

Measuring equality at a local level

September 2008

Dr Amanda Tuke, Deputy Director, Office for National Statistics

Contents

Summary	3
1. Introduction	4
1.1 Context	
1.2 Gaps in equality data	
1.3 Section summary	
1.4 The remainder of this report	
2. Context	9
2.1 Introduction	
2.2 Equality information in support of indicators in LAAs and the wider performance framework	
2.3 Equality information for CAAs	
2.4 Equality information for impact assessments	
2.5 Equality information for the ESLG	
2.6 Section summary	
3. Mapping data onto an equality measurement framework	14
3.1 Introduction	
3.2 Measurement framework	
3.3 Data audit	
3.4 Section summary	
4. Building an equality evidence base.	22
4.1 Introduction	
4.2 Community and inequality profiles	
4.3 Indicator equality profiles	
4.4 Sharing equality data and local information systems	
4.5 Section summary	
5. Conclusions and next steps	35
Annex A. National Sources of equality information	36
Annex B. Key indicators within National Indicator set for measuring equality	45
Annex C. Equality data available from Neighbourhood Statistics	54

Summary

There are strong links between the current view of the role of local government and the challenges for local government in addressing inequalities and meeting the statutory requirements of equality legislation.

Fit for purpose equality information will be essential to understand communities and support place-shaping. While there are a number of gaps in equality data, particularly at a local level, data sources still need to be exhausted before new data collection burdens are imposed on service users. Consistency of concepts and methods in data collection across services will then allow data to be used more widely as will better systems for sharing data among local partners. When information is collected, its quality will be improved if the purpose of collecting information on equality is effectively communicated. Respondents need to understand why they are being asked for potentially sensitive information.

There are a number of different requirements for equality data which have arisen in recent years but the overlap in the scope of information which is needed is considerable. Local Area Agreements (LAAs), Comprehensive Area Assessments (CAAs), Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) and the Equality Standard for local government all require up-to-date information about communities, their needs, aspirations and the barriers they face.

The process of auditing information across an equality measurement framework proposed in the 'Equalities Review'¹ clarified that most existing information on equality is about outcomes with a small amount on process relating to treatment by services and little or no information on choice and control in different domains. At a national and local level across all equality domains, equality information is particularly weak for equality relating to disability, sexual orientation and religion/belief. There is no quantitative information on transgender.

Across domains, equality information at a local level is scarce for

- objective measures of health
- physical and legal security
- in relation to young people after leaving compulsory education.

In the interests of efficiency, there is a need for national-level equality information to be owned, updated and disseminated by the relevant organisations to provide a context for local area profiles.

In the short-term local authority partnerships need to find effective and creative ways of building and sharing an equality information base which includes data and analysis. Much better use should be made of administrative data sources. And as the information is developed, it will be a rich source for improving the national level picture of inequality.

As William W. Watt said 'Do not put your faith in what statistics say until you have carefully considered what they do not say'. This caveat is particularly pertinent in relation to collecting information about inequalities where given the multiple links between different aspects of inequality, it would be easy to draw the wrong conclusions from an incomplete picture.

¹ Cabinet Office, The Equalities Review, 'Fairness and Freedom: the final report of the Equalities Review', 28th February 2007 <http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/equalitiesreview/>

1. Introduction

1.1 Context

The current view of the role of local government has at its core recognition that local areas differ and have diverse needs. And within those local areas, there is a huge diversity of experiences and life chances.

The major change in direction for local government outlined in the local government White Paper, 'Strong and Prosperous Communities'² was closely followed by the presentation of a more holistic view of equality in 'The Equalities Review: Fairness and Freedom'³.

The local government White Paper was a clear recognition of the differences between local areas and that top-down targets will not necessarily present better outcomes at a local level. Instead councils will need to 'place-shape', through agreeing local priorities, building partnerships with other providers in the public, private and third sectors and, crucially, understanding and engaging with their local communities.

The Equalities Review reported on a number of persistent inequalities in Britain, many of which had a very local dimension. The key proposal from the Equalities Review was that equality should be not only equality outcomes or opportunities but equality of life chances. And that equality should be monitored nationally and locally through a coherent measurement framework to include age, disability, gender, race, religion/belief and sexual orientation.

A recent IDeA essay⁴ links the ideas in these two publications as sharing a similar concern to move beyond the tyranny of process, which has often led to a tick-box approach, and at worst, a set of prescriptive rules that can easily be characterised as political correctness. The essay identifies the need for better access to local data and equality mapping to understand the needs of communities, and the shaping of new interventions to try and reduce equality gap.

² Department of Communities and Local Government 'Strong and Prosperous Communities', October 2006 <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/strongprosperous>

³ Cabinet Office, The Equalities Review, 'Fairness and Freedom: the final report of the Equalities Review', 28 February 2007 <http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/equalitiesreview/>

⁴ Solace Foundation Imprint 'How equality shapes place: diversity and localism', May 2008 <http://www.sfi.uk.com/pdf/SFI%20-%20How%20equality%20shapes%20place.pdf> which contains Tiotto, J 'Outcomes and equality – Keeping it simple', May 2008

1.2 Gaps in equality data

ONS-led review of equality data

The Equalities Review made a strong case for the inadequacy of the existing equality evidence base at a national and local level.

‘The data available on inequalities are inadequate in many ways, limiting people’s ability to understand problems and their causes, set priorities and track progress. And even where data do exist, they are not consistently used well or published in way which makes sense.’⁵

The recommendation was made that:

‘a cross-cutting Government review of current data needs is a fundamental and necessary starting point if Government and devolved administrations are to properly analyse, understand and address inequalities... the Office for National Statistics (ONS) should be responsible for leading the review and for ensuring the data on equalities across Government and the devolved administrations meet existing and future need, nationally and locally.’

In June 2007 the ONS convened a cross-government task force to steer a review of equality data and the following October, the report from this data review was published⁶.

The aims of the data review were to make general and specific recommendations for improvements to equality data by autumn 2007 which would increase their suitability for the purposes of

- fulfilling government’s statutory duties on equality
- fulfilling the public sector’s responsibilities as an employer
- effective policy development by central or local government and demonstrating progress
- targeting public services
- raising awareness and challenging prejudice.

And therefore allowing organisations from all sectors to monitor the state of society in a coherent framework across the UK.

While the four month data review focused primarily on national level data sources predominantly surveys, the task force also agreed a range of recommendations, many of which would improve the equality evidence base at both national and local level. The review proposes a draft set of principles for collecting and publishing equality data. Four of the

⁵ Cabinet Office, The Equalities Review, ‘Fairness and Freedom: the final report of the Equalities Review’, 28th February 2007 <http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/equalitiesreview/>

⁶ ONS ‘Review of equality data’, October 2007 <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/data/measuring-equality/review.asp>

eight principles have particular relevance for measuring equality at a local level in support of the national indicators.

Exhausting data sources

Principle 1 from the data review reads

‘Given resource and provider burden constraints, not all potential user needs for equality statistics can be met. User needs therefore need to be prioritised and periodically reprioritised as needs change. This should be done on the basis of an agreed and public set of criteria.’⁷

Data users in local government and elsewhere need to first prioritise the equality questions they are trying to answer. In most cases, local authorities will be keenly aware of multi-disadvantaged groups in their areas but given the ever-changing nature of inequalities, an element of horizon-scanning will need to be built in to developing an information base.

In a climate of limited resources and recognition of the burden of data collection on providers, it is essential that users of data, including local authorities, first exhaust existing data sources to answer these equality questions. For their part, data providers will need to improve the accessibility of data and give users information on the limitations of their data source for these purposes. In addition, managers of data sources in central government need to get better at communicating developments relating to equality data sources to users in local government. To this end IDeA are currently developing a web page which will summarise equality data developments across government for the benefit of local authority equality officers and their colleagues.

Only when there is real clarity on the remaining equality data gaps can there be a justification for new initiatives which increase administrative burdens. These might include commissioning new data collection. Local strategic partnerships should certainly explore the potential of data partnerships with neighbouring authorities, local businesses and the third sector.

Consistency and coherence in concepts

Principle 4 from the data review reads:

‘Consistency of methods, concepts and classifications is fundamental in the collection, analysis and presentation of equality statistics.’⁸

Equality data will only improve if there is an agreed government-wide strategy for data, taking a long-term view across all potential data sources. In the short-term, we need swift

⁷ Cabinet Office, The Equalities Review, ‘Fairness and Freedom: the final report of the Equalities Review’, 28th February 2007 <http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/equalitiesreview/>

⁸ Cabinet Office, The Equalities Review, ‘Fairness and Freedom: the final report of the Equalities Review’, 28th February 2007 <http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/equalitiesreview/>

agreement on some fundamental equality concepts and classifications. The data review identified the need for body to take this strategic view.

A cross-government strategy group has now been set up to address obstacles to better measurement of equality and met for the first time in March 2008. The local authority viewpoint is represented on that group by the Local Government Association (LGA).

Some immediate priorities for this group will be to monitor the development of a family of standard questions for collecting information on disabled people and to support the development and roll-out of standard questions for collecting information on sexual identity.

Sharing data

Principle 6 from the data review reads:

‘All equality data collected and information produced by public bodies should be publicly accessible within the constraints needed to preserve confidentiality. Users should be able to easily access equality data and reports; this includes the requirement for reasonable adjustments to be made.’⁹

As key data users, local authorities are in a strong position to feed into improvements in the publication of equality data.

IDeA, ONS and LGA have been working together to develop guidance for local authorities on finding equality data within Neighbourhood Statistics and other data publication sites. ONS recognises the increasing needs of analysts and policy-makers working at the local authority and regional level and are developing the [NeSS website](#) to facilitate access to data for these users which will include better sign-posting of data.

The challenge will be to ensure that the equality information councils collect effectively serves and informs policy development, service development, and Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs). And, as data providers, local authorities will need to consider the extent to which this equality information is and should be publicly accessible.

Explaining data collection

Principle 8 from the data review reads:

‘Equality data will be improved if people responding to requests for data understand the purpose(s) that the data will be used for, and those asking for the data understand and value the information as useful for their own purposes.’¹⁰

⁹ Cabinet Office, The Equalities Review, ‘Fairness and Freedom: the final report of the Equalities Review’, 28th February 2007 <http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/equalitiesreview/>

¹⁰ Cabinet Office, The Equalities Review, ‘Fairness and Freedom: the final report of the Equalities Review’, 28th February 2007 <http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/equalitiesreview/>

If we are to improve the accuracy of equality information that we collect it is essential that respondents value the purposes for which we are collecting it. Local authorities and their local strategic partners have a key role to play in partnership with central government in communicating the purpose of collecting equality data and demonstrating how the data collected leads to better public services.

While a national level publicity campaign would be of value, this will only be effective if it is supported by the continuous and effective communication of the need for equality data at the point of collection.

1.3 Section summary

There are strong links between the current view of the role of local government and the challenges for local government in meeting the statutory requirements of equality legislation.

Fit for purpose equality information will be essential to understand communities and support place-shaping. While there are a number of gaps in equality data, particularly at a local level, data sources still need to be exhausted before new data collection burdens are imposed on service users. Consistency of concepts and methods in data collection across services will allow data to be used more widely, as will better systems for sharing data among local partners.

The quality of information collected will be improved if the purpose of collecting information on equality is effectively communicated.

1.4 The remainder of this report

The aims of this report are to

- clarify the need for equality information in support of a range of statutory duties and other requirements for local authorities
- inform local partners of the availability of equality information in a wide range of data sources at a national and local level and to highlight the gaps in information
- propose a number of pragmatic approaches for developing equality information with wide applicability
- demonstrate how equality information and analysis can be approached in a number of different ways.

Section 2 demonstrates the overlapping requirements for equality data for a number of purposes.

Section 3 summarises the availability of national and local level equality information in the context of 'measurement framework' proposed in the 'Equalities Review'.

Section 4 reports on a number of approaches to building up equality information and understanding at a local level, with examples of new analysis produced in partnership with local authorities.

Section 5 concludes and makes recommendations which, it is hoped, will lead to improvements in measuring equality at a local level.

2. Context

2.1 Introduction

Equality data, both demographic information about the local community and information about different experiences and outcomes within the community, are needed to

- address local government priorities set out in Local Area Agreements (LAAs) and wider central government priorities
- contribute to Comprehensive Area Assessments (CAAs)
- meet statutory equality duties through the mechanism of Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)
- progress through the Equality Standard for local government.

While these needs have arisen at different times, the following summaries demonstrate the considerable overlap in the kinds of equality information required. Developing one information base to meet these needs should considerably reduce the burden on local authorities.

2.2 Equality information in support of indicators in Local Area Agreements and wider performance framework

The National Indicator Set (NIS) was announced by the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) in October 2007, following the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review 2007¹¹. The NIS will be the only set of indicators on which central government will performance manage local government, replacing all other existing sets of indicators, including Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) and Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) indicators, from 1st April 2008.

The new performance framework for local government includes a number of indicators (around 20 from the set of 198) which explicitly address equality issues, for example indicator 107 'Key stage 2 attainment for Black and minority ethnic groups'. For these indicators, data sources have been identified. But the need for information by equality characteristics does not stop there. Reducing, for example, the number of 16-18 year olds not in education, employment or training (NEETs) is unlikely to be successful without understanding of the obstacles faced by different groups.

Local strategic partnerships (including local authorities, police forces and primary care trusts) have agreed 35 or more indicators or sub-indicators for their LAA against which the performance of the area will be assessed.

A number of priority objectives for local government will need equality information, whether or not the indicators appear in disaggregated form within Local Area Agreements.

¹¹ Department of Communities and Local Government 'The New Performance Framework for Local Authorities and Local Authority Partnerships: a single set of national indicators', October 2007
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/nationalindicator>

2.3 Equality information for Comprehensive Area Assessment

From April 2009, Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) will replace Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA)¹². This marks a significant change to the current assessment regime following the passing of the 'Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act'¹³. CPA focused on services provided by local authorities. CAA will look at the public services in an area delivered by councils and their partners including the private and voluntary sectors.

CAA will provide assurance about how well-run local public services are and how effectively they use taxpayers' money. But it also aims to be more relevant to local people by focusing on issues that are important to their community. It will develop a shared view about the challenges facing an area, such as crime, community cohesion, a sustainable environment or public health issues such as obesity, and will also create a more joined up and proportionate approach to public service regulation.

The CAA will draw together evidence and information from a wide range of sources. Much of it will be the very information that local service bodies and the local strategic partnership (LSP) have used to draw up their Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and will be using to manage their own performance. This will include information drawn from the new National Indicator Set (NIS) and will take account of progress being made towards targets in their LAAs.

Core to the CAA will be a particular focus on those whose circumstances make them particularly vulnerable and evidence of reducing inequalities in key services, for example health and education.

The CAA consultation document, published November 2007, indicated that it is the Audit Commission's intention to rely only on management information used by local bodies and partnerships to understand the needs and performance of their areas. The Audit Commission and the Inspectorates recognise that for public services to improve they need good quality and timely information about their performance which is vital to their ability to understand and root out inequality¹⁴.

And using the CAA process to stimulate significant improvement in the quality of data and the use of information by decision makers is highly relevant to improving performance on equality and diversity¹⁵.

¹² Audit Commission 'Comprehensive Area Assessment' (CPA)
<http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/caa/index.asp>

¹³ 'Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act', 2007
http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2007/ukpga_20070028_en_1

¹⁴ Audit Commission, 'Our approach to assessing the equality impact of Comprehensive Area Assessment', July 2008
<http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/caa/downloads/EqualityImpactAssessment.doc>

¹⁵ Audit Commission, 'Our approach to assessing the equality impact of Comprehensive Area Assessment', July 2008
<http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/caa/downloads/EqualityImpactAssessment.doc>

2.4 Equality information for impact assessment

The legal responsibilities of public authorities regarding equality are set out in legislation and statutory codes of practice relating to the

- Equal Pay Act 1970;
- Sex Discrimination Act 1975
- Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 (RRAA 2000)
- Disability Discrimination Act 2005 (DDA 2005)
- Equality Act 2006 (EA 2006)

Public authorities have specific statutory duties to develop and publish equality schemes for gender, race and disability demonstrating how they will go about delivering their general statutory duties and employment duties and including a 'statement of the authority's arrangements for assessing the impact of its policies and practices, or the likely impact of its proposed policies and practices, on equality'.

Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are important not only because they are a legal requirement but because they help to improve policies, strategies, procedures, functions, projects, reviews and organisational change for the whole community and not just minority groups¹⁶.

Information gathering forms a core part of the process of EIA with the expectation that equality information collected for a particular policy, strategy, service etc will be of future use for other related functions. In gathering information for EIAs, previous EIAs should clearly be the first reference point¹⁷. Sufficient evidence must be collected to justify the rationale behind decisions to take, or not take, action to promote equality.

The Disability Rights Commission's guidance 'Disability equality impact assessment and the Disability Equality Duty' concludes that gathering and analysing evidence about disability is both core to the process of impact assessment for disabled people and important in its own right for a range of purposes.

'In practice it is not easy to draw a firm distinction between impact assessment and gathering and analysing evidence to inform action. One that we draw is that gathering and analysing evidence may be used for purposes other than impact assessment and could also be used for more than one assessment, forming a growing pool of information about disabled people in the authority's catchment area'¹⁸.

¹⁶ Improvement and Development Agency online Equality Impact Assessment guidance
<http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pagelId=8017247>

¹⁷ Improvement and Development Agency 'Information gathering in Equality Impact Assessment'
<http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pagelId=8017775>

¹⁸ Disability Rights Commission, 'Do the duty'
<http://www.dotheduty.org/>

2.5 Equality information for the Equality Standard for local government

The Equality Standard for Local Government was developed in partnership by the IDeA, Employers' Organisation for Local Government, Commission for Racial Equality (CRE), Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC), Disability Rights Commission (DRC), the Audit Commission and the Local Government Association (LGA) and was published first in 2001. It was then revised in 2007 to bring it in line with the new equality legislation, in particular widening its scope to include age, religion/belief and sexual orientation¹⁹.

Pre-dating the Equality Impact Assessment process, for which there is now a statutory duty, it set up a way for local authorities to mainstream equalities in service delivery and employment.

The Standard requires a different approach from the one required by the legal duties, but the overall goal is the same – improved outcomes for groups that have traditionally experienced disadvantage.

In common with meeting the legal equality duties, collecting and using equality information is essential for the Standard.

At the time of writing the IDeA were developing an Equality Framework for Local Government (EFLG) to replace the ESLG. The Framework will complement the developing National Improvement and Efficiency strategy and the work of the Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnerships (RIEPs) in improving performance on equality and diversity. To find out the latest developments on the Framework please see this link www.idea.gov.uk/equalityframework.

2.6 Section summary

There are a number of different requirements for equality data which have arisen in recent years but the overlap in the scope of information which is needed is considerable.

In summary, for local authorities or local authority partnerships to meet the equality information needs of Local Area Agreements, Comprehensive Area Assessments, Equality Impact Assessments and the Equality Standard, they need to start building up the following information about their community:

- who they are (in terms of age, disability, gender, ethnicity, religion/belief and sexual orientation)
- where different people live and work (including information about the workforce of public authorities in the local authority partnership)
- the experience of different groups in relation to public services and how they fare in relation to key national indicators, their needs, aspirations and the barriers they face and which groups are multiply disadvantaged
- the impact of national and local interventions on different groups

¹⁹ Improvement and Development Agency 'The Revised Equality Standard for local government', October 2007 <http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageld=5145192>

This information needs to be collated in a way which will serve the various purposes listed here and minimise duplication in collecting information. This should considerably reduce the burdens on local authorities and members of the community.

While some inequalities persist, disadvantage is rarely static in a community. Local authority partnerships will need to review their information base at intervals to anticipate groups which are in danger of becoming disadvantaged.

With this challenging list in mind, it seems sensible to gain a clear idea of what equality information is currently available in relation to different population sub-groups and different domains of life. The following chapter presents an overview of the availability of equality information at a national and local level.

3. Mapping existing data onto an equality measurement framework

3.1 Introduction

Section one of this report concluded that local authorities should exhaust existing equality data sources before creating additional burdens on data providers. In practice this is not straightforward. The 'Review of equality data'²⁰ pointed out that even where equality information was available, it was not always easy to find.

This chapter summarises the results of the audit of national level data carried out as part of the 'Review of equality data', and indicates where there is potential to disaggregate the data to regional or local area level. 'Annex A: National sources of equality information' lists the information on national sources and 'Annex B: A number of indicators within National Indicator Set which may be considered important for measuring equality and equality information available for them' shows the available information on potential for disaggregation of data sources supporting key indicators in the National Indicator Set (NIS).

'Annex C: Neighbourhood statistics and equality information' of this report sets out the equality information which is available for local areas via Neighbourhood Statistics, collated with assistance from the Local Government Analysis and Research (LGAR) team.

3.2 A measurement framework

The Equalities Review²¹ (ER) accepted the recommendation of a measurement steering group that a definition of equality should focus on what matters to people and recognise that people have diverse goals in life. It defines an equality society as follows

'An equal society protects and promotes equal, real freedom and substantive opportunity to live in the ways people value and would choose, so that everyone can flourish.

An equal society recognises people's different needs, situations and goals and removes the barriers that limit what people can do and be'.

²⁰ ONS 'Review of equality data', October 2007

<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/data/measuring-equality/review.asp>

²¹ Cabinet Office, The Equalities Review, 'Fairness and Freedom: the final report of the Equalities Review', 28th February 2007 <http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/equalitiesreview/>

The ER proposed definition of equality captures three aspects of equality

- **Opportunity** – whether everyone really has the same substantive freedom to flourish
- **Agency** – what degree of choice and control an individual has in achieving the valued activity
- **Process** – whether discrimination (or some barrier or process) causes or contributes to a particular inequality.

Ten steps were identified to achieve greater equality. Step three covers measuring progress towards equality through a comprehensive framework of measurement. In terms of purpose, it recommends that

- the framework is used by all public bodies to agree priorities, set targets and evaluate progress towards equality
- the framework is used by the CEHR (now EHRC), to inform its triennial 'State of the Nation' report, with the five year goal of achieving, among other things, a shared understanding of what we mean by equality and a common framework of measurement at national, regional and local levels.

The proposed measurement framework includes gender, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, transgender, religion/belief and age because these characteristics share two features

- they can be treated as beyond an individual's control
- existing evidence suggests they are a source of inequality.

Ten domains are also proposed, developed from domains in international human rights frameworks combined with the results of public consultation (see Table 1).

The structure of the proposed framework can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1 The measurement framework proposed by Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (2006) and endorsed by the Equalities Review

Equality characteristic► Equality domain▼	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Sexual orientation	Trans-gender	Religion/belief
Longevity	[Information on outcomes, process and choice/control]						
Physical security							
Health							
Education							
Standard of living							
Productive and valued activities							
Individual, family and social life							
Participation, influence and voice							
Identity, expression and self-respect							
Legal security							

A summary of the coverage of domains outlined in the Equalities Review is shown below.

- Longevity** including avoiding premature mortality.
- Physical security** including freedom from violence and physical and sexual abuse and freedom to use public spaces without fear.
- Health** including well-being and access to high quality health care.
- Education** including both being able to be creative, to acquire skills and qualifications and having access to training and life-long learning.
- Standard of living** including being able to live with independence and security: and covering nutrition, clothing, housing, warmth, utilities, social service and transport. Living with independence, dignity and self-respect.

Productive and valued activities	such as access to employment, a positive experience in the workplace, work/life balance, and being able to care for others.
Individual, family and social life	including self-development, having independence and equality in relationships and marriage. Enjoy support in pregnancy, maternity and in childhood.
Participation, influence and voice	including participation in decision-making and democratic life, participation in local community and civil organisations including trade unions.
Identity, expression and self-respect	including freedom of belief and religion.
Legal security	including being treated with equality and non-discrimination before the law and equality treatment by justice system. Knowing privacy will be respected and personal data protected.

At the time of writing, the government’s response to the Equalities Review had not been published, so the precise structure of the measurement framework should be considered provisional at this stage. However, the revised ‘Equality Standard for Local Government’ is making use of this measurement framework.

The next section provides an overview of data available across this measurement framework with an additional column for socio-economic status as the data review task force considered this an additional important dimension.

3.3 Data audit

Approach

The following exercises were undertaken in carrying out this data audit

- Information on data coverage of the measurement framework at a national level was drawn from the ‘Review of equality data’²² and additional information sought on the possibility for disaggregating data at a local level (Annex A).
- Indicators from the National Indicator Set (NIS) were allocated across the measurement framework, and data sources underpinning these were investigated for information on equality characteristics (Annex B).
- Equality information available through Neighbourhood Statistics was then listed to contribute to increasing accessibility (Annex C).

This information was then used to identify data sources which could be combined to provide some coverage and areas where data were most scarce.

²² ONS ‘Review of equality data’, October 2007
<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/data/measuring-equality/review.asp>

Information on demographic characteristics for a community

The assumption has been made here that all local authorities already make use of census data to provide a ten year benchmark for age, gender, ethnicity, religion/belief, socio-economic status, household status and combinations of characteristics where these are available. Information which could contribute to understanding disability is also collected in the census.

At a national level, updated information on some or all of gender, age, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic status and/or religion/belief can be drawn from a number of major national household surveys

- the quarterly ONS 'Integrated household survey' (which combines the 'General household survey' with the 'Labour force' and other surveys) – sample size around 220,000 across the UK
- the 'Family resources survey' (Department of Work and Pensions) – sample size 28,000 across the UK
- the 'Citizenship survey' (Department of Communities and Local Government) – 10,000 across England and Wales
- the 'British crime survey' (Home Office) – 45,000 across England and Wales
- the 'Health survey for England' (Information Centre for Health and Social Care)
- the 'British social attitudes survey' – sample of 3,300.

A number of these could be used to produce regional breakdowns, and for the larger surveys, limited analysis at local authority areas level. It is unlikely, however, that developments in the short-term could do much to improve the use of these national level surveys for local areas.

Administrative data sources will therefore be of primary importance for building local level information on equality in particular the 'School census' (which can also be used to analyse the changes in proportions of ethnic groups at a local level), health administration data, benefits data and data from delivering other local services.

Developments in collecting equality data on patients should improve the possibilities for using health administrative data more widely in the future. Data on ethnicity is already collected for patients admitted to care although not when registering with GPs. The Department of Health reports that consideration is being given to this.

National and local level information is weakest around disability where developing an agreed approach to question formulation is currently underway. While there is currently no single source of information on disabled people at a local level, a picture of disability for a particular local area could be developed by combining

- national level information on trends in different types of disability
- local level information from the census on individuals with limiting long-term illness or disability and how they are distributed geographically
- local level breakdowns from data on benefits administration, social care services and third sector organisations
- links between disability and other characteristics like ethnicity.

In the future, the ONS has been commissioned to carry out a 'Disability survey' by the Office for Disability Issues, this development should improve the information base. Section four of this report, 'Sourcing, analysing and sharing equality information', includes a description of making best use of existing information on disability in the Sheffield area.

ONS is developing questioning on sexual orientation (in this case sexual identity) for the IHS in partnership with a number of stakeholders. Questions on sexual identity are currently being trialled in both the 'Citizenship survey' and the 'British crime survey' (Home Office).

There are no official sources of equality information on transgender status.

National longitudinal surveys, where individuals are tracked over a number of years, are also a vital source of national level information on causes of inequality. These include

- the ONS' 'Longitudinal study'
- the 'British household panel survey' which will be replaced by the 'UK household longitudinal survey (Economic and Social Research Council)
- 'National child development survey (Institute of Education/UK Data Archive)
- 'Families and children study' (Department of Work and Pensions)
- 'Youth cohort study' (Department of Children, Schools and Families)
- 'The European social survey'.

Availability of equality data across domains and characteristics

The following summarises the key findings from the data audit across equality domains.

Longevity and health

- The small numbers of older people from ethnic groups at the current time mean that it would be extremely difficult to calculate differential life expectancies even at a national level.
- Self-reported health at a national level can be disaggregated by a range of equality characteristics.
- Equality disaggregation is limited even at a national level for conceptions among under 18s, breastfeeding and obesity although in the case of obesity, the National Child Measurement Programme could offer future potential for disaggregation if it was combined with School Census data.
- Equality information on healthy lifestyles at a local level is scarce. Local level information on smoking is only collected for adults who are actually referred to the NHS stop smoking programmes. Some analysis of levels of participation in sport or physical activity by gender and ethnicity will be possible at a local level.
- Mental health is important as an aspect of health but also as one factor underlying disability. There is little local level information on mental health in general terms and a lack of information even at a national level around equality aspects of mental health.
- Treatment by the National Health Service will be collected by each local partnership through the 'Place survey' but its small sample size (1100 households) means that there is little potential for equality disaggregation.

Physical and legal security

- For reported crime, police administrative data on different equality characteristics of offenders or victims varies considerably across forces.
- The 'British crime survey' asks about experiences of crime and collects information on equality characteristics. There may be potential for some regional disaggregation using this source.
- Youth offending team data should be able to provide local level information on the ethnicity of offenders but other information on other aspects of equality, in particular disability, will be patchy.
- No equality information is collected by the courts service.

Education

- Equality disaggregation for school age children is possible for ethnicity at a local level. At this level, children eligible for free school meals, considered a reasonable approximation for deprivation, can be separated out. The most important gap here is for robust data on disability and educational outcomes. Discussions are currently underway on the relationship between the definition of children with special needs and disabled children.
- For 16-18 year olds not in employment, education or training (NEETs), there are a number of definitional problems which mean that national level headline data are inconsistent with data collected by local Connexions Services. However at a local level, breakdown should be possible by gender, ethnicity and other aspects related to high risk, for example being a care leaver.
- The level of skills in the working age population will be available from the 'Integrated household survey' which will allow breakdown by a range of characteristics, although it may be necessary to combine data from a number of time periods to draw robust conclusions at a local level.

Productive and valued activities

- Indicators making use of the 'Integrated household survey', for example employment rates, will have potential for equality disaggregation at local level as described for skills above.
- It will be possible to disaggregate average earnings for men and women at a local level for larger authorities but there is an absence on other equality information at a local level around earnings.
- There is no known official source of equality information about carers and caring collected at a local level.
- The tribunal service does not collect information on equality characteristics over and beyond information on the jurisdiction of each case.

Standard of living

- A range of equality characteristics of households below average income are available at a national level. The data source to support the children in poverty indicator at a local level is households receiving out of work benefits giving much less potential for equality disaggregation.
- Equality information is not readily available at a local level on households in temporary accommodation or homeless people.

Further domains (Individual, family and social life; Participation, influence and voice; Identity, expression and self-respect)

- The 'Place survey' will collect information which would contribute to some of these domains but as explained previously will have little use for equality disaggregation until a number of years worth of data have been collected.

In general, the potential for analysing people who are multi-disadvantaged is limited in many cases, this is a particular issue in relation to socio-economic status in combination with other variables.

3.4 Section summary

Across the measurement framework at a national level, most information on equality is about outcomes, with a small amount on process relating to treatment by services and little or no information on choice and control in different domains.

At a national and local level across all equality domains, equality information is particularly weak for equality relating to disability, sexual orientation and religion/belief. There is no quantitative information on transgender.

The lack of information on disability and sexual orientation should be improved in the future by developments which are underway. There are examples given in Section 4, 'Sourcing, analysing and sharing equality information', on how this could be addressed. Much better use could be made of administrative data sources to collect equality information and this has much greater potential for analysis at a local level than overstressing national surveys.

Across domains, equality information at a local level is scarce for:

- objective measures of health
- physical and legal security and absent in relation to the courts service
- young people after leaving compulsory education.

The immediate priorities for filling data gaps should be for outcomes for disabled people, the new equality strands, and a range of equality information for young people, health and physical/legal security outcomes.

There is a lack of analysis about the relationship between equality characteristics, for example, when it is being poor that matters for outcomes rather than which ethnic group you identify with.

4. Sourcing, analysing and sharing equality information

4.1 Introduction

The previous section summarised the existing equality data and identified a number of gaps. While the 'Review of equality data'²³ describes initiatives underway to improve the coverage of equality data, most of these will not deliver benefits for a number of years. In the meantime, there are a number of ways in which local authorities can make best use of existing data.

Information on equality in a local area can be developed

- in an overview report on equality
- with a focus on a particular community or population sub-group
- with a focus on a particular local area target.

This section gives some examples of each approach, describing some existing work and reporting on a number of new reports produced in partnership local authorities during the collation of this report. While the use of surveys has been explored, particular emphasis was given to the use of administrative data sources.

Given the lack of information on disability highlighted in the previous section, a community profile was developed for this diversity strand. In addition, examples are also given for how equality information can be collated in support of indicators included in local area agreements (LAAs).

Finally, an approach for sharing equality data and analysis is proposed.

4.2 Community and inequality profiles

Overview

Collecting information and building a knowledge base has long been recognised as an essential part of knowing your community.

The Audit Commission advocates the use of 'area profiles' and has created guidance to help local authorities and local authority partnerships create their own²⁴. Profiles may take the form of an overall picture of an area or a focus on one particular group in the community. This report distinguishes these as area or community profiles respectively.

The Audit Commission guidance describes the purpose of area profiles as to

²³ ONS 'Review of equality data', October 2007
<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/data/measuring-equality/review.asp>

²⁴ Audit Commission 'Area profiles'
<http://www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk/>

‘help users paint a rich picture of the quality of life and service provision in a local area...(an area profile) helps you to focus on people and place, and identify priorities that cut across service boundaries’

A further benefit of area or community profiles is making publicly available a summary of data and information on the quality of life and local services;

Key stages of building community profiles are

- collecting information at a national and local level
- consultation with key stakeholders – public, private and voluntary sector
- open engagement with target community to hear their experience, needs and aspirations
- being explicit about how the information will be used to shape strategies.

The Audit Commission has also produced guidance particularly aimed at developing area or community profiles for ethnic minority groups²⁵ and older people²⁶.

Areas or community profiles appear to be most frequently focused on particular ethnic minority groups with a smaller number of examples focusing on older people, gender issues and sexual orientation. While an exhaustive investigation was not carried out as part of this work, examples were not found for disability or religion/belief.

Community profiles for Rotherham

Community profiles developed by Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council are a good example of combining national level data with local area information, and making good use of qualitative and quantitative information.

Rotherham MBC first piloted community profiles in 2005, in partnership with the Audit Commission. These profiles describe the characteristics and priorities of seven local target communities of interest prioritised from a list circulated by the Cabinet Office’s Social Exclusion Unit. The evident value of the first profile, a ground-breaking report on the Irish community in Rotherham, led to increased enthusiasm for further profiles by the council and its partners. The profiles addressed the authority’s conclusion that the understanding about communities of interest, particularly the less visible communities, was the weakest part of tackling social exclusion through for example the local neighbourhood renewal strategy.

The format of the reports, starting with the national profile and then focusing on the local profile and information, was drawn from the experience one analyst had gained from an economic regeneration consultancy. The report combines qualitative information from focus groups and public meetings with quantitative information from the census, other local area information available through Neighbourhood Statistics, databases held by the council, surveys and other local partners and performance information.

²⁵ Audit Commission ‘BME perspective guidance’

<http://www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk/staticfiles/BMEperspectiveguidance.pdf>

²⁶ Audit Commission <http://www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk/staticfiles/OCPguidance.pdf>

The profiles make an important contribution to the equality evidence base and they have led to tangible changes in the way the authority carries out its business. The report on the Irish community led to the development of an active forum for Irish people which continues to provide focus groups, most recently assessing health needs of Rotherham's minority ethnic communities. The reports on women and older people in Rotherham informed four-year strategies which are currently underway.

The authority recognises the need to regularly update the profiles and a two-year rolling programme is planned.

Analysts in Rotherham believe that a central updated source for the national level part of community profiles which all authorities could draw on would make the development of the profiles more efficient.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender profile for Lambeth

A project in the London Borough of Lambeth is an example of best practice in filling data gaps using a range of approaches and addressing issues of multiple disadvantage.

Lambeth Council identified the absence of necessary data on their lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) community and in 2006 commissioned a study to address this. At that time, the 'National surveys of sexual attitudes and lifestyles' included questions on sexual behaviour, but there were no national level data sources which collected information on sexual identity (although since then questioning on sexual identity has been included in the 'British crime survey' and the 'Citizenship survey'). The study included information from a literature review, a quantitative survey, a number of focus groups and face-to-face interviews both for council workers and the wider community. There was particular focus on multi-disadvantage from different experiences and concerns within the LGBT community relating to age, ethnicity and social class.

Key findings were

- Lambeth Council were seen as being out of touch with the LGBT community and largely ignorant of its needs and concerns
- LGBT communities are 'diffuse and fractured' with little that unites LGBT needs.

The report, published in 2006, included a range of recommendations for the way the council communicates with the community, for crime and safety, education and other local services.

Recommendations included the need to

- collect local level information on LGBT identity
- recognise the differences between sub-groups among the Lambeth LGBT community
- challenge homophobia in Lambeth schools
- address conflicts where they exist between sexual orientation and religion/belief
- work more closely with the community to develop appropriate services.

Review of inequalities in Brighton and Hove

A report commissioned by the Brighton and Hove Local Strategic Partnership is an example of best practice in how better information on inequality should feed directly into the development of a local area agreement (LAA).

In 2007, the Brighton and Hove 2020 Community Partnership commissioned an ambitious review of inequalities in the local area²⁷. The stated aim of the review was to 'inform the Public Service Board and Local Strategic Partnership about

- the effectiveness of the city's Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy
- policy options for the future to reduce inequality
- measures of success that could be used as targets in future'.

The intention of the first phase of the review report was to carry out an exhaustive analysis of the evidence base, with a scope incorporating not just neighbourhoods but also disadvantage amongst client groups and communities of interest across the city, relating to factors such as race, disability, gender and sexual orientation.

The report from this phase includes contextual information about the area, information about areas of deprivation, and outcomes for different groups in relation to key domains, health, education, skills and employment.

Some key findings from this phase were that

- the most deprived areas across the city are not 'closing the gap' on important indicators of equality
- some groups are particularly concentrated in the most deprived areas, for example, the Bangladeshi and Black African populations (though *not* minority ethnic groups overall)
- however, of all people in Brighton and Hove who face inequality by a range of indicators, the majority are widely located and not limited to the most deprived 20 per cent of areas across the city
- lone-parent households (most headed by women) contribute 70 per cent of all out of work households.

The second phase of the review used information from the first phase to recommend approaches and strategies for reducing inequality in the city.

Disability profile for Sheffield

Developing disability profiles is particularly challenging because of the historical lack of consistency in defining disability and the lack of local level data sources. A pragmatic approach is needed to begin forming a picture of disability in a particular area.

The ONS, IDeA and Sheffield City Council worked in partnership to build information on disability in the Sheffield area (see Box 1)²⁸. The purpose of the profile was to increase the

²⁷ Oxford Consultants for Social Exclusion and EDuce Ltd (December 2007) 'Developing appropriate strategies for reducing inequalities in Brighton and Hove'
<http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/index.cfm?request=c1186912>

local strategic partnership's understanding of disability in relation to indicators which are part of the Sheffield's local area agreement.

Box 1. Steps which were taken to begin building a disability profile for a local area

1. The planned objectives and scope of the disability profile were set out and a number of national indicators relating to disability were identified.
2. To build a national picture of disability, they
 - looked across a range of national sources for trends for different aspects of disability with the help of the relevant central government policy departments
 - collated information relating to outcomes for disabled people and carers including information on other aspects of equality where available
 - investigated, where appropriate, why different sources suggest different outcomes
 - identified data and source issues, in particular what the information does not tell and included this in the profile
 - drew conclusions indicating the degree of confidence they had in them.
3. To build a local picture of disability, they
 - used information available on Neighbourhood Statistics to investigate disability and place in the Sheffield area (see full guidance on this in Annex B of Disability profile for Sheffield)
 - analysed the relationship between disability and ethnicity and disability and deprivation in the Sheffield area
 - focused in particular on issues of national importance for example mental health trends.
4. Collated information on Sheffield social care services held by the Information Centre for Health and Social Care relating to disability.
5. Identified a number of further questions and a series of further sources which should be investigated.

The profile begins by presenting a national picture of disability trends, drawing on a range of national sources. It then explores disability in terms of household status and ethnicity, and describes different outcomes for disabled people relating to standard of living, education and skills and employment. This part of the profile, which was collated with assistance from the Office for Disability Issues²⁹, could be used by other local strategic partnerships in carrying out a similar exercise for their area.

The key findings at a national level were

- around one in six of all ages identify themselves as disabled with rates at around one in seven for children

²⁸ Improvement and Development Agency (2008) 'Analysis of Disability in Sheffield'

www.idea.gov.uk

²⁹ Office for Disability Issues website <http://www.officefordisability.gov.uk/http://www.officefordisability.gov.uk/>

- around one in twenty report mental health issues and around two in five working age people claiming incapacity benefit give mental health as the underlying reason
- around one in ten children have mental health issues
- around one in forty people have a learning disability and MIND estimates that more than half of all adults with learning disabilities live with their parents
- lone-parents (mostly women) were more likely to have a disability and in particular were three times more likely to have mental health issues than others
- men and women from Pakistani and Bangladeshi backgrounds were more likely to report having a disability than average with women from these backgrounds particularly affected (around one in four compared with one in six on average)
- one in five people in mental health institutions are from ethnic minority groups compared to ethnic minority people as one in ten of the wider population
- families with a disabled adult and no disabled children are at greater risk of living in poverty than other families (one in three compared to around one in five on average)
- one in two working age disabled people were in work in 2007 compared with four in five non-disabled people, although there was variation among disability types with only one in four people with depression in employment and one in three learning disabled people
- 19 year olds with a disability or health problem were three times more likely to be not in employment, education or training than others (one in four compared with around one in twelve on average).

The next section of the profile then presents information about disability and place drawn from Neighbourhood Statistics using a range of proxy indicators for disability including reported limiting long-term illness and incapacity benefits. Comparisons were made with other authorities in the region and the relationship has been explored between disability and deprivation, ethnicity, age and gender at a small area level within the Sheffield area. For example, initial findings showed that for Sheffield as a whole, around one in five of the population (21 per cent) reported a limiting long-term illness or disability in 2001 and for some areas of Sheffield, rates were nearly as high as one in three. This compared to 19 per cent for the Yorkshire region as a whole and 18 per cent for England.

Social care data suggests that the demand for mental health care is increasing faster in Sheffield than nationally.

A number of further steps have been recommended to increase the value of this report as a disability profile.

In the long-term, an updated national level picture of disability will be needed which can be used to provide context for analysis in all local areas.

4.3 Indicator equality profiles

Overview

The new local area agreements (LAAs) present challenges to local strategic partnerships (LSPs) in terms of addressing inequalities. A number of the most commonly selected

indicators included in LAAs for 2008-2011 will require an informed assessment of how different groups within the community are affected and might be differently affected by policy interventions. One approach to achieving this is to create what can be termed an 'indicator equality profile' which draws together national and local information about the experiences of different groups in relation to the indicator.

Two examples of indicator equality profiles follow were developed as this report was collated, addressing

- National Indicator 117 '16-18 year olds who are not in employment, education or training (NEET)'
- National Indicator 56 'Obesity among primary school age children in Year 6'

These indicators appeared first and third respectively in the list of most commonly chosen indicators in LAAs in England.

In both cases, emphasis has been placed on seeing each indicator as one in a group of closely related indicators, to increase the profile's value. The second most popular indicator was National Indicator 112 'Under 18 conception rate' which would be an ideal candidate for a further profile.

Equality information and National Indicator 117 '16-18 year olds who are not in employment, education or training (NEET)'

Recognising all the different reasons why young people find themselves NEET must be essential in developing successful intervention strategies. At present there is no single location or source for equality information at a national level addressing the risk of being NEET for different groups. The objective for developing this indicator profile was to collate national level equality information which could be used by other local authorities and then combine it with local area information to allow conclusions, albeit tentative, to be drawn.

This profile collates equality information from national sources to inform our understanding of NEET young people and then combines this with information from a particular local area, in this case Coventry. A number of conclusions were then drawn as outlined below.

The issue of 16-18 year olds not in employment, education or training remains a persistent challenge nationally with rates tending to increase over the last thirteen years.

Findings from a major Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) research report which identified the following as characteristics of the national NEET group. They

- have achieved no or very low qualifications when leaving school at 16 years
- have not enjoyed school, have history of truancy and/or exclusion and feel that they were not treated as adults as school
- are male, white and come from lower socio-economic backgrounds
- share a number of other characteristics including low self-awareness and have parents with low qualifications and aspirations.

There is a challenge for local partnerships in achieving targets while addressing inequalities. The data collated in this note suggests that view of dominant characteristics of the NEET

group above while factually accurate may mask the disproportionate risk some groups experience of being not in employment, education or training.

The different risk for young men and women is difficult to untangle. Headline estimates suggest that men are more likely to be NEET than women, whereas the Youth Cohort Study (YCS) suggests that young women have a greater risk of being NEET than young men. Given the higher rate of achieving five or more good GCSEs or equivalent for young women, the reason why this does not lead to conclusively lower rates of NEET may need investigation. There is some evidence that for young women, having caring responsibilities may be a contributory factor.

Given that the population of England remains predominantly White with 88 per cent of individuals from White backgrounds in 2007 (Labour force survey), we would expect the NEET group to be predominantly White. In addition, young people aged 16-18 from all Asian groups are much more likely to be in full-time education than young people from White groups, but there is some evidence nationally that young people from Pakistani or Bangladeshi backgrounds are at greater risk of being NEET than other groups including young people from Indian backgrounds.

17 year olds with parents in routine occupations or with parents not in work were more than four times as likely to be NEET than young people whose parents were in managerial or professional occupations. Those reporting a disability or health problem were less likely to be in full-time education and more likely to be NEET than others.

Local area information suggests that Coventry has a slightly higher proportion of 16-18 year olds who are NEET than average (one in eleven compared with around one in thirteen). In 2000, Coventry had lower rates of 16 and 17 year olds in education or work-based learning than average (77 per cent compared with 80 per cent) but by 2005 the gap had closed (both 81 per cent).

Data collected by Connexions Coventry and Warwickshire and school census data suggests the following

- around one in thirteen young men and one in ten young women are NEET in Coventry (711 young people in total)
- around three in five young people who are NEET live in areas described by Coventry City Council as 'priority neighbourhood areas'
- young people from White backgrounds are over-represented in the NEET sub-group and young people from Asian and Black backgrounds are under-represented
- around one in twenty NEET young people are looked after or care leavers
- around one in four young women who are NEET are teenage mothers or pregnant
- around one in thirty NEET young people are suffering from long term illness.

More information is needed at a local level on whether there is still an effect of ethnicity once adjusted for socio-economic status.

In the long-term, an updated national level picture of equality issues around being NEET will be needed which can be used to provide context for analysis in all local areas. In addition, there is a need for information on different reasons for being NEET in combination with other characteristics, like gender, ethnicity and disability.

Equality information and National Indicator 56 'Obesity among primary school age children in Year 6'

Obesity is notable as a health condition with very little robust information available on risks of being obese for different equality groups. As for information on young people becoming NEET, there is no single report or source which collates equality information at a national level addressing the risk of being obese for different groups.

The objective for developing this indicator profile was to collate national level equality information which could be used by other local authorities and then combine it with local area information to allow conclusions, albeit tentative, to be drawn. In this case, the focus was on the Tower Hamlets community.

The following tentative conclusions were drawn.

Obesity rates for the whole population are growing with around one in six children and around one in four adults classed as obese in 2006. One in six children in Year 6 were classed obese in the 2006/07 National Child Measurement Programme.

At a regional level, London has high rates of obesity prevalence for both girls and boys with London boys having the highest risk of obesity (24 per cent) of all groups. The 'Health survey for England' reports that, in general, inner city children are more at risk of being obese than others (one in five compared with one in six for others).

The evidence for how the risk of obesity affects different groups in England is far from robust, but there are a number of tentative conclusions which can be drawn, pending improvements in data sources.

Evidence from the Health Survey for England and the National Child Measurement Programme (NCMP) suggests while there is little gender difference in rates of being overweight, boys are more at risk than girls of being obese in Year 6 (19 per cent compared with 16 per cent). Projections suggest that this gender gap will grow over time.

A number of sources show a strong relationship between risk of being obese and deprivation, income or socio-economic status. Children who go to school in the most deprived areas are much more likely to be obese in Year 6 than children in the least deprived areas and this is more evident at Year 6 than at Reception. Rates of eligibility for free school meals appear to have a stronger link with rates of obesity than other available measures of deprivation, income and socio-economic status.

The application of a single threshold for obesity for all ethnic groups is described by the Information Centre for Health and Social Care as 'under debate'. There is evidence that the relationship between body fat and body mass index (BMI) varies across ethnic groups and the disease risks, particularly for south Asian communities, are greater even when body mass indices are lower than those considered obese. It should be noted that issues around appropriate measures are not explicitly addressed in the report from the Equality Impact Assessment of the national obesity strategy.

It is also possible that the relationship between obesity prevalence rates and ethnicity groups reflects the higher risk for some groups of living in poverty. No analysis has been found which adjust ethnic differences for income or socio-economic status.

The evidence from the NCMP suggests that children from Pakistani, Bangladeshi and most Black backgrounds have higher than the national average rates of obesity in Year 6. Children from Black groups tended to have higher than average rates of obesity and being overweight. Pupils from White Irish backgrounds were also more likely to be obese at Year 6. It is difficult to draw conclusions for children from any of the Mixed groups because of the small numbers of children in these groups and therefore the large confidence intervals around the data.

People with learning difficulties were shown in one study to be at greater risk than others of being obese (35 per cent compared with 22 per cent for others in this case), but little is known about obesity risk for people with physical disabilities or mental health issues.

Obesity among adults is an important factor in identifying at risk children. Girls aged 2-15 were two and a half times more likely than other girls to be obese if their mothers were obese. Analysis also suggests that the relationship between parental obesity and child obesity is generally stronger for girls than boys, although it is important to consider whether this is because there were more obese mothers than fathers being considered in this analysis.

Breastfeeding, healthy diet and physical activities have all been linked with obesity. Both breastfeeding and healthy diet have a strong relationship with socio-economic status and/or income, with higher income groups most likely to breastfeed and eat five or more fruit and vegetable portions each day. More women than men and more boys than girls ate the recommended portions of fruit and vegetables. No information could be found on the relationship between these and ethnicity.

Evidence suggests that overweight girls are also more likely to report low physical activity levels than others but there was no clear relationship for boys. Adults from Black Caribbean and Asian groups had the lowest rates of participation in sport. The gender gap in sport or physical activity participation is also more pronounced among Bangladeshis, Black Africans and Pakistanis than in the population as a whole with only 21 per cent of Pakistani women and 19 per cent of Bangladeshi women participating in one physical activity or sport in the previous four weeks.

For a number of reasons relating to national trends, there is a strong likelihood that Tower Hamlets will have high rates of obesity prevalence among Year 6 school children in comparison with other communities. The 2006/7 National Child Measurement Programme data shows that the prevalence of obesity among Year 6 pupils was significantly higher in Tower Hamlets than both London as a whole and the national rate (23.0 per cent compared with 20.8 per cent and 17.5 per cent).

Tower Hamlets has high levels of deprivation with 52 per cent of children in primary schools eligible for free school meals in 2006/07, compared with 25 per cent for London as a whole. There is evidence of a link between deprivation and obesity rates for adults and children with rates of eligibility for free school meals having a particularly strong relationship with obesity rates.

Tower Hamlets also has a significant proportion of people from Bangladeshi backgrounds (33 per cent) with 63 per cent of primary school children from Bangladeshi backgrounds. The evidence which exists for different ethnic groups suggests that Bangladeshi children are at greater risk of being obese than average in Year 6 (21 per cent compared with 18 per cent) and in Reception year (12 per cent compared with 10 per cent). Given that there is evidence to suggest that people from south Asian groups are at greater risk of disease than others even for body mass indices lower than those considered obese, it may be particularly important to address being overweight in these groups than others.

Children from Black African backgrounds also are a significant ethnic minority group in Tower Hamlets primary schools and these children are also more at risk than average of being obese in Year 6 (26 per cent compared with 18 per cent) and in Reception Year (17 per cent).

Women from both these groups, Bangladeshi and Black African, report lower than average participation in physical activity with participation particularly low for Bangladeshi women.

No information could be found on the relationship between risk of being obese and disability but should one subsequently emerge, it should be noted that the proportion of under 16 year olds receiving disability living allowance is higher in Tower Hamlets than average.

More information is needed on whether there is an effect of ethnic group once corrected for socio-economic status.

In the long-term, an updated national level picture of equality issues around obesity will be needed which can be used to provide context for analysis in all local areas.

4.4 Sharing equality data and local information systems

The evidence base on equality is far from robust. However, there are some examples already described of where individual local authorities or LSPs have addressed data gaps. The benefits of gathering new information or analysis at a local level will only be fully realised if data and analysis is shared with local partners and the wider community so that services can be targeted for the most disadvantaged.

Some method for data sharing or local information system (LIS) is key to supporting the place-shaping role of local government and will also be an essential tool for sharing equality data.

The local government White paper 'Strong and Prosperous Communities' described a more significant role for LIS in the future. It was recognised that local partnerships will need to have a better shared understanding of their communities for a number of reasons including

- **Empowerment and devolution:** to use local information to radically reshape services in ways that better meet the expectations of their communities.
- **Preventative work and early intervention:** targeting services for groups suffering from multiple disadvantages.
- **Bottom up accountability:** to provide citizens with timely information.

A study of LIS was commissioned by the Department for Communities and Local Government and reported in March 2007³⁰. 69 systems were found at time of study, with only two older than 2000, and in most cases they had been developed to support neighbourhood regeneration strategies.

The common features of the LIS were that they regularly collect, process, store and disseminate information, in some cases using an approach and presentation which is very similar to Neighbourhood Statistics.

Across the 69 LIS, datasets had been collected from a range of sources including

- local authority service departments (social care, housing, environmental services) and other local strategic partners (the local Primary Care Trust, police force, fire and rescue service, Connexions service etc)
- the census and ONS surveys
- data from central government departments
- the Audit Commission, the local Learning and Skills Council (LSC), University and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS)
- the local Chamber of Commerce
- the regional health observatories
- the Land Registry and the Countryside Agency.

One example of a LIS, MAIDeN (Multi-Agency Information Database for Neighbourhoods) system developed by local partners in Gloucestershire, combines datasets with analytical reports³¹. It includes a range of data drawn from the Census, benefits data and other sources and presents a range of analytical reports about the community including an ethnicity profile for Gloucestershire and reports on older people, health needs and care provision and housing and households. In all the reports viewed, there was an emphasis on mapping information to ward level.

Existing information systems like MAIDeN will provide an excellent tool for disseminating both data sets and equality analytic reports like those described above.

4.5 Section summary

While there a number of developments underway which will improve equality information in the long term, there is an immediate and urgent need for better understanding of communities and different experiences within communities. In general, we need a better understanding of which equality differences remain over and above the effects of socio-economic status.

This need can be addressed in a number of different ways by local authority partnerships using existing data. Examples were given in this section of analytical reports aimed at inequality in general, particular diversity strands and different outcomes in relation to

³⁰ Department of Communities and Local Government (March 2007) 'Local Information Systems: a review of their role, characteristics and benefits'

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/324177.pdf>

³¹ MAIDeN local information system <http://www.maiden.gov.uk/>

National Indicators. In particular, much better use could be made of administrative data sources.

In the interests of efficiency, there is an urgent need for national level equality information to be owned, updated and disseminated by the relevant organisations to provide a context for local area profiles.

At a local level, equality information also needs to be shared between local stakeholders and the existing network for local information systems (LIS) would be an ideal tool for doing this.

5 Conclusions and next steps

Knowledge about how local areas differ, their diverse needs and the diversity of experiences and life chances within communities will be essential if local government is to shape places by addressing inequalities.

At both national and local level, the key to understanding inequality and the causes of inequality is robust and up-to-date information. There is a paucity of analysis on which characteristics are of primary importance, for example, whether it is your income or your ethnic background which determines a particular outcome. It may be that the information we do not know is as or more important as information we do know from the perspective of policy development.

The equality evidence base has a number of weaknesses, and while there are developments underway to improve this in the long term, there are a number of immediate steps which could be taken to make best use of existing equality information nationally and locally.

There must be an onus on central government departments and agencies to build and maintain a picture of inequality at a national level in relation to central government priorities reflected in the National Indicator Set. And this must be made readily available in a form which will be of most use to local strategic partnerships. Without this, there is a risk that scarce analytical resources across local government will be used in separate authorities to build this national picture for local uses.

Local authorities will need to address immediate equality information gaps in the short term by drawing on the national picture and then exhausting existing data sources; making creative use of local level data and accompanying this with cautious analysis. In particular, better use should be made of administrative data sources. Once again, sharing the information effectively between partners will be as important as building the knowledge base in the first place. Developing a locally centralised source which meets the range of needs for equality information should not be an extra burden on local authorities and has the potential to encourage future efficiencies.

Fit-for-purpose equality data at a national or local level will only be collected if local communities understand why information is being requested. Central and local government need to work with other stakeholders to ensure that a clear and consistent message about the need for equality data is reiterated; in particular explaining why personal and potentially sensitive information is requested.

The immediate priorities for filling data gaps should be for outcomes for disabled people, the new equality strands, and a range of equality information for young people, health and physical/legal security outcomes.

As local level equality datasets are built up, they will become a rich source for improving the understanding of equality at a national level. Every effort should be made to ensure that further use is made of this aggregated to the national level.

Annex A National sources of equality information

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Equality domain	Key national-level sources	Key indicators and information on equality characteristics	Notes
Longevity and health	Mortality statistics in combination with Integrated Household Survey (ONS/GRO)	Infant mortality rates G, E, S - Life expectancy at birth G - Teenage conceptions - Health expectancies (including healthy life expectancy and disability free life expectancy) G	Place of birth of mother is collected rather than ethnicity.
	Integrated Household Survey (ONS)	- Self-reported limiting long-standing illness - Self-reported general health status - Smoking prevalence (all A, D, G, R, E, S)	
	Health Survey for England (ICHC)	- Self-reported longstanding limiting illness - Self-reported general health status - Obesity prevalence - Smoking prevalence - Mental well-being scale* (all A, E, G, S)	Annual survey – one year after time period.
	Q research (using data from 500 GP practices)	- Vascular risk score A, E, G, S	To become quarterly. PCT level.
	Infant feeding survey (ICHC)	- Breastfeeding (continuation/initiation) A, S (and mother's country of birth)	One year after time period.
	Hospital Episode Statistics (ICHC)	- Women who have seen a midwife or appropriate healthcare professional by 12 weeks A, E	Within 3-6 months of reporting period. PCT level.
	Referrals, Assessments and Packages of Care data (CSCI)	- achieving independence	A new measure, characteristics unknown at present.
	National Child Measurement Programme (DH)	- Obesity at Reception age and Year 6. E optional	Location also recorded so links with deprivation can be made.

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Equality domain	Key national-level sources	Key indicators and information on equality characteristics	Notes
Physical and legal security	Administrative data (Office for Criminal Justice Reform at the Ministry of Justice)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suspects/offenders (stop and search) E (observed and self-identified) - Arrests for recorded crime (notifiable offences) A, E (observed and self-identified), G - Violence against the person (not known) 	Quarterly and financial year. Disaggregated to police force level. Notifiable offences by authority available on Neighbourhood Statistics
	Administrative data: Court proceedings database (Office for Criminal Justice Reform at the Ministry of Justice)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suspects/offenders (court defendants) A, E (observed and self-identified), G 	Annual, calendar year by CJS area and court
	Administrative data: Cautions database (Office for Criminal Justice Reform at the Ministry of Justice)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suspects/offenders (cautions) A, E (observed and self-identified), G 	Annual, calendar year by police force area
	British Crime Survey (Home Office)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall crime - Hate crime - Domestic violence and sexual assault - Property crime – vandalism - Anti-social behaviour - Fear of crime - Confidence in police <p>A, D, E, G, R, S</p>	Breakdown by Government Office region and police force area. Also collects information about a wide range of other characteristics such as employment and education
	Road Accident Data (DfT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Casualties A (children or elderly recorded separately) 	

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Equality domain	Key national-level sources	Indicators and information on equality characteristics	Notes
Education	'Official estimates' (DCSF)	- Key stage attainment - 5+ GCSEs A, E, G, S plus SEN status	
	School Census (DCSF)	- Pupil absence - Pupil exclusion - English as an Additional language A, E, G plus SEN	
	Skills for Life Survey (DIUS)	- Literacy and numeracy A, E, G and S	LEA breakdown. Health, education level and economic activity also recorded.
	Integrated Household Survey - Labour Force module (ONS) <i>and in combination with Admin Data (DCSF)</i>	- higher level skills – adult level 4+ A, E, D, G, S - Young people not in education, employment or training (NEETs) G	English Regions only
	Administrative data (Learning Skills Council)	- Skills for Life qualification A, D, E, G	Local authority level
	Higher Education Statistics Agency student record/DIUS	- Student numbers A, D, E, G, S - Increasing participation A, D, E, G, S - Widening participation A, G, S	- one can be disaggregated to local area - two and three cannot
	Connexions Service Management Information (DCSF)	- NEETs A, E, G	Local authority level Records on reason for being NEET
	Youth Cohort Study (DCSF)	- NEETs A, E, D, G, S	Longitudinal information.

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Equality domain	Key national-level sources	Indicators and information on equality characteristics	Notes
Standard of living	Households Below Average Income (DWP)	- Families with children in poverty A, D (receipt of disability benefits), E, G	Information on family type, size of family, age of youngest child, educational attainment, economic status, benefit/tax credit receipt and other financial info also collected. Regional breakdown.
	Benefits Admin Data (DWP)	- Claimants of out of work benefits A, G	Type of benefit and underlying medical reason where appropriate gives some information.
	Family Resources Survey (DWP)	A range of potential indicators A, D, E, G, O, R, S	
	Integrated Household Survey (ONS)	A range of potential indicators A, D, E, G, (O), R, S	

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Equality domain	Key national-level sources	Indicators and information on equality characteristics	Notes
Productive and valued activities	Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ONS)	- Earnings, earnings gap A, G	Survey of employers. Information on occupation and industry also collected.
	Integrated Household Survey (Labour Force module)	- Employment, self-employment, unemployment levels and rates - Occupational status - Part-time, full-time - Use of child-care - Job tenure/employment history - Earnings/earnings gap - Access to and take-up of flexible working A, D, E, G, (O), R, S	Household survey Can be disaggregated to ward level although statistical reliability is reduced for small areas.
	Families and Children Study (DWP)	- Occupational status - Earnings/earnings gap - Freedom of choice/perceived willingness to work - Access to care for dependents D, E, G	A longitudinal survey. Can be disaggregated by region. Information on family, occupational status, benefit receipt, education, health and caring responsibilities also collected.
	Maternity and Paternity Rights Survey (DWP/BERR)	- Freedom of choice/perceived choice/willingness to work D, E, G	Periodic survey. Information on family, occupational status and education also collected.
	Childcare and Early Years Survey (DCSF)	- Access to care for dependents D, E, G	Can be disaggregated by region.

Equality domain	Key national-level sources	Indicators and information on equality characteristics	Notes
	Case Management Database (Employment Tribunals Service)	Number of employment tribunal claims by jurisdiction (only jurisdiction recorded)	Available by employment tribunal catchment areas.
	Employment Tribunals Service Equal Opportunity Monitoring Form (ETS)	- Characteristics of Employment Tribunal Applicants A, D, E, G, R	
	Survey of Employment Tribunal Applicants (BERR)	- Satisfaction with tribunal process and outcomes A, D, E, G, R, S O being considered for future surveys	Five year survey.
	Fair Treatment at Work Survey (BERR)	- Experience of unfair treatment and discrimination at work - Experience of bullying and sexual harassment at work A, D, E, G, O, R, S	Periodic survey Information also collected on long-term illness, physical appearance, accent, dress, pregnancy, union membership, education.
	Employment Rights at Work – Survey of Employees (BERR)	- Employee awareness and knowledge of employment rights - Employment problems at work A, D, E, G, O, R	Four year survey
	Work Life Balance Employee Survey (BERR)	- Access to and take-up of flexible working - Job satisfaction A, D, E, G, O, R, S	3-4 years. Information also collected on caring responsibilities, qualifications, income.

Equality domain	Key national-level sources	Indicators and information on equality characteristics	Notes
	Work Life Balance Employer Survey (BERR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision and take-up of flexible working - Work life balance policies and practices A, G	3-4 years
	Workplace Employment Relations Survey (BERR with ESRC, PSI and ACAS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equal Opportunities policies and practices - Flexible working take up - Job satisfaction A, D, E, G	Six years
	Household Survey of Entrepreneurship (BERR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proportion of working age population considering going into business A, E, G	Two years. Might be introduced in the UK Household Longitudinal Survey instead. Disaggregation possible by region. Information also collected on marital status, education, urban/rural, index of multiple deprivation, caring responsibilities
	Annual Small Business Survey (BERR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Business ownership/leadership - Access to finance A, D, E, G	Information on education also collected.
	National Child Development Survey (Institute of Education/UK Data Archive)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Job tenure/employment history A, D, E, G	Information on education also collected.

Equality domain	Key national-level sources	Indicators and information on equality characteristics	Notes
	British Household Panel Survey/UK Longitudinal Household Survey (ESRC)	- Job satisfaction Expectation of A, D, E, G, R, S	Ethnic minority boost is planned. Information also collected on earnings, education, flexible working.

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Equality domain	Key national-level sources	Indicators and information on equality characteristics	Notes
Individual, family and social life or Participation, influence and voice or Identity, expression and self-respect	Not clear at present what might be possible indicators for these domains. Future investigation on sources of information on representation in local government and other governance structures would certainly be worthwhile. Likely data sources include: Census/Longitudinal Study A, (D), E, G, R, S Citizenship Survey (Communities and Local Government) A, D, E, G, O, R, S Place survey (aggregated from Local authority level) A, D, E, G, O, R, S UK Household Longitudinal Survey (A, D, E, G, R, S) British Social Attitudes Survey A, D, E, G, R, S		

Annex B A number of indicators within National Indicator Set which may be considered important for measuring equality and equality information available for them

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Key indicators for 'Longevity and health'	Source proposed by CLG and source owner	Equality characteristics collected in these sources
119 Self-reported health and wellbeing 137 Health life expectancy at 65 140 Fair treatment by local services	Place survey (local authorities)	A, D, E, G, O, R, S planned although analysis by disaggregated groups other than gender is unlikely to be possible.
120 All age all cause mortality rate	Death registrations (General Registry Office – part of Home Office)	S
123 16+ smoking rate	NHS admin data from 'Stop Smoking' service (Information Centre for Health and Social Care)	A, E, G or geographic area
112 U18 Conception rates	Birth registrations	Place of birth of mother
53 Prevalence of breastfeeding at 6-8 weeks	PCT records	No equality disaggregation in publication.
55 Obesity in reception year 56 Obesity in Year 6	For obesity data collected as part of the National Child Measurement Programme.	E was optional in 2006/7. Postcode of school is also recorded so Free School Meals rates can also be used.
8 Adult participation in sport	Sport England Active People Survey	A, D, E, G, S a mapping tool is available.
124 Long term condition - independent and in control	PCT patient survey (Healthcare Commission)	A, D, E, G plus age leaving full-time education.
126 Access to maternity services	Health Episode Statistics (ICHSC)	A
57 Children's participation in sport	School sport survey (DCSF)	By school. FSM, ethnic minority and SEN proportions.

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Indicators for 'Physical and legal security'	Source proposed by CLG	Equality characteristics collected in these sources
15 Serious violent crime 16 Serious acquisitive crime 20 Assault with injury rate 28 Knife crime rate 29 Gun crime rate 32 Repeats of domestic violence 34 Domestic violence – murder*	Police data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Police data supplied to the Home Office is defined in the Annual Data Requirement. - Equality information on victim or offender characteristics is not consistently collected on a national basis, with the exception of homicides where gender and ethnicity is collected and race hate crime where ethnic group of victims is recorded. - Domestic violence homicides can be identified and so those can also be broken down by gender and ethnicity, although numbers for some ethnic groups will be too small to allow year on year analysis. - Although there are plans to obtain record-level data in due course, and for some forces that is already on its way, victim and offender characteristics are not being recorded consistently across all forces and local areas for all crimes. Once data is being received in record-level rather than summary form, this should be more practical; and many forces could probably supply this already in some form. - At present national statistics are only at police force and crime and disorder partnership (basically local authority) level; but once record-level data is available should be capable of analysis at alternative geographies. - A separate collection has been set up to cover some knife crimes and gun crime collection. No equality information is collected for knife crimes but age, gender and ethnicity of victim is collected for gun

Indicators for 'Physical and legal security'	Source proposed by CLG	Equality characteristics collected in these sources
		crime. Investigation needed into potential for making use of Hospital Episode data for equality information on physical assaults.
25 Satisfaction with different [BME] groups with police and local council dealing with anti-social behaviour	Source to be confirmed	Not known at present.
21 Police and local council dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime 22 Perceptions of parents taking responsibility for child behaviour 23 Perceptions of people in area treating each other with respect and consideration	Place Survey	A, D, E, G, O, R, S (see earlier reference in this annex)
44 Ethnic composition of offenders on YJS disposals 43 Young people within YJS sentenced to custody 45 Young offenders engaged in EET 111 First time entrants to Youth Justice System 10-17	Youth Offending team data	A, E, G are collected routinely. Some aspects of disability may be collected particularly where they are relevant to the offence/s. Feasibility of collecting religion/belief information is being investigated.
48 Children killed or seriously injured in road accidents	Department for Transport data	Investigation should be carried out on whether Hospital Episode Data could supplement DfT data. This would provide information on age bands and gender.
69 Experiencing bullying	Ofsted Tell Us survey	A, E, G are collected. Information on learning difficulties and eligibility for Free School Meals. Religion is not currently collected.

Indicators for 'Physical and legal security'	Source proposed by CLG	Equality characteristics collected in these sources
		There are issues around coverage of children with special educational needs (SEN).
70 Hospital admissions from unintentional/deliberate injuries to children	HES database	G

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Key indicators for 'Education'	Source proposed by CLG	Equality characteristics collected in these sources
75 Achievement of 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent	Key stage 4 test results from schools	E, G are collected. Having special educational needs and eligibility for free school meals also collected.
81 Inequality gap in the achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19 82 Inequality gap in the achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19	School Census National Pupil Database, NISVQ database and Independent Learning Records	Information collected varies across sources. Further investigation is needed here.
91 Participation of 17 year olds in education or training	ONS Population estimates, Schools Census, FE ILR, HESA, Work-based learning ILR.	Information collected varies across sources. Further investigation is needed here.
92 Narrowing the gap between the lowest achieving 20% in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile and the rest	Early Years Foundation Stage Profile results	Full child-level records include date of birth, gender and postcode and will be extended to all children by Nov 2008. These can then be linked to the National Pupil Database once children begin compulsory education.
101 Children in care achieving 5 A*-C GCSEs at KS 4 (including English and Maths)	'OC2 data collection at present to be replaced by SSDA903 matched to National Pupil Database'	As for indicator 75.
102 Achievement gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers achieving the expected level at KS 2 and 4. 104 The SEN/non-SEN gap achieving KS2 English and Maths threshold 105 The SEN/non-SEN gap achieving 5 A*-C GCSEs at KS 4 (including English and Maths) 107 KS2 attainment for BME groups 108 KS4 attainment for BME groups	KS2 and 4 test results, FSM, SEN and ethnicity data from School Census matched by DCSF to National Pupil database.	As for indicator 75.

Key indicators for 'Education'	Source proposed by CLG	Equality characteristics collected in these sources
106 Young people from low income backgrounds progressing to higher education	Linked data from National Pupil database and HESA	As for indicator 75.
114 Rate of permanent exclusions from school	School data	As for indicator 75.
117 16-18 year olds who are not in employment, education or training (NEET)	Client Caseload Information systems maintained by local authorities or connexions providers.	A, E, G and reasons for being NEET including being a mother, caring responsibilities etc.
163/4/5 Working age population qualified to at least Level 2/3/4 or higher	Annual Population Survey (boosted LFS sample in IHS)	A, D, E, G, (O), S

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Key indicators for 'Employment'	Source proposed by CLG	Equality characteristics collected in these sources
118 Take up of formal childcare by low-income families	HMRC tax credit administrative data based on 10% sample of tax claimants	Not known.
151 Overall employment rate	Annual Population Survey (boosted LFS sample in IHS)	As for indicator 163.
152 Working age people on out of work benefits 153 Working age people claiming out of work benefits in the worst performing neighbourhoods	Work and Pensions Longitudinal Study (DWP)	D and age bands recorded.
166 Average earnings of employees in the area	Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ONS)	G for most authorities. Potential for some socio-economic disaggregation for groups of authorities as a bespoke service on application to ONS.

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Key indicators for 'Standard of living'	Source proposed by CLG	Equality characteristics collected in these sources
116 Proportion of children in poverty	Department of Work and Pensions data services – out of work benefits data.	A, D, E, G, S can be analysed at a national level. Limited information with benefits data.
156 Number of households living in temporary accommodation	'P1E data'	E (five categories), and information on 'priority need' will allow some analysis at a local level.

A – age, D – disability, E – ethnicity, G – gender, O – sexual orientation, R – religion/belief, S – socio-economic status

Key indicators for other domains	Source proposed by CLG	Equality characteristics collected in these sources
1 % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in the local area. 4 % of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality	Place Survey	A, D, E, G, O, R, S are planned although analysis by disaggregated groups other than gender is unlikely to be possible.

Annex C Neighbourhood statistics and equality information

Demographic data

NeSS table reference where applicable		None	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Religion	Social class	Other
	Age								
UV75	Age – Workplace Population (2001)					x			
KS02	Age Structure (2001)					x			
	Resident Population Estimates by Broad Age Band (2001-2005)		x			x			
	Disability								
KS21	Households with Limiting Long-term Illness and Dependent Children (2001)				x	x			x
	Incapacity Benefit/Severe Disablement Allowance Claimants (2001-2007) – <i>medical reason</i> .		x		x	x			
UV22	Limiting Long-term Illness (2001)				x				
	Ethnicity								
KS06	Ethnic Group (KS06) (2001)			x					
	Key figures for People and Society: Population and Migration: ethnicity (5 groups) (2005)			x					
UV69	Multiple Ethnic Groups (UV69) (2001) – <i>in households</i>			x					
	Resident Population Estimates by Ethnic Group, All Persons (2001-2005)			x		x			
	Resident Population Estimates by Ethnic Group, Females (2001-2005)		x	x		x			
	Resident Population Estimates by Ethnic Group, Males (2001-2005)		x	x		x			
	Religion								
KS07	Religion (2001)						x		
	Socio-economic status								
UV78	Approximated Social Grade – Workplace Population (2001)							x	
UV50	Approximated Social Grade (2001)							x	

NeSS table reference where applicable		None	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Religion	Social class	Other
KS14C	National Statistics Socio-economic Classification – Females (2001)		x						
KS14B	National Statistics Socio-economic Classification – Males (2001)		x						
UV76	National Statistics Socio-economic Classification – Workplace Population (2001)							x	
UV32	NS-SeC of Household Reference Person - People Under Pensionable Age (2001)							x	
UV33	NS-SeC of Household Reference Person (2001)							x	
UV85	Residents in Households by NS-SeC of Household Reference Person Under Pensionable Age (2001)							x	
	Other equality characteristics								
	Child Benefit Statistics (1999-2006)		x			x			x
UV08	Country of Birth (2001)								x
UV06	Dependent Children (2001)					x			x
KS20	Household Composition (2001)								x
KS22	Lone Parent Households with Dependent Children (2001)		x						x
KS04	Marital Status (2001)								x
UV48	People Aged 18 to 64 in Single Adult Households (2001)								x
UV93	Same-sex Couples (2001)								x

Education domain

NeSS table reference where applicable		None	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Religion	Social class	Other
	National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 1 by Free School Meal Eligibility (2004-2006)								x
	National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 1 (2004-2006)		x						
	National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 1 by Ethnic Group (2004-2006)			x					
	National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 2 by Free School Meal Eligibility (2004-2006)								x
	National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 2 (2001-2006)		x						
	National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 2 by Ethnic Group (2004-2006)			x					
	National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 3 by Free School Meal Eligibility (2004-2006)								x
	National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 3 (2001-2006)		x						
	National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 3 by Ethnic Group (2004-2006)			x					
	GCSE and Equivalent Results for Young People by Free School Meal Eligibility (2004-2006)								x
	GCSE and Equivalent Results for Young People (2001-2006)		x						
	GCSE and Equivalent: Results for Young People by Ethnic Group (2004-2006)			x					
	GCSE and Equivalent: Average Point Scores and Associated Value Added Measures for Young People by Ethnic Group (2004-2006)			x					
	GCE/VCE A/AS Results for Young People by Ethnic Group (2004-2006)			x					
	Pupil Absence in Schools in England (Referenced by Location of Educational Institution) (2004-2006)	x							
UV24	Qualifications (UV24) (2001)	x							
KS13	Qualifications and Students (KS13) (2001)	x							

Health domain

NeSS table reference where applicable		None	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Religion	Social class	Other
	Life Expectancy at Birth (2001-2006)		x						
	Life Expectancy: Healthy and Disability-Free Years (2001)		x		x				
UV22	Limiting Long-term Illness (2001)				x				
	Incapacity Benefit/Severe Disablement Allowance Claimants (2001-2007) – medical reason.		x		x	x			
KS21	Households with Limiting Long-term Illness and Dependent Children (2001)				x				
KS08	Working age and Limiting Long-term Illness (2001)				x				
KS08	Self-reported health (2001)	x							
	Low Birthweight Live Births (1999-2004)	x							
	Standardised Mortality Ratios (2003)	x							
	Healthy Lifestyle Behaviours: Model Based Estimates (2003-2005)	x							
	Total Fertility Rates (2002)	x							
	Conceptions – Under 18s (1998-2004)	x							
	Conceptions – Under 18s: Local Analysis (2000-2003)	x							
	Infant Mortality (1998-2005)	x							
UV21	Provision of unpaid care by hours (2001)	x							

Physical security domain

NeSS table reference where applicable		None	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Religion	Social class	Other
	Road Accident Data (1999 - 2003)					x			
	Notifiable Offences Recorded by the Police (2001 - 2007)	x							

Standard of living domain

(including possible key indicators where no equality information is recorded)

NeSS table reference where applicable		None	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Religion	Social class	Other
	Homelessness (2000-2005)			x					x
	Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit Claimants (2005)		x			x			x
	Pension Credit Claimants (2004-2006)		x			x			x
	Child Benefit Statistics (1999-2006)		x			x			x
UV45	Tenure – Pensioners (UV45) (2001)					x			
	Indices of Deprivation 2000 for Districts (2000)	x							
	Indices of Deprivation 2004: Homelessness Indicator (2004)	x							
	Indices of Deprivation 2004: Local Authority Summaries (2004)	x							
	Indices of Deprivation 2007: Local Authority Summaries (2007)	x							
	Best Value Performance Indicators, 2000/01 (Survey Data) General Satisfaction with Local Authority and Street Cleanliness (2000-2001)	x							
	Best Value Performance Indicators, 2000/01 (Survey Data) Tenants Satisfaction with Opportunities for Participation (2000-2001)	x							
UV56	Accommodation Type – Household Spaces (2001)	x							
UV42	Accommodation Type – People (2001)	x							
UV51	Number of People Living in Households (UV51) (2001)	x							
UV57	Number of Rooms (UV57) (2001)	x							
UV58	Persons per Room – Households (UV58) (2001)	x							
UV83	Persons per Room – Household Residents (UV83) (2001)	x							
UV59	Occupancy Rating (UV59) (2001)	x							
KS18	Tenure (KS18) (2001)	x							
UV63	Tenure – Households (UV63) (2001)	x							

NeSS table reference where applicable		None	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Religion	Social class	Other
UV43	Tenure - People (UV43) (2001)	x							
	Dwelling Stock by Council Tax Band (2001-2006)	x							
	Dwelling Stock by Tenure and Condition (2001-2005)	x							
UV62	Cars or Vans (2001)	x							

Table A Productive and valued activities

NeSS table reference where applicable		None	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Religion	Social class	Other
KS09B	Economic Activity – Males (2001)		x		x	x			
KS09C	Economic Activity – Females (2001)		x		x	x			
KS10	Hours Worked (2001)		x			x			
KS11B	Industry of Employment – Males (2001)		x						
KS11C	Industry of Employment – Females (2001)		x						
UV30	Occupation Groups (UV30) (2001)							x	
KS12B	Occupation Groups – Males (2001)		x					x	
KS12C	Occupation Groups – Females (2001)		x					x	
UV27	Time Since Last Worked (2001)								x
UV28	Economic Activity (2001)				x				x
UV50	Approximated Social Grade (2001)							x	
UV75	Age – Workplace Population (2001)					x			
UV76	National Statistics Socio-economic Classification – Workplace Population (2001)							x	
UV78	Approximated Social Grade – Workplace Population (2001)							x	
UV85	Residents in Households by NS-SeC of Household Reference Person Under Pensionable Age (2001)							x	
	Benefits Data Indicators: Working Age Client Group (2001-2005)		x		x	x			
	Benefits Data: Working Age Client Group (2001-2007)		x		x	x			
	Claimant Count and Claimant Count Rate (1999-2004)					x			
	Disability Living Allowance Claimants (2002-2006)		x			x			
	Employee Jobs (1998)		x						
	Incapacity Benefit/Severe Disablement Allowance Claimants (2001-2007)		x			x			

NeSS table reference where applicable		None	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Religion	Social class	Other
	Income Support Claimants (2001-2006)		x		x	x			
	Jobseeker's Allowance Claimants by Ethnicity (2005-2007)			x					
	New Deal Programme: Jobs Gained by Ethnic Group (2001-2006)			x					
	New Deal Programme: Jobs Gained by Gender (2001-2006)		x						
	New Deal Programme: Starts by Ethnic Group (2001-2006)			x					
	New Deal Programme: Starts by Gender (2001-2006)		x						

Table B Productive and valued activities (possible key indicators where equality information is not collected)

NeSS table reference where applicable		None	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Religion	Social class	Other
UV21	Provision of Unpaid Care (2001)	x							
UV29	Economic Activity - Full-time Students (2001)	x							
KS15	Travel to Work (2001)	x							
UV35	Distance Travelled to Work (2001)	x							
UV37	Method of Travel to Work – Daytime Population (2001)	x							
UV39	Method of Travel to Work – Resident Population (2001)	x							
UV80	Distance Travelled to Work – Workplace Population (2001)	x							
	Employment Rate (1999-2004)	x							