

Appendix 1

GRANT ADVISORY PANEL MEETING - 13 APRIL 2011

MINUTES

1. Present:: - Panel Members – Dick Edwards, Sandra Garner, Steve Manwaring, Judith Monk and Karen Rigby-Faux.
Chris May, Protector, and Jayne Butters, Borough Solicitor, Hastings Borough Council.
2. Declarations of interest – there were no declarations of interest.
3. Election of Chair – Sandra Garner was elected.
4. Election of Vice-Chair – Dick Edwards was elected.
5. Election of Secretary – Steve Manwaring was elected as secretary.
6. Administrative needs and arrangements for the Panel.
The Panel discussed their requirements and were agreed that they needed some administrative support for the compilation and distribution of agendas and minuting of meetings. The Borough Solicitor explained that currently there was no resource due to the staffing levels and this would not be available until after the 5 May. It was explained that as this would be HBC employed staff, there would be a re-charge to the Foreshore Trust as there would be for the hire of a room for meetings in the Town Hall. Members of the Panel were concerned that any costs incurred by the Panel would reduce the surplus available for distribution as grants. They agreed that they would meet in Jackson Hall once the lease between the Council and HVA has been completed. Members would also investigate what other administrative assistance might be available to the Panel.

7. Consideration of the Constitution

The Panel considered the terms of the constitution agreed by the Charity Committee. Subject to certain amendments as shown in the attached Appendix A, the Constitution was adopted by the Panel.

8. Consideration of Draft Grant Criteria

The Panel discussed this at length and agreed amendments to the draft criteria as shown in Appendix B to these minutes. The answered the set questions as follows:-

1. Would they want to consider prioritising or limiting the areas eligible for funding - ie choosing some, but not all, of the criteria set out in

paragraph 23 of the draft paper, or weighting them in some way (eg a higher/lower percentage of grant for different areas).

Response:-the Group's preferred areas of benefit are:-

1. The prevention or relief of poverty
2. The advancement of education
3. The advancement of health or the saving of lives
4. The advancement of citizenship or community development
5. The advancement of the arts, cultures, heritage or science
6. The advancement of amateur sport
7. The advancement of human rights, conflict resolution or reconciliation or the promotion of religious or racial harmony or equality and diversity
8. The advancement of environmental protection or improvement
9. Any other purposes currently recognised as charitable and any new charitable purposes which are similar to another charitable purposes

Weighting might be appropriate but the Group found it difficult to give this full consideration until the extent of funding available was known. However, from the indications at the meeting of Charity Committee on 29 March 2011, it would be sensible to see this funding limited at present to £50,000 and the rest of the responses are given with this in mind.

2. Does the trust want to be a funder of last resort (ie all other sources of funding being exhausted) or not

Response:- the Group found this difficult to answer as they felt this to be too loose a concept. They wanted to retain as much flexibility as possible. They also wanted absolute clarity for applicants on the approach to be adopted by the Trust.

3. Would the amount of grant be the least possible to enable a project to go ahead, or would it be based on achieving maximum impact - or a combination of both

Response: - Until the level of funding is known it is difficult to answer this question.

4. The CPF approach encourages organisations to submit applications in terms of full cost recovery --- ie all the costs and overheads associated with a project are eligible for grant. The panel will want to consider whether they go for this approach, or just want to fund a particular activity and not associated overheads (as is the case with many other funding regimes)

Response: - as for 3.

5. Does the applicant have to be a charity - or can another type of organisation be eligible as long as the activity which is grant aided is for one or other of the charitable purposes set out in sect 23.

Response:- It is not necessary for the group to be a registered charity but it should be a charity or working towards charity status. It was commented that over 70% of organisations working within the voluntary

sector were not charities. It was agreed that the group should have a written constitution with appropriate equality provision and the grant has to be for charitable purposes.

6. Do they want to recommend a rolling grant programme - or one that that is periodic in nature

Response: - It was suggested that there should be an invitation for applications for grants twice a year and the grant fund to be divided equally between the two grant processes. It was envisaged that the process would entertain one-off grants and that no new application on the same project could be considered in the annual period. In the first instance the advertisement would probably set the maximum of a single grant at £5K.

7. Should the applicant have to be based within the Borough? (If not, that would mean other aspects might need to be considered – how does the charitable purpose benefit persons within the Borough)

Response: - The benefit has to be within the Borough to comply with the terms of the Scheme but the applicant does not itself have to be based in the Borough. Preference would be given to locally based applicants.

8. Intervention rates, if any - ie could the grant fund 100% of the cost of the activity, or must there be an element of other funding, and if so how much

Response:- It is too early to answer this question without knowing the level of funding available. The Group did not think it was necessary at this stage, though it is reasonable to ask the applicant as part of the application process whether they have sought or have other funding available to them.

9. Are there any particular outcomes/outputs that the panel might want to recommend to the Trustees in terms of being able to evaluate applications in terms of value for money and to set a common and transparent measure of impact of grant funded activity.

Response:- The Group would expect the applicant to be able to give a measure of showing how it would achieve the funding purpose. This along with a question regarding the sustainability of the project would be questions on the application form. Concern was raised regarding the position of professional fund raisers and that these should be excluded by the application form.

9. Any other business

The Panel expressed a wish to meet with the members of Charity Committee informally. The Borough Solicitor agreed to arrange this. The Panel also requested a copy of the Community Partnership Funding criteria.

10. Date of next meeting:-

4 May 2011 at 6pm at Jackson Hall.