

## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

### Report

<b>Committee:</b>	Culture, Communities and Rural Affairs Select Committee
<b>Date:</b>	12 January 2012
<b>Title:</b>	Financial Support to Cultural and Community Organisations
<b>Reference:</b>	3594
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Culture, Communities and Business Services

**Contact name:** Nicola Horsey

**Tel:** 01962 845423      **Email:** nicola.horsey@hants.gov.uk

#### 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out proposals for a restructured grants programme that will be presented to the Executive Member for Culture and Recreation at his Decision Day on 20 January 2012. The new programme takes a more integrated and open approach to grants with scheme criteria and objectives clearly linked to Hampshire County Council's Open for Business Plan in addition to relevant service strategies.
- 1.2 The report sets out the outcomes of a consultation exercise with funded organisations and the recommendations of the Select Committee Panel set up to consider this matter. This has informed the development of the new programme which, if approved, will be launched and open for application in 2012/13, with all funding from 2013/14 onwards allocated from the new schemes and in line with the corporate grants process.
- 1.3 In the meantime there is also a requirement to confirm the allocation of funding support to cultural and community organisations for 2012/13. This will include some disinvestments supported by transition funding and conditional offers of future funding which are subject to meeting the criteria of the new programme or to the exploration of opportunities for change. These proposals will be presented to the Select Committee at the meeting on 12 January 2012.

#### 2. Background

- 2.1 At the decision day on the 8 July 2011 the Executive Member for Culture and Recreation approved proposals to consult on financial contributions to cultural and community organisations to inform:

- The allocation of financial support to cultural and community organisations in 2012/13.
- Future strategy for the use of financial contributions to support the delivery of cultural and community services.

- 2.2 This was a necessary response to funding cuts which would require a reducing on-going dependency on Hampshire County Council funding. It also acknowledged that a significant proportion of existing funding arrangements were closed and had been in place for many years. It recognised that there may be positive opportunities for change and that grant support could be used as an alternative to direct service delivery. A further factor was the Coalition Government's legislative programme around localism.
- 2.3 The consultation explored these issues to help identify how Hampshire County Council could best support the future sustainability of key cultural and community infrastructure, achieve good value for money, meet priorities and support new ways of working and new organisations in the future.

### **3. Consultation Outcome**

- 3.1 The consultation opened on the 8 July with all those cultural and community organisations that the portfolio had funded on a regular basis. District Councils, Hampshire Association of Local Councils and Community Action Hampshire were also consulted. The Executive Member for Culture and Recreation wrote to all County Councillors providing them with details of the consultation and requesting their views. The consultation closed on Friday 14 October 2011 and has subsequently been considered by the Culture, Communities and Rural Affairs Select Committee to inform their recommendations to the Executive Member for Culture and Recreation.
- 3.2 The consultation documents were issued to 85 organisations, 53 responded, an overall response rate of 62%. The overall nature of the consultation responses was positive and constructive and recognised the challenge faced by the County Council in maintaining its commitment to the publicly funded cultural and community sector with diminishing resources.
- 3.3 Thirty-one organisations expressed a preference for a criteria-based approach to allocate grant to currently funded organisations on a prioritised basis, compared to 18 organisations preferring a further 8% across the board reduction. Four organisations did not express a preference.
- 3.4 Thirty-three organisations supported the draft criteria proposed in the consultation. Twenty-one of these providing some comment or qualification, only one was explicitly against, with the remainder indicating more highly qualified acceptance or no view. The most significant comments related to the difficulties in reducing dependency in the current climate and particularly any need to secure funding from Districts. Some concern was also expressed over not funding out of Hampshire organisations where they delivered benefits to Hampshire residents.

3.5 The main issues that were identified for the future were:

- Openness to new models (including mergers, outsourcing and sharing resources)
- Improved cross-sector use of specialisms (e.g. use of volunteers, fund-raising)
- More integrated provision of generic services (e.g. training, marketing)
- Support to secure external funding and investment in future solutions.
- Streamlining of grants systems and process.
- Funding should be more open, longer term and outcome based with clear criteria.
- Increasingly important role of community based organisations and local solutions.

3.6 Finally consultees stressed the importance of keeping people informed and making early decisions. A summary of the responses was provided to all consulted organisations. This summary is attached at Appendix 1.

#### **4. Select Committee Recommendations**

4.1 A Review Panel of the Culture, Communities and Rural Affairs Select Committee considered the future approach to grant aid to cultural and community organisations. The Panel considered the following evidence:

- Information and officer presentations on how each grant stream operates at present,
- The views of regularly funded organisations regarding future funding options as established through the consultation,
- Views of lead grant officers regarding opportunities for change/improvement in the future operation of grant-aid,
- Evidence of grant allocation good practice from other grant awarding bodies.

4.2 Taking all of this onboard, the Panel considered the way forward for grant allocation from 2012 and made the following recommendations.

- That grant streams be opened up to a broader range of potential applicants.
- Grant criteria be strengthened based on specific outcomes and the level of grant awarded to organisations funded previously be reviewed to establish what level is appropriate going forwards.
- That requirements for match funding not be limited to funding by District/Borough Councils, while support from Districts, where available, be welcomed.
- When larger grant applications are considered, applications from organisations with good budget and business planning be prioritised.
- That consistent processes be developed across grant streams where possible, with consideration given to the potential to consolidate project funding streams and revenue funding streams.
- When considering applications for large grants (over £25,000) the Executive Member take into account relevant evidence such as the number of anticipated beneficiaries (including an estimate of subsidy per head) and whether alternative provision exists, to inform consideration of value for money.

- Organisations based outside Hampshire only be considered for funding on the basis of a project taking place in Hampshire, or where the organisation provides a significant service to Hampshire residents that would otherwise not be available.
- Funding for small project grants be prioritised.
- Solent Sea Rescue apply in future to a grant stream with a broader remit, such as the grants allocated by the Executive Member for Policy and Resources and the relevant budget less 8% transfer to support this.

4.3 The Panel's findings, following approval by the full Select Committee, have been presented to the Executive Member for Culture and Recreation with the request that these are taken into account in his deliberations. The full conclusions and recommendations of the Select Committee Panel are attached as Appendix 2.

## **5. Finance**

5.1 The total value of grant funding allocated to the cultural and community organisations covered by this report was £1,573,000. An 8% reduction needs to be found in 2012/13 from all service budgets. This would amount to a sum of £125,800 on these grants, leaving £1,447,200 for allocation.

5.2 The proposals presented to the Executive Member for Culture and Recreation will confirm allocations of £1,299,500 for 2012/13. This leaves a further £147,700 for re-allocation.

5.3 Further budget reductions, currently expected to be of the order of 2% per annum, can be expected in future years. The proposals in this report provide an approach with the flexibility to continue to secure the required savings in future years.

## **6. Other Key Issues**

6.1 The Arts and Museums Service has also been undertaking a major review of its activity over this period, grant-aid is a primary delivery mechanism for this service and officers have been collaborating to ensure that the outcomes of these workstreams are complementary. The inter-related paper, The Hampshire Arts and Museums – Planning for the Future Phase 2, is also considered on this agenda.

6.2 A corporate review of all Hampshire County Council grants has been completed and proposals approved for the implementation of a common application process, including electronic forms and corporate database for all grants. The proposals for the culture and community grants set out in this report will comply fully with this new corporate process. All grants applications for decision after the 31 March 2012 will be made on the corporate form and progressed through the common application process.

## 7. Future Direction: Proposed Grant Programme

### 7.1 Grant Programme Proposal

The proposal is for an integrated and transparent grants programme managed on a three year cycle, with all streams fully open to applications for the 2013/14 financial year. Scheme criteria and objectives will be clearly linked to Hampshire County Council's Open for Business Plan and relevant service strategies.

#### 7.1.1 A. Cultural and Community Investment Fund

The top priorities. A programme of investment in strategic cultural and community infrastructure within the remit of the Executive Member for Culture and Recreation. This can include existing clients but will also be open to new organisations and new models of provision on a three year cycle. However, funding would only be committed on an annual basis and clients would have to apply every year. There would be two distinct elements to this funding:

#### 7.1.2 A1: Centres of Cultural Activity:

An organisation will be able to apply if it provides a cultural service that:

- meets broad HCC priorities and relevant service strategies,
- delivers benefit to Hampshire residents across a number of Districts,
- provides a service that could not be easily commissioned from others,
- enables and supports other organisations to provide cultural services,
- provides 'added value' to this funding over the life of the grant,
- can demonstrate how it already minimises dependency on HCC funding and/or is working towards reducing this in the future.

The loss of a Centre of Cultural Activity would have a significant impact beyond that felt by its own service users.

#### 7.1.3 A2: Centres of Community Action:

Applicants must be community based organisations with local governance arrangements and be engaged in improving access to services in their area of benefit, including for vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. They will be able to demonstrate how they:

- deliver social welfare objectives by improving life chances and quality of life,
- work towards optimising their economic, social and environmental sustainability,
- work in partnership and are engaged with relevant neighbourhood partnerships,
- ensure the delivery and improvement of high quality services,
- provide 'added value' to this funding over the life of the grant.
- minimise dependency on HCC funding and/or are working towards reducing this in the future.

The loss of a Centre for Community Action would have a significant impact across the community or group that it serves.

#### 7.1.4 B. Cultural and Community Small Grants Programme

A programme of support to a limited number of outcome themes which will be set out in the form of a “prospectus” detailing the priorities for a three year programme. These will reflect the emerging Open for Business plan (e.g. improve outcomes for vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, strengthen and empower communities), and relevant service strategies. It is proposed that the small grants programme would provide:

- general support to groups and organisations to encourage cultural participation that benefits individuals and communities and provides opportunities for people to become more involved in community-led, cultural activities.

The outcome themes would be reviewed every three years, the first full prospectus would be produced for 2013/14 to 2015/16.

#### 7.1.5 C. Transition and Change Fund

Funding also needs to be made available to support transition and change.

7.1.6 The Transition and Change Fund will support a reasonable approach to disinvesting from organisations that are currently funded but are not considered to be priorities for the future. It would also allow specific, time-limited support to work with funded organisations to achieve efficiencies and reduce on-going dependency. This could include exploration of alternative funding opportunities and new delivery models.

#### 7.1.7 D. Capital Scheme

Capital funding to support small scale refurbishment and improvement of local community buildings that are managed and operated by the voluntary sector. There are no proposals to fundamentally change or extend this scheme as there are insufficient funds to support this. However, it is proposed that the existing criteria are updated.

Currently, for projects costing more than £15,000, the grant is calculated at 50% of the combined District and Parish Council contribution up to a maximum of £12,500. The current financial restrictions have reduced the availability of District and Parish Council contributions resulting in a fall off of applications because projects can no longer meet the criteria. This reduces the County Council’s ability to support schemes and the outcome will be a deterioration of important community assets.

It is therefore proposed that the existing criteria are changed so that for projects costing more than £15,000 the grant is calculated at 50% of the funding from sources other than the applicant’s own funding, up to a maximum of £12,500.

7.1.8 In addition to establishing these funding streams consideration needs to be routinely given to the following:

- **Commissioning and Contracts:** establish those elements of current grant funding that are more suited to the commissioning of specified services such as the provision of outdoor education.
- **In-House Direct Delivery:** identify opportunities to outsource delivery, through contract or grant, where this may be more effective and will support the viability of the cultural and community sector.

7.1.9 The proposals above respond to the consultation, to the recommendations of the Select Committee and to the priorities established in the Open for Business Plan. They also support delivery of the required savings, facilitate on-going and appropriate challenge of the status quo and provide a mechanism to enable change where appropriate.

7.1.10 A high level Equality Impact Assessment of the potential impact of the proposals has been completed and is attached at Appendix 3. The overall conclusion is that there is a greater community focus in the revised structure of the grants programme to support cultural activity and community action, focused on local community priorities.

7.1.11 Equality impacts have been considered as part of the review, consultation and decision-making and, on balance, the proposals should improve equality outcomes whilst securing the required savings in 2012/13 and in future years. Actions have already been identified to mitigate the impacts of change and these are summarised in the Equality Impact Assessment.

7.1.12 Further work will be undertaken to complete the detailed funding strategy and scheme criteria for the new programme.

7.1.13 The process for applications and assessment, including information requirements, will comply with that recently developed and approved through the corporate grants review. This will include a light-touch approach for applications under £1,000 and a proportional assessment of supporting documents such as business plans for applications over £25,000.

## 7.2 Implications for Existing Funding

There is a requirement to confirm the allocation of funding support to cultural and community organisations for 2012/13. These cannot be progressed through the proposed new scheme but still needs to meet the savings requirement and to respond to outcomes of the consultation and the conclusions of the Select Committee. This will include some disinvestments supported by transition funding and conditional offers of future funding which are subject to meeting the criteria of the new programme or to the exploration of opportunities for change. These proposals will be presented to the Select Committee at the meeting on 12 January 2012.

## 7.3 Implementation Programme for New Schemes

7.3.1 Savings achieved as a result of the decisions above will be reallocated into the new grant schemes for full launch and receipt of applications during 2012/13 so that all applications will be through the new programme for 2013/14. The

financial year 2012/13 will largely serve as a transition year, this will include supporting disinvestments and exploring opportunities for change. Where there are opportunities to confirm new grant allocations in 2012/13 these decisions will be made in line with new criteria and the requirements of the corporate grants process.

- 7.3.2 This will provide opportunities for new applicants to the Investment Fund and for all cultural and community organisations to apply for project funds that meet the outcomes of the Small Grants Programme.
- 7.3.3 Organisations will also be able to qualify for change funding to support them in reducing dependency and to better meet scheme requirements in the future.

## **8. Recommendations**

- 8.1 Further to the recommendations already made to the Executive Member for Culture and Recreation, see paragraph 4.2, the Select Committee are asked to make any final representations on this matter to the Executive Member for Culture and Recreation to inform his deliberations at the Decision Day on 20 January 2012.**

**CORPORATE OR LEGAL INFORMATION:**

**Links to the Corporate Strategy**

<b>Hampshire safer and more secure for all:</b>	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
<b>Maximising well-being:</b>	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
<b>Enhancing our quality of place:</b>	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	

**Other Significant Links**

<b>Links to previous Member decisions:</b>		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Date</u>
Consultation on Financial Support to Cultural and Community Organisations	2996	8 July 2011
<b>Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives</b>		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>	

<b>Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents</b>	
<p>The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)</p>	
<u>Document</u>	<u>Location</u>
None	

## **IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:**

### **1. Equalities Impact Assessment:**

1.1. See detailed Appendix 3 attached.

### **2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:**

2.1. The recommendations of this report do not have any impact on crime and disorder.

### **3. Climate Change:**

a) How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

There is no significant impact arising from the recommendations of this report.

b) How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

The proposals of this report do not consider this. Individual funding decisions will need to consider this impact.

## Consultation on Financial Contributions to Cultural and Community Organisations: Summary of Consultation Responses

On 8 July 2011 the Executive Member for Culture and Recreation opened a consultation with those cultural and community organisations that the portfolio had funded on a regular basis. The purpose was to ensure that their views and comments were fully considered in advance of any significant changes to existing funding arrangements. The consultation responses will inform final decisions about funding awards for 2012/13 and consideration of how grant-aid is used to support service delivery in the future.

The consultation closed on Friday 14 October 2011 and has subsequently been considered by the CCRA Select Committee to inform their recommendations to the Executive Member.

### 1. Consultation Response

The consultation documents were issues to 85 organisations, 53 responded, an overall response rate of 62%. The response rate for each grant stream is detailed in the table below.

Organisation Type	Issues	Responses
Arts Organisations (RFO's)	11	10 (91%)
Community Organisations (Revenue Grants)	24	13 (54%)
Outdoor Centres (Partnership Funding)	7	6 (86%)
Countryside Organisations (Voluntary Sector)	4	2 (50%)
Museums (Partnership Funding)	6	4 (67%)
Voluntary Sports Organisations	12	6 (50%)
Policy Fund	9	4 (44%)
Other Consultees (District Councils, CAH, HALC)	12	8 (67%)
<b>All Consultees</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>53 (62%)</b>

The overall nature of the consultation responses was positive and constructive and seemed to recognise the challenge faced by HCC in maintaining it's commitment to the publicly funded cultural and community sector with diminishing resources.

### 2. Do you believe that option A or B below would result in the most effective use of grant funding?

- 18 organisations preferred Option A: a further 8% across the board reduction to all currently funded organisations
- 31 organisations preferred Option B: a criteria-based approach to allocate grant to currently funded organisations on a prioritised basis.
- 4 organisations did not express a preference.

The responses for each grant stream are detailed in the table below:

Organisation Type	Option A	Option B	Neither	Preference
Arts Organisations (RFO's)	2	8	1	Option B
Community Organisations (Revenue Grants)	4	7	1	Option B
Outdoor Centres (Partnership Funding)	3	3	0	Neither
Countryside Organisations (Voluntary Sector)	1	0	1	Option A
Museums (Partnership Funding)	2	3	0	Neither
Voluntary Sports Organisations	4	0	1	Option A
Policy Fund	1	3	0	Option B
Other Consultees (District Councils, CAH, HALC)	0	7	0	Option B
All Consultees	18	31	4	Option B

### 3. What are your views on these options?

Organisations views for and against these options are summarised in the table below:

Option A: For	Option B: For
Need support to core funding, provides leverage with other funders (A)	More effective, priority driven allocation (A, O, P, Other)
More equitable (A, Comm, O, Sport)	More strategic, will protect key infrastructure (A)
Provides the opportunity for all organisations to survive and adjust in the short-term (A, O, S, P)	More viable and could be combined with more innovative "option c" solutions (A)
Simpler and cheaper to administer (Comm, O, S, Country)	Opportunity for change to more effective models and innovative collaborations (A)
Greater certainty (M)	A fresh start with all judged on the same criteria is fairer (Comm)
Maintains existing relationships (M)	Flexibility to respond to wider priorities (Comm)
	Responds to community needs and supports the most deserving (Comm, P)
	Better targeted support and value for money (Country, P, Other)
	More transparent and targeted (M)

<b>Option A: Against</b>	<b>Option B: Against</b>
Won't give medium to long-term stability (A)	More complex and expensive to comply with (A, M)
Steady decline in service and quality (A)	Challenging and potentially destabilising (A)
Makes no sense with generally reducing funding (A)	Unfairly favours areas of high multiple deprivation (Comm)
Not a sustainable solution, will begin to undermine viability in 2012/13 (A)	
Difficult for small organisations to absorb (A)	
Doesn't reward performance (A)	
Historic allocation no longer appropriate (Comm)	
Will not promote change and improvement (O)	
Equal misery for all (M)	

#### 4. Do you believe there are other options that should be considered for 2012/13?

<b>Organisation Type</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Options Proposed</b>
Arts Organisations (RFO's)	6	4	Increased focus on "return on investment". Review the role of key, strategic providers across Hampshire. Investigate opportunities to outsource HCC delivery to funded organisations and the voluntary sector to support viability where cost-effective. Support to secure external funding and investment of some resources in future solutions. Opportunities to integrate services.
Community Organisations (Revenue Grants)	7	6	Mergers and joint-working. Remove admin/monitoring costs with "no strings" grants. Grants based on percentage of turnover to allow forward planning. Outsource services such as libraries to Community Associations Pooling of resources and provision of training.
Outdoor Centres (Partnership Funding)	6	0	
Countryside Organisations (Voluntary Sector)	0	2	Investigate opportunities to consolidate funded initiatives. Sharing of resources to reduce fixed costs. Consolidation of grant streams around cross-cutting priority outcomes. Simpler, standardised application process
Museums	3	1	Promote partnerships that make use of different

(Partnership Funding)			organisations specialist skills to support the broader sector (e.g use of volunteering, fund-raising). Sharing resources. Joint marketing and promotion.
Voluntary Sports Organisations	4	2	More shared use of facilities and generic services (e.g. first-aid) Use agents in the sector to distribute grant-aid.
Policy Fund	3	1	Sharing of resources and use of modern technology Use impact assessments to assess the implications of withdrawing funding. Review direct delivery to identify opportunities for outsourcing.
Other Consultees (District Councils, CAH, HALC)	6	2	Assess the cost effectiveness both of outsourcing and taking services in house. Mergers, sharing of management, overheads and premises. Community involvement in the future use of funding. Commit towards more fundamental change in 2013/14. Commissioned based locality approach focussed on shared priorities Prioritise support for initiatives that increase community capital, social action and self-delivered solutions. Stepped approach to exit strategies.

**5. We have set out some over-arching criteria. Do you believe that these represent a reasonable approach to grant decisions in the current context?**

The criteria proposed in the consultation were:

- Support for Hampshire County Council's priorities: safer and more secure for all, maximising well-being, enhancing our quality of place.
- Priority should be given to Hampshire based organisations.
- Increasing participation in cultural and community activity.
- Providing and improving access to services for disadvantaged groups.
- Delivering services that meet local priorities in areas of deprivation.
- Clear demonstration of need for funding, value for money, efficiency plans and consideration of alternative sources of funding.
- Proposals to reduce on-going dependency on Hampshire County Council and to maximise alternative funding streams including from District Councils.

The response to these was:

- 33 organisations were supportive of the proposed criteria, 12 of these indicated unqualified support, with 21 indicating a limited level of qualification.
- 9 organisations accepted the proposed criteria but with high levels of qualification.

- 10 organisations did not express a view.
- 1 organisation did not support the proposed criteria.

<b>Organisation Type</b>	<b>Yes (with limited level of qualification)</b>	<b>Highly Qualified Acceptance</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No view expressed.</b>
Arts Organisations (RFO's)	7 (6)	1	0	2
Community Organisations (Revenue Grants)	8 (5)	3	0	2
Outdoor Centres (Partnership Funding)	4 (1)	0	1	1
Countryside Organisations (Voluntary Sector)	2 (2)	0	0	0
Museums (Partnership Funding)	3 (1)	0	0	1
Voluntary Sports Organisations	2 (2)	2	0	2
Policy Fund	4 (2)	0	0	0
Other Consultees (District Councils, CAH, HALC)	3 (2)	3	0	2
<b>All Consultees</b>	<b>33 (21)</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>

The main areas of the criteria where respondents added qualification were around reducing dependency and the ability to rely on other public authorities who are also reducing funding.

Concern was also expressed about excluding organisations from outside Hampshire if they could demonstrate the benefit to Hampshire residents.

#### **6. What would be the likely impact of the following reductions in funding on your organisation? 8%, 30%, 100%.**

It is very difficult to produce a meaningful, general summary of responses to this question beyond the obvious that the greater the reduction the greater the impact. As would be expected the impact is very much organisation specific and an understanding of this will be helpful in assessing the impact of specific decisions when these are made.

#### **7. Do you have any other comments on funding arrangements for 2012/13?**

There is some duplication in this section and section 7 that follows with responses already made in section 3.

The list below summarises the comments made:

- More opportunity to sell services and benefits to HCC officers and members. (Outdoor)
- Opportunities to benefit from HCC services in other ways (e.g access to free training) (Outdoor)
- The endorsement of HCC funding provides credibility, could this be provided in other ways? (Outdoor)
- Appreciative of the consultation. (Outdoor)
- Problems compounded by uncertainty of funding from other sources, including other public sector funding and earned income. HCC funding critical over the next few years. (Sports, Countryside, Arts)
- To be kept fully informed (Sports)
- Note value of HCC support and advice in addition to funding (Community)
- Need to see community centre/village halls as community hubs key to government strategy(Community)
- Recognise value of monitoring and completing quality assessments such as Visible (Community)
- Value of three year funding agreements to provide the stability for more strategic planning (Arts)
- Recognise the economic impact of funding organisations and the leverage this provides to secure funding from other sources (Arts)
- Organisations to develop long-term funding strategies (Museums)
- Role of the voluntary sector to become increasingly important (Community)
- Value of “pump-priming” funding (Other)
- 2012/13 funding decisions should be based on identified need and communicated as soon as possible (Other)
- Importance of smaller community organisations and schemes (Other)
- Need for stronger partnership working between commissioning and funding organisations (Other)

**8. Consultees are asked to provide any other comments and thoughts about different approaches and solutions to the delivery of cultural infrastructure and community support in the future.**

The list below summarises the comments made:

- Challenge of monitoring outcomes (Arts)
- Training/support for fund-raising and benefitting from philanthropy (Arts)
- Difficulties of satisfying multiple funders (Arts)
- Benefits arts organisations deliver include: economic impact, community engagement and support to smaller organisations (Arts)
- Need for new strategic partnerships, new models and collaborations (Arts)
- Three year funding agreements (Arts)
- Funding to be more competitive, outcome-based but longer term, encourage collaboration and consortia (Arts)
- Need to support infrastructure to lever other funding and deliver outcomes...a healthy dependency (Arts, Countryside)
- Don't create a two tier system of HCC run services and the voluntary sector...what can be outsourced? (Arts)

- Scope for local decision-making (Arts)
- Continued involvement in development of future plans (Outdoor)
- Make a fresh start with a new process and new criteria (Outdoor)
- Support in accessing alternative funding streams (Outdoor)
- Slow decline in grants provides best opportunity for organisations to adjust and become self-sufficient (Sports)
- Surcharge on mooring fees to support SSRO (Sports)
- Role of community centre's as a local hub for services (Community)
- Value of community associations and volunteers to support localism (Community)
- Delivery of services through community associations can save money (Community)
- Develop clusters of associations to work in partnership (Community)
- Duplication in the CVS support network (Community)
- Greater community involvement in the development of projects (Community)
- Shared provision of back-office services (Community)
- Need for longer funding cycles and a clearer agreement of what the funding is for. (Countryside)

**Officers gave a brief presentation of the findings on the day of the Select Committee Panel. Panel Members were invited to debate the findings, and to consider how this affected their conclusions regarding the future use of grant aid.**

## **Culture Communities and Rural Affairs Select Committee Review Panel: Future Approach to Grant Aid**

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 1.1 The Panel considered evidence regarding:
  - how each grant stream operates at present
  - the views of regularly funded organisations regarding future funding options given reduced budgets
  - views of lead grant officers regarding opportunities for change/improvement
  - evidence of grant allocation good practice from other grant awarding bodies.
- 1.2 Taking all of this onboard, the Panel considered the way forward for grant allocation from 2012. Members agreed to focus on principles, rather than individual grants or individual grant streams. The Panels findings are presented to the Executive Member, including recommended principles for the future approach to grant aid to cultural and community organisations.

## **2 Openness**

- 2.1 Members noted that a significant number of grants, particularly in financial terms, were rolled forwards each year to the same organisations, with only small adjustments for inflation or a % reduction across the board. The Panel were of the view that it was appropriate to take the opportunity to review the level of grant allocated to those organisations – to revisit what the organisations were engaged to provide and what level of funding was appropriate to fulfil those ambitions. This would enable judgements to be made based on each organisations circumstances rather than a ‘one size fits all’ approach.
- 2.2 The Panel was of the view that grant application should be opened up to allow other organisations the opportunity to apply. In some cases, this may involve adjusting application criteria e.g. not limiting funding for community activities to Community Associations so that other community based organisations could apply.
- 2.3 Increasing the range of organisations considered for grants would be a change of culture – moving away from rolling forward grants year on year based on historical ties, towards a more competitive process where the County Council selects which organisations to fund based on which best meet current priorities. Members noted that the responses received to the consultation with grant funded organisations and other stakeholders indicated a majority were supportive of the proposal to adopt a criteria based approach to prioritising grant decisions rather than further across the board cuts.
- 2.4 Members commented that the County Council may wish to consider how grant funding opportunities were promoted in order to reach those organisations that didn’t currently apply.

- 2.5 Members also wished to reinforce the principle that all grant allocations be undertaken transparently, and that allocation of large grants require approval of the Executive Member (noting that the work on a Corporate Grants Database was distinguishing between small grants under £1000 and large grants over £25,000).

**Recommendation 1:** That grant streams be opened up to a broader range of potential applicants.

### **3 Service Provided**

- 3.1 Members also noted that in some cases the criteria for allocation of grants were very broad, such as contribution to the Corporate Priorities. The Panel was of the view that such criteria should be strengthened based on more specific desired outcomes. This would enable judgements to be made in a fair and equitable way when there were more applications than there was funding available.
- 3.2 Members also commented that organisations should be encouraged to seek efficiencies in how they worked, and work towards requiring a smaller grant in future years where possible.

**Recommendation 2:** Grant criteria be strengthened based on specific outcomes and the level of grant awarded to organisations funded previously be reviewed to establish what level is appropriate going forwards.

- 3.3 Members also commented that there were areas where there was potential for organisations providing a similar service to collaborate, for example in the provision of rural touring. It was noted that some of the other authorities considered encouraged joint working by giving preference to organisations working together in their grant allocation criteria. Members also noted that a number of organisations responding to the consultation on the future of grant funding commented on the potential for organisations to collaborate on functions such as training or marketing.
- 3.4 Members noted that some of the other authorities considered entered into Service Level Agreements with organisations receiving larger grants, which could be for one two or three years. One authority indicated that for grants over £100,000 it may be appropriate to enter into a contract with the organisation. Members were of the view that consideration could be given to adopting a similar approach in Hampshire, so that there were clearer expectations where organisations were awarded significant funding by the authority.

### **4 Flexibility**

- 4.1 Members noted that some grants required match funding from the relevant Local Council. Members commented that while it was positive to do so to encourage support from Local Councils, organisations could potentially benefit from the flexibility to generate match funding from other sources such as Parish Councils or local businesses. Members were aware that District and Borough Councils would also have budget pressures to respond to, and did not wish to rule out organisations from achieving funding from the County Council where the District Council was unable to provide support.

- 4.2 Members also commented that organisations applying for grants could be encouraged to explore sponsorship from businesses or local philanthropy.

**Recommendation 3:** That requirements for match funding not be limited to funding by District/Borough Councils (while support from Districts where available be welcomed).

- 4.3 When considering the Policy Fund grant stream, Members acknowledged that it may be beneficial to have flexible funding available that could be used for valuable projects that did not fit the criteria for the main grants, however Members were of the view that if such grants were considered in future it should be through a transparent process with Executive Member decision.

## 5 Expectation of Sound Planning

- 5.1 Members commented that applications for grants should include realistic budget planning indicating what the funds applied for (and any other resources available) would be spent on. Members also suggested that organisations applying for revenue grants should demonstrate contingency planning for how their business could adapt to reduced funding, given that funding from a variety of public sector sources was likely to be reducing. Members commented that organisations should not make plans based on assumed continuation of grant funding. The Panel noted that Lancashire County Council stated that organisations should demonstrate how the organisation or project was sustainable without County Council support beyond the first year of funding.
- 5.2 Members were of the view that priority should be given to organisations that could demonstrate they had sought and/or achieved funding from other sources, noting that other Local Authorities had made this a part of their criteria. Grant applicants could be signposted to alternative sources of income on the application form, following the example of Kent County Council.
- 5.3 Members acknowledged that funding the arts could generate additional income to the local area due to 'secondary spend' of those visiting the funded organisation. Members suggested it was the responsibility of the organisations concerned to demonstrate this benefit as part of their business case in their application.

**Recommendation 4:** When larger grant applications are considered, applications from organisations with good budget and business planning be prioritised.

## 6 Consistency

- 6.1 The Panel learned that existing grant streams had a variety of application processes, and did not support oversight across the range of grant allocation. It was noted that work was underway to implement a single portal for grant application across the County Council. Members were of the view that greater consistency across grant streams would be beneficial.

- 6.2 Members were interested in the work of Lancashire County Council, as this Authority had consolidated grant allocation from across the Council into two streams 'central gateway grants' and 'local initiatives fund'. While it was beyond the scope of this review to suggest grants be consolidated across departments, the Panel were of the view that there was scope to consolidate the grants to cultural and community organisations by bringing together all types of project funding and all types of revenue funding.
- 6.3 Members noted that consolidating grant streams would support consistency across grant allocation, however it was commented that variation in criteria should still be accommodated where this supported focus on the particular outcomes desired.

**Recommendation 5:** That consistent processes be developed across grant streams where possible, with consideration given to the potential to consolidate project funding streams and revenue funding streams.

## 7 Application Processing

- 7.1 Members were mindful of the resources required both for organisations to apply and for the County Council to process applications. Members were of the view that grant processes should be proportionate to the level of funding applied for. Therefore, applying for small project grants (e.g. up to £1000 as per the updated Corporate policy) should have light requirements, and applying for significant revenue funding (e.g. over £25,000 as per the updated Corporate policy) should have more stringent requirements.
- 7.2 The Panel was of the view that when considering disinvestment or comparing organisations where not all could be funded, the Executive Member would wish to inform such a decision with relevant evidence.

**Recommendation 6:** When considering applications for large grants (e.g. over £25,000) the Executive Member take into account relevant evidence such as the number of anticipated beneficiaries (enabling an estimate of subsidy per head) and whether alternative provision exists, to inform consideration of value for money.

- 7.3 From consideration of other grant allocating bodies processes, Members noted that it was good practice to set expectations – to indicate the level of interest compared to the amount of funds available (giving an indication of likelihood of an application succeeding), and to state clearly the timeframe for the funding and whether funding was to be expected in future years. The Panel was of the view that, in moving away from rolling forward the same grant allocations year on year, it should be made clear to grant applicants whether they could expect future funding. It was noted that three year funding agreements were desirable to give organisations stability and space to plan, however it was recognised that in the current financial climate the County Council would need to consider very carefully any commitment to future funding.
- 7.4 Members valued the knowledge and experience of the officers taking the lead for each grant stream at present. The Panel were minded that while consistency across grant allocation was desirable, and that the information required to make a judgement on an application should be provided through the application process,

understanding of the service area was important. Therefore, while aspects of the application process may have the potential to be streamlined, the Executive Member may benefit from the professional view of the relevant lead officer when considering allocation of grants.

- 7.5 Members also commented on the fact that the County Council allocated a Member representative to a committee for a number of the funded organisations, and that the relevant Member could be invited to give a view on the organisation concerned when a future grant application was being considered.
- 7.6 Members considered that an appropriate degree of monitoring was required, to identify if an organisation had achieved the aims set out in its application. This could inform future funding decisions should the organisation re-apply. Members noted that another authority withheld a small proportion of larger grants until a report had been received regarding the outcomes achieved.

## **8 Organisations from Outside Hampshire**

- 8.1 Members were of the view that with reducing budgets, priority should be given to Hampshire based organisations. The panel was of the view that greater clarity was required regarding the County Council's position in relation to funding organisations based outside Hampshire. Members were content that project funding should be open to organisations based outside Hampshire if the project in question was taking place in Hampshire. With regard to revenue funding, Members were of the view that funding organisations based outside of Hampshire in this way would only be justified in exceptional circumstances e.g. where there was evidence of significant benefit to Hampshire residents, which could not be provided by other organisations.

**Recommendation 7:** Organisations based outside Hampshire only be considered for funding on the basis of a project taking place in Hampshire, or where the organisation provides a significant service to Hampshire residents that would otherwise not be available.

## **9 Small Grants**

- 9.1 The Panel strongly supported the use of small grants for one off projects, commenting that these had significant impact on communities for small cost. Members wished to see this type of grant funding given priority, and commented that the focus for budget reductions should be the larger grants to large organisations.

**Recommendation 8:** Funding for small project grants be prioritised.

- 9.2 Members noted that the Hampshire Playing Fields Association distributed funds in small grants to other organisations, and that providing a grant to this organisation for this purpose saved the County Council from administering small grants directly in this area. Members commented that consideration could be given to whether this model could be applied to other service areas e.g. engaging one of the countryside organisations to allocate the smaller rights of way grants.

## 10 Solent Sea Rescue

- 10.1 When considering the grant stream for support to voluntary sports organisations, Members noticed that the Solent Sea Rescue Organisation performed a different function to the other organisations supported by this grant stream. While the Panel considered it appropriate for the County Council to support this organisation, Members were of the view that its role as a life saving organisation should be recognised and therefore that it was not appropriate for this grant to be considered alongside support to sports associations.

**Recommendation 9:** Solent Sea Rescue apply in future to a grant stream with a broader remit, such as the grants allocated by the Executive Member for Policy & Resources. (*the relevant budget less 8% will need to transfer to support this*)

## 11 Closing Remarks

- 11.1 The Panel consider that it is appropriate to take the opportunity at this juncture to re-consider how grants are allocated. Select Committee Members consider that if the above principles are applied to grant allocation, the Culture Communities and Business Services Department will have a fair and equitable basis upon which to make decisions regarding grant allocation in future. This will be particularly important given reducing budgets.

<b>Name of Initiative, Policy or Project</b>	Review of financial support (grant funding) to cultural and community organisations.
<b>Department</b>	Culture, Communities and Business Services (CCBS)
<b>Names of people completing assessment</b>	Helen Wheeler, Neil Cole, Nick Coe
<b>Date</b>	26 May 2011 (Updated December 2011)
<b>Summary: what is the specific change?</b>	
<p>This is a high level Equality analysis of the potential impact of proposed funding changes for 2012/13 and the proposed restructured grants programme (2013/14 and beyond) for financial contributions to support cultural and community organisations.</p> <p>The equality analysis is carried out to ensure that the way in which the council reaches its decisions on these changes is fair and equitable and that there is no disproportionate negative impact on any protected group as a result of any reductions in funding or resulting from the outcomes of this process. The analysis will consider the impact of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the proposed change to the structure of the grant programme and the move to a fully criteria-based open programme from 2013/14</li> <li>- the change from current funding levels (overall 8% cut in 2012/13) – reductions in levels of support to some organisations</li> <li>- the review to determine which organisations should continue to receive support and where to withdraw it completely, taking into account transition funding</li> </ul> <p><b>Context: why is this change/policy decision needed?</b></p> <p>As a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review settlement for local authorities in 2010 and the work of the Coalition Government to reduce the country's deficit, budget reductions are being implemented across all Council services. The County Council needs to achieve a 25% budget reduction over 4 years through its Efficiency and Expenditure programme. This programme includes a full review of the internal processes for the management and award of grants to achieve efficiencies in the way the Council administers grant-giving. The key outcomes of this will be;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A simplified and standardised application process</li> <li>- A single central database for the administration of all grant awards</li> <li>- Equality monitoring is part of the application form</li> </ul> <p><b>Background - CCBS grants and financial support</b></p> <p>Up to now there has been no formal over-arching strategy for culture and communities grants. The key purpose of using grants has</p>	

been as a primary and effective means of achieving improved service delivery, or supporting delivery that the Council does not do itself. Grant allocations have been managed by each Service to support their service strategy and in accordance with criteria defined for each grant programme or terms agreed with the funded organisation. These have included specific equality criteria or objectives related to delivery for particular groups and equality monitoring is part of the application form.

In 2011/12 CCBS applied an 8% budget reduction across its services including its grant programmes and the financial support it provides to a number of regularly funded organisations. Discussions were opened at the earliest opportunity with the funded organisations to warn them of the likelihood and the anticipated level of the reduction to their funding for 2011/12. Due to the time constraints to achieve the efficiency savings and to allow at least a 3 month warning to the organisations, it was decided that the fairest and most equitable approach at that time was to apply the 8% reduction across the board, unless the savings could be found elsewhere within service budgets (these were also reduced by 8% in all cases).

A further 8% reduction is needed in 2012/13 from all Service budgets to include the grant programmes and grants to the regularly funded organisations. Achieving reduction target means that the current CCBS funding arrangements will be unsustainable in the longer-term. Therefore it was decided in July 2011 to undertake a full review of the financial support and grant funding programme.

### **The consultation process**

CCBS has carried out a consultation with the regularly funded organisations on options to achieve the savings, setting out alternatives to applying another 8% reduction for everyone in 2012/13. The consultation took place between July and October 2011. All the organisations that received funding from the CCBS grant programme in 2011/2012 were contacted directly by letter, and through direct dialogue with the officers who manage the current grant fund streams.

Informed by the consultation feedback, officer knowledge, corporate and departmental objectives and the continued financial constraints, proposals are now being put forward to the Executive Member for Culture and Recreation for a strategy for future funding that will;

1. restructure the CCBS grant funding streams – to annual/one-off and 3 year funding arrangements reviewed annually
2. award funding in future through the application of criteria that support specific corporate and departmental objectives
3. open the applications for financial support to a wider range of groups and organisations

The review has also been informed by the Review Panel of the Culture, Community & Rural Affairs Select Committee specifically to challenge and assess;

1. the potential impact of the reductions for the organisations affected and through continued officer dialogue with the regularly funded organisations to get a better understanding of the resilience of the organisations to inform final decisions
2. to develop options for making the reductions in funding in 2012/13 and inform the proposals for the formal 3 month

consultation.

3. to agree the specific proposals to be put forward for Executive Member approval in the light of the feedback of views expressed in the consultation
4. to understand and consider any positive or negative equality impacts of the specific proposals

### **Describe main purpose of Initiative, Policy, Project**

#### **The options proposed in consultation**

The options for 2012/13 funding were;

1. apply 8% reduction across all funding streams and organisations
2. apply an overarching set of criteria when deciding which organisations the department should continue to support. Equal access and the advancement of equality are to be included in these criteria.

The consultation paper expressed and invited views on the issues in relation to the future of Council funding support to local organisations beyond 2012/13. Some criteria were proposed in the consultation and organisations were invited to comment on these as well as to propose different criteria. Equal access and the advancement of equality will be an essential part of the final criteria.

#### **What are the main activities?**

The main elements of the process to manage the reduction in the amount of money the department has to support organisations in the form of grant funding are;

1. A review within the CCBS department of the grant programmes currently run and the reasons why we support the regularly funded organisations. This was to assess the overall scope and potential impact of reductions and to identify the issues and the risks for the culture and sport infrastructure and community organisations. Workshops have been held with lead officers for each programme and a panel of senior managers and Councillors to offer challenge and scrutiny.
2. Informal dialogue with the regularly funded organisations to ascertain the impact on their organisation of funding changes. This took into account not only funding received from the County Council but also their other sources of income in order to establish a better understanding of the resilience of the organisation.
3. As a result of these processes, to develop options for making the reductions in funding in 2012/13 and begin a formal 3 month consultation period with the organisations. A Consultation paper and covering letter to the individual organisations was drafted and Executive Member approval sought to consult on this basis. A full broad public consultation was considered but it was decided that the consultation was more critical with the organisations that already receive funding, with additional challenge provided by the Select Committee.
4. Following the consultation phase, the responses have been considered and specific proposals for the funding of each

organisation in 2012/13 will be put forward for Executive Member approval in January 2012. Organisations will be given 3 months notice of changes that will come into effect from April 2012 or April 2013. A summary of the responses has been fed back to the organisations involved in the consultation.

5. It is intended to further consult on a future Funding Strategy in early 2012 which will be subject to further EIA at that stage.

**Who is intended to benefit?**

The proposed changes are intended to have a positive impact and advance equality by;

- creating a more open and transparent funding programme with criteria that direct financial support to groups and organisations that are able to deliver against defined objectives
- providing a grant programme that has a greater focus on local community priorities and disadvantage
- supporting the future sustainability of key cultural and community infrastructure
- providing increased value for money from diminishing resources
- encouraging and supporting new ways of working more closely with the voluntary and community sector organisations

**What do you know about the breakdown of people who use your services compared to the community profile?**

Age, Disabled People, Faith, Gender, Transgender, Race, LGBT, Low or no income, People disadvantaged by background or other factors

Monitoring data is collected as part of the grants application process about the organisation applying for funding and the people its activities support in the community.

The grant funding currently supports a large number and range of cultural, sports and community organisations across Hampshire. The people using, attending or participating include the Hampshire population and visitors and people living outside Hampshire.

**Will some people be unable to use or benefit from this service?**

*What are the possible negative impacts?*

A number of organisations that have received year-on-year funding will no longer receive financial support from CCBS as they are not considered to be priorities for the future. The reasons for reduction or withdrawal of funding are included in the Executive Member Decision Reports of 20<sup>th</sup> January 2012. Equality considerations have played a key part in these decisions.

Some organisations will face a reduction or receive transitional funding for one year only.

**How could the initiative improve equality of access?***What are the potential positive Impacts?*

As a result of the Corporate Grants review additional equality monitoring data will be collected in future. This will include supplementary equality issues to provide better data analysis of which groups are benefiting from and accessing the grants. The information will be used to inform the development of criteria for future schemes.

Funding will respond to critical outcomes and needs of the community and people instead of being primarily service delivery based. It will be directed to support corporate priorities (Open for Business Plan) and CCBS Vision and service objectives including disadvantage and equality issues in future, in particular the proposed Centres of Community Action and the Cultural and Community Inclusion Programme.

All the grant fund streams will be open to all for applications from 2013/14 instead of a large percentage of the total fund being committed year-on-year to the same organisations. The Council will review the way in which organisations are made aware of the grant scheme and how they are offered support to submit applications.

There is a greater community focus in the revised structure of the grants programme to support cultural activity and community action focused on local community priorities, disadvantage and inclusion.

Equality impacts have been considered as part of the review, consultation and decision-making and on balance the proposals should improve equality outcomes whilst securing the required savings in 2012/13 and in future years. Actions have already been identified to mitigate the impacts of change and these are summarised below.

**Have you identified that any groups are disadvantaged and is this likely to be unlawful? No**

*This relates purely to any potential breach of legislation*

<b>Further action (please specify – actions to mitigate any identified negative impacts )</b>					
<b>Impact identified</b>	<b>Actions to be taken</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Review date</b>
<b>Decisions to disinvest in some organisations and reduce funding to others may destabilise or threaten their sustainability</b>	Transitional and change funding will be provided to those facing reductions and disinvestment as agreed by Executive Member in line with Panel and officer recommendations	<b>Lead grant officer for affected organisations.</b>	EM Decision Jan 2012	Disinvestment supported in 2012/13	<b>December 2012</b>
<b>A positive impact is that the funding programme may be available to other organisations who were not previously receiving funding or aware of it</b>	The remodelled grant programme and prospectus of priorities to be launched and publicised widely during 2012/13 to the community to attract new applicants. The new programme to be rigorously checked for accessibility and promoted through the Council's community outreach resources.	<b>Nicola Horsey</b>	During 2012/13 for 2013/14 fund applications.	New applicants for funds to the 2013/14 programme	<b>Monitor applications to the 2013/14 fund</b>

<p><b>Ensuring that equality issues and equality monitoring data inform the criteria of the grants programmes</b></p>	<p>The specification for future grant programmes to consider corporate equality objectives and target resources accordingly. The criteria and future decisions about funding to embody positive action to ensure inclusion of all the protected characteristics and other excluded or disadvantaged groups</p>	<p><b>Nicola Horsey</b></p>	<p>Criteria for 2013/14 to be agreed by April 2013.</p>	<p>Programmes support positive action specifically for excluded and disadvantaged groups</p>	<p><b>Monitor applications to the 2013/14 fund</b></p>
---	--	-----------------------------	---	--	--

**Agreed by: Helen Wheeler, Neil Cole and Nick Coe**

**Date of completion of this Impact Assessment:** Revised – December 2011

**Summary published on web:** Yes

**Date published:** 13<sup>th</sup> January 2012

**The following groups should be considered in progressing the mitigating actions above:**

**Age :** *Children, young people, young parents, older or retired people*

**Disabled People :** *Mobility, sight, hearing, speech & language disability or difficulty, mental health/distress*

**Faith :** *Communities or individuals with different religions or beliefs*

**Gender :** *Women, Men, boys, girls, carers (of children, disabled or older people)*

**Transgender :** *(those who have changed gender or are in the process of change)*

**Race :** *Black and minority ethnic individuals and communities, gypsies and travellers, migrant workers*

**Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual**

**Low or no Income**

**People disadvantaged by background or other factors:** *Includes-, where they live, socio-economic status, location(rural/urban), educational achievement*