**Equalities Impact Assessment**

The London Councils Grants Programme is under review. A public consultation took place from 24 July 2015 to 2 October 2015 concerning the future grants programme beyond the current four-year commissioning cycle, which ends in March 2017. Responses were invited as to whether a Grants Programme should be delivered beyond March 2017, and the priorities, as well as views on the equalities impacts of any changes to them. Over 250 responses were received. This assessment provides an overview of the key equalities information relevant to the review of the grants programme 2017-21.

This includes information on the equalities effects of the current programme to enable members to make decisions on the future of the scheme informed by the equalities impact of the current priorities.

1. **Analysis of 2013-15 equalities information provided in the consultation**

London Councils identified the groups which currently benefit from each priority area within its grants programme. This was presented alongside the consultation in order to assist respondents in assessing the equality implications of any changes to the programme. This information is provided at **Appendix One.**

The consultation asked respondents if they agreed with the summary of the groups which currently benefit from each priority area within the grants programme. Of the 206 respondents that answered this question, 190 said that they did agree with the summary. Sixteen respondents said they did not agree with the summary. The reasons can be summarised as follows.

There were comments on specific categories that should be amended/ expanded. For example the addition of neurodiverse to the disabled category. That the summary missed information, for example that under Priority 4 the ‘other disability’ category should have been ticked. Also that it is misleading regarding Priority 4 because equalities information collected reflects the equalities makeup of the individuals from frontline service providers that attend training, events and other capacity building activities. It does not reflect the wider work of the frontline organisations that benefit from this work, nor does it reflect the equalities nature of the work provided (such as training on the gender recognition act). Other comments focused on the question of how much impact the programme has for the categories highlighted and the need to separate equalities categories that are incidental to service delivery and those that are directly addressed/ met through service delivery.

Officer have attempted to address the last two points by providing information in the summary of 2013-15 equalities information below in terms of specific equalities/ specialised work.

Some comments focused on the fact that the information provided was not sufficient to determine either way. This issues is addressed below with the provision of more in depth information on equalities statistics for the programme.

1. **Further 2013-15 Equalities data**

In order to assess the impact of any changes to the scale or scope of the programme it is useful to consider the equalities effects of the current programme. Summary information on the equalities effects was provided with the consultation. As outlined above the respondents to the survey largely agreed with this summary. However, a few respondents suggested that a fuller breakdown of data should be provided to enable a robust assessment of the impact.

The following four tables provide data on numbers of people with a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010. The data relates to the period 1 April 2013-31 March 2015.

It is useful to have these figures to assess equalities impact. However, they do not present the entire picture as they do not provide information on the part that a characteristic plays in the way people access services. Officers have therefore also provided information on specifically targeted services which address the specific needs related to a protected characteristic. This also addressed issues raised in the consultation on the limits of providing data alone.

**Homelessness: equalities impact 2013-15**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Equalities protected group** | **Support provided (number)** |
| **Age** | **8,225** young people aged 16-24  **2,414** service users aged 55+  Examples of specialist support: London Youth Gateway (lead partner, New Horizon Youth Centre) supporting homeless young people and those at risk of homelessness |
| **Disability** | **3,193** service users with mental impairment  (mental health issues, learning difficulties)  **218** service users with sensory impairment (Deaf, hearing impaired, blind, visually impaired)  **2,746** service users with mobility impairment or other disabilities  Examples of specialist support: Shelter works with RNID to support deaf service users requiring housing support. |
| **Race** | **16,009** service users from Black, Asian and minority ethnic communities[[1]](#footnote-1)  **12,645** service users from White communities[[2]](#footnote-2)  Examples of specialist support: Shelter’s targeted work around BAME communities. |
| **Sexual Orientation** | **2,479** lesbian, gay, bi-sexual (LGB) service users  Examples of specialist support: Stonewall Housing's LGBT homelessness advice and support project  London Youth Gateway (lead partner, New Horizon Youth Centre) supporting LGBT homeless young people and those at risk of homelessness through partners Stonewall Housing, GALOP and PACE |
| **Gender reassignment** | **202** transgender service users.  Examples of specialist support: Stonewall Housing as above |
| **Sex** | **17,992** men  **12,808** women  Examples of specialist support:  Trio Project (lead partner, Thames Reach) – targeted support to women rough sleepers. Women in Prison – providing housing advice to women leaving prison. |
| **Pregnancy/ maternity** | **200** service users with pregnancy/ maternity issues |
| **Marriage/ civil partnership** | **2,074** service users that are married or in a civil partnership |
| **Religion** | **14,402** service users that have stated they have a religion/ belief |

**Sexual and domestic violence: equalities impact 2013-15**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Equalities protected group** | **Support provided (number)** |
| **Age** | **28,280** children young people aged 0-24  **2,914** service users aged 55+  Examples of specialist support: Tender provides prevention work in schools and other youth settings. |
| **Disability** | **6,431** service users with mental impairment  (mental health issues, learning difficulties)  **632** service users with sensory impairment (Deaf, hearing impaired, blind, visually impaired)  **2,011** service users with mobility impairment or other disabilities  Examples of specialist support: Signhealth through the DeafHope project support women who have experienced domestic violence and are deaf/ hearing impaired. |
| **Race** | **33,441** service users from Black, Asian and minority ethnic communities[[3]](#footnote-3)  **30,242**  service users from White communities[[4]](#footnote-4)  Examples of specialist support: Culturally specific advice work under the Ascent project (lead by Solace Women’s Aid), Specialist refuge provision (lead by Ashiana), culturally specific advice provided by AWRC and DVIP around harmful practices. |
| **Sexual Orientation** | **2,313** lesbian, gay, bi-sexual (LGB) service users  Examples of specialist support: DAP project providing specialist advice to LGBT survivors of sexual and domestic violence (lead by GALOP) |
| **Gender reassignment** | **58** transgender service users.  Examples of specialist support: see GALOP above |
| **Sex** | **10,524** men  **74,999**  women  Examples of specialist support:  Women only refuge provision as provided by Ashiana and partners. |
| **Pregnancy/ maternity** | **2,549** service users with pregnancy/ maternity issues |
| **Marriage/ civil partnership** | **8,413** service users that are married or in a civil partnership |
| **Religion** | **28,043** service users that have stated they have a religion/ belief  Examples of specialist support:  Culturally sensitive support provided by Jewish Women’s Aid. |

**Poverty: equalities impact 2013-15**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Equalities protected group** | **Support provided (number)** |
| **Age** | 17-26 909 service users 22%  27-36 1258 service users 30%  37-46 1176 service users 28%  47-56 679 service users 16%  57-66 124 service users 3%  67-76 5 service users <1% |
| **Disability** | 477 service users 11% |
| **Race** | 2590 BAME service users 62% |
| **Sexual Orientation** | 68 service users |
| **Transgender** | 2 service users |
| **Sex** | 3,130 Female service users 75% |
| **Pregnancy/ maternity** | 29 service users |
| **Marriage/ civil partnership** | 607 service users 15% |
| **Religion** | 3016 service users 73% |
|  |  |

**Capacity Building: equalities impact 2013-15**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Equalities protected group** | **Support provided (number)** |
| **Age** | Age UK supported 350 older peoples organisations.  Children England supported 2,134 children’s organisations |
| **Disability** | Inclusion London supported 221 Deaf and disabled persons organisations.  LVSC has also trained 6 disability organisations through the HEAR partnership. |
| **Race** | Advice UK supported 432 BAME specific organisations.  Refugee council supported 653 refugee community organisations |
| **Sexual Orientation** | LVSC has provided training to 3 LGB organisations through the HEAR partnership.  25 LGBT organisations supported to gain skills in income diversification |
| **Gender reassignment** | London for All partnership (lead partner, LVSC) delivered a number of training sessions and workshops to improve the accessibility and inclusivity of London voluntary sector organisations for trans people. In addition two trans specific organisations have been supported. |
| **Sex** | LVSC has trained 8 women’s organisations through the HEAR partnership. |
| **Pregnancy/ maternity** | Advice UK provided a programme of maternity/pregnancy discrimination training, in support of this protected equalities group. |

2015-16 Q1&2 equalities stats are available on request but are not provided here as they do not provide a complete picture.

1. **Equalities effects relating to the current priorities 2013-17**

The survey requested views on the equalities effects of the current priorities. The responses to this question are summarised in the relevant priority sections under section three in the main body of this report.

1. **Equalities effects relating to changing the priorities**

The survey requested further views in terms of how any potential change to the priorities would impact on people with the protected equalities characteristics. Responses to this question are summarised below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Protected characteristic | Summary of Comments |
| Age | Responses highlighted the increased housing issues faced by young people following the changes to housing benefits and the fact that the living wage is set at a lower rate for young people.  Young people who experience domestic abuse or hate crime would be negatively affected by changes to priorities on homelessness and sexual and domestic violence. In particular young LGBT people who seek specialist services, where they feel safer. Prevention work and early intervention was felt to be most effective when undertaken with young people.  A number of responses outlined the need for age specific capacity building. Responses highlighted the growing older population, reduction in public services. It was felt that boroughs would lose some of the benefit they currently gain from having a strong voluntary sector responding to older people's needs.  Responses highlighted research that shows that older women are often more isolated and at risk of domestic violence and abuse and that therefore targeted support is vital to enable them to remain safe and healthy. Young women and children facing domestic and sexual violence (including harmful practices) would be adversely affected if the priorities were changed. |
| Disability | Responses highlight the complex mental health needs experienced by services users of homelessness and sexual and domestic violence. In addition those who are disabled are shown to be at greater risk of abuse and exploitation often from family members. Responses highlighted the high prevalence of mental health needs in LGBT domestic violence survivors.  Changes to the capacity building priority would affect disabled people’s organisations (and the disabled people these support) because they are currently served by specialist disability second tier support in this priority area. Responses highlighted research that has proven that Deaf and Disabled people have been disproportionately impacted by the welfare reform and cuts in local authority services and that a strong disabled focused VCS is essential in addressing these challenges. Deaf and Disabled peoples organisations also face challenges in terms of an increased preference for mainstream providers and a reduction in funding available.  Employment programmes focused on target groups around disability would also be negatively impacted by a change to the priorities. |
| Gender reassignment | Responses stated that the current priorities, particularly delivered at a pan-London level have provided opportunity for services for trans-people that would otherwise be difficult to be delivered at a borough level. This is particularly with regard to the homelessness and sexual and domestic violence priorities. Responses highlighted that research has shown that trans people experience more violence within relationships and are less likely to access support, pointing towards the need for specialist support. Research was cited in which no trans people were accessing mainstream domestic violence services.[[5]](#footnote-5)  In addition under the capacity building priority training has been delivered to frontline organisations on gender reassignment issues. |
| Marriage and Civil Partnership | Responses have particularly highlighted the issues around marriage and civil partnership with regards to women affected by domestic violence and with no recourse to public funds. In cases in which women are reliant on a spousal visa with regards to their immigration status their marital status is integral to their experience and the services they require. |
| Pregnancy and maternity | Women returning to the job market were a group that were highlighted in responses that could be negatively affected by a change to the priority of poverty.  It was felt that a change to the priority of sexual and domestic violence would negatively affect women affected by pregnancy and maternity, due to the higher levels of risk of experiencing domestic abuse during this period. |
| Race | Responses stated that changing the focus on sexual and domestic violence would have a negative effect on race. It was felt that one of the strengths of the currently funded programme is that it is unique in its ability to reach BAMER (black, Asian, minority ethnic and refugee) survivors of sexual and domestic violence as a result partnerships of specialist providers. It would be difficult to deliver the range of specialist cultural provision at a local level.  Responses have also highlighted the role of capacity building in supporting small frontline BAMER voluntary and community organisations. This was felt to be something that had often disappeared at a local level. Refugee community organisations were seen as playing a key role in supporting refugees in education, training, ESOL, advice and accessing services. However, responses highlighted that these frontline organisations experience funding issues, as well as challenges in terms of financial and management skills, pointing towards a need for specialist capacity building support.  In addition, particular communities that experience lower levels of employment benefit from the poverty priority. |
| Religion or belief | Similarly with the Race category, it was felt that specialist capacity building support was important in supporting smaller cultural/ faith based organisations. |
| Sex | Responses highlighted the increased levels of severity and repeat victimisation amongst women in terms of sexual and domestic violence. The importance of specialist women-only services were highlighted in terms of women fleeing violence. The importance of male services was also emphasised. Women’s voluntary and community organisations were also felt to be particularly affected by funding issues and the need for specialist capacity building support was highlighted.  Changes to the poverty priority would also affect this category, due to the target group of women returning to work. |
| Sexual Orientation | Research by Safer Lives (2014) showed that few LGBT domestic abuse survivors accessed help from mainstream services, with only 1.3% of survivors accessing other DV services identified as LGB and none as T. [[6]](#footnote-6) The role of specialist domestic violence provision for LGBT people is relevant at a pan-London level.  LGBT people fleeing hate crime also seek specialist homelessness provision in terms of service providers that understand their needs and where they feel safe from further experiences of homophobic abuse. |

**5 Reducing the equalities impact of changing the programme**

The survey asked for comments on how the equalities impact of changing the programme could be reduced?

Responses highlighted a number of ways to mitigate negative impacts of any potential change to the programme including a phased or transitional approach providing organisations with time to seek alternative funding. Also to have sufficient lead in time for projects to form relevant partnerships. It was felt that further mapping would be useful to understand which groups require pan-London provision and those that could be addressed locally. Local EIAs were highlighted as a means of establishing impact and mitigation utilising data from the London Councils Grants programme. Responses also highlighted the importance of service user involvement in planning any changes to the programme, in particular service users from specific equalities groups. A focus on partnerships was felt to be important in terms of reducing core costs to direct more resources towards direct provision.

**6 Equalities representation in the consultation**

Finally it is important to ensure that a sufficiently diverse range of voices have been heard during the consultation process.

The following list provides information on the number of consultation responses against each of the protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010.

1. Age – of the 130 respondents on this question, 6% were under 24 years and 15% were over 55 years old. In addition NHYC submitted a response put together by the young beneficiaries of the project. Organisations representing older people, children and young people also submitted responses (including Age UK, Children England and New Horizon Youth Centre)
2. Disability - 35 respondents identified themselves as having a disability. In addition a number of disability related organisations submitted responses including Inclusion London, Disability Advice Service Lambeth, Greenwich Association of Disabled People

and SignHealth

1. Race – of the 147 respondents on this question 45% of responses were from White British people,55% of responses were from BAME categories. In addition responses were received from organisations with a BAME/ race focus including ROTA, Latin American Disabled People's Project, Refugee Council
2. Sex – of the 143 respondents that answered the question on sex 78% of respondents were women. In addition a number of organisations focusing on violence against women and girls submitted responses such as Women’s Resource Centre.
3. Sexuality – of the 135 respondents that answered 70% heterosexual, 8 % from bisexual people, 7 % from gay men, 7 % from lesbians; 7% of respondents other/ preferred not to say. In addition GALOP and Stonewall Housing submitted a summary of LGBT services user survey responses. GALOP, Stonewall Housing and Broken Rainbow also submitted responses.
4. Religion and belief – of the 114 respondents that answered 89 stated that they had a religion or belief
5. Gender reassignment – Trans Network London submitted a response
6. Pregnancy/ maternity – of the 145 respondents 6 stated that they had pregnancy/ maternity issues
7. Marriage/ Civil partnership – of the 139 respondents, 35 stated that they were single, 88 were married/ civil partners and living with a partner, 16 other

**Appendix One**

**Equalities impact assessment published as part of the London Councils Grants Programme Consultation July – October 2015**

**Priority 1 and 2**

|  |
| --- |
| **Equalities Information** |
| The following table outlines the protected groups that benefit from funding in priority one and two (marked with an X). |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Protected Groups that benefit from Priority 1 and 2** | | | | | | | |
| **Ethnic Background** |  |  | **Gender/Identity** |  |  | **Age** |  |
| Asian – Bangladeshi | X |  | Female | X |  | Under 16 | X |
| Asian – British | X |  | Male | X |  | 16-17 | X |
| Asian – Indian | X |  | Transgender | X |  | 18-24 | X |
| Asian – Pakistani | X |  | Other | X |  | 25-34 | X |
| Asian – Other | X |  |  |  |  | 35-44 | X |
| Black – African | X |  | **Sexual Orientation** |  |  | 45-54 | X |
| Black – British | X |  | Bisexual | X |  | 55-64 | X |
| Black – Caribbean | X |  | Gay Man | X |  | 65+ | X |
| Black – Other | X |  | Heterosexual | X |  |  |  |
| Chinese | X |  | Lesbian | X |  | **Pregnancy or maternity** |  |
| Latin American | X |  | Other | X |  | Pregnancy/maternity | X |
| Middle Eastern | X |  |  |  |  | **Marriage or Civil Partnership** |  |
| White – British | X |  | **Religion/Belief** |  |  | Pregnancy/maternity | X |
| White – Irish | X |  | Agnostic | X |  |  |  |
| White – European | X |  | Atheist | X |  |  |  |
| White – Other | X |  | Baha’i | X |  |  |  |
| Mixed Ethnicity | X |  | Buddhist | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Christian | X |  |  |  |
| **Disabled** |  |  | Hindu | X |  |  |  |
| Blind or Visual Impairment | X |  | Humanist | X |  |  |  |
| Learning Difficulty | X |  | Jain | X |  |  |  |
| Mental health | X |  | Jewish | X |  |  |  |
| Mobility | X |  | Muslim | X |  |  |  |
| Other disability | X |  | Rastafarian | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Sikh | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Zoroastrian | X |  |  |  |
| **Deaf** |  |  | None | X |  |  |  |
| Deaf or Hearing Impairment | X |  | Other | X |  |  |  |

**Priority 3**

|  |
| --- |
| **Equalities Information** |

The following table outlines the protected groups that benefit from funding in priority three (marked with an X).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Protected Groups that benefit from Priority 3** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ethnic Background** |  |  | **Sexual Orientation** |  |  | **Age** | | | |  |
| Asian or Asian British – Bangladeshi | X |  | Bisexual | X |  | 16-17 | | | | X |
| Asian or Asian British – Indian | X |  | Gay Man | X |  | 18-24 | | | | X |
| Asian or Asian British – Pakistani | X |  | Heterosexual | X |  | 25-34 | | | | X |
| Asian or Asian British – Other | X |  | Lesbian | X |  | 35-44 | | | | X |
| Black or Black British – African | X |  | Other | X |  | 45-54 | | | | X |
| Black or Black British – Caribbean | X |  |  |  |  | 55-64 | | | | X |
| Black or Black British – Other | X |  | **Religion/Belief** |  |  | 65+ | | | | X |
| Chinese | X |  | Agnostic | X |  | **Pregnancy or maternity** | | | |  |
| Mixed – White and Asian | X |  | Atheist | X |  | Pregnancy/maternity | | | | X |
| Mixed – White and Black African | X |  | Baha’i |  |  | **Marriage/Civil Partnership** | | | |  |
| Mixed – White and Black Caribbean | X |  | Buddhist | X |  | Pregnancy/maternity | | | | X |
| Mixed – Other Mixed Background | X |  | Christian | X |  |  | | | |  |
| White – Irish | X |  | Hindu | X |  |  | | | |  |
| White – British | X |  | Humanist | X | \* Priority 3 only collects information relating to whether participants have a disability or not, but no further detail about the type of disability.  \*\* Priority 3 does not collect information relating to whether participants are Deaf or have Hearing Impairments. | |  |  |
| White – Other | X |  | Jain | X |  | |  |  |
| Any other ethnic background | X |  | Jewish | X |  | |  | | | | |  |
| **Disabled\*** |  |  | Muslim | X |  | |  | | | | |  |
| Yes | X |  | Rastafarian | X |  | |  | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | Sikh | X |  | |  | | | | |  |
| **Deaf\*\*** |  |  | Zoroastrian | X |  | |  | | | | |  |
| **Gender/Identity** |  |  | None | X |  | |  | | | | |  |
| Female | X |  | Other | X |  | |  | | | | |  |
| Male | X |  |  |  |  | |  | | | | |  |
| Transgender | X |  |  |  |  | |  | | | | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | | | | |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Providing support to London’s voluntary and community organisations** |

**Priority 4**

|  |
| --- |
| **Equalities Information** |

The following table outlines the protected groups that benefit from funding in priority four (marked with an X).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Protected Groups that benefit from Priority 4** | | | | | | | |
| **Ethnic Background** |  |  | **Gender/Identity** |  |  | **Age** |  |
| Asian – Bangladeshi | X |  | Female | X |  | Under 16 | X |
| Asian – British | X |  | Male | X |  | 16-17 | X |
| Asian – Indian | X |  | Transgender |  |  | 18-24 | X |
| Asian – Pakistani | X |  | Other |  |  | 25-34 | X |
| Asian – Other |  |  |  |  |  | 35-44 | X |
| Black – African | X |  | **Sexual Orientation** |  |  | 45-54 | X |
| Black – British | X |  | Bisexual | X |  | 55-64 | X |
| Black – Caribbean | X |  | Gay Man | X |  | 65+ | X |
| Black – Other | X |  | Heterosexual | X |  |  |  |
| Chinese | X |  | Lesbian | X |  | **Pregnancy or maternity** |  |
| Latin American | X |  | Other | X |  | Pregnancy/maternity | X |
| Middle Eastern | X |  |  |  |  | **Marriage or Civil Partnership** |  |
| White – British | X |  | **Religion/Belief** |  |  | Marriage/Civil Partnership |  |
| White – Irish | X |  | Agnostic | X |  |  |  |
| White – European | X |  | Atheist | X |  |  |  |
| White – Other |  |  | Baha’i |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Ethnicity | X |  | Buddhist |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Christian | X |  |  |  |
| **Disabled** |  |  | Hindu | X |  |  |  |
| Blind or Visual Impairment | X |  | Humanist | X |  |  |  |
| Learning Difficulty | X |  | Jain |  |  |  |  |
| Mental health | X |  | Jewish | X |  |  |  |
| Mobility | X |  | Muslim | X |  |  |  |
| Other disability | **X\*** |  | Rastafarian |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Sikh |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Zoroastrian |  |  |  |  |
| **Deaf** |  |  | None | X |  |  |  |
| Deaf or Hearing Impairment | X |  | Other | X |  |  |  |

\*amended in response to feedback in the consultation on the future of the grants programme July-October 2015

1. Consists of BAME + Mixed Ethnicity figures [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Includes White British, Irish, European and White Other. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Consists of BAME + Mixed Ethnicity figures [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Includes White British, Irish, European and White Other. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *LGBT practice briefing for Idvas,* Safer Lives <http://www.safelives.org.uk/file/lgbt-practice-briefing-idvas-finalpdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. *LGBT practice briefing for Idvas,* Safer Lives <http://www.safelives.org.uk/file/lgbt-practice-briefing-idvas-finalpdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)