



SUMMARY VERSION: Community Engagement Framework Equalities Impact Assessment

This document summarises the findings of the Equalities Impact Assessment undertaken of Haringey's Community Engagement Framework.

The full document can be found at: www.haringey.gov.uk/framework

Title: Haringey's Community Engagement Framework

Directorate: Chief Executive's

Business Unit: PPP&C

Date: September 2009

Officers:

Kirsty Fox – Haringey Council

Helena Pugh – Haringey Council

Margaret Allen – Haringey Council

Leon Joseph – Haringey Council

Philip Satherley – Haringey Council

Yuniea Semambo – Haringey Council

Anne Vessey – College of North East London

Dilo Lalande – NHS Haringey

Eric Monk – Metropolitan Police

Mirca Morera – Family Mosaic

Pamela Pemberton – HAVCO

Simon Godfrey – Homes for Haringey

John Brown – London Fire Brigade

The aim of the Community Engagement Framework:

Haringey's first Community Engagement Framework (CEF) reaffirms the Haringey Strategic Partnership's understanding of and commitment to community engagement.

The **aim** of the Framework is enable the Haringey Strategic Partnership (HSP):

'To engage with local communities and empower them to shape policies, strategies and services that affect their lives.'

The Community Engagement Framework defines engagement as:

- Informing
- Listening
- Consulting
- Involving
- Collaborating
- Empowering

The Framework will develop and extend good practice across organisations in the partnership. It does not prescribe community engagement activity, but acts as a guide to inform community engagement work. It includes clear **principles** to be used when carrying out community engagement activities in Haringey. The HSP partners will:

- Work in partnership to join up our engagement activities
- Engage when engagement is necessary
- Be clear about what we're asking
- Be inclusive and aim to engage with all communities where appropriate
- Communicate the results of engagement activity
- Build capacity of communities to take part in engagement activities

A draft Delivery Plan to accompany the Framework has been developed to identify the outcomes and priorities for improving community engagement in the borough.

All those living in, working in and visiting Haringey will benefit from the Framework.

There are a number of reasons why community engagement is central to the work of the HSP. Engaging with our local communities will help us to meet our Sustainable Community Strategy vision of: **'A place for diverse communities that people are proud to belong to.'**

The benefits of achieving our vision are:

- 1. Empowering people to define and shape their own community**
- 2. Responsive services tailored to meet people's needs**
- 3. Better informed citizens**
- 4. Encouraging democratic involvement**
- 5. Building responsible citizenship**
- 6. Building capacity of people to take part in engagement activities**
- 7. Improving relationships between partner agencies and the public**
- 8. Better monitoring and measuring of performance**
- 9. Meeting our statutory obligations**

Potential positive impacts of the Framework include:

- HSP organisations will develop better knowledge of how different communities engage or want to engage with different communities
- HSP organisations will share information regarding the engagement needs of different communities
- Communities will be better informed about engagement opportunities
- Relationships will improve between different communities and partner organisations
- Equalities issues considered when engagement activities planned
- Improved services that meet the needs of communities

Potential negative impacts of the Framework include:

- Some decision-making on engagement initiatives may initially be slower than usual, due to joint working
- Increased demand on existing resources – both staff and funds

The overall impact of the Framework is likely to be very positive.

Potential equalities impacts identified by HSP officers:

It should be noted that the initial screening findings were not raised during public consultation, but they are factors which staff in HSP organisations feel should be considered when undertaking any engagement activity.

Age	Disability	Ethnicity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People may feel reluctant to attend events because they may feel they are not relevant to them or may feel intimidated (particularly young people) • Certain age groups may be underrepresented in publications. Generic publications are often not seen as being aimed at young or old people. Targeted publications may be better received. • Younger people prefer to engage via new media – texts, online etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information may not be accessible if it is produced only in one format • Disabled people may have difficulty attending and participating in engagement activities • Facilities at events may not meet the needs of disabled people • Presentations and debate may be inaccessible – e.g. presentation material not readable / people speak too quickly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language barriers may stop people from ethnic minority groups accessing information and attending engagement activities • Written information may not be accessible due to lower levels of literacy in some ethnic groups • The meaning of words or phrases may change when translated

Religion	Sexuality	Gender
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing of engagement activities and other events may clash with religious services or festivals which could prevent some people from attending. • Content of information publications may be considered inappropriate by some religious groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement activities or information may be located in places accessed by the LGBT community • LGBT people may be reluctant to raise LGBT issues in open fora as they may be concerned it will identify them as LGBT or that they fear a homophobic response. • LGBT people with cross oppress ional issues my be reluctant to raise LGBT concerns as they are more likely not be “out” about their sexuality for fear of family and friends finding out about their sexuality or a homophobic response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people – both men and women – may be reluctant to attend mixed gender events and activities • Women are more likely to have caring responsibilities for both children and for older / disabled relatives which may prevent them from attending engagement activities.

Consultation on the CEF found:

Age	Disability	Ethnicity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of those who returned the equalities monitoring form were aged over 35, demonstrating that younger adults did not engage with the consultation. Children under 18 were not specifically targeted during the consultation. Young people were mentioned as a target group for consultation and engagement by some respondents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses were received from community and voluntary groups representing disabled people, but in fewer numbers than those from other equalities strands. 7 people who returned the equalities monitoring form stated they had a disability (13.5%). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisations covering a wide range of ethnicities completed the consultation (see Appendix A for details). However, the consultation was sent to community and voluntary groups, staff at which may be more likely to write and speak English. Those who returned the equalities monitoring form came from a wide range of ethnic backgrounds (see Appendix B). Many respondents raised the issue of targeting different communities during engagement activities (see Appendix C).

Religion	Sexuality	Gender
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisations and individuals from a wide range of religions and faith groups responded to the consultation. No concerns were raised regarding religion and engagement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That responses were received from community and voluntary groups representing LGBT people, but in fewer numbers than those from other equalities strands. That 1 person stated they were gay, and 1 person stated they were bisexual. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That a fairly equal split of men and women returned the equalities monitoring form. Gender was not raised as a specific issue by respondents. Women's groups responded to the consultation (see Appendix A for details).

Summarised actions to be implemented

The draft **Community Engagement Framework Delivery Plan** aims to provide tools and processes to enable partners to work together to carry out more effective community engagement. As such, it is envisaged that the Plan will lead to improved engagement with all sectors of the community. The full Delivery Plan will be available at www.haringey.gov.uk/framework .

The projects within the Plan do not target specific groups. However, the following projects within the Plan are particularly relevant to reducing barriers to inequality in engagement:

Project	Timescale / Existing progress	Resource implications	Key output(s) – to be decided by group responsible	Team / Group responsible
1. Establish a common evaluation process for engagement activities to ensure that we use results to improve local services, identify best practice and learn from mistakes	2010-11	Within existing resources	Evaluation process designed and rolled out across partner agencies Results analysed Process used and results analysed on an on-going basis	Council's Consultation Group, with representatives of HSP partners in attendance
2. Make recommendations to expand / rationalise / share activities	2010-11	Within existing resources	Recommendations made to PMG	Council's Consultation Group, with representatives of HSP partners in attendance
3. Develop publicity plan for Community Engagement Framework (for residents, councillors, staff in HSP organisations etc)	2010-11 Progress to date: CEF already published on website. CEF summary and Easy Read versions in production.	Within existing resources	Publicity Plan produced	HSP Communications Network
4. Undertake review of how different communities prefer to engage and support required	2010-11	Within existing resources	Review undertaken using results of evaluation process and recommendations made to PMG	HSP Commissioning Group
5. Establish HSP approach to	2011-12	Resource	HSP approach to community	HSP Commissioning

Project	Timescale / Existing progress	Resource implications	Key output(s) – to be decided by group responsible	Team / Group responsible
service user payment, taking into account needs of different communities (e.g. travel expenses, caring options, language support, etc)		required	support established Increased uptake of support measured by: increased attendance of different communities at meetings and engagement events	Group
6. Develop partnership advocacy strategy	2011-12	Within existing resources	HSP Advocacy Strategy and Action Plan agreed by HSP	Well-Being Partnership Board with input from CEF Steering Group

