

# Equality Analysis (EA)

Financial Year  
**2016/17**

## Section 1 – General Information (Aims and Objectives)

Name of the report

### Event Fund – Annual Report 2016/17

This is to analyse the implementation of the Event Fund during the period 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.

47 out of 54 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"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform decision making</li> </ul> <p>Please also how the proposal will promote the three One Tower Hamlets objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Reducing inequalities</li> <li>-Ensuring strong community cohesion</li> <li>-Strengthening community leadership</li> </ul>
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 five funded events ( the majority answered not known)
Religion or Belief	Positive	It appears that various groups participated in at least eight funded events. ( the majority answered not known)
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 six 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
<b>Example</b>				
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. Better outreach and geographical spread of the Event Fund across the borough	1. Set up 2 workshops prior to each quarterly application deadline in venues across the borough. Working with THCVS to deliver. To encourage more participation and to widen the spread of funding across the borough.	1. some workshops have already taken place, and they have been useful in connecting to the community and understanding their concerns re. applying for funds. They have also enabled us to express the priorities and purpose of the fund and target specific areas.	1 AD / EF-R	1. First workshops were done Jan 2017 (ongoing)

<p>2. More streamlined collection and collation of monitoring data and simplify.</p> <p>3. Simplified Application forms</p>	<p>2. Create new simplified monitoring and evaluation forms for 2017-18.</p> <p>3. Review of the application form and criteria to simplify process and increase involvement from less confident communities</p>	<p>2. One TH have revised the requirement for the Event Fund. Review of processes and evaluation forms to be put online for 1718. We will work towards implementing the online Evaluation form to enable us to gather more consistent monitoring statistics within quarter 3 of 1718.</p> <p>3. Overhaul of application process for 1718 with new application forms for £500 and under and £501 to £2500</p>	<p>AD / NSJ / EF-R</p> <p>AD / NSJ</p>	<p>2. Evaluation form to be online by end of August 2017 (In progress)</p> <p>New forms and guidelines and criteria online by Quarter 3 2017-18</p>
---	---	--	--	---