

Equality Impact Assessment for Service changes / Budget proposals



WHAT IS AN EIA?

An EIA is a tool which will help you assess whether there are any positive or negative equality impacts on people affected by proposed changes. This EIA form is for use in two circumstances (service changes and budget proposals):-

- (a) Service change involves redesigning or reshaping, (and in some cases the removal of) current service provision – whether directly provided by Council officers or commissioned by the Council for provision by an external provider.
- (b) Budget proposals should arise from service changes that you are considering throughout the year in light of the current financial climate. The EIA for budget proposals should cover the same issues as considered for service changes.

Our public sector equality duty requires us to ensure that we do not discriminate against any protected group or person with protected characteristics (see below) covered by the Equality Act 2010 when taking decisions that affect them. Potential negative impacts that we disregard or ignore could mean discrimination. We also have a duty to actively promote positive impacts that advance equality of opportunity. The protected characteristics covered by the Equality Act 2010 are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation.

The EIA template has a series of questions that you need to answer in order to identify any positive or negative equality impacts arising from the work you are doing. If there are negative impacts, this does not mean we cannot go ahead. Decision makers must have “due regard” to the findings and consider (if they do decide to go ahead) whether any mitigating actions can be taken to address negative impacts.

WHY IS AN EIA REQUIRED?

An EIA helps us assess whether we are meeting our public sector equality duty: eliminating discrimination and promoting equality of opportunity.

For example: Providing equality of access to services or other opportunities (such as employment related issues) because of barriers some groups may experience which may not be in place for others (language, information, or location).

The action plan identifies what steps we can reasonably take as a consequence of the EIA findings.

An EIA also enables us to identify where we do not have the data or information necessary to equality impact a decision. The EIA action plan enables us to map out how and when this data gap will be addressed.

WHEN DO WE NEED AN EIA?

The first thing to do is to assess whether there is any equality impact. This can be done by filling in a **screening questionnaire** as soon as you start your project/report. Answer the screening questions in order to determine whether an EIA is needed.

HOW IS AN EIA CARRIED OUT?

Before you start: If you are not sure whether you need to do an EIA, fill in the screening questionnaire to determine whether you need to complete one. The screening questionnaire is not obligatory, but will help.

What to do: When an EIA is required:

Step 1 The proposal

This part is at the start of the planning process. It sets out the service user profile, the proposed change to the service, and potential equality impacts arising as a result of the proposal.

Step 2 Consultation

This part highlights the outcome of consultation with service stakeholders about the service change proposal and likely equality impacts.

Step 3 The recommendation

The final part of the EIA identifies any changes made to the original proposal in Step 2 as a result of consultation and further consideration.

Completing the form requires you to consider the impact on **service users**, with the exception of a single question about staff. In order to assess the equality impact of staffing changes, complete the separate **EIA template for organisational reviews** which presents the 'before' and 'after' staff profiles of services affected.

NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.

Equality Impact Assessment for service changes / budget proposals

Name of service	Support for the voluntary and community sector (commonly referred to as “infrastructure support”) and support for volunteering
Lead officer and Contact details	Miranda Cannon, Director of Delivery, Communications and Political Governance
List of other(s) involved	Equality officer: Irene Kszyk Finance officer: Colin Sharpe

What is this EIA about?

(Please tick✓)

Budget proposal for existing service or service contract to achieve savings	
Budget proposal for new or additional service expenditure	
Commissioning a new service or service contract	✓
Changing or removing an existing service or service contract	✓

Step 1: The proposal (how you propose to change the service)

Question 1:

<p>What is the proposal/proposed change?</p> <p>Current situation:</p> <p>The City Council currently commissions Voluntary Action Leicestershire (VAL) to deliver the following (ref: Specification of requirements for service agreement 2013 – 14):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build and maintain an appropriate infrastructure organisation that represents and supports all voluntary and community organisations in Leicester, based on NAVCA core standards; • To build and maintain an effective volunteer centre based on the six core functions as defined by Volunteering England; and • To build and maintain effective communication and consultation channels between the voluntary and community sector, the City Council, Leicester City CCG, and Leicestershire Constabulary and other statutory agencies as appropriate, that ensures the sector is fully engaged in both the planning and delivering of services, and in taking forward the City Mayor’s vision for the city. <p>Consultation proposals:</p> <p>The proposals set out a departure from this current approach which involves a model of direct “consultancy” type support to individual voluntary and community sector organisations.</p>
--

NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.

To be eligible for this support, organisations would need to meet eligibility criteria (e.g demonstrate that they deliver services which benefit local communities and that they practise equality of opportunity). The City Council would then work with each organisation to help determine their support needs through a simple diagnostic process. From a menu of support packages, the appropriate package(s) would then be agreed. VCS organisations would then be able to choose a provider for each of the support packages they need, from a range of providers approved by the City Council.

In relation to volunteering the consultation proposals seek views on the best way support could be delivered which would enable groups to be effective and confident in their ability to recruit, retain and manage volunteers, enable organisations to manage and develop new volunteering opportunities, particularly to tackle priority themes and city objectives, and ensure that volunteer managers have access to training and support, including networking opportunities. The options proposed are a one stop shop with one provider undertaking the full range of support activities, splitting out the two main components (brokerage and support) or for alternatives.

It is not proposed that the City Council would continue to fund activity relating to building and maintaining effective communication and consultation channels between the voluntary and community sector, the City Council and other statutory agencies as appropriate.

Further details on the proposals can be found <http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/corporate-resources-and-support/vcs>

Who will it affect and how will they likely be affected?

The proposals directly impact on voluntary and community organisations in the city and therefore indirectly on the beneficiaries of their services who may be individuals and / or organisations and groups. The aim of the review is to determine how the current needs of the VCS in the city can best be supported with a potentially more limited funding envelope.

Different services collect different types of data and service user information to capture the service they deliver and the outcome service users receive. The aim of the profile below is to capture what you already collect, not to make your information fit a standard template. List the equality profile of your service users. Where you find you do not address a particular characteristic, ask yourself why. You may need to follow up any information gaps as an action point. If this is the case, add it to the action plan at the end of the template.

Question 2:

What is the equality profile of current service users?

For 2012/13 the break-down of the groups that attended VAL networking events (43 events with a total of 200 local VCS groups attending) is as follows:

- White – 74% (152)
- BME – 26% (52)

Groups linked to other protected characteristics:

- Religion or belief – 7% (13)
- Sexual orientation – 4% (8)
- Age – 62% (123)
- Disability – 24% (48)
- Sex – 22% (43)

No groups were reported as being linked to gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership and pregnancy and maternity.

The above is based on VAL distinguishing groups as being managed and run by those with the protected characteristic as identified by the group itself.

The following table sets out the profile of organisations VAL has supported in 2012/13 compared to the make-up of organisations on their database.

Diversity of VCS organisations supported based on data VAL hold for the 282 groups we have supported this quarter

Diversity Characteristic	Of City groups on VAL database		Quarter 1 groups supported		Quarter 2 groups supported		Quarter 3 groups supported		Quarter 4 groups supported	
	No.	Propn	No.	Propn	No.	Propn	No.	Propn	No.	Propn
BME led organisations	344	38%	102	32%	73	31%	73	33%	76	27%
LGBT led organisations	5	1%	3	1%	1	1%	1	1%	2	1%
Older people led organisations	5	1%	5	2%	2	1%	3	1%	3	1%
Faith led organisations	41	4%	9	3%	10	4%	10	5%	12	4%
Mental Health led organisations	25	3%	14	4%	11	5%	13	6%	12	4%
Learning Disabilities	14	2%	5	2%	5	2%	5	2%	4	1%
Physical Disabilities	28	3%	14	4%	10	4%	9	4%	7	2%
Self Help group	38	4%	12	4%	9	4%	8	4%	10	4%
Women's group	55	6%	18	6%	14	5%	19	9%	11	4%
Young People's group	22	2%	12	4%	11	5%	11	5%	10	4%
No specific diversity characteristic	340	37%	125	39%	86	37%	124	56%	135	48%
Total City Groups	917		319		232		220		282	

Finally in relation to volunteering in 2012/13, VAL dealt with 6045 enquiries from 3044 individuals. In terms of the profile of those providing details at the point of accessing information about volunteering, 64% were from Leicester's BME communities which are higher than the BME demographic in the city as a whole. The table below provides further information on the profile as taken from VAL's quarter 4 report in 2012/13.

	City		Q1 VAL	Q2 VAL	Q3 VAL	Q4 VAL
Ethnicity						
BME People	42%		68%	70%	70%	64%
Not BME people	58%		32%	30%	30%	36%
Age						
Under 25	37.50%		59%	59%	58%	54%
Gender						
Men	48%		35%	32%	27%	32%
Women	52%		65%	68%	73%	68%

Do you anticipate any changes to your service user profile as a result of your proposal/proposed change? If yes, how will it change?

It is expected that the profile would continue to be broadly reflective of the overall profile of VCS organisations in the city.

Think about the diversity of your service users and the specific needs they may have that you need to address, depending on the service context and user group. An example of service need is school aged children having differing school meal requirements due to their ethnic or religious background; a potential issue could be poverty/low income having adverse impacts on children, women (lone parents), pensioners.

What are the main service needs and/or issues for those receiving the service because of their protected characteristic?

	Service needs and/or issues by protected characteristic
Age	No information available
Disability	No information available
Gender reassignment	No information available
Pregnancy and maternity	No information available
Race	No information available
Religion or belief	No information available
Sex (gender)	No information available
Sexual orientation	No information available

Consultation did not raise the issue of different protected characteristics needing different types of support. Consideration of how to meet the diverse range of needs across different protected characteristics will be included in contract specifications.

Question 3:

Will the proposal have an impact on people because of their protected characteristic? Tick the anticipated impact for those likely to be affected and describe that impact in the questions 4 & 5 below.

NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.

	No impact ¹	Positive impact ²	Negative impact ³	Impact not known ⁴
Age				√
Disability				√
Gender reassignment				√
Pregnancy and maternity				√
Race				√
Religion or belief				√
Sex (gender)				√
Sexual orientation				√

Question 4:

Where there is a positive impact, describe the impact for each group sharing a protected characteristic. How many people are likely to be affected?

Question 5:

Where there is a negative impact, describe the adverse impact for each group sharing a protected characteristic. How many people are likely to be affected?
How can the negative impact for each group sharing a protected characteristic be reduced or removed?

Question 6:

Which relevant stakeholders were involved in proposing the actions recommended for reducing or removing adverse impacts arising from the proposal?
Consultation with stakeholders will take place and inform the review and its proposals and potential impacts.
What data/information/analysis have you used to inform your equality impact findings?
VAL 2012/13 quarterly reports and annual report

Supplementary information

Question 7:

Is there other alternative or comparable provision available in the city? Who provides it and where is it provided?
As part of the review a soft market testing was undertaken in relation to the proposals around supporting the city's voluntary and community sector. There were 6 respondents to

¹ The proposal has no impact (positive or negative) on the group sharing a protected characteristic.

² The proposal addresses an existing inequality experienced by the group sharing a protected characteristic (related to provision of services or facilities).

³ The proposal disadvantages one or more of the group sharing a protected characteristic.

⁴ There is insufficient information available to identify if the group sharing a protected characteristic will be affected by the proposal.

NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.

this including VAL. The responses illustrated that there are a range of organisations out there who are working with groups and individuals to deliver a wide range of support and development activities with voluntary and community sector organisations. The SMT was advertised in Source Leicestershire from 25 November 2013 to 3 January 2014.

Examples of alternative forms of provision in the city in addition to the services provided by VAL, as identified by the Soft Market Testing carried out by Leicester City Council's Contracts & Assurance Section:

- CASE delivers capacity building, advice, training and support to people wanting to set up co-operatives and social enterprises in Leicester
- Leicestershire Cares provides volunteering opportunities for companies looking to get involved with communities in Leicestershire
- Leicestershire & Rutland ProHelp is a group of professional firms offering advice and guidance, free of charge, to not-for-profit groups in need of assistance.
- Supportive Aid Training Ltd take initial assessments by conducting a needs analysis exercise with the key stakeholders (service users and staff) to establish goals and aspirations.
- LASS Social Enterprise Ltd develops new social enterprise programmes in the health and social care sector, which enables a network of support linking organisations with others with similar issues, ways of working, delivery sites or on a geographical basis.

The SMT was representative and on a par with the responses we usually get from such an exercise. The main findings were that there are organisations who can provide bespoke and specific tailored training, they can do so on an ad hoc basis and they are prepared to enter into contractual negotiation on day rates.

Can this alternative or comparable provision help reduce or remove the negative impacts identified in Question 5? If not, why not?

N/A (no negative impact identified in Question 5)

Would service users negatively affected by the proposal be eligible to use this alternative or comparable provision? Would it meet their identified needs?

N/A (no service users identified as being negatively affected by the proposal)

Question 8:

Will any particular area of the city be more affected by the proposal than other parts of the city? What area and why?

72% of VCS groups in the city serve residents across all 22 wards. 37% of groups are located in Castle Ward and Spinney Hills with the remainder relatively evenly located across the remaining 20 wards. It is not expected that the proposals will have any impact on this distribution particularly as it will continue to be a city-wide approach working with all VCS groups who serve residents of the city.

For example, Government policies or proposed changes to current provision by public agencies (such as new benefit arrangements) that have an adverse impact on residents; external economic impacts such as the recession/economic downturn; socio-economic factors such as deprivation/low income.

NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.

Question 9:

Is it likely that there may be other sources of negative impacts affecting service users over the next three years that need to be considered? What might compound the negative effects of this proposal? Describe any additional negative impacts over time that could realistically occur.

Continued pressure on public finances will be the main impact. The VCS as a whole has a significant dependency on public money which is often time limited in nature. This will continue to generate significant demand for support from the VCS, and is likely to continue to generate demand in relation to volunteering particularly as a route to employment, and from organisations who need volunteers to support Board level governance.

Question 10:

Will staff providing the service be affected by the proposal/proposed changes? If yes, which posts and in what way?

We are unaware of any City Council staff being affected by the review and its potential outcome

Date completed 23/10/13

Step 2: Consultation on the proposal

Consulting potential service users on the proposal will provide you with an opportunity to collect information from them on the equality impacts they think may occur as a result of the proposed change, positive as well as negative. For negative impacts, this is an opportunity for them to identify how best to mitigate any negative impacts on them that they think may occur.

Question1:

**What consultation on the final proposal has taken place?
When, where and who with?**

The public consultation on the proposals commenced on 28 October 2013 and closed on 17 January 2014 (i.e. 12 weeks in duration). The approach was consistent with that agreed with the Executive at the outset: a public consultation open to everyone. The rationale was that this review could have implications for any resident in the city, not just VCS organisations themselves, inasmuch as the VCS provides a wide range of services to citizens in Leicester and equally citizens themselves may be involved in working for and / or supporting VCS organisations either as volunteers or as paid employees – or that they themselves (or their family and friends) could be past, present or future beneficiaries, employees or volunteers of VCS organisations and their services.

The consultation involved:

- an online survey posted on the City Council's Citizen Space consultation hub;
- hard copy questionnaires, completed versions of which which could be handed in at any one of 27 City Council sites across the city (e.g. public libraries);
- nine public briefing sessions scheduled across the city, facilitated by the Project Director

[NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.](#)

and the VCS Engagement Manager, with occasional support from other City Council officers; and

- attendance by the Project Director and/or VCS Engagement Manager at ad hoc meetings held on this matter by other organisations.

A press release was used to advertise the public consultation and the VAL e-bulletin was used to issue weekly updates on progress and to promote the face-to-face briefing sessions. A generic email account was set up to ensure the project team was able to monitor and share emails from all interested parties.

A total of 136 survey responses were received, including completed hard copy questionnaires. Content from the hard copy was manually typed into the online template for ease of analysis. This has been transferred directly without corrections to the original spelling or grammar, or any interpretation of what might be meant if the original text is unclear.

Appendix 2 of the Executive Decision Report is the report generated from Citizen Space on the quantitative questions. In addition, comments from the survey are captured in an Excel spreadsheet (which is available if required).

Of these 136 responses:

- 64 were on behalf of charities, voluntary organisations, social enterprises, faith-based or community groups. Of these, social enterprises formed the largest number (29) followed by charities (18);
- 10 were from people describing themselves as volunteers;
- 57 were from service users; and
- 5 chose not to classify their answers under any of these categories.

Of the hard copy returns, 21 were received as a bundle from SDS, self-identified as having been completed and submitted "on your own behalf as a service user". However, it appears that service users were assisted to complete these forms, as the same handwriting was used across many of the forms, all of which contained very similar comments and expressed a consistent view in terms of supporting the proposals and in appealing for continued support for SDS.

The majority of organisations responding to the survey provide services across the city, with only six stating that they operate in a single ward (wards referenced being Evington, Fosse, Freeman and Spinney Hills). Others stated that while their service was primarily based and focused on a defined area of the city, it was of a kind that would be accessible to anyone.

In relation to the size of organisations responding, we asked them to indicate their level of gross income, the number of staff they employ and number of volunteers they work with. The results show a spread across all the specified income ranges (although only one organisation declared its gross income as being over £1 million) and across staffing levels and volunteer numbers.

Finally the survey asked for an indication of the area of work that the responding organisations undertake. "Community development/neighbourhood involvement" formed the largest response (26 out of 36 who completed this section). There were several areas of

[NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.](#)

work which were not covered (e.g. disability, domestic violence, offenders, race and ethnicity, and refugees and asylum seekers). However it should be noted that some of these areas were represented among the organisations attending the public briefing sessions (see Appendix 5 of the Executive Decision Report).

There is more information in Appendix 2 of the Report on the type, size and focus of the organisations completing the questionnaire. Appendix 5 of the Report lists all the organisations which responded in some way to the consultation (by completing and returning the questionnaire either online or as hard copy, by attending a public briefing session or by submitting messages with general comments or support for an organisation or service).

Many respondents to the review made meaningful contributions only to that part which they perceived as directly impacting on their own organisation(s) or area(s) of interest, rather than contributing to the questionnaire as a whole.

Nine public briefing sessions were planned, from 6 November to 13 January 2014.

- 78 people attended;
- 44 VCS organisations were represented (listed in Appendix 5 of the Report);
- 5 of the VCS organisations in scope of this review were represented at these briefings.

One session (Knighton Library, 12 December 2013) was cancelled due to only one person having registered to attend (who was offered an alternative date and venue). A relevant public meeting organised by another agency was being held elsewhere in the city at the same time (which the City Council VCS Engagement Manager attended).

At the public briefing sessions there was a short presentation giving an overview of the review aims, objectives and proposals. The sessions were then opened up to participants to discuss specific areas of interest in small groups. Detailed notes were taken at the sessions (which are available if required).

In addition there were:

- Face-to-face meetings with the current provider – VAL;
- Emails/letters of support for the current provider;
- Other feedback via email/letter;
- Attendance at 3 other meetings at the invitation of groups / organisations, one of which was held at VAL; and
- The Project Team monitored comments posted on social media sites.

Question 2:

What potential impacts did consultation stakeholders identify?

In relation to support for the VCS stakeholders were concerned about:

- The proposal would be administratively costly, consequently not best value for money;
- It could potentially be bureaucratic and burdensome as an approach;
- Support would be difficult to access, particularly for smaller volunteer-led groups, with a general concern about having to “jump through hoops” to get access;
- Potential for the approach to fragment the VCS rather than support partnership working

[NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.](#)

and collaboration (echoed in the public briefing sessions);

- Lack of future support for communication, consultation and engagement, a “collective voice” for the VCS (echoed in the public briefing sessions);
- Resources would be stretched too thinly, raising concern about whether organisations get support outside of the defined packages, and what happens once they have used up their allocation because there would be no means of ongoing advice, support and guidance for the VCS (echoed in the public briefing sessions);
- Doubt that robust quality control and feedback could be assured; and
- The ability and capacity of organisations to make best use of and act on the support.

Headlines regarding strand 1 from the public briefing sessions – positive and negative – are shown below (more detailed notes, from each individual meeting, as well as compiled thematically, are available on request):

- concern over loss of collective voice for the VCS in the city as this model does not appear to offer any way of bringing together people, groups and organisations, either in forums or consortia;
- concern over loss of single overarching organisation for VCS; VAL provides best practice, advice, guidance, helpline and ad hoc support virtually on tap – and aspects such as VAL’s e-briefings received positive comments;
- this model would not allow consortia to access support – counter-productive if Leicester City Council and other relevant agencies (such as LLEP) want to encourage groups and organisations to work together more closely in partnership, particularly where this will help to ensure greater financial sustainability and the ability to leverage more funding;
- Worcestershire County Council model⁵ inappropriate, even when adapted to local circumstances, with concerns about it being administratively burdensome and that it would stretch limited resources too thinly to have positive impact;
- groups and organisations of different age, experience, purpose and size require different kinds of support – model does not appear to acknowledge or cater for this;
- concern over diagnostic or triage aspect of model – potential for conflict of interest and for organisations to be reticent to come forward for diagnostic, revealing their weaknesses when they may be hoping to get contracted work from Leicester City Council;
- mixed response to the place of VAL in the review, with as many respondents expressing dissatisfaction with its current service as satisfaction, and many expressing concern about downgrading the level of support that VAL might receive from the City Council, leading in turn to a downgrading in the support that VAL would be able to give the sector;
- some positive responses to City Council proposing to target directly a wider range of VCS organisations at the grass roots;
- some attendees liked the idea that VCS organisations would be able to choose support options more suited to their needs, from providers with whom they could build a meaningful relationship; and
- clear picture of support-needs being focused on financial sustainability, including new

⁵ The proposals for this first strand were based on the “Changing Futures Fund”, put in place some 18 months ago by Worcestershire County Council as a way of refreshing its relationship with the VCS in its area of jurisdiction. While acknowledging that Worcestershire is obviously a very different place from Leicester (and their local authority very different from our City Council), the principles appeared sound and adaptable to local circumstances. However, having tested this out with those who participated in our review, there was virtual unanimity that the proposed model would not suit the needs of Leicester’s VCS and that it was not sufficiently workable in terms of an efficient and effective approach. The project team kept a weather eye on how the Worcestershire model had fared in other parts of the country where it had been adopted (to which the answer has to be, that it hasn’t fared well). Despite the shortcomings of the proposed model, which became clear early in the consultation, foregrounding that we were considering adopting this approach yielded useful results, in that it helped us identify and understand what it is that the sector needs and values, and to identify local priorities for support.

NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.

ways of working, identification of funding opportunities and fund-raising (including bid-writing), support for good governance, and core support for organisations that are just setting up or are newly established.

In relation to support for volunteering there were no specific equality impacts identified, the consultation helped to highlight the sort of focus and emphasis organisations wanted in a service which supports volunteering, for example making it easier to recruit volunteers and more recognition for volunteers themselves.

What positive equality impacts were identified? For people with which protected characteristics?

None identified

What negative equality impacts were identified? For people with which protected characteristics?

There were concerns about the lack of future engagement / support for BME groups specifically including reference to the work done by TREC in hosting the Racial Minority Assembly for BME VCS organisations.

Greater representation of organisations which focus on mental health.

VAL currently identifies 38% of the VCS organisations on its database as BME led and 3% of the VCS organisations on its database as focusing on mental health. In relation to the profile of groups they supported during 2012/13, BME-led groups made up less than 38%, while mental health focused groups made up more than 3%.

Question 3:

Did stakeholders indicate how positive impacts could be further promoted? How?

As above – no specific issues relating to positive equality impacts were identified

Did stakeholders indicate how negative impacts could be reduced or removed? How?

Retain current provision including continuing support for TREC to host the Racial Minority Assembly

Ensure support takes account of groups working in the area of mental health

Date completed 07/02/14

Step 3: The recommendation (the recommended decision on how to change the service)

Question 1:

Has your recommended proposal changed from the proposal in Step 1 as a result of consultation and further consideration?

Yes

If yes, describe the revised proposal and how it will affect current service users?

As a result of the consultation the proposals have changed and it is proposed to use the consultation findings to develop more tailored and focused specifications as the basis for tendering. It is proposed that this be packaged as two separate specifications, as follows:

- **Supporting collaboration and a collective voice for the VCS:** A service that focuses on building and maintaining effective channels of communication and consultation between the VCS, City Council and the wider public sector. The service should promote effective partnership working and collaboration between VCS organisations in order to maximise opportunities for leveraging external funding (thereby helping organisations improve their financial sustainability) and enable the VCS to engage effectively in the planning, delivery, monitoring and improvement of services, particularly in taking forward the City Mayor's priorities for Leicester.
- **Provision of guidance, advice and training to VCS organisations:** A service which effectively supports Voluntary and Community Sector organisations in the city, focusing on support in relation to: financial sustainability; business planning; new ways of working; fund raising and bidding for funding; good governance and organisational set up.

Separating these out as discrete packages of activity (the former related to connected, collective activities; the latter to individual VCS organisations) is preferred to a single tender, as it is hoped this would enable a wider range of organisations to bid.

In relation to volunteering there will be a tendering process for an organisation to deliver a one-stop-shop service, recruiting, developing, retaining and managing volunteers, matching them to appropriate opportunities and supporting the agencies, groups and organisations that use them, which specifically takes the following into account:

- Giving something back to volunteers: a desire to have some form of accreditation for volunteers that helps recognise the skills and development they have gained from volunteering, and that also enables transferrable skills on core common elements to be recognised (e.g. health and safety, safeguarding, first aid, equal opportunities, boundaries and communications) and enables them to step into volunteering roles at other organisations quickly, smoothly and securely;
- Making it easier and more efficient for organisations to recruit and manage volunteers through central provision of the common core training (e.g. health and safety and safeguarding), on-line versions of policies that can be taken and adapted accordingly, and a centralised approach to DBS checks, combined with a simple on-line approach to brokerage;
- Acknowledging the different types of volunteers and more explicitly supporting the recruitment of volunteers with appropriate skills to serve as Board members and Trustees; and
- Overall recognition of the importance of volunteering to meet a range of objectives, including specifically as a route into employment and also to support health and wellbeing (e.g. to help those who are more vulnerable as a result of mental health conditions).

What are the equality implications of these changes? Identify the likely positive and negative impacts of the final proposal and the protected characteristic affected.

Go back to the initial exercise you carried out at the beginning, on understanding your equality profile. Re-visit each characteristic and what has changed as a result of amending your recommendation. Revise potential positive and negative equality impacts accordingly.

The proposals retain the key elements of the support service which is currently commissioned but use the consultation findings to refine and focus this to respond to the views of the voluntary and community sector that will receive this support. The impact should be a service which is more focused and aligned to the sector's needs and the City Mayor's priorities.

In relation to volunteering, again this will retain the core service but with a refined focus and emphasis.

The anticipated positive impacts of these proposals are that they will ensure continued support for VCS organisations and volunteers to enable them to continue their activities in the city, but in closer alignment with the sector's specific needs as identified in the consultation.

How can any negative impacts be reduced or removed?

Future specifications to refer to the need for the service to be representative of the profile of VCS groups in the city, and the City Council to then monitor the profile of VCS organisations which take up the services proposed.

The revised proposals that are being recommended will provide for support for partnership working and collaboration. If there is a need for it, this could include partnership working and collaboration between groups who have commonalities in terms of the area they work in and / or the beneficiaries of this service including mental health and BME-led VCS organisations.

There were no evident equality implications arising in relation to volunteering. However it is important to note that the current service user profile in relation to volunteering shows a high proportion of volunteering enquiries are from the BME community (higher than the ethnicity profile for the city as a whole). Similarly, a high proportion of enquiries are from the under-25 age group. This finding is not unsurprising, inasmuch as volunteering is widely considered a route to employment for young people. It will be important to monitor the equalities profile of service users of any future service.

Question 2:

Are there any actions⁶ required as a result of this EIA?

Yes

If yes, complete the action plan on the next page.

⁶ Actions could include improving equality information collected or identifying the actions required to mitigate adverse impacts identified in the EIA.

NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.

Date completed 28/02/14

Step 4: Sign-off

This EIA completed by	Name	Signature	Date
Lead officer	George Ballentyne		
Countersigned by Equalities Officer	Irene Kszyk		
Signed off by Divisional Director	Miranda Cannon		

Completion - Keep a copy for your records, and **send an electronic copy** of the completed and signed form to the [Corporate Equalities Lead](#) for audit purposes

EIA Action Plan

Please list all the equality objectives, actions and targets that result from the Equality Impact Assessment. These should be included in the relevant service plan for performance management purposes.

Equality Objective	Action required	Target	Officer responsible	By when?
Example: To know equality profile of all service users.	Example: collect monitoring data on disabled users (currently not being provided)	Example: To have data for first performance review	Example: Joe Smith	Example: Start collection of data in April 2013
Specifications to make clear the need to ensure the service seeks to meet the needs of the range of VCS groups in the city.	Ensure appropriate wording is included in the specifications	To ensure that that service responds to the needs of the VCS in the city	George Ballentyne	1 July 2014
City Council to monitor the profile of VCS organisations which take up the services proposed.	Monitor the profile of service users of the newly commissioned services	To ensure the profile of service users is suitably representative of the VCS in the city	George Ballentyne	Quarterly monitoring
Tracking the profile of volunteers receiving support.	Monitoring information collected from volunteers.	To annually present an equality profile of volunteers active in the VCS.	George Ballentyne	Annual report

NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.

What to do next?

If this EIA has identified any issues that need to be addressed (such as plugging a data gap, or carrying out a specific action that reduces or removes any negative impacts identified), complete the attached EIA Action Plan to set out what action is required, who will carry it out, and when it will be carried out/completed.

Once your EIA has been completed, (countersigned by the equalities officer/finance officer **and signed off by your Director**) the equality officer will work with you to monitor this action plan.

Officers to contact:

Corporate Equalities Lead/Corporate Resources and Support: Irene Kszyk 296303

Adult Social Care, Health & Housing: Gurjit Minhas 298706

Children's Services: Sonya King 297738

City Development & Neighbourhoods: Daxa Patel 296674

NB Any Actions you identify through completing this EIA, you must add to the Action Plan at the end.