



# Equality and Inclusion Report 2019-2020



<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page No</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	3
<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>Our Company Purpose and Values</b>	6
<b>Our Equality Commitment, Principles and Aims</b>	7
<b>National Context for Equality and Inclusion</b>	8
<b>Our locality</b>	9
<b>Essex CRC Employee Profile and Staff Commitments</b>	10
<b>Summary of Essex CRC's Service User Data and Service Delivery for 2018-19</b>	13
<b>Action Plan for 2018-19</b>	19
<b>Appendix A: Service user Data for Essex CRC</b>	21
• Service User Protected Characteristics	21
• Breaches of Community and Suspended Sentence Orders	22
• Completion of Community Orders and Suspended Sentence Orders – Service Level Measure 008	27
• Recalls to Custody	31
• Compliance with Licences and Post Sentence Supervision Periods – Assurance Metric J	34
<b>Service User Protected Characteristics Data – 2018-19</b>	37
• Breaches of Community and Suspended Sentence Orders	37
• Completion of Community Orders and Suspended Sentence Orders – Service Level Measure 008	44
• Recalls to Custody	50
• Compliance with Licences and Post Sentence Supervision Periods – Assurance Metric J	55

## Executive Summary

We know that at the heart of probation work is a focus on the individuality of service users. Skilled assessment of needs relating to offending, motivation of service users, and delivery of planned supervision that seeks to address individual needs are the means by which change is achieved. We also know that some groups of people benefit from different approaches, and it is our duty to be responsive to this.

This report provides an overview of how Sodexo as the parent organisation and Essex Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) approach our commitment to equality and inclusion. It provides an overview of our company's purpose, values, duties, principles, aims, and policy. It then focuses specifically on Essex CRC, firstly in relation to environment we create for our staff, and secondly, in relation to our service users.

Our service user data analysis focuses on the protected characteristics outlined in the Equality Act 2010, covering the service delivery areas of breach, the successful completion of community and suspended sentence orders, recall, and the successful completion of licences and post sentence supervision (PSS). Each section will also highlight Essex CRC's response where applicable. Interspersed in the report, in the relevant sections is an update on the actions we committed to in our last report. These will be **highlighted in bold blue**, and preceded by a sentence such as 'last year we said we would.....' The report will highlight our achievements during 2018-19, whilst identifying actions to take forward during 2019-20.

### **Our successes during 2018-19 include:**

- Progress on the collection of protected characteristics data – particularly for ethnicity.
- Improvements in our women's service, including a specialist RO for resettlement.
- The commissioning of 4Front to develop our BAME specific intervention.
- 16% of new staff identify as BAME.
- Deployment of a Sodexo CRCs harmonised Dignity at Work Policy.
- A number of staff events or campaigns focused on mental health and well-being
- Progress on the introduction of a Learning Disability screening tool.
- HMIP findings that our assessment for unpaid work placements take into account individual circumstances.
- Working in partnership across the health and criminal justice system to develop an approach to improve the use of Mental Health Treatment Requirements.

### **Our Action Plan for 2019-20 includes:**

- Continue to improve diversity in recruitment so that our staff group reflects our local population.
- Support BAME staff in professional development and succession planning opportunities.
- Align the work of the Equality and Inclusion group with the work of the Health and Safety team to promote the emotional well-being of staff.

- Further develop a culture of inclusion and belonging, including for those who are absent from work, for example, through maternity leave.
- Continue to develop our service delivery for service users with learning difficulties in partnership with agencies who hold expertise in this area.
- Implement our BAME intervention.
- Contribute to the work led by the Essex Criminal Justice Board to reduce disproportionality for BAME service users in the Criminal Justice System.
- Engage our service user council in enabling the CRC to understand why our service users with a recorded disability have lower successful completion rates, and higher breach/recall rates.
- Work with partner agencies to improve access to Mental Health Treatment Requirements.
- Enable Essex CRC staff to improve their knowledge and skills in working with service users from travelling communities.
- Continue to improve recording of protected characteristics, including building staff confidence to discuss and gather this information in order to create the responsive service required.

## Introduction

Diversity is expressed in all the visible and invisible differences between people, and this can lead to differences in experiences, values, attitudes, ways of thinking, behaving, communicating and working. Inclusion describes the mind-set which welcomes and seeks to accommodate all of the above, and equality defines the way in which we ensure that no individual or group is disadvantaged either consciously or unconsciously as a result of difference.

Essex Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) is committed to upholding the Public Sector Duties as part of the Equality Act 2010. This requires all agencies that provide services to the public to proactively engage in the following 'General Duties', whereby we:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not;
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

We are committed to preventing and actively addressing any form of discrimination and harassment in our work above and beyond the legal requirements. Our intent is to create an environment where staff and service users are valued, respected and motivated to contribute their best. Key to this aim is developing and promoting a culture which recognises and values the diversity of our employees, service users, strategic partners, victims and beneficiaries.

In addition, an equally important aspect of the Equality Act 2010 is the Specific Duties which support and aid compliance with the General Duties, requiring organisations to:

- Publish information annually to demonstrate how we meet the General Duties;
- Prepare and publish one or more objectives to meet any of the aims of the General Duties.

For organisations like Essex CRC with 150 or more staff, this must include information relating to employees and others affected by our policies and practices, such as service users. The compilation of this report serves to meet the legal requirements outlined under the Specific Duties and will address each of the protected characteristics in relation to the General Duties. Our report will demonstrate how Essex CRC assures itself that the delivery of services and employment practices is fair, accessible and appropriate for the diverse communities in which we operate and for the people we supervise and employ.

The report focuses primarily but not exclusively on groups represented within the Protected Characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, and includes the recent addition of recommendations brought by the Young Review Report regarding BAME groups.

The nine protected characteristics are as follows:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex (gender)
- Sexual identity

## Our Company Purpose and Values

Essex CRC's purpose, alongside the five other Sodexo CRCs, is to change lives for the better by reducing re-offending and risk of harm and improving the quality of life of those under our supervision and care. Our Justice Strategy (July 2018) states our belief that everyone has the right to be treated decently, respectfully and fairly; everyone has a responsibility to treat others accordingly; and everyone has a right to a safe environment.

Our values and behaviours support the Strategy by defining clear expectations as follows:

SERVICE SPIRIT	TEAM SPIRIT	SPIRIT OF PROGRESS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proud to provide services to others</li><li>• Take care in getting to know our clients and customers. We listen to their needs and pay attention to detail</li><li>• Make ourselves available and responsive, welcoming and efficient</li><li>• What we say is what we do; we believe we must always keep our promises.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strong teamwork is essential to deliver our services</li><li>• Working together successfully means recognising our diverse qualities and skills</li><li>• Open honest communication and respect for each other, with everyone pulling together to achieve our goals.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Excellence in service means finding every opportunity for improvement</li><li>• Going the extra mile, taking the initiative, looking for better ways of doing things every day</li><li>• We learn from our mistakes when they occur. In these ways we each make progress and the company as a whole succeeds.</li></ul>

Whilst the aforementioned values and related behavioural expectations have been shared widely amongst Essex managers and staff, we also take a continuous approach to creating an inclusive culture and service.

In July 2018 we launched the *Dignity at Work Policy* which now applies consistently to each of Sodexo's CRCs, updating and replacing former local bullying and harassment policies. Our *Dignity at Work Policy* re-states our commitment to staff regarding the provision of a safe, fair working environment; fostering an inclusive culture for all, with equal access to opportunities to enable all employees to develop to their full potential.

## **Our Equality Commitment, Principles and Aims**

Equality and diversity are championed at the highest level of our parent company and led within the CRC by the regional CEO and Essex CRC's senior leadership team. There are a number of 'lenses' we rely on to assess our effectiveness in delivering an equality agenda, and through which we hold ourselves to account.

Locally, Essex CRC oversees its responsibilities via a bi-monthly Equality and Inclusion group which is chaired by the CRC Director. Membership of this group includes staff, managers as well as a union representative and through this group the objectives we have established each year are driven forward and reviewed regularly. This progress is reported to the CRC's quarterly governance meeting and to the authority through the Service Management Group (SMG) and the Relationship Management Group (RMG) in order to maintain accountability and appropriate focus.

We ensure that equality work is prioritised in our work with service users through our partnership with User Voice, who act as a 'critical friend'. Chaired by the CRC Director, our bi-monthly User Voice Council meeting provides a forum where Essex can learn from what is progressing well across the organisation and where there are still improvements to be made. We value this partnership not least for the innovative proposals that it generates for the CRC to consider, but also for the authentic opportunity it facilitates in bringing together CRC senior leaders and the service users using our services, who are well placed to comment on them, influence decision making, and shape future delivery.

Essex has a robust complaints procedure which enables us to address any concerns about fair and equal treatment of service users, as well as providing us once again with a rich source of information regarding learning and areas for improvement. During the year we have received and resolved 15 complaints, none of which related to protected characteristics.

In addition, our annual service user satisfaction survey provides invaluable insight and feedback about the experience of those who use our services. These avenues for reflection and challenge enable us to adopt a continuous improvement approach to our equality agenda, ensuring that our commitment is properly realised and translates into practice delivery.

As an employer we pride ourselves on an approach which promotes equality of opportunity and inclusion, ensuring that appropriate principles guide our thinking and delivery of HR services. We ensure that policies and procedures are regularly monitored, reviewed, and impact assessed, then shared with trade unions both at the local Essex CRC level and nationally through pan-CRC. We support the open and transparent challenge of

discriminatory behaviour through formal investigation, and invoke disciplinary procedures as necessary.

Essex CRC has a robust framework around diversity and inclusion, both as a CRC and supported by our parent organisation, Sodexo. Expectations around inclusion are clearly stated, from the point of induction for all new staff and re-iterated through diversity training for all staff.

## National Context for Equality and Inclusion

Two national reviews continue to be of specific note in this plan: The Young Review chaired by Baroness Lola Young of Hornsey and the Lammy Review, 2017 chaired by David Lammy MP. The key focus of the Young Review is the disproportionately high numbers of black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) service users and the poor outcomes they face in the Criminal Justice System (CJS). Despite having been the subject of independent scrutiny and attempted institutional reform over a sustained period, the review found that poor outcomes still persist for BAME service users within the CJS. Starting its work in October 2013, one of the main aims of the Young Review was to consider how existing knowledge regarding the disproportionately negative outcomes experienced by black and Muslim male service users may be applied in the significantly changed environment introduced under the Transforming Rehabilitation (TR) reforms.

The Young review made five main recommendations as follows, which need to be continued into the future work of our organisation; some of these are attributable directly to the CRC and some are not.

- Rigorously monitored mechanisms need to be developed and implemented to ensure that independent providers address the specific needs of BAME.
- HMPPS publishes its Equality Strategy to a) provide transparency for all stakeholders and b) form the basis for action, to include a stringent overhaul of the approach to services for young black and/or Muslim men in the CJS.
- Individuals who understand the lived experience of young black and/or Muslim male service users should play an integral part in the planning and delivery of programmes and interventions to support desistance.
- The emphasis should be on dedicated resources for community engagement and partnership working models in prisons, rather than commissioning frameworks and supply chains.
- Ministry of Justice should give consideration to potential future opportunities for legislation in regard to BAME service users similar to that which exists to ensure that provision meets the specific needs of women service users under the Public-Sector Equality Duty.

The Lammy Review made wide reaching comments about the Criminal Justice System and proposed a number of recommendations.



Those of specific relevance to probation providers and to Essex CRC relate to:

- The need to build the trust of BAME groups including defendants, service users and the wider community in the entire CJS. The lack of trust in the system was identified as the primary reason for disproportionate representation of these groups in custody.
- The requirement to adopt the principle of ‘explain or reform’ that underpins the Lammy recommendations. If CJS agencies cannot provide an evidence-based explanation for apparent disparities between ethnic groups, then reforms should be introduced to address those disparities.
- The requirement to contribute to an MoJ working group to discuss the barriers to more effective sub-contracting by CRCs and to implement the findings and recommendations of the group.
- To collect and publish the data specified by the MOJ covering protected characteristics.

Essex has begun to focus its attention on the collection and publishing of data around protected characteristics this year and it is a work in progress. We are pleased to report improvements in this, with ethnicity recording for service users now at 99.9%. The principle of ‘explain or reform’ is one we will apply in this report to the analysis of our data, ensuring we can address any disparity in outcomes between ethnic groups.

## Our locality

The charts below show the makeup of the population of our locality and we would expect both our service users and our staff to reflect the demographics of our area. The county had a population of 1,457,900 in 2016 (last available figure), increased from 1,393,587 at the 2011 census. Some eastern areas of the county suffer high levels of deprivation and include some of the most highly deprived wards in the country. In contrast, West and South-West Essex is one of the most affluent parts of eastern England, forming part of the London commuter belt with a large middle class and some wealthy towns. The area’s proximity to London means it has a rising population but there have been only slow increases in ethnic populations; 94.27% of the population is white and 97% have English as a first language.

### Figures taken from ONS 2011

<u>Ethnicity</u>	% of Population Belonging to each Ethnic Group				
County	White	Black	Asian	Mixed	Other
Essex	94.27	1.3	2.5	1.5	.38

<u>Language</u>	% of Population Whose Main Language is Not English Who:					% of Population with English as Their First Language
County	Speak English Very Well	Speak English Well	Cannot Speak English Well	Cannot Speak English	Total	
Essex	1.5	1.1	0.4	.07	3.07	97

<u>Religion</u>	% of Population Belonging to each Religion								
County	Christian	Buddhist	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Other	None	Not Stated
Essex	61.78	0.34	0.6	0.48	0.98	0.16	0.37	28.13	7.19

## Essex CRC's Employee Profile and Staff Commitments

On 30<sup>th</sup> April 2019, Essex CRC employed 193 staff and our operational delivery is supported by the 21.2 FTE staff and volunteers employed by our three operational partners (Nacro, Open Road, Ormiston Families). Our data about, and commitments to, our staff is as follows:

### Age:

Our breakdown by age is 24.1% Baby Boomer, 32.3% Gen X and 43.6% Gen Y.

### Gender:

As an organisation we understand the issues around gender inequality and our approach is to reduce the impact of this. This is recognised in our staff profile as 71% of staff are female and 29% are men. This changes to 53.8% female and 46.2% males for middle managers, and 33.3% female and 66.6% male for senior managers. Although nationally there is an improving picture for women in senior management roles across many industries there continues to be a recognition of the gender pay gap. Ensuring we share promotion opportunities to women whilst on maternity leave will assist in reducing this. In addition, we actively promote managerial training opportunities to both men and women, with 3 out of the 4 Level 5 management training opportunities being awarded to women.

### Ethnicity:

Our staff ethnicity data shows 6.7% BAME, 11.8% unknown and 81.5% white, and this year we said that we would **improve diversity in recruitment**. During 2018-19 we had 36 new starters, of which 14% were from an ethnic minority and 78% were female. We are pleased with our level of recruitment for BAME staff, but we have currently have no BAME team or senior managers, and wish to ensure we have the correct succession planning arrangements in place.

### Disability:

Our data shows that 7.1% of our staff state they have a disability, 10.2% unknown and 82.7% state no disability. We apply reasonable adjustments and support staff to utilise the Access to Work scheme and Posturite to ensure that staff are not excluded from work because of a disability. The numbers of DSE assessments taken up by Essex employees in in 2018/19 were 46% this year, which is the same as last year. Posturite undertook and provided equipment for 30 members of staff. We do not formally track the volume of reasonable adjustments currently in place across the CRC, but going forward this will be captured by our local HR administrator.

This year we said that we would improve the mental health awareness and support systems for staff. We have had a number of campaigns in relation to this, including mental health awareness events, the promotion of our employee assistance programme – Sodexo Supports Me – and the active use of stress risk assessments and occupational health referrals where applicable. The Health, Safety and Wellbeing Strategy has clear objectives for the current year that commits to supporting and promoting health initiatives across the CRC and ensuring that all staff continue to have access to these wellbeing interventions.

### **Religion and Belief:**

Of our staff who responded to a pulse survey this year, 3.2% identify as Buddhists, 45% as Christian, 0.8% as Muslim, 44.3% as No Religion, 0.8% as Pagan, and 3.2% as preferred not to disclose.

We encourage religious observances and we ensure religious festivals, holidays and rights of worship are recognised and accommodated, wherever and whenever reasonably practicable taking into consideration business needs and requirements.

### **Pregnancy and Maternity**

We support staff that are pregnant and ensure appropriate risk assessments are completed. Whilst on maternity leave we encourage and promote the use of 'Keeping in Touch (KIT) days' in order to support the member of staff's return to work. These days are used in a way that they will find most beneficial to them. It is our policy to inform staff on maternity leave of any vacancies within the organisation to ensure that they are not disadvantaged. However, through our grievance process, we have become aware this year that there are improvements we can make regarding keeping in touch with those on maternity leave, and this will be taken forward next year.

### **Marriage and civil partnership**

65% of our staff who responded to our pulse survey state they are married or in a domestic partnership. Essex CRC actively encourages the take up of paternity leave, and our shared parental leave policy has received positive feedback at our Equality and Inclusion meeting.

### **Sexual identity:**

In our pulse survey, 3.2% identified as LGBT, 92.7% as heterosexual, and 4% preferred not to disclose.

We understand that sexual orientation represents a non-observable or underlying type of diversity and as such gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees can choose to what extent they reveal their sexual orientation in the workplace. However, our full intention is to create an environment where our staff are comfortable to bring their whole self to work, but we ensure their confidentiality, as it still personal choice. We promote and encourage our staff to attend LGBT+ networks.

### **Gender transition:**

In our pulse survey 0.8% of our staff identified in a gender different from that registered at birth, and 0.8% preferred not to say.

Essex CRC has a comprehensive Transitioning at Work Policy, which we developed in consultation with Stonewall.

**Staff support:**

As promised, and stated earlier, we have deployed **our dignity at work policy**, which replaced and harmonised the six Sodexo CRC’s previous bullying and harassment policies. This new policy was supported by the unions and local equality and inclusion groups.

Essex staff are actively encouraged to take part in Sodexo networks, HMPPS networks, and local networks such as the Essex LGBT Alliance.

The Sodexo networks are as follows:



Aims to raise awareness and understanding of the different generational groups and the impact they can have in the workplace, and to support employees with parental and caring responsibilities.



Aims to encourage inclusivity and cohesion amongst our employees by celebrating everyone’s cultures, heritage and beliefs and by promoting equal opportunities for all.



Aims to foster an inclusive culture within Sodexo to help promote gender balance at every level.



Aims to lead and enable lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT) colleagues to achieve their full potential through creating a positive, supportive and inclusive working environment.

Importantly, diversity training forms part of our core training offer. Our managers also have access to Sodexo’s Spirit of Inclusion training, through the management development programme. Our training focus for next year will be events to increase knowledge and confidence in working with our service users who are part of travelling communities.



*This one-day programme looks at diversity and inclusion from an individual, team and business perspective. It's designed to increase awareness of the moral, legal and business case for diversity and help people to manage relationships with colleagues, clients and customers.*

## Summary of Essex CRC's Service User Data and Service Delivery for 2018-19

This year, we said that we would **analyse and improve our work to ensure positive work with protected characteristic groups**, and we have done this by reviewing our data for breach, recall and the successful completion of orders and licences. This data can be found in full at Appendix A but is summarised below under each protected characteristic; where we also outline key aspects of our service delivery.

### **Age:**

Our data tells us that the age profile of the breach cohort was dominated by Gen Y (66%) and Gen X (27%), with Gen Y contributing to 76% of proven breaches.

For completion of community and suspended sentence orders, the age profile of this cohort was dominated by Gen Y (65%) and Gen X (27%). The age proportions of completions largely match the age proportions of the cohort, except the highest rate of completion was for Traditionalist (100% cf. cohort rate of 0.2%), and the lowest completion rate was for Gen Y (71% cf. cohort rate of 74%).

The majority of the cohort on licence were Gen Y (62%) or Gen X (30%). The recall rate was disproportionately high for Gen Y service users (12%) compared with the cohort recall rate of 10%, and their contribution to the number of recalls (74%) was greater than their cohort proportion (62%).

For successful completions of licence/PSS, the majority of the cohort were Gen Y (66%) or Gen X (28%). Gen Y service users had the lowest completion rates (59%) compared with the cohort completion rate of 63%.

In response, Essex continues to promote its Young Adults' Strategy which highlights the importance of understanding maturity rather than age for service users.

We deliver a bespoke Rehabilitation Activity Requirement, Fearless Futures, for our service users aged 18-24 years old. This intervention is also available for NPS service users, via the Rate Card.

### **Good news story - working with an older service user**

*During 2018-19, K was due for release from prison. Not only was he homeless, he had additional care needs relating to his physical health, mental capacity and the onset of dementia. He also had a history of non-compliance. His RO worked hard with him while he was still in custody to motivate him, and introduce him to colleagues and other professionals who could support him. She co-ordinated visiting him in prison, pulling together professionals*

*and information from across the criminal justice and healthcare systems. As a result of her persistence, hard work, and attention to detail, this service user was supported into a residential care placement directly upon his release from prison. Responsivity was at the heart of the work with K, which achieved the best outcome for him – a management plan that accommodates his health needs, treats him with dignity, and provides stability – whilst keeping himself and others safe.*

### **Disability:**

Our data tells us that the disability profile of our breach cohort was 66% - No recorded disability, and 34% - Recorded disability. The highest rate of breach was for recorded Disabled (21% cf. cohort rate of 19%). Disabled service users (34% of cohort) disproportionately contributed to the number of Proven Breaches, with 37% of breaches.

For completions of community or suspended sentence orders, 30% of the cohort had a recorded disability. The completion rate for those with a disability was lower (61%) than for those with no recorded disability (79%).

Recall – 28% of the cohort had a recorded disability. The recall rate of those with a disability was higher (13%) than the cohort recall rate of 10%.

31% of the cohort for the successful completion of licence/PSS had a recorded disability. Those with a recorded disability had the lowest completion rate (55%) compared with the cohort completion rate of 63%.

In response to this, during 2019-20, Essex CRC will engage our service user council to help ascertain the reasons for lower completion rates and higher breach/recall rates for our service users with a recorded disability.

Meanwhile, service user access to our services is important to us and all Essex CRC premises are compliant with Disability Discrimination Act. There was a short period of time this year where the lift at the Colchester LMC was broken, and arrangements were made with partner agencies for staff and service users to use their premises when required.

Community Payback was commended in our most recent HMIP Report (published October 2018) as follows: *‘there was sufficient assessment activity to demonstrate an individualised approach to the allocation of the person to the unpaid work placement. These assessments consistently considered diversity matters and the impact these would have on the likelihood of completion of unpaid work’.*

This year we said that we would **introduce a Learning Disability tool in assessments**. Essex will adopt a screening tool which has been developed by Norfolk & Suffolk CRC in consultation with a local charity, ‘Opening Doors’. This will enable an approach to involving the service user throughout the assessment process in a meaningful way.

In addition to this data, our needs analysis and service user feedback continues to confirm that the need for better mental health services is ever present in our cohort and requires a specialist approach throughout the delivery of the order. Currently the CRC has an average of less than 5 Mental Health Treatment Requirements at any one time.

The CRC has committed to spending innovation money to rejuvenate this work, in partnership with the NPS, HMCTS, NHS England and Essex County Council, and with the support of the MOJ/Health Board which is governing this work nationally. The CRC will employ assistant psychologists to deliver the treatment requirements, but second them to the local health trust, where they will be based within the right service for clinical assessment and supervision.

### **Marriage and Civil Partnership:**

Domestic status was either not recorded (41%) or not disclosed (13%) for 55% of our breach cohort. For those service users where domestic status was recorded, the greatest proportion were single (27% of cohort), followed by cohabiting (7%). The highest rate of breach (excluding Not recorded or Not disclosed statuses) was for single service users (25% of Single service users breached, cf. cohort average of 19%). Single service users (27% of cohort) disproportionately contributed to the number of proven breaches, with 36% of breaches.

Domestic status was not recorded or disclosure was refused in 64% of the cohort for successful completion of community or suspended sentence orders. 24% of the cohort were Single. The completion rates were lowest for single service users (53%) compared with the cohort completion rate of 75%. Excluding those with no recorded Domestic Status, single service users contributed the highest proportion of completions (17%), albeit lower than their cohort proportion of 24%.

The domestic status was not recorded or not disclosed in the majority of the recall cohort. Single service users had the highest recorded proportion (21%), and contributed disproportionately to the overall recalls (27% of recalls were for Single service users).

Domestic status was not recorded or not disclosed in 70% of the successful completion of licence/PSS cohort. 24% of the cohort were recorded as single. The completion rates of single, separated, not disclosed, and in a relationship but not cohabiting service users were below the cohort completion rate of 63%.

Before we can analyse this information further, Essex CRC needs improved recording for Domestic Status, which we will take forward this year.

### **Race:**

Within our breach cohort, White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish (White British) service users comprise 77% of the cohort. The next highest ethnicities are White: All Other at 5% and Black or Black British at 4%. The highest rate of breach was for Black or Black British service users, at 26% (cf. 19% cohort breach rate). White British, and Black or Black British service users disproportionately contributed to the number of proven breaches at 83% (cf. cohort proportion of 77%) and 6% (cf. cohort proportion of 4%) respectively.

For the successful completion of community or suspended sentence orders, 74% of the cohort were White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish (White: British). The next highest proportion of ethnicities were White: All Other (5%) and Black or Black British (4%). Both White: British and Black or Black British service user had lower completion rates than the cohort completion rate of 74%. Each ethnicity's contribution to overall completions was approximately aligned with their cohort proportion.

For recall, 79% of the cohort were White: British; 5% were Black or Black British. Our recall rate was highest for White: British and White: Other at 11%, compared with the cohort recall rate of 10%. White: British service users contributed disproportionately (85%) to the cohort recalls, compared with their cohort proportion of 79%.

For the successful completion of licence/PSS, 81% of the cohort was White: British, and 4% were Black or Black British. White: British and White: Other service users' completion rates were below the cohort completion rate of 63%. Black or Black British service users had a higher completion rate (76%) than the cohort. This whole caseload data shows better outcomes for our BAME service users than HMIP found with their caseload sample in the summer of 2018. None-the-less, in line with HMIP's recommendation, we are pleased to have commissioned the 4Front project to design and help us implement a bespoke BAME intervention. The programme of work will begin as a pilot in Thurrock from May 2019 and the outcomes will be subject to independent evaluation. This is a welcome step forward for Essex and we will be able to compare our experience with BeNCH CRC who are also piloting the approach in Luton.

We have identified some learning from a SFO review that indicates our staff would benefit on training regarding work with our Roma and travelling communities, and this will be taken forward next year.

Essex began to promote the identification of hate crime and shared with staff the process for recording against a designated code in n-Delius which will support us in capturing this data going forward.

We actively promote the use of translation services across Essex. We have a suite of translated materials available in order to enable an inclusive approach as well as provision for telephone and face to face translation services via Language line.

### **Sex (gender):**

17% of the breach cohort are Female service users. The highest rate of breach was for Male service users (20%, cf. 19% cohort breach rate). Female service users had a lower breach rate of 17%. Male service users disproportionately contributed to the number of proven breaches at 85% (cf. cohort proportion of 83%).

For successful completion of community and suspended sentence orders, 18% of the cohort were Female. Female service users had the higher completion rate (78%) compared with the cohort completion rate of 74%.

11% of the recall cohort were Female, 12% of Females were recalled (compared with cohort rate of 10%). 13% of all recalls were for Female service users.

For the successful completion of licence/PSS, 13% of the cohort were Female, and Females had a lower completion rate (53%) than the cohort completion rate (63%).

Essex CRC's focus this year has been to move our women's service from CRC premises and into the community. Following a successful multi-agency stakeholder event hosted by the CRC in July 2018, where we explored whether the partnership had an appetite for a women's centre, we were given the opportunity by Essex County Council, Virgin Care and Barnardo's to utilise their Family Hubs for our service delivery. Southend and Thurrock councils offered use of their Children's Centres in the same way. Whilst not exclusively women only spaces, they are proving a significant step forward in terms of community delivery with access to other services.



In addition to providing venues for Open Road's delivery of our women's programme, this has also enabled the roll out of Women Only Workshops (WOW) to these sites. The WOW days enable monthly face-to-face contact with ROs in a women only environment, provide on-going support and connection with Open Road, advice and support for employment, and access to clothes, toiletries, and food vouchers.

In addition, the creation of the resettlement team and a specialist women's RO to be the single point of contact for HMPs Peterborough and Bronzefield, has enabled us to focus on improving outcomes for women on licence. We have part funded, with our regional CRCs a pilot accommodation project in Peterborough, aimed at reducing recalls. Whilst Essex women are not eligible for this project, we are closely sighted on the learning, as we work with Nacro and the NPS to develop our own accommodation project locally.

### **Good news stories - our improved women's service:**

*D was referred to the women's service in December 2018. At this time, she wasn't engaging well and had failed to attend a number of appointments. She was very low in mood and was isolating herself from everyone. She started engaging with Open Road in January and attended her first WOW session in February. During that session she disclosed that she had been sleeping on her sofa for a year which was problematic due to numerous health conditions, including osteoarthritis and a hernia. Her 17-year-old son had been sleeping on a mattress on the floor during this time. Through charitable connections, Open Road sourced 2 beds, bedding, and a sofa, and her son cried when they were delivered saying "I can't believe I've actually got a bed now". By the end of March 2019, the change in D was remarkable. She had enrolled on a course at the Job Centre with the Shaw Trust and had been offered the opportunity to volunteer in a local charity shop one day a week. She said that she felt like a different person and credits this change to the women's service. She explained "I actually feel human again – I was in such a dark place, and now I want to get back out there again. I have been humbled by people's kindness and I feel that life is worthwhile again".*

*V was referred to the women's service and commenced the women's programme in September 2018. She had served a custodial sentence for supply of class A drugs and had completed a peer mentoring qualification whilst serving her sentence. Her RO believed that she would benefit from the women's group and also add a lot of value given her excellent progress whilst in custody. V went on to complete the women's programme and as expected, acted as a great role model within the group to the other women. The other service users respected her opinions and she became a great support to the group facilitator. She had expressed an interest in becoming a peer mentor early on so once she had completed the 8 mandatory group sessions she continued attending to assist within the group. She helped to make teas and coffees and write on the whiteboard and shared her experiences within the group to inspire and motivate the other women. As she completes her PSS, she is planning to volunteer with Open Road.*

### **Religion or Belief:**

Within our breach data Religion was either not recorded (23%), Not Disclosed (11%), or Unknown (4%) for 37% of the cohort. Religion was recorded as No Religion in a further 47% of the cohort, leaving only 15% of the cohort for which a religion was disclosed and recorded. For those service users where religion was recorded, the greatest proportion were Christian (7% of cohort), followed by Roman Catholic (4%), Church of England (2%) and Muslim (1%). The highest rates of breach for the religions with significant representation (more than 20 service users in the cohort) were for Christian (20% breached), Roman Catholic (16% breached) and Muslim (16% breached) service users. Breaches were approximately aligned with the cohort proportions of each religion.

For the successful completion of community or suspended sentence orders, of the small proportion of the cohort with a stated religion, the highest proportions were Christian, Church of England (Anglican), Roman Catholic and Muslim. The completion rates are broadly similar to the cohort completion rate, for those religions with more than 20 service users.

For recalls, religion was not recorded or not disclosed in the majority of the cohort. There is no discernible correlation between religion and recall.

There is also no discernible correlation between recorded religion and completion of licence/PSS, as religion was not recorded or not disclosed in 40% of the cohort, and a further 42% declared No Religion.

In order to accommodate religion and belief, we will consider reasonable adjustments whilst still taking into account the delivery of the sentence of the Court. An example of this is the awareness work that we do during the fasting period of Ramadan.

### **Sexual Identity:**

Service users who identify as heterosexual comprise 61% of the breach cohort, with 37% of the cohort having either no recorded sexual orientation or refusing to disclose their sexual orientation. Bisexual, and Gay/Lesbian service users each account for c.0.7% of the cohort. The highest rate of breach was for heterosexual service users, at 20% (cf. 19% cohort breach rate). Heterosexual service users disproportionately contributed to the number of proven breaches at 66% (cf. cohort proportion of 61%).

For the completion of community and suspended sentence orders, of those where sexual orientation was recorded, the majority (55%) identified as heterosexual. These service users had a lower completion rate (66%) than the cohort rate (74%).

In 50% of the recall cohort sexual orientation was not recorded or not disclosed. The low volumes of recorded sexual orientations (other than heterosexual) prevent the identification of reliable correlations.

Sexual orientation was not recorded or not disclosed in 46% of the cohort for the completion of licence/PSS. A very small proportion (2%) declared themselves Gay/Lesbian or Bisexual. Completion rates were highest where the sexual orientation was not disclosed or recorded; only 55% of heterosexual service users completed, compared with the 63% cohort completion rate.

This coming year, we will build staff confidence to talk to service users about their protected characteristics so that our we can gather more complete data sets and ensure our service is responsive.

### **Gender Reassignment:**

For all four areas of service delivery analysed for this report, the volumes are not sufficient to make any inference from our data.

However, whilst gender re-assignment is not a common occurrence, we are confident that Essex CRC provides appropriate support. During the last year, we can evidence a careful and successful placement into an individual placement for the completion of unpaid work.

## **Pregnancy and Maternity:**

We do not routinely record pregnancy and maternity information for service users in a way that allows data extraction. This information is usually recorded in the body of an OASys assessment, or a contact log entry.

Our risk assessments for Community Payback includes assessments for expectant mothers and clearly identifies any potential risk factors and how to manage them. This includes allowing additional breaks if necessary whilst still ensuring a reasonable amount of work is undertaken.

As of 30<sup>th</sup> April 2019, Essex CRC was currently supervising 5 women with unpaid work requirements, who were all completing their hours in an individual placement, rather than a work group setting.

## **Additional Information**

There is a final action from 2018-19, that has not yet been addressed during this report. Last year, we said that we would **improve assessment and service delivery, taking account of protected characteristics and diversity of our service users**. We clearly have examples of where we do this well – for example, in our women’s work, and in the delivery of unpaid work. We also know, as highlighted by HMIP and OSAG, that we have a good range of services on offer that have the potential to be responsive – for example, our Fearless Futures programme; and soon to be implemented the 4Ward programme. However, we also acknowledge that there are still improvements to be made in our assessment and sentence plan delivery generally, and this work will continue into 2019-20 through our HMIP and OSAG audit actions plan.

## **Action Plan for 2019-20**

### **Staff inclusion:**

1. Continue to improve diversity in recruitment so that our staff group reflects our local population.
2. Support BAME staff in professional development and succession planning opportunities.
3. Align the work of the Equality and Inclusion group with the work of the Health and Safety team to promote the emotional well-being of staff.
4. Further develop a culture of inclusion and belonging, including for those who are absent from work, for example, through maternity leave.

### **Service user inclusion:**

5. Continue to develop our service delivery for service users with learning difficulties in partnership with agencies who hold expertise in this area.
6. Implement our BAME intervention, the 4Ward programme.
7. Contribute to the work led by Essex Criminal Justice Board to reduce disproportionality for BAME service users in the Criminal Justice System.

8. Engage our Service User Council in enabling the CRC to understand why our service users with a recorded disability have lower successful completion rates, and higher breach/recall rates.
9. Work with partner agencies to improve access to Mental Health Treatment Requirements.
10. Enable Essex CRC staff to improve their knowledge and skills in working with service users from travelling communities.
11. Continue to improve recording of protected characteristics, including building staff confidence to discuss and gather this information in order to create the responsive service required.

## Appendix A: Service User Data for Essex CRC

### Service User Protected Characteristics

#### Overview

The service delivery and outcomes have been assessed for all service users in contract year 2018/19, identifying the following protected characteristics:

- Age
- Disability
- Domestic Status
- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Religion
- Sexual Orientation
- Transgender Process

For each of these characteristics, the service delivery and outcomes in the following categories have been assessed:

- **Breaches of Community Orders and Suspended Sentence Orders**
- **Completion of Community Orders and Suspended Sentence Orders - Service Level Measure 008**
- **Recalls to Custody**
- **Compliance with Licences and Post Sentence Supervision Periods – Assurance Metric J**

## Breaches of Community and Suspended Sentence Orders

The cohort is all service users supervised by Essex CRC at some time during 2018/19, whilst serving a Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order. Within this cohort, those service users breach whilst under the supervision of Essex CRC are selected to determine if breach practice and outcomes correlate with service user protected characteristics.

The cohort size was 4914 service users, of which 19% were breached (Proven Breach) by Essex CRC in the period.

### Age

The age profile of the cohort was:

Age Category	Min Birth Year	Max Birth Year	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Traditionalist		1945	7	0.14%	0% of SUs were Traditionalist
Baby Boomer	1946	1964	340	6.93%	7% of SUs were Baby Boomer
Gen X	1965	1979	1310	26.71%	27% of SUs were Gen X
Gen Y	1980	2000	3239	66.03%	66% of SUs were Gen Y
Gen Z	2001		9	0.18%	0% of SUs were Gen Z

The age profile of the cohort was dominated by Gen Y (66%) and Gen X (27%).

The highest rate of breach was for Gen Y (22% cf. cohort rate of 19%). All other categories breach rates were lower than the cohort rate of 19%.

Gen Y service users (66% of cohort) disproportionately contributed to the number of Proven Breaches, with 76% of breaches.

### Disability

The disability profile of the cohort was:

Disabled	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
No recorded disability	3250	66.14%	66% of SUs had No recorded disability
A recorded disability	1664	33.86%	34% of SUs had A recorded disability

The disability profile of the cohort was 66% - No recorded disability, and 34% - Recorded disability.

The highest rate of breach was for recorded Disabled (21% cf. cohort rate of 19%).

Disabled service users (34% of cohort) disproportionately contributed to the number of Proven Breaches, with 37% of breaches.

## Domestic Status

The domestic status profile of the cohort was:

Domestic Status	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Cohabiting	344	7.00%	7% of SUs were Cohabiting
Divorced / Dissolved	51	1.04%	1% of SUs were Divorced / Dissolved
In a relationship but not cohabiting	85	1.73%	2% of SUs were In a relationship but not cohabiting
Married / Civil partnership	233	4.74%	5% of SUs were Married / Civil partnership
Not Disclosed	658	13.39%	13% of SUs were Not Disclosed
Not recorded	2039	41.49%	41% of SUs were Not recorded
Separated	144	2.93%	3% of SUs were Separated
Single	1350	27.47%	27% of SUs were Single
Widowed	10	0.20%	0% of SUs were Widowed

Domestic status was either not recorded (41%) or not disclosed (13%) for 55% of the cohort. For those service users where domestic status was recorded, the greatest proportion were Single (27% of cohort), followed by Cohabiting (7%).

The highest rate of breach (excluding Not recorded or Not disclosed statuses) was for Single service users (25% of Single service users breached, cf. cohort average of 19%).

Single service users (27% of cohort) disproportionately contributed to the number of proven breaches, with 36% of breaches.

## Ethnicity

The ethnicity profile of the cohort was:

Ethnicity	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	313	6.37%	6% of SUs were Not recorded
Arab	4	0.08%	0% of SUs were Arab
Asian or Asian British	82	1.67%	2% of SUs were Asian or Asian British
Black or Black British	204	4.15%	4% of SUs were Black or Black British
Mixed	114	2.32%	2% of SUs were Mixed
Other Ethnic Group	21	0.43%	0% of SUs were Other Ethnic Group
Refusal	131	2.67%	3% of SUs were Refusal
White: All Other	244	4.97%	5% of SUs were White: All Other
White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	3801	77.35%	77% of SUs were White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish

White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish (White British) service users dominate the cohort at 77%. The next highest ethnicities are White: All Other at 5% and Black or Black British at 4%.

The highest rate of breach was for Black or Black British service users, at 26% (cf. 19% cohort breach rate).

White British, and Black or Black British service users disproportionately contributed to the number of proven breaches at 83% (cf. cohort proportion of 77%) and 6% (cf. cohort proportion of 4%) respectively.

## Gender

Gender	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Female	858	17.46 %	17% of SUs were Female
Male	4056	82.54 %	83% of SUs were Male

17% of the cohort are Female service users.

The highest rate of breach was for Male service users (20%, cf. 19% cohort breach rate). Female service users had a lower breach rate of 17%.

Male service users disproportionately contributed to the number of proven breaches at 85% (cf. cohort proportion of 83%).

## Religion

Religion	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	1116	22.71 %	23% of SUs were Not recorded
Agnostic	2	0.04%	0% of SUs were Agnostic
Atheist	12	0.24%	0% of SUs were Atheist
Buddhist	8	0.16%	0% of SUs were Buddhist
Christian	324	6.59%	7% of SUs were Christian
Church of England (Anglican)	113	2.30%	2% of SUs were Church of England (Anglican)
Mormon	3	0.06%	0% of SUs were Mormon
Muslim	44	0.90%	1% of SUs were Muslim
No Religion	2330	47.42 %	47% of SUs were No Religion
Non Conformist	2	0.04%	0% of SUs were Non Conformist
Not Disclosed	538	10.95 %	11% of SUs were Not Disclosed
Other	18	0.37%	0% of SUs were Other
Pagan	7	0.14%	0% of SUs were Pagan
Roman Catholic	175	3.56%	4% of SUs were Roman Catholic



Sikh	8	0.16%	0% of SUs were Sikh
Spiritualist	8	0.16%	0% of SUs were Spiritualist
Unknown	177	3.60%	4% of SUs were Unknown
(blank)		0.00%	0% of SUs were (blank)
Hindu	8	0.16%	0% of SUs were Hindu
Jewish	4	0.08%	0% of SUs were Jewish
Methodist	2	0.04%	0% of SUs were Methodist
Greek Orthodox	4	0.08%	0% of SUs were Greek Orthodox
Jehovah's Witness	3	0.06%	0% of SUs were Jehovah's Witness
Druid	1	0.02%	0% of SUs were Druid
Orthodox (Greek/Russian)	4	0.08%	0% of SUs were Orthodox (Greek/Russian)
Taoist	1	0.02%	0% of SUs were Taoist
Baptist	1	0.02%	0% of SUs were Baptist

Religion was either not recorded (23%), Not Disclosed (11%), or Unknown (4%) for 37% of the cohort. Religion was recorded as No Religion in a further 47% of the cohort, leaving only 15% of the cohort for which a religion was disclosed and recorded. For those service users where religion was recorded, the greatest proportion were Christian (7% of cohort), followed by Roman Catholic (4%), Church of England (2%) and Muslim (1%).

The highest rates of breach for the religions with significant representation (more than 20 service users in the cohort) were for Christian (20% breached), Roman Catholic (16% breached) and Muslim (16% breached) service users.

Breaches were approximately aligned with the cohort proportions of each religion.

### Sexual orientation

Sexual orientation	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	1090	22.18%	22% of SUs were Not recorded
Bisexual	37	0.75%	1% of SUs were Bisexual
Gay/Lesbian	32	0.65%	1% of SUs were Gay/Lesbian
Heterosexual/Straight	3009	61.23%	61% of SUs were Heterosexual/Straight
Not Disclosed	744	15.14%	15% of SUs were Not Disclosed
Other	2	0.04%	0% of SUs were Other

Heterosexual/Straight service users dominate the cohort at 61%, with 37% of the cohort having either no recorded sexual orientation or refusing to disclose their sexual orientation. Bisexual, and Gay/Lesbian service users each account for c.0.7% of the cohort.

The highest rate of breach was for Heterosexual/Straight service users, at 20% (cf. 19% cohort breach rate).

Heterosexual/Straight service users disproportionately contributed to the number of proven breaches at 66% (cf. cohort proportion of 61%).

## Transgender process

Transgender process	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	1745	35.51 %	36% of SUs were Not recorded
No	3014	61.33 %	61% of SUs were No
Prefer Not To Say	147	2.99%	3% of SUs were Prefer Not To Say
Yes	8	0.16%	0% of SUs were Yes

Service users declaring themselves not in transgender process (No) dominate the cohort at 61%, with 36% not recorded and 3% refusing to disclose. Service users declaring themselves to be in transgender process (Yes) account for only 0.16% of the cohort.

The volumes are not sufficient to make breach rate inferences for those in transgender process.

## Service Level Measure 008 - Completion of Community Orders and Suspended Sentence Orders

The cohort is all service users supervised by Essex CRC, where their Community or Suspended Sentence Order was terminated positively (successful completion of the Order) or negatively (early termination of the Order due to re-sentencing following breach enforcement or further offending) during 2018/19. Within this cohort, those service users successfully completing their Orders whilst under the supervision of Essex CRC are selected to determine if outcomes correlate with service user protected characteristics.

### Age

Age Category	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Baby Boomer	196	6.94%	7% of SUs were Baby Boomer
Gen X	776	27.48%	27% of SUs were Gen X
Gen Y	1846	65.37%	65% of SUs were Gen Y
Traditionalist	6	0.21%	0% of SUs were Traditionalist
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2824</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

The age profile of the cohort was dominated by Gen Y (65%) and Gen X (27%).

The highest rate of completion was for Traditionalist (100% cf. cohort rate of 0.2%). The lowest completion rate was for Gen Y (71% cf. cohort rate of 74%).

The age proportions of completions largely matched the age proportions of the cohort.

### Disability

Recorded Disability	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
No recorded disability	1986	70.20%	70% of SUs had No recorded disability
A recorded disability	843	29.80%	30% of SUs had A recorded disability
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2829</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

30% of the cohort had a recorded disability.

The completion rate for those with a disability was lower (61%) than for those with no recorded disability (79%).

Completions for those with a disability were disproportionately low(25%) compared with their cohort proportion of 30%.

### Domestic Status

Domestic Status	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Cohabiting	146	5.16%	5% of SUs were Cohabiting
Divorced / Dissolved	25	0.88%	1% of SUs were Divorced / Dissolved
In a relationship but not cohabiting	24	0.85%	1% of SUs were In a relationship but not cohabiting
Married / Civil partnership	94	3.32%	3% of SUs were Married / Civil partnership
Not Disclosed	446	15.75%	16% of SUs were Not Disclosed

<b>Not recorded</b>	1358	47.95%	48% of SUs were Not recorded
<b>Separated</b>	63	2.22%	2% of SUs were Separated
<b>Single</b>	671	23.69%	24% of SUs were Single
<b>Widowed</b>	5	0.18%	0% of SUs were Widowed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2832</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

Domestic status was not recorded or disclosure was refused in 64% of the cohort.

24% of the cohort were Single.

The completion rates were lowest for Single service users (53%) compared with the cohort completion rate of 75%.

Excluding those with no recorded Domestic Status, Single service users contributed the highest proportion of completions (17%), albeit lower than their cohort proportion of 24%.

### Ethnicity

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Service Users</b>	<b>Service Users %</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
<b>Not recorded</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>10.85%</b>	11% of SUs were Not recorded
<b>Arab</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.04%</b>	0% of SUs were Arab
<b>Asian or Asian British</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1.24%</b>	1% of SUs were Asian or Asian British
<b>Black or Black British</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>3.71%</b>	4% of SUs were Black or Black British
<b>Mixed</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>2.09%</b>	2% of SUs were Mixed
<b>Other Ethnic Group</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0.42%</b>	0% of SUs were Other Ethnic Group
<b>Refusal</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>3.22%</b>	3% of SUs were Refusal
<b>White: All Other</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>4.70%</b>	5% of SUs were White: All Other
<b>White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish</b>	<b>2086</b>	<b>73.74%</b>	74% of SUs were White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2829</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

74% of the cohort were White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish (White: British). The next highest proportion of ethnicities were White: All Other (5%) and Black or Black British (4%).

Both White: British and Black or Black British service user had lower completion rates than the cohort completion rate of 74%.

Each ethnicity contribution to overall completions was approximately aligned with their cohort proportion.

### Gender

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Service Users</b>	<b>Service Users %</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
<b>Female</b>	501	17.71%	18% of SUs were Female
<b>Male</b>	2328	82.29%	82% of SUs were Male
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2829</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

18% of the cohort were Female.

Female service users had the higher completion rate (78%) compared with the cohort completion rate of 74%.

### Religion

Religion	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	694	24.53%	25% of SUs were Not recorded
Agnostic	1	0.04%	0% of SUs were Agnostic
Atheist	3	0.11%	0% of SUs were Atheist
Buddhist	3	0.11%	0% of SUs were Buddhist
Christian	155	5.48%	5% of SUs were Christian
Church of England (Anglican)	59	2.09%	2% of SUs were Church of England (Anglican)
Mormon	1	0.04%	0% of SUs were Mormon
Muslim	26	0.92%	1% of SUs were Muslim
No Religion	1285	45.42%	45% of SUs were No Religion
Non Conformist	1	0.04%	0% of SUs were Non Conformist
Not Disclosed	333	11.77%	12% of SUs were Not Disclosed
Other	11	0.39%	0% of SUs were Other
Pagan	4	0.14%	0% of SUs were Pagan
Roman Catholic	103	3.64%	4% of SUs were Roman Catholic
Sikh	3	0.11%	0% of SUs were Sikh
Spiritualist	2	0.07%	0% of SUs were Spiritualist
Unknown	131	4.63%	5% of SUs were Unknown
Hindu	4	0.14%	0% of SUs were Hindu
Jewish	2	0.07%	0% of SUs were Jewish
Methodist	1	0.04%	0% of SUs were Methodist
Greek Orthodox	3	0.11%	0% of SUs were Greek Orthodox
Jehovah's Witness	2	0.07%	0% of SUs were Jehovah's Witness
Orthodox (Greek/Russian)	1	0.04%	0% of SUs were Orthodox (Greek/Russian)
Baptist	1	0.04%	0% of SUs were Baptist
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2829</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

Of the small proportion of the cohort with a stated religion, the highest proportions were Christian, Church of England (Anglican), Roman Catholic and Muslim.

The completion rates are broadly similar to the cohort completion rate, for those religions with more than 20 service users.

### Sexual orientation

Sexual Orientation	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	689	24.35%	24% of SUs were Not recorded
Bisexual	23	0.81%	1% of SUs were Bisexual
Gay/Lesbian	18	0.64%	1% of SUs were Gay/Lesbian
Heterosexual/Straight	1570	55.50%	55% of SUs were Heterosexual/Straight
Not Disclosed	528	18.66%	19% of SUs were Not Disclosed

Other	1	0.04%	0% of SUs were Other
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2829</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

Of those where sexual orientation was recorded, the majority (55%) were Heterosexual/Straight. These service users had a lower completion rate (66%) than the cohort rate (74%).

### Transgender process

Transgender process	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	1186	41.92%	42% of SUs were Not recorded
No	1528	54.01%	54% of SUs were No
Prefer Not To Say	112	3.96%	4% of SUs were Prefer Not To Say
Yes	3	0.11%	0% of SUs were Yes
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2829</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

The low level of recording of this characteristic, and the very low volumes of service users declaring to be in transgender process, make it impossible to draw inference of correlation between transgender process and completion of community sentences.

## Recalls to Custody

The cohort is all service users supervised by Essex CRC at some time during 2018/19, whilst serving a Licence (following release from custody). Within this cohort, those service users recalled to custody whilst under the supervision of Essex CRC are selected to determine if recall practice and outcomes correlate with service user protected characteristics.

### Age

Age Category	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Baby Boomer	135	7.23%	7% of SUs were Baby Boomer
Gen X	561	30.05%	30% of SUs were Gen X
Gen Y	1164	62.35%	62% of SUs were Gen Y
Gen Z	1	0.05%	0% of SUs were Gen Z
Traditionalist	6	0.32%	0% of SUs were Traditionalist
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

The majority of the cohort on licence were Gen Y (62%) or Gen X (30%).

The recall rate was disproportionately high for Gen Y service users (12%) compared with the cohort recall rate of 10%, and their contribution to the number of recalls (74%) was greater than their cohort proportion (62%).

### Disability

Recorded Disability	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
No recorded disability	1358	72.47%	72% of SUs had No recorded disability
A recorded disability	516	27.53%	28% of SUs had A recorded disability
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

28% of the cohort had a recorded disability.

The recall rate of those with a disability was higher (13%) than the cohort recall rate of 10%.

### Domestic Status

Domestic Status	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Cohabiting	85	4.54%	5% of SUs were Cohabiting
Divorced / Dissolved	7	0.37%	0% of SUs were Divorced / Dissolved
In a relationship but not cohabiting	14	0.75%	1% of SUs were In a relationship but not cohabiting
Married / Civil partnership	44	2.35%	2% of SUs were Married / Civil partnership
Not Disclosed	314	16.76%	17% of SUs were Not Disclosed
Not recorded	989	52.77%	53% of SUs were Not recorded
Separated	21	1.12%	1% of SUs were Separated
Single	397	21.18%	21% of SUs were Single
Widowed	3	0.16%	0% of SUs were Widowed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

The domestic status was not recorded or not disclosed in the majority of the cohort. Single service users had the highest recorded proportion (21%), and contributed disproportionately to the overall recalls (27% of recalls were for Single service users).

### Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	74	3.95%	4% of SUs were Not recorded
Arab	1	0.05%	0% of SUs were Arab
Asian or Asian British	38	2.03%	2% of SUs were Asian or Asian British
Black or Black British	98	5.23%	5% of SUs were Black or Black British
Mixed	45	2.40%	2% of SUs were Mixed
Other Ethnic Group	8	0.43%	0% of SUs were Other Ethnic Group
Refusal	57	3.04%	3% of SUs were Refusal
White: All Other	79	4.22%	4% of SUs were White: All Other
White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	1474	78.66%	79% of SUs were White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

79% of the cohort were White: British; 5% were Black or Black British.

The recall rate was highest for White: British and White: Other at 11%, compared with the cohort recall rate of 10%.

White: British service users contributed disproportionately (85%) to the cohort recalls, compared with their cohort proportion of 79%.

### Gender

Gender	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Female	203	10.83%	11% of SUs were Female
Male	1671	89.17%	89% of SUs were Male
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

11% of the cohort were Female, 12% of Females were recalled (compared with cohort rate of 10%).

13% of all recalls were for Female service users.

### Religion

Religion	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	607	32.39%	32% of SUs were Not recorded
Agnostic	1	0.05%	0% of SUs were Agnostic
Atheist	4	0.21%	0% of SUs were Atheist
Buddhist	5	0.27%	0% of SUs were Buddhist
Christian	124	6.62%	7% of SUs were Christian



Religion	Count	Percentage	Interpretation
Church of England (Anglican)	31	1.65%	2% of SUs were Church of England (Anglican)
Mormon	1	0.05%	0% of SUs were Mormon
Muslim	23	1.23%	1% of SUs were Muslim
No Religion	659	35.17%	35% of SUs were No Religion
Non Conformist	1	0.05%	0% of SUs were Non-Conformist
Not Disclosed	277	14.78%	15% of SUs were Not Disclosed
Other	8	0.43%	0% of SUs were Other
Pagan	1	0.05%	0% of SUs were Pagan
Protestant	1	0.05%	0% of SUs were Protestant
Roman Catholic	50	2.67%	3% of SUs were Roman Catholic
Sikh	2	0.11%	0% of SUs were Sikh
Spiritualist	2	0.11%	0% of SUs were Spiritualist
Unknown	77	4.11%	4% of SUs were Unknown
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

Religion was not recorded or not disclosed in the majority of the cohort. There is no discernible correlation between religion and recall.

### Sexual orientation

Sexual Orientation	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	590	31.48%	31% of SUs were Not recorded
Bisexual	11	0.59%	1% of SUs were Bisexual
Gay/Lesbian	13	0.69%	1% of SUs were Gay/Lesbian
Heterosexual/Straight	898	47.92%	48% of SUs were Heterosexual/Straight
Not Disclosed	362	19.32%	19% of SUs were Not Disclosed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

In 50% of the cohort sexual orientation was not recorded or not disclosed. The low volumes of recorded sexual orientations (other than Heterosexual/Straight) prevent the identification of reliable correlations.

### Transgender process

Transgender process	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	996	53.15%	53% of SUs were Not recorded
No	820	43.76%	44% of SUs were No
Prefer Not To Say	57	3.04%	3% of SUs were Prefer Not To Say
Yes	1	0.05%	0% of SUs were Yes
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

Recording of transgender process characteristics prevents reliable inference.

## Assurance Metric J - Compliance with Licences and Post Sentence Supervision Periods

The cohort is all service users supervised by Essex CRC, where their Licence or Post Sentence Supervision Period was terminated positively (successful completion of the Licence/Post Sentence Supervision Period) or negatively (early termination of the Licence due to recall, or committal to custody for breach of Post Sentence Supervision) during 2018/19. Within this cohort, those service users successfully completing their Licences and Post Sentence Supervision Periods whilst under the supervision of Essex CRC are selected to determine if outcomes correlate with service user protected characteristics.

### Age

Age Category	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Baby Boomer	58	5.02%	5% of SUs were Baby Boomer
Gen X	328	28.37%	28% of SUs were Gen X
Gen Y	766	66.26%	66% of SUs were Gen Y
Traditionalist	4	0.35%	0% of SUs were Traditionalist
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1156</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

The majority of the cohort were Gen Y (66%) or Gen X (28%)

Gen Y service users had the lowest completion rates (59%) compared with the cohort completion rate of 63%.

### Disability

Disability	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
No recorded disability	787	67.90%	68% of SUs had No recorded disability
A recorded disability	372	32.10%	32% of SUs had A recorded disability
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1159</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

31% of the cohort had a recorded disability. Those with a recorded disability had the lowest completion rate (55%) compared with the cohort completion rate of 63%.

### Domestic Status

Domestic Status	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Cohabiting	37	3.19%	3% of SUs were Cohabiting
Divorced / Dissolved	2	0.17%	0% of SUs were Divorced / Dissolved
In a relationship but not cohabiting	6	0.52%	1% of SUs were In a relationship but not cohabiting
Married / Civil partnership	16	1.38%	1% of SUs were Married / Civil partnership
Not Disclosed	252	21.74%	22% of SUs were Not Disclosed
Not recorded	555	47.89%	48% of SUs were Not recorded
Separated	14	1.21%	1% of SUs were Separated
Single	277	23.90%	24% of SUs were Single
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1159</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

Domestic status was not recorded or not disclosed in 70% of the cohort. 24% of the cohort were recorded as Single.

The completion rates of Single, Separated, Not disclosed, and In a Relationship but not cohabiting service users were below the cohort completion rate of 63%.

### Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	64	5.52%	6% of SUs were Not recorded
Asian or Asian British	18	1.55%	2% of SUs were Asian or Asian British
Black or Black British	42	3.62%	4% of SUs were Black or Black British
Mixed	30	2.59%	3% of SUs were Mixed
Other Ethnic Group	2	0.17%	0% of SUs were Other Ethnic Group
Refusal	26	2.24%	2% of SUs were Refusal
White: All Other	35	3.02%	3% of SUs were White: All Other
White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	942	81.28%	81% of SUs were White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1159</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

81% of the cohort was White: British, and 4% were Black or Black British.

White: British and White: Other service users completion rates were below the cohort completion rate of 63%. Black or Black British service users had a higher completion rate (76%) than the cohort.

### Gender

Gender	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Female	147	12.68%	13% of SUs were Female
Male	1012	87.32%	87% of SUs were Male
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1159</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

13% of the cohort were Female, and Females had a lower completion rate (53%) than the cohort completion rate.

### Religion

Religion	Service Users	Service Users %	Interpretation
Not recorded	293	25.28%	25% of SUs were Not recorded
Atheist	1	0.09%	0% of SUs were Atheist
Buddhist	2	0.17%	0% of SUs were Buddhist
Christian	64	5.52%	6% of SUs were Christian
Church of England (Anglican)	23	1.98%	2% of SUs were Church of England (Anglican)
Muslim	16	1.38%	1% of SUs were Muslim
No Religion	491	42.36%	42% of SUs were No Religion
Non Conformist	1	0.09%	0% of SUs were Non-Conformist

<b>Not Disclosed</b>	169	14.58%	15% of SUs were Not Disclosed
<b>Other</b>	7	0.60%	1% of SUs were Other
<b>Roman Catholic</b>	26	2.24%	2% of SUs were Roman Catholic
<b>Sikh</b>	2	0.17%	0% of SUs were Sikh
<b>Spiritualist</b>	1	0.09%	0% of SUs were Spiritualist
<b>Unknown</b>	63	5.44%	5% of SUs were Unknown
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1159</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

### Sexual orientation

<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	<b>Service Users</b>	<b>Service Users %</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
<b>Not recorded</b>	294	25.37%	25% of SUs were Not recorded
<b>Bisexual</b>	5	0.43%	0% of SUs were Bisexual
<b>Gay/Lesbian</b>	16	1.38%	1% of SUs were Gay/Lesbian
<b>Heterosexual/Straight</b>	605	52.20%	52% of SUs were Heterosexual/Straight
<b>Not Disclosed</b>	239	20.62%	21% of SUs were Not Disclosed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1159</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

### Transgender process

<b>Transgender process</b>	<b>Service Users</b>	<b>Service Users %</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
<b>Not recorded</b>	576	49.70%	50% of SUs were Not recorded
<b>No</b>	534	46.07%	46% of SUs were No
<b>Prefer Not To Say</b>	49	4.23%	4% of SUs were Prefer Not To Say
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1159</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Service User Protected Characteristics Data – 2018/19

### Breaches of Community and Suspended Sentence Orders

#### Age

Table 1 Proportion of SUs in each age category breached

Age Category	No Proven Breach	Proven Breach	Interpretation
Baby Boomer	92.94%	7.06%	7% of Baby Boomer SUs were breached
Gen X	84.43%	15.57%	16% of Gen X SUs were breached
Gen Y	77.83%	22.17%	22% of Gen Y SUs were breached
Gen Z	88.89%	11.11%	11% of Gen Z SUs were breached
Traditionalist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Traditionalist SUs were breached
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>80.69%</b>	<b>19.31%</b>	<b>19% of Cohort SUs were breached</b>

Table 2 Proportion of breaches by age category

Age Category	Service Users with Proven Breaches	Service Users with Proven Breaches %	Interpretation
Baby Boomer	24	2.53%	3% of breached SUs were Baby Boomer
Gen X	204	21.54%	22% of breached SUs were Gen X
Gen Y	718	75.82%	76% of breached SUs were Gen Y
Gen Z	1	0.11%	0% of breached SUs were Gen Z
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>947</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

#### Disability

Table 3 Proportion of SUs with/without disability breached

Recorded Disability	No Proven Breach	Proven Breach	Interpretation
No recorded disability	81.60%	18.40%	18% of No recorded disability SUs were breached
A recorded disability	78.91%	21.09%	21% of A recorded disability SUs were breached
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>80.69%</b>	<b>19.31%</b>	<b>19% of Cohort SUs were breached</b>

Table 4 Proportion of breaches by disability (binary)

Recorded Disability	Service Users with Proven Breaches	Service Users with Proven Breaches %	Interpretation
No recorded disability	598	63.01%	63% of breached SUs had No recorded disability
A recorded disability	351	36.99%	37% of breached SUs had A recorded disability
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Domestic Status

Table 5 Proportion of SUs breached by domestic status

Domestic Status	No Proven Breach	Proven Breach	Interpretation
Cohabiting	82.85%	17.15%	17% of Cohabiting SUs were breached
Divorced / Dissolved	92.16%	7.84%	8% of Divorced / Dissolved SUs were breached
In a relationship but not cohabiting	81.18%	18.82%	19% of In a relationship but not cohabiting SUs were breached
Married / Civil partnership	90.56%	9.44%	9% of Married / Civil partnership SUs were breached
Not Disclosed	72.19%	27.81%	28% of Not Disclosed SUs were breached
Not recorded	84.99%	15.01%	15% of Not recorded SUs were breached
Separated	86.11%	13.89%	14% of Separated SUs were breached
Single	74.96%	25.04%	25% of Single SUs were breached
Widowed	90.00%	10.00%	10% of Widowed SUs were breached
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>80.69%</b>	<b>19.31%</b>	<b>19% of Cohort SUs were breached</b>

Table 6 Proportion of breaches by domestic status

Domestic Status	Service Users with Proven Breaches	Service Users with Proven Breaches %	Interpretation
Cohabiting	59	6.22%	6% of breached SUs were Cohabiting
Divorced / Dissolved	4	0.42%	0% of breached SUs were Divorced / Dissolved
In a relationship but not cohabiting	16	1.69%	2% of breached SUs were In a relationship but not cohabiting
Married / Civil partnership	22	2.32%	2% of breached SUs were Married / Civil partnership
Not Disclosed	183	19.28%	19% of breached SUs were Not Disclosed
Not recorded	306	32.24%	32% of breached SUs were Not recorded
Separated	20	2.11%	2% of breached SUs were Separated
Single	338	35.62%	36% of breached SUs were Single
Widowed	1	0.11%	0% of breached SUs were Widowed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Ethnicity

Table 7 Proportion of SUs for each ethnicity breached

Ethnicity	No Proven Breach	Proven Breach	Interpretation
Not recorded	92.33%	7.67%	8% of Not recorded SUs were breached
Arab	75.00%	25.00%	25% of Arab SUs were breached
Asian or Asian British	89.02%	10.98%	11% of Asian or Asian British SUs were breached
Black or Black British	73.53%	26.47%	26% of Black or Black British SUs were breached
Mixed	78.95%	21.05%	21% of Mixed SUs were breached
Other Ethnic Group	95.24%	4.76%	5% of Other Ethnic Group SUs were breached
Refusal	90.08%	9.92%	10% of Refusal SUs were breached
White: All Other	84.84%	15.16%	15% of White: All Other SUs were breached
White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	79.32%	20.68%	21% of White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish SUs were breached
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>80.69%</b>	<b>19.31%</b>	<b>19% of Cohort SUs were breached</b>

Table 8 Proportion of breaches by ethnicity

Ethnicity	Service Users with Proven Breaches	Service Users with Proven Breaches %	Interpretation
Not recorded	24	2.53%	3% of breached SUs were Not recorded
Arab	1	0.11%	0% of breached SUs were Arab
Asian or Asian British	9	0.95%	1% of breached SUs were Asian or Asian British
Black or Black British	54	5.69%	6% of breached SUs were Black or Black British
Mixed	24	2.53%	3% of breached SUs were Mixed
Other Ethnic Group	1	0.11%	0% of breached SUs were Other Ethnic Group
Refusal	13	1.37%	1% of breached SUs were Refusal
White: All Other	37	3.90%	4% of breached SUs were White: All Other
White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	786	82.82%	83% of breached SUs were White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Gender

Table 9 Proportion of each gender breached

Gender	No Proven Breach	Proven Breach	Interpretation
Female	83.22%	16.78%	17% of Female SUs were breached
Male	80.15%	19.85%	20% of Male SUs were breached
Cohort	80.69%	19.31%	19% of Cohort SUs were breached

Table 10 Proportion of breaches by gender

Gender	Service Users with Proven Breaches	Service Users with Proven Breaches %	Interpretation
Female	144	15.17%	15% of breached SUs were Female
Male	805	84.83%	85% of breached SUs were Male
Cohort	949	100.00%	

## Religion

Table 11 Proportion of each religion breached

Religion	No Proven Breach	Proven Breach	Interpretation
Not recorded	84.14%	15.86%	16% of Not recorded SUs were breached
Agnostic	50.00%	50.00%	50% of Agnostic SUs were breached
Atheist	83.33%	16.67%	17% of Atheist SUs were breached
Buddhist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Buddhist SUs were breached
Christian	80.25%	19.75%	20% of Christian SUs were breached
Church of England (Anglican)	86.73%	13.27%	13% of Church of England (Anglican) SUs were breached
Mormon	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Mormon SUs were breached
Muslim	84.09%	15.91%	16% of Muslim SUs were breached
No Religion	77.94%	22.06%	22% of No Religion SUs were breached
Non Conformist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Non Conformist SUs were breached
Not Disclosed	81.23%	18.77%	19% of Not Disclosed SUs were breached
Other	83.33%	16.67%	17% of Other SUs were breached
Pagan	85.71%	14.29%	14% of Pagan SUs were breached
Roman Catholic	84.00%	16.00%	16% of Roman Catholic SUs were breached
Sikh	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Sikh SUs were breached
Spiritualist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Spiritualist SUs were breached
Unknown	82.49%	17.51%	18% of Unknown SUs were breached
Hindu	87.50%	12.50%	13% of Hindu SUs were breached
Jewish	50.00%	50.00%	50% of Jewish SUs were breached
Methodist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Methodist SUs were breached



Greek Orthodox	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Greek Orthodox SUs were breached
Jehovah's Witness	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Jehovah's Witness SUs were breached
Druid	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Druid SUs were breached
Orthodox (Greek/Russian)	50.00%	50.00%	50% of Orthodox (Greek/Russian) SUs were breached
Taoist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Taoist SUs were breached
Baptist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Baptist SUs were breached
Rastafarian	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Rastafarian SUs were breached
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>80.69%</b>	<b>19.31%</b>	<b>19% of Cohort SUs were breached</b>

Table 12 Proportion of breaches by religion

Religion	Service Users with Proven Breaches	Service Users with Proven Breaches %	Interpretation
Not recorded	177	18.65%	19% of breached SUs were Not recorded
Agnostic	1	0.11%	0% of breached SUs were Agnostic
Atheist	2	0.21%	0% of breached SUs were Atheist
Christian	64	6.74%	7% of breached SUs were Christian
Church of England (Anglican)	15	1.58%	2% of breached SUs were Church of England (Anglican)
Muslim	7	0.74%	1% of breached SUs were Muslim
No Religion	514	54.16%	54% of breached SUs were No Religion
Not Disclosed	101	10.64%	11% of breached SUs were Not Disclosed
Other	3	0.32%	0% of breached SUs were Other
Pagan	1	0.11%	0% of breached SUs were Pagan
Roman Catholic	28	2.95%	3% of breached SUs were Roman Catholic
Unknown	31	3.27%	3% of breached SUs were Unknown
Hindu	1	0.11%	0% of breached SUs were Hindu
Jewish	2	0.21%	0% of breached SUs were Jewish
Orthodox (Greek/Russian)	2	0.21%	0% of breached SUs were Orthodox (Greek/Russian)
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Sexual orientation

Table 13 Proportion of sexual orientation breached

Sexual Orientation	No Proven Breach	Proven Breach	Interpretation
Not recorded	84.86%	15.14%	15% of Not recorded SUs were breached
Bisexual	81.08%	18.92%	19% of Bisexual SUs were breached
Gay/Lesbian	87.50%	12.50%	13% of Gay/Lesbian SUs were breached
Heterosexual/Straight	79.23%	20.77%	21% of Heterosexual/Straight SUs were breached
Not Disclosed	80.11%	19.89%	20% of Not Disclosed SUs were breached
Other	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Other SUs were breached
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>80.69%</b>	<b>19.31%</b>	<b>19% of Cohort SUs were breached</b>

Table 14 Proportion of breaches by sexual orientation

Sexual Orientation	Service Users with Proven Breaches	Service Users with Proven Breaches %	Interpretation
Not recorded	165	17.39%	17% of breached SUs were Not recorded
Bisexual	7	0.74%	1% of breached SUs were Bisexual
Gay/Lesbian	4	0.42%	0% of breached SUs were Gay/Lesbian
Heterosexual/Straight	625	65.86%	66% of breached SUs were Heterosexual/Straight
Not Disclosed	148	15.60%	16% of breached SUs were Not Disclosed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Transgender process

Table 15 Proportion of transgender process breached

Transgender process	No Proven Breach	Proven Breach	Interpretation
Not recorded	85.16%	14.84%	15% of Not recorded SUs were breached
No	78.43%	21.57%	22% of No SUs were breached
Prefer Not To Say	73.47%	26.53%	27% of Prefer Not To Say SUs were breached
Yes	87.50%	12.50%	13% of Yes SUs were breached
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>80.69%</b>	<b>19.31%</b>	<b>19% of Cohort SUs were breached</b>

Table 16 Proportion of breaches by transgender process

Transgender process	Service Users with Proven Breaches	Service Users with Proven Breaches %	Interpretation
Not recorded	259	27.29%	27% of breached SUs were Not recorded
No	650	68.49%	68% of breached SUs were No
Prefer Not To Say	39	4.11%	4% of breached SUs were Prefer Not To Say
Yes	1	0.11%	0% of breached SUs were Yes
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Service Level Measure 008 - Completion of Community Orders and Suspended

### Age

Table 17 Proportion of SUs in each age category completions

Age Category	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Baby Boomer	11.52%	88.48%	88% of Baby Boomer SUs completed
Gen X	23.78%	76.22%	76% of Gen X SUs completed
Gen Y	28.96%	71.04%	71% of Gen Y SUs completed
Traditionalist	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Traditionalist SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>26.28%</b>	<b>73.72%</b>	<b>74% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 18 Proportion of completions by age category

Age Category	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Baby Boomer	169	8.28%	8% of completions were Baby Boomer
Gen X	577	28.26%	28% of completions were Gen X
Gen Y	1290	63.17%	63% of completions were Gen Y
Traditionalist	6	0.29%	0% of completions were Traditionalist
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2042</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

### Disability

Table 19 Proportion of SUs with/without disability completing

Recorded Disability	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
No recorded disability	20.99%	79.01%	79% of No recorded disability SUs completed
A recorded disability	38.98%	61.02%	61% of A recorded disability SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>26.34%</b>	<b>73.66%</b>	<b>74% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 20 Proportion of completions by disability (binary)

Recorded Disability	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
No recorded disability	1540	75.34%	75% of completions were No recorded disability
A recorded disability	504	24.66%	25% of completions were A recorded disability
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2044</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Domestic Status

Table 21 Proportion of SUs completing by domestic status

Domestic Status	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Cohabiting	32.17%	67.83%	68% of Cohabiting SUs completed
Divorced / Dissolved	20.00%	80.00%	80% of Divorced / Dissolved SUs completed
In a relationship but not cohabiting	33.33%	66.67%	67% of In a relationship but not cohabiting SUs completed
Married / Civil partnership	10.64%	89.36%	89% of Married / Civil partnership SUs completed
Not Disclosed	41.84%	58.16%	58% of Not Disclosed SUs completed
Not recorded	10.89%	89.11%	89% of Not recorded SUs completed
Separated	38.71%	61.29%	61% of Separated SUs completed
Single	46.89%	53.11%	53% of Single SUs completed
Widowed	40.00%	60.00%	60% of Widowed SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>26.31%</b>	<b>73.69%</b>	<b>74% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 22 Proportion of completions by domestic status

Domestic Status	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Cohabiting	97	4.74%	5% of completions were Cohabiting
Divorced / Dissolved	20	0.98%	1% of completions were Divorced / Dissolved
In a relationship but not cohabiting	16	0.78%	1% of completions were In a relationship but not cohabiting
Married / Civil partnership	84	4.10%	4% of completions were Married / Civil partnership
Not Disclosed	253	12.36%	12% of completions were Not Disclosed
Not recorded	1186	57.94%	58% of completions were Not recorded
Separated	38	1.86%	2% of completions were Separated
Single	350	17.10%	17% of completions were Single
Widowed	3	0.15%	0% of completions were Widowed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2047</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Ethnicity

Table 23 Proportion of SUs for each ethnicity completing

Ethnicity	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Not recorded	1.66%	98.34%	98% of Not recorded SUs completed
Arab	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Arab SUs completed
Asian or Asian British	22.86%	77.14%	77% of Asian or Asian British SUs completed
Black or Black British	36.89%	63.11%	63% of Black or Black British SUs completed
Mixed	23.73%	76.27%	76% of Mixed SUs completed
Other Ethnic Group	16.67%	83.33%	83% of Other Ethnic Group SUs completed
Refusal	5.49%	94.51%	95% of Refusal SUs completed
White: All other	18.60%	81.40%	81% of White: All other SUs completed
White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	31.08%	68.92%	69% of White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>26.34%</b>	<b>73.66%</b>	<b>74% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 24 Proportion of completions by ethnicity

Ethnicity	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Not recorded	297	14.53%	15% of completions were Not recorded
Arab	1	0.05%	0% of completions were Arab
Asian or Asian British	27	1.32%	1% of completions were Asian or Asian British
Black or Black British	65	3.18%	3% of completions were Black or Black British
Mixed	45	2.20%	2% of completions were Mixed
Other Ethnic Group	10	0.49%	0% of completions were Other Ethnic Group
Refusal	86	4.21%	4% of completions were Refusal
White: All Other	105	5.14%	5% of completions were White: All Other
White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	1408	68.88%	69% of completions were White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2044</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Gender

Table 25 Proportion of each gender completing

Gender	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Female	22.36%	77.64%	78% of Female SUs completed
Male	27.20%	72.80%	73% of Male SUs completed
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>26.34%</b>	<b>73.66%</b>	<b>74% of Grand Total SUs completed</b>

Table 26 Proportion of completions by gender

Gender	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Female	382	18.69%	19% of completions were Female
Male	1662	81.31%	81% of completions were Male
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2044</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Religion

Table 27 Proportion of each religion completing

Religion	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Not recorded	10.91%	89.09%	89% of Not recorded SUs completed
Agnostic	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Agnostic SUs completed
Atheist	66.67%	33.33%	33% of Atheist SUs completed
Buddhist	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Buddhist SUs completed
Christian	28.57%	71.43%	71% of Christian SUs completed
Church of England (Anglican)	26.32%	73.68%	74% of Church of England (Anglican) SUs completed
Mormon	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Mormon SUs completed
Muslim	19.23%	80.77%	81% of Muslim SUs completed
No Religion	33.94%	66.06%	66% of No Religion SUs completed
Non Conformist	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Non Conformist SUs completed
Not Disclosed	30.37%	69.63%	70% of Not Disclosed SUs completed
Other	27.27%	72.73%	73% of Other SUs completed
Pagan	50.00%	50.00%	50% of Pagan SUs completed
Roman Catholic	36.00%	64.00%	64% of Roman Catholic SUs completed
Sikh	66.67%	33.33%	33% of Sikh SUs completed
Spiritualist	50.00%	50.00%	50% of Spiritualist SUs completed
Unknown	13.85%	86.15%	86% of Unknown SUs completed
Hindu	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Hindu SUs completed
Jewish	50.00%	50.00%	50% of Jewish SUs completed
Methodist	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Methodist SUs completed
Greek Orthodox	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Greek Orthodox SUs completed
Jehovah's Witness	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Jehovah's Witness SUs completed
Orthodox (Greek/Russian)	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Orthodox (Greek/Russian) SUs completed
Baptist	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Baptist SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>26.34%</b>	<b>73.66%</b>	<b>74% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 28 Proportion of completions by religion

Religion	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Not recorded	604	29.55%	30% of completions were Not recorded
Agnostic	1	0.05%	0% of completions were Agnostic
Atheist	1	0.05%	0% of completions were Atheist
Buddhist	3	0.15%	0% of completions were Buddhist
Christian	110	5.38%	5% of completions were Christian
Church of England (Anglican)	42	2.05%	2% of completions were Church of England (Anglican)
Mormon	1	0.05%	0% of completions were Mormon
Muslim	21	1.03%	1% of completions were Muslim
No Religion	833	40.75%	41% of completions were No Religion
Non Conformist	1	0.05%	0% of completions were Non Conformist
Not Disclosed	227	11.11%	11% of completions were Not Disclosed
Other	8	0.39%	0% of completions were Other
Pagan	2	0.10%	0% of completions were Pagan
Roman Catholic	64	3.13%	3% of completions were Roman Catholic
Sikh	1	0.05%	0% of completions were Sikh
Spiritualist	1	0.05%	0% of completions were Spiritualist
Unknown	112	5.48%	5% of completions were Unknown
Hindu	4	0.20%	0% of completions were Hindu
Jewish	1	0.05%	0% of completions were Jewish
Methodist	1	0.05%	0% of completions were Methodist
Greek Orthodox	3	0.15%	0% of completions were Greek Orthodox
Jehovah's Witness	2	0.10%	0% of completions were Jehovah's Witness
Baptist	1	0.05%	0% of completions were Baptist
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2044</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Sexual orientation

Table 29 Proportion of sexual orientation completing

Sexual Orientation	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Not recorded	9.79%	90.21%	90% of Not recorded SUs completed
Bisexual	30.43%	69.57%	70% of Bisexual SUs completed
Gay/Lesbian	37.50%	62.50%	63% of Gay/Lesbian SUs completed
Heterosexual/Straight	34.44%	65.56%	66% of Heterosexual/Straight SUs completed
Not Disclosed	23.37%	76.63%	77% of Not Disclosed SUs completed
Other	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Other SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>26.34%</b>	<b>73.66%</b>	<b>74% of Cohort SUs completed</b>



Table 30 Proportion of completions by sexual orientation

Sexual Orientation	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Not recorded	689	24.35%	24% of completions were Not recorded
Bisexual	23	0.81%	1% of completions were Bisexual
Gay/Lesbian	18	0.64%	1% of completions were Gay/Lesbian
Heterosexual/Straight	1570	55.50%	55% of completions were Heterosexual/Straight
Not Disclosed	528	18.66%	19% of completions were Not Disclosed
Other	1	0.04%	0% of completions were Other
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2829</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Transgender process

Table 31 Proportion of transgender process completing

Transgender process	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Not recorded	12.14%	87.86%	88% of Not recorded SUs completed
No	36.84%	63.16%	63% of No SUs completed
Prefer Not To Say	31.82%	68.18%	68% of Prefer Not To Say SUs completed
Yes	66.67%	33.33%	33% of Yes SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>26.34%</b>	<b>73.66%</b>	<b>74% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 32 Proportion of completions by transgender process

Transgender process	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Not recorded	1020	49.90%	50% of completions were Not recorded
No	948	46.38%	46% of completions were No
Prefer Not To Say	75	3.67%	4% of completions were Prefer Not To Say
Yes	1	0.05%	0% of completions were Yes
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>2044</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Recalls to Custody

### Age

Table 33 Proportion of SUs in each age category recalls

Age Category	Not recalled	Recalled	Interpretation
Baby Boomer	97.04%	2.96%	3% of Baby Boomer SUs were recalled
Gen X	91.80%	8.20%	8% of Gen X SUs were recalled
Gen Y	87.97%	12.03%	12% of Gen Y SUs were recalled
Gen Z	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Gen Z SUs were recalled
Traditionalist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Traditionalist SUs were recalled
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>89.82%</b>	<b>10.18%</b>	<b>10% of Cohort SUs were recalled</b>

Table 34 Proportion of recalls by age category

Age Category	Service Users Recalled	Service Users Recalled %	Interpretation
Baby Boomer	4	2.11%	2% of recalled SUs were Baby Boomer
Gen X	46	24.21%	24% of recalled SUs were Gen X
Gen Y	140	73.68%	74% of recalled SUs were Gen Y
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

### Disability

Table 35 Proportion of SUs with/without disability recalls

Recorded Disability	Not recalled	Recalled	Interpretation
No recorded disability	91.02%	8.98%	9% of No recorded disability SUs were recalled
A recorded disability	86.82%	13.18%	13% of A recorded disability SUs were recalled
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>89.86%</b>	<b>10.14%</b>	<b>10% of Cohort SUs were recalled</b>

Table 36 Proportion of recalls by disability (binary)

Recorded Disability	Service Users Recalled	Service Users Recalled %	Interpretation
No recorded disability	122	64.21%	64% of recalled SUs had No recorded disability
A recorded disability	68	35.79%	36% of recalled SUs had A recorded disability
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Domestic Status

Table 37 Proportion of SUs recalled by domestic status

Domestic Status	Not recalled	Recalled	Interpretation
Cohabiting	92.94%	7.06%	7% of Cohabiting SUs were recalled
Divorced / Dissolved	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Divorced / Dissolved SUs were recalled
In a relationship but not cohabiting	92.86%	7.14%	7% of In a relationship but not cohabiting SUs were recalled
Married / Civil partnership	97.73%	2.27%	2% of Married / Civil partnership SUs were recalled
Not Disclosed	81.85%	18.15%	18% of Not Disclosed SUs were recalled
Not recorded	92.92%	7.08%	7% of Not recorded SUs were recalled
Separated	85.71%	14.29%	14% of Separated SUs were recalled
Single	86.90%	13.10%	13% of Single SUs were recalled
Widowed	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Widowed SUs were recalled
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>89.86%</b>	<b>10.14%</b>	<b>10% of Cohort SUs were recalled</b>

Table 38 Proportion of recalls by domestic status

Domestic Status	Service Users Recalled	Service Users Recalled %	Interpretation
Cohabiting	6	3.16%	3% of recalled SUs were Cohabiting
In a relationship but not cohabiting	1	0.53%	1% of recalled SUs were In a relationship but not cohabiting
Married / Civil partnership	1	0.53%	1% of recalled SUs were Married / Civil partnership
Not Disclosed	57	30.00%	30% of recalled SUs were Not Disclosed
Not recorded	70	36.84%	37% of recalled SUs were Not recorded
Separated	3	1.58%	2% of recalled SUs were Separated
Single	52	27.37%	27% of recalled SUs were Single
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Ethnicity

Table 39 Proportion of SUs for each ethnicity recalled

Ethnicity	Not recalled	Recalled	Interpretation
Not recorded	97.30%	2.70%	3% of Not recorded SUs were recalled
Arab	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Arab SUs were recalled
Asian or Asian British	92.11%	7.89%	8% of Asian or Asian British SUs were recalled
Black or Black British	93.88%	6.12%	6% of Black or Black British SUs were recalled
Mixed	91.11%	8.89%	9% of Mixed SUs were recalled
Other Ethnic Group	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Other Ethnic Group SUs were recalled
Refusal	92.98%	7.02%	7% of Refusal SUs were recalled
White: All Other	88.61%	11.39%	11% of White: All Other SUs were recalled
White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	89.01%	10.99%	11% of White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish SUs were recalled
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>89.86%</b>	<b>10.14%</b>	<b>10% of Cohort SUs were recalled</b>

Table 40 Proportion of recalls by ethnicity

Ethnicity	Service Users Recalled	Service Users Recalled %	Interpretation
Not recorded	2	1.05%	1% of recalled SUs were Not recorded
Asian or Asian British	3	1.58%	2% of recalled SUs were Asian or Asian British
Black or Black British	6	3.16%	3% of recalled SUs were Black or Black British
Mixed	4	2.11%	2% of recalled SUs were Mixed
Refusal	4	2.11%	2% of recalled SUs were Refusal
White: All Other	9	4.74%	5% of recalled SUs were White: All Other
White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	162	85.26%	85% of recalled SUs were White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Gender

Table 41 Proportion of each gender recalls

Gender	Not recalled	Recalled	Interpretation
Female	88.18%	11.82%	12% of Female SUs were recalled
Male	90.07%	9.93%	10% of Male SUs were recalled
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>89.86%</b>	<b>10.14%</b>	<b>10% of Cohort SUs were recalled</b>

Table 42 Proportion of recalls by gender

Gender	Service Users Recalled	Service Users Recalled %	Interpretation
Female	24	12.63%	13% of recalled SUs were Female
Male	166	87.37%	87% of recalled SUs were Male
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Religion

Table 43 Proportion of each religion recalls

Religion	Not recalled	Recalled	Interpretation
Not recorded	93.74%	6.26%	6% of Not recorded SUs were recalled
Agnostic	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Agnostic SUs were recalled
Atheist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Atheist SUs were recalled
Buddhist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Buddhist SUs were recalled
Christian	90.32%	9.68%	10% of Christian SUs were recalled
Church of England (Anglican)	90.32%	9.68%	10% of Church of England (Anglican) SUs were recalled
Mormon	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Mormon SUs were recalled
Muslim	86.96%	13.04%	13% of Muslim SUs were recalled
No Religion	87.10%	12.90%	13% of No Religion SUs were recalled
Non Conformist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Non Conformist SUs were recalled
Not Disclosed	87.73%	12.27%	12% of Not Disclosed SUs were recalled
Other	87.50%	12.50%	13% of Other SUs were recalled
Pagan	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Pagan SUs were recalled
Protestant	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Protestant SUs were recalled
Roman Catholic	96.00%	4.00%	4% of Roman Catholic SUs were recalled
Sikh	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Sikh SUs were recalled
Spiritualist	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Spiritualist SUs were recalled
Unknown	84.42%	15.58%	16% of Unknown SUs were recalled
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>89.86%</b>	<b>10.14%</b>	<b>10% of Cohort SUs were recalled</b>

Table 44 Proportion of recalls by religion

Religion	Service Users Recalled	Service Users Recalled %	Interpretation
Not recorded	38	20.00%	20% of recalled SUs were Not recorded
Christian	12	6.32%	6% of recalled SUs were Christian
Church of England (Anglican)	3	1.58%	2% of recalled SUs were Church of England (Anglican)
Muslim	3	1.58%	2% of recalled SUs were Muslim
No Religion	85	44.74%	45% of recalled SUs were No Religion
Not Disclosed	34	17.89%	18% of recalled SUs were Not Disclosed
Other	1	0.53%	1% of recalled SUs were Other
Roman Catholic	2	1.05%	1% of recalled SUs were Roman Catholic
Unknown	12	6.32%	6% of recalled SUs were Unknown
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Sexual orientation

Table 45 Proportion of sexual orientation recalls

Sexual Orientation	Not recalled	Recalled	Interpretation
Not recorded	93.39%	6.61%	7% of Not recorded SUs were recalled
Bisexual	90.91%	9.09%	9% of Bisexual SUs were recalled
Gay/Lesbian	84.62%	15.38%	15% of Gay/Lesbian SUs were recalled
Heterosexual/Straight	88.08%	11.92%	12% of Heterosexual/Straight SUs were recalled
Not Disclosed	88.67%	11.33%	11% of Not Disclosed SUs were recalled
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>89.86%</b>	<b>10.14%</b>	<b>10% of Cohort SUs were recalled</b>

Table 46 Proportion of recalls by sexual orientation

Sexual Orientation	Service Users Recalled	Service Users Recalled %	Interpretation
Not recorded	39	20.53%	21% of recalled SUs were Not recorded
Bisexual	1	0.53%	1% of recalled SUs were Bisexual
Gay/Lesbian	2	1.05%	1% of recalled SUs were Gay/Lesbian
Heterosexual/Straight	107	56.32%	56% of recalled SUs were Heterosexual/Straight
Not Disclosed	41	21.58%	22% of recalled SUs were Not Disclosed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Transgender process

Table 47 Proportion of transgender process recalls

Transgender process	Not recalled	Recalled	Interpretation
Not recorded	91.87%	8.13%	8% of Not recorded SUs were recalled
No	87.56%	12.44%	12% of No SUs were recalled
Prefer Not To Say	87.72%	12.28%	12% of Prefer Not To Say SUs were recalled
Yes	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Yes SUs were recalled
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>89.86%</b>	<b>10.14%</b>	<b>10% of Cohort SUs were recalled</b>

Table 48 Proportion of recalls by transgender process

Transgender process	Service Users Recalled	Service Users Recalled %	Interpretation
Not recorded	81	42.63%	43% of recalled SUs were Not recorded
No	102	53.68%	54% of recalled SUs were No
Prefer Not To Say	7	3.68%	4% of recalled SUs were Prefer Not To Say
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Assurance Metric J - Compliance with Licences and Post Sentence Supervision Periods

### Age

Table 49 Proportion of SUs in each age category completions

Age Category	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Baby Boomer	12.96%	87.04%	87% of Baby Boomer SUs completed
Gen X	32.20%	67.80%	68% of Gen X SUs completed
Gen Y	41.24%	58.76%	59% of Gen Y SUs completed
Traditionalist	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Traditionalist SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>36.65%</b>	<b>63.35%</b>	<b>63% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 50 Proportion of completions by age category

Age Category	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Baby Boomer	47	9.00%	9% of completions were Baby Boomer
Gen X	160	30.65%	31% of completions were Gen X
Gen Y	312	59.77%	60% of completions were Gen Y
Traditionalist	3	0.57%	1% of completions were Traditionalist
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

### Disability

Table 51 Proportion of SUs with/without disability completing

Recorded Disability	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
No recorded disability	33.28%	66.72%	67% of No recorded disability SUs completed
A recorded disability	45.13%	54.87%	55% of A recorded disability SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>36.52%</b>	<b>63.48%</b>	<b>63% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 52 Proportion of completions by disability (binary)

Disability	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
No recorded disability	401	76.38%	76% of completions were No recorded disability
A recorded disability	124	23.62%	24% of completions were A recorded disability
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Domestic Status

Table 53 Proportion of SUs completing by domestic status

Domestic Status	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Cohabiting	28.00%	72.00%	72% of Cohabiting SUs completed
Divorced / Dissolved	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Divorced / Dissolved SUs completed
In a relationship but not cohabiting	50.00%	50.00%	50% of In a relationship but not cohabiting SUs completed
Married / Civil partnership	7.69%	92.31%	92% of Married / Civil partnership SUs completed
Not Disclosed	58.39%	41.61%	42% of Not Disclosed SUs completed
Not recorded	24.84%	75.16%	75% of Not recorded SUs completed
Separated	50.00%	50.00%	50% of Separated SUs completed
Single	51.46%	48.54%	49% of Single SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>36.52%</b>	<b>63.48%</b>	<b>63% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 54 Proportion of completions by domestic status

Domestic Status	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Cohabiting	18	3.43%	3% of completions were Cohabiting
Divorced / Dissolved	2	0.38%	0% of completions were Divorced / Dissolved
In a relationship but not cohabiting	2	0.38%	0% of completions were In a relationship but not cohabiting
Married / Civil partnership	12	2.29%	2% of completions were Married / Civil partnership
Not Disclosed	62	11.81%	12% of completions were Not Disclosed
Not recorded	342	65.14%	65% of completions were Not recorded
Separated	4	0.76%	1% of completions were Separated
Single	83	15.81%	16% of completions were Single
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	



## Ethnicity

Table 55 Proportion of SUs for each ethnicity completing

Ethnicity	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Not recorded	6.78%	93.22%	93% of Not recorded SUs completed
Asian or Asian British	35.71%	64.29%	64% of Asian or Asian British SUs completed
Black or Black British	23.53%	76.47%	76% of Black or Black British SUs completed
Mixed	34.78%	65.22%	65% of Mixed SUs completed
Other Ethnic Group	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Other Ethnic Group SUs completed
Refusal	21.05%	78.95%	79% of Refusal SUs completed
White: All other	58.33%	41.67%	42% of White: All other SUs completed
White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	39.66%	60.34%	60% of White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>36.52%</b>	<b>63.48%</b>	<b>63% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 56 Proportion of completions by ethnicity

Ethnicity	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Not recorded	55	10.48%	10% of completions were Not recorded
Asian or Asian British	9	1.71%	2% of completions were Asian or Asian British
Black or Black British	26	4.95%	5% of completions were Black or Black British
Mixed	15	2.86%	3% of completions were Mixed
Other Ethnic Group	1	0.19%	0% of completions were Other Ethnic Group
Refusal	15	2.86%	3% of completions were Refusal
White: All Other	10	1.90%	2% of completions were White: All Other
White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	394	75.05%	75% of completions were White: British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Gender

Table 57 Proportion of each gender completing

Gender	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Female	47.06%	52.94%	53% of Female SUs completed
Male	35.03%	64.97%	65% of Male SUs completed
Cohort	36.52%	63.48%	63% of Cohort SUs completed

Table 58 Proportion of completions by gender

Gender	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Female	54	10.29%	10% of completions were Female
Male	471	89.71%	90% of completions were Male
Cohort	525	100.00%	

## Religion

Table 59 Proportion of each religion completing

Religion	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Not recorded	22.40%	77.60%	78% of Not recorded SUs completed
Atheist	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Atheist SUs completed
Buddhist	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Buddhist SUs completed
Christian	42.86%	57.14%	57% of Christian SUs completed
Church of England (Anglican)	50.00%	50.00%	50% of Church of England (Anglican) SUs completed
Muslim	50.00%	50.00%	50% of Muslim SUs completed
No Religion	44.27%	55.73%	56% of No Religion SUs completed
Non Conformist	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Non Conformist SUs completed
Not Disclosed	34.62%	65.38%	65% of Not Disclosed SUs completed
Other	100.00%	0.00%	0% of Other SUs completed
Roman Catholic	46.67%	53.33%	53% of Roman Catholic SUs completed
Spiritualist	0.00%	100.00%	100% of Spiritualist SUs completed
Unknown	51.16%	48.84%	49% of Unknown SUs completed
Cohort	36.52%	63.48%	63% of Cohort SUs completed

Table 60 Proportion of completions by religion

Religion	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Not recorded	194	36.95%	37% of completions were Not recorded
Atheist	1	0.19%	0% of completions were Atheist
Buddhist	2	0.38%	0% of completions were Buddhist
Christian	24	4.57%	5% of completions were Christian

Church of England (Anglican)	7	1.33%	1% of completions were Church of England (Anglican)
Muslim	6	1.14%	1% of completions were Muslim
No Religion	175	33.33%	33% of completions were No Religion
Non Conformist	1	0.19%	0% of completions were Non Conformist
Not Disclosed	85	16.19%	16% of completions were Not Disclosed
Roman Catholic	8	1.52%	2% of completions were Roman Catholic
Spiritualist	1	0.19%	0% of completions were Spiritualist
Unknown	21	4.00%	4% of completions were Unknown
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Sexual orientation

Table 61 Proportion of sexual orientation completing

Sexual Orientation	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Not recorded	23.90%	76.10%	76% of Not recorded SUs completed
Bisexual	75.00%	25.00%	25% of Bisexual SUs completed
Gay/Lesbian	54.55%	45.45%	45% of Gay/Lesbian SUs completed
Heterosexual/Straight	45.09%	54.91%	55% of Heterosexual/Straight SUs completed
Not Disclosed	32.93%	67.07%	67% of Not Disclosed SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>36.52%</b>	<b>63.48%</b>	<b>63% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 62 Proportion of completions by sexual orientation

Sexual Orientation	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Not recorded	294	25.37%	25% of completions were Not recorded
Bisexual	5	0.43%	0% of completions were Bisexual
Gay/Lesbian	16	1.38%	1% of completions were Gay/Lesbian
Heterosexual/Straight	605	52.20%	52% of completions were Heterosexual/Straight
Not Disclosed	239	20.62%	21% of completions were Not Disclosed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>1159</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Transgender process

Table 63 Proportion of transgender process completing

Transgender process	Incomplete	Complete	Interpretation
Not recorded	26.14%	73.86%	74% of Not recorded SUs completed
No	49.56%	50.44%	50% of No SUs completed
Prefer Not To Say	48.28%	51.72%	52% of Prefer Not To Say SUs completed
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>36.52%</b>	<b>63.48%</b>	<b>63% of Cohort SUs completed</b>

Table 64 Proportion of completions by transgender process

Transgender process	Service Users Completing	Service Users Completing %	Interpretation
Not recorded	339	64.57%	65% of completions were Not recorded
No	171	32.57%	33% of completions were No
Prefer Not To Say	15	2.86%	3% of completions were Prefer Not To Say
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	