



***Equality Impact & Needs Analysis –  
Proposed closure of Townsend  
Primary School in September 2023***

***April 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](http://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 competing the Climate impact section below.

### Section 1: Equality impact and needs analysis details

<b>Proposed policy/decision/business plan to which this equality analysis relates</b>	The proposed closure of Townsend Primary School on the 31 <sup>st</sup> August 2023
---	---

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

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

---

### 2.1 Brief description of policy/decision/business plan

Townsend Primary School is a one form of entry (1FE) primary school, on Larcom Street, London SE17 1NQ. Since 2017, the school has struggled to fill the 30 places it is able to admit each year. This academic year 11 children initially took up Reception class places, 17 joined Reception the previous year. Only 2 families applied to Reception for 2023/24. This low level of admissions has had a considerable financial impact on the school over the years, which has led to a substantial and growing in year financial deficit, which is unsustainable and shows little prospect of being able to be addressed. Given the vacancy levels in the vicinity of the school, the consideration of closure proposals is recommended.

## Section 3: Overview of service users and key stakeholders consulted

---

### 3. Service users and stakeholders

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

## 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 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

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

<b>Age</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).	
<b>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.</b>	<b>Potential Socio-Economic impacts/ needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)</b>
The closure of Townsend Primary School could ostensibly reduce choice for parents wanting a secular education in the locality for their child. It could potentially affect all age groups from 4-11 (children) and parents (generally 18-50) differentially. This, however, does not take into account the <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>	As outlined in the adjacent “ <i>potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy</i> ” column, the potential socio-economic impacts of closing the school as regards to age will be minimal. Closing the school will not effectively change the intake and relative demographics of the children attending other schools in the locality.

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 a 1 form entry (1FE) school is no longer viable to staff and run. Therefore, the loss of “choice” will largely be theoretical.

As most of the pupils attending the school live locally, and this is the case with other local schools, the closure of Townsend will not in itself change the local demographics or socio-economic profile.

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

**Socio-Economic data on which above analysis is based**

i) The reduction of pupil numbers at the school is self-evident – there has been a near **34% loss of pupils (56 children)** since 2019 (*Source, School Censuses 2019-23*)

The North Walworth ward Census 2021 data shows that there is a higher percentage of the population aged 0-19 lives in the ward (30%) than lives in the borough (21%); this said, there are a greater concentration of schools in the locality than the borough as a whole.

Year	R	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
2019	21	20	24	26	28	23	25	167
2020	22	21	20	24	23	27	25	162
2021	20	26	24	25	27	24	29	175
2022	17	20	23	20	27	25	25	157
2023	11	17	20	16	20	25	22	131

(*Source, School Censuses 2019-23*)

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

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

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%
<b>0-19</b>	<b>4,657</b>	<b>4,543</b>	<b>-114</b>	<b>-2%</b>

Year	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
1 <sup>st</sup>	19	17	12	11	2
All	46	52	43	45	3

(*Source, Applications records - LBS 2019-2023*)

(*Source ONS Census 2021*)

ii) the school is situated in the “North Walworth” ward of the Council, but takes pupils in from further afield – 56% of the pupils come from this ward. Of the pupils from within Southwark, 74% come from planning area 1 (Borough, Bankside & Walworth). Another 18% of the pupils come from planning area 2 (Bermondsey and Rotherhithe) and the remaining 9% of pupils of the existing roll come from outside these PAs but within Southwark (4%) or outside Southwark (5%). Most of the latter come from Lambeth and Lewisham (2% each) All of these localities have seen a reduction in births (including Lewisham) over the last 5 years, and this is projected to continue in the near future (*Source, ONS Census and Birth data 2021-22*)

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*)



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)	
<b>Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken</b>	
As there have been no negative impacts relating to age identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed.	

**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.

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

The closure of Townsend Primary School will have a negligible effect on disabilities, as the facilities, adaptations and services offered on the school campus for pupils and staff will be available at other schools to which they may move. All children with EHCPs will be offered an alternative suitable placement to meet their needs	There will be little or no potential socio-economic impacts arising from socio-economic disadvantage as regards disability, as schools in the locality are as accessible as Townsend and there are numerous school within close travelling distance of the school
--	---

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

No central record of disability is maintained by the LA, but a proxy measure is the number of children with Education and Healthcare Plans (EHCPs), or children who have been identified as SEND Plus at a variety of geographies. Townsend Primary has around the same level of EHCPs nationally and Londonwide, but slightly below Southwark’s average. The SEND Plus percentage is above local, regional and national averages.	As there is no perceptible potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage for people with disabilities, no data has been identified.
--	--

Type	Townsend	LBS	LDN	England
<b>EHCP</b>	4.1%	3.4%	4.1%	4.0%
<b>SEND+</b>	18.7%	15.9%	11.7%	12.6%

(Source, School Census January 2023- EHCPs and SEN Support, DfE Statistics 2022)

<p>In terms of staffing, no register of staff disability is maintained – disability does not form part of the selection process for staff recruitment or redundancy, so is unlikely to affect disabled staff disproportionately. In England, in the 2021 Census, a smaller proportion but larger number of people were disabled (17.7%, 9.8 million), compared with 2011 (19.3%, 9.4 million). In Southwark, the prevalence is 18.6%, and in London, 15.8%, so Southwark has a higher than England and London average.</p>	
<p><b>Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken</b></p>	
<p>As there have been no negative impacts relating to disability identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed.</p>	

<p><b>Gender reassignment:</b>  - The process of transitioning from one gender to another.  <b>Gender Identity:</b> 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><b>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.</b></p>	<p><b>Potential socio-economic impacts/ needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)</b></p>
<p>Gender reassignment is unlikely to involve children of primary age. As regards staffing, there are no staff undergoing gender reassignment at Townsend at present, but, were this to be the case, the gender 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, as this will not affect pupils and is unlikely to affect parents/carers and staff.</p>
<p><b>Equality information on which above analysis is based.</b></p>	<p><b>Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based</b></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 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>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>
<p><b>Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken</b></p>	
<p>As there have been no negative impacts relating to gender reassignment identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed.</p>	



**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><b>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan</b></p>	<p><b>Potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)</b></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

As regards staffing, no records of the marital status of Townsend staff are kept at the 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.

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 presence, medical needs or distance criteria alone. Therefore there are no realistic socio-economic impacts, needs or issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage relating to marital status

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

**Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based**

No records are maintained on the marital or civil partnership status of parents & carers, or staff members of Townsend Primary 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 (*Source, ONS Census 2021*)

Area	%	Area	%
North Walworth	27.5	England	44.5
Southwark	26.4	London	39.7

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.

**Mitigating actions to be taken**

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

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

Pregnancy and maternity are unlikely to directly involve children of primary age.

As regards staffing, Townsend staff's 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.

As mentioned in the adjacent "potential impacts of the proposed policy", the pregnancy or maternity 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. Similarly, this status would not form 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.

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

**Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based**

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

As there is no perceptible potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage for people with pregnancy or maternity status, no

Area	GFR	TFR	appropriate or useful data has been identified.
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.

**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 proposed closure could be that the pupils could potentially be placed in less diverse schools than the school proposed for closure Presently, the school is 89.9% Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) (i.e. non-White UK) –. For the local ward (North Walworth), the BME population is 68.2%. For the planning area the school is in (planning area 1 – PA1), the total percentage of BME pupils are 87.7%. As a whole, Southwark primary pupils are 78.9% BME as regards of Southwark’s population as a whole is 62.5%. The likelihood is that children will be reaccommodated in local schools in PA1, and that these schools will share the same level of diversity that the school presently has. There is no evidence therefore to show that closing the school would be likely to change the ethnic make-up of local alternative schools, as schools in the same planning area are as diverse as Townsend –In terms of staffing, the school’s workforce will – over time – find work in other local schools. 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 could be that the school becomes 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 PA1.</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>
--	--

<b>Equality information on which above analysis is based</b>						<b>Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based</b>
A table giving the relative percentages of the local population at schools and in the locality is given below						The Census 2021 and School Census 2023 figures opposite show that the school population is considerably more diverse than the population at large, and provided the children attending school remain inborough, that the population of Southwark will continue to become more diverse as time advances. Evidence is given elsewhere that the birth rate is falling in the locality, under “pregnancy and maternity”.
<b>Group</b>	<b>Townsend</b>	<b>North Walworth</b>	<b>PA1</b>	<b>Southwark pupils</b>	<b>Southwark population</b>	
Bangladeshi	3.8%	2.7%	5.0%	2.3%	1.8%	
Indian	0%	3.5%	0.7%	0.7%	2.0%	
Pakistani	0.3%	1.6%	0.4%	0.7%	0.7%	
Other Asian Background	1.3%	3.1%	3.0%	1.8%	2.7%	
Black African	36.7%	16.3%	27.6%	25.2%	15.7%	
Black Caribbean	6.3%	5.1%	6.1%	6.3%	5.9%	
Any Other Black Background	5.1%	3.8%	7.8%	5.2%	3.5%	
Chinese	0%	3.5%	1.3%	1.3%	2.7%	
Mixed - White & Black African	0%	1.0%	1.9%	2.2%	1.2%	
Mixed - White & Caribbean	5.7%	2.0%	2.6%	3.3%	2.1%	
Mixed - White & Asian	0%	1.2%	1.1%	1.7%	1.5%	
Any Other Mixed Background	5.7%	2.4%	6.5%	6.5%	2.4%	
White British	10.1%	31.8%	12.3%	21.1%	35.5%	
White Irish	0%	2.2%	0.2%	0.4%	2.0%	
Gypsy / Roma	0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	
Traveller of Irish Heritage	0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	
Any Other White Background	8.2%	14.8%	8.0%	9.3%	13.4%	
Any Other Ethnic Group	15.8%	6.0%	12.2%	7.7%	1.0%	
Unknown / Missing	1.3%	1.3%	3.3%	4.1%	5.3%	
<b>Non-White UK</b>	<b>89.9%</b>	<b>68.2%</b>	<b>87.7%</b>	<b>78.9%</b>	<b>64.5%</b>	
<i>(Source, Pupil Census, 2022, ONS Census 2021)</i>						

**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.

<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>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.</b>	<b>Potential socio-economic impacts/ needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)</b>
<p>The removal of 30 places from a school with no religious foundation could potentially remove choice and the availability of secular primary places in Southwark and beyond. Additionally, guidance when deciding this type of decision requires us to consider the balance of religious places in the borough,</p> <p>All of this said, the effect on the provision of secular places is likely to be minimal – for one, the take up of such places has been falling for years – as indeed it has for other denominational provision. Secondly, the effect</p>	<p>Religious schools in the past have often had a markedly different intake to academy, foundation and community schools, socio-economically. As Townsend is not a religious school, this is not the case. The school is amongst the most diverse schools in Southwark</p>

of a loss of 30 places (1FE), seen in the context of the overall number of places is also minimal.

As regards staffing, selection of staff for alternative employment is unlikely to be affected by the religion of the staff member

**Equality information 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	3,615	3,555	3,495
CE	3,149	2,895	2,865
Non-R	15,690	15,324	14,724

As a percentage of places this is shown below. Secular places (Non-R remain at 70% throughout)

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

The uptake of places are shown below

Type	2022	2023	2024
RC	2,874	2,686	2,483
CE	2,310	2,185	2,106
Non-R	15,690	15,324	14,724

This shows the demand for secular places has increased, but only by 1% of pupils overall

Type	2022	2023	2024
RC	14%	13%	13%
CE	11%	11%	11%
Non-R	75%	76%	76%

As noted above, there is no requirement for staff to be of a particular religion or none and therefore no record of staff's religious belief is maintained. It is therefore unlikely that a school closure will have any discernible effect on secular/non-religious education in Southwark as regards staffing and as regards pupil choice. Similarly, any restructuring as regards staff is also unlikely to have repercussions on any particular religious group or another.

**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.

**Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based**

Non-religious parents may wish for a secular education, but this is unlikely to be based on socio economic background. A table is given overleaf of the level of religious observance extracted from the 2021 Census. No breakdown of Christian faith is recorded for North Walworth ward. No religious register is kept of staff or pupils.

Religion	NW	Southwark
Christian	44%	46%
Buddhist	1%	1%
Hindu	1%	10%
Jewish	1%	0%
Muslim	13%	7%
Sikh	0.2%	0%
Other/No religion/not stated	39%	37%

(Source, ONS Census 2021)

This shows that there is a slightly lower level of Christian religious belief in the North Walworth, but no solid conclusions can be drawn from this.

<b>Sex - A man or a woman.</b>																																																									
<b>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.</b>	<b>Potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)</b>																																																								
<p>If there was a significant imbalance in the provision or uptake of places at the school then the closure of the school may affect this. Prevalence of male to female pupils in the both at the school and in the locality are approaching 50:50, so the school closing will not have an effect on the mix of pupils in terms of gender</p> <p>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</p>	<p>There are no potential socio-economic impacts or issues arising from disadvantage as regards the closure of the school with respect to the gender of pupils. As regards staffing, it could be that female staff are affected more, due to their prevalence in the workforce</p>																																																								
<b>Equality information on which above analysis is based</b>	<b>Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based</b>																																																								
<p>The percentage of girls to boys varies from year to year. At reception, there are more girls than boys, across all year groups the same proportions in reverse. Overall, numbers are more or less equal</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender</th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> <th>6</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>F</td> <td>7</td> <td>12</td> <td>10</td> <td>4</td> <td>11</td> <td>16</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>M</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>10</td> <td>12</td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>11</td> <td>17</td> <td>20</td> <td>16</td> <td>20</td> <td>25</td> <td>22</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender</th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> <th>6</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>F</td> <td>64%</td> <td>71%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>55%</td> <td>64%</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>M</td> <td>36%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>45%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>68%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	F	7	12	10	4	11	16	7	M	4	5	10	12	9	9	15	Total	11	17	20	16	20	25	22	Gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	F	64%	71%	50%	25%	55%	64%	32%	M	36%	29%	50%	75%	45%	36%	68%	<p>The number of female staff on the workforce are generally high. It is not felt that the closure therefore will disproportionately affect women more than men, save that there are more female staff than male across most of our schools in any case</p>
Gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total																																																		
F	7	12	10	4	11	16	7																																																		
M	4	5	10	12	9	9	15																																																		
Total	11	17	20	16	20	25	22																																																		
Gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total																																																		
F	64%	71%	50%	25%	55%	64%	32%																																																		
M	36%	29%	50%	75%	45%	36%	68%																																																		
<b>Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken</b>																																																									
As there have been no negative impacts relating gender identified, no mitigating or improvement actions are proposed.																																																									

<b>Sexual orientation - Whether a person's sexual attraction is towards their own sex, the opposite sex or to both sexes</b>	
<b>Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan; this also includes needs in relation to each part of the duty.</b>	<b>Potential socio-economic impacts/needs/issues arising from socio-economic disadvantage (positive and negative)</b>
<p>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/carers. Closing the school 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 closure will not disproportionately affect staff members as regards their sexual orientation.</p>	<p>There are no potential socio-economic impacts or issues arising from disadvantage as regards the closure of the school with respect to the sexual orientation of pupils, parents/carers or staff.</p>
<b>Equality information on which above analysis is based</b>	<b>Socio-economic data on which above analysis is based</b>



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.

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

As mentioned above, there are no potential socio-economic impacts as regards the closure of the school or 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.

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.

**Mitigating and/or improvement actions to be taken**

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

**Human Rights**

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

**Potential impacts (positive and negative) of proposed policy/decision/business plan**

In respect of the 16 rights listed, the proposal to close Townsend will not affect any of those listed. This said, the "First Protocol", this states "*The first sentence of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 guarantees an individual right to education. The second guarantees the right of parents to have their children educated in conformity with their religious and philosophical convictions*". Removal of a single form of entry from Townsend Primary School will not endanger this freedom, as there are numerous school places available in schools within walking distance of Townsend, both religious and non-religious. This proposal will also not affect the rights of staff members.

**Information on which above analysis is based**

At the last census time, there were 5,790 spare places in Southwark primary schools, including 1,540 spare places in Planning Area 1, 22% for each respectively. For non-religious education, there are numerous alternative schools very close to Townsend with numerous spare places available

**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.

<b>Number</b>	<b>Description of issue</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>
---------------	-----------------------------	---------------	------------------

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.

<b>Objective and measure</b>	<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Current performance (baseline)</b>	<b>Targets</b>	
			<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>
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.

### **Section 5: Further actions and objectives**

#### **Further actions**

Based on the initial analysis above, please detail the key mitigating actions or the areas identified as requiring more detailed analysis.

**No negative impacts of the arrangements have been identified, so no mitigating actions are required, and no actions will derive from these specific proposals.**

Number	Description of issue	Action	Timeframe
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Equality objectives (for business plans)

Based on the initial analysis above, please detail any equality objectives 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.

**No negative impacts of the arrangements have been identified, so no mitigating actions are required, and no equality objectives will derive from these specific proposals.**

Objective and measure	Lead officer	Current performance (baseline)	Targets	
			Year 1	Year 2
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Health objectives (for business plans)

Based on the initial analysis above, please detail any health objectives 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.

**No negative impacts of the arrangements have been identified, so no mitigating actions are required, and no health objectives will derive from these specific proposals.**

Objective and measure	Lead officer	Current performance (baseline)	Targets	
			Year 1	Year 2
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A