

Title of proposed EIA	Reducing 'Support to the Arts' budget by 33.33%
Reference No	EQUA101
EA is in support of	Both Policy & Service Change
Review Frequency	No preference
Date of first review	01/09/2019
Directorate	Place
Division	Sports, Parks, Open Spaces, Events and Culture
Service Area	Cultural Development
Responsible Officer(s)	Symon Easton
Quality Control Officer(s)	Leroy Pearce
Accountable Officer(s)	Steve Hollingworth
Purpose of proposal	See 'Initial equality impact assessment of your proposal' section below
Data sources	Interviews
Please include any other sources of data	Historic financial information
ASSESS THE POTENTIAL IMPACT AGAINST THE PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS	
Protected characteristic: Age	Service Users / Stakeholders; Wider Community
Age details:	<p>The Culture on our Doorstep funding scheme is designed to target adults living in areas of high deprivation across the city and particularly those who are least engaged including older people. Any reduction in this fund will result in less opportunity / activity for these adults.</p> <p>The Next Generation funding scheme is designed to target young people across the city (up to 25yrs) including disadvantaged children such as NEETS, Young Carers, Children in Care / Leaving Care. Funding helps deliver cultural engagement and development projects so any reduction in this budget will result in less opportunity / activity for engaging young people.</p>
Protected characteristic: Disability	Service Users / Stakeholders; Wider Community
Disability details:	As it impacts on potentially all service users, there is no detrimentally adverse impact on protected characteristics except where funded arts organisations are no longer able to support existing cultural activities for people with disabilities due to the cuts.
Protected characteristic: Gender	Not Applicable

Gender details:	As it impacts on potentially all service users , there is no detrimentally adverse impact on protected characteristics.
Protected characteristics:	Not Applicable
Gender Reassignment	
Gender reassignment details:	As it impacts on potentially all service users , there is no detrimentally adverse impact on protected characteristics.
Protected characteristics:	Not Applicable
Marriage and Civil Partnership	
Marriage and civil partnership details:	As it impacts on potentially all service users , there is no detrimental adverse impact on protected characteristics.
Protected characteristics:	Not Applicable
Pregnancy and Maternity	
Pregnancy and maternity details:	As it impacts on potentially all service users , there is no detrimentally adverse impact on protected characteristics.
Protected characteristics:	Service Users / Stakeholders; Wider Community
Race	
Race details:	The current Re-Generation funding scheme is targeted at residents from a Black and Ethnic Minority community across the city (this funding had previously been allocated to support activity at The Drum which closed in 2016.). The budget also supports the delivery of Black History Month across the city in October. Any reduction in this fund will result in less opportunity for cultural engagement and development activity for our BAME residents.
Protected characteristics:	Not Applicable
Religion or Beliefs	
Religion or beliefs details:	As it impacts on potentially all service users , there is no detrimentally adverse impact on protected characteristics.
Protected characteristics:	Service Users / Stakeholders
Sexual Orientation	
Sexual orientation details:	As it impacts on potentially all service users , there is no detrimentally adverse impact on protected characteristics.
Please indicate any actions arising from completing this screening exercise.	
Please indicate whether a full impact assessment is recommended	
What data has been collected to facilitate the assessment of this policy/proposal?	

Consultation analysis	Revenue funded organisations have been consulted on 11 th and 13 th December, along with the wider cultural sector database.
Adverse impact on any people with protected characteristics.	
Could the policy/proposal be modified to reduce or eliminate any adverse impact?	
How will the effect(s) of this policy/proposal on equality be monitored?	
What data is required in the future?	
Are there any adverse impacts on any particular group(s)	No
If yes, please explain your reasons for going ahead.	
Initial equality impact assessment of your proposal	<p>The proposal is to reduce the 'Support to the Arts' budget by a third. This provides grant support to the likes of Performances Birmingham Ltd (PBL) i.e. Town Hall and Symphony Hall, The CBSO, Birmingham Royal Ballet, the Mac, Birmingham REP Theatre etc.</p> <p>In addition, the Support to the Arts budget provides opportunities for local arts development initiatives (such as the Local Arts Fora) and for smaller independent arts organisations to bid for funding for specific community engagement projects.</p> <p>It is not envisaged that any of the larger institutions that currently receive an arts grant from this funding will close as a result. However, once the c.£1m unavoidable PBL service charge cost is taken out of the available budget, some current recipients may receive no support at all going forward. The impact of the cut for these organisations is likely to see a reduction in cultural product (new works etc.), staff establishment numbers, outreach work, and audience development in the community.</p> <p>Existing services and independent arts organisations will see a reduction in opportunities to deliver activity for the wider community across the city to engage in arts and cultural activities.</p>
Consulted People or Groups	Public consultation starts 14.11.18

Informed People or Groups	All regularly funded arts organisations have been written to and invited to meetings early December with the Cabinet Member. All arts organisations that have been funded by BCC have been sent a newsletter signposting them to the budget consultation portal.
Summary and evidence of findings from your EIA	Proposed budget reductions impacts on potentially all service users, we will not know the actual impact of cuts to the Support to the Arts budget until consultation has been concluded.
QUALITY CONTROL SECTION	
Submit to the Quality Control Officer for reviewing?	No
Quality Control Officer comments	This EIA has been quality checked and sent to the Accountable Officer for a final quality review.
Decision by Quality Control Officer	Proceed for final approval
Submit draft to Accountable Officer?	Yes
Decision by Accountable Officer	
Date approved / rejected by the Accountable Officer	