

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS (EqIAA)

COUNCIL REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2022 - 23

Date(s) of completing the EqIAA: August 2021 - onwards
Person(s) completing the EqIAA: EqIAA Lead: Head of Financial Services

EqIAA SUMMARY

The Covid-19 pandemic continues to lay bare the stark inequalities present across South Gloucestershire. These are not new inequalities, they have existed for a long time; in some areas however, the pandemic has increased them.

These inequalities have significant implications for the council revenue budget and capital programme and this EqIAA sets out key issues to be taken account of as an integral part of decision-making.

It is clear that direct health impacts have been experienced by all groups, and that some have experienced proportionately significantly greater direct health impacts. It is also clear that Covid-19 is affecting life in South Gloucestershire in a wide range of ways including, but not limited to, physical and mental health, personal relationships, social interactions, jobs, finance and the natural environment and these issues are also being experienced differentially by protected characteristic groups.

Factors contributing to the ongoing disproportionate impact on protected characteristic groups include:

- Deprivation
- Socio-economic status
- Poverty and financial hardship
- Geography (where you live)
- Standard of housing and over-crowded conditions (adversely affects the physical and mental health of household members, the educational attainment of children and young people, the development of cohesive communities, social mobility, and life chances)
- Types of job are clearly identified as factors contributing to the ongoing disproportionate impact on protected characteristic groups
- Barriers to accessing healthcare services
- Discrimination, including hate crime and sexual or domestic violence

Consultation results and data and information gathered throughout the year show that:

In terms of 'welfare benefits and council tax reduction', 'increasing our fees and charges' and 'increasing the recovery of our costs', people aged 16 – 44, disabled people, people from BAME backgrounds and LGB people were more likely to state that the proposed saving was 'too much'. This links with data surrounding financial hardship. Our data show that BAME population groups are just over 3 times more likely to apply for a Community Resilience and Household Support fund with people from Pakistani, Black African, Mixed ethnicity and White Other heritage being significantly over-represented in the Fund data. These same groups, along with Gypsy, Roma Traveller and Bangladeshi heritage people are also significantly over-represented in South Gloucestershire Free School Meals uptake data. Further, analysis of the last 6 years of data relating to access to welfare and debt advice services show that females, people in younger years, disabled people and people from BAME backgrounds are consistently, significantly more likely to access the services. Data from our survey of BAME communities in South Gloucestershire show that males from a BAME background have been more likely than females to have been placed on furlough, lost income from self-isolation or been made redundant. This is significant because males in many BAME communities are more likely to be the sole providers in a family unit with dependents. Analysis of those currently part of the Housing Register in South Gloucestershire identifies the following groups are significantly over-represented: Females,

Disabled People, People aged 25 – 44, and people from the following heritage: Bangladeshi, African Black/African/Caribbean/Black British - Other Mixed Ethnicity, White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller and White – Other. We also know that people from LGBTQ+ communities are over-represented in homelessness data nationally and this is likely to be mirrored in South Gloucestershire. In relation to the consultation results, people aged under 45, disabled people and people from BAME backgrounds were least likely to want to see an increase of 3.99%.

In terms of social care services for adults and children in South Gloucestershire, data show a proportionately lower uptake of Home Care services by people from minority ethnic backgrounds. It shows a higher rate of Mental Health Act assessments for both the 'Black' and 'White other' ethnic groups of around double the population ratio, and there is a significantly higher proportion of assessments leading to detention for all BAME groups, with the exception of 'mixed/dual heritage'. In relation to children and young people, it is clear that children and young people from BAME backgrounds are proportionately over twice as likely to be subject of a Section 47 enquiry and Child Protection Plan. It also shows a higher amount of time between entering care and moving in with family for adopted children for boys.

People aged under 45 and disabled people were more likely than average to state that the area had become worse as a place to live over the last two years.

Overall satisfaction with Public Health showed a slight reduction in comparison to last year. Last year, people from BAME backgrounds stated over three times lower levels of satisfaction than average with Public Health – this year, this has increased, but is still lower than average at 35% satisfaction. There is a significantly lower than average Covid-19 vaccine uptake amongst BAME groups in South Gloucestershire. Data from our survey of BAME communities in South Gloucestershire show that people reported a struggle to stay close and well connected to friends and family and this was especially true of younger respondents aged under 35. 40% of South Gloucestershire BAME survey respondents were reporting a high level of anxiety on the previous day and this compares to a national ONS Annual Population Survey result of 24% high anxiety amongst the population overall. More women than men from BAME backgrounds reported that they had a high level of anxiety. Linked to this, the Online Pupil Survey of 2021 showed significantly lower mental health and wellbeing scores for children and young people from many BAME groups and this was also true for LGBTQ+ pupils.

South Gloucestershire has seen an increase in hate crime and this is consistent with an increase across Avon & Somerset and across the UK generally. Latest national figures and research show an increase in reported hate crime over the last five years. In South Gloucestershire, where the characteristic of victims of reported hate crimes is clear and recorded, Race is the most prevalent characteristic by a significant margin, followed by Sexual Orientation and Disability. Data from our survey of BAME communities in South Gloucestershire show that the top priority expressed by communities is that of tackling racism and discrimination.

The second highest priority expressed via our survey of BAME communities in South Gloucestershire is that of Education. The ongoing lower attainment levels of pupils from many BAME backgrounds, boys (including White British boys) and pupils with SEND continues to be identified as a key priority. In relation to this, additional investment was made into a new Educational Attainment Programme on a recurrent basis as part of the 2021/22 budget-setting process and taskforces in respect of Race, LGBTQ+ and Disability have been delivering focussed work during 2021/22 which is set to continue at pace. It is noted that satisfaction levels with schools have seen a significant increase amongst consultation respondents from BAME backgrounds this year.

Our information obtained via consultation and via our range of continuing engagement activity show that key, ongoing issues for consideration in terms of the budget setting process are:

- Ongoing lower attainment levels of pupils from many BAME backgrounds, boys (including White British boys) and pupils with SEND.
- Growing levels of hate crime, especially targeting BAME and disabled people, as well as growing levels of domestic violence, and of sexual violence.
- Employment, especially for people from BAME backgrounds, women, disabled people, younger people and people from some faith groups.
- The extent of poverty and financial hardship, which disproportionately includes people from BAME backgrounds, disabled people (including people with mental health conditions and people with learning difficulties), lone parents, children living in households in poverty (disproportionately affecting children in Bangladeshi, Black African, Pakistani and Other ethnicity households), children leaving care, women at risk of domestic abuse. These issues impact on such areas as health, digital exclusion and overall life chances.
- Mental health, especially for LGBTQ+ people, younger people, people from BAME backgrounds and disabled people.
- Access for older people and disabled people especially in terms of digital inclusion, transport, the built and natural environment and the wider economy.
- Housing, especially for people from BAME backgrounds, lone parents, young care leavers, young offenders, LGBTQ+ young people, transgender people, people with mental health conditions, women at risk of domestic abuse, ex-services personnel, and those living in material deprivation.
- Access to healthcare, especially for people with learning disabilities and disabled people more broadly, people from BAME backgrounds, refugees and asylum seekers, Gypsies, Roma and Travellers and LGBTQ+ people.

Tackling these issues is not a short term 'fix', it is about persistently and consistently taking action to address disparities and demonstrate that actions taken genuinely work for people on the ground. In the context of the budget setting process and in response to these issues:

- The Council Plan clearly sets out 'closing the inequalities gap' as being fundamental to every priority and commitment. Managers are required to clearly tackle issues of equality/inequality as an integral part of their delivery of services;
- Internally, a comprehensive action plan continues to be implemented. The plan contains eight key objectives and a robust set of actions, which support and empower managers to take action to address inequalities, measure and monitor progress;
- A further £30k has been allocated from the Contain Outbreak Management Fund to allow the council's support of South Gloucestershire Equalities Voice to continue for a further year in 2022/23. This work involves close work with the council's expert equalities partners to resource actions that will directly tackle equalities issues 'on the ground'. The group has supported managers in action planning to specifically address inequalities during 2021/22 and will continue to do so;
- As part of the 2021/22 budget-setting process, additional investment of £600k per annum was made into a new Educational Attainment Programme on a recurrent basis and this continues into 2022/23. This programme is already showing benefits and recognises the long-term impact the pandemic has had on children's learning and opportunities. This funding is being used to drive down inequalities of opportunity; and includes an Equality in Education Steering Group having been put in place which oversees the work of the newly established Equality in Education Taskforces which focus on Race Equality, LGBTQ+ Equality and Disability Equality. A clear rise in the satisfaction levels of people from BAME backgrounds with schools in South Gloucestershire is noted in the consultation results;
- The Prevention Fund will be another step forward in terms of reducing health inequalities. At the end of 2020/21, funding from BNSSG Clinical Commissioning Group was transferred to each of the councils within the Integrated Care System to support the implementation of the Healthier Together Single System Plan under a s256 agreement. The aim of the agreement is to improve financial sustainability across the NHS and the Local Authority and meet the strategic goals of health, public health and social care commissioners. One such proposed investment working across BNSSG Public Health teams will accelerate the implementation of a population health approach in the

Healthier Together system with a focus on data and prevention. Into the medium term, the drive to use data more effectively through the Finance and HR system replacement will also feed into this priority;

- In 2021/22 £1m was allocated to the Community Resilience Fund scheme and this will continue during 2022/23. The data show that BAME population groups are just over 3 times more likely than average to apply for a fund. This is in line with national data that estimates that communities from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds are 2 – 3 times more likely to be living in poverty/financial hardship and this demonstrates that these funds are reaching and are accessible to our communities. The ongoing continuation of the Holiday Activity and Food Programme into 2022/23 will also provide much needed support to low-income families and assist in getting access to families and individuals most in need;
- £15.3m has been invested into Integrated Children's Services over the course of the next 4 years and as part of this, an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion workstream is underway which seeks to positively impact recruitment and retention of staff and an Equality Plan will be delivered which seeks to positively impact the experience of children, young people and families within the service;
- Investment in improving children's literacy and access to libraries will also drive improvements in educational attainment in particular supporting families on low incomes with access to services based in libraries.
- A new Housing Strategy will be consulted upon during 2022/23 with the groups listed above as being disproportionately impacted being specifically taken account of. Actions to address the issues will be formulated as part of the Strategy development and resource requirements considered;
- Each service area within the council continues with its own EqlAA work. The internal development of the council's EqlAA Digital Dashboard will be progressed during the year, especially as this identifies resource requirements on individual team levels;
- The council will be carrying out work during 2022/23 to specify and procure services for survivors of domestic violence and abuse. This work will be completed during 2023/24 and will look to address needs identified through a comprehensive Needs Assessment which includes accommodation needs for those with disabilities; from different cultural backgrounds; and for older victims.

This EqlAA 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).

SECTION 1 - 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 EqlAA is to provide all parties with clear and robust information relating to equalities issues and considerations which influence decisions in respect of budget setting.

This EqlAA 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 allows 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 EqlAA provides information not only concerning the consultation results collected between October 2021 and January 2022, but also analyses trends year-on-year since 2014/15. This allows for a comprehensive EqlAA 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. Taking this approach, which involves large numbers, provides a robust level of feedback from diverse communities - the nature of this process contributes towards the promotion of community cohesion.
- This EqlAA 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 EqlAA should be read in conjunction with the Council's [Annual Equalities Reports](#), the [South Gloucestershire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment](#) and the specific [EqlAAs](#) that are conducted as part of the delivery of all Council 'functions'. In addition, this EqlAA 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. Details of this can be found in the Council's [Annual Equalities Reports](#).

SECTION 2 – CONSULTATION & RESEARCH

The extent of the council's consultation activity and the analysis of feedback received in respect of 'protected characteristic' groups allows Councillors 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 following pages of this EqlAA provide information concerning the equalities issues emerging as a result of consultation conducted and, where possible, provides a comparison against historical consultation results so that any trends can be highlighted.

South Gloucestershire Trends Analysis

The following information summarises 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 EqlAA](#) and should be read in conjunction with the following summary information. This approach is significant as for the majority of areas and issues consulted upon, the Council now has nine years of data which this EqlAA 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.

This information shows where patterns of certain protected characteristic groups reporting higher and lower levels of satisfaction with services has remained the same over successive years. These results are therefore considered a reliable indicator for these groups as compared to all respondents.

Satisfaction with Services – Trends

Service Area	Trends
Care for Older People	<p>Non-disabled people, people aged under 45 and people from BAME backgrounds are consistently less satisfied than average with care for older people with satisfaction levels of 26%, 17% and 26% respectively.</p> <p>Older people and disabled people are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 32% and 35% respectively - both of which are a reduction in comparison to recent years.</p>
Care for physically disabled and those with learning difficulties	<p>Non-disabled people, people aged under 45 and people aged 46 – 64 are consistently less satisfied than average with satisfaction levels of 17%, 21% and 17% respectively.</p> <p>Disabled people and people aged over 65 years are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 35% and 24% respectively - both of which are a reduction in comparison to recent years.</p>
Children's Social Services	<p>People aged under 45 and disabled people show a trend of being consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 19% and 21% respectively.</p> <p>It is noted that the satisfaction levels reported by from people from BAME backgrounds has increased this year, however, is still low at 26%.</p>

Service Area	Trends
Customer services	<p>Younger people and people aged 45-64 are consistently less satisfied than average.</p> <p>It is noted that the satisfaction levels reported by from people from BAME backgrounds has increased this year, however, is still significantly lower than average.</p>
Environmental health and trading standards	<p>Older people and disabled people are consistently more satisfied than average.</p> <p>It is noted that the satisfaction levels reported by from people from BAME backgrounds have reported a lower than average satisfaction level for the last 2 years.</p>
Housing advice services	<p>Disabled people and people aged under 45 are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 21% and 33% respectively.</p>
Highways and Roads	<p>People aged under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average, however, the satisfaction level has dropped to a low of 26% this year.</p> <p>Disabled people continue to be significantly less satisfied than average.</p>
Libraries	<p>People aged under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average with a satisfaction level of 69%.</p> <p>The consultation results last year showed a significant drop in satisfaction levels expressed by people from BAME backgrounds and this lower than average level of satisfaction has continued.</p>
Local Bus Services	<p>People aged over 65 years are consistently more satisfied than average with a satisfaction level of 63%.</p> <p>People aged under 45 and 46 – 64 years continue to be less satisfied than average with satisfaction levels of 42% and 39% respectively.</p> <p>The consultation last year showed a significant drop in satisfaction levels expressed by people from BAME backgrounds and this year satisfaction levels reported have increased significantly.</p>
Parks and open spaces	<p>This area shows the highest overall level of satisfaction of all services (79%).</p> <p>Parks and open spaces, along with Waste and recycling services are the only service areas to rate at over 70% satisfaction.</p> <p>People from BAME backgrounds are showing a trend of lower than average satisfaction (65%)</p>
Planning	<p>Disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average (14%).</p> <p>People under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average with planning; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 24%.</p>

Service Area	Trends
Public Health	<p>Overall satisfaction with Public Health showed a slight reduction in comparison to last year.</p> <p>Last year, people from BAME backgrounds stated over three times lower levels of satisfaction than average with Public Health – this year, this has increased, but is still lower than average at 35%.</p>
Schools	<p>People over 65 and disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average with schools at 36% and 37% respectively.</p> <p>People aged under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average.</p> <p>The 2020 consultation showed people from BAME backgrounds expressed the lowest level of satisfaction whereas this year, people from BAME backgrounds expressed the highest level of satisfaction. It is noted that Education, Learning and Skills have delivered work consistently over the last year in regard to the improvement of race equality in education.</p>
Sport and leisure facilities	<p>People aged over 65 and disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average.</p> <p>People aged under 45 years and females are consistently more satisfied than average.</p> <p>It is noted that the satisfaction levels reported by from people from BAME backgrounds have reported a lower than average satisfaction level for the last 2 years.</p>
Waste and recycling services	<p>There are no significant trends in terms of satisfaction with services Waste and recycling services, along with Parks and open spaces, are the two areas rated with the highest satisfaction levels and are only service areas to rate at over 70% satisfaction.</p> <p>It is, however, noted that the satisfaction levels reported by from people from BAME backgrounds have reported a lower than average satisfaction level for the last 2 years.</p>
Welfare benefits and council tax reduction for which the council is responsible	<p>Males, people aged under 45, people aged 46 – 64 and people from BAME backgrounds are consistently less satisfied than average with satisfaction levels of 25%, 21%, 19% and 28 respectively.</p> <p>People aged over 65 years, disabled people and females are consistently more satisfied than average although satisfaction levels are not high at 32% and 44% and 49% respectively.</p>
Free Car parking	<p>This was the fourth year for a question surrounding free car parking. There appears to be a trend emerging in relation to lower satisfaction amongst disabled people who expressed a satisfaction level of 48%.</p> <p>The lowest satisfaction level was expressed by people from BAME backgrounds at 43%.</p>

The next year

The consultation covered a proposed savings programme which would deliver £6.1m of savings in 2022/23 across services through a variety of efficiency drivers.

Responses to the questions are shown in the data tables at Appendix 1 and key points emerging are as follows:

Proposals	Feedback
Different ways of working to save £4.6m (75.4% of savings)	Females, disabled people and people from BAME backgrounds were more likely to state this amount was 'too much' than they were to say it was 'too little'. However, 'about right' was the most favoured response by all groups by a significant margin.
Introducing more new technology & automation to save £0.2m (3.3% of savings)	'About right' was the most favoured response by all groups by a significant margin.
Increasing fees and charges to save £0.8m (13.1% of savings)	<p>'About right' was the most favoured response by all groups and this was closely followed by 'too much'.</p> <p>People aged 16 – 44, disabled people, people from BAME backgrounds and LGB people were more likely to state 'too much' than they were to state 'about right'. This follows data demonstrating that people from these groups are more likely than average to be living in poverty/financial hardship.</p>
Increasing the recovery of our costs by £0.5m (8.2% of savings)	<p>'About right' was the most favoured response by all groups by a significant margin.</p> <p>People aged 16 – 44, disabled people, people from BAME backgrounds and LGB were more likely than average to state 'too much'.</p>

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 as compared to all respondents.

Approach	Feedback and Trends
Support for targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need	<p>The majority of respondents (70%) supported this approach.</p> <p>Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last nine years (average support over the nine year period is 66%)</p>
Support for reducing the quality of services provided	<p>This approach resulted in the lowest level of overall support (14%) over the nine year period.</p> <p>Trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, respondents have consistently not supported this approach over the last nine years (average support over the eight year period is 19%).</p> <p>In particular, females, people aged under 45 and disabled people show a trend of lower support for this than average with low support levels this year of 12%, 7% and 11% respectively this year.</p>
Support for increasing fees and charges for some services	<p>36% of respondents supported this approach and this is the lowest level of support over the nine year period.</p> <p>Disabled people and people from BAME backgrounds are consistently less likely than average to support this approach and linking this is data demonstrating that people from these groups are more likely than average to be living in poverty/financial hardship.</p>
Support for making more services available online	<p>59% of respondents supported this approach.</p> <p>People aged under 65 and particularly those aged under 45 are consistently more likely than average to support this approach.</p> <p>Disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (46%).</p>
Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services	<p>The majority of respondents (63%) supported this approach.</p> <p>People aged under 65 are consistently more likely than average to support this approach.</p> <p>Disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (50%).</p>
Making more efficient use of council assets such as land and buildings	<p>The majority of respondents (86%) supported this approach.</p> <p>Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last eight years (average support over the nine year period is 86%).</p>

Approach	Feedback and Trends
Support for scaling back or stopping some services	<p>This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (%).</p> <p>Females and disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with just 11% support which shows a significant drop since last year.</p>
Stopping provision of some discretionary services to protect services to older people and the vulnerable	<p>33% of respondents supported this approach.</p> <p>People from BAME backgrounds show a trend for lower than average levels of support, with 30% support this year.</p> <p>Regardless of protected characteristics, the average support over the nine year period is 35%)</p>
Changing working practices to make better use of technology and more efficient ways of working	<p>The majority of respondents (80%) supported this approach.</p> <p>Disabled people show a trend for lower than average levels of support for this, however, level of support this year is still high at 72%.</p>
Working in partnership and sharing services with other councils and public sector agencies	<p>The majority of respondents (79%) supported this approach.</p> <p>Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last eight years (average support over the eight year period is 80%).</p>
Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies	<p>This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (21%).</p> <p>Females and disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (16% and 17% respectively).</p>
Transferring services to community groups, social enterprises and town and parish councils	<p>43% of respondents supported this approach.</p> <p>There are no clear trends relating to protected characteristic groups and this approach.</p>
Encouraging more people to volunteer their time to become involved in the delivery of services	<p>53% of respondents supported this approach.</p> <p>There are no clear trends relating to protected characteristic groups and this approach. Across the nine year period, the average level of support for this approach is 54%.</p>

Council Tax options for 2022/23

The most favoured option was an increase of 1.99% with 32% of respondents favouring this option. This was closely followed by an increase of 3.99% favoured by 29% of respondents and a freeze at the current level with 28% of respondents favouring this option. The following are noted:

- People in younger age groups were more likely to want to see a freeze of council tax. In addition, people aged under 45, disabled people and people from BAME backgrounds were least likely to want to see an increase of 3.99%.
- People in these same groups are also most likely to oppose a council tax rise greater than 3.99% were Government to relax the current annual council tax increase thresholds.

The Local Area and the Council

This information shows key results gained via the 2021-22 Council Revenue Budget and Capital Programme consultation.

Consultation Topic	Feedback
Satisfaction with the local area as a place to live	The majority of respondents (77%) stated that they were satisfied with the area as a place to live.
Over the past two years, do you feel that South Gloucestershire has become a better place to live, is the same or is worse?	<p>Just 6% of respondents stated that they felt the area had got better as a place to live over the last two years.</p> <p>35% of respondents stated that they felt the area had got worse as a place to live over the last two years and this is the highest level over the eight year period that this question has been asked.</p> <p>People aged under 45 and disabled people were more likely than average to state that the area had become worse (41% and 39% respectively).</p>
Satisfaction with the way South Gloucestershire Council runs things	56% of respondents stated satisfaction with the way the council runs things, a reduction of 6 percentage points when compared to last year.
The council keeps me informed about services	<p>50% of respondents agreed that the council keeps them informed about the services it provides, a reduction of 9 percentage points when compared to last year</p> <p>In particular, people aged under 45 had a significantly lower than average level of agreement to this question.</p>
The council keeps me informed about any proposals for change	<p>49% of respondents agreed that the Council keeps them informed about proposals for change.</p> <p>In particular, people aged under 45 had a significantly lower than average level of agreement to this question.</p>
I can influence decisions affecting my local area	<p>Just 13% of respondents felt that they could influence decisions in their local area.</p> <p>Males, people aged under 45 and disabled people had lower levels of agreement than average with agreement levels of 11%, 6% and 11% respectively.</p>
The council acts on the concerns of local residents	<p>36% of respondents felt that the Council acts on the concerns of local residents.</p> <p>The lowest level of agreement came from people aged under 45 at 22% agreement.</p>

Health impacts relating to Covid-19

- Covid-19 diagnosis rates increased with age for both males and females. When compared to all-cause mortality in previous years, deaths from Covid-19 have a slightly older age distribution, particularly for males.
- Working age males diagnosed with Covid-19 were twice as likely to die as females.
- Compared with people under 40, the probability of death was about three times higher among those aged 40 to 49, nine times higher among those aged 50 to 59, twenty-seven times higher among those aged 60 to 69, fifty times higher among those aged 70 to 79 and seventy times higher among those aged 80 and over.
- Deprivation and socio-economic status directly impact the risk of death from Covid-19. People who live in deprived areas have higher diagnosis rates and death rates than those living in less deprived areas. The mortality rates from Covid-19 in the most deprived areas were more than double the least deprived areas, for both males and females. This is greater than the inequality seen in mortality rates in previous years, indicating greater inequality in death rates from Covid-19.
- There are worse health outcomes for people from BAME backgrounds diagnosed with Covid-19 compared to white British people. Covid-19 has replicated existing health inequalities, and in some cases, increased them. People from black ethnic groups were most likely to be diagnosed. Death rates from Covid-19 were highest among people from black and Asian ethnic groups. People of Bangladeshi ethnicity had around twice the risk of death than people of white British ethnicity. From the evidence available at the time of the Disparities report, people of Chinese, Indian, Pakistani, other Asian, Caribbean and other black ethnicity had between 10 and 50% higher risk of death when compared to white British.
- It is important to note that there is not a suggestion that there is a causal link between ethnicity and risk of death from Covid-19 - wider factors which impact on people's lives have a real and measurable impact on the risk of death. There are significantly worse outcomes for people from BAME backgrounds in all major areas of life compared to white British people. These factors contribute vastly to worse health outcomes in relation to Covid-19 for people from BAME backgrounds. There is no one, single factor alone which can explain the disproportionate impacts of Covid-19 on people from BAME backgrounds. Factors contributing to the disproportionate impact on people from BAME backgrounds include, in no particular order: poverty and financial hardship, where people live, overcrowded housing, types of job, racism and discrimination, other illnesses and access to health services.
- The death rate for people with learning disabilities is up to 6.3 times higher than the general population after adjusting for other factors such as age and sex. Deaths are also spread much more widely across the age spectrum among people with learning disabilities, with far greater mortality rates in younger adults, compared to the general population. The death rate for people aged 18 to 34 with learning disabilities was 30 times higher than the rate in the same age group without disabilities.
- One in six adults experienced some form of depression in summer 2021 (21 July to 15 August, Great Britain), compared with one in ten before the pandemic (July 2019 to March 2020). Younger adults, women, disabled adults, unemployed adults, those who could not afford an unexpected expense of £850 and adults living in the most deprived areas of England were more likely to experience some form of depression.
- Personal wellbeing measures all remain worse than their pre-pandemic (February 2020) levels.
- A quarter of people who have been employees during the pandemic had been on furlough at some point between March 2020 and June 2021. Those aged between 35 and 64 years or with a degree-level qualification were less likely to have been furloughed.
- Working adults on the lowest incomes were most likely to see a fall in household income.
- Adults living in the most deprived areas were more likely to report vaccine hesitancy.
- Vaccine uptake is significantly lower amongst BAME communities compared with White British communities.

Factors contributing to ongoing disproportionate impacts relating to Covid-19

Poverty and financial hardship are clearly identified as factors contributing to the ongoing disproportionate impact on protected characteristic groups. In respect of these:

- Disabled people are three times more likely, dependent upon impairment type, to be living in poverty and have extra living costs of £570 per month on average, with one in five facing additional living costs of more than £1,000 per month. Disabled people in South Gloucestershire have a significantly higher likelihood of accessing welfare and debt advice services and are significantly over-represented on the Housing Register.
- People from BAME backgrounds who, depending on ethnic group, are twice as likely to be living in poverty (20% of adults regardless of ethnicity are living in relative poverty and 30% of children are living in households in poverty in the UK). In South Gloucestershire, data relating to the Community Resilience and Household Support Funds show that BAME population groups are just over 3 times more likely to apply for a fund with people from Pakistani, Black African, Mixed ethnicity and White Other heritage being significantly over-represented in the Fund data. These same groups, along with Gypsy, Roma Traveller and Bangladeshi heritage people are also significantly over-represented in South Gloucestershire Free School Meals uptake data.
- People from BAME backgrounds are more likely to be in poorer standard housing and in overcrowded conditions. Together with socio-economic deprivation, sub-standard housing adversely affects the physical and mental health of household members, the educational attainment of children, the development of cohesive communities, social mobility and life chances. HCI's report reveals that more than 6% of the white British population is overcrowded, but this rises to between 15% and 30% for BAME households depending on ethnic group (Black Africans and Bangladeshis most often live in overcrowded conditions). Almost 70% of the BAME population lives in the 25% most overcrowded neighbourhoods in England. Some 15% of BAME households live in homes with at least one Category 1 Housing Health and Safety Rating System hazard (this system focuses on health outcomes of a variety of physiological and psychological hazards). This climbs to 18% in the private rented sector. Clearly we know that Covid-19 will be more likely to pass to others in overcrowded conditions. Poor housing conditions often means greater likelihood of co-morbidities associated with worse outcomes from Coronavirus e.g. Asthma.
- Analysis of those currently part of the Housing Register in South Gloucestershire identifies the following groups are significantly over-represented: The above data from the housing register gives a snap shot of applicants at a point of time. The data shows that the following groups are disproportionately over-represented: Females, Disabled People, People aged 25 – 44, and people from the following heritage: Bangladeshi, African Black/African/Caribbean/Black British - Other Mixed Ethnicity, White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller and White – Other.
- Across Britain, women are more likely to live in poverty than men, and are also more likely than men to experience severe material deprivation. IN south Gloucestershire, women are significantly over-represented in accessing welfare and debt advice services and are significantly over-represented on the Housing Register.
- Across Britain, people aged 16–24 are proportionately more likely to be living in poverty and South Gloucestershire data shows significantly higher proportions of younger people accessing welfare and debt advice services, and being part of the Housing Register.
- Types of job are clearly identified as factors contributing to the ongoing disproportionate impact on protected characteristic groups. In respect of these: Those employed in insecure work (defined as temporary employment or in agency work or in low-paid self-employment, identified by self-employment in caring, leisure and other service occupations, process, plant and machine operative occupations, or elementary occupations, such as cleaners or kitchen and catering assistants) are proportionately more greatly impacted. Some groups are more likely to be in insecure employment than others; these tend to be young people, Disabled people, people in certain ethnic groups and those from Muslim communities. Refugee and Asylum-Seeking communities are also more severely disadvantaged in the workplace – some are already not allowed to work and others much more likely to be in lower paid, poorer conditions. Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) communities are more likely to be running small businesses or be self-employed or working for the most impacted business areas e.g. Taxi Drivers, working in take-aways or restaurants, hotels etc.

Wider and Linked Information

The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) report '*Is Britain Fairer? 2018*' is the latest EHRC state-of-the-nation report on equality and human rights. This was published in 2019 prior to the advent of the Covid-19 pandemic, however is highly relevant when linked to the evidence of Covid-19 affecting life in South Gloucestershire in a wide range of ways including, but not limited to, physical and mental health, personal relationships, social interactions, jobs, finance and the natural environment. (Further details and links are shown in [Appendix 2](#) of this EqlAA).

Work

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.

- 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.

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.

- 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.

Living Standards

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. The South Gloucestershire Homelessness Strategy shows that women, people aged 16-44, disabled people, people from Asian and Dual/Mixed heritage are over-represented in the number of accepted homelessness decisions.

In England, people from ethnic minorities are still much more likely to live in overcrowded accommodation compared with White people.

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.

Analysis of those currently part of the Housing Register in South Gloucestershire identifies the following groups are significantly over-represented: The above data from the housing register gives a snap shot of applicants at a point of time. The data shows that the following groups are disproportionately over-represented: Females, Disabled People, People aged 25 – 44, and people from the following heritage: Bangladeshi, African Black/African/Caribbean/Black British - Other Mixed Ethnicity, White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller and White – Other

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

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.

People from BAME backgrounds who, depending on ethnic group, are twice as likely to be living in poverty (20% of adults regardless of ethnicity are living in relative poverty and 30% of children are living in households in poverty in the UK). People from the following ethnic groups are disproportionately more likely to be living in poverty: people from Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Black African, Mixed ethnicity, Other ethnicity and Chinese backgrounds. In South Gloucestershire, data relating to the Community Resilience and Household Support Funds show that BAME population groups are just over 3 times more likely to apply for a fund with people from Pakistani, Black African, Mixed ethnicity and White Other heritage being significantly over-represented in the Fund application data. These same groups, along with Gypsy, Roma Traveller and Bangladeshi heritage people are also significantly over-represented in South Gloucestershire Free School Meals uptake data.

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.

Access to Healthcare

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.

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.

Men report slightly higher rates of good health 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.

National research tells us that one in eight LGBT people (13 per cent) have experienced some form of unequal treatment from healthcare staff because they're LGBT. Almost one in four LGBT people (23 per cent) have witnessed discriminatory or negative remarks against LGBT people by healthcare staff. One in seven LGBT people (14 per cent) have avoided treatment for fear of discrimination because they're LGBT.

Mental health

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.

In 2017 the South Gloucestershire Online Pupil Survey found: 59% of LGBTQ pupils in South Glos Schools reported a low mental health score (Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale).

In 2018 national research found: 52% of LGBT people said they've experienced depression in the last year, with one in eight 18-24 (13 per cent) reporting they've attempted to take their own life in the last year and almost half of trans people (46 per cent) having thought about taking their own life in the last year, 31 per cent of LGB people who aren't trans said the same.

In 2021 the South Gloucestershire Online Pupil Survey found: 81% of LGBTQ pupils in South Glos Schools reported a low mental health score (Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale).

45% of all looked after children in England have a diagnosable mental health condition (compared with 10% of all children).

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.

Justice and Personal Security

Increases in police recorded hate crime have been observed across all monitored hate crime strands in England and Wales, particularly for disability hate crimes.

In South Gloucestershire, 382 hate crimes were reported to the Police between 1 February 2020 and 31 January 2021.

SARI received 50 referrals for hate incidents.

This is a 22% increase over the same period in the previous year. That is consistent with a 20% increase across Avon & Somerset and across the UK generally across the same period.

The latest detailed analysis shows: Patchway, Filton and Kingswood saw the greatest number of reported hate crimes. Where the characteristic of victims of reported hate crimes during this period is clear and recorded, those characteristics were as follows: Race 64%, Sexual orientation 14%, Disability 10%, Gender 5%, Faith 3%, Transgender identity 1%

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.

National data and information

The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) report '*Is Britain Fairer? 2018*' also puts forward the following findings:

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.

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.

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 2021/22 consultation has included the collection of information in respect of LGB people, trans people and people with and without a religion or belief for the last three 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 EqlAA.

SECTION 3 - EqlAA OUTCOMES

The Covid-19 pandemic continues to lay bare the stark inequalities present across South Gloucestershire. These are not new inequalities, they have existed for a long time; in some areas however, the pandemic has increased them.

These inequalities have significant implications for the council revenue budget and capital programme and this EqlAA sets out key issues to be taken account of as an integral part of decision-making.

In the context of the budget setting process and in response to the issues raised within the EqlAA:

- The Council Plan clearly sets out 'closing the inequalities gap' as being fundamental to every priority and commitment. Managers are required to clearly tackle issues of equality/inequality as an integral part of their delivery of services;
- Internally, a comprehensive Equality Reset Plan continues to be implemented. The Plan contains eight key objectives and a robust set of actions, which support and empower managers to take action to address inequalities, measure and monitor progress. Each service area within the council continues with its own EqlAA work. The internal development of the council's EqlAA Digital Dashboard will be progressed during the year, especially as this identifies resource requirements on individual team levels;
- As part of the 2021/22 budget-setting process, additional investment of £600k per annum was made into a new Educational Attainment Programme on a recurrent basis and this continues into 2022/23. An element of this funding is being used to invest in ideas to drive down inequalities of opportunity with an Equality in Education Steering Group having been put in place which oversees the work of the newly established Equality in Education Taskforces which focus on Race Equality, LGBTQ+ Equality and Disability Equality;
- A further £30k has been allocated from the Contain Outbreak Management Fund to allow the council's support of South Gloucestershire Equalities Voice to continue for a further year in 2022/23. This work involves close work with the council's expert equalities partners to resource actions that will directly tackle equalities issues 'on the ground'. The group has supported managers in action planning to specifically address inequalities during 2021/22 and will continue to do so;
- £1m has been allocated to the Community Resilience Fund schemes and this will continue during 2022/23. The data show that BAME population groups are just over 3 times more likely than average to apply for a fund. The ongoing continuation of the Holiday Activity and Food Programme into 2022/23 will also provide much needed support to low-income families and assist in getting access to families and individuals most in need;
- £15.3m has been invested into Integrated Children's Services over the course of the next 4 years and as part of this, an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion workstream is underway which seeks to positively impact recruitment and retention of staff and an Equality Plan will be delivered which seeks to positively impact the experience of children, young people and families within the service;
- The Prevention Fund will be another step forward in terms of reducing health inequalities. At the end of 2020/21, funding from BNSSG Clinical Commissioning Group was transferred to each of the councils within the Integrated Care System to support the implementation of the Healthier Together Single System Plan under a s256 agreement. The aim of the agreement is to improve financial sustainability across the NHS and the Local Authority and meet the strategic goals of health, public health and social care commissioners. One such proposed investment working across BNSSG Public Health teams will accelerate the implementation of a population health approach in the Healthier Together system with a focus on data and prevention. The drive to use data more effectively through the Finance and HR system replacement will also feed into this priority;
- Investment in library cards for school children will also drive improvements in educational attainment in particular supporting families on low incomes with access to services based in libraries;
- A new Housing Strategy will be consulted upon during 2022/23 with the groups listed above as being disproportionately impacted being specifically taken account of. Actions to address the issues will be formulated as part of the Strategy development and resource requirements considered;
- The council will be carrying out work during 2022/23 to specify and procure services for survivors of domestic violence and abuse. This work will be completed during 2023/24 and will look to

address needs identified through a comprehensive Needs Assessment which includes accommodation needs for those with disabilities; from different cultural backgrounds; and for older victims.

The consultation process has been robust and allows for information to be gathered year-on-year and considered in respect of 'Protected Characteristics'. The EqlAA 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.

This EqlAA, 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 EqlAAs 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 EqlAA processes.

Implementation of savings projects will continue to be monitored in respect of their EqlAA progress.

SECTION 4 – EqlIAA 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 Consultation Output Report, January 2019
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan Consultation Output Report, January 2020
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan Consultation Output Report, January 2021
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan Consultation Output Report, January 2022
- South Gloucestershire Annual Equalities Reports (2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014 –15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21)
- [South Gloucestershire Council Equality Impact Assessment and Analysis](#) (EqlIAA) 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
- [Public Health England, *Disparities in the risk and outcomes from Covid-19* report](#)
- [Deaths of people identified as having learning disabilities with COVID-19 in England in the Spring of 2020](#)
- [Coronavirus \(Covid-19\) latest Insights](#), ONS, October 2021

APPENDIX 1 – CONSULTATION DATA TABLES

Consultation Respondents (The following table shows the number of respondents to the Budget Consultation process in each of the last 9 years):

The following table shows the number of respondents to the Budget Consultation Process in each of the last 9 years:																											
	Total	Female	Male	16 - 34	35 - 44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	681	315	314			83	357	200	46	576	584	27															
2015/16	1426	682	716			349	563	491	185	1203	1275	35															
2016/17	1127	508	568			361	561	170	102	949	931	86															
2017/18	1270	595	616			188	432	591	171	1039	1051	88															
2018/19	1045	480	519			138	218	667	107	843	928	52															
2019/20	1753	841	853			669	559	453	212	1435	1537	84	35	37	#	27	1352	10	1542	#	815	#	#	#	#	17	691
2020/21	1342	661	647	54	108	162	511	625	200	1068	1187	68	24	11	#	21	1050	#	1165	#	708	#	#	#	#	13	414
2021/22	1398	586	734			180	466	673	203	1083	1220	108	61				1186	#	1192	#	730	#	#	#	#	19	431
2022/23	1475	612	783			88	361	624	239	1155	1290	54	61				1118	#	1259	#	829	#	#	#	#	14	390

Note: where numbers are 10 or less, the # symbol is used in order to ensure confidentiality.

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.

Satisfaction with 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.

The following tables show the percentage of respondents stating satisfaction with the service.

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	11%	7%	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%	55%	37%	0%	34%	0%	45%	0%	0%	0%		33%	21%
2021/22	35%	36%	36%			13%	32%	42%	37%	34%	37%	18%	55%				35%	0%	36%	100%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	25%
2022/23	28%	30%	28%			17%	23%	32%	35%	26%	29%	26%	29%				27%	-	29%	0%	33%	-	100%	0%	-	25%	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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	15%	6%	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%	38%	28%	0%	27%	0%	34%	0%	33%	0%		0%	20%
2021/22	27%	29%	27%			19%	27%	31%	38%	27%	27%	18%	45%				28%	0%	29%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	22%
2022/23	22%	20%	21%			21%	17%	24%	35%	17%	21%	14%	18%				22%	-	22%	0%	26%	-	100%	0%	-	0%	18%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	0%	13%	0%	14%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%		0%	17%
2021/22	14%	16%	14%			27%	17%	9%	13%	15%	15%	6%	14%			15%	0%	15%	0%	16%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	13%
2022/23	16%	11%	17%			19%	17%	15%	21%	14%	15%	26%	6%			15%	-	16%	0%	19%	-	100%	100%	-	0%	11%	

Customer Services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	15%	28%	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%	62%	57%	0%	56%	0%	62%	50%	50%	0%		33%	51%		
2021/22	47%	56%	41%			40%	44%	53%	49%	48%	49%	31%	51%				48%	0%	50%	0%	52%	0%	100%	0%	0%	50%	45%		
2022/23	45%	50%	41%			43%	41%	45%	44%	45%	46%	40%	58%				47%	-	47%	33%	49%	-	100%	0%	-	75%	43%		

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	4%	13%	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%	33%	42%	0%	41%	25%	43%	0%	0%	0%	-	63%	40%
2021/22	37%	41%	36%			29%	32%	44%	45%	39%	38%	25%	46%				39%	0%	40%	0%	40%	100%	0%	0%	-	46%	37%
2022/23	34%	34%	33%			33%	31%	37%	36%	33%	35%	24%	35%				36%	-	35%	33%	39%	-	100%	33%	-	40%	28%

Housing advice services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	4%	5%	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%	29%	16%	0%	17%	0%	16%	0%	0%	0%	-	25%	16%
2021/22	15%	19%	14%			17%	17%	14%	15%	17%	16%	13%	35%				16%	100%	16%	0%	18%	100%	0%	0%	-	20%	10%
2022/23	18%	19%	14%			33%	18%	14%	21%	16%	16%	26%	12%				19%	-	18%	0%	20%	-	100%	0%	-	25%	14%

Highways and roads

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	22%	29%	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%	24%	36%	0%	35%	20%	33%	29%	50%	60%	-	54%	36%
2021/22	33%	36%	32%			43%	32%	33%	25%	34%	34%	24%	48%				33%	50%	35%	100%	34%	100%	100%	0%	-	47%	35%
2022/23	29%	33%	26%			26%	32%	27%	26%	30%	29%	37%	31%				31%	-	30%	67%	31%	-	0%	0%	-	38%	30%

Free car parking

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	41%	51%	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%	43%	65%	100%	64%	80%	67%	40%	75%	50%	-	55%	60%
2021/22	65%	69%	64%			69%	61%	69%	59%	67%	66%	60%	73%				66%	0%	67%	75%	69%	0%	0%	100%	-	53%	64%
2022/23	59%	61%	58%			54%	58%	60%	48%	62%	59%	43%	53%				61%	-	60%	75%	62%	-	100%	33%	-	70%	57%

Libraries

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	33%	39%	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%	75%	71%	0%	69%	40%	71%	40%	67%	100%	-	43%	71%
2021/22	60%	63%	59%			72%	55%	63%	60%	63%	62%	47%	58%				62%	100%	63%	100%	63%	100%	0%	0%	-	40%	64%
2022/23	66%	69%	63%			69%	63%	66%	67%	66%	67%	51%	65%				68%	-	67%	100%	68%	-	100%	50%	-	29%	68%

Local bus services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	70%	33%	-	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%	0%	59%	-	58%	75%	63%	71%	75%	75%	-	45%	52%
2021/22	56%	60%	53%			52%	47%	63%	55%	56%	58%	40%	55%				56%	50%	58%	100%	60%	100%	100%	0%	-	45%	54%
2022/23	50%	50%	50%			42%	48%	49%	39%	52%	49%	59%	61%				51%	-	51%	75%	56%	-	0%	33%	-	25%	46%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	52%	69%	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%	81%	80%	50%	80%	100%	80%	75%	75%	20%	-	75%	80%
2021/22	79%	82%	77%			75%	76%	84%	73%	80%	81%	64%	78%			79%	100%	80%	100%	82%	100%	0%	33%	-	65%	79%	
2022/23	79%	80%	78%			71%	80%	81%	73%	81%	80%	65%	77%			82%	-	81%	75%	81%	-	0%	0%	-	77%	81%	

Planning

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	7%	12%	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%	10%	25%	0%	24%	67%	25%	0%	33%	0%	-	38%	25%
2021/22	20%	19%	22%			24%	19%	21%	16%	22%	21%	18%	19%				21%	0%	22%	0%	20%	67%	0%	0%	-	18%	24%
2022/23	18%	17%	18%			24%	23%	17%	14%	19%	18%	21%	10%				20%	-	19%	0%	18%	-	0%	0%	-	14%	21%

Public Health (not including NHS services)

Age Religion (not including Fine service)																											
	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	70%	14%		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%	0%	37%		36%	67%	40%	0%	0%	33%	-	50%	31%
2021/22	42%	43%	44%			37%	42%	45%	41%	44%	45%	13%	40%				42%	0%	45%	0%	45%	0%	0%	0%	-	36%	46%
2022/23	37%	40%	33%			48%	34%	36%	38%	37%	37%	35%	48%				38%	-	38%	0%	42%	-	100%	50%	-	60%	33%

Schools

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	11%	19%	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%	56%	49%	0%	48%	50%	47%	40%	0%	0%	-	29%	49%
2021/22	45%	52%	41%			65%	44%	39%	35%	48%	46%	31%	41%				46%	0%	47%	100%	44%	100%	0%	0%	-	71%	49%
2022/23	44%	48%	42%			56%	52%	36%	37%	45%	44%	61%	40%				46%	-	46%	0%	46%	-	100%	0%	-	60%	46%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	30%	47%	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%	67%	70%	0%	69%	75%	68%	67%	67%	67%	-	50%	71%
2021/22	58%	65%	54%			71%	57%	56%	59%	61%	59%	50%	70%				60%	0%	61%	100%	62%	100%	0%	0%	-	63%	59%
2022/23	59%	62%	56%			63%	60%	57%	54%	59%	59%	50%	52%				62%	-	60%	67%	63%	-	0%	50%	-	67%	57%

Waste and recycling services

Age and Respondent Characteristics														Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity														Religion									
	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	56%	73%	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%	86%	79%	50%	79%	60%	81%	78%	50%	80%	-	67%	77%										
2021/22	80%	85%	76%			75%	75%	86%	79%	80%	81%	62%	82%				79%	100%	81%	80%	82%	100%	100%	67%	-	67%	78%										
2022/23	77%	81%	75%			72%	72%	78%	76%	78%	78%	65%	79%				79%	-	78%	100%	80%	-	0%	67%	-	83%	76%										

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	26%	12%	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%	38%	33%	0%	34%	33%	39%	0%	50%	50%	-	20%	29%
2021/22	35%	43%	30%			34%	30%	40%	50%	32%	35%	24%	41%				34%	0%	36%	0%	41%	100%	0%	50%	-	50%	29%
2022/23	31%	39%	25%			21%	19%	32%	44%	27%	33%	28%	41%				34%	-	34%	0%	39%	-	100%	0%	-	0%	24%

The Next Year

Looking at the information in the consultation document, how do you feel about the proposed amount of savings by category?

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-44	45-64	65+	Disabled	Non disabled	White	BAME	LGBQ	Heterosexual	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
Different ways of working to save £4.6m (75.4% of savings)																						
TOO LITTLE	13%	7%	18%	15%	11%	15%	10%	14%	13%	6%	18%	12%	-	12%	0%	10%	-	0%	0%	-	7%	16%
About right	55%	55%	57%	47%	63%	55%	51%	57%	57%	50%	56%	59%	-	58%	50%	59%	-	100%	100%	-	57%	54%
TOO MUCH	11%	12%	9%	11%	9%	11%	12%	10%	10%	17%	13%	10%	-	10%	50%	12%	-	0%	0%	-	7%	8%
Don't know	17%	21%	13%	25%	14%	17%	23%	15%	17%	20%	11%	17%	-	17%	0%	16%	-	0%	0%	-	14%	18%
Introducing more new technology & automation to save £0.2m (3.3% of savings)																						
TOO LITTLE	27%	17%	36%	38%	32%	27%	24%	29%	27%	19%	26%	27%	-	27%	25%	25%	-	0%	0%	-	14%	30%
About right	44%	47%	42%	33%	44%	48%	39%	45%	45%	50%	51%	47%	-	46%	25%	47%	-	100%	100%	-	43%	42%
TOO MUCH	9%	10%	7%	9%	7%	8%	10%	8%	9%	9%	8%	8%	-	8%	50%	9%	-	0%	0%	-	14%	6%
Don't know	16%	21%	11%	18%	13%	15%	20%	15%	16%	13%	10%	16%	-	16%	0%	15%	-	0%	0%	-	21%	17%
Increasing fees and charges to save £0.8m (13.1% of savings)																						
TOO LITTLE	10%	6%	13%	8%	11%	10%	10%	10%	10%	6%	13%	9%	-	9%	25%	10%	-	0%	0%	-	0%	8%
About right	40%	36%	44%	34%	40%	43%	29%	43%	41%	35%	28%	44%	-	42%	0%	41%	-	100%	0%	-	43%	45%
TOO MUCH	31%	32%	29%	36%	32%	28%	36%	29%	30%	39%	36%	29%	-	30%	75%	31%	-	0%	100%	-	43%	26%
Don't know	15%	21%	11%	19%	14%	16%	21%	14%	15%	15%	18%	15%	-	16%	0%	15%	-	0%	0%	-	14%	16%
Increasing the recovery of our costs by £0.5m (8.2% of savings)																						
TOO LITTLE	19%	14%	23%	17%	19%	20%	18%	20%	19%	9%	26%	19%	-	18%	50%	20%	-	0%	0%	-	14%	17%
About right	46%	43%	49%	44%	48%	49%	38%	48%	48%	43%	41%	49%	-	48%	0%	48%	-	100%	67%	-	43%	49%
TOO MUCH	12%	13%	10%	15%	12%	10%	13%	10%	10%	24%	15%	10%	-	11%	50%	11%	-	0%	33%	-	29%	10%
Don't know	19%	25%	14%	23%	17%	19%	26%	17%	19%	19%	13%	19%	-	19%	0%	18%	-	0%	0%	-	14%	20%

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?

The following tables show the percentage of respondents stating agreement with the approach.

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	48%	70%	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%	67%	68%	50%	67%	60%	67%	56%	100%	40%	-	46%	69%
2021/22	70%	71%	70%			77%	68%	71%	71%	71%	70%	71%	75%			71%	50%	71%	80%	69%	100%	100%	33%	0%	63%	73%	
2022/23	70%	75%	67%			61%	70%	71%	73%	70%	71%	69%	80%			72%	-	72%	100%	73%	-	100%	0%	-	50%	70%	

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	22%	16%	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%	14%	15%	0%	15%	0%	15%	11%	25%	0%	-	0%	16%
2021/22	18%	14%	22%			16%	17%	19%	16%	19%	18%	22%	20%			18%	50%	18%	40%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	16%	
2022/23	14%	12%	16%			7%	17%	16%	11%	15%	13%	24%	15%			13%	-	13%	0%	13%	-	0%	67%	-	21%	15%	

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	33%	44%	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%	48%	46%	0%	45%	0%	44%	44%	75%	0%	-	46%	50%
2021/22	43%	42%	45%			37%	46%	42%	41%	45%	43%	35%	39%			44%	100%	43%	40%	43%	33%	100%	33%	0%	32%	46%	
2022/23	36%	34%	39%			25%	39%	39%	30%	38%	36%	37%	34%			39%	-	37%	25%	37%	-	100%	33%	-	29%	38%	

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	52%	70%	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%	48%	61%	100%	61%	20%	56%	67%	50%	60%	-	62%	70%
2021/22	64%	60%	68%			83%	74%	51%	49%	67%	64%	66%	62%				66%	100%	65%	80%	60%	100%	100%	67%	0%	53%	73%
2022/23	59%	52%	66%			72%	75%	59%	46%	63%	59%	76%	72%				60%	-	60%	50%	55%	-	0%	100%	-	64%	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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	56%	71%	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%	43%	64%	100%	62%	20%	57%	67%	50%	80%	-	77%	72%
2021/22	67%	63%	71%			84%	76%	55%	50%	70%	67%	67%	64%				69%	50%	68%	60%	61%	100%	100%	67%	0%	53%	79%
2022/23	63%	56%	70%			80%	81%	63%	50%	68%	63%	80%	72%				65%	-	64%	50%	59%	-	100%	100%	-	71%	75%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	63%	88%	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%	81%	89%	50%	88%	80%	88%	89%	75%	100%	-	54%	88%
2021/22	85%	85%	86%			87%	88%	82%	80%	88%	86%	81%	87%			87%	100%	88%	60%	85%	33%	100%	67%	0%	89%	89%	
2022/23	86%	85%	87%			89%	90%	87%	81%	88%	86%	87%	89%			87%	-	86%	75%	86%	-	100%	100%	-	79%	89%	

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	15%	18%	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%	10%	17%	0%	17%	0%	16%	0%	0%	40%	-	8%	18%
2021/22	22%	17%	26%			26%	21%	21%	22%	22%	22%	22%	13%				22%	50%	22%	20%	22%	0%	0%	33%	0%	16%	23%
2022/23	17%	11%	21%			18%	18%	18%	11%	18%	16%	19%	20%				16%	-	16%	0%	17%	-	0%	0%	-	36%	17%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	33%	40%	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%	43%	37%	0%	37%	0%	37%	56%	50%	20%	-	31%	36%
2021/22	37%	35%	39%			38%	35%	38%	43%	37%	38%	30%	26%				38%	50%	38%	0%	38%	100%	0%	33%	0%	16%	39%
2022/23	33%	32%	34%			31%	29%	36%	33%	34%	34%	30%	31%				34%	-	34%	0%	34%	-	100%	0%	-	57%	35%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	63%	86%	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%	67%	84%	100%	83%	60%	81%	89%	75%	60%	-	62%	87%
2021/22	84%	81%	86%			95%	85%	79%	75%	86%	84%	85%	89%			85%	100%	84%	100%	82%	100%	100%	33%	0%	84%	89%	
2022/23	80%	78%	84%			84%	87%	82%	72%	84%	80%	80%	82%			83%	-	81%	100%	80%	-	100%	100%	-	79%	85%	

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	67%	82%	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%	81%	82%	100%	81%	80%	81%	89%	75%	40%	-	62%	83%
2021/22	80%	79%	82%			86%	83%	77%	67%	83%	80%	76%	75%				81%	100%	81%	60%	80%	100%	100%	33%	0%	74%	84%
2022/23	79%	78%	81%			78%	83%	82%	72%	82%	80%	80%	79%				82%	-	80%	75%	80%	-	100%	100%	-	71%	81%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	19%	20%	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%	33%	19%	0%	19%	0%	21%	22%	25%	0%	-	23%	17%
2021/22	22%	18%	26%			19%	23%	23%	20%	23%	23%	18%	15%				23%	50%	23%	20%	24%	67%	0%	67%	0%	11%	22%
2022/23	21%	16%	26%			23%	21%	23%	17%	23%	22%	9%	15%				22%	-	22%	0%	22%	-	100%	33%	-	36%	19%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	44%	47%	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%	62%	44%	50%	44%	40%	44%	67%	25%	40%	-	54%	43%
2021/22	46%	45%	48%			44%	49%	44%	43%	47%	46%	49%	39%				46%	50%	47%	40%	48%	67%	0%	33%	0%	47%	45%
2022/23	43%	43%	43%			38%	47%	44%	40%	44%	43%	54%	49%				44%	-	44%	75%	44%	-	100%	67%	-	64%	44%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	59%	54%	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%	62%	55%	50%	55%	60%	58%	67%	75%	60%	-	23%	50%
2021/22	54%	53%	57%			52%	53%	57%	57%	54%	55%	54%	56%				55%	50%	56%	40%	58%	100%	100%	33%	0%	42%	52%
2022/23	53%	55%	52%			48%	57%	54%	51%	54%	53%	72%	54%				55%	-	54%	75%	55%	-	100%	100%	-	50%	52%

Council Tax options for 2022/23

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-44	45-64	65+	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	BAME	LGBQ	Heterosexual	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
Which of the following options would you prefer?																						
Option A: increase council tax by 3.99%	29%	28%	30%	19%	29%	30%	23%	31%	30%	17%	26%	32%	-	30%	25%	29%	-	0%	0%	-	0%	33%
Option B: increase council tax by 1.99%	32%	33%	32%	33%	32%	36%	29%	33%	32%	41%	34%	34%	-	33%	75%	34%	-	0%	33%	-	50%	29%
Option C: freeze council tax at the current level	28%	28%	27%	42%	33%	27%	27%	28%	27%	35%	28%	25%	-	26%	0%	25%	-	100%	67%	-	36%	29%
No preference	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	0%	2%	2%	-	2%	0%	2%	-	0%	0%	-	7%	2%
Don't know	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	-	2%	0%	2%	-	0%	0%	-	0%	2%
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%?																						
SUPPORT	16%	12%	18%	11%	14%	16%	14%	17%	16%	15%	16%	17%	-	16%	25%	16%	-	0%	0%	-	7%	19%
Neither support nor oppose	12%	15%	11%	11%	9%	12%	16%	11%	13%	9%	13%	13%	-	13%	25%	13%	-	0%	0%	-	14%	11%
OPPOSE	68%	70%	68%	76%	76%	70%	64%	70%	68%	76%	66%	68%	-	68%	50%	68%	-	100%	100%	-	79%	68%

Your Local Area and the Council

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%															
2016/17	11%	9%	12%			9%	12%	11%	9%	11%	11%	16%															
2017/18	9%	9%	9%			10%	7%	10%	9%	9%	9%	10%															
2018/19	8%	8%	8%			7%	7%	8%	11%	7%	8%	10%															
2019/20	8%	8%	9%			11%	7%	7%	4%	9%	9%	8%	29%	24%	30%	7%	9%	70%	9%	0%	7%	13%	0%	17%	0%	18%	11%
2020/21	7%	7%	6%	6%	7%		6%	7%	7%	6%	6%	10%	8%	18%	17%	14%	7%	0%	7%	0%	8%	22%	25%	0%		8%	6%
2021/22	7%	8%	7%			11%	6%	8%	6%	8%	7%	5%	11%				7%	50%	7%	0%	8%	33%	0%	0%	0%	16%	7%
2022/23	6%	5%	6%			8%	6%	5%	7%	5%	5%	11%	8%				6%	-	6%	0%	6%	-	0%	0%	-	0%	5%
WORSE																											
2015/16	25%	27%	22%			21%	29%	23%	24%	26%	27%	24%															
2016/17	23%	18%	27%			22%	24%	22%	29%	22%	22%	14%															
2017/18	27%	25%	28%			24%	33%	23%	26%	27%	26%	31%															
2018/19	26%	24%	28%			19%	30%	26%	21%	26%	25%	17%															
2019/20	29%	29%	29%			35%	35%	25%	32%	29%	29%	25%	14%	14%	40%	44%	28%	30%	28%	0%	26%	38%	67%	67%	0%	29%	28%
2020/21	30%	31%	28%	17%	28%		34%	27%	33%	29%	30%	16%	25%	0%	0%	29%	28%	50%	28%	40%	27%	0%	50%	40%		15%	30%
2021/22	31%	25%	33%			24%	35%	27%	33%	30%	30%	38%	25%				30%	50%	28%	20%	26%	0%	100%	33%	0%	42%	32%
2022/23	35%	31%	36%			41%	30%	34%	39%	34%	34%	30%	30%				31%	-	33%	25%	32%	-	0%	0%	-	43%	32%

The following tables show the percentage of respondents stating satisfaction with the service.

Overall, how satisfied 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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	74%	84%	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%	90%	81%	50%	80%	60%	83%	56%	25%	40%		85%	77%
2021/22	79%	83%	79%			85%	77%	81%	80%	80%	80%	68%	84%			80%	50%	81%	100%	82%	100%	100%	100%	0%	74%	80%	
2022/23	77%	80%	75%			70%	78%	79%	74%	79%	78%	78%	85%			81%	-	79%	75%	82%	-	100%	33%	-	64%	78%	

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	59%	64%	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%	71%	68%	50%	67%	20%	70%	44%	25%	40%	-	46%	67%
2021/22	62%	69%	59%			56%	56%	69%	57%	64%	65%	37%	61%			63%	50%	65%	40%	69%	100%	100%	33%	0%	53%	59%	
2022/23	56%	63%	51%			43%	53%	59%	55%	56%	57%	52%	62%			59%	-	58%	100%	62%	-	0%	33%	-	50%	54%	

The following tables show the percentage of respondents stating agreement with the question posed.

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	37%	43%	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%	52%	49%	50%	49%	20%	48%	33%	25%	60%	-	31%	50%
2021/22	59%	63%	58%			58%	63%	58%	54%	61%	61%	47%	52%				60%	50%	60%	60%	60%	100%	100%	67%	0%	58%	63%
2022/23	50%	49%	51%			40%	52%	52%	48%	51%	51%	50%	49%				53%	-	52%	75%	54%	-	0%	33%	-	36%	51%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	41%	44%	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%	57%	50%	50%	49%	40%	50%	33%	25%	40%	-	31%	49%
2021/22	53%	56%	52%			54%	56%	53%	41%	56%	54%	46%	46%				54%	100%	55%	20%	55%	100%	100%	67%	0%	26%	56%
2022/23	49%	51%	49%			38%	51%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	59%				52%	-	51%	75%	52%	-	0%	33%	-	43%	52%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	26%	18%	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%	14%	18%	0%	18%	20%	18%	11%	25%	0%	-	15%	20%
2021/22	15%	17%	14%			16%	15%	15%	12%	16%	15%	9%	20%				15%	50%	16%	0%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	21%	16%
2022/23	13%	15%	11%			6%	16%	12%	11%	13%	13%	17%	16%				15%	-	14%	0%	14%	-	0%	0%	-	21%	14%

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	BAME	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Heterosexual	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%	41%	34%	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%	57%	42%	50%	41%	60%	45%	44%	50%	40%	0%	38%	35%
2021/22	41%	43%	41%			33%	37%	48%	36%	43%	42%	30%	44%			42%	0%	44%	0%	47%	100%	0%	33%	0%	47%	39%	
2022/23	36%	40%	34%			22%	35%	37%	36%	37%	37%	33%	48%			38%	-	38%	50%	41%	-	0%	0%	-	43%	34%	

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?

<p>In 2010, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) produced its first progress report on equality, entitled “How Fair is Britain?”</p> <p>In October 2015, the EHRC published its follow-up report on both equality and human rights, entitled “Is Britain Fairer?”</p> <p>The latest EHRC report, published in 2019, entitled “<u>How Fair is Britain? (2018)</u>” is available here.</p>	
Note:	A brief overview of findings is shown on pages 64-70 of this EqlAA.

Race Disparity Audit

<p>The Government’s “Race Disparity Audit” report was published in October 2017. An overview of findings is shown under the following headings:-</p>	
Hyperlinks:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full Report• Communities• Poverty and Living Standards• Education• Employment• Housing• Policing• Criminal Justice• Health• The Public Sector Workforce
Note:	A brief overview of findings is shown on pages 71-74 of this EqlAA.

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.