

**Manchester City Council  
Report for Resolution**

**Report to:** Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee – 1 February 2018

**Subject:** Our Manchester Voluntary Sector Funding Programme

**Report of:** Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhoods)  
Executive Director for Strategic Commissioning and  
Director of Adult Social Care Services (DASS)

---

**Summary**

This report responds to the request of the last meeting of this Committee for a further report, to include consideration of:

- the process undertaken for the first round of VCS funding;
- information on the next stages, including support for organisations which were not awarded funding and the timescale for equality impact assessments; and
- how the process can be improved in future to better engage with Ward Councillors

**Recommendations**

Members are asked to consider the arrangements set out in the report and to make suggestions as to how they can be improved.

---

**Wards Affected:** All

---

**Alignment to the Our Manchester Strategy Outcomes (if applicable)**

<b>Manchester Strategy outcomes</b>	<b>Summary of how this report aligns to the OMS</b>
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	This funding programme draws its outcomes from the Our Manchester Strategy. The city's voluntary sector has a unique role in unlocking the potential of our communities. This programme provides security of the funding for a significant number of

	voluntary sector groups in the city.
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	

**Contact Officers:**

Name: Liz Goodger  
Position: Strategic Commissioning Manager  
Telephone: 0161 234 1285  
E-mail: l.goodger@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Michael Salmon  
Position: Programme Lead  
Telephone: 0161 234 4557  
E-mail: m.salmon@manchester.gov.uk

**Background documents (available for public inspection):**

The following documents disclose important facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy please contact one of the contact officers above.

4 January 2017<sup>1</sup> and 22 June 2017<sup>2</sup> reports to this Committee  
Report to Executive Committee 28 June 2017<sup>3</sup>  
Prospectus for funding (circulated to members August 2017)  
Detailed information circulated to Members following the January 2018 meeting of this committee

---

1

[http://www.manchester.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/22332/6\\_part\\_two\\_%E2%80%93\\_our\\_manchester\\_voluntary\\_and\\_community\\_sector\\_funding](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/22332/6_part_two_%E2%80%93_our_manchester_voluntary_and_community_sector_funding)

2

[http://www.manchester.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/23099/6\\_our\\_manchester\\_voluntary\\_and\\_community\\_sector\\_funding](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/23099/6_our_manchester_voluntary_and_community_sector_funding)

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.manchester.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/23122/item\\_6\\_-\\_our\\_manchester\\_voluntary\\_and\\_community\\_sector\\_funding](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/23122/item_6_-_our_manchester_voluntary_and_community_sector_funding)

## **1.0 Introduction**

1.1 At the last meeting of this Committee, Members asked for more detail on the decision making process for the Our Manchester VCS Funding Programme and for more information on the next steps for groups who have been unsuccessful in securing a provisional offer of funding. In addition, Members asked for further consideration of the role of ward Members in such funding awards and the issue of appeals. This report responds to these requests.

## **2.0 Background**

2.1 Since the summer of 2016, the Council has been working with the voluntary sector to determine the best way in which the Council can use its funding to support the sector in the city to be more resilient and effective. We have conducted a wide ranging consultation process, including six well attended workshops and an online survey. At the heart of this work has been a co-design group of Council, NHS and voluntary sector colleagues, working together to design a new funding process.

2.2 Reports on this process have been considered by this Committee in January and June 2017 and the outcome of this work is the Our Manchester VCS funding programme, which made provisional offers of funding in mid December 2017.

2.3 OMVCS funding is £2,467,054 a year for 3 years (£7.4m in total). It brings together the following existing strands of Council funding: Equalities Funding Programme, Community Associations Fund, Mental Health contracts, Health and wellbeing grants, carers contracts and two small miscellaneous contracts. The Council also funds the voluntary sector through a wide variety of other grants and contracts across the Council. Examples include: contracts to provide Housing Related Support, strategic grants to large arts organisations, grants to cultural organisations, support for youth activities through Young Manchester and small grants for sports and campaigning activity (hate Crime Awareness, International Women's Day etc.) It is worth noting that the total amount of Council funding to the voluntary sector is estimated to be over £30m a year.

2.4 The names of the co-design group, the assessment panel and the Programme Board are listed at appendix 1

## **3.0 The Assessment Process**

3.1 A description of the assessment process has been circulated to Members of this Committee following the January meeting. It is provided again here, for completeness.

3.2 An assessment panel of six people was convened to assess applications to the fund and generate a set of recommendations for review by the OMVCS Programme Board. The make-up of the assessment panel was discussed in depth by the co-design group.

3.3 The panel's independent (non-voting) chair, Nigel Rose (Macc) ensured the panel carried out its assessment robustly, in accordance with the results of the extensive co-design and consultation process that resulted in the published prospectus and guidance. The panel kept in mind throughout the assessment process the aim of the programme to

*“support voluntary and community sector organisations to carry out activities that make an important contribution to meeting the outcomes of the Our Manchester Strategy in accordance with the Our Manchester Principles”*

and that the grant programme is focused on:

*“supporting the work of organisations that are well run and can demonstrate a track record of effective work with Manchester citizens”.*

The panel examined each application for eligibility. If the application was eligible the panel searched for evidence for the following 3 sets of criteria. (Listed in detail at appendix 2)

1. How the organisation is run (40%)
  - a. Well-run
  - b. Involvement of Manchester Citizens and their beneficiaries
  - c. Collaborative
  - d. Diverse Income
  - e. Coherent and Convincing
2. How services are organised (40%)
  - a. Successful
  - b. Strength-based approach in existing activities
  - c. Vision and Values
  - d. Proposed Activities
  - e. Outcomes
  - f. Coherent and Convincing
3. Value for money (20%)
  - a. Value for money
  - b. Additional Income

In all cases the panel, after discussion, was able to reach a reasonably consistent view of the evidence presented within the application form. In line with the guidance and prospectus, the panel excluded applications that fell below an acceptable quality threshold from further consideration.

### 3.4 Results

Total amount requested from the fund	£15,241,583
Total amount allocated is	£7,399,961
Unallocated amount is	£1,201
Number of funded organisations	<b>63</b>
Number of organisations currently funded, further grant awarded	50
Number of newly funded organisations	13
Number of organisations on the reserve list for funding	<b>4</b>
Number of organisations currently funded not funded	13
Number of applications not funded	<b>46</b>

### 3.5 Process in detail

3.5.1 Initial sifting: 144 applications were received. The Resources and Programmes Team undertook the first sifting of the applications against the following eligibility criteria:

- Have organisations applied for the correct amount of grant. Those organisations not currently funded from the funds brought together, were only eligible to apply for the medium grant
- Applying for mainly youth related activities was ineligible as the Youth Fund was being launched
- Applications below the minimum word count allowable on certain question (20%)

Following the assessment and a moderation exercise, 30 applications (21%) were ineligible for further consideration, leaving 114 applications for consideration by the panel, a duplicate application leaving 113.

3.5.2 Panel Assessment: The panel spent a total of 28.5 hours over 6 days considering their decision. This does not include the time spent individually by panel members assessing applications before the panel began or a half-day briefing.

*Step 1:* Each panel member individually ranked all applications and recorded the reasons for their decisions on an assessment form.

*Step 2:* Applications where there was a high degree of consensus in scoring were allocated either to definitely funded, possibly funded or of such a poor quality they could not be funded.

*Step 3:* All applications where there was not a reasonable degree of consensus in rankings were systematically reconsidered by the panel looking for evidence to support each element of the assessment criteria. This process took most of the time of the panel and in almost every case a reasonable degree of consensus was reached about the evidence or lack of evidence and the rankings were adjusted accordingly. This process was carried out for approximately 90 applications. Records were made of every decision for the purpose of audit, feedback and future development work by liaison officers.

*Step 4:* Of the 6 rankings by panel members the lowest ranking and highest ranking were removed and the remaining rankings were averaged. All applications were then listed in order.

*Step 5:* Organisations, who are currently funded, asked for increases from 0% to almost 400%. The prospectus and publicity around the fund made it clear organisations could ask for an increase (except for organisations who applied for very large grants) but as there was no increase in overall programme funding, requests for extra funding should be kept at reasonable levels.

After extensive discussion, it was decided increases in funding to individual organisations currently receiving funding should be limited to £60,000 as this meant that almost all organisations would be given the funding they asked for. The capping at £60,000 resulted in a saving of £453,948 and an additional 3 applications being funded.

Additionally the panel set a minimum ranking order at which new (not currently funded) applications could be funded. These applications had to be of a high quality and meet all criteria to a reasonable extent in line with the balancing criteria of “avoiding damaging disruption to Manchester’s voluntary and community sector by withdrawing funding from large numbers of organisations that are presently funded”.

*Step 6:* The panel then considered the list of applications that could be funded given the size of the fund in ranking order and considered the following balancing criteria

1. Equitably distributed across neighbourhoods and across communities of identity and the objectives of the fund
2. Level of funding for carers support maintained near to present levels.

3.6 The resulting programme was presented to the Programme Board for consideration on 4th December 2017.

3.7 Summary of the OMVCS Programme Board discussion

- The Board held a lengthy discussion regarding those groups who currently receive funding, where the assessment panel did not recommend funding under the OM VCS Programme.

- The Board was concerned that all groups in this situation be supported to work through the impact of the loss of funding on their organisation, and on their service users.
- The Board noted the Decommissioning Guide, agreed by the Council with the voluntary sector in 2011. The guide provides a structured, collaborative approach to understanding the full impact of funding withdrawal. This includes the impact on service users and carers, service delivery and the organisation as a whole. Fundamental to the approach, is ensuring organisations are given adequate notice of the withdrawal of funding. In this case organisations will be given more than three months. Relevant officers met on 11th December to work through the detail of this process (explained in more detail in paragraph 4) which began in early January.
- The Board discussed the reserve list and agreed the 4 organisations should be approached, in ranking order, should any of the organisations recommended for funding not pass the due diligence process.
- The Board noted the process for due diligence, which involves Members of the Council, officers and where relevant, MHCC staff. Any issues of concern raised about groups by any individual must be supported by evidence. The Board asked for a report on the outcome of the due diligence process, which is expected to conclude in February 2018. This report should also highlight lessons learned on the process, for future implementation.
- The Board agreed that all Members be provided with the list of provisionally funded groups. At the same time Members to be asked (as set out in the due diligence process) if they know of any reasons, supported by evidence, why groups should not be funded.
- All Members to also be sent the list of currently funded groups, who will not receive funding through the OMVCS fund from 1st April 2018.

3.8 In conclusion, the Board confirmed it was content the assessment process that led to the recommended programme was robust and had been properly followed, and so it supported the recommendations of the Assessment Panel.

3.9 In doing so, the Board noted that the OMVCS funding process has been about building a strong, resilient and effective voluntary sector in Manchester. Inevitably, it has highlighted areas of the city, and certain communities, where voluntary sector capacity is stronger than elsewhere.

3.10 The Programme Board requested urgent further analysis to deepen our understanding of the underlying reasons for this disparity, to enable the new programme team for this funding, and others, to develop plans to address gaps.

#### **4.0 Unsuccessful organisations**

4.1 A total of 46 organisations applied unsuccessfully to the OMVCS fund. Of these, thirteen organisations are currently receiving funding from one of the 5

funds listed in paragraph 2.3. An additional 4 organisations are on the reserve list. Should any organisation provisionally offered funding not pass the due diligence stage, these organisations will be offered funding, in order of ranking. Three of the organisations on the list are currently in receipt of Council funding, meaning that up to 16 organisations which currently receive funding from the Council may (depending on due diligence) lose this funding from 31st March 2018. A further seven organisations, currently receiving funding did not complete applications to the fund, bringing the maximum to 23.

- 4.2 All organisations have been aware that their funding may come to an end for at least a year. A strong theme which came through the consultation with the sector was that most groups are used to uncertain funding and that a lack of notice of funding changes is a key concern. From the start of the process groups have asked the Council to provide at least 3 months notice of funding coming to an end.
- 4.3 The loss of funding can have a wide range of effects on organisations depending on the amount lost, the proportion of this to the organisation's other income and the overall resilience of the organisation.
- 4.4 As a first step, all of the organisations above have been contacted to ask if they want to work with us to help understand the impact of the loss of Council funding on their organisation, on the services they provide, on their service users and on any buildings they may run. This process is derived from "Decommissioning in Manchester: Principles and Good Practice Guide" agreed between the Council and the voluntary sector in 2011.
- 4.5 Groups have been contacted by the officer with whom they have the most contact, generally their main commissioner, and offered a face to face meeting to go through a structured process of collecting information about the impact of funding loss on the organisation. At this stage the process is to understand impact, not to try to offer immediate solutions. At the time of writing the process of meeting groups and gathering information is still underway. Not all groups will want or need to engage in this process, however we are strongly encouraging them to do so, where appropriate, so we can gain an accurate picture.
- 4.6 The following step is for these impact assessments to be collated and analysed. The impact of funding withdrawal on local communities will be part of this, feeding into a wider gap analysis detailed below. There are a number of ways in which groups may want to respond to this situation. For example:
  - Partner: another provider of similar services or working with a similar client group may be able to offer support, for example, taking over back office or governance functions
  - Transfer service users: another provider of similar services or working with a similar client group may be able to take on all or some of a group's service users
  - Secure alternative funding



- Access organisational development support
- Do nothing: for example where the loss of funding is small and the group's work can continue with minor alterations

## **5.0 Appeals**

5.1 The funding prospectus explained that there is no appeals process for this funding programme. We do not usually offer an appeals process as part of a grant programme, for example we did not do so when we last awarded the Community Association and Equalities Funding Programmes. Large funders such as the Big Lottery Fund do not do so either.

5.2 In awarding funding, the Council has a duty to have a proper process in place. If organisations believe the Council has not applied its process properly then they can complain to the Council on this basis. In such cases the Council would only consider whether there had been a procedural failing that ultimately affected the funding outcome. There would not be a re-consideration of the merits of a particular funding application.

## **6.0 The role of ward Members**

6.1 Members of this Committee have asked for consideration of how the local knowledge and expertise of ward Members can be used more effectively in future grant processes.

6.2 This change to the way we fund the voluntary sector has been discussed extensively twice by this Committee. Members have also attended some of the consultation events. Alongside the detailed co-design process, local members could be more involved in the process of determining the criteria for grant funding and also the specifics of how the balancing stage of the allocation process works: across wards and across communities of identity, within the constraints of the funding available.

6.3 A detailed report on this process could be discussed by Members of this Committee in time for any future funding rounds. A small group of Members may wish to work in depth with officers on this issue.

## **7.0 Next steps**

7.1 As requested by the Programme Board for this funding, work is underway to produce a gap analysis. This will consist of:

- a funding map showing where the service users of the funded organisation live. This has been completed and circulated to Members of this Committee.
- an equality analysis. An analysis was undertaken at funding design stage and a further analysis needs to be completed on the outcome of the process. This will be informed by data provided by organisations on the numbers of their

service users from the various communities of identity and, where possible, by the impact assessments currently underway.

- 7.2 This gap analysis will help inform plans for addressing those areas of the city, and in our communities of identity where voluntary sector capacity needs additional support, within the wider commissioning agenda. The work to provide that support will need to come from a range of places, in particular by working with partners in the city such as housing providers, other funders, neighbourhood teams and the new Programme Team for this funding and the Our Manchester Investment Fund. The new Programme Team will largely be in place by the time of this meeting. Members will need to be central to both agreeing and implementing this process.
- 7.3 This funding programme is a small element of the city's overall spend with the voluntary sector and of spending in geographical communities and communities of identity. This gap analysis will need to place this funding programme in that wider context of service provision and commissioning.
- 7.4 Due diligence work is currently underway to establish whether provisional offers of funding can be confirmed. This work is a combination of desk based research and face to face visits. Members have been asked for their input into this process. Previously unfunded groups are being prioritised and this work is to be completed by the end of February. The new Liaison Officer role created by this process, after strong representations during consultation, is central to this process and to building strong relationships with our funded groups.
- 7.5 The OMVCS Programme Board will meet again on 14th March to consider the outcome of the due diligence process and the impact this may have on the final funding programme. Immediately following the Programme Board, the Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhoods) and the Director of Adult Social Services will meet to formally decide the final funding programme. These officers have delegated powers under the Council's Constitution to make grants to voluntary organisations.
- 7.6 The Board will also discuss a paper on the principles of, and process for, accepting additional funding into the OMVCS Funding Programme

## Appendix 1

### OMVCS Co-design group

Claire Evans	Chief Executive 4CT
Lynne Stafford	Chief Executive, The Gaddum Centre
Rachel Bottomley	Assistant Director, LGBTF
Francess Davies-Tagoe	General Manager, Tree of Life
Michael Salmon	Commissioning Manager, Mental Health, MCC/MHCC
Martin Preston	Deputy Chief Executive, Macc
Mark Rainey	Strategic Lead – Neighbourhoods (South), MCC
Juliet Eadie	Commissioning Manager, Mental Health CCG/MHCC
Val Bayliss-Brideaux	Senior Engagement Manager, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)
Liz Goodger	VCS Development Manager MCC/ Strategic Commissioning Manager MHCC

### Assessment Panel

Val Bayliss-Brideaux	Senior Engagement Manager, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)
Keiran Barnes	Equalities Team Leader, MCC
Paul Johnston	Commissioning Development Specialist, MHCC
Mark Rainey	Strategic Lead – Neighbourhoods (South), MCC
Kirsten Blackwood	Deputy Chief Executive (Finance & Resources) Salford CVS
Michael Salmon	Commissioning Manager, Mental Health, MHCC

### Programme Board Members

Cllr Sue Murphy (chair)	Deputy Leader, Manchester City Council
Sara Todd	Deputy Chief Executive, MCC
Dr. Carolyn Kus*	Executive Director of Commissioning and Director of Adult Social Care Services
Mike Wild	Chief Executive, Macc
Nick Gomm	Director of Corporate Affairs, MHCC
Sharmila Kar*	Director of Workforce and Organisational Development MHCC
Jane Gant	Strategic Director People and Places Southway Housing
Beth Plant*	Policy and Learning Manager Big Lottery Fund

\*Apologies given to 4.12.2017 meeting

**Appendix 2**

**Assessment Criteria**

**Set 1 - How the Organisation is Run – 40%**

Well-run	<p>Does the organisation have a functioning board</p> <p>Does the organisation have staff with appropriate skills to carry out their activities?</p> <p>Does the organisation have a reasonably clear vision for where it is going?</p> <p>Does the organisation have ways of collecting stakeholder feedback?</p> <p>Does the organisation act on the feedback it receives?</p>
Involvement of Manchester Citizens and beneficiaries	<p>To what extent are Manchester Citizens involved in a voluntary capacity in the governance of work carried out by the organisation in Manchester?</p> <p>To what extent are Manchester Citizens involved in a voluntary capacity in delivering services?</p> <p>To what extent are people who are beneficiaries of the organisation involved in a voluntary capacity, in governance?</p> <p>To what extent are people who are involved in activities involved in a voluntary capacity in delivering services?</p> <p>To what extent does the organisation employ people who have been involved in their activities or who have experience of having used similar activities?</p>
Collaborative	<p>To what extent does the organisation collaborate with private, voluntary and public organisations locally and nationally in providing activities, sharing back office functions, devising strategy and policy, and planning activities?</p>
Diverse Income	<p>Does the organisation have a diverse range of income streams such that that they would be able to successfully continue if one or more of those streams ended?</p>
Coherent and Convincing	<p>Having considered all of the factors above, to what extent to they form a coherent and convincing narrative?</p>

**Set 2 – How Services are organised – 40%**

Successful	To what extent has the organisation demonstrated a record of success in activities with Manchester Citizens?
Strength-based approach in existing activities	To what extent are people participating in activities involved in defining their own outcomes and in planning how to reach those outcomes? To what extent are people participating in activities enabled to identify their strengths and capabilities and how to use them to meet their outcomes? To what extent are people participating in activities encouraged and enabled to use other organisations, activities and resources in meeting their needs? To what extent does the organisation encourage and enable peer support?
Vision and values	To what extent are the vision and values of the organisation put into practice in their existing activities?
Proposed Activities	Are the proposed activities the same as successful existing activities If the activities are significantly different to the proposed activities: To what extent is the development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aimed at communities that the organisation already has links with?</li> <li>2. Using the same general methodology that the organisation has shown success in?</li> <li>3. Using connections, collaborations and partnership that are in place?</li> <li>4. Consistent with the vision of where the organisation is going?</li> <li>5. Based on evidence?</li> </ol>
Outcomes	Are the outcomes clearly linked to the objectives? Are the outcomes clear and specific? Do the outcomes clearly link to the proposed activities?
Coherent and Convincing	Having considered all of the factors above, to what extent do they form a coherent and convincing narrative?

**Set 3 - Value for Money – 20%**

Value for money	Are there any unreasonable costs?
Additional income	To what extent does the organisation raise additional income to support Manchester Citizens?

## Appendix 3

### Funding lists

**Organisations to be offered provisional funding in alphabetical order (\*newly funded)**

Organisation	Proposed funding (3 year total)	Running Total
4CT Ltd	224,829	224,829
African Caribbean Care Group	89,916	314,745
Age Concern Manchester (Trading as Age UK Manchester)	114,000	428,745
Albert Kennedy Trust	57,000	485,745
All Arts & Media trading as ALL FM*	32,400	518,145
Alzheimer's Society	129,999	648,144
Assist Neighbourhood Care	110,700	758,844
Back on Track*	60,000	818,844
Barlow Moor Community Association Ltd	174,152	992,996
Benchill Community Centre	134,100	1,127,096
Burnage Good Neighbours	132,827	1,259,923
Captain J H Greenhalgh Legacy CIC/Wythenshawe Good Neighbours	84,000	7,399,961
Caritas Dioceses of Salford	153,900	1,413,823



Cheetham Hill Advice Centre*	55,179	1,469,002
Chorlton Good Neighbours (CGN)	150,000	1,619,002
Coffee4Craig*	10,000	1,629,002
Connect Support Ltd	167,508	1,796,510
Didsbury Good Neighbours	70,200	1,866,710
EMERGE (FareShare Greater Manchester)*	59,941	1,926,651
Fallowfield Library & Community Resource Centre (The Place at Platt Lane)*	60,000	1,986,651
Friends of Burnage Library*	53,800	2,040,451
Gaydio CIC	54,000	2,094,451
George House Trust	78,476	2,172,927
Greater Manchester Coalition for Disabled People	119,560	2,292,487
Healthy Me Healthy Communities Ltd*	60,000	2,352,487
Higher Blackley Community Organisation	84,000	2,436,487
Hulme Community Garden Centre	74,880	2,511,367
JustLife Foundation*	60,000	2,571,367
Levenshulme Inspire	72,900	2,644,267
LGBT Foundation Ltd	161,094	2,805,361
Manchester Digital Laboratory CIC Ltd (Madlab)	107,100	2,912,461

Manchester Action on Street Health	91,635	3,004,096
Manchester Bangladeshi Women's Organisation	215,300	3,219,396
Manchester Carers Centre	241,338	3,460,734
Manchester Carers Forum	300,000	3,760,734
Manchester Deaf Centre	120,000	3,880,734
Manchester Mens' Room*	45,912	3,926,646
Manchester Mind	641,918	4,568,564
Manchester Rape Crisis	150,000	4,718,564
Manchester Refugee Support Network	119,819	4,838,383
Manchester Settlement	115,000	4,953,383
Medical Foundation for the Care of Victims of Torture (Freedom From Torture)*	59,400	5,012,783
Moodswings	79,380	5,092,163
Nephra Good Neighbours	35,625	5,127,788
Northmoor Community Association	113,556	5,241,344
People First Housing Association	83,700	5,325,044
Rainbow Haven*	60,000	5,385,044
Royal Oak and Baguley Residents Association	45,000	5,430,044

Saheli	107,580	5,537,624
Shopmobility	45,000	5,582,624
Stroke Association	107,488	5,690,112
Talbot House Support Centre	93,000	5,783,112
The Proud Trust	108,000	5,891,112
TLC St Lukes	90,834	5,981,946
Together Dementia Support CIC*	60,000	6,041,946
The Tree of Life Centre	91,531	6,133,477
Trinity House Community Resource Centre	141,000	6,274,477
Turkey Lane & Monsall Neighbourhood Centre	60,000	6,334,477
Venture Arts	80,213	6,414,690
Wai Yin Society	615,701	7,030,391
Whalley Range Community Forum	106,710	7,137,101
Whitemoss Club for Young People	60,000	7,197,101
Women in Prison	118,860	7,315,961

**Reserve list of organisations in ranking order**

Salvation Army Housing Association	£	60,000
African Caribbean Mental Health Services	£	43,974
St Georges Community Association	£	60,000
Himmat	£	222,669

4

**Unfunded currently supported groups**

<b>Organisation</b>
BHA for Equality
Faith Network for Manchester (FN4M)
Harpurhey Neighbourhood Project Society Ltd
Indian Senior Citizens Centre
Irish Community Care Manchester
Levenshulme Good Neighbours
Lifted Greater Manchester AddVentures Project
LMCP Care Link
NEESA Well Women Drop In Project
North Manchester Black Health Forum
Somali Adult Social Care Agency

Federation of Jewish Services
Wythenshawe Community Housing Group

**Currently funded groups that did not apply**

<b>Organisation</b>
42 <sup>nd</sup> Street
Admiral Nurses
Awaaz
Birch Community Centre
MCCR
Simply Cycling
Wythenshawe Oasis

## Appendix 4

### Timeline

- March 2016: Council agreed to extend relevant VCS grants and contracts until March 2017 (Equalities Fund, Community Associations, Mental Health, Carers, Health and Wellbeing)
- April 2016: Single Outcome, Single Finance and Single Monitoring forms introduced for the five programmes above
- August - September 2016: New approach to VCS funding workshops (3) take place with VCS partners (North, Central, South)
- 7th September 2016: Discussion at Members Voluntary Sector Interest Group
- October 2016 Co-design group established with VCSE representatives from across the city
- October 2016 - June 2017 Co-design group works through structured process to develop models for consultation and then works to refine and propose new model
- 4th January 2017: Communities & Equalities Scrutiny Committee progress report includes up date on co-design and new models for consultation
- January - February 2017: Consultation on new approach/models: online and through 3 open workshops (North, South, Central)
- February - April 2017: Co-design group sessions building on consultation findings
- March 2017: VCS extended until December 2017
- 14th June 2017: Briefing and Q&A with Members of former Voluntary Sector Interest Group
- 22nd June 2017: Communities & Equalities Scrutiny Committee progress report includes new model, extension to infrastructure contract and development of new Programme Team.
- 28th June 2017: Executive Committee approval of Our Manchester VCS Funding Programme
- June 2017: VCS grants extended to 31st March 2018
- 7th July 2017: Briefing and Q&A with Lead Equality Members
- 21st July 2017: Inaugural meeting of OMVCS Programme Board
- 4th September 2017: Our Manchester VCS Funding Programme open to application
- 7th September 2017: Launch event in the Great Hall
- September to October 2017: Online application period (6 weeks)
- September - October 2017: Application writing/support workshops run by Macc
- 16th October 2017: application process closes
- October - November 2017: Assessment Panel scoring and meetings
- December 2017: Programme Lead and Programme officers recruited
- 4th December 2017: Programme Board: Recommendations approved
- 12th December 2017: All Elected Members informed of funding decisions and invited to respond to specific questions up to 22nd December 2017
- 12th December 2017: All applicants (successful and unsuccessful) informed of decisions and provided with information on requesting feedback
- 11th December 2017: Lead officers for all existing funded groups meet to discuss decommissioning process

- 21st December 2017: Unsuccessful organisations (currently funded) contacted and informed of follow up meetings with officers to be arranged in January 2018
- December 2017: Liaison Officers (due diligence) briefing session
- December 2017 - January 2018: Further gap analysis and information produced for Programme Board
- January - February 2018: Due diligence process to be completed
- January - February 2018: Decommissioning visits/ongoing conversations to take place with providers
- January/February 2018: Full Programme Team to commence working
- 14 March 2018: OMVCS Programme Board meeting
- March 2018: Grant agreements finalised and signed
- April 2018: Grants go live
- April 2018 - March 2021: Programme funding period, subject to grant monitoring and review