

## FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

<b>Area of Assessment:</b>	<b>Essex Crime Prevention Fund 2022-23</b>
<b>Date of Assessment:</b>	<b>10 May 2022</b>
<b>Owner:</b>	<b>Greg Myddelton (Strategic Head of Partnerships and Delivery)</b>
<b>New or existing policy / function:</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>Stage 1 – Detail of policy, function, project or proposal</b>	
Briefly describe the aims, objectives and outcomes of the policy/function	
<p>The Crime Prevention Fund is a small grants programme that allocates funding to groups in Essex (eg charities, community groups) with the intention of delivering on the Police and Crime Plan commitment to continue investing in crime prevention. The PFCC made £200,000 available via the Crime Prevention Fund to coincide with the publication of the Police and Crime Plan 2021 - 2024 and the Crime Prevention Strategy.</p> <p>A total of 62 applications were received and, after evaluation, 16 organisations across Essex were selected as successful.</p>	
What policies / procedures / functions are relevant to this area?	
<p>This Fund relies on our grant funding agreements as the legal framework through which we ensure the funding is allocated and utilised in the way outlined in the approved bid. The PFCC's standard grant funding agreement has recently been reviewed and updated to ensure its continued fitness for purpose.</p>	
<b>Stage 2 – Consider the Evidence</b>	
Which individuals and organisations are likely to be affected by the policy / function and in what way?	
<p>Those organisations applying for funding and the individuals that engage with those organisations during the delivery phase of this work.</p>	
What relevant quantitative data has been considered?	
<p>Other than generic needs assessments, there is relatively little quantitative data available. Some applicants included evidence of the number of service users they engage with or other demographic data to evidence the need for their intervention, but there was no requirement within the criteria for any specific datasets to be incorporated within bids.</p>	

When evaluating the allocation of funds, consideration was given to making the process as fair as possible whilst also providing coverage of the whole county to make sure that no geographic areas of Essex were excluded. This was articulated within the fund criteria.

What relevant qualitative data has been considered?

As above, this was dependent on the information shared within the bids. Some applications included case studies, or examples of individuals already supported by agencies. This was helpful to the panel as it brought services to life and gave real examples of the impact that projects aimed to achieve.

As part of the evaluation process, members of the panel shared any anecdotal information they had about the areas each bid worked in as well as the themes the bid focused on or any data they held about the group itself that they were able to share.

Has the function / policy been subject to consultation? If no, why not? If yes, which individuals and organisations were consulted and what form did consultation take?

The development of the fund and the way it was administered was discussed through the PFCC's Senior Management Team (for example at the meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2022) and Management Team (discussed on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2022). In addition, the process was informed by an independent internal audit of our commissioning and grant funding processes carried out by RSM in 2021.


The fund used deliberately open criteria which encouraged a wide range of bids. This is based on feedback received from bidders that they welcome less prescriptive criteria in order to stimulate innovative approaches.

We use feedback from bidders and those on the evaluation panel to inform the continual development of our processes.

Were any gaps in information identified? If so, what consideration has been given to commissioning work where required?

No specific gaps identified other than the need for funding streams for small community groups to respond in the way this fund intends. I would expect that robust needs assessment processes that accompany our formally contracted services (eg for victim support services) would be more appropriate for identifying gaps in provision.

### Stage 3- Assessment of impact

		Yes/No	Comments and evidence where appropriate
Potential for differential	Race	Y	 PFCC Crime Prevention Fund -Cr

			<p>The attached Crime Prevention Fund criteria specifically encouraged bids which “Recognise and welcome the increased diversity of Essex”. This demonstrates the desire of the fund to ensure that projects funded are reflective of all communities and groups in the county.</p> <p>The criteria also notes that projects may focus on groups with specific characteristics, e.g. through “Work to reduce the fear women feel in their communities”. This has an obvious impact of being targeted towards certain groups and focusing accessibility and outcomes on those groups.</p> <p>We also acknowledge that some individuals or communities, such as those with a disability, those from different ethnic or cultural groups, or those with English as a second language, may face barriers to entry into more traditional offers of support / intervention. Within the fund criteria we therefore asked groups to outline their “Target audience including how the project will be accessible to the target audience” so that consideration was given to making the projects available to all. Accessibility was also considered when the bids were evaluated.</p> <p>As part of our monitoring arrangements, we require successful bidders to provide performance information that demonstrates achievement of the impact articulated in the application. The monitoring template also asks groups to consider the Equality Act, and specifically asks organisations to answer: “How will this grant support delivery against the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation.</li> <li>- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share one or more protected characteristics and those who do not.</li> <li>- Foster good relations between people who share one or more protected characteristics and those who do not”</li> </ul> <p>The monitoring form asks basic demographic information including the age, gender,</p>
	<b>Disability (Including physical, sensory and mental health)</b>	Y	
	<b>Gender reassignment</b>	N	
	<b>Age</b>	N	
	<b>Religion or belief</b>	N	
	<b>Sexual orientation</b>	N	
	<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	N	
	<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	N	
	<b>Sex</b>	Y	

			sexuality, ethnicity and whether those engaged have a disability. This allows the PFCC to track the diversity of the individuals engaged within each project.
--	--	--	---

<b>Stage 4 – Deciding the way forward</b>			
If potential for differential / adverse impact remains, explain why implementation is justifiable in order to meet the wider policy aims.			
<p>The fund criteria seek to ensure that potential differential impacts for those with protected characteristics are considered, and where they exist (for example, in projects designed to tackle violence against women and girls), these are deliberate and positive.</p> <p>With the steps outlined in stage 3 we do not believe any adverse impacts remain.</p>			
Summarise any changes made to the policy to reduce or remove the potential for differential / adverse impact			
<p>The fund criteria seek to minimise any adverse impact by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlighting a requirement for consideration of the diversity of Essex</li> <li>• Requiring bids to outline specifically how the target audience of each project will be engaged</li> <li>• Outlining monitoring requirements, including capture of demographic information and questions regarding how the Equality Act is complied with.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, and outside the bid criteria document, the process of evaluating bids and making proposals about the allocation of funding consider whether the bids give due consideration to the equality, diversity and inclusion agenda.</p>			
If the function / policy is to be abandoned, please explain why and how the implications will be managed			
<p>If we chose not to utilise the funding, it may have an adverse effect on all protected characteristics as we would be missing the opportunity deliver on the Police and Crime Plan commitment to invest further in crime prevention.</p>			
Describe how the function / policy promotes good relations			
<p>The investment of this funding allows organisations to deliver interventions and projects that benefit local residents and communities and deliver on the Police and Crime Plan. There will be media opportunities as a result of this funding which will promote the positive impact of the PFCC's work and that of delivery organisations.</p>			

The availability of local, small grants is regularly identified by charitable groups and delivery partners as a gap that limits their ability to do good work in our communities. The allocation of this fund assists in addressing this concern.

### Stage 5 - Monitoring Arrangements

Describe how the function / policy is (or will be) monitored

This is a one-off grants programme so there is no requirement to continue to monitor the criteria, but any learning will be fed back into the PFCC's regular grant-giving work including the Community Safety Development Fund (CSDF). Feedback from individual projects can also be fed into the Commissioner's understanding of local needs and assets.

The delivery of individual projects supported through the fund will be monitored in accordance with the PFCC's standard grant funding agreement.

Have the assessment outcomes been fed back to those consulted?

Not applicable

<b>Impact assessed by:</b>	<b>Greg Myddelton (Strategic Head of Partnerships and Delivery)</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>10.5.22</b>
<b>Approved by (owner):</b>	<b>Pippa Brent-Isherwood (Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer)</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>01.07.2022</b>