

APPENDIX 2 – Equalities Considerations

The Community Safety Plan 2013-16 is informed by both the Strategic Assessment 2012 and annual Strategic Assessments within its term, which analyses data on the trends and future local challenges, and through consultation with both members of the public and the wide membership of the Community Safety Partnership (Safe and Cohesive Community Plan Delivery Group). A number of cross cutting issues were also considered as part of this process.

From this detailed evaluation of the strategic landscape and assessment of the most effective governance arrangements, priority areas were developed. This included consideration of the drivers of crime locally and equalities - through the impact on people from different protected characteristic groups. This has influenced the identification of the Plan's priorities for 2013-16, which are:

- Gangs and Serious Youth Violence
- Anti-Social Behaviour (including Arson)
- Drugs and Alcohol
- Violence (inc. Domestic Violence and Violence Against Women and Girls)
- Prostitution
- Hate Crime and Cohesion
- Killed or Seriously Injured
- Property / Serious Acquisitive Crime

Cross-cutting Priorities:

- Public Confidence
- Reducing Re-offending
- MOPAC 7

A high level test of relevance equalities screening has been undertaken on the Plan. This is attached as appendix 2. As the Plan is to be further developed through Community Safety Partnership (CSP) subgroup action plans – further detailed evaluation of equalities in the action plans will be undertaken by those subgroups to ensure they continue to be considered with the development of the Plan.

The Plan is a jointly owned partnership approach – it is not solely owned by the Council – so the authority will communicate the importance of ensuring subgroups give 'due regard' to equalities in the action plan development process and are aware of the requirement to provide appropriate evidence: These considerations will be recorded through the inclusion of equalities considerations in the template for creating their action plans. As sub-group action plans are presented to the Community Safety Partnership (Safe and Cohesive CPDG) equalities considerations will be evaluated by the members.

APPENDIX 3 - Equalities Analysis - Initial Screening Document

This document is to be used for:-

- Establishing whether an Equality Analysis needs to be undertaken for the policy, function or strategy. *(Based on Section 4 around Impacts)*
- Reviewing existing equality analysis (EQIA) to ascertain whether the original EQIA needs revising.

Section 1 – General Information

Name of the Policy or Function
Community Safety Partnership Plan 2013-16

Service area
Safer Communities Service

Team name
The Community Safety Partnership

Service manager
Emily Fieran-Reed

Name and role of the officer completing the Initial Screening
(Explain why these people were selected i.e. the knowledge and experience they bring to the process)
Colin Hewitt – CSP Officer, Community Safety

Section 2 - Information about the Policy or Function

Is this a policy or function? Policy Function

Is the policy or function strategic or developmental?

Strategic Developmental

Is this a new or existing policy or function? New Existing

If for a new policy or function, please indicate the date this form was undertaken
April 2013

If for an existing policy or function, what was the original date(s) the equality analysis (Initial Screening or EQIA) was undertaken
(please attach a copy of any previous equality analysis)

What are the main aims and objectives of the Policy or Function

There is a legal requirement for each Community Safety Partnership formerly Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (Safe & Cohesive CPDG) to have a Community Safety Plan.

The Safe and Cohesive Plan 2013-2016 has been created in consultation with members of the Safe & Cohesive CPDG. The objective of the Plan is to address the following local priorities:

- Gangs and Serious Youth Violence
- Anti-Social Behaviour and Arson
- Drugs and Alcohol
- Violence (inc. Domestic Violence and Violence Against Women and Girls)
- Prostitution
- Hate Crime and Cohesion
- Killed or Seriously Injured
- Property/Serious Acquisitive Crime

Cross-cutting Priorities:

- Public Confidence
- Reducing Re-offending
- MOPAC 7

Who are the main stakeholders:

The London Borough of Tower Hamlets

The Police

London Fire Brigade

Probation Services

Health, NHS, CCG and Public Health

Those who live, work, study and visit the borough

Is this policy/function associated with any other policy or function of the Council
(i.e. *Community Plan, One Tower Hamlets etc.*)

- The Community Plan
- Children and Young People's Plan
- Substance Misuse Strategy 2011-2014 (Drugs & Alcohol)
- Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy
- Integrated Offender Management Plan
- Tower Hamlets Prevent Delivery Plan (under review in line with National Guidance)
- ASB Profile
- Hate Crime Strategy
- Community Cohesion Contingency Plan

Section 3 – Information about Existing Policies and, or Changes to Functions only

Has there been any 'significant' change to the Policy or Function?

Yes No

If yes, Please indicate what the change will be and what has brought about this change to the policy or function?

has been NO SIGNIFICANT amendments to an existing policy/function there is no need to continue to Section 4 below or a full equalities analysis

Section 4 – The Impact

(Briefly assess the potential impact that the policy/function could have on each of the target groups. The potential impact could be negative, positive or neutral. If you have assessed negative potential impact for any of the target groups you will need to also assess whether that negative potential impact is high, medium or low). Please also indicate if there is any link to Community Cohesion.

Identify the potential impact on the following groups and:

Target Groups What impact will the 'new' or 'significantly' amended policy or function have on specific groups of service users?	Impact – Positive or Adverse	Reason(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and, • Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making • Can the negative impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality?
Race	Positive	<p>For race equality the priority of addressing Hate Crime and Cohesion may be of particular relevance.</p> <p>The data collected in the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 suggests that depending on your racial background, the likelihood of you being a victim of crime or identified as a perpetrator of crime varies significantly. The analysis below summarises this information and sets out key areas which will be addressed by sub-groups in developing detailed plans to reduce crime, protect victims and promote equality for people from different racial backgrounds.</p> <p>National crime data</p> <p>There is a significant amount of national and regional evidence about the different experiences of crime by people from different racial background, some of which is summarised below. These suggest possible areas of inequality locally. In developing the CSPP sub-group action plans we will seek to collect and analyse local data to identify patterns in the borough:</p> <p>Overall crime: Analysis from the Ministry of Justice's Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System 2010 and according to the 2010/11 British Crime Survey, showed that nationally the risk of being a victim of personal crime was higher for adults from a Mixed background than for other ethnic</p>

groups. It was also higher for members of all BME groups than for the White group. Over the five year period 2006/7 to 2010/11, there was a statistically significant fall in the risk of being a victim of personal crime for members of the White group of 0.8%. The apparent decrease for those from BME groups was not statistically significant.

Violent crime: Of the 2,007 homicides nation-wide recorded between 2007/8 and 2009/10, 75% of victims were White, 12% Black and 8% Asian. These proportions are lower for the white group and higher for the Black and Asian groups than reflected in estimates of the general population. In the majority of homicide cases, victims were suspected of being killed by someone of the same ethnic group, which is consistent with the previous trend (88% of White victims, 78% of Black victims and 60% of Asian victims).

Arrest and sanction rates: Across England and Wales, there was a 3% decrease in the total number of arrests in 2009/10 (1,386,030) compared to 2005/6 (1,429,785). The number of arrests for the White group also decreased during this period, arrests of Black persons rose by 5% and arrests of Asian people by 13%. Overall, there were more arrests per 1,000 population of each BME group (except for Chinese or Other) than for people of White ethnicity in 2009/10. Per 1,000 population, Black persons were arrested 3.3 times more than White people and those from Mixed ethnic group 2.3 times more than White people.

Conviction ratios for indictable offences were higher for White persons in 2010 than those in the Black and Asian groups (81% for White, 74% for Black and 77% for Asian). A higher percentage of those in the BME groups were sentenced to immediate custody for indictable offences than in the White group in 2010 (White 23%, Black 27%, Asian 29% and Other 42%), this is mainly due to differences in plea between ethnic groups.

Regional crime data:

Analysis from the MOPAC Policing and Crime Plan 2013-17 Equality Impact Assessment 2013 states that London is disproportionately affected by crime problems, such as robbery and knife crime, typically associated with young males who often operate in groups or 'gangs'. Current analysis shows that all of the gang members scored on the MPS matrix are male and that 79% are described as Black and Minority Ethnic (BME). In 2011 14% of homicides (19) were gang related and two thirds (12) were teenagers and all but one was male and from a BME background.

Hate crime: Analysis from the MOPAC Policing and Crime Plan 2013-17 Equality Impact Assessment 2013 states that hate crime is greatly unreported and which is a great concern for many communities. In 2011/12 there was a 6.8% reduction in the number of reported racist and religious hate crimes.

Analysis by the Home Office shows that there were 43,748 hate crimes recorded by the police in 2011/12 in England and Wales, of which 35,816 (82%) were race hate crimes

The number of Racially motivated crimes/incident recorded by the Police in 2010/11 was 18% lower at 51,187, than they were during the 5 year period 2006/7 to 2010/11.

Local data

Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 under Cohesion & Hate Crime indicator recording the number of racist and religious offences showed a 9% decrease (34 less) in the number of offences in the year up to September 2012, when compared to the previous year. Offence numbers have remained reasonable static for the last 3 years, with an average of 358 offences a year, or one a day.

Recommendations from CSP Strategic Assessment to CSP and Subgroups were that their action plans should maintain a continued focus on all Hate Crime Offences of which Racist and Religious Offences fall into. The CSP and its Subgroups to continue their work around education of potential victims and suspects within this crime category and to carry on with various education/crime prevention plans linked to this subject.

Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 provided by the Metropolitan Police to Victim Support regarding victims of crime by ethnicity and age is not thorough and reliant on the information recorded on the Police CRIS system. However combined figures for segmented groups into large groups (Asian, White, Black, Other) shows that during the period 1st October 2011 to 30th September 2012, 45% of victims of crime were from the White group, 35% from the Asian group and 9% from the Black group. Population figures for Tower Hamlets from the 2011 Census shows 45% from the White group, 41% from the Asian Group and 7% from the Black group. Therefore the Asian group is underrepresented by 6 percentage points and the Black group is over represented by 2 percentage points.

Looking at crime breakdown by ethnicity White people are over represented in the borough being victims to 60% of burglary and 50% of robbery, when compared to the population figure of 45%. Black people are over represented in the borough being victims to 12% of violent crime, when compared to

		<p>the population figure of 7%.</p> <p>Recommendation from Victim Support in the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 is for the Metropolitan Police to improve the recording of specific hate crime categories which will improve the referrals to Victim Support via the automatic data transfer from the Police CRIS system. More accurate recording of ethnicity of victims will enable Victim Support to analyse trends in crimes for the borough and assist in targeted work for CSP Subgroups to deliver.</p>
Disability	Positive	<p>For disability equality, the priority of addressing Hate Crime and Cohesion may be of particular relevance.</p> <p><u>National and regional data</u></p> <p>Analysis by the Home Office shows that there were 43,748 hate crimes recorded by the police in 2011/12 in England and Wales, of which 1,744 (4%) were disability hate crimes</p> <p>Analysis of regional police force figures show that there were 133 disability hate crimes recorded by the Metropolitan Police Force in 2011. This demonstrates a 14.66% increase on the number of recorded disability hate crimes in 2010 (116) and a 34% increase when compared to the ACPO figures for London in 2009 (99).</p> <p>Analysis in the British Crime Survey 2010/11 shows that Disabled people are significantly more likely to be victims of crime than non-disabled people. This gap is largest amongst 16-34 year-olds where 39 per cent of disabled people reported having been a victim of crime compared to 28 per cent of non-disabled people. Disabled people are less likely than their non-disabled peers to think the Criminal Justice System (CJS) is fair. This gap is largest amongst 16-34 year-olds, where 54 per cent of disabled people think that the CJS is fair compared to 66 per cent of non-disabled people</p> <p>Analysis from the MOPAC Policing and Crime Plan 2013-17 Equality Impact Assessment 2013 states that hate crime is greatly unreported and which is a great concern for many communities. There is significant underreporting of disability hate crimes (according to the Met's 2011/12 Annual Report).</p> <p><u>Local data:</u></p> <p>Analysis from the Tower Hamlets Local Voices report (Hearing the Voices of Disabled People in Tower Hamlets) produced by REAL in 2013, of which 99 disabled people responded to the survey showed that the number one issue for 12% of the survey respondents and number 2 issue for 9.1% of</p>

		<p>the respondents was Crime and Safety. Older people, Asian people and those with a Mental Health condition has slightly higher levels of concern and a greater sense that crime and safety services were failing disabled people than others. Nearly half of the survey respondents disagreed/strongly disagreed that disabled people were safe from harassment and hate crime and only 30% agreed they were safe. Within each gender, age and ethnicity groups of those disabled people who completed the survey, it was Men, people under 60 and Asian people who most tended not to agree that disabled people were safe. Amongst different impairment groups, disagreement was particularly high for people with visual impairment (55%), people with learning disability or cognitive impairment (80%) and people with mental health condition (87%). Overall 28% of survey respondents believed crime and safety services did not serve disabled people well, making it fourth worst performing service out of the survey. People with visual impairment were particularly critical, with 25% saying it fails disabled people.</p> <p>Response - In line with the equalities duty and the No Place For Hate & Domestic Violence action plan, The Domestic Violence & Hate Crime Team are committed to supporting both agencies and disabled service users in the context of all crime and disorder.</p> <p>The DV & Hate Crime Team currently provide monthly training to service users who experience mental health illness & learning disabilities around recognising what domestic violence and hate crime is, which also shows them how they can report incidents. We have recently produced an 'easy read' DV leaflet for adults with learning disabilities and will have finished an easy read HC leaflet by November 2013. The team also provide regular training to the Community Mental Health Team, Safeguarding Adults Board, Safeguarding Adults Champions and local community groups including REAL, Positive East and MIND.</p>
Gender	Positive	<p>For gender equality, the priority of addressing Violence (with a focus on Domestic Violence) may be of particular relevance.</p> <p><u>National and regional data</u></p> <p>Analysis from the Ministry of Justice's Statistics on Women and the Criminal Justice System 2012, shows an estimated three in every 100 adults were a victim of violent crime according to the Crime Survey England and Wales 2011/12, with 2% of women reporting being victims of violent crime compared to 4% of men. The type of violence most commonly reported differs by gender. Women who reported being a victim of violence were most commonly victimized by an acquaintance whereas men</p>

		<p>most commonly were victims of stranger violence.</p> <p>A higher proportion of women reported being victims of intimate violence such as partner or family non-physical abuse, threats sexual assault or stalking - 7% of women compared with 5% of men.</p> <p>201 women were victims of homicide in 2010/11 compared with 435 men according to data from the Homicide Index. A greater proportion of female victims than male victims knew the principal suspect, 78% and 57% respectively in 2011.</p> <p>34% of females and 31% of males were arrested for violence against the person in 2010/11 - the most common offence group for arrest during the five year period 2006/7 to 2010/11.</p> <p>According to the Ministry of Justice figures for 2010/11 by Police Force area, the Metropolitan Police arrested 50,293 men and 9,464 women that year for Violence Against the Person. The next highest was 28,207 arrests of men and 8,471 arrests of women for Theft and Handling, followed by 20,980 arrests of men and 1,894 arrests of women for Drug Offences.</p> <p>Nationally more than 1.2m persons of known gender were convicted and sentenced at all courts in 2011. Of these 24% were female and 76% were male.</p> <p>Analysis from the MOPAC Policing and Crime Plan 2013-17 Equality Impact Assessment 2013 states that London is disproportionately affected by crime problems, such as robbery and knife crime, typically associated with young males who often operate in groups or 'gangs'. Current analysis shows that all of the gang members scored on the MPS matrix are male. In 2011 14% of homicides (19) were gang related and two thirds (12) were teenagers and all but one was male.</p> <p><u>Local data</u></p> <p>Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 under Violent Crime Indicator for the 'Number of Most Serious Violence offences per 1,000 of the population' and 'Number of Assault with Injury' show that victims are more likely to be male although repeat victims are more likely to be female. Currently (October 2013) Non Domestic Violence with Injury accounts for 68% and Domestic Violence With Injury accounts for 32% of all Violence with Injury in the borough. In the town centre hotspot, victims and suspects are less likely to know each other. When they do know each other they are more likely to be acquaintances, whereas on the rest of the borough, they are more likely to have been in a past or current relationship with each other (domestic violence).</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Recommendations from CSP Strategic Assessment to CSP and Subgroups was that their action plan should include a continued focus on Violence Related Offences, the Community Safety Partnership to continue its work around education of potential victims and suspects within this crime category. Carry on with various education plans linked to this subject and continue crime prevention programmes. The subgroup responsible for the CSP Priority Violence (with a focus on Domestic Violence) action plan should contain detailed actions to address these findings, which should lead to a decrease in the number of offences and an increase in partnership working, social cohesion and education around this subject.</p> <p>Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 under Violence Against women and Girls, measures the number of Domestic Violence Offences shows an increase in the number of offences by 6% year on year over the three year period. This increase could be down to a number of factors including numbers of people living in the borough, overcrowding and the economic downturn, particularly the associated pressures that these can bring, but also may be down to an increase in confidence to report offences. A lot of work has been done in the borough to raise awareness of domestic violence, specifically Violence Against Women and Girls as it has been both nationally and locally grossly under reported. The Crime Survey for England and Wales estimates that since the age of 16, 29% of Women have experienced Domestic Violence; 20% have experience Sexual Assault and 19% have experienced Stalking. Approximately 97% of all known victims of interpersonal violence in Tower Hamlets are Female, which is a significant gender bias towards Women.</p> <p>Recommendations from CSP Strategic Assessment to CSP and Subgroups were that their action plan should include a continued focus on all violence related offences, especially those that can be linked to Domestic Violence. The CSP and Subgroups should continue to work and focus around education of potential victims and engaging with suspects within this crime category. Carry on with various education plans linked to this subject and continue with gender specific crime prevention programmes.</p>
Gender Reassignment	Positive	<p>For transgender equality, the priority of addressing Hate Crime and Cohesion may be of particular relevance, as this priority aims to address all hate crimes, of which trans phobic crime is one.</p> <p>Analysis by the Home Office shows that there were 43,748 hate crimes recorded by the police in 2011/12 in England and Wales, of which 315 (1%) were transgender hate crimes.</p> <p>In 2013 Galup's hate crime report stated that there were only 50 transphobic crimes recorded in</p>

		<p>London during 2012/13, yet anecdotal evidence collected by Galup identifies individual trans people who are the target of over 50 transphobic crimes each year.</p> <p>We do not have any local or borough data to analyse as there were no recorded trans phobic crimes in last year according the local Police data.</p>
Sexual Orientation	Positive	<p>For Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual people, the priority of addressing Hate Crime and Cohesion may be of particular relevance.</p> <p><u>National and regional data</u> Analysis by the Home Office shows that there were 43,748 hate crimes recorded by the police in 2011/12 in England and Wales, of which 4,252 (10%) were sexual orientation hate crimes.</p> <p>Analysis from the MOPAC Policing and Crime Plan 2013-17 Equality Impact Assessment 2013 states that hate crime is greatly unreported and which is a great concern for many communities. In 2011/12 there was a 5.5% reduction in the number of reported homophobic crimes.</p> <p>A report on homophobic crime produced by the Equality and Human Rights Commission shows that LGB people appear to worry about being the victim of crime to a greater degree than other minority groups. In 2008 around 40 per cent of LGB people say they are worried about being the victim of a crime. This compares to 13 per cent of people on average who are worried about being the victim of a crime. A survey of Homophobic hate crime in 2008 showed that eleven per cent of LGB people say being the victim of a crime is their biggest worry.</p> <p><u>Local data</u> Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 under Cohesion & Hate Crime indicator recording the number of Homophobic offences shows no pattern in the levels of offences each year. The figures from the control period shows increases one year and decreases the following, this is due to the low number of offences that are reported each year in the borough, 71 in the year up to September 2012. Over the past three years the average number of offences was 73.</p> <p>Recommendations from CSP Strategic Assessment to CSP and Subgroups were that their action plan should maintain a continued focus on all Hate Crime Offences of which Homophobic Crime can be categorised. The CSP and its Subgroups should continue their work around education of potential victims to boost confidence and increase reporting and work with the LGB community to address</p>

		homophobic attitudes which drive hate incidents and hate crimes. It should also carry on with various education/crime prevention plans linked to this subject to prevent further incidents/crimes.
Religion or Belief	Positive	<p>For Religion/Belief equality , the priority of addressing Hate Crime and Cohesion may be of particular relevance.</p> <p><u>National and regional data</u> Analysis by the Home Office shows that there were 43,748 hate crimes recorded by the police in 2011/12 in England and Wales, of which 1,621 (4%) were religion hate crimes.</p> <p>Analysis from the MOPAC Policing and Crime Plan 2013-17 Equality Impact Assessment 2013 states that hate crime is greatly unreported and which is a great concern for many communities. In 2011/12 there was a 6.8% reduction in the number of reported racist and religious hate crimes.</p> <p><u>Local data</u> Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 under Cohesion & Hate Crime indicator recording the number of racist and religious offences showed a 9% decrease (34 less) in the number of offences in the year up to September 2012, when compared to the previous year. Offence numbers have remained reasonable static for the last 3 years, with an average of 358 offences a year, or one a day.</p> <p>Recommendations from CSP Strategic Assessment to CSP and Subgroups were that their action plans should maintain a continued focus on all Hate Crime Offences of which Racist and Religious Offences fall into. The CSP and its Subgroups to continue their work around education of potential victims and suspects within this crime category and to carry on with various education/crime prevention plans linked to this subject.</p>
Age	Positive	<p>For age equality , the priorities of addressing Gangs & Serious Youth Violence and Reducing Re-offending may be of particular relevance.</p> <p><u>National and regional data</u> Analysis from the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime states that London is disproportionately affected by crime problems, such as robbery and knife crime, typically associated with young males who often operate in groups or 'gangs'. In 2011 14% of homicides (19) were gang related and two thirds (12) were teenagers. Gang members mostly fall into the 13-24 age range, with the largest cohort being 18-24 (75% of the highest harm individuals are over the age of 18); intelligence also suggests</p>

that 10-13 year olds are increasingly being drawn into gang membership.

Analysis from the Ministry of Justice's Breaking the Cycle: Effective punishment, rehabilitation and sentencing of offending 2010, states that 75% of young people released from custody and 68% of young people on community sentences re-offend within a year

Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 provided by the Metropolitan Police to Victim Support regarding victims of crime by ethnicity and age is not thorough. However looking at victim breakdown by age shows that 18 – 24 year olds are over represented at 24% of the borough's victims when compared to the population figure from the 2011 census of 12%. It also shows that 25-34 year olds are over represented in the victim breakdown for the borough at 34%, when compared to this group making up 25% of the population.

Local data

Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 under Violent Crime Indicator for the 'Number of Most Serious Violence offences per 1,000 of the population' and 'Number of Assault with Injury' show that offenders and victims show similar patterns of age, with a peak occurring in the 20's and a steep decline as age increases.

Recommendations from CSP Strategic Assessment to CSP and Subgroups was that their action plan should include a continued focus on Violence Related Offences, the Community Safety Partnership to continue its work around education of potential victims and suspects within this crime category. Carry on with various education plans linked to this subject and continue crime prevention programmes. The subgroup responsible for the CSP Priority Violence (with a focus on Domestic Violence) action plan should contain detailed actions to address these findings, which should lead to a decrease in the number of offences and an increase in partnership working, social cohesion and education around this subject. It recommends a continued investment in youth diversionary/outreach services to prevent young people being involved in crime and anti-social behaviour either as a victim or a perpetrator. The borough Gangs Matrix aims to tackle those already involved in gang activity/crime, offering ways out of offending behaviour or where this is not accepted by the offender, taking enforcement action against them.

Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 under Violent Crime Indicator for the number of 'Hospital admissions for unintentional and deliberate injuries for young people aged 0 – 17 years, shows that 0 – 4 and 5 – 14 age groups by 3 year pooled data, show downward trends in the numbers of admissions, with a more pronounced downward trend in 0 – 4 year age group.

Recommendations from CSP Strategic Assessment to CSP and Subgroups are for

- Programmes that support parents and families, develop life skills in children, work with high risk youth and reduce availability of and misuse of alcohol have proven effective at reducing violence. Measures to ensure appropriate identification, care and support mechanisms are in place are important in minimising the harms caused by violence and reducing its recurrence.
- Reducing violence to 0-5 does depend on widespread, multi-sectorial action and requires a well-planned strategic approach to involving all members of the partnership and Local Safeguarding Children Board. Moving straight into action planning now would be precipitate. However better data on presentations to A7E (work is on-going), we need better information on what is being delivered across the piece and thirdly we need a strategy that sets out what, why and how we are proposing action.

The subgroup responsible for the CSP Priority Violence (with a focus on Domestic Violence) and Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) action plans should contain detailed actions to address these findings, which should lead to a decrease in the number of offences and an increase in partnership working, social cohesion and education around this subject.

Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 under Property Crime indicator 'Number of Personal Robberies' will also contain some correlation with Serious Youth Violence and Knife Crime and shows that School pupils and students account for almost half of all victims on the borough, with mobile phones being the most frequently stolen property around 29% of all property taken. Personal Robbery appears to be mainly a crime whereby the majority of suspects are aged between 15 and 19 years and the majority of victims tend to be youths. Knife Enabled Robbery remained a persistent proportion of all personal robbery offences.

Recommendations from CSP Strategic Assessment to CSP and Subgroups was that their action plan should include a continued focus on Personal Robbery Offences and offenders as there are overlaps between offenders for robbery and other offence types. Community Safety Partnership and subgroups to continue their work around education of potential victims and suspects within this crime category. Carry on with various education plans linked to this subject and continue with crime prevention programmes. The subgroups responsible for the CSP Priorities Reducing Re-offending and Gangs & Serious Youth Violence action plans should contain detailed actions to address these findings, which should lead to a decrease in the number of offences and an increase in partnership working, social cohesion and education around this subject.

Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 under Youth Crime, measures the number of victims, offenders, incidents, entering custody, successfully completing orders and proven re-offending of young people. They show clear correlations between Knife Crime Offences, Robbery Offences and Serious Youth Violence as these offences tend to overlay each other in crime types and peak and trough at the same time throughout the year.

Recommendations from CSP Strategic Assessment to CSP and Subgroups was that their action plan should acknowledge the clear correlation between Knife Crime, Robbery and Serious Youth Violence and vital partnership working around all three identify the link and adapt their plans accordingly to ensure that they are all part of the strategy and performance measure. Increase in activity around hotspot wards for these offences will impact on one another as there is a link between the schools and robbery offences. Partnership working around facilities provided (ie. Schools, youth clubs and leisure facilities), as 80% of all Tower Hamlets' serious youth violence victims lives within the borough. The subgroups responsible for the CSP Priorities Reducing Re-offending and Gangs & Serious Youth Violence action plans should contain detailed actions to address these findings, which should lead to a decrease in the number of offences and an increase in partnership working, social cohesion and education around this subject.

Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 under Drugs and Alcohol, measures the number of Young People taking drugs and or alcohol in specialist treatment has shown an 11.5% increase in the number of Young People in treatment over the three year period. This could be down to the realignment of services due to changes in funding, the YOT becoming part of the specialist treatment network and having a dedicated drug worker or a combination of both. However it is expected that the performance over the coming 3 years is likely to stay relatively stable, which goes against the national trend of a decrease over both periods.

Recommendations from CSP Strategic Assessment to CSP and Subgroups was that specialist treatment service should continue to be monitored and adjustments made to it in accordance with the needs of the users/clients.

Analysis of National Research shows that Domestic violence is a significant issue for the welfare of children and young people. It is estimated that nearly three quarters of children on the 'at risk' register live in households where domestic violence is occurring (Department of Health 2002 – Women's Mental Health: Into the mainstream). The majority of children in households experiencing domestic

		<p>violence will witness abusive behaviour. It is estimated that 90% of children are in the same or next room when abuse occurs (Hughes, 1992)</p> <p>Response from Tower Hamlets Safeguarding Children’s Board is that it has risk assessment tool to support professionals in identifying risks to children in families experiencing domestic violence and ensure appropriate response and actions. The tool and accompanying guidance supports the London safeguarding children board procedure “Safeguarding children abused through domestic violence”.</p>
Socio-economic	Positive	<p>For this target group, the priorities of Drugs and Alcohol and Reducing Re-offending may be of particular relevance.</p> <p>Analysis from the CSP Strategic Assessment 2012 under Violence Against women and Girls, shows an increase in the number of domestic violence offences by 6% year on year over the three year period. This increase could be down to a number of factors including an increasing number of people living in the borough; overcrowding and; the economic downturn, particularly the associated pressures that these can bring, but also may be down to an increase in confidence to report offences.</p> <p>Recommendations from CSP Strategic Assessment to CSP and Subgroups were that their action plans should include a continued focus on all violence related offences, especially those that can be linked to Domestic Violence. The CSP and Subgroups should continue to work and focus around education of potential victims and engaging with suspects within this crime category. Carry on with various education plans linked to this subject and continue with crime prevention programmes.</p>
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Positive	No data available for analysis
Pregnancy and Maternity	Positive	<p>Research nationally shows that It is estimated 30% of domestic violence begins or escalates during pregnancy, and it has been identified as a prime cause of miscarriage or still-birth, premature birth, foetal psychological damage, foetal physical injury and foetal death. The mother may be prevented from seeking or receiving adequate ante-natal or post-natal care. In addition, if the mother is being abused this may affect her attachment to her child, more so if the pregnancy is a result of rape by her partner.</p>

		Response from the CSP and the DV Forum is that they have recognised this increased risk during pregnancy and recent birth of a child. It has included this in their Domestic Abuse Stalking and Honour-based Violence Risk Assessment Form, for consideration of individual cases when taking cases to their Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference on a bi-monthly basis.
--	--	--

As a result of completing the above, what is the potential impact of your policy/function on the public, giving particular regard to potential impacts on minority or protected groups?

High Medium Low

Equalities to be further considered at the Action Planning stage.

If you have identified a LOW impact or, there has been NO SIGNIFICANT amendments to an existing policy/function there is no need to continue to a full equalities analysis.

If you have assessed the potential impact as MEDIUM or HIGH you will now need to complete a full equalities analysis - building upon the findings of the initial impact assessment (section 4)

