

RECORD OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

The draft policy for funding voluntary and community sector organisations using the Shopping, Investing and Giving framework (Appendix 1) and the draft policy for award of grants by Redditch Borough Council to voluntary and community sector organisations (Appendix 2) have been circulated to voluntary and community sector organisations and Council officers.

No comments were received that required amendment to the draft Shopping, Investing and Giving framework (Appendix 1).

The table below records the responses received regarding the draft policy for award of grants by Redditch Borough Council to voluntary and community sector organisations (Appendix 2), and the changes made to this policy as a result.

Comment From	Comment Made	Action Taken
Phil Hunt, Carers Careline	<p>I think that the review panel have done an excellent job in researching the whole area of funding local voluntary and community sector organisations. The proposals give a clear way forward and, more importantly, a level playing field for all those organisations wishing to seek the support of the Council.</p> <p>Priorities, either nationally or locally will always change just the same as the aims and/or make up of voluntary and community sector organisations can themselves change. With a well written policy in place that sets out clearly the expectations of the Council and monitoring etc requirements to be met we will all know where we stand. The Council will have greater control not only over how funding is distributed but also over what then happens to it - monitoring is key. This obviously also comes in line with funding requirements at County Level and removes any taint of 'favouritism' by having all applications vetted by a panel of independent elected members.</p> <p>I believe that this will be a great step forward for Redditch and the funding that it provides to local groups.</p>	No amendments made
Jim D Smith, North Worcestershire DIAL	<p>I'm pleased to comment on the draft policies and especially to complement the authority in undertaking this exercise. I think the most significant aspect is the ongoing commitment to ensuring that the Borough had a thriving and vibrant Voluntary and Community Sector.</p> <p>The commitment to the Worcestershire Compact principles is one which will require a degree of culture change and training for all which has not been</p>	No amendments made

	<p>always taken on board by statutory bodies when planning service delivery and monitoring.</p> <p>The potential for using other business models for public services delivery is one that fits well with the economic climate of today and the Shopping, Investing and Giving model meets this need.</p>	
Internal Audit	Definition of a 'small grant' in paragraph 3.6 is vague	Paragraph 3.6 reworded
Internal Audit	Paragraph 5.1c may not provide sufficient protection regarding bank account requirements.	Paragraph 5.1c reworded to ensure all account transactions require authorisation by at least two people.
Internal Audit	Paragraph 6.3 should be strengthened to ensure that spending is evidenced.	Paragraph 6.3 reworded to ensure evidenced spend of money for approved purposes.
Internal Audit	Paragraph 9.6 should require audited accounts.	Many small organisations are not legally required to have audited accounts and it would be unreasonable for the Council to require organisations to incur this expense with no guarantee of funding. However, paragraph 9.6 reworded to require evidence of sound financial management within the organisation.
Internal Audit	Paragraph 9.12 appears to commit the Council to securing funding for organisations.	Paragraph 9.12 re-worded to clarify that the commitment is only to signpost to other sources of funding advice, not to ensure that funding is secured.
Charity Commission (review of best practice guidance)	Funders should be clear about their policy on how an organisation's reserves will affect funding applications.	Paragraph 5.1e reworded to make explicit the Council's consideration of reserves in grant assessment.
Policy Team	Little information is provided on payment schedules.	New paragraph 7.7 added, providing payment schedule guidelines.
Policy Team	Paragraph 9.8 does not provide a clear approach to full cost recovery.	Paragraph 9.8 reworded to provide the Council's working definition of full cost recovery.
Policy Team	Paragraph 9.9 does not provide a quorum for the Grants Panel to make decisions.	Paragraph 9.9 reworded to define Grants Panel quorum.
Policy Team	The assessment timescales presented in section 10 do not make clear the difference between the central Council grants process and other grant processes.	Section 10 reworded to highlight differences in processes.
Housing Options	The application timescales in section 10 are too restrictive.	Minimum application window reduced from four weeks to three weeks.