

1. IDENTIFY THE POLICY, PROJECT, SERVICE REFORM OR BUDGET OPTION:

a) Name of the Policy, Project, Service Reform or Budget Option to be screened

Development and Implementation of a new Grant Fund (Glasgow Communities Fund) to replace the Integrated Grant Fund (IGF) from 1 April 2020

b) Reason for Change in Policy or Policy Development

The Council's [Strategic Plan 2017-22](#) for Glasgow outlines a number of strategic priorities that the City Government intends to take forward. This includes carrying out a review of how we fund third sector and community groups to reflect a partnership approach and simplifying procedures.

c) List main outcome focus and supporting activities of the Policy, Project, Service Reform or Budget Option

The following key objectives have been adopted for the review:

- **Objective 1:** to consider and determine the policy priorities for the Fund, which are to reduce the impacts of poverty, inequality and disadvantage for Glasgow residents;
- **Objective 2:** to establish new funding programmes and outcomes to deliver on the policy priorities;

NOT OFFICIAL

- **Objective 3:** to improve access to the Fund and consider eligibility criteria;
- **Objective 4:** to consider the funding model to be used as the basis for determining how funds are allocated;
- **Objective 5:** to examine how we can fund projects for longer than a year and how we facilitate reporting on spending;
- **Objective 6:** to rationalise grant administration processes and procedures including consideration of e-based applications and processes;
- **Objective 7:** to rebrand and promote the new Fund to clearly convey its values and vision; and
- **Objective 8:** to develop an approach to evaluation/impact of programmes that enables sharing and replication of good practice and informed decision making.

The outcome of the review is to have a brand new fund that will tackle specific strategies and priorities allowing resources to be directed where they are required and can make the most impact.

The IGF will cease operating on 31st March 2020. The creation of a new grant fund is part of the Glasgow City Council strategic plan and has been in discussion for two years. All existing funded organisations, as well as those organisations not funded by the current IGF, will get the opportunity to input to the shape of the new fund, and during Sept/Oct 2019 apply to the new fund for grants to deliver against new priorities.

d) Name of officer completing assessment (signed and date)

Judith Hunter, Principal Officer (Equalities) and Jackie Henderson, Monitoring Assistant

e) Assessment Verified by (signed and date)

NOT OFFICIAL

NOT OFFICIAL

Richard Kelly, Grants & Initiatives Manager, 29.10.19

NOT OFFICIAL

NOT OFFICIAL

2. GATHERING EVIDENCE & STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The best approach to find out if a policy, etc is likely to impact positively or negatively on equality groups is to look at existing research, previous consultation recommendations, studies or consult with representatives of those groups. You should list below any data, consultations (previous relevant or future planned), or any relevant research or analysis that supports the Policy, Project, Service Reform or Budget Option being undertaken.

i) Please name any research, data, consultation or studies referred to for this assessment:

The Scottish Government and Glasgow City Council have published equality evidence matrices, which provide a limited set of data & research. Both cross reference the Equality characteristics with various issues e.g. health, access to services, employment and so on. However, while these are a useful guide, they would not substitute for consultation with organisations likely to be directly affected by a loss/reduction of funding.

For reference, the Scottish Government matrix can be found here: <https://scotland.shinyapps.io/sg-equality-evidence-finder/>

and the Glasgow City Council matrix here: <http://connect.glasgow.gov.uk/article/15070/Equalities-Impact-Assessment-Evidence-Matrix>

Data from Glasgow City Council City Ward Factsheet 2017: <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=3543&p=0>

Data from Glasgow Centre for Population Health: Understanding Glasgow website:

https://www.understandingglasgow.com/profiles/neighbourhood_profiles

Consultation at three generic stakeholder events.

Consultation paper received from Glasgow Equality Forum featuring direct feedback from members on the Grants proposal – comments from this paper are threaded through this EQIA. A summary of GEF's comments is available here: <https://equalityupdates.org.uk/update-on-glasgow-city-councils-new-grants-fund/>

NOT OFFICIAL

NOT OFFICIAL

ii) **Please state if this reference refers to one or more of the protected characteristics:**

- **age**
- **disability,**
- **race and/or ethnicity,**
- **religion or belief (including lack of belief),**
- **gender,**
- **gender reassignment,**
- **sexual orientation**
- **marriage and civil partnership,**
- **pregnancy and maternity,**

The data sources above provide information on all of the protected characteristic groups. For the purposes of this EQIA, most of the groups above will be referenced, although marriage and civil partnership and pregnancy and maternity are less relevant in the circumstances.

iii) **Do you intend to set up your own consultation? If so, please list the main issues that you wish to address if the consultation is planned; or if consultation has been completed, please note the outcome(s) of consultation.**

Community Empowerment Services worked in partnership with colleagues in the Glasgow Third Sector Interface Network (GTSIN) to deliver Stakeholder Engagement Events for third sector organisations in March/April 2019 which brought parties together to discuss their views on a range of issues including the programmes and principles that the fund should be built around and how partners can work together to deliver the new fund, taking into consideration the potentially limited resources that are available.

A total of 325 representatives from 282 third sector organisations attended across the three Stakeholder Engagement events, including a number of Equalities organisations: specifically BME, Disabled People's Organisations, women's, faith, youth and LGBT groups.

The aims of the events were to

- Learn from our stakeholders;

NOT OFFICIAL

NOT OFFICIAL

- Identify emerging priorities within local communities;
- Better align our resources; and
- Brief stakeholders on suggested priorities for the new fund and a draft timetable.

A few points which were consistently made over the course of the three events related to:

- The desire for flexible, long term funding, particularly 3–5 year funding
- The desire for the fund to be opened up to organisations that have not been able to apply in the past
- The need for additional support to be provided to access the new fund through capacity building resources
- The need for a clearer, more streamlined application and grant management process
- The scale of the potential impact on services and service users when the new fund comes into effect
- The scale of the task involved in creating a new fund to replace a fund which had been part of the fabric of the third sector in the city for decades

An EQIA Working Group has been created and includes representation from the third sector and equality groups via Glasgow Equality Forum (GEF), however any conflicts of interest will need to be avoided. GEF's comments have reflected the views of their members which comprise Glasgow voluntary sector equality networks and equality organisations, which were broadly captured in their written submissions. As this EQIA is a living document, it is intended the working group will re-convene once the application process has been completed and all applicants know whether their applications were successful or not and will feed into the EQIA process on an ongoing basis. The group will also consider what equality information can, and should, be gathered via the application and monitoring forms. GEF commented that it was important for these questions to be asked: "Crucially, projects must then report on how they have met equalities needs in their communities and how they are moving forward. This neatly fits in with the human rights legislative requirement of demonstrating "progressive realisation of rights"."

This full EQIA will make a number of recommendations on the new grant fund and on the application process, so that in future, better equalities data is collected from all Glasgow Communities Fund applicants, and not only those with a specific equalities focus.

NOT OFFICIAL

NOT OFFICIAL

3. ASSESSMENT & DIFFERENTIAL IMPACTS

It is not yet known whether equality groups will be positively or negatively impacted by the introduction of the new grant fund. However, one positive impact is that organisations not previously in receipt of IGF will have the opportunity to apply to the new fund.

Whilst the replacement of the IGF presents significant challenges, the new fund is also an opportunity to better meet the needs of people with protected characteristics living in Glasgow by:

- improving access to mainstream voluntary sector projects,
- removing barriers that currently exist and
- providing specialist services where they are needed.

In addition, this is an opportunity to address issues such as improving the collection and disaggregation of equalities data, assisting with mapping of services, improving connections between locality and city-wide work, and more effectively monitoring and evaluating outcomes. The new questions in the application will enable the monitoring of projects based on their accessibility, understanding of community needs, and willingness to adopt best practice to ensure groups from protected characteristic groups are welcomed and planned for in their service delivery.

Positive Impacts

Despite the uncertainty outlined above, the development of the funding programme is guided by the following principles:

- A focus on early intervention and prevention
- A focus on equalities
- A focus on innovation and initiatives that respond to emerging areas
- A focus on outcomes (rather than tasks, inputs or outputs)
- A recognition of full cost recovery

NOT OFFICIAL

NOT OFFICIAL

The recognition of equalities issues as an integral part of the new programme should give some comfort to organisations working with protected characteristic groups. It has also been agreed that the main purpose of the new Grant Fund is for the following:

- Respond to the impact of poverty, deprivation and inequalities by supporting local residents and communities to co-design, develop and deliver sustainable services that help to create and sustain a successful city that everyone can benefit from
- Empower local residents and community groups so that they are better able to participate in the social, economic and cultural life of the city by engaging with and influencing service development, planning and decision-making

While protected characteristics are not specifically mentioned at this point, it is recognised that people with equalities considerations are among the most marginalised communities in Glasgow, and more likely to experience poverty. Some information on the population of Glasgow is provided below. While it is unrealistic to expect an exact match, **the new Glasgow Communities Fund should be funding projects that reflect the demographic profile of the city** and its most vulnerable citizens as outlined here and in the table below.

Bearing in mind that the main data sets are from the 2011 census and very out of date, we can note that male and female life expectancy is markedly lower than the Scottish average. Women live on average nearly six years longer than men. Twelve per cent of the population is from an ethnic minority, although the figure increases to 18% if including White Other e.g. Irish, Polish etc. Breaking this down further, Pakistani is the largest ethnic group in the city, with Africans second and Chinese third. There are currently no projects funded from IGF to work specifically with African communities. It is clear from anecdotal evidence that the BME population of Glasgow has been increasing steadily since the last census, partly due to the city's status as an asylum housing provider. It is likely that the new Communities Fund will support a wider variety of organisations that support BME communities, especially in localities with high BME populations, which are predominantly in the inner Southside and North West of the city.

Data on [employability](#) from the Scottish Government indicates a gap between ethnic minorities and the White population of almost 20%, despite school leavers from Indian, Pakistani and Chinese communities having a higher rate of further education. With employment being one of the key routes out of poverty, work to tackle this could make a positive impact via the Glasgow Communities Fund.

Single parent households make up 40% of all households with dependent children. Six out of ten people live within 500m of vacant or derelict land. Twenty-one per cent of adults are claiming out of work benefits, 32% of children live in poverty and levels of deprivation are considerably higher than the Scottish average. 23% of people have a limiting disability. Data from the Glasgow Disability Alliance shows higher levels of

NOT OFFICIAL

NOT OFFICIAL

poverty in families with a disabled person – 20% compared to 8% in the general population. Disabled people are also likely to have lower qualifications: 25% of disabled people have low or no qualifications at SCQF level 4, compared to 10% of non-disabled people. In addition, only 40% of disabled adults are in employment, compared to 80% of the white adult population. The new Communities Fund has the potential to make a positive impact on this area.

Data on LGBT+ groups is usually incomplete and difficult to find at a city of Glasgow level. However the Equality Network ‘Scottish Equality Report’ of 2015, highlights that LGBT people continue to face inequality and discrimination in Scotland. More than two thirds experienced verbal abuse, however, this is not always reflected as Hate Crime reports. Types of disadvantage reported by survey respondents included service providers and employers not meeting the needs of LGBT people, isolation and exclusion from society, underrepresentation in public life, specific economic disadvantages and the long term negative impacts that prejudice and discrimination have on their lives, particularly in terms of mental health.

Glasgow Voluntary Sector LGBT+ Network, with support from Glasgow Equality Forum, produced a report in December 2017 because “Members of the Network have had longstanding concerns about the historic lack of both a strategic approach and core funding for LGBTI+ organisations in Glasgow.” <http://77.104.153.122/~equalityupdates/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/FINAL-GEF-LGBTI-web-2018.pdf> The report stated that “The Scottish Government’s Sexual Orientation in Scotland 2017 Report indicates specifically that 25% of LGBT people live in deprived postcode areas compared to 19% of non-LGBT people. It also shows an 11% unemployment rate among LGBT people, three times higher than the national average, and that 72% of LGBT people are single, evidencing issues of social isolation within the community.” The Glasgow Communities Fund could support LGBT+ projects that have a positive impact on this.

Overall, the population in Glasgow decreased marginally by -0.6% between 1996 and 2012. Underlying this were more significant changes within age groups: there were reductions in the numbers of children (-18%) and older adults (-13%), while the working age population, particularly those aged 45-64 years increased. The IGF has a history of projects that support young people, as well as the older population and the Glasgow Communities Fund has the opportunity to continue with these positive impacts, particularly for the older population. This Scottish Government [report](#) highlights the projection that the 75 plus age group is predicted to rise by 75% by 2031.

NOT OFFICIAL

NOT OFFICIAL

Group	ID	Indicator	Count	%	Difference from Scotland	Time Period
Population	P1	People aged 0 - 15	96,263	16.2%	-6%	2012
	P2	People aged 16 - 64	415,859	69.9%	+7%	
	P3	People aged 65 - 74	43,111	7.2%	-24%	
	P4	People aged 75 and over	39,847	6.7%	-15%	
Cultural	C1	People from an ethnic minority	68,778	11.6%	+191%	2011
	C2	People who are married, in a civil partnership, or co-habiting	202,694	42.0%	-25%	
	C3	Single parent households	26,531	40.4%	+46%	
	C4	Householders living alone	123,252	21.3%	+34%	
	C5	People with religious affiliation	367,748	61.9%	+10%	
Environment/ Transport	E1	People who travel to place of work or study by walking, bike or public transport	185,651	50.3%	+36%	2011
	E2	People living within 500m of vacant or derelict land	360,483	60.2%	+100%	
	E3	Households with one or more cars	140,702	49.2%	-29%	
	E4	Overcrowded households	49,695	17.4%	+92%	
Socio-economic	S1	Owner occupied households	130,407	45.6%	-26%	2011
	S2	People with grade D or E social classification	76,896	34.0%	+22%	
	S3	People in employment	260,131	56.8%	-10%	
	S4	People claiming Employment and Support Allowance	20,525	3.4%	+75%	2012
	S5	People claiming out of work benefits	85,855	21.4%	+49%	
Education	ED1	Adults with qualifications at Higher level and above	240,631	48.3%	-4%	2011
	ED2	Young people not in education, employment or training	3,753	11.8%	+26%	
Poverty	PO1	People in income deprivation	127,170	21.4%	+62%	2012
	PO2	People of working age in employment deprivation	77,220	19.1%	+51%	
	PO3	Children in poverty	35,070	32.2%	+74%	2011
Health	H1	People in "good" or "very good" health	460,217	77.5%	-6%	2011
	H2	People limited "a lot" or "a little" by disability	134,889	22.7%	+16%	
	H3	Male life expectancy	72.3 years		-5%	2008 - 2012
	H4	Female life expectancy	78.2 years		-3%	

NOT OFFICIAL

NOT OFFICIAL

Feedback from Equality Organisations:

Glasgow Equality Forum (GEF) provided a collective consultation response to the development and implementation of the new grant fund.

GEF would welcome improved data gathering disaggregated equalities data from funded projects. This information has not been requested in recent years due to the quality of information that was being provided. Further capacity building support would be needed for projects to ensure qualitative information is reported.

The full set of recommendations in the GEF consultation were noted in the committee paper on the Glasgow Communities Fund which can be found [here](#). It has already been agreed that specific work will be undertaken via GEF members, as well as generic Third Sector stakeholders, to ensure that the voices of equality groups are heard directly in the process. GEF involvement in the application process has finished. They will still be involved in ongoing EQIA work insofar as it influences the conditions of grant, monitoring forms, and capacity building for grant recipients, training content etc.

They noted that there can be significant barriers for smaller organisations, many of which are led by people from protected characteristic groups. Organisations with funding officers and larger infrastructures have an advantage in having the capacity and skills to produce good quality, evidenced based funding applications. It is hard for smaller, volunteer led project to compete, even though they are likely to be the best placed within particular communities and may be the most cost effective. The process has recognised these challenges, and considered ways that the process can eliminate any disadvantages. One way has been to support organisations through the Capacity Building Programmes funded by the current IGF programme.

GEF have also made comments on longer term aims of the fund over 3-5 year period, namely “Longer term objectives for the new fund could include further embedding co-production, phasing out rental costs for City Property premises for third sector to reduce rental costs, moving towards co-location of services where that is appropriate, improved data collection, equalities disaggregation and mapping of services, better recording and publicising of outcomes achieved and more clarity about how other community planning partners are supporting the third sector, particularly what is being funded by GCC Health and Social Care Partnership (HSCP).” Some of these comments fit in with other strategic objectives relating to GCC property.

NOT OFFICIAL

4. OUTCOMES, ACTION & PUBLIC REPORTING

Further Action Required/ Action To Be Undertaken	Lead Officer and/or Lead Strategic Group	Timescale for Resolution of Negative Impact (s) / Delivery of Positive Impact (s)
<p>This EQIA needs to be updated as the work on the new Grants programme progresses.</p> <p>Some actions will be practical e.g. GEF members making recommendations for equalities monitoring information in the application forms.</p> <p>GEF members should have the opportunity to comment on EQIA on ongoing basis, when updates are required.</p> <p>It is also recommended that GEF provide capacity building support on equalities to the wider Third Sector. This would tie together suggestions for changing the information gathered by organisations, as well as providing best practice guidance for engaging with people with protected characteristics. Once the fund is ready to be launched, consideration needs to be given to inclusive marketing e.g. use of different language, fonts, use of Equality networks and organisations to promote the fund.</p>	<p>EQIA Group – Judith Hunter, Jackie Henderson and Cormac Quinn, GCC and Lorraine Barrie, GEF.</p> <p>GEF plus support from GCC.</p>	<p>Updates are ongoing as further detail of the new fund is clarified.</p> <p>GEF recommendations on the application form completed by end of August 2019</p> <p>Further consultation with GEF by end of October 2019</p> <p>GEF capacity building programme to be delivered 2020/21</p> <p>Grant fund was promoted via the Glasgow Equality Forum and Equality Bulletin. An audio visual guide was also produced to support applications.</p>

NOT OFFICIAL

<p>In addition, consideration needs to be given to specific equalities support required for organisations to apply and for capacity building of small organisations.</p>		<p>During application process – September to November 2019, additional support was provided by consultants in the GCVS/CEIS capacity building programme. This gave increased opportunity for equalities orgs and smaller orgs the best chance to submit good applications.</p>
--	--	--

5. MONITORING OUTCOMES, EVALUATION & REVIEW

The Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) screening is not an end in itself but the start of a continuous monitoring and review process. The relevant Strategic, Policy, or Operational Group responsible for the delivery of the Policy, Project, Service Reform or Budget Option, is also responsible for monitoring and reviewing the EQIA Screening and any actions that may have been take to mitigate impacts.

Individual services are responsible for conducting the impact assessment for their area, staff from **Corporate Strategic Policy and Planning** will be available to provide support and guidance. As stated, this EQIA is still in a draft stage and more data and information to be added when more detail is available. However, the review group will continue to meet to ensure actions are delivered within the correct timescale. Monitoring of the Equalities impacts will be gathered at both the application stage and at the annual monitoring return stage and a report provided to enable any review process to take place. More equalities information is being gathered via the new application form, which means that there will be a much improved baseline going forward.

In addition, the group of Council officers in the EQIA working group will meet again in December 2019 to consider how well this EQIA has impacted on the application and assessment process.

NOT OFFICIAL