Quality of life
Using quality of life indicators
The Audit Commission is an independent body responsible for ensuring that public money is spent economically, efficiently and effectively, to achieve high-quality local and national services for the public. Our work covers local government, health and criminal justice services.

Our national studies on the performance of local authorities examine services from a user’s perspective and identify and promote examples of good practice. We also appoint auditors to local authorities in England and Wales.
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Introduction

1 What is ‘quality of life’ or sustainable development and why is it important? Can you measure it, and, if so, how? This Audit Commission publication seeks to answer these questions, and to provide a set of indicators and other practical advice for local authorities and their partners.

2 There are a number of reasons why quality of life has moved up the policy agenda in recent years. The Local Government Act 2000 (Ref. 1) placed a duty on local authorities to produce a long-term community strategy with their partners to improve the quality of life in their local area. At the same time, following the international Earth Summit in Johannesburg in August/September 2002, there is increasing pressure on local authorities and their partners to ensure that their activities and plans are based on the principles of sustainable development.

3 A number of initiatives have begun or are underway both internationally and within this country, some led by Government departments, others by voluntary organisations, to develop ways to monitor progress on quality of life. The Audit Commission led a year-long pilot process in order to develop a set of quality of life indicators with more than 90 local authorities during the financial year 2001/02.

4 This publication outlines the background to that pilot process, and summarises the lessons learned from it. It includes a set of quality of life indicators that local authorities and their partners can use to help to monitor their community strategy. The degree to which these indicators are relevant to objectives in individual community strategies will, of course, vary. However this publication also suggests ways in which the indicators can be used and how we will support their future use.

Davy Jones
Quality of Life Indicators Project Co-ordinator
Why quality of life indicators are important

This section looks at what quality of life means and how it might be measured. It also explains why quality of life indicators are important and how they can be useful.

What is ‘Quality of Life’?

Quality of Life means different things to different people, but we use it here to describe those things that make an area a good place to live in. Surveys show that members of the public regularly specify certain issues as important. In October 2001, MORI conducted a nation-wide survey for the Audit Commission (Ref. 2). The results indicated that for the public, the most important issues in making somewhere a good place to live were:

- crime levels;
- health services;
- housing;
- shopping facilities;
- public transport; and
- education provision.

When pressed on which issues most needed to be improved locally, the top issue was activities for teenagers, followed by levels of crime, repairing roads and pavements, public transport and facilities for young children. The results of this survey have been built into the recommended set of quality of life indicators (see pull-out chart).

When the Audit Commission consulted local authorities in England on the idea of developing quality of life indicators (Ref. 3) in November 2000, it examined a number of previous examples of work in this area. Some had focused on developing indicators concentrating on 'green' issues with a longer term time-frame. Others had tried to capture the public's concerns on a broader range of social and economic issues, often with a shorter time-frame. The Commission has developed a set of indicators that addresses both of these approaches and includes a range of sustainable development issues. At the heart of sustainable development is the idea of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for generations to come. The Audit Commission therefore uses the term quality of life as this is better understood by the public.
Can quality of life be measured?

It is not easy to measure quality of life. It is more difficult than measuring more ‘traditional’ issues in the public sector, such as how much council tax has been collected. Many quality of life topics come under the category of ‘cross-cutting’ issues, that is they cut across the traditional boundaries of different service providers. Frequently, there is no single agency responsible for the issue. Because it is difficult to measure, often there are no reliable and consistent sources of data. And sometimes the only way to capture the issue is by asking the public what they think through surveys, which can be time-consuming and costly.

But just because something is hard to measure, it does not mean that the task should not be attempted. ‘Measure what you value, don’t just value what you can easily measure’, is a good adage for performance measurement.

The quality of life indicators proposed in this report look at the full range of important issues that help to ‘paint a picture’ of the quality of life in a particular area, and may affect many different service providers. The Commission has worked with a number of national agencies and Government departments to devise robust definitions for the indicators so that data from the indicators is comparable.

Government policy

The Local Government Act 2000 (Ref. 1) gave local authorities for the first time the power to promote the social, economic and environmental well-being of their local community. In addition, it placed a duty on them to prepare with their partners from the public, private, community and voluntary sectors, a long-term community strategy to improve these quality of life issues locally. The Government recommended (Ref. 4) that local authorities form Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) to oversee the development and monitoring of these community strategies. The vast majority of English local authorities have produced a community strategy and established an LSP, or they are in the process of doing so (Ref. 5).

How can quality of life indicators be useful?

Quality of life indicators can be useful tools. They can help local authorities and their partners to:

- identify key objectives within their community strategies;
- monitor progress against the objectives and local priorities set within their community strategies;
- foster partnership working across all agencies involved in local areas, and help to measure the effectiveness of the LSP itself;
• facilitate comparisons of performance between different areas;
• paint a picture of, and monitor changes to the quality of life in a local area; and
• involve the public in discussing how to improve the quality of life in their local area.

Quality of life indicators can be helpful for partners in an LSP to monitor their joint efforts to improve the quality of life of local people through their community strategy. Uniquely, quality of life indicators cover the issues that affect how people feel about life in their local area regardless of which agency provides particular services. Local authorities already have to report on a number of performance indicators (PIs) that measure how well they deliver services. In particular the Government sets best value performance indicators (BVPIs). Some of these BVPIs cover quality of life (sustainable development) issues, such as crime and recycling rates. Under the Government's new Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) framework these BVPIs form an important component of the assessment of local authorities. Other local partners, such as the police and health authorities, also have performance monitoring regimes. LSPs will also need to consider indicators to assist them in their own performance management functions, which the quality of life indicators do not address. LSPs should consider supplementing the quality of life indicators with sectoral, impact and process outcome indicators. The ODPM/DfT's National Five Year LSP Evaluation Programme will be providing further advice on what may be suitable.
The Audit Commission's quality of life indicators

This section explains how the Audit Commission developed the indicators. It summarises the topics included in the indicator set, the main issues that arose during the pilot and the lessons drawn from it.

Voluntary performance indicators

Since the Government assumed responsibility for setting the BVPIs, which replaced the previous national set of Audit Commission performance indicators (ACPIs), the Commission has focused its work on developing voluntary performance indicators.

In particular, in 2001 it established a Library of Local Pls (Ref. 6) with the Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA). This library provides local authorities with robust "off the shelf" definitions for local Pls for voluntary use in a variety of important service areas. The Library intends to save local authorities having to 'reinvent the wheel' when developing indicators that focus on local priorities. It also aims to provide data on the indicators to enable those using the library to benchmark their performance against other authorities.

The pilot

Following the introduction of the Local Government Act 2000 (Ref. 1), the Commission consulted on the idea of quality of life indicators as a way to monitor the effectiveness of local community strategies. It built upon the work of previous projects, including Local Quality of Life Counts, also known as the CLIP (Central and Local Information Partnership) project. This initiative developed a set of local sustainable development indicators that are linked to the Government's national and regional quality of life projects. The Commission also reviewed the Urban Audit and European Common Indicators for Local Sustainability projects.

The Audit Commission issued a consultation document to local authorities and various national and voluntary organisations in November 2000 (Ref. 3). It proposed 13 broad thematic areas and 69 possible quality of life indicators. Around 90 per cent of those responding to the consultation supported the indicators as a useful way of monitoring community strategies. The 13 thematic areas were endorsed and 32 indicators were selected to form a proposed set for a pilot exercise.
The quality of life pilot indicators

The indicators used in the pilot (Ref. 7) were grouped according to the following 13 themes:

1. **Combating unemployment**: including employment, long-term unemployment and youth unemployment.
2. **Encouraging economic regeneration**: including new business start-ups and workforce expansion.
3. **Tackling poverty and social exclusion**: including deprivation levels, households on benefits, children in low income households.
4. **Developing people's skills**: qualifications at age 19.
5. **Improving people's health**: including death rate by cause, infant mortality rates and teenage pregnancies.
6. **Improving housing opportunities**: including affordable housing, unfit homes and number of homeless people.
7. **Tackling community safety**: including drug-related crime and noise nuisance.
8. **Strengthening community involvement**: including community well-being, childcare provision and access to key services.
9. **Reducing pollution**: including air pollution and river quality.
10. **Improving management of the environment**: including energy use and domestic water use.
11. **Improving the local environment**: parks and green spaces, derelict land and clean streets.
12. **Improving transport**: including traffic volumes, travel to school and cycle paths.
13. **Protecting the diversity of nature**: changes in natural/semi-natural habitats.

See the pull-out chart for a full list of the indicators.

Initially, 78 local authorities volunteered to pilot the indicators for the financial year 2001/02 (this number rose to over 90, including 2 LSPs, by the end of the pilot process). The objectives of the pilot were to test how effective the indicators and their definitions were, to establish the feasibility of collecting the data, and to make recommendations on the future use of the indicators. A national Advisory Group, with representatives from the voluntary, private and public sector including government departments (see Appendix 1), oversaw the pilot process with the Audit Commission.

Source: Feedback on Voluntary Quality of Life and Cross-cutting Indicators, Audit Commission, February 2001
Improving the pilot set of indicators

From the outset of the pilot process, it was recognised that there were gaps in the set of indicators, in particular those proposed on community involvement. The Commission therefore initiated a major piece of work with national and local experts in order to develop a distinct set of indicators on this issue. Two national seminars were convened, and a joint national conference with the Community Development Foundation (CDF) was held in July 2002. Following these events, and a national consultation process, a good practice set of indicators on community involvement has been agreed for use in the Library of Local PLs, and a few have now been included in the recommended set of quality of life indicators. In addition, through the pilot process further gaps in the set were identified: on climate change, activities for young people, public transport usage and access to culture and leisure. In some cases, amendments to the recommended set of quality of life indicators have been agreed, in others a place has been earmarked for one or more agreed indicators after developmental work and consultation have been completed.

The proposed menu of indicators

After a year-long rigorous process to test the indicators, most of the pilot set have been approved, albeit with some amendments to their definitions. A small number have had to be significantly amended and three have been dropped altogether. Three indicators - on drug offending, homelessness and cycle lanes - encountered insuperable problems with their definitions and no acceptable alternatives were identified. The greatest difficulties identified during the pilot were with the environmental indicators. In some cases, data were simply not available. In others, the proposed definitions were flawed. Nevertheless, the set of indicators includes a full range of amended environmental indicators. At the end of the pilot process, some 73 pilot authorities submitted data on most of the indicators. Some county councils submitted data for their districts and, in total, data were received covering 117 local authority areas. The pilot authorities raised a number of issues arising from the pilot, including a slight urban bias to the set of indicators, the difficulties of the different geographic boundaries of the agencies involved in collecting the data, and the problems of the resources required for the survey-based indicators.

At the end of the pilot process, the Advisory Group considered the pilot authorities' feedback on the indicators, along with the results of a survey (Ref. 8) of the pilots and non-piloting authorities about quality of life indicators. This reported that 95 per cent of the pilots had found the project very or fairly useful. In addition, 97 per cent of pilots and 90 per cent of non-pilot authorities felt that they would be very or fairly useful in the future. The Advisory Group considered that the overall objectives of the pilot process had been successfully met, and it made a series of recommendations to local and national government about their future use (Ref. 9). The final good practice set of quality of life indicators which the advisory group proposed for use by local authorities and their partners is set out in the pull-out chart.
Quality of life
Using quality of life indicators
# Quality of life indicators

**Indicator** | **Short definition (indicators in italics require a survey)**
--- | ---

## Economic

**QoL 1** | Proportion of people of working age in employment
--- | ---
**QoL 2** | Proportion of people claiming unemployment benefit who have been out of work for more than a year
**QoL 3** | Proportion of young people (18-24 year olds) in full-time education or employment
**QoL 4** | Percentage increase or decrease in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area
**QoL 5** | Percentage increase or decrease in the number of local jobs

## Social

**QoL 6** | Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10 per cent and/or 25 per cent of wards in the country
**QoL 7** | Percentage of population of working age who are claiming key benefits
**QoL 8** | Proportion of children under 16 who live in low income households
**QoL 9** | (a) Proportion of 19 year olds with Level 2 qualifications (that is 5 GCSEs A*-C or NVQ equivalent)
**BVPI** | (b) Percentage of 15 year old pupils in schools maintained by the local authority achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A*-C or equivalent
**QoL 10** | Death rate by cause (standardised mortality rate per 100,000 population in the following categories):
  - cancer in under 75s
  - circulatory diseases in under 75s
  - suicide and undetermined injury – all ages
  - all accidents – all ages
**QoL 11** | Infant mortality (number of deaths of infants under a year old and number of stillbirths – per 1,000 live births)
**QoL 12** | Rate of conceptions among girls aged less than 18 years
**QoL 13** | Affordable housing (house price/earnings affordability ratio)
**QoL 14** | Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings
**QoL 15** | (a) Percentage of residents surveyed who feel ‘fairly safe’ or ‘very safe’ after dark whilst outside in the local authority area
**BVPI** | (b) Percentage of residents surveyed who feel ‘fairly safe’ or ‘very safe’ during the day whilst outside in the local authority area
**QoL 16** | Crimes committed:
  - domestic burglaries (per 1,000 households)
  - violent offences (per 1,000 population)
  - vehicle crimes (per 1,000 population)
**QoL 17** | Percentage of residents surveyed who are concerned about different types of noise in their area
**QoL 18** | Percentage of residents surveyed who are satisfied with their local area as a place to live
**QoL 19** | Percentage of residents surveyed who consider that their local area is getting worse
**QoL 20** | Number of childcare places per 1,000 population aged 0–5 not in early education
**QoL 21** | Facilities for young people indicator(s) – under development, will be added in the future
Quality of life Indicators

QoL 22  
(a) Percentage of residents surveyed finding it easy to access key local services  
(b) Actual distance to key local services

Social – community involvement

QoL 23  Percentage of adults surveyed who feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area
QoL 24  Percentage of voluntary/community organisations functioning in a specified locality per 1000 residents that performed well in the past year
QoL 25  Percentage of people surveyed who feel that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds and communities can live together harmoniously
QoL 26  
(a) Percentage of people surveyed who have carried out any of a specified list of actions, unpaid, for someone who is not a relative in the past 12 months
(b) Percentage of people surveyed who have received any of a specified list of actions, unpaid, by someone who is not a relative in the past 12 months

Environmental

QoL 27  Air pollution  
(a) Number of days per year when air pollution is ‘moderate’ or ‘higher’ for PM10  
(b) Annual average nitrogen dioxide concentration  
(c) For rural sites, number of days per year when air pollution is ‘moderate’ or ‘higher’ for ozone
QoL 28  Carbon dioxide emissions by sector (tonnes per year) and per capita emissions (tonnes)
QoL 29  Percentage of main rivers and canals rated as ‘good’ or ‘fair’ quality
QoL 30  Household energy use (gas and electricity) per household
QoL 31  Water leakage rate from main and customer pipes
QoL 32  Percentage of the total tonnage of household waste that has been:

BVPI  
- recycled  
- composted  
- used to recover heat, power and other energy sources  
- landfilled
QoL 33  
(a) Proportion of land stock that is derelict
BVPI  
(b) Percentage of new housing development on previously developed land
QoL 34  Percentage of highways that are either of a ‘high’ or ‘acceptable’ standard of cleanliness
QoL 35  Annual average traffic flow per 1000 km of principal roads
QoL 36  Percentage of residents surveyed who used different modes of transport, their reasons for, and distance of, travel
QoL 37  Percentage of children travelling to (a) primary school, and (b) secondary school by different modes
QoL 38  The area of land designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and that is in ‘favourable condition’  
- number and hectares of land designated as a SSSI in a local authority area  
- percentage of assessed area in favourable and unfavourable recovering condition, within SSSIs  
- area of Local Nature Reserve per 1000 population (ha)  
- local species count, for example wild birds, amphibians, water voles and so on

Note: Those using the indicators are encouraged to analyse the data where appropriate by gender, ethnicity, age and disability. This is particularly important for the community involvement and other survey-based indicators.

Detailed definitions are available at: www.audit-commission.gov.uk/pis/quality-of-life-indicators.shtml
Useful websites

Best value performance indicators
www.local-regions.odpm.gov.uk/bestvalue/indicators/indicatorsindex.htm

Comprehensive Performance Assessment
www.audit-commission.gov.uk/ltc/cpa.shtml

Environment Agency
www.environment-agency.gov.uk

European Common Indicators

Home Office
www.homeoffice.gov.uk

Improvement and Development Agency
www.idea.gov.uk

Library of Local PIs
www.local-pl-library.gov.uk/index.shtml

Local Government Association
www.lga.gov.uk

Local government legislation
www.local-regions.odpm.gov.uk/legislation/index.htm

Local public service agreements
www.local-regions.odpm.gov.uk/ipsa/index.htm

Local strategic partnerships
www.neighbourhood.odpm.gov.uk/partnerships/index.htm

MORI (Market Opinion and Research International)
www.local-regions.odpm.gov.uk/bestvalue/indicators/indicatorsindex.htm

National Statistics
www.statistics.gov.uk

Neighbourhood renewal unit
www.neighbourhood.gov.uk

New economics foundation
www.neweconomics.org/default.asp?strRequest=aboutnef

NHS performance indicators
www.doh.gov.uk/nhsperformanceindicators

NOMIS (National Online Manpower Information System)
www.nomisweb.co.uk

Office for National Statistics
www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/home.asp

Quality of Life project

Sustainable Development
www.sustainable-development.gov.uk

Urban Audit
There was growing interest in the pilot project from national organisations and Government departments working on quality of life, sustainable development, regeneration and related themes. The Advisory Group carried out a lot of work to help to 'join up' these various initiatives and to integrate the pilot indicators into them. This included working with:

- the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) and its work on accrediting LSPs in the 88 most deprived areas of the country;
- the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and its work with the NRU on developing neighbourhood statistics;
- the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) team dealing with Local Public Service Agreements (LPSAs);
- the Round Table group involving the Department of Health (DH), the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and other government departments working on the development of local strategic planning for health; and
- the Cabinet Office and the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) to encourage the water and energy companies to produce data on usage by local authority area.

Source: Audit Commission, 2002.
Moving forward: future use of the indicators

24 This section looks at how local authorities and their partners can use the quality of life indicators and how they might be developed in the future.

Using the quality of life indicators

25 Every local authority has a duty to produce a community strategy with its local partners. Quality of life indicators can be useful in a number of ways for local authorities and their partners grappling with this task by:

- helping local authorities and LSPs to paint a picture of, and monitor change over time on quality of life issues locally;
- making available a menu of quality of life indicators from which local authorities and their partners can choose those appropriate to their particular circumstances;
- helping to inform, monitor and evaluate community planning processes – justifying and setting future local priorities;
- enhancing partnership working between the council, other public sector agencies, and the business, community and voluntary sector;
- allowing local authorities and their partners to compare their performance on these issues with other similar areas;
- helping to fill gaps in the knowledge of local authorities and LSPs, and supplementing existing service delivery indicators;
- stimulating debate and raising public awareness of these important issues; and
- helping focus local authority best value reviews, mainstream service planning and in regeneration and other funding bids.

The role of the Audit Commission

26 The Audit Commission in conjunction with other national organisations is promoting the quality of life indicators to encourage as many local authorities and their partners through LSPs to use them as most benefits local communities. The indicators will be available for voluntary use through the Library of Local PIs. A detailed definitions manual is available (Ref. 10) to explain precisely what is meant by each indicator and the sources of the data. The Library has email and telephone helplines to help those using the indicators, and it intends to collect data on the indicators from local authorities and LSPs in Spring 2003. The Commission is sponsoring other developments to support the indicators, including:

- work with the Library of Local PIs to fill identified gaps in the set;
• work with the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) to facilitate data being made available at ward and neighbourhood levels;

• work with a number of agencies to develop good practice guidance on how to publish quality of life data; and

• a study with the New Economics Foundation (NEF) and the University of the West of England (UWE) to evaluate how effective quality of life indicators can be in influencing local policy-making (Ref. 11).

Future use of the indicators

The quality of life indicators are voluntary. The guidance on community strategies issued by the Government states that using such indicators to monitor community strategies is recommended good practice (Ref. 4). There is no statutory requirement to do so. The Audit Commission recommends that the best approach at this stage is to seek the support of local authorities and their partners to adopt the indicators on a voluntary basis.

Conclusion

This set of quality of life indicators has been developed and tested through a thorough piloting exercise involving one-quarter of English councils along with the Local Government Association (LGA) and the IDeA. The set is now about to undergo a similar piloting process throughout Wales, co-ordinated by the Local Government Data Unit (LGDU). The indicators have been drawn up following extensive consultation and networking with Government departments and national agencies. Local authorities and their partners should, therefore, feel confident that the indicators can make a genuinely useful contribution to developing and monitoring the impact of their community strategies.

Contact information

You can email the project on:

quality-of-life@audit-commission.gov.uk

Telephone:
0207 396 1487
and ask for Sarah McMahon or Davy Jones

Visit the website at:

Appendix 1: advisory group membership

The Advisory Group was made up of the following people and organisations:

- Alan Smith and Paul Barnett (Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions – now Office of the Deputy Prime Minister);
- Dr Simon Peck, then Steve Pugh (Department of Health – DoH);
- Jiggy Lloyd (Confederation of British Industry – CBI);
- John Colvin (Environment Agency – EA);
- Adrian Barker (Improvement and Development Agency – IDeA);
- Roger Sykes (Local Government Association – LGA);
- Sally Cooke (National Council for Voluntary Organisations – NCVO);
- Andrew Fellowes (National Association of Councils for Voluntary Service – NACVS);
- Jil Matheson (Office for National Statistics – ONS);
- Davy Jones, Emma Whittlesea and Sarah McMahon (Audit Commission).

Two other organisations regularly attended the Advisory Group meetings, reflecting their involvement in aspects of the project:

- Florian Sommer (New Economics Foundation – NEF); and
- Warren Hatter and Nicholas Gilby (MORI Social Research Foundation – MORI).

In addition, a number of pilot authorities and LSPs attended individual Advisory Group meetings.
Appendix 2: acronyms

ACPI  Audit Commission performance indicator
BVPI  Best value performance indicator
CDF  Community Development Foundation
CLIP  Central and Local (Government) Information Partnership
CPA  Comprehensive performance assessment
DEFRA  Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DETR  Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (now ODPM)
DfT  Department for Transport
DoH  Department of Health
DTI  Department of Trade and Industry
DTLR  Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions (now ODPM)
IDeA  Improvement and Development Agency
LGA  Local Government Association
LGDU  Local Government Data Unit (Wales)
LSPs  Local strategic partnerships
LPSAs  Local public service agreements
NEF  New Economics Foundation
NRU  Neighbourhood Renewal Unit
ODPM  Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
ONS  Office for National Statistics
Pls  Performance indicators
UWE  University of the West of England
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All the Audit Commission publications referred to above are available on the Audit Commission website:

Performance Breakthroughs – Improving Performance in Public Sector Organisations.

Managing performance well is vital for providing good public services. Drawing on the experiences of a wide range of public service organisations, this new report will help public service managers understand why managing performance can be difficult, and how others have managed to overcome these difficulties to deliver better quality services to local people.

Accompanying this report is a wall-chart designed to help organisations assess and improve the way they manage their performance. This practical tool can be purchased in packs of ten.


Acting on Facts: Using performance measurement to improve local authority services. This management paper reviews the experiences of local authorities to show how performance indicators can be used to improve public services. It is intended to help organisations make performance measurement an everyday activity generating good quality information that can be effectively monitored and acted on.

Management Paper, 2002,
ISBN 1862403635, £18, stock code GMP2758

Getting Better All the Time: Making benchmarking work. Getting Better All The Time looks at the increasing use of benchmarking to help to deliver better services in local government and the health service. It discusses the factors that lead to successful benchmarking. It also examines in detail the barriers preventing organisations from achieving improvements in service delivery, and how they may be overcome. This title complements the management papers, On Target and Aim ing To Improve.

Management Paper, 2000,
ISBN 1862402531, £15, stock code LMP1497

Learning from Audit, Inspection and Research: Equality & Diversity. This paper looks at how well councils are performing on equality and diversity. It highlights action that is required for councils to integrate equality and diversity into all aspects of their services as they endeavour to improve.

2002, ISBN 1862403643, £18,
stock code LLI2744
To order further printed copies, please contact Audit Commission Publications, PO Box 99, Wetherby, LS23 7JA, 0800 502030.

This document is available on our website at www.audit-commission.gov.uk