

Appendix A

Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form

(Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance when completing this form)



Name of proposal	VCS Grants Prospectus – Allocation of Bristol Impact Fund 2017-2021
Directorate and Service Area	Neighbourhoods (& cross-council)
Name of Lead Officer	Jane Houben

Step 1: What is the proposal?

Please explain your proposal in Plain English, avoiding acronyms and jargon. This section should explain how the proposal will impact service users, staff and/or the wider community.

1.1 What is the proposal?

Bristol City Council has changed the way it delivers grant funding to organisations in Bristol. We have worked with colleagues in the voluntary and community sector (VCS) to co-design this new approach to the way we use grant funding. It is called the VCS Grants Prospectus and it is bringing £3.29m of the council's grant funds together to form the new Bristol Impact Fund to improve the lives of disadvantaged people in the city and reduce inequality. The prospectus outlines what we want to achieve and what we expect from grant organisations and it is a change from the way previous grants have been delivered.

There are many pressures faced by disadvantaged people in our city and we want to ensure that our investment of public funding into the voluntary and community sector helps to tackle disadvantage and has a positive impact for Bristol citizens. We recognise that although £3.29 million is a significant fund, it is clearly not of a scale to tackle all the factors shaping disadvantage in Bristol. We have therefore agreed five different 'key challenges' which we want the grants-funded activity to address and these are below:

- Reducing financial, food and fuel poverty
- Tackling unemployment and underemployment
- Improving access to information, services and opportunities in the city

and increasing digital inclusion

- Enabling influence and participation in the community
- Reducing social isolation and improving wellbeing mental health and wellbeing

Organisations were invited to apply for one or more Bristol Impact Fund grants to address at least one of the Key Challenges, using their skills and experience and agreeing to our four stated 'Ways of Working' listed:

- Giving the right help at the right time
- Helping people to help themselves and each other
- Building on the strengths of people and communities
- Connecting people and organisations within and across communities

They have told us how their work will contribute to our grant impacts:

- reducing disadvantage and inequality,
- improving health and wellbeing,
- increasing resilience of individuals and communities.

We have appraised 100 VCS proposals to the Bristol Impact fund medium & large grants and have discussed over 70 small grant proposals with VCS organisations. This proposal is making grant funding recommendations for the Council's new pooled Bristol Impact Fund.

Step 2: What information do we have?

Decisions must be evidence-based, and involve people with protected characteristics that could be affected. Please use this section to demonstrate understanding of who could be affected by the proposal.

2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

The Prospectus focuses £3.29m of council revenue grant money on the most disadvantaged people in Bristol. The evidence of disadvantage in the city is set out in the VCS Grants Prospectus Key Challenges which uses data about disadvantage from the following sources:

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) 2015
Fairness Commission Report
Social Isolation Report

Early Intervention Report

We know that people who experience discrimination (because they have one or more protected characteristics) are more likely to experience other factors contributing to disadvantage, thus compounding their experience.

We know from the above data sources that there is also a spatial dimension to disadvantage in the city, as shown in the JSNA 2015.

People experience more disadvantage in the South (particularly the outer areas) and in the north and west outer areas of the city as well as in the inner eastern areas.

In our VCS Grants prospectus we have provided examples backed up by available data for each of the five Key Challenges in order to give shape to our grant process. These are only examples and do not in any way illustrate or reflect our priorities.

2.2 Who is missing? Are there any gaps in the data?

We know that data about incidence and service take up does not capture LGB or Transgender people because of poor monitoring practice and reluctance/distrust from the LGB and T communities towards completing returns. Therefore our available data for LGBT+ people is poor.

We know that we do not have full information about the number of refugees and asylum seekers in the city and we know that the number is going to increase and currently the proportion of grant funding used to support migrants is only 2%. The two currently grant-funded organisations (working with asylum seekers and refugees) have data about demand and use of their services but this cannot be used to predict future need.

We have some data about the diversity of VCS organisations in the city but this is not comprehensive. In terms of equalities-led organisations we know that:

Eighty seven organisations who proactively target one or more equalities groups were funded by the council in 2014/15, twenty four of which are equalities led organisations (i.e. over 75% of their management committee are women/disabled people/people from BME communities/LGBT/older).

We recognise that the VCS sector is changing rapidly. This is due to a combination of factors, for example austerity has reduced public funding,

charitable donations are decreasing, procurement and commissioning can favour larger organisations and consortiums, organisations may have dissolved due to funding problems or management issues. For example, there are fewer BME led VCS organisations in the city today compared with five years ago, in particular we have seen a reduction in the number of African-Caribbean led organisations. However there are many more BME led social enterprises and social entrepreneurs who are keen to deliver services to BME communities.

2.3 How have we involved, or will we involve, communities and groups that could be affected?

We co-designed the grants prospectus with colleagues from the local VCS. We included two colleagues from local equalities voice and influence organisations in this co-design group and established links with BEING (Bristol Equalities & Inclusion Networking Group), both through these two members and through engaging with BEING at key points in the process (such as ‘testing’ the vision and principles). We engaged with and involved BEING in the consultation and post consultation.

We ran a 13 week consultation from mid-November 2015 to mid-February 2016 and had face-to-face contact with 265 people from 170 VCS organisations in the city and 6 non-VCS organisations. We had survey responses from 22 people, telephone and other meeting contact with 10 people and a further two organisations provided written submissions. We briefed Neighbourhood Partnership Coordinators and provided summary papers for all Neighbourhood Partnerships so that they were aware of the proposal and the consultation process.

We designed the new Bristol Impact fund small and medium/large Grants processes using the feedback we received from the consultation exercise. The application processes were designed collaboratively with Voscur’s Compact Officer.

The council also commissioned a piece of facilitated work with some leaders from local BME voluntary sector organisations to which provided us with possible solutions to a number of concerns and we used these to help us develop the final processes.

We advertised and ran 4 briefing sessions about the grants application processes for interested organisations in different areas of the city and at different times of day (and evening). Working collaboratively with Voscur’s

Compact Officer meant that Voscur was able to plan and deliver a range of events and sessions to support organisations with the process.

Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts on people with protected characteristics must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts in this section, referring to all of the equalities groups as defined in the Equality Act 2010.

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics?

The focus of the prospectus is to reduce disadvantage and inequality. However we will need to ensure that grant funding is used in a way that gives us the right distribution and balance of provision in terms of factors that contribute to disadvantage, communities of interest and geographic communities and that our use of grant-funding does not counter our stated vision and principles approach to increase understanding and respect between different people.

Tackling discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations are fundamental principles and the intention is that people with protected characteristics will benefit from the new arrangements.

128 organisations applied for medium and large grants and 110 organisations submitted an expression of interest form for small grants. Clearly a large number of organisations will be disappointed that their applications have not been successful and a number of these will be equalities-led organisations.

70 organisations are currently funded through council grant streams that will be pooled to form the new Bristol Impact Fund and some of these organisations currently receive more than one grant. 39 of these organisations will receive some grant funding as a result of this process.

With the exception of Bristol Women's Voice, the process has not delivered the level of equalities voice and influence applications we were expecting. We are committed to ensuring that people with protected characteristics have a strong voice and influence in the city and we will therefore set aside £0.14m per year from the Bristol Impact Fund to commission equalities voice and influence through a separate process to enable us to fulfil our Public Sector Equality Duty effectively. We will work with the affected equalities voice and

influence organisations to support them through this process (Bristol Disability Equality Forum, Bristol Multi Faith Forum, Bristol Older People's Forum, LGBTBristol, Voscur BME Voice).

Our grant funding relationship will end with the following 27 organisations, 6 of which did not apply for grant, 1 withdrew from the process and the remaining 20 are not part of any proposal recommended for funding:

Age UK Bristol	Knowle West Health Association
Alive!	LinkAge
Avon University Settlement	Malcolm X Centre
Awaz Utaoh	Mothers for Mothers
Boss Employment Project	Overseas Chinese Association
Bristol & Avon Chinese Women's Group	Playing Out
Bristol Community FM	Rethink
Bristol Shopmobility	Royal Mencap
Bristol Stroke Association	Shirehampton Public Hall CA
Centre for Deaf People	Sixteen Cooperative
Easton Community Centre	Southmead CA
FORWARD	Upper Horfield Community Trust
Hartcliffe Community Park Farm	Working In Southmead for Health (WISH)
Integrate Bristol	

And of these -

- 11 organisations do not target their activities at any specific equalities group
- 5 target some or all of their activities at women (Chinese women, Asian women, women suffering from perinatal depression and raising awareness of FGM).
- 7 target some or all of their activities at Disabled people (of these, 3 are targeted at people with Learning Difficulties and 1 is targeted at Deaf people).
- 6 target some or all of their activities at BME people (as above, these are Chinese women and elders, Asian women, communities practising FGM, African Caribbean people).
- 3 target some or all of their activities at older people.
- 5 of the organisations are equalities-led (the majority of board members or trustees share the same protected characteristics as the targeted

users).

For some user groups, such as women experiencing mental health issues, older Asian women and African Caribbean women and men we have recommended allocations to organisations that will be offering targeted services to them. For Chinese women we are aware that the Lottery-funded Chinese Lantern project offers information and signposting to the Chinese community across the South West.

However the removal of funding to three Learning Difficulties services, one Deaf people's service and a local service to raise awareness of FGM could have potentially adverse effects on these communities.

The process has also resulted in the failure of a number of community centres to successfully apply for funding. Some of these have received grant for only a few years but others have benefited from council grant funding for a significant period. Whilst these are not targeting their services at specific equalities groups we know from their equalities monitoring figures that some of them have a significant percentage of BME users.

3.2 Can these impacts be mitigated or justified? If so, how?

We made it clear from the outset that we will need a balance of provision across the city and we designed a grants process to make this possible (i.e. not based on scoring). We designed processes based on feedback received from consultation and from commissioned BME VCS work.

The small grant was designed to be as accessible as possible. It was a three-step process:

Step 1 – a brief expression of interest form

Step 2 – eligible organisations invited to a 15 minute face to face discussion session after which feedback was given.

Step 3 – organisations invited to submit an application, with support available from Voscur.

The medium and large grant process was designed to reduce the work needed by organisations making multiple applications because they had to complete only one Part 1 form (about the organisation) and we designed a single Part 2 form which could be used for solo or partnership proposal applications.

We have asked organisations to tell us if they currently meet baseline standards or to commit to doing so within 6 months. In order to support BME-

led, Disabled-led and LGBT+-led organisations we have said that we will give them an extended timescale (12 months) in which to meet these standards.

We published our appraisal criteria in the grant guidance and put in place a score card for each of the technical appraisal considerations which was used by all the panels to help ensure consistency and objectivity. Our emphasis is on impact for disadvantaged communities and proposals had to pass each of the impact, quality and value for money elements of the technical appraisal process to be considered by the Allocations Advisory Panel.

We developed an allocations matrix which shows the impact assessments we made (considering the mix of allocations geographically, across the range of beneficiaries and across Key Challenges) and this was published in the Prospectus. The Allocations Advisory Panel was made up of council and external members (3:5) with expertise and knowledge of the city, VCS, funding and equalities issues.

We worked with Voscur, our local VCS support provider to identify support needed by organisations to help them apply under the new prospectus grants process and have identified priorities for support.

We will use our Bristol Compact agreed Withdrawal of Grant Protocol and meet with organisations that will lose grant funding in order to understand and plan to mitigate the impacts of funding loss and to plan communications with them for their service users.

We will focus our resources on undertaking decommissioning impact assessments with the two local Learning Difficulties services, the Deaf people's service and the local FGM project. We will work with other funders active in the city and with Voscur to support these organisations to secure other funding.

3.3 Does the proposal create any benefits for people with protected characteristics?

13 proposals will not target any specific equalities group (these proposals have a total spend of £0.83m in year 1) but will be open to all people in the community. All funded organisations have agreed to use fully accessible venues to deliver their activities.

Of the remaining £2.5m we are retaining £0.14m for equalities voice and

influence services which will directly benefit BME people, Disabled people, LGBT+ people, women, older people and people of faith. £2.3m of grant will be allocated to proposals that specifically target one or more equalities group. Detail is shown in Appendix D of the Cabinet report and an overview is given below.

Black & Minority Ethnic People

We are proposing allocations to 17 proposals that specifically target BME communities with a grant spend of £1.18m in year 1. We have increased our reach into African and Caribbean communities through this process, particularly through the small grants process and through medium and large partnership proposals.

Our proposals will also increase our support to Refugee and Asylum and seekers, funding 3 proposals (5 organisations) and to victims of modern slavery, many of whom are from BME communities.

Disabled People

We are proposing grant allocations to 18 proposals that will specifically target Disabled people with a grant spend of £1.59m in year 1.

We have a spread of proposals to benefit Disabled people with physical impairments, mental ill health and specific long term health conditions. These proposals address wide needs of Disabled people including travelling around the city, reducing fuel poverty, learning new skills and reducing isolation. All organisations have agreed to use fully accessible venues to deliver their activities.

Women

We are proposing grant allocations to 8 proposals that specifically target women with a grant spend of £0.73m in year 1. These targeted proposals will address women's mental health and employment, women's voice and influence, discrimination and hate crime.

Men

We are proposing grant allocations to 2 proposals that specifically target men's health issues with a grant spend of £0.03m. We have not included the hate crime and discrimination services in these figures because there are no cases brought to the current services where people have been victims of discrimination or hate crime because of they are men.

Older people

We are proposing grant allocations to 9 proposals that specifically target older people with a grant spend of £0.86m. We have not included the hate crime and discrimination services in these figures because there are very few cases brought to the current services where people have been victims of

discrimination or hate crime because of they are older. The funded proposals address the needs of older people with impairments, counter isolation and improve wellbeing and engagement.

Young people

We are proposing grant allocations to 5 proposals that specifically target young people with a grant spend of £0.09m. These proposals address employment, volunteering and engagement. We have not included the hate crime and discrimination services in these figures because there are very few cases brought to the current services where people have been victims of discrimination or hate crime because of their youth.

LGBT+ people

We are proposing grant allocations to 3 proposals that specifically target LGBT+ people with a grant spend of £0.47m to the hate crime and discrimination services and to other targeted proposals.

Faith communities

We are proposing grant allocations to 1 proposal that specifically targets faith communities with a grant spend of £0.41m to the hate crime and discrimination services.

3.4 Can they be maximised? If so, how?

We will maximise benefits in the following ways:

- We will ensure that all grant-funded organisations have grant agreements in place with their agreed outcomes and outcome measures, clearly identifying the benefit for targeted equalities groups. We will require them to provide us with performance monitoring information against these outcomes so that we can understand the benefit and act to support the organisations to improve performance if required.
- We will share best practice and learning between funded organisations so that benefits can be maximised.
- We will encourage closer collaboration between organisations and where we have the capacity to do so will broker relationships between organisations and agencies for the increased benefit of disadvantaged people.
- We will ensure that all grant-funded organisations have fit-for-purpose equalities policies in place and that these are meaningfully implemented (by checking their policies at grant allocation stage) and by requiring them to provide us with annual equalities monitoring information and evidence of how they use this information to address gaps and increase understanding.

3.5 (i) What are the positive and negative impacts for people from the City's disadvantaged **beneficiary groups?**

We asked organisations to tell us who their activities will benefit from a range of 17 beneficiary groups. From the information they provided we can see that the beneficiary groups served by the highest number of proposals will be:

- People with mental health difficulties
- Low income families
- Unemployed people
- Single or lone parents
- Refugees and asylum seekers

We had very few proposals that targeted care leavers (but only a few which targeted young people).

We have identified the loss of grant funded services for people with Learning Difficulties and people with sensory impairments in section 3.1 above. There are 6 proposals which will provide activities targeted at people with Learning Difficulties and 4 proposals which will provide activities targeted at people with sensory impairments.

We have achieved some coverage with proposals targeted across each of the 17 beneficiary groups with the exception of ex armed forces.

3.5 (ii) How can these benefits be maximised and risks minimised?

We stated in the Prospectus that we will expect grant funded organisations to monitor their service users and report to us about the number of care leavers benefiting from their activities. We will ensure that this is included in grant agreements and that we ask them to report against this.

We will consider the benefit and feasibility of including monitoring for ex armed forces personnel in these grants and will seek advice about compliance with the Council's armed forces covenant.

3.6 (i) What are the positive and negative impacts for the most **disadvantaged and deprived areas of the city?**

Of the £3.28m Bristol Impact Fund we are recommending that 43% (£1.42m) is allocated to proposals that will work in specific wards. The remaining 57% of the budget will be allocated to proposals which will be city-wide (they will be open to disadvantaged people no matter where they live in the city).

We received proportionately fewer proposals from the more deprived outer edges of the city and some of these did not pass the technical appraisal. We

have therefore weighted our allocations in favour of proposals that are based in and delivering to the deprived outer estates, ensuring that our grant has a reach into these areas. (We applied percentage reductions to the amounts of grant requested in order to enable us to fund as many of the proposals as possible. These reductions are 10% for £0.01m to £0.05m; 15% for £0.05m to £0.1m; 20% for over £0.1m. We reduced or removed the percentage reductions for proposals based in and delivering benefit to deprived outer wards).

For mapping purposes, where a proposal targets specific wards, we have shared the total amount of recommended funding for that proposal evenly across those wards. Based on these calculations:

- The highest level of proposed funding is in Ashley ward (£174,541).
- Lawrence Hill and Easton Wards and Hartcliffe and Bishopsworth wards will all benefit from over £90,000 of the recommended funding.
- Avonmouth and Lawrence Weston, Henbury and Brentry and Eastville wards will each receive at least £75,000 of proposed funding.
- Five wards, all in West Bristol have no ward specific funding but disadvantaged people from these wards will be able to access city-wide proposals.
- We have mapped the allocation distribution across wards and the coverage of key challenges across wards in Appendix D.
- There are few proposals that are working to address the poverty key challenge in South Bristol across some of the most deprived wards.

3.6 (ii) How can the benefits be maximised and the risks minimised?

From the proposals presented to panel we are satisfied that we have achieved a satisfactory mix and balance of activities across the city with the desired focus on the most deprived wards.

Where organisations have stated that they will work in several wards we will ask them to focus on deprived areas where there is least relevant activity. We will also ask 4 of the city-wide proposals to target the outer estates in the North and South of the city in wards which have high deprivation rates and we will monitor against this.

There are few proposals that are working to address the poverty key challenge in South Bristol across some of the most deprived wards. We were unable to address this through this process but will feed this into the current Information, Advice and Guidance review which will inform future commissioning.

3.7 (i) What are the positive and negative impacts against our 5 Key Challenges?

We have considered the balance of key challenges across the city, taking into account for each challenge the most disadvantaged beneficiary groups and the most disadvantaged areas. We have also considered pattern of other service provision and other funding streams contributing to the key challenges.

We have identified primary and secondary key challenges for all proposals that were presented to the Allocations Panel and this has allowed us to consider total spend against each.

We have allocated the largest sums to the following two key challenges:

- Improving access to information, services and opportunities in the city and increasing digital inclusion (£1.45m).
- Reducing social isolation and improving wellbeing mental health and wellbeing (£1.02m).

We have allocated significantly less to the other three Key Challenges:

- Enabling influence and participation in the community (£0.5m including the retained funds for equalities Voice & Influence)
- Reducing financial, food and fuel poverty (£0.23m)
- Tackling unemployment and underemployment (£0.1m).

The context of the panel's recommendations is provided below.

- In addition to this grant allocation the council also currently invests £0.75m grant each year to support advice services which address this Key Challenge and provides a further £1.1 million investment through in-house and commissioned services which are currently being reviewed as part of our Information Advice and Guidance commissioning. The Panel is recommending that we grant fund the small number of proposals that address fuel poverty and those with wrap-around advice and/or skills development to improve financial poverty and food poverty.
- The Panel found that the majority of proposals which will address the challenge to enable influence and participation in the community are local community-based and smaller in terms of spend.
- The Panel recommended funding to a small number of proposals that will directly contribute to the Key Challenge to tackle unemployment and underemployment. In addition to this grant allocation the City will benefit from £6m investment across the West of England as part of the West of England Works (funding from Big Lottery and European Social Fund announced in December 2016) allocated across a range of VCS partners with a focus on young people who are not in employment, education or training and some of which has been allocated to BIF

applicant organisations. In addition the council commissions engagement support for young people and support into employment and apprenticeships from local VCS organisations. The Panel took this into consideration when allocating grant against this Key Challenge and chose to allocate grant to employment support for people with complex needs. A number of small grant proposals will address this as a primary or secondary key challenge.

3.7 (ii) How can the benefits be maximised and the risks minimised?

We have broadly categorised the activity types of the proposals to help us better understand the balance across key challenges. This is included in Appendix D- and shows the significant funding levels to three activities: community transport services, hate crime and discrimination services and social prescribing services. Allocating funds to four large proposals (partnerships involving 15 organisations) has skewed our allocation against the access to information and social isolation key challenges.

Step 4: So what?

The Equality Impact Assessment must be able to influence the proposal and decision. This section asks how your understanding of impacts on people with protected characteristics has influenced your proposal, and how the findings of your Equality Impact Assessment can be measured going forward.

This EqIA

- (a) Changed and informed our approach to how we intend to facilitate our Public Sector Equalities Duty.
- (b) Provided a framework for our allocation decisions, we have added the considerations against key challenges, beneficiary groups and geographic spread.
- (c) Helped to explain how decisions have been made, the context and narrative behind the Panel's decisions and the benefits to equalities groups.
- (d) Helped to identify areas where the Bristol Impact fund process has not delivered the desired results.
- (e) Enabled us to consider the broad impact of ending grants for currently funded organisations in June 2017.

4.2 What actions have been identified going forward?

- (a) We will undertake decommissioning impact assessments with all organisations whose grant will end in June 2017 and we will focus capacity on the organisations (and their service users) identified.
- (b) We will ask organisations who have specified several wards for their proposals to focus on disadvantaged areas where there is least relevant activity.
- (c) We will ensure that monitoring processes are proportionate but still include equalities monitoring of service users.

4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured moving forward?

Organisations funded through the Prospectus pooled grant will be asked to suggest measures for the changes they expect to create. These measures must relate to the stated impacts (reduce disadvantage and inequality, improve health and wellbeing, increase resilience). We will work with organisations to develop a shared 'basket' of indicators through the life of the grant. This will enable us to measure the impact of the Prospectus pooled grant. All funded organisations will be required to undertake equalities monitoring for their service users and report this collated information to us annually so that we can see the overall impact of the fund. They will also be asked to tell us how they have used this information, what gaps they have identified in their uptake/provision and how they will address these in the following year.

Appendices:

Appendix D Summary to show balance achieved across key challenges, beneficiary groups and geographic spread

Service Director Sign-Off: Di Robinson	Equalities Officer Sign Off: Anne James
Date: 23/2/17	Date: 23/2/17