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# Executive Summary

**Developing an evidence base on ethnicity for the Greater Manchester Strategy**

The Independent Inequalities Commission brought together a wealth of evidence on inequalities from across Greater Manchester and provided a set of recommendations to confront the intractable realities of structural racism within the city region. Under the context of the Covid-19 pandemic and the Black Lives Matter movement, the commission highlighted what needed to be done to bring about a city-region that works for everyone, where the economy serves the people, and everyone has a voice.

One of its recommendations was for a Greater Manchester Race Equality Strategy to be produced.

This report supports the development of a Race Equality Strategy for the city region by contributing to the evidence baseline which will underpin it.

The report uses the newly refreshed [Greater Manchester Strategy (GMS](https://aboutgreatermanchester.com/the-greater-manchester-strategy-2021-2031/)) as its framework – assessing each of the indicators it contains to identify which can be disaggregated by ethnicity. It aims to draw out the key issues for racially minoritised communities across Greater Manchester to support policy makers and leaders as they develop the strategy.

The [Centre on the Dynamics of Ethnicity](https://www.ethnicity.ac.uk/) (CoDE) at University of Manchester, have developed an accompanying report, which highlights the broader issues relevant to race equality across the themes of education, employment, health and criminal justice.

Together the two reports provide a comprehensive understanding of the current issues facing racially minoritised communities in Greater Manchester.

**Key findings are limited by the lack of local data but highlight continuing racial inequality**

Evidence of racial inequality is evident across all the indicators that were available and will come as no surprise for those with lived experience of these issues.

The gaps in outcomes are experienced throughout the life course right from early years through to older age demonstrating the scale of the challenge.

The reasons are complex – and discussed in detail in the report by CoDE – accompanying this report, but include a legacy of structural and institutional racism. They also relate to poverty which is evidently not exclusive to racially minoritised communities and with increasing cost of living pressures is likely to be exacerbated further.

The available data on ethnicity is patchy and limited. This does not reflect a lack of ambition from the authors to identify the key trends and themes, but rather reflects a profound lack of data on racially minoritised communities at city region and more localised level and particularly on the themes and issues identified as critical within the Greater Manchester Strategy.

The call for more local, timely and accurate data to better understand Greater Manchester’s diverse communities is at the heart of this report and echoed in the report by CoDE. It is essential to track progress on the issues raised by CoDE and Greater Manchester’s Race Equality Panel and to ensure that services are effectively targeted towards those that need them most.

**Greater Manchester Strategy Indicators disaggregated by ethnicity at a Greater Manchester level**

Just under a third of the total relevant indicators contained within the Greater Manchester Strategy are available at a Greater Manchester level and the majority of these are survey based which, whilst providing useful intelligence can make them difficult to benchmark and track historically. As they continue to be measured over time this will build up a better picture of the issues faced. Key headlines include:

* **Employment**: People from racially minoritised communities in Greater Manchester are less likely to be in employment. 66% of people who identify as Mixed and 52% of people who identify as Pakistani or Bangladeshi are in work compared to 74% of white people. This challenge is not new and limited progress has been made to reverse trends ingrained for decades.
* **Apprenticeship starts**: In Greater Manchester, there is an acute ethnicity gap among young apprentices between the ages of 16 and 18. People from racially minoritised groups constitute over a fifth of all young people, but among apprentices they make up just 8%.
* **Food insecurity:** In Greater Manchester, racially minoritised people are significantly more likely to have eaten less than they should have because of a lack of money or other resources, compared to the GM average (27% compared to 16%).
* **Sense of belonging of an individual to their local area**: Data and intelligence on ‘sense of belonging’ of an individual to their local area shows a more diverse picture for various ethnic groups. White and Black African, White and Black Caribbean and Black Caribbean people have the least sense of belonging and those from Pakistani, Indian, Bangladeshi and Any other Asian Backgrounds have the highest sense of belonging in Greater Manchester. This demonstrates the importance of community level understanding and a need to bring in a broad range of lived experiences when co-designing the strategy.
* **Perceptions of safety in local area:** Analysis shows that people from Irish, White and Black African and African backgrounds in Greater Manchester feel the safest in their local area and those from any other Mixed background, Chinese and Other ethnic group feel the least safe.

**Proxy data (national and/or connected indicators) is available for many of the other Greater Manchester Strategy indicators and can add to our understanding but may not be fully reflective of the experience of Greater Manchester residents**

Where Greater Manchester or local authority split of the data was not available larger geographies or proxy data sets have been used and key headlines are below:

* + **National data on take-up of funded childcare**: shows that children who speak English as an additional language were found to be nearly three times as likely not to take up their full five terms of eligible preschool compared to children with English as their first language, in a study of 3-year-olds.
  + **National qualifications data:** national data on level 4+ qualifications shows that 72.6% of White British people over the age of 16 have a level 4+ qualification compared to 66.6% of those from ethnic minorities.
  + **Regional proxy for median Earnings**: Median earnings for the North West show that there is a 5.4% pay gap between the median hourly earnings of those from racially minoritised communities compared to White British employees.
  + **National data on low-pay employment**: Nationally, employees who identify as Bangladeshi are the most likely to be in low-pay employment (30%) but all ethnic groups except for Chinese and Indian have higher percentages of low pay than those identifying as White. Employees who identified as Chinese and Indian were the most likely ethnic groups to have quality work (73% and 71% respectively), followed by White (68%). Only 51% of Bangladeshi employees reported having good quality work.
  + **Proxy for Healthy Life Expectancy**: Healthy life expectancy cannot be broken down by ethnicity, but life expectancy (not taking into account the health of an individual) shows that across England and Wales there is a big variation across ethnic group. Black Caribbean, White, Mixed and Bangladeshi have the lowest life expectancies. Those from the Black African ethnic group as well as Asian other, Black other and Other all have the highest life expectancies.
  + **National data on low-income households**: National figures show that all other ethnic groups have higher levels of people living in relative low-income households compared to White British households. This is particularly high for Bangladeshi children where 68% of children living in Bangladeshi households are considered to be in a low-income household after housing costs.
  + **National data on health outcomes**: There are also significant differences in health outcomes by ethnic group. In England Black people are the least likely to say that they have high or very high life satisfaction. White people are the most likely, closely followed by Indian people.

**Next steps to address the data gaps identified**

To better understand and to monitor progress for racially minoritised communities in Greater Manchester, it is important that improvements to data are made.

Locally resident survey responses split by ethnicity and plans to use local authority cuts of data, for example around take up of funded childcare will help.

Lobbying national government to improve data by characteristic at smaller geographies if we are to progress with an evidence-led approach is also critical.

Data from the Census 2021, as detailed by the CoDE report, published from June 2022 will also provide a rich resource for understanding the communities in Greater Manchester.

Finally, there is an opportunity through the refresh of the GMS for further work with local policy makers to ensure that the collection of data on ethnicity is embedded within programmes from the outset so that the outcomes of communities experiencing racial inequality can be measured across Greater Manchester.

# Introduction

The Independent Inequalities Commission [report](https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/media/4605/the-next-level-good-lives-for-all-in-greater-manchester.pdf) brought together the available evidence around intersecting inequalities that exist between communities and local areas across Greater Manchester. It highlighted the challenge that Greater Manchester faces if it wants to create a system which fully collaborates around the vision of good lives for all.

The Commission produced a series of recommendations that would begin to tackle the root causes of inequalities in the economic system, in the way public services work, and in deep-rooted discrimination of all kinds, including structural racism. One of these recommendations was for GMCA and local authorities to produce a Race Equality Strategy, which the Mayor has also committed to producing.

The refreshed [Greater Manchester Strategy](https://aboutgreatermanchester.com/the-greater-manchester-strategy-2021-2031/) (GMS), was launched in March 2022. It is Greater Manchester’s plan for all the communities, neighbourhoods, towns and cities which make up the city-region and sets out a plan for recovery and renewal following the pandemic. It provides a clear direction of travel for the city-region with a shared vision: *Good Lives for All: Greater Manchester is a great place to grow up, get on and grow old; a great place to invest, do business, visit and study*. Equalities sits at the heart of this strategy, acknowledging that to effectively address the most pressing and ingrained issues, there is a need to delve below averages and to understand what is happening at an individual community level, such that no area is left behind.

Building on the importance of the equalities agenda, this report then provides a summary of the Greater Manchester Strategy performance framework through an ethnicity lens. By breaking down the indicators and outlining what the current data shows, it aims to provide a snapshot of what life in Greater Manchester is like for those from racially minoritised communities. The purpose of this report is to inform the next steps in developing a Greater Manchester Race Equality Strategy by providing an evidence baseline.

This report focuses on the indicators within the performance framework of the [Greater Manchester Strategy](https://aboutgreatermanchester.com/the-greater-manchester-strategy-2021-2031/) and outlines the differences that exist between the outcomes of ethnic groups. It does not cover broader topics which are relevant to race equality but which are not covered in the GMS. This report, therefore, should be read alongside the report of the [Centre on the Dynamics of Ethnicity](https://www.ethnicity.ac.uk/) (CoDE) at University of Manchester which goes into more depth around the issues being faced by communities experiencing racial inequalities in Greater Manchester.

It is important that the Greater Manchester Strategy (GMS) works for everyone in our city region, and this report provides a baseline to measure performance against for ethnic minority communities.

# Structure of the report

The [GMS performance framework](https://aboutgreatermanchester.com/media/jlslgbys/greater-manchester-strategy-our-plan.pdf) includes indicators which will be used to understand how Greater Manchester is responding to the GMS and to measure performance against shared outcomes and commitments.

Each of these indicators within the performance framework has a linked dataset. This report uses these datasets and provides a brief analysis by ethnicity. Several of the indicators are not relevant when looking through an ethnicity lens, so only indicators which relate to the outcome of a person have been included within this report.

There are, however, significant challenges around getting data that can be broken down by ethnic group. In many cases this is not possible when the data is cut to a Greater Manchester level but may be possible at a larger geography such as North West or even England. Whilst this does provide a limitation, as it makes it more difficult to understand the specific challenge within Greater Manchester, it does go some way in showing the inequality which exists between ethnic groups.

Within this report, where the data allows a breakdown of ethnicity by Greater Manchester or local authority level this has been used. Where this is not possible, a larger geography has been used. In some cases, even at a national level it is not possible to break some datasets down by ethnicity. In these cases, a proxy measure has been used.

# Definitions

This report uses the term racially minoritised to describe people and communities experiencing racial inequality. The term racially minoritised recognises that individuals have been minoritised through social processes rather than just existing as distinct minorities.

Despite this, the report acknowledges the negative consequences of grouping all minoritised individuals together under one term as there are significant differences between these groups. This also applies for specific ethnic groupings and we recognise that they do not accurately capture individual experiences within groups.

The report acknowledges that when reporting on inequality, research and data collection should seek to capture more detailed insights to better understand and reflect the experiences of minoritised ethnic groups. The report accepts that ethnicity is an integral part of a person’s identity and treats it as such, although the data does not always allow us to comment to this effect.

Greater Manchester is a diverse conurbation. The 2011 Census revealed that 20.2% of the population of Greater Manchester was from a racially minoritised background which was slightly higher than the national average (19.5%).

The 2011 Census showed that the largest ethnic group was Pakistani with 130,000 residents. The next largest was "other white" (70,414,) many of whom are from Poland and other east European countries. The third largest group in the 2011 Census were Indians (53,461). See chart below.

The 2021 Census results will show more recent trends though the pandemic will have had an impact on international migration and deaths.

Chart 1: Residents in Greater Manchester by size of ethnic group in 2011

Source: Office for National Statistics

More recent data by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) published in 2019 estimates Greater Manchester’s racially minoritised population to be 21%, slightly higher than the 2011 Census of 20.2%. Racially minoritised groups are largest in Manchester at 41.6% and lowest in Wigan at 4.4%. This highlights the differences and the varying challenges between districts in Greater Manchester.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ethnicity 2019 estimates** | **Total population** | **Racially minoritised population** | **Percentage** |
| Bolton | 287,550 | 63,783 | 22.2% |
| Bury | 190,990 | 28,597 | 15.0% |
| Manchester | 552,858 | 230,022 | 41.6% |
| Oldham | 237,110 | 64,033 | 27.0% |
| Rochdale | 222,412 | 50,311 | 22.6% |
| Salford | 258,834 | 41,141 | 15.9% |
| Stockport | 293,423 | 31,490 | 10.7% |
| Tameside | 226,493 | 27,179 | 12.0% |
| Trafford | 237,354 | 45,671 | 19.2% |
| Wigan | 328,662 | 14,591 | 4.4% |
| **Greater Manchester** | **2,835,686** | **596,819** | **21.0%** |
| **England** | **56,286,961** | **11,747,950** | **20.9%** |

# Shared Outcomes

The Greater Manchester Strategy includes three Shared Outcomes. These are issues and areas of focus in which there is a strong willingness to drive change over the coming decade. The shared outcomes look outwards to the UK and the rest of the world, and inward to the people and places in Greater Manchester. The Shared Outcomes are detailed below:

**The Wellbeing of our People**

* A Greater Manchester where our people have good lives, with better health; better jobs; better homes; culture and leisure opportunities; and better transport
* A Greater Manchester of vibrant and creative communities, a great place to grow up get on and grow old, with inequalities reduced in all aspects of life

**Vibrant and Successful Enterprise**

* A Greater Manchester where diverse businesses can thrive, and people from all our communities are supported to realise their potential
* A Greater Manchester where business growth and development are driven by an understanding that looking after people and planet is good for productivity and profitability

**Greater Manchester as a leading city-region in the UK and globally**

* Greater Manchester as a world-leading low carbon city-region
* Greater Manchester as a world-leading digital city-region.

The table below outlines the indicators which will be used to measure performance against the three broad shared outcomes. It also makes a comment on the data availability and relevance to discussion around ethnicity. It is clear that some of these indicators are not relevant to understanding ethnicity as they do not directly focus on the outcomes of individuals.

What is also clear is that there is a big challenge around data availability when exploring the data through an ethnicity lens. As highlighted above, where possible the dataset that is linked to the GMS indicator has been used. Where this is not possible, alternatives such as making the geography larger, or sourcing an alternative proxy dataset have been used.

As shown in the table below, within the indicators that will be used to measure success against the Shared Outcomes, there are ten which relate to the outcomes of a person.

Three of these indicators can be broken down by ethnicity. For those that cannot be broken down, we have included a similar dataset to draw conclusions from where possible.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Shared Outcomes** |  |
| **Indicator** | **Data availability and relevance** |
| * Healthy life expectancy at birth | Not available split by ethnicity  Proxy sourced – Life expectancy  National data analysed |
| * Median resident earnings | Not available split by ethnicity  Regional data analysed |
| * % of energy performance certificates (EPC) / display energy certificates (DEC) for existing buildings (excluding new build) with a net movement in the reporting year from a rating of D or below to C and above | Not relevant |
| * Number of engagements by GM residents with cultural organisations supported by the GM Cultural Fund | Not possible to access this data  Proxy sourced – participation in the arts  National data analysed |
| * % of people responding ‘easy’ or ‘very easy’ to ‘How easy or difficult do you find travelling to [selection of destinations / trip purposes] (by any form of transport)?’ | Not possible to access this data  Proxy sourced – Transport trends  National data analysed |
| * % of children living in low income households | Not available split by ethnicity  National data analysed |
| * % people with a strong sense of belonging to their local area | Greater Manchester data split by ethnicity available |
| * Business births | Not relevant |
| * % of working-age population in employment | Greater Manchester data split by ethnicity available |
| * % of working-age population with Level 4+ qualifications | Not available split by ethnicity  National data analysed |
| * % of working-age population with sub-Level 2 qualifications | Not available split by ethnicity  National data analysed |
| * Manchester's position on the Resonance World's Best Cities index | Not relevant |
| * Carbon emissions estimates p.a., ktCO | Not relevant |
| * Number of properties at risk of flooding | Not relevant |
| * No. people employed in digital industries | Not available  No relevant proxy available |

### 4.1 Healthy Life expectancy at birth

This indicator cannot be broken down by ethnicity and national data for healthy life expectancy by ethnicity is not available either. The table below shows a national data set for life expectancy by ethnic group.

There is a big variation between females and males across many ethnic groups but White people, people with Mixed ethnicity and Black Caribbean people and Bangladeshi males have the lowest life expectancy across England and Wales.

Life expectancy, however, differs from healthy life expectancy because it relates to the total years people live for rather than the number of years lived in self-assessed good health. Healthy life expectancy therefore relates to the quality of a person’s life. A broader discussion of health and ethnicity can be found in the report of CoDE which can be read alongside this report.

Chart 2: Life expectancy at birth by sex and ethnic group: England and Wales 2011 to 2014

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ethnic group** | **Females** | **Males** | **Sex gap (years)** |
| **Asian other** | 86.9 | 84.5 | 2.4 |
| **Bangladeshi** | 87.3 | 81.1 | 6.2 |
| **Black African** | 88.9 | 83.8 | 5.1 |
| **Black Caribbean** | 84.6 | 80.7 | 3.9 |
| **Black other** | 86.8 | 82.0 | 4.8 |
| **Indian** | 85.4 | 82.3 | 3.1 |
| **Mixed** | 83.1 | 79.3 | 3.8 |
| **Other** | 86.9 | 84.0 | 2.9 |
| **Pakistani** | 84.8 | 82.3 | 2.5 |
| **White** | 83.1 | 79.7 | 3.4 |

Source: Office for National Statistics

* 1. **Median resident earnings: hourly pay**

The dataset which informs this indicator is the Annual Population Survey which outlines the pay gaps between parts of the UK and between groups. It cannot be broken down by Greater Manchester and by ethnicity.

Data from 2019, however, shows that nationally those from most racially minoritised groups continue to earn less than White British employees. Those in the Chinese, White Irish, White and Asian, and Indian ethnic groups, however, all earned higher hourly pay than White British employees.

The North West has a pay gap of 5.4% compared to 23.8% in London. This means that the median hourly earnings from racially minoritised people are 5.4% less than median hourly earnings of White British employees in the North West.

The pay gap of 5.4% in the North West is affected by multiple different factors, such as occupation, age and sex. Whilst this in itself can reveal important characteristics about work, if pay determining characteristics vary between ethnic groups, the pay gaps observed might result from differences in these characteristics, rather than because of ethnicity.

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) have produced an adjusted pay gap which accounts for these other factors. This modelling estimates the effect of ethnicity, if all other characteristics were the same between the different groups of people.

The graph below shows that there is a big variation between those born within the UK and outside. In the North West an Asian person born outside the UK has on average a median hourly wage nearly 10% lower than a UK born White person. A UK-born Asian earns 2.4% less on average. The North West has a smaller ethnicity pay gap than the England average for all ethnic groups except for Non-UK White and UK born Other.

A UK born Black person, however, on average has a negative pay gap meaning that they earn 3.5% more than a UK born White person. This is compared to 9.6% gap for Non-UK born Black people.

Chart 3: Adjusted Ethnicity pay gap - North West and England (% is gap between group and White UK born)

Source: Office for National Statistics, Ethnicity pay gaps: 2019

* 1. **Number of engagements by GM residents with cultural organisations supported by the GM Cultural Fund**

There is potential for this data source to be split by ethnicity, but it has not been possible to attain this data within the timescales of this project.

Whilst this dataset is unique to Greater Manchester, a national dataset on participation in the arts (the Taking Part survey) shows that people aged 16 and over from Mixed backgrounds are the most likely to have taken part in the arts in the past year (88.7%). This compares to 69.3% of White people, 68.5% of people from Black backgrounds, 66.5% from the other ethnic group and 59.7% of Asian people.

* 1. **% of people responding ‘easy’ or ‘very easy’ to ‘How easy or difficult do you find travelling to [selection of destinations / trip purposes] (by any form of transport)?’**

Although this dataset is not yet available for analysis, national data from the Transport Survey does provide some insight into ethnic disparity in travel trends.

White people travelled the longest distance (on average 6,878 miles per person per year, 983 trips) and made the most trips, whilst Black people travelled the shortest distance (4,066 miles per person per year, 773 trips) and made the fewest trips.

Journeys by car or van made up 63% of trips by white people, the highest of all ethnic groups, whereas travel by car or van accounted for 40% of trips by Black people – the lowest of all ethnic groups.

Journeys by local bus made up 19% of trips by Black people which was the highest for all ethnic groups, whereas for white groups this was just 5%.

* 1. **% of children living in relative low income households**

Figures for Greater Manchester in this dataset cannot be broken down by ethnicity. National figures however show stark differences for some racially minoritised groups compared to White British.

A household is in low income if they live on less than 60% of the UK’s median income (a couple with no children would be in low income with an annual household income of up to £17,100 before housing costs and £14,800 after housing costs).

The table below shows that between 2017 and 2020, people in Pakistani and Bangladeshi households are the most likely out of all ethnic groups to live in low income households, before and after housing costs. This has been the case since 2008.

This worsens for children, as 68% of children living in Bangladeshi households are considered to be in a low income household after housing costs.

People in White British households are consistently the least likely to live in low income households.

Chart 5: Percentage of people living in households in low income, by ethnicity of the household

Source: Office for National Statistics, People in Low-income Households, 2021

* 1. **% of people with a strong sense of belonging to their local area**

This indicator is taken from the Community Safety Survey which is commissioned by GMCA and carried out by an external partner, [DJS](https://www.djsresearch.co.uk/). The survey asks 325 people from each Local Authority (3250 total) per quarter a range of questions around their personal experiences of safety.

The survey has been running since July 2019 and nine quarters of data are currently available. It is a robust data source that can be analysed by specific ethnic group (except for any other Black background, Kashmiri and Arabic where the sample size is too small).

The graph below shows that White and Black African, White and Black Caribbean and Caribbean are the least likely to agree with that they have a strong sense of belonging to their local area followed by Chinese, Eastern European and Any other mixed background.

Individuals from some racially minoritised groups have very high levels of agreement with this statement, such as Pakistani, Indian, Bangladeshi and Any other Asian Background.

Chart 4: % that agree with the statement: "I feel a strong sense of belonging to my local area"

Source: Community Safety Survey, July 2019-September 2021

* 1. **% of working-age population in employment**

There are clear racial disparities within the employment rate for the Working Age Population (those aged 16 to 64) in Greater Manchester, with higher levels of White people in employment compared to racially minoritised groups. This has been consistent since 2011/12.

For the period between July 2020 and June 2021, 74% of the Working Age Population who identified as White were in employment. This is compared to 66% who identify as Mixed, 69% Indian, 52% Pakistani/Bangladeshi, 66% Black and 58% Other.

All groups have experienced an increase in the employment rate between 2011/12 and 2020/2021, however there are differences between groups. As the graph below shows, the employment rate of those identifying as White has risen 6 ppt from 69% in 2011/2012 to 74% in 2020/2021. For those identifying as Indian or Pakistani/Bangladeshi, the increase was 3 ppt and 4 ppt respectively. For those identifying as Mixed, Black or Other, the employment rate increase was larger than that of the White groups – increases of 12 ppt, 9ppt and 8 ppt respectively over the same period.

Note: ONS defines ‘employment’ as those aged 16 years and over who did one hour or more of paid work per week and those who had a job that they were temporarily away from (for example, because they were on holiday or off sick)

Chart 6: Employment rate of Working Age Population in Greater Manchester, 2011/2012 to 2020/2021, by ethnic grouping

Source: Annual Population Survey 2021 via Nomis

When comparing GM to the rest of England, GM has lower levels of employment for all ethnic groups, including those identifying as White. The only exception to this is Black or Black British groups, in which 67.3% are in employment in GM vs 67.2% in England.

* 1. **% of working-age population with Level 4+ qualifications**

The dataset on further education and skills cannot be broken down by ethnicity and by geography. National figures, however, show that 72.6% of White British people over the age of 16 have a higher qualification (level 4+). This is compared to 66.6% of those from ethnic minorities.

It is not possible to break this data down into ethnic groups.

* 1. % **of working-age population with sub Level 2 qualifications**

This dataset is the same as above. Nationally it shows that 83.3% of people from ethnic minority backgrounds aged 16 and over have level 1 qualifications compared to 83.9% of those from White British backgrounds.

# Shared commitments – place priorities

The Greater Manchester Strategy includes fifteen shared commitments. These are the things that the GMS sets out to do or the areas of intervention which will support the attainment of the shared outcomes. The shared commitments have been split between place and system priorities. There are three shared commitments – place priorities which are outlined below.

* + - * We will drive investment into our growth locations, and use that to create opportunities in adjacent town and local centres
      * We will enable the delivery of resilient, safe and vibrant communities where everyone has access to essential services, local centres and high streets which are successful and reflective of their populations, and access to high quality culture and leisure spaces
      * We will ensure our local communities, neighbourhoods, villages, towns, cities and districts are protected and strengthened through the Places for Everyone Plan and Stockport Local Plan, with new homes delivered in line with our Zero Carbon commitments and Housing Strategy

The table below shows the indicators which will be used to measure the performance against the three shared commitment- place priorities. As shown below, three of these indicators are related to the outcomes of people and are therefore relevant to a discussion around ethnicity.

All three will be used to inform the second shared commitment- place priority of ‘We will enable the delivery of resilient, safe and vibrant communities where everyone has access to essential services, local centres and high streets which are successful and reflective of their populations, and access to high quality culture and leisure spaces’.

One, however, is duplicated from the shared outcomes and therefore is not included here again (% of people responding ‘easy’ or ‘very easy’ to ‘How easy or difficult do you find travelling to [selection of destinations / trip purposes] (by any form of transport)?’).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Shared commitment – place priorities** |  |
| **Indicator** | **Data availability and relevance** |
| * Employment space and housing growth | Not relevant |
| * % increase in residential development in main town centres | Not relevant |
| * % of residents who feel 'very' or 'fairly safe' in their local area | Greater Manchester data split by ethnicity available |
| * No. of neighbourhood crimes per 1,000 population | Not relevant |
| * % of victims who are satisfied with the overall service received from Greater Manchester Police (GMP) | Greater Manchester data split by ethnicity available |
| * % of people responding ‘easy’ or ‘very easy’ to ‘How easy or difficult do you find travelling to [selection of destinations / trip purposes] (by any form of transport)?’ | Duplicate from shared outcomes |
| * Net additional dwellings built p.a. | Not relevant |
| * Number of new build homes with an energy performance certificate (EPC) rating in the reporting year of A | Not relevant |

* 1. **% of residents who feel 'very' or 'fairly safe' in their local area**

This question is also asked within the Community Safety Survey (see above). The survey asks 325 people from each Local Authority in Greater Manchester (3250 total) per quarter a range of questions around their personal experiences of safety.

One of the questions asks how safe people feel within their local area, which is described as a 5 minute walk from their house. The sample size is 28,937 people so analysis of the response to this question is possible by most minor ethnic groups except for Any Other Black background, Kashmiri and Arabic where the sample size is still too small.

The graph below shows that African, White and Black African, British /English/Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish and Irish people feel the safest whilst Chinese, Any other Asian background, White and Asian, White and Black African, White and Black Caribbean, Any other Mixed race, Other and Any other white ethnic groups feel the least safe.

Chart 7: % that feel safe in their local area

Source: Community Safety Survey, July 2019-September 2021

* 1. **% of victims who are satisfied with the overall service received from Greater Manchester Police (GMP)**

This question is also asked within the community safety survey (see above) but it is only asked to those who identified that they have reported a crime to GMP. This means that the sample size is lower (6985) and the analysis can only be done by major ethnic groups.

The graph below shows the results for this question for the whole time period of the survey (July 2019-September 2021). Black people have the highest satisfaction with GMP (57% satisfied) and Asian and Mixed race groups the least (51% satisfied).

Chart 8: % Satisfaction with GMP

Source: Community Safety Survey, July 2019-September 2021

# Shared commitments – system priorities

As described above, the shared commitments are split between place and system priorities. There are twelve shared commitments – system priorities which outline the things that Greater Manchester will do to create a public sector system which delivers against the shared outcomes. The twelve shared commitments are outlined below.

* We will create a carbon neutral Greater Manchester by 2038, with better air quality and natural environment
* We will deliver a low carbon London-style fully integrated public transport system across bus, tram, train and bike
* We will enable the delivery of world-class smart digital infrastructure
* We will realise the opportunities from our world-class growth and innovation assets, driven by our Places for Everyone Plan, Local Growth Plans and Industrial Strategy to open up opportunities in all parts of the city-region
* We will support our businesses to grow sustainably and be as prosperous as they can be
* We will support the creation of better jobs and good employment that has a purpose beyond growing shareholder value, utilising the opportunity to positively impact on our communities
* We will ensure businesses are able to access the skills and talent they need, and people are able to realise their full potential – by provision of high-quality learning and wrapping support around individuals – with access to good work for those who can, support for those who could, and care for those who can’t
* We will ensure all our children and young people leave education and training ready to succeed in the labour market with a balance of academic, technical and ‘life ready’ skills
* We will ensure digital inclusion for all, including under 25s, over 75s and disabled people online
* We will ensure the delivery of safe, decent and affordable housing, with no one sleeping rough in Greater Manchester
* We will tackle food and fuel poverty experienced by Greater Manchester residents
* We will reduce health inequalities experienced by Greater Manchester residents, and drive improvements in physical and mental health

The table below shows the indicators that will be used to measure the shared commitments- system priorities. Of the total thirty-six indicators, there are twenty-two which relate to the outcomes of people and are therefore included in this report.

The datasets used to inform eight of these indicators can be broken down by ethnicity whilst for three it will be possible in the near future when the survey data has been collated. For those where the dataset cannot be broken down by ethnicity for Greater Manchester, a national dataset or similar proxy measure is described.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Shared commitment – place priorities** |  |
| **Indicator** | **Data availability and relevance** |
| * Level of NO2 emissions and exceedances | Not relevant |
| * Amount of renewable electricity installed capacity | Not relevant |
| * Municipal / household waste recycling rate | Not relevant |
| * Number of trees planted per annum | Not relevant |
| * % who find it easy to use different forms of transport in one journey | Greater Manchester data split with minimal ethnicity split available |
| * % of people who say they can afford to travel by public transport as much as they like | Not possible to access this data  No proxy available |
| * % and total annual trips made via public transport / active travel | Not relevant |
| * % of the GM bus fleet that is zero emission (at tailpipe) | Not relevant |
| * % of premises unable to access download speeds of at least 30Mbit/s | Not relevant |
| * Number of employees / companies in GM's frontier sectors | Not relevant |
| * Number of innovation-active businesses | Not relevant |
| * Number of GM businesses engaged by the Growth Company | Greater Manchester data split with minimal ethnicity split available |
| * Number of GM businesses signed up to the Race to Zero campaign | Not relevant |
| * % of employees paid above the Real Living Wage (RLW) | Not available split by ethnicity for GM  National data analysed |
| * % of GM residents in ‘good work’ | Will be available through Residents Survey  Proxy sourced – Job quality  National data analysed |
| * Trends in Adult Education Budget (AEB) starts and achievements | Not currently available split by ethnicity for GM |
| * Trends in apprenticeship starts and achievements (focus on cohorts, sector subject area, level) | Greater Manchester data with ethnicity split available |
| * % take up of funded childcare and early education places for two-year-olds | Not currently available split by ethnicity for GM  National data analysed |
| * % of children at or above the expected level of development at 2-2.5 years | Not available split by ethnicity for GM  Proxy sourced – Development of 4-4.5 year olds  National data analysed |
| * Attendance at school: rate of pupil unauthorised absence (all age, all settings) | Greater Manchester data with ethnicity split available |
| * % of young people reporting good or higher wellbeing (Year 10s) | Greater Manchester data with ethnicity split available by end of March 2022 |
| * Trends in transitions for GM young people, including priority cohorts, across childhood | Not currently available split by ethnicity for GM  National data analysed |
| * % of residents not accessing the internet in the last 3 months | Not available split by ethnicity for GM  National data analysed |
| * Level of digital exclusion within priority groups (tbc.) | Not currently available  Proxy sourced – life readiness |
| * Total number of learners taking digital skills courses funded under the GM Adult Education Budget (AEB) | Not currently available  No proxy available |
| * % of energy performance certificates (EPC) / display energy certificates (DEC) for existing buildings (excluding new build) with a net movement in the reporting year from a rating of D or below to C and above | Not relevant |
| * Number of new affordable homes built per annum | Not relevant |
| * Number of people sleeping rough | Not currently available split by ethnicity  National data analysed |
| * % of households that are food insecure | Available with minimal ethnicity split for GM |
| * Volume of unsecured personal loans | Not relevant |
| * % of adults reporting ‘high’ or ‘very high’ satisfaction with their life | Not currently available split by ethnicity for GM  National data analysed |
| * % of adults reporting high levels of anxiety | Not currently available split by ethnicity for GM  National data analysed |
| * % of people who are active or fairly active | Not currently available split by ethnicity for GM  Regional data analysed |
| * % of GM residents who are overweight or obese | Not currently available split by ethnicity for GM  National data analysed |
| * % of adults (18+) who are current smokers | Not currently available split by ethnicity for GM  National data analysed |
| * No. of emergency hospital admissions due to falls per 10,000 adults aged 65 and over | Not currently available split by ethnicity  No proxy available |

* 1. **% who find it easy to use different forms of transport in one journey**

According to the Network Principles Survey 2021, Asian or Asian British respondents were less likely than average to find multi-modal travel easy.

This disparity was particularly concentrated amongst respondents with a Pakistani or Bangladeshi background, although sample sizes at this level of analysis are small. ‘Other’ includes respondents with varied ethnic backgrounds. The low sample size of this group means the difference in perceived ease of multi-modal travel is not significant.

Chart 9: How easy or difficult is it for you to use different types of transport in one journey in Greater Manchester?

Source: Project R130. Fieldwork March to April 2021. Q1b. *How easy or difficult is it for you to use different types of transport in one journey in Greater Manchester?* Base = 1,676 (2021), 1,232 (2018). Sample sizes per group shown in brackets

* 1. **% of people who say they can afford to travel by public transport as much as they like**

This data is currently unavailable but it should be possible to get a Greater Manchester breakdown by ethnicity in the future.

* 1. **Number of GM businesses engaged by the Growth Company**

In the financial year of 2021/2022, 1004 businesses were supported by the Business Growth Hub in Greater Manchester and 149 (15.92%) of these business owners were from a minority ethnic group.

* 1. **% of employees paid above the Real Living Wage (RLW)**

Data for this is not available for Greater Manchester that can be split by ethnicity. According to the Living Wage Foundation, however, 19% of those from racially minoritised communities compared to 16% of white workers earn below the living wage nationally.

* 1. **% of GM residents in ‘good work’**

Data to inform this indicator is going to be collected in the Greater Manchester Residents survey where questions will be asked around a variety of different factors such as earnings, job security, work-life balance, opportunities for progression and development, level of stress. These will be aggregated to produce a ‘good work’ measure. It will be possible to split this data by ethnicity.

In 2019, the ONS published experimental analysis of job quality in the UK using newly reweighted earnings data from the Annual Population Survey (APS) for 2018. The analysis considers good hours (employees working 48 or fewer hours a week and not wishing to work more), a desired contract type (employees either in a permanent contract or who did not accept a non-permanent contract because they could not find a permanent one) and pay (employees who are earning above two-thirds of the hourly median pay).

83% of employees in GM had satisfactory hours in 2018, compared to 78% in 2014. 98% of employees had a desired contract, up from 97% in 2014. 8% of employees were in low pay.

Although ethnicity breakdowns is not available at GM level, the national analysis shows that employees who identify as Bangladeshi were the most likely to be in low-pay employment (30%). Mixed/multiple ethnic groups, Pakistani, any other Asian background, Black/African/Caribbean/Black British and other ethnic all reported higher percentages of low pay than those identifying as White at UK level. Chinese and Indian employees reported lower levels of being in low-pay employment when compared to White groups.

Employees who identified as Chinese and Indian were the most likely ethnic groups to have quality work (73% and 71% respectively), followed by employees who self-identified as ethnically White (68%). Only 51% of Bangladeshi employees reported having good quality work.

* 1. **Trends in Adult Education Budget (AEB) starts**

Data on the number of Adult Education Budget starts and achievements is not yet available by ethnicity for GM so is not included in this report.

* 1. **Trends in apprenticeship starts and achievements (focus on cohorts, sector subject area, level)**

Most of the Apprenticeship starts were by white learners – 84% of starts in 2020/21. Over the past three years, the overrepresentation of White learners in Apprenticeships starts has remained consistent.

The ethnicity gap is at its most acute among young apprentices between the ages of 16 and 18. People from racially minoritised groups constitute over a fifth of all young people, but among apprentices they make up just 8%. However, the gap is lowest among ‘mid-career’ apprentices: those between the ages of 31 and 49. For this age group proportions of racially minoritised groups apprentices are virtually in line with the proportion of the population overall.

Racially minoritised groups apprentices are also heavily concentrated in just three subject areas: business administration, health and social care and retail and commercial enterprises (81% of racially minoritised groups apprentices compared with 72% of ‘white’ apprentices). They are underrepresented in engineering and construction – subject areas likely to lead to better paying employment.

Apprenticeships are jobs and as such are likely to exhibit some of the patterns of labour market discrimination that exist in the wider worker culture. Racially minoritised people have higher rates of unemployment and underemployment and tend to be overrepresented in lower paid and more insecure work.

Nationally, like in Greater Manchester, there is an overrepresentation of White groups in apprenticeships when compared to the overall population. In England, 84% of the population is White, but 88.2% of the people on apprenticeships are White. Asian groups are the most underrepresented ethnic group nationally with 5% of apprenticeships despite making up 8.4% of the overall population.

* 1. **% take up of funded childcare and early education places for two-year-olds**

This is one of the performance indicators for the GMS that will be broken down to a neighbourhood level. A neighbourhoods’ approach considers the importance of engaging all communities and demonstrates the differences in outcomes even within districts.

Rather than use the data that is published nationally, Greater Manchester plans to collate its own data. When this data is collected, it will be possible to split this by ethnicity but currently this dataset is not available.

The national dataset does provide numbers of 2 year olds that take up their funded entitlement by ethnic group but it is not possible to get a percentage of how many this is compared to how many are entitled and therefore the conclusions are limited.

A report produced by the Department for Education in 2018 entitled ‘Take-up of free early education entitlements’ looks at the take up rate of ethnic groups across the UK.

Take-up was found to be lower among children from Bangladeshi, Gypsy/Roma/Traveller, Black African and Pakistani backgrounds in a study of take up among 3-year-olds in 2010.

More recent findings show that children who speak English as an additional language were found to be nearly three times as likely not to take up their full five terms of eligible preschool compared to children with English as their first language, in a study of 3-year-olds.

A regression analysis was undertaken to understand the importance of various factors in whether a child takes up their funded entitlement.

The regression analyses found that Local Authority take-up rates for the 2 year old entitlement were predicted by English as an additional language, suggesting that the higher the proportion of children with English as an additional language, the lower the take-up rate.

Region, economic disadvantage and employment status are all also associated with take-up and the regression analysis suggested that population mobility and SEND were particularly important alongside English as an additional language.

* 1. **% of children at or above the expected level of development at 2-2.5 years**

Data on expected level of development for 2-2.5 year olds is not available by ethnicity but a similar dataset reports on expected development for 4-5 year olds.

Nationally, 71% of 4 to 5 year olds met the expected standard in development by the end of the 2018 to 2019 school year, however there is variation between ethnic groups.

78% of Indian 4 to 5 year olds met the expected standard in development, much higher than the average of 71% across all groups. Bangladeshi and Pakistani pupils though perform less well – 67% and 64% respectively.

Black groups, compromised of Black African, Black Caribbean and Black Other all underachieved when compared to all groups – 68%, 68% and 66% respectively.

73% of White British 4 to 5 year olds met the expected standard in development compared to just 34% for those identifying as Gypsy or Roma and 39% Irish Traveller.

* 1. **Attendance at school: rate of pupil unauthorised absence (all age, all settings)**

The dataset to inform this measure is available split by ethnicity and by local authority. It provides a snapshot of a single term in 2020 and presents a mixed picture by ethnicity.

Chinese (GM average 0.3%), Black African (GM average 0.72%) and Indian (GM average 0.8%) students across GM have some of the lowest unauthorised absence rates. Greater Manchester performs better (lower rates of unauthorised absence) than the national average for these ethnic groups.

White minority groups (Traveller and Gypsy Roma) have by far the highest rates of unauthorised absence (GM average 9% and 10.2% respectively). Greater Manchester rates of unauthorised absences, although high, are lower than the national average – 14% for Traveller and 11.5% Gypsy Roma.

The graph below shows the differences across local authorities by broader ethnic groups.

Chart 10: Pupil absence across Greater Manchester

Source: Department for Education, 2021

* 1. **% of young people reporting good or higher wellbeing (Year 10s)**

The #BeeWell survey explores the domains and drivers of wellbeing among young people across Greater Manchester. 40,000 young people in year 8 and year 10 from more than 160 secondary schools across all 10 local authorities in Greater Manchester were asked a series of question in Autumn 2021. Survey responses are linked to demographic data provided by local authorities and schools.

Results from wave 1 (Autumn 2021) show that Chinese and Mixed race pupils have lower levels of life satisfaction than white pupils. Compared to white pupils, psychological wellbeing is significantly lower among Black young people and higher for Asian young people. In addition, Asian young people say that they are less stressed than white peers.

Inequalities around ethnicity are much less pronounced than those by gender identity, sexual orientation, and transgender status.

* 1. **Trends in transitions for GM young people, including priority cohorts, across childhood**

Data from the Greater Manchester Apprenticeship & Careers Service split by ethnicity is not available. Data on the number of 16–17-year-olds in priority groups who are not in education, employment or training (special educational needs and disabilities; looked after children; care leavers) in Greater Manchester is also not available.

However national figures provided by the ONS, based on a 3-year pooled dataset of the Annual Population Survey between 2017 and 2019, show the percentage of 16-24 year olds not in Employment, Education or Training (NEET) by ethnicity.

14.3% of young people aged 16 to 24 who identify as Pakistani are NEET compared to 11.7% of all White groups. Bangladeshi are the only other ethnicity group that have higher NEET rates (12%) than White groups. Indian and Chinese young people have significantly lower rates of NEET, 7.3% and 4.5% respectively, then other ethnic groups including White groups.

Chart 11: Percentage of 16-24 year olds not in Employment, Education or Training, for interviews carried out at any time during the three-year period 2017-2019, by ethnicity and employment status.

Source: Annual Population Survey - 3 year pooled dataset, 2017-2019

When considering the percentage of pupils achieving grades 5 or above in English and Mathematics GCSEs in Greater Manchester, Black and Other groups perform less well than White groups – 44%, 46% and 48% respectively.

Chinese pupils significantly outperform both White groups and other ethnic groups with 86% achieving grades 5 or above in English and Maths GCSEs. Across all ethnicities, with the exception of Chinese who outperform, fewer proportion of pupils in Greater Manchester achieve grades 5 or above in English and Mathematics GCSEs compared with the national average.

Chart 12: Percentage of pupils achieving grades 5 or above in English and Mathematics GCSEs

Source: Key stage 4 performance, Academic Year 2020/21 – Explore education statistics – GOV.UK

* 1. **% of residents not accessing the internet in the last 3 months**

This dataset is not available broken down by ethnicity for Greater Manchester. National research shows clear, but narrowing, ethnic disparities when it comes to internet non-users (“Internet non-users” refers to those who have never used the internet or last used it more than three months ago).

In 2011, there were wide disparities in recent internet use among the different ethnic groups, however, in 2018, this gap had narrowed. This is particularly the case for adults of Bangladeshi ethnicity.

In 2018, White groups were the most likely to be internet non-users (10%). Chinese and mixed and multiple ethnic groups were the least likely to be internet non-users – both 1.8%.

Chart 13: Percent of internet non-users by ethnicity Chart showing Percent of internet non-users by ethnicity in England. 

The chart shows the fall in internet non-users across all ethnicities between 2011 to 2018. 

2018
10% White
7% Bangladeshi
7% Black, African, Caribbean, Black British
6% Indian
5% Pakistani
4% Other ethnic group
3% Other Asian Background
2% mixed
2% Chinese
are internet non-users


Source: Office for National Statistics - Internet Users, Labour Force Survey (LFS)

* 1. **Level of digital exclusion within priority groups (tbc.)**

The priority groups which will be targeted are yet to be decided but this indicator will be measured using a question in the Residents survey and data is not yet available. The only dataset available around digital exclusion that can be split by ethnicity is the dataset used in the indicator above.

There may be some learning from the 2020 life readiness survey which asked 7500 Year 10s whether they had everything they needed to learn from home if they needed to. It found that pupils living in the most deprived neighbourhoods reported barriers to home learning at higher rates than those in the least deprived neighbourhoods (30% compared to 24%). A higher prevalence was also reported by pupils of a Black (38%) and Mixed (36%) ethnicity.

* 1. **Total number of learners taking digital skills courses funded under the GM Adult Education Budget (AEB)**

Data on the proportion of the adult population who have all five basic skills are only available at regional-level, and not for Greater Manchester. It has not been possible to access this data within the timeframe of the project and an appropriate proxy could not be identified.

* 1. **Number of people sleeping rough**

There is very little data collected on the characteristics of rough sleepers. In England, each local authority carries out a rough sleeper count on a single night in August which is the data that will be measured in the GMS performance framework

This data is not split by ethnicity, even nationally. To improve the evidence base on people sleeping rough and rough sleeping in England, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) conducted in-depth research between February 2019 and March 2020. This included a more thorough demographic breakdown.

84% of those rough sleeping were White compared to 5% Black, 4% Mixed race, 4% Other ethnic group and 2% Asian. The majority of the respondents (81%) were UK nationals.

* 1. **% of households that are food insecure**

GMCA commissioned BMG to undertake a regular survey around the impacts of the pandemic on communities in Greater Manchester. This has been running since November 2020.The survey asked around 100 respondents per district per month (1000 total) about their experiences with Covid-19 and has now been superseded by the residents survey.

As the sample size is small, it is not possible to break the monthly reports down by ethnicity or other characteristics accurately because the ethnic groups become very small. BMG, however, produced a more detailed characteristic analysis which looks at the data from three months (Feb-April 2021). The sample size, however, remains relatively small for ethnic minorities (487 who describe their ethnicity as anything other than White British).

Ethnic minorities are significantly more likely to have eaten less than they should have because of a lack of money or other resources, compared to the GM average (27% compared to 16%).

Ethnic minorities are significantly more likely to have used a foodbank than the GM average (18% compared to 10%).

This survey is limited and mainly focused around Covid-19 and it is not clear from this data how entrenched these issues around food are or whether they are a direct impact of the pandemic.

A residents survey has been commissioned which will include several measures included in the GMS performance framework, one of which is on food insecurity so there will be ongoing data around this that will be split by ethnicity.

* 1. **% of adults reporting ‘high’ or ‘very high’ satisfaction with their life**

The life satisfaction dataset produced by ONS is only available at a national scale split by ethnicity. The latest data available is 2018 so this does not account for any changes to life satisfaction throughout the Covid-19 pandemic.

The graph below shows that black people are the least likely to say that they have high or very high life satisfaction. White people are the most likely, closely followed by Indian people.

People from the Arab and Pakistani ethnic groups were more likely than the UK average to have very high levels of satisfaction.

Chart 14: % of people who feel they have high and very high life satisfaction

Source: Office for National Statistics, Life Satisfaction, 2018

* 1. **% of adults reporting high levels of anxiety**

This data is only available nationally split by ethnicity. In 2018, when people in the UK were asked how anxious they felt yesterday, the average score was 2.85 out of 10 (where 10 is 'completely anxious’). Bangladeshi groups reported the lowest average score of anxiety (2.62).

The average anxiety scores for people from the Arab (3.46), Mixed (3.07) and Chinese (3.00) ethnic groups were higher than the UK average.

* 1. **% of people who are active or fairly active**

The smallest geography available for this dataset which splits physical activity by ethnicity is region.

In the North West, an average of 59% of people are physically active and 11% are fairly active. The graph below shows that White British and White Other are the most active ethnic groups.

Data is not available for the percentage of people in the Chinese or Other ethnic group that are fairly active due to small sample sizes. Both ethnic groups, however, have a low proportion of people who are physically active compared to the average.

For the ethnic groups that have data for both active and fairly active, Asian people have the lowest levels of activity.

The North West has lower levels of physically active people compared to the England average for all ethnic groups. This is particularly true for Asian people with 43% physically active in North West compared to 50% nationally. Similarly, 45% of Chinese people in North West are physically active compared to 57% in England.

Chart 15: % of people in the North West over 16 that are active or fairly active

Source: Office for National Statistics, Physical activity, 2019-2020

* 1. **% of GM residents who are overweight or obese**

This data is not available split by ethnicity and geography. In the UK, as of November 2020, 62.8% of all adults (people aged 18 and over) were overweight or obese. A BMI of 25 or more is classed as overweight and 30 or more is classed as obese.

67.5% of Black adults were overweight or obese – the highest percentage out of all ethnic groups – compared with 32.2% of Chinese adults who were the lowest out of all ethnic groups. For those identifying as White British, 58% were overweight or obese.

* 1. **% of adults (18+) who are current smokers**

This dataset cannot be split by geography. The national dataset, however, shows that in 2019 the percentage of adults who smoked was higher than average in the Mixed and White ethnic groups as shown in the graph below.

The percentage of adults that smoke was lower than average in the Chinese, Asian and Black ethnic groups.

Chart 16: % of people over 18 that smoke

Source: Office for National Statistics, Cigarette smoking among adults, 2019

* 1. **No. of emergency hospital admissions due to falls per 10,000 adults aged 65 and over**

This data is held by NHS digital, and it was not possible to access this data set within the timescales of this project.

# Next steps

It is clear that there are significant challenges around accessing data that is split by ethnicity at a Greater Manchester geography. The vast majority (nearly 70%) of the datasets used to explore the GMS indicators within this report have relied on national or regional data because data for Greater Manchester is unavailable.

To better understand and to monitor progress for racially minoritised communities in Greater Manchester, it is important that improvements to data are made.

Many of the datasets used within the GMS performance framework are national datasets controlled by the Office for National Statistics and by government departments through Gov.uk. GMCA should lobby national government to improve data by characteristic at smaller geographies if we are to progress with an evidence-led approach.

The GMS performance framework does include a series of indicators which will be measured through a Greater Manchester residents survey. This will give better access to data on Greater Manchester communities and it will be possible to split this by a series of characteristics, including ethnicity. The results of this survey will go some way in meeting the shortfalls of national datasets. The first wave of the residents survey is expected imminently and questions around food insecurity, good work and digital inclusion are included within this.

Furthermore, the GMS does outline some instances where it plans to use bespoke data, for example around take up of funded childcare and early education places for two-year-olds where local authority data will be collated.

Data from the Census 2021 which will start to be published from June 2022 will also provide a rich resource for understanding the communities in Greater Manchester. This will particularly be the case for demographic breakdowns and employment, health and education statistics.

Finally, there is an opportunity through the refresh of the GMS for further work with local policy makers to ensure that the collection of data on ethnicity is embedded within programmes from the outset so that the outcomes of communities experiencing racial inequality can be measured across Greater Manchester.