

Equality Analysis (EA)

Financial Year
2016/17

Section 1 – General Information (Aims and Objectives)

Name of the report

Event Fund - Report on Event Fund Awards 2016/17 – Quarter 3

This is to analyse the implementation of the Event Fund during the period of the third quarter of the financial year of 2016/17.

See Appendix
A

Current decision
rating



Service area:

Children's

Team name:

Culture, Learning and Leisure

Service manager:

Judith St. John, Acting Divisional Director for Sports, Leisure and Culture

Name and role of the officer completing the EA:

Alison Denning, Festival and Events Officer

Section 2 – Evidence (Consideration of Data and Information)

What initial evidence do we have which may help us think about the impacts or likely impacts on service users or staff?

The service collects the following data:

1. Protected characteristics that the events intended to focus on. This information was collected by the evaluation form.
2. Equalities data of people who benefited from the project in percentage. This information is collected by the successful applicants and included in the event evaluation form. The form requires the event organisers to specify if the number is actual or estimate.

2. Equality data of people who benefited from the events

All event applications need to demonstrate that their events will be accessible to deaf and disabled people, this includes venues, content and with some of the applications they specifically mentioned disabled people benefiting.

17 out of 19 organisations have submitted the evaluation form including the equality data of people who benefited from the events to the service. The details of the returned data are as attached Appendix D: Event Participants Equalities Data. It should be noted that the majority of the data is based on estimates and some evaluation forms did not give data for all categories.

Section 3 – Assessing the Impacts on the 9 Groups

Target Groups	Impact – Positive or Adverse	Reason(s)
	What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users or staff?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and, • Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform decision making <p>Please also how the proposal will promote the three One Tower Hamlets objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reducing inequalities -Ensuring strong community cohesion -Strengthening community leadership
Race	Positive	The given data suggest that a range of communities of this group participated in the events.
Disability	Positive	The given data shows that this group participated in at least seven events during this period.
Gender	Positive	The given data suggest that both male and female participated in the events.
Gender Reassignment	Positive	The given data show some trans people participated in three events.
Sexual Orientation	Positive	There is data that this group participated in two funded events.
Religion or Belief	Positive	It appears that various groups participated in at least three funded events.
Age	Positive	The given data suggest that different age groups participated in the events.
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Positive	The data suggests the relationship status of the participants at three events.
Pregnancy and Maternity	Positive	The given data suggest that people of this group participated in two events.
Other Socio-economic Carers		

Section 4 – Mitigating Impacts and Alternative Options

N/A

From the analysis and interpretation of evidence in section 2 and 3 - Is there any evidence or view that suggests that different equality or other protected groups (inc' staff) could be adversely and/or disproportionately impacted by the proposal?

Yes?

No?

If yes, please detail below how evidence influenced and formed the proposal? For example, why parts of the proposal were added / removed?

(Please note – a key part of the EA process is to show that we have made reasonable and informed attempts to mitigate any negative impacts. An EA is a service improvement tool and as such you may wish to consider a number of alternative options or mitigation in terms of the proposal.)

Where you believe the proposal discriminates but not unlawfully, you must set out below your objective justification for continuing with the proposal, without mitigating action.

Section 5 – Quality Assurance and Monitoring

N/A

Have monitoring systems been put in place to check the implementation of the proposal and recommendations?

Yes?

No?

How will the monitoring systems further assess the impact on the equality target groups?

Does the policy/function comply with equalities legislation?

(Please consider the [OTH objectives](#) and [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) criteria)

Yes?

No?

If there are gaps in information or areas for further improvement, please list them below:

How will the results of this Equality Analysis feed into the performance planning process?

Section 6 - Action Plan

*As a result of these conclusions and recommendations what actions (if any) **will** be included in your business planning and wider review processes (team plan)? Please consider any gaps or areas needing further attention in the table below the example.*

Recommendation	Key activity	Progress milestones including target dates for either completion or progress	Officer responsible	Progress
Example				
1. Better collection of feedback, consultation and data sources	1. Create and use feedback forms. Consult other providers and experts	1. Forms ready for January 2010 Start consultations Jan 2010	1.NR & PB	
2. Non-discriminatory behaviour	2. Regular awareness at staff meetings. Train staff in specialist courses	2. Raise awareness at one staff meeting a month. At least 2 specialist courses to be run per year for staff.	2. NR	

Recommendation	Key activity	Progress milestones including target dates for either completion or progress	Officer responsible	Progress
1 Simplify the Evaluation form to make it more accessible to EF awardees	1 Modify and refine the categories.	1 Some modification will be investigated for 1718 to simplify the categories and a more comprehensive review will be done for future rounds.	1 AD / EF-R	1 First modification to be done by end of March 2017 (in progress)
2 More streamlined collation of monitoring data	2 Create online evaluation system. Staff trained or given refresher training in GIFTS	2 Evaluation process to be put online for 1718	AD / NSJ	2 Evaluation form to be online by end of April 2017 (In progress)