EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS (EqIAA)

COUNCIL REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME

Date(s) of completing the EqIAA: July 2019 - onwards
Person(s) completing the EqIAA: EqIAA Lead: Head of Financial Services (S151 Officer)

INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of the Council's budget setting process is to set the Council's annual revenue budget, its capital programme and the council tax. The overall success of this process is measured through the delivery of the council's priorities within a balanced budget.

In respect of this, the key purpose of this EqIAA is to provide all parties with robust equalities information in order to provide clear information which will influence decisions in respect of budget setting and council tax. As such, this EqIAA also serves to remind the Council of its statutory duty, in the exercise of its functions, to have due regard to the need to:-

1. **Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by the Equality Act 2010;**
2. **Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;** this means:-
    − removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic.
    − taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it.
    − encouraging persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
3. **Foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;** this means:-
    − tackling prejudice.
    − promoting understanding.

There are several issues to be raised within this introduction as follows:
- Extensive consultation has been conducted and this allowed for information to be explicitly gathered and analysed with respect to 'Protected Characteristic' groups as defined by The Equality Act 2010. It is important to note that this EqIAA provides information not only concerning the consultation results collected between October 2019 and January 2020, but also analyses trends year-on-year since 2014/15. This allows for a comprehensive EqIAA which includes information regarding cumulative impacts to form a robust part of decision making processes.
- A diverse cross section of residents have been engaged in the consultation exercise. Taking this approach, which involves large numbers, provides a robust level of feedback from different communities - the nature of this process contributes towards the promotion of community cohesion.
- This EqIAA sets out an analysis of equalities issues as elicited through national and local research and consultation and provides decision-makers with a wealth of information regarding the priorities and satisfaction levels of residents as disaggregated according to 'Protected Characteristic group'. This allows for the information to form a robust part of decision making processes.
- This EqIAA should be read in conjunction with the Council's Annual Equalities Reports, the South Gloucestershire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and the specific EqIAAs that are conducted as part of the delivery of all Council 'functions'. In addition, this EqIAA should be read in conjunction with the Equality and Human Rights Commission's most recent report 'Is Britain Fairer? 2018'.
- Equalities monitoring is carried out by services on an on-going basis which allows for equalities impact to be specifically researched and assessed with ongoing development activities designed and implemented. Full details of this can be found in the Council's Annual Equalities Reports.

National data and information

The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) is Great Britain's national equality body and has been awarded an 'A' status as a National Human Rights Institution (NHRI) by the United Nations. It is a statutory non-departmental public body with the responsibility to encourage equality and diversity, eliminate unlawful discrimination, and protect and promote the human rights of everyone in Britain. Overall, the role of the EHRC is to make these rights and freedoms a reality for everyone. The EHRC uses a range of powers to do so, by providing advice and guidance to individuals, employers and other organisations, reviewing the effectiveness of the law and taking legal enforcement action to clarify the law and address significant breaches of rights.

The EHRC has a statutory duty to report to the UK Parliament on how far everyone in Britain is able to live free from discrimination and abuses of their human rights. '***Is Britain Fairer? 2018***' is the latest EHRC state-of-the-nation report on equality and human rights. The review covers progress in relation to outcomes in education, health, living standards, justice and security, work and participation in politics and public life. It is the most comprehensive survey of how England, Scotland and Wales are performing in these areas, and the evidence contained is intended to help set the agenda for the Britain of the future.

An over-arching summary of findings contained within the most recent EHRC report ('Is Britain Fairer? 2018') provides the following information:

Socio-economic disadvantage

The picture is still bleak for the living standards of Britain's most at-risk and 'forgotten' groups of people, who are in danger of becoming stuck in their current situation for years to come.

Poverty has changed little and for children it has increased; it is particularly prevalent among disabled people and for some ethnic minorities. In line with our 2015 report, UK-wide reforms to welfare and tax since 2010 continue to have a disproportionate impact on the poorest in society. These reforms are pulling more people into poverty, particularly disabled people, people from some ethnic minorities and women, weakening the safety net provided by social security that is vital to those unable to work, or stuck in low-paid or precarious work.

Despite rising employment levels, work increasingly does not guarantee an adequate standard of living. Homelessness is also on the rise, putting more people in a precarious position and particularly affecting people from ethnic minorities, disabled people and other at-risk groups.

The South Gloucestershire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) reports that there are more than 6,000 children living in poverty in South Gloucestershire. South Gloucestershire has a lower percentage of children living in low income families (10.5%) than the South West (14.2%) or England (18.0%).   Children in workless families are three times as likely to live in poverty compared to families where at least one parent works. South Gloucestershire has a lower rate of worklessness than the national average. In South Gloucestershire, the proportion of residents employed in occupations which usually require a low level of education is higher than the national and sub-regional averages. This suggests that there may be a higher proportion of South Gloucestershire residents in low paid jobs than other areas.

Additionally, it is important to note that responses to the Council budget and savings programme consultation 2020/21 has found that Females and disabled people were more likely than average to prefer not including Universal Credit as an income when assessing someone's LCTR entitlement. It has also found that people from BAME backgrounds and disabled people were more likely than

average to select the area of 'Housing' as their highest priority area for investment over the next 10 years.

Socio-economic disadvantage has a knock-on effect across different areas of life, such as education and health. Despite improvements in school attainment for most children over the last few years, those from lower income backgrounds and Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children are getting below-average school exam results. These same children are also more likely to be excluded from school, and poorer young people are less likely to go to university.

These trends are clear in South Gloucestershire where Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children achieve significantly below average across all Key Stages and feature significantly more in school exclusions data with a worsening trend in the area of exclusions.

In addition, children from 'Black' and 'Mixed' backgrounds, as well as boys from poorer backgrounds have significantly lower attainment rates when compared to both overall South Gloucestershire and national data. Work is currently being conducted with the South Gloucestershire Race Equality Network to establish the actions required in respect of children from some ethnicities who are achieving below-average school exam results.

Infant mortality, the risk of which increases with deprivation, rose in 2016 for the first time in decades.

Some groups being left behind

Disabled people falling further behind

Disabled people are not enjoying the progress experienced by other groups. Their right to an inclusive education is not being fulfilled – in fact, the proportion of disabled children at special rather than mainstream schools has increased in England and Wales – and they are more likely to be excluded from school. (This same trend in respect of exclusions is clear in South Gloucestershire data and current work being led by the Council's Education, Learning and Skills team seeks to specifically address this). *This disadvantage continues in later life. The disability pay gap persists, with disabled people earning less per hour on average than non-disabled people. Disabled people are more likely to be in low-pay occupations and this likelihood has increased.*
Disabled people are also more likely to be in poverty. Those who can't work rely on an increasingly restricted welfare regime that is projected to lower their living standards even further. They also face poorer health and lack of access to suitable housing. Safety is another major concern, as fewer disabled people have confidence that the criminal justice system is effective.
Without the fundamental building blocks of good education, an adequate standard of living, and being safe and healthy, disabled people are often unable to participate fully in society.

Challenges to women's safety and career progression

In some ways women's equality has progressed significantly. The employment gap and pay gap with men has narrowed, and the number of women in higher pay occupations and represented on company boards has increased. However, full gender equality has not been achieved and there are still many factors holding women back at work – some of which stem from gender stereotypes and emerge from school or earlier. For example, gender differences in career aspirations can be seen at an early age. This trickles through to higher education, where women are under-represented in most science, technology, engineering and maths courses, despite girls performing better than boys in education.

The under-representation of girls in STEM subjects has been recognised as a problem needing urgent attention with high-profile reviews leading to publication of the Roberts Review (*Roberts, 2002*) and the Greenfield Report (*Peters et al., 2002*). The Roberts Review highlighted the shortage

of girls taking STEM subjects at A-level and HE and the need for courses to 'inspire and interest pupils, particularly girls'. The review called for increased participation in STEM by women and under-represented ethnic minority groups, particularly in schools…." The EHRC have also highlighted actions that might be taken to address under-representation, *"…slow progress in attracting women to careers in STEM with reference to continued lack of information, few visible role models and mentors and little hands on experience. Alongside these are 'stereotyping of careers advice and lack of knowledge and experience for girls and young women in non-traditional areas of work' (Peters et al., 2002:36)."* In their report of May 2014, the Campaign for Science and Engineering (CaSE) state that, *"A more diverse science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) workforce is not simply desirable in terms of equality, but necessary if we are to maximise individual opportunity and meet economic need"*.

This is particularly important given the West of England's national importance in advanced engineering including aerospace, creative and digital industries.

Gender segregation is also prominent in apprenticeships. All of these factors contribute to women still being more likely to be in low-pay occupations.

Bullying and sexual harassment are widespread in the workplace and in education.

The Online Pupil Survey (OPS) in South Gloucestershire has found the most frequent reasons for bullying in order of most frequent to least frequent are: people think you are LGB; your disability; your skin colour; your accent; people think you are trans; your religion; your home language; you are a traveller.

Three-quarters of new mothers have had a negative or potentially discriminatory experience at work as a result of pregnancy or maternity.

Sexual and domestic violence is a persistent and growing concern, and affects women and girls disproportionately. These negative experiences and the inequalities we continue to observe relate closely to stereotypes and perceptions of women and girls, and limit women's choices and opportunities.

Some ethnic minority groups falling behind

People from certain ethnic minorities, such as Indian and Chinese people, have continued to succeed in education and at work, and for others there have been marked improvements in these areas of life. However, Black African, Bangladeshi and Pakistani people are still the most likely to live in poverty and deprivation, and – given the damaging effects of poverty on education, work and health – families can become locked into disadvantage for generations. Ethnic minorities are more at risk of becoming homeless, have poorer access to healthcare and higher rates of infant mortality, and some groups have lower trust in the criminal justice system.

Gypsy, Roma and Travellers face multiple disadvantages across different areas of life. They achieve below-average results at school, experience difficulties accessing healthcare, worse health, and often have low standards of housing.

Moving backwards on justice and personal security

We have seen a marked backwards move in justice and personal security since the improvements we found in our 2015 review. Access to justice enables us to realise our rights to freedom and fairness, but restrictions on legal aid and the introduction of employment tribunal fees – now repealed – have severely reduced people's ability to secure redress when their rights are breached. The conditions experienced by people held in detention have also deteriorated, with overcrowding in prisons in England and Wales risking prisoner safety and increases in incidents of self-harm and assaults in prisons. There is still a disproportionate number of ethnic minority detainees in prison and in the youth secure estate in England and Wales, despite fewer young people in custody. Levels of trust in the criminal justice system among black people are far lower than for other groups.
The level of hate crime, sexual violence and domestic abuse is concerning. While increases in reported crime may be the result of better reporting and recording, the level of identity-based violence is worrying, particularly in light of Britain's impending exit from the EU and the spikes in hate crime we saw around the time of the referendum. The higher rates of domestic abuse and sexual assault experienced by disabled people, LGBT people and women are also of concern.

Gaps in the data

We have been able to paint a comprehensive picture of equality and human rights for disabled people, people from ethnic minorities, women and men. But gaps in the data available to us mean that we do not yet know as much as we would like about the experiences of groups who share other protected characteristics. Evidence is particularly scarce for LGBT people, people with a religion or belief, and pregnant women and new mothers. The Council budget and savings programme 2020/21 consultation has included the collection of information in respect of LGBT people, trans people and people with and without a religion or belief for the last two years and will continue to do so in order that a more robust evidence base becomes well established, thus resulting in an enhanced level of consideration of issues.

The 'Is Britain Fairer? 2018' report provides 50 recommendations, many of which directly impact upon the work of Local Authorities. A summary of key findings contained within each chapter of the 'Is Britain Fairer? 2018' report is shown in this EqIAA.

This EqIAA now goes on to summarise the key trends emerging as a result of South Gloucestershire Council budget and savings programme consultations conducted since 2013. This approach is significant as for the majority of areas and issues consulted upon, the Council now has 7 years of data which this EqIAA specifically investigates. In turn, this allows for an understanding of both trends and cumulative impacts in respect of protected characteristics to continue to mature and influence decisions and actions.

South Gloucestershire Trends Analysis

The following information provides an overview of the key trends emerging as a result of South Gloucestershire Council budget and savings programme consultations conducted since 2013. Full data tables are shown in Appendix 1 of this EqIAA and should be read in conjunction with the following summary information.

This information shows where patterns of certain protected characteristic groups being more or less satisfied with services has remained the same over successive years. These results are therefore considered a reliable indicator of levels of satisfaction for these groups compared to all respondents.

Satisfaction with Services - Trends

Service Area	Trends
Care for Older People	Non-disabled people and people aged under 45 are consistently less satisfied than average with care for older people. Older people and disabled people are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 42% and 49% respectively.
Care for physically disabled and those with learning difficulties	Non-disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average. Disabled people and people aged over 65 years are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 48% and 29% respectively.
Children's Social Services	Disabled people are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 17%.
Customer services	People from a BAME background are consistently more satisfied than average. People aged 45-64 are consistently less satisfied than average.
Environmental health and trading standards	People from BAME backgrounds are consistently more satisfied than average.
Housing advice services	Disabled people are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 27%.
Highways and Roads	People aged under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at around 40%.
Libraries	People aged under 45 year are consistently more satisfied than average with a high satisfaction level of 77%. Females continue to be slightly more satisfied than average.
Local Bus Services	People aged over 65 years are consistently more satisfied than average with a high satisfaction level of 67%. People aged under 65 years and disabled people continue to be less satisfied than average with satisfaction levels of around 47% and 56% respectively.

Satisfaction with Services – Trends (continued)

Service Area	Trends
Parks and open spaces	Disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average. Younger people are consistently more satisfied than average.
Planning	Disabled people and older people are consistently less satisfied than average. People under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average with planning.
Public Health	There is a low level of satisfaction with people aged 45-64 being less satisfied in most years.
Schools	Older people are consistently less satisfied than average with schools. People aged under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average. Females show some consistency in being more satisfied than average.
Sport and leisure facilities	People aged over 65 and disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average. People aged under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average.
Waste and recycling services	There are no significant trends in terms of satisfaction with services.
Welfare benefits and council tax reduction for which the council is responsible	People aged 35 – 64 and non disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average with welfare benefits and council tax. People aged over 65 years and disabled people are consistently more satisfied than average although satisfaction levels are not high at 40% and 47% respectively.
Free Car parking	This was the second year for a question surrounding free car parking and no significant trends are yet identified.

Council Transformation and Savings Programme – proposed amount of savings

The following analyses feedback relating to the Council Transformation and Savings Programme.

Children, Adults & Health (£4.4m or 3.4% of department budget)	37% of respondents felt that this was too much. 32% of respondents felt that this was about right. People aged 16 – 64 years were more likely to state that this was too much. People aged 65 and over were more likely than average to state that this was about right.
Environment & Community Services (£3.1m or 7.4% of department budget)	40% of respondents felt that this was about right. 32% of respondents felt that this was too much. People aged 16 – 64 years were more likely to state that this was too much. People aged 65 and over were more likely than average to state that this was about right.
Chief Executive & Corporate Resources and Central Items (£0.2m or 1.2% of department budget)	40% of respondents felt that this was too little. 28% of respondents felt that this was about right. People aged 16 – 64 years were more likely to state that this was too little. People aged 65 and over were more likely than average to state that this was about right.

The next 5 - 10 years

Again, this information shows the pattern of certain groups preferring a certain approach over successive years. These results are therefore considered a reliable indicator of levels of preference for these groups compared to all respondents.

Approach	Feedback and Trends
Support for targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need	The majority of respondents (68%) supported this approach. Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last 7 years (average support over the 7 year period is 65%)
Support for reducing the quality of services provided	This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (15%). Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, respondents have consistently not supported this approach over the last 7 years (average support over the 7 year period is 20%)
Support for increasing fees and charges for some services	45% of respondents supported this approach. Disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (37%).
Support for making more services available online	The majority of respondents (60%) supported this approach. People aged under 45 are consistently more likely than average to support this approach (89% of 16 – 34 year olds; 88% of 35 – 44 year olds). People aged over 65 and disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (46%).
Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services	The majority of respondents (62%) supported this approach. People aged under 65 are consistently more likely than average to support this approach (83% of 16 – 34 year olds; 88% of 35 – 44 year olds; 69% of 45 – 64 year olds). People aged over 65 and disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (50% and 49% respectively).
Making more efficient use of council assets such as land and buildings	The majority of respondents (87%) supported this approach. Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last 7 years (average support over the 7 year period is 86%).
Support for scaling back or stopping some services	This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (17%). Disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (13%).

The next 5 - 10 years (continued)

Approach	Feedback and Trends
Stopping provision of some discretionary services to protect services to older people and the vulnerable	Just 36% of respondents supported this approach. Regardless of protected characteristics, the average support over the 7 year period is 35%)
Changing working practices to make better use of technology and more efficient ways of working	The majority of respondents (82%) supported this approach. Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last 6 years (average support over the 6 year period is 83%). In addition, people aged under 45 years show a trend of having more support than average for this approach.
Working in partnership and sharing services with other councils and public sector agencies	The majority of respondents (81%) supported this approach. Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last 6 years (average support over the 6 year period is 80%).
Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies	This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (19%). Males are consistently more likely than average to support this approach, however, only at level of 22% this year. Disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (16%).
Transferring services to community groups, social enterprises and town and parish councils	43% of respondents supported this approach. There are no clear trends relating to protected characteristic groups and this approach. However, on the whole, younger people appear to show slightly more support for this approach than average across the 7 year period.
Encouraging more people to volunteer their time to become involved in the delivery of services	54% of respondents supported this approach. There are no clear trends relating to protected characteristic groups and this approach. Across the 7 year period, the average level of support for this approach is 54%.

Priorities for investment in the next 10 years

In order of support gained (from highest to lowest)

Priority	Feedback and Trends
Education	25% of respondents identified this as their highest priority. People aged 16 – 34 and people aged 35 – 44 were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (43% and 29% respectively).
Health and wellbeing	23% of respondents identified this as their highest priority. People aged 16 – 34, people aged over 65 years, disabled people and people from BAME backgrounds were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (28%, 28%, 30%, 28% respectively).
Safeguarding vulnerable children and adults	21% of respondents identified this as their highest priority. Females and disabled people were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (24% and 30% respectively).
Maintaining safe, strong and clean communities	16% of respondents identified this as their highest priority. People from BAME backgrounds were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (31%). People under 44 years were less likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (10.5%).
Housing	15% of respondents identified this as their highest priority. People aged over 65 and disabled people were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (18% and 19% respectively). People under 44 years were less likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (8%).

Priorities for investment in the next 10 years (continued)

Priority	Feedback and Trends
Developing infrastructure (e.g. roads, rail, broadband)	15% of respondents identified this as their highest priority. People aged over 65 were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority area (19% respectively). People aged 34 - 65 were less likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (10.5%).
Protecting the environment	15% of respondents identified this as their highest priority. People aged 16-34 years were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (19%).
Meeting assessed social care needs for children and adults	14% of respondents identified this as their highest priority. Females and disabled people were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (16% and 17% respectively).
Public transport	12% of respondents identified this as their highest priority. People aged 16-34, people aged over 65 years, disabled people and people from BAME backgrounds were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (15%, 15%, 14% and 19% respectively). People aged over 65 years, disabled people and people from BAME backgrounds were also more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority in 2019/20.
Employment	10% of respondents identified this as their highest priority. People aged over 65, were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (13%). People aged over 65 years, were also more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority in 2019/20.
Reducing inequality and deprivation	6% of respondents identified this as their highest priority. People aged 16-34 and disabled people an were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (9%, and 8% respectively).

Council Tax Options for 2020/21

Level of Council Tax for 2020/21

40% of respondents preferred Option B (3.00% increase)

People aged 16 – 34, 35 – 44 and 46 – 65 years were more likely than average to prefer Option A (3.99% increase). People aged over 65 and disabled people were least likely to prefer Option A.

In regard solely to Option C (a freeze), disabled people were more likely than the average to prefer this option. However, in regard to all options presented, 33% of disabled people supported Option C and 38% of disabled people supported option B.

A general council tax increase of 1.99% if it was ring-fenced for a specific service

38% of respondents agreed with this option.
29% of respondents disagreed with this option.

16-34 year olds were more likely to disagree or 'neither agree nor disagree'.

People aged over 65 years and disabled people were most likely of all groups to agree with this option, however the agreement levels for these groups were 41% and 40% respectively.

Should government relax the current annual council tax increase thresholds, to what extent would you support or oppose a council tax rise greater than 3.99%?

The majority of respondents opposed this option (64%) with no significant differences regardless of protected characteristics.

Changes to the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme (LCTR)

26% of respondents supported keeping the current scheme and take into account all compensation payments as capital. This was the largest level of support relating to the options provided.

46 – 65 year olds and disabled people were more likely than average to support keeping the current scheme (30%).

People aged 35-44 were more likely to prefer disregarding any amount received from a government compensation scheme (31%).

Universal Credit

33% of respondents supported keeping the current scheme and taking into account all of the Universal Credit as an income.

32% of respondents supported not including Universal Credit as an income when assessing someone's LCTR entitlement.

Females, people aged under 65 and disabled people were more likely than average to prefer not including Universal Credit as an income when assessing someone's LCTR entitlement (36%, 38% and 37% respectively).
As noted in the 'Summary' section of this EqIAA, this is important to note as the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) report that: *Our analysis of changes to taxes, benefits, tax credits and Universal Credit since 2010 found that by the 2021/22 tax year, the largest impacts will be felt by those with lower incomes and that the changes will have a disproportionately negative impact on several protected groups. Negative impacts are particularly large for households with more disabled members, and more severely disabled individuals, as well as for lone parents on low incomes. For households with at least one disabled adult and a disabled child, average annual cash losses are just over £6,500 – over 13% of average net income. Women lose about £400 per year on average, and men £30, although these figures conceal very substantial variation within sexes. ("Is Britain Fairer? (2018)", the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), 2018).*

The local area and the council

Satisfaction with the local area as a place to live

The majority of respondents (79%) stated that they were satisfied with the area as a place to live.

People aged 16-34 were least likely to state satisfaction, however, 67% of 16-34 year olds still reported satisfaction.

Over the past 2 years, do you feel that South Gloucestershire has become a better place to live, is the same or is worse?

Just 7% of respondents stated that they felt the area had got better as a place to live over the last two years.

30% of respondents stated that they felt the area had got worse as a place to live over the last two years. People aged 46-55 years were most likely to state the area had got worse (34%) and this group shows a trend over the last 6 year period for feeling that the area has got worse as a place to live.

Satisfaction with the way South Gloucestershire Council runs things

65% of respondents stated satisfaction with the way the Council runs things with no significant differences regardless of protected characteristics.

The Council providing value for money

46% of respondents felt that the Council provides value for money.

People over the age of 65 years are showing a trend for being more likely than average to agree that the Council provides value for money; however, there is still only 54% agreement amongst the over 65s age grouping.

People aged under 65 years are showing a trend for being more likely than average to disagree that the Council provides value for money; an average of 38% of people amongst the under 65s age groupings agreed that the Council provides value for money.

The council keeps me informed about services

47% of respondents agreed that the Council keeps them informed about the services it provides.

This rises to 52% agreement amongst people aged 16 – 34 years and falls to 40% agreement amongst disabled people.

The council keeps me informed about any proposals for change

47% of respondents agreed that the Council keeps them informed about proposals for change.

There are no great differences amongst protected characteristic groups in regard to this question across the year, however it is worth noting that disabled people are more likely to disagree that the Council keeps them informed about proposals for change.

I can influence decisions affecting my local area

Just 17% of respondents felt that they could influence decisions in their local area.

There are no significant trends to note regardless of protected characteristics.

The council acts on the concerns of local residents?

39% of respondents felt that the Council acts on the concerns of local residents.

People aged 46 – 65 years show a trend for a lower level of agreement (33%).

People aged over 65 years show a trend for a lower level of agreement (46%).

CONSULTATION RESPONDENTS

The extent of the council's consultation activity and the analysis of feedback information in respect of 'Protected Characteristic' groups allows the Council to consider equalities impacts in a robust way and fully consider the aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty throughout the budget setting process.

The consultation conducted in regard to the Council Budget and Capital Savings Programme 2020/21 used a wide variety of methods which are detailed within the Consultation Output Report (Table 1, Page 8) and included a full range of equalities groups within South Gloucestershire.

Response rates according to 'Protected Characteristic' groups are as follows:

Characteristic	Responses to consultation	Census proportions
Sex		
Female	661 49%	50%
Male	647 48%	50%
Disability		
Disabled	200 15%	16%
Non-disabled	1068 79%	84%
Sexual Orientation		
Bisexual	24 2%	1%*
Gay man	11 0.8%	2%*
Gay woman/ Lesbian	6 0.4%	1%*
Hetero-sexual	1050 77%	93%*
Other	21 2%	1%*
*Annual Population Survey 2017 - UK figures		

Characteristic	Responses to consultation	Census proportions
Age		
Under 45	162 12%	57%
46 to 64	511 38%	26%
Over 65	625 46%	17%
Race		
White British	1187 87%	95%
BAME	68 5%	5%
Gender Reassignment		
Transgender Yes	2 0.1%	
Transgender No	1165 86%	

*At the moment there is no official figure on the number of trans people in the UK. Government figures have tentatively suggested an estimate of 200,000-500,000 people but this figure isn't based on any robust data

Religion or Belief		
Buddhist	5 0.4%	0.3%
Christian	708 52%	60%
Hindu	9 0.7%	0.6%
Jewish	4 0.3%	0.1%
Muslim	5 0.4%	0.8%
Sikh	0 0.0%	0.2%
Any other religion	13 1.0%	0.3%
No religion/not stated	414 30%	38%

Consultation respondents over the last 7 year period

The following table shows the number of respondents to the Budget Consultation process in each of the last 7 years:

	Total	Sex		Age					Disability		Ethnicity		Sexual Orientation					Gender Reassignment		Religion or Belief							
		Female	Male	16 - 34	35 - 44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
Number of responses 2014/15	**681**	*315*	*314*			*83*	*357*	*200*	*46*	*576*	*584*	*27*															
Number of responses 2015/16	**1426**	*682*	*716*			*349*	*563*	*491*	*185*	*1203*	*1275*	*35*															
Number of responses 2016/17	**1127**	*508*	*568*			*361*	*561*	*170*	*102*	*949*	*931*	*86*															
Number of responses 2017/18	**1270**	*595*	*616*			*188*	*432*	*591*	*171*	*1039*	*1051*	*88*															
Number of responses 2018/19	**1045**	*480*	*519*			*138*	*218*	*667*	*107*	*843*	*928*	*52*															
Number of responses 2019/20	**1753**	*841*	*853*			*669*	*559*	*453*	*212*	*1435*	*1537*	*84*	*35*	*37*	*10*	*1352*	*27*	*10*	*1542*	*3*	*815*	*8*	*3*	*6*	*1*	*17*	*691*
Number of responses 2020/21	**1342**	*661*	*647*	*54*	*108*	*162*	*511*	*625*	*200*	*1068*	*1187*	*68*	*24*	*11*	*6*	*1050*	*21*	*2*	*1165*	*5*	*708*	*9*	*4*	*5*	*0*	*13*	*414*

In regard to the protected characteristics of 'Sexual Orientation', 'Gender Reassignment' and 'Religion or Belief', the Council continues to engage closely with community groups representing these areas and as a result, statistical information is supplemented via this proactive approach.

EqIAA OUTCOMES

The consultation process has been robust and allows for information to be gathered year-on-year and considered in respect of 'Protected Characteristics' and taken into account in relation to budget proposals.

This EqIAA, in addition to providing information for decision-makers, also provides a host of information which will be used should a particular department, team or function consider any changes to provision during the development of specific, full EqIAAs using the council's comprehensive approach to undertaking equality analysis. As shown, a range of data has been collected in respect of different aspects of the council's activity and further data also feeds into specific EqIAA processes.

This EqIAA forms part of the council Revenue and Capital Budget Reports in order that Members have sufficient information to discharge the Public Sector Equality Duty (all Members have received equalities training which specifically covered details of and responsibilities under the Duty).

Implementation of transformation projects will continue to be monitored in respect of their EqIAA progress.

SECTION 4 – EqIAA EVIDENCE

The evidence which has been used as part of the systematic approach to the consideration of equality impact includes:

- South Gloucestershire Council Budget 2014-15 Consultation Report, January 2014
- South Gloucestershire Council Savings Plan and Budget Report, January 2015
- South Gloucestershire Council Savings Plan and Budget Report, January 2016
- South Gloucestershire Council Savings Plan and Budget Report, January 2017
- South Gloucestershire Council Savings Plan and Budget Report, January 2018
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan 2019-20 Consultation Output Report, January 2019
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan 2019-20 Consultation Output Report, January 2020
- South Gloucestershire Annual Equalities Reports (2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014 –15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19)
- South Gloucestershire Council Equality Impact Assessment and Analysis (EqIAA) documents and reports
- "*How Fair is Britain?*", the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), 2010
- "*Is Britain Fairer?*", the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), 2015
- "*Is Britain Fairer? (2018)*", the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), 2018
- Race Disparity Audit, October 2017
- Casey Review, December 2016

Services

Note:
Areas highlighted GREEN are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more above the proportion of all respondents.
Areas highlighted RED are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more below the proportion of all respondents.

Care for older people

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**31%**	32%	32%			22%	26%	39%	26%	32%	32%	43%															
2015/16	**9%**	11%	8%			5%	7%	15%	19%	8%	9%	14%															
2016/17	**9%**	10%	7%			4%	10%	13%	15%	7%	8%	10%															
2017/18	**9%**	8%	10%			4%	5%	14%	20%	8%	9%	7%															
2018/19	**12%**	11%	11%			7%	9%	14%	22%	10%	12%	10%															
2019/20	**7%**	6%	8%			17%	8%	12%	11%	6%	7%	6%	11%	3%	0%	7%	11%	0%	7%	0%	11%	13%	0%	0%	0%	18%	4%
2020/21	**34%**	39%	30%	40%	22%		24%	42%	49%	29%	35%	31%	25%	0%	0%	37%	55%	0%	34%	0%	45%	0%	0%	0%		33%	21%

Care for physically disabled and those with learning difficulties

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	31%	31%	31%			28%	29%	35%	29%	31%	34%	14%															
2015/16	7%	8%	6%			5%	6%	10%	16%	6%	7%	3%															
2016/17	6%	7%	5%			3%	7%	5%	18%	4%	5%	9%															
2017/18	7%	6%	7%			4%	4%	9%	18%	5%	6%	8%															
2018/19	8%	6%	8%			9%	7%	7%	17%	6%	8%	8%															
2019/20	6%	5%	6%			18%	5%	7%	16%	4%	6%	5%	3%	0%	0%	6%	15%	0%	5%	0%	7%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	5%
2020/21	25%	30%	21%	40%	19%		21%	29%	48%	18%	26%	19%	25%	0%	33%	28%	38%	0%	27%	0%	34%	0%	33%	0%		0%	20%

Children's social services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	31%	37%	22%			32%	28%	34%	15%	34%	33%	33%															
2015/16	4%	4%	4%			5%	4%	3%	5%	4%	4%	9%															
2016/17	3%	4%	3%			2%	4%	4%	3%	3%	5%	3%															
2017/18	3%	3%	3%			4%	2%	3%	6%	2%	2%	5%															
2018/19	4%	3%	4%			5%	6%	10%	9%	3%	4%	2%															
2019/20	5%	5%	5%			19%	3%	4%	11%	4%	4%	15%	3%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	4%	0%	6%	25%	0%	0%	0%	6%	3%
2020/21	13%	11%	15%	56%	8%		13%	12%	17%	12%	11%	21%	13%	14%	33%	13%	0%	0%	14%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%		0%	17%

Customer Services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2016/17	**16%**	17%	16%			12%	17%	21%	22%	15%	16%	24%															
2017/18	**17%**	17%	16%			14%	12%	21%	23%	16%	17%	18%															
2018/19	**18%**	19%	16%			16%	13%	19%	28%	17%	18%	21%															
2019/20	**27%**	28%	27%			40%	22%	28%	29%	27%	27%	38%	40%	22%	30%	28%	15%	70%	28%	0%	31%	25%	67%	0%	0%	29%	25%
2020/21	**54%**	56%	52%	67%	58%		46%	59%	52%	54%	55%	50%	56%	57%	50%	57%	62%	0%	56%	0%	62%	50%	50%	0%		33%	51%

Environmental health and trading standards

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**53%**	50%	56%			58%	55%	48%	29%	58%	55%	69%															
2014/15	**29%**	31%	30%			13%	38%	20%	27%	31%	31%	40%															
2015/16	**9%**	10%	8%			8%	8%	10%	12%	9%	9%	20%															
2016/17	**8%**	7%	8%			5%	9%	11%	12%	7%	7%	13%															
2017/18	**8%**	8%	8%			10%	6%	10%	11%	8%	8%	10%															
2018/19	**9%**	9%	9%			8%	7%	10%	15%	9%	9%	13%															
2019/20	**14%**	15%	14%			28%	10%	15%	18%	14%	14%	20%	51%	27%	20%	13%	4%	70%	14%	0%	17%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	11%
2020/21	**40%**	40%	40%	64%	35%		37%	41%	38%	41%	40%	37%	47%	50%	25%	42%	33%	0%	41%	25%	43%	0%	0%	0%		63%	40%

Housing advice services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	33%	34%	31%			38%	31%	28%	18%	34%	33%	50%															
2015/16	3%	4%	3%			3%	3%	4%	8%	3%	4%	3%															
2016/17	4%	4%	3%			2%	3%	6%	11%	3%	3%	7%															
2017/18	3%	3%	3%			3%	3%	3%	6%	3%	3%	3%															
2018/19	5%	5%	5%			7%	6%	4%	12%	4%	5%	6%															
2019/20	5%	6%	4%			18%	5%	4%	6%	5%	5%	6%	23%	0%	0%	5%	4%	70%	5%	0%	5%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	5%
2020/21	17%	17%	18%	20%	20%		16%	17%	27%	13%	17%	29%	10%	14%	33%	16%	29%	0%	17%	0%	16%	0%	0%	0%		25%	16%

Highways and roads

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	23%	25%	23%			35%	24%	19%	10%	25%	23%	27%															
2014/15	16%	15%	18%			17%	16%	18%	16%	17%	16%	28%															
2015/16	25%	24%	26%			32%	21%	24%	26%	25%	25%	29%															
2016/17	31%	33%	30%			36%	29%	28%	18%	33%	31%	40%															
2017/18	27%	28%	25%			31%	25%	27%	23%	27%	28%	18%															
2018/19	27%	32%	23%			43%	26%	25%	25%	28%	28%	29%															
2019/20	27%	32%	23%			35%	23%	25%	29%	27%	28%	31%	46%	8%	20%	29%	22%	70%	27%	33%	27%	13%	0%	33%	0%	35%	29%
2020/21	33%	38%	29%	43%	40%		32%	32%	31%	35%	34%	35%	27%	36%	33%	36%	24%	0%	35%	20%	33%	29%	50%	60%		54%	36%

Libraries

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	78%	79%	77%			82%	76%	80%	76%	80%	78%	86%															
2015/16	48%	45%	51%			57%	40%	52%	49%	48%	49%	57%															
2016/17	45%	50%	39%			50%	41%	46%	49%	44%	44%	52%															
2017/18	41%	46%	36%			53%	34%	43%	38%	42%	43%	31%															
2018/19	37%	42%	31%			49%	29%	36%	34%	38%	36%	44%															
2019/20	38%	46%	30%			53%	33%	38%	40%	38%	38%	37%	60%	8%	40%	39%	33%	80%	38%	33%	40%	38%	0%	50%	100%	41%	34%
2020/21	68%	73%	63%	77%	77%		62%	69%	68%	68%	68%	71%	60%	29%	75%	71%	75%	0%		69%	40%	71%	40%	67%	100%	43%	71%

Local bus services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	53%	52%	54%			55%	52%	54%	30%	55%	53%	50%															
2014/15	52%	52%	56%			50%	47%	65%	41%	54%	55%	39%															
2015/16	36%	38%	36%			25%	33%	49%	42%	36%	36%	34%															
2016/17	35%	36%	36%			28%	40%	36%	26%	36%	37%	35%															
2017/18	36%	37%	35%			25%	25%	47%	38%	36%	37%	30%															
2018/19	38%	37%	39%			36%	29%	42%	30%	40%	39%	42%															
2019/20	34%	32%	35%			37%	28%	47%	29%	35%	34%	39%	69%	30%	40%	33%	41%	70%	34%	67%	38%	25%	33%	17%	0%	35%	30%
2020/21	57%	59%	57%	50%	43%		47%	67%	56%	58%	57%	58%	65%	55%	100%	59%	58%	0%	58%	75%	63%	71%	75%	75%		45%	52%

Parks and open spaces

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2015/16	**59%**	59%	60%			69%	57%	56%	51%	61%	60%	66%															
2016/17	**57%**	60%	54%			67%	55%	41%	34%	59%	58%	60%															
2017/18	**61%**	66%	58%			79%	62%	56%	51%	64%	62%	58%															
2018/19	**57%**	60%	53%			70%	56%	54%	41%	60%	57%	58%															
2019/20	**67%**	68%	67%			82%	61%	63%	59%	70%	69%	56%	80%	86%	80%	69%	52%	80%	69%	67%	69%	88%	33%	33%	0%	59%	69%
2020/21	**79%**	78%	80%	85%	83%		76%	80%	71%	80%	80%	66%	71%	91%	100%	80%	81%	50%	80%	100%	80%	75%	75%	20%		75%	80%

Planning

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**32%**	30%	35%			35%	33%	30%	12%	36%	35%	17%															
2015/16	**9%**	10%	8%			9%	9%	9%	10%	9%	9%	3%															
2016/17	**9%**	8%	11%			11%	9%	9%	7%	9%	9%	6%															
2017/18	**7%**	6%	8%			11%	7%	6%	5%	8%	7%	7%															
2018/19	**7%**	6%	8%			9%	10%	6%	6%	7%	7%	6%															
2019/20	**12%**	12%	13%			22%	12%	11%	9%	13%	12%	10%	31%	24%	0%	12%	7%	70%	13%	0%	14%	13%	0%	50%	0%	6%	12%
2020/21	**24%**	24%	24%	29%	38%		26%	20%	22%	25%	24%	31%	31%	22%	25%	25%	10%	0%	24%	67%	25%	0%	33%	0%		38%	25%

Public Health (not including NHS services)

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**50%**	51%	49%			47%	43%	64%	42%	52%	53%	31%															
2015/16	**5%**	6%	5%			5%	6%	5%	6%	5%	5%	11%															
2016/17	**5%**	5%	4%			5%	5%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%															
2017/18	**6%**	5%	7%			5%	4%	8%	8%	5%	6%	3%															
2018/19	**6%**	6%	7%			8%	5%	6%	8%	6%	7%	8%															
2019/20	14%	12%	15%			24%	12%	17%	15%	14%	14%	23%	31%	27%	10%	14%	15%	70%	13%	0%	17%	25%	0%	17%	0%	12%	11%
2020/21	**35%**	34%	36%	53%	33%		32%	36%	36%	36%	36%	34%	33%	38%	25%	37%	38%	0%	36%	67%	40%	0%	0%	33%		50%	31%

Schools

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**62%**	62%	61%			64%	63%	54%	44%	63%	61%	57%															
2015/16	**18%**	17%	21%			39%	16%	7%	12%	20%	18%	31%															
2016/17	**16%**	19%	15%			35%	7%	9%	8%	17%	17%	19%															
2017/18	**17%**	21%	15%			43%	18%	9%	15%	18%	18%	17%															
2018/19	**13%**	15%	11%			30%	20%	6%	9%	14%	12%	19%															
2019/20	19%	21%	17%			35%	18%	12%	21%	19%	19%	32%	46%	0%	20%	19%	11%	80%	19%	0%	19%	25%	0%	0%	0%		18%	20%
2020/21	**46%**	50%	42%	74%	67%		43%	38%	47%	47%	46%	48%	40%	14%	33%	49%	56%	0%	48%	50%	47%	40%	0%	0%		29%	49%

Sport and leisure facilities

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**68%**	72%	64%			81%	69%	59%	42%	71%	69%	67%															
2015/16	**34%**	33%	37%			52%	32%	26%	32%	35%	35%	49%															
2016/17	**31%**	36%	26%			44%	25%	22%	25%	32%	31%	36%															
2017/18	**34%**	38%	29%			60%	35%	24%	22%	35%	34%	31%															
2018/19	**31%**	35%	27%			49%	41%	24%	25%	32%	31%	33%															
2019/20	**45%**	50%	41%			63%	42%	34%	30%	49%	46%	45%	66%	46%	70%	47%	30%	80%	46%	33%	46%	63%	67%	67%	0%	24%	48%
2020/21	**68%**	67%	68%	89%	72%		68%	64%	58%	71%	69%	63%	62%	43%	60%	70%	67%	0%	69%	75%	68%	67%	67%	67%		50%	71%

Waste and recycling services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**70%**	73%	69%			67%	70%	76%	52%	73%	72%	59%															
2015/16	**64%**	62%	66%			62%	60%	71%	59%	66%	65%	63%															
2016/17	**69%**	72%	67%			63%	72%	72%	68%	69%	71%	66%															
2017/18	**69%**	73%	67%			69%	68%	72%	61%	71%	71%	70%															
2018/19	**70%**	75%	66%			65%	65%	73%	64%	72%	72%	65%															
2019/20	**71%**	74%	69%			76%	67%	79%	70%	72%	72%	63%	83%	73%	90%	73%	56%	90%	73%	67%	73%	63%	33%	50%	0%	82%	73%
2020/21	**77%**	80%	76%	85%	71%		74%	81%	74%	79%	78%	80%	71%	64%	67%	79%	86%	50%	79%	60%	81%	78%	50%	80%		67%	77%

Welfare benefits and council tax reduction

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**34%**	42%	25%			33%	32%	40%	22%	36%	36%	18%															
2015/16	**12%**	11%	13%			9%	10%	16%	23%	10%	12%	17%															
2016/17	**9%**	11%	8%			4%	10%	17%	22%	8%	9%	12%															
2017/18	**11%**	13%	10%			9%	9%	15%	22%	10%	12%	9%															
2018/19	**15%**	18%	12%			9%	10%	17%	34%	12%	15%	17%															
2019/20	**13%**	14%	12%			19%	11%	22%	25%	11%	13%	8%	29%	5%	40%	12%	26%	70%	13%	0%	17%	25%	0%	0%	0%	35%	10%
2020/21	**34%**	35%	34%	47%	21%		27%	40%	47%	29%	35%	15%	38%	25%	100%	33%	38%	0%	34%	33%	39%	0%	50%	50%		20%	29%

Free car parking

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2019/20	**50%**	50%	50%			55%	49%	55%	47%	51%	52%	31%	66%	49%	50%	51%	41%	70%	51%	33%	51%	25%	67%	67%	0%	47%	52%
2020/21	**63%**	63%	64%	70%	63%		60%	65%	60%	64%	64%	56%	65%	40%	83%	65%	43%	100%	64%	80%	67%	40%	75%	50%		55%	60%

How do you feel about the proposed amount of savings by department?

Children, Adults & Health (£4.4m or 3.4% of department budget)

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	45-64	65+	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
TOO LITTLE	13%	16%	11%	15%	13%	12%	15%	23%	12%	13%	18%	25%	18%	0%	13%	29%	0%	14%	0%	14%	11%	25%	20%	0%	8%	14%
About right	32%	30%	34%	26%	16%	29%	37%	26%	32%	30%	44%	42%	45%	50%	32%	48%	0%	32%	20%	36%	33%	25%	60%		31%	26%
TOO MUCH	37%	36%	38%	43%	51%	44%	30%	35%	38%	38%	26%	21%	27%	50%	38%	10%	50%	37%	40%	32%	22%	25%	20%	0%	54%	44%
Don't know	15%	15%	14%	11%	18%	14%	15%	12%	15%	15%	10%	21%	9%	0%	14%	19%	50%	14%	40%	14%	22%	25%	0%		8%	14%

Environment & Community Services (£3.1m or 7.4% of department budget)

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	45-64	65+	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
TOO LITTLE	11%	12%	11%	17%	8%	13%	10%	13%	11%	12%	3%	13%	18%	0%	11%	19%	0%	11%	0%	13%	11%	25%	20%	0%	15%	9%
About right	40%	41%	39%	24%	31%	35%	47%	43%	39%	38%	51%	38%	27%	50%	41%	52%	0%	40%	20%	43%	56%	0%	20%		38%	36%
TOO MUCH	32%	30%	33%	41%	39%	37%	24%	27%	33%	31%	32%	25%	55%	50%	31%	14%	50%	32%	40%	27%	0%	50%	60%	0%	38%	39%
Don't know	14%	14%	14%	11%	18%	13%	15%	12%	15%	15%	10%	25%	9%	0%	14%	19%	50%	14%	40%	14%	22%	25%	0%		8%	14%

Chief Executive & Corporate Resources and Central Items (£0.2m or 1.2% of department budget)

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	45-64	65+	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
TOO LITTLE	**40%**	39%	41%	54%	55%	45%	32%	29%	43%	40%	34%	42%	55%	33%	39%	33%	50%	39%	40%	35%	33%	50%	60%	0%	38%	44%
About right	**28%**	28%	27%	17%	17%	26%	32%	29%	27%	27%	31%	13%	36%	67%	30%	33%	0%	29%	0%	32%	11%	25%	20%		31%	26%
TOO MUCH	**13%**	13%	13%	7%	9%	11%	15%	23%	11%	12%	18%	25%	9%	0%	12%	10%	0%	13%	20%	14%	22%	0%	20%	0%	23%	12%
Don't know	**17%**	16%	16%	15%	17%	15%	17%	16%	16%	17%	15%	21%	9%	0%	15%	33%	50%	16%	40%	16%	22%	25%	0%		8%	16%

The next 5 – 10 years

In the next 5 - 10 years, the council will continue to find ways to make services more affordable to run. How strongly do you agree or disagree with using the following approaches?

Targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**51%**	54%	48%			54%	54%	47%	50%	51%	52%	59%															
2015/16	**67%**	65%	68%			65%	67%	66%	69%	67%	68%	55%															
2016/17	**68%**	70%	65%			70%	68%	61%	61%	70%	69%	64%															
2017/18	**64%**	68%	61%			60%	68%	63%	65%	64%	65%	58%															
2018/19	**69%**	70%	67%			61%	64%	72%	73%	68%	70%	50%															
2019/20	**68%**	68%	68%			75%	67%	66%	68%	68%	69%	57%	71%	57%	40%	70%	48%	70%	69%	67%	66%	100%	67%	50%	100%	71%	72%
2020/21	**68%**	66%	69%	72%	69%		69%	66%	67%	68%	68%	57%	71%	73%	50%	68%	67%	50%	67%	60%	67%	56%	100%	40%		46%	69%

Support for reducing the quality of services provided

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	25%	19%	29%			17%	25%	24%	19%	23%	22%	37%															
2015/16	20%	21%	18%			19%	20%	20%	20%	20%	19%	23%															
2016/17	23%	20%	26%			24%	23%	21%	15%	24%	23%	28%															
2017/18	20%	16%	23%			17%	21%	19%	16%	20%	20%	18%															
2018/19	23%	25%	23%			25%	24%	23%	24%	24%	24%	21%															
2019/20	16%	12%	21%			16%	18%	15%	20%	16%	17%	12%	20%	41%	10%	16%	22%	80%	16%	33%	15%	25%	0%	67%	0%	12%	18%
2020/21	15%	16%	13%	9%	13%		17%	13%	14%	15%	14%	10%	21%	36%	0%	15%	14%	0%	15%	0%	15%	11%	25%	0%		0%	16%

Support for increasing fees and charges for some services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	40%	37%	44%			30%	44%	39%	35%	42%	41%	29%															
2015/16	41%	43%	39%			38%	44%	40%	37%	42%	41%	39%															
2016/17	46%	45%	47%			44%	48%	41%	38%	47%	47%	42%															
2017/18	43%	39%	48%			36%	46%	44%	37%	44%	44%	34%															
2018/19	46%	45%	48%			43%	46%	47%	47%	47%	48%	33%															
2019/20	43%	41%	47%			45%	45%	40%	36%	45%	43%	62%	40%	62%	30%	44%	33%	80%	43%	33%	40%	50%	33%	67%	0%	41%	48%
2020/21	45%	44%	47%	52%	49%		48%	41%	37%	47%	45%	37%	46%	55%	17%	46%	48%	0%	45%	0%	44%	44%	75%	0%		46%	50%

Support for making more services available online

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	61%	60%	64%			89%	69%	37%	41%	63%	61%	74%															
2015/16	62%	63%	62%			80%	67%	44%	51%	64%	62%	61%															
2016/17	64%	62%	68%			85%	57%	45%	46%	67%	66%	62%															
2017/18	56%	53%	60%			81%	66%	42%	42%	58%	55%	64%															
2018/19	56%	54%	60%			86%	67%	47%	41%	60%	57%	56%															
2019/20	68%	69%	70%			98%	65%	46%	55%	72%	69%	77%	86%	76%	70%	70%	52%	90%	69%	67%	59%	100%	33%	100%	0%	65%	80%
2020/21	60%	58%	63%	89%	88%		67%	46%	46%	64%	60%	62%	71%	73%	83%	61%	48%	100%	61%	20%	56%	67%	50%	60%		62%	70%

Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2017/18	58%	55%	63%			80%	68%	46%	43%	61%	58%	64%															
2018/19	57%	54%	62%			87%	64%	49%	44%	61%	57%	60%															
2019/20	70%	68%	73%			97%	67%	50%	59%	72%	70%	83%	86%	78%	80%	71%	56%	90%	70%	67%	60%	100%	33%	83%	0%	53%	81%
2020/21	62%	59%	66%	83%	88%		69%	50%	49%	66%	62%	63%	67%	73%	67%	64%	43%	100%	62%	20%	57%	67%	50%	80%		77%	72%

Making more efficient use of council assets such as land and buildings

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**84%**	82%	86%			91%	86%	75%	85%	84%	84%	82%															
2015/16	**86%**	86%	86%			89%	87%	82%	81%	87%	86%	81%															
2016/17	**86%**	85%	87%			89%	88%	77%	77%	88%	87%	77%															
2017/18	**85%**	86%	86%			87%	90%	82%	80%	86%	86%	91%															
2018/19	**87%**	86%	89%			91%	92%	85%	86%	88%	88%	79%															
2019/20	**87%**	86%	88%			100%	85%	86%	83%	87%	87%	90%	94%	100%	60%	88%	63%	90%	88%	67%	86%	100%	67%	100%	100%	76%	89%
2020/21	**87%**	86%	89%	96%	93%		88%	85%	85%	88%	87%	85%	96%	91%	83%	89%	81%	50%	88%	80%	88%	89%	75%	100%		54%	88%

Support for scaling back or stopping some services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**30%**	21%	39%			20%	32%	29%	26%	30%	29%	44%															
2015/16	**27%**	31%	23%			29%	28%	23%	22%	27%	27%	19%															
2016/17	**28%**	24%	33%			31%	29%	21%	22%	29%	28%	28%															
2017/18	**25%**	21%	29%			22%	28%	23%	19%	26%	25%	25%															
2018/19	**24%**	22%	27%			30%	23%	24%	22%	25%	25%	19%															
2019/20	**19%**	14%	23%			17%	21%	17%	13%	19%	19%	14%	37%	46%	0%	18%	15%	80%	18%	0%	20%	13%	0%	67%	0%	12%	18%
2020/21	**17%**	15%	19%	6%	9%		19%	17%	13%	18%	16%	16%	13%	18%	0%	17%	10%	0%	17%	0%	16%	0%	0%	40%		8%	18%

Stopping provision of some discretionary services to protect services to older people and the vulnerable

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	21%	18%	23%			18%	22%	18%	20%	19%	20%	15%															
2015/16	37%	39%	35%			34%	39%	37%	41%	36%	37%	26%															
2016/17	36%	31%	40%			33%	38%	36%	31%	37%	36%	34%															
2017/18	38%	37%	40%			36%	40%	38%	35%	38%	39%	38%															
2018/19	40%	38%	42%			32%	32%	44%	43%	40%	41%	25%															
2019/20	38%	34%	43%			35%	39%	44%	40%	38%	39%	26%	43%	30%	50%	40%	33%	80%	39%	33%	38%	25%	100%	33%	100%	47%	40%
2020/21	36%	36%	37%	24%	22%		35%	41%	32%	38%	36%	34%	42%	9%	17%	37%	43%	0%	37%	0%	37%	56%	50%	20%		31%	36%

Changing working practices to make better use of technology and more efficient ways of working

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2015/16	86%	87%	84%			85%	88%	84%	85%	86%	86%	97%															
2016/17	85%	84%	86%			91%	85%	73%	72%	88%	87%	70%															
2017/18	80%	77%	82%			86%	84%	75%	66%	82%	80%	92%															
2018/19	79%	77%	82%			90%	77%	77%	64%	81%	79%	73%															
2019/20	84%	83%	86%			100%	82%	78%	75%	86%	84%	89%	97%	78%	70%	86%	63%	90%	85%	67%	81%	88%	100%	100%	0%	94%	88%
2020/21	82%	80%	83%	91%	91%		83%	79%	74%	85%	82%	84%	79%	82%	67%	84%	67%	100%	83%	60%	81%	89%	75%	60%		62%	87%

Working in partnership and sharing services with other councils and public sector agencies

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2015/16	**82%**	83%	82%			83%	84%	81%	82%	83%	83%	77%															
2016/17	**82%**	81%	83%			84%	84%	69%	66%	84%	84%	72%															
2017/18	**79%**	77%	80%			84%	79%	77%	69%	80%	79%	84%															
2018/19	**80%**	79%	82%			85%	80%	79%	70%	82%	80%	71%															
2019/20	**79%**	80%	79%			93%	77%	77%	77%	80%	80%	64%	89%	78%	60%	82%	67%	90%	80%	33%	78%	88%	67%	100%	0%	82%	83%
2020/21	**81%**	79%	84%	87%	81%		81%	81%	76%	83%	81%	85%	88%	91%	50%	82%	81%	100%	81%	80%	81%	89%	75%	40%		62%	83%

Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**28%**	26%	32%			23%	30%	27%	26%	28%	29%	30%															
2015/16	**27%**	28%	25%			27%	28%	24%	21%	27%	27%	26%															
2016/17	**27%**	22%	32%			28%	28%	21%	23%	28%	28%	22%															
2017/18	**25%**	22%	29%			24%	26%	25%	20%	26%	25%	22%															
2018/19	**22%**	20%	24%			20%	22%	22%	16%	23%	22%	27%															
2019/20	**21%**	19%	23%			25%	22%	17%	17%	22%	21%	23%	34%	22%	10%	20%	19%	80%	20%	0%	19%	13%	0%	67%	0%	35%	21%
2020/21	**19%**	17%	22%	9%	21%		20%	19%	16%	20%	19%	22%	29%	9%	0%	19%	33%	0%	19%	0%	21%	22%	25%	0%		23%	17%

Transferring services to community groups, social enterprises and town and parish councils

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**46%**	49%	45%			54%	49%	43%	52%	47%	47%	49%															
2015/16	**51%**	52%	51%			50%	52%	51%	51%	52%	51%	58%															
2016/17	**49%**	50%	49%			56%	47%	44%	39%	51%	51%	37%															
2017/18	**46%**	44%	50%			48%	46%	47%	40%	48%	48%	40%															
2018/19	**46%**	46%	47%			55%	42%	46%	43%	47%	46%	48%															
2019/20	**45%**	44%	47%			52%	45%	40%	49%	45%	45%	54%	49%	51%	30%	47%	44%	80%	46%	33%	46%	50%	33%	83%	0%	71%	46%
2020/21	**43%**	42%	44%	54%	36%		43%	43%	41%	44%	44%	44%	67%	36%	0%	44%	62%	50%	44%	40%	44%	67%	25%	40%		54%	43%

Encouraging more people to volunteer their time to become involved in the delivery of services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**54%**	56%	54%			60%	53%	58%	50%	55%	57%	52%															
2015/16	**56%**	55%	57%			51%	51%	65%	60%	55%	56%	55%															
2016/17	**53%**	52%	54%			48%	55%	57%	49%	53%	55%	45%															
2017/18	**54%**	54%	55%			52%	49%	60%	49%	55%	55%	49%															
2018/19	**56%**	57%	57%			57%	49%	59%	60%	57%	57%	44%															
2019/20	**53%**	54%	52%			58%	48%	57%	50%	54%	53%	63%	51%	54%	80%	54%	59%	80%	53%	33%	55%	88%	33%	83%	100%	59%	51%
2020/21	**54%**	55%	53%	52%	45%		50%	58%	48%	55%	53%	62%	63%	55%	83%	55%	62%	50%	55%	60%	58%	67%	75%	60%		23%	50%

Which of the following areas would you choose as the three highest priorities for investment in the next 10 years?

	Total (all respondents)	Male	Female	16-34	35-44	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
Employment																										
Highest Priority	**10%**	9%	11%	9%	7%	8%	13%	12%	10%	10%	12%	13%	9%	50%	9%	33%	50%	10%	20%	12%	0%	25%	20%		15%	6%
Second Priority	**8%**	7%	8%	9%	6%	8%	7%	9%	8%	7%	12%	4%	0%	0%	8%	10%	0%	8%	20%	9%	0%	0%	0%		8%	6%
Third Priority	**6%**	6%	6%	2%	3%	5%	8%	8%	6%	6%	6%	4%	9%	0%	6%	10%	0%	7%	0%	6%	11%	0%	0%		0%	7%
Housing																										
Highest Priority	**15%**	14%	15%	9%	7%	13%	18%	19%	13%	15%	10%	4%	27%	17%	14%	33%	50%	14%	0%	16%	0%	25%	20%		8%	13%
Second Priority	**10%**	10%	10%	6%	6%	8%	12%	12%	10%	10%	18%	4%	0%	0%	10%	14%	0%	10%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%		8%	8%
Third Priority	**7%**	7%	7%	9%	5%	7%	7%	9%	6%	7%	4%	4%	0%	17%	7%	0%	0%	7%	40%	8%	11%	0%	0%		15%	6%
Education																										
Highest Priority	**25%**	23%	27%	43%	29%	20%	27%	23%	24%	24%	24%	25%	18%	0%	24%	38%	50%	25%	20%	26%	0%	25%	60%		8%	23%
Second Priority	**12%**	11%	13%	17%	12%	11%	12%	10%	12%	12%	21%	17%	9%	17%	12%	10%	0%	12%	20%	12%	44%	0%	0%		15%	12%
Third Priority	**9%**	8%	10%	9%	12%	10%	8%	12%	8%	9%	9%	8%	9%	0%	9%	5%	0%	9%	0%	9%	11%	25%	0%		23%	7%
Health and wellbeing																										
Highest Priority	**23%**	23%	22%	28%	16%	18%	28%	30%	21%	22%	28%	21%	36%	50%	20%	76%	50%	22%	20%	24%	44%	0%	20%		23%	17%
Second Priority	**12%**	13%	12%	11%	5%	12%	14%	10%	12%	0%	0%	13%	0%	17%	13%	5%	0%	12%	40%	13%	0%	25%	20%		23%	10%
Third Priority	**6%**	5%	7%	2%	7%	6%	6%	6%	7%	6%	3%	8%	0%	33%	7%	5%	0%	7%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%		0%	8%
Maintaining safe, strong and clean communities																										
Highest Priority	**16%**	17%	16%	7%	14%	14%	18%	16%	16%	15%	31%	4%	9%	0%	16%	38%	50%	17%	0%	19%	33%	0%	20%		8%	12%
Second Priority	**13%**	11%	14%	7%	11%	12%	14%	10%	13%	13%	7%	8%	18%	33%	13%	19%	0%	12%	20%	12%	0%	25%	40%		15%	14%
Third Priority	**10%**	11%	9%	11%	12%	13%	8%	8%	11%	10%	10%	17%	9%	17%	10%	5%	0%	11%	20%	9%	22%	25%	0%		8%	12%

	Total (all respondents)	Male	Female	16-34	35-44	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
Reducing inequality and deprivation																										
Highest Priority	6%	6%	7%	9%	6%	6%	7%	8%	6%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	6%	19%	0%	7%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%		0%	7%
Second Priority	8%	8%	7%	9%	3%	6%	10%	11%	7%	7%	9%	8%	9%	0%	7%	29%	50%	7%	20%	9%	11%	0%	20%		8%	6%
Third Priority	7%	6%	7%	6%	8%	6%	6%	6%	6%	7%	1%	17%	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	7%	20%	7%	0%	0%	0%		0%	6%
Safeguarding vulnerable children and adults																										
Highest Priority	21%	18%	24%	11%	22%	19%	24%	30%	19%	21%	13%	4%	18%	0%	21%	62%	50%	21%	20%	22%	0%	25%	20%		31%	19%
Second Priority	13%	12%	14%	9%	14%	11%	14%	15%	13%	13%	13%	13%	0%	0%	13%	14%	0%	13%	20%	14%	11%	25%	0%		0%	11%
Third Priority	8%	9%	8%	9%	8%	9%	8%	11%	8%	8%	13%	8%	9%	0%	8%	10%	0%	8%	0%	8%	0%	0%	40%		15%	8%
Meeting assessed social care needs for children and adults																										
Highest Priority	14%	12%	16%	9%	8%	15%	15%	17%	13%	14%	6%	4%	18%	0%	13%	48%	50%	14%	0%	16%	0%	25%	0%		0%	12%
Second Priority	12%	11%	11%	6%	6%	11%	13%	15%	10%	11%	9%	8%	18%	0%	12%	5%	0%	12%	40%	12%	11%	0%	20%		31%	10%
Third Priority	9%	8%	10%	4%	15%	8%	9%	11%	9%	9%	13%	8%	0%	0%	10%	10%	0%	9%	0%	10%	22%	0%	0%		8%	7%
Protecting the environment																										
Highest Priority	15%	13%	16%	19%	14%	15%	15%	13%	15%	15%	13%	21%	27%	0%	14%	38%	50%	15%	20%	14%	11%	0%	20%		23%	15%
Second Priority	13%	13%	14%	7%	14%	13%	14%	13%	14%	14%	10%	8%	18%	17%	12%	19%	0%	13%	20%	13%	0%	0%	0%		15%	14%
Third Priority	12%	12%	11%	24%	10%	8%	14%	10%	12%	0%	0%	8%	18%	17%	12%	0%	0%	12%	20%	13%	0%	0%	20%		8%	12%
Public transport																										
Highest Priority	12%	11%	12%	15%	6%	9%	15%	14%	11%	12%	19%	13%	9%	0%	10%	29%	50%	11%	20%	12%	33%	0%	20%		23%	9%
Second Priority	12%	13%	12%	19%	12%	11%	13%	13%	12%	12%	19%	0%	36%	0%	13%	24%	50%	13%	20%	14%	11%	25%	20%		8%	12%
Third Priority	12%	14%	11%	7%	6%	12%	13%	12%	12%	12%	6%	29%	18%	0%	12%	10%	0%	12%	0%	12%	0%	0%	0%		31%	13%
Developing infrastructure (e.g. roads, rail, broadband)																										
Highest Priority	15%	15%	15%	13%	9%	13%	19%	16%	15%	14%	13%	17%	18%	17%	14%	33%	100%	15%	0%	17%	22%	0%	20%		8%	13%
Second Priority	13%	13%	13%	7%	7%	15%	13%	11%	13%	13%	10%	17%	27%	0%	13%	29%	0%	13%	20%	14%	0%	0%	20%		23%	12%
Third Priority	12%	14%	10%	13%	10%	12%	11%	11%	12%	12%	12%	4%	18%	0%	11%	10%	0%	12%	0%	11%	0%	25%	20%		8%	11%

Council Tax Options for 2020/21

Which of the following options would you prefer?

	Total (all respondents)	Male	Female	16-34	35-44	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
Option A: increase council tax by 3.99%	**27%**	30%	25%	33%	30%	30%	24%	22%	28%	28%	19%	33%	36%	17%	29%	5%	0%	28%	20%	25%	22%	0%	0%	-	31%	33%
Option B: increase council tax by 3.00%	**40%**	37%	43%	31%	37%	37%	43%	38%	40%	40%	37%	38%	27%	50%	41%	43%	0%	41%	40%	42%	0%	50%	60%	-	46%	38%
Option C: freeze council tax at the current level	**28%**	29%	26%	30%	30%	29%	27%	33%	27%	26%	46%	21%	36%	17%	25%	38%	100%	26%	40%	26%	78%	50%	40%	-	15%	25%
No preference	**2%**	2%	3%	0%	0%	2%	3%	4%	2%	2%	0%	8%	0%	0%	2%	14%	0%	2%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	-	0%	1%
Don't know	**2%**	2%	2%	6%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	2%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	-	0%	2%

To what extent would you agree or disagree with a general council tax increase of 1.99% if it was ring-fenced for a specific service, rather than for all services?

	Total (all respondents)	Male	Female	16-34	35-44	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
AGREE	**38%**	39%	37%	20%	37%	37%	41%	40%	37%	38%	34%	33%	36%	17%	40%	52%	50%	38%	40%	42%	0%	50%	40%		38%	35%
Neither agree nor disagree	**32%**	29%	34%	41%	34%	33%	30%	27%	32%	31%	32%	63%	27%	50%	31%	29%	0%	32%	60%	31%	22%	0%	0%		31%	33%
DISAGREE	**29%**	30%	28%	41%	27%	30%	28%	32%	28%	29%	31%	8%	45%	17%	28%	24%	50%	28%	0%	26%	67%	50%	60%		23%	31%

The government currently sets limits to the annual increases in both general council tax and the adult social care precept. Should government relax the current annual council tax increase thresholds, to what extent would you support or oppose a council tax rise greater than 3.99%?

	Total (all respondents)	Male	Female	16-34	35-44	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
Support	**18%**	21%	16%	28%	18%	19%	18%	18%	19%	19%	15%	17%	9%	17%	20%	5%	0%	19%	0%	18%	22%	0%	0%		31%	21%
Neither support nor oppose	**15%**	13%	17%	11%	16%	15%	16%	15%	15%	15%	15%	33%	36%	33%	15%	10%	0%	16%	20%	16%	0%	25%	20%		23%	15%
OPPOSE	**64%**	64%	65%	61%	64%	65%	64%	66%	65%	64%	71%	54%	55%	50%	64%	76%	100%	64%	80%	64%	67%	50%	80%		46%	64%

Which option do you most strongly support?

	Total (all respondents)	Male	Female	16-34	35-44	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
Disregard any amount received from a government compensation scheme	22%	19%	24%	26%	31%	24%	18%	25%	22%	22%	21%	8%	9%	17%	23%	0%	0%	22%	40%	20%	0%	0%	0%		31%	27%
Keep the current scheme and take into account all compensation payments as capital	26%	28%	25%	13%	19%	30%	26%	30%	26%	25%	37%	29%	27%	17%	25%	57%	50%	26%	0%	27%	33%	0%	60%		23%	24%
No preference	20%	23%	19%	19%	12%	19%	23%	18%	21%	21%	16%	13%	27%	50%	21%	5%	50%	21%	20%	23%	44%	25%	0%		15%	18%
Don't know	26%	25%	28%	41%	35%	23%	27%	22%	27%	27%	18%	42%	45%	17%	25%	33%	0%	26%	20%	25%	11%	25%	0%		31%	29%

Which option do you most strongly support for customers in receipt of Universal Credit?

	Total (all respondents)	Male	Female	16-34	35-44	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
Do not include Universal Credit as an income when assessing someone's LCTR entitlement	**32%**	29%	36%	39%	38%	38%	26%	37%	32%	32%	32%	29%	45%	33%	33%	10%	0%	33%	40%	31%	56%	0%	60%		31%	34%
Keep the current scheme and take into account all of the Universal Credit as an income	**33%**	35%	32%	26%	31%	34%	34%	30%	34%	33%	25%	21%	27%	50%	33%	43%	100%	33%	20%	35%	11%	0%	20%		23%	32%
No preference	**13%**	14%	11%	7%	11%	10%	15%	11%	13%	12%	19%	17%	0%	17%	13%	19%	0%	13%	0%	12%	22%	25%	20%		8%	14%
Don't know	**18%**	17%	19%	22%	18%	17%	20%	17%	19%	19%	21%	25%	27%	0%	18%	14%	0%	18%	20%	19%	0%	25%	0%		23%	18%

Over the past 2 years, do you feel that South Gloucestershire has become a better place to live, is the same or is worse?

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
better 2015/16	61%	56%	65%			61%	60%	60%	49%	62%	61%	52%															
better 2016/17	11%	9%	12%			9%	12%	11%	9%	11%	11%	16%															
better 2017/18	9%	9%	9%			10%	7%	10%	9%	9%	9%	10%															
better 2018/19	8%	8%	8%			7%	7%	8%	11%	7%	8%	10%															
better 2019/20	8%	8%	9%			11%	7%	7%	4%	9%	9%	8%	29%	24%	30%	9%	7%	70%	9%	0%	7%	13%	0%	17%	0%	18%	11%
better 2020/21	7%	7%	6%	6%	7%		6%	7%	7%	6%	6%	10%	8%	18%	17%	7%	14%	0%	7%	0%	8%	22%	25%	0%		8%	6%
worse 2015/16	25%	27%	22%			21%	29%	23%	24%	26%	27%	24%															
worse 2016/17	23%	18%	27%			22%	24%	22%	29%	22%	22%	14%															
worse 2017/18	27%	25%	28%			24%	33%	23%	26%	27%	26%	31%															
worse 2018/19	26%	24%	28%			19%	30%	26%	21%	26%	25%	17%															
worse 2019/20	29%	29%	29%			35%	35%	25%	32%	29%	29%	25%	14%	14%	40%	28%	44%	30%	28%	0%	26%	38%	67%	67%	0%	29%	28%
worse 2020/21	30%	31%	28%	17%	28%		34%	27%	33%	29%	30%	16%	25%	0%	0%	28%	29%	50%	28%	40%	27%	0%	50%	40%		15%	30%

Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your local area as a place to live?

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**81%**	80%	82%			80%	82%	80%	82%	81%	82%	74%															
2015/16	**63%**	69%	60%			66%	65%	63%	50%	65%	65%	60%															
2016/17	**81%**	84%	81%			83%	81%	81%	71%	83%	84%	78%															
2017/18	**81%**	84%	78%			83%	81%	81%	79%	82%	82%	74%															
2018/19	**81%**	85%	79%			83%	74%	84%	84%	82%	83%	77%															
2019/20	**81%**	83%	80%			87%	79%	84%	81%	82%	83%	68%	71%	92%	90%	84%	74%	90%	83%	67%	85%	63%	67%	33%	100%	76%	82%
2020/21	**79%**	80%	78%	67%	82%		78%	80%	80%	79%	80%	62%	58%	100%	100%	81%	90%	50%	80%	60%	83%	56%	25%	40%		85%	77%

Satisfaction with the way the council runs things

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	*60%*	57%	63%			60%	55%	66%	62%	60%	61%	48%															
2015/16	*47%*	50%	46%			47%	46%	51%	35%	49%	49%	37%															
2016/17	*62%*	68%	58%			59%	64%	64%	56%	63%	64%	66%															
2017/18	*60%*	65%	56%			56%	55%	67%	57%	61%	62%	55%															
2018/19	*58%*	61%	54%			50%	57%	60%	57%	58%	60%	44%															
2019/20	*61%*	63%	60%			60%	59%	68%	56%	62%	62%	60%	80%	57%	70%	64%	59%	80%	63%	33%	67%	63%	0%	33%	100%	65%	60%
2020/21	*65%*	68%	62%	63%	59%		63%	69%	61%	66%	66%	57%	63%	82%	67%	68%	71%	50%	67%	20%	70%	44%	25%	40%		46%	67%

Agreement that the council provides value for money

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	**45%**	43%	47%			44%	41%	51%	47%	45%	46%	39%															
2015/16	**54%**	54%	54%			59%	54%	54%	33%	56%	55%	44%															
2016/17	**49%**	54%	47%			47%	52%	48%	48%	50%	52%	52%															
2017/18	**47%**	50%	45%			40%	42%	54%	46%	48%	49%	40%															
2018/19	**43%**	46%	41%			33%	37%	48%	46%	44%	45%	40%															
2019/20	**41%**	42%	40%			41%	40%	46%	35%	43%	41%	37%	71%	32%	50%	43%	37%	80%	43%	0%	48%	13%	33%	33%	0%	59%	37%
2020/21	**46%**	49%	43%	33%	42%		40%	54%	46%	46%	47%	37%	58%	45%	50%	49%	67%	0%	48%	40%	53%	33%	25%	40%		38%	43%

Agreement that the council keeps me informed about services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	*53%*	55%	52%			45%	53%	59%	57%	53%	55%	55%															
2015/16	*45%*	46%	43%			38%	43%	51%	44%	45%	45%	42%															
2016/17	*48%*	49%	49%			45%	52%	42%	41%	50%	48%	59%															
2017/18	*43%*	43%	44%			35%	43%	48%	39%	44%	45%	35%															
2018/19	*43%*	43%	44%			38%	39%	46%	37%	44%	44%	44%															
2019/20	41%	38%	45%			40%	44%	43%	45%	42%	42%	54%	49%	30%	30%	43%	37%	80%	42%	33%	43%	25%	33%	33%	100%	76%	41%
2020/21	47%	47%	47%	52%	38%		50%	45%	40%	48%	47%	44%	50%	64%	0%	49%	52%	50%	49%	20%	48%	33%	25%	60%		31%	50%

Agreement that the council keeps me informed about proposals for change

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2015/16	46%	47%	47%			47%	46%	46%	22%	49%	45%	52%															
2016/17	43%	43%	45%			39%	45%	44%	43%	44%	44%	52%															
2017/18	41%	40%	42%			41%	39%	43%	36%	42%	41%	38%															
2018/19	41%	43%	39%			39%	38%	43%	33%	42%	42%	40%															
2019/20	42%	42%	44%			43%	44%	44%	41%	44%	43%	51%	66%	32%	60%	44%	41%	90%	44%	33%	44%	25%	67%	67%	100%	59%	44%
2020/21	47%	47%	47%	57%	44%		47%	46%	41%	48%	47%	43%	54%	73%	0%	50%	57%	50%	49%	40%	50%	33%	25%	40%		31%	49%

Ability to influence decisions in the local area

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	18%	17%	19%			17%	15%	21%	22%	17%	19%	6%															
2015/16	52%	48%	57%			54%	56%	45%	41%	54%	53%	52%															
2016/17	21%	23%	20%			21%	21%	21%	22%	21%	21%	28%															
2017/18	17%	19%	16%			12%	18%	19%	17%	17%	19%	13%															
2018/19	21%	23%	19%			22%	20%	21%	21%	21%	21%	27%															
2019/20	18%	18%	19%			23%	17%	16%	16%	19%	18%	37%	49%	3%	20%	18%	26%	70%	19%	0%	19%	0%	0%	33%	100%	41%	19%
2020/21	17%	18%	16%	30%	21%		17%	16%	14%	18%	17%	15%	25%	27%	0%	18%	14%	0%	18%	20%	18%	11%	25%	0%		15%	20%

Agreement that the council acts on the concerns of residents

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	38%	37%	38%			36%	31%	45%	38%	38%	38%	42%															
2015/16	18%	22%	17%			26%	18%	17%	19%	19%	18%	26%															
2016/17	39%	43%	38%			34%	42%	44%	46%	39%	41%	40%															
2017/18	37%	39%	35%			36%	31%	42%	36%	37%	39%	30%															
2018/19	5%	5%	4%			4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	37%															
2019/20	33%	31%	35%			31%	30%	42%	29%	34%	33%	40%	57%	43%	50%	34%	41%	70%	34%	33%	37%	13%	0%	17%	0%	65%	29%
2020/21	39%	40%	38%	35%	32%		33%	46%	37%	38%	38%	35%	46%	36%	0%	42%	57%	50%	41%	60%	45%	44%	50%	40%	0%	38%	35%

APPENDIX 2 - NATIONAL INFORMATION

The following information shows important findings in relation to national research conducted in respect of equalities and inequalities. The information is shown in order to highlight issues on a national level which are pertinent to the residents of South Gloucestershire.

For ease of reading, the following hyperlinks are included to allow readers of this document to skip directly to information which may be of particular interest:

How Fair is Britain?

In 2010, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) produced its first progress report on equality, entitled **"How Fair is Britain?"** In October 2015, the EHRC published its follow-up report on both equality and human rights, entitled **"Is Britain Fairer?"** The latest EHRC report, published in 2019, entitled **"How Fair is Britain? (2018)"** is available here.	
Note:	**A brief overview of findings is shown on pages 50-56 of this EqIAA.**

Race Disparity Audit

The Government's **"Race Disparity Audit"** report was published in October 2017. An overview of findings is shown under the following headings:-	
Hyperlinks:	• **Full Report** • **Communities** • **Poverty and Living Standards** • **Education** • **Employment** • **Housing** • **Policing** • **Criminal Justice** • **Health** • **The Public Sector Workforce**

The Casey Review

"The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration" set out to look at: how well we get on with each other; how well we all do compared to each other. An overview of findings is shown under the following headings:-	
Hyperlinks:	• **Full Report** • **Social and Economic Exclusion** • **Equality and Division** • **Leadership** • **Recommendations**

HOW FAIR IS BRITAIN 2018 – OVERVIEW OF KEY FINDINGS

EDUCATION

Attainment at school-leaving age has improved for some groups in recent years. However, inequalities persist:
  – On average, boys continue to do worse than girls at school.
  – Children with educational support needs, poorer children and Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children continue to achieve below-average school exam results.
  – Gender differences in career aspirations emerge at an early age.
  – Boys aged 7–11 are 20 times more likely than girls to aspire to be an engineer or architect.

The overall exclusion rate is on the rise in England and Wales. There are major differences in the exclusion rate of different groups:
  – Boys are more likely than girls to be excluded from school.
  – Children with educational support needs, children from disadvantaged backgrounds and Gypsy and Traveller children have high exclusion rates.
  – White children tend to have comparatively high exclusion rates compared with other ethnicities across Britain. But in England, Black and Mixed ethnicity children are more likely to be excluded than their White British peers.

Half of all children report that they are bullied. Certain groups are at greater risk than others:
  – Girls are more likely than boys to be bullied; more than a third of young women experience sexist comments online.
  – Bullying of lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LGBT) children is highly prevalent and has been linked with mental health conditions and higher risk of suicide.

The overall proportion of young people who are not in education, employment or training (NEET) has declined:
  – Disabled people are around twice as likely as non-disabled people to be NEET.

The proportion of people holding degree-level qualifications increased between 2013/14 and 2016/17. Some groups are more likely to go to university, and succeed there, than others:
  – Women are more likely than men to pursue higher education. However, women continue to be under-represented in most science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM) courses.
  – Women perform better than men in higher education, on average.
  – In terms of access to higher education, the gap between disadvantaged white men and the average is particularly large.
  – Overall, the proportion of higher education students from poor backgrounds is increasing, but remains small.
  – White British people are less likely to have a degree than those from ethnic minorities.
  – However, white students are much more likely to receive a first or 2:1 than ethnic minority students.

Disabled people continue to be less likely to hold a degree than non-disabled people and are more likely to drop out; they are also less likely to engage in ongoing, lifelong learning.

WORK

Overall employment has risen and unemployment fallen, while the rate of insecure employment has risen both overall and for many groups.

Young people, disabled people, Pakistani and Bangladeshi people, and Muslims have consistently lower employment and higher unemployment rates and are more likely to be in insecure employment than other groups.
  – Differences in employment and unemployment rates for some groups have narrowed.
  – Disabled people's employment rate is well below that of non-disabled people and they are more likely to be unemployed, in insecure employment, or economically inactive than non-disabled people.
  – Employment rates vary considerably by type of impairment; the lowest rates are for those with learning difficulties, a speech condition or mental health conditions.
  – Pakistani and Bangladeshi people have both particularly low employment rates and high unemployment rates, although their unemployment rates have fallen. They are also more likely than many other ethnic groups to be in insecure employment. The unemployment rates for the Mixed/Multiple and Black groups have fallen, but remain high.
  – Among religion or belief groups, Muslims have the lowest rate of employment and the highest rate of unemployment and insecure employment.
  – People aged 16–24 have much higher unemployment rates than those in all age groups up to the age 65–74.

Bullying and sexual harassment remain widespread in the workplace, although a lack of recent large-scale Britain-wide surveys means that it is difficult to quantify their precise extent. There is some evidence that women, particularly young women, ethnic minorities, LGB and transgender people are at greater risk than other groups.

Three-quarters of mothers have had a negative or possibly discriminatory experience during pregnancy, maternity leave or on their return to work from maternity leave.

There continues to be a pay gap between groups who share protected characteristics. The gender pay gap in hourly earnings for full-time employees in Britain has narrowed. It is consistently wider in England than in Scotland or Wales.
  – Disabled people have lower average hourly earnings than non-disabled people and the size of the pay gap varies according to the type of impairment.
  – The size of the gender pay gap for full-time employees varies considerably between occupations and is particularly wide for those in skilled trades and for process, plant and machine operatives. It also varies considerably between industries and is particularly wide in the finance sector.

There has been a small increase in the proportion of people in high-pay occupations.
  – However, against this overall change there was an increase in the proportions of disabled people in low-pay occupations. Disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be in low-pay occupations.
  – Women are much more likely to be in low-pay occupations than men, however the proportion of women in high-pay occupations has risen.

Although women's share of company board positions has increased considerably in recent years, they remain under-represented on them and are still much more likely to be non-executive directors than executive directors.

Apprenticeships remain strongly segregated by sex and women are still under-represented in the construction and engineering sectors.

LIVING STANDARDS

Homelessness continues to be a serious concern across all nations. Evidence links this to recent UK-wide reforms to social security, as well as a lack of affordable housing and reductions in local authority budgets to tackle homelessness. Recent legislative and policy measures to address homelessness are welcome but it is too early to evaluate their impact.

- Homelessness disproportionately affects ethnic minorities, lone parents, young care leavers, young offenders, LGBT young people, transgender people, people with mental health conditions, women at risk of domestic abuse, ex-services personnel, and those living in material deprivation.

In England, people from ethnic minorities are still much more likely to live in overcrowded accommodation compared with White people. Across Britain, disabled people face a shortage of accessible and adaptable homes and long delays in making existing homes accessible.

Refugees and asylum seekers continue to be affected by poor housing. A more hostile housing policy environment towards Gypsies and Travellers in England has been linked to an increase in unauthorised encampments.

Child poverty has increased. Three in 10 children live in households in poverty, rising to over half of children in Bangladeshi, Black African, Pakistani and Other ethnicity households.

There has been little change overall in the proportion of adults living in poverty and the overall proportion in severe material deprivation has reduced.

Disabled people, women, and many ethnic minorities are more likely to live in poverty or to experience severe material deprivation.

- Food poverty continues to increase across Britain. Fuel poverty has remained stable in England but reduced in Scotland and is estimated to have reduced in Wales.
- UK-wide reforms to social security and taxes since 2010 are having a disproportionately negative impact on the poorest in society and are particularly affecting women, disabled people, ethnic minorities and lone parents.
- Benefit sanctions are applied inconsistently and may disproportionately impact disabled people, younger people, men and ethnic minorities.
- The proportion of social care service users reporting that they were treated with dignity and respect increased in England but declined slightly in Scotland. Older people and those with physical disabilities, frailty and sensory impairments were less likely to report this in England. In Scotland, older people, people with all impairment types, bisexual people and those of 'Other' sexual orientation were less likely to report this.
- Reductions to social care funding in England have led to concerns about their effect on the availability and quality of care provided, and the impact on people's ability to live independently. Scottish and Welsh Governments have protected social care funding although the amount available has reduced in real terms due to rising need for services and no research has yet assessed the potential impact on the quality of care provided.

HEALTH

Access to healthcare

Across Britain, patients are unable to access the quality service and treatment they need in line with referral and waiting time targets set by respective governments:
– Waiting times have increased in all three countries since 2014. In March 2017, nearly one in 10 people (9.7%) in England who were waiting for treatment had waited for more than 18 weeks. In Scotland one in six people (16.8%) who received treatment had waited for more than 18 weeks since referral. In Wales, nearly one in eight people (12.0%) were waiting for health services for more than 26 weeks since referral.
– People with learning disabilities and disabled people more broadly, homeless people, refugees and asylum seekers and Gypsies, Roma and Travellers continue to experience the most significant barriers to accessing healthcare services.
– Transgender people experience considerable barriers to accessing specialist services in England and Wales, and face poor treatment and discrimination when accessing general health services.
– Workforce shortages across the health and social care sector in Britain have had an impact on the quality of and timely access to health services.
– Rules governing eligibility to NHS healthcare in England are inconsistently and incorrectly applied by healthcare providers resulting in refugees and asylum seekers being wrongly refused access to healthcare.

Health outcomes

In 2015, 75.8% of adults in England, 80.6% of adults in Wales and 73.0% of adults in Scotland (in 2016) reported good health:
– Men report slightly higher rates than women and, overall, disabled people report much lower rates of good health.

Some groups experience worse physical and mental health outcomes than the rest of the population, particularly homeless people, transgender people, Gypsies, Roma and Travellers, refugees and asylum seekers and people with learning disabilities. These are linked with poorer socio-economic outcomes for these groups, which exacerbate poor health.

As more people are living to older age, many of those extra years are being spent in poor health (particularly by women), posing a greater demand on existing health and social care services.

On average, the life expectancy of women and men with a learning disability is 18 years and 14 years shorter than for non-disabled women and men, respectively.

In 2016, infant mortality increased following decades of decreases:
– In England and Wales, Pakistani and Black African groups had the highest infant mortality rates and the Other White ethnic group had the lowest rate. This pattern has continued since 2009.
– Infant mortality rates were higher in the most deprived areas compared with the least deprived areas in both England and Wales and increased risk of infant mortality is associated with higher levels of maternal deprivation.

In 2016, men were more likely to die by suicide than women: in Britain and England, three times more likely; in Wales over four times more likely; and in Scotland over two-and-a-half times more likely.

In 2016, the suicide rate for those aged 45–54 was almost double that for those aged 15–24 in Britain. This pattern was repeated across England and Scotland.

Mental health

The lack of ring-fenced funding for mental health in England, Wales and Scotland risks money being diverted away from mental health to fund other services.

Overall, more adults in Wales report poor mental health than in England and Scotland:
– Lesbian, gay and bisexual people, and those reporting other sexual orientations were almost twice as likely (27.2%) as heterosexual people (14.3%) to report poor mental health in England.
– 45% of all looked after children in England have a diagnosable mental health condition (compared with 10% of all children).

Access to specialist perinatal mental health services is extremely poor; 40% of people in the UK have no access at all. This is worse in Wales where 70% of people have no access.

Despite numerous programmes to help children and young people with mental health needs, learning disabilities and/or autism in England, this has not yet resulted in improved access or outcomes for children and young people in need of mental health services.

In 2016/17, known rates of Mental Health Act 1983 detention in the Black or Black British group were over four times that of the White group, and rates of Community Treatment Order use were almost nine times those of the White group.

The use of restrictive interventions on mental health service users is also over three times higher for Black or Black British groups compared with White British.

JUSTICE AND PERSONAL SECURITY

Civil and criminal justice

Overall confidence in the justice systems of Britain remains high, but there is evidence of lower levels of confidence among some groups:
- Just 43% of disabled adults in England and Wales reported that the criminal justice system is effective, compared with an average of 53%.
- Only 54% of Black Caribbean adults in England and Wales reported that the criminal justice system is fair, compared with an average of 68%.

Employment tribunal claims have increased substantially across Britain since the abolition of employment tribunal fees in July 2017, but are still below the levels seen before the fees were introduced.

The volume of legal aid applications granted in England and Wales continues to fall, with evidence suggesting this has had a negative impact on people's access to affordable advice and access to justice generally.

Violence and abuse

Increases in police recorded hate crime have been observed across all monitored hate crime strands in England and Wales, particularly for disability hate crimes. There has been a decrease in the number of racially aggravated charges recorded in Scotland.

Homicide rates in England have reached their highest level since 2010/11, but remain low by historic standards.

There has been a sharp increase in the number of sexual offences and domestic abuse related offences reported to, and recorded by, the police in England and Wales, including non-recent sexual offences against children.

Those most at risk of sexual or domestic violence are women, LGB people and disabled people, particularly those with mental health conditions or learning disabilities.

Conditions of detention

Two-thirds of adult prisons are overcrowded in England and Wales, posing potential risks for prisoner safety.

People from ethnic minorities continue to be over-represented in the adult prison population and within the youth secure estate in England and Wales, despite an overall decrease in the number of young people in custody.

The use of police stations as a place of safety for people detained under the Mental Health Act has decreased considerably in England and Wales.

There has been a considerable increase in self-harm and assault incidents in prisons across Britain and an increase in the rate of non-natural deaths among prisoners in England and Wales.

The number of self-harm incidents requiring medical treatment in immigration detention settings almost trebled between 2011 and 2017.

PARTICIPATION

Political and civic participation and representation

There was an increased voter turnout between the 2015 and 2017 General Elections, but younger people and ethnic minorities are still less likely to take part in political activities, to be on the electoral register, or to vote. In Scotland 16 and 17 year olds now have the vote.

Prisoners released on temporary licence will now be permitted to vote in UK elections.

Women remain under-represented among local election candidates and in public appointments, and in England and Wales there remains a lack of disabled and ethnic minority magistrates.

Access to services

Transport services are at risk of becoming less accessible for disabled and older people, because of reductions in bus services and inconsistency of government public transport policy.

Being older, a disabled person, or living in a rural area remain risk factors for digital exclusion, although personal internet use is improving among those groups. In Wales and Scotland, there continue to be areas of digital exclusion in rural areas.

Fewer older people, disabled people, women and those from lower socio-economic groups access cultural and leisure services.

Privacy and surveillance

Internet use in Britain is increasing while the number of people who do not share information online is few and declining, therefore the potential impact from breaches of privacy online is increasing.

There is uncertainty around the extent to which the UK Government's bulk powers of surveillance, particularly regarding the retention of communications data and its use, are compliant with human rights law.

Social and community cohesion

Feelings of trust and belonging to one's local area tend to be lower among ethnic minorities, younger people, those from lower socio-economic backgrounds or who are economically excluded, and for those living in urban areas.

Recent public discourse and policy-making around social cohesion has focused predominantly on the exclusion of ethnic minorities while evidence suggests other groups are also at risk from isolation including young people, LGBT groups, disabled people and older people. However, there is little evidence on what works to foster social and community cohesion.

RACE DISPARITY AUDIT

The Government's "Race Disparity Audit" report was published in October 2017.

Overall, the audit shows that there are disparities between ethnic groups in all areas of life affected by public organisations. Some are more pronounced than others or have a greater impact on people's life chances and quality of life. In some areas, disparities are reducing, while in others, they are static or increasing.

Key findings include:-

Communities

The UK has become more ethnically diverse. The proportion of people identifying as White British in England and Wales decreased from 87.4% in 2001 to 80.5% in 2011.

The majority, 87%, of the usual resident population of England and Wales in 2011 were born in the UK, and 13% (7.5 million) were born outside the UK.

The majority of people in each ethnic group also felt a sense of belonging to their local neighbourhood. This was similar across ethnic groups, and manifested in a range of positive civic behaviours and attitudes. More than three quarters of people from each ethnic group felt that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together: Black people reported the lowest levels and people from an Asian background reported very high levels. However, Black people – together with White people and people in the Other group – were the most likely to participate in some regular formal volunteering. Black people felt appreciably more able to influence decisions that affect their local area (such as contacting their councillor) than White people.

Poverty and living standards

Asian and Black households and those in the Other ethnic group were more likely to be poor and were the most likely to be in persistent poverty. Around 1 in 4 children in households headed by people from an Asian background or those in the Other ethnic group were in persistent poverty, as were 1 in 5 children in Black households and 1 in 10 White British households. Households of Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Black, Mixed and Other backgrounds were more likely to receive income-related benefits and tax credits than those in other ethnic groups. The ethnic minority population is more likely to live in areas of deprivation, especially Black, Pakistani and Bangladeshi people.

Education

Pupils in several ethnic groups were achieving and progressing better than White British pupils. Pupils from Chinese and Indian backgrounds showed high attainment and progress throughout their school careers and high rates of entry to university. Pupils from Gypsy and Roma, or Irish Traveller background (which are not included in the White British category), had the lowest attainment and progress, and were least likely to stay in education after the age of 16. Although pupils in the Black ethnic group made more progress overall than the national average, Black Caribbean pupils fell behind. White British pupils and those from a Mixed background also made less progress than average.

Low educational attainment and progress is closely associated with economic disadvantage. There is a sizeable gap in attainment between disadvantaged pupils and those from better off households among White British, White Irish and Mixed pupils. In particular, White British and White Irish pupils who were not eligible for free school meals were around twice as likely to attain A*- C in maths and English GCSEs as those who were eligible. In contrast, attainment for Black Caribbean pupils is very low overall, with a smaller gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and those not. Pupils from Pakistani and Bangladeshi backgrounds are achieving almost as well as, and progressing better than, White British pupils, whereas the attainment and progress of Black Caribbean pupils is much lower. White pupils from state schools had the lowest university entry rate of any ethnic group in 2016.

Of all regions in England, the most educational progress and best attainment in state primary and secondary schools was found in London, where more than half of pupils were from ethnic minority groups. Disadvantaged pupils in receipt of free school meals in London made more progress and had higher attainment than their counterparts elsewhere in England.

Employment

Employment rates have increased for all ethnic groups, but substantial differences remain in their participation in the labour market; around 1 in 10 adults from a Black, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or Mixed background were unemployed compared with 1 in 25 White British people. Although women from Pakistani and Bangladeshi backgrounds were the least likely to be employed, the proportion who were in work has increased substantially since 2004.

While employment rates among people from Pakistani and Bangladeshi backgrounds have been improving, these populations remain more likely to be in low skilled, low paying occupations than other ethnic groups. They also have higher rates of self-employment. Pakistani or Bangladeshi employees received the lowest average hourly pay, which was £4.39 per hour less in the last three months of 2016 than Indian employees who received the highest average hourly pay.

Housing

Home ownership, access to social housing, affordability and the quality of housing varies very widely between ethnic groups. Home ownership is most common among households of White British, Indian, Pakistani, and Mixed White and Asian origin; it is substantially lower among African, Arab, and Mixed White and Black African households.

The households that are most likely to rent social housing were headed by someone in the African, Caribbean, Other Black, Bangladeshi, Irish and Arab groups, or the Mixed groups other than Mixed White and Asian. As a group, ethnic minority households are also much more likely to rent privately than White British households and to spend a higher proportion of their incomes on rent, regardless of whether they rent from a social or private landlord. Their housing tends to be of lower quality, particularly among households of Pakistani origin, and overcrowding is more common, especially among households of Bangladeshi origin. Overcrowding affects ethnic minority households disproportionately, and London had one of the highest rates of overcrowding of all regions of England.

There has been an increase in the number of ethnic minority households accepted by local authorities as statutorily homeless over the past two decades, even though the number of acceptances overall has fallen substantially.

Policing

There are lower levels of confidence in the police among Black people, and especially among younger Black adults. While there has been a very large reduction in the use of Stop and Search among Black people since 2008/09, the use of these powers remains far higher on this ethnic group than others. Black men are also almost three and a half times more likely to be arrested than White men.

Criminal justice

Of all defendants, including juveniles, who were remanded at Crown Court for indictable offences, the proportion of defendants who were remanded in custody (rather than allowed out on bail) was highest for Black defendants, and particularly for Black males.

Among adults who were tried for indictable offences, the percentage of prosecutions resulting in conviction – known as the conviction ratio – was highest among White defendants at 87% in 2016, and lowest for Asians (81%); for Black defendants it was 82%. Across all ethnic groups the conviction ratio was lower for juveniles than adults. The lowest conviction ratio for juveniles was among Black defendants (69%); the conviction ratio for juveniles from all other ethnic groups ranged between 71% and 73%.

For all offenders (including juveniles), the average custodial sentence length (ACSL) for indictable offences has increased for all ethnic groups since 2009. White offenders consistently received the shortest ACSL. In 2016, the ACSL for White offenders was 18 months whereas Black and Asian offenders received the longest ACSL at 24 and 25 months respectively. These statistics do not take into account any other contextual factors such as the offences dealt with, which may differ by ethnic group.

Health

There are differences between ethnic groups across a range of health-related behaviours and preventable poor outcomes, and each ethnic group exhibits both healthy and unhealthy behaviours. More than half of adults in all ethnic groups other than the Chinese group were overweight (having a Body Mass Index of 25 and over), and this was particularly so among the White and Black ethnic groups, affecting 2 out of 3 White and Black adults. Adults in the Mixed group were the most likely to be physically active but also the most likely to smoke.

Most Asian groups express lower levels of satisfaction and less positive experiences of NHS General Practice services than other ethnic groups and there are differences in the prevalence of mental ill-health, its treatment and outcomes between ethnic groups.

In the general adult population, Black women were the most likely to have experienced a common mental disorder such as anxiety or depression in the last week, and Black men were the most likely to have experienced a psychotic disorder in the past year. However, White British adults were more likely to be receiving treatment for a mental or emotional problem than adults in other ethnic groups. Of those receiving psychological therapies, White adults experienced better outcomes than those in other ethnic groups. Black adults were more likely than adults in other ethnic groups to have been sectioned under the Mental Health Act.

The public sector workforce

The public sector workforce is a major employer, but ethnic minority employees are concentrated in the lower grades or ranks, and among younger employees.

In 2016, 18% of the non-medical NHS workforce (all staff excluding doctors and dentists) were from an ethnic minority group (excluding White minorities). Only 7% of very senior managers and 11% of senior managers were from an ethnic minority group. Also, the executive boards of many NHS trusts do not reflect the diversity of the NHS workforce: 93% of NHS board members in England are White (which includes White ethnic minority backgrounds). Court judges are disproportionately White, though the imbalance is less marked among tribunal judges (though the judiciary are independent office holders).

Some parts of the public sector workforce are more ethnically diverse than others. For example, the vast majority of police officers are from the White group and this has not changed over the past decade. The volunteer, part-time Special Constabulary was the most ethnically diverse part of the police workforce, followed by Police Community Support Officers. The Army is far more diverse than the Air Force.

THE CASEY REVIEW

"The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration" was published in December 2016. The review set out to look at:

1. how well we get on with each other;
2. how well we all do compared to each other.

Key findings include:

- "Discrimination and disadvantage feeding a sense of grievance and unfairness, isolating communities from modern British society". Examples include: "black boys still not getting jobs, white working class children on free school meals still doing badly in our education system, Muslim girls getting good grades at school but no decent employment opportunities…"

- "…high levels of social and economic isolation in some places and cultural and religious practices in communities that are not only holding some of our citizens back but run contrary to British values and sometimes our laws. The report often found that "…it was women and children who were the targets of these regressive practices. And too often, leaders and institutions were not doing enough to stand up against them and protect those who were vulnerable."

The report establishes that these remain absolutely vital problems to tackle and get right to improve our society – "The less integrated we are as a nation, the greater the economic and social costs we face – estimated as approximately £6 billion each year in one study. We know that where communities live separately, with fewer interactions between people from different backgrounds, mistrust, anxiety and prejudice grow. Conversely, social mixing and interactions between people from a wider range of backgrounds can have positive impacts; not just in reducing anxiety and prejudice, but also in enabling people to get on better in employment and social mobility."

The report raises a wide range of issues and some of these are reproduced below (please view the full report for full details of all the issues raised):

Our population today

As a nation, we are getting older, more secular and more open about our sexuality, while the growing ethnic minority population is younger and more likely to identify as religious (particularly among Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic groups).

Immigration

Britain is an increasingly diverse nation with a long history of immigration but it has changed dramatically in recent years. By 2011, 13% of us were foreign born and nearly 20% of us identified ourselves as belonging to ethnic minorities (compared with 9% and 12% respectively a decade earlier).

In the year ending December 2015, the 'net' immigration figure was 333,000 – but emigration does not really 'cancel out' immigration; it is the total churn in population that can alter the characteristics of a neighbourhood and the net figure of 333,000 reflected almost a million people in total arriving in or leaving the country over 12 months. Additionally, the placement of asylum seekers across the country – often in poorer communities – and the presence of an unknown number of illegal immigrants, adds to the level of change being experienced.

Higher birth rates among foreign born parents are also contributing to the growing diversity of the UK - while foreign born residents made up 13% of the population in 2011, 27% of births in 2014 were to mothers born outside the UK (predominantly to Polish, Pakistani and Indian mothers).

Settlement and segregation

Minority ethnic groups have tended to settle more in urban and industrial areas, often reflecting labour market gaps which immigrant communities came to fill in the 20th Century. As the diversity of the nation has increased another dynamic is also clear – people from minority groups have become both more dispersed and in some cases more concentrated and segregated:
– 50% of the British population lives in areas with relatively high migration flows.
– Half of all minority ethnic citizens in Britain live in London, Birmingham and Manchester.
– Similar patterns of urban concentration of ethnic minorities exist in Scotland and Wales.

Taken together, high ethnic minority concentration in residential areas and in schools increases the likelihood of children growing up without meeting or better understanding people from different backgrounds.

Research examined during the review suggests that concentrations of ethnic communities can have both positive and negative effects, and that outcomes do not appear to be uniform for all groups. Ethnic concentration can improve bonding between people from similar backgrounds, particularly when they are new to an area, but it can also:
– limit labour market opportunities, notably for Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups – although it appears to improve employment opportunities for Indian ethnic groups;
– reduce opportunities for social ties between minority and White British communities; and
– lead to lower identification with Britain and lower levels of trust between ethnic groups, compared to minorities living in more diverse areas.

Youth programmes that engage young people in altruistic activities seem to be having some success in enabling teenagers from different backgrounds to mix, leading to greater understanding and tolerance, and reduced prejudice and anxiety.

How do people feel about these changes?

The impact of these changes and the challenges they present all of us are complex. Generally, measures of national sentiment show a strong sense of community cohesion and belonging. In 2015-16, 89% of people thought their community was cohesive and a similar proportion felt a sense of belonging to Britain. However, other research reflects a different position, suggesting that the much more significant scale of immigration since the 1990s had affected public attitudes by 2011, with negative judgments about the cultural and economic impact of migration growing and 60% rating the settlement of migrants overall as negative.

Poorer groups felt even more negatively. But unease about immigration is not limited to traditional White British communities.

While there has been a range of polling that suggests British Muslims feel positive about Britishness and life in Britain, polls also highlight differences in attitudes, with some Muslims and some other minority faith groups or indeed other minority sections of society expressing less progressive views, for example towards women's equality, sexuality and freedom of speech.

Social and economic exclusion

Some minority groups have fared better over time than others. Those (particularly of Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnicity) with higher levels of residential and school segregation appear to be disadvantaged across a wider range of socio-economic factors. At the same time, some White British communities – particularly in areas of industrial decline – experience significant disadvantage and are increasingly being left behind. And Gypsies and Irish Travellers, while small in number relative to other ethnic groups (at 58,000 people or 0.1% of the population in the 2011 Census) also face persistent socio-economic disadvantage.

There are 13.2 million people across the UK living on relative low income. People living in households headed by someone from an ethnic minority background are more likely than their White counterparts to live on a 'relative low income', with 41% to 51% of households of Black, Pakistani, Chinese and Bangladeshi ethnicity on relative low income compared with 19% of White households.

While children from many ethnic minorities are increasingly matching or out-performing White British pupils in education, there is growing evidence of poorer White British boys, in particular, falling behind. White British pupils on Free School Meals are less than half as likely to achieve five or more good GCSEs as pupils who are not eligible for Free School Meals.

People from Black, Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic groups are three times more likely than White British people to be unemployed. And there are more concerning aspects of disadvantage relating to gender and age in particular groups:
– For young Black men, aged 16-24, the unemployment rate is 35%, compared with 15% for young White men.
– Where they are in work, men of Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnicity tend to be in low status employment – one in four Pakistani men are employed as taxi-drivers and two in five Bangladeshi men work in restaurants (although a number of these will be in family-owned businesses).
– Economic inactivity levels remain unusually high among women from Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic groups – 57.2% are inactive in the labour market compared with 25.2% of White women and 38.5% of all ethnic minority women.

The range of socio-economic exclusion suffered by some groups must be given greater attention. The persistent disadvantage experienced by young Black men in employment, the falling behind of poorer White British communities in some areas needs to be addressed if we are to prevent cracks and divisions in society from growing.

But in relation to social and economic integration in particular, there is a strong correlation of increased segregation among Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic households in more deprived areas, with poorer English language and poorer labour market outcomes, suggesting a negative cycle that will not improve without a more concerted and targeted effort.

Equality and division

Equality is another important factor of successful integration. Britain has developed some of the strongest equalities legislation in the world, and provided greater freedoms to be different; but there is more still to be done.

This review has highlighted worrying levels of segregation and socio-economic exclusion in different communities across the country and a number of inequalities between groups; one of the most striking of which is the inequality of women.

A similar picture is seen for lesbian, gay and bisexual groups – who suffer discrimination in mainstream society, but are affected twice over when they also belong to a community that can be culturally intolerant of non-heterosexual identification.

Incidents of hate crime are also on the rise. In 2015-16, there were 62,518 hate crimes (based on race, sexual orientation, religion, disability and transgender) recorded by the police – up 19% on the previous year. The Crime Survey for England and Wales suggests that the actual level of hate crime experienced – including anti-Semitic and Islamophobic attacks – is more than four times the number of recorded incidents.

We all have a responsibility to counteract hate in any form, and to undermine those seeking to divide us, whoever they are and however uncomfortable it may be.

Leadership

For the last fifteen years Governments have commissioned many reviews of community cohesion and developed strategies to improve it. But these cohesion or integration plans have not been implemented with enough force or consistency, they have been allowed to be diluted and muddled, they have not been sufficiently linked to socio-economic inclusion, and communities have not been engaged adequately.

We need leaders at all levels – in Government, in public sector and faith institutions, and in communities – to stand up and be more robust on this.

Recommendations

The report identified some initial recommendations, which are summarised below summarised below, and are designed to:

Build local communities' resilience in the towns and cities where the greatest challenges exist, by:
(1) Providing additional funding for area-based plans and projects that will address the key priorities identified in this review, including the promotion of English language skills, empowering marginalised women, promoting more social mixing, particularly among young people, and tackling barriers to employment for the most socially isolated groups.

(2) Developing a set of local indicators of integration and requiring regular collection of the data supporting these indicators.

(3) Identifying and promoting successful approaches to integration.

Improve the integration of communities in Britain and establish a set of values around which people from all different backgrounds can unite, by:
(4) Attaching more weight to British values, laws and history in our schools.

(5) Considering what additional support or advice should be provided to immigrants to help them get off to the best start in understanding their rights and obligations and our expectations for integration.

(6) Reviewing the route to British citizenship and considering the introduction of an integration oath on arrival for immigrants intending to settle in Britain.

Reduce economic exclusion, inequality and segregation in our most isolated and deprived communities and schools, by:
(7) Working with schools providers and local communities to promote more integrated schools and opportunities for pupils to mix with others from different backgrounds.

(8) Developing approaches to help overcome cultural barriers to employment.

(9) Improving English language provision through funding for community-based classes and appropriate prioritisation of adult skills budgets.

(10) Improving our understanding of how housing and regeneration policies could improve integration or reduce segregation.

(11) Introducing stronger safeguards for children who are not in mainstream education, including those being home schooled.

Increase standards of leadership and integrity in public office, by:
(12) Ensuring that British values such as respect for the rule of law, equality and tolerance are enshrined in the principles of public life and developing a new oath for holders of public office.