## Main Grants 2017-18 report

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of organisation** | Lewisham Mencap |
| **Date of meeting** | 30 August 2016 |
| **Names and positions of attendees** | Abike Fakoya, Chair<br>Mary Olaniyi, Coordinator/Family Advisor<br>Cynthia Davis, Director and Volunteer<br>Petra Marshall, Community Resources Manager LBL |

| **Group Name:** | **Total** | **Q1** | **Q2** | **Q3** | **Q4** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total funding received 2015-16 | £30,000 | N/A | £10,000 | £10,000 | £10,000 |
| Total funding to be received 2016-17 | £40,000 | £10,000 | £10,000 | £10,000 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Outcomes | **Support** |
| | **1.** Provide activities for vulnerable adults that reduce isolation. Vibrant community infrastructure: High quality social activities for people with learning disabilities which cost about 50p to enter each club. |
| | **2.** People with learning disabilities in Lewisham can access holidays that give them the support they need. |
| | **3.** Advocacy support provided for people with learning disabilities and their families to ensure that they can gain access to services thereby improving their quality of life, social well-being.<br>Parents and carers of people with learning disabilities can access practical support (writing letters, phone calls) and advocacy.<br>Give parents and carers a voice in local service development. |
| | **4.** Parent, Carers and Cared for, gain more confidence and develop understanding of the process of the Direct Payments and Self-Directed Support.<br>Opportunity to share information and experience. |
| | |

| Outputs: | 2015-16 Target | 2015-16 Q2 | 2015-16 Q3 | 2015-16 Q4 | **2015-16 Total** | **% Achieved** | 2016-17 Target | 2016-17 Q1 | 2016-17 Q2 | **% Achieved TD** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Provide 3 evening clubs per week in 2 centres (in locations) within Lewisham (*no. of sessions*) | 117 | 39 | 33 | 39 | **111** | **94.87%** | 156 | 37 | | **94.87%** |
| *2.* One hour of support activities using the Leemore Centre sports garden once a week (*no. of sessions*) | 18 | 6 | 6 | 6 | **18** | **100%** | 24 | 6 | | **100%** |
| **3.** Offer a range of supported holidays determined by club members (*1 holiday per year*) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | **1** | **100%** | 1 | 1 | | **100%** |
| **4.** Provide an appointment based and drop in advocacy service (*no. of people*) | 12-15 | 5 | 5 | 4 | **14** | **100%** | 16-20 | 5 | | **100%** |
| **5.** Provision of healthy snacks within Clubs and Discos (*number of sessions available*) | 39 | 13 | 13 | 13 | **39** | **100%** | 52 | 13 | | **100%** |
| **6.** Develop (deliver in 2016/17) Focus Group consisting of Parents, Carers and Adults with a learning disability who receive the Direct Payments or | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | **3** | **100%** | 4 | 1 | | **100%** |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Personal Budget (*number of focus groups per year*) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

## 1. Remove funding from under-performing groups/those performing least well

| Have you achieved at least 90% of the agreed reporting outputs and outcomes in all quarters since the start of the programme? |
|---|
| The outputs for 2015/16 have all been met or exceeded except one, which was just under 95%. Performance for quarter 1 in 2016/17 is also on track to meet all targets.<br><br>The funding for this round of Main Grant (2015-18), agreed by Mayor & Cabinet (Contracts) in May 2015, states that Mencap's grant award would be for the provision of social clubs and related activity; and that this should be the priority for the organisation.<br><br>It further agreed that advocacy, and information and advice would not be funded and those services should be delivered by other organisations where needed.<br><br>However, Mencap have continued to use the Main Grant for the provision of advocacy and information and advice, and provide monitoring data for this (outputs 4 and 6). The council has continued to accept this monitoring data in error and has not directly addressed the use of the grant in this way.<br><br>During the course of this process this error has become apparent and Mencap report that they are in fact providing support and advocacy to many more people than that being reported. |

| Have you achieved all of the wider outcomes outlined in the initial grant application? |
|---|
| The organisation appears to be delivering against the wider outcomes agreed at the start of 2015/16 grant year.<br><br>Mencap provide lively and well attended clubs three evenings a week; averaging attendance between 50 and 80 per club night. In addition around 6 outings per year are delivered (e.g. to Hastings, Windsor) which allow the participants to socialise in a different setting and visit new places. In 2015/16 Mencap's assisted holiday was to Blackpool in June. This is subsidised with participants paying around £400 each. The organisation report that everyone had a great time, visiting Liverpool and going a river cruise and visiting the Beatles Story; going to a show, an animal farm and People History Museum.<br><br>The Direct Payments focus group covered a range of topics including rights under the Carers Act 2014, information on DBS, ACAS and insurance; and support was given in filling in legal help forms. In 2015/16 50 parents and carers and adults with learning disabilities attended across 3 sessions. In May 2016 Mencap presented to Lewisham Islamic Centre where 13 people attended; and information was given on right to care, assessment, SEN education and Direct Payments. There doesn't appear to be any satisfaction feedback. |

| If no to either of the above:<br>• what are the mitigating factors?<br>• what plans are in place for improving performance?<br>• what progress has been made against actions agreed with your Development Officer? |
|---|

N/A

What local support/evidence of need can you identify for the work you are undertaking?

The organisation state that without their provision people would be isolated and would have an impact on their health; and that carers / families would not have respite care.

Attending the clubs gives the users confidence and reduces depression, stress and anxiety.

## 2. Negotiate reductions and seek alternative funding streams

Are there any proposals that you can put forward that will deliver significant saving against current expenditure? This can include capital investment to change your delivery/business model.

There are no significant savings suggested; however Mencap are looking at a number of small scale savings:

- seeking someone to share their offices on Lee High Road to make a saving of approximately £4-6k; although there has been little interest to date. They have been advised by their lead officer to explore the option of taking a desk at Leemore or Mulberry
- making parents pay for photocopies
- yearly membership rates increased from £5 to £20
- shopping centre fundraising
- other small scale efficiencies

What alternative funding streams are you already pursuing?

Mencap have undertaken some fundraising and funding bids as follows:

- People's health Trust March 2016 – not successful
- Lee Charity of William Hatcliffe May 2016 £20,000 – no outcome yet
- Big Lottery Reaching Communities 2 x application for £40,000, July and September 2016 – no outcome yet

Mencap state that they will continue to submit funding applications; however fundraising agencies have advised them that they are unlikely to get core funding or funding for existing projects. They are seeking to develop new projects to attract funds.

Are there any other funding streams that you can identify that the council can support you to access?

None were identified.

3. **Work with groups to consider mergers or asset sharing**

| Are there any organisations doing similar work to you in the borough who you may consider sharing resources or merging with? Who have you considered/approached? |
| --- |
| Mencap are seeking to share their office space to realise savings; although it has been suggested to them by their lead officer that they also investigate taking a desk space in one of the community hubs to make greater savings. They state that what Mencap do is different to other providers and therefore sharing assets or merging is not possible.<br><br>Mencap showed no interest in sharing resources with or merging with other similar Learning Disability providers. |

| Are there other groups in the local area that you could share resources with even if they are delivering a different type of service? Again, who have you considered/approached? |
| --- |
| As above. |

| What support might you need to move these suggestions forward? |
| --- |
| N/A |

4. **Pro-rata reductions across all groups**

| What would a 25% cut in your grants look like in service delivery terms? What are the wider impacts? |
| --- |
| The recommendation report for funding for this round of Main Grant (2015-18), agreed by Mayor & Cabinet (Contracts) in May 2015, stated that Mencap's grant award would be for the provision of social clubs and related activity; and that this should be the priority for the organisation. It further recommended that advocacy, and information and advice be delivered by other organisations where needed.<br><br>Mencap have continued to use the Main Grant for the provision of advocacy and information and advice, and provide monitoring data for this (see outputs 4 and 6 above). The council has also continued to accept this monitoring data and has not dealt with this error until now.<br><br>It appears that a substantial proportion of the grant is used to provide this advocacy, information and advice; and Mencap are providing it erroneously. The social groups which the council does fund are predominantly run by volunteers with a small amount of administrative support and sessional worker cost.<br><br>As such, it is recommended that Mencap receive a 50% cut. This is to safeguard the social activities which they are funded for; and in recognition that the advocacy, information and advice work is not funded by the council.<br><br>When a pro-rata cut of 25% was discussed with the organisation they stated that they would need to close; that they couldn't continue to run. However, officers believe that a |

| |
|---|
| 50% cut would enable them to continue to deliver the social activities which was the original purpose of the grant in 2015. |

| Have you modelled this cut and developed an action plan for its implementation? |
|---|
| Several emergency meetings have been held to discuss a possible 25% cut and a number of actions have arisen from this (e.g. advertising the sharing of the office, small scale fundraising). Some modelling against 2017/18 budget forecast has taken place. |

**Conclusion**

| **Any other comments / areas discussed** |
|---|
| |

| **Conclusion and recommendation** |
|---|
| Mencap provide well attended and much loved social activities in the form of clubs, outings and holidays for people with learning difficulties. However, they have also been using the funding received from the council for the provision of advocacy, information and advice despite this not being part of their grant award.<br><br>**It is recommended that Mencap receive a 50% cut in their funding.** |

| Equalities groups disproportionately impacted by recommendations | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| Ethnicity: | | Pregnancy / Maternity: | |
| Gender: | | Marriage & Civil Partnerships: | |
| Age: | | Sexual orientation: | |
| Disability: | x | Gender reassignment: | |
| Religion / Belief: | | | |
| Commentary and potential mitigations: | | | |
| Mencap provide support and activities for people with learning disabilities. A reduction in their funding will have a disproportionate effect on the protected characteristic of disability; however officers will work with the organisation to mitigate this impact as much as possible when agreeing new outputs for 2017/18. | | | |