

**Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report**

<b>Equality Impact Assessment Report</b>	<b>Please enter responses below in the right hand columns</b>
<b>Date to EIA panel, department, DLT or DMT</b>	
<b>Sign-off path for EIA (please add/delete as applicable)</b>	DMT DLT SLB Corporate EIA Panel Cabinet Full Council
<b>Title of Project, business area, policy/strategy</b>	Redress Scheme in respect of child sexual abuse in Lambeth’s children’s homes
<b>Author</b>	David Orekoya Sarah McCulloch
<b>Job title, division and department</b>	Lead Commissioner- Health Improvement, Adult and Community Services Senior Commissioning Officer- Staying Healthy, Adult and Community Services
<b>Contact email and telephone</b>	<a href="mailto:DOrekoya@lambeth.gov.uk">DOrekoya@lambeth.gov.uk</a> 0207 926 0477 <a href="mailto:SMcCulloch@lambeth.gov.uk">SMcCulloch@lambeth.gov.uk</a> 0207 926 5137
<b>SLB Sponsor</b>	

<h1>London Borough of Lambeth Full Equality Impact Assessment Report</h1>		<p>Please enter responses below in the right hand columns.</p>
<h2>1.0 Introduction</h2>		
<p><b>1.1 Business activity aims and intentions</b></p> <p><i>In brief explain the aims of your proposal/project/service, why is it needed? Who is it aimed at? What is the intended outcome? What are the links to the cooperative council vision, corporate outcomes and priorities?</i></p>	<p><b>Context</b></p> <p>Lambeth Council is one of a number of public organisations - principally local authorities- that are due to be investigated by the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA). The investigation centres on the response by the council to allegations of historic sexual, emotional and physical abuse and neglect which took place in its children’s homes. Lambeth assumed responsibility for a number of children’s homes following its establishment in 1965 up until the closure of the last children’s home in the late 1990’s.</p> <p>During this period it is estimated that up to around 15,000 children were looked after in children’s homes that were managed by the council, on both short and longer term placements. A significant number of these were placed at Shirley Oaks Children’s Home, and it is allegations of abuse at this specific home from 1948 (which predate Lambeth Council’s formation) to 1983 which precipitated wider investigations by Lambeth Council and the Metropolitan Police. IICSA itself will examine issues relating to potential organisational failure which may have been relevant to this.</p> <p>In the meantime the council has worked with Shirley Oaks Survivors Association (SOSA), the organisation which represents and individuals who have been affected by historic abuse whilst in the care of Lambeth children’s homes. SOSA presented the council with evidence of widespread and systematic abuse and neglect which has been damaging to a significant number of individuals. These include serious allegations of sexual abuse and</p>	

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

	<p>abuse of vulnerable children and adolescents with physical and learning disabilities. There is some evidence evidence suggestive of high levels of physical abuse in Shirley Oaks and 3 other homes managed by council. In addition approximately a third of current complainants present testimony indicative of sexual abuse. In view of the overall propensity of claims it cannot be assumed that any children’s home or placement that was managed by the council was absolutely safe.</p> <p>The campaign by SOSA plus the wider publicity generated by IICSA has led to a number of people to come forward seeking recognition of and some form of recompense from the council for the harm and subsequent distress that they have experienced. Currently there are approximately over 1100 members of although it is difficult to say with any certainty the exact numbers that may come forward to make an application for under the redress scheme. Nevertheless the council anticipates that there could be a significant number of people who come forward to claim compensation from both SOSA members and individuals who are not linked to SOSA.</p> <p>The events that took place within Shirley Oaks and other children’s homes in Lambeth present the council with an unparalleled organisational and financial challenge. A key aspect of this is the response to the number of compensation claims from victims of abuse whilst in the care of children’s homes managed by the council. In response the council believes that there are two main options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. That potential claimants seek compensation for harm and distress caused by taking legal action against the council. This may require litigants to engage in a lengthy, adversarial and intrusive court process with no guarantee of a positive outcome.</li><li>2. The council develops its own bespoke redress scheme which would allow claims for compensation to be settled by mutual agreement between the claimant(s) and Lambeth Council.</li></ol> <p>Given the scale and sensitivity of the issues involved and the potential impact on many (often vulnerable) individuals the Council prefers the latter course of action. A redress scheme is currently being designed, drawing on national and international experience, with</p>
--	---

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

	<p>input from SOSA and legal advisors who have expertise in this field. The aim of the redress scheme is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implement a swift and compassionate process for making and resolving claims</li><li>• Provide quicker access to justice and redress</li><li>• Eliminate or at least reduce the need for litigation which might well be complex and distressing for claimants to pursue</li><li>• Ensure that individuals do not suffer any undue additional harm or distress that is associated with pursuing a claim</li><li>• Reduce the administrative cost and burden to individuals</li></ul> <p>Principles that have informed the development of the redress scheme are that it should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide some recognition of the harm and distress that individuals may well have experienced</li><li>• Enable affected individuals to move on with their lives as swiftly as possible</li><li>• Be straightforward for individuals to register a claim and navigate the overall process</li><li>• Allow resolution of claims in a timely and cost effective manner</li><li>• Provide individuals with appropriate information, advice and support to assist them throughout the process</li><li>• Ensure that the council's requests for evidentiary information relevant to the basis of the claim are justifiable and proportionate</li></ul> <p>It must be noted that this EIA is based on access to the proposed Redress Scheme being available to all individuals who were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• in the care of a children's home managed by Lambeth Council</li><li>• and affected by historic abuse during the relevant period.</li></ul> <p>If access to the scheme is restricted to only those who were in residential care at Shirley Oaks, this could impact on a significant number of individuals. It would lead to differential treatment between those who may have experienced harm whilst resident at Shirley Oaks and those who experienced harm at other children's homes during the same period in</p>
--	--

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

question. If such a limited scheme is pursued this could lead to inequitable outcomes between both populations which could have consequences for the council's statutory obligations in relation to equalities legislation. Potential claimants who were not resident at Shirley Oaks would be treated less favourably across all equality domains by being denied access to any redress scheme.

In mitigation, this EIA has been undertaken on the basis that any agreed redress scheme is available to all eligible individuals irrespective of the home at which they were resident at the time period in question. This is also particularly important given that during this time some of the children's homes were specifically to care for children with disabilities (including learning and/or physical disabilities). These children will have been particularly vulnerable and therefore at a higher risk of abuse and neglect.

There are limitations on equalities data due to both changes in equalities legislation and related policy guidance, and local practice regarding systematic capture of equalities data over the period in question. However based on historic and current knowledge of the Lambeth population, the council believes that potential redress scheme beneficiaries consist of two broad and overlapping cohorts. These cohorts cut across all the protected characteristics outlined in equalities and human rights legislation and can be briefly summarised as those:

- From 1936-1964, mainly of white British and Irish heritage often placed in care homes that were the responsibility of organisations such as the London Metropolitan Council which existed prior to the creation of Lambeth Council in 1964. Many of these individuals will be aged over 65 with a significant numbers who are now over 75 years old. As they are now older some of these individuals are likely to have long term health conditions such as diabetes and dementia - the known risks of which increase with age.
- In 1965 Lambeth council assumed responsibility for the management of many of these children's homes including the Shirley Oaks complex. From 1965-1983 children resident in these homes would have- over time- reflected an increasingly diverse ethnic composition. This slightly younger population would include more residents from BME populations, particularly those of African Caribbean and to lesser extent African heritage.

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

	<p>This reflected both initial patterns of settlement by ethnic minority populations in and within London and from the 1970's national and local evidence of over-representation of specific ethnic groups, especially individuals of black African Caribbean and black and white mixed (Anglo-Caribbean) heritage within the childcare system, specifically those received into care.</p> <p>Across both groups some broad common characteristics are that they are more likely to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• be from families with lower socio-economic status as measured by parental educational, housing, occupation and income status</li><li>• experienced (familial) neglect or abuse which may have led to the reception into care</li><li>• had vulnerabilities relating to physical, learning disability, mental health or conduct (behavioural) disorder or by virtue of low educational attainment which may have led to their reception into care.</li><li>• been placed in (respite) care because a parent (in these cases very often mother) was temporarily unable or deemed as unfit to care for the child(ren) for health or other reasons, such as prevailing social norms, which would have influenced the professional judgements that agencies made regarding child welfare at the time (i.e unmarried mothers).</li><li>• experienced multiple and overlapping stigma relating to a particular characteristic- ethnicity, gender, sexuality, socioeconomic status; for being in care itself; and for having been a victim of abuse. For some individuals this abuse may well have been internalised leading to or complicating existing emotional, psychological or mental health difficulties and effecting overall life outcomes.</li><li>• have a greater potential for vulnerability due to the specific and unique impact of proximity to neglectful or abusive environment or having been abused or neglected.</li></ul> <p>National evidence as well as local data illustrates that many of these individuals would already have been disadvantaged prior to the reception into the care of Lambeth Council and its predecessors. Experience of abuse may well only have compounded this across life course given the: immediate trauma and distress; impact on longer term mental, emotional and physical health and wellbeing; effect on interpersonal and family relationships; and</p>
--	---

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

	<p>impact on outcomes across key domains across the life course including education, housing, jobs and careers, income and so on. For some of these individuals the intersection of the impact of the historic abuse and neglect they suffered alongside the disadvantages in early life that they may have experienced will have constituted in what amounts to, in effect, a life sentence.</p> <p>Forcing these individuals who have already experienced multiple and intersecting disadvantages to engage in litigation could have the potential to exacerbate these inequalities and amplify the manifold distress arising out of the original abuse and neglect that they may have been subject to. Many of the individuals who experienced abuse or neglect will also be distrustful of institutions of authority consequential to this traumatising experience. Implementation of the proposed scheme avoids the council having to engage in potentially protracted and contentious litigation with the risk that this could be experienced as a perpetuation of institutional abuse by claimants.</p> <p>In the light of all the available information the council believes that the proposed redress will –overall- impact positively on all equalities groups, especially those deemed to have specific vulnerabilities related to physical or mental health or mental capacity. Making the process of lodging claims with and navigating the redress scheme as straightforward as possible can both speed up the process and minimise claimants being exposed to additional harm related to either the process or excessive time taken to resolve claims.</p> <p>The re-dress scheme proposed by the Council is considered to be the most appropriate ethical and legal response to compensation claims and will be less burdensome and stressful for claimants to pursue than seeking legal action. It also seeks to provide survivors with a symbolic recognition of the impact on affected individuals, which may then provide some semblance of justice. It will be designed to be swift and compassionate, and claimants will receive tailored support to effectively access and navigate the scheme, taking account of any specific needs that individual claimants may have</p> <p>The design of redress scheme seeks to ameliorate some of the disadvantages outlined with respect to three core aspects of the scheme namely:</p>
--	--

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ensuring multiple access channels which take account of the barriers that may inhibit some individuals from making applications for redress, whilst respecting individuals right to privacy.</li><li>• Implementating a straightforward and proportionate process by which claimants can lodge an application and provide agreed evidentiary information in support of the claim</li><li>• Assuring that the scheme is broadly beneficial to claimants health and well being, including individual’s financial health particulalry those who are vulnerable.</li></ul> <p>Summary overview of each of these aspects in turn, illuminates they way in which the council has incorporated both its equalities duties and the need to support potentially vulnerable individuals as central tenents of the scheme development.</p> <p>With respect to access, the the council’s initial intention is that the scheme will last for a period of 2 years from the official launch date. This should provide sufficient time for individuals to register to make a claim. Once the scheme is launched it will be publicised through a number of channels including through council newsletter, website, SOSA, Healthwatch and local health and care partners. Legal firms will also be aware of the scheme and will advice potential claimants accordingly of their right to claim. This should ensure wide reach of information about the scheme. However specific outreach to target potential applicants will not be undertaken due to the risk of breaching people’s confidentiality. Central to the scheme design is the recognition that some individuals may not wish to come forward for a variety of reasons including the desire not to have dwell on events from the past, and/or to maintain complete anonymity.</p> <p>For those that do wish come forward they will be able to self refer to the scheme; the council will establish a PO Box number for those wish to claim but have no direct contact with the council; or an advocate or legal advisor will be able to lodge a claim on their behalf. Families or those administering the estates of those who have died will also be able to lodge a claim, as will advocates and others acting behalf of individuals who may be unable to claim due to mental or physical incapacity.</p>
--	---

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

	<p>Once individuals lodge a claim the process will be as straightforward and proportionate as possible. Most claims will be settled based on a transparent, agreed but flexibly interpreted schema, with only the most complex cases requiring a more specific legal process. The council will shoulder the costs of all legal expenses incurred by claimants and will provide additional assistance where necessary. This will include helping people with administrative issues relating to claims such as; providing proof of identity; establishing residence at a home or foster placement; and/or practical help and signposting in relation to social care, health or other needs where appropriate.</p> <p>For some individuals settlement of claims may provide a profound sense of acknowledgement and closure. However for others the effect of any settlement may be more nuanced depending on the overall impact of abuse on their life to date and whether any compensation awarded equates with their expectations. Settlement may present additional challenges relating to some vulnerable individuals receiving significant financial payments which may place them at risk of exploitation.</p> <p>In general the council will advise all claimants of the potential implications of a financial settlement if they are in receipt of benefits. The council will also encourage individuals (and their advisors) who receive substantial compensation to access independent financial advice. However unless individuals fall within the auspices of mental capacity or safeguarding legislation, the council accepts that individuals have the right to make their own choice regarding how they manage their finances. Sometimes this means accepting that some people with vulnerabilities linked to mental health, frailty or drugs and alcohol use for instance, will make what might be regarded as 'unwise' financial decisions. For those that do fall within the bounds of mental capacity and vulnerable adults legislation the council will be able to work with carers, families and others to protect their financial interests.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the inclusive approach to the design of the scheme the council recognises there will be a limit to the positive impact that the redress scheme in itself, can have for each individual. Some people will have been living with the effects of abuse and/or neglect for their whole lives and will continue to do so even if they receive compensation through</p>
--	---

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

	<p>the redress scheme. Other individuals may simply wish and will be able to move on with their lives. Nevertheless the fact is that these individuals were exposed to abuse and neglect and had to suffer the council’s refusal to acknowledge responsibility until more recently. This redress scheme cannot undo or atone for these acts of abuse or neglect or the sometimes profound impact it will have had on a significant number of individuals.</p> <p>What the redress scheme can do is ensure that the council exercises its responsibility to provide some form of recognition and restitution in the most sensitive, timely and cost effective manner for all parties.</p>
<h3>2.0 Analysing your equalities evidence</h3>	
<p><b>2.1 Evidence</b></p> <p><i>Any proposed business activity, new policy or strategy, service change, or procurement must be informed by carrying out an assessment of the likely impact that it may have. In this section please include both data and analysis which shows that you understand how this decision is likely to affect residents that fall under the protected characteristics enshrined in law and the local characteristics which we consider to be important in Lambeth (language, health and socio-economic factors). <b>Please check the council's equality and monitoring policy and your division’s self assessment. Each division in 2011/12 reviewed its equality data and completed a self assessment about what equality data is relevant and available?</b></i></p> <p><b>IF YOUR PROPOSAL ALSO IMPACTS ON LAMBETH COUNCIL STAFF YOU NEED TO COMPLETE A STAFFING EIA.</b></p>	
<p><b>Protected characteristics and local equality characteristics</b></p>	<p><b>Impact analysis</b></p> <p><b>For each characteristic please indicate the type of impact (i.e. positive, negative, positive and negative, none, or unknown), and:</b></p> <p><i>Please explain how you justify your claims around impacts.</i></p>

**Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report**

	<p><i>Please include any data and evidence that you have collected including from surveys, performance data or complaints to support your proposed changes.</i></p> <p><i>Please indicate sources of data and the date it relates to/was produced (e.g. ‘Residents Survey, wave 10, April 12’ or ‘Lambeth Business Survey 2012’ etc)</i></p>
<p><b>Race</b></p>	<p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>National reports such as that undertaken by the Department for Children, Schools and Families in 2010 have highlighted the overrepresentation of children from Black and Minority ethnic backgrounds within Looked after children (LAC) population, especially those African Caribbean and dual heritage. Although data regarding ethnicity was not captured consistently throughout the timeframe in question, existing local information indicates that local experience of BME populations was in line with this national picture.</p> <p>Many individuals of BME heritage who make up part of Lambeth’s cohort of Looked After Children (LAC) during the period in question will have been resident in children’s homes under the statutory care of Lambeth. Where individuals may have experienced abuse under the care of Lambeth they will likely have been negatively affected by this which may have been further compounded by social and economic disadvantages linked to racial and other forms of discrimination.</p> <p>Since December 2016 Lambeth Council has received 640 Subject Access Requests from adults, who as children were in the care of Lambeth Council and/ or London Metropolitan Borough of Lambeth and resided in Lambeth run children’s homes. This data can be used as a proxy measure for the LAC population within Lambeth Children’s Homes during the period in question.</p> <p>Breakdown of the SAR data by race showed that the largest cohort were categorised as white (217 / 60%), followed by black (117 / 33%), other (16 / 4%), and there was no information for 10 SARs or 3%, showing there to be a noticeably higher proportion of white adults according to this data.</p> <p>For individuals of BME heritage the impact of abuse and neglect may have contributed to existing known inequalities in outcomes specific to Caribbean and some African</p>

**Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report**

	<p>populations in the Lambeth. These include lower rates of educational attainment; over representation within the criminal justice and mental health systems; and high rates of substance misuse and long term conditions including hypertension, diabetes and cardiovascular disease.</p>
<p><b>Sex</b></p>	<p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>Potential claims for compensation arise out of the distressing experiences that many claimants will have had whilst in the care of children’s homes managed by Lambeth at the time. Whilst national evidence highlights the disproportionate burden of violence and sexual abuse against women and girls overall, information sources - including those from previous inquiries into abuse in Lambeth- show that a considerable number of both girls and boys were subject to abuse and neglect or placed at risk of significant harm.</p> <p>Reviewing the SAR data received since December 2016 shows that there were a total of 640 SARs, of which 342 (53%) were made by males and 298 (47%) by females. This indicates broadly similar numbers of males and females who may have experienced abuse whilst in the care of Lambeth during the period in question.</p> <p>Research, although at present relatively limited has indicated that certain types of abuse tend to be perpetrated against males and females disproportionately. Data captured from the Crime Survey for England and Wales, year ending March 2016 shows that with the exception of physical abuse, the level of abuse experienced during childhood was more prevalent for females than for males across all abuse types. The category of any sexual assault shows the largest difference between males and females. Women were nearly 4 times as likely to be a survivor of any sexual assault in childhood, with 11% of females and 3% of males experiencing this type of abuse during childhood.</p> <p>There are limitations however and it could be argued that males might be less likely to report certain types of abuse, such as sexual. This is an area which requires further research.</p>

**Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report**

<p><b>Gender re-assignment</b></p>	<p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>As with many other public bodies, Lambeth Council has only very recently started to systemically capture information regarding gender reassignment. Nevertheless national research and policy documents from organisations such as Stonewall starkly highlight that individuals from transgender communities are at a higher risk of experiencing adverse experiences such as discrimination and abuse throughout their life.</p> <p>Indicative feedback from transgender individuals who have accessed local support services suggest that these negative experiences may have been further compounded by adverse experiences of abuse and neglect whilst placed in a Lambeth children’s home during the period in focus.</p> <p>Individuals making a claim via the redress scheme will have access to tailored support throughout the process which is likely to be particularly beneficial to adults with specific vulnerabilities. The scheme will be designed to be a straightforward process which minimises the burden and stress which might otherwise be experienced as a result of pursuing formal legal action. In light of this it can be reasonably considered that the implementation of a redress scheme will have a positive effect on individuals possessing this equalities characteristic.</p>
<p><b>Disability</b></p>	<p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>There were several Lambeth children’s homes which were set up to care for children with disabilities (including learning, physical and mental health related disabilities) of which it is fair to assume that a proportion of these children may have had multiple disabilities, therefore heightening their vulnerability to abuse.</p> <p>Some of these units were also set up for the provision of temporary based (respite) care. Due to the nature of respite services, it was likely that these services saw higher numbers</p>

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

of children being cared for in this environment as they passed in and out of the service on a temporary basis, increasing the risk of abuse to take place.

Data captured from SARs since December 2016 show a total of 26 cases with a ‘recognised’ disability recorded. The way disability is regarded and recorded in social work practice has changed since this time period however the data shows that the majority of these cases were deemed at the time as ‘maladjusted’ (18 / 69%), followed by those with ‘educational special needs’ (5/ 19%) and 1/ 4% for ‘epileptic’, ‘partially sighted’ and ‘psychological’.

It must be noted that these numbers very likely represent only a partial estimate of the total number of LAC with disabilities – for instance data was only available for 119 requestors, a relatively small population cohort size. Due to the inconsistent nature of data recording and capturing on LAC during this period, it is reasonable to assume that there were a higher number of children with disabilities under the care of Lambeth than the Council currently has records/ data for.

It is also reasonable to assume that some children whilst under the care of Lambeth did possess a disability however this was not sufficiently diagnosed at the time. Another cohort to note may be those who whilst under the care of Lambeth did not have any disability (recorded or otherwise) however since leaving care they have since gone onto develop a disability.

Some of this population cohort which have had or since been diagnosed with a disability may possess specific language and communication needs, increasing their vulnerability to abuse and making them more likely to have specific support needs and vulnerabilities as an adult.

Children and adults with disabilities are considered to be at a higher risk of vulnerability and as such LAC with disabilities in Lambeth may have been more likely to have experienced abuse and neglect. Due to disability, the negative experiences faced may also have had a compounding significant impact upon their adult life outcomes and functioning.

**Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report**

	<p>For instance we know that adults with disabilities overall tend to have lower economic incomes and are more at risk of and likely to experience social isolation.</p> <p>These are factors which all contribute to people with disabilities being more vulnerable to abuse and it could be considered that people with disabilities may find it more difficult to report abuse. When cases are reported, these individuals may be at an increased risk of discrimination within the legal system; specifically experiencing challenges around cases being successfully brought to justice – this may be due to the prevailing legal evidentiary standards and potential stigmatising beliefs that individuals with disabilities may be less reliable witnesses for instance.</p> <p>Individuals who may have experienced abuse whilst under the care of Lambeth will have been negatively affected and it is reasonable to suggest this will have further compounded the likelihood of facing lower incomes and higher rates of isolation throughout their adult lives.</p> <p>Individuals making a claim via the redress scheme will have access to tailored support throughout the process which is likely to be particularly beneficial to adults with vulnerabilities and is likely to be of particular help to adults with disabilities who may possess certain communication and/ or support needs.</p>
<p><b>Age</b></p>	<p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>Actual and potential claimants will be adults who were children in the care of Lambeth Council or the London Metropolitan Council at the time the events took place. As children, these individuals would have expectations that at the least Lambeth Council, whilst acting in loco parentis, had a duty of care to ensure their safety and wellbeing.</p> <p>Some of these individuals will have been babies when they were under Lambeth’s care, making them extremely vulnerable to abuse and neglect. Despite being at such a young age and likely unable to recall events directly themselves, the Council still retains an ethical duty to ensure these individuals are given access to recognition and redress for the</p>

**Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report**

	<p>experiences they suffered. It is also reasonable to suggest that the abuse they may have experienced as a baby will have a long term negative impact upon their lives.</p> <p>Many of these individuals are now adults of both working age and a significant proportion of retirement age. Data gathered from the Subject Assess Requests (SARs) received since 2016 indicates that the highest proportion of individuals making SARs are from the age bracket of between 60-69. Out of a total of 640 SARs received, 252 (39%) were from individuals aged 60-69, this is followed by a total of 203 (32%) from people aged 50-59 and 93 (15%) aged 40-49. There were also a number of requests made by individuals aged between 70-79 (75 requests, 12%).</p> <p>Evidence shows that with age comes an increase in risk of developing a disability. It is therefore likely that a proportion of these older individuals possess some form of disability currently.</p> <p>Given this data, we can assume that the many individuals who may seek to access the redress scheme will now be over 65, some of whom may be elderly and have a disability including those related to long time life limiting health conditions.</p> <p>The re-dress scheme will be designed to be swift and compassionate process and claimants will be supported to effectively access the scheme, including older claimants. This could be argued is of particular importance for older people, who may seek a quicker resolution for instance if they feel that due to their older age they have less time in which to fully benefit from redress (whether this be symbolically and/or financially) or one which is less burdensome, should they be in poor health.</p> <p>Individuals will be effectively supported when accessing the redress scheme, including the most appropriate support to older people which may be required. In light of the aims of the redress scheme and support which will be offered it is considered that the implementation of the redress scheme in this instance will result in a positive impact upon those who access it, including older people.</p>
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<b>Positive</b>

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

	<p>Information regarding this equalities characteristic has not been previously been captured either formally or informally during the period in question.</p> <p>Individuals making a claim via the redress scheme will have access to tailored support throughout the process which is likely to be particularly beneficial to adults with specific vulnerabilities. Therefore despite not having local data available, there is no reason to believe that the redress scheme will have a negative impact upon anyone in this equalities group.</p>
<b>Religion and belief</b>	<p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>Information regarding this equalities characteristic has not been previously been captured either formally or informally during the period in question.</p> <p>Despite this there is no evidence to suggest that the implementation of a re-dress scheme will have disproportionate negative impact on people with this equality characteristic.</p>
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	<p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>Information regarding this equalities characteristic has not been previously been captured either formally or informally during the period in question.</p> <p>Despite this there is no evidence to suggest that the implementation of a re-dress scheme will have any negative impact on people with this equality characteristic.</p>
<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	<p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>Information regarding this equalities characteristic has not been previously been captured either formally or informally during the period in question.</p> <p>Despite this there is no evidence to suggest that the implementation of a re-dress scheme will have any negative impact on this people with this equality characteristic.</p>

**Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report**

<p><b>Socio-economic factors</b></p>	<p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>Due to historical data capturing and recording practices within the Local Authority, we do not have access to specific data which identifies the socioeconomic factors or backgrounds of individuals who were a Lambeth LAC during the period in question.</p> <p>However, we do know anecdotally (on both a local and national scale) that children from poorer socioeconomic backgrounds are significantly overrepresented within the LAC care system. We also know anecdotally that people from poorer socioeconomic backgrounds are more likely to experience ongoing inequalities and poorer life outcomes throughout their lifetime. Evidence also shows that people who have been abused as a child are more likely to be negatively affected in terms of their financial situation; being more likely to have less economic income. This may be due to a range of factors including suffering from poorer long term mental health which has then contributed to lower educational attainment and workplace achievements.</p> <p>An indicator of inequality within poorer socioeconomic backgrounds is that concerning literacy rates. Data shows us that children and adults from poorer backgrounds have higher rates of illiteracy which could be argued adds to their vulnerability and diminishes their ability and resources available to seek proper help when placed in an adverse and abuse environment as experienced as a LAC.</p> <p>In light of this overrepresentation we can therefore surmise that people from poorer socioeconomic backgrounds within the LAC care system are more likely to have experienced abuse and neglect.</p> <p>Individuals making a claim via the redress scheme will have access to tailored support throughout the process which is likely to be particularly beneficial to adults with specific vulnerabilities. This could be argued this is of particular importance for people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, who may be more likely to lack the resources or assets necessary to successfully navigate the legal system outside of this scheme.</p>
<p><b>Language</b></p>	<p><b>Positive</b></p>

**Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report**

	<p>Due to historical data capturing and recording practices within Local Authority, we do not have access to specific data which identifies the factors surrounding language from those who were a Lambeth LAC during the period in focus. However, we do know anecdotally that there was an overrepresentation of BME children within the LAC system, of which may have possessed specific language needs such as English as another language. These language barriers for BME children who did not speak fluent English may have exacerbated their vulnerability to abuse whilst under the care of Lambeth as a LAC.</p> <p>Individuals will be effectively supported when accessing the redress scheme, including the practical support to people which may be required. In light of the aims of the redress scheme and support which will be offered it is considered that the implementation of the scheme in this instance will result in a positive impact upon all those who access it, including people with language needs where English as another language.</p>
<p><b>Health</b></p>	<p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>The proposed scheme is in line with the Council’s commitment to narrow the gap between the most vulnerable and the general population by reducing inequalities as outlined in the Borough’s Community Plan 2016-21. Looked After Children experience considerable inequalities relating to poor health outcomes including mental health and emotional wellbeing, substance misuse and engaging in risk taking and offending behaviours all of which contribute to worsened health outcomes. Evidence of historic abuse may well have resulted in additional negative impacts upon the life chances, over and above this.</p> <p>Evidence continues to grow around the link between mind and body and the influence that mental and emotional wellbeing has on someone’s physical health and vice versa. Evidence shows that people who suffered abuse or neglect as a child are more likely to suffer from poorer health outcomes in adulthood. Childhood abuse is positively related to common mental illnesses such as depression but also to more serious mental illnesses.</p> <p>There is an established link between mental health and physical health, particularly around unhealthy behaviours; for instance smoking rates are far higher in this population cohort.</p>

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

	<p>Evidence also shows that children who have experienced abuse and neglect are at a higher risk of engaging with drugs and alcohol; with these populations being more likely to have substance misuse and addictions problems which consequently impact negatively on physical health and wellbeing.</p>
<p><b>2.2 Gaps in evidence base</b>  <i>What gaps in information have you identified from your analysis? In your response please identify areas where more information is required and how you intend to fill in the gaps. If you are unable to fill in the gaps please state this clearly with justification.</i></p>	<p>As set out above, there are various gaps in the evidence base currently for this population cohort in the period in question. Data recording and reporting practices and requirements were different during this period to what we have today across Children’s Services therefore certain data on equalities characteristics are not available for us to evaluate.</p> <p>This is specifically the case for data pertaining to race, sexual orientation, gender re-assignment, religion, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, language and health.</p> <p>In terms of these gaps in data, it’s proposed that we will seek to address these as part of the process for the implementation of the redress scheme. Equalities data will aim to be collected for all claimants therefore the scheme itself will provide an opportunity to fill in some of these gaps and build knowledge as to this specific cohort of the population.</p>
<p><b>3.0 Consultation, Involvement and Coproduction</b></p>	
<p><b>3.1 Coproduction, involvement and consultation</b>  <i>Who are your key stakeholders and how have you consulted, coproduced or involved them? What difference did this make?</i></p>	<p>The redress scheme has been developed with extensive input from Shirley Oaks Survivors Association and their legal advisors, Cabinet and Members and senior officers. This has been to ensure that the scheme is in line with the principles espoused and recognises the council’s ethical and moral duty whilst remaining within the boundaries of the authority’s constitutional and financial authority.</p>
<p><b>3.2 Gaps in coproduction, consultation and involvement</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>

## Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment Report

<p><i>What gaps in consultation and involvement and coproduction have you identified (set out any gaps as they relate to specific equality groups)? Please describe where more consultation, involvement and/or coproduction is required and set out how you intend to undertake it. If you do not intend to undertake it, please set out your justification.</i></p>	
<h3>4.0 Conclusions, justification and action</h3>	
<p><b>4.1 Conclusions and justification</b>  <i>What are the main conclusions of this EIA? What, if any, disproportionate negative or positive equality impacts did you identify at 2.1? On what grounds do you justify them and how will they be mitigated?</i></p>	<p>Based on the above equalities evaluation it is considered that the implementation of a Council re-dress scheme will in this instance have a positive impact on most equalities groups and where we do not have sufficient data to draw conclusions it is considered that the scheme will have no significant impact.</p> <p>This conclusion has been reached in consideration of the aims of the re-dress scheme and the alternative option should a re-dress scheme not be available to the claimant group in question, many of whom it is considered may have increased vulnerabilities as a result of their experiences as a Looked After Child in Lambeth during the period in focus</p> <p>A redress scheme is currently being designed drawing on national and international experience, with input from SOSA and legal advisors who have expertise in this field. It is anticipated that the re-dress scheme would provide a more practical, quicker, less burdensome alternative to claimants than legal action (of which claimants may still wish to pursue and have the option to). The re-dress scheme will be designed to be swift and</p>

