

## 2023/24 budget process

### Budget proposal equality impact and needs analysis screening template

This template should be used to carry out and record an initial screening of the equality implications of each budget proposal. Please note that this is not a substitute for a full equality analysis, which is required for all high and medium impact areas. A full equality analysis is required to inform the budget proposal decision making process in all high and medium impact areas for January Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and Council Assembly.

The equality screening template must be completed and be available for the first budget challenge round in the autumn.

#### 1. Details of budget proposal

<b>Budget proposal</b>	Reduction in PAUSE Service capacity
<b>Department</b>	Children's & Adults' Services
<b>Division</b>	Children & Families
<b>Lead officer</b>	Michael Crowe, Service Development Manager
<b>Date</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> December 2022

#### 2. Brief summary of the budget proposal, its aims and the projected saving

<b>Brief description of budget proposal</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>Projected saving of £59k</p>
---	--

#### 3. Potential impacts on service users and/or the wider community; consider also socio-economic disadvantage

<b>Service user / wider community impacts</b>	<p>This reduction will reduce the volume of interventions the team is able to provide. With approximately with 6-7 less women, usually from disadvantaged groups, a year in receipt of services. This could potentially increase pressures on those individuals and wider community services.</p>
---	---

#### 4. Potential impacts the proposal may have internally, for example on the services delivered by other departments or on staff

<b>Internal impacts on the council</b>	<p>Reduction will impact on existing postholder with potential for re-deployment or loss of office.</p> <p>Possible increase in demand on services needed in the event of further pregnancies resulting from the lack of access to preventative services.</p>
--	---

**5. How does the proposal impact on Borough Plan priorities and areas of work ?**

<b>impact on Borough Plan</b>	There is a risk of adverse impact on Borough plan priorities to tackle health inequalities and support a great start in life.
-------------------------------	---

**6. Potential impacts on particular “protected characteristics” which includes meeting needs of diverse groups, any impacts for community relations and positive, negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts.**

Please mark with an “X” whether the proposal is likely to have a “positive, negative or neutral” impact on people with the following protected characteristic. Please use as much information and data as possible to undertake the initial screening assessment, including service user and community/staff feedback.

Please remember : How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider below:

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

1. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
2. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
3. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**7. Socio-economic disadvantage –** although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area’s, an individual’s or family’s economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation.

**Does the proposal positively/ negatively or have a neutral impact on addressing socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?**

**Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis**

	<b>Needs/Impacts</b>		
<b>Protected characteristic</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Negative/Disproportionate/Adverse</b>
Age			<b>X</b>
Sex			<b>X</b>
Race		<b>x</b>	
Disability		<b>x</b>	
Sexual orientation		<b>x</b>	
Gender reassignment/Gender identity		<b>x</b>	
Religion or belief		<b>x</b>	
Pregnancy or maternity			<b>x</b>
Socio_Economic Disadvantage			<b>x</b>

**8. Risk Level**

Please assign a risk level to any negative impacts on particular equality groups using the risk matrix provided.

<b>Protected characteristic</b>	<b>Description of potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts</b>	<b>Risk level</b>
<b>Age</b>	The Pause programme works most commonly with particular age groups of early to early middle adulthood. The reduction in capacity will have an adverse impact on the availability of services to a particular age group	<b>Amber (C2)</b>
<b>Sex</b>	The Pause programme delivers exclusively to women. The proposals will reduce the capacity of the service which works exclusively to support vulnerable women	<b>Amber (C2)</b>
<b>Pregnancy or maternity</b>	The Pauses programme supports women who have had multiple children removed into care to prevent further pregnancies. The reduction in service provision could lead to more vulnerable women becoming pregnant and facing further removals of their children	<b>Amber (C2)</b>
<b>Socio_Economic Disadvantage</b>	Most of the client group worked with by the service face existing socio-economic disadvantage, the reduction in service could compound concerns for this vulnerable group	<b>Amber (C2)</b>

## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis


### 9. Checklist

Please complete each row of the checklist

Checklist		
	Yes	No
Have any potential significant concerns amongst service users or the wider community been identified?	x	
Have you used information and data to inform your initial equality screening exercise ? Please outline data sources.	x	
Have any potential internal impacts been identified?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts on particular protected characteristics been identified?	x	
Have potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts been assigned a risk level using the matrix provided?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts of this proposal been assigned a "red" risk level?		x
Where a red risk level has been assigned, has a full equality analysis been completed in respect of this proposal?		x
Is a full equality analysis planned in respect of this proposal?		x

## Equality impacts risk matrix

### How to use this matrix

- For negative impacts identified assign an overall risk level using the matrix below. This is based on the likelihood of the negative/adverse impact occurring and the seriousness of the impact.
- For **red** risk level impacts a full equality analysis should be completed. **Amber** risk level proposals may also be need to be considered for a full analysis, particularly where the equality groups affected may face cumulative effects from other proposals.
- A full equality analysis must accompany the final budget proposal presented to Cabinet in January and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Council Assembly in February.

		SERIOUSNESS OF IMPACT (1-4)			
		1	2	3	4
LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRING (A-D)	A				
	B				
	C				
	D				

**Likelihood:**

A = Very likely  
 B = Likely  
 C = Unlikely  
 D = Very unlikely

**Seriousness:**

1 = Major  
 2 = Significant  
 3 = Moderate  
 4 = Minor

## 2023/24 budget process

### Budget proposal equality impact and needs analysis screening template

This template should be used to carry out and record an initial screening of the equality implications of each budget proposal. Please note that this is not a substitute for a full equality analysis, which is required for all high and medium impact areas. A full equality analysis is required to inform the budget proposal decision making process in all high and medium impact areas for January Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and Council Assembly.

The equality screening template must be completed and be available for the first budget challenge round in the autumn.

#### 1. Details of budget proposal

<b>Budget proposal</b>	<b>Redesign Children &amp; Family Centre Delivery Model</b>
<b>Department</b>	<b>Children's &amp; Adults' Services</b>
<b>Division</b>	<b>Children &amp; Families</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Michael Crowe, Service Development Manager</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>16<sup>th</sup> December 2022</b>

#### 2. Brief summary of the budget proposal, its aims and the projected saving

<b>Brief description of budget proposal</b>	Redesign of delivery model of children's centres to maximise the use of the council estate and community assets, through better co-location of services and increases non-building based function
---	---

#### 3. Potential impacts on service users and/or the wider community; consider also socio-economic disadvantage

<b>Service user / wider community impacts</b>	Some potential loss of local facilities mitigated by increased outreach functions
---	---

#### 4. Potential impacts the proposal may have internally, for example on the services delivered by other departments or on staff

<b>Internal impacts on the council</b>	None
--	------

#### 5. How does the proposal impact on Borough Plan priorities and areas of work ?

<b>impact on Borough Plan</b>	N/a
-------------------------------	-----

**6. Potential impacts on particular “protected characteristics” which includes meeting needs of diverse groups, any impacts for community relations and positive, negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts.**

Please mark with an “X” whether the proposal is likely to have a “positive, negative or neutral” impact on people with the following protected characteristic. Please use as much information and data as possible to undertake the initial screening assessment, including service user and community/staff feedback.

Please remember : How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider below:

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

4. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
5. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
6. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**7. Socio-economic disadvantage –** although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area’s, an individual’s or family’s economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation.

**Does the proposal positively/ negatively or have a neutral impact on addressing socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?**

**Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis**

	<b>Needs/Impacts</b>		
<b>Protected characteristic</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Negative/Disproportionate/Adverse</b>
Age			<b>x</b>
Sex		<b>x</b>	
Race		<b>x</b>	
Disability		<b>x</b>	
Sexual orientation		<b>x</b>	
Gender reassignment/Gender identity		<b>x</b>	
Religion or belief		<b>x</b>	
Pregnancy or maternity		<b>x</b>	
Socio_Economic Disadvantage			<b>x</b>

**8. Risk Level**

Please assign a risk level to any negative impacts on particular equality groups using the risk matrix provided.

<b>Protected characteristic</b>	<b>Description of potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts</b>	<b>Risk level</b>
<b>Age</b>	Services within children & family centres work predominantly with young and new families. Reduction in site specific services could negatively impact on some geographically specific groups	<b>Green (C3)</b>
<b>Socio-economic disadvantage</b>	Centres are predominantly located within areas of high socio-economic need – reduction in site specific services could impact adversely on some groups – however this is mitigated by enhanced outreach function and the continued provision of centres within wider locales	<b>Green (C3)</b>

**9. Checklist**

## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis

Please complete each row of the checklist

Checklist		
	Yes	No
Have any potential significant concerns amongst service users or the wider community been identified?		x
Have you used information and data to inform your initial equality screening exercise ? Please outline data sources.	x	
Have any potential internal impacts been identified?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts on particular protected characteristics been identified?	x	
Have potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts been assigned a risk level using the matrix provided?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts of this proposal been assigned a “red” risk level?		x
Where a red risk level has been assigned, has a full equality analysis been completed in respect of this proposal?		x
Is a full equality analysis planned in respect of this proposal?		x

## Equality impacts risk matrix

### How to use this matrix

- For negative impacts identified assign an overall risk level using the matrix below. This is based on the likelihood of the negative/adverse impact occurring and the seriousness of the impact.
- For **red** risk level impacts a full equality analysis should be completed. **Amber** risk level proposals may also be need to be considered for a full analysis, particularly where the equality groups affected may face cumulative effects from other proposals.
- A full equality analysis must accompany the final budget proposal presented to Cabinet in January and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Council Assembly in February.

		SERIOUSNESS OF IMPACT (1-4)			
		1	2	3	4
LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRING (A-D)	A				
	B				
	C				
	D				

**Likelihood:**

A = Very likely  
 B = Likely  
 C = Unlikely  
 D = Very unlikely

**Seriousness:**

1 = Major  
 2 = Significant  
 3 = Moderate  
 4 = Minor

## 2023/24 budget process

### Budget proposal equality impact and needs analysis screening template

This template should be used to carry out and record an initial screening of the equality implications of each budget proposal. Please note that this is not a substitute for a full equality analysis, which is required for all high and medium impact areas. A full equality analysis is required to inform the budget proposal decision making process in all high and medium impact areas for January Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and Council Assembly.

The equality screening template must be completed and be available for the first budget challenge round in the autumn.

#### 1. Details of budget proposal

<b>Budget proposal</b>	<b>Reduce capacity in Keeping Families Together Team</b>
<b>Department</b>	<b>Children's &amp; Adults' Services</b>
<b>Division</b>	<b>Children &amp; Families</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Michael Crowe, Service Development Manager</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>16<sup>th</sup> December 2022</b>

#### 2. Brief summary of the budget proposal, its aims and the projected saving

<b>Brief description of budget proposal</b>	Reduction of one practitioner post within the specialist edge of care team  Projected saving of £54k
---	--

#### 3. Potential impacts on service users and/or the wider community; consider also socio-economic disadvantage

<b>Service user / wider community impacts</b>	<b>Possible impact on young people through reduction in service available which is targeted at prevention of entry of children into care. Mitigated as service operates at low volume and reduction on one post does not impact on significant levels of capacity within wider service</b>
---	--

#### 4. Potential impacts the proposal may have internally, for example on the services delivered by other departments or on staff

<b>Internal impacts on the council</b>	<b>None</b>
--	-------------

#### 5. How does the proposal impact on Borough Plan priorities and areas of work ?

impact on Borough Plan	N/a
------------------------	-----

**6. Potential impacts on particular “protected characteristics” which includes meeting needs of diverse groups, any impacts for community relations and positive, negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts.**

Please mark with an “X” whether the proposal is likely to have a “positive, negative or neutral” impact on people with the following protected characteristic. Please use as much information and data as possible to undertake the initial screening assessment, including service user and community/staff feedback.

Please remember : How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider below:

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

1. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
2. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
3. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**7. Socio-economic disadvantage –** although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area’s, an individual’s or family’s economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation.

**Does the proposal positively/ negatively or have a neutral impact on addressing socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?**

**Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis**

## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis

	Needs/Impacts		
Protected characteristic	Positive	Neutral	Negative/Disproportionate/Adverse
Age			x
Sex		x	
Race		x	
Disability		x	
Sexual orientation		x	
Gender reassignment/Gender identity		x	
Religion or belief		x	
Pregnancy or maternity		x	
Socio_Economic Disadvantage			x

### 8. Risk Level

Please assign a risk level to any negative impacts on particular equality groups using the risk matrix provided.

Protected characteristic	Description of potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts	Risk level
<b>Age</b>	The team works predominantly to support adolescents to remain in the care of their families. Reduction in service capacity would disproportionately impact that age group of children	<b>Green (C3)</b>
<b>Socio-economic disadvantage</b>	The majority of children supported by the team come from disadvantaged backgrounds, reduction in service capacity could disproportionately impact those groups	<b>Green (C3)</b>

## 9. Checklist

Please complete each row of the checklist

Checklist		
	Yes	No
Have any potential significant concerns amongst service users or the wider community been identified?		x
Have you used information and data to inform your initial equality screening exercise ? Please outline data sources.	x	
Have any potential internal impacts been identified?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts on particular protected characteristics been identified?	x	
Have potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts been assigned a risk level using the matrix provided?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts of this proposal been assigned a “red” risk level?		x
Where a red risk level has been assigned, has a full equality analysis been completed in respect of this proposal?		x
Is a full equality analysis planned in respect of this proposal?		x

## Equality impacts risk matrix

### How to use this matrix

- For negative impacts identified assign an overall risk level using the matrix below. This is based on the likelihood of the negative/adverse impact occurring and the seriousness of the impact.
- For **red** risk level impacts a full equality analysis should be completed. **Amber** risk level proposals may also be need to be considered for a full analysis, particularly where the equality groups affected may face cumulative effects from other proposals.
- A full equality analysis must accompany the final budget proposal presented to Cabinet in January and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Council Assembly in February.

		SERIOUSNESS OF IMPACT (1-4)			
		1	2	3	4
LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRING (A-D)	A				
	B				
	C				
	D				

**Likelihood:**

A = Very likely  
 B = Likely  
 C = Unlikely  
 D = Very unlikely

**Seriousness:**

1 = Major  
 2 = Significant  
 3 = Moderate  
 4 = Minor

## 2023/24 budget process

### Budget proposal equality impact and needs analysis screening template

This template should be used to carry out and record an initial screening of the equality implications of each budget proposal. Please note that this is not a substitute for a full equality analysis, which is required for all high and medium impact areas. A full equality analysis is required to inform the budget proposal decision making process in all high and medium impact areas for January Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and Council Assembly.

The equality screening template must be completed and be available for the first budget challenge round in the autumn.

#### 1. Details of budget proposal

<b>Budget proposal</b>	<b>Reduce Clinical Service Capacity</b>
<b>Department</b>	<b>Children's &amp; Adults' Services</b>
<b>Division</b>	<b>Children &amp; Families</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Michael Crowe, Service Development Manager</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>16<sup>th</sup> December 2022</b>

#### 2. Brief summary of the budget proposal, its aims and the projected saving

<b>Brief description of budget proposal</b>	<p>Phased reductions in the capacity of the clinical services which provides therapeutic support to children and families and specialist advice and support to social work teams</p> <p>Projected saving £420k</p>
---	--

#### 3. Potential impacts on service users and/or the wider community; consider also socio-economic disadvantage

<b>Service user / wider community impacts</b>	<b>Possible impact through loss of capacity to provide therapeutic support to vulnerable children and families</b>
---	--

#### 4. Potential impacts the proposal may have internally, for example on the services delivered by other departments or on staff

<b>Internal impacts on the council</b>	<b>Possible impact on wider social care services by reducing specialist capacity to support change in family circumstances leading to increased and longer term intervention by wider social care teams</b>
--	---

#### 5. How does the proposal impact on Borough Plan priorities and areas of work ?

<b>impact on Borough Plan</b>	<b>Possible reduction in services to support the health and wellbeing of children and families</b>
-------------------------------	--

**6. Potential impacts on particular “protected characteristics” which includes meeting needs of diverse groups, any impacts for community relations and positive, negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts.**

Please mark with an “X” whether the proposal is likely to have a “positive, negative or neutral” impact on people with the following protected characteristic. Please use as much information and data as possible to undertake the initial screening assessment, including service user and community/staff feedback.

Please remember : How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider below:

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

1. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
2. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
3. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**7. Socio-economic disadvantage –** although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area’s, an individual's or family’s economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation.

**Does the proposal positively/ negatively or have a neutral impact on addressing socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?**

**Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis**

## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis

	Needs/Impacts		
Protected characteristic	Positive	Neutral	Negative/Disproportionate/Adverse
Age		X	
Sex		X	
Race		X	
Disability		X	
Sexual orientation		X	
Gender reassignment/Gender identity		X	
Religion or belief		X	
Pregnancy or maternity		X	
Socio_Economic Disadvantage			X

### 8. Risk Level

Please assign a risk level to any negative impacts on particular equality groups using the risk matrix provided.

Protected characteristic	Description of potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts	Risk level
<b>Socio-economic disadvantage</b>	A high proportion of services users are from deprived backgrounds as such reduction in capacity within these services could negatively impact on the ability to support those families and promote their wellbeing	<b>Amber (C2)</b>

### 9. Checklist

## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis

Please complete each row of the checklist

<b>Checklist</b>		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Have any potential significant concerns amongst service users or the wider community been identified?		<b>x</b>
Have you used information and data to inform your initial equality screening exercise ? Please outline data sources.	<b>x</b>	
Have any potential internal impacts been identified?	<b>x</b>	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts on particular protected characteristics been identified?	<b>x</b>	
Have potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts been assigned a risk level using the matrix provided?	<b>x</b>	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts of this proposal been assigned a “red” risk level?		<b>x</b>
Where a red risk level has been assigned, has a full equality analysis been completed in respect of this proposal?		<b>x</b>
Is a full equality analysis planned in respect of this proposal?		<b>x</b>

## Equality impacts risk matrix

### How to use this matrix

- For negative impacts identified assign an overall risk level using the matrix below. This is based on the likelihood of the negative/adverse impact occurring and the seriousness of the impact.
- For **red** risk level impacts a full equality analysis should be completed. **Amber** risk level proposals may also be need to be considered for a full analysis, particularly where the equality groups affected may face cumulative effects from other proposals.
- A full equality analysis must accompany the final budget proposal presented to Cabinet in January and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Council Assembly in February.

		SERIOUSNESS OF IMPACT (1-4)			
		1	2	3	4
LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRING (A-D)	A				
	B				
	C				
	D				

**Likelihood:**

A = Very likely  
 B = Likely  
 C = Unlikely  
 D = Very unlikely

**Seriousness:**

1 = Major  
 2 = Significant  
 3 = Moderate  
 4 = Minor

## 2023/24 budget process

### Budget proposal equality impact and needs analysis screening template

This template should be used to carry out and record an initial screening of the equality implications of each budget proposal. Please note that this is not a substitute for a full equality analysis, which is required for all high and medium impact areas. A full equality analysis is required to inform the budget proposal decision making process in all high and medium impact areas for January Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and Council Assembly.

The equality screening template must be completed and be available for the first budget challenge round in the autumn.

#### 1. Details of budget proposal

<b>Budget proposal</b>	<b>Reduction in Youth Offending Service</b>
<b>Department</b>	<b>Children's &amp; Adults' Services</b>
<b>Division</b>	<b>Children &amp; Families</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Michael Crowe, Service Development Manager</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>16<sup>th</sup> December 2022</b>

#### 2. Brief summary of the budget proposal, its aims and the projected saving

<b>Brief description of budget proposal</b>	Increasing management ratios within the service and redistribution of workload capacity across teams  Projected saving £110k
---	--

#### 3. Potential impacts on service users and/or the wider community; consider also socio-economic disadvantage

<b>Service user / wider community impacts</b>	<b>Possible impact of less capacity to support vulnerable young people at risk of criminality. Possibel impact on wider community of less intervention capacity to prevent young people reoffending</b>
---	---

#### 4. Potential impacts the proposal may have internally, for example on the services delivered by other departments or on staff

<b>Internal impacts on the council</b>	<b>None</b>
--	-------------

#### 5. How does the proposal impact on Borough Plan priorities and areas of work ?

<b>impact on Borough Plan</b>	<b>Possible less capacity to support closing the gap in life chances, and safer neighbourhoods priorities</b>
-------------------------------	---

**6. Potential impacts on particular “protected characteristics” which includes meeting needs of diverse groups, any impacts for community relations and positive, negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts.**

Please mark with an “X” whether the proposal is likely to have a “positive, negative or neutral” impact on people with the following protected characteristic. Please use as much information and data as possible to undertake the initial screening assessment, including service user and community/staff feedback.

Please remember : How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider below:

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

1. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
2. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
3. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**7. Socio-economic disadvantage –** although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area’s, an individual’s or family’s economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation.

**Does the proposal positively/ negatively or have a neutral impact on addressing socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?**

**Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis**

	<b>Needs/Impacts</b>		
<b>Protected characteristic</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Negative/Disproportionate/Adverse</b>
Age	<b>X</b>		
Sex	<b>X</b>		
Race		<b>x</b>	
Disability		<b>x</b>	
Sexual orientation		<b>x</b>	
Gender reassignment/Gender identity		<b>x</b>	
Religion or belief		<b>x</b>	
Pregnancy or maternity		<b>x</b>	
Socio_Economic Disadvantage	<b>X</b>		

**8. Risk Level**

Please assign a risk level to any negative impacts on particular equality groups using the risk matrix provided.

<b>Protected characteristic</b>	<b>Description of potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts</b>	<b>Risk level</b>
<b>Age</b>	Service works predominantly with adolescents. There is a possible negative impact of reduced capacity leading to less individual intervention time for those young people	<b>Green (C3)</b>
<b>Sex</b>	The majority of service users are male and as such reduction of the service will disproportionality impact this protected group	<b>Green (C3)</b>
<b>Socio-economic disadvantage</b>	A high proportion of service users are from disadvantaged backgrounds and as such are disproportionately impacted by reductions in capacity	<b>Green (C3)</b>

## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis

### 9. Checklist

Please complete each row of the checklist

Checklist		
	Yes	No
Have any potential significant concerns amongst service users or the wider community been identified?		
Have you used information and data to inform your initial equality screening exercise ? Please outline data sources.		
Have any potential internal impacts been identified?		
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts on particular protected characteristics been identified?		
Have potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts been assigned a risk level using the matrix provided?		
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts of this proposal been assigned a “red” risk level?		
Where a red risk level has been assigned, has a full equality analysis been completed in respect of this proposal?		
Is a full equality analysis planned in respect of this proposal?		

## Equality impacts risk matrix

### How to use this matrix

- For negative impacts identified assign an overall risk level using the matrix below. This is based on the likelihood of the negative/adverse impact occurring and the seriousness of the impact.
- For **red** risk level impacts a full equality analysis should be completed. **Amber** risk level proposals may also be need to be considered for a full analysis, particularly where the equality groups affected may face cumulative effects from other proposals.
- A full equality analysis must accompany the final budget proposal presented to Cabinet in January and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Council Assembly in February.

		SERIOUSNESS OF IMPACT (1-4)			
		1	2	3	4
LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRING (A-D)	A				
	B				
	C				
	D				

**Likelihood:**

A = Very likely  
 B = Likely  
 C = Unlikely  
 D = Very unlikely

**Seriousness:**

1 = Major  
 2 = Significant  
 3 = Moderate  
 4 = Minor

## 2023/24 budget process

### Budget proposal equality impact and needs analysis screening template

This template should be used to carry out and record an initial screening of the equality implications of each budget proposal. Please note that this is not a substitute for a full equality analysis, which is required for all high and medium impact areas. A full equality analysis is required to inform the budget proposal decision making process in all high and medium impact areas for January Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and Council Assembly.

The equality screening template must be completed and be available for the first budget challenge round in the autumn.

#### 1. Details of budget proposal

<b>Budget proposal</b>	<b>Reduce Family Group Conferencing Service</b>
<b>Department</b>	<b>Children's &amp; Adults' Services</b>
<b>Division</b>	<b>Children &amp; Families</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Michael Crowe, Service Development Manager</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>16<sup>th</sup> December 2022</b>

#### 2. Brief summary of the budget proposal, its aims and the projected saving

<b>Brief description of budget proposal</b>	<p>Reduced offer of Family Group Conferences to be more targetted at those who would most benefit from this. Consolidation of responsibilities within existing roles that promote improvement in family engagement.</p> <p>Projected savings of £60k</p>
---	--

#### 3. Potential impacts on service users and/or the wider community; consider also socio-economic disadvantage

<b>Service user / wider community impacts</b>	<b>The service supports family and community networks to come together to provide their own support to vulnerable members of their networks. Reuctions in the service offer could impact on the capacity of families to self-help and identify how they can resolve support from within</b>
---	---

#### 4. Potential impacts the proposal may have internally, for example on the services delivered by other departments or on staff

<b>Internal impacts on the council</b>	<b>None</b>
--	-------------

#### 5. How does the proposal impact on Borough Plan priorities and areas of work ?

<b>impact on Borough Plan</b>	<b>Possible negative impact on closing the gap in life chances of vulnerable families</b>
-------------------------------	---

**6. Potential impacts on particular “protected characteristics” which includes meeting needs of diverse groups, any impacts for community relations and positive, negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts.**

Please mark with an “X” whether the proposal is likely to have a “positive, negative or neutral” impact on people with the following protected characteristic. Please use as much information and data as possible to undertake the initial screening assessment, including service user and community/staff feedback.

Please remember : How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider below:

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

1. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
2. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
3. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**7. Socio-economic disadvantage – although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area’s, an individual’s or family’s economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation.**

**Does the proposal positively/ negatively or have a neutral impact on addressing socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?**

**Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis**

	Needs/Impacts		
Protected characteristic	Positive	Neutral	Negative/Disproportionate/Adverse
Age		X	
Sex		X	
Race		X	
Disability		X	
Sexual orientation		X	
Gender reassignment/Gender identity		X	
Religion or belief		X	
Pregnancy or maternity		X	
Socio_Economic Disadvantage			x

**8. Risk Level**

Please assign a risk level to any negative impacts on particular equality groups using the risk matrix provided.

Protected characteristic	Description of potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts	Risk level
<b>Socio-economic</b>	The service provides support disproportionately to disadvantaged families, reducing team capacity could mean less support and intervention to those families	<b>Amber (C2)</b>

## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis

### 9. Checklist

Please complete each row of the checklist

Checklist		
	Yes	No
Have any potential significant concerns amongst service users or the wider community been identified?		x
Have you used information and data to inform your initial equality screening exercise ? Please outline data sources.	x	
Have any potential internal impacts been identified?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts on particular protected characteristics been identified?	x	
Have potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts been assigned a risk level using the matrix provided?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts of this proposal been assigned a “red” risk level?		x
Where a red risk level has been assigned, has a full equality analysis been completed in respect of this proposal?		x
Is a full equality analysis planned in respect of this proposal?		x

## Equality impacts risk matrix

### How to use this matrix

- For negative impacts identified assign an overall risk level using the matrix below. This is based on the likelihood of the negative/adverse impact occurring and the seriousness of the impact.
- For **red** risk level impacts a full equality analysis should be completed. **Amber** risk level proposals may also be need to be considered for a full analysis, particularly where the equality groups affected may face cumulative effects from other proposals.
- A full equality analysis must accompany the final budget proposal presented to Cabinet in January and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Council Assembly in February.

		SERIOUSNESS OF IMPACT (1-4)			
		1	2	3	4
LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRING (A-D)	A				
	B				
	C				
	D				

**Likelihood:**

A = Very likely  
 B = Likely  
 C = Unlikely  
 D = Very unlikely

**Seriousness:**

1 = Major  
 2 = Significant  
 3 = Moderate  
 4 = Minor

## 2023/24 budget process

### Budget proposal equality impact and needs analysis screening template

This template should be used to carry out and record an initial screening of the equality implications of each budget proposal. Please note that this is not a substitute for a full equality analysis, which is required for all high and medium impact areas. A full equality analysis is required to inform the budget proposal decision making process in all high and medium impact areas for January Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and Council Assembly.

The equality screening template must be completed and be available for the first budget challenge round in the autumn.

#### 1. Details of budget proposal

<b>Budget proposal</b>	<b>Disestablish Council Parenting Team</b>
<b>Department</b>	<b>Children's &amp; Adults' Services</b>
<b>Division</b>	<b>Children &amp; Families</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Michael Crowe, Service Development Manager</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>16<sup>th</sup> December 2022</b>

#### 2. Brief summary of the budget proposal, its aims and the projected saving

<b>Brief description of budget proposal</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>Projected savings £289k</p>
---	---

#### 3. Potential impacts on service users and/or the wider community; consider also socio-economic disadvantage

<b>Service user / wider community impacts</b>	<b>Cessation of the service would impact on the availability of parenting support to vulnerable families and vulnerable children. Possible impact on wider community of unaddressed support needs for parents</b>
---	---

#### 4. Potential impacts the proposal may have internally, for example on the services delivered by other departments or on staff

<b>Internal impacts on the council</b>	<b>Loss of office impact for staff in post</b>
--	--

#### 5. How does the proposal impact on Borough Plan priorities and areas of work ?

impact on Borough Plan	Impacts on capacity to improve the health and wellbeing of residents and closing the gap in life chances for some residents
------------------------	---

**6. Potential impacts on particular “protected characteristics” which includes meeting needs of diverse groups, any impacts for community relations and positive, negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts.**

Please mark with an “X” whether the proposal is likely to have a “positive, negative or neutral” impact on people with the following protected characteristic. Please use as much information and data as possible to undertake the initial screening assessment, including service user and community/staff feedback.

Please remember : How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider below:

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

1. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
2. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
3. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**7. Socio-economic disadvantage – although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area’s, an individual’s or family’s economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation.**

**Does the proposal positively/ negatively or have a neutral impact on addressing socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?**

**Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis**

	Needs/Impacts		
Protected characteristic	Positive	Neutral	Negative/Disproportionate/Adverse
Age			x
Sex		x	
Race		x	
Disability		x	
Sexual orientation		x	
Gender reassignment/Gender identity		x	
Religion or belief		x	
Pregnancy or maternity		x	
Socio_Economic Disadvantage			x

**8. Risk Level**

Please assign a risk level to any negative impacts on particular equality groups using the risk matrix provided.

Protected characteristic	Description of potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts	Risk level
<b>Age</b>	The service works with predominantly young families and cessation of the service will adversely impact young parents	<b>Amber (C2)</b>
<b>Socio-economic disadvantage</b>	Services are provided predominantly to those from disadvantaged backgrounds, reduction in service availability will potential leave needs of disadvantage communities less supported	<b>Amber (C2)</b>

## Equality impacts risk matrix

### How to use this matrix

- For negative impacts identified assign an overall risk level using the matrix below. This is based on the likelihood of the negative/adverse impact occurring and the seriousness of the impact.
- For **red** risk level impacts a full equality analysis should be completed. **Amber** risk level proposals may also be need to be considered for a full analysis, particularly where the equality groups affected may face cumulative effects from other proposals.
- A full equality analysis must accompany the final budget proposal presented to Cabinet in January and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Council Assembly in February.

		SERIOUSNESS OF IMPACT (1-4)			
		1	2	3	4
LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRING (A-D)	A				
	B				
	C				
	D				

**Likelihood:**

A = Very likely  
 B = Likely  
 C = Unlikely  
 D = Very unlikely

**Seriousness:**

1 = Major  
 2 = Significant  
 3 = Moderate  
 4 = Minor

## 2023/24 budget process

### Budget proposal equality impact and needs analysis screening template

This template should be used to carry out and record an initial screening of the equality implications of each budget proposal. Please note that this is not a substitute for a full equality analysis, which is required for all high and medium impact areas. A full equality analysis is required to inform the budget proposal decision making process in all high and medium impact areas for January Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and Council Assembly.

The equality screening template must be completed and be available for the first budget challenge round in the autumn.

#### 1. Details of budget proposal

<b>Budget proposal</b>	<b>Redistribution of caseload capacity across Safeguarding &amp; Corporate Parenting Services</b>
<b>Department</b>	<b>Children's &amp; Adults' Services</b>
<b>Division</b>	<b>Children &amp; Families</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Michael Crowe, Service Development Manager</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>16<sup>th</sup> December 2022</b>

#### 2. Brief summary of the budget proposal, its aims and the projected saving

<b>Brief description of budget proposal</b>	Reduction in posts within social work services and re-distribution of case load capacity
---	--

#### 3. Potential impacts on service users and/or the wider community; consider also socio-economic disadvantage

<b>Service user / wider community impacts</b>	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
---	--

#### 4. Potential impacts the proposal may have internally, for example on the services delivered by other departments or on staff

<b>Internal impacts on the council</b>	Limited impact on other staff who may see a small increase in their average workload
--	--

#### 5. How does the proposal impact on Borough Plan priorities and areas of work ?

<b>impact on Borough Plan</b>	N/a
-------------------------------	-----

**6. Potential impacts on particular “protected characteristics” which includes meeting needs of diverse groups, any impacts for community relations and positive, negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts.**

Please mark with an “X” whether the proposal is likely to have a “positive, negative or neutral” impact on people with the following protected characteristic. Please use as much information and data as possible to undertake the initial screening assessment, including service user and community/staff feedback.

Please remember : How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider below:

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

1. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
2. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
3. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**7. Socio-economic disadvantage –** although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area's, an individual's or family's economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation.

**Does the proposal positively/ negatively or have a neutral impact on addressing socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?**

**Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis**

	Needs/Impacts		
Protected characteristic	Positive	Neutral	Negative/Disproportionate/Adverse
Age		x	
Sex		x	
Race		x	
Disability		x	
Sexual orientation		x	
Gender reassignment/Gender identity		x	
Religion or belief		x	
Pregnancy or maternity		x	
Socio_Economic Disadvantage		x	

**8. Risk Level**

Please assign a risk level to any negative impacts on particular equality groups using the risk matrix provided.

Protected characteristic	Description of potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts	Risk level

## 9. Checklist

Please complete each row of the checklist

Checklist		
	Yes	No
Have any potential significant concerns amongst service users or the wider community been identified?		x
Have you used information and data to inform your initial equality screening exercise ? Please outline data sources.	x	
Have any potential internal impacts been identified?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts on particular protected characteristics been identified?		x
Have potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts been assigned a risk level using the matrix provided?		x
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts of this proposal been assigned a “red” risk level?		x
Where a red risk level has been assigned, has a full equality analysis been completed in respect of this proposal?		x
Is a full equality analysis planned in respect of this proposal?		x

## Equality impacts risk matrix

### How to use this matrix

- For negative impacts identified assign an overall risk level using the matrix below. This is based on the likelihood of the negative/adverse impact occurring and the seriousness of the impact.
- For **red** risk level impacts a full equality analysis should be completed. **Amber** risk level proposals may also be need to be considered for a full analysis, particularly where the equality groups affected may face cumulative effects from other proposals.
- A full equality analysis must accompany the final budget proposal presented to Cabinet in January and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Council Assembly in February.

		SERIOUSNESS OF IMPACT (1-4)			
		1	2	3	4
LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRING (A-D)	A				
	B				
	C				
	D				

**Likelihood:**

A = Very likely  
 B = Likely  
 C = Unlikely  
 D = Very unlikely

**Seriousness:**

1 = Major  
 2 = Significant  
 3 = Moderate  
 4 = Minor

## 2023/24 budget process

### Budget proposal equality impact and needs analysis screening template

This template should be used to carry out and record an initial screening of the equality implications of each budget proposal. Please note that this is not a substitute for a full equality analysis, which is required for all high and medium impact areas. A full equality analysis is required to inform the budget proposal decision making process in all high and medium impact areas for January Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and Council Assembly.

The equality screening template must be completed and be available for the first budget challenge round in the autumn.

#### 1. Details of budget proposal

<b>Budget proposal</b>	The redesign of short breaks
<b>Department</b>	Children's and Adult's Services
<b>Division</b>	Adult Social Care
<b>Lead officer</b>	Rob Skipwith
<b>Date</b>	09/11/2022

#### 2. Brief summary of the budget proposal, its aims and the projected saving, efficiency, commitment

<b>Brief description of budget proposal</b>	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 £600,000
---	---

#### 3. Potential impacts on service users and/or the wider community; consider also socio-economic disadvantage

<b>Service user / wider community impacts</b>	There will be an impact on service users with Learning Disabilities, Autism and challenging behaviours as well as their families and carers.
---	--

#### 4. Potential impacts the proposal may have internally, for example on the services delivered by other departments or on staff

<b>Internal impacts on the council</b>	The move away from focussing on specialist short breaks may put pressure on other teams including the council's placement team.
--	---

**5. How does the proposal impact on the Council Delivery Plan priorities and areas of work ?**

<b>Council Delivery Plan impact</b>	This does not impact the Council Delivery Plan or associated work.
-------------------------------------	--

**6. Potential impacts on particular “protected characteristics” which includes meeting the needs of diverse groups, any impacts for community relations and positive, negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts.**

Please mark with an “X” whether the proposal is likely to have a “positive, negative or neutral” impact on people with the following protected characteristic. Please use as much information and data as possible to undertake the initial screening assessment, including service user and community/staff feedback.

Please remember: How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider the below:

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

- a. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- b. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
- c. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will:

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**7. Socio-economic disadvantage – does the proposal positively/ negatively or have a neutral impact on addressing socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?**

Although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area's, an individual's or family's economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation.

**Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis**

	Needs/Impacts		
Protected characteristic	Positive	Neutral	Negative/Disproportionate/Adverse
Age		x	
Sex		x	
Race			x
Disability			x
Sexual orientation		x	
Gender reassignment/Gender identity		x	
Religion or belief		x	
Pregnancy or maternity		x	
Socio_Economic Disadvantage			x

**8. Risk Level**

Please assign a risk level to any negative impacts on particular equality groups using the risk matrix provided.

Protected characteristic	Description of potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts	Risk level
<b>Race</b>	Black, Asian Minority Ethnic people are disproportionately represented within the cohort of individuals supported by the All Age Disability & Learning Disability service	
<b>Disability</b>	The cohort of individuals accessing short break services are disabled	
<b>Socio_Economic Disadvantage</b>	CYP& Adults with disability in Southwark are more likely to be social economically disadvantaged than those without disability	

## 9. Checklist

Please complete each row of the checklist

Checklist		
	Yes	No
Have any potential significant concerns amongst service users or the wider community been identified?		x
Have you used information and data to inform your initial equality screening exercise ? Please outline data sources. Mosaic, Power BI, Existing JSNA	x	
Have any potential internal impacts been identified?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts on particular protected characteristics been identified?	x	
Have potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts been assigned a risk level using the matrix provided?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts of this proposal been assigned a "red" risk level?	x	
Where a red risk level has been assigned, has a full equality analysis been completed in respect of this proposal?		x
Is a full equality analysis planned in respect of this proposal?	x	

## Equality impacts risk matrix

### How to use this matrix

- For negative impacts identified assign an overall risk level using the matrix below. This is based on the likelihood of the negative/adverse impact occurring and the seriousness of the impact.
- For **red** risk level impacts a full equality analysis should be completed. **Amber** risk level proposals may also be need to be considered for a full analysis, particularly where the equality groups affected may face cumulative effects from other proposals.
- A full equality analysis must accompany the final budget proposal presented to Cabinet and Council Assembly in February.

		SERIOUSNESS OF IMPACT (1-4)			
		1	2	3	4
LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRING (A-D)	A				
	B				
	C				
	D				

**Likelihood:**

A = Very likely  
 B = Likely  
 C = Unlikely  
 D = Very unlikely

**Seriousness:**

1 = Major  
 2 = Significant  
 3 = Moderate  
 4 = Minor

## 2023/24 budget process

### Budget proposal equality impact and needs analysis screening template

This template should be used to carry out and record an initial screening of the equality implications of each budget proposal. Please note that this is not a substitute for a full equality analysis, which is required for all high and medium impact areas. A full equality analysis is required to inform the budget proposal decision making process in all high and medium impact areas for January Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and Council Assembly.

The equality screening template must be completed and be available for the first budget challenge round in the autumn.

#### 1. Details of budget proposal

<b>Budget proposal</b>	<b>Reductions in Family Early Help Service</b>
<b>Department</b>	<b>Children's &amp; Adults' Services</b>
<b>Division</b>	<b>Children &amp; Families</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Michael Crowe, Service Development Manager</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>16<sup>th</sup> December 2022</b>

#### 2. Brief summary of the budget proposal, its aims and the projected saving

<b>Brief description of budget proposal</b>	Reduction of 2 practitioners posts within early help services  Projected savings £150k
---	--

#### 3. Potential impacts on service users and/or the wider community; consider also socio-economic disadvantage

<b>Service user / wider community impacts</b>	<b>Proposal would mean reduced capacity in the service to provide support and intervention for vulnerable families. Impact is minor as capacity can be redistributed to wider services</b>
---	--

#### 4. Potential impacts the proposal may have internally, for example on the services delivered by other departments or on staff

<b>Internal impacts on the council</b>	<b>Possible minor impact on increase in workload of other service staff</b>
--	---

#### 5. How does the proposal impact on Borough Plan priorities and areas of work ?

<b>impact on Borough Plan</b>	<b>Possible impact on capacity to provide services to support closing the gap in life chances</b>
-------------------------------	---

**6. Potential impacts on particular “protected characteristics” which includes meeting needs of diverse groups, any impacts for community relations and positive, negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts.**

Please mark with an “X” whether the proposal is likely to have a “positive, negative or neutral” impact on people with the following protected characteristic. Please use as much information and data as possible to undertake the initial screening assessment, including service user and community/staff feedback.

Please remember : How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider below:

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

1. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
2. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
3. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**7. Socio-economic disadvantage –** although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area's, an individual's or family's economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation.

**Does the proposal positively/ negatively or have a neutral impact on addressing socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?**

**Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis**

	<b>Needs/Impacts</b>		
<b>Protected characteristic</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Negative/Disproportionate/Adverse</b>
Age		<b>x</b>	
Sex		<b>x</b>	
Race		<b>x</b>	
Disability		<b>x</b>	
Sexual orientation		<b>x</b>	
Gender reassignment/Gender identity		<b>x</b>	
Religion or belief		<b>x</b>	
Pregnancy or maternity		<b>x</b>	
Socio_Economic Disadvantage			<b>x</b>

**8. Risk Level**

Please assign a risk level to any negative impacts on particular equality groups using the risk matrix provided.

<b>Protected characteristic</b>	<b>Description of potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts</b>	<b>Risk level</b>
<b>Socio-economic</b>	The service mostly works to support vulnerable families with a higher proportion of services provided to those from disadvantage socio-economic backgrounds. Reduction in capacity to support those families could lead to an adverse impact on their health and wellbeing. Mitigated by minimal reduction in service offer, and sufficient capacity to absorb within wider services	<b>Green( C3)</b>

## 9. Checklist

Please complete each row of the checklist

Checklist		
	Yes	No
Have any potential significant concerns amongst service users or the wider community been identified?		x
Have you used information and data to inform your initial equality screening exercise ? Please outline data sources.	x	
Have any potential internal impacts been identified?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts on particular protected characteristics been identified?	x	
Have potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts been assigned a risk level using the matrix provided?	x	
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts of this proposal been assigned a “red” risk level?		x
Where a red risk level has been assigned, has a full equality analysis been completed in respect of this proposal?		x
Is a full equality analysis planned in respect of this proposal?		x

## Equality impacts risk matrix

### How to use this matrix

- For negative impacts identified assign an overall risk level using the matrix below. This is based on the likelihood of the negative/adverse impact occurring and the seriousness of the impact.
- For **red** risk level impacts a full equality analysis should be completed. **Amber** risk level proposals may also be need to be considered for a full analysis, particularly where the equality groups affected may face cumulative effects from other proposals.
- A full equality analysis must accompany the final budget proposal presented to Cabinet in January and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Council Assembly in February.

		SERIOUSNESS OF IMPACT (1-4)			
		1	2	3	4
LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRING (A-D)	A				
	B				
	C				
	D				

**Likelihood:**

A = Very likely  
 B = Likely  
 C = Unlikely  
 D = Very unlikely

**Seriousness:**

1 = Major  
 2 = Significant  
 3 = Moderate  
 4 = Minor

## 2023/24 budget process

### Budget proposal equality impact and needs analysis screening template

This template should be used to carry out and record an initial screening of the equality implications of each budget proposal. Please note that this is not a substitute for a full equality analysis, which is required for all high and medium impact areas. A full equality analysis is required to inform the budget proposal decision making process in all high and medium impact areas for January Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and Council Assembly.

The equality screening template must be completed and be available for the first budget challenge round in the autumn.

#### 1. Details of budget proposal

<b>Budget proposal</b>	Reduction in FEH Evaluation Officer posts
<b>Department</b>	Children's & Adults' Services
<b>Division</b>	Children & Families
<b>Lead officer</b>	Michael Crowe, Service Development Manager
<b>Date</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> December 2022

#### 2. Brief summary of the budget proposal, its aims and the projected saving

<b>Brief description of budget proposal</b>	Removal of vacant post in data team Projected saving of £40k
---	---

#### 3. Potential impacts on service users and/or the wider community; consider also socio-economic disadvantage

<b>Service user / wider community impacts</b>	None
---	------

#### 4. Potential impacts the proposal may have internally, for example on the services delivered by other departments or on staff

<b>Internal impacts on the council</b>	None
--	------

#### 5. How does the proposal impact on Borough Plan priorities and areas of work ?

<b>impact on Borough Plan</b>	N/a
-------------------------------	-----

**6. Potential impacts on particular “protected characteristics” which includes meeting needs of diverse groups, any impacts for community relations and positive, negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts.**

Please mark with an “X” whether the proposal is likely to have a “positive, negative or neutral” impact on people with the following protected characteristic. Please use as much information and data as possible to undertake the initial screening assessment, including service user and community/staff feedback.

Please remember : How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider below:

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

1. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
2. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
3. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**7. Socio-economic disadvantage –** although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area’s, an individual’s or family’s economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation.

**Does the proposal positively/ negatively or have a neutral impact on addressing socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?**

### Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis

---

	Needs/Impacts		
Protected characteristic	Positive	Neutral	Negative/Disproportionate/Adverse
Age		x	
Sex		x	
Race		x	
Disability		x	
Sexual orientation		x	
Gender reassignment/Gender identity		x	
Religion or belief		x	
Pregnancy or maternity		x	
Socio_Economic Disadvantage		x	

#### 8. Risk Level

Please assign a risk level to any negative impacts on particular equality groups using the risk matrix provided.

Protected characteristic	Description of potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts	Risk level

## 9. Checklist

Please complete each row of the checklist

Checklist		
	Yes	No
Have any potential significant concerns amongst service users or the wider community been identified?		x
Have you used information and data to inform your initial equality screening exercise ? Please outline data sources.		x
Have any potential internal impacts been identified?		x
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts on particular protected characteristics been identified?		x
Have potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts been assigned a risk level using the matrix provided?		x
Have any potential negative, disproportionate or adverse impacts of this proposal been assigned a “red” risk level?		x
Where a red risk level has been assigned, has a full equality analysis been completed in respect of this proposal?		x
Is a full equality analysis planned in respect of this proposal?		x

## Equality impacts risk matrix

### How to use this matrix

- For negative impacts identified assign an overall risk level using the matrix below. This is based on the likelihood of the negative/adverse impact occurring and the seriousness of the impact.
- For **red** risk level impacts a full equality analysis should be completed. **Amber** risk level proposals may also be need to be considered for a full analysis, particularly where the equality groups affected may face cumulative effects from other proposals.
- A full equality analysis must accompany the final budget proposal presented to Cabinet in January and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Council Assembly in February.

		SERIOUSNESS OF IMPACT (1-4)			
		1	2	3	4
LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRING (A-D)	A				
	B				
	C				
	D				

**Likelihood:**

A = Very likely  
 B = Likely  
 C = Unlikely  
 D = Very unlikely

**Seriousness:**

1 = Major  
 2 = Significant  
 3 = Moderate  
 4 = Minor

## BUDGET PROPOSAL EQUALITY IMPACT AND NEEDS ANALYSIS TEMPLATE

<b>BUDGET PROPOSAL</b>		<b>Reduction in funding for 0-19 community children's services (health visiting and school nursing)</b>			
<b>EQUALITY ANALYSIS AUTHOR</b>		Youssof Oskrochi, senior public health specialist			
<b>STRATEGIC DIRECTOR:</b>		David Quirke-Thornton			
<b>DEPARTMENT</b>		Children & Adults	<b>DIVISION</b>	Public Health	
<b>PERIOD ANALYSIS UNDERTAKEN</b>		2022			
<b>DATE OF REVIEW (IF APPLICABLE)</b>					
<b>SIGN-OFF</b>	Sangeeta Leahy	<b>POSITION</b>	Director of Public Health	<b>DATE</b>	26/01/2023

### Guidance notes

#### Things to remember:

Under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) within the Equality Act 2010, public authorities are required to have due regard to the aims of the general equality duty when making decisions, *including budget related decisions*.

The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:

1. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
2. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
3. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values: that we will

- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism.

The PSED is also about relevance and proportionality, hence the higher the degree of relevance to equalities an area has, so accordingly the degree of data/information required.

The “protected characteristics” under the Act are: Age, Sex, Disability, Race Religion/Belief, Sexual Orientation, Gender Reassignment, Pregnancy and Maternity Marriage and Civil Partnerships<sup>1</sup>. In addition the Council also considers socio-economic status and socio-economic disadvantage.

An equality impact and needs analysis should be completed in respect of key budget proposals where it is identified via screening that there is a significant risk of the decision having an adverse, negative or disproportionate impact on equality groups sharing a “protected characteristic”. Indicate also where the proposal will have a positive impact on our duty to promote equality.

The Council also has a specific duty to publish information showing how it has met its duties under the Act. A full equality impact and needs analysis for all high and medium impact areas must accompany the final Cabinet report on budget proposals in January

Understanding the implications of the council’s budget decisions on people with different protected characteristics is an important part of complying with the general equality duty.

Under the PSED the council must ensure that:

- Decision-makers are aware of the general equality duty’s requirements.
- The general equality duty is complied with before and at the time a proposal is under consideration and when a decision is taken.
- We 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.
- We have sufficient information to understand all the potential effects of the proposal.
- We consciously consider the need to do the things set out in the aims of the general equality duty not only when a proposal is developed and decided upon, but when the decision is being implemented.
- Importantly an equality analysis informs the decision making process from the start and carries through into implementation stages.

### **The budget setting process:**

1. Undertake an initial equality screening using all available information, including any consultation and engagement data; primary or secondary research; demographic data; local feedback etc.
2. An initial equality screening should be available at the first budget challenge process; if a full equality analysis has also begun at this stage then this should also be made available at the budget challenge process.
3. Where the initial equality screening highlights that a full equality analysis is required, then it should be started at the earliest.
4. An initial equality screening and where possible a full equality analysis should inform the decision making process at December Cabinet.
5. At the January Cabinet an initial equality screening and full equality analysis where highlighted must be available to decision makers.
6. The same must be made available to the Equality and Human Rights Panel (EHRP) in January and also to Overview and Scrutiny Committee in January.

---

<sup>1</sup> Only the “eliminate unlawful discrimination” part of the duty applies to marriage and civil partnerships

7. All documents should also be made available to full Council Assembly in February.
8. As part of the implementation of the budget decision the full equality analysis must be reviewed and added to as required.

### **When carrying out the analysis:**

- How does the proposal sit with Borough Plan commitments and priorities ?
- Consider all the protected characteristics and all aims of the general equality duty (apart from in relation to marriage and civil partnership, where only the discrimination aim applies).
- In addition, consider impacts and needs arising from socio-economic disadvantage in the borough. Overall will the proposal help to address socio-economic disadvantage in the borough ?
- Under the socio-economic duty we are required to ensure that we do not make conditions worse for those experiencing socio-economic disadvantage and to mitigate possible adverse impacts wherever possible.
- Focus on understanding the effects of a proposal on equality and any actions needed as a result, not just the production of the document.
- It is about finding out about and understanding needs and impacts for diverse groups in relation to the three parts of the duty when developing a specific budget proposal.
- Take a proportionate approach. In practice this means giving greater consideration to the Duty when a proposal has the potential to have a significant effect on discrimination or equality of opportunity, the public or employees, and less consideration when the effect on equality is slight.
- Use good evidence. Where it isn't available, take steps to gather it (where practical and proportionate). Information and data is key to an adequate equality analysis.
- Using insights from engagement with employees, service users and others can help provide evidence for equality analysis.
- Findings from an equality analysis help us to understand needs/impacts and implications for diverse groups in the community. A decision maker then has to weigh up the findings in relation to all material considerations and on balance make the final decision. The Council needs to be able to demonstrate that it has undertaken a reasonable and rational process of decision making.
- Where mitigating actions are identified in the equality analysis, these should then be incorporated into departmental and service business plans.

The public will be able to view and scrutinise any equality analysis undertaken. Equality analysis should therefore be written in a clear and transparent way using plain English. Equality analysis will be published under the council's publishing of equality information.

Equality analysis should be reviewed after a sensible period of time to see if the effects that were expected have occurred. This does not always mean repeating the full equality analysis, but using the experience gained through implementation to check the findings and to make any necessary adjustments.

Engagement with the community is recommended as part of the development of an equality analysis.

## Section 1: Description of budget proposal

### Background

Since 2015, Guys and St Thomas's (GSTT) community services have provided the 0-19 children's community services for Southwark. They have operated under a section 75 agreement that Southwark holds with the South East London ICS (previously CCG).

We have been working with the service over the years to adapt to the needs of the changing population.

### Current financial situation

The cost of the original contract was ~£7.5m, split between the health visiting (HV) at ~£6.25m and school nursing (SN) services at ~£1.27m.

The nature of the variation is a new total contract value of £6,649,364.00.

### Summary needs assessment (details in appendix 1)

A review and analysis of the population level estimates of need available (both snapshot and trend data) have allowed an assessment to be made with the following outcomes (Table 1):

1. There is very high confidence that the 0-5 population has decreased and has reduced demand and need compared to previous years.
2. There is high confidence that the 5-19 population (and therefore school nursing service) has increased demand and need levels compared to previous years.

**Table 1. Summary of the evidence and judged impact on health visiting and school nursing service needs**

Service	Markers suggestive of increased needs	Markers suggestive of static need	Markers suggestive of reduced need	Interpretation	Confidence
Health Visiting (0 to <5 population)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower % of healthy weight children entering reception than London</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deprivation score has improved slightly</li> <li>Safeguarding demands for 0-4's remained relatively static.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large reduction in 0-5 population</li> <li>Reduction in LAC rate</li> <li>Reduction in service activity</li> <li>Falling &lt;18's conception rate</li> </ul>	Overall reduced need levels	Very high

## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis

<b>School Nursing (5 to 19 population)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in 5-19 population</li> <li>• Lower % of healthy weight children in Year 6 than London</li> <li>• Lower attainment at foundation levels than London</li> <li>• Higher % of SMEH students than London</li> <li>• Increase in FSM eligibility</li> <li>• Higher % of students with SEND requirements</li> <li>• Increase in age 12+ safeguarding demand</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deprivation score has improved slightly</li> <li>• Safeguarding demands for 5-11's remained relatively static or reduced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in LAC rate</li> <li>• Improvement in youth justice figures</li> </ul>	<b>Overall increased need levels</b>	<b>High</b>
--	--	---	---	--------------------------------------	-------------

### Proposed impact of savings overall

#### Health visiting service

- Evidence of reducing 0-5 population (between 11% and 25% lower) and reduction in service activity data (12% reduction since 2018/19).
- The magnitude of the reduction in eligible population is similar to the reduction in budget (11.5%) that the service is expected to meet.
- Population level indicators also reveal a reduction in the levels of need.
- Therefore, implementing the budget savings is not expected to adversely impact the eligible.

#### School nursing service

- There is evidence of increasing 5-19 population and worsening need indicators; this would result in increased demand for the service.
- It is therefore likely that overall demand on the school nursing service has increased.

## Section 2: Overview of service users and key stakeholders consulted

Service users and stakeholders	
<b>Key users of the department or service</b>	Health visiting and school nursing providers – <b>Not formally yet consulted as part of this work.</b> Children and their families aged 0 to under 5 (health visiting service) – <b>Not formally yet consulted as part of this work.</b> Children and their families aged 5-19 (School nursing service) – <b>Not formally yet consulted as part of this work.</b>
<b>Key stakeholders who were/are involved in development of this budget proposal</b>	Public health commissioners in Southwark Public health commissioners in London Borough of Lambeth Children and Adults board Councillor leads Finance

Please remember : How does the budget proposal incorporate and consider below:

**The public sector equality duty ( PSED ) requires us to find out about and give due consideration to the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to the three parts of the duty:**

4. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
5. Advancing equality of opportunity, including finding out about and meeting diverse needs of our local communities, addressing disadvantage and barriers to equal access; enabling all voices to be heard in our engagement and consultation undertaken; increasing the participation of under represented groups
6. Fostering good community relations; promoting good relations; to be a borough where all feel welcome, included, valued, safe and respected.

The PSED is now also further reinforced in the two additional Fairer Future For All values; that we will


- a. Always work to make Southwark more equal and just
- b. Stand against all forms of discrimination and racism

**Socio-economic disadvantage** – although the Equality Act 2010 does not include socio-economic status as one of the protected characteristics, Southwark Council recognises that this continues to be a major cause of inequality in the borough. Socio economic status is the measure of an area's, an individual's or family's economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation

### Section 3: Pre-implementation equality analysis


This section considers the potential needs and impacts (positive and negative) on groups with 'protected characteristics', the equality information on which this analysis is based and any mitigating actions to be taken. It is about needs and impacts of diverse groups in relation to the three parts of the duty ( see pages above ).

<b>Age – Older people, young people etc</b>
<b>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of budget proposal, which includes addressing needs of these groups; This also includes needs/impacts arising from socio-economic disadvantage and age.</b>
<p><b>Impact assessment: No impact</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is anticipated that there is no impact as the savings will adjust the overall financial envelop to be more aligned with the reduction in child population and the associated reduction in services.</li> <li>2. It is unlikely that a reduction in operating budget would have any impact based on maternal age, especially as the service is estimated to be currently under-utilised.</li> <li>3. It maybe that the impacts of the increased cost of living and other wider socio economic may affect the health needs of this population. This will be carefully monitored as services are re-aligned to the changing population.</li> </ol>
<b>Equality information on which above analysis is based</b>
<p><b>Definition:</b> Where this is referred to, it refers to a person belonging to a particular age (e.g. 32 year olds) or range of ages (e.g. 18 - 30 year olds).</p> <p><b>Data and background</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Since 2010, the age profile of mothers in the borough has changed, with significant reductions in births among younger women and increases among those aged 40 and over</li> </ol> <p><b>Figure 1. Percentage change in live births in Southwark by age between 2010 and 2021.</b></p>



5. A review of service equity in March 2022 identified that there was a smaller proportion of young mothers (aged 19-29) enrolled in the service than would be expected for Southwark's population
6. The service recently decommissioned the Family Nurse Practitioner (FNP) programme, which specifically targeted mothers under 19 years old. This seems appropriate given that in 2021 only around 33 births in the borough were to mothers under 20 and this number is likely to decrease further.
7. It is however likely that young and more vulnerable mothers will continue to have greater needs. As the operating budget changes are implemented, there will be close working with providers and users to ensure that young mothers continue to be identified and offered higher tiers of service provision owing to their increased vulnerability.

**Figure 2. Maternal age comparison: Southwark and health visiting services**



### Mitigating actions to be taken

8. As the operating budget changes are implemented, there will be close working with providers and users to ensure that young or vulnerable mothers continue to be identified and offered higher tiers of service provision owing to their increased vulnerability.

<b>Disability</b> - A person has a disability if s/he has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on that person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. Important to also consider impacts on different disabilities.			
<b>Possible impacts (positive and negative) of budget proposal, which includes addressing needs of disabled people. A disabled person should not be in a less favourable position to a non-disabled person as a result of this proposal and decision.</b>			
<b>This also includes needs/impacts arising from socio-economic disadvantage and disability.</b>			
<b>Impact assessment: No impact</b>			
1. It is unlikely that a reduction in operating budget would have any impact on users with disabilities. 2. The national specification for health visiting services accounts for disabilities within its need levels and thus it is expected that at the minimum the current status quo is maintained. 3. The provider should however remain vigilant and be receptive to any issues and/or approaches which may arise from service users with disabilities regarding their access to the service.			
<b>Equality information on which above analysis is based</b>			
4. The annual population survey 2009/10 estimated that there were 36,600 people in Southwark with a disability, 17.5% of the adult population <sup>2</sup> . 5. Health visiting services stratify clients into risk groups based on criterion that include disability.			
<b>Table 1. Proportion (and number) of HV clients by level of need per year</b>			
	<b>Universal</b>	<b>UP</b>	<b>UPP</b>
2018/19	89.0% (13,166)	9.4% (1,383)	1.6% (234)
2019/20	89.3% (12,324)	9.2% (1,263)	1.5% (211)
2020/21	89.9% (11,540)	8.5% (1,095)	1.6% (203)
2021/22*	88.8%	9.6%	1.6%

<sup>2</sup> [Southwark | Statistical Databank \(southwarkstats.com\)](https://southwarkstats.com)

Average	89.3%	9.2%	1.6%
<p>6. Whilst this is lower than the recorded disability proportion of Southwark (10.8% vs 17.5%), it should be noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Not all disabilities may require a higher levels of support,</li> <li>(b) The Southwark estimate is adult population and the health visiting service also considers the disability status of the child.</li> <li>(c) Not all clients at higher levels of need will be due to disabilities as the criteria are broad (e.g. mental health, substance misuse etc.).</li> </ul>			
<b>Mitigating actions to be taken</b>			
<p>7. As the operating budget changes are implemented, there will be close working with providers and users to ensure that mothers and children with disabilities continue to be identified and offered appropriate service provision owing to their increased vulnerability.</p>			

<p><b>Gender reassignment</b> - The process of transitioning from one gender to another.  <b>And Gender Identity</b> – this includes the wide spectrum of all gender identities.</p>
<p><b>Possible impacts (positive and negative) of budget proposal, which includes addressing needs of these groups.</b></p>
<p><b>Impact assessment:</b> No impact</p>
<p><b>Equality information on which above analysis is based.</b></p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stonewall estimate that up to 1% of the population may identify as transgender, including people who identify as non-binary.<sup>3</sup></li> <li>2. Applying this estimate to Southwark suggests up to 2,567<sup>4</sup> residents may identify as transgender.</li> <li>3. The service does not currently collect information on gender reassignment for</li> </ol>

<sup>3</sup> [The truth about trans \(stonewall.org.uk\)](https://www.stonewall.org.uk)

<sup>4</sup> Based on Southwark's ONS 2020 mid year population estimate of 256,712.

demographic or criteria assessment purposes for this age group.
<b>Mitigating actions to be taken</b>
4. Assessments will take into account any additional needs identified for this population group. 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.

<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b> - (Only to be considered in respect to the need to eliminate discrimination).
<b>Possible needs/ impacts (positive and negative) of budget proposal</b>
<b>Impact assessment:</b> No impact
<b>Equality information on which above analysis is based</b>
1. Census 2011 data revealed that over half of adults in Southwark had never been married or registered in a civil partnership at the time of the Census.
<b>Mitigating actions to be taken</b>
2. It is not anticipated that any operating budget changes will impact on this population group. Specific vulnerabilities associated with personal marriage or civil partnership circumstances will be assessed and identified as part of the routine assessment for vulnerabilities.

<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b> - Pregnancy is the condition of being pregnant or expecting a baby. Maternity refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth, and this includes treating a woman unfavourably because she is breastfeeding.
---

<p><b>Possible impacts (positive and negative) of budget proposal, which includes addressing needs of these groups.</b></p> <p><b>This also includes needs/impacts arising from socio-economic disadvantage and pregnancy and maternity.</b></p>														
<p><b>Impact assessment:</b> No impact</p> <p>1. It is unlikely that a reduction in operating budget would have any impact on pregnant users.</p>														
<p><b>Equality information on which above analysis is based</b></p> <p>2. In 2021, Southwark had a total fertility rate<sup>5</sup> of 1.1 children per woman. This is lower than the national average for England (1.62).</p> <p>3. In 2021, Southwark had 3,372 live births, down from 5,265 in 2010, a 36% decrease.</p> <p>4. In 2021, 67% of mothers giving birth in Southwark were aged 30-39 with less than 1% being under 20</p> <p><b>Figure 3. Live births in Southwark in 2021 by maternal age</b></p> <table><thead><tr><th>Maternal Age Group</th><th>Percentage</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Under 20 years</td><td>1%</td></tr><tr><td>20-24 years</td><td>6%</td></tr><tr><td>25-29 years</td><td>16%</td></tr><tr><td>30-34 years</td><td>37%</td></tr><tr><td>35-39 years</td><td>30%</td></tr><tr><td>40+ years</td><td>9%</td></tr></tbody></table>	Maternal Age Group	Percentage	Under 20 years	1%	20-24 years	6%	25-29 years	16%	30-34 years	37%	35-39 years	30%	40+ years	9%
Maternal Age Group	Percentage													
Under 20 years	1%													
20-24 years	6%													
25-29 years	16%													
30-34 years	37%													
35-39 years	30%													
40+ years	9%													
<p><b>Mitigating actions to be taken</b></p> <p>5. It is not anticipated that any operating budget changes will impact on this population group. Specific vulnerabilities associated with pregnancy and maternity circumstances will be assessed and identified as part of the routine</p>														

<sup>5</sup> The total fertility rate in a specific year is defined as the total number of children that would be born to each woman if she were to live to the end of her child-bearing years and give birth to children in alignment with the prevailing age-specific fertility rates.

assessment for vulnerabilities.

**Race** - Refers to the protected characteristic of Race. It refers to a group of people defined by their race, colour, and nationality (including citizenship) ethnic or national origins.

**Possible impacts (positive and negative) of budget proposal, which includes addressing diverse needs of these groups.**

**This also includes needs/impacts arising from socio-economic disadvantage and race/ethnicity.**


**Impact assessment: No impact**

1. Black and minority ethnic populations may experience different health needs compared to a white population for example particular health conditions such as sickle cell, heart disease, diabetes and hypertension.

**Equality information on which above analysis is based**

2. Southwark is an ethnically diverse borough with around 60% of its population being from Black and other ethnic minority backgrounds.
3. In 2021, the majority of births within Southwark (54%) occur to women who were not born in the UK. The most common countries were Nigeria, Sierra Leone, USA, France and Ghana.

**Figure 4. Ethnicity comparison - Southwark and health visiting services**



## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis

<p>4. The same review also identified that those from Black and other ethnic backgrounds were less likely to have completed appointments when compared to those from White ethnic group.</p> <p>5. To note that there are data collection issues around recording of ethnicity with around 20% of clients not having ethnicity data recorded.</p>
<b>Mitigating actions to be taken</b>
<p>6. It is not anticipated that any operating budget changes will impact on this population group. Specific vulnerabilities associated with health conditions affecting a BAME mother or child will be assessed and identified as part of the routine assessment for vulnerabilities.</p>

<b>Religion and belief</b> - Religion has the meaning usually given to it but belief includes religious and philosophical beliefs including lack of belief (e.g. Atheism). Generally, a belief should affect your life choices or the way you live for it to be included in the definition.
<b>Possible impacts (positive and negative) of budget proposal, which includes addressing needs of these groups.</b>
<p><b>Impact assessment:</b> No impact</p> <p>1. It is unlikely that a reduction in operating budget would have any impact on users based on their religion.</p>
<b>Equality information on which above analysis is based</b>
<p>2. Southwark is a religiously diverse borough with around 65% of its population stating that they were religious at the time of the 2011 Census.</p>
<b>Mitigating actions to be taken</b>
<p>3. It is not anticipated that any operating budget changes will impact on this population group. Specific vulnerabilities associated with personal religious practice and circumstances will be assessed and identified as part of the routine assessment for vulnerabilities.</p>

--

<b>Sex</b> - A man or a woman.
<p><b>Possible impacts (positive and negative) of budget proposal, which includes addressing needs of these groups;</b></p> <p><b>This also includes needs/impacts arising from socio-economic disadvantage and sex.</b></p>
<p><b>Impact assessment: No impact</b></p> <p>1. It is unlikely that a reduction in operating budget would have any impact on this characteristic.</p>
<b>Equality information on which above analysis is based</b>
<p>2. The 0-5 health-visiting programme is primarily aimed at mothers and their children owing to the fact that the service model begins during pregnancy and follows the mother and child from there.</p> <p>3. It would be expected that in a situation where the mother is no longer able to care for the child (e.g. death) and the father instead becomes the primary care giver, that the service continue to provide the same service irrespective of parental sex.</p>
<b>Mitigating actions to be taken</b>
<p>4. It is not anticipated that any reduction in operating budget will impact on this population group. Specific vulnerabilities will be assessed and identified as part of the routine assessment for vulnerabilities.</p>

<b>Sexual orientation</b> - Whether a person's sexual attraction is towards their own sex, the opposite sex or to both sexes
<b>Possible impacts (positive and negative) of budget proposal, which includes addressing needs of these groups</b>

**Impact assessment: No impact**

1. It is unlikely that a reduction in operating budget would have any impact on users based on their sexual orientation.
2. Stakeholders will need to work closely with the LGBTQ+ community to collect sexual orientation data given the relatively large gay and lesbian population within Southwark and ensure that service provision is equitable.

**Equality information on which above analysis is based**

3. Southwark's has one of the largest gay and lesbian populations in the country, with around 5% (12,900) of adults in the borough identifying as such).

**Figure 5. Southwark residents identifying as gay or lesbian 2013-2015**



4. Evidence exists which shows that even in the context of robust equity policies, barriers exist which may prevent marginalised groups from effectively accessing healthcare due to bias or lack of familiarity amongst staff with particular groups<sup>6</sup>.
5. For same sex couples, these barriers include avoidant or uncomfortable behaviour when asking questions about relationships and/or sexual identity or the assumption that clients are heterosexual. These may reduce engagement with services.
6. The data LGBTQ+ is currently limited.

**Mitigating actions to be taken**

<sup>6</sup> Henry von Doussa, Jennifer Power, Ruth McNair, Rhonda Brown, Margot Schofield, Amaryll Perlesz, Marian Pitts, Andrew Bickerdike, Building healthcare workers' confidence to work with same-sex parented families, *Health Promotion International*, Volume 31, Issue 2, June 2016, Pages 459–469, <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/dav010>

7. It is not anticipated that any operating budget change will impact on this population group. Specific vulnerabilities associated with LGBTQ+ circumstances will be assessed and identified as part of the routine assessment for vulnerabilities.

**SocioEconomic Disadvantage** - Socio economic status is the measure of an area's, an individual's or family's economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, health, living conditions and occupation. Please also consider socio-economic disadvantage in relation to age, race, disability, sex, sexual orientation etc.

**Possible impacts (positive and negative) of budget proposal, which includes addressing needs of these groups**

**Impact assessment:** No impact


**Equality information on which above analysis is based**

1. Southwark has one of the highest IDACI<sup>7</sup> indices in London<sup>8</sup> and although it has seen an improvement between 2015 and 2019, it is still one of the most deprived boroughs.
2. The general index of multiple deprivation (IMD) ranking tells a similar story, while Southwark improved compared to other local authorities in England between 2015 and 2019, it still remains one of the most deprived boroughs in the country overall<sup>9</sup>.
3. For the Health visiting service, there is no indication that there is differential service provision according to level of deprivation. The deprivation distribution of the population is reflected in the service.

<sup>7</sup> Index of deprivation which highlights where deprivation is most affecting children

<sup>8</sup> [South East London CYPMH Inequalities snapshot \(healthylondon.org\)](https://www.healthylondon.org/south-east-london-cypmh-inequalities-snapshot)

<sup>9</sup> Indices of Deprivation 2019. Southwark's JSNA. Southwark Council: London. 2019.



**Section 4:** Summary of Equality Impact and Needs Analysis for Budget Proposal

---

Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan/ budget proposal
<p><b>No impact.</b></p> <p>It is not anticipated that any operating budget change will impact on this population group. Specific vulnerabilities associated with protected characteristics will be assessed and identified as part of the routine assessment for vulnerabilities.</p>
<b>Equality information on which above analysis is based</b>
<p><b>See Appendix and above.</b></p>

## Section 5: Further actions


<b>5. Further analysis and actions; including mitigation actions and actions to tackle inequality and promote equality.</b>			
Based on the initial analysis above, please detail the key mitigating actions and desired outcomes, or the areas identified as requiring more data or detailed analysis. Please also note interrelations between the different protected characteristics; all of us are made up of many of the protected characteristics.			
	<b>Description of issue</b>	<b>Action and desired outcome</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>
1	Further detail on how the service will implement the savings	Request for breakdown of costs	By March 23
2	High risk families / vulnerable parents need more support	Development of new pathway to support high risk families (Bright Beginnings)	By Nov 22
3	Strengthened monitoring and oversight	Oversight from a new monitoring board	Quarterly from Apr 23
4	Additional service level information on the school nursing service	Service to share their school nursing processes and overviews for deep dive analysis	By March 23
5	Further information on implementation of health visitor audit (Summer 22)	Engagement with this from service in the monitoring board	Quarterly as above
6	Develop service specification and KPIs	Development of these, and agreement into the service	By Dec 22

Appendix  
Whole population statistics

Demographics

From 2015 to 2020, the 0-19 population in Southwark has changed significantly; the 0 to 4 (including under 5's) population has decreased by 11% or 2,401 children, while the 5-19 population has increased by 9.6% or 4,594 children (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Southwark's 0-19 population between 2015 and 2020




It is important to note that these figures might overestimate the population size in both age groups as the Census 2021 results show a much larger 25% decrease in the 0-5 population and only a 0.9% increase in the 5-19 population.

HV service data supports the fact that the eligible population is now smaller than what it has been<sup>10</sup>. The services own activity figures demonstrate a reduction in activity levels by 12% between 2018/19 and 2020/21 (Figure 7).

Figure 7. Number of clients registered with the HV service provider 2018/19 to 2020/21

<sup>10</sup> Anonymised client level service activity data (EYMDs) provided by GSTT (March 2022).



### Deprivation

Broadly speaking, the needs of a population are closely reflected by the level of deprivation in an area.

Deprivation is a measure which tells us the relative disadvantages a local area has which prevents those living there from having a good quality of life.

Southwark has one of the highest IDACI<sup>11</sup> indices in London<sup>12</sup> and although it has seen an improvement between 2015 and 2019, it is still one of the most deprived boroughs.

The general index of multiple deprivation (IMD) ranking tells a similar story, while Southwark improved compared to other local authorities in England between 2015 and 2019, it still remains one of the most deprived boroughs in the country overall<sup>13</sup>.

As levels of deprivation increase, generally so do the needs. In reality however it is a little more nuanced and we need to consider a broad range of different indicators to assess the needs of the population.

It is important to note that population need is not the same as individual need (as each person is different) but looking at the needs of a population supports making informed to meet individual need.

### Safeguarding

Since 2013, the rate of Southwark's children on CPP has varied between 45 and 53 per 10,000 and always higher than London.


As a result of the pandemic this went up to 59.5 per 10,000 for 2020/21; a 36% increase on the year before and the second highest in London (average 31 per 10,000).

<sup>11</sup> Index of deprivation which highlights where deprivation is most affecting children

<sup>12</sup> [South East London CYPMH Inequalities snapshot \(healthylondon.org\)](https://www.healthylondon.org/south-east-london-cypmh-inequalities-snapshot)

<sup>13</sup> Indices of Deprivation 2019. Southwark's JSNA. Southwark Council: London. 2019.


**Figure 8. Rates of CPP's per 10,000 children (0-18) in Southwark 2013 to 2021**



### Looked after children

The rate of looked after children in Southwark has been gradually reducing since 2015 (Figure 9).

**Figure 9. Rate of LAC's per 100,000 children aged 0-18 in Southwark 2015 to 2021**




Nevertheless, Southwark still has the fourth highest rate of looked after children (LAC) per 10,000 children under 18 in London (Figure 10)<sup>14</sup>.

**Figure 10. Children looked after rate, per 10,000 children aged under 18 (from 2015/16 to 2020/21)**

<sup>14</sup> [Children looked after rate, per 10,000 children aged under 18 in Southwark | LG Inform \(local.gov.uk\)](#)

## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis



A higher proportion of LAC's in Southwark have special educational need and disability (SEND) requirements (35.1%) than the London average (32.3%)

## Vaccinations

Children in Southwark generally have higher or similar vaccination coverage rates<sup>15</sup> than London (Table 2).

**Table 2. Vaccination rates in Southwark vs London for major childhood vaccinations**

Vaccination	Age group	Data	Southwark	London
Flu vaccine	2-3 years	2020/21	48.2%	47.1%
MMR two doses	<5 year old	2020/21	83.1%	74.7%
DTaP/IPV pre-school booster	<5 year old	2020/21	79.3%	72.3%
HPV one dose (females)	12-13 year old	2020/21	77.9%	70.4%
HPV one dose (males)	12-13 year old	2020/21	78.4%	65.9%
Meningococcal ACWY	13-15 year old	2020/21	77.4%	77.8%

In addition, the percentage of LAC in Southwark with up to date vaccinations (86%) is amongst the highest in London (average 76%).

<sup>15</sup> [Childhood Vaccinations Rates in Your Area | LG Inform \(local.gov.uk\)](#)

**Needs relating to 0 to under 5’s Health Visiting**

**Safeguarding in under 5’s**

Between 2019/20 and 2020/21, there was a 15.4% (475) reduction in the number of contacts and a 5.5% (47) reduction in both number of referrals and assessments made for <5’s safeguarding concerns (**Figure 11**).


This was however in the context of increasing rates of contacts resulting in referrals (28% in 2019/20 to 31.2% in 2020/21) and increasing rates of referrals resulting in assessments (86.4% in 2019/20 to 100% in 2020/21).

For 2020/21 the number of assessments is greater than referrals due to individuals being referred prior to birth (“unborn” classification) and then assessed once born.

Therefore, while numbers have gone down, a greater proportion of referrals are leading into the child protection plan (CPP) process thus indicating greater need of each.

Overall, the demand on the service is likely to remain the same; fewer cases, but more likely to require entry into CPP process.


**Figure 11. 0-4’s safeguarding services front door activity data (2019/20 to 2020/21)**



## Conception in under 18's

The under 18's conception rate in Southwark has reduced by 64% since 2015, standing at 9.3 conceptions per 1,000 girls aged 15-17 years (Figure 12). This reflects the national trend but Southwark has seen big improvements in recent years.


**Figure 12. Conception rate per 1,000 women at ages under 18 (from 2015 to 2021) for Southwark**



As a result, Southwark has one of the lowest under 18's conception rates in London and well below the London average (Figure 13).

**Figure 13. Conception rate per 1,000 women at ages under 18 (from 2015 to 2020) for London**

## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis



## Needs relating to School Nursing

---

### Physical, mental health and educational needs of schoolchildren

The evidence regarding needs of schoolchildren in Southwark is varied.

Between 2012/13 and 2018/19, the proportion of children at foundation stage achieving the expected level in Personal, Social and Emotional Development has increased from 80.7% to 84.2%<sup>16</sup>, although this is still below the London average.

Similar improvements were seen when looking at the percentage of all children achieving at least the expected level in the prime areas of learning and in the specific areas of literacy and mathematics at foundation stage, improving from 59.6% to 74.1% and now being higher than London average<sup>17</sup>.

Children in Southwark however are generally less likely to be a healthy weight; in 2019/20 only 73% of those in reception<sup>18</sup> and 58% of those in Year 6<sup>19</sup> were healthy weight, both below the London average. Unfortunately, data that is more recent is currently not available.

Southwark has one of the highest proportion of school children have social, emotional and mental health (SEMH) needs at 3%. This is higher than the London (2.6%) average and only lower than Lambeth (3.2%) and Bromley (3.2%) in South East London. Nationally there is evidence that the number of CYP aged 5-19 experiencing mental health problems is growing<sup>20</sup>.

In Southwark, approximately 34.8% of students were eligible for free school meals (FSM) in the 2021/22 academic year, an increase of 50.6% since 2015/16 (from 23.1% to 34.8%)<sup>21</sup>.

Southwark ranks higher than the London average (25.4%) but lower than other inner London boroughs such as Islington, Camden, Hackney, Tower Hamlets, Lambeth and Westminster (**Figure 14**).

Eligibility for FSM is considered a proxy measure for deprivation; therefore, higher proportions for students eligible for FSM can be indicators of increased need.

In 2020, amongst those with SEMH, approximately 45% were eligible for FSM<sup>22</sup>.

Children on FSM (and therefore those most likely to be deprived) in Southwark generally do well however, with over 67% achieving at least the expected level in the

---

<sup>16</sup> [Percentage of children achieving at least the expected level in Personal, Social and Emotional Development at foundation stage in Southwark | LG Inform \(local.gov.uk\)](#)

<sup>17</sup> [Percentage of all children achieving at least the expected level in the prime areas of learning and in the specific areas of literacy and mathematics at foundation stage in Southwark | LG Inform \(local.gov.uk\)](#)

<sup>18</sup> [Percentage of children in reception year who are healthy weight in Southwark | LG Inform \(local.gov.uk\)](#)

<sup>19</sup> [Percentage of children in year 6 who are healthy weight in Southwark | LG Inform \(local.gov.uk\)](#)

<sup>20</sup> [Improving children and young people's mental health services - The Health Foundation](#)


<sup>21</sup> [Percentage of all pupils known to be eligible for free school meals in Southwark | LG Inform \(local.gov.uk\)](#)

<sup>22</sup> [CYPMH Inequalities Data Snapshot South East London \(healthy london.org\)](#)

## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis

prime areas of learning and in the specific areas of literacy and mathematics at foundation stage (2018/19), more than the London average<sup>23</sup>.

**Figure 14. Geographic comparison of proportion of students eligible for FSM (Southwark marked)**



<sup>23</sup> [Percentage of pupils with eligible for free school meals achieving at least the expected level in the prime areas of learning and in the specific areas of literacy and mathematics at foundation stage in Southwark | LG Inform \(local.gov.uk\)](#)

## Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)

In 2021/22, 19.6% of Southwark pupils either had a statutory plan of SEN (statement or EHC plan, total 4.3%) or were receiving SEN support (15.3%). Overall this is higher than the London average (16.1%)<sup>24</sup>.

The proportion of Southwark pupils with SEND requirements has increased since 2017/18, with students requiring a statement or EHC plan increasing by 38% (from 3.1% to 4.3%) and those with SEN support increasing 10.8% (from 13.8% to 15.3%).

Pupils who are looked after children (LAC) or children in need (CIN) are highly represented within the SEND cohort.

Southwark has a higher proportion of LAC pupils with (35.1%) and without statements/plans (29.7%) than the London average (32.2% and 25.2% respectively).

In addition, 18.6% of CIN have SEND requirements with 41.5% of those having an active statement or EHC plan, higher than the London average (34.6%).

Primary SEND needs in Southwark schools are broadly similar to those in London but with some notable differences (Table 3)

**Table 3. Significant differences in the primary needs of schoolchildren in Southwark vs London (2021/22)**

	More need (vs London)	Lower need (vs London)
<b>Primary school</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ASD (18.9% vs 13.9%)</li> <li>Specific learning difficulties (9.9% vs 7.2%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SALC need (38.1% vs 41.8%)</li> <li>SEMH needs (13.0% vs 14.6%)</li> <li>Moderate learning difficulties (7.6% vs 9.1%)</li> </ul>
<b>Secondary school</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ASD (13.1% vs 11.7%)</li> <li>Other difficulty/disability (13.0% vs 6.1%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEMH needs (19.3% vs 22.4%)</li> <li>SALC needs (16.6% vs 19.3%)</li> <li>Moderate learning difficulty (11.5% vs 13.6%)</li> </ul>
<b>Special schools</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ASD (47.9% vs 41.8%)</li> <li>SEMH needs (15.7% vs 8.0%)</li> <li>Primary physical disability (2.8% vs 1.4%)</li> <li>Specific learning disability (2.8% vs 1.6%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate learning disability (1.8% vs 9.3%)</li> <li>SALC needs (1.7% vs 7.0%)</li> </ul>

ASD: autistic spectrum disorder  
SALC: Speech, Language and Communication  
SEMH: Social, Emotional and Mental Health

<sup>24</sup> A statutory plan of SEN (statement or EHC plan) or are receiving SEN support, data from [Local area Special Educational Needs and Disabilities report for London Borough of Southwark | LG Inform](#)

### Safeguarding in 5-11


Between 2019/20 and 2020/21, there was a 13.2% (631) reduction in the number of contacts, a 10.4% (135) reduction in the number of referrals and an essentially static (0.3% increase or 3 children) number of assessments made for 5-11's safeguarding concerns (Figure 15).

This was in the context of relatively static rates of contacts resulting in referrals (27.3% in 2019/20 to 28.2% in 2020/21) and increasing rates of referrals resulting in assessments (86% in 2019/20 to 96.2% in 2020/21).

Therefore, while numbers have gone down significantly and a broadly similar proportion of contacts result in referrals, of those contacts that do require referral, most reach assessment.

Overall, the demand on the service is likely to have remained either static or decreased: fewer overall numbers and similar levels requiring entry into CPP process.

**Figure 15. 5-11's safeguarding services front door activity data (2019/20 to 2020/21)**



### Safeguarding in 12+


Between 2019/20 and 2020/21, there was a 12.4% (625) reduction in the number of contacts, a 4.9% (60) increase in the number of referrals and a 13.5% (145) increase in the number of assessments made for 12+ safeguarding concerns (**Figure 16**).

This was in the context of increasing rates of contacts resulting in referrals (24.5% in 2019/20 to 29.3% in 2020/2) and rates of referrals resulting in assessments (86.9% in 2019/20 to 94.1% in 2020/21).

Therefore numbers have increased significantly and both a larger proportion of contacts result in referrals and a larger portion of referrals require assessment (and therefore formal entry into CPP process).

Overall, the demand on the service is likely to have increased; more overall numbers and greater proportion requiring entry into CPP process.


**Figure 16. 12+ safeguarding services front door activity data (2019/20 to 2020/21)**



## Youth justice

In 2021, Southwark generally had lower rates of youth justice incidents than other boroughs in London (Figure 17)<sup>25</sup>, although the rates of first time entrants is higher than the London average<sup>26</sup> (Figure 18).

**Figure 17. Headline youth justice figures for London (Southwark highlighted)**




**Figure 18. Juvenile first time entrants to the criminal justice system per 100,000 of 10-17 year olds (from 2010 to 2021)**

<sup>25</sup> [Youth justice statistics: 2020 to 2021 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/youth-justice-statistics-2020-to-2021)

<sup>26</sup> [Juvenile first time entrants to the criminal justice system per 100,000 of 10-17 year olds in Southwark | LG Inform \(local.gov.uk\)](https://www.local.gov.uk/inform/juvenile-first-time-entrants-to-the-criminal-justice-system-per-100000-of-10-17-year-olds-in-southwark)


## Appendix 1 Equality Screenings/Analysis



Since 2017/18 Southwark's youth justice statistics have however improved substantially (**Figure 19**):

- 77% reduction in the rate of proven offences committed by children,
- 75% reduction in the rate of youth cautions or sentences given to children,
- 68% reduction in rates of children cautioned or sentenced<sup>27</sup>,
- 54% reduction in the rate of juvenile first entrants to the criminal justice system.

**Figure 19. Youth justice headline figures from 2013 to 2021**



<sup>27</sup> [Youth justice statistics - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/youth-justice-statistics)