

EQUALITY IN PRACTICE

Report of a survey on the adoption and implementation by English councils of *Racial Equality Means Quality*, the CRE Standard for local government

by the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham,
on behalf of the Commission for Racial Equality,
the Employers' Organisation for Local Government
and the Local Government Association



The Commission for Racial Equality
works in partnership with individuals and organisations
for a fair and just society which values diversity
and gives everyone an equal chance
to work, learn and live free from discrimination,
prejudice and racism

Credits

Laurence Ward London Borough of Hammersmith
Project manager and Fulham

Project team

Joe Charlesworth	Commission for Racial Equality
Mandy Wright	Employers' Organisation for Local Government
Peter Smith	Local Government Association
Sarah Palmer	Local Authority Race Relations Information Exchange
Julian Clarke	Centre for Local Policy Studies
Stuart Speeden	Centre for Local Policy Studies

© Commission for Racial Equality

Elliot House
10/12 Allington Street
London SW1E 5EH

Published 2001

ISBN 1 85442 234 0

CONTENTS

Foreword	5
Preface	7
1. Introduction	9
2. The legislative and administrative framework	12
The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000	12
The Human Rights Act 1998	13
The EU Directives on Race and Employment	14
DETR and Audit Commission performance indicators	15
Community planning	16
3. The survey findings	17
Corporate performance	17
Best performing departments	17
Progress on the Standard	19
Adopting the Standard	20
Wider interest in the Standard	21
4. Conclusions and recommendations	22
Conclusions	22
Recommendations for local government	23
Recommendations for central government	24
Recommendations for other organisations	24
Appendix 1 Methodology	25
Appendix 2 Bibliography and useful websites	27
Appendix 3 Sample questionnaire	29

FOREWORD

For nearly twenty-five years, local government has had a special duty under the Race Relations Act 1976 to take account of the need to eliminate racial discrimination and promote equality of opportunity between different racial groups. Unfortunately, this duty has not been given the priority it deserves, although a handful of local authorities have made impressive progress.

In early 1999, the Stephen Lawrence Report encouraged local government to re-appraise its stance and challenged authorities to ensure that their policies did not disadvantage ethnic minorities in their communities.

There is no shortage of guidance available to local authorities. In particular, the CRE Standard for local government, *Racial Equality Means Quality*, first published in 1995, provides an invaluable tool for taking stock of policies and practices, assessing the quality and extent of action taken, and planning a systematic way forward. Yet, three years after the Standard was issued, fewer than a quarter of authorities were using it.

As this report shows, the position has improved considerably: local authorities have taken notice of the Lawrence Report and the performance framework for Best Value, set by the Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR), and two thirds of councils have adopted the Standard. The worry, however, is that only two out of five have gone on to audit themselves against the Standard, and only one in ten has achieved more than level two out of five possible levels of attainment.

The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, which is expected to come into force at the beginning of April 2001, will give all public authorities clear, positive and enforceable duties on racial equality. Details of these duties will shortly be issued by the Home Office and codes of practice will be produced by the CRE afterwards. *Racial Equality Means Quality*, which may be revised and reissued as a generic equalities Standard covering race, sex and disability, will continue to be a vital aid for local authorities in complying with their new duties.



Gurbux Singh,
*Chair, Commission
for Racial Equality*



Sir Jeremy Beecham
*Chair, Local Government
Association*



Ian Swithenbank
*Chair, Board of
Employers'
Organisation for
Local Government*

PREFACE

In June 2000, the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham was commissioned by the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE), the Employers' Organisation for Local Government (EO) and the Local Government Association (LGA) to conduct a comprehensive survey of the performance of local authorities against *Racial Equality Means Equality*, the CRE Standard for local government. The survey, which was conducted in August and September 2000, focused on the adoption and implementation of the Standard by English authorities. Surveys of local government performance in Scotland and Wales will be undertaken separately in the near future.

The report begins by describing the legislative and administrative framework within which local authorities are expected to operate today and showing how the CRE Standard can help them meet their various requirements, such as the Best Value performance indicators set by the DETR; the duty they have under the Local Government Act 2000 to prepare community strategies for the development of their areas; the new public duty which the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 will place on them when it comes into force in April 2001; and the legal and positive obligations placed on them by the Human Rights Act 1998. The case for quality management as a means of ensuring that racial equality penetrates all aspects of employment and service delivery underpins the CRE Standard itself and has been examined more closely in earlier studies, such as *Auditing for Equality* and *Measuring Up*.

Chapter three sets out the findings of the survey. Based on an excellent response rate of over 90 per cent, they have a high level of validity. Two major concerns emerge from the study: the widespread failure by English authorities to move beyond adoption of the Standard – 69 per cent of all authorities had adopted the Standard, but only 41 per cent had undertaken an audit; and the striking contrast between overall performance by individual authorities and the attainment levels achieved by individual departments – only one council achieved level four of the Standard overall, whereas nine councils had individual departments at level four.

The report concludes with a number of recommendations to national, regional and local bodies on how to take the Standard forward.

All the authorities which took part in the survey have agreed to share the information on which this report is based. Both the database

of local authority responses and a copy of the report are available at the website of the Local Authority Race Relations Information Exchange (LARRIE) at www.lg-employers.gov.uk/equal-tk-cre.html. The report can also be found at the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham website, at www.lbhf.gov.uk; the Local Government Association website, at www.lga.gov.uk; and the CRE website, at www.cre.gov.uk.

1. INTRODUCTION

Racial Equality Means Quality (REMQ) establishes a framework for performance that can be adopted by all local authorities and used to audit their progress towards racial equality. *REMQ* defines racial equality outcomes and measurements in five areas – policy and planning; service delivery and customer care; community development; employment (recruitment, selection, development and retention); and marketing and corporate image – and it offers five levels of attainment against which local authorities can measure and improve their performance. Level one is a basic starting point, with progressive attainment leading eventually to level five. Each level in each area contains between two and six action targets. Attainment in each area is cumulative and, to attain level three, say in policy and planning, an authority must have already attained and maintained its performance at levels one and two in this area.

The sequence implicit in the Standard is that authorities should:

- adopt the Standard
- audit themselves in the relevant areas against the Standard, both corporately and by individual department
- determine the level they have achieved, corporately and by department (the corporate performance level will be set by the lowest departmental level)
- develop an action plan and timetable for reaching the next level.

EARLIER SURVEYS

Since the production of *REMQ* in 1995, there have been several attempts to evaluate council performance against the Standard. For a variety of reasons, these studies were either indirect or incomplete. The first of these, *Auditing for Equality*, was a survey of all authorities in England, Wales and Scotland conducted by the CRE in 1998. It achieved a response rate of 68 per cent and found that 122 (27%) authorities had adopted the Standard.

A second study was conducted by the Centre for Local Policy Studies in 1998/99 and was published at the CRE website in 2000 under the title of *Measuring Up*. The survey was based on a representative, but non-random, sample of 54 authorities, and found that 57 per cent of them had adopted the Standard. The report also took a

qualitative look at how the Standard was managed within the sampled authorities.

In its 1997 *Direction*, the Audit Commission included *REMQ* as a performance indicator. The first data returns received were for 1998–99 and showed that, on 30 March 1999, a total of 153 (39%) authorities in England had adopted the Standard (see Table 1). A year later (see Table 2), the number had increased to 195 (50%).

Table 1. Adoption of the Standard by English councils in 1998-99

	District	Metropolitan	London	Unitary	County	All
Number of councils	238	36	33	46	34	387
Adopted Standard	25%	72%	76%	50%	53%	39%

Table 2. Adoption of the Standard by English councils in 1999-2000

	District	Metropolitan	London	Unitary	County	All
Number of councils	238	36	33	46	34	387
Adopted Standard	37%	78%	85%	65%	59%	50%

For the year 2000–2001, the Audit Commission will expect local authorities to report on whether they have adopted the Standard and on the performance level they have achieved. However, the level will relate only to service provision, with the other four areas (for example, workforce monitoring) being assessed indirectly.

THE PRESENT SURVEY

The aims of this survey are:

- to provide a comprehensive picture of the adoption of *REMQ* by English authorities and the progress made since the Standard was published in 1995, both corporately and by individual department or directorate
- to create a database which local authorities can use to exchange information about good practice
- to identify services where particular guidance or support might be needed.

The information returned by local authorities was based on their own assessments of progress and should be treated with appropriate caution. Self-assessment is inevitably more subjective than assessment by an external body, but lack of resources and expertise at both national and regional level means that the availability of assistance with the auditing process is limited at present, an issue we address in our recommendations.

The findings are organised around the sequence of activities which authorities must follow to use the Standard effectively (see p 9). A note on methodology, a sample questionnaire and a reading list are attached as appendices.

2. THE LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK

Since the Standard was issued in 1995 various arguments have been advanced for adopting it, in particular the 'quality' argument, which seeks to make racial equality a central issue for public sector management. The case for 'quality management' was outlined in the Standard itself and was expanded in *Auditing for Equality*. These arguments still apply, and have been reinforced by recent British and European legislative developments, and by the decision of the Audit Commission to prescribe the CRE Standard as a performance indicator.

THE RACE RELATIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT 2000

The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, which is expected to come into force in April 2000, strengthens the Race Relations Act 1976 in two main ways: it prohibits racial discrimination by public authorities in carrying out *any* of their functions, including functions contracted out to private or voluntary organisations; and it introduces a new, enforceable positive duty to promote racial equality that applies to an extensive list of public authorities, including local authorities. This duty gives statutory force to the scrutiny of policies and practices called for by the Stephen Lawrence Report. The duty is set out in section 71 (which replaces the original section 71) and sections 71A to 71E and comprises the elements listed below.

1. **A general statutory duty.** Section 71 of the amended Race Relations Act states that every public body specified in the Act 'shall, in carrying out its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a) eliminate unlawful racial discrimination; and
 - b) promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups.'

This new formulation means that racial equality work in local authorities will no longer be optional. The impact of the duty is likely to be greatest in local authorities with relatively small ethnic minority populations, where action under the 1976 Race Relations Act was often not considered to be appropriate or necessary.

2. **Specific duties.** The Home Secretary can impose specific duties on some or all public authorities, by order, to ensure better performance of the general duty. Many of the items that make up the Standard will become legal requirements under the new Act and local authorities should prepare themselves for their new responsibilities by using the Standard to carry out a thorough audit of their various activities.
3. **Codes of practice.** The new Act gives the CRE the power to issue statutory codes of practice (following consultation). The codes will give general guidance on compliance with the general statutory duty and the specific duties. The CRE is proposing to issue six codes altogether, including one specifically for local authorities.
4. **Enforcement.** The CRE has the power to enforce any specific duties imposed by the Home Secretary, by issuing 'compliance notices', if it believes a public authority has failed to comply with its specific duties. These notices will specify what needs to be done and give a date by which the authorities must report on progress. If, after three months, the authority has not complied with the CRE's notice, the CRE can ask the county court to order compliance.

A national survey of local authority responses to the Stephen Lawrence Report, conducted by the Local Authorities Race Relations Information Exchange and the Local Government Association in July 2000, and published in January 2001, has revealed a large gap between existing practice and the new requirements of the Race Relations Act, as recently amended: the proportion of councils that have taken the first step towards meeting the requirements of the amended Act – that is, undertaking a corporate review of all their policies in order to determine the impact they have on racial equality – is estimated to be as low as 18 per cent.

THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998

On 2 October 2000, when the Human Rights Act 1998 came into effect, the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR), which the United Kingdom ratified in 1951, became an integral part of the law throughout the UK. Complainants are now able to pursue cases through domestic courts rather than having to go to the European Human Rights Court in Strasbourg.

The ECHR protects certain fundamental civil and political rights and Article 14 prohibits unjustified discrimination by any public authority in the enjoyment of these rights. The grounds on which discrimination is prohibited are wide, and include race, colour, language, religion, and national or social origin.

The Human Rights Act makes it unlawful for a public authority to act incompatibly with the Convention rights, unless an Act of Parliament leaves no choice. This not only puts a legal obligation on public authorities to ensure that they do not actively violate a person's Convention rights, but also imposes on them positive obligations to protect rights, for example, by having effective systems in place to safeguard them.

The Human Rights Act is therefore a broadly based mechanism through which discrimination can be addressed as a question of human dignity. It will require the development of good practice standards to ensure that discrimination on racial (and other) grounds is outlawed. The Act also provides individuals with additional grounds on which to challenge discriminatory treatment, which may lead to more cases being taken against local authorities.

THE EU DIRECTIVES ON RACE AND EMPLOYMENT

On 7 June 2000, a European Union Race Directive 'implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic background' was adopted under the new powers to combat discrimination introduced by the Amsterdam Treaty. The Directive, which member countries must put into effect within three years, prohibits racial discrimination in the areas of employment, education, social security, health care, and access to goods and services and ensures that victims of discrimination have rights to redress in all member states. Significant innovations in the Directive include:

- a wide definition of indirect discrimination
- a right to redress for victims through a judicial or administrative procedure, associated with appropriate sanctions for those who discriminate
- placing the burden of proof (in civil cases) on respondents once a *prima facie* case of discrimination has been made by a complainant and accepted by a court or tribunal
- providing protection against harassment and victimisation
- outlawing discrimination in employment, training, education, social protection (including social security and health care) and the supply of, and access to, goods and services, including housing
- requiring member states to provide information about the measures they adopt to fight discrimination.

On 17 October 2000, EU employment ministers also agreed another Directive to combat discrimination in the workplace on grounds of age, sexual orientation, disability and religion or belief. The Employment Directive complements and, in many respects, is modelled on the Race Directive. It covers recruitment and selection, training, and terms and conditions, including pay and dismissals.

The combined force of the two Directives and the Human Rights Act will provide individuals with powerful legal rights to challenge discriminatory treatment and could lead to more cases being taken against local authorities.

DETR/AUDIT COMMISSION PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The full range of performance indicators introduced by the DETR and the Audit Commission for 2000/2001 include at least 29 indicators relating to racial equality issues. In respect of the corporate health indicators, four focus on racial equality: they relate to the CRE Standard, workforce monitoring, measuring customer satisfaction and complaints classified by ethnicity. These indicators will provide another benchmark for authorities to monitor their performance on racial equality.

Councils have a legal duty to collect this information and their responses form an integral part of Best Value inspections. Indeed, if a council's performance is not thought to be satisfactory, the Audit Commission has the power to make recommendations to the Secretary of State calling for amendments to the council's performance plans .

The performance indicator relating to the CRE Standard was first introduced in 1998/99. As already mentioned (see p 10), for 2000/01, authorities will be required to state which *level* of the CRE Standard they have reached. In practice, they will have to audit all their departments individually and establish the level each has reached; the lowest departmental level then sets the level for the entire authority. It is important to remember that the DETR indicator is concerned only with service provision, not the other four areas covered in *REMQ*.

The linking of the Standard to the DETR and Audit Commission's performance indicators, and the development of racial equality as the subject of corporate health indicators under Best Value, emphasise the relationship between quality and equality.

COMMUNITY PLANNING

Part 1 of the Local Government Act 2000 places a duty on local authorities to prepare community strategies for promoting or improving the economic, social and environmental well-being of their areas. DETR guidance says that compliance with the new duties in the amended Race Relations Act should underpin these community strategies. The Standard provides an essential framework for meeting this obligation.

3. THE SURVEY FINDINGS

CORPORATE PERFORMANCE

We have followed the existing convention of setting corporate performance against the CRE Standard by the level of the lowest performing department or directorate in the authority. Table 3 (see p 18) gives corporate performance on this basis across the five areas of the Standard for different types of authority. It is worth repeating here that self-audits do not provide an objective basis for directly comparing one authority with another and that the results should be treated with caution.

As Table 3 shows, 69 per cent of local authorities responding to the survey have adopted the Standard, but only 41 per cent have undertaken audits. Among district councils, the gap is still more pronounced: 58 per cent of responding councils have adopted the Standard and only 29 per cent have gone on to conduct audits of their performance. Most worrying is the fact that over 40 per cent of district councils have not yet adopted the Standard.

Some authorities told us they were at level one or above, but said they had not undertaken an audit. Others did not tell us what levels they had reached, although they said they had carried out an audit. For the purposes of calculation, we only accepted figures from authorities which told us they had undertaken an audit. Where audits had been undertaken without the Standard being adopted, we accepted this and included these figures in the calculations.

BEST PERFORMING DEPARTMENTS

Many authorities have departments which perform significantly better than the figures for corporate performance suggest. Table 4 (see p 19) shows performance in terms of the best performing departments. The statistics are based on performance in all five areas, not just service provision, as required by the DETR and Audit Commission's Best Value indicators. Equally, some authorities may perform better on one area of the Standard than another, but this dimension has not been explored here.

As one would expect, the effect of taking the level of the highest performing department or directorate, rather than the corporate level, is, generally, to reduce the number of authorities at level one and

increase the numbers at levels two, three, and four. Over twice as many departments are on level three as authorities overall and only one authority has achieved level four while nine authorities have individual departments at that level.

Table 3. Corporate performance of councils against the CRE Standard, based on lowest performing department

	District	Metropolitan	London	Unitary	County	All
No. of councils	238	36	33	46	34	387
Responding councils						
No.	203	35	32	45	33	348
%	85	97	97	98	97	90
Adopted Standard						
No	117	30	29	37	27	240
%	58	86	91	82	82	69
Carried out audit						
No.	58	20	24	24	16	142
%	29	57	75	53	48	41
Attained level 1						
No.	38	9	7	12	11	77
%	19	26	22	27	33	22
Attained level 2						
No.	10	5	10	10	3	38
%	5	14	31	22	9	11
Attained level 3						
No.	1	3	3	1	2	10
%	0	9	9	2	6	3
Attained level 4						
No.	1	0	0	0	0	1
%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attained level 5						
No.	0	0	0	0	0	0
%	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Percentage figures are calculated against the total number of responses from each type of authority.

Table 4. Performance of best performing council departments

	District	Metropolitan	London	Unitary	County	All
No. of councils	238	36	33	46	34	387
Attained level 1						
No.	32	3	3	9	7	54
%	16	9	9	20	21	14
Attained level 2						
No.	12	5	8	12	4	41
%	6	14	25	27	12	11
Attained level 3						
No.	6	6	7	1	3	23
%	3	17	22	2	9	6
Attained level 4						
No.	1	3	2	1	2	9
%	0	9	6	2	6	2
Attained level 5						
No.	0	0	0	0	0	0
%	0	0	0	0	0	0

Overall, the best performing departments appeared to be social services, housing, and the chief executives' departments. Education and environment performed less well, while direct services departments generally performed poorly. The full database, available on the LAR-RIE website, contains details of the corporate returns from the authorities that responded to the survey.

PROGRESS ON THE STANDARD

Many authorities had not adopted the Standard at the time of the survey, but pointed out in their letters that they were in the process of doing so. Some said they were working to develop a generic standard, which would cover all types of discrimination, rather than working on the existing racial equality Standard. Several authorities had adopted targets to reach level one, or higher, even though they had not yet adopted the Standard. One authority had not even heard of the Standard, and couldn't find anybody who knew anything about it. A total of 177 authorities had adopted corporate targets to improve their level of performance against the Standard. This was over half of all the authorities which responded to the survey, but nearly three quarters (74%) of those who had adopted the Standard.

ADOPTING THE STANDARD

As Table 5 shows, the last two years saw a marked increase in the number of authorities adopting the CRE Standard. This was mainly due to the recommendations of the Stephen Lawrence Report, and to the fact that the Audit Commission began using the Standard as a performance indicator. This pattern of recent adoption was most pronounced among district councils, where two thirds of those that had adopted it had done so in the last two years, and among unitary councils, where the proportion was half. A significant number of the early adopters of the Standard have not audited their performance yet, or set improvement targets. We do not have the information to make an exact assessment, but it does seem clear that the Stephen Lawrence Report inspired many of the early adopters to carry out audits and set targets. In this respect, more has probably happened over the last 18 months than over the last five years. It should be noted that the totals for district, London and unitary authorities here are different from Table 3, because some authorities have adopted the Standard, but have not said when they adopted it.

Table 5. When the Standard was adopted

	District	Metropolitan	London	Unitary	County	All
1995						
No.	8	6	6	5	2	27
%	7	20	21	14	7	12
1996						
No.	8	2	5	2	6	23
%	7	7	18	6	22	10
1997						
No.	4	7	6	5	3	25
%	4	23	21	14	11	11
1998						
No.	17	3	2	6	5	33
%	15	10	7	17	19	14
1999						
No.	28	4	4	14	4	54
%	25	13	14	39	15	23
2000						
No.	46	8	5	4	7	70
%	41	27	18	11	26	30
Total						
No.	111	30	28	36	27	232
%	100	100	100	100	100	100

WIDER INTEREST IN THE STANDARD

The project team was pleasantly surprised by the number of bodies other than local authorities that had embraced the Standard as a model for work on racial equality. We received responses from passenger transport authorities, fire services, and national voluntary organisations and had discussions with them about developing standards relevant for their services. As this will require an initiative at national level, we address this in the recommendations (see p 24).

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The CRE Standard for local government has been in existence for five years. The recommendations of the Stephen Lawrence Report and the racial equality performance indicators set by the Audit Commission appear to have had a major impact on the rate of adoption of the Standard, and on performance, over the last two years. However, many authorities still have a long way to go before they make any progress.

There are three main areas of concern:

- Many of the authorities that have adopted the Standard have not carried out audits. Without an audit, a council simply cannot be sure of the level it has reached.
- Over 40 per cent of district councils have not yet adopted the Standard. Many of them have small ethnic minority populations and possibly believe that the Standard is not relevant to their situation. Nevertheless, these authorities will be expected to comply with the new public duty to promote racial equality in the Race Relations (Amendment) Act. Early adoption and implementation of the Standard will help councils to prepare for their new responsibilities, by providing a framework for auditing their performance. Further advice is available from LARRIE's web-based toolkit (see Appendix 2).
- There appear to be striking differences in the levels achieved within individual authorities; for example only one council achieved level four of the Standard overall whereas nine councils had individual departments at this level. This suggests that there is considerable scope for departments or services within a council to learn from each other. In some authorities, resources could be directed at under-performing departments or directorates to bring them up to the level of the best.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES

- Work on the CRE Standard should be integrated into the Best Value and community planning process at all stages (there are several good examples of how this can be done in the LARRIE database)
- Authorities with an executive/scrutiny split should ensure that the equalities function is a properly allocated portfolio, and that a designated deputy or cabinet member and panel have prime responsibility for overseeing the process.
- Authorities that have not yet adopted the Standard should do so as soon as possible and not wait until the new duties under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act compel them to act. They should be prepared to undertake the following steps:
 - adopt the Standard
 - audit themselves, corporately and by individual departments, in the relevant areas against the relevant levels (for the Best Value indicators this will be in service provision)
 - determine the level they have achieved, corporately and by individual departments (corporate performance level will be equal to the lowest departmental level)
 - develop an action plan and timetable for achieving the next level.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

- To avoid duplicating work, care should be taken to ensure that, as far as possible, the requirements of local authorities under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act, the Local Government Act 1999 (Best Value) and the Local Government Act 2000 (Community Strategies) are made common, or at least complementary.
- The DETR should require local authorities, through the Best Value performance indicator, to state which level of the CRE Standard they have reached in all five areas of the Standard, instead of just service delivery.
- National targets should be set for performance against the Standard, and these should be reviewed and monitored by the DETR, in consultation with the Local Government Association, the CRE, the Employers' Organisation and the Improvement and Development Agency, as part of their new duties under

the amended Race Relations Act. Targets could relate to rates of adoption and audit, and to the numbers and percentages at specified levels.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OTHER ORGANISATIONS

National bodies such as the CRE, the EO, the LGA and the IDeA should be involved in making the Standard more rigorous. We recommend:

- The way in which the CRE Standard is currently self-assessed should be reviewed, especially as the Standard is envisaged as measure for national audit and is increasingly being used in this way. New methods, by which these internal audits can be externally validated, should be developed.
- The IDeA model of peer group review, as defined by the Local Government Improvement Project, should be considered as a possible model of external assessment in respect of the CRE Standard. Benchmarking should form part of any assessment.
- Work on the generic equalities standard for local government, which is currently being prepared by the CRE, the Equal Opportunities Commission, the Disability Rights Commission, the EO, the LGA and IDeA, should be completed. The scope for developing race and/or generic equality standards for use in other parts of the public sector should be actively explored.
- There should be a national award for achievement in promoting racial equality, building on the success of LARA, the CRE Local Authority Race Awards.
- Racial equality councils should note the results of the survey in their areas and take appropriate steps to encourage relevant local authorities to adopt, audit and set targets against the Standard.

APPENDIX 1: METHODOLOGY

Self-assessment

Performance against the CRE Standard is evaluated through a process of self-assessment by the authority itself and is very rarely confirmed by any form of external evaluation. The findings published in this report, then, are indicative of progress being made by local government across the country in the five areas of the Standard and can be used to draw certain general conclusions. The findings may also help to identify authorities that have made good progress and can provide examples of good practice. However, the results are not an objective, externally validated assessment of what individual authorities have achieved in meeting racial equality standards and it would be inappropriate to use them to produce 'league tables' of individual authorities' performance on racial equality.

The process

The questionnaire and accompanying LGA circular No. 544/00 were sent out to authorities in England on 27 July 2000. This followed discussions with the Local Government Association, the Employers' Organisation and the CRE in Wales and Scotland, which indicated that they would be doing their own surveys. Authorities were given until 1 September to send their responses. We received around 200 out of a possible 387 responses.

After the initial responses were received, we had to call a number of authorities to check the information they had sent out, as a number of the replies contained omissions and mistakes. Reminders were sent to all the authorities that had not responded, giving them a new deadline of 22 September. This reminder elicited a further 80 responses. We then phoned a number of authorities which we knew had adopted the Standard but had not replied and gave them a further week to send in their responses. Phone calls were finally made to all authorities to give them a final chance of replying. This gave us a total of 348 responses out of 387. Our provisional target was to elicit a 60 per cent response rate, but the effectiveness of the follow-up enabled us to revise our targets to 80 per cent overall, and 90 per cent for the metropolitan, London, unitary and county councils. We ended up with an overall response rate of 90 per cent.

The questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed through discussions between the CRE, the EO, the LGA, and the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. Our self-imposed constraints were that it should fit on one page, be capable of being filled in by one officer, and that it should give us both departmental and corporate information about the Standard and performance against the Standard. We also wanted the questionnaire to provide us with information as to what authorities were planning to do as well as actual performance. We produced a sample questionnaire and tested it on a small number of authorities to check that these conditions were met. After some minor amendments, the questionnaire was circulated. We believe that the brevity of the questionnaire accounted in part for the high response rate.

In *Measuring Up*, our previous survey of the implementation of the Standard, we had asked chief executives to tell us the name and location of the officer designated to deal with our request for information. We repeated the exercise for this survey and obtained a similarly useful picture of who had completed the questionnaire.

APPENDIX 2: BIBLIOGRAPHY AND USEFUL WEBSITES

- Association of Local Government Equalities Committee, *Translation and Interpreting Services: A handbook for local authorities*, 1999
- Audit Commission, *The Publication of Information – Direction 98 – Performance Indicators for the financial year 1999/2000*, 1998
- British Quality Foundation, *Guide to the business excellence model*, 1998
- Commission for Racial Equality, *Racial Equality Means Quality: A standard for local government in England and Wales*, 1995
- Commission for Racial Equality, *Auditing for Equality: Auditing council performance against the Commission for Racial Equality's standard for local government 'Racial Equality Means Quality'*, 1999
- Commission for Racial Equality, *Measuring Up: Report of a study of the adoption and implementation of Racial Equality Means Quality, the Commission for Racial Equality's Standard for Local Government*, 1999
- Commission for Racial Equality, *Reform of the Race Relations Act 1976: Proposals for change submitted by the Commission for Racial Equality to the Rt Hon Jack Straw MP, Secretary of State for the Home Department, on 30 April 1998*, 1998
- Council of European Union, *Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin*, 2000
- Equal Opportunities Commission, *Mainstreaming gender equality in local government*, 1997
- Improvement and Development Agency, Employers' Organisation for local Government and Local Government Association, *Best Value Initiatives: Database Survey Report (Part 1: Preliminary Feedback)*, 2000
- Local Authority Race Relations Information Exchange, *The Race Relations (Amendment) Bill – Briefing*, 2000
- Local Authority Race Relations Information Exchange, *One Year On: A Review of Local Authority Responses to the LGA, EO and IDEA's Initial Guidance on Stephen Lawrence Inquiry*, June 2000
- Local Authority Race Relations Information Exchange, Local Government Association, Employers' Organisation for Local

Government and Improvement and Development Agency, *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry: Further Guidance for Local Authorities*, November 1999

Local Government Association, Employers' Organisation for Local Government and Improvement and Development Agency, *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry and Home Secretary's Action Plan: Initial Guidance for Local Authorities*, June 1999

Useful websites

LARRIE has developed an online toolkit to help councils develop an effective racial equality strategy. The toolkit includes case-studies, presentations, reports, and links to relevant materials and contact officers on issues such as: gaining support for racial equality work; using the CRE to audit performance on racial equality; consultation methods for reaching people from ethnic minorities; achieving a representative workforce; mechanisms for monitoring employment and service delivery by ethnicity; and dealing with complaints of racial harassment and discrimination.

The toolkit also provides a table, listing the size of the ethnic minority population and workforce for each council, which can be very useful for benchmarking and networking. To help councils, particularly those with small ethnic minority populations, share good practice and technical information, the website has an online discussion forum.

Copies of the toolkit can be downloaded free from:
<http://www.lg-employers.gov.uk/equal-pol-small.html>

APPENDIX 3: SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

 <p>COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY</p>	 <p><i>employersorganisation</i></p>	 <p><i>Local Government Association</i></p>
<p>Original Survey Project Managed by the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham</p>		
<h2>CRE Standard for Local Government</h2>		
<p>Q1. Has your authority made a formal decision to adopt the CRE Standard for Local Government - 'Race Equality Means Quality'?. If so when?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Year adopted</p>		
<p>Q2. Has your authority carried out an audit and determined what level of the standard it has reached?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>		
<p>Q3. If so, what level of the Standard has been achieved by the authority as a whole. (Note: this will be the same as the lowest level achieved by any department of directorate - (Auditing for Equality p15 and BVPI2)?</p> <p>Level 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Level 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Level 5 <input type="checkbox"/></p>		
<p>Q4. Which departments/directorates have attained this level? Please list:</p> <p>1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....</p>		
<p>Q5. What is the highest level achieved by any department/directorate?</p> <p>Level <input type="checkbox"/> Name(s) of Departments/Directorates 1.....2.....3.....</p>		
<p>Q6. Has your authority agreed a corporate target (i.e. for achievement by <u>all</u> departments). If so, what level and by when?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Level <input type="checkbox"/> Target date?</p>		
<p>Q7. What, if any, external groups or agencies did you involve in assessing yourselves at the current level.</p> <p>CRE <input type="checkbox"/> Local REC <input type="checkbox"/> Other authority(ies) <input type="checkbox"/> Consultants <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Community Representatives <input type="checkbox"/> Service Users <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)</p>		
<p>Name of Authority:</p>		
<p>Type of Authority Shire District <input type="checkbox"/> Metropolitan District <input type="checkbox"/> London Borough <input type="checkbox"/> Unitary <input type="checkbox"/> County <input type="checkbox"/></p>		
<p>Name of Officer</p>		<p>Note: Officer details will not appear in the database</p>
<p>Phone Number</p>		
<p>Fax/e-mail</p>		
<p>Thank you for filling in this form. Please return it to:</p>		
<p>Please return at least 1 calendar month before next version</p>		<p>Sarah Palmer LARRIE / CRE DATABASE Layden House, 76 - 86 Turnmill Street, London EC1M 5QU</p>

