

## APPENDIX C: EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented</b><br>(proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal)  | <b>Annual Report for Event Fund Applications for Events taking place during quarters 1 - 4 financial year 2016/17</b>  |
| <b>Directorate / Service</b>  | <b>Children's / Culture, Learning and Leisure</b>  |
| <b>Lead Officer</b>   | <b>Steve Murray, Head of Arts, Parks and Events</b>  |
| <b>Signed Off By (inc date)</b>   |  |
| <b>Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A)</b><br>(Please provide a summary of the findings of the Quality Assurance checklist. What has happened as a result of the QA? For example, based on the QA a Full EA will be undertaken or, based on the QA a Full EA will not be undertaken as due regard to the nine protected groups is embedded in the proposal and the proposal has low relevance to equalities) | <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: #00b050; margin-right: 10px;"></div> <div><b>Proceed with implementation</b></div> </div> <p>An Equality Analysis is attached.</p> |

| Stage    | Checklist Area / Question  | Yes / No / Unsure | Comment (If the answer is no/unsure, please ask the question to the SPP Service Manager or nominated equality lead to clarify)    |
|----------|--|-------------------|---|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Overview of Proposal</b>  |                   |   |
| a        | Are the outcomes of the proposals clear?   | Yes               | Annual Report showing the awards made from the Event Fund for the period 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2016 to 31 <sup>st</sup> March 17. |
| b        | Is it clear who will be or is likely to be affected by what is being proposed (inc service users and staff)? | Yes               | An Equality Analysis (Appendix B) identifies the positive impact on the protected characteristics.                                |

|          |  |     |   |
|----------|--|-----|---|
|          | Is there information about the equality profile of those affected?   |     | Monitoring data included in the Evaluation Form provide an audience profile.<br><br>The evaluation highlights benefits for residents, including involving equalities groups (e.g. young people, older people, families, under-represented communities) and enhancing cross-cultural understanding and cohesion. |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation</b>  |     |   |
| <b>a</b> | Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts?  | Yes | Evaluation / monitoring forms reflect this data.  |
|          | Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis?   | Yes | The applicants provide necessary information by completing Events fund application  |
| <b>b</b> | Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis?             | Yes | The service have evaluated the data and information provided by the applicants and recommended events making high enough scores.  |
| <b>c</b> | Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal?  | Yes | Covered in application process  |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Assessing Impact and Analysis</b>   |     |   |
| <b>a</b> | Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics? | Yes | The online Event Fund Application Form and guidelines and criteria include expected benefits and impact on the different protected characteristics.<br>The assessment questions and score sheet provide interpretation of impact against different protected characteristics.                                   |
| <b>b</b> | Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups?                          | Yes | See above.  |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan</b>  |     |   |
| <b>a</b> | Is there an agreed action plan?  | Yes | The report is retrospective, however the Equalities Data (Appendix D) highlights areas to be included in an action plan for increasing outreach for the Equalities 9 protected Characteristics.   |

|          |  |     |   |
|----------|--|-----|---|
| b        | Have alternative options been explored   | Yes | Applications which did not fully meet the criteria and priorities outlined in section 4 of the Event Fund 2016/17 Guidelines and Criteria were not successful.  |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Quality Assurance and Monitoring</b>  |     |   |
| a        | Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal?                     | Yes | The fund procedures are reviewed annually along with its criteria and how it is marketed. Additional reviews are ongoing to ensure that any areas not being addressed are targeted.   |
| b        | Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics??      | Yes | The successful applicants will be asked to provide a completed evaluation form.<br><br>The second payment of 20% will not be made until the Council receive required documents including a completed evaluation form and equalities monitoring. |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan</b>  |     |   |
| a        | Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment? | Yes |   |