

**Equalities Impact Assessment for :
Delivering Value Through London’s Cultural Services Programme**

Assessment Form – Equality Target Groups

Please use the table below to assess the impact of services/policies/function on the agreed equality target groups.

Consider the impact of this policy or function would have on the listed equality target groups

	Positive impact – it could benefit	Negative impact – it could disadvantage	Reason
Gender: Men	✓		Cultural services deliver outcomes for people and this programme is designed to support Local Authorities effectively deliver against wider outcomes and Local Area priorities, including provided targeted services based on need as identified in Local Area Agreements
Women	✓		“
Race: Asian or British Asian people	✓		“
Black or black British people	✓		“
Chinese or other people	✓		“
People of mixed race	✓		“
White people - including Irish people	✓		“
Disabled People	✓		“
Lesbians or gay men	✓		“
Age Older People (60+)	✓ ✓		“

Young people (17-25) and children			
Faith Groups	✓		"
Equal opportunities and or improved relations	✓		The programme particularly contributes to national indicators for community cohesion

Notes:

Categories are from Race section of the 2001 census. Please consider also the needs of specific communities within broad categories e.g. Bangladeshi people and other communities, which do not appear as a separate category in the census e.g. Turkish/Turkish Cypriot, Greek/Greek Cypriot, Italian and Polish people. Faith Groups include the most common- Muslims, Christians, Buddhists Jews Sikhs and Hindus. Please consider categories individually and collectively when considering positive and negative impacts.

Looking at your findings, in what areas are there concerns that the policy/function could have a negative impact? Tick all that apply

- | | |
|------------|--------------------------|
| Gender | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Race | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sexuality | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Age | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Faith | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please state if the negative impact you have identified is Legal (i.e. not discriminatory under anti-discriminatory legislation).

N/a
Yes
No

Identify the level of impact

N/a
High
Low

Describe how you could minimise any impact that is of low significance

Areas of high impact should be exposed to a full equality impact assessment as outlined in section 3 of the accompanying impact assessment document.

Equality Impact Assessment

Please refer to the supporting document attached to assist with completion.

The service, policy or function being assessed

Delivering Value Through London's Cultural Services Programme

Manager responsible for the assessment

Sue Thiedeman

Officers within the functional unit responsible for carrying out the assessment

Sue Thiedeman

Others who will be involved in the process (Officers, stakeholders, community groups etc)

Leisure Culture and the Olympics

1. The Overview Summary

- (i) The main issues relating to equality, diversity and community cohesion are ensuring that the programme is extended to all London Boroughs. Engagement with the initial phase of the London Cultural Improvement Programme has been exceptional with over 90% sign up achieved for all programmes and 100% sign up for the Library Change Programme. This programme intends to build on this success and ensure effective engagement with London boroughs.
- (ii) The Programme supports London boroughs to meet National Performance Indicators, and will impact on community cohesion indicators. In particular London's events provide an opportunity for people from all backgrounds to meet and enjoy activities in their local area.
- (iii) The Programme encourages collaborative working and facilitates the sharing of best practice; this will raise standards and improve working practices across the capital.
- (iv) The marketing training will improve promotion of local authority cultural activities and programmes and improve access to these opportunities. The programme will include a module on reaching hard to reach groups
- (v) The Place Survey carried out every 3 years, tests people's satisfaction with cultural services.

2. Applying an external challenge

The Programme has been developed following extensive consultation with Local Authorities and stakeholders the programme is subject to approval by the Capital Ambition Programme Board

3. The Impact Assessment

Area being assessed:

“Delivering Value Through London’s Cultural Services”

Date assessment commencing:

14/7/09

What evidence is there that the design of the policy/function **does not** contribute to improving the quality of life outcomes for specific groups in the community?
 (Consider impact on grounds of race, disability, age, gender, & sexuality)

The Programme will be subject to robust monitoring procedures through the Programme’s governance arrangements and by the Capital Ambition Programme Board

What potential is there for the policy or function to contribute to quality of life outcomes for specific groups from the point of race, disability, age, gender & sexuality?

Delivering Value Through London’s Cultural Services	NATIONAL INDICATORS															
	1	2	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	14	17	18	50	54	110	117
B. B. Working with Children’s services	ü		ü										ü	ü	ü	ü
C. C. Heritage Change Programme.		ü	ü	ü			ü	ü	ü						ü	
D. D. Improvement Programme for London Events	ü		ü	ü	ü	ü		ü	ü	ü	ü	ü			ü	
E. E. Marketing and Boosting London’s Visitor Economy			ü			ü	ü	ü	ü							

Please describe some examples of good practice supporting equalities relating to the area being assessed

The initial phase one of the London Cultural Improvement Programme has been commended by the I&DeA as an example of good practice

This programme aims to identify and share good practice across all London Boroughs

Is there written evidence to show that the service which the policy or function represents supports and promotes equality of opportunity?

The host organisation and all partners to the programme have a policy for equal opportunities.
London Boroughs are working towards various levels of the Local Government Standard for Equalities and this is included in the Culture and Sport Improvement Tool Self Assessment and would form part of a Borough's improvement plan if it were deemed to be unsatisfactory

Describe how the aim of this service demonstrates consistency with Council policy on equalities, diversity and community cohesion.

The Programme supports delivery against national indicators for community cohesion

Please give examples of available data used to monitor the take up of service relating to this policy or function.

The Place Survey assesses levels of resident satisfaction with the local area and with cultural services,

What does the data tell us about the take up of this service?

Despite the fact that these are increasing London still ranks as the lowest region for satisfaction of place, with 74.9% compared to a national average of 79.7%, it is also the lowest region for NI2, % who feel they belong to their immediate neighbourhood at 52% with the average for England being 58.7%. London Performed poorly in the previous BVPI satisfaction performance indicators, for example: only one borough was above the upper threshold for satisfaction with sport and leisure facilities and 13 were below; 17 boroughs were below the lower threshold for satisfaction with museums and galleries and 16 for theatres and concert halls. This performance was the worst of any region and clearly identified that London was not reaching its obvious potential in this area. The place survey results for satisfaction (though not directly comparable due to differing methodology) clearly put Londoners satisfaction with sport and culture equally badly compared to other English regions, for example: satisfaction with London's museum and galleries and theatres and concert halls is the worst in the county at 35.8% and 39% respectively compared with a national average of 41.5% and 41.2% and top scores of 46.1% and 46.7%; satisfaction with London's public libraries is ranked second lowest at 67.6% compared with a national average of 69%.;satisfaction with sport and leisure facilities is just above the national average of 46.2% with 46.5% satisfaction ;satisfaction with London's parks and open spaces is however the second from top rating in the country with 72.3% compared with the national average of 68.5%. There is also considerable variation across London with all the place survey results and some of the lowest scores in the country occurring in London boroughs.

If there is evidence of disadvantage, who does it affect and for what reasons?

National Indicators for sport and culture strongly correlate with levels of education attainment and household income, it is possible to use this data to

identify need based on levels of participation and demographics

There is considerable variation in both provision and quality of cultural services across London boroughs and also a considerable variation in participation levels and propensity to engage

Using the learning obtained from examining the take up of this service, what changes or practical measures do you think could be introduced which might reduce disadvantage to particular groups? (Consider direct and indirect discrimination)

Improved use of data and evidence to target services according to need would represent a best practice example

Please describe the forms of consultation used to obtain public opinion of this service.

Place survey

Taking Part

Local Authority customer and residents surveys

What does available data tell us about the consultation process/processes used for this service is the process inclusive?

The process is robust and forms part of the National Performance Framework

If there is evidence of disadvantage, what are the reasons for this?

There is considerable variation in participation across London

Using the learning obtained from examining the existing consultation process, what changes or practical measures do you think could be introduced which might reduce disadvantage to particular groups? (Consider direct and indirect discrimination)

Use data and evidence to target services based on need

Describe the measures that could be introduced to proactively improve access to the service?

Improve marketing and promotion of cultural services