

**Appendix I (i)**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 6 February 2023	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Cabinet
<b>Report title:</b>		Policy & Resources Strategy 2023/2024 - Response to Overview & Scrutiny Commission Recommendation on Review of Equality Analyses	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>Cabinet Member:</b>		Cllr Stephanie Cryan – Cabinet Member for Communities, Equalities and Finance	

**FOREWORD - COUNCILLOR STEPHANIE CRYAN, CABINET MEMBER  
FOR COMMUNITIES, EQUALITIES AND FINANCE**

Considering how our decisions impact on equality and tackling inequality in Southwark is a key part of our budget setting process. This addendum report to the cabinet report provides additional valuable insight. It brings together all of the equality screening and analysis that has been carried out as the budget proposals have developed and focuses on those groups of people that may be affected multiple times by different proposed changes so for example all of the proposals impacting on children and young people are considered together rather than looking at changes through the lens of only one individual proposal.

The report also focuses on reviewing a number of specific screenings and analyses highlighted through the council's budget scrutiny process and reports the results of that review. Regardless of the officer advice it is our duty as decision makers is to satisfy ourselves that we have consciously and conscientiously considered what we know about the impact of our proposals on equality alongside other considerations when making our decisions.

While it is inevitable, given the financial challenges we continue to face, that our decisions may have some negative impacts, where these have been identified mitigating actions and continued monitoring and review of impacts is planned to take place to deal with this. At this stage in the process the report concludes that there is no identifiable significant negative impact on any one protected characteristic it is now our duty to satisfy ourselves that we have sufficient information to allow us to assess the impacts as we make our decision.

## **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

### **Recommendation(s) for the Cabinet**

1. That cabinet note the officer review of equality analyses as set out in this report.
2. That cabinet note the responsibilities that the Public Sector Equality Duty places on decision makers as set out in this report.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

3. Under the equality duty (set out in the Equality Act 2010), public authorities including local authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation as well as to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
4. The protected characteristics covered by the equality duty are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. The duty also covers marriage and civil partnerships, but only in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination.
5. The law requires that public authorities demonstrate that they have had 'due regard' to the aims of the equality duty in their decision-making. Assessing the potential impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is one of the key ways in which public authorities can demonstrate that they have had 'due regard'.
6. By law, assessments of impact on equality must:
  - Contain enough information to enable a public authority to demonstrate it has had 'due regard' to the aims of the equality duty in its decision-making
  - Consider ways of mitigating or avoiding any adverse impacts.
7. Such assessments do not have to take the form of a document called an equality impact assessment but should consist of something that systematically assesses any adverse impacts of a change in policy, procedure or practice will be required.
8. Assessing impact on equality is not an end in itself and it should be tailored to, and be proportionate to, the decision that is being made.
9. Whether it is proportionate for an authority to conduct an assessment of the impact on equality of a financial decision or not depends on its relevance to the authority's particular function and its likely impact on people with

protected characteristics.

10. Assessments of impact on equality are based on relevant information and enable the decision-maker to understand the equality implications of a decision and any alternative options or proposals.
11. There is no prescribed format for assessing the impact on equality.
12. In summary, public authorities covered by the general equality duty must ensure that:
  - Decision-makers are aware of the general equality duty requirements and place equality considerations at the centre of policy formulation, side by side with other considerations.
  - Decision-makers understand that the duty falls on them personally. What they know and what they take into account is what matters – not what is in the mind of officers who report to them.
  - Compliance with the general equality duty takes place before and at the time a particular policy is under consideration and when a decision is taken.
  - Decision-makers consciously consider the need to do the things set out in the aims of the general equality duty as an integral part of the decision-making process. They must recognise it is not just a matter of ‘box ticking’.
  - Decision-makers have sufficient information to understand the effects of the policy, or of the particular decision, on the aims set out in the general equality duty.
  - Decision-makers review policies or decisions if circumstances change (e.g. if the make-up of service users alters). This is vital as the duty is a continuing one.
  - Decision-makers take responsibility for complying with the general equality duty with regard to all relevant functions. Responsibility cannot be delegated to external organisations that are carrying out public functions on their behalf.
  - Decision-makers consciously consider the need to do the things set out in the aims of the general equality duty not only when a policy is developed and decided upon, but when it is being implemented.
13. As in previous years officers have produced an initial Cumulative Equality Analysis document. This is an analysis of all Equality Impact Assessments or Screenings that have been completed for the 2023/2024 budget setting process, assessing the overall impact that the proposed changes made by the council may have on the borough.

14. The report is a high level summary of the data and considerations that were taken into account for each of the protected groups and looks at the cumulative impact of these changes upon each group to identify whether any particular protected characteristic is significantly disproportionately impacted.
15. The report also sets the specific proposals in the context of the Council Delivery Plan and wider council service delivery. It sets out a cross council overview of the equality analysis of the 2023/2024 budget proposals. The report is also designed to help strengthen scrutiny of the decisions being made by bringing this information together into one place in a transparent and accessible way.
16. The purpose of the report is to outline how the totality of the council's Budget decision-making impacts on protected groups and what we are doing to meet the public sector Equality Duty (PSED). The PSED requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

17. At its meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2023 the Overview & Scrutiny Committee conducted a scrutiny review of the council's budget proposals. A copy of the Cumulative Equality Analysis of the Budget Proposals was available to the commission as part of this scrutiny session and questions were asked on it of cabinet members and officers throughout the session.
18. The Overview & Scrutiny Committee met again on the evening of 24<sup>th</sup> January 2023 to consider its recommendations to Cabinet. In advance of this meeting a submission was received by the Chair of OSC from the Equalities & Human Rights Panel.
19. The Equalities & Human Rights Panel is commissioned by the council to act as a critical friend to the council in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty, including providing feedback and challenge when appropriate. It also reviews Equality Analyses undertaken by the council, and provides constructive feedback and challenge on these as well.
20. It is a closed panel and there are currently 10 members from a variety of VCSOs representing many of the protected characteristics strands. These include Citizens Advice Southwark, Southwark Law Centre, Southwark Pensioners Centre, Southwark Disablement Association, Metro Charity, Community Southwark, Southside Rehabilitation Association, Inspire, Latin American Women's Rights service, Southwark Day Centre for Asylum Seekers.
21. In their submission the EHRP picked out a number of the budget proposals

that it noted as ones with a potential negative impact on children and young people for review and these are the ones covered by this report and considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee. Copies of the initial screenings/assessments are attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

22. Officers have conducted that review of these specific proposals and the accompanying Equality Screenings/analyses and among other things considered whether in the officers view:

- They clearly set out the financial proposal, reason for the change, how the change may impact on protected groups and how they relate to each other (to establish whether there is a possible cumulative impact of the proposals taken together on a particular protected characteristic).
- What research or data is available to support the assessments of impact?
- Whether they are sufficient to identify whether there is a positive or negative impact to see if particular protected characteristics are more likely to be affected than others.
- Whether they are sufficient to identify that there is no or neutral impact that gives potential for discrimination or on opportunities to advance equality.
- Whether there are adjustments or mitigating actions identified to better advance equality, reduce the negative impact and monitor it.

23. In summary the position on these proposals is as follows:

Ref No:	Proposal	Assessment	Mitigation where necessary
106	<b>Reduction in PAUSE Service capacity</b> The Pause Service is a voluntary programme for women who have experienced, or are at risk of, repeat removals of children from their care. The proposals is to reduce the team capacity by one Experienced Practitioner. The Pause offer will be reduced to be a leaner intervention model. Projected savings of £59k.	Negative impact for some service users – the proposal is projected to reduce the volume of interventions from the current average level of 20 by 6-8 women per year. The screening includes reference to data on women Pause works with on which the analysis is based.	The screening includes mitigation proposals including continued discussion with partnership agencies on the opportunity to joint fund the PAUSE service – and mitigate the reduction in Local Authority funding. Continued funding of the core service to ensure provision for the most vulnerable women  Delivering a leaner service delivery model, to seek to mitigate the

			<p>overall reduction in capacity</p> <p>Continued investment in early help services to reduce the need for high end intervention services</p> <p>Development of Family Hubs and Start for Life Programme across multi-agency partnership with parenting and infant support at the core of the new offer to increase resilience in vulnerable communities and reduce demand on high end interventions</p>
113	<p><b>Redistribution of caseload capacity across Safeguarding and Corporate Parenting Services</b></p> <p>Projected efficiency saving £110k.</p>	<p>Neutral or no impact/ possible minimal impact due to less workers across the system, some existing posts have minimal caseloads and these can be redistributed across the system with minor impact on overall caseloads of staff.</p> <p>As at 26 January 2023 there were 2,065 children and young people being actively supported by the statutory social work and leaving care services. This gives an average workload across all staff of 12.29 children per worker.</p> <p>The proposal is to reduce overall capacity by 2 posts, and redistribute workloads. The revised workload would equate to approximately 12.43</p>	<p>Continuing work to deliver improvements in partnership early intervention to reduce the need for statutory intervention</p> <p>Continuing to develop our workforce and learning and development offer to build on previous success in increasing the impact, efficiency and effectiveness of our social work services – which decreases the length of intervention with families and consequent overall levels of demand.</p>

		<p>children per worker.</p> <p>Whilst any reduction in social work numbers has a negative impact on the capacity to deliver the same levels of support to children and families it is not anticipated that a significant impact will be seen from this current proposal.</p> <p>It is notable that the number of children in the care of the council has reduced by 5% over the previous year and the longer term trend of children from the borough entering care is one of slowly reducing numbers through the work of "good" Ofsted rated services.</p> <p>It is recognised nationally that children and families from deprived backgrounds are more likely to be subject to statutory child protection interventions. However, the minimal increase in overall caseloads is not expected to disproportionately impact on any of the protected characteristics</p>	
120	<p><b>Redesign Children and Family Centre Delivery Model</b></p> <p>Redesign of delivery model of children's centres to maximise the use of the</p>	<p>Potential for Negative impact on service users with mitigation in place. The analysis includes available</p>	<p>Development of the Family Hubs programme to expand the offer of community based and outreach multi-agency support.</p>

	council estate and community assets, through better co-location of services and increases non-building based function. Projected efficiency saving £100k.	data including that the 2021 census data notes the largest decline in borough population has been seen among those aged 0 to 4, with a decrease of 21%, or 4,300 people. The 0-9 reduction has been 19%.	Development of increased outreach support, using partnership efficiencies on facilities to ensure the continuation and, where possible, expansion of services with better coordinated community-asset based service delivery. Using existing shared partnership facilities to deliver services where families are more likely to attend. Undertaking a facilities and accessibility review to ensure equity of access across the borough, particularly for those most in need.
122	<b>Reductions in Family Early Help Service</b> Reduction of 2 practitioners posts within early help services Projected savings £150k.	Negative impact for some service users with mitigation in place. The screening refers to available data. As at 3 January 2023 there were 642 children being actively supported by the Family Early Help Service. This gives an average workload across all staff of 16.05 children.  The proposal is to reduce overall capacity by 2.5 posts, and redistribute workloads. The revised workload would equate to approximately 17.12 children per worker	Delivery of an improved partnership early intervention model to reduce overall demand on local authority services Streamlining of family early help assessment and intervention delivery model to increase the throughput of family support activities and reduce overall demand levels and workloads across the service  Analysis of existing workloads across service shows re-distributed increase in individual caseloads of retained staff will be marginal
125	<b>Reduce capacity in Keeping Families Together Team</b> Reduction of one practitioner post within the specialist edge of care team Projected saving £54k.	Negative impact for some service users with mitigation in place. The team works with an average of 24 young people	Continued investment in early help and preventative service to reduce demand on higher end interventions, and enhance the ability of non-statutory services to



		<p>annually. The proposal would potentially reduce the average number of children worked with to 6 annually.</p>	<p>support more intensive intervention with those at risk of entering care</p> <p>Improved learning and development offer to wider social work service to increase skills and capacity to deliver similar interventions within mainstream teams</p> <p>Continued reform of social care system to reduce demand on statutory social work, reduce caseloads and increase the capacity for more intensive intervention by all practitioners</p> <p>Development of Adolescent Sure Start programme to provide additional whole system early intervention capacity for adolescents who may be on a trajectory towards higher levels of statutory intervention and potential entry into care</p> <p>Continued support from mainstream social work services</p> <p>Review of KFT model to ensure it maximises numbers of young people it could work with and greater uses expertise to build capacity in the wider children's social care system.</p>
161	<p><b>Efficiencies in the 0-19 visiting and school nursing contract as a result of the continuing reduction of the 0-19 population.</b></p> <p>Proposed efficiency saving £863k</p>	<p>Overall neutral or no impact. Full Analysis conducted that includes available data and among other things identifies that the reduction in eligible population is similar</p>	<p>Proposed mitigation in case of any negative impact as this proposal goes forward and further analysis is conducted includes that assessments will take into account any additional needs</p>

		to the reduction in budget that the service is expected to meet.	<p>identified. As the operating budget changes are implemented, there will be close working with providers and users to ensure that mothers and children and young people identified to be more vulnerable are offered higher tiers of service provision owing to their increased vulnerability.</p> <p>The reduction is proposed to be reinvested into other Public Health services as well as children's mental health provision.</p>
175	<p><b>Review of short breaks through greater use of direct payments, voluntary sector provision and spot purchased respite care.</b></p> <p>The proposed redesign of short breaks and change of emphasis from specialist short breaks to a broader framework of short breaks that supports a wider cohort of individuals and is provided as part of an earlier intervention approach. This proposal is required to deliver a saving of £600k.</p>	Neutral or no impact	<p>This proposal will support the financial sustainability of the council as ASC supports the corporate budget challenge whilst seeking to develop more varied and accessible types of short breaks. It will also support a broadening of the short break offer that focuses on earlier intervention within AAD/LD25. This will enable easier access close to home. It seeks to transform and improve services across the age range.</p> <p>The council will continue to discharge its statutory duties and provide direct payments to individuals and families/carers to meet their eligible care and support needs.</p> <p>The social work service understands the profile of needs and will work closely with individual's families and carers to sign post and support the supplementary delivery of</p>

			provision provided through universal, third sector and targeted short breaks service, ensuring that individuals are in receipt of eligible benefits and supported to live more independent lives.
305	<b>Reduce Clinical Service Capacity</b> Phased reductions in the capacity of the clinical services which provides therapeutic support to children and families and specialist advise and support to social work teams Projected saving £140k.	Neutral or no impact taking into account mitigation	Possible impact through loss of capacity to provide therapeutic support to vulnerable children and families, mitigated by alternative service offers. Continue to seek joint funding arrangements to reduce the impact on overall capacity. Re-distribution of capacity within retained staff group. All children and young people continue to be supported by mainstream social care and youth offending teams. Further embed the clinical training and workforce development offer to mainstream social care and youth offending teams to offset reductions in specialised capacity. Reductions in clinical assessment and intervention capacity could decrease the timeliness and impact of social care intervention leading to increases in overall system demand. Improved cross system knowledge and skills could conversely promote efficiency and throughput of casework and reduce overall demand.  Possible reductions in stability of care placements for our looked after children who are well supported by clinical practitioners to remain in their

			placements when issues arise
308	<b>Reduction in Youth Offending Service</b> Increasing management ratios within the service and redistribution of workload capacity across teams Projected saving £110k.	Potential for some impact on some service users. Data suggests among other things that The current average caseload of all staff across the service is 5.3. The proposals are for a reduction of 2 posts within the service which would increase average caseloads to 5.8 per worker. In its 2021 Annual Report: inspections of youth offending services, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation identified significant variety in average caseloads nationally, between 3 – 15. Southwark caseloads even accounting for the proposed reductions are at the lower end of the range of national comparators.	Investment from Government funded Turnaround Project into the service – 3 year ring-fenced funded support to all councils to support every council across England and Wales to deliver additional prevention work through youth offending services to intervene earlier to prevent escalation of offending behaviour and support children away from criminality  Management of safe Case Manager workloads in comparison to national findings – and through continued effectiveness of wider council early help and support offer which has successfully reduced first time entrants into the youth justice system by approximately 30% in recent years.  Investment in Adolescent Sure Start programme to promote community based early intervention with adolescents at risk of criminality
309	<b>Reduce Family Group Conferencing Service</b> Reduced offer of Family Group Conferences to be more targeted at those who would most benefit from this. Consolidation of responsibilities within existing roles that promote improvement in family engagement. Projected savings £60k.	Potential for minimal negative Impact.  The proposal is to reduce capacity within the team by 1 post and consolidate wider responsibilities as far as possible within the retained staff group, maintaining as much capacity as possible to continue to promote the primary	Focusing capacity on the primary delivery of FGCs to families most in need  Upskilling of the wider workforce to deliver similar family group decision making processes at earlier points in family involvement with social care and early help services  Embedding family network focused

		team purpose of delivering Family Group Conferences.	development tools within early intervention and social work practice to expedite professional understanding of family and network capacity to support their vulnerable members.
310	<b>Downsizing Council Parenting Team</b> Phased reduction of the availability of standalone parenting team within the early help service. Including cessation of council run parenting support programmes and the continuation of limited offer through the VCS. Projected savings £58k.	<p>Negative impact for some service users. The current Parenting Team consists of 3 Parenting Practitioners, an Empowering Parents Empowering Communities Hub lead and a Team Leader. The Team delivers 10 parenting support programmes with capacity to deliver to approximately 450 parents a year. The Team also train and supervise parents to provide peer support groups to their local communities. The proposal is for a reduction of one practitioner post.</p> <p>Overall, 60% of families referred for a parenting programme reside within the top 20% of deprived areas in the country, with 22% in the top 10%. Reduction in capacity has the potential to impact negatively on the socio-economic protected characteristic. Additionally the majority (56.8%) of referrals to the Parenting Team are</p>	<p>Re-focus of internal Parenting Team to upscale its existing successes in developing voluntary and community-led capacity for parent peer led support programmes</p> <p>Family Hubs programme investment in the transformation of parenting support over 3-year period to develop and implement new models of delivery and upskill the wider partnership workforce to deliver.</p>

		<p>from other social care support teams, who are more likely to be working with families already facing disadvantage.</p> <p>The Parenting Team and its associated programmes work to support the parents of all age groups of children, however, more children and families worked with tend towards younger aged children with parents in the 25-35 age range. Reduction in capacity of the service offer could disproportionately impact specific age groups.</p> <p>The service has historically worked well with the VCS sector to deliver parenting support peer-led and evidence based programme activity which will seek to be built on in mitigating the proposed change</p> <p>This approach will be supported by the 3-year transformation funding provided under the Family Hubs and Start for Life Programme which includes significant ring fenced funding towards the piloting and development of new more efficient and community based approaches</p>	
--	--	--	--

		to delivering parenting support, particularly aimed at younger children.	
--	--	--	--

24. As a result the Cumulative Equality Impact Assessment document has been revised (Appendix B) to provide some more detail on these proposals.
25. It is officers view having conducted this review that each of these screenings/analyses clearly set out the proposals and the potential impacts, are supported by the available data, identify impacts on particular protected characteristics and include mitigations where necessary.
26. It should also be noted that equality analysis is an ongoing process that does not end once proposals are agreed and implemented. Monitoring and review is essential and will take place if these proposals continue.
27. Having reviewed these assessments the conclusion of the initial cumulative equality analysis that there is no significant disproportionate impact on any one protected characteristic is unchanged.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

### **Director of Law and Governance**

28. This report is provided in the context of the public sector equality duty in section 149 Equality Act 2010 which requires the Cabinet to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and to foster good relations between people with protected characteristics and others when exercising its functions. The report provides an analysis of equality issues that have been raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in its recommendations on the council budget proposals for 2023-24 which are being considered by the Cabinet on 6 February 2023.
29. As indicated in the report the Cabinet should give due regard to the equality duty with reference to the particular matters identified in this report, and any relevant material in the other budget papers, including any potential negative impacts on people with protected characteristics and any mitigation referred to. Cabinet will note that a Cumulative Equality Impact assessment which had already been prepared has been updated, and in the light of this should consider the impact on individuals and their protected characteristics as a result of the potential effect on them of a combination of budget proposals. Cabinet will also note that in relation to some of the proposals additional equality analysis will be undertaken as further decisions are made in relation to the particular areas being addressed.

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Copies of Equality Screenings/Analyses
Appendix 2/Appendix H	Policy & Resources Strategy 2023/2024 Initial Cumulative Equality Impact Assessment 2023/2024

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Cabinet Member</b>	Cllr Stephanie Cryan, Cabinet Member for Communities, Equalities and Finance		
<b>Lead Officer</b>	Stephen Douglass, Director of Communities		
<b>Report Author</b>	Stephen Douglass, Director of Communities		
<b>Version</b>	Final		
<b>Dated</b>	1 February 2023		
<b>Key Decision?</b>	Yes		
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>			
<b>Officer Title</b>		<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments Included</b>
Director of Law and Governance		Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance		Yes	Yes
List other officers here			
<b>Cabinet Member</b>		Yes	Yes
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>			1 February 2023