

Appendix E – Equalities Impact Assessment

Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form

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



| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Name of proposal | Universal Business Support |
| Directorate and Service Area | Growth and Regen, Economic Development |
| Name of Lead Officer | Robin McDowell |

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?

Universal Business Support (UBS) is a three year programme (2020-2023) funded by WECA and BCC. The budget for the programme is £900k in total over the three years.

The programme will deliver advice, support and grant schemes for start-up entrepreneurs and early stage growing small businesses based in disadvantaged communities in the North West, North East and East of the City and from under-represented groups in enterprise – principally, **young people, women, black and minority ethnic groups and disabled people**.

The programme will support 75 pre start up entrepreneurs and 85 post start up / early stage, growing businesses and social enterprises using a 'high intensity' support model of at least 12 hours per entrepreneur / business (comprising a mix of workshop and 1to1 methods) with the objective of creating 24 registered new businesses (private or socially owned) and 60 new jobs in new and existing businesses supported.

The programme will focus on delivering support in isolated areas to harder-to-reach groups improving access to services and supporting established businesses to grow, creating new employment opportunities through the delivery of targeted start up and growth services in community locations via

‘pop-ups’. Experience has shown that fostering start-ups from a wider range of communities across the region will create more innovative businesses and employment opportunities

BCC Economic Regeneration will commission either a single lead agency and / or a consortium of partner with a lead agency to deliver the programme.

The contractor / lead agency and partners, will be selected by public open tender. Selection criteria will prioritise successful prior experience of delivery of public-funded business and social enterprise support based on community outreach and engagement of entrepreneurs from disadvantaged areas and under-represented groups in a similar urban context.

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 programme will be specifically targeting disadvantaged communities in the North West, North East and East of the city.

The Deprivation in Bristol report (2019) shows that ‘Bristol has 41 areas in the most deprived 10% in England, including 3 in the most deprived 1%. Much of central Eastern Bristol and the northern areas (W and E) have high levels of deprivation. Over half of Lawrence Hill ward is within the poorest 10% and none of this ward it is better off than the most deprived 30% in the country.

Avonmouth and Lawrence Weston, Southmead, Lockleaze and Henbury and Brentry have large areas housing people in the most disadvantaged 20% or 10% in the country. The other wards Ashley, , Easton, Eastville, Frome Vale, , Hillfields, Horfield, , St George Central, and St George West. are all majority deprived, with large proportions of their residents living in the poorest areas; whilst at the same time, as in St George Troopers Hill there are more wealthy areas directly adjacent, serving to emphasise the relative scale of disadvantage and inequality.

The UBS will target all these areas as a high proportion of residents will be subject to factors identified in the Index of Multiple Deprivation, including poor housing, education and health, which all contribute to a lack of equality in the workforce and in entrepreneurship.

Bearing in mind that early mortality is a reasonable proxy for health conditions limiting employment and entrepreneurship opportunity, premature mortality figures are considered. Wards in the N and E of the city that have significantly higher numbers of premature deaths (under the age of 75) per 100,000 population are in our targeted wards – they are: Lawrence Weston premature mortality (number of deaths under the age of 75 per 100,000 people) is significantly worse than the city average, at 636/100,000 compared with 380/100,000 for the city. With Central (566/100,00), St. George Central (538/100,000), Easton (520/100,000) and Lockleaze (514/100,000) all being significantly higher than the city average (Ward Profiles 2019) These figures will in many cases reflect limiting long term illness, a proxy for disability.

According to BCC's ward profiles, of the targeted wards for purposes of this programme, the following have a higher percentage of the population by ethnicity than that of Bristol as a whole (16%): Lawrence Hill (59.6%); Easton (37.9%); Eastville (34.6%); Ashley (33.5%); Lockleaze (30.1%); Hillfields (22%); Horfield (19.6%); St George West (19.6%); Frome Vale (19%).

The Population of Bristol Report 2019 comments further on the geography of the BAME population in the city:

'The BAME population varies significantly across the city - in Lawrence Hill ward 60% of all people belong to a BAME group compared to 4% in Bishopsworth. This difference is emphasised even more when looking at areas smaller than wards (see Figure 16) – in 'St Pauls Grosvenor Road' 80% of all people belong to a BAME group whilst just 1.4% are BAME in 'The Coots' in Stockwood.

5.9 Since 2001, the distribution of the BAME population of Bristol has changed considerably (Figure 17). Whilst in 2001 the BAME population largely lived in the inner city wards of Ashley, Easton, Lawrence Hill and Eastville, in 2011 the distribution of the BAME population had extended out to the north east of the city. Now wards with a BAME population above 20% include Lawrence Hill, Easton, Eastville, Ashley, Lockleaze, Central and Hillfields.'

Joint research by the Centre on the Dynamics of Ethnicity (CoDE) and the University of Manchester reveals that Bristol is the seventh worst place in England and Wales to live as a member of a Minority Ethnic community, and shows a worsening situation of inequality for all Minority Ethnic groups between

2001 and 2011.

A number of long-standing issues that local organisations working closely with BME communities in the business support context such as Babassa Youth Empowerment Projects, the Black South West Network (BSWN) and the Centre for Capacity Building and Enterprise Development (CCBED) have identified include: the lack of a strategic brokerage function that brings together BME entrepreneurs and investors; the lack of appropriate BME business sector development policies and approaches; the lack of BME enterprise development functions at an appropriate scale; the lack of access to funding/investment by BME entrepreneurs, particularly social entrepreneurs; the lack of information and networking opportunities for aspiring entrepreneurs; and the lack of physical space/hubs for nurturing BME enterprises.

The Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (RSA) Inclusive Growth Commission asserts that: “In a world in which it is cities that are increasingly the primary drivers of growth, urban areas are also the places where people are most experiencing the downside of unbalanced growth. Too many people are being left behind and this is now the biggest economic challenge facing our society.”

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

There are no immediately obvious gaps in the data underpinning the rationale for the project, although it could potentially be the case that substantial data gaps of this nature are due to there being relatively little directly relevant local data – as opposed to more accessible data covering wider geographical areas – being readily available.

However, during its three year period the programme should afford the opportunity to contribute to the existing evidence base and help develop further understanding of the barriers to accessing business support of this nature faced by groups with protected characteristics – and to help develop mitigating actions.

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

A key component of project delivery is the intention to deliver as much provision as possible in appropriate community venues (access issues will of course be considered and mitigated against as appropriate). The procurement exercise will select the successful contractor/ lead agency and partners will prioritise successful prior experience of delivery of public-funded business and social enterprise support based on community outreach and engagement of

entrepreneurs from disadvantaged areas and under-represented groups in a similar urban context.

Also, in past projects BCC Economic Development officers have liaised with their colleagues in Equalities & Community Cohesion to ensure appropriate compliance in terms of commissioning practices and will be doing so again for this project.

Furthermore, ongoing monitoring of project activity will help ensure that the anticipated numbers of people from under-represented groups are actually engaging in project activity, so that corrective action can be taken if required. Case study material and feedback from those supported will also help inform any changes that should/could be made.

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?

No, although it is important to note that there is a finite budget available that precludes an even focus on all groups with protected characteristics, necessitating a certain emphasis on particular social or demographic groups, namely young people, women and people from BME communities. However, this is not to say that people with other protected characteristics such as the over 50s or people with disabilities will be overlooked. The intention is to be as inclusive as unavoidable parameters will allow.

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

Please see 3.1 above. Support will in no way be to the exclusion of groups outside those mentioned above as the main focus of support. Efforts will be made to mitigate any inadvertent adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics not deemed the main focus of the programme because of finite resources through regular engagement with appropriate representative groups, and drawing on the knowledge, support and expertise of partner organisations and the likes of BCC's Equalities & Community Cohesion team.

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

Yes

3.4 Can they be maximised? If so, how?

- As already stated the procurement exercise to select the delivery contractor/ lead agency and partners will prioritise successful prior experience of delivery of public-funded business and social enterprise support based on community outreach and engagement of entrepreneurs from disadvantaged areas and under-represented groups in a similar urban context.
- Through close monitoring – for example, given the nature of programme with elements of it specifically targeting under-represented groups, Equal Opportunities will be, as a matter of course, regularly discussed at project management meetings; and the procurement processes will require the successful contractor/ lead agency and partners to demonstrate their commitment and capacity to provide an effective and appropriate service to people from groups with protected characteristics
- Through the dissemination of case study material and best practice with a view to demonstrating to the peers of people with protected characteristics that participate in programme the benefits of doing so

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.

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?

Given the nature of the programme, the impact on various groups with protected characteristics was considered throughout its development. Essential criteria for procurement of the project's lead agency and partners will include knowledge of groups with protected characteristics in North & East Bristol and proven experience of providing advice and support to equalities groups under-represented in enterprise, and use of appropriate communication channels for recruitment of project staff. A diversity adviser (internal or external) will also be identified to join the tenders appraisal panel.

4.2 What actions have been identified going forward?

Other than those already identified as part of the programme's pre-delivery development, none as yet.

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

Through close monitoring of project activity, including equalities data embedded throughout, revolving around a tightly structured and timetabled project management, reporting and claims process.

Service Director Sign-Off:
Nuala Gallagher

Equalities Officer Sign Off:
Simon Nelson

Date:

Date:
19/02/2020

2019 National Deprivation Deciles by Lower Layer Super Output Area (LSOA)

Source: Strategic Intelligence and Performance using MHCLG 2019 Indices of Deprivation

