

Equality Impact Assessment [version 2.9]



Title: Changing Futures Bid	
<input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Function <input type="checkbox"/> Service <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other [please state] Funding Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Already exists / review <input type="checkbox"/> Changing
Directorate: People	Lead Officer name: Katherine Williams
Service Area: Adult Social Care - Commissioning	Lead Officer role: Strategic Commissioning Manager

Step 1: What do we want to do?

The purpose of an Equality Impact Assessment is to assist decision makers in understanding the impact of proposals as part of their duties under the Equality Act 2010. Detailed guidance to support completion can be found here [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](#).

This assessment should be started at the beginning of the process by someone with a good knowledge of the proposal and service area, and sufficient influence over the proposal. It is good practice to take a team approach to completing the equality impact assessment. Please contact the [Equality and Inclusion Team](#) early for advice and feedback.

1.1 What are the aims and objectives/purpose of this proposal?

Briefly explain the purpose of the proposal and why it is needed. Describe who it is aimed at and the intended aims / outcomes. Where known also summarise the key actions you plan to undertake. Please use plain English, avoiding jargon and acronyms. Equality Impact Assessments are viewed by a wide range of people including decision-makers and the wider public.

Changing Futures is a national funding programme (MHCLG) aiming to

1. Improve how local services and systems work for adults experiencing multiple disadvantage
2. Influence government policy and local commissioning
3. Generate learning, and test new partnership approaches

Bristol has submitted a proposal for £3.5m over 3 years and is currently awaiting a decision. If successful we will be 1 of to 15 areas funded to deliver the programme.

Our vision is that: 'People with multiple disadvantage are valued and empowered. They inspire and are inspired to have a life beyond services'

In line with the requirements our proposal focusses on creating system change, tackling disadvantage at individual, service and system levels for clients experiencing at least three of the following: homelessness, substance misuse, mental ill-health, criminal justice involvement, domestic abuse.

We have selected 3 cohorts to work with in Bristol with the view that learning from these will be applied to wider populations experiencing multiple disadvantage

- Young People from minority ethnic communities (MEC), experiencing multiple disadvantage compounded by discrimination
- Women experiencing domestic abuse
- People experiencing complex/compound trauma, behavioural challenges, chronic homelessness

1.2 Who will the proposal have the potential to affect?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bristol City Council workforce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service users	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The wider community
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Commissioned services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City partners / Stakeholder organisations	
Additional comments: This proposal is about system change, whilst we would initially be working with 3 specific cohorts the aim is to have an impact across all of the groups above.		

1.3 Will the proposal have an equality impact?

Could the proposal affect access levels of representation or participation in a service, or does it have the potential to change e.g. quality of life: health, education, or standard of living etc.?

If 'No' explain why you are sure there will be no equality impact, then skip steps 2-4 and request review by Equality and Inclusion Team.

If 'Yes' complete the rest of this assessment, or if you plan to complete the assessment at a later stage please state this clearly here and request review by the Equality and Inclusion Team.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	[please select]
--	------------------------------------	-----------------

Step 2: What information do we have?

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

Please use this section to demonstrate an understanding of who could be affected by the proposal. Include general population data where appropriate, and information about people who will be affected with particular reference to protected and other relevant characteristics: <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/people-communities/measuring-equalities-success>.

Use one row for each evidence source and say which characteristic(s) it relates to. You can include a mix of qualitative and quantitative data e.g. from national or local research, available data or previous consultations and engagement activities.

Outline whether there is any over or under representation of equality groups within relevant services - don't forget to benchmark to the local population where appropriate. Links to available data and reports are here [Data, statistics and intelligence \(sharepoint.com\)](#). See also: [Bristol Open Data \(Quality of Life, Census etc.\)](#); [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\)](#); [Ward Statistical Profiles](#).

For workforce / management of change proposals you will need to look at the diversity of the affected teams using available evidence such as [HR Analytics: Power BI Reports \(sharepoint.com\)](#) which shows the diversity profile of council teams and service areas. Identify any over or under-representation compared with Bristol economically active citizens for different characteristics. Additional sources of useful workforce evidence include the [Employee Staff Survey Report](#) and [Stress Risk Assessment Form](#)

Data / Evidence Source [Include a reference where known]	Summary of what this tells us
Golden Key 2x Stakeholder Workshops, Lived Experience Workshops Jan, March 2021	These workshops informed the Changing Futures Bid with equality, diversity and Inclusion questions central throughout. We identified 3 cohorts (rationale given below) experiencing persistent, systemic barriers that stakeholders feel we stand to learn the most from; can achieve scale of impact with; and who are supported by multi-agency readiness.
	Bristol has significant, growing numbers of adults experiencing multiple disadvantage; 69% higher than

<p><u>Hard Edges: Mapping Severe and Multiple Disadvantage in England</u> Lankelly Chase</p>	<p>national average. Applying the Lankelly approach to local data samples, we estimate a cohort of c.5,750 adults in Bristol</p> <p>Cognisant 2021: 22% of 375 people with Multiple disadvantage were from minority ethnic communities.</p>
<p><u>Young People from minority ethnic communities (MEC), Rationale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) undermine coping mechanisms • Significant disproportionality seen in Youth Homelessness services (41% MEC), Criminal Justice system (CJS) (40% MEC); Mental Health; and ‘dropping off’ from Children’s Services • Bristol’s 16–24 MEC population is projected to increase significantly as Bristol becomes more ethnically diverse • Lack of trust in CJS (Lammy Review) set in the content of the Black Lives Matter movement • Learning from Golden Key’s ‘Call-In youth’ diversion model, and ‘Street to Boardroom’ initiative, developing culturally appropriate interventions and preventing ‘life-course’ disadvantage. • Police and Crime Commissioner report 2017: Prison to community experienced as a ‘cliff edge’ with 62% recalls to prison, 72% of these for people with complex needs • Multiple disadvantage is compounded by discrimination. • Strong evidence of negative impact on young people presented by the data and local intelligence. 	
<p><u>Women experiencing domestic abuse (W&DA), Rationale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During COVID19, 30% more women approached Domestic Abuse (DA) services. Of these 2,280 we considered high-risk (48% MEC; 38% disabilities), with trauma, mental ill-health, ACEs, immigration issues, substance misuse, offending. • Of 421 women sex-workers experiencing domestic abuse, 68% were homeless, 81% experiencing chronic physical and mental ill-health • Services lack a unified trauma informed and culturally informed approach, or a collective understanding and shared data on the full impact of domestic abuse. • Women from minority ethnic communities were reluctant to disclose, or encounter bias and differential treatment. • Golden Key 2021 Report on Gender, Bristol Mayoral DA commission, DA Group, DA Bill provide impetus. • Next Link link Q1-3 2020 reporting shows: 6000+ Domestic Abuse (DA) survivors across BNSSG of which 38% with high needs • Multiple disadvantage is compounded by stigma and trauma. • The data available, both qualitative and quantitative, signals that domestic abuse is an issue for women that cuts across several protected characteristics. 	
<p><u>People experiencing emotional dysregulation, complex/compound trauma, chronic homelessness, (Chronic Homelessness) behaviour challenges services; mental ill-health; Learning Disabilities and/or autism; long-term physical health conditions, Rationale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘High-impact’ users of emergency/crisis services, high-need accommodation, CJS • 60-80 revolving rough sleeping/hostels; 50+ stuck in temporary housing; 16 ‘high needs’ in B&B; • 70% mental ill-health; dual diagnosis • Growing over-representation of Black, Asian and minority ethnic service users • Service models deter engagement, lack trauma/therapeutic offer. • System lacks ‘high-tolerance housing’. • Builds on jointly sponsored ‘Change for Good’ initiative • BCC Homelessness prevention: 21% of 857 homeless people are long term homeless (Q1/2 2021); mental health and drug & alcohol are most prevalent support needs • BCC Streetwise team: 90% of 125 clients have mental ill health • Multiple disadvantage is compounded by stigma and trauma - we know that the system needs to make considerable changes to appropriately support people who present with behaviour that challenges. • The impact that trauma has on life chances and experiences is profound and the systems’ response compounds the issues by treating the consequences rather than the root cause of the issues. 	
<p>Additional comments:</p> <p>Across these identified cohorts our understanding of how multiple disadvantage is experienced by people different because of their protected and other relevant characteristics is inconsistent, and in some cases inadequate. Improving our data and intelligence is a central part of our proposal and we have sought significant investment to improving.</p>	

2.2 Do you currently monitor relevant activity by the following protected characteristics?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Reassignment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy/Maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Religion or Belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sexual Orientation

2.3 Are there any gaps in the evidence base?

Where there are gaps in the evidence, or you don't have enough information about some equality groups, include an equality action to find out in section 4.2 below. This doesn't mean that you can't complete the assessment without the information, but you need to follow up the action and if necessary, review the assessment later. If you are unable to fill in the gaps, then state this clearly with a justification.

For workforce related proposals all relevant characteristics may not be included in HR diversity reporting (e.g. pregnancy/maternity). For smaller teams diversity data may be redacted. A high proportion of not known/not disclosed may require an action to address under-reporting.

We have significant gaps in the evidence base and have included a number of deliverables within our proposal to address this:

- We have identified an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) lead - this was beyond the key roles that MHCLG required but we felt this central to Bristol's approach
- Lived experience input is central and we have people involved at all stages, as part of the bid team and running co-production workshops including a women-only session
- By drawing together data held by both statutory organisations and the VCSE to agree a system-wide view of how healthy our approach to multiple disadvantage is
- We are proposing a series of 'Deep Listening' exercises be carried out by and with people experiencing multiple disadvantage, to further inform system change
- Establishing a shared case management system to support peoples' ambition to have their story told once, and supplementing information as opposed to repeating
- Taking a trauma-informed approach and establishing multi-disciplinary teams to work with the individual for as long as it takes
- Local and National evaluation of the programme and our learning hub that will provide further evidence of the changes that are needed to reduce the inequalities experienced

2.4 How have you involved communities and groups that could be affected?

You will nearly always need to involve and consult with internal and external stakeholders during your assessment. The extent of the engagement will depend on the nature of the proposal or change. This should usually include individuals and groups representing different relevant protected characteristics. Please include details of any completed engagement and consultation and how representative this had been of Bristol's diverse communities. See <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/people-communities/equalities-groups>.

Include the main findings of any engagement and consultation in Section 2.1 above.

If you are managing a workforce change process or restructure please refer to [Managing change or restructure \(sharepoint.com\)](#) for advice on consulting with employees etc. Relevant stakeholders for engagement about workforce changes may include e.g. staff-led groups and trades unions as well as affected staff.

- Within Bristol, through 7 years of the Golden Key partnership (Fulfilling Lives) we have been working to change the way we collectively recognise and respond to people experiencing multiple disadvantage.
- Our learning so far supports the principles of our proposal: that support must be collectively person-centred, relational, equalities-informed, unconditional, and enduring.
- We have had Lived experience input throughout and have run 7 co production workshops involving a wide range of stakeholders.
- We have been consulting with a wide range of organisations that support people directly e.g. Nilaari, Polish Women's' group, St Mungos Assertive Contact and Engagement, BRISDOC Community Health, 1625 Independent People, Barnardo's, One25, Next Link, Nelson Trust etc.

- **2.5 How will engagement with stakeholders continue?**

- Explain how you will continue to engage with stakeholders throughout the course of planning and delivery. Please describe where more engagement and consultation is required and set out how you intend to undertake it. Include any targeted work to seek the views of under-represented groups. If you do not intend to undertake it, please set out your justification. You can ask the Equality and Inclusion Team for help in targeting particular groups.

- Our proposal will continue to build upon Golden Keys Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Statement of Action.
- We have an EDI lead and a Lived Experience lead in paid roles and have ensured these are both golden threads throughout the programme including governance and accountability.
- Direct consultation with the identified cohorts through Deep Listening exercises at several points throughout the programme, monitoring and evaluation plans will ensure the individuals voice is heard.
- Aiming for individuals to be an active part in their care and support, with access to their records and a commitment from all people working with them to coproduce.
- We will be refreshing the existing Golden Key Partnership to fully reflect the ambitions of Changing Futures and with a clear communications plan and a pivotal learning hub the proposal builds on stakeholder engagement. Alongside this, there is an ambition to develop a Lived Experience Academy, to extend the involvement and contribution of people with diverse backgrounds and lived experiences, city-wide.
- As part of our refreshed governance arrangements, a partnership standing conference will be introduced to engage a wide network of diverse stakeholder organisations, share learning and build impact.

- **Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?**

- Analysis of impacts must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts of the proposal in this section, referring to evidence you have gathered above and the characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010. Also include details of existing issues for particular groups that you are aware of and are seeking to address or mitigate through this proposal. See detailed guidance documents for advice on identifying potential impacts etc. [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](https://sharepoint.com)

- **3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?**

- Consider sub-categories (different kinds of disability, ethnic background etc.) and how people with combined characteristics (e.g. young women) might have particular needs or experience particular kinds of disadvantage.
- Where mitigations indicate a follow-on action, include this in the 'Action Plan' Section 4.2 below.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GENERAL COMMENTS (highlight any potential issues that might impact all or many groups) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the early phase of the programme we will be inviting referrals from a range of stakeholders to select cohorts (approximately 20 individuals for each) that will form the initial caseload. • We are building on Golden Key experiences and whilst it will not be possible to work with everyone who is referred, we will take the approach that nobody will be excluded on the basis of their protected characteristics. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS 	
Age: Young People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Programme funding is primarily focussed on 18+

Mitigations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed with funders that a small proportion of 16-18-year olds can be included in cohort to reflect that transitions age group. Learning from the initial young people cohort is expected to have a wider impact beyond initial cohorts selected
Age: Older People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Disability	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People experiencing mental illness and/or physical disability are likely to be reflected in all cohorts
Mitigations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning from initial cohorts expected to have a wider impact beyond the initial cohort selected. In terms of addressing Mental Health AWP are key partners in the Changing Futures bid and are committed to system change.
Sex	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the evidence presented we have chosen to focus on women experiencing domestic violence, which does exclude men.
Mitigations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning from initial cohorts expected to have a wider impact beyond the initial cohort selected.
Sexual orientation	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Pregnancy / Maternity	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Gender reassignment	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Race	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the evidence presented we have chosen to focus on young people from minority ethnic communities, which will exclude other groups.
Mitigations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning from initial cohorts expected to have a wider impact beyond the initial cohort selected.
Religion or Belief	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Marriage & civil partnership	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
OTHER RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS	
Socio-Economic (deprivation)	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience of multiple disadvantage has a strong correlation with deprivation so the focus of the programme itself could be seen to exclude groups from less deprived areas.
Mitigations:	
Carers	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Other groups [Please add additional rows below to detail the impact for other relevant groups as appropriate e.g. Asylum seekers and Refugees; Looked after Children / Care Leavers; Homelessness]	

Potential impacts:	Refugee/asylum seeker right to remain could be an issue which will be considered at referral to cohorts, but this doesn't necessarily preclude people.
Mitigations:	This is an opportunity to highlight issues with national policy and inform future policy and programmes.

3.2 Does the proposal create any benefits for people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?

Outline any potential benefits of the proposal and how they can be maximised. Identify how the proposal will support our Public Sector Equality Duty to:

- ✓ Eliminate unlawful discrimination for a protected group
- ✓ Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't
- ✓ Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't

This proposal will make a positive contribution to supporting our Public Sector Equality Duty given the primary focus is on multiple disadvantage. This will allow us the opportunity to truly understand peoples' experiences and how services and the system can flex to better meet their required outcomes and address inequalities, working towards long term sustainable system change.

The holistic, trauma informed approaches that the programme will take and the experiences, increased workforce training and system learning this generates could be seen as a mitigation for any potential disbenefits.

All of the protected characteristics will be reviewed as part of the initial cohort selection which will further our understanding of the multiple factors at play.

The Initial cohort sizes will be limited and whilst this will exclude some people initially the intention is that these cohorts have been chosen to generate a wider system impact.

Step 4: Impact

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

What are the main conclusions of this assessment? Use this section to provide an overview of your findings. This summary can be included in decision pathway reports etc.

If you have identified any significant negative impacts which cannot be mitigated, provide a justification showing how the proposal is proportionate, necessary, and appropriate despite this.

Summary of significant negative impacts and how they can be mitigated or justified:

We have not identified any significant negative impact from the proposal. The prioritisation of particular characteristics and circumstances is based on available evidence of need.

Summary of positive impacts / opportunities to promote the Public Sector Equality Duty:

Learning is expected to have a wider positive impact beyond the initial cohort selected.

4.2 Action Plan

Use this section to set out any actions you have identified to improve data, mitigate issues, or maximise opportunities etc. If an action is to meet the needs of a particular protected group, please specify this.

Improvement / action required	Responsible Officer	Timescale
Review/refresh Golden Key Partnership	TBC dependent on successful bid	TBC dependent on successful bid

Improvement / action required	Responsible Officer	Timescale
Ongoing consultation including stakeholder conference	EDI / Lived Experience Lead	TBC dependent on successful bid
Improved diversity monitoring and analysis/reporting	EDI Lead	TBC dependent on success
Develop Lived Experience Academy	Lived Experience Lead	TBC dependent on successful bid

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

How will you know if you have been successful? Once the activity has been implemented this equality impact assessment should be periodically reviewed to make sure your changes have been effective your approach is still appropriate.

The proposal contains a variety of outcomes measures at an individual, service and system level. There will also be a national and local evaluation. Learning will be shared across the wider Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucester area.

Step 5: Review

The Equality and Inclusion Team need at least five working days to comment and feedback on your EqIA. EqIAs should only be marked as reviewed when they provide sufficient information for decision-makers on the equalities impact of the proposal. Please seek feedback and review from the [Equality and Inclusion Team](#) before requesting sign off from your Director¹.

<p>Equality and Inclusion Team Review: <i>Reviewed by Equality and Inclusion Team</i></p>	<p>Director Sign-Off:</p>  <p>Hugh Evans</p>
Date: 6/7/2021	Date: 9/7/2021

¹ Review by the Equality and Inclusion Team confirms there is sufficient analysis for decision makers to consider the likely equality impacts at this stage. This is not an endorsement or approval of the proposal.