



**DRAFT Equality Impact Assessment  
Cultural Services  
(Surrey Arts, Heritage, Adult  
Community Learning)**

# DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

## 1. Topic of assessment

<b>EIA title:</b>	Cultural Services Public Value Reviews (including the Heritage, Surrey Arts, and Adult and Community Learning PVRs)
-------------------	---

<b>EIA author:</b>	Sally Wilson, Barrie Higham, Tracey Fottrell, Ian Dewar
--------------------	---

## 2. Approval

	Name	Date approved
<b>Approved by<sup>1</sup></b>	Peter Milton	

## 3. Quality control

<b>Version number</b>	1.2	<b>EIA completed</b>	
<b>Date saved</b>	22/10/12	<b>EIA published</b>	

## 4. EIA team

Name	Job title (if applicable)	Organisation	Role
Sally Wilson	Corporate Planning and Improvement Manager	Surrey County Council	Heritage PVR Lead
Barrie Higham	Culture and Tourism Legacy Officer	Surrey County Council	Surrey Arts PVR Lead
Tracey Fottrell	Directorate Support Manager, Customers and Communities	Surrey County Council	Surrey Arts PVR Lead
Ian Dewar	Policy Manager, Customers and Communities.	Surrey County Council	ACL PVR Lead
Paul Hoffman	Adult Learning Manager	Surrey County Council	ACL PVR Lead
Nina Schuller	Policy Officer, Customers and Communities	Surrey County Council	Heritage and Surrey Arts PVR Project Officer
Vicki Eade	Policy Officer, Customers and Communities	Surrey County Council	Surrey Arts PVR Project Officer
Gregory Finneron	Policy Officer, Customers and Communities	Surrey County Council	ACL PVR Project Officer
Angeliki Humphries	Policy Officer (Equalities & Cohesion), Customers and Communities	Surrey County Council	Advisor on this EIA.

<sup>1</sup> Refer to earlier guidance for details on getting approval for your EIA.

# DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

## 5. Explaining the matter being assessed

<p><b>What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?</b></p>	<p>The findings of the three PVRs pointed to the considerable additional benefits that would accrue from working together within a clear Cultural Services framework that also incorporates Libraries and Registration Services. This, and the realisation that many of the same issues have been identified for improvement and development in each service, suggested the integration of the final reporting of the reviews</p> <p>In keeping with this, the “Cultural Services” PVR EIA focuses on the equality implications of the commonalities and the potential synergies arising from the PVR findings and reflected in the combined report recommendations.</p> <p>There are separate detailed EIAs in relation to each of the cultural services PVRs and these provide more detail on the services being reviewed.</p>
<p><b>What proposals are you assessing?</b></p>	<p>The joint report on the three PVRs has four recommendations which will be delivered through joint and individual service actions to be detailed in the Service Improvement Plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Notes the outcomes of the three PVRs and confirms these roll forward into a new strategy and vision for Cultural Services in Surrey, with detailed Service Improvement Plans in place by March 2013.</li> <li>(b) Agrees that a refreshed strategy and vision is developed for Cultural Services, including Libraries and Registration Services, which will position Surrey to become a leader for quality cultural activity in the country.</li> <li>(c) Requests that a feasibility study is undertaken to create options for the provision of a new cultural hub that would position Surrey at the forefront of culture nationally and internationally, to be brought back to Cabinet for decision.</li> <li>(d) Agrees that a detailed research and evaluation project is undertaken to assess the potential benefits and risks of a new approach to the delivery of Cultural Services through other business models.</li> <li>(e) Agrees that, following completion of the Service Improvement Plans, a follow-up report is presented to the Cabinet Member, detailing all financial implications for final decision.</li> </ul> <p>Specific Equalities Impact Assessments will be undertaken as part of detailed implementation and delivery. For some recommendations, such as proposals for structural change, the inherently different characteristics of the individual services will require individual service-specific EIAs to be undertaken but, in keeping with the overall</p>

# DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	<p>direction towards a more cohesive approach to the development of Culture and Learning leadership for the county, cross-service assessments will be undertaken where appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</b></p>	<p>These Cultural Services already provide and tailor services to people with protected characteristics - detailed information on this is provided in the individual PVR EIAs.</p> <p>Specific service provision has been developed in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children and young people (including children on free school meals, looked after children, young carers and asylum seekers, those not in education and training, and children with SEN).</li> <li>• Older people.</li> <li>• Disabled people, including deaf people and people with learning difficulties.</li> <li>• Boys and young men.</li> <li>• Various ethnic groups, including Gypsy, Roma and Traveller groups.</li> <li>• LGBT groups.</li> <li>• Various faith groups.</li> </ul> <p>Changes to these services could therefore have a particular impact on these groups. The expectation is that this will be positive since a greater awareness of, and response to, actual and potential need is integral to many of the PVRs' recommendations.</p> <p>Many services provided to these groups are currently commissioned by internal and external commissioning agencies. In some cases cultural services work in partnership with, and/or commission external agencies to deliver services to these groups. Such relationships have been considered within the cultural services PVRs.</p> <p>A review of these services raises further questions about how such groups are targeted by Cultural Services as a whole, and whether there are opportunities for more joining up of delivery, targeting, etc, on the basis of improved customer insight information which can be broken down by protected characteristic.</p> <p>Awareness of equalities issues is generally high amongst the staff of these services and all have attended Equality and Diversity training. Specialist support and advice is also provided by the Directorate and corporate policy teams.</p> <p>Staffing data (further data provided in the individual EIAs) suggests a relatively high level of homogeneity amongst staff in these services (the majority of staff are white (97%), female (84%), between 45 – 64 (63%), and have no disabilities (96%). Any changes in staffing structures could present opportunities to look for ways in which to encourage better representation of protected characteristics (i.e meeting workforce targets).</p>

# DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

## 6. Sources of information

### Engagement carried out

Comprehensive information on the data sources used in relation to each of the cultural services PVRs is set out in the individual PVRs EIAs.

This has included direct engagement with:

- All staff - including through one to one interviews; workshops; presentations to managers and other staff, and formal surveys.
- Large groups of stakeholders (as identified by the services themselves). Stakeholders included: partner organisations; representative groups, councillors; users; residents of Surrey. Methods of engagement have included one to one meetings (e.g with commissioners of services for people with various protected characteristics) and formal surveys. Hard copies and alternative formats were offered in relation to the surveys.
- Members - through the PVR members reference groups and Communities Scrutiny Committee.
- External challengers e.g from English Heritage, the Arts Council, CityLit etc.
- Trade Unions
- The Directorate Equalities Group.

### Data used

The PVRs have included analysis of:

- Various quantitative data available on the services and national benchmarking processes. This has included some information on the protected characteristics of users (e.g in terms of use of the Surrey archive room) which has been integrated into the EIAs. It has also included SCC workforce data and targets, and data on volunteers.
- Various qualitative data available on the services e.g existing customer feedback on music education, Adult Learner feedback and evaluations of initiatives such as Exploring Surreys Past.
- Previous Cultural Service EIAs (from 2008).
- Existing SCC policies, including policies with equalities aspects e.g archive collection policies.
- Existing national policies and findings on how the protected characteristics engage with these services e.g percentages of people with particular protected characteristics volunteering in archive services.
- Some audits of existing facilities e.g venues used by the services.
- Comparisons with other authorities, including data collected, service provided, etc. This was collected through desk based research, telephone interviewing, and site visits.

## 7. Impact of new/amended policy, service or function

There is real potential for a significant positive impact from the implementation of the PVR recommendations, both for the people of Surrey as a whole and particularly for those with protected characteristics. The outcomes will advance equal opportunities, eliminate discrimination and enable people with protected characteristics to benefit from much improved and more appropriate and accessible services. The integration of the cultural services will also enable people to take advantage of the range of opportunities without encountering artificial and unhelpful barriers.

Features of the recommendations that illustrate this include:

- A strong commitment to partnership and joint planning and delivery of services, within the context of a robust common strategy and vision, that enables the service offer to be strengthened and diversified and engages the expertise of other service providers more directly
- Greater understanding of the needs and characteristics of Surrey's people and communities, service users and those that do not currently engage, that informs what the services offer and how this will best enable take-up and involvement
- Improvements in service structures and processes that have a direct beneficial impact on the customer's experience and options for engaging with and taking part in cultural activity
- Improved promotion and marketing, including targeted work with people with protected characteristics, that enhances awareness of what is available and extends and simplifies options for accessing information, enrolment and payment
- Enhanced resources, including additional revenue generation, as a basis for future service development, including free and subsidised services that address the public health, well being and social care agendas.

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

### 7a. Impact of the proposals on residents and service users with protected characteristics:

The joint report on the three PVRs has five recommendations which will be delivered through joint and individual service actions to be detailed in the Service Improvement Plans:

- (a) Notes the outcomes of the three PVRs and confirms these roll forward into a new strategy and vision for Cultural Services in Surrey, with detailed Service Improvement Plans in place by March 2013.
- (b) Requests that a feasibility study is undertaken to create options for the provision of a new cultural hub that would position Surrey at the forefront of culture nationally and internationally, to be brought back to Cabinet for decision.
- (c) Requests a feasibility study is undertaken to create options for the provision of a new cultural hub that would position Surrey at the forefront of culture in the country, which is brought back to Cabinet for decision.
- (d) Agrees that a detailed research and evaluation project is undertaken to assess the potential benefits and risks of a new approach to the delivery of Cultural Services through other business models.
- (e) Agrees that, following completion of the Service Improvement Plans, a follow-up report is presented to the Leader, detailing all financial implications for final decision.

The Service Improvement Plans will be finalised by March 2013 and will require specific Equalities Impact Assessments to be undertaken as part of detailed implementation and delivery. For some recommendations, such as proposals for structural change, the inherently different characteristics of the individual services will require more service-specific EIAs to be undertaken but, in keeping with the overall direction towards a more cohesive approach to the development of Culture and Learning leadership for the county, cross-service assessments will be undertaken where appropriate.

For the purposes of this combined EIA, much of the specific action will be developed in relation to Recommendation (b) and there follows a more detailed assessment of the impacts of four themes of proposed change that are reflected across all three services and will be taken forward jointly:

1. The creation of a shared Culture strategy and vision
2. Developing a strong business culture that enhances income generation
3. Improved advocacy of the health, well-being and community benefits of Cultural Services
4. General overview of impacts of Staff restructure (These will be service-specific and indicative detail will vary as individual EIAs are developed)

# DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

## Theme 1. The creation of a shared Culture strategy and vision

Protected characteristic <sup>2</sup>	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Age</b></p>	<p>For all protected characteristics, the development of a Culture Strategy, and the implementation of the PVR recommendations is expected to have a positive effect, enhancing the understanding of needs and the most appropriate way to meet them, improving income generation that will create greater cross-subsidy for delivery targeted on need and disadvantage, and improving the visibility and access to services for all.</p> <p>Cultural Services, including Heritage, ACL and Surrey Arts, are universal providers and, between them, deliver to all age groups, although ACL by definition is focussed on 18+. They also deliver a range of services aimed at improving various social outcomes, including disadvantage groups. A shared Culture strategy will build upon this.</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly no negative impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework and partnership working which supports this approach.</p>	<p>Evidence of local need in relation to particular age groups is included in Surrey needs analysis e.g the Fairness and Respect – Vulnerable Group Analysis, and JSNA.</p> <p>Age-related evidence from the individual PVR EIAs identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of Surrey Arts clients (particularly music education) are children and young people. This includes provision to disadvantaged groups as identified through needs assessment. There is also some limited adult education provision.</li> <li>• The majority of people volunteering and accessing the Surrey archive centre are over 45 years old.</li> <li>• The majority of people participating in community archaeology are children and young people.</li> <li>• ACL is intentionally focussed on adult learners (18+) and has a</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> More information on the definitions of these groups can be found [here](#).

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	<p>Age data is collected as part of much of the customer contact, and could be used more effectively for monitoring and assessment of service use, and improving age-related service development and promotion. There is only limited use made of customer insight at present</p> <p>Across the three services, there can be issues around transition between age-specific delivery and a unified approach would help to improve the customer experience in this journey. Use of common needs assessments (to ensure targeting of those with the highest need), working with both children’s and adult commissioners, and appropriate joined up information, marketing and service access will enhance this.</p>		<p>typical demographic that is weighted more towards the older age range. Currently the service offers a discount on course fees to learners aged 60+</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Disability</b></p>	<p>Much of the comment relating to Age is equally applicable for disability. All the cultural services work closely with disabled people’s groups, and some provide specific services for these groups.</p> <p>Disability information is collected as part of customer interaction, such as enrolment onto ACL courses where this is used to inform risk assessment and agree any</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly no negative impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework and partnership working which supports this approach.</p>	<p>Evidence of local need in relation to disabled people is included in Surrey needs analysis e.g the Fairness and Respect – Vulnerable Group Analysis, and JSNA.</p> <p>Evidence from the full PVR EIAs identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surrey Arts (both music education and arts) work with disabled groups, particularly people with learning</li> </ul>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	<p>provisions needed.</p> <p>Surrey Arts, Surrey Heritage and ACL have dedicated programmes of work with Learning Disabled people. An overall cultural strategy and related policies will provide a framework for a more integrated approach to services that benefit people with disabilities and establish greater equality of access. The improved business culture will also enable greater cross subsidy to ensure that more provision can be made for disabilities and other specific needs at reduced or no charge.</p>		<p>difficulties and children with special educational needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage data shows that disabled people are accessing community archaeology, archives and exploring Surrey's past.</li> <li>• ACL delivers supported targeted learning for people with Learning Disabilities or mental health issues and there is also a high level of take-up of the mainstream course offer from this group. (In 2011/12 there were 851 learners with declared conditions - which represents 9% of all learners - of whom 462 were on targeted programmes).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Gender reassignment</b></p>	<p>There is very limited information on how cultural services are assessing or meeting the needs of people who are going through or have undergone gender reassignment.</p> <p>However it is envisaged that there will be positive impacts from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives.</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly no negative impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework and partnership working which supports this approach.</p>	<p>There is very limited evidence available from local needs analysis or cultural services on how people with this protected characteristic engage with cultural services.</p>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Pregnancy and maternity</b></p>	<p>There is very limited information on how cultural services are engaging with pregnant women and young mothers, however there is some targeting of provision for children and families (e.g connections into sure start as well as some music provision for babies and toddlers).</p> <p>Some enhanced benefit for mothers may also derive from the proposed extension of ACL provision to include other time slots that may be more conducive to home or work commitments, and potential for more widespread provision of crèche or child-minding facilities</p> <p>However it is envisaged that there will be positive impacts from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives.</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly no negative impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework and partnership working which supports this approach.</p>	<p>Evidence of local need in relation to pregnancy and maternity is included in Surrey needs analysis e.g the Fairness and Respect – Vulnerable Group Analysis, and JSNA.</p> <p>Evidence from the full PVR EIAs identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surrey Arts are developing provision in relation to early years</li> <li>• Heritage are developing “learning” provision that engages with sure start</li> <li>• ACL Family Learning targets parents and children in priority Children Centres in schools with relatively poor attainment – 1443 Learners</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Race</b></p>	<p>Although there is evidence that the cultural services are delivering some targeted projects (e.g Roma Routes), there is limited evidence on how cultural services are being used to promote race equality and improve social outcomes for the</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly no negative</p>	<p>The Surrey Fairness and Respect Vulnerable Groups needs analysis identifies that BME groups may be more isolated and less likely to participate in arts, cultural and other activities. Further issues are also identified in the above analysis e.g. health and wellbeing</p>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	<p>most disadvantaged groups as identified in local needs assessments. ACL does include the provision of ESOL learning which is a direct benefit to people from other national backgrounds.</p> <p>Similarly although data is captured on race e.g user surveys, there is limited data on how different ethnic groups are accessing general services being delivered, and again there is limited evidence that available data is being used for customer insight.</p> <p>An overall cultural strategy and related policies could seek to increase accessible and engagement of different ethnic groups across cultural services functions eg use of common needs assessments (to ensure targeting of those with the highest need), appropriate joined up advertising and resourcing, monitoring and responding to changes in service use by different ethnic groups, etc.</p>	<p>impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework and partnership working which supports this approach.</p> <p>Areas of potential negative impact, that will need to be avoided, include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Lack of customer insight</u> and failure to tailor services and contact to racial / cultural / religious characteristics</li> <li>2. Links between ethnic group and <u>poverty/deprivation</u></li> <li>3. <u>Inappropriate Marketing</u> including sympathetic approach to particular characteristics such as gender roles</li> <li>4. <u>Lack of digital access</u></li> <li>5. Difficulties in <u>accessible</u> locations</li> <li>6. <u>Venues and facilities</u> which are not accessible or appropriate for particular groups.</li> </ol>	<p>outcomes.</p> <p>Evidence from the full PVR EIAs identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surrey Arts are developing provision of a wide variety of music genres, including world music as part of the development of the music education hub.</li> <li>• It is known that the Heritage Service works with different ethnic groups e.g. Roma Routes. However Heritage survey data shows that around 100% of archive search room users are white. The survey was a Public Service Quality Group (PSQG) held over a 2 week period</li> <li>• ACL has a high level of engagement with people of various minority ethnicities, especially people from Asian backgrounds. In 2011/12 24% of learners were from minority ethnic groups. Specific focus groups have been run with Asian people. Black and Minority Ethnic participation in Family Learning programmes was 31.8% (399)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Religion and belief</b></p>	<p>There is very limited information on how cultural services are assessing or meeting the needs of people with different religions and beliefs.</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and</p>	<p>Evidence of local need in relation to particular religious groups is included in Surrey needs analysis e.g the Fairness and Respect – Vulnerable Group</p>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	<p>However it is envisaged that there will be positive impacts from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives.</p>	<p>makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly no negative impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework and partnership working which supports this approach.</p> <p>Much of what is identified in race, above, applies here as well</p>	<p>Analysis, and JSNA.</p> <p>Evidence from the full PVR EIAs identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pupils with specific faiths, such as Muslims, may have restrictions on the times they can learn music. Music is closely linked to religious worship in many cultures, and so opportunity for music tuition to support pupils’ religious education. This may be especially pertinent to Surrey’s faith schools.</li> <li>• Heritage have been working with specific religious groups (e.g Muslim groups) to encourage them to deposit archives.</li> <li>• Muslim women have been specifically targeted as part of the ACL Family learning and Community Learning programmes. Cultural Diversity Week promotes different faith’s impacts on our learning</li> </ul>
<b>Sex</b>	<p>The Cultural Services are universal providers and work with both genders.</p> <p>Data collected on customers/users includes capturing data on gender. Evidence suggests that females are more likely than males to engage with cultural services than females.</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly no negative impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework</p>	<p>Evidence of local need in relation to gender is included in Surrey needs analysis e.g the Fairness and Respect – Vulnerable Group Analysis, and JSNA.</p> <p>Evidence from the full PVR EIAs identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boys are less likely to want to learn a music instrument than girls,</li> </ul>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	<p>An overall cultural strategy and related policies could seek to increase accessible and engagement of genders across cultural services functions eg use of common needs assessments (to ensure targeting of those with the highest need), appropriate joined up advertising and resourcing, monitoring and responding to changes in service use by the genders, etc</p>	<p>and partnership which supports this approach.</p>	<p>representing 43% of pupils as at September 2012. The service already has a strong focus on increasing take up among boys.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local data suggests usage of the Heritage Service by men and women (e.g volunteers and archive users) that is relatively close to being representative for the local population.</li> <li>ACL has a much higher proportion of female learners (77%) than male (23%)</li> </ul>
<p>Page 285</p> <p><b>Sexual orientation</b></p>	<p>It is known that Cultural Services works with LGBT groups. However there is no specific data available from the Heritage Service in relation to this protected characteristic.</p> <p>However it is envisaged that there will be positive impacts from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives.</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly no negative impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework and partnership working which supports this approach.</p>	<p>Evidence of local need in relation to sexual orientation is included in Surrey needs analysis e.g the Fairness and Respect – Vulnerable Group Analysis, and JSNA.</p> <p>Evidence from the full PVR EIAs identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage have delivered projects targeted at LGBT groups.</li> <li>ACL and Surrey Arts do not currently have any information relating to LGBT characteristics</li> </ul>
<p><b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b></p>	<p>Surrey Arts, Heritage, and Surrey Arts do not provide specific provision for this protected characteristic.</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into</p>	<p>Some limited data on marriage and civil partnership is including in Surrey needs analysis e.g. the Fairness and Respect – Vulnerable Group Analysis.</p>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	<p>However it is envisaged that there will be positive impacts from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives.</p>	<p>corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly no negative impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework and partnership working which supports this approach.</p>	<p>There is very limited evidence available on how people with this protected characteristic engage with cultural services.</p>
--	--	--	---

### Theme 2. Developing a strong business culture that enhances income generation.

(n.b.: This should be read in conjunction with Section 1, above (Cultural Strategy), since much of the evidence and comment applies equally and is not repeated)

Page 286

Protected characteristic <sup>3</sup>	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<b>Age</b>	<p>For all protected characteristics the drive towards an improved business culture for the Cultural Services is expected to have a beneficial effect. This will result primarily from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved market knowledge, use of customer insight and other data that will ensure the more effective shaping and targeting of the service offer</li> <li>More accessible and user-friendly web-presence, and comms, including diversity of access to services and key interfaces such as enrolment, bookings and awareness of cultural events and</li> </ul>	<p>There may be negative impacts relate to potential barriers faced by particular age groups in terms of accessing services.</p> <p>This could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient useful customer insight information (e.g user satisfaction gathered by a range of appropriate methods), may mean that the service (including universal provision) is not tailored to their needs or improved.</li> <li>Links between age and poverty / deprivation may mean that people on a low income cannot access a service due to the level of fees/charges.</li> <li>Marketing may not be appropriate,</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Lack of Customer Insight Information:</b> There is very little local evidence from any of the PVR EIAs on this being consistently gathered <u>or used to inform decisions</u>. User satisfaction surveying is conducted in all three services to some extent. ACL :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ACL surveys all learners at mid and end of course as part of the necessary return for the Skills Funding Agency. Annual focus groups are also held</li> <li>Surrey Arts parents survey feedback identified that raising fees could lead to some parents withdrawing their children from music lessons</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> More information on the definitions of these groups can be found [here](#).

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	<p>opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An increased potential for informed income generation that will in turn provide greater cross subsidy to enhance the subsidised or free availability of mainstream and tailored service provision for those with specific needs</li> <li>• Increased access, engagement and satisfaction for those with protected characteristics as a result.</li> </ul>	<p>or possible, to access all age groups, may be discriminatory in nature, or indicates business choices that may have an implicit disadvantage for some.</p> <p>4. Lack of digital access to the internet and other digital technologies, particularly for older people, and the potential resource costs of maintaining sufficient alternatives.</p> <p>5. Difficulties in accessing locations or facilities due to distance, lack of public transport, or internal barriers to access and use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage surveys all visitors to the archives over a 2 week period to provide data/feedback on age; disability; gender; access to facilities. etc</li> </ul> <p>However, much of this data does not include the demographic details needed to provide evidence for specific characteristics</p> <p><u>2. Poverty and Deprivation:</u> The SCC Fairness and Respect vulnerable group needs analysis identified that young people, especially those between 20-24 years old have been disproportionately affected by the recent recession. IMD data shows that 17.79% of older people living in Surrey have incomes in the bottom 50% of incomes in England and are described as suffering from income deprivation. Areas of Surrey where this is higher than the County average include Woking, Guildford and Runnymede.</p> <p>ACL offers discounts to benefit claimants and to learners aged over 60 but course fees</p> <p>Surrey Arts provides access to free group tuition, free hire of a musical instrument (subject to availability) and free access to ensembles for children on Free School Meals, Looked After Children, Young Carers and Asylum</p>
--	---	---	---

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

		<p>Seekers, .</p> <p><u>3. Marketing:</u> There is no specific local information on marketing issues, although there is national information on targeting appropriate marketing and promotion to different groups.</p> <p><u>4. Digital exclusion</u> is still an issue for some groups in society e.g those on low income. Internet use is linked to various socio-economic and demographic characteristics, such as age, disability, location and earnings. Adults who were more likely to have never used the Internet included the over 65s, disabled people and the widowed (Office for National Statistics 2011). In Surrey it is estimated that around 124,033 adults have never accessed the internet; and 30,004 children have no home internet access.</p> <p><u>5. Physical accessibility:</u> the Libraries PVR included maps considering physical accessibility. However similar maps have not yet been produced for the other cultural services PVRs. The SCC Fairness and Respect vulnerable group needs analysis identifies that 86% of Surrey Households have one or more car, and that the high level of car ownership can mean that those without a car can find themselves isolated from accessing services.</p> <p><u>6. Venues:</u> Accessibility audits have been undertaken on existing cultural</p>
--	--	--

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

			services venues e.g libraries, ACL and heritage, but not aware of any for Surrey Arts premises
<b>Disability</b>	See the comments in Age, above	<p>Potential negative impacts relate to potential barriers faced by disabled people in terms of accessing services. This could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Lack of customer insight</u></li> <li>2. Links between disability and <u>poverty/deprivation</u></li> <li>3. <u>Inappropriate Marketing</u></li> <li>4. <u>Lack of digital access</u></li> <li>4. Difficulties in <u>accessing</u> locations</li> <li>5. <u>Venues and facilities</u> which are not internally accessible for people with disabilities.</li> </ol> <p>(see previous section on Age above for more detail)</p>	<p><u>1. Lack of Customer Insight Information:</u> As for “Age” above.</p> <p><u>2. Poverty and Deprivation:</u> The SCC Fairness and Respect vulnerable group needs analysis identified that it is estimated that only half of disabled people of working age are in employment in comparison to four fifths of non-disabled people. For those who do work, their income is, on average, less than half that earners by non-disabled people. In addition, national estimates state that 55% of families with a disable child are living in or at the margins of poverty, as many parents of disabled children are less likely to be in work due additional caring responsibilities.</p> <p><u>3. Marketing:</u> As for Age above.</p> <p><u>4. Digital exclusion:</u> As for Age above.</p> <p><u>5. Physical accessibility:</u> As for Age above</p> <p><u>6. Venues:</u> As for Age above</p>
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	See the comments in Age, above	Any potentially negative impacts are most likely to relate to inappropriate marketing, issues of confidentiality or attitude / behaviour of other users.	<p><u>1. Lack of Customer Insight Information:</u> As for “Age” above.</p> <p><u>2. Poverty and Deprivation:</u> No information available in the local SCC Fairness and Respect vulnerable group needs analysis relating to gender</p>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

			<p>reassignment.</p> <p><u>3. Marketing:</u> As for age above</p> <p><u>4. Digital exclusion:</u> As for age above</p> <p><u>5. Physical accessibility:</u> As for age above</p> <p><u>6. Venues:</u> As for Age above</p>
<p>Page 290</p> <p><b>Pregnancy and maternity</b></p>	<p>See the comments in Age, above. Additionally there is potential benefit for Pregnant women and those with young families from the possible development of more targeted service delivery, based on identified need and delivered sympathetically to their circumstances.</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged beyond those highlighted in age, above. With specific reference to this protected characteristic, the provision of support facilities, such as crèches, baby changing rooms will be necessary and the availability of service will need to be influenced by those times and venues best suited to people with young families or during pregnancy. Where services are charged, the cost may be a barrier for some who are not able to take advantage of benefit-related discounts. Additional cost reductions related to this characteristic could alleviate this.</p>	<p><u>1. Lack of Customer Insight Information:</u> As for “Age” above.</p> <p><u>2. Poverty and Deprivation:</u> See information on differences in income for gender identified by the SCC Fairness and Respect vulnerable group needs analysis (in gender section below). The differences in full time earning could impact significantly on lone parent households of which there are 17,339 in Surrey (4.02% of households) as Surrey has a high number of female single parents in full time work (29% of female single parents).</p> <p><u>3. Marketing:</u> As for Age above.</p> <p><u>4. Digital exclusion:</u> No data available at this stage</p> <p><u>5. Physical accessibility:</u> Baby changing facilities in service buildings but no other specific provision identified</p> <p><u>6. Venues:</u> ACL venues and Surrey History Centre provide baby changing facilities but there are no established crèche facilities. The Guildford Centre hosts a playgroup that may provide scope for partnership.</p>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

<p><b>Race</b></p>	<p>See the comments in Age, above. There is a considerable body of targeted work with ethnic minority groups evident in all three services and this will developed as a positive enhancement of the service that this characteristic receives.</p>	<p>Potential negative impacts relate to failure to alleviate or remove barriers faced by particular ethnic minorities in terms of accessing services. This could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Lack of customer insight</u> and failure to tailor services and contact to racial / cultural / religious characteristics</li> <li>2. Links between ethnic group and <u>poverty/deprivation</u></li> <li>3. <u>Inappropriate Marketing</u> including sympathetic approach to particular characteristics such as gender roles</li> <li>4. <u>Lack of digital access</u></li> <li>5. Difficulties in <u>accessible</u> locations</li> <li>6. <u>Venues and facilities</u> which are not accessible or appropriate for particular groups.</li> </ol> <p>See also previous section on Age for more detail.</p>	<p><u>1. Lack of Customer Insight Information:</u> As for “Age” above.</p> <p><u>2. Poverty and Deprivation:</u> The JSNA suggests all ethnic minority groups in the UK have a higher proportions of poverty compared to the majority white population. Poverty differs among ethnic groups. The SCC Fairness and Respect vulnerable group needs identified children from ethnic minority groups are at greater risk of having a worse start in life, being more likely to experience poverty.</p> <p><u>3. Marketing:</u> See Age above.</p> <p><u>4. Digital exclusion:</u> No specific data available at this stage</p> <p><u>5. Physical accessibility:</u> No specific data available at this stage</p> <p><u>6. Venues:</u> No specific data available at this stage</p>
<p><b>Religion and belief</b></p>	<p>See the comments in sections on Age, and Race, above</p>	<p>Potential negative impacts relate to potential barriers faced by faith and belief groups in terms of accessing services. This could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Lack of customer insight</u></li> <li>2. Links between ethnicity, religion, and <u>poverty/deprivation</u></li> <li>3. <u>Inappropriate marketing</u></li> <li>4. <u>Lack of digital access</u></li> <li>4. Difficulties in <u>accessible</u> locations</li> </ol>	<p><u>1. Lack of Customer Insight Information:</u> As for “Age” above.</p> <p><u>2. Poverty and Deprivation:</u> Indicative data drawing correlation between Religion / belief and income / deprivation to be built in from 2012 census once released</p> <p><u>3. Marketing:</u> As for Age.</p> <p><u>4. Digital exclusion:</u> No specific data available at this stage</p> <p><u>5. Physical accessibility:</u> No specific data available at this stage</p>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

		<p>5. <u>Venues and facilities</u> which are not accessible.</p> <p>See sections on Age, and race, above for more detail.</p>	<p>6. <u>Venues</u>: No specific data available at this stage</p>
<p>Page 292</p> <p><b>Sex</b></p>	<p>See the comments in Age, above</p>	<p>Potential negative impacts relate to potential barriers faced by particular genders in terms of accessing services. This could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Lack of customer insight</u></li> <li>2. Links between gender and <u>low wages</u>.</li> <li>3. <u>Inappropriate Marketing</u> that does not give proper consideration of how to access different age groups, and/or is ageist in nature.</li> </ol> <p>See section on Age above for more detail.</p>	<p>1. <u>Lack of Customer Insight Information</u>: As for “Age” above. Boys are less likely to want to learn a music instrument than girls, representing 43% of pupils as at September 2012. The service already has a strong focus on increasing take up among boys.</p> <p>2. <u>Poverty and Deprivation</u>: The SCC Fairness and Respect vulnerable group needs analysis identifies that the County has different rates of economic inactivity between genders with 27.8% of women in Surrey classified as economically inactive compared to 13.4% of men (similar to national findings). Men working full time earn an average of £716.10 per week in comparison to the average weekly wage for women working full time which is £522.</p> <p>3. <u>Marketing</u>: See section on Age above.</p> <p>4. <u>Digital exclusion</u>: No specific data available at this stage</p> <p>5. <u>Physical accessibility</u>: the Libraries PVR included maps considering physical accessibility. However similar maps have not yet been produced for the other cultural services PVRs. And</p>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

			safety of venues (e.g in terms of domestic violence issues). 6. <u>Venues</u> : See section on Age above.
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	See the comments in Age, above	<p>Potential negative impacts relate to potential barriers faced by sexual orientations in terms of accessing services.</p> <p>This could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Lack of customer insight</u></li> <li>2. <u>Inappropriate marketing</u></li> </ol> <p>See section on Age above.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Lack of Customer Insight Information</u>: As for “Age” above.</li> <li>2. <u>Poverty and Deprivation</u>: No specific data available at this stage</li> <li>3. <u>Marketing</u>: See section on age above.</li> <li>4. <u>Digital exclusion</u>: No specific data available at this stage</li> <li>5. <u>Physical accessibility</u>: No specific data available at this stage</li> <li>6. <u>Venues</u> No specific data available at this stage.</li> </ol>
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>	See the comments in Age, above	<p>Potential negative impacts relate to potential barriers related to marital / civil partnership status in terms of accessing services. This could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Lack of customer insight</u></li> <li>2. <u>Marketing</u></li> </ol> <p>See section on Age above.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Lack of Customer Insight Information</u>: See section on Age above.</li> <li>2. <u>Poverty and Deprivation</u>: No specific data available at this stage</li> <li>3. <u>Marketing</u>: See section on age above.</li> <li>4. <u>Digital exclusion</u>: No specific data available at this stage</li> <li>5. <u>Physical accessibility</u>: No specific data available at this stage</li> <li>6. <u>Venues</u> No specific data available at this stage.</li> </ol>

### Theme 3. Improved advocacy of the health, well-being and community benefits of Cultural Services.

(nb: This should be read in conjunction with Section 1, above (Cultural Strategy), since much of the evidence and comment applies equally and is not repeated)

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

Protected characteristic <sup>4</sup>	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<b>Age</b>	<p>There is considerable informal evidence of the social and health benefits derived by older people participating in cultural and learning activities, particularly as part of groups, which may be their principal social contact. All three services are committed to recognising and developing these benefits, including enhanced close working with other care and health professionals to maximise the therapeutic and preventative benefits.</p>	<p>The proposals seek to ensure that service design, development and delivery is informed by a greater understanding of the customers' needs. The risks for this protected characteristic, should this not be applied, would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsatisfactory access to information and processes such as enrolment and payment</li> <li>• Lack of appropriate opportunities for a given age-group</li> <li>• Location, timing and style of service delivery that excludes certain age groups</li> <li>• Physical barriers to access within buildings</li> <li>• Lack of appropriate support equipment, including furniture, hearing loops and mobility aids, that restrict participation</li> <li>• Prohibitive costs, particularly for older people with less disposable income</li> </ul>	<p>There is little formal evidence of the benefits of cultural activity on health and well-being arising from the services themselves, though informal feedback provides a strong indication that learning, arts and music are seen as a key factor in recovery, restoration and prevention of more acute conditions and social isolation. There is, however, a growing body of research evidence that demonstrates this link: Recent scientific studies have explored how people learn and there is the suggestion that although formal rote learning using the working memory is problematic for people with learning difficulties and for those who have experienced major memory loss due to ageing, there can be the potential for them to engage in creative activities. This in turn may have positive developmental effects. The American Cancer Society states that art therapy has not undergone rigorous scientific study to determine its therapeutic value for people with cancer, but many clinicians have observed and documented significant benefits among people who have participated in art therapy</p>

<sup>4</sup> More information on the definitions of these groups can be found [here](#).

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

			<p>The physical benefits of dance therapy as exercise are well documented. Experts have shown that physical activity is known to increase special neurotransmitter substances in the brain (endorphins), which create a state of well-being.</p> <p>Scientific studies have shown the positive value of music therapy on the body, mind, and spirit of children and adults.</p> <p>Music and arts can also help to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relieve stress, apprehension and fear</li> <li>• Improve mood</li> <li>• Lower heart rate, blood pressure and breathing rate</li> <li>• Relieve depression</li> <li>• Relieve sleeplessness</li> <li>• Relieve muscle tension and provide relaxation</li> </ul>
<p><b>Disability</b></p>	<p>Opportunities for people with physical, mental and learning disabilities are well-established in all three services and will be enhanced and improved as the recommendations are implemented. As with age, there is considerable social and health benefit to people with disabilities engaging through targeted activities or supported participation in the wider service. Extending Supported learning will enable more people with learning</p>	<p>See Age, above, which applies equally to disability.</p>	<p>See evidence statement for Age, above</p>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	<p>disabilities to take greater advantage of the wider service offer. Specific benefits for some disabilities will derive from greater opportunities to take part in activities that offer enhanced sensory, manual; dexterity and therapeutic impacts</p>		
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	<p>There is very limited information on how cultural services are assessing or meeting the needs of people who are going through or have undergone gender reassignment. However, as part of an informed approach to protected characteristics, positive benefits should be achieved</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged from the implementation of these recommendations, which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly no negative impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework and partnership working which supports this approach.</p>	<p>See evidence statement for Age, above</p>
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	<p>Positive benefits will derive from a more targeted approach to pregnant mothers and young families, including the possible development of specific learning and cultural programmes, and a more informed approach to venue and scheduling that meets their needs. Health outcomes will most clearly be achieved from enhanced social contact, opportunities for exercise and play-based activities and improved understanding of</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged and the offer should enhance the experience and opportunity of pregnant women and young families. The potential negative impacts will derive from a failure to accommodate the demands of the other parts of their lives, preventing them from taking a full part in the services offered. This might mean inappropriate times and venues for service delivery, failure to provide necessary support and facilities, such as crèches, and no targeted provision</p>	<p>See evidence statement for Age, above</p>

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	child and maternity focussed learning.	to meet specific needs and interests.	
<b>Race</b>	A more informed approach to designing, marketing and delivery of services that will enable ethnic minority groups to take greater opportunities would be expected to have a positive impact on individual and community well-being. For some the opportunity to engage in mixed-race activities may prove a beneficial experience whilst, for others, the provision of dedicated activities for particular ethnic or religious groups may be more acceptable. The Cultural service offer will seek to enable both approaches.	No negative impacts are envisaged and the offer should enhance the experience and opportunity of people from ethnic minorities to take advantage of the cultural service offer. Potential negative impacts relate to failure to alleviate or remove barriers faced by particular ethnic minority groups in terms of accessing services.	See evidence statement for Age, above
<b>Religion and belief</b>	See Race, above	No negative impacts are envisaged from the creation of an overall cultural strategy which integrates consideration of all protected characteristics and makes strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly no negative impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework and partnership working which supports this approach.  Much of what is identified in race, above, applies here as well	See evidence statement for Age, above

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

<b>Sex</b>	<p>Use of Cultural Services is, at present, more prevalent among females than males. Improved marketing and service offers should enhance the attraction of the services to males, as well as widening age and minority participation. In doing so males will benefit from greater opportunities and options than at present</p>	<p>The proposals seek to ensure that service design, development and delivery is informed by a greater understanding of the customers' needs. There is an identified need to attract greater involvement from males and this will require specific marketing approaches and the development of a more attractive service offer for this demographic.</p> <p>The potential negative impact is that we fail to enthuse the wider population, including males and younger females, to get involved, denying them the strong health, well-being and learning opportunities that the service offers. Since many of these are increasingly linked with educational and employment attainment, this would be a tangible dis-benefit for individual and community economic and social development, as well as Quality of Life.</p>	See evidence statement for Age, above
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<p>See Gender Reassignment, above. There are no evident positive or negative impacts</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged – see also Gender Reassignment,.</p>	See evidence statement for Age, above
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>	<p>There are currently no identified barriers to use of services resulting from marital or civil partnership status, which should not alter as a result of these recommendations</p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged that relate to marital or civil partnership status</p>	See evidence statement for Age, above

# DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

## 7b. Impact of the proposals on staff with protected characteristics:

### Theme 4. General overview of impacts of Staff restructure (Detail will be service specific).

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence – Most recently available (August 2012) Workforce data for Cultural Services as a whole.																											
<b>Age</b>	<p>Any restructure could seek to improve representation of younger age groups in the cultural services workforce.</p> <p>Currently cultural services representation of the 15-24 year age group is around 8%, while the SCC and Directorate target is 10% (from August 2012 SCC Workforce data)</p>	<p>Changes in conditions due to a restructure or change in location, could act as a barrier to some groups e.g difficulties in accessing a new location or office, need for flexible working arrangements in order to undertake caring responsibilities, etc.</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #008000; color: white;"> <th>Age Analysis</th> <th>Culture</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>15-19 %</td><td>3.97</td></tr> <tr><td>20-24 %</td><td>4.18</td></tr> <tr><td>25-29 %</td><td>3.76</td></tr> <tr><td>30-34 %</td><td>5.95</td></tr> <tr><td>35-39 %</td><td>5.64</td></tr> <tr><td>40-44 %</td><td>8.46</td></tr> <tr><td>45-49 %</td><td>11.59</td></tr> <tr><td>50-54 %</td><td>17.22</td></tr> <tr><td>55-59 %</td><td>19.83</td></tr> <tr><td>60-64 %</td><td>14.20</td></tr> <tr><td>65-69 %</td><td>3.97</td></tr> <tr><td>70-75 %</td><td>1.15</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Analysis	Culture	15-19 %	3.97	20-24 %	4.18	25-29 %	3.76	30-34 %	5.95	35-39 %	5.64	40-44 %	8.46	45-49 %	11.59	50-54 %	17.22	55-59 %	19.83	60-64 %	14.20	65-69 %	3.97	70-75 %	1.15	
Age Analysis	Culture																													
15-19 %	3.97																													
20-24 %	4.18																													
25-29 %	3.76																													
30-34 %	5.95																													
35-39 %	5.64																													
40-44 %	8.46																													
45-49 %	11.59																													
50-54 %	17.22																													
55-59 %	19.83																													
60-64 %	14.20																													
65-69 %	3.97																													
70-75 %	1.15																													
<b>Disability</b>	<p>Any restructure could seek to improve representation of disabled people in the cultural services workforce.</p> <p>Current cultural services workforce representation is 3.55%, while the SCC and Directorate target is 4%.</p>	<p>Changes in conditions due to a restructure or change in location, could act as a barrier to some groups e.g difficulties in accessing a new location or office, or need for flexible working arrangements, relating to reasonable adjustments, etc.</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #008000; color: white;"> <th>Disability Analysis</th> <th>Culture</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Disabled Headcount %</td><td>3.55</td></tr> <tr><td>Disabled Front Line Staff %</td><td>3.38</td></tr> <tr><td>Disabled Team Leaders %</td><td>3.57</td></tr> <tr><td>Disabled Middle Mgr %</td><td>5.13</td></tr> <tr><td>Disabled Senior Mgr %</td><td>16.67</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Disability Analysis	Culture	Disabled Headcount %	3.55	Disabled Front Line Staff %	3.38	Disabled Team Leaders %	3.57	Disabled Middle Mgr %	5.13	Disabled Senior Mgr %	16.67															
Disability Analysis	Culture																													
Disabled Headcount %	3.55																													
Disabled Front Line Staff %	3.38																													
Disabled Team Leaders %	3.57																													
Disabled Middle Mgr %	5.13																													
Disabled Senior Mgr %	16.67																													

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

Page 300

	Current senior management representation is 17%, while the SCC and Directorate target is 8%.	There is legislation in relation to changes in working conditions and disability.													
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	There is no benchmark data for this group.	Changes in conditions due to a restructure or change in location, could act as a barrier e.g need for flexible working arrangements during the gender reassignment process.	No general data available, and may not be known to managers in many cases.												
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	There is no benchmark data for this group.	Changes in conditions due to a restructure or change in location, could act as a barrier e.g need for flexible working arrangements.  There is legislation in relation to changes in working conditions and maternity.	No general data available, but managers will be aware of which of their staff this will apply to if any restructure takes place, and they will need to take the relevant legislation into account.												
<b>Race</b>	Any restructure could seek to improve representation of BME groups in the cultural services workforce.  Currently cultural services representation of the BME groups is around 3.24%, while the SCC and Directorate target is 9%.	Not know at this point.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #008000; color: white;">Ethnicity Analysis</th> <th style="background-color: #008000; color: white;">Culture</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BME Headcount %</td> <td>3.24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BME Front Line Staff %</td> <td>3.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BME Team Leaders %</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BME Middle Mgr %</td> <td>5.13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BME Senior Mgr %</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ethnicity Analysis	Culture	BME Headcount %	3.24	BME Front Line Staff %	3.50	BME Team Leaders %	0.00	BME Middle Mgr %	5.13	BME Senior Mgr %	0.00
Ethnicity Analysis	Culture														
BME Headcount %	3.24														
BME Front Line Staff %	3.50														
BME Team Leaders %	0.00														
BME Middle Mgr %	5.13														
BME Senior Mgr %	0.00														

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	Currently there is no senior management representation, while the SCC and Directorate target is 6%.																														
<b>Religion and belief</b>	<p>Any restructure could seek to improve representation of religious and belief groups in the cultural services workforce.</p> <p>Currently SCC and Directorate target to increase representation of religion and belief.</p>	Changes in conditions due to a restructure or change in location, could act as a barrier e.g need for pray space and flexible working to participate in religious festivals and practices.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Religion</th> <th>Culture</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Any other religion %</td> <td>2.51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Buddhist %</td> <td>0.31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Christian - all faiths %</td> <td>34.55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hindu %</td> <td>0.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jewish %</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Muslim %</td> <td>0.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No Faith / Religion %</td> <td>16.81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sikh %</td> <td>0.31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Stated %</td> <td>44.26</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Religion	Culture	Any other religion %	2.51	Buddhist %	0.31	Christian - all faiths %	34.55	Hindu %	0.63	Jewish %	0.00	Muslim %	0.63	No Faith / Religion %	16.81	Sikh %	0.31	Not Stated %	44.26								
Religion	Culture																														
Any other religion %	2.51																														
Buddhist %	0.31																														
Christian - all faiths %	34.55																														
Hindu %	0.63																														
Jewish %	0.00																														
Muslim %	0.63																														
No Faith / Religion %	16.81																														
Sikh %	0.31																														
Not Stated %	44.26																														
<b>Sex</b>	<p>Any restructure could seek to improve representation of gender in the cultural services workforce.</p> <p>Currently cultural services representation of female team leaders around 69%, while the SCC and Directorate target is 60%.</p> <p>Currently cultural services representation of female senior managers around 33%, while the SCC and Directorate target is 48%.</p>	Not known at this point, although there are relationships between gender and care giving e.g need for flexible working arrangements.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender Analysis</th> <th>Culture</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Female %</td> <td>83.92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male %</td> <td>16.08</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female Front Line Staff %</td> <td>86.61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female Team Leaders %</td> <td>69.05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female Middle Mgr %</td> <td>66.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female Senior Mgr %</td> <td>33.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> </td> </tr> <tr> <th>Full Time / Part Time</th> <th>Culture</th> </tr> <tr> <td>FT Female %</td> <td>20.02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PT Female %</td> <td>79.98</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FT Male %</td> <td>53.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PT Male %</td> <td>46.75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Gender Analysis	Culture	Female %	83.92	Male %	16.08			Female Front Line Staff %	86.61	Female Team Leaders %	69.05	Female Middle Mgr %	66.67	Female Senior Mgr %	33.33			Full Time / Part Time	Culture	FT Female %	20.02	PT Female %	79.98	FT Male %	53.25	PT Male %	46.75
Gender Analysis	Culture																														
Female %	83.92																														
Male %	16.08																														
Female Front Line Staff %	86.61																														
Female Team Leaders %	69.05																														
Female Middle Mgr %	66.67																														
Female Senior Mgr %	33.33																														
Full Time / Part Time	Culture																														
FT Female %	20.02																														
PT Female %	79.98																														
FT Male %	53.25																														
PT Male %	46.75																														

## DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<p>Any restructure could seek to improve representation of religious and belief groups in the cultural services workforce.</p> <p>Currently SCC and Directorate target to increase representation of LGBT groups.</p>	Not known at this point.	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #008000; color: white;"> <th style="text-align: left;">Sexual Orientation</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Culture</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bisexual %</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gay Man %</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Heterosexual %</td> <td style="text-align: right;">45.62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lesbian %</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prefer Not to Say %</td> <td style="text-align: right;">23.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Stated %</td> <td style="text-align: right;">29.33</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sexual Orientation	Culture	Bisexual %	0.42	Gay Man %	0.73	Heterosexual %	45.62	Lesbian %	0.10	Prefer Not to Say %	23.80	Not Stated %	29.33
Sexual Orientation	Culture																
Bisexual %	0.42																
Gay Man %	0.73																
Heterosexual %	45.62																
Lesbian %	0.10																
Prefer Not to Say %	23.80																
Not Stated %	29.33																
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>	There is no benchmark data for this group.	Changes in conditions due to a restructure or change in location, could act as a barrier e.g need for flexible working arrangements.	There is marriage workforce data available														

# DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

## 8. Amendments to the proposals

No anticipated impacts that require a change in the proposed direction have been identified at this stage. This will need to be kept under review and the development of action-specific EIAs in delivering the Operational Improvement Plans will identify and address any changes that further evidence, consultation or implementation demands suggest.

Change	Reason for change
None identified	

## 9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
Not applicable			

## 10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

Potential negative impact	Protected characteristic(s) that could be affected
None Identified.	

## 11. Summary of key impacts and actions

<b>Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis</b>	<p>Comprehensive research into data sources has underpinned the PVR research and has contributed to this EIA. The findings emphasise very strongly the positive benefits that can be expected from the approach reflected in the PVR recommendations, especially in relation to protected characteristics and the wider well-being and Quality of Life impacts of cultural activity.</p> <p>The research information has included quantitative data, both national and domestic, including demographic and profiling data from census, deprivation indices and other sources such as Mosaic. Qualitative data, including evidence from customer feedback, professional assessment and learner / service user achievement has been sought and assessed. Evidence has also been developed through comparison and benchmarking with other authorities, collected through desk based research, telephone interviewing, and site visits, and</p>
--	---

# DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – Cultural Services

	<p>audits of existing venues.</p> <p>Engagement has been extensive and has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All staff - including through one to one interviews; workshops; presentations to managers and other staff, and formal surveys.</li> <li>• Large groups of stakeholders such as partner organisations; representative groups, councillors; users; residents of Surrey.</li> <li>• Members - through the PVR members reference groups and Communities Scrutiny Committee.</li> <li>• External challengers e.g from English Heritage, the Arts Council, CityLit etc.</li> <li>• Trade Unions</li> <li>• The Directorate Equalities Group</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics</b></p>	<p>No negative impacts are envisaged from the implementation of the PVR recommendations which integrate consideration of all protected characteristics and make strong connections into corporate needs assessments and objectives. Similarly, no negative impacts are envisaged in relation to a performance management framework and partnership working which supports this approach.</p> <p>Positive outcomes for those with protected characteristics will derive from a greater understanding of the needs and requirements of individuals and communities, resulting in a better targeted offer, more flexible options for taking part and a greater choice of free or subsidised provision that supports social, health and skills needs.</p> <p>Proposals relating to changes to structures and functions will provide positive benefits for the people of Surrey and should also improve the work experience for staff by releasing professional time through a better approach to administrative and support requirements.</p>
<p><b>Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA</b></p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p><b>Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts</b></p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p><b>Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated</b></p>	<p>Not applicable</p>