



CAPITAL CITY PARTNERSHIP

Occasional research papers (1)

Recorded Ethnicity on Caselink – September 2020

This paper looks at the ethnicity recorded by clients on Caselink. The data was downloaded from Caselink on the 22nd September 2020 and looks at all clients who;

- Had an Edinburgh address
- Had started with a provider since 1st April 2019 or had started prior to that date but had an active engagement on the 22nd September 2020.
- Had achieved and verified an outcome between 1st April 2019 and 22nd September 2020.

Overall, there were 6,218 engagement records and 3,081 outcome records that fell within these parameters. One point to make is that the outcomes could have been achieved by clients who don't feature in the engagement count as their engagement had been marked as completed and was no longer active at the time of the data download.

Table 1 below looks at the overall breakdown of these clients by ethnicity and compares this to the Ethnic split of Edinburgh as identified by the 2011 census.

Table 1 Ethnicity of Caselink Clients Compared to 2011 Census Results

	Count	Percentage	2011 Census for Edinburgh
White Scottish	3187	51%	70.20%
Other British	1047	17%	11.70%
Irish	31	0%	1.80%
Other White	717	12%	7.90%
TOTAL WHITE	4982	80%	91.70%
Asian	344	6%	5.50%
African	163	3%	0.90%
Caribbean/Black	165	3%	0.20%
Mixed/Multiple	60	1%	0.80%
Other Non-White	239	4%	0.80%
TOTAL NON-WHITE	971	16%	8.20%
Not Known	265	4%	
All	6218	100%	

This broad white and non-white split is how it has been presented in the census summary prepared by CEC¹ and to allow comparability this report follows this format. What we can see is that overall 16% of clients are Non-White, almost double the figure for Edinburgh from the last Census.

Table 2 looks at the percentage of clients who are within particular broad ethnic groups by provider. We can see that with one or two exceptions, overall there is a split in ethnicity that is either similar to the census breakdown for Edinburgh, or indicates more representation from BAME communities than would have been anticipated based simply on the ethnic split in the city.

¹ <https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/24253/ethnicity-and-related-themes-topic-report-for-edinburgh>

Table 2 Percentage of Clients by Ethnicity in terms of Providers

	Access to Industry	Action for Children	All Cleaned Up	All in Edinburgh	Canongate Youth	CEC MA	CEC NOLB Stage 1	Childcare Providers	Citadel	CHAI	COSS	Community Renewal	Cyrenians	Dunedin Canmore	Fort Kinnaird	FUSE	Impact Arts	LINKnet	Support at Work	Broomhouse Centre	Volunteer Edinburgh	Working Rite	2011 Census for Edinburgh
White Scottish	72	84	0	50	48	75	78	37	76	47	32	47	65	74	30	16	52	0	49	61	38	89	70.2
Other British	12	6	100	26	25	8	11	16	7	6	9	13	14	4	27	48	21	3	18	27	25	0	11.7
Irish	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1.8
Other White	5	2	0	10	1	7	4	23	2	12	14	17	9	6	4	14	1	26	13	7	14	6	7.9
TOTAL WHITE	90	93	100	86	74	90	92	76	85	65	57	77	89	83	62	79	74	29	82	95	77	94	91.7
Asian	3	1	0	7	3	4	2	3	2	7	26	7	2	0	3	2	12	24	6	0	11	0	5.5
African	1	0	0	1	4	1	0	4	4	10	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	0	0.9
Caribbean/ Black	1	2	0	1	3	1	0	2	0	5	1	5	1	0	0	4	0	4	2	2	1	0	0.2
Mixed/ Multiple	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	6	0.8
Other Non- White	1	1	0	3	0	0	1	4	2	12	5	4	0	2	7	4	3	40	5	0	5	0	0.8
TOTAL NON-WHITE	7	4	0	13	10	8	3	15	12	35	38	21	5	3	11	11	15	71	17	5	22	6	8.2
Not Known	3	4	0	1	16	1	5	9	2	0	5	2	6	14	27	11	11	0	1	0	1	0	

A couple of points to bear in mind. Firstly, some providers may specialise in supporting specific client groups which may explain the BAME split. LINKnet for example focus on working with BAME clients, this is reflected in the fact that 71% of their clients described their ethnicity as non-white. Other providers work with groups where there may be an implicit ethnic imbalance, for example, prison-leavers. Given that 95% of Scotland's prison population are white² this gives reduced scope for working with BAME individuals.

Secondly, we have to remember that the client group being supported by these providers are generally requiring assistance to find work or progress in the labour market. This is important as unemployment does not necessarily affect all ethnicities the same.

For example, the attainment of school leavers differs by ethnicity. McPherson³ in her 2015 report to the Scottish Parliament found that that the average tariff⁴ score across all students when leaving school (based on ethnicity) was 461. Chinese pupils achieved the highest average tariff score (671) and white Scottish pupils achieved the lowest average score (404). The average tariff score for all other Asian pupils - and among pupils from a mixed or multiple ethnic grouping - was at, or slightly above, the pupil average. Pupils of non-Scottish white ethnicity or whose ethnicity is African, Black or Caribbean performed less well than the average (438 and 433 respectively). All things being equal therefore we would expect to see more of the lower tariff score ethnicities being supported by early stage employability programmes such as Activity Agreements.

McPherson's report also looks in detail at rates of employment among different ethnic minority groups. She found that people who report their ethnicity as Indian have a higher than average employment rate – 80.1 per cent in 2014 compared with a Scottish average of 73.2 per cent. By contrast, most other minority ethnic groups have an employment rate below the Scottish average, with Pakistani and Bangladeshi people having the lowest employment rate (52.3%), and people from mixed or multiple ethnicities a rate of 62.9 per cent.

The final factor to bear in mind is geography. Some of the providers work in specific areas of the city. If these areas are more or less ethnically diverse then it would follow that projects should reflect this in their client groups.

Table 3 below looks at outcomes. We can see overall the number of outcomes recorded and verified for Edinburgh residents since 1/4/2019 and then also the number of outcomes recorded and verified by broad ethnicity groups. Overall, there were 3,081 outcomes recorded and verified since 1/4/2019. To try and put this in some context we can then compare the number of outcomes achieved with the number of clients engaged.

What we can see is that of the 3,081 outcomes, 2,634 were achieved by clients who had an ethnicity described as white and 380 by clients with an ethnicity described as non-white. From this we can see that whilst 80% of clients were white, 86% of outcomes were achieved by this ethnicity. Compare this to the fact that of all outcomes 12% were achieved by those that described themselves as non-white, who made up 16% of the client group.

² <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-prison-population-statistics-2019-20/pages/4/>

³ http://www.parliament.scot/ResearchBriefingsAndFactsheets/S4/SB_15-31_Ethnicity_and_Employment.pdf

⁴ The level of an award (e.g. Advanced Higher) and the grade achieved in that award will provide a pupil with tariff points. The higher the level and grade of award, the higher the tariff points achieved. The total of all tariff points achieved by the time the pupil leaves school gives the total tariff score achieved.

Table 3 Verified Outcomes by Ethnicity

Row Labels	All Clients		White		Non White		Ethnicity Not Known/ Blank	
	Count	Ratio	Count	Ratio	Count	Ratio	Count	Ratio
Employability Training	230	27	198	25	28	35	4	66
In Work Progression	84	74	66	75	18	54		
Job Entry Full Time	525	12	427	12	93	10	5	53
Job Entry Part Time	194	32	161	31	30	32	3	88
Activity Agreement	70	89	68	73	1	971	1	265
Education Full-Time	183	34	157	32	19	51	7	38
Education Part-Time	83	75	63	79	19	51	1	265
Other	61	102	46	108	11	88	4	66
Vocational Training	582	11	522	10	54	18	6	44
Volunteering	106	59	85	59	20	49	1	265
Work Placement	100	62	95	52	5	194		
Qualification	637	10	554	9	59	16	24	11
Re-Engage with Education	103	60	84	59	8	121	11	24
Retained Employment	109	57	95	52	14	69		
Self-Employed Outcome	13	478	12	415	1	971		
Supported Employment	1	6218	1	4982				
Grand Total	3081	2	2634	2	380	3	67	4

Table 3 goes further and looks at the number of particular outcomes achieved by ethnicity of the client. The table also gives a broad ratio, so for example there were 4,982 client engagements since the 1st April 2019 where the client identified as a white ethnicity, which, based on 427 full time jobs, suggest that 1 full time job was achieved for every 12 white clients. For non-white clients the ratio was 1 job for every 10 clients. This allows us to see if there are any particular outcome categories where non-white clients have higher, or lower, chances. This indicates that as well as non-white clients appearing to have more chance of achieving a full-time job outcome, a similar picture is apparent for in-work progression. On the other hand, chances of achieving an outcome for Work Placements or Activity Agreements is lower than for the cohort as a whole and for their white contemporaries. It should be noted that overall there are less young non-white clients within the cohort that we have looked at – 39% of the white group are under the age of 25 whilst only 22% of the non-white group are under 25. This will have an impact on outcomes such as Work Placements and Activity Agreements that tend to be achieved by younger clients.

Conclusion

Overall, we can see that based on the data held on Caselink compared to the 2011 Census there are, proportionally, slightly more clients from a non-white background receiving support in Edinburgh than we would expect. Clearly there are a number of caveats that would have to be raised including the fact that the ethnic make-up of the city might have changed over the last 9 years. Perhaps more interesting is the outcomes data where we can see that proportionally there have been 1 full time job outcomes for every 10 non-white clients compared to 1 for every 12 white clients.

Where non-white clients appear to be under-represented looks to be in services that deliver at the early stage of the pipeline and also in outcomes that may be more young people focused, such as work placements.