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Introduction

This report sets out the findings of an assessment of how public authorities in England are publishing equality objectives. Data for the assessment was collected between September and December 2012.

The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) replaced the race, disability and gender equality duties with the public sector equality duty (‘the equality duty’ or ‘the duty’) on 5 April 2011. The equality duty covers nine protected characteristics which are set out in the Act.¹ The equality duty applies to over 40,000 public authorities across Great Britain and relates to everything they do, including their decision-making, policy development, budget setting, procurement, service delivery and employment functions.

The general duty² requires public authorities in all their functions to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination and harassment;
- advance equality of opportunity; and
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

These aims are supported by specific duties³ intended to improve performance on the general duty. These are set out in separate regulations which are different for England, Scotland and Wales. In summary, listed public authorities in England are required to:

- at least annually, publish information to demonstrate compliance with the general duty and
- at least every four years, prepare and publish one or more objectives that it thinks it needs to achieve to further any of the aims of the general equality duty.

---

¹ The protected characteristics are race, disability, sex, age, religion or belief, sexual orientation, gender re-assignment, pregnancy and maternity and marriage or civil partnership discrimination (the last characteristic applying only to discrimination in the workplace). Gender reassignment was covered to a limited extent by the Gender Equality Duty. The Equality Act 2010 recognises it as a ‘relevant protected characteristic’ for the purposes of the general equality duty in s.149.

² The general duty is set out in s.149 of the Act.

³ Schedule 1 of the Equality Act 2010 (specific duties) Regulations 2011 lists the public authorities in England which are subject to the specific duties. For the Specific Duty regulations in England, please go to: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2011/2260/contents/made
Assessment of the publication of equality objectives by English public authorities

In December 2012, the Commission published a report ‘Publishing equality information: Commitment, engagement and transparency’, about how public authorities in England had performed with regard to the first specific duty (publication of equality information). The report demonstrated that one in two public authorities reviewed were publishing equality information on their workforce and service users by April 2012. Many more (78%) were publishing information on either their staff or their service users.

Aspects of good practice were evident within all sectors. The report can be found at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/PSD/publishing_equality_information_final.pdf

Content of the report
This report gives an overview of how listed authorities are performing in terms of the second specific duty (publication of equality objectives). A range of factsheets are available alongside the report. These set out how different sectors performed with regard to publishing objectives.

The Commission has issued guidance: ‘Equality objectives and the equality duty’ to help public authorities to develop effective equality objectives. This can be found at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/

Assessment
In total, 2,010 assessments were conducted across a range of sectors. The types of authority covered included each of the following sectoral groupings:
- Police forces (all – 39);
- Probation trusts (all – 34);
- Universities (all – 130);
- Colleges (random sample: 189 out of 341- 55%);
- Primary schools (random sample: 390 out of 20,569 - 1.9%);
- Secondary schools (random sample: 383 out of 6,592 - 5.8%);
- Local authorities (all – 354);
- Healthcare providers (all –256);
- Healthcare commissioners (all – 147);
- National organisations (all – 39);
- Government departments (all – 49).
For a full list of the organisations assessed, see Appendix 2.
Terminology
The following terms have been used in the report:

- ‘Older [protected] characteristics’ to refer to the characteristics covered by the former equality duties (race, gender and disability).
- ‘Newer [protected] characteristics’ to refer to the additional characteristics also covered by the public sector equality duty (age, religion or belief, sexual orientation, gender reassignment in full and pregnancy and maternity).
- ‘Sectors’ to describe the broad groups of authorities used in reporting the results. There may be a range of different types of organisation within a sector (e.g. ‘national organisations’ refer to a wide range of organisations working at a national level across England).
- ‘Publishing authorities’ to describe the public authorities who have published equality objectives.

---

4 Gender reassignment was covered to a limited extent by the Gender Equality Duty. The Equality Act 2010 recognises it as a ‘relevant protected characteristic’ for the purposes of the general equality duty in s.149.
Main findings

This report documents the number and proportion of public authorities publishing objectives, and where objectives were published:

- whether the objectives were explicitly linked to the general duty aims;
- the protected characteristics they covered;
- the functions they covered and the types of objectives published;
- whether there was a rationale given for the chosen objectives;
- whether the objectives were specific and measurable;
- whether the objectives were available in alternative formats.

Publication of objectives

For the majority of sectors, all public authorities were assessed but, due to their large numbers, samples were selected from colleges as well as from primary and secondary schools. Although undated objectives were included if they appeared relevant, objectives published prior to the introduction of the equality duty in April 2011 were not taken into account. Except where stated otherwise, the rest of this chapter reports on the quality of the objectives published and all percentages relate to public authorities which published objectives. These will be referred to as ‘publishing authorities’.
### Table 1: Equality objectives by date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number of authorities assessed (un-weighted base)</th>
<th>% with equality objectives dated 2011/12</th>
<th>% with equality objectives not dated</th>
<th>% with objectives pre-dating the 2011 equality duty*</th>
<th>% assessed where no objectives found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities excluding schools</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* out of scope as pre-dating April 2011 equality duty implementation date. Percentages may not add to 100 per cent due to rounding. Figures for all public authorities are weighted to adjust for sampling of schools and colleges.
An estimated 24.7 per cent of public authorities had published equality objectives. Excluding schools from the results, the percentage of authorities publishing equality objectives (dated 2011/2012 or undated) becomes considerably higher, at 81.7 per cent.5

More than 90 per cent of NHS service providers, NHS service commissioners, police forces and national organisations had published equality objectives. Over 80 per cent of local government, probation trusts and universities published objectives. This was followed by Government departments and colleges, where more than 60 per cent published objectives. Just one in five primary schools (21.3 per cent) and secondary schools (23.2 per cent) published objectives. However, behind these top line figures there are variations in performance, with some sectors having high publication rates, but performing poorly on other indicators, such as being specific and measurable.

Since December 2012 when the assessment period finished, the Commission has noted that many more public authorities have published objectives. Overall, by May 2013, 91.7 per cent of authorities (excluding schools) assessed had published up to date (or undated) objectives. 29.2 per cent of the sampled primary schools had published up to date (or undated) objectives, and 32.1 per cent of the sampled secondary schools had published up to date (or undated) objectives. This demonstrates that progress is continuing to be made by public authorities.

5 This percentage estimates the overall proportion that had published objectives, including those that were not included in the assessment sample. To calculate this estimate, the results for primary and secondary schools, colleges and other public authorities have been weighted to adjust for the different proportions assessed in each group.
The general duty

The specific duties are intended to support progress on the general duty, so it is helpful for public authorities to explain how their objectives link to the aims of the duty. Overall, a third of publishing authorities (36.6 per cent) made a reference to the general duty. However, no more than half of any sector did and 44.4 per cent of national organisations, 41.6 per cent of secondary schools and 41.4 per cent of NHS service commissioners did so. This was in stark contrast to police forces, where just three forces (8.1 per cent) did so.

A quarter of publishing authorities (27.0 per cent) made reference to all three aims of the duty; 30.5 per cent referred to the first aim of the duty (eliminating discrimination), 31.9 per cent referred to the second aim (advancing equality) and 32.5 per cent referred to the third aim (fostering good relations). This reflected a balanced spread across the different aims.
### Table 2: Reference to the general duty aims
Percentage of authorities who published objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>% making a clear reference to the general duty</th>
<th>% making reference to each aim</th>
<th>Elimination of discrimination</th>
<th>Advancing equality</th>
<th>Fostering good relations</th>
<th>All three aims of the general duty</th>
<th>Unweighted base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protected characteristics

Data was collected on whether or not the published objectives covered one or more protected characteristics. Where characteristics were identified, these were also noted. Table 3 sets out the proportion of publishing authorities with objectives that referred to particular protected characteristics (PCs). It shows that four-fifths (82.7 per cent) of publishing authorities referred to one or more protected characteristics. Tables 4 and 5 set out which protected characteristics were covered by the objectives.

A sixth (16.3 per cent) of publishing authorities had published objectives that explicitly referred to only one protected characteristic. For example, an objective to encourage women to apply for management positions where they are underrepresented.

A sixth of publishing authorities (15.8 per cent) had one or more objectives that related to all of the protected characteristics. For example, an objective to improve satisfaction rates for social care service users across all of the nine characteristics. As these objectives are not specific to any particular characteristic, they are reported on separately (see table 4) rather than being added to the total findings for each of the different characteristics (see table 5).
Table 3: References in objectives to protected characteristics (PCs)
Percentage of authorities who published objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Authorities with one or more objectives that refer to one or more PC</th>
<th>Un-weighted base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: References in objectives to protected characteristics (PCs) by type of characteristic
Percentage of authorities who published objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Only one PC referred to in objectives</th>
<th>Objective(s) that only relate to race, disability or gender</th>
<th>One or more objective(s) that refer to all PCs</th>
<th>Un-weighted base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: References in objectives to particular protected characteristics
Percentage of authorities who published objectives (not including objectives which cover ‘all protected characteristics’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Gender Reassignment</th>
<th>Marriage and civil partnership</th>
<th>Pregnancy and maternity</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
<th>Un-weighted base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A key finding was that many publishing authorities had objectives that included the newer characteristics. Of the newer characteristics, religion or belief was the most common, with 27.9 per cent of publishing authorities having at least one objective on this characteristic. The next most common characteristics were gender reassignment (20.2 per cent), sexual orientation (19.7 per cent) and age (16.9 per cent). Very few had objectives covering pregnancy and maternity (3.8 per cent) or marriage and civil partnership (2.2 per cent).

Functions covered

In order to support the aims of the general duty, equality objectives should ideally address the key equality challenges facing a public authority. These will vary between sectors and authorities. Although many public authorities have traditionally focussed their equality work on employment matters, in recent years more has been done by public authorities to improve equality in service design and delivery. In order to establish whether public authorities are addressing both internal and external equality matters, data was collected about the functions that were covered by equality objectives.

The assessment found that 44.8 per cent of publishing authorities had objectives that aim to tackle employment as well as service delivery issues. A further 44.0 per cent had service delivery (but not employment) objectives and 3.5 per cent had employment (but not service) objectives. The other 7.7 per cent of publishing authorities had objectives that only covered ‘other’ equality issues. Examples of these include: assessing impact on equality, revising equality strategies and improving data gathering.
Table 6: Functions covered by objectives
Percentage of authorities who published objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>% with both employment and service delivery objectives</th>
<th>% with service delivery objectives (but not on employment)</th>
<th>% with employment objectives (but not on services)</th>
<th>% with objectives that only cover areas other than employment or service delivery</th>
<th>Un-weighted base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Employment objectives

## Table 7: Types of employment objectives
Percentage of authorities who published employment objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Applications and appointments</th>
<th>Pay gap</th>
<th>Promotions or representation in senior roles</th>
<th>Discrimination, harassment, bullying or grievances</th>
<th>Sickness absence or staff leaving</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Un-weighted base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service delivery objectives

Table 8: Types of objectives relating to service delivery
Percentage of authorities who published service delivery objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Service delivery outcomes</th>
<th>Satisfaction with services</th>
<th>Complaints</th>
<th>Service take-up</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Un-weighted base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale for objectives

The assessment looked at whether or not publishing authorities provided a rationale for choosing their objectives. Overall, 48.3 per cent of publishing authorities included a rationale. In terms of the reasons why public authorities had chosen their objectives, around a quarter of authorities referred to quantitative data (22.2 per cent) or qualitative data (26.2 per cent). This could include, for example, the findings of engagement with stakeholders (e.g. people with protected characteristics). One in six chose their objectives by saying that they had taken into account their published equality information (N.B this could also be counted as qualitative or quantitative data).

Of those organisations giving other reasons, it was apparent that some sectors were influenced by national equality guidance and frameworks. This included sector specific initiatives, as well as national frameworks such as the Stonewall Equality Index. Many health authorities cited the NHS Equality Delivery System.

---

6 https://www.stonewall.org.uk/at_work/stonewall_top_100_employers/default.asp
7 http://healthandcare.dh.gov.uk/equality-delivery-system/
## Table 9: Provision of rationale and reasons for choosing objectives
Percentage of authorities who published objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>% of authorities that provided a rationale for their objectives</th>
<th>Information used for choosing objectives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative data</td>
<td>Qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific and measurable

Setting specific and measurable objectives can help authorities and stakeholders to assess whether sufficient progress is being made to achieve the desired outcome. The assessment therefore looked at whether public authorities clarified: the quantity of improvement required for delivery; the timeframe required for improvements to be made; who was responsible for delivery and how performance would be reported.

Half of publishing authorities had at least one objective that quantified the level of improvement needed for delivery and half (48.8 per cent) set out the timeframe for the improvements to be made in. Overall, 58.5 per cent of publishing authorities had set out who was responsible for delivery and 39.8 per cent of publishing authorities set out reporting arrangements.
### Table 10: Specification of improvements required in objectives
Percentage of authorities who published objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>% of authorities with objectives which set out the quantity of improvement required for delivery</th>
<th>% of authorities with objectives which set out the timeframe required for the improvement to be made in</th>
<th>Un-weighted base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Specification of responsibility and reporting intentions
Percentage of authorities who published objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>% of authorities where the objectives included a named person responsible for delivery</th>
<th>% of authorities where it was clear in the objectives how performance would be reported</th>
<th>Un-weighted base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accessibility

The assessment looked at whether or not the objectives were also available in alternative formats, such as in large text or in an easy read format.

**Table 12: Availability of objectives in alternative formats in percentages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Alternative formats available to download (A)</th>
<th>Statement and contact details for alternative formats (B)</th>
<th>Statement only that alternative formats available (C)</th>
<th>Any of these (A+B+C)</th>
<th>Un-weighted base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation trusts</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare providers</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare commissioners</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public authorities</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Providing equality objectives in alternative formats can improve access as well as transparency and accountability to members of the public. Overall, a fifth of publishing authorities (21.6 per cent) indicated in one of these ways that their objectives were available in alternative formats. This was made up of: 8.9 per cent of publishing authorities who had alternative formats available for download from their website, 10.6 per cent who gave contact details for requesting alternative formats and 2.1 per cent who said alternative formats were available, but gave no information about how to obtain them\(^8\).

---

\(^8\) When undertaking the assessment, the Commission did not make individual requests to public authorities to provide objectives in alternative formats, so it is not possible to quantify exactly how many authorities were in fact able to produce their objectives in this way.
Summary of findings

- Excluding schools, the percentage of authorities who had published equality objectives between 2011 and 2012 (or whose objectives were undated) was 81.7 per cent. If schools are included, this percentage drops to a quarter of public authorities (24.7 per cent).

- Public authorities have continued to make progress in terms of publishing equality objectives since the end of the assessment period (December 2012).

- A third of authorities (36.6 per cent) made a clear reference to the aims of the general duty. However, in practice many authorities published objectives that did relate to the general duty, even where not explicitly acknowledged.

- Many publishing authorities published objectives that included the newer protected characteristics set out under the duty, rather than only focussing on race, disability or gender.

- Publishing authorities were most likely to publish objectives on employment as well as on service delivery (44.8 per cent).

- Around half of publishing authorities (48.3 per cent) had included a rationale to explain why they had chosen their objectives.

- In terms of being specific and measurable, 49.7 per cent of public authorities set out the quantity of improvement required, and 48.8 per cent had set out the timeframe required for the improvement to be made in.

- One in five publishing authorities (21.6 per cent) appeared to have their equality objectives available in alternative formats.
Appendix 1: Methodology

Introduction

In total 2,010 assessments were conducted between September and December 2012. For a breakdown of the sectors, and the number of organisations assessed, see Appendix 2.

We looked at the entirety of 8 sectors. However, due to the large numbers of colleges, primary schools and secondary schools, organisations from these sectors were sampled. This was done in a systematic way. For example, with colleges we chose alternate ones from a list, and ensured a spread across the nine English regions.

Assessors spent up to 30 minutes per assessment (approach described below). 15 minutes was considered a reasonable amount of time for a member of the public to search for the objectives. If the objectives could not be found on a website within that timeframe, the objectives were not deemed to be accessible and the assessors would not look any further.

Where no objectives were found, the process was repeated by another assessor using the same methodology, in order to verify the findings of the first assessment.

The purpose of publishing equality objectives is to support performance on the general duty. As the new general duty came into force in April 2011, objectives published before then were not assessed. Equality objectives that were undated but which appeared to cover the present and/or future period were included in the assessment.

A three step approach was taken:
1. If the website had a search function then assessors entered “equality objectives”. They looked at the top ten results and if they found equality objectives clearly dated or in a web page or document from 2011 or 2012, or that were undated but appeared relevant, then they used these objectives for the assessment.

---

9 For colleges, primary schools and secondary schools, organisations were sampled using a systematic approach. This was based on the selection of every nth organisation from a list. For example, alternative colleges were selected (n=2) and the list was sorted by region so as to obtain an even spread across the nine English regions.
2. If the previous method didn’t return results, a search was done for an equality/diversity section on the website. If there was a search function then “equality” followed by “diversity” were entered. If an equality or diversity page was found in the top ten results, then assessors looked here to see if there were any equality objectives from 2011 or 2012 or that were undated but appeared relevant.

3. If the first two methods didn’t return results then (through the search function or the site map) assessors looked for an “Equality Scheme/Plan”, “Strategic/Business Plan” or “Annual Report” in that order. They then searched through these documents to find any equality objectives.

Information was gathered about the availability of equality objectives in alternative formats. This included assessing websites to establish whether they had an accessibility function (i.e. where the font size or colour of the text can be changed on the website) and whether they had an accessibility page which explained whether documents were available in other formats, either directly available on the website or by request.

There are strengths and weaknesses to any assessment approach. One strength of the approach taken is that it enabled a large number of assessments to be undertaken over a relatively short period of time. We could also assess how easy equality objectives were to find and where they were located. Where objectives were not found this is likely to be because they were not present, or they were relatively inaccessible. In some cases where no objectives were found, this may have been because they were located elsewhere on a website, published somewhere other than the website in hard copy, or not available due to technical issues.

The following assessment template guided the internal team of assessors searching for information on equality objectives as they reviewed each website. This helped to ensure a consistent and fair approach to conducting the assessments. They entered relevant information into the template which generated a database with information for all 2,010 assessments.
Assessment questions

Getting started

Enter the name of the organisation you are assessing and select the appropriate sector and sub-sector from the drop down menus. Search for equality objectives for no longer than 15 minutes. If you do not find any equality objectives, using the methodology below, within this 15 minute period then you should select option d below.

Method 1: If the website has a search function then enter “equality objectives”. Look at the first top 10 results and if you find equality objectives clearly dated or in a web page or document from 2011 or 2012 then use these objectives for the assessment.

Method 2: If the previous method doesn’t return results then search for an equality/diversity section on the website. If there is a search function then enter “equality” and then “diversity” if this fails. If you find an equality or diversity page in the top 10 results then look here to see if there are any equality objectives from 2011 or 2012.

Method 3: If the first two methods don’t return results then through either the search function or site map you should look for an “Equality Scheme/Plan”, “Strategic/Business Plan” or “Annual Report” in that order. You should then search through these documents to find any equality objectives.

Question 10

Record at Question 10 which of the three methods was successful in finding the equality objectives or whether no objectives were found. Select one of the following options:

- Select Q10a if it was by method 1
- Select Q10b if it was by method 2
- Select Q10c if it was by method 3

Select Q10d if no objectives were found using all of the 3 methods.
If Q10d is selected then that will be the end of the exercise. The form will take you to Q32 and you should enter the end time and then finish the exercise.
Assessment of the publication of equality objectives by English public authorities

**Question 11**
Record the date of equality objectives or the documents or web pages in which you found the equality objectives in. Select one of the following options:

- Select Q11a from 2011 or 2012 onwards
- Select Q11b older than 2011
- Select Q11c Undated

If Q11b is selected then that will be the end of the exercise and the form will take you to Q32 and you should enter the end time and then finish the exercise.

**Question 12**
Enter the number of equality objectives the organisation has published.

**Question 13**
Copy and paste the web address of the page or document that contains the equality objectives.

**Question 14**
Indicate whether the information that you find following the methodology in questions 10 and 11 (whether that is in a web page or document) contains any details on the availability of equality objectives in alternative formats. For the purposes of this exercise “alternative formats” refers to the provision of information in 2 or more different formats of any kind. Example: a pdf document and a word document or a document in English and a document in another language or a document in standard text and an easy read document. Select one of the following options:

- Select Q14a if there is a statement that can be found in the information that you find that equality objectives are available in alternative formats with contact info for requesting
- Select Q14b if there is a statement that can be found in the information that you find about the availability of equality objectives in alternative formats but unclear how to obtain
- Select Q14c if equality objectives in alternative formats can be downloaded direct from the information you find
- Select Q14d if there is no mention at all in the information that you find about the availability of equality objectives in alternative formats.
When answering questions 15 to 31 please remember the following:

- You are not required to base your answers to questions Q15 to Q31 on an assessment of each individual equality objective that has been published. (NOTE: The exception to this are for Q20j and 20k – see page 7 and for Q28 – see page 11 for details)
- You should base your answers to questions Q15 to Q31 on an overall assessment of the details of all equality objectives that you find.

**Question 15**
Indicate whether the organisation has given an explanation or justification of why they chose their particular equality objectives. This explanation may be provided in an introduction to the all equality objectives or an explanation may be given as part of the equality objectives. If you find an explanation for the equality objectives you should select Q15a (YES). It may be that the organisation has simply published a list of equality objectives without an explanation and if this is the case and you can find no explanation then you should select Q15b (NO).

**Question 16**
(You should only answer this question if you selected Q15a). Indicate what type of information the authority has included in their explanation of why the equality objectives were selected. Select as many of the following that apply:

- Select Q16a if the explanation includes quantitative data
- Select Q16b if the explanation includes any qualitative evidence from engagement, involvement or consultation
- Select Q16c if the explanation includes an explicitly statement that the organisation has used the equality information, they are required to publish under the specific duties, to inform the selection of their equality objectives.
- Select Q16d if the explanation includes any other reason or justification for the selection of the equality objectives.

**Question 17**
Indicate whether the explanation for selection of equality objectives makes an explicit link to the 3 aims of the general duty. Select Q17a (YES) if you find an explicit reference to these aims in the explanation. Select Q17b (NO) if you find an explicit reference to these aims in the explanation.
Question 18
(You should only answer this question if you selected Q17a.) Indicate which of the aims of the general duty were explicitly referenced. Select as many of the following that apply:
- Select Q18a if there is an explicit reference to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act.
- Select Q18b if there is an explicit reference to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and people who do not share it.
- Select Q18c if there is an explicit reference to foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it.

Question 19
Record which of the protected characteristics are explicitly referenced in the equality objectives. Select Q19a (YES) if any of the equality objectives explicitly references one or more protected characteristics. Select Q19b (NO) if there is no explicit reference to one or more of the protected characteristics in the equality objectives.

Question 20
(You should only answer this question if you selected Q19a). Record which of the protected characteristics were explicitly referenced. Select as many of the following that apply:
- Select Q20a if there is an explicit reference to age
- Select Q20b if there is an explicit reference to disability
- Select Q20c if there is an explicit reference to gender
- Select Q20d if there is an explicit reference to gender reassignment or trans
- Select Q20e if there is an explicit reference to Marriage and civil partnership
- Select Q20f if there is an explicit reference to pregnancy and maternity
- Select Q20g if there is an explicit reference to race/ethnicity
- Select Q20h if there is an explicit reference to religion or belief
- Select Q20i if there is an explicit reference to sexual orientation/LGB
- Select Q20j if there is an explicit reference to all 9 protected characteristics
- Select Q20k if any equality objectives address a combination of protected characteristics.
  If you select this option you should detail, in the accompanying in the text box, the combination of protected characteristics that are referred to.
- Select Q20l if any individual equality objective explicitly states it is for people with all protected characteristics.
- Select Q20m if any individual equality objective addresses issues for people with a combination of protected characteristics.
**Question 21**
Select Q21a (YES) if any of the equality objectives are explicit about the policy, function or practice that they relate to.
Select Q21b (NO) if none of the equality objectives are explicit about the policy, function or practice that they relate to. Examples of objectives that are not explicit about the policy, function or practice covered:
A school sets an equality objective to “Become a more inclusive school”;
A council sets an equality objective to “Make PSEDville a better place”;
A Government department sets an equality objective to “Become an excellent employer”

**Question 22**
(You should only answer this question if you selected YES for Q21). Select Q22a (YES) if any of the equality objectives cover employment-related policy function or practice. Select Q22b (NO) if none of the equality objectives cover employment-related policy function or practice.

**Question 23**
(You should only answer this question if you selected YES for Q22). Select which employment-related policy, function or practice list is included in the equality objectives. Select as many of the options that apply. If what you find is not included in this list then you should select Q23i and summarise what this is in the text box.

**Question 24**
(You should only answer this question if you selected YES for Q21). Select Q24a (YES) if any of the equality objectives cover service delivery-related policy function or practice. Select Q24b (NO) if none of the equality objectives cover service delivery-related policy function or practice.

**Question 25**
(You should only answer this question if you selected YES for Q24). Select which service delivery-related policy, function or practice list is included in the equality objectives. Select as many of the options that apply and summarise details of the policy, function or practice in the text box below.
Question 26
(You should only answer this question if you selected YES for Q21). Select Q26a (YES) if any of the equality objectives cover other types of policy function or practice. Select Q26b (NO) if none of the equality objectives cover other types of policy function or practice.

For the purposes of this exercise we have categorised this into two categories:

1) Equality or organisational processes: This category relates to objectives that are only focussed on improving organisational processes (such as procurement, improving data collection, engagement, equality analysis etc) without any explicit link to employment or service delivery.

You should select this “other” option if any of the objectives focuses only on the organisational process. If the objective states that this process is linked to employment or service delivery then you should not select this option and instead select YES for employment (Q22) or service delivery (Q24).

2) Other: This category relate to objectives that aim to deliver equality outcomes in the local area beyond the direct employment or service delivery of a public body in question. Examples of public value objective are those that relate to:
   • civic participation,
   • VCS funding,
   • improving community cohesion/relations,
   • reduce prejudice/stigma etc.

You should select this “other” option only if the objective does not specifically mention employment or service delivery. If the objective does state that the public body will do something about its employment or service delivery to achieve the outcome in question, then you should not select this option and instead select YES for employment (Q22) or service delivery (Q24).

Question 27
(You should only answer this question if you selected YES for Q26). Select which of the two categories of other policy, function or practice list is included in the equality objectives. Select as many of the options that apply and summarise details of the policy, function or practice in the text box below. For the purposes of this exercise an objective can only be considered specific and measurable if it meets all of the following 4 criteria:
• It contains specific reference to one or more protected characteristics
• It contains specific reference to a policy, function or practice
• It contains specific reference to the quantity of improvement required
• It contains explicit reference to the timeframe for achieving the quantity of improvement

Example of a specific objective: A NHS trust sets an equality objective to increase the number of lesbian patients accessing their cervical smear service by 60 per cent over the next four years.

Example of a non-specific objective: A college sets an equality objective to increase educational attainment of disabled students

**Question 28**
Indicate whether any of the equality objectives you find meet the 4 criteria for being specific and measurable. Select one of the following options: Select Q28a if all of the equality objectives you find meet the four criteria for being specific and measurable. Select Q28b if at least one of the equality objectives you find meet the four criteria for being specific and measurable. Select Q28c if none of the equality objectives you find meet the four criteria for being specific and measurable.

**Question 29**
Indicate which of the 4 criteria were not met by any of the equality objectives. Select as many of the following that apply:
• Select Q29a if none of the equality objectives contain specific reference to one or more protected characteristics
• Select Q29b if none of the equality objectives contain specific reference to a policy, function or practice
• Select Q29c if none of the equality objectives contain specific reference to the quantity of improvement required
• Select Q29d if none of the equality objectives contain specific reference to the timeframe for achieving the quantity of improvement
**Question 30**
Indicate whether any of the equality objectives are aimed at delivering outcomes for organisations or outcomes for people. Select as many of the following that apply: Select Q29a if any of the equality objectives are aimed at delivering organisational process related outcomes. Select Q29b if any of the equality objectives are aimed at delivering outcomes for staff, service users or other people.

**Question 31**
You should select Q30a (YES) if any of the equality objectives are explicit about which person or department is responsible for delivery. You should select Q30b (NO) if none of the equality objectives are explicit about which person or department is responsible for delivery.

**Question 32**
You should select Q31a (YES) if any of the equality objectives are explicit about how updates of progress will be provided. You should select Q31b (NO) if none of the equality objectives are explicit about how updates of progress will be provided.

**Question 33**
Enter the date and time you completed your assessment.
# Appendix 2: Authorities assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Sub-sector</th>
<th>All in sector</th>
<th>Number assessed</th>
<th>Category used in the report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Police forces</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Police forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Probation Trusts</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Probation Trusts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational bodies</td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleges (1)</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary schools (2)</td>
<td>20,569</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>Primary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>6,592</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>District Councils</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Councils</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Borough</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unitary Authority</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Councils</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, social care and social security</td>
<td>Acute Trusts</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Health and Social Care – Service Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambulance Trusts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Care Trust</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental Health Trust</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NHS Foundation Trust</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Care Trusts</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>NHS service commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organisations</td>
<td>Police (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>National organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal justice (4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health, social care and social security (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Endnotes

1. Due to time and resource constraints, all 341 colleges were not assessed. A sample of 189 colleges were selected to represent the nine English Regions. This was done by grouping colleges by region and selecting a random sample from the list.

2. Primary and secondary schools were also randomly sampled.


(6) The Audit Commission.

(7) Student Loans Company Ltd, Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE).


(10) BBC, Channel 4.


(16) Charity Commission, Commissioners for Reduction of the National Debt, Crown Estate
Crown Prosecution Service, Food Standards Agency, Forestry Commission, Government
Actuary’s Department, HM Customs and Revenue, HM Land Registry, National Archives,
National Savings and Investments, Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services
and Skills (Ofsted), Office of Fair Trading, Office of Rail Regulation, Office of Gas and
Electricity Markets, Office of Qualifications and Examination Regulation (Ofqual),
Office of Water Services, Ordnance Survey, Public Works and Loans Board, Royal Mail,
Serious Fraud Office, Treasury Solicitors, UK Statistics Authority, UK Supreme Court,
UK Trade and Investment.
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