

Equality Impact Assessment	Please enter responses below in the right hand columns
TEMPLATE UPDATED SEPT 2015 Date	Tuesday 14 August 2018
<p>Sign-off path for EIA (please add/delete as applicable) If you are conducting an EIA on a Cabinet decision, it should come to Corporate EIA panel for sign off.</p> <p>There is no corporately set sign off path for EIAs. It is up to you to decide the level of risk (legal, community, political, equalities) and to think about the appropriate level of scrutiny and challenge. If you are not sure email equalities@lambeth.gov.uk Places where an EIA can be signed off are listed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Equalities (email equalities@lambeth.gov.uk) • Director (this must be a director not responsible for the service/policy subject to EIA) • Strategic Director or Chief Exec • Directorate Management Team (Children, Health and Adults, Corporate Resources, Neighbourhoods and Growth) • Procurement Board • Corporate EIA Panel • Cabinet
Title of Project, business area, policy/strategy	LB Lambeth Redress Scheme
Author	David Orekoya
Job title, directorate	Lead Commissioner Health Improvement
Contact email and telephone	DOrekoya@lambeth.gov.uk 0207 926 0477
Strategic Director Sponsor	Fiona Connolly, Strategic Director, Adults and Health

London Borough of Lambeth Equality Impact Assessment

Please enter responses below in the right hand columns.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Business activity aims and intentions

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 political vision, and outcomes?

Introduction

Lambeth Council is one of a number of public organisations that are being 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.

The Council has established a formal Redress Scheme to provide a formal means of recognition and recompense to individuals who may have suffered as a result of their time in the care of the local authority. The scheme is without precedent in scope. Lambeth is the only local authority in the country which has put in place a process to provide victims and survivors of abuse with both acknowledgement and some measure of financial compensation without reference to litigation.

An initial EIA based on the principle of establishing a Redress Scheme was conducted in September 2018. Following review by the Council's Corporate Equalities Panel the recommendation from the assessment was that the such a scheme would -by mitigating the need for potentially drawn out litigation- be clearly in line with and beneficial for the Council's duties under Equalities and Human Rights legislation.

Aims and Objective of Equalities Impact Assessment

Following ratification of the proposed Redress Scheme Policy by Cabinet and full Council in December 2017, the Lambeth Redress Scheme was launched formally on 2nd January 2018.

As part of the implementation plan the Council committed to undertake an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) on the first 6 months operation of the scheme. The aim of this EIA is to provide transparency and assist current understanding of the reach, scope and effect of the scheme with reference to actual and potential applicants. At this stage the focus of the EIA has been to:

- Identify the equalities characteristics of the potential cohort of applicants when compared with the general population where possible based on available evidence
- Assess any equalities implications with respect to how actual and potential applicants find out about the scheme

This EIA is set out in three discrete but interrelated sections:

- Section 1A provides a brief overview of the Lambeth Redress Scheme
- Section 1B provides a summary of the information in possession of the Council regarding the 'protected characteristics' of the cohort of individuals that may have been in the care of Lambeth during the relevant period as defined under current equalities guidance and legislation. This is set out within the context of the Council's statutory equalities duties which have evolved over time.
- Section 2 below analyses available equalities evidence with respect to access (including how people find out about the scheme; experience of the process; and outcome of applications for redress.

Section 1A: Overview of Lambeth Redress Scheme

The Lambeth Redress Scheme has been established as a formal mechanism by which to provide recognition and recompense to individuals who may have been affected by historic abuse whilst in the care of Lambeth from a period dating from approximately the mid 1930's to the early 1990's. The scheme officially launched in January 2018 for a period of two years until January 2020. The scheme is open to individuals and- where relevant i.e. in the case of individuals who are now deceased-their family and carers who:

- may have been accommodated whether temporarily or on a longer term basis at a Lambeth Children's home or Shirley Oaks Primary School, or placed in foster care direct from a Lambeth children's home

- and who experienced or had reason to fear emotional, physical or sexual abuse and/or neglect whilst in the care of Lambeth

The overall aim of the scheme is to:

- Implement a swift and compassionate process for making and resolving claims
- Provide quicker access to justice and redress
- Eliminate or at least reduce the need for litigation which might well be complex and distressing for claimants to pursue
- Ensure that individuals do not suffer any undue additional harm or distress that make associated with pursuing a claim
- Reduce the administrative cost and burden to individuals

Principles that have informed the development of the redress scheme are that it should:

- Provide some recognition of the harm and distress that individuals may well have experienced
- Enable affected individuals to move on with their lives as swiftly as possible
- Be straightforward for individuals to register a claim and navigate the overall process
- Allow resolution of claims in a timely and cost effective manner
- Provide individuals with appropriate information, advice and support to assist them throughout the process
- Ensure that the council's requests for evidentiary information relevant to the basis of the claim are justifiable and proportionate

These aims and broader underpinning principles provide the context against which the overall performance of the scheme is evaluated.

Redress Scheme Compensation

The Lambeth Redress Scheme provides for financial redress for individuals who had reason to fear or actually experienced abuse or neglect whilst in the care of Lambeth up until the early 1990's. Available financial compensation falls into two categories:

- Harm's Way Payment for individuals who were resident at a Lambeth Children's Home and feared that they would be physically or sexually abused and/or who were neglected or suffered cruelty.
- Individual Redress Payment which an applicant may be eligible for if they suffered sexual or physical abuse or suffered psychological injury whilst resident at Lambeth children's home or Shirley Oak's Primary School.

Lambeth Redress Scheme: Operational Overview

All claims for compensation under the Redress Scheme are managed by a dedicated Redress Team within the Council that records applications; processes applications in line with agreed legal parameters and the Council's constitution; and makes offers of compensation based on the appropriate compensation tariff. Individuals can lodge a claim for compensation by completing an application form which is available by calling the Council on a dedicated direct line; downloading the form from the Lambeth website; or writing to the Council via a specific PO Box address for the scheme.

Where an individual is deceased, lacks capacity or needs support (i.e. as a result of learning disability, mental health condition, ill health or literacy) a personal representative can make an application on their behalf. This representative can be a family member, carer or advocate including legal representatives. An application can be lodged at any time whilst the scheme is open. Once an application is submitted the Redress Team undertakes the following actions:

- Attempt to verify an applicant's time or placement at a Lambeth's children's home or Shirley Oaks Primary School
- Work with the applicant or nominated representative to collate any additional information required to support a claim which may encompass where appropriate medical and other reports

Once there has been confirmation of an applicant's time and/or placement with Lambeth the Redress Scheme provides for remediation including¹:

¹ Presented at Corporate EIA Panel 03.09.2018: Feedback requested to highlight non-financial remediation alongside compensation scheme.

- Send a written apology (if requested)
- Offer a meeting with a senior representative of the Council
- Make a Harm's Way Payment of up to £10,000
- Offer signposting to counselling, therapy or other suitable services
- Offer signposting to further specialist advice and help with things like housing, welfare, benefits and employment

Assessment of Awards

A number of criteria are applied to assess the total financial redress that applicants may receive. The Harm's Way payment is a stepped payment up to a maximum of £10,000 based on the length of time that an individual was accommodated at a Lambeth children's home as set out below:

- More than 6 months-£10,000
- 3-6 months £5,000
- More than 1 week and up to 3 months £2,500
- Less than 1 week £1,000

Applicants who were in a specialist unit (see Section 1B below) receive the £10,000 payment and this not dependent on length of stay. These applicants will not have to provide written evidence in their application for a Harm's Way payment.

For applicants making claims for a an Individual Redress Payment (IRP), offer of an award will take accounts factors such as:

- The severity, longevity and frequency of abuse
- The immediate and any longer impact of abuse on the individual
- Whether an individual suffered mental or psychological injury alongside any physical harm
- Overall prognosis and likely outcome resulting from any recommended treatment
- Expenses arising from recommended medical or psychiatric treatment to address any mental, psychological or physical injury arising from the abuse.

- Other reasonable and relevant costs including travel costs for any medical or other assessments related to a claim

Applicants for Harm's Way and/or IRPs will have legal costs met by the Council and are not deducted from any award made to applicants. In the case of Harm's Way payments fixed legal cost will be paid direct by the council to an applicant's legal representative. For IRPs all reasonable legal costs will be paid the council direct to applicant's legal representatives.

Section 1B Equalities Data

Recording of Equalities Data

This section provides a summary of the available equalities data sources with respect to both individuals in the care of Lambeth during the period in question and individuals who have applied to the Redress Scheme. It must be acknowledged that there are gaps in the available data due to a number of differing factors including:

- Evolution of equalities legislation over the period in question. In Lambeth, as with virtually all other public bodies the prerequisite to collect data emerged in 2001 under the Race Relations Act 1976 (Statutory Duties) Order 2001 (made under powers in the RRA 1976). This act placed a specific duty on public authorities to monitor both: the recruitment and career progression of staff by reference to the racial groups to which they belong; and the impact of its policies on people of different racial groups. In addition to eliminating discrimination, the purpose for equality monitoring raised the broader substantial issue for public authorities about their capacity to plan and shape their services without statistics about the service users and populations. Under this duty, public authorities were also required to publish and ensure public access to information on the results of any assessments, consultations and monitoring they carried out to see whether their policies have an adverse impact on race equality. These provisions were subsequently replicated for Disability in 2006 as part of the updated Disability Discrimination Act 2005 followed by a Gender Equality Duty in April 2007. The legal duty to capture information regarding other

'protected characteristics' such as sexual orientation, religion, and marital status was not enshrined into legislation until the Equality Act 2010. A full summary of relevant equalities legislation is attached in Appendix 1.

- Restrictions regarding census data for Lambeth and London during the relevant period which means that data information regarding the ethnic breakdown of the population or on other equalities characteristics was not routinely captured. In addition many children placed in the care were from other local authorities in London and it is impossible to access census and demographic profile of those boroughs at that time
- There were different legal standards the retention of information which has impacted on the accuracy of records regarding individuals placed in the care of Lambeth's children's home at the time. At present the Council has only been able locate registers of individuals placed Shirley Oaks from the up until 1973, ten years before the closure of the unit. Similarly the Council has only been able to trace record records of those placed in the care of Southvale for those with family names beginning with letter A-S. In both these instances efforts to locate and update records are ongoing, but in the meantime analysis of equalities impact is necessarily approximate based on extrapolation from existing data sources. A summary of available data sources is outlined in Appendix 2.
- Changes in social attitudes reflected in social work and general recording practice which means either use of language to describe certain equalities characteristics such as ethnicity or disability which would have been widely common at the time but not considered acceptable today. In addition there would have been no systematic capture of equalities data regarding characteristics such as sexual orientation and gender identity.
- There is more understanding of certain health conditions and disabilities now compared to previous eras. This means that professionals and carers would not have been aware of certain health conditions (i.e. ADHD) and would have had no professional language to describe them which means that they would not have been recorded.

- We cannot and should not require applicants to the scheme to provide equalities data as a condition of access to the scheme. Given that the scheme has just been launched recently this necessarily impacts on the overall accuracy and representativeness of equalities information regarding the specific operation of the scheme.
- Some equalities data completed by applicants to the scheme applies to their current status rather than that during the time they may have been in care. This is particularly relevant to health and disability. Whilst national evidence suggests that people who have been in care and/or experienced abuse are more likely to experience poor physical or mental health direct correlation between time in care and any current ill health cannot automatically be inferred.

Equalities Information: Potential Scheme Applicants

Approximately 15,000 children were accommodated in care of Shirley Oaks and other Lambeth children's homes during the relevant period up to the early 1990's. This section provides a brief overview of the available information regarding equalities characteristics of these individuals including those who have subsequently made a claim. A full summary of available information for accommodated children is contained in Appendix 2 and for scheme applicants in Appendix 3. In summary key points are that:

- Admissions registers for the Shirley Oaks School and residential complex from 1936-1973 record some 8589 admissions by a total of 6472 individual children. Of these 3670(57%) were boys and 2749 (43%) were girls. Most of the children were from Lambeth, Lewisham or Southwark and their precursor authorities, however a significant minority were drawn from other boroughs throughout London. Data regarding ethnicity and disability is not recorded or cannot be surmised from available entries on the paper based registration system. To date the Council is still trying to locate information for the period between 1974-1983 when Shirley Oaks closed.
- Admissions data from Southvale residential group homes from 1967-1995 show 3519 individual records. Of these 1609 (46%) were girls and 1905 (54%) were boys. Age on

admission for the vast majority of children was between 2-15 years old () although significant numbers were under 2 and over 15. Of the children admitted 1424 (41%) are identified as potentially of black or ethnic minority heritage. However the general categorisations assigned to children at the time render meaningful disaggregation virtually impossible. However given the likely changes in the composition of the population of Lambeth and neighbouring boroughs during this time, it is highly probable that many of these individuals would have been of mixed black and white and black African Caribbean ethnicity. This is supported by national evidence that suggest over representation of children of African Caribbean heritage received into care during the time that the homes were open.

- Approximately 200 individuals have records indicating that admission to Southvale was for assessment of behavioural, physical or learning disability which encompasses 60 recorded as having Extra Special Needs (ESN); 123 as 'maladjusted' and 23 as having a physical disability. Given improvement in knowledge and expertise it is likely that this figure represents an underestimate especially the incompleteness of the available information. Subsequently at least some 120 children and young people were moved on to establishments including remand home, approved schools and homes for behavioural and/or adjustment disorder. This suggests that some of these individuals may have been vulnerable and had further contact with mental health, learning disability, criminal justice and related services.
- To date there have been 964 subject access requests (SARS) for childcare case files from people who were in the care of Lambeth. Of these 504 were from men and 460 from women. The majority were from people aged 50-69 with some 600 (64%), although substantial minorities were aged 70-79 (170, 18%) and individuals aged 40-49 (102, 11%). Information regarding ethnicity is not currently collected. Preliminary data regarding health and disability captured from SARs since December 2016 show a total of 26 cases with a 'recognised' disability recorded. It is likely that these numbers will have increased since this date.

Based on this information and what is known or can be deduced about the Lambeth and London population over the period in question potential scheme beneficiaries fall into two broad and overlapping groups. Both groups cut across equalities characteristics and many

individuals would have experienced socioeconomic and racial disadvantage prior to the reception into care.

- 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. A significant number who are now over 70 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 African heritage. 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 dual (Anglo-Caribbean) heritage within the childcare system, specifically those received into care.

Across both groups some broad common characteristics are that they are more likely to:

- be from families with lower socio-economic status as measured by parental educational, housing, occupation and income status
- experienced (familial) neglect or abuse which may have led to the reception into care
- be vulnerable due to physical, learning disability, mental health or conduct (behavioural) disorder
- be placed in (respite) care because a parent 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
- experienced multiple and overlapping stigma relating to a particular characteristic-i.e. ethnicity, gender, sexuality, socioeconomic status; for being in care itself; and for having been a victim of abuse.

Equalities Information: Applicants to Lambeth Redress Scheme January-June 2018

There have been 552 applications to the scheme from its launch 2nd January 2018 and 30th June 2018, of whom 363 (66%) returned equalities monitoring forms, although not all respondents completed all fields which means equalities data is limited and will evolve as the Scheme progresses. Full details are listed in Appendix 3, however key points to note with respect to equalities information provided are:

- Ethnicity- of those responding the overwhelming majority of applicants who were in care prior to 1965 were white British (81/ 22%) with a very small number identifying as Irish (3/under 1%) and a small number (9/2.5%) identifying as Black or Mixed black and white African or Caribbean ethnicity. For those in care between 1965-1969 the equivalent figures were 12 White British and 12 Black or Mixed Black and White African or Caribbean (3.3% each). Amongst applicants who provided details and were in care between 1970-1979 the figures were 13 people (3.4%) of Black African or Caribbean descent, 9 (2.5%) people of mixed black and white African and Caribbean origin and 26 (7.1%) of White English or other white origin. Further details regarding those of Irish or other ethnic groups cannot be gleaned from the data although given the Lambeth and London population and number of people that did not provide details it is likely that representation of these ethnic groups is underreported.
- Disability-of those providing information 65 (18%) reported that were limited a little by a disability or health condition, whilst 61 (17%) reported being limited a lot; 91 (25%) did not provide information. Further details regarding the nature and degree of health condition or disability is not available, although it must be noted that the responses reflected individual's current status rather than that at the time of their time in care. However the existence of health condition or disability whilst they were in care must be considered possible for some individuals. Based on current applications it appears that there have been no applications from individuals who may have been in care in one of the specialist homes for children that had disabilities or 'special needs'.
- Age-data regarding the age of people who have lodged a claim with the scheme so far is not available. However based on when the homes in question were open and

SARS requests received to date, most individuals who lodge claims are likely to be aged 50-79. However further analysis involving cross matching of applications against available records will be undertaken to provide a more complete breakdown.

- Gender-of those who responded, up to the end of June there have been over 80 applicants by women and approximately 145 by men which is broadly in the line with the ratio of males to females that were in care across the relevant period.
- Religion-of 270 respondents, 159 (59%) identified as Christian and 54 (22%) stated that they were of Muslim faith.
- 151 individuals provided information on where they found out about the scheme. Of these a considerable majority (80/52%) had gained information direct from SOSA with smaller numbers (approximately 20/ 13%) from the press and related media and a small number (10/7%) from television and news programmes. These numbers will only capture those who had the capacity to respond or who had a representative or carer who may have been able to respond on their behalf. There may be other individuals who may not be aware of the scheme as a result of mental or physical incapacity or being within an institutional environment such as prisons who may be entitled to apply. What the figures do seem to suggest is that for many individuals SOSA has been the main conduit for dissemination of information about the scheme to date.
- To date there have been 353 offers of Harm Way Payments under the scheme. Based on those respondents who provided information 210 (59%) of these applicants can be identified as White, 55 (15%) Black African or Caribbean, 25 (7%) of mixed/or multiple ethnic heritage.

At this point there is insufficient data to locate any specific trends regarding analysis of application and outcome by protected characteristics under equalities legislation. As the scheme progresses the Council hopes to collate such information as the overall number of both applicants and settled claims increases which will enable discernment of any specific trends.

At present the focus has been to ensure that the Council maximises access to the scheme from individuals who may be entitled to make an application for compensation under the

	<p>terms of the scheme. Section 2 below attempts to provide some outline of indicative trends with respect to this based on the first 6 months operation of the scheme.</p>
<p>2.0 Analysing your equalities evidence</p>	
<p>2.1 Evidence <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).</i></p> <p>IF YOUR PROPOSAL ALSO IMPACTS ON LAMBETH COUNCIL STAFF YOU NEED TO COMPLETE A STAFFING EIA.</p>	
<p>Protected characteristics and local equality characteristics</p>	<p>Impact analysis For each characteristic please indicate the type of impact (i.e. positive, negative, positive and negative, none, or unknown), and: <i>Please explain how you justify your claims around impacts. Please include any data and evidence that you have collected including from surveys, performance data or complaints to support your proposed changes. 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>Race</p>	<p>As a consequence of the evolution of both equalities and social care recording and monitoring requirements there are gaps in information which make it difficult fully to assess whether the individuals from BME backgrounds are accessing the scheme proportionately in line with the demographic profile of children received into care at the time. Available data suggests that within Southvale approximately 1424 % (41%) were from a BME background, though figures from Shirley Oaks are not available. To date of 552</p>

	<p>applicants, 55 individuals (10%) identified as being of Black or Mixed Black and White African or Caribbean ethnicity have received offers of a Harms Way Payment. In light of this the Council may need to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underreporting of ethnicity including Black Caribbean, Black African and Asian given understanding of the Lambeth population and the cohort of children that are likely to have been received into care. This might indicate that the Council should continue to make efforts to maximise uptake amongst individuals from people of African and Caribbean ethnicity who may be entitled to make an application to the scheme. • A number of applicants to the scheme have come from people living abroad including Ireland. Despite the known existence of a significant Irish population in both Lambeth and London there is consistent underreporting of Irish ethnicity in local information systems which may need to be considered as part of the Council's strategy to promote the scheme.
Gender	<p>Based on available data more boys than girls were in the care of homes managed by the Council. This appears to be reflected by applications received to date though the data must be treated with caution since many applicants did not complete the equalities data. Based on the information that is available there have been 80 applicants by women and approximately 145 by men. These overall numbers should increase over the lifetime of the scheme.</p>
Gender re-assignment	<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 operation of the Redress Scheme to date will have any negative impact on people with this equality characteristic.</p>
Disability	<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) some of which provided temporary based (respite) care. It is highly likely that some of the children</p>

cared for in these homes would have had multiple disabilities that would have exposed them to heightened vulnerability to an abusive environment as they passed in and out of the service on a temporary basis, increasing the risk of abuse to take place.

At least 200 children had records of admission to Southvale indicative of behavioural and/or adjustment disorder, physical and/or learning disability. These numbers almost certainly underestimate the number of people who may have had a disability or limiting health condition whilst they were in the care of the Council.

Notably to date the Council cannot confirm that it has received applications either directly from or from individuals who have or acting on behalf of someone who had a possible lifelong disability at the time.

Self-reported data from applicants to the scheme show that 126 (36%) of 353 felt that they had a health condition that impacted on their daily functioning to some degree. Of these 61 reported that they had a health condition that limited them quite substantially. Some of these individuals may have had a lifelong health condition, for others they may have developed ill health over the course of the lives. In either case the responses for this latter group may suggest that at least some of them experience some form of mental health, learning or physical disability.

Further work is being undertaken by the Council to increase the number of opportunities and channels through which people living with disabilities can find information about the scheme. Particular priority groups include:

- Ensuring that carers of or representatives acting in the best interest of people who may lack capacity due to physical or mental health issues or limiting health condition, have information about the scheme.
- Ensuring that people with learning disabilities and their carers can access information about the scheme, including making provision for local advocacy organisations to support people to make a claim.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making information about the scheme available in easy read and audio file format for people who may be visually impaired or have difficulty with reading (including those with literacy problems). • Where possible within the bounds of GDPR regulations undertaking checks of local care records to see if it is possible to identify individuals who may have been in the care of the local authority during the period in question and may be entitled to make an application. This is particular resonance for individuals who may have been accommodated in one of the Council’s specialist units and may currently lack the capacity or ability to make a claim. If any such individuals are identified either internally or by providers or partner agencies the Council has mechanisms in place to make an award on the principle of acting in the individuals ‘best interest’.
Age	<p>According to the available data at least 130 (24%) applications to the Redress Scheme have been from people who were in care prior to 1965; approximately 35 (6%) from those in care between 1965-1969; and some 83 applications from individuals care between 1970-1979. This accords with overall SARS data which show that the largest number of requests have come from people who would be now aged between 50-69 (64%) whilst 11% came from those aged 70-79.</p> <p>Of note is that 60 requests for SARS have been lodged on behalf of individuals who are now deceased which highlights the fact that there may a number of individuals who due to ill health and infirmity or death may be unable to apply to the scheme themselves. Therefore it will be important to ensure that information about the scheme is disseminated amongst advocacy and other organisations that represent older people and carers so that people are aware they can apply on behalf of someone who may have been in care. This may also involve checking social care records and asking health and social care partners to check their records to identify people who may be able entitled to claim either directly or via family member, carer or other nominated or agreed representative.</p>

	<p>However we must also acknowledge that some people may have died without telling anyone about what happened to them, and the Council must respect the right of individuals who not wish to reveal this information.</p>
Sexual orientation	<p>Information regarding this equalities characteristic has not previously been captured either formally or informally during the period in question.</p> <p>Despite this there is no evidence to suggest that the operation of the Redress Scheme to date scheme will have any negative impact on people with this equality characteristic.</p>
Religion and belief	<p>To date of 270 respondents, 159 (59%) identified as Christian and 54 (22%) stated that they were of Muslim faith</p>
Pregnancy and maternity	<p>Information regarding this equalities characteristic has not previously been captured either formally or informally during the period in question.</p> <p>Despite this there is no evidence to suggest that the operation of the Redress Scheme to date scheme will have any negative impact on people with this equality characteristic.</p>
Marriage and civil partnership	<p>Information regarding this equalities characteristic has not previously been captured either formally or informally during the period in question.</p> <p>Despite this there is no evidence to suggest that the operation of the Redress Scheme to date scheme will have any negative impact on people with this equality characteristic.</p>
Socio-economic factors	<p>Data on the socioeconomic status of applicants to the scheme is not captured. However the national and local policy evidence is that the majority of children received into care have been from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. These individuals are more likely to experience persistently worse outcomes across all life domains including education, income and health as a result of being in care which may have been compounded by exposure to</p>

	<p>and/or fear of abuse. This means they may be more likely to be in poor housing and on low incomes including benefits.</p> <p>As outlined in the original EIA for the Redress Scheme literacy rates can be a proxy indicator for socioeconomic status. Evidence suggests that children and adults from poorer backgrounds have higher rates of illiteracy which may compound existing inequalities and impact ability to access information and resources. This may have affected ability to interact with public organisations including accessing information, dealing with correspondence and completing paperwork.</p> <p>Children placed in care during the period in question were more likely to have poorer educational outcomes which may have been aggravated as a result of being placed in an adverse and abusive environment.</p> <p>In the light of the these factors key considerations are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that local welfare and legal advice agencies have details about the scheme and can provide information and support to individuals who approach them • Ensure that applicants to the scheme can access practical advice and support (including with completing forms, accessing documents and records) • Signpost individuals who may be awarded compensation whilst in receipt of benefits to appropriate advice regarding the impact of any award on their benefit claim
Language	<p>Although this data has not been captured there may well have been individuals in care for whom English was a second language. In addition other individuals may need support with literacy due to learning or physical disability (i.e. visual impairment) or ill health or other communication issue. For some individuals this can be managed through their legal</p>

	<p>representative or other advocate; for others assistance with specific language and communications issues can be included as part of the overall process where appropriate in aid of making, progressing and settling a claim.</p>
<p>Health</p>	<p>The Redress Scheme is in line with the Council’s commitment to reducing inequalities as outlined in the Borough’s Community Plan 2016-21. To date 126 applicants have reported that they have a health issue which impacts on them, 65 of whom reported that it has a substantial impact on their wellbeing. Whilst some individuals will have acquired health conditions over their life course evidence indicates that individuals who have been in care 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>Moreover some individuals will have been placed in care due to a physical or mental health condition for which they would have required support. In light of this the Council is checking social care records to identify if any current beneficiaries of care services may be eligible for compensation. In addition information is being circulated to partners and local providers as previously outlined and applicants or their personal representatives can access practical support (i.e. to collate documentation etc.) where necessary in pursuit of a claim.</p>
<p>2.2 Gaps in evidence base <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>There are various gaps in the evidence base currently for this population cohort in the period in question due to differences in data recording and changes in reporting practices and requirements. Moreover it is not possible and would be unethical to insist on completion of equalities data as a prerequisite of applications to the scheme.</p> <p>Therefore there is only partial data available in relation to equalities characteristics including ethnicity, age, gender, disability, health, religion and little or none in relation to other protected characteristics. However equalities considerations have informed both the design and ongoing review of the scheme to ensure it meets the stated objective to provide</p>

	<p>swift, fair and proportionate acknowledgement and remediation for individuals who may have experienced suffering and harm consequential to their time in the care of the Council.</p>
<p>3.0 Consultation, Involvement and Coproduction</p>	
<p>3.1 Coproduction, involvement and consultation <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 a range of stakeholders incorporating Shirley Oaks Survivors Association and their legal advisor; 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>The Council will make efforts to garner the views and feedback of those who have made applications under the Scheme in order to help refine the process where appropriate and necessary.</p> <p>The Council is keen to have further engagement with stakeholders to support the annual review of the scheme and is using a multi-channel approach involving a number of activities outlined in Section 4.1 below.</p>
<p>3.2 Gaps in coproduction, consultation and involvement <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>	<p>As previously outlined there are considerable gaps in the available equalities information due in part to the historical nature of events some of which date back to before the formal constitution of the Council in 1965. In addition there have been more recent changes in equalities legislation which means equalities data captured now would not have been collected in the past.</p> <p>Nevertheless the Council recognises that continued efforts are required to ensure access to the scheme from key groups including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People of African Caribbean, African and Irish ethnicity • People with learning and physical disabilities, particularly those who may lack the capacity to make a claim on their behalf. • Older people and those individuals who may be in poor health • Individuals who have died but may have family members who may be entitled to claim on their behalf.

	<p>The Council has also engaged with an expert facilitator to assist in identifying the best way of securing the views of victims and survivors of abuse regarding the operation of the scheme. This will include finding the best and most appropriate way of enabling individuals who access the scheme to provide feedback on their experience should they wish to do so.</p>
<p>4.0 Conclusions, justification and action</p>	
<p>4.1 Conclusions and justification <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>Commitment to and recognition of the Council’s equalities obligations have been integral to the development and implementation of the Redress Scheme. To date the number of applications to the scheme have been broadly in line with expectations. Nevertheless continuing priority is to ensure that people who may be eligible to make a claim are aware of the scheme. In the light of this the Council continues to use a multi-channel approach to advertise the scheme both locally and nationally, which involves a number of activities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advertising the scheme in the national press in recognition that many affected individuals live outside London in other parts of the UK • Piloting targeted advertising at media more likely to be used by particular communities, some of whom may have returned to their home countries, such as individuals of African Caribbean and Irish ethnicity. • Ensuring organisations that represent victims and survivors have up to date information about the scheme including working with NAPAC to understand how to make best use of online channels. • Advertising with a range of national and local voluntary sector, advocacy and advice agencies and media outlets including those that represent and/or work with a range of potentially vulnerable groups including: older people; people with physical and/or learning disabilities; carers organisation; and welfare and legal advice agencies (including in the legal press); and offenders. • Providing information in easy read and audio file format for individuals who may need support with literacy or have a visual impairment.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distributing information to local partners and providers who deliver care on behalf of the Council in case they may identify individuals who may be entitled to claim but due to incapacity or ill health are unable to do so without assistance. • Checking the Council's social care database to see whether there are any vulnerable individuals –including those who lack capacity- currently in receipt of social care or other support from the Council, who may come under the auspices of the scheme. <p><i>The council is aware that this scheme is targeted at a specifically older cohort. Therefore traditional newsprint media will have a significant reach for this group including targeting key groups globally e.g. through publishing in the Irish Independent. The council will also disseminate the information through local advocacy groups such as attending the Learning Disability Assembly on 18th September 2018. However, the use of social media also should not be ignored even though it is not the usual channel used for reaching this age group. It is worth noting that the professionals that survivors work with are likely to be younger and therefore using social media.²</i></p> <p><i>The council also recognises the wider equality impact of financing the £100m loan taken out by the council and who this burden falls on in terms of longer term repayments for council tax payers.³</i></p>
<p>4.2 Equality Action plan <i>Please list the equality issue/s identified through the evidence and the mitigating action to be taken. Please also detail the date when the action will be taken and the name and job title of the responsible officer.</i></p>	
<p>Equality Issue</p>	<p>Mitigating actions</p>
<p>Example: That the equality analysis may not have accurately covered all the equality impacts; and the mitigations may not act to reduce disproportionate impact</p>	<p>Example: Review the EIA and assess whether the mitigating actions were sufficient.</p>

² Presented at Corporate EIA Panel 03.09.2018: Feedback highlighted the difficulties around the communication channels that best reach the target age cohort.

³ Presented at Corporate EIA Panel 03.09.2018: Feedback highlighted this as a wider equalities consideration related to the Redress scheme.

