



The Education and Skills Board  
19 April 2016

**Henrietta Parker Trust Update**

**Purpose of the report:** To further update the Education and Skills Board on the progress of the recommendations made from its meeting of 22 October 2015 in response to the Henrietta Parker Trust internal audit report.

**1.0 Introduction:**

- 1.1 This report follows on from the interim report to the Education and Skills Board of 14 January 2016.

**2.0 Steps Taken:**

The service has taken the following steps in response to the recommendations from the Education and Skills Board:-

- 2.1 The management board of the Henrietta Parker Trust met for the first time on Thursday 3 March 2016. In attendance were Linda Kemeny, Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills, and Educational Achievement; Mary Lewis, Cabinet Associate Member; Ian Burrows Elmbridge Borough Council; Cheryl Poole, Community Partnerships and Committee Officer, Elmbridge; Peter Milton, Head of Cultural Services; and Paul Hoffman, Principal Surrey Adult Learning.
- 2.2 The management board reviewed and agreed the Terms of Reference for the Board – refer appendix 1.
- 2.3 The four options, previously summarised in the previous report to the Education and Skills Board were considered – detailed in Appendix 2. There emerged a clear preference for Option 1; that a more robust and accountable variation on the current position, strengthened by the new governance arrangements, should be given two full academic years commencing in September 2016 to prove its effectiveness. This option will maximise the funds available to be utilised in line of the donor's original intentions and the 1984 Scheme agreed by the Charity Commission.
- 2.4 There was enthusiasm about how the Henrietta Parker Trust could make a difference to peoples' lives under the right management, governance

and local engagement strategies. There was a strong interest in exploring how the donor's intentions could be met within a wider geographical context in Elmbridge. The management board was also mindful that if after a two year period the delivery goals were not being met then other options would need to be considered again.

	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
<b>Option 1:</b> A more robust and accountable variation on the current position	Provide maximum funds toward the charitable goals of the Trust. Provide the opportunity for SCC, Elmbridge Borough and local voluntary organisations to build a strong coherent programme. Flexibility, can move to another solution if option fails to deliver.	Most demanding option in terms of ongoing SCC officer time.
<b>Option 2:</b> Establish an independent charitable trust	Would require no further input from SCC once Trust was established.	Set up cost of the Legal framework. Reduced funds for the charitable goals as income would be required to fund the administration of the Trust. Likely resistance from Charity Commission due to concerns about: long term sustainability of the fund; and capacity to deliver on equalities
<b>Option 3:</b> Establish a Flow-through Fund with the Community Foundation for Surrey	Provide flexible, professional support toward delivering the charitable goals. Can be a part solution in tandem with Option 1. Flexibility, can move to another solution if option fails to deliver.	A 10% charge payable to the Community Foundation for Surrey on any funds allocated. Some potential loss of control in the use of the funds compared to Option 1.
<b>Option 4:</b> Establish a permanent and bespoke community fund with the Community Foundation for Surrey	The administrative overhead of administering the fund would be placed with a specialist professional Surrey based organisation. A solution likely to find support with the Charity Commission if SCC wished to give up the role. SCC would still set the framework for the use of the charitable funds through appointments to the Fund Panel.	A one way solution, once the fund was established. Cost of establishing the community fund £30,000 Annual administrative charges of £9,000-12,000.

- 2.5 The management board agreed to explore a relationship with the Surrey Community Foundation as effective and efficient means of enabling the Trust reach and support aligned local initiatives. Elements of Option 3 may be pursued during the 2 year evaluation period.
- 2.6 The Board will look to gain a greater understanding of the investment performance of the Trust to help shape its view on the matter at its next meeting.
- 2.7 The Board will plan to meet on a twice annual basis commencing May 2016.

### **3.0 Next Steps:**

- 3.1 The HPT Management Board plans to:
  - a) Meet in May 2016 when it will consider a plan for use of the Trust funds in the 2016-17 Academic Year.
  - b) Consider the potential involvement of the Surrey Community Foundation in supporting the delivery of the Trusts goals.
  - c) Gain an understanding of the investment strategies and performance of investments pertaining to the Trust.

### **4.0 Conclusion & Recommendation:**

- 4.0 There continues to be good progress since the Education and Skills Board meeting of 22 October 2015. There is an ambition in the Management Board to make effective use of Trust for residents and in keeping with the donor's intentions.
- 4.1 An annual report to be submitted to the Education and Skills Board at the conclusion of each academic year to enable scrutiny of the performance of the Trust on a regular basis.

---

**Report contact:** Paul Hoffman, Principal, Community Learning Skills Service  
**Contact details:** [Paul.Hoffman@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Hoffman@surreycc.gov.uk) 01483 519460  
**Sources/background papers:** Henrietta Parker Trust SCC Internal Audit Report 2015;

This page is intentionally left blank