

Older People's Fund Consultation Report August 2019

This report is a summary of the results of the consultation carried out by Manchester City Council concerning proposals for the Population Health Targeted Fund - Older Peoples Fund

The aim of the consultation was to gather feedback from voluntary and community groups (and other key stakeholders) to improve and build on the draft proposals for the grant fund.

The consultation consisted of a central event attended by individuals/organisations and 37 individual responses to an online survey.

The central event focused discussions on each element of the proposals for the grant fund. The online survey produced a combination of statistics and detailed comments and provided feedback along with making suggestions for how to improve the proposals. It is these comments that form the bulk of this report.

Every attempt has been made to include key points and themes but some comments have been left out in consideration of the timing and length of the report. Many of the comments included were made by one or a small number of respondents. Where there was a large number of comments making the same point this has been reflected in the themes.

Thank you to everyone who contributed and our apologies to anyone whose comments are not featured in this report.

This report is structured in the same order as the central event and online consultation.

Creating an Age Friendly City for Older People (Older Peoples Fund)

As stated in the introduction, the consultation for the Older People Fund consisted of:

- a Central consultation event - held at Kings House Conference Centre on Thursday 18 July 2019. In total 33 people, from 29 organisations attended the event, and an
- Online consultation

In total **37 responses** were received for the on-line consultation.

The make-up of the respondents for the online consultation were as follows:

(A respondent may have ticked more than one box e.g a resident may also work for an OMVCS funded organisation).

Resident	41%
OMVCS funded organisation	70%
Young Manchester (Youth and Play) funded organisation	5%
Cultural Partnership Agreement funded organisation	0%
VCS organisation not funded by OMVCS	0%
Manchester City Council Employee	0%
Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) employee	3%
Councillor	0%

Of the voluntary and community sector (VCS) groups that responded, the size of their organisation was as follows:

Micro (under £10k income)	5%
Small (£10k - £100k income)	46%
Medium (£100k - £1m income)	24%
Large (more than £1m income)	14%
Not Applicable	11%

The following information provides a breakdown of the online consultation and responses and key themes. This is then supported by additional commentary from the central engagement event.

Aims

Respondents were asked about the following aims of the fund

The primary aim of the grant programme is:

- To increase the health and wellbeing of older people in every one of the 12 neighbourhoods of Manchester

Through supporting older people

1. To be more socially connected to family, friends, colleagues and neighbours
2. To increase their skills and abilities to help themselves and others
3. To make more use of local organisations and amenities

100% of the respondents said that the aims were clear

The responses on whether these were the right aims were as follows:

Strongly Disagree	0%
Disagree	3%
Neither agree or disagree	3%
Agree	65%
Strongly Agree	30%

95% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that these were the right aims.

The key themes emerging were:

- Give groups examples of specific types of activities or way of delivery.
- Ensure local grassroot/unfunded organisations are involved in delivery.
- Recognition of the need for both new and existing partnerships.
- Loneliness/Isolation came up a number of times and the need for a definition for these terms.

This reflected the discussion and feedback from the central event where the following additional comments/suggestions were made

- Clarification that citywide groups need to focus on neighbourhoods. Capacity building across the network.
- General consensus that aims are clear and the right ones
- More clarity requested about what can and cannot be funded.
- The aims were good, quite broad, recognising that it will work differently in every area so needs to be less prescriptive but clear (which it is) on the outcomes

Priorities

Respondents were asked about the following priorities for the Fund

It is not intended that the grant programme should solely focus on these priorities but they should be met across the grant programme

The Key priorities for the grant programme are:

1. People over the age of 65
2. People from BAME communities
3. People who are lonely and/or isolated

95% of the respondents said that the priorities were clear

The responses on whether these were the right priorities were as follows:

Strongly Disagree	0%
Disagree	3%
Neither agree or disagree	14%
Agree	65%
Strongly Agree	19%

84% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that these were the right priorities.

The key themes emerging were:

- Age range came up frequently.
- Greater Manchester age friendly work was referred to a number of times.

This reflected the discussion and feedback from the central event where the following additional comments/suggestions were made

- Should involve reaching new people who are hidden.
- Access to 'hard to reach' groups
- The equality and diversity agenda needs to be clearer.

- General consensus that priorities are clear and the right ones
- Clarity needed around partnership working and role of the Lead partner
- Clarity needed on how much of the funding should be passed on by the lead partner.
- People of all ages 'People who are at risk of' - needs to be preventative
- Need to be 'older people who'. Reword to 'older people who are at risk of becoming lonely and/ or isolated.

Objectives

Respondents were asked about the following objectives for the Fund

- We want grant applicants to demonstrate how they will enable older people
- To be more socially connected to family, friends, colleagues and neighbours
 - To increase their skills and abilities to help themselves and others
 - To make more use of local organisations and amenities

Through

1. Peer support, where older people help one another individually or in groups
2. And through volunteering by older people

97% of the respondents said that the objectives were clear:

The responses on whether these were the right objectives were as follows:

Strongly Disagree	0%
Disagree	3%
Neither agree or disagree	8%
Agree	62%
Strongly Agree	27%

89% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that these were the right objectives.

The key themes emerging were:

- Whether it is about new or existing connections (or both).
- How impacts and outcomes will be monitored.
- Use of the word 'peer' / 'peer support'. Needs to be clearer
- Environments/spaces/some groups needing to change to ensure that they are accessible and inclusive

This reflected the discussion and feedback from the central event where the following additional comments/suggestions were made

- Intergenerational work, working with older people and younger people together.
- The objectives encourage groups to use/share assets
- Using clear examples in the prospectus - i.e. what will and won't be funded
- Similar to the aims, clear, make sense and open enough for groups to respond in different ways.
- Adding examples of the types of activities - info, advice, guidance, physical, health & wellbeing, social, IT etc.
- Nothing in the wording about partnership working - yet this is key.
- How will the grant fund link with statutory services - locality based health partnerships.
- Partnerships - it's not the number of partnerships it is the quality of them.

Funding Proposal

Respondents were asked about the proposal to only fund one bid per neighbourhood. A breakdown of the funding allocations per neighbourhood is as follows:

Overall amount of the Fund is £1.061M over 2 years split across the 12 neighbourhoods

£94,640K for each of the following neighbourhoods

- Higher Blackley, Harpurhey & Charlestown
- Gorton & Levenshulme
- Wythenshawe
- Ancoats, Clayton & Bradford
- Miles Platting, Newton Heath, Moston & City Centre
- Wythenshawe & Northenden

£89,180K for each of the following neighbourhoods

- Cheetham & Crumpsall
- Hulme, Moss Side & Rusholme
- Ardwick & Longsight
- Didsbury, Burnage & Chorlton Park

£68,250K for each of the following neighbourhoods

- Fallowfield & Withington
- Chorlton, Whalley Range & Fallowfield

Please note, the funding allocations per neighbourhood had already been set and were not being consulted on.

92% of the respondents said that the funding proposal was clear

The responses on whether this was the right funding proposal were as follows:

Strongly Disagree	3%
Disagree	16%
Neither agree or disagree	41%
Agree	38%
Strongly Agree	3%

41% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that this was the right funding proposal. **41%** of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that this was the right funding proposal.

The key themes emerging were:

- Number of suggestions that more than 1 bid (and 2 bids) should be funded in each neighbourhood
- The need to be explicit about the partnership expectations

This reflected the discussion and feedback from the central event where the following additional comments/suggestions were made

- Some activities don't need a lot of money - need to get the balance right
- Bigger neighbourhoods - where there is already a lot of activities/groups, more potential bidders
- How will groups find out who the potential bidders are in each neighbourhood
- Make conditions clearer e.g the plan for sharing funding
- Set advisory limit or give more guidance about 'significant amount' but not necessarily a fixed percentage.

Application Process

Respondents were asked about the application process

All applications will have to have a lead organisation currently funded via the following grant programmes

- Our Manchester Voluntary and Community Sector (general fund)
- Young Manchester (Youth and Play Fund)
- Council's Cultural Partnership (Grant Agreement)

The proposal is for a 2 stage application process, a simple expression of interest followed by a full application.

The expression of interest will be non-binding and a summary of all the expressions of interest will be shared openly so that all interested parties can see who is proposing to bid and where the gaps are.

Where there are gaps we will attempt to find a lead organisation. Funding from one neighbourhood will not be transferred to other neighbourhoods.

97% of the respondents said that the application process was clear:

The responses on whether this was the right application process were as follows:

Strongly Disagree	3%
Disagree	3%
Neither agree or disagree	30%
Agree	57%
Strongly Agree	8%

65% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that this was the right application process.

The key themes emerging were:

- Expectations in terms of development
- Clarity on the role of smaller organisations around monitoring
- Request for bid scenarios

This reflected the discussion and feedback from the central event where the following additional comments/suggestions were made

- Need time to have discussions and get partnerships in place
- Mapping exercise required
- Summer holidays need to be factored in
- Partnerships take a long time to develop - based on values and trust. This needs to be taken into account.

Requirements

Respondents were asked about the Fund Requirements

Key requirements for groups applying for funding are:

- Strong emphasis on partnership working (formal and Informal)By formal partnership, we mean that a significant part of the funding goes to a partner through any suitable funding mechanism eg partnership agreement, service level agreement etc
- Every lead organisation will be expected to work with at least one formal partner unless there is clear reasons not to
- All formal partnerships will be expected to take part in the due diligence process pending confirmation of award of a grant
- High level of linkage with organisations and amenities with some or whole of the neighbourhood
- Demonstrate evidence of running activities that help older people
- Demonstrate links with Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) older people

97% of the respondents said that the application process was clear

The responses on whether these were the right requirements were as follows:

Strongly Disagree	0%
Disagree	0%
Neither agree or disagree	16%
Agree	68%
Strongly Agree	16%

84% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that these were the right requirements.

The key themes emerging were:

- Expectations around monitoring
- Project sustainability
- Clarification of role and expectation on lead partners

This reflected the discussion and feedback from the central event where the following additional comments/suggestions were made

- Need to be clear about due diligence process
- Can an eligible group work with another eligible group or does it need to be an unfunded group
- There should be a stronger message about it not being about full coverage (of a neighbourhood).

General Comments

- Reaching parts of communities not engaging with and building relationships
- Refreshing not using the term reductions as coming from an asset base
- Queries around the ongoing role of Integrated Neighbourhood Leads, Health Development Coordinators, Buzz workers and Neighbourhood officers
- Queries on how the grant funding will fit in with mainstream delivery at neighbourhood level.

The feedback from this consultation is being used in the development of the prospectus, guidance and application documents for this grant fund and will also be addressed in an updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document that will be made public to groups and other stakeholders.

Older Peoples Fund Consultation Response

You Said	We Did
Generally, you told us that the aims, objectives and priorities made sense and could be strengthened with some more clarity, some tweaks to the language and some specific suggestions below	We have taken this forward into the development of the prospectus, application form and guidance documents that will be launched for the fund and respond to some of the specific feedback themes below
Engagement needs to be considered from a geographical, age, disability, community of interest perspective.	We agree. We want and will be asking for applicants to consider equality and diversity across all of their bids, particularly the impacts on individuals that can be multiple. Rather than being too prescriptive and potentially excluding particular groups, we want applicants to prioritise Black, Asian and Ethnic Minority (BAME) older people and to consider equality and diversity across all of their bids.
Existing and new (connections). Can these be either or just new?	The grant is about existing and new connections. This will be reflected in the prospectus and guidance documents that will be launched for the fund.
Request for bid scenarios.	We will address this in the prospectus and guidance documents for the fund. For example, the number of times that you can apply, be funded in partnership and apply to different neighbourhoods. Regardless of the scenario, there will need to be an eligible lead applicant and the focus should be on how this will benefit the older people you are/will be working with.

<p>Clarity requested as to how neighbourhood allocations have been worked out and whether more than one bid per neighbourhood will be funded.</p>	<p>The neighbourhoods allocations were worked out using a range of health, social care, population and economic data and intelligence which will be referenced in the prospectus for the fund.</p> <p>The focus of the grant fund is on impact and setting up longer term infrastructures (partnerships, networks, support and activity) in each neighbourhood of the city with a view to securing future investment in the fund. Further information will be provided in the prospectus and guidance for the fund when launched about the amount you should apply for and which parts of the neighbourhood you intend to work.</p>
<p>Can we have a word version of the application form and will there be a save and go back facility when completing the on-line form?</p>	<p>Yes to both, we will make both available.</p>
<p>Clarity required around the role of smaller organisations around monitoring</p>	<p>The lead applicants will be expected to ensure that the monitoring is completed and submitted. This should be part of the partnership discussions and agreement, clearing setting out who is doing what. This will be covered in the prospectus and guidance documents for the grant fund.</p>

The detailed FAQs have been circulated separately with this report and will also be available via <https://www.mhcc.nhs.uk/news> and www.manchestercommunitycentral.org and by request to omfunds@manchester.gov.uk

