

The Next Level: Good Lives for All in Greater Manchester

The report of
**The Greater Manchester
Independent Inequalities
Commission**



This is the time... And this is the place



Contents

Chair's Foreword	3
The Greater Manchester Independent Inequalities Commission	4
Summary and recommendations	5
<hr/>	
Full Report	
What is the Independent Inequalities Commission?	14
What do we mean by inequalities?	15
How unequal is Greater Manchester?	17
<hr/>	
The vision: Good lives for all in Greater Manchester	24
The essential pivot	26
Power in people's hands	33
Good jobs, decent pay	39
Building wealth	44
Services for a good life	49
<hr/>	
Creating a system for change in Greater Manchester	57
Actions for central government	60
Next steps	61
<hr/>	
Acknowledgements	62

Chair's Foreword

“A good society is a society which believes that it is not good enough” Zygmunt Bauman

During the past few months, while the world has drawn a collective breath, imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic – the Greater Manchester Independent Inequalities Commission has seized this moment to survey the damage done and the inequalities exposed. Amid deep uncertainties, we believe this is a once in a lifetime chance to build a fairer society fit for the future; the pandemic brings opportunities as well as lessons.

At the same time that Covid-19 was laying bare the deep fractures of inequality running across our society, revealing just how unprepared we were for unexpected and unimagined challenges, the resurgence of the [Black Lives Matter](#) movement shone more light than ever on the blight of racism, discrimination and prejudice within our midst – in our institutions and in our relationships with one another.

Our Commission has set its compass by these two guiding stars: Covid-19 and Black Lives Matter have shown us the depth of the inequalities we must transcend but they have also revealed the strengths within our communities, our collective spirit, and how much we care for each other. We don't know what the future holds, but we know it can't be the same as the past. The Commission has focused on what truly matters for people in Greater Manchester, recognising that sustainable wellbeing should be the real wealth of the city-region.

This must be a time of great hope. A time for change, a time of recognition that we all want to build back better, and that we cannot let the shadows of the past dim the bright promise of a fairer future.

We applaud the openness to the Commission's work that we have encountered from everyone we've met in Greater Manchester. As we've engaged with diverse groups, we've been struck by two things. First, the wealth of good things already happening within this vibrant city-region to reduce inequalities – the Commission recognises these and hopes its recommendations will amplify them. Second, the strength of representations from the people we have met, rightly articulating the inequalities that affect them most, and sharing their ideas for change. Thank you to all who gave us your time and your truths.

I must also thank my fellow Commissioners. They are an outstanding group, bringing great expertise and experience to our work. They have brought passion, humour, integrity and tenacity to the Commission and devoted far more time to it than they could ever have anticipated at the start. All our work has been conducted remotely, with the technical and social challenges that involves, but there has been a real spirit of friendship and commitment to consensus in our meetings – so thank you, colleagues, for your work and your wisdom.

Finally, my thanks to everyone who reads this report and joins the conversation. This is a pivotal time, but we all need to pivot together. As an independent Commission our aim has been to encourage everyone in Greater Manchester – politicians, policymakers and public – to join in making the enlightened and bold changes that are needed. Those who currently have power and privilege need to come together with those most affected by interacting and intersecting inequalities and injustices to take the Commission's recommendations forward. This report is only the first step in taking Greater Manchester to the next level and creating good lives for all. We hope that reading it will give YOU hope: a vision that excites you, actions that you can take, inspiration to go further.

This must be a time of great hope. This is the time for change, a time of recognition that we all want to build back better, and that we cannot let the shadows of the past dim the bright promise of a fairer future. And this is the place.

Kate Pickett



The Greater Manchester Independent Inequalities Commission

Chair: Kate Pickett

Professor of Epidemiology, Deputy Director of the Centre for Future Health and Associate Director of the Leverhulme Centre for Anthropocene Biodiversity, at the University of York



Saeed Atcha MBE DL

CEO of Youth Leads UK, Deputy Lieutenant of Greater Manchester and UK Social Mobility Commissioner



Miatta Fahnbulleh

Chief Executive of the New Economics Foundation



Ruth Lupton

Honorary Professor of Education, University of Manchester, and former Head of the Inclusive Growth Analysis Unit




Neil McInroy

CEO of the Centre for Local Economic Strategies



Andrew Westwood

Professor of Government Practice and Vice Dean Faculty of Humanities, University of Manchester and Associate Partner at Public First



Lord Simon Woolley

Director and founder of Operation Black Vote, and cross-bench Peer



The Commission thanks Christine Berry, independent writer and researcher, without whom this report would not have been possible; Beti Baraki and colleagues from the New Economics Foundation and Resolution Foundation for data, insight and research intelligence. Further acknowledgements follow our full report.

Summary and Recommendations


The Vision: Good Lives for All in Greater Manchester

Imagine a city-region where:

- ▶ Everyone works towards an agreed set of wellbeing and equality targets that aim to leave no-one behind, and those targets have been agreed through inclusive conversations.
- ▶ The city-region puts people at the heart of local economic development and regeneration. All its major institutions work together to use their financial power and role as influencers to direct wealth into the local economy, promoting inclusivity and social value.
- ▶ When policymakers make big decisions or change their strategies, they do so in partnership with the people who will be most affected by those changes. Diverse communities are represented at all levels of decision making.
- ▶ In this vibrant city-region, children and young people are supported on their journey to become healthy, fulfilled and engaged adults, supported in civic and cultural activity, and are taught in outstanding schools and colleges.
- ▶ The city-region has work programmes that create good, local jobs that are open to a wide range of people, whatever their background, in the growth sectors of the future – in the green economy, the caring economy, and high-

tech. People are helped when they enter the world of adult work for the first time and also throughout their working lives and retirement as well – they can learn new skills, move into new sectors, work flexibly to fit their needs, get involved in their communities.

- ▶ If you want to start a small business in this city-region, you know where to go for advice and support, there is investment finance to help you get started, and a community hub where you can build your business alongside other local enterprises.
- ▶ Thriving communities are built around decent, affordable homes and high-quality shared spaces in the high streets and parks; and communities are connected to each other by excellent public transport that everyone can afford to use.
- ▶ Public services in the city-region are accessible and community-based agencies work together to respond to and support local needs and individual people. When problems arise in this city-region everyone works together to tackle them, with specific “missions” focused on complex challenges.



The vision we describe above is not a utopia, and it is not a pipe dream for Greater Manchester. Everything we describe is **already happening**, either somewhere within the city-region, in one of its localities or one of its institutions, or in another city or place where we have looked for inspiration. Throughout our full report we shine a light on case studies and best practice that can be emulated. Nothing we describe in this vision for the city-region is impractical or unachievable. Good things might be already happening somewhere, but they need to be happening everywhere.

The **Greater Manchester Independent Inequalities Commission** was launched in October 2020 with a six-month mission to examine inequalities across the city-region, consider how they should be tackled and outline some specific and hard-hitting recommendations. The Commission has taken stock of existing evidence and good practice and engaged, in the short time available, with stakeholders in the business, public, voluntary and community sectors. We have asked people to tell us what change they would like to see. You can find more information on our approach and activities [here](#).

The Commission has viewed inequalities within a framework that considers how **interacting and intersecting inequalities** create barriers that stop people from living the good lives they want. We have confronted the entrenched prejudices, discrimination and injustices, including **structural racism**, that withhold power and resources from diverse communities. We describe this approach to inequalities in detail in our full report.



Greater Manchester Independent Inequalities Commission


Model of Interacting Inequalities

Demographic Inequalities

Age
Sex and Gender
Race/Ethnicity
Disability
Sexual Orientation
Religious Affiliation
Caring Responsibility
Language
Migrant/ Undocumented Status/ Asylum Seeking
And all other groups experiencing inequalities
⋮

Entrenched and Intersecting Inequalities

Socio-Economic Inequalities



Geographic Inequalities

International
National
Regional
City/Town
Neighbourhood
Community
Etc.
⋮



We have brought together a wealth of **evidence on inequalities** within Greater Manchester, including from previous commissions, reviews and existing strategies, and commissioned new research from the [New Economics Foundation](#) and the [Resolution Foundation](#) to give us a deep dive into the structural inequalities across the city-region. A full supplement of evidence of Covid-19-related inequalities, as well as inequalities between communities and local areas in Greater Manchester is available [here](#).

2020 was a wake-up call. The **Covid-19 pandemic** exposed the fractures running across our society and the **Black Lives Matter** movement forced us to acknowledge and confront the intractable realities of structural racism. These have been the guiding stars for the work of the Greater Manchester Independent Inequalities Commission. We want to help bring about a city-region that works for everyone, where the economy serves the people, and everyone has a voice.

In our full report, we set out a practical programme of policies for Greater Manchester to tackle the

root causes of inequalities. And by Greater Manchester, we mean not just the [Greater Manchester Combined Authority](#), but also the local authorities of the city-region, the businesses, institutions, voluntary and community sector, and the public. The Commission believes that Greater Manchester can only build a strong **economy** by focusing on the foundations – the services and sectors that meet our basic needs; by giving local people a stake and a say in the economy; and by asking more of high-value ‘frontier’ sectors, to ensure that local people with the least opportunities benefit from the jobs and investment they create. Greater Manchester can only build excellent **public services** in partnership with those who use them, amplifying the ground-breaking ‘Greater Manchester Model’ of public service reform and taking its ambitions further. “Nothing about us without us” must be the mantra and the norm for co-designing and delivery of services across the system. Greater Manchester can only tackle **structural racism and all forms of discrimination** by empowering marginalised groups to hold decision-makers to account and to have a seat at the table.

If Covid-19 and Black Lives Matter have shone a light on inequalities within Greater Manchester, they have also, like past crises, revealed its greatest strength. The city-region has a **collective spirit** of looking after one another, and a proud tradition of radicalism, co-operation and standing up against injustice. Greater Manchester can build on this spirit of co-operation to recover and rebuild for a fairer future.

Change can be hard, and the initial costs of effort and resources can feel intimidating. But the risks of doing nothing are stark. Inequalities are deeply damaging: to people's health, wellbeing

and resilience throughout their lives; to a flourishing, productive and inclusive economy; to sustainability; and, not least, to the quality of the social fabric, to trust and the relationships between us. There are huge **costs to doing nothing**, and any challenges in implementing the Commission's recommendations need to be weighed against the serious risks and costs posed by a continuation of the status quo. Throughout the Covid-19 pandemic, we've seen different strategies adopted to contain the transmission of the virus, to treat infection, and to develop vaccines against the disease. Not everything worked, and usually local solutions

and partnerships and collective action worked best, but when you're trying to solve a big problem, it's OK to have some failures along the way and to need to adapt and flex policies and programmes until they do work. Fear of failure and fear of the size of the problem must be conquered.

This is the time for bold thinking and brave action, this is the time for an essential pivot towards a new way of doing things that puts tackling inequality at its heart, this is the time to take Greater Manchester to the next level, a place with good lives for all.



Our Recommendations

There is a vast amount of good work being done and many areas in which Greater Manchester is leading the way and making progress. But now is the time for a step change in its delivery. Our recommendations focus on how Greater Manchester can both respond to the immediate challenges created by the pandemic, and pivot towards a new way of doing things that puts tackling inequality at its heart. We have not tried to provide a comprehensive blueprint for tackling all inequalities in Greater Manchester – that is beyond the scope of our short Commission. Instead, we have focused on some key ways in which Greater Manchester could seek to shift wealth, power and opportunity to those too often denied it.

Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) can set goals and show leadership, but ultimately the vision will only be achieved by the whole system working together: GMCA, local authorities, health and the wider public sector, businesses and trade unions, the community and voluntary sector, and local residents. The Commission recognises that many of the big shifts needed to tackle inequality are outside of Greater Manchester's control and sit with national government – for instance, the urgent need to repair our social safety net by reforming Universal Credit and lifting statutory sick pay.

The double hit of the pandemic and a decade of austerity has also put local authority budgets under more pressure than ever before. This makes it all the more urgent to be creative with the powers and resources that are available – targeting resources to where they are most effective and working in partnership with communities.

The Commission hopes that our proposals will take Greater Manchester to the next level in creating a good life for all, built on the strong foundations already present in the city-region.

An Essential Pivot

1. Put **wellbeing and equality goals** at the heart of the Greater Manchester Strategy and align budgets, portfolios and activities to these so that good lives for all is the focus of everything Greater Manchester does.
2. Convene a **GM Anchor Action Network** and use their spending, investment and soft power to drive social value, support disadvantaged groups and create good, secure, living wage¹ jobs.

People Power

3. Create a **People's Taskforce** to put power into people's hands at every level of Greater Manchester and a **People's Assembly** to contribute to priority setting and work with public authorities in delivering them.
4. Give the **Equality Panels more teeth** with a stronger mandate and resources to constructively challenge public bodies.
5. Establish an **independent Anti-Discrimination body** to tackle breaches of the Equality Act.
6. Agree a joint commitment across GMCA, districts and statutory partners to **tackle inequality faced by minority groups** with a clear plan for roll out.
7. Develop a **GMCA Race Equality Strategy**, backed by a plan to increase representation of Black and Asian minorities in senior positions in GMCA and tackle race inequality in health, education, policing, work and housing.

¹ In this document, the term 'living wage' is used to mean the Real Living Wage calculated annually by the Resolution Foundation and overseen by the [Living Wage Commission](#)

Good Jobs, Decent Pay

8. Set up **'GM Works'** to create good jobs, upskill and reskill people to take up these jobs and provide apprenticeships and 6-month Job Guarantees for disadvantaged groups in key sectors.
9. Set an ambitious target for every employer in Greater Manchester to **pay the living wage and offer living hours by 2030**, using the Good Employment Charter, conditions on access to public goods, services and contracts and support for businesses in low paid sectors to get there.
10. **Bridge the skills divide** with universities, colleges and training providers working jointly to improve access to training, life-long learning and in-work progression schemes for disadvantaged groups.

Building Wealth

11. **Create a Community Wealth Hub** to support and grow co-operatives, mutuals, social and community enterprises, staffed by people from the co-operative and community sector who understand the market.
12. Set up a **Community Investment Platform** to tap into local savings, unlock community investment and build-up assets to share wealth with everyone in Greater Manchester.
13. Set up a **Land Commission** to look at ownership and control of land in Greater Manchester, its impacts on inequality and potential solutions.

Services for a Good Life

14. Move towards **universal basic services** in which education, health, childcare, adult social care, housing, transport and digital connectivity are provided to all and lobby central government to invest and devolve funding to make this a reality.
15. Launch an **Education Challenge** to give every child an equal start in life by levelling up schools in deprived areas, supporting young people's transition at 16 and improving access to activities that build social skills, confidence and resilience.
16. Scale up **public and social sector housebuilding** to deliver affordable, decent homes, backed by a plan to acquire land, rental properties, new builds and commercial properties for social housing.
17. Amplify the **Greater Manchester Model of integrated public services in 10 pathfinder deprived neighbourhoods and pilot an income guarantee** in one or more to tackle inequality, using community-led priorities, cross-service teams, pooled budgets and participatory budgeting.

In our full report we give detail on these recommendations and encouragement for other actions, including GMCA's role as a convener of calls to action for national actions and policies.



Full Report

2020 was a wake-up call. The Covid-19 pandemic exposed the fractures running across our society: the North-South divide, deep inequalities in health, our resilience and resistance eroded by austerity, and the fragility and insecurity of so many people's livelihoods and wellbeing. Even before the pandemic, death rates had started to rise in some groups and rates of mental ill health were rising in children and adults. And then in the middle of the pandemic, the Black Lives Matter movement forced us to acknowledge and confront the intractable realities of structural racism. These two things – Covid-19 and Black Lives Matter – have been the guiding stars for the work of the Greater Manchester Independent Inequalities Commission. We want to help bring about a city-region that works for everyone, where the economy serves the people, and everyone has a voice.

What is the Independent Inequalities Commission?

The [Greater Manchester Combined Authority](#) launched the Independent Inequalities Commission in October 2020 to support and influence the city-region's renewal following the Covid-19 pandemic. The Combined Authority has challenged the Commission to be a catalyst for transformation, helping to develop ideas, and providing expert opinion, evidence and guidance to re-shape Greater Manchester's (GM's) economy and society over the coming months and years. Setting up the Commission was a key action in the one-year [Greater Manchester Living with COVID Resilience Plan](#) and its recommendations will shape the revised [Greater Manchester Strategy](#), due later in 2021.

The mission of the Greater Manchester Independent Inequalities Commission has been to better understand the pre-existing and emerging inequalities in the city-region, consider how these inequalities should be tackled, and outline some specific and hard-hitting recommendations. Our aim has been to shift the balance away from collecting evidence to taking action. The Commission's independence means that it sits outside all formal Greater Manchester decision-making structures, allowing us to scrutinize and challenge, praise all the good progress being made within the city-region whilst setting out a road map for going further and faster to reduce inequalities.

We didn't have to start from scratch. We have built upon strong foundations of existing research, commissions, strategies and good practice, including, but not limited to, the Greater Manchester Strategy, the [GM Economic Vision developed by businesses through the Local](#)

[Enterprise Partnership](#), the [Greater Manchester Model](#), the [Good Employment Charter](#), the [Greater Manchester Independent Prosperity Review](#) and [the Centre for Ageing Better's partnership with the Combined Authority](#). We have drawn on the work of Fairness Commissions, Poverty Truth Commissions, the [Marmot review of health equity in Greater Manchester](#) and other enquiries.

As well as taking stock of the evidence already available across Greater Manchester, we have had meetings with expert witnesses, held round table discussions and hearings and commissioned specific evidence and research work, supported by the New Economics Foundation and the Resolution Foundation. In the short time we had available, we wanted to ask bold and searching questions about inequalities in the city-region. We have reached out to Greater Manchester's ground-breaking [Equality Panels](#) and engaged with the business, public, voluntary and community sectors. We worked with [Greater Manchester Poverty Action](#) to convene a new Poverty Reference Group. Together these groups and organisations are a strong movement, benefiting from lived experience and the talents of diverse communities. We asked people to tell us what change they would like to see.

Further information on the approach of the Commission, the engagement activities which took place and an Equality Impact Assessment for our work will be published [here](#).


What do we mean by inequalities?

Equality means each individual person or group of people has the same resources or opportunities or has an equal chance to take up opportunities and fulfil their potential. As well as giving people equal opportunities, a more equal society creates more equal outcomes for people.

There are many kinds of inequalities, such as inequalities between ethnic groups or inequalities in people's education or access to good jobs. Sometimes it can feel as if the need to tackle one kind of inequality might mean placing a lower priority on a different inequality. But this is not a zero-sum game.

The Commission views inequality through a framework of interacting and intersecting **vertical and horizontal inequalities** (Figure 1).

Figure 1



There are deep fissures between groups: inequalities between men and women, between ethnic groups, between those with disabilities and those without; inequalities related to sexual orientation, language, religion, who has access to public funds and who doesn't, inequalities related to migration status, and more, including all the characteristics protected by the 2010 Equality Act. There are also deep inequalities between places: between neighbourhoods, for example, or between cities and towns in the region, and between the North of England and the

South. We can think of these as '**horizontal inequalities**', inequalities between groups of people with different characteristics or who live in different places.²

Then there are the inequalities running across society from top to bottom, what we can call the '**vertical inequalities**': the inequalities of income and wealth, the disparities in access to resources and power. The scale of these vertical inequalities is a measure of the social hierarchy, which presses down and exacerbates all the horizontal inequalities.

There are many of these kinds of vertical inequalities, but they can be seen through two main lenses:

- ▶ Power – not having agency or control over the things that matter to you, such as your working environment, your safety, or not being able to influence or participate in decisions that affect you, your family and your community.
- ▶ Resources – not having access to assets or wealth, such as being able to own a home, not having enough income, not having access to services or resources, like health care, green space, public transport, and decent housing.

The inequalities experienced by, for example, women and girls compared to men and boys, or between different ethnic groups, are widened by the vertical inequalities pressing down through society, from the rich and powerful at the top to the poor and disempowered at the bottom. As just one example, in societies with bigger differences between rich and poor, women are less enfranchised and have less power, resources and prestige than women in societies where those differences are smaller.

Because inequalities are so interconnected, it doesn't make sense to think that one kind of inequality matters more than another. We wouldn't be happy if there was no gender pay gap in Greater Manchester, but everyone had very low pay. In fact, the gender pay gap in Greater Manchester is slightly smaller than in the rest of the UK, but only because men are paid less, on average, than elsewhere. The interactions and intersections between vertical and horizontal inequalities produce self-perpetuating cycles of inequality which systematically disadvantage particular groups. This affects people in different ways and inequalities can be compounded, based

on overlapping identities such as sex, race, migration status, class, disability, age and sexual orientation. For example, women, Black people and younger people are all less likely to own assets, and older Black women may have a different experience of inequality than younger White boys living with a disability. The Commission's aim has been to make recommendations to tackle intersecting inequalities as well as the interactions between both horizontal and vertical inequalities, for the benefit of all.

Confronting structural racism

The Covid-19 pandemic and the resurgence of the Black Lives Matter movement brought structural racism to the fore. Historical and contemporary systemic and institutionalised discrimination and prejudice in the treatment of Black and Asian people, and people belonging to other ethnic minorities, have resulted in entrenched inequalities rooted in long-standing structural issues of poverty and disadvantage.

The Commission has used the definition of structural racism as a form of racism that is embedded as normal practice within society or an organization. It can lead to such issues as discrimination in immigration and asylum cases, in criminal justice, employment, housing, health care, political power, and education as well as the persistent ethnic inequalities in health exposed by the Covid-19 pandemic.

The deep roots of inequality

In summary, the Commission's approach to inequalities has been to look at the **systemic and structural** causes in a framework of intersecting and interacting inequalities, not simply considering issues in isolation (for example, health, income or digital connectivity), but seeking to understand the common drivers of these inequalities.

How unequal is Greater Manchester?

Covid-19 has exposed the deadly consequences of inequalities and research confirms that the health and economic impacts of the pandemic are falling on those already experiencing inequalities, widening those inequalities further.

Even before the pandemic, Greater Manchester was fractured by inequalities in health, wellbeing, employment and pay, skills, school readiness, child poverty and more, cutting across localities, ethnic groups, age and gender, with Greater Manchester too often falling below national averages.

The picture of inequalities in Greater Manchester is well known. In this report we highlight a few stark and salient statistics – a fuller picture of pre-existing and Covid-19 related inequalities in GM is available in an [online supplement](#) to this report.

Most starkly, nationally, Covid-19 death rates for people of Black African or Black Caribbean ethnicity were more than twice as high as for White people.³ People with jobs that exposed them more to other people had higher rates of Covid-19 infection and mortality than people who could work from home, and Black and Asian men were the most likely to have these jobs.⁴

The economic and financial impacts of the pandemic have also been unequal. Workers from 'Other White' ethnic groups were more likely to have lost take-home pay than White British or people of Indian heritage;


people from Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Chinese or Other Asian ethnicities were more likely than White British people to worry about their future financial situation.⁵

Shielding during the pandemic, and self-isolating, has been more challenging for people living in larger, more over-crowded households. This has been a particular issue for multi-generational households, and notably those with older family members; this is more common for people of Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Indian ethnicity,⁶ reflected in the higher death rates among South Asian older women who live with younger people.⁷

Disabled people have also experienced a disproportionate impact from Covid-19. National research found that deaths were 40% higher for 'more-disabled' women, compared to their non-disabled counterparts, 20% higher for 'less-disabled' women and 10% higher for 'more-disabled' men, even after taking into account pre-existing health conditions and personal and household characteristics. Before making those adjustments, the differences were even wider, which highlights how inequalities related to disability are amplified by socio-economic inequalities. People with learning disabilities had an even greater risk of Covid-19 death, 70% higher than people who did not have a learning disability after taking into account personal and household characteristics.⁸

Figure 2 shows a steep gradient in Covid-19 related deaths in GM by the deprivation of the area where the person lived, from the most deprived areas on the left to the least deprived on the right.⁹ More than a quarter of deaths were among people living in the most deprived areas of Greater Manchester.

Figure 2: Greater Manchester Covid-19 related deaths (within 28 days of a positive test) by deprivation decile of residency, March to July 2020



Source: Office for National Statistics *Deaths involving Covid-19 by local area and deprivation* (August 2020).

The higher Covid-19 infection and death rates experienced by people of Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Black ethnicity can in large part be explained by their concentration in more densely populated, deprived areas, and the inequalities related to this.

Nothing new

These Covid-19 related inequalities are not surprising. Greater Manchester has made a transition from its industrial past to a modern knowledge economy but that success has not reached everyone and the transition has left a legacy of inequalities. The effects of the 2008 recession after the global financial crisis and the subsequent decade of austerity compounded those inequalities, and Covid-19 and Brexit have added further pressure.

Greater Manchester's employment rate is consistently below that for England, and the unemployment rate higher.¹⁰ Although the government's Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (furlough) has helped, unemployment-related benefit claims increased rapidly following the first lockdown, and have remained high (8%) and above the national average (6%); the rise has been steepest among the young.¹¹ And nearly a quarter of Greater Manchester adults of working age (24%) are economically inactive, well above levels for England as a whole (21%).¹²

On all labour market indicators, there is considerable variation across the city-region. For people from minority ethnic groups in Greater Manchester, employment rates are over ten percentage points below the overall working-age employment rate, six percentage points below the national average, and with significant variance by locality.¹³ Only half of Greater Manchester working-age residents with a disability are in employment, lagging the England average, and 25 percentage points below the employment rate for the city-region's working-age population as a whole.¹⁴

Skills levels in Greater Manchester are also well below the national average: 37% of the city-region's working-age population have higher level (Level 4+) skills, compared to the England average of 40%; and GM has a disproportionately high proportion of working-age people with no qualifications (9%).¹⁵

Inequalities start young – and widen through the education system¹⁶

Before the pandemic, school readiness for all pupils had been improving steadily in Greater Manchester, but still trailed the national average by a considerable margin: in the 2018/19 school year, 68% of reception-age children in Greater Manchester were assessed as having a 'good level of development', compared to 72% nationally. And although the gap had been narrowing in recent years, pupils eligible for free school meals were less likely to have reached this level. The pandemic has disrupted the learning, development, and wellbeing of all children, but particularly so for the most vulnerable. A national Ofsted survey of early years and childcare providers in November 2020 found that more children were needing help for issues such as special educational needs and disability, particularly in the most deprived areas.¹⁷ Locally, around a third of providers of early years education and care in Greater Manchester fear they might have to close in the coming year.¹⁸

At later stages of education (Key Stages 4 and 5, GCSE and A-level), Greater Manchester lags behind the national average. There are noticeable differences by gender and ethnicity, and considerable variation across Greater Manchester localities, much of it explained by deprivation.


Pay and poverty

The skills deficit evident at all levels of the Greater Manchester population is a key driver of the enduring productivity gap between the city-region and England as a whole, and reinforces the predominance of lower value, low pay employment in the city-region compared to the south of England and GM's international comparators. Median gross weekly pay for all workers (full and part-time) living in Greater Manchester in 2020 was £456, £26 per week less than the England average. Median pay for Rochdale residents was £420 per week, more than £100 below that for Bury residents (£525). Women's pay in GM was £125 per week lower

than men's pay, and the majority of GM workers paid less than the Real Living Wage in GM in 2020 were women. Locally, the highest levels of low pay for women were in Bolton (38% earning less than the Real Living Wage), compared to 17% for Manchester and 16% for Salford.¹⁹

Figure 3 shows ethnic inequalities in low pay for employees in Greater Manchester (hourly pay in grey, weekly pay in orange), and has been provided for the Commission by the Resolution Foundation from its recent [research](#) on low pay. Although there has been some reduction in low pay over the period charted (largely down to the introduction of the National Living Wage), this has benefited Black and Black British workers less than others.

Figure 3: Proportion in low pay, Greater Manchester



Source: Resolution Foundation analysis of Office for National Statistics Labour Force Survey data. Low pay = earning less than two-thirds of the median for all UK employees.

It should be noted that in this report, where the term 'living wage' is used, this is taken to be the Real Living Wage, which is calculated annually by the Resolution Foundation and overseen by the [Living Wage Commission](#).

Low income levels underpin high levels of child poverty (26%) in Greater Manchester, which are well above the national rate of 18%.²⁰ Child poverty is increasing across Greater Manchester, but faster in some areas (particularly Bolton and Oldham) than others. Analysis by Greater Manchester Poverty Action suggests that areas with the highest ethnic populations in the city-region also have the highest levels of child poverty: 15 out of the 20 wards with the largest ethnic populations in Greater Manchester had a child poverty rate (after housing costs) of over 50% in 2018/19.²¹ During the pandemic, more than 4,500 additional children in Greater Manchester became eligible for free school meals over the period from January to October 2020.²²

But Greater Manchester's population is ageing, and the growth in the number of people in mid and later life represents the biggest demographic shift facing the city-region over the next few decades. The growth in older workers, those aged 50+, over the next two decades represents one of the biggest changes in the workforce composition in Greater Manchester and there is compelling evidence of ageism in recruitment and retention of older workers, leading to low incomes and lack of social roles in mid-life and later life.

Tackling Health Inequalities – work with the Marmot Team at the Institute of Health Equity

In Autumn 2019, the Marmot Team at the Institute of Health Equity at University College London was commissioned to work collaboratively with Greater Manchester to become the first city-region to actively apply the Marmot principles in a considered, in-depth way. The aim was to assess what Greater Manchester could do to address health inequalities, building on successful approaches around school readiness and work and health and based on the opportunities for system-wide approaches in a connected city-region with devolved powers.

A Greater Manchester case study, published alongside the Marmot Review 10 Years On report, provided a detailed baseline. The aim has been to further narrow the gap in health outcomes experienced by the most disadvantaged families and communities in GM, by focusing on the social determinants of health such as education, quality of work, living standards, housing, and the broader life chances and opportunities that support good mental and physical health and enable us to thrive.

The Greater Manchester Marmot programme reflects on the impact of Covid-19 and will provide a steer on system-wide policy and practice approaches to reduce health inequalities that also consider the direct and indirect effects of the pandemic. The outputs from the collaboration will include a Marmot Beacon Indicator set that will help to track progress in the coming years, various in-depth analyses, and Greater Manchester-specific recommendations for action.




Health inequalities

A full report on health inequalities and inequalities in the social determinants of health in Greater Manchester was published by the Institute for Health Equity alongside the national [Marmot Review 10 Years On](#) report.

Figure 4 shows female life expectancy at birth by deprivation for local authorities in England, with Greater Manchester localities highlighted in orange.²³ There is a strong correlation: life expectancy is higher in Stockport and Trafford – with lower levels of deprivation; and lowest in Manchester where deprivation levels are high. There are even bigger gaps (26-27 years) in *healthy* life expectancy between different places in Greater Manchester.²⁴ Even within the more affluent areas of the city-region, the gap for males was 24 years across different areas of Stockport, and nearly 17 years across Trafford.²⁵

Figure 4:

English local authorities by female life expectancy and Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) average score



Source: Office for National Statistics *Life expectancy estimates, all ages, UK, 2017-19* (2020); Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government *English indices of deprivation 2019* (2019)


A closer focus

Although it's not always possible to get data for smaller areas than local authorities, when we are able to take a finer-grained look at inequalities, the conditions and outcomes for communities come into sharper focus. The maps in Figure 5 demonstrate this and have been chosen because they represent risk factors for inequalities in the health and economic impacts of Covid-19.


We could look at many more maps relating to Covid-19 risk factors, such as the prevalence of long-term health conditions for example diabetes or obesity, lack of access to a private vehicle and hence a dependency on public transport, household over-crowding and/or population density. These maps would show a similar pattern of clustering in the same areas. The distribution of the root causes of inequalities in infection, illness and death is clear and without radical action, there is a grave risk that these inequalities will widen even further.

Figure 5:
Overlapping geographical inequalities in Greater Manchester


- Deprivation scores by tenths – the darker colours show the 10% most deprived communities in Greater Manchester²⁶




- Elementary occupations requiring a minimum level of education for residents; again, the darker colours show where proportions are higher²⁸



- People who are not of White ethnicity, with darker colours showing where communities of diversity are concentrated²⁷



- Children living in low-income families – the darker colours showing where the poorest families live²⁹



The cost of doing nothing

Inequality has long been recognised as a problem in Greater Manchester. Nearly a decade ago, the Greater Manchester Poverty Commission was based on the recognition that “despite the economic success of the sub-region... economic growth has not benefited those areas and residents that need it the most.” One of their recommendations was that “all strategies for growth and economic development within the sub-region [should be] designed to ensure future levels of growth provide benefits for all sections of the Greater Manchester population”. The 2017 Greater Manchester Strategy includes a “focus on ensuring that the people of Greater Manchester can all benefit from economic growth and the opportunities it brings throughout their lives”.

In 2019 the [GM Independent Prosperity Review](#) noted that health inequalities were holding back productivity. The Review refuted the idea of a trade-off between inequality and growth – greater equality actually leads to more growth.

“The interactions between poor physical and mental health and growth stand out dramatically in Greater Manchester. The proportion of the adult population in Greater Manchester with long-term health conditions in employment is nearly 13 percentage points lower than for the GM adult population as a whole. This demonstrates that poor health

outcomes have a significant negative impact on the productivity of city regions. Health needs to feature far more prominently in discussions of human capital, labour market participation, and productivity. A focus on health and social care is also important for spreading prosperity and tackling disadvantage in some Greater Manchester communities.”

A key question for the Greater Manchester Independent Inequalities Commission therefore, has been why inequalities have proved so intractable.

But the pandemic has focused minds. The GM Independent Prosperity Review noted in its [‘One Year On’](#) report that “the crisis has made the case for tackling our economic and social inequalities unarguable... national government must take a lead here. But if Greater Manchester is committed to building back better, the city region will also need to do more and put tackling inequality at the centre of recovery plans.” There is widespread agreement that this is a time for change. The Commission agrees with the Local Enterprise Partnership that this is the moment for an ‘economic reset’ in Greater Manchester. As they note in their [new Economic Vision](#), “much about the current model simply hasn’t worked for many of our people – their wealth and wellbeing – or for our planet.” The Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) Leadership Group has described the crisis as “a unique opportunity to revision and repurpose

our economy towards one which more equitably distributes wealth and opportunity across GM’s people and places; provides high levels of health and well-being for all; reduces poverty; and works within environmental limits.” Numerous community leaders have suggested that we need a GM-wide conversation to build “a shared vision for the city we want to be a part of creating” as we emerge from the crisis.

The pandemic is already disrupting the old ways. The ways people work and shop are changing – and evidence suggests that the rise of home working and shift to online retail may be here to stay. This poses huge challenges for city-regions like Greater Manchester whose prosperity has relied on thriving city centres. But it also presents huge opportunities to spread that prosperity more widely – to places that have not previously benefitted from it. The pandemic response has also brought out the best in people and pointed the way towards new partnerships between local government and communities - from distributing food during school holidays to rolling out the vaccine for homeless people. The most successful city-regions will be those that lean into these changes – finding creative ways to reinvent themselves whilst also protecting people from the economic damage they face.

This is the time for bold thinking and brave action – the risks of any new approach need to be weighed against the serious risks posed by a continuation of the status quo.

The Vision: Good Lives for All in Greater Manchester

We have found broad recognition of the need to focus on the foundations of Greater Manchester's prosperity and wellbeing. A good job, a decent home, affordable transport, digital access, green space, clean air and safe streets, support to maintain good health, the chance to learn and develop: these are some of the things people have told us matter most. Just as the pandemic and Black Lives Matter have been the guiding stars for our Commission, Greater Manchester needs to pivot all of its strategy and all that it does towards reducing inequalities and growing wellbeing. In practical terms, this means ensuring that everyone in Greater Manchester has access to the basics for a good life – no matter who they are or where they live.

And in all of this, we have not forgotten the climate emergency and the need for the city-region's future to be grounded in sustainability. The climate crisis risks compounding existing inequalities if we do not respond to it in a way that is just. Therefore, the vision we lay out for Greater Manchester must help both people and planet.

The Commission has been focused and we have been practical. Our proposals target resources at the people and places within Greater Manchester who face the greatest barriers to living good lives. But when we reduce inequalities everyone benefits.

A fairer future is not a pipe dream for Greater Manchester. By scaling up and emulating existing good practice and endorsing and adopting the Commission's proposals, Greater Manchester can make this vision a reality.

Getting practical: *"nothing about us without us"*

In a recent speech, the Mayor of Greater Manchester declared his belief that "you can only level up from the bottom up". We think this is vital, although top-down actions and leadership are also necessary. This is as true within Greater Manchester as it is for the UK as a whole. Just as local leaders know what their city-region needs better than ministers and officials in distant Whitehall offices, so local people know best what their neighbourhoods and communities need. More than this, they have the skills and ability to make it happen, if they are resourced and empowered to do so. And, just as 'levelling up' the UK economy means redirecting investment from the capital to the regions, so levelling up within Greater Manchester means redirecting investment to the places and people who have been cut off from the benefits of growth.

The challenge for Greater Manchester is therefore to combine clear leadership from the top on *prioritising* inequalities, with being brave enough to share power with those most *affected* by inequalities. The message we have heard loud and clear from local people is: *"nothing about us without us."*

We need to tackle the root causes of inequalities in the economic system, in the way public services work, and in deep-rooted discrimination of all kinds, including structural racism.

At the heart of our approach in all these areas is democracy and empowerment. To tackle the root causes of inequalities, Greater Manchester must embrace the following principles:

We can only build a **strong economy** if we focus on the foundations: the services and sectors that help us all meet our basic needs, like care, retail, housing and transport. Building the foundations also means giving local people a stake and a say in the economy – putting wealth and power in the hands of people in our communities, through democratic ownership, community investment and support for small local businesses. And it means asking more of high-value 'frontier' sectors, to ensure that local people with the least opportunities benefit from the jobs and investment they create.

We can only build excellent **public services** if we break down siloes and shift spending towards preventing problems and meeting needs in holistic ways, working in partnership with people and communities. The 'Greater Manchester Model' of public service reform is ambitious and ground-breaking but more integration and investment is needed for it to fulfil its potential. And still too often people find some services dehumanising and disempowering. Treating people as whole human beings rather than labelling them (as unemployed, mentally ill etc), and involving them in co-designing and delivering services, must become the norm across the system.

We can only tackle **structural racism and all forms of discrimination** by empowering marginalised groups – not just to hold decision-makers to account, but to have a seat at the table. GMCA has led the way in establishing Equality Panels. These now need to be given more power to hold decision-makers to account for reducing inequalities. More also needs to be done to embed these voices and this participation right across the system – from education to healthcare, from policing to planning.

If the pandemic and the Black Lives Matter movement have shone a light on inequalities within Greater Manchester, they have also revealed the city-region's greatest strength: its collective spirit, people's desire to help each other and work together. Communities, voluntary organisations and small businesses have stepped up and worked together with local authorities with dedication and creativity to support those at the sharp end of inequalities. We must build on this spirit of co-operation to recover and rebuild for Greater Manchester's fairer future.

Building on what's there

Throughout this report, we highlight examples of action already being taken - both across Greater Manchester and within the ten boroughs - that aligns with the Commission's vision. There is a vast amount of good work being done and many areas in which the city-region is leading the way and making progress. But now is the time for a step change. Our recommendations focus on how Greater Manchester can both respond to the immediate challenges created by the pandemic, and pivot

towards a new way of doing things that puts tackling inequality at its heart. We have not tried to provide a comprehensive blueprint for tackling all inequalities in Greater Manchester – that is beyond the scope of our short Commission. Instead, we have focused on some key ways in which Greater Manchester could seek to shift wealth, power and opportunity to those too often denied it.

GMCA can set goals and show leadership, but ultimately the vision will only be achieved by the whole system working together: GMCA, local authorities, health and the wider public sector, businesses and trade unions, the community and voluntary sector, and local residents. The Commission recognises that many of the big shifts needed to tackle inequality are outside Greater Manchester's control and sit with national government – for instance, the urgent need to repair our social safety net by reforming Universal Credit and lifting statutory sick pay. The double hit of the pandemic and a decade of austerity has also put local authority budgets under more pressure than ever before. This makes it all the more urgent to be creative and resourceful with the powers and resources available – targeting resources to where they are most effective, working in partnership with communities, and ensuring that resources are not creamed off to perpetuate inequalities but are returned to, and distributed within, communities.

Now is the time to establish Greater Manchester's fairer future. The Commission hopes that our recommendations will be a scaffolding to create a framework for a good life for all in Greater Manchester from the building blocks already present in the city-region.





The essential pivot

Put good lives for all at the heart of everything Greater Manchester does

Ensuring that everyone in Greater Manchester has access to the basics for a good life – no matter who they are or where they live – should be the guiding star for all strategy across Greater Manchester.

Across the world, countries, regions, cities and neighbourhoods are deciding to focus on the things that matter for a good life, rather than economic growth that leaves inequalities untouched. For countries, such as Wales, Scotland and New Zealand, that means turning away from Gross Domestic Product as a measure of success and focusing instead on wellbeing.

As the Local Enterprise Partnership's *Economic Vision* and the Greater Manchester Strategy both recognise, achieving economic growth is important but it cannot, without a change of focus, improve lives for the poorest areas and most marginalised groups.

Measures of economic growth, such as gross value added (GVA – the measure of the value of goods and services produced) and productivity should be pursued to the extent that they demonstrably help to improve lives for the people of Greater Manchester – not growth for its own sake, or growth that increases inequalities.

Tackling inequalities and promoting wellbeing needs to be the responsibility of the whole system – importantly, it needs to be part of economic strategy – and not left to other systems, such as social policy or health systems.

What do we mean by wellbeing?

When people hear the word 'wellbeing' they often think first of health, or things like physical activity, nutrition and meditation. But the Commission means much more when we talk about wellbeing.

Wellbeing encompasses all the things that enable people to have good lives. It is as much about a good environment, for example having access to parks and green spaces, as it is about optimal health and accessible health and social care services. Wellbeing means having a good standard of living, living in a vibrant community where cultural diversity is respected and cultural expression encouraged. Wellbeing is about the work you do (paid or unpaid) and the places you do it in and being able to balance work and other important things in life, such as time with family and friends. Wellbeing is your physical, psychological, and spiritual health.

Wellbeing is about opportunities for participation and self-determination, being governed well and having your voice heard.

Wellbeing targets in other places – food for thought

The [Welsh Wellbeing of Future Generations Act](#) (2015) set out seven ‘wellbeing goals’, based on a national conversation involving 10,000 people, which public bodies must work towards: a prosperous Wales, a resilient Wales, a healthier Wales, a more equal Wales, a Wales of cohesive communities, a Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh Language, and a globally responsible Wales. The Act also set out five ways of working: long-term, collaboration, involvement, prevention and integration. An independent Commissioner was appointed to drive the implementation of the Act.

The [London Prosperity Index](#) was developed through an in-depth deliberative process with communities in east London to define the things that matter most to their prosperity and quality of life. It measures 15 factors including good quality and secure jobs, voice and influence, healthy, safe and secure neighbourhoods, and sense of community.

[Amsterdam’s city government](#) is using ‘doughnut economics’ to help it plan its recovery from the Covid-19 pandemic. Doughnut economics asks communities to consider how to build a home for thriving people, in a thriving place, whilst respecting the wellbeing of all people and the health of the planet? The doughnut model provides a different way of looking at the world, in which the aim of a city like Amsterdam should be to bring all of its residents into a safe space that provides the essentials of a good life (such as food, housing, healthcare and political voice), without overshooting planetary boundaries – replacing the traditional focus on only driving economic growth. Amsterdam worked with all stakeholders to decide what benchmarks would bring them inside “the doughnut”. Most of the City’s priorities were assessed to ensure that they at least matched or exceeded the level of ambition set out in the Sustainable Development Goals and their related targets. A central part of the approach is engagement and collaboration. Amsterdam’s Doughnut Coalition comprises 40 organisations including community groups, commons-based organisations, SMEs, businesses, academia and local government. The City is developing a ‘Monitor’ to track progress.

Recommendation 1: GMCA should agree a new set of wellbeing and equality goals to sit at the heart of a refreshed Greater Manchester Strategy, and then align budgets, portfolios and activities around these goals.

Throughout the world a lot of work has focused on how to measure wellbeing and set goals, targets and indicators. The Commission encourages GM to draw on the wealth of best practice that is available, including the [United Nations Sustainable Development Goals](#),

the [Marmot Indicators](#) and the [World Health Organization’s Healthy Cities’ Indicators](#), as well as its own experience and expertise. The Equalities and Human Rights Commission has developed a measurement framework for equality and a [“Human Rights Tracker”](#). What really matters is to prioritise the **drivers of wellbeing** – for instance, secure and meaningful work, a decent home, a sense of belonging. This might include furthering GM’s ambition to become a Real Living Wage City Region, to achieve 100% digital inclusion, or the recent declaration of support for a legal ‘right to food’.

But crucially, the Commission favours a democratic approach – allowing residents to **help define** what matters most for them to be able to live good lives, and then orienting policy around that.

The input we have received from people across GM has given us a clear sense of the things they value. A good job, a decent home, affordable transport, digital access, green space, clean air and safe streets, support to maintain good health, the chance to learn and develop: these are some of the things people have told us matter most. A participant in one of our roundtables felt that inequalities were sometimes treated as a “bolt-on” to “*the proper stuff...after things like roads and airports*”. Instead, it should be front and centre: “*You don’t get to build your skyscraper unless it’s clearly got massive benefits in reducing inequality. If we’re going to build back better, we build for everyone.*” Thinking about how to measure success in reducing inequalities should not be delayed.



A dashboard of wellbeing and equality goals, targets and indicators needs to extend across **all the pillars of the GM Strategy**, so there is wellbeing and equality in all policies and aspirations for the city-region as a whole. And it won't be enough to simply 'raise the average' on indicators, Greater Manchester needs to set **'baseline threshold targets'**: levels of wellbeing below which no residents or neighbourhood should fall, as well as **'equity targets'** of narrowing inequalities between groups, and between areas of Greater Manchester.

These goals should inform the organisation of budgets, portfolios, staff teams and policy impact assessment. Over time, GMCA should reorientate its resources so that tackling inequalities and supporting good lives for all is at the heart of every portfolio. Once again, it is crucial that this includes economic as well as social policy. For instance, over time the activities of the Business Investment Fund and Housing Investment Fund must actively support these goals – whilst still generating a return

– going beyond their current stated aims of “encouraging business growth and investment in property and infrastructure”.³⁰

The Commission also encourages a greater focus on social mobility, and that the proposed refresh of the Greater Manchester Strategy should have consideration of how to enable greater freedom for individuals, families, households, or other categories of people to move within or between social strata in society. This is a theme which will be further developed in the good jobs and decent pay section of this report.

Other partners such as the [Growth Company](#), [Transport for Greater Manchester](#), and the [Health & Social Care Partnership](#) should also re-orientate their resources around these goals. With the replacement of EU structural funds, there is in any case a need and an opportunity to rethink strategies and pursue new objectives in areas previously financed by those funds.

Some of Greater Manchester's local authorities already have their own inequality strategies,

and the Commission encourages all local authorities to follow this example – as well as working together through GMCA to address common challenges across the city-region. Similarly, we applaud the decision of a number of boroughs to implement or consider implementing a **duty to promote socio-economic equality** ([Section 1 of the Equalities Act](#)), as advocated by the Equality Trust and Greater Manchester Poverty Action, and encourage GMCA to do likewise.

The GMCA Tackling Inequalities Board should have overall responsibility for driving this change but ultimately this is a shared agenda for all of the Combined Authority – with the Growth Board and the Reform Board tasked with embedding this pivot into economic policy and public services respectively. *At the end of this report, we indicate how our recommendations map onto the three boards and the ten pillars of the current Greater Manchester Strategy, and how they relate to the wider GM system.*

Local economic strategies across Greater Manchester

Across Greater Manchester, individual local authority areas are already embracing the tackling inequality agenda through their approaches to building community wealth or inclusive economies.

Bolton has described community wealth building as part of its [approach to creation of 'social value'](#). Social Value is about the additional value created in the delivery of services which has wider community and public benefit and is a key plank of the work to achieve the Bolton Vision.

Bury Council has published its [Growth Plan](#), which involves creating the right circumstances for fostering growth through economic development initiatives, supporting social growth and creating thriving, healthy and equitable communities.

Manchester City Council has used its procurement to build community wealth. Working in [partnership with the Centre for Local Economic Strategies](#) for over 10 years, it monitors its annual spend with local organisations and undertakes analysis of its own ability to retain its local spend within Manchester and the city-region to promote local growth.

Oldham has invested in a series of policies and strategies developed to support the borough's growth and development, including the [Oldham Town Investment Plan](#), which was published in December 2020.

Rochdale Council has a strategic approach to supporting community wealth, an inclusive local economy, and social value, driven through a huge number of grass roots co-operative and community-led projects across the town.


Salford has put inequality at the heart of the '[Salford Way](#)' three specific strategies (Inclusive Economy, Tackling Poverty; and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion), which are being brought together to support a renewed focus on tackling systematic economic, health and social inequalities in the city.

The **Stockport** Council Plan focuses on inclusive and resilient neighbourhoods. Inclusive growth is an on-going focus and Stockport has put in place a [Mayoral Development Corporation](#) to drive forward some of this work.

Tameside Council is developing a new Inclusive Growth Strategy and has carried out extensive community engagement in its development. Tameside also adopted a [Social Value Charter](#) in early 2020 and have recently formed a local Inequalities Reference Group.

The **Trafford** Inclusive Growth Board provides strategic leadership in the delivery of key priorities which reflect the GM Strategy, the Northern Powerhouse agenda and [Trafford's Economic and Housing Growth Framework](#).

Wigan launched its [Community Wealth Building Strategy](#) in September 2020. Wigan aims to use Community Wealth Building to tackle economic inequality locally and create a fairer borough with greater opportunities for all. The Council has published a vision and principles document which sets out how it will move forward with this approach to create sustainable social, economic, and environmental benefits for all residents for decades to come.



Get anchors to focus on inequality

Tackling endemic inequalities is a whole place effort. All kinds of large 'anchor' organisations have a role to play in building a movement to tackle inequality.

Anchor institutions are large organisations rooted in place, which, because of their scale, have a significant economic, social and ecological influence as purchasers of goods and services, as employers and as owners of land, property and financial assets. Examples include local authorities, NHS organisations, universities and further education colleges. They can also be private companies and voluntary and community sector organisations, who are tied to particular places (historically or commercially).

There are a range of anchor institutions in Greater Manchester. By deeper collaborative working they could exert more measurable impact on the Greater Manchester economy and play an enhanced role in tackling inequalities. Fortunately, there is no need to start from scratch. As well as much collaborative and

partnership working across the city-region over many years, there has also been some foundational work on creating an anchor network from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the Inclusive Growth Analysis Unit and the [Centre for Local Economic Strategies](#) with 7 key Greater Manchester anchors. This offers a launchpad to build a broader, cogent, and focused anchor network. FE colleges will be important anchor institutions in their communities, and it is vital that they are included, to fully support their civic and community, as well as their economic role. The ingredients are in place, to move forward simply requires the political and institutional will to deliver.

The 'size of the prize' could be huge – the Centre for Local Economic Strategies analysis for the GM Health and Social Care Partnership showed that if they adopted a social value approach this would unlock more than **£65 million** each year to drive wellbeing and equality goals. If social value was adopted as common practice across the city-region the estimated value would be more than **£750 million** per year.

The Greater Manchester Social Value Framework provides a strong basis for using this collective financial power to tackle inequality. Although the past focus has been mostly on public sector procurement, perhaps missing opportunities to build community wealth and promote the public good, there is now an opportunity to harness business interest in social value and channel this into tackling inequality in Greater Manchester. The Social Value Framework can be used to guide business actions and spearhead a campaign to change business behaviours, driving 'good employment' and sustainability measures, for example, throughout a network of 'anchor' organisations. The aspirations and priorities set out in the Framework now need a focused political mandate, dedicated resources and institutional leadership. Creating a focal point within the GM system to help embed the Framework within commissioning and procurement processes would be a significant step forwards.



Social value in Greater Manchester

Greater Manchester has been an early adopter of social value following the Social Value Act. In 2014, GMCA published its first Social Value Procurement Policy and Framework setting out how the Combined Authority would deliver social value through its commissioning and procurement activities. Six years on, and the Mayor of Greater Manchester announced a new [Social Value Framework](#), approved by all ten Greater Manchester Local Authorities.

The aim is that every organisation in Greater Manchester acts to manage its resources and draw in investment in ways that create lasting benefits for the people of Greater Manchester, and improve the local economy, whilst positively contributing (or at least minimising damage) to the environment.

This framework can be used across all sectors to tackle widening inequalities and build back a better, fairer and greener economy in Greater Manchester, and contains six priorities:

- ▶ Provide the best employment that you can
- ▶ Keep the air clean in Greater Manchester
- ▶ Create the employment and skills opportunities that we need to Build Back Better
- ▶ Be part of a strong local community
- ▶ Make your organisation greener
- ▶ Develop a local, GM-based and resilient supply chain

National legislation and guidance around procurement is changing post-Brexit, with an increased focus on 'public

good' and on allowing 'below threshold' contracts to be placed directly with 'local' SMEs or social enterprises. The core principles proposed in the Procurement Green Paper (public good, value for money, transparency, integrity, fair treatment of suppliers, non-discrimination) could underpin a shift in public procurement strategy in Greater Manchester that focuses on creating wellbeing and tackling inequalities.

If – as expected – the forthcoming National Procurement Policy Statement includes a requirement to create new businesses, jobs and skills in the UK through public procurement, to improve supplier diversity and innovation, to tackle climate change and reduce waste, this will mean that 'social value' can be explicit in contract specifications, and not just an 'add on'.



Recommendation 2: The Mayor of Greater Manchester should convene a GM Anchor Action Network with a focus on tackling inequality.

This should be an early action by the Mayor of Greater Manchester following the elections in May; bringing together organisations which have previously been involved in this work with others which have shown leadership on tackling inequality. The Network should quickly develop a plan for mutual activity and commit to meeting regularly.

The Mayor should convene the major anchor institutions across Greater Manchester with a common purpose to tackle inequalities through:

Using their spending and investment power to deliver social value, including:

- ▶ Adopting a consistent framework that weights social value highly in all procurement
- ▶ Positive weighting for enterprises that represent marginalised groups in the economy (e.g. Black-led enterprises based in deprived areas) in any shortlisting for 'below threshold' contracts
- ▶ Growing local enterprises, SMEs, employee owned businesses, social enterprises, cooperatives and community owned enterprises. (See also recommendation 11).

Progressive stewardship of land, property and financial assets, including:

- ▶ A shared approach to all publicly-owned land and assets with commitment to consider social value in all new developments
- ▶ Proactively supporting communities who wish to use or develop underutilised assets
- ▶ Supporting and promoting progressive finance initiatives including ethical pension investments and encouraging their staff to open savings accounts with local credit unions.

Fair employment, including:

- ▶ Incentivising sign-up to the Good Employment Charter through the procurement and commissioning processes of GMCA and the ten Districts, with an ambition to roll this out across all anchors and the VCSE and private sectors
- ▶ Committing to a 'fair for all pledge' to pay the Real Living Wage, providing secure, safe employment, addressing gender and ethnic pay imbalances and developing strategies for in-work progression and wellbeing support³¹
- ▶ Seeking to recruit locally and from priority groups where appropriate e.g. young people, people with disabilities and long-term health problems, people experiencing poverty
- ▶ Ensuring workers are respected and have an effective voice.

Recommendations 1 and 2 lay the foundations for a system-wide refocus on the urgent need to tackle inequalities. The remainder of our recommendations focus on actions that can be taken now to address urgent inequalities arising from the pandemic, whilst also helping to pave the way for the longer-term system changes described above. This is not a comprehensive blueprint for tackling inequalities across Greater Manchester – which is well beyond the scope of our short Commission. Rather, we have focused on interventions that could help to spread **power, opportunity, good work, wealth and services more widely across the city-region** – simultaneously tackling multiple sources of inequalities.



Power in people's hands

A respondent to the Commission's call for ideas told us *"a refocused Greater Manchester economy would be a place where every citizen has the opportunity to participate and feel empowered to make a difference through their communities, workplaces, and local democratic institutions."*

Power and voice have been consistent themes in our discussions with local people. Inequality affects everyone and building a more equal city-region means creating structures where everyone can have a stake and a say in the things that affect their daily lives: be it their work, homes, high streets or green spaces. These themes run through all the recommendations in this report, not just the ones in this section. This is about more than formal politics or policy – it's also about new forms of social ownership and a new relationship between local government and community organisations.

We heard a clear message that people want to be more involved in decisions that affect them, and that decision-making could be improved by drawing on the lived experience of people worst affected by inequality. Councillors do an incredible job of representing their local communities, but even more could be achieved by complementing this with greater participation by people from diverse communities and from those whose voices are not always heard. We need spaces for participation to complement and strengthen systems of elected representation. If Greater Manchester's approach to tackling inequalities is to be successful, the people who

live in the city-region must be empowered to help shape it – and hold their leaders to account for delivering it.

Put power in the hands of ordinary people

A round-table participant told us:
"People who decisions relate to should be centred in all decision-making processes"

People felt that public engagement, such as surveys and one-off consultation events were limited, sometimes feeling only like an opportunity *"to feed back on someone else's agenda"*. Instead, people told us they wanted more spaces for people to help set the agenda and be equal partners in delivering it – participating in discussions on the 'big picture' as well as on details and being involved in development and evaluation throughout the policy process.

These processes also need to be **constantly alert to who is being excluded or marginalised from the conversation** – whether physically (e.g. if meetings are held in non-accessible buildings), culturally (e.g. by language barriers or social stigma) or economically (e.g. lacking the time or resources to participate). A round-table participant told us: *"People with learning disabilities are disenfranchised and disempowered almost from the moment they are born"*. One person pointed out that even the language of 'citizenship' can be experienced as threatening and exclusionary by migrants and asylum seekers, and we should be

thinking in terms of 'active residents' rather than 'active citizens'. Processes that do not actively seek to redress these inequalities will inevitably reproduce them.

One way to address this is to start from the ground up, **making use of the relationships and infrastructure that already exists in communities** across Greater Manchester and connecting this into the policy making process, rather than starting with policy makers who consult from the top down. As recognised by programmes like gmsystemschargers.org.uk, marginalised people need spaces to organise and advocate on their own terms. People want to be in 'organic spaces' not just 'invited spaces' so they can participate in discussions on their own terms – such as those run by Reclaim, an organisation that works to support and amplify the voices of working class young people. As one person told us, *"we're not hard to reach, you just have to get on the 192 bus."*

The Commission heard many examples of where participation has been done well – from creative approaches such as 'walking tours' to facilitate dialogue between people from different parts of the city, to Poverty Truth Commissions and volunteering programmes for local councillors. One response to the Commission's call for ideas suggested 'reverse mentoring' programmes pairing people experiencing inequalities with councillors or officials.

But Greater Manchester needs to go further than just better consultation on decisions – a more diverse range of people need to be making those decisions. This means **better pathways to representation in elected office and positions of power for people from diverse communities and in marginalised groups** who feel ‘locked out’ of politics. Power and resources can be devolved to community level – for example, through **neighbourhood assemblies, community forums and participatory budgeting** – so that people can deliberate together about their priorities and how to achieve them. Some people will want to participate in big-picture conversations about Greater Manchester’s future, but many others just want more say in what happens on their own streets – for instance, decisions about planning and local services.

Finally, the Commission heard a strong desire for more **accountability mechanisms** – for communities to be able to see how decision-makers have acted on their priorities. People wanted to know how they could continue working with city-region

leaders beyond the life of the Commission – recognising that tackling inequalities will be a long process and one that requires sustained dialogue and pressure. Greater Manchester can draw on a passionate and committed base.

This needs to happen both inside and outside established power structures. A thriving democracy needs a thriving civil society – including trade unions, tenants’ unions, community organisations and others. The pandemic has shown the vital role that such organisations play, not just in providing direct support, but also in advocating and campaigning on the local and national stage.

It is beyond the scope of the Commission to make detailed recommendations for widening participation at every level of GM’s decision-making – especially as there is no ‘one size fits all’ solution. However, we do suggest some next steps at GM level to ensure wide participation in the next phase of the conversation about tackling inequality in the city-region, and to enhance the role of the existing Equality Panels in this process. We also urge individual local authorities to consider how they can take this agenda forward.

The WHO-endorsed **Age-friendly Greater Manchester framework** is about working with older residents to improve the physical and social environment. Central to the ‘movement’ have been the voices from a range of actors, including the GM Older People’s Network, community organisations representing LGBTQ+ people, those from minority ethnic communities and from right across the ten GM local authority areas. The Ambition for Ageing programme, led by GMCVO, worked in 29 neighbourhoods, the Pride in Ageing project gives a voice to LGBTQ+ elders across GM, in addition to creating local older people’s forums and committees and multiple research projects. The Mayoral Age Friendly neighbourhood challenge was awarded to 57 local partnerships. In 2021 a new representative Age Equality Panel, bringing together these voices, will be launched. Central to this work is tackling ageism, and campaigns such as “Valuable not Vulnerable” during the pandemic represent how older adults can lead initiatives that challenge society’s entrenched and dangerous attitudes to older people.

The **GM Ageing Hub**, based in the Combined Authority, is a unique strategic and collaborative space that brings together public services, research institutions, communities and businesses to take action on the challenges and opportunities of population ageing. Tackling social exclusion was the core conceptual approach taken in the 2018 Age-friendly GM strategy, covering themes such as employment and economic life, place, culture, housing, transport and planning and health. The Hub’s strategic partnership with the Centre for Ageing Better is an example of its approach.

There is clear evidence that interventions in later life, in public health, housing, transport and other areas, can reduce inequalities faced by older people, and that tackling ageism plays a critical role in how a society and services support a creative and active later life for all.

Recommendation 3: Create a People's Task Force with a remit to improve participation and democracy at all levels in GM, including how a permanent People's Assembly could contribute to priority setting and working with public authorities in delivering them.

Citizens' Assemblies are well-established and successful ways of addressing complex problems – such as climate change or constitutional reform – in a participatory and deliberative way. The Commission envisages that this body would work according to these established practices, but have used the term 'People's Assembly' to make clear that such a body should aim to represent everyone who lives in the city-region, rather than making distinctions based on formal citizenship status. We suggest that a Greater Manchester People's Assembly could be convened in the first instance to hear evidence and call expert witnesses in relation to a specific issue, followed by an evaluation of its effectiveness and any necessary adaptations made before convening a permanent body made up of:

- One-third elected representatives nominated from across the 10 local authorities
- One-third GM residents chosen by lot (sortition) from across the city-region
- One-third representatives of the Greater Manchester Equality Panels.

The Commission also encourages the 10 districts to consider setting up their own structures to allow diverse local people to play an advisory and accountability role in driving action on equalities – as some are already doing, for example the Tameside Inequalities Reference Group and the Rochdale Equalities Assembly.

Tackle discrimination and structural racism

As well as improving democratic participation generally, tackling power inequalities demands **a specific focus on groups who face particular oppressions or injustices because of their identity**. Greater Manchester has led the way in recognising this, establishing a range of panels and other networks to engage with diverse communities. These include the Disabled People's Panel, LGBTQ+ Adviser and Panel, Greater Manchester Ageing Hub, Race Equality Panel, Women and Girls' Panel and the Youth Combined Authority. The contributions made by members of these panels and the organisations and individuals who have set up and sustained them should be recognised and celebrated. A round-table participant told us *"Representation is massive – I've never seen so many people of colour in one place as when I joined the Race Equality Panel, and that's big."*

However, in our conversations with the panels themselves and others from under-represented groups, we encountered a widespread feeling that the Equality Panels need to be given more 'teeth'. There was frustration within some panels that their role and mandate were not clearly defined and that it was often difficult to persuade people in the system to come and talk to them. There was also a feeling that the panels sat in different silos and more needed to be done to bring them together in an intersectional approach.



Recommendation 4: Give the Equality Panels more teeth with a stronger mandate and resources to constructively challenge public bodies.

In particular:

- ▶ All Panels should be fully independent with a clear mandate to: (a) co-develop city-region wide commitments for their communities of identity; (b) be consulted at an early stage on issues and decisions that affect their communities of identity, so that their experience and expertise can help shape them; and (c) proactively examine and constructively challenge GMCA (and other bodies) for their delivery of equality commitments, acting in an advisory capacity. There should be an expectation that leaders and officials will attend meetings with the panels if asked.
- ▶ All Panels should also have a budget to carry out research and produce reports at their own initiative, as well as being consulted by GMCA. Discussion should take place with all Panel

members as to how their operation can be made accessible to everyone in GM, including removing financial barriers to participation and choosing meeting times that allow those in work or with other personal commitments or responsibilities to join.

- ▶ The Panels should have connections through their Chairs with an independent Anti-Discrimination body (see recommendation 5) and have the power to escalate issues for consideration by that body.
- ▶ GMCA should ensure that the voices of older people and faith communities are also heard alongside the existing Panels, and that they all work collaboratively to ensure intersectional discussion around the key socioeconomic inequalities.
- ▶ Building from the Poverty Reference Group, which was brought together for this Commission, a new Panel should be established for people with lived experience of poverty, to complement the existing panels based on communities of identity. As with

all the Panels, this should complement and is not a substitute for wider work to improve participation and engagement of people with lived experience in decision-making.

- ▶ A Forum where representatives of each Panel can come together to discuss and take action on common issues with an intersectional approach should be created. They will always, and should, be able to take diverse approaches to how they work because the communities and groups they work with are diverse. But by working together on a common agenda they can have greater impact on the overlapping and intersecting inequalities set out in this report.

In addition to the 'soft power' exerted by the panels, we also heard that there is a need for an independent body that can improve enforcement of existing legal duties under the Equalities Act – in both the public and private sectors. At the current time, local authorities do not have the capacity to actively root out systemic discrimination across all organisations operating in their area.

Recommendation 5: Greater Manchester should look at options for establishing an independent Anti-Discrimination body to tackle breaches of the Equalities Act.

This body could be supported in the early phases by GMCA and other statutory partners. It should be staffed by professionals, but members of the Equality Panels could be represented on its governing board, and it might operate in a similar manner to Health Watch organisations acting as a critical friend to the whole Greater Manchester system. The Anti-Discrimination body should be empowered to meet with key organisations to help them set clear targets for improvement and monitor their progress against these targets.



Recommendation 6: The GM Lead Member for Ageing and Equalities, supported by the Tackling Inequality Board, should agree a joint commitment with districts and their statutory partners to tackle inequalities faced by minority groups.

The roll out of this commitment should include:

- ▶ Developing or revising an Equality Strategy for each district in partnership with communities of identity and existing Equality Panels.
- ▶ Appointment of a cabinet member for equalities (where this doesn't exist) and lead Councillors for particular communities.
- ▶ Collection and publication of data about the communities in their area.
- ▶ Ensuring staff and senior leadership represent the communities the organisation is operating in – and if it does not, they should have specific targets and plans in place to address this.
- ▶ Ensuring existing community and civil society infrastructure – those already working with the most marginalised – are properly resourced and empowered, ideally at district and neighbourhood level as well as at GM level.

Greater Manchester Combined Authority itself should have a clear equalities policy and objectives set in consultation with each of the panels, and in line with its obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty. The Disabled People's Panel has already been working with GMCA to develop a 'Disabled People's Commitment' under which GMCA will commit to realising the rights of disabled people under the UN Convention on

the Rights of Disabled People. A similar approach should be adopted for all panels.

In light of the Black Lives Matter protests and the disproportionate impacts of the pandemic on people experiencing racial inequality, the Commission feels strongly that structural racism must be a top priority for any serious agenda to tackle inequality. For too long, debates about race equality in the UK have been sidelined or ignored, yet – as described earlier – the pandemic has exposed the deadly nature of these inequalities. Manchester takes pride in its role in abolishing the slave trade, but we are less keen to remember that our prosperity was built on slavery – and that the resulting inequalities of power and wealth endure to this day.

Greater Manchester's ability to get to grips with racial inequality is hampered by the lack of representation of racial minorities in the organisations that have the power to act. A key issue raised with us by the Race Equality Panel was the small percentage of people from diverse communities in senior leadership positions across Greater Manchester. Three of Greater Manchester's NHS Trusts have no board members from an ethnic minority background.³² One of GM's local authorities has no ethnic minority councillors, although 8% of its population are from ethnic communities; in a further four councils, the proportion of elected members from ethnic backgrounds is lower than the proportion of local residents from ethnic communities.³³ Despite a recently successful strategy by Greater Manchester Police to recruit more officers from ethnic minority backgrounds, in March 2020 only 5% of GM police officers were Asian and 1% Black (compared to a resident population of 9% and 3% respectively).³⁴

Recommendation 7: GMCA should publish a Race Equality Strategy, in consultation with the Race Equality Panel, and should encourage other anchor institutions to do the same. Individual local authorities should also publish their own strategies.

In developing the Race Equality Strategy, the Race Equality Panel should be empowered to meet with key bodies – including the Health and Social Care Partnership, NHS Trusts, universities, colleges, schools, the LEP and chambers of commerce. The Commission does not wish to pre-empt discussions with the Race Equality Panel about what this strategy should include. However, based on our discussions with them and on the available evidence, we indicate some possible priority areas for action:

► **Leadership and representation** – A Mayoral-led initiative to achieve equal representation of racial minorities in the public, private and voluntary sector could bring together mentoring and leadership programmes with stepping up action via the Good Employment Charter on recruitment practices - creating pipelines into both entry-level and senior leadership positions. GMCA should lead by example with a major push to improve racial diversity in its staff and senior leadership.

► **Health** – Priority areas for action could include improving representation of racial minorities in NHS senior leadership, identifying gaps in health outcomes based on race and publishing a plan to close these gaps; and effective support structures like outreach or translation services to ensure the health system is open to all groups.

► **Education and young people** – Setting targets for representation in governing bodies and amongst teaching staff; working towards zero exclusions to address the systematic marginalisation of black boys in the education system; inclusion of youth workers within schools; improving digital inclusion for children from minority backgrounds; and ensuring that post-Covid-19 catch-up programmes are tailored to specific communities that need additional support.

► **Jobs and pay** – Using the Good Employment Charter to promote ethnic minority pay gap reporting for all companies above a certain size (say, 50 employees); representation targets for boards and committees of large companies; and a wider push to reduce low pay and insecurity as this disproportionately affects racial minorities.

► **Policing** – Transparency and consistent reporting of the use of policing powers, including stop and search;³⁵ reversing the use of school-based police officers; a more robust response to hate crimes; targets for representation of racial minorities in the judicial system and emergency services (such as Fire and Rescue).

► **Housing** – Tackling overt discrimination in the private rented sector; improving the availability of affordable housing in deprived neighbourhoods and consistent roll out of neighbourhood equalities officers.

Good jobs, decent pay

Access to good jobs and decent pay is still out of reach for too many people in Greater Manchester. Nearly a quarter of working age adults in the city region are economically inactive and, according to the Resolution Foundation, in 2019 17% were trapped in low paid work; work which is often insecure and with no routes for progression. The pandemic has simply compounded these old divides with the poor, the young and the less highly educated paying the largest economic price of both the virus and the lockdowns. For example, there has been almost no fall in the number of graduates in paid work over the past year, while there have been big declines in the number of non-graduates in work. Those aged under 25 have been three times as likely as those over 35 to have stopped work.

Unless we can make good jobs and decent pay the norm for every person in Greater Manchester, we cannot get to grips with inequality. But the city-region has good foundations to build on. Greater Manchester has a strong record of training and job creation for the unemployed, including through the Greater Manchester Growth Company and a network of voluntary, community and anchor institutions. Its districts have a long tradition of finding creative ways to support people into work and

the devolution of the adult skills budget to the Combined Authority creates the opportunity for further innovation.

Critically, the city-region has opportunities to create good jobs. Greater Manchester is proud to be home to world-leading industries in sectors such as life sciences and advanced manufacturing, which together employ some 60,000 people across Greater Manchester and are projected to deliver significant increases in productivity over the next ten years. These sectors are amongst those targeted as 'industries for the future' under the Greater Manchester Local Industrial Strategy;³⁶ as part of ongoing work to produce sector development plans, it will be important to explore employment and progression opportunities for under-represented groups.

The city region has an ambitious target to transition to net zero by 2038, with the opportunity to create significant numbers of new jobs as we take carbon out of our homes, businesses and public spaces and build the green industries and services we will need for the future. This will include jobs in retrofit, low carbon construction, green energy, low carbon transport and nature conservation. And thousands of jobs will continue to be created



in the foundational economy that provides all of us with basic things we need for everyday life.³⁷ This includes sectors like care and retail, which are characterised by low pay, and where we must drive up pay and conditions so that people in these jobs are rewarded properly for the valuable and essential work they do. To make the most of these opportunities, Greater Manchester should redouble its efforts to provide good work for all as it recovers from the economic fallout from the last year.

'GM Works' and how to make it happen

Recommendation 8: Greater Manchester should set up GM Works to create good jobs, upskill and reskill people to take up these jobs and provide apprenticeships and 6-month Job Guarantees for disadvantaged groups in key sectors.

GM Works should be a city-region wide initiative that brings together the Combined Authority, employment services across districts, the Local Enterprise Partnership, information, advice and guidance services, FE colleges, local businesses and the Growth Company with a common aim to get people into good work. This should include:

- ▶ Targeted investment and a clear plan to support job creation in **frontier, green and foundational economy** sectors.
- ▶ Identifying the **pipeline** of jobs that could be created across these sectors and the skills needed to open up these opportunities to local residents.

▶ Developing a **training offer** to upskill or reskill people for these emerging jobs.

▶ Providing **dedicated training provision in target sectors**, such as a Green Jobs Academy and a Caring Academy, to accelerate workforce training and skills development in these areas.

▶ Creating a **job placement scheme** targeted at the unemployed and particular disadvantaged groups and communities with an offer of coaching, training and a paid apprenticeship or a 6 month paid Job Guarantee.

▶ **In-work progression programmes** targeted at disadvantaged groups, supported by equalities plans for all high growth frontier sectors (health and life sciences, business services, advanced manufacturing, creative and digital, green industry and services) and the public and social sector to ensure disadvantaged groups have the opportunity to access the jobs that are being created.

Living Wage guarantee for all

Greater Manchester is home to an impressive movement for good jobs that involves businesses, trade unions, the VCSE sector, academic experts and the public sector – backed up by the resources and convening power of the GMCA – culminating in the development of the **Good Employment Charter**. This is a unique platform to build upon. With more than 230 employers involved, covering more than 200,000 employees, the Good Employment Charter already has impressive scale and reach and great potential to go further. The Commission welcomes recent efforts, in partnership with the Equality Panels, to enhance the Charter's focus on equality and diversity, ensuring that employers implement good equalities practices.

But Covid-19 demands that we redouble our efforts. In addition to rising unemployment, the crisis is already exerting downward pressure on the quality of existing jobs. Supporting the creation of good, decent paid jobs, and resisting the pressure to settle for 'any jobs', will be critical during recovery from the pandemic.

Recommendation 9: The Mayor should set an ambitious target to get every employer across Greater Manchester to pay the living wage and offer 'living hours' by 2030, using the Good Employment Charter, conditions on access to public goods, services and contracts, and support for businesses in low paid sectors to get there.

The lessons from the development of the Good Employment Charter – promotion, engagement, peer support and GMCA incentivisation – should be applied in delivering this ambition.

This should include:

- ▶ Growing the movement of organisations signing up to the Charter
- ▶ Building a living wage and guaranteed living hours requirement into procurement and planning activities across the GMCA, districts and anchor institutions ([See recommendation 2](#))
- ▶ Making access to public funds and services conditional on signing a 'fair for all pledge' ([See recommendation 2](#)) with its commitment to a living wage and secure contract
- ▶ Working with employers to change pay structures and practices in sectors where low pay and poor working practices are endemic such as social care, childcare, retail and hospitality as they are reshaped after the pandemic.

The Greater Manchester Good Employment Charter

The Greater Manchester Good Employment Charter is a voluntary membership and assessment scheme that aims to raise employment standards across the city-region, for all organisations of any size, sector or geography. The Charter describes seven key characteristics of good employment: secure work, flexible work, real living wage, engagement and voice, recruitment, people management, and health and wellbeing. It is closely linked with the campaign to make Greater Manchester a Real Living Wage City Region.

The charter has three levels in which any organisation that employs people can get involved: – **Supporters** have made a commitment to improving practice in all characteristics of good employment; **Members** have made the Supporter Commitment and meet the membership criteria in all characteristics of the Charter; and **Advocates** excel in characteristics of good employment and share their expertise with others to support the aims of the Charter.

Members include public sector, private business, educational institutions and employers in the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector.



Bridging the Skills Divide

As we described in an [earlier section](#) skills levels in Greater Manchester are low compared to the rest of England and the city-region has many more people with no formal qualifications than other areas. There are particular skills challenges in the poorest communities where a range of inequalities intersect. These include many of the former industrial towns in Greater Manchester, but also communities and declining economic centres in more prosperous local authorities.

The Commission recognises that **employment and training programmes must fit the needs of the people they are for**: many of the people we spoke to said that they had found their encounters with some services or programmes to be dehumanising and stigmatising – often being steered towards work that was inappropriate or undesirable for them, or feeling judged based on their skin colour or disabilities. They wanted to be treated with respect, and supported to develop their talents and capabilities. There are good examples of projects underway within Greater Manchester that take this more supportive, person-centred approach – often led by grassroots organisations which are best placed to reach and support marginalised people (see box). Such approaches may be more effective than rigid target-driven approaches at supporting people into work.

Greater Manchester's Colleges have a vital role to play for young people as they continue their learning and for adults seeking to gain new skills or to retrain. The scale and importance of their role – in supporting the city-region's local economies, social mobility and tackling disadvantage – should not be underestimated. For example, Oldham

College in 2020/2021 has over 5,000 students, including 3,500 from disadvantaged areas and more than half overall from Black, Asian and minority ethnic communities.

The Commission also recognises GMCA's leadership in creating a vision of [good apprenticeship](#) employment for people at all working ages: aiming to remove barriers to apprenticeships (e.g. free public transport for apprentices); working with the [national 5 Cities Project](#) to increase the diversity of the apprenticeship workforce; encouraging the development of part-time apprenticeships; working with the Greater Manchester Ageing Hub; launching a Greater Manchester small-to-medium enterprise apprenticeship package; working with levy-paying employers, and working to put apprenticeships at the heart of the public sector. This leadership can be underpinned by the city-region's educational institutions.

Recommendation 10: Universities, FE Colleges and training providers within the Greater Manchester Anchor Action Network (Recommendation 2) should work to bridge the skills divide.

The city-region's educational institutions and anchor network should:

- ▶ **Provide enhanced access programmes** – with a commitment to meet more Access and Participation targets across the city-region – building on the work of [GM Higher](#)³⁸ and existing institutional plans. To accelerate social mobility, this should aim to double access to HE courses from the most deprived groups over the next five years.

- ▶ **Build an improved system for adult skills and lifelong learning in GM.** More provision and opportunities for adults both inside and outside the workplace is desperately needed. This should be a key mission in a refreshed GMS – increase skill levels across the city region and particularly in the most disadvantaged areas.

- ▶ **Improving access to in-work training and progression.** This could include changing entry requirements and pre-entry programmes targeted at specific areas and groups; development bursaries for career changers; and targeted programmes for those moving from benefits to work such as the University of Manchester's 'The Works'.

- ▶ **Apprenticeships and Jobs Guarantees** – Targeting apprenticeships and the GM Job Guarantee at disadvantaged groups (e.g. people living in deprived areas, carers and care leavers, people with disabilities) to increase access to in-work training.

Case study: Greater Manchester European Social Fund Community Grants

The Workers Education Association is now entering the second phase of a four-year programme distributing and managing ESF Community Grants in Greater Manchester. These grants support local adult education projects with the aim of helping participants move into formal education, skills training or employment.

In just over 12 months, £4.4 million has been allocated through WEA to the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector, creating 243 local adult education and employability projects across the 10 Greater Manchester boroughs. The projects are run by people from diverse communities, using diverse methods, often based on the organisation's knowledge of their community or client group. Employability skills and functional learning is often combined with

practical hands-on activities, with a strong focus on well-being. Developing digital skills, a focus on self-employment and one-to-one mentoring are strong themes. Organisations' established links are being used to engage marginalised groups, such as young people not in education, employment or training, people experiencing racial inequality, those with physical disabilities and neuro-diverse communities.

► **Community Revival** worked across four areas in Manchester and Oldham engaging 70 pre-entry – entry level participants from ethnic minorities around employability and English for Speakers of Other Languages. There was a 100% completion rate for the project with 70% of participants moving onto further training and education.

► **YPAC Manchester**, a Young People's organisation working with young people and the wider community has used its detached youth work presence in Harpurhey, Newton Heath and Collyhurst to identify and support 25 young people who are vulnerable and/or at risk of offending. Thirteen of those young people have progressed into further training, one has secured an apprenticeship, and eight are participating in a new social enterprise, which has recently secured development funding.

► **Flourish** has created a group of 18 women acting as a force for social change. Six women have already got into work, 10 of the women who accessed the programme have set up early stage social ventures and two have secured development funding.



Build wealth

Jobs and incomes are just one dimension of economic inequality. If we are serious about building a more equal Greater Manchester, we also need to look at flows of wealth. At the core is a focus on effective flows of finance and locally productive forms of business. These “generative” businesses, such as **employee-owned firms, cooperatives, community business and social enterprise** are firms in which wealth is both created and shared broadly between owners, workers and consumers. By offering local people a genuine stake and say in local economies in this way, we can help to reduce inequalities of power and help secure better local wealth outcomes.

Several local authorities in Greater Manchester are already adopting ‘community wealth building’ (including Wigan, Salford and Stockport). There is both a need and an opportunity to amplify the scale and reach of this work and bring it together as part of an overarching city-region strategy which puts community wealth building at the heart of addressing inequalities and building a more inclusive economy after the pandemic.

Building Community Wealth

GM can lay claim to being the birthplace of the social economy with the founding of the co-op movement in Rochdale in 1844. But today co-operatives represent only 0.5% of the city region's GDP according to GMCA's assessment.³⁹ Although it isn't easy to measure the scale of the social economy, the Commission estimates that there are nearly 7,000 social enterprises in Greater Manchester, some 6% of the total number of businesses.⁴⁰ In other countries the social economy is significantly larger, e.g. it is estimated to make up some 12% of the economy in Spain – driven by places like the Basque Country and cities like Bilbao, home to organisations including the Mondragon Corporation, a large federation of worker cooperatives.⁴¹

But the practical barriers for people looking to establish and grow these organisations with a social as well as commercial purpose are significant. In addition to challenges in raising capital, there is a need for better pathways to access business support and legal advice (as identified by the [Greater Manchester Co-operative Commission](#)). As one respondent to our consultation noted: *“Many people have the propensity to become great socially conscious entrepreneurs but can find it difficult to understand and engage with the full range of options available to them when setting up a new enterprise.”*

It is clear that if Greater Manchester wants to grow the social economy then it needs to actively ‘market-make’ these sectors. The Business Growth Hub and other business support services need to develop their expertise to support businesses with a social purpose – and should be measured in their success in doing that. New approaches to procurement and commissioning by GMCA, local authorities and other anchor institutions (See recommendation 2) should also actively seek to grow the social economy.

Crucially, support needs to be provided by people who understand the specific issues faced by co-operatives and social enterprises, and who are trusted by local entrepreneurs, especially those from groups under-represented in business and enterprise. As one person put it to us, *“it's really important for communities to support themselves, to talk to people who are like them and who they trust to give them good advice”*. Often, they added, support services *“don't have people who look like the people they want to help.”* There are already examples in Greater Manchester of this being done well at community level, for instance under the umbrella of the Abram Ward Community Co-operative, which could be drawn on and scaled up.

Recommendation 11: GMCA should create a Community Wealth Hub to support and grow employee-owned, co-operative, mutual, social and community enterprises, staffed by people from the co-operative and community sector who understand the market, connecting and scaling existing efforts to grow and ‘market make’ the social economy from across the ten boroughs.

Learning from exemplars across the UK, The Hub should host or facilitate:

- ▶ Business support services that provide wrap-around advice and support to social economy organisations (for example, the Greenwich Co-operative Development Agency offers local support, advice and training for social enterprise initiatives tackling poverty).
- ▶ Funding streams to support the development of new social economy firms to supply target sectors (linked to equalities plans for high-growth ‘frontier’ sectors – [see recommendation 8](#)).
- ▶ Support for co-operative, mutual and social enterprise models in key ‘foundational economy’ sectors – the Commission urges that a high initial priority should be the **childcare and social care sectors**. Finding better ways to organise care has high potential to alleviate multiple intersecting inequalities by improving the quality of both jobs in care and the care provided.

- ▶ Support (technical and financial) for the conversion of existing businesses to new models of ownership, including employee-ownership – for example, worker ownership conversion support targeted at businesses which are at the point of business transition (e.g. owners retiring, owners selling), or businesses which are struggling due to the impact of the pandemic and are at risk of takeover by venture capital.
- ▶ Support for developing “**platform co-operatives**” – umbrella organisations in key sectors, such as childcare and social care, to provide the scale needed for small organisations to compete in public sector and commercial markets.
- ▶ Targeted programmes to help diversify the sector and address business ownership gaps, e.g. support for social entrepreneurship among people experiencing racial inequality (in 2019 just 5% of UK SMEs were ethnic minority-led).⁴² Support for the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector to create new, **generative alternatives to meet local needs**.
- ▶ Support for communities to take over empty shops or buildings and repurpose them as community hubs (discussed further in relation to the Investment Platform below).

The Hub should recruit and second people in from the local VCSE and co-operative sector, with a focus on under-represented identities, as well as disbursing money out – ensuring that programmes are led by the people they are designed to help. This will both enhance their effectiveness and contribute to diversifying the offer. It should also act as a focal point for knowledge exchange, peer learning and resource sharing between local authorities. There are many exemplars and case studies to learn from as Greater Manchester steps into a leading role supporting community wealth building.



Case studies: support for building community wealth

One example of Wigan's Community Wealth Building approach is led by Abram Ward Community Co-operative, which acts to provide umbrella support to community businesses in that part of Wigan, under the **'Made in Wigan'** banner. The Co-operative welcomes local residents who want to set up a business to come and talk about their ideas, access advice, join the shared marketing platform, or access physical space to run their business. The Made in Wigan platform encourages other businesses and consumers to buy locally, is used by the Council and other public sector organisations in their procurement, and helps small, local businesses trade with each other.

Middleton Co-operates – Originating as an initiative with a focus on Warwick Mill in Middleton, a partnership has been established between local residents and businesses, along with organisations from the voluntary, community and public sectors to deliver community-led economic development based on a co-operative approach to community wealth-building, to create Middleton Co-operative Community Partnership. The aim of this Partnership is to implement an innovative community-led economic development approach in Middleton and create a place-based 'co-operative zone'. Middleton Co-operates will act as an umbrella or development agency for local, community-driven projects and businesses. Local anchor institutions such as the local authority, housing provider and VCSE infrastructure organisation are all active members of the Partnership.

Unlocking Community Investment

To build a **just and sustainable** recovery from the pandemic, GM must expand its ability to mobilise local resources (public, household, large-scale private or philanthropic), and channel them into viable investments that help build community wealth. The Commission acknowledges that the mainstream finance sector is not well designed to do this. Resolving this will ultimately require a long-term strategy to cultivate **local, socially-driven finance institutions** – which could include the proposed GM Mutual Bank – and support to scale up the credit union sector. However, this strategy will take time to bear fruit – and the need is urgent. The pandemic risks widening wealth inequalities at community level as well as for individuals, posing a serious threat to the viability

of local businesses, high streets and community assets (such as community centres and leisure centres). This is likely to be most severe in the most deprived areas which have been hardest hit by both the virus and the economic fallout. GMCA is already partnering with social investors in schemes to help social enterprises survive and thrive such as Access Partnership. Meanwhile, in city centres, innovative thinking could prevent a sustained (and perhaps permanent) decline of high-street retail and office-based working. The hospitality and leisure sectors similarly risk widespread failures, empty premises and job losses, as well as making previously-planned (pre-pandemic) future developments now potentially unviable.

Access Partnership

The £2.25 million GM Emergency Investment Fund, is a partnership between Access – the Foundation for Social Investment (Dormant Assets), with co-investment from GMCA and managed by GMCVO. The Fund is making flexible low cost funding available to community enterprises threatened by Covid-19 – such as the Kashmir Youth Project based in Rochdale that operates a nursery and community hub, and Bolton Wanderers Community Trust, which runs mentoring and education projects. Philanthropic grant funding has been key in de-risking the loan component of the funding from GMCA's perspective – meaning that they can absorb a high loan failure rate and still break-even.

These shifts create opportunities to rethink our high streets and revitalise towns and suburbs, for example if people continue to work more from home and shop more in local high streets, as they have done throughout the pandemic.⁴³ And, as commercial property values decline, there are potential opportunities to acquire buildings and put them to work to achieve community wealth ambitions. As the Greater Manchester Independent Prosperity Review noted, cities will need to “*evolve*” and “*reinvent themselves*”, finding “*new uses... for old space*.” Such ‘old spaces’ could be turned into shared spaces such as cafes, shops and markets, spaces for co-working or co-locating micro-businesses, community centres and wellbeing hubs. As well as strengthening local economies, such shared spaces are vital for reducing social isolation and promoting a sense of community – as Ambition for Ageing emphasised in their response to our consultation.

Meanwhile, the [Bank of England](#) estimates that £250bn of excess savings will have been built up by July by more affluent households due to lockdown restrictions. Although regional data for bank deposits and savings are not available, a rough estimate based on disposable household income would suggest that GM’s share of this could amount to £10.2bn.

As well as a source of widening inequality, this represents a potentially significant untapped resource to help drive the recovery and build community wealth. For comparison, the government’s entire ‘Levelling Up Fund’ amounts to £4.8bn nationally, with a maximum bid size of £20m per project/locality, and no control for communities over which projects the government chooses to fund.

Recommendation 12: Greater Manchester should set up a Community Wealth Investment Platform to tap into local savings, unlock community investment and build up assets to share wealth with everyone in the city-region.

The GM Community Wealth Investment Platform would act as an online portal or ‘shop front’ connecting local individuals and social investors to opportunities to invest their money for community good. GMCA should spearhead **a major campaign to encourage people to put their money to work to support communities across Greater Manchester** to recover from Covid-19 – whether by saving with their local credit union, donating or investing directly via the Community Wealth Investment Platform (for example, via municipal bond issues or community share offers).

This should be part of a wider **GM Community Wealth Investment Strategy**, building on existing GM investments and partnerships to mobilise public and social investment, alongside philanthropic funding, to support a recovery based on community wealth. We suggest that two key priorities for this strategy should be: bringing together ‘social investment’ - Social Investment Tax Relief Funds, philanthropic funding and GMCA investment funds; as well as providing a platform for local individuals to invest or donate. These funds should be invested for blended financial and social return, with grant funding helping to de-risk these investments, focussing on:

- ▶ supporting the acquisition of land and empty buildings for community use, with the aim of working in partnership to create social infrastructure in every neighbourhood – including multi-purpose spaces which can combine premises for small businesses, co-working space, sports and leisure facilities, health and wellbeing services – owned and run by the local community, who are best placed to identify their specific needs.
- ▶ supporting local small businesses – directly and/or by investing in the capacity of the local credit union sector to lend to SMEs, for example by providing part-grant, part-loan funding to help support Credit Union expansion (the Access Partnership has reached agreement in principle to trial this approach with Oldham Credit Union, and GM’s other credit unions are keen to scale up to meet demand).

A respondent to the Commission’s call for ideas told us: “*Communities who need the most support, are least likely to have social capital to bid for resources*”. A particular challenge is to find ways to distribute capital from more affluent areas, where excess savings are building up through the pandemic, to deprived areas which may not have the spare capital to support community share offers or similar. In the Commission’s view, this is the added value of a city-region wide Community Wealth Investment Platform, and could be achieved for example via a municipal ‘green recovery bond’ issue to finance decarbonisation projects – as pioneered by Abundance Generation with West Berkshire and Warrington Councils. Debt-based instruments have the advantage of being

compatible with local community ownership since they do not involve taking an equity stake. Importantly, interest rates need to be at least as low as available to councils elsewhere, to ensure that the net effect is redistributive rather than regressive.

Case study: Firs Community Benefit Society, Sale West

The Firs Community Benefit Society is a community-owned and controlled organisation working to develop a new sports and community centre in Sale West. Supported by social investment from the Resonance Community Developers Fund, the group is taking over and rebuilding an existing sports centre next to an under-used outdoor space, transforming it into a multi-purpose community hub. As well as sports and leisure facilities, the new building will house local services such as citizens' advice and the local food bank. A café and community gym will aid footfall and help the building to be financially sustainable whilst also creating local jobs, training and apprenticeship opportunities. The centre is located close to the Firsway Health Centre and aims to partner with it on programmes to promote health and wellbeing for the local community – for example, with the health centre referring patients to the centre to prevent and address health problems through physical activity.

A future GM Land Commission

One critical driver of wealth inequalities that the Commission has had insufficient time and expertise to investigate is the ownership and use of land. We know that land wealth in Greater Manchester is substantially concentrated in Manchester city-centre where land values are highest. High land values can act as a barrier to communities taking ownership of properties, and to small businesses who struggle with high commercial rents. This acts as a block to a more diverse and plural economy which would better meet local needs for affordable goods and services, and also discourages entrepreneurship amongst those on lower incomes, including young people. We also know that the pandemic is disrupting the housing market by prompting many people to move out of urban centres seeking more space, in part due to the rise of home working – but there are currently major uncertainties over how these trends will play out in the long term, and what impacts they will have on land values, high streets, housing affordability and gentrification across the city-region.

We are aware of a number of research projects currently underway, for example at the University of Manchester and the New Economics Foundation, to map and explore the dynamics of land ownership and use in Greater Manchester. This will provide critical intelligence about the factors driving inequalities in the city-region and how they might be addressed. Scotland and Liverpool have both recently set up Land Commissions and research by the New Economics Foundation and Shared Assets is currently underway to establish what the role of such a Commission might be in an England-wide context.



We believe that Greater Manchester would benefit from a similar initiative to build from previous work carried out with a focus on the effective collective use of public sector land to harness the important work being done in this space and explore its implications for policy to reduce inequalities. In particular, this might consider ways to connect interested parties to the right skills to buy and develop land from the private sector.

Recommendation 13: GMCA should set up a Land Commission to look more closely at the ownership and control of land in Greater Manchester, its impacts on inequality, and potential solutions.

Services for a good life

The Covid-19 pandemic is increasingly being described as a '1945 moment'. After 1945, investment in public goods and universal services was seen as key to building a more equal society. In the decade preceding the 2020 pandemic the UK government implemented a fiscal policy of sustained reductions in public spending with the aim of reducing the government budget deficit. When the Commission spoke to local people about what would help to tackle inequalities in Greater Manchester, often their responses were about public goods such as affordable housing, transport, green space and digital access. Building (and in some cases rebuilding) an offer of basic services required for a good life must be the ambition for Greater Manchester in the months and years ahead as the underpinning of a healthy and resilient society and economy.

But as the Greater Manchester Model of public service reform recognises, the way public services are traditionally organised must also change. Services operate in silos, making it

difficult for people to get the holistic support that they need and for public money to be spent in the most effective ways – for example to avoid the short- and long-term costs of school exclusion by investing more in youth work or family support.

This is challenging as public services operate on different geographical footprints and with different funding models which all take account of need and place in different ways. As a result, services do not always tap into the energy, knowledge and capacity that exists on the ground, too often leaving people feeling 'done to' rather than empowered to shape their own lives or to improve things in their local areas.

Greater Manchester has been leading the way in a reform programme for public services that can address these problems and this approach has already been accelerated by the need for rapid collaborative responses to the pandemic. Now is the moment to push on even further.

Towards universal basic services

The Commission endorses the principle of '**universal basic services**' as a key plank of a more equal society i.e. that by providing cost-free or low cost basic services to everyone we can enable everyone to live a decent life and to contribute to the economy and society.⁴⁴ Advocates of a Universal Basic Services identify core services as: education and training, health, childcare, adult social care, housing, transport and digital connectivity. In endorsing the need for universal basic services, the Commission also endorses the principle of **proportionate universalism** (the resourcing and delivering of universal services at a scale and intensity proportionate to the degree of need), recognising that some people and some communities need targeted, stepped up or more intensive services. The proportionate universalist approach is inherent in Greater Manchester's becoming a 'Marmot city-region' to reduce health inequalities.

Recommendation 14: Greater Manchester should build up an offer of universal basic services for all its residents and lobby central government to invest in making this a reality.

As Greater Manchester seeks to develop an offer of universal basic services, it must ensure that these are **accessible to the most disadvantaged groups** that need them the most. It must seek to improve the **quality and affordability** of universal services to the extent that it can, through more democratic ownership and delivery models ([See recommendation 11](#)), and co-production with those who use them ([See recommendation 17](#)). GMCA and local authorities cannot do much about the lack of money for public goods and services, but they can do something about where that money goes – ensuring it works to build community wealth and reduce inequalities.

The Commission recognises that many of the levers to achieve universal basic services are outside of Greater Manchester control – and indeed that the Combined Authority and local authorities are facing more pressure on services than ever before with the effects of the pandemic falling on already stretched budgets. We urge **central government to step up its support** for local authorities to meet cost pressures and income losses resulting from the pandemic: failure to do so risks further widening inequalities by hitting services such as social care and homelessness support. And we encourage Greater Manchester to continue advocating to central government for policy changes that will enable it to move towards truly universal basic services. Most obviously, this means funding

changes, but it also includes greater devolved powers over services and budgets.

Whilst we need central government to act to make universal basic services a reality, there are things that Greater Manchester can do now to build towards this. Over the coming years, the Combined Authority and the boroughs might choose to campaign and focus on specific issues. The Commission believes that there are two areas that stand out for action coming out of the pandemic: **education and housing** – but choosing priorities for future missions could be a deliberative and democratic process. **A great education and access to activities** is vital for ensuring every child and young person gets the best start in life but the pandemic has highlighted how unequal this access is. **Decent housing** is the most basic necessity for a good life yet stark inequalities in housing quality have been exposed and amplified throughout the pandemic year and during lockdowns.

Giving every child an equal start in life

Every child and young person in the city-region deserves a safe, happy, full and supported life and the opportunity to explore and develop their identity, interests and talents, fulfil their potential and shape the lives they want to lead. But currently children and young adult lives are vastly unequal. The pandemic has shone a new light on the huge differences that exist between richer and poorer children from differences in access to food, a decent and warm home, books, computers, internet access, green space, and parental time and expertise in home learning. There were also enormous differences in access to after-school and weekend opportunities,

extra support with learning, and social networks that provide work experience or job opportunities.

The education system should play a key role in mitigating inequalities between children, and in many cases it does. But in Greater Manchester, as nationally, children's experiences of this system remain stratified by socio-economic status, ethnicity, gender, and special educational needs and disabilities. Children from poorer backgrounds are much less likely to be in independent schools or high-ranking state schools and more likely to be in schools judged inadequate by Ofsted: schools which are under the most pressure and often have the greatest difficulties with teacher recruitment and retention.⁴⁵ They are more likely to be excluded; in 2018/19 children in Greater Manchester state schools who were eligible for free school meals and those with special educational needs were at least three times more likely than others to be excluded from school.

These issues are difficult to resolve entirely at Greater Manchester level because there are no devolved powers over education. But that doesn't mean action can't be taken. Evidence from the London Challenge and City Challenges (of which Greater Manchester was one) demonstrate the value of place-based approaches which bring organisations together to collaborate on system improvement. And nationally, there are increasing calls for similar approaches to be developed, to counter the fragmentation of the school system that has developed in the last decade with widespread conversion to Academies.

Place-based Approaches to Educational Improvement and Equity

Between 2003 and 2011, schools in London were part of the **London Challenge**, England's most substantial and successful example of a whole-system approach to improving quality and equity across a city-region. The London Challenge does not explain all of the large improvement in educational attainment in London and the closing of 'disadvantage gaps', but multiple evaluations suggest that it was an important contributing factor.

System-wide changes included: 'figurehead leadership' (a London Schools Commissioner); a powerful sense of moral purpose and a positive framing; use of data to identify key priorities and link similar schools; engagement of experienced school leaders as advisors; and fostering of school-to-school collaboration. The programme focused on 'Keys to Success': schools and key boroughs facing the deepest challenges. It established professional development opportunities for teachers tailored to the context (for example new teacher and leader networks around English as an additional language, and a Chartered London Teacher scheme). Among other things, it also developed a London student pledge relating to cultural

and sporting opportunities and a coordinated partnership with higher education institutions.

The 'challenge' approach was extended to Greater Manchester, but with less funding and for three years only, nevertheless external evaluations reported significant impacts. Some of the key principles of the GM Challenge – effective use of data, fostering inter-school collaboration, and a focus on equity – remain at the heart of Greater Manchester's current approach.

Since 2011, area-based approaches at city-region level have not been supported by central government, but many areas are developing new forms of collaborative approach, recognising that when organisations take collective responsibility for education in an area, fewer schools and fewer children will be left behind ([Area-Based Education Partnerships Association](#)). Strong area-based partnerships can develop collective responsibility for fair admissions, for vulnerable pupils, for school improvement and capacity-building, so that professional knowledge is shared and all schools improve.⁴⁶

Greater Manchester has taken important strides to help children and young people get an equal start in life from establishing the **Education and Employability Board** to coordinating action across the multiple organisations involved in the education system, creating the **Greater Manchester Apprenticeship and Career Service**, to the **Youth Taskforce**. These developments provide the foundation for a more ambitious programme to address inequalities amongst children and young people in education.

Recommendation 15: Greater Manchester should launch a new Education Challenge, building back from the pandemic to provide better and fairer opportunities for all of its children and young people.

Youth Task Force

In June 2020 the Mayor of Greater Manchester, Andy Burnham, announced the [appointment](#) of former Olympian Diane Modahl as Chair of the new Youth Task Force. Set up in response to the impact of the Covid-19 crisis on young people, the Task Force developed a Young Person's Guarantee in Greater Manchester. Its work involved hearing from hundreds of young people from across the city region.

The Guarantee focuses on four key areas:

- ▶ **Keeping connected** – Increased challenges caused because of social and digital exclusion, particularly amongst young people who are most disconnected and disadvantaged.
- ▶ **Staying well** – Greater risk of poorer mental health and wellbeing caused by social isolation, reductions in support and increased anxiety about the future.
- ▶ **Preparing for transition back into work and/or education** – Increased chances of young people experiencing longer-term labour market inequalities and challenges because of the consequences of the pandemic.
- ▶ **Reducing economic inequalities** – Greater risk of poorer transitions from school and college, particularly for those young people in Years 11 and 13, and for those seeking employment.

The Education Challenge can build on existing work and strong collaborative relationships established in the city-region over the past two decades. In particular, it will inspire, mobilise and convene families, schools, colleges, local authorities, public organisations, like the police and health services, voluntary organisations, businesses, universities and local communities, to work together in the interests of Greater Manchester's young people, particularly those growing up in the most difficult circumstances. Greater Manchester can become a centre of innovation and excellence in breaking the link between economic disadvantage, low educational outcomes and limited life chances.

At the heart of the Education Challenge should be a **set of wellbeing goals for children and young people** that all agencies can work towards. These will be a sub-set of the goals developed through [Recommendation 1](#) and should be co-produced with young people and communities. These goals will include educational qualifications – success in exams like GCSEs, 'A' and 'T' Levels but not be limited to them. Education is not only about exams, and the Commission expects the goals to include, for example, physical and mental health, safety, participation and employability. These goals should also be the basis for extending and embedding the existing Young Person's Guarantee beyond the immediate post-Covid recovery period.

The Education Challenge should initially focus on three main areas:

- ▶ **Strengthening and re-focusing collaborative work across the education system**, including supporting schools in the most challenging areas and identifying and supporting the least advantaged learners.

Schools should take collective responsibility for fair admissions policies, and the inclusion and progress of disadvantaged and vulnerable pupils, supported by a strengthening of data and intelligence systems to better highlight inequalities and areas for action. Existing work on the sharing of good practice and professional development should be built on and extended, focusing most on the schools that need greater support. Building on lessons from London Challenge, a team of expert advisors should be established to work across the system, in particular with schools facing challenging circumstances.

- ▶ **A new cross-Greater Manchester focus on improving post-16 transitions** for those most at risk of dropping out or needing extra support. This should involve supporting information-sharing between pre- and post-16 providers, ensuring that careers guidance and support focuses on those who need it most, developing additional provision where needed, and developing schemes with employers and to support enterprise.
- ▶ **Equalising opportunities in access to extra-curricular activities**, so that all children and young people can explore their talents, build their confidence and lead full and rich lives. This should be enabled by the **establishment of a Children and Young Persons' Fund**, funded through creative use of public funds (for example the Pupil Premium), social investment and philanthropy, and a voluntary levy on sport and leisure activities. A new network should be established supporting schools to bring their facilities into community use and to work with other schools and the VCSE sector to expand shared local extra-curricular opportunities.

The Challenge should be led and coordinated by the existing Education and Employability Board. However, the Board will need new resources in order to create the flexibility that will encourage further collaboration and innovation. To support its efforts to position itself as a centre for innovation and learning, Greater Manchester should also establish an education research hub, involving universities working in partnership with practitioners and community partners.

Decent Housing for All

Housing is a critical driver of inequalities of both health and wealth. Access to home ownership is a key driver of wealth inequalities – with private renters significantly more likely to be young and from ethnic minorities. Overcrowding, damp, cold and vermin-infested homes are also associated with health inequalities – and poor housing has been associated with Covid-19 spread.⁴⁷ As one respondent to our survey put it bluntly: *“bad housing makes you sick.”*

The intersection of inequalities is all too apparent in the data on over-crowding: only 3% of White households in Greater Manchester were over-crowded in 2011, compared to 17% of Asian or Asian British households, and 12% of Black African, Black Caribbean or Black British.⁴⁸ People with disabilities also experience disproportionate housing inequalities: the *GM Big Disability Survey* found that 32% of respondents were worried about their housing situation, and 37% reported that their housing was not accessible or only partially accessible, with considerable implications for their ability

to live independently.⁴⁹ The LGBTQ+ panel has also found that issues of homelessness and housing insecurity have been exacerbated by the pandemic for members of this community.

The Commission endorses the **Greater Manchester Housing Strategy**, Greater Manchester’s ground-breaking commitment to eradicate rough sleeping, various initiatives such as **‘A Bed Every Night’** and recent moves to accelerate the delivery of decent, affordable housing. Greater Manchester is leading the way on building new publicly-owned housing and ‘in-sourcing’ management of existing social housing. For example, **‘Hive Homes’**, the Registered Providers Joint Venture, is buying up land to build new social housing in deprived areas of boroughs such as Rochdale and Bolton where private developers are not interested in building, while **Salford City Council** is building a new generation of affordable homes via its development company ‘Derive’. Social homes are also being taken back into public control in **North Manchester**, where ALMO Northwards Housing is being in-sourced at an expected saving of £77m over 30 years. The recent establishment of the **Greater Manchester Community-led Homes Hub** provides advice, training, funding and practical support to local groups, councils and developers looking to develop community-led housing.

Recommendation 16: GMCA should scale up its delivery of affordable housing through public-owned and social sector housebuilding.

This should include:

- ▶ Setting a 15-year target for **half of new homes built to be genuinely affordable**, using the planning system to secure more affordable homes as part of new developments, including by fast tracking developments that meet a minimum threshold.
- ▶ Lobbying central government to **devolve funding for housing** as well as new powers to enable the Combined Authority and districts to build at scale.
- ▶ Using existing funding through the **Housing Infrastructure Fund, Shared Ownership and Affordable Housing Programme** to acquire land as well as rental properties from private landlords, unwanted new build and empty property space for social housing.
- ▶ Investing in innovative social investment projects to provide affordable housing to specific groups facing disadvantages. Purchasing homes from the private rented sector, **retrofitting** them, and leasing them as affordable housing for those who would otherwise struggle to access suitable accommodation, delivers a **‘win-win-win’ for tackling inequality**.
- ▶ Building strategic partnerships with housing associations to increase the delivery of social housing on publicly owned or bought land.

Resonance Supported Homes Fund

The Resonance Supported Homes Fund for people with learning disabilities, autism and mental health challenges launched in 2020 with initial investment of just over £10m, of which GMCA invested £5m alongside other social investors. The fund will buy, refurbish, and adapt – or potentially build – residential properties in communities, with half the funds initially invested within Greater Manchester. The fund is managed in partnership with learning disability charity United Response and learning disability housing provider Reside Housing Association, who will provide person-centred support to enable people to move out of unsuitable housing and into homes of their choice, as well as specialist support for independent living. The Resonance Homelessness Property Fund has utilised a similar model in other UK cities to provide housing for people at risk of homelessness.

The pandemic is also exacerbating inequalities between private renters and home-owners. In particular rent arrears are becoming a significant issue for those who have lost income during the pandemic. We urge GMCA and local authorities to explore ways to help alleviate the immediate crisis facing renters – for instance, by exerting soft power to encourage landlords to offer forbearance on rent debt – and to lobby central government to bring forward the ban on no-fault evictions as well as devolve powers to introduce rent-controls.

A Bed Every Night

Greater Manchester has a strong ‘system’ approach to addressing and preventing homelessness. A Bed Every Night provides a bed, warm welcome, and personal support for anyone who is sleeping rough or at imminent risk of sleeping rough in Greater Manchester. It is part of an integrated support system and is one of a number of options available to people experiencing or at risk of rough sleeping in Greater Manchester. What is different is that A Bed Every Night isn’t just a commissioned service, it is a collaboration across all sectors, with each stakeholder playing their role in fundraising, promotion, co-ordination, referrals, services and helping people onwards in their lives. **The Greater Manchester Homeless Action Network** brings together everyone in Greater Manchester working to end homelessness: people with personal insights into homelessness, people from frontline organisations, public sector officers, and anyone working to find more effective solutions to the homelessness crisis. A Bed Every Night is just one of the initiatives that the Network supports.

The **Greater Manchester Mayor's Charity**, founded by the Mayor and run by volunteers, helps people in need of special care or support. 100% of funds raised go to help the most vulnerable across the city region, and its giving is focused on people who are, or at risk of becoming, homeless.

Tackling inequalities in neighbourhoods

Greater Manchester has already made great strides towards transforming public services so that they are **more holistic, more people-centred and more place-based**. There is an opportunity to build on this with greater collaboration between the public sector and the voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) sector to tackle inequalities in Greater Manchester’s most deprived neighbourhoods.



The Greater Manchester Model of public service reform

The Greater Manchester Model outlines how public service delivery works in Greater Manchester to deliver the vision contained in the Greater Manchester Strategy. It describes a fresh relationship between the public and the public sector and includes: freeing up frontline services to be more responsive to communities; devolving power; and allocating resources more effectively to meet need.

The Greater Manchester Model is presented in the form of a White Paper in which a people-centred theme of **'names, not numbers'** is central. The Paper describes a shift in philosophy, not just policy, and a focus on people in communities who most need support. It also describes a need to build integrated solutions around certain communities, rather than chasing the statistics and targets that public services are forced to monitor by government departments and outdated commissioning practices.

Six key features are core to the Model: geographic alignment; leadership and accountability; one workforce; shared financial resource; programmes, policy and delivery; tackling barriers and delivering on devolution.

The Greater Manchester Model is owned by a multi-agency partnership board – the Greater Manchester Reform Board, chaired by the Mayor of Greater Manchester and involves key public and voluntary, community and social enterprise leaders in driving the transformation of services for the people of Greater Manchester.

Recommendation 17: Amplify the Greater Manchester Model of integrated public services in 10 pathfinder deprived communities, alongside piloting an income guarantee in one or more.

This should include:

- ▶ Creating **neighbourhood teams**, involving residents and volunteers working alongside professionals, building from the emergency response arrangements put in place as a response to the Covid-19 pandemic.
- ▶ Agreeing **shared goals** with local communities, through participatory processes that allows them to set their own priorities.
- ▶ Developing **collective responsibilities** for achieving outcomes, which include an increased role for neighbourhood-level political leadership, alongside local communities, VCSE organisations, local businesses and public bodies.

- ▶ Calculating total public spend in a place and developing **participatory budgeting** processes, areas of **pooled budgeting**, and **joint commissioning** with and for communities.

- ▶ Breaking down barriers to **shared data and intelligence** to target support.
- ▶ Seizing opportunities to develop and **link local economic development and public service plans** for communities.

The local authorities of Greater Manchester should work collaboratively to bid for new funding from Government, and invest existing resources to turbo-charge the implementation of the GM Model in 10 deprived neighborhoods, (one in each local authority) and piloting an income guarantee in one or more communities. The pilot should draw on approaches and the evidence-base that has been developed in other areas that have trialled an income guarantee such as Stockton in the USA or North Ayrshire in the UK.



Levelling up from the bottom up – case studies

Rochdale Boroughwide Housing is a social landlord which is co-operatively led by its tenants and staff. It has been working across two of the borough's most deprived neighbourhoods, Lower Falinge and College Bank, to implement a radical new approach to support residents. From conversations with local residents, it was clear that employment, health and wellbeing, and housing quality were all things that they wanted to improve, along with connectedness within and to the wider community.

A masterplan was developed for the physical redesign of the area to provide a better physical basis for the housing and community residents wanted, connecting them to local assets, the

town centre and each other. To fill gaps between national and Greater Manchester level support, Rochdale Boroughwide Housing created the Rochdale New Pioneers Programme to support residents stuck in a cycle of unemployment and insecure under-employment. The Programme has three main parts: (1) a New Pioneers' Income (which so far has been limited to a small bursary); (2) New Pioneers' Brokers – intensive, personalised coaching and practical support for people; (3) New Pioneers' community and peer support, including through a dedicated New Pioneers' Space.

The estates of Holts and Lees in Oldham have seen services brought together to support residents in the context of high

demand for public services. The team brought together Greater Manchester Police, First Choice Homes, Oldham MBC, Positive Steps and those employed in the community and voluntary sector.

Evaluation has shown high levels of engagement and trust, an increase in self-referrals and improvement in casework outcomes for people, including many substantial improvements in individuals' and families' financial situations. There are social benefits too, the team is combating social isolation and loneliness. Over time, research shows that being socially isolated or lonely is as damaging to health as smoking with significant costs to public services.

Creating a system for change in Greater Manchester

In order to go to the next level, Greater Manchester needs to create a 'system' which fully collaborates around the vision of good lives for all. This requires strong and purposeful leadership from individuals and organisations, and from communities and institutions. Figure 6 describes how the Greater Manchester partnership boards which focus on Growth, Reform and Tackling Inequality can work together to drive forward activity against the shared objectives of people power, good jobs and decent pay, building wealth, and services for a good life.

Critically, the refresh of the Greater Manchester Strategy provides a unique opportunity to bring wellbeing and equality goals front and centre of the work of the Combined Authority and its partners, and the Tackling Inequality Board should be charged with ensuring that this essential pivot is put in place.

Figure 6 – this diagram shows the recommendations of the Commission and the role of key actors in making them happen – including the Greater Manchester Growth Board, Reform Board and Tackling Inequality Board. It suggests that all sectors should work with communities to achieve good lives for all in Greater Manchester.

Figure 6: Creating a system for change in Greater Manchester



Finding the money

The Commission is acutely aware of the financial pressures facing local government. This means creative ways are needed to harness the resources that exist in the city-region, and to ensure that all spending and investment delivers maximum value in tackling inequalities and improving people's lives. Throughout this report we have suggested ways in which this could be done, but they include:

- ▶ **pooling budgets** to support joint action on inequalities in priority neighbourhoods or thematic areas;
- ▶ treating **community wealth building as an investment** in deprived neighbourhoods, promoting economic development in Greater Manchester and thus meriting use of investment funds, and preventing future public service costs;
- ▶ redeploying investment resources and scaling up existing social investment activity until **investing to tackle inequalities becomes the norm** across all investment activities;
- ▶ finding new ways **to harness the estimated £10bn of additional savings built up during the pandemic** by more affluent GM households – for example via municipal bond issues, a community investment platform and promoting local credit unions;
- ▶ ensuring that **procurement and commissioning** practices support good jobs, local ownership and a thriving VCSE sector – and reducing or eliminating the extent to which they support business and ownership models that extract wealth from the city region or enable poor employment practices;

- ▶ convening **anchor institutions to maximise the potential benefits of their combined spending** in terms of social value; ensuring that high-growth 'frontier' sectors play their part in tackling inequalities – through social value commitments in contracts and section 106 agreements.

We note that many Greater Manchester development activities, such as the work and skills provision and Growth Company, are funded via **EU structural funds** which will shortly be withdrawn. The constraints attached to this funding are presently a barrier to innovation and to reorienting approaches in these areas – the transition to a new funding settlement offers an opportunity for Greater Manchester to rethink its strategy and redesign systems.

The Commission also urges local authorities within Greater Manchester and others preparing bids into the new **Levelling Up and Towns Funds**, and also the **UK Community Renewal Fund** to take on board our recommendations, including seeking capital investment to create 'assets' which will be held in partnership with communities, taking holistic, bottom-up approaches to neighbourhood development, and using mutual, co-operative and worker business ownership models. As government has chosen a centralised bidding and funding allocation process for these new sources of funding, local authorities will need to find creative ways to make the most of the funding available to tackle inequalities and build community wealth. This should include finding new ways to collaborate on areas of common interest.

A collaborative culture

The system shift needed to realise the Commission's vision for Greater Manchester is not just about resources – it also requires new ways of working. As we learned from approaches taken elsewhere, for example in Wales and Amsterdam, collaboration and creative thinking have been key in enabling systems to pivot to work towards new goals. Now, more than ever, it is critical that everyone in Greater Manchester works together towards the common goal of a just and fair recovery from the pandemic. This applies both across policy silos *within* institutions, and *between* institutions – including GMCA, the ten local authorities, the Health and Social Care Partnership, FE colleges, universities and other anchor institutions, such as the NHS and business.

This demands a **new social contract** between local government, communities and local residents – giving people genuine opportunities to participate and have control over things that affect their lives and working closely with groups and organisations that represent them. Making this meaningful requires local leaders to be brave enough to share power with those most affected by inequalities.

Finally, as we have emphasised throughout this report, this culture must be one that is willing to experiment and take risks – **recognising that in a crisis, the biggest risk of all may be doing nothing.**



Actions for central government

Greater Manchester, including GMCA and the 10 local authorities, has demonstrated its soft power in helping to influence and support central government throughout the pandemic. The Commission urges Greater Manchester to develop and amplify its convening power across the city-region and across the North of England. The elected mayors of Northern combined authorities, the membership of the Convention for the North, as well as Leaders and elected Mayors of the major cities can be a powerful collective voice for tackling inequality.

Greater Manchester should (continue to) compel central government to:

- ▶ Enact the **Socio-economic Duty** of the 2010 Equality Act
- ▶ Make the **Universal Credit uplift** permanent and introduce a minimum income guarantee
- ▶ Give local and combined authorities **more devolved decision-making over budgets** to help support people into good employment, and more control over universal credit – especially the housing component

- ▶ Work with local government to test and fully evaluate an **Income Guarantee** within the city-region
- ▶ **End the hostile environment** and ‘no recourse to public funds’ for migrants
- ▶ **End no-fault evictions** and give local authorities the power to introduce **rent controls**
- ▶ **Fund local authorities fully to compensate for the extra budgetary pressures created by the pandemic and long-term funding for local services, including social care, transport and housing.**

Next steps

The Commission suggests that GMCA should develop a roll-out plan to implement our recommendations, including plans for governance and accountability. GMCA should **report on progress against our recommendations after six months, or on the publication of the Greater Manchester Strategy** (whichever is later), including how the recommendations have been included in the refreshed strategy. At this stage, the Commission should reconvene briefly and produce a short report commenting on progress as well as any wider developments since our report was published. We encourage everyone implementing our recommendations to continue the conversations with those most affected by inequalities. Whilst the process for developing new wellbeing and equality targets is ongoing all actors can simply ask:

-
- ▶ Will this action make someone's life better?
 - ▶ Will it work for everyone that it needs to?
 - ▶ Will it reduce inequality at individual, institutional, and structural levels?
 - ▶ Will it work in the long term?

Acknowledgements

For advice, guidance and encouragement, Kate Pickett thanks: Debbie Abrahams, Fran Darlington-Pollack, Danny Dorling, Bill Kerry, Neil Lawson, Alyson Malach, Katherine Trebeck, Andrea Westall, Martin Wilkinson, Richard Wilkinson, Wanda Wyporska, [The Equality Trust](#) and the [Wellbeing Economy Alliance](#).

The Commission would like to thank the people of Greater Manchester who took the time to respond to our call for ideas, as well as everyone who took part in round tables, workshops, and discussions for the Commission, including members of the Greater Manchester equalities panels, the Poverty Reference Group, and GM Equalities Alliance. Thanks to Policy@Manchester for hosting round tables and showcasing academic research for the Commission. We have included insight from a range of communities of identity and experience in our online Annex alongside the quantitative data.

Finally, the Commission thanks the team at GMCA for their support and hard work, in particular: Anne Lythgoe, Amy Foots, Francis Markus, John Wrathmell and Alan Harding.

This has been a huge exercise conducted at speed: it would have been impossible without the support and enthusiasm of the many, many people who have joined us in wanting to make good lives for all in Greater Manchester.

Notes

- ¹ In this document, the term ‘living wage’ is used to mean the Real Living Wage calculated annually by the Resolution Foundation and overseen by the [Living Wage Commission](#).
- ² The Commission recognises not only the inequalities between groups defined by the protected characteristics (age, sex, race, disability, sexual orientation, pregnancy and maternity, religion and belief, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership), but others too, such as inequalities related to caring responsibilities, migration status, and so forth.
- ³ Office for National Statistics *Updating ethnic contrasts in deaths involving the coronavirus (Covid-19), England and Wales: deaths occurring 2 March to 28 July 2020* (October 2020). Data are quoted having adjusted for age, geography, socio-economic characteristics and health measures, including pre-existing conditions.
- ⁴ Office for National Statistics *Coronavirus (Covid-19) related deaths by occupation, England and Wales: deaths registered between 9 March and 28 December 2020* (January 2021).
- ⁵ National data, sourced from Office for National Statistics *Why have Black and South Asian people been hit hardest by Covid-19?* (December 2020).
- ⁶ Office for National Statistics *Coronavirus (Covid-19) roundup, 13 to 17 July 2020* (July 2020).
- ⁷ Nafilyan, V. *et al*, *Ethnicity, Household Composition and Covid-19 Mortality: A National Linked Data Study* (November 2020).
- ⁸ Office for National Statistics *Updated estimates of coronavirus (COVID-19) related deaths by disability status, England: 24 January to 20 November 2020* (February 2021). Disability status was sourced from 2011 Census self-reported data, with those who said that their day-to-day activities were ‘limited a little’ or ‘limited a lot’ referred to in the ONS paper as ‘less disabled’ and ‘more disabled’ respectively.
- ⁹ More recent fine grained local data on Covid-19 deaths (at MSOA level) are not available.
- ¹⁰ Office for National Statistics *Annual Population Survey* (data for the year to September 2020).
- ¹¹ Department for Work and Pensions *Claimant Count* (January 2021 data). The quoted percentages relate to the 16+ population, for whom the number of claimants increased by 89% between February 2020 and January 2021; the increase for 16-24 year olds was 93%.
- ¹² Office for National Statistics *Annual Population Survey* (data for the year to September 2020). Note that ‘economically inactive’ includes students, people looking after the family or home, those who are temporarily or long-term sick, ‘discouraged’ and retired people.
- ¹³ Office for National Statistics *Annual Population Survey* (data for the year to September 2020).
- ¹⁴ Office for National Statistics *Annual Population Survey* (data for the year to September 2020). Disability is defined under the Equality Act (2010) core definition: a person is considered to have a disability if they have a long-standing illness, disability or impairment, which causes difficulty with day-to-day activities.
- ¹⁵ Office for National Statistics *Annual Population Survey* (all data quoted are for the year to December 2019).
- ¹⁶ Crawford C, Macmillan L & Vignoles A. (2017) When and why do initially high-achieving poor children fall behind?, *Oxford Review of Education*, 43:1, 88-108, DOI: 10.1080/03054985.2016.1240672
- ¹⁷ Ofsted *Covid-19 series: briefing on early years, November 2020* (December 2020). ‘Deprivation’ is based on the estimated percentage of funded three- and four-year-

olds eligible for Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP) in the spring term 2020. Providers with no eligible EYPP children are considered the 'least deprived', whilst providers with 40% or over are considered the 'most deprived'.

¹⁸ GM Early Education Leads and GMCA School Readiness Team *Childcare provider pulse survey – Wave 2* (December 2020).

¹⁹ All data in this paragraph sourced from Office for National Statistics *Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings* (2020 provisional data).

²⁰ Data on the proportion of children aged under-16 living in relative low income families, sourced from Department for Work and Pensions / HM Revenue and Customs *Children in Low Income Families – local area statistics, Great Britain: 2014/15 to 2018/19 (Experimental)* (2020). Relative low income is defined as a family in low income before housing costs. A family must have claimed one or more of Universal Credit, Tax Credits or Housing Benefit at any point in the year to be classed as low income in the data.

²¹ Note that the Greater Manchester Poverty Action research draws on a different source of child poverty data, published by End Child Poverty (*Child Poverty In Your Area 2014/15 – 2018/19*). See <https://www.gmpovertyaction.org/poverty-monitor-child-poverty/> and <https://www.gmpovertyaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Poverty-monitor-child-poverty-and-ethnicity-table.pdf>

²² Numbers grew by over 12,500, instead of the c.8,000 that might have been expected due to ongoing roll-out of Universal Credit under 'business as usual' conditions. This is a 13%

increase, five percentage points higher than the 8% increase seen for the period from January to October 2019.

²³ Life expectancy at birth is the average number of years that would be lived by babies born in the year the data refer to, if current mortality levels at each age remain constant in the future. The 2019 Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) average score is a summary measure that weights scores across the seven IMD domains; the more deprived an area, the higher the IMD score. Areas plotted to the bottom right of the chart have higher levels of deprivation and lower life expectancy, and those to the top left have lower levels of deprivation and higher life expectancy.

²⁴ Office for National Statistics *Life Expectancy (LE) and Healthy Life Expectancy (HLE) at Birth by Sex for Middle Layer Super Output Areas (MSOAs) in England, 2009 to 2013* (2015). Healthy life expectancy at birth is an estimate of the average length of time that babies born in the year the data refer to would live in a state of 'good' general health, if current levels of mortality and good health at each age remain constant in the future.

²⁵ The Stockport and Trafford data are for male healthy life expectancy, from the same source.

²⁶ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government *English indices of deprivation 2019* (2019).

²⁷ Census 2011.

²⁸ Census 2011. Elementary occupations require a minimum general level of education, equating to that acquired by the end of compulsory education.

²⁹ Department for Work and Pensions / HM Revenue and Customs *Children in Low Income Families – local area statistics, Great Britain: 2014/15 to 2018/19 (Experimental)* (2020). Note that the map plots data on the proportion of children aged under-16 living in relative low income families.

³⁰ <https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/what-we-do/investment/>

³¹ A good example of this kind of work is the adoption by a number Local Authorities of Unite's Construction Charter into their procurement procedures. This charter lays out 11 requirements for both contractors and their supply chains, such as developing and implementing skills and training opportunities, mandating direct employment of workers and ensuring access to trade union representation.

³² NHS Workforce Statistics, March 2019.

³³ Operation Black Vote, BAME Local Political Representation Audit, 2019.

³⁴ Police workforce (see <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/workforce-and-business/workforce-diversity/police-workforce/latest#download-the-data>). Population data are from Census 2011.

³⁵ [Greater Manchester statement on George Floyd and Black Lives Matter - Greater Manchester Combined Authority](https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/greater-manchester-statement-on-george-floyd-and-black-lives-matter) ([greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk](https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk))

³⁶ HM Government / Greater Manchester Combined Authority *Greater Manchester Local Industrial Strategy* (2019), p.20.

- ³⁷ Foundational Economy: The Infrastructure of Everyday Life. The Foundational Economy Collective. Manchester University Press. 2018.
- ³⁸ Examples include:
<https://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=44186>
https://www.mmu.ac.uk/media/mmuacuk/content/documents/students/ManchesterMetropolitanUniversityAPP_2020-21_V1_10004180.pdf
<https://www.bolton.ac.uk/assets/Uploads/Updated-Access-Participation.pdf>
[https://www.salford.ac.uk/schools-and-colleges/outreach-and-widening-participation201920-Access-and-Participation-Plan-1.pdf\(rncm.ac.uk\)](https://www.salford.ac.uk/schools-and-colleges/outreach-and-widening-participation201920-Access-and-Participation-Plan-1.pdf(rncm.ac.uk))
- ³⁹ <https://gmcommission.coop/>
- ⁴⁰ Bureau van Dijk *Financial Analysis Made Easy (FAME) business database* (2020). The dataset does not define social enterprises specifically, and the quoted data comprises businesses that are listed as either a 'Charitable Organisation' or a 'Private Limited' / 'Limited by Guarantee' company that is categorised as a 'Community Interest Company'. The data include businesses that either have a registered office or trading address in Greater Manchester.
- ⁴¹ http://oa.upm.es/41201/1/INVE_MEM_2015_227727.pdf
- ⁴² <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/workforce-and-business/business/leadership-of-small-and-medium-enterprises/latest> Businesses are considered to be 'ethnic minority-led' if 50% or more of their management team are from ethnic minorities, or if a person from an ethnic minority is in sole control of the business.
- ⁴³ <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2020/aug/30/independent-shops-enjoy-business-boost-due-to-commuting-drop>
- ⁴⁴ 'Social prosperity for the future: A proposal for Universal Basic Services'. UCL Institute for Global Prosperity
- ⁴⁵ Ofsted *Childcare providers and inspections* (March 2020). Nearly one in five (18.8%) of state-funded schools located in the 20% most deprived areas of Greater Manchester were rated as either 'inadequate' or 'requires improvement' at their last Ofsted inspection, more than double the 8.2% of providers in the 20% least deprived areas. Data are sourced from Ofsted [*State-funded schools inspections and outcomes as at 31 August 2020*](#) (August 2020). The deprivation data used by OFSTED are drawn from the income deprivation affecting children index (IDACI), part of the 2019 [*Index of Multiple Deprivation*](#) (each school was assigned a score based on the home postcodes of pupils at the time of the January 2020 school census, with the schools then placed into one of five deprivation bands).
- ⁴⁶ Cousin, S. and Crossley-Holland, J. (2021) *Developing a New Locality Model for English Schools*.
- ⁴⁷ <https://www.insidehousing.co.uk/insight/insight/the-housing-pandemic-four-graphs-showing-the-link-between-covid-19-deaths-and-the-housing-crisis-66562>
- ⁴⁸ Office for National Statistics *Census 2011* (2011).
- ⁴⁹ Greater Manchester Disabled People's Panel, *GM Big Disability Survey: Covid-19* (Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People, 2020), p.23.