeace-Gray, Principal Programme Manager (KM) informed the Committee that Priority 1 outcomes were 15 per cent above profile but Priority 2 were 4.5 per cent below profile for Quarters 1 to 3 of the current financial year. KM also drew members' attention to Appendix 1 of the report and the need to revise the RAG scoring methodology to bring out issues of under delivery.
- 5.3 In relation to Standing Together Against Domestic Violence (STADV) in section 4.2 of the report, members were informed that as the project was currently at amber, monitoring had been stepped up and there was an action plan in place. Members agreed to endorse the approach of officers to review a number of the outcomes that STADV is delivering against, in light of the fact that the project is delivering specific elements of the 1.3 service area specification.
- 5.4 KM pointed out that in Appendix 2 of the report the maps showed areas with more significant gaps between profile and delivery and concentrated on improvements which had taken place.
- 5.5 YB confirmed that in relation to Priority 3 projects, the report confirmed the incentives and approaches being adopted in relation to under performance. A new Quality Assurance officer had been appointed which has been welcomed by partners, the key issues had been identified and London Councils officers continued to work closely with the Priority 3 partners. The impact on partners cashflows had been recognised, and payments to providers continue to be made monthly rather than quarterly, with minimal risk to London Councils due to the robust quality assurance process now in place.
- 5.6 Cllr Littlewood congratulated the team at London Councils on the work done, as he had been concerned that the Priority 3 projects were not recoverable, and recognised the improvement in provider relationships.
- 5.7 Cllr Massey asked what organisational lessons had been learned from the issues in that considerable inputs had been required to deal with the problem? YB responded that the key learning was around how projects were taken on and initiated, and the need to build in proper contingencies.

- 45.8 Cllr Massey also asked, regarding the maps, what steps were being taken to look at the underperformance of the three boroughs, in terms of indicative and actual performance? Cllr Hargrove also wanted to know why only three boroughs were included in the report. KM responded that six boroughs had been identified relating to both Priority 1 and Priority 2 and that the three identified in the report were those that appeared on both lists. Work had been undertaken with borough officers to identify the underlying issues for this under-delivery in the three boroughs and to establish actions to address it. It was planned to roll this work out for the additional boroughs. The July Grants Committee would be presented with four quarters reporting, with borough reports for all boroughs, including some further analysis of under-delivery. The aim was to build on the reporting going forward.
- 5.9 Cllr Scott-McDonald informed the Committee that while it was recognised that engagement with borough officers had improved, there was more to do to improve borough engagement. She highlighted concern that the report noted some projects were green rated, which should not be. KM responded that work was underway with borough officers, including grants officers. She also informed the Councillor that there had been nuanced changes to the performance framework because of weighting changes, and the proposed changes, when modelled over the last two quarters would have changed a maximum of two projects from a green rating to an amber rating; issues relating to these two projects were reported on at the time.
- 5.10 Cllr Comer-Schwartz asked about the seeming randomness of outcomes for those performing well and not well, as she was keen to understand this. KM responded that improvements had been made in Quarter 3, but the results could also be influenced by the frequency of return of evaluation forms and the inputting of service users feedback onto the database. Reference was made to section 4.2 and Appendix five of the report, which provided further detail on this.
- 5.11 Cllr Wales asked about the difference between organisations in Priority 1 and 2, and Priority 3, and also felt that some boroughs seemed to be receiving more than they should in terms of delivery. YB confirmed that Priority 3 was part ESF funded, and that the funding regime and delivery strategy for those projects was different.
- 5.12 The Chair asked for staff to consider and report back to the Committee the lessons learned in respect of the Priority 3 issues, and to agree with boroughs the format and content of borough reports before reporting back to July Grants Committee.
- 5.13 Members took a view on the draft AGM paper attached as Appendix 4 to the report. It was agreed that Item 11, Provider Presentations, should focus on Priority 3, highlighting partnership working and key issues.

The Committee noted:

- a) the priority level outcomes for Priority 1, 2 and 3:
- b) the number of interventions delivered within the three Priority groups in the relevant quarters
- c) the progress of schemes, and outcomes at project level
- d) the progress on the administration of £100,000 per year for two years on behalf of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) to enhance training to front-line professionals on identifying harmful practices, as set out in section three.

And:

- e) Endorsed the approach taken by officers to review outcomes for Standing Together Against Domestic Violence (STADV) to ensure these are more in line with the issues raised in the Grants Review as set out in Section 4.2 of the report

- f) Endorsed the approach taken by officers to review the scoring ranges of the Red, Amber, Green (RAG) performance rating framework, as outlined in Appendix One of the report
- g) Endorsed the communications plan set out in Appendix Three, which has been provided in response to requests at the November meeting of the Grants Committee for additional information on communications strategies, noting the Chair's request to strengthen communications between the Committee and Borough lead officers.
- h) Agreed the format for the first annual report on the 2017-21 Grants Programme as outlined in Section Five of the report and Appendix Four.

6. Thematic review: Perpetrators

- 6.1 The Committee was informed that this was the second of the 'thematic review' papers and would be supplemented by presentations from Sara Kirkpatrick (SK) from Respect, and Susie McDonald (SM) and Kate Lexen (KL) from Tender Education and Arts.
- 6.2 KM hoped that the report and presentations would highlight the role of local authorities in tackling perpetrators, including through funding the Grants Programme. It was also hoped to encourage boroughs, when commissioning services, to consider making the Respect standard a requirement
- 6.3 SK from Respect informed the Committee that the organisation had three areas of specialism: perpetrators of domestic abuse; male victims of abuse; and young people living in abusive situations. They also provided pan London training (which was the core funding) and projects with the Drive and Advance programmes as well as working with Women's Aid.
- 6.4 Members were informed that Respect also worked with Ascent, providing a helpline funded by London Councils (second tier support services) and training in areas like developing confidence. SK confirmed that there were two types of training provided. One focused on those directly delivering perpetrator prevention programmes and one supporting an improved response from other services that deal with perpetrators (such as housing and children's services).
- 6.5 SK confirmed that one to one support was in high demand, including delivery of a specialist package with Women's Aid.
- 6.6 SM and KL presented on the work of Tender Education and Arts, which focused on providing two-day healthy relationship projects for groups of 25 to 30 young people, working with them to share experiences via performance. The organisation was also developing a longer term 'champion school' programme which would last a year, with the aim of challenging social norms and helping young people examine peer and their own behaviors via role play.
- 6.7 Cllr Comer-Schwartz was keen for her borough to do more with perpetrators but was concerned that the work was expensive and took a long time. SK confirmed that while it was the case that such work was not short term, it was important for it to be done effectively and safely.
- 6.8 Cllr Comer-Schwartz was also concerned that, as Islington had 63 schools, what could the impact of the 'champion school' programme be across her borough and asked what more London Boroughs could do to assist. SM and KL agreed that while the work was not reaching as many schools as others would like, it was important for the programme to be run well and not to be a 'box ticking' exercise. It was also noted that some boroughs had been able to provide top up funding in the past to assist such programmes, and schools had been able to access finance through trusts and foundations.

- 6.9 Cllr Dheer asked whether the work of the organisations addressed the issues of the negative pressure of social media. It was confirmed that while issues were addressed, it should be noted that the age group covered by the programmes were 'digital natives' and therefore care had to be taken not to see social media as inherently destructive, although the programmes did challenge abuse within social media platforms as unacceptable.
- 6.10 In response to a question from Cllr Atterton, it was confirmed that the Tender programmes could be adapted and tailored for specific audiences. Cllr Atterton also asked whether boroughs were using public health money to supplement the Respect work. SK thought not, but recognised that this might be because of the lack of contact from commissioning organisations.
- 6.11 Cllr Linette asked whether female perpetrators were also addressed as well as males. SK agreed that although the examples of research provided in the presentation focused on violence from men to women, which made up the vast majority of reported cases, women to male violence was recognised, and was included in the work to enable all people to understand their rights and responsibilities.
- 6.12 Cllr MacCauley asked whether use of social media as a violation of bail conditions would be picked up. SK confirmed that compliance with bail conditions would form part of the work done with perpetrators, although the programme did not engage with the criminal justice system.
- 6.13 The Chair thanked the representatives for their presentations and was pleased to see the work done to address perpetrator issues in addition to supporting victims. The Chair also noted the comments regarding the impact of the Tender programme due to the timescales and would like to see how opportunities could be maximised to boost the programme.
- 6.14 In response to a question from Councillor Comer-Schwartz KM confirmed that the Policy team at London Councils had fed in to the recent GLA consultation on Domestic Violence
- 6.15 The Committee:
- Agreed to send the thematic report to the London Councils Executive member for crime and public protection.
 - Agreed to share the report and the project information in the 2017-21 report on the agenda for this meeting with their local authority to ensure that officers are aware of the activities regarding perpetrators that are commissioned through the programme.
 - Agreed to share information on the Respect Standard (outlined in paragraphs 2.7 and 3.1 to 3.4 of the report) with their local authority and consider making the Standard a requirement (achieved/working towards) when commissioning perpetrator interventions locally.

7. Leadership in the Third Sector: Work Plan Progress

- 7.1 YB informed the Committee that the paper represented the final report from the Third Sector member sub Group, but not the end of the work; work would continue with City Bridge Trust and London Funders to develop The Way Ahead via a pan London Systems Change Group, a new Hub, and the Cornerstone Fund. Councillor Littlewood and the Chair were both thanked for their involvement, and it was hoped to share the work done with the wider membership.
- 7.2 It was reported that the City Bridge Trust would continue to shape 'The Way Ahead' programme of work and were keen that momentum should not be lost and links with members remain established to make the best use of Third Sector resources. It was also reported that YB was now a London Funders trustee, which would assist this work.

- 7.3 The Committee was informed that members of the Hub Steering groups and the System Change group would be reporting back to members, but embedding the work with borough grants officers through, for example, developing commissioning principles, was important.
- 7.4 Cllr Comer-Schwartz informed the Committee that she met with Sharon Long from the Hub, who is keen to develop conversations with members, focusing initially on governance issues.
- 7.5 Cllr Massey questioned how much progress had been made with the programme. He was also concerned that although the objective was to support the voluntary sector across London, the arrangements might favour those boroughs directly supported by the sector, which may hinder identifying the gaps.
- 7.6 Cllr Ellis and Cllr Littlewood asked about the case studies mentioned in the report, expressing their disappointment at the small number of returns, and asked whether those boroughs that had not yet provided responses would be chased. YB mentioned that the responses were provided by the borough Grants Officers, but Cllr Ellis felt that we could improve responses by involving Grants Committee members. It was agreed that YB would talk to the Communications team about publicising these.
- 7.7 Cllr Littlewood also felt that while he enjoyed his involvement in the Systems Change Group which provided good networking opportunities, he was conscious that his role was limited in terms of how much it could reflect the views of the whole Committee. The Chair noted this and felt that officers should get a steer from members as to how they wanted to be involved in this work. He also stated his concerns about the Hub's capacity.
- 7.8 Cllr Millbank felt that although the case studies were useful, they did not provide context as to why boroughs provided services in the way they did. She was pleased however with the work of City Bridge Trust, particularly in organising a round table for other funders.
- 7.9 Members:
- Endorsed the direction of travel against the agreed workplan, noted in section 2 of the report and summarised at Appendix 1, and the draft outcomes of the Cornerstone Fund at Appendix 2.
 - Noted the examples of local practice in commissioning the third sector and funding of civil society infrastructure support in Appendix 3.
 - Endorsed the recommended Principles for Good Commissioning in Appendix 4 (to be taken forward by the Borough Grants Officers group)
 - Noted the Communications Plan, which has been used to disseminate information and learning from the Leadership in the Third Sector workplan in Appendix 5
 - Endorsed the steps which will be taken to continue this work. In particular, that from April 2018, the Strategy Director as a Trustee of London Funders, will maintain a direct link for the role of London Councils going forward.

8. Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2017/18

- 8.1 David Sanni, London Councils Head of Financial Accounting (DS), presented the Forecast report, informing the Committee that it presented income and expenditure to Quarter 3 of the current financial year with a forecast to the end of the year.
- 8.2 DS reported a projected surplus of £755,000 for the year due to slippage on the ESF grants funded programme. The projected level of Committee reserves as at 31 March 2018 was £328,000

- 8.3 Cllr Wallace asked whether the cash amounts spent by borough could be shown? KM responded that it would be possible on a borough basis to show the number of beneficiaries against target, but it would be difficult to show specific spend because different beneficiaries cost different amounts. Cllr Massey agreed with the suggestion, although the Chair emphasised that the Grants programme was a London wide scheme, and that financial analysis at a borough level would be problematic.

The Chair thanked the Committee for its hard work and achievements, and on behalf of the Committee thanked London Councils staff for their support.

The meeting finished at 12:32pm