

***Equality Impact & Needs
Analysis – Amalgamation of
Cobourg and Camelot Primary
Schools in August 2023***

May 2023

Guidance notes

Things to remember:

Under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) public authorities are required to have due regard to the aims of the general equality duty when making decisions and when setting policies. Understanding the affect of the council's policies and practices 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 particular policy is under consideration and when a decision is taken.
- They consciously consider the need to do the things set out in the aims of the general equality duty as an integral part of the decision-making process.
- They have sufficient information to understand the effects of the policy, or the way a function is carried out, on the aims set out in the general equality duty.
- They review policies or decisions, for example, if the make-up of service users changes, as the general equality duty is a continuing duty.
- They take responsibility for complying with the general equality duty in relation to all their relevant functions. Responsibility cannot be delegated to external organisations that are carrying out public functions on their behalf.
- They consciously consider the need to do the things set out in the aims of the general equality duty not only when a policy is developed and decided upon, but when it is being implemented.

Best practice guidance from the Equality and Human Rights Commission recommends that public bodies:

- 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).
- Use equality analysis to inform policy as it develops to avoid unnecessary additional activity.
- Focus on the understanding the effects of a policy on equality and any actions needed as a result, not the production of a document.
- Consider how the time and effort involved should relate to the importance of the policy to equality.

- Think about steps to advance equality and good relations as well as eliminate discrimination.
- Use good evidence. Where it isn't available, take steps to gather it (where practical and proportionate).
- Use insights from engagement with employees, service users and others can help provide evidence for equality analysis.

Equality analysis should be referenced in community impact statements in Council reports. Community impact statements are a corporate requirement in all reports to the following meetings: the cabinet, individual decision makers, scrutiny, regulatory committees and community councils. Community impact statements enable decision makers to identify more easily how a decision might affect different communities in Southwark and to consider any implications for equality and diversity.

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 may be published under the council's publishing of equality information, or be present with divisional/departmental/service business plans. These will be placed on the website for public view under the council's Publications Scheme.

Equality analysis should be reviewed after a sensible period of time to see if business needs have changed and/or if the effects that were expected have occurred. If not then you will need to consider amending your policy accordingly. This does not mean repeating the 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 equality analysis. The council's Community Engagement Division and critical friend, the Forum for Equality and Human Rights in Southwark can assist with this (see section below on community engagement and www.southwarkadvice.org.uk).

Whilst the equality analysis is being considered, Southwark Council recommends considering Socio-Economic implications, as socio-economic inequalities have a strong influence on the environment we live and work in. As a major provider of services to Southwark residents, the council has a legal duty to reduce socio-economic inequalities and this is reflected in its values and aims.

For this reason, the council recommends considering socio-economic impacts in all equality analyses, not forgetting to include identified potential mitigating actions.

Similarly, it is important for the Council to consider the impact of its policies and decisions in relation to tackling the climate emergency. This includes both the potential carbon emissions of a policy or decision and its potential effect on the borough's biodiversity. You are asked to consider the impact on climate of your policy and decision under discussion by completing the Climate impact section below.

Section 1: Equality impact and needs analysis details

Proposed policy/decision/business plan to which this equality analysis relates	The amalgamation of Camelot and Cobourg Primary Schools in September 2023
---	---

Equality analysis author	Ric Euteneuer		
Strategic Director:	David Quirke-Thornton		
Department	Childrens' & Adults'	Division	Education
Period analysis undertaken	March 2023		
Date of review (if applicable)	March 2024		
Sign-off	Nina Dohel	Position	Director of Education
		Date	

Section 2: Brief description of policy/decision/business plan

2.1 Brief description of policy/decision/business plan

Cobourg Primary School is a one-form entry (1FE) school near to the Old Kent Road and Burgess Park. In their latest inspection in 2022, Cobourg was rated “Requires Improvement” by Ofsted, the second time the school has received this rating. The school has significant vacancy levels: it has a capacity of 390 across all year groups of the school, of which 178 places are empty. It is proposed to amalgamate Cobourg with Camelot Primary school, with all pupils being offered at place at the latter and Cobourg school then closing.

Section 3: Overview of service users and key stakeholders consulted

3. Service users and stakeholders

Key users of the department or service	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Children (2-11 years old) attending a primary, infants, juniors or attached nursery setting in Southwark• Parents, carers and families of those children.• School staff (teaching or non-teaching)• Governors of those schools• Local Authority departments (Children’s Social Care, Education)
Key stakeholders were/are involved in this policy/decision/business plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Head teachers of all primary schools in Southwark• Governors of all primary schools in Southwark• Members of the Council• Leadership teams in Education and Children’s and Adults’ services• Finance, Sustainable development, Schools’ HR, Legal, Communications colleagues

Section 4: Pre-implementation equality impact and needs analysis

This section considers the potential impacts (positive and negative) on groups with ‘protected characteristics’, the equality information on which this analysis is based, any mitigating actions to be taken and importantly any improvement actions to promote equality and tackle inequalities. It is important to also understand impacts as including needs of different groups.

Due regard is about considering the needs of different protected characteristics in relation to each part of the duty as relevant and proportionate to the area at hand.

An equality analysis also presents as an opportunity to improve services to meet diverse needs, promote equality, tackle inequalities and promote good community relations. It is not just about addressing negative impacts. It is important to consider any actions which can be considered to advance equality of opportunity through positive actions, for example.

The columns include societal issues (discrimination, exclusion, needs etc.) and socio-economic issues (levels of poverty, employment, income). As the two aspects are heavily interrelated it may not be practical to fill out both columns on all protected characteristics.

The aim is, however, to ensure that socio-economic issues are given special consideration, as it is the council's intention to reduce socio-economic inequalities in the borough. Key is also the link between protected characteristics and socio-economic disadvantage, including experiences of multiple disadvantage.

Socio-economic disadvantage may arise from a range of factors, including:

- *poverty*
- *health*
- *education*
- *limited social mobility*
- *housing*
- *a lack of expectations*
- *discrimination*
- *multiple disadvantage*

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 underrepresented 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

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

Age - 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>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.</p>	<p>Potential Socio-Economic impacts/ needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)</p>
<p>The amalgamation of the Cobourg ad Camelot schools and the consequent education in the overall PAN of the combined school would ostensibly reduce choice for parents Therefore it could potentially differentially affect all age groups from 4-11 (children) and parents (generally 18-50). This, however, does not take into account the</p> <p><i>i) reduction in pupils numbers and applications for the school</i> <i>ii) reduction in the births in the locality</i> <i>iii) the outmigration of children from the locality and Southwark as a whole</i></p> <p>Due to i), ii) and iii), there has been a considerable fall in demand for places at the school, and numbers have fallen to an extent that the combined school would have the same numbers as 2 separate schools. Therefore, the loss of “choice” will be largely theoretical.</p>	<p>As outlined in the adjacent “potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy” column, the potential socio-economic impacts of closing the school as regards to age will be minimal. Reducing the intake of the school will not effectively change the intake and relative demographics of the children attending the school, around half of which come from the ward the schools is situated in</p> <p>This proportion is not expected to change, nor are the (relative) percentages of the school intake.</p>

Equality information on which above analysis is based

i) The reduction of pupil numbers at Cobourg is self-evident – there has been a **42%** loss of pupils (**151** children) since 2019 (*Source, School Censuses 2019-23*). Camelot has lost 46 pupils, or 12% of the total and increased this year.

Cobourg R 1 2 3 4 5 6 Total

2019	26	55	52	58	51	60	60	362
2020	27	27	52	47	50	48	58	309
2021	27	25	28	48	44	44	45	261
2022	25	24	26	27	51	42	45	240
2023	25	27	29	16	28	47	39	212

Camelot R 1 2 3 4 5 6 Total

2019	48	36	51	58	62	61	66	382
2020	37	45	35	51	59	59	58	344
2021	42	46	50	35	54	61	62	350
2022	45	45	48	50	35	52	60	335
2023	40	49	49	46	57	40	55	336

In terms of applications for the school, the numbers show a steep fall overall both in terms of first choices and choices overall

Cobourg	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
1 st	45	53	25	25	13
All	87	93	61	51	42
Camelot	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
1 st	45	53	31	31	42
All	87	93	83	66	77

(*Source, School Censuses January 2019-2023*)

ii) the schools are situated separate planning areas (Cobourg PA1, Camelot PA3) but both in the “Old Kent Road” ward of the Council. Both both takes pupils in from further afield – 81 (18%) at Cobourg and 174 (27%) from Camelot of the pupils at both schools come from this ward. A breakdown by planning area for each school is given below, with Cobourg taking more pupils from the north of the borough and Camelot further south, particularly in Peckham

Socio-Economic data on which above analysis is based

Both schools are in the Old Kent Road ward. Census 2021 data shows that a similar percentage of the population aged 0-19 lives in the ward (23%) than lives in the borough (21%), so there is not a pressing need for additional school places.

The under 4 component of the ward population has fallen by 279 (20%) since 2011.

Age	2011	2021	+/-	%
0-4	1,345	1,071	-279	-20%
5-9	1,009	1,132	+123	+12%
10-14	1,215	1,183	-32	-3%
15-19	1,088	1,157	+149	+14%
0-19	4,657	4,543	-114	-2%

Overall the under 19 component of the population has fallen and the 0-4 cohort are the future primary pupils in the ward

Therefore it is likely that pupil numbers in this ward will continue to fall (*Source, ONS Census 2021*)

PA	Cobourg	Camelot	Cobourg	Camelot
1	39	25	17%	7%
2	60	30	27%	8%
3	100	251	44%	69%
4	10	15	4%	4%
5	2	8	1%	2%
OB	14	37	6%	10%
Total	225	366	100%	100%

At a ward level the figures show much the same

PA	Ward	Cobourg	Camelot	Cobourg	Camelot
1	Borough & Bankide	0	1	0%	0%
1	Chaucer	4	1	1%	0%
1	Faraday	21	12	5%	2%
1	Newington	1	0	0%	0%
1	North Walworth	4	6	1%	1%
1,2 & 3	Old Kent Road	81	174	18%	23%
1	St George's	1	4	0%	1%
2	London Bridge & WB	3	1	1%	0%
2	North Bermondsey	6	3	1%	0%
2	Rotherhithe	3	5	1%	1%
2	South Bermondsey	10	11	2%	1%
2	Surrey Docks	1	0	0%	0%
3	Nunhead & Queens Rd	10	35	2%	5%
3	Peckham	52	42	11%	5%
3	Peckham Rye	1	2	0%	0%
3	Rye Lane	3	8	1%	1%
4	Camberwell Green	7	9	2%	1%
4	Champion Hill	0	2	0%	0%
4	St Giles	4	6	1%	1%
5	Dulwich Hill	1	0	0%	0%
5	Dulwich Village	0	4	0%	1%

5	Dulwich Wood	0	5	0%	1%
OB	Outborough	11	37	2%	5%

(Source, Pupil Census January 2023, ONS Census and Birth data 2021-22)

iii) In terms of outmigration, there has been net outmigration of pupils aged from 0-15 in recent years, and this continues to be the case – the net migration figures by age below (GLA migration estimates, 2023)

Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken

As there have been no negative impacts relating to age identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed. Reduction of the school to 1FE will take place over a number of years, so no existing pupils, parents or carers will be negatively affected or required to move schools. A reduction to 1FE effectively is an recognition of what is already happening at the school and placing this on an equal footing. .

Disability - 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. Please note that under the PSED due regard includes:

Giving due consideration in all relevant areas to “the steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.”

This also includes the need to understand and focus on different needs/impacts arising from different disabilities.

Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.	Potential socio-economic impacts/ needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)
--	--

The reduction of the amalgamation and closure of Cobourg Primary School will have a negligible effect on disabilities, as the facilities and services offered on the school campus will not change. Children from Cobourg with EHCPs and SEND Plus are being worked with to ensure their needs are met whether they are proceeding to Camelot or elsewhere.	There will be little or no potential socio-economic impacts arising from socio-economic disadvantage
---	--

Equality information on which above analysis is based	Socio-economic data on which analysis is based
--	---

No central record of pupil disability is maintained by the LA, but a proxy measure is the number of children with Education and Healthcare Plans (EHCPs), or pupils identified as “SEND Plus”.	As there is no perceptible potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic
--	--

<p>Camelot and Cobourg Primary are around or slightly below the same level of EHCPs nationally and Londonwide. The SEND Plus percentages are slightly above local, regional and national averages.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type</th> <th>Cobourg</th> <th>Camelot</th> <th>LBS</th> <th>LDN</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>EHCP</td> <td>2.6%</td> <td>2.9%</td> <td>3.4%</td> <td>4.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEND+</td> <td>19.0%</td> <td>18.2%</td> <td>15.9%</td> <td>11.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Source, School Census January 2023- EHCPs and SEN Support, DfE Statistics 2022)</p> <p>In terms of staffing, no record of disability is maintained by the LA or school, but disability would not be a hindrance to recruitment or redeployment from Cobourg to Camelot or other schools.</p>					Type	Cobourg	Camelot	LBS	LDN	EHCP	2.6%	2.9%	3.4%	4.1%	SEND+	19.0%	18.2%	15.9%	11.7%	<p>disadvantage for people with disabilities, no data has been identified.</p>				
Type	Cobourg	Camelot	LBS	LDN																				
EHCP	2.6%	2.9%	3.4%	4.1%																				
SEND+	19.0%	18.2%	15.9%	11.7%																				
<p>Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken</p>																								
<p>As there have been no negative impacts relating to disability identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed. Reduction of the school to 1FE will take place over a number of years, so no existing pupils, parents or carers will be negatively affected or required to move schools.</p>																								
<p>Gender reassignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The process of transitioning from one gender to another. <p>Gender Identity: Gender identity is the personal sense of one's own gender. Gender identity can correlate with a person's recorded sex or can differ from it.</p>																								
<p>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.</p>					<p>Potential socio-economic impacts/ needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)</p>																			
<p>Gender reassignment is unlikely to involve children of primary age. As regards staffing, there are no staff undergoing gender reassignment at either school at present, but, were this to be the case, then gender reassignment would form no part of the recruitment or indeed the redeployment process, so would not negatively impact on staffing.</p>					<p>There will be little or no potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage resulting from gender reassignment.</p>																			
<p>Equality information on which above analysis is based.</p>					<p>Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based</p>																			
<p>Data is not collected for children, parents or carers on gender reassignment. It is likely to be such a small number as to make it statistically insignificant. In the 2021 Census, 0.6% of the UK population identified themselves as not having the</p>					<p>As there is no perceptible potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage for people with</p>																			

<p>same gender they were born with. In London, this rose to 1.4%, and Southwark, 1.2%. Such a percentage would mean that the lack of a transgender staff member would not be statistically significant. (Source, ONS Census 2021)</p>	<p>gender reassignment, no appropriate or useful data has been identified.</p>
---	--

Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken
 As there have been no negative impacts relating to gender reassignment identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed.

Marriage and civil partnership – In England and Wales marriage is no longer restricted to a union between a man and a woman but now includes a marriage between a same-sex couples. Same-sex couples can also have their relationships legally recognised as 'civil partnerships'. Civil partners must not be treated less favourably than married couples and must be treated the same as married couples on a wide range of legal matters. **(Only to be considered in respect to the need to eliminate discrimination.)**

<p>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan</p>	<p>Potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)</p>
<p>Marriage or civil partnership is unlikely to directly involve children of primary age, although they may be the children of married or unmarried parents or civil partners. The marital status of the parents or carers of school pupils forms no part of the admissions process, and children are admitted based on religious or distance criteria alone</p> <p>As regards staffing, no records of the marital status of staff are kept at either school at present, but, were this to be the case, the marital or civil partnership status of a staff member or potential applicant would form no part of the recruitment or indeed the redeployment process, so would not negatively impact on staffing.</p>	<p>As mentioned in the adjacent “potential impacts of the proposed policy”, the marital status of the parents or carers of school pupils forms no part of the admissions process. Children are admitted based on sibling, medical or distance criteria alone.</p> <p>Therefore there are no realistic socio-economic impacts, needs or issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage relating to marital status.</p>

Equality information on which above analysis is based	Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based												
<p>No records are maintained on the marital or civil partnership status of parents & carers, or staff members of either School, so it would be challenging to evidence any level of discrimination or disadvantage. Figures at a ward, borough, regional and national level for the percentage of the local population by marital and civil partnership status are given below. Old Kent Road ward is slightly higher than the Southwark average, but some way adrift on London and England averages (<i>Source, ONS Census 2021</i>)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="130 750 1010 884"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>%</th> <th>Area</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Old Kent Road</td> <td>27.5</td> <td>England</td> <td>44.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Southwark</td> <td>26.4</td> <td>London</td> <td>39.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Area	%	Area	%	Old Kent Road	27.5	England	44.5	Southwark	26.4	London	39.7	<p>As there is no perceptible potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage for people with gender reassignment, no appropriate or useful data has been identified.</p>
Area	%	Area	%										
Old Kent Road	27.5	England	44.5										
Southwark	26.4	London	39.7										
Mitigating actions to be taken													
<p>As there have been no negative impacts relating to gender reassignment identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed.</p>													

<p>Pregnancy and maternity - 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>	
<p>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.</p>	<p>Potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)</p>
<p>Pregnancy and maternity are unlikely to directly involve children of primary age, and so there not be any potential impacts of the strategy on pupils. Given the extensive level of vacancies, it is also unlikely to affect parental choice.</p> <p>The pregnancy and maternity rate in Southwark has been falling for many years.</p>	<p>As mentioned in the adjacent "<i>potential impacts of the proposed policy</i>", pregnancy/maternity status of the parents/carers of school pupils forms no part of the admissions process, and children not are admitted based</p>

<p>As regards staffing, school employees contracts mean that they are paid for some of their pregnancy and maternity leave; the pregnancy status of a staff member or potential applicant would form no part of the recruitment or indeed the redeployment process, so would not negatively impact on staffing</p>	<p>this status. Similarly, this status is not part of the recruitment process. Therefore there are no realistic socio-economic impacts, needs or issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage relating to pregnancy or maternity status.</p>
--	---

<p>Equality information on which above analysis is based</p>	<p>Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based</p>
---	--

Fertility is measured at a range of rates and geographies by the ONS. These include the “GFR” and “TFR”. The “*General Fertility Rate (GFR)*” is the number of live births per 1,000 women aged 15-44. The Total Fertility Rate (TFR) is the number of births per woman aged 15-44

Area	GFR	TFR
Southwark	44	1.14
Inner London	48	1.28
London	56	1.52
England	56	1.62

(Source, GLA/ONS 2021 (latest figures))
 From this, we can see Southwark has low fertility rate compared the rest of London and England. This is another explanation, together with outmigration – why pupils numbers in Southwark are falling.

As there is no perceptible potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage for people with pregnancy or maternity status, no appropriate or useful data has been identified.

Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken

As there have been no negative impacts relating to pregnancy or maternity status identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed.

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. N.B. Gypsy, Roma and Traveller are recognised racial groups and their needs should be considered alongside all others

Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.	Potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)
<p>A potential impact of the closure of Cobourg and the net PAN reduction could be that Camelot were to become less diverse racially than it is at present. Presently, Cobourg is school is 91.0% Black Minority Ethnic (BME) (i.e. non-White UK) and Camelot 95.5%. For the local ward (Old Kent Road), the BME population is 75.6%. For the planning area the school is in (planning area 3 – PA3), the total percentage of BME pupils are 87.4%. As a whole, Southwark primary pupils are 78.5% BME as regards of Southwark’s population as a whole is 62.5%. There is no evidence therefore to show that closure of Cobourg Primary School and reducing the combined school’s PANs would be likely to de-diversify the school. The schools in the same planning area are almost as diverse each other, and the same with the Old Kent Road ward population</p> <p>In terms of staffing, the school’s workforce will – over time – adapt and fall to match a smaller intake of pupils. As race will not form part of the selection process of staff, then no discernible effects as regards race will be noted or action required.</p>	<p>A potential impact of the closure of Cobourg Primary School and consequent net PAN reduction could be that the school were to become less diverse socio-economically than it is at present. This is thought unlikely, as there has been no major development near the school, and the school’s intake is predominately from PA3.</p> <p>What is evident is that people in Southwark are having less children, and those that are tend to be from the families that have remained, and are the same socio-economic class as the present parents and carers – just fewer of them.</p>
Equality information on which above analysis is based	Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based
<p>A table giving the relative percentages of the local population at schools and in the locality is given below</p>	

Group	Cobourg	Camelot	Old Kent Road Ward	PA3	Southwark pupils	Southwark population
Bangladeshi	4.1%	1.1%	1.7%	1.4%	2.3%	1.8%
Indian	0.4%	0.0%	1.2%	0.5%	0.7%	2.0%
Pakistani	1.1%	2.1%	0.6%	1.1%	0.7%	0.7%
Other Asian Background	1.9%	1.8%	3.5%	1.8%	1.8%	2.7%
Black African	29.1%	45.5%	25.3%	33.9%	25.2%	15.7%
Black Caribbean	6.3%	10.8%	8.1%	9.5%	6.3%	5.9%
Any Other Black Background	3.7%	6.6%	4.8%	6.9%	5.2%	3.5%
Chinese	0.4%	0.3%	1.8%	0.8%	1.3%	2.7%
Mixed - White & Black African	3.7%	1.3%	1.3%	2.4%	2.2%	1.2%
Mixed - White & Caribbean	4.9%	3.2%	2.5%	3.9%	3.3%	2.1%
Mixed - White & Asian	0.4%	0.5%	0.8%	1.2%	1.7%	1.5%
Any Other Mixed Background	9.0%	8.7%	2.5%	6.5%	6.5%	2.4%
White British	9.0%	4.5%	23.1%	12.3%	21.1%	35.5%
White Irish	0.0%	0.5%	1.3%	0.3%	0.4%	2.0%
Gypsy / Roma	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%
Traveller of Irish Heritage	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%
Any Other White Background	17.2%	4.2%	9.2%	5.7%	9.3%	13.4%
Any Other Ethnic Group	9.0%	8.2%	1.8%	7.6%	7.7%	1.0%
Unknown / Missing	0.0%	0.8%	9.5%	3.7%	4.1%	5.3%
Non-White UK/BME	91.0%	95.5%	76.9%	87.4%	78.5%	62.5%

(Source, Pupil Census, 2022)

Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken

As there have been no negative impacts relating to race identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed.

Religion and belief - 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.

Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.

Potential socio-economic impacts/ needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)

Statutory guidance when deciding this type of decision requires us to consider the balance of religious places in the borough, and the balance between different denominations. As neither school has a religious foundation, the

As outlined opposite, neither school has a religious foundation, the closure of Cobourg Primary School and the overall reduction of 1FE will

closure of Cobourg Primary School and the overall reduction of 1FE will not affect that balance. As regards staffing, there is no requirement for staff to practice (or not) any religion, so a reduction in the number of staff would not differentially effect one group of staff over another.

not affect any religious provision that exists. There are no potential socio-economic impacts/ needs/issues arising the change nor any socio-economic disadvantage

Equality information on which above analysis is based

Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based

The percentages of religious/non-religious places (Non-R) in Southwark are given in the table below, both before (2022 and 2023) and after the proposals in 2024

Type	2022	2023	2024
RC	16%	16%	17%
CE	14%	13%	14%
Non-R	70%	70%	70%

As outlined above, neither school has a religious foundation, the closure of Cobourg Primary School and the overall reduction of 1FE will not affect any religious provision that exists. This means there will no potential socio-economic impacts/ needs/issues arising the change nor any socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative) resulting from that change. A table is given overleaf of the level of religious observance extracted from the 2021 Census. No breakdown of Christian faith is recorded

No change in the percentage of non-religious places has been identified. As noted above, as regards staffing, other than the Head or Deputy, there is no explicit requirement for staff to be practicing Christians, and no record of staff's religious belief is maintained. It is therefore unlikely that a amalgamation or PAN reduction will have any discernible effect on staff's religious belief education in Southwark. Similarly, any restructuring as regards staff is also unlikely to have repercussions on one religious group or another.

Religion	OKR	Southwark
Christian	51%	46%
Buddhist	1%	1%
Hindu	1%	10%
Jewish	0%	0%
Muslim	12%	7%
Sikh	0%	0%
Other/No religion/not stated	34%	37%

(Source, ONS Census 2021)

	This shows that there is a slightly higher level of Christian religious belief in the Old Kent Road, but no solid conclusions can be drawn from this.
--	---

Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken
 As there have been no negative impacts relating to religion or belief identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed.

Sex - A man or a woman.

Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.	Potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)
--	---

<p>If there was a significant imbalance in the provision or uptake of places at the school then the closure of Cobourg and net reduction of the PAN may effect this. However, the schools are both co-educational and there is no entrance requirement based on gender.</p>	<p>There are no potential socio-economic impacts or issues arising from disadvantage as regards the closure of Cobourg and reduction of the combined PANs by 1FE with respect to the gender of pupils.</p> <p>As regards staffing, it could be that female staff are affected more, due to their prevalence in the workforce</p>
---	--

Equality information on which above analysis is based	Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based
--	---

<p>Prevalence of male to female pupils in the 2 schools is broadly 50:50. Pupil percentages shown below by school by year group</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: left;">Cam</td> <td style="text-align: left;">R</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>Total</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: left;">Girls</td> <td></td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">21</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">22</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">27</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">31</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">23</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">19</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">29</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">172</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: left;">Boys</td> <td></td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">19</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">25</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">18</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">16</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">33</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">20</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">26</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">157</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: left;">Cob</td> <td style="text-align: left;">R</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>Total</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: left;">Girls</td> <td></td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">15</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">16</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">14</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">7</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">12</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">25</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">18</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">107</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: left;">Boys</td> <td></td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">11</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">10</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">13</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">11</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">16</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">22</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">22</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">105</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>Total</td> </tr> </table>	Cam	R	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	Girls		21	22	27	31	23	19	29	172	Boys		19	25	18	16	33	20	26	157	Cob	R	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	Girls		15	16	14	7	12	25	18	107	Boys		11	10	13	11	16	22	22	105			1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	<p>As there is no gender based socio-economic impact for pupils, no data has been sourced.</p>
Cam	R	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total																																																												
Girls		21	22	27	31	23	19	29	172																																																											
Boys		19	25	18	16	33	20	26	157																																																											
Cob	R	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total																																																												
Girls		15	16	14	7	12	25	18	107																																																											
Boys		11	10	13	11	16	22	22	105																																																											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total																																																												

Cam	R								
Girls		53%	47%	60%	66%	41%	49%	53%	52%
Boys		48%	53%	40%	34%	59%	51%	47%	48%
Cob	R		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
Girls		58%	62%	52%	39%	43%	53%	45%	50%
Boys		42%	38%	48%	61%	57%	47%	55%	50%

Similarly as regards staffing, a large proportion of the staff are female, but this is normal for primary schools of any type across the UK

Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken

As there have been no negative impacts relating gender identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed.

Sexual orientation - Whether a person's sexual attraction is towards their own sex, the opposite sex or to both sexes	
Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.	Potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)
At age 4-11, it is unlikely that children will have identified with one sexuality or another, but they may have parents or carers who are LGBTQ+. In either case, admissions do not take into account the sexuality of the child or parent/carer. Reducing the published admissions number will therefore have no differential effect on parents whatever their sexuality. Similarly, with regard to staff, sexuality or sexual orientation forms no part of the selection for recruitment or redundancy, so a PAN reduction will not disproportionately affect staff members as regards their sexual orientation.	There are no potential socio-economic impacts as regards the closure of Cobourg Primary School and the overall reduction of PAN totals by 1FE, nor issues arising from disadvantage with respect to the sexual orientation of pupils, parents/carers or staff.

Equality information on which above analysis is based	Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based																																								
<p>The prevalence of different sexualities was covered in the 2021 Census for the first time. This is not (yet) available at a ward level, but the figures for Southwark show the following figures for the population over 16.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="167 577 949 1086"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Straight or Heterosexual</th> <th>Gay or Lesbian</th> <th>Bisexual</th> <th>Pansexual</th> <th>Asexual</th> <th>Queer</th> <th>All other sexual orientations</th> <th>Not answered</th> <th>Non heterosexual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Southwark</td> <td>82.71</td> <td>4.53</td> <td>2.57</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>0.07</td> <td>0.17</td> <td>0.06</td> <td>9.21</td> <td>8.07</td> </tr> <tr> <td>London</td> <td>86.19</td> <td>2.23</td> <td>1.52</td> <td>0.37</td> <td>0.05</td> <td>0.06</td> <td>0.04</td> <td>9.54</td> <td>4.27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>England</td> <td>89.37</td> <td>1.54</td> <td>1.29</td> <td>0.23</td> <td>0.06</td> <td>0.03</td> <td>0.02</td> <td>7.46</td> <td>3.17</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Southwark is lower than the national and London-average for heterosexuality and more than twice the London average for gay and lesbian residents over 16</p>	Area	Straight or Heterosexual	Gay or Lesbian	Bisexual	Pansexual	Asexual	Queer	All other sexual orientations	Not answered	Non heterosexual	Southwark	82.71	4.53	2.57	0.67	0.07	0.17	0.06	9.21	8.07	London	86.19	2.23	1.52	0.37	0.05	0.06	0.04	9.54	4.27	England	89.37	1.54	1.29	0.23	0.06	0.03	0.02	7.46	3.17	<p>As mentioned above, there are no potential socio-economic impacts as regards the closure of Cobourg Primary School and the overall reduction of PAN totals by 1FE, nor issues arising from disadvantage with respect to the sexual orientation of pupils, parents/carers or staff. The figures for prevalence are given in the column adjacent to this one.</p>
Area	Straight or Heterosexual	Gay or Lesbian	Bisexual	Pansexual	Asexual	Queer	All other sexual orientations	Not answered	Non heterosexual																																
Southwark	82.71	4.53	2.57	0.67	0.07	0.17	0.06	9.21	8.07																																
London	86.19	2.23	1.52	0.37	0.05	0.06	0.04	9.54	4.27																																
England	89.37	1.54	1.29	0.23	0.06	0.03	0.02	7.46	3.17																																
Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken																																									
<p>As there have been no negative impacts relating to sexual orientation identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed or required.</p>																																									

<p>Human Rights</p> <p>There are 16 rights in the Human Rights Act. Each one is called an Article. They are all taken from the European Convention on Human Rights. The Articles are The right to life, Freedom from torture, inhuman and degrading treatment, Freedom from forced labour , Right to Liberty, Fair trial, Retrospective penalties, Privacy, Freedom of conscience, Freedom of expression, Freedom of assembly, Marriage and family, Freedom from discrimination and the First Protocol</p>
<p>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan</p>
<p>In respect of the 16 rights listed, the proposal to amalgamate the schools and close Cobourg Primary School will not affect any of those listed. This said, the “First Protocol”, this states “<i>The first sentence of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 guarantees an individual right to education. The second guarantees the right</i></p>

of parents to have their children educated in conformity with their religious and philosophical convictions". Closure of a school and the net removal of a single form of entry from the combined schools will not endanger this freedom, as there are numerous school places available in other schools nearby

Information on which above analysis is based

At the last census time in January 2023, there were 5,790 spare places in Southwark primary schools, including 1,571 spare places in Planning Area 3, 22% and 30% respectively..

Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken

As there have been no negative impacts relating to human rights identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed or required.

Conclusions

Summarise main findings and conclusions of the overall equality impact and needs analysis for this area:

Section 5: Further equality actions and objectives

5. Further actions			
Based on the initial analysis above, please detail the key mitigating and/or improvement actions to promote equality and tackle inequalities; and any areas identified as requiring more detailed analysis.			
Number	Description of issue	Action	Timeframe
As no mitigating or improvement actions to promote equality and tackle inequalities have been proposed, no further actions are required or proposed			

5.1 Equality and socio-economic objectives (for business plans)				
Based on the initial analysis above, please detail any of the equality objectives outlined above that you will set for your division/department/service. Under the objective and measure column, please state whether this objective is an existing objective or a suggested addition to the Council Plan.				
Objective and measure	Lead officer	Current performance (baseline)	Targets	
			Year 1	Year 2
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

6. Review of implementation of the equality objectives and actions
As no mitigating or improvement actions to promote equality and tackle inequalities have been required or proposed, no further reviews of the equality objectives and actions are required

7. Implementation Equality Impact and Needs Analysis

No issues as regards equalities and needs have been identified – therefore no mitigating or improvement actions to promote equality and tackle inequalities have been proposed as a result of this analysis.