SSA EQUALITY IMPACT AND NEEDS ANALYSIS

Directorate	Chief Executive
Service Area	Customer and Partnerships
Service/policy/function being assessed	Community Engagement Strategy
Which borough (s) does the service/policy apply to	Richmond
Staff involved	Anna Sadler, Matthew Maher, Mandy
	Skinner
Date approved by Directorate Equality	
Group (if applicable)	
Date approved by Policy and Review	08/10/18
Manager	
All EINAs must be signed off by the Policy	
and Review Manager	
Date submitted to Directors' Board	11.10.2018

SUMMARY

Please summarise the key findings of the EINA.

The Community Engagement Strategy will enable residents to make a tangible difference and have a meaningful say over the decisions that impact on them and their community. To achieve a democratised, open and transparent approach to decision making the Council will focus on three main approaches. Firstly, creating a local area budget for each ward to be spent on community priorities. Second to facilitate regular local meetings where decisions and issues can be raised and discussed. Finally, launching an outreach programme with seldom heard groups in the borough to ensure that we are listening to everyone.

From data gathered previously regarding current levels of engagement with the council, young people are particularly likely to not be involved in Council activities or

consultations. The proposed strategy will therefore have a positive impact on this group by encouraging them to have a meaningful say over decisions that affect their community.

It has also been shown here that residents who identify as LGBTQ+ are much less likely to engage with mainstream services and are much more likely to use specialist organisations. By focusing on less heard groups like this, the strategy will have a positive impact by encouraging people who identify as LGBTQ+ to use Council services. However, as people identifying as LGBTQ+ are disproportionately affected by reductions in funding to voluntary organisations, changes to the Council's available funds will affect this group accordingly. This will be especially important if the changes in funding mean that there is less support and funding available to voluntary organisations.

1. Background

Briefly describe the service/policy or function:

The new community engagement strategy is designed to enable residents to have a meaningful say over the decisions that impact on them and their community. This will be facilitated through changes to three key areas of the Council's current approach to community engagement.

The first is the creation of local area budgets for each ward to be spent on community priorities. This proposed change will place an emphasis on funding local projects that create resources in local area and empower local people to improve their area while involving ward councillors in the response to local priorities and connecting with local communities, especially those who are currently 'unheard'.

The second is the establishment of local area meetings bringing together wards that have a strong local connection and providing residents with the opportunity to have a meaningful say and influence over the decisions which impact on them. At least one round of meetings will be delivered per year. Alongside these local area meetings, an outreach programme with seldom heard groups will be started so that their concerns and priorities are better understood. Activities will include street interviews, digital campaigns, focus groups, letter drops and the use of local networks and partner organisations. Finally, there will be a realignment of the boundaries used to decide the allocation of the Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (NCIL). It is proposed that the current village-based system is adapted into a two-area approach, with the creation of two allocation areas – East and West – with the River used as a boundary. This will allow larger community benefit projects to be proposed while preserving the option to priorities projects that have a focus on the immediate area.

2. Analysis of need and impact

Guidance:

Findings

- Use service user data where possible and compare this to census data or other benchmarking data.
- Be clear what analysis of this data shows i.e is any group of service users over/under represented
- If you do not have local data use national data/research or service user feedback to identify impact
- Use consultation and complaints/compliments if data is available say what this tells you about the service and any barriers
- Use feedback from service user groups or forums what have they said about the service/policy area
- Use local and national research what has this shown about access to the service/impact of the policy or service need.
- Always say where your data/information is from
- If the strategy/service/policy covers Wandsworth and Richmond be clear on the impact on each boroughs' residents separately and any borough specific impact

Protected group	Findings
Age	According to the findings of the Richmond Residents Survey (2017) relatively few 16-24 year olds interact with the council (see table below). Only for attending a Council event is the proportion of individuals in this age group consistent with others, standing at 17% of respondents, compared with 22%, 23% and 18% for 25-44 year olds, 45-64 year olds and 65+ year olds respectively. Across all other forms of engagement with the council however, young people consistently interact less than those in the other age brackets.

Data regarding the engagement of children with council services is not currently captured. However, overall children make up approximately 20% of the borough's population, with a higher proportion of 5-9 year olds (7.2%) than in London.

	16-24	25-44	45-64	65+
Taken part in a council consultation	8%	17%	17%	18%
Attend an event organised or supported by the council	17%	22%	23%	18%
Attended a village planning event or filled in a Village planning survey	10%	13%	18%	17%
Contacted a local councillor	5%	12%	17%	17%
Made a complaint to the Council	3%	14%	20%	19%
Used the Council website to apply for or pay for a service online, or report a fault	13%	46%	53%	30%
Unweighted sample base	108	386	320	186
Borough population	9.0%	29.3%	26.4%	15.5%

Disability	Data collected as part of the Richmond Residents Survey did not find a statistically significant difference in engagement with the council among those who are part of this protected characteristic.
	However, census data shows that in Richmond 6.6% of people have a disability that limits day-to-day activity a little, while 4.9% have a disability that limits day-to-day activity a lot. In both cases this is lower than in London and England.
	Of relevance is the fact that, according to the Richmond Residents Survey, non-access to the internet is significantly higher among residents where there is a disability (31%) compared to where there is not (5%). The new engagement strategy will use digital platforms but will focus on non digital methods such as face to face groups and strengthening relationships with Community Engagement Officers.
Gender (sex)	According to the Richmond Residents Survey females are significantly more likely than males (60% cf. 54%) to indicate that they spend time doing something to help improve their community or neighbourhood. Within the borough as a whole, 51% of the population is female and 49% male.
	Data collected as part of the Richmond Residents Survey did not find a statistically significant difference in engagement with the council among those who are part of this protected characteristic.
Gender reassignment	Data on engagement with the council and genderreassignment is not currently collected. However, the NationalInstitute of Economic and Social Research (2016) found thatwhile data is poor, at a national level the engagement withmainstream services among LGB&T people is lower than forthe rest of the population. They also found that LGB&T peopleprefer engaging through specialist organisations and are

	therefore disproportionately negatively affected by spending cuts on Voluntary and Community Services.
Marriage and civil partnership	Data regarding engagement among those who are married or are a civil partner is not currently collected. In Richmond as a whole, however, the proportion of people who are married (47%) or in a civil partnership (0.4%) is higher than in both London and England.
Pregnancy and maternity	Data collected as part of the Richmond Residents Survey did not find a statistically significant difference in engagement with the council among those who are part of this protected characteristic.
Race/ethnicity	Data collected as part of the Richmond Residents Survey did not find a statistically significant difference in engagement with the council among those from BME groups. However, at a national level BME groups have particular recognised needs and experiences in relation to health and use of health and social care services.
	Indeed, while Richmond has a lower proportion of population from BME groups (14%) compared to London (40%) this proportion grew by 5% between 2001 and 2011.
Religion and belief, including non belief	Within Richmond the proportion of the population who consider themselves to have no religion is increasing. Currently, Richmond has a higher proportion than London of Christian (55% vs 48%) and no religion (28% vs 21%) with a lower proportion of other religions (e.g. Muslim 3% vs 12%).
	Data specifically regarding engagement amongst those within this protected characteristic is not currently collected.
Sexual orientation	As mentioned above, at a national level the engagement with mainstream services among LGB&T people is lower than for the rest of the population. LGB&T people have a preference for specialist organisations
L	1

	According to the ONS, within Richmond 1.8% of the population were LGB, compared with 2% in the UK as a whole and 2.7% in London.
Across groups i.e older LGBT service users or bme young men	

Data gaps.

Data gap(s)	How will this be addressed?
Currently, data regarding the level of engagement among individuals with certain protected characteristics, namely those who are LGBTQ+, those who are religious or non-religious and individuals below the age of 16, is not collected.	The proposed programme will target those groups who are less engaged than others through focus groups, local networks and partner organisations. This will allow the capture of data on the current level of engagement among these as yet unrepresented groups and, going forward, any changes in involvement to be identified.

3. Impact

Guidance

Positive Impact – put in here what the policy/service will do

- to address barriers to access/under-representation;
- to foster good relations between groups;
- to support protected groups to benefit from the service/policy
- to advance equality of opportunity
- to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation

For example:

- if you have identified in your analysis that a service is not currently accessed by men say how the proposed changes will address this or
- if your data has shown that older residents do not access the service say how your service specification will address this or
- if service user feedback shows BME residents do not access a service what your strategy will do to address this and how this will feed into the supporting action plan or
- if your strategy has identified that bringing together service users from different backgrounds will increase understanding say how you will do this

<u>Negative impact</u> – if the service/policy will have a negative impact say what this will be and what action can be put in place to mitigate the impact. Even if there is only a small risk that there will be a negative impact put this into the EINA.

If you are changing a service/policy do not just put "no negative impact" you need to include how you know there will be no impact

If the EINA covers both Richmond Council and Wandsworth Council If the strategy/service/policy covers Wandsworth and Richmond be clear on the impact on each boroughs' residents separately and any borough specific actions required.

Protected group	Positive	Negative
Age	The strategy aims to improve engagement among seldom heard groups, one of which is young people below the age of 18.	Young people are underrepresented in the data outlined above. This means that any positive changes will affect individuals from this age group less than those in others.
	The use of a wide range of engagement tools including face to face conversations and focus groups, will overcome the risk that those over the age of 65+, who are less likely to interact with the council online, are still engaged.	
Disability	The increased variety of engagement tools will make it likelier that those with a disability, among whom there is a greater prevalence of non-access to the internet, are reached by the Council. The engagement programme will target groups and forums which represent individuals with a disability.	

Gender (sov)	The strategy aims to improve	Data not available. Nogativo impacts as
Gender (sex)	The strategy aims to improve engagement among seldom heard groups, one of which is LGBTQ+ people. Thus, its implementation will make it easier for people in this group to engage with the Council. The engagement programme will target groups and forums which represent individuals who identify as LGBTQ+.	Data not available. Negative impacts as outlined above.
Gender	The strategy aims to improve	
reassignment	engagement among seldom heard groups, one of which	
	is LGBTQ+ people. Thus, its	
	implementation will make it	
	easier for people in this	
	group to engage with the	
	Council. The engagement programme will target	
	groups and forums which	
	represent individuals who	
	identify as LGBTQ+.	
Marriage and	Data not available. Positive	Data not available. Negative impacts as
civil partnership	impacts as outlined above.	outlined above.
Pregnancy and	Data not available. Positive	Data not available. Negative impacts as
maternity	impacts as outlined above.	outlined above.
Race/ethnicity	The strategy aims to improve	
	engagement among seldom	
	heard groups, in particular	
	those that are from a non- white British background.	
	The engagement programme	
	will target groups and	
	forums which represent	

	individuals from a non-white	
	British background.	
	_	
Religion and	Data not available. Positive	Data not available. Negative impacts as
belief, including	impacts as outlined above.	outlined above.
non belief		
Sexual	The strategy aims to improve	LGBTQ+ people are more likely to rely
orientation	engagement among seldom	on specialist organisations and are
	heard groups, one of which	therefore disproportionately
	is LGBTQ+ people. Thus, its	negatively affected by spending cuts
	implementation will make it	on Voluntary and Community Services.
	easier for people in this	If changes to the distribution of
	group to engage with the	Council funds lead to a decrease in the
	Council.	amount available to such
		organisations, LGBTQ+ people will be
		disproportionately affected.

4. Actions

Put in this table actions you have identified that will be included in your strategy/policy and supporting action plan or mitigating actions you have identified that need to be undertaken.

Include how the impact of actions will be measured for example if you resolve to make a service more accessible for older residents say what your current baseline is and what target you want to achieve.

These actions will be tracked by the Policy and Review Team.

Action	Lead Officer	Deadline
To carry out a profiling exercise	Consultation	End of
	and	2019
	engagement	financial
We will carry out a profiling exercise to inform us on the current rates of engagement among residents with difference protected characteristics. We will be able to analyse the data collected over the next twelve months and compare rates of engagement with borough wide statistics to identify existing gaps.	team	year

Engaging hard to reach groups	Consultation	End of
	and	2019
	engagement	financial
By delivering on the proposed strategy we will directly	team	year
engage hard to reach groups and improve on current rates of		
engagement among communities with protected		
characteristics.		