

MINUTES

Tuesday 25 April 2017
10.00 am – 12 noon
Rooms 1&2, Ivory Place, Friends Centre,
Morley Street, Brighton BN2 9QE

Present

Annie Alexander	BHCC, Public Health
Josh Bellamy	Sussex Police
Freiya Benson	Community Works
Carolyn Bristow	BHCC, Children's Services
Val Cane	Community Works
Reuben Davidson	Community Works
Geraldine Des Moulins	Joint Chair & Third Sector Equalities Representative (Disability)
Cllr Leo Littman	BHCC
Jane Lodge	Brighton & Hove NHS CCG
Tessa Marshall	University of Brighton
Emma McDermott	BHCC, Communities, Equality & Third Sector
Nicky Thurston	East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service
Sarah Tighe-Ford	BHCC, Communities, Equality & Third Sector
Sam Warren	BHCC, Communities, Equality & Third Sector

Apologies

Jane Cossutta	Kent, Surrey & Sussex CRC
Cllr Emma Daniel	Joint Chair & BHCC
Gareth Davies	Sussex Police
John Francis	BHCC
Barbara Harris	BSUH NHS Trust
Melinda King	East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service
Simon Newell	Brighton & Hove Connected
Cllr Dee Simson	BHCC
Laura Williams	Community Works

Action

1 Welcome & Introductions

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Round-table introductions were made and apologies noted.

Hanan Mansi (Community Works BME rep) and Brian Warren (Chamber of Commerce) had stood down as members and replacements were being sought.

Action

A new representative from BHCC Health & Adult Social Care was also in hand, as AA was leaving.

2 Minutes of the Last Meeting & Matters Arising

2.1 Corrections

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as an accurate record.

2.2 Feedback from CESP Services Action Group (SAG)

2.2.1 EM confirmed that Simon Newell had taken the recommendation from the previous meeting back to the SAG.

2.2.2 EM to arrange for Simon Newell's presentation from the last meeting to be re-circulated. **EM**

2.2.3 The Chairs of the other three CESP Action Groups were keen to update Equip on their progress around the CESP agenda and it was agreed to invite them to the October meeting for feedback and discussion. **EM**

2.2.4 EM confirmed that older people would be included in the protected characteristics being addressed by the SAG, in terms of employment opportunities.

2.3 Equip's 2017 Priorities - Equalities Skills Development

2.3.1 The focus requested by GDM on 'disability confident' would be picked up in the meeting under the agenda item on diversity in the workforce.

2.3.2 Lisa Bell had been invited but was unable to attend. Josh Bellamy attending for Sussex Police.

2.4 Equip's additional Fairness Commission recommendations

Discussion deferred to a future meeting.

2.5 Mental Health First Aid

JL to follow up on the action on mental health first aid training. AA to circulate some details she had on an MHFA training course. **JL
AA**

		<u>Action</u>
3	Collaboration Framework	
3.1	<u>Background</u>	
	SW gave some background on the new CF, an update of the 2009 Community Engagement Framework which had involved a broad range of stakeholders and partners. Each strand of collaboration was underpinned by a commitment and these would be developed into an action plan by the Steering Group that had been working on the draft. The action plan would then be taken back to EquIP. The draft CF was nearing finalisation and SW invited views.	
3.2	<u>Discussion and actions</u>	
3.2.1	All agreed that the document was easy to read and accessible to all.	
3.2.2	JL had a number of comments and would email them to SW.	JL
3.2.3	Any additional good examples of case studies demonstrating collaboration to be sent to SW for potential inclusion. SW asked for a case study from the CCG, ideally around commissioning. GDM to follow up on the possibility of an example from the private sector, eg RecruitAbility. It was suggested that it would be a good idea to maintain a store of case studies, to enable the document to be updated with different examples. It was agreed to consider making the case studies shorter and include more than one example per strand, where there were particularly good examples. SW to circulate a template for the case studies (including a timeframe and deadline).	All JL GDM
3.2.4	The CF would be going to the NICE Committee in July, although the action plan might not be completed by then, and would also be taken to City Management Board and Brighton and Hove Connected for sign-off at that level.	EM
3.2.5	LL requested a brief definition of 'system' to be included in the section on Collaborative Systems, to ensure clarity.	SW
3.2.6	SW to circulate a final draft version within the next two weeks, with deadlines for comments in relation to committee and CMB timeframes. Everyone to circulate the final draft within their organisations and gain a commitment at senior level to its principles and to involvement in the action plan. SW offered to attend any meetings if needed.	SW All
3.2.7	The next stage would be sign-up from the partners to specific actions, which would then come back to EquIP for monitoring.	All
3.2.8	It was suggested that the focus of the section on collaborative commissioning could be broadened out to cover the commissioning of private sector organisations and the upskilling of public sector organisations.	SW

4 Leadership on Diversity in the Workforce

4.1 Background

It had become clear that skills development work amongst partner organisations could be better coordinated, and opportunities to learn from and challenge one another were not always picked up.

4.2 Data sharing

Each rep shared with the group the main points from their equalities data and analysis and actions around them in relation to workforce diversity. EM emphasised that the meeting was a safe space for honest and open discussion on organisations' challenges and actions.

The key points for each organisation that needed to be addressed, or were currently being addressed, were;

4.2.1 ESFRS

- a) Underrepresentation of women and BME people operationally across the service.
- b) High average age due to lack of operational recruitment over the last 10 years. A recruitment drive would be taking place from May onwards.
- c) Number of disabled staff operationally very low, but mainly due to the physical demands of the job.
- d) Mental health well discussed but disclosure low.

4.2.2 Clinical Commissioning Group

- a) Issue around progression, but not necessarily race-related and this was being addressed.
- b) Lack of equality and diversity leadership; a champion from the governing body had been appointed.
- c) Diversity in the workforce increasing.

4.2.3 Community Works

- a) The diversity data in Taking Account was quite limited, but in general it echoed the data provided by the other organisations.
- b) There was no data on disability and this would need to be picked up with Taking Account.

4.2.4 Sussex Police

- a) BME representation at officer level and staff level was still below representation in the local population.
- b) Some work had been done to address gender and LGBT issues.
- c) The current lack of a proper process for acting up was under review as this had a negative impact on women, disabled and BME colleagues.
- d) Work was ongoing around breaking down the negative experiences of policing within particular communities and cultures.
- e) JB referred to the 'Enable' initiative, run in conjunction with the Disability & Care Association. Inhibiting factors, e.g. reasonable adjustments not being available during training, were under review and work was being done with external disability reference groups.

4.2.5 University of Brighton

- a) Women overrepresented in lower grades and support services, men overrepresented in certain academic schools.
- b) Issue around progression for women and BME staff to senior roles across the organisation.
- c) Disproportionately high turnover of female and BME members of staff.
- d) BME staff representation lower than the local average population in Brighton, but higher than the local average in Eastbourne and Hastings.
- e) High disclosure rates for disability, but disabled people more likely to be involved in HR procedures. Recognised need to focus not simply on recruitment but on disabled staff's experience of working there.
- f) Mental health disclosure rates had been increasing.

4.2.6 BHCC

- a) Significant issues in relation to BME staff had been highlighted in 2013. Some improvement since, but the workforce had less than half the city rate of economically active BME people. Barriers to BME recruitment had been investigated and the recruitment and selection training had been revamped accordingly. BME disabled staff were overrepresented in some formal processes and work was needed on this.
- b) Proportion of disabled people in the workforce roughly comparable to the proportion of economically active disabled people in the city.
- c) Progression issues in relation to both BME and disabled staff.
- d) Gender balance and age balance both needed addressing.
- e) Retention issues to be looked at.
- f) BHCC had signed up to a national scheme around diversity in apprenticeships.

Action

4.2.7 Allsorts

- a) RD made the point that trans people were significantly more at risk of discrimination and faced different issues from the LGB community, and therefore felt that it was unfair to put them together with LGB in this context and that more organisations should make that distinction in their recruitment and equality & diversity monitoring processes.
- b) The volunteer team at Allsorts reflected the race and disability protected characteristics more than the staff team, and these issues being addressed as far as possible (the office was not accessible).

4.3 Discussion

4.3.1 There was some discussion about the potential for those leading on workforce equality and diversity to feel isolated in the role if they were not part of a minority group themselves, which could also impact on their commitment. It was agreed that leaders would need to be supported with training and peer mentoring to ensure they had the right skills. Training could also be provided to senior leaders more broadly.

4.3.2 It was noted that equality and diversity monitoring was voluntary in some organisations and mandatory in others. The rates of (voluntary) completion at BHCC had increased following a push to explain its importance. Voluntary monitoring equated with low disclosure rates at ESFRS and high disclosure rates at the UoB. Home Office monitoring was mandatory, but included a 'prefer not to say' option.

4.3.3 A question was raised as to whether the BME residents profile for the city should be disaggregated to take account of the changing profile, e.g. increasing numbers of people from Arabic countries. It was agreed that this was a very important point, but that there was a need for the data to be both aggregated and disaggregated.

4.3.4 It was noted that although disabled people were being made 'job ready', organisations were not always ready for them. Some organisations were not necessarily taking the initiative required by 'Disability Confident' in recruiting disabled people. GDM felt that public sector organisations, in particular, could be doing better. VC felt that the current BHCC application form was intimidating for an entry-level job; STF to take that back to HR.

STF

4.4 Actions

4.4.1 It was agreed to bring this issue back to an EquIP meeting in six months' time to assess progress.

EM

4.4.2 It was agreed to arrange a peer-to-peer meeting with the key senior leads on equality and diversity from the public sector organisations to look at common

EM

	<u>Action</u>
issues, eg progression and BME staff, in terms of shared learning and development.	
4.4.3 It was agreed to continue to work jointly on progressing 'Disability Confident', possibly having a specific meeting on this. GDM reminded the group that as a 'Disability Confident' leader, Possability People would be happy to offer advice and support.	
4.4.4 It was agreed to have further discussion on reviewing and improving recruitment processes, particularly public sector, and with a focus on more value-based recruitment and progression and examples of good practice.	
4.4.5 EM suggested community outreach for recruitment. It was noted that HR was planning to do some community engagement, and discussion was needed on how to progress this, eg perhaps to include roadshow events.	
4.4.6 EM proposed a celebration event of high profile work on diversity and opportunities, also involving 'the sector' to demonstrate what was possible and achievable.	
4.4.7 JB to forward details of the upcoming national event for senior women in the police, to be held on the city, to be circulated through the partnership.	JB
4.4.8 City Management Board had suggested a Coordinator post to undertake some of the workforce equality and diversity work and actions, which would be jointly funded and led. The group agreed this in principle.	
4.4.9 Meeting agreed to convene a sub-group of public sector partners to meet and discuss in more detail how they could work together to tackle some of their issues and improve workforce equality and diversity in their respective organisations. The sub-group would also look at the role of the coordinator.	EM
5 Scoping and taking forward the Cumulative Equalities Impact Assessment of public sector savings	
5.1 The City Management Board had challenged itself as to whether it fully understood the collective impact of public sector budget decisions. EM asked public sector EquIP members to discuss processes and governance within their organisations, to enable an optimum amount of public information on EIAs to be brought together. The CETS Team would take the lead on bringing this intelligence together to show the impact on communities and sectors of a variety of high level decisions. This information would then be shared in a joined-up approach, with the aim of producing a snapshot cumulative impact assessment of the city to inform citywide discussions.	All EM
5.2 It was agreed to approach the Community University Partnership Programme at the University of Brighton for support on this in terms of who might put it together.	EM

		<u>Action</u>
5.3	NT to circulate to the group details on a similar cumulative assessment done by Coventry City Council.	NT
5.4	It was noted that progress on Equip's prioritised Fairness Commission actions would be brought back to the group at its January 2018 meeting for review.	EM
6	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>There were no items of additional business.</p>	
7	<p>Close and Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>Tuesday 18th July 2017, 10.00 am – 12.00 pm at The Friends Meeting House, Ship Street, Brighton</p>	