

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Name of activity:	Community Grants Policy Review 2020-21	Date Completed:	01/09/21		
Directorate / Division responsible for activity:	Community Services	Lead Officers:	Craig Downs/Matt Lethbridge		
Existing Activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	New / Proposed Activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	Changing / Updated Activity	x

What are the aims / main purposes of the activity? (Why is it needed? What are the main intended outcomes?)

Community Services has recently undertaken a range of service redesign exercises to transform, improve and enhance our current service delivery and in offering the most efficient services that offers both financial and social value. Our initial assessment of the grants process was that it was no longer fit for purpose and it would be beneficial to review policy and practice and the underpinning infrastructure and objectives of our funding support model. The grants programme was last reviewed in 2013 and receives regular audit and oversight. This review supports the development of Community Services and the wider corporate priorities and pressures.

What are the main actions and processes involved?

The purpose of the grants review was to:

- Move from a position of discretionary grant giving to an investors approach
- Be able to better measure impacts and outcomes in and with our communities and with individuals
- Deliver a fit for purpose funding model that is needs led, and evidenced based
- Maximise our investments, making our money work for us, by seeking a rate of return both socially and financially
- Reduce the dependant nature of existing relationships with those who receive grants

Who is intended to benefit & who are the main stakeholders? (e.g. tenants, residents, customers or staff. How will they benefit?)

The review is based on wanting the best outcomes, for our residents, the sector and in evidencing outcomes and impacts that offer value for money and offer a good rate of return (financial and social) on our investments and we do this by:

- Building alliances, to ensure that all the resources in a community are mobilised to develop resilience, capacity and capability.
- Actively listening to sections of the community that are most dependent on services and protecting their interests when funding and spending decisions are being made.
- A commitment to collaborative working and alliance building, where each partner has an equal voice and brings a different perspective, offering both challenge and support.

- A needs-led approach, responding to evidence of needs among local people, rather than previous priorities, or benevolent acts that can shift the power paradigm.
- Building on extensive local knowledge that encourages a stronger sense of community and of identity and place.
- Common values, partners agree on a common vision, mission and plan of action to improve a place in terms of somewhere to live, work, visit and study.

Have you already consulted on / researched the activity? (What consultation has taken place & what were the key findings?)

What evidence already exists? Are there any gaps that need further investigation? What still needs to be done?)

A project group of officers has looked at funding tools and options and is testing a new online application form with input from voluntary and community groups to ensure the application process is easy to use.

Impact on people with a protected characteristic (What is the potential impact of the activity? Are the impacts high, medium or low?)

Protected characteristics / groups	Is there an impact (Yes / No)	If Yes, what is it and identify whether it is positive or negative
Age (older / younger people, children)	Yes	<u>Positive Impact</u> The redesigned grants programme has children as a priority group, in terms of prevention in respect of those who are able to be supported in terms of developing unnecessary and unavoidable vulnerabilities and disadvantage. More universally the proposed changes need to be read in the context of our play, health and wellbeing approaches.
Disability (people with physical / sensory impairment or mental disability)	Yes	<u>Positive Impact</u> It is envisaged that through our whole service review, that we will better represent individuals who might face additional barriers in accessing services and or support, or who require more specialist approaches to level the playing field in terms of equity.
Gender reassignment (the process of transitioning from one gender to another.)	No	
Marriage & civil partnership (Marriage is defined as a 'union between a man and a woman'. Civil partnerships are legally recognised for same-sex couples)	No	

Pregnancy & maternity (Pregnancy is the condition of being pregnant & maternity refers to the period after the birth)	No	
Race (ethnicity, colour, nationality or national origins & including gypsies, travellers, refugees & asylum seekers)	Yes	<u>Positive Impact</u> The grants review, and subsequent changes to the process is designed to have improved representation and reach.
Religion & belief (religious faith or other group with a recognised belief system)	Yes	<u>Positive Impact</u> The grants review, and subsequent changes to the process is designed to have improved representation and reach.
Sex (male / female)	No	
Sexual orientation (lesbian, gay, bisexual, heterosexual)	Yes	<u>Positive Impact</u> Equalities and need are at the heart of our new ways of working, and key to our developments are those who may face additional challenges, prejudice and discrimination, this approach will more ably celebrate our LGBTQ+ communities.
Whilst Socio economic disadvantage that people may face is not a protected characteristic; the potential impact on this group should be also considered	Yes	<u>Positive Impact</u> A new model of delivery is predicated on delivering the best services for Crawley residents through an Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) approach, creating greater synergy across the Council and partner organisations. The outcomes will include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing Social Mobility - Reducing health inequalities - Improving Community connectivity and cohesion - Supporting a resilient and sustainable VCSE sector

What evidence has been used to assess the likely impacts? (e.g. demographic profiles, research reports, academic research, benchmarking reports, consultation activities, staff surveys, customer surveys, public surveys, complaints, grievances, disciplinary cases, employment tribunal cases, ombudsman cases, media reports)

This EqIA is based on a detailed review of our current grants offer, its processes and beneficiaries, this process has been subject to financial scrutiny, wide stakeholder consultancy, bench marking comparisons, market analysis and has been subject to significant internal partnership input.

What resource implications are there to deliver actions from this EqlA? (Quantify: people, time, budget, etc.)

The resources are not anticipated to increase as a result of these actions, the investment made into the review, releases savings, efficiencies and the changes in our grants process will realise greater capacity, capability and in our evidence measures that relate to impact and outcomes.

Outcome following initial assessment

Does the activity have a positive impact on any of the protected groups or contribute to promoting equality, equal opportunities and improving relations within target groups?	Yes	If yes, record the evidence below. If no STOP and re-examine the activity. Yes for all priority groups as VCSE sector support is more targeted by the council.
Does the activity have a negative impact on any of the protected groups, i.e. disadvantage them in any way.	No	If yes, identify necessary changes and record appropriate actions below. If no, record the evidence and assessment is complete.

Decision following initial assessment

Continue with existing or introduce new / planned activity	Yes	Amend activity based on identified actions	N/A
-------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---------------------------------------------------	-----

Action Plan (Has the EqlA identified any positive or negative impact on any of the protected groups which requires action? E.g. adjustments to the approach or documents, changes to terminology, broadening parameters of policy, etc. If so record any actions to be undertaken and monitored)

Impact identified	Action required	Lead Officer	Deadline

Monitoring & Review

Date of last review or Impact Assessment:	N/A
Date of next 12 month review:	Reviewed on 3 year cycle, unless there is a significant change to the programme or administration.

Date of next 3 year Impact Assessment (from the date of this EqIA):	September 2024
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------

Date EIA completed:	01/09/21
Signed by Person Completing:	Craig Downs (Funding & Commissioning Officer) Community Services
Date Sent to HR and Equalities Team:	01/09/21
Approved by Head of Service:	Kate Wilson (approved final draft)

NB – The original signed hard copy & an electronic copy should be kept within your Department for audit purposes. Send an electronic copy to the OD Officer in HR & Development. Also, please complete the summary document overleaf. This will be included on the Council's website.

The EIA Toolkit provides guidance on completing EIAs & HR&D can provide further advice.



Completed Equality Impact Assessment	Key findings	Future actions
<p>Directorate / Division:</p> <p>Function or policy name:</p> <p>Officer completing assessment (Job title):</p> <p>Date of assessment:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Services • Community Grants • Craig Downs • 01/09/21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review in September 2024 or earlier if required