

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) Lunch Clubs

Title of spending review/service change/proposal	Phased reductions in funding to lunch clubs
Name of division/service	Adult Social Care – Commissioning and Care Services
Name of lead officer completing this assessment	Cathy Carter
Date EIA assessment completed	27 07 18
Decision maker	City Mayor
Date decision taken	

EIA sign off on completion:	Signature	Date
Lead officer Cathy Carter	Cathy Carter	27 07 18
Equalities officer Surinder Singh	Surinder Singh	27 07 18
Divisional director Tracie Rees		

Please ensure the following:

- (a) That the document is understandable to a reader who has not read any other documents, and explains (on its own) how the Public Sector Equality Duty is met. This does not need to be lengthy, but must be complete.

- (b) That available support information and data is identified and where it can be found. Also be clear about highlighting gaps in existing data or evidence that you hold, and how you have sought to address these knowledge gaps.
- (c) That the equality impacts are capable of aggregation with those of other EIAs to identify the cumulative impact of all service changes made by the council on different groups of people.

1. Setting the context

Describe the proposal, the reasons it is being made, and the intended change or outcome. Will current service users' needs continue to be met?

The proposal is to implement phased reductions to grants provided by Adult Social Care (ASC) to 14 lunch clubs for older people. The lunch clubs are mainly located in the central areas of the city – a map showing the locations is at Appendix 1.

Adult Social Care (ASC) has funded these lunch clubs for many years. The funding was originally provided in order to provide nutritious, culturally appropriate meals for groups of older people from ethnic minority groups.

However, the Care Act 2014 changed the landscape of Adult Social Care in a way that more clearly distinguished the duties of councils to provide care and support for people who are assessed as eligible for council social care, from the duties of councils to prevent, delay or reduce the development of such needs. Under the Care Act, people who appear to have a need for support, for example to meet their nutritional needs or to mix socially, can have an assessment. If the assessment finds that they are eligible because of such needs they can have a package of care which could include statutory services such as domiciliary care to help with meals, community opportunities to provide social interaction and so on, or a Direct Payment with which to buy the support they need themselves. This would include culturally appropriate food or social opportunities if needed.

Lunch clubs are not statutory services – that is they are not aimed at people who have been assessed as having eligible needs. Their purpose has therefore tended to have been seen as 'preventative'. In addition, new grant agreements issued to

them on 2016 reduced the emphasis on meal provision. As the funding is in the form of grants, and is not statutory, the contractual requirements to provide detailed monitoring and quality assurance information is not as significant as it would be for statutory services

The 'choice' of which club is funded and how much they are funded had developed over time in an ad hoc way, and there was no specific analysis of need, or preventative value. In addition, there is no particular rationale for funding these specific 14 groups to provide social activities for older people, when there are many other activities for older people that do not get adult social care funding.

ASC hopes that the lunch clubs will be able to continue without council funding and will provide advice to assist them to do this. However, unlike statutory services, there is no obligation to find alternatives for service users if they are unable to do so. Having said this, where a disproportionate negative impact on a protected group is identified as part of this impact assessment, we will identify mitigating actions to remove or reduce the impact.

The lunch clubs affected, current and phased reductions in funding are shown below:

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
	Current	From Jan 2019 25% less	From Jan 2020 50% less	From Jan 2021 25% less	From Jan 2022 End of funding
Provider A	£40,086	£37,581	£27,559	£17,538	£7,516
Provider B	£2,254	£2,113	£1,550	£986	£423
Provider C	£9,601	£9,001	£6,601	£4,200	£1,800
Provider D	£16,932	£15,874	£11,641	£7,408	£3,175
Provider E	£7,058	£6,617	£4,852	£3,088	£1,323
Provider F	£9,384	£8,798	£6,452	£4,106	£1,760

Provider G	£421	£395	£289	£184	£79
Provider H	£5,493	£5,150	£3,776	£2,403	£1,030
Provider I	£16,770	£15,722	£11,529	£7,337	£3,144
Provider J	£4,741	£4,445	£3,259	£2,074	£889
Provider K	£308	£289	£212	£135	£58
Provider L	£9,216	£8,640	£6,336	£4,032	£1,728
Provider M	£12,500	£11,719	£8,594	£5,469	£2,344
Provider N	£5,263	£4,934	£3,618	£2,303	£987
Total	£140,027	£131,275	£96,269	£61,262	£26,255

Part of the basis for the proposal is that it is argued that lunch clubs could continue without ASC funding if they change their 'business model'. This is evidenced by the fact that many lunch clubs or similar community activities are able to operate without council funding, especially low-cost activities – for example coffee mornings. Options for the lunch clubs include charging for meals, finding cheaper sources of food, stopping providing lunches and moving to cheaper activities, finding cheaper venues to meet in, making more use of volunteers, seeking donations, seeking funding from other sources. It is intended to provide information and signposting to lunch clubs to give them advice and support to do this – e.g. via

- VAL's Group Support Service and other sources. VAL's Group Support Service offers a wide range of support on setting up and running a group and finding funding. <https://www.valonline.org.uk/groups/advice-support/setting>
- Leicestershire Cares – specifically ProHelp which is a group of professional firms who are committed to making a difference in the community by offering their services for free to community organisations in need of support <http://www.leicestershirecares.co.uk/prohelp/> .
- DMU Square Mile <https://dmusquaremile.our.dmu.ac.uk/> who could help with skills training for those that run the clubs

- **Spacehive & CrowdFundLeicester**– these are the new funding opportunities for communities and groups that the Mayor is also jointly supporting with the Community Engagement Fund, <https://www.spacehive.com/movement/crowdfundleicester>
- Sports funding for those that carry out physical activities - <https://www.leicester.gov.uk/leisure-and-culture/sport-and-leisure/other-sports/sports-development/funding/>

The reasons for the proposal are:

- That there is no evidence that lunch clubs prevent people from developing needs for statutory ASC care and support. This is because the only requirement is that service users are over 55 and this on its own is not a significant risk factor for developing statutory needs;
- That the current provision is ad hoc, based on historic funding arrangements, and is not based on priority needs (such as having a complex health condition or mental health problem etc); and
- There is a requirement to make savings in adult social care. This funding forms part of a wider review of ASC prevention services commissioned from the VCS. Although there are equalities implications for taking forward this proposal, this should be weighed against the potential equalities implications should the council be unable to afford to deliver statutory ASC care and support.

2. Equality implications/obligations

Which aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) are likely be relevant to the proposal? In this question, consider both the current service and the proposed changes.

	Is this a relevant consideration? What issues could arise?
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------

Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation

How does the proposal/service ensure that there is no barrier or disproportionate impact for anyone with a particular protected characteristic

The funding reductions are proposed to take place across all lunch clubs. The lunch clubs are for older people (55+) and although they state they are open to all, in practice are targeted at people from specific ethnic and faith communities. There may therefore be a disproportionate impact in these groups, plus on people with disability or long-term health conditions, as these characteristics are more prevalent amongst older people. In order to respond to this potential disproportionate impact we have identified the following mitigating actions:

To provide information, guidance and contacts which will help lunch clubs to develop alternative business models and/or alternative sources of funding.

However, the majority of older people in the city, including those from the ethnic or faith groups who would be affected by the proposal, do not have access to a council funded lunch club. In addition, the lunch clubs do not cover other communities who may have an equal or greater need, for example people living on the outer estates of the city.

If the lunch club is able to continue by using donations, making more use of voluntary workers, charging those who attend the full cost of the meal and/or finding other sources of funding, service users may see no change. The lunch club may decide to meet less often, or if the club is no longer able

	to continue, service users may need to find alternative activities to attend.
<p>Advance equality of opportunity between different groups How does the proposal/service ensure that its intended outcomes promote equality of opportunity for users? Identify inequalities faced by those with specific protected characteristic(s).</p>	The original proposal was to end funding all in one go from January 2019. The proposal has been amended to take a phased approach to ending funding in order to enable lunch clubs to find alternative sources of funding and/or change their business model to reduce costs. This change should provide a better chance for lunch clubs to continue, which, if this happens, would mitigate the risk to the attendees across protected characteristics.
<p>Foster good relations between different groups Does the service contribute to good relations or to broader community cohesion objectives? How does it achieve this aim?</p>	As above.

3. Who is affected?

Outline who could be affected, and how they could be affected by the proposal/service change. Include current service users and those who could benefit from but do not currently access the service.

The 14 lunch clubs receive small grants from ASC. For this reason, it is not required that they provide detailed monitoring information. The specification sets targets for the number of meals provided, but not for the number of unique individuals accessing these meals. It is therefore difficult to provide an accurate picture of service users. In addition, the meal itself is not the

key benefit. People who do struggle to meet their nutritional needs because of a social care need can be assessed for a package of care. The main benefit of lunch clubs is to provide a source of social support.

Some of the lunch clubs do submit demographic data – and the list below shows which ones did and what they submitted for quarter 3 2018-19, which gives us a partial picture of the characteristics of some service users:

Provider	Ethnicity	Disability	Age	Religion	Gender	Sex Orientation
Provider A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Provider B	No	No	No	No	No	No
Provider C	No	No	No	No	No	No
Provider D	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Provider E	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Provider F	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Provider G	No	No	No	No	No	No
Provider H	No	No	No	No	No	No
Provider I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Provider J	No	No	No	No	No	No
Provider K	No	No	No	No	No	No
Provider L	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Provider M	Yes	No	No	No	No	No

Provider N	Yes	Don't Know	No	No	No	No
------------	-----	------------	----	----	----	----

From those that did submit demographic data a broad summary is shown below:

The full data from those that submitted is shown in Appendix 2.

Of 520 service users,:

- There were 306 females and 214 males.
- There were 28 aged under 65, 204 aged 65-74, 230 aged 75-84 and 58 aged 85 or over
- The predominant ethnic group was Indian (404 people), with Caribbean second (103)
- The predominant disability was 'learning difficulty' (267 people) with physical disability second (80)
- The predominant faith group was Hindu (277 people), with Sikh second (103).

It must be stressed that **this only represents data from less than half of the lunch clubs**. None of the lunch clubs submit data on sexual orientation.

This means that the data alone does not give a full picture of the equality impact of the proposed decision. However, because of the target user groups for the lunch clubs, it is likely that the proposal to taper and cease funding would be likely to result in a disproportionate negative impact on:

- People over 55 years
- People with disability or a long-term health condition (because of the higher prevalence of these amongst older people)
- People from Asian and African Caribbean ethnic groups

- People from minority faith groups: Hindu, Sikh, Jewish.

Therefore it has been identified, as part of the proposal that work must be undertaken to support the organisations who will be affected by the proposal, to make changes to their business model or to identify other sources of funding which would aid them in being able to continue to offer lunch clubs.

4. Information used to inform the equality impact assessment

What **data, research, or trend analysis** have you used? Describe how you have got your information and what it tells you. Are there any gaps or limitations in the information you currently hold, and how you have sought to address this, e.g. proxy data, national trends, etc.

As described above, data has been used from monitoring returns submitted by some of the lunch clubs, the service specification (which specifies that the club should be for people over 55) and observation about the target group for the lunch club and observations made on visits during quarterly monitoring and as part of engagement and consultation during the review.

5. Consultation

What **consultation** have you undertaken about the proposal with current service users, potential users and other stakeholders? What did they say about:

- What is important to them regarding the current service?
- How does (or could) the service meet their needs?
- How will they be affected by the proposal? What potential impacts did they identify because of their protected characteristic(s)?
- Did they identify any potential barriers they may face in accessing services/other opportunities that meet their needs?

Consultation on the proposal was undertaken from 9th April to 29th June 2018. The consultation consisted of a survey, which people could complete online or on paper, together with a range of meetings with lunch club providers and with service users at the lunch clubs themselves.

172 people responded to the survey. In response to the survey, 89% of respondents disagreed with the proposal to end the funding to the lunch clubs. From both the survey and from the meetings with the lunch clubs, the key points made in the consultation were:

- a. the majority of people disagreed with the proposal
- b. the clubs helps people to avoid isolation and provides a social life,
- c. they help people with health problems by providing exercise and advice and support on keeping safe and well.
- d. the clubs do a lot more than provide lunch – providing both activities, and access to other sources of support such as advocacy in hospital, falls prevention, diabetes support, warm homes and also running activities such as fitness.
- e. changes to lunch clubs will affect ethnic minorities more because they are culturally appropriate.
- f. the value of lunch clubs is reinvested in the community – because they are not businesses.
- g. providers recognised the financial constraints facing the council and support for the proposal to phase out funding rather than remove it all at once
- h. funding cuts are short-sighted as people will need formal care and support earlier if they are not accessing lunch clubs
- i. clubs would need support to become self-sufficient, and for some this will be difficult as they have limited capacity. Some felt that VAL does not necessarily provide the support that groups need; and
- j. the wider issues that groups are facing – for example other cuts to the VCS – should be taken into account.

A consultation report is available which sets out the findings in more detail.

6. Potential equality Impact

Based on your understanding of the service area, any specific evidence you may have on service users and potential service users, and the findings of any consultation you have undertaken, use the table below to explain which individuals or community groups are likely to be affected by the proposal because of their protected characteristic(s). Describe what the impact is likely to be, how significant that impact is for individual or group well-being, and what mitigating actions can be taken to reduce or remove negative impacts.

Looking at potential impacts from a different perspective, this section also asks you to consider whether any other particular groups, especially vulnerable groups, are likely to be affected by the proposal. List the relevant that may be affected, along with their likely impact, potential risks and mitigating actions that would reduce or remove any negative impacts. These groups do not have to be defined by their protected characteristic(s).

Protected characteristics	Impact of proposal: Describe the likely impact of the proposal on people because of their protected characteristic and how they may be affected. Why is this protected characteristic relevant to the proposal?	Risk of negative impact: How likely is it that people with this protected characteristic will be negatively affected? How great will that impact be on their well-being? What will determine who will be negatively affected?	Mitigating actions: For negative impacts, what mitigating actions can be taken to reduce or remove this impact? These should be included in the action plan at the end of this EIA.

	How does the protected characteristic determine/shape the potential impact of the proposal?		
Age¹	The lunch clubs are for people over 55 years of age.	May not have a lunch club to attend if the club is unable to continue without ASC funding. This could lead to loneliness and isolation for some.	Advice/Support to be provided to lunch clubs to help them continue without ASC funding. Signposting to other activities for older people. Signposting to ASC for an assessment to see if they are eligible for statutory ASC support
Disability²	Over 55 years – more likely to have a disability or long term health condition.	May not have a lunch club to attend if the club is unable to continue without ASC funding. This could lead to loneliness and isolation for some.	Support to be provided to lunch clubs to help them continue without ASC funding. Signposting to other accessible activities for people. Signposting to ASC for an assessment to see if they are eligible for statutory ASC support
Gender Reassignment³	No impact identified at this stage.	As above	Signposting to other accessible activities for people.

¹ Age: Indicate which age group is most affected, either specify general age group - children, young people working age people or older people or specific age bands

² Disability: if specific impairments are affected by the proposal, specify which these are. Our standard categories are on our equality monitoring form – physical impairment, sensory impairment, mental health condition, learning disability, long standing illness or health condition.

³ Gender reassignment: indicate whether the proposal has potential impact on trans men or trans women, and if so, which group is affected.

Marriage and Civil Partnership	No impact identified at this stage.		
Pregnancy and Maternity	Unlikely to be an impact – service is for older people		
Race⁴	Indian and Caribbean	Some service users converse in languages other than English, for example at one Lunch club Gujarati is widely spoken. This could limit options for people to attend other groups or activities in the local community.	If a lunch club was to close, seek to signpost to groups or activities for similar communities, where same language spoken as far as possible. Where appropriate, where people require help with their language skills, signpost them to local ESOL classes.
Religion or Belief⁵	People from different faiths use the lunch clubs, Hindu, Sikh, Jewish, Christian	May not have a lunch club to attend if the club is unable to continue without ASC funding.	Advice/Support to be provided to lunch club to help them continue without ASC funding. Signposting to other activities for people.
Sex⁶	More women than men use the lunch clubs.	May not have a lunch club to attend if the club is unable to continue without ASC funding.	Advice/Support to be provided to lunch club to help them continue without ASC funding.

⁴ Race: given the city's racial diversity it is useful that we collect information on which racial groups are affected by the proposal. Our equalities monitoring form follows ONS general census categories and uses broad categories in the first instance with the opportunity to identify more specific racial groups such as Gypsies/Travellers. Use the most relevant classification for the proposal.

⁵ Religion or Belief: If specific religious or faith groups are affected by the proposal, our equalities monitoring form sets out categories reflective of the city's population. Given the diversity of the city there is always scope to include any group that is not listed.

⁶ Sex: Indicate whether this has potential impact on either males or females

			Signposting to other activities for people.
Sexual Orientation⁷	No impact identified at this stage.		
<p>Summarise why the protected characteristics you have commented on, are relevant to the proposal? Those who attend lunch clubs will be people who have particular protected characteristics, such as disability and age. However, it is important to recognise that people accessing the clubs will have a wide range of, and possibly multiple, protected characteristics.</p> <p>Summarise why the protected characteristics you have not commented on, are not relevant to the proposal? We will continue to monitor as the proposed changes are implemented, and should any disproportionate negative impact become apparent we will identify mitigating actions where possible to reduce or remove the impact.</p>			

Other groups	<p>Impact of proposal: Describe the likely impact of the proposal on children in poverty or any other people who we consider to be vulnerable. List any vulnerable groups likely to be affected. Will their needs continue to be met? What issues will affect their take up of services/other opportunities that meet their needs/address inequalities they face?</p>	<p>Risk of negative impact: How likely is it that this group of people will be negatively affected? How great will that impact be on their well-being? What will determine who will be negatively affected?</p>	<p>Mitigating actions: For negative impacts, what mitigating actions can be taken to reduce or remove this impact for this vulnerable group of people? These should be included in the action plan at the end of this EIA.</p>
---------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

⁷ Sexual Orientation: It is important to remember when considering the potential impact of the proposal on LGBT communities, that they are each separate communities with differing needs. Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people should be considered separately and not as one group. The gender reassignment category above considers the needs of trans men and trans women.

Children in poverty	No specific impact		
Other vulnerable groups			
Other (describe)	Many service users will be on low incomes will mean it is more difficult to charge the service users for the costs of the meal	More difficult to attract donations from the community or sponsorship from private sector organisations.	One mitigating action could be for attendees to be asked to pay what they can even if it is not the full cost of the meal. In addition, finding other sources of funding other than from the local community itself may be possible.

7. Other sources of potential negative impacts

Are there any other potential negative impacts external to the service that could further disadvantage service users over the next three years that should be considered? For example, these could include: other proposed changes to council services that would affect the same group of service users; Government policies or proposed changes to current provision by public agencies (such as new benefit arrangements) that would negatively affect residents; external economic impacts such as an economic downturn.

The wider reduction in funding available to VCS groups will mean that finding alternative funding for the groups will be more challenging.

Some of the groups are also affected by: cuts to community groups by Neighbourhood Services; re-commissioning of Community Opportunities services; and the end of the 5 year BIG Lottery funded Leicester Ageing Together programme funding in 2019. <https://www.leicesteraeingtogether.org.uk/>

Economic downturn – and the fact that many service users will be on low incomes will mean it is more difficult to charge the service users for the costs of the meal and more difficult to attract donations from the community or sponsorship from private sector organisations.

8. Human Rights Implications

Are there any human rights implications which need to be considered (please see the list at the end of the template), if so please complete the Human Rights Template and list the main implications below:

None.

9. Monitoring Impact

You will need to ensure that monitoring systems are established to check for impact on the protected characteristics and human rights after the decision has been implemented. Describe the systems which are set up to:

- monitor impact (positive and negative, intended and unintended) for different groups
- monitor barriers for different groups
- enable open feedback and suggestions from different communities
- ensure that the EIA action plan (below) is delivered.

ASC will maintain contact with the clubs on a regular basis during the phasing out of the funding to monitor their wellbeing and to provide support to help them find a sustainable way forward.
Information on alternative activities in the local neighbourhood will be provided.

10. EIA action plan

Please list all the equality objectives, actions and targets that result from this Assessment (continue on separate sheets as necessary). These now need to be included in the relevant service plan for mainstreaming and performance management purposes.

Equality Outcome	Action	Officer Responsible	Completion date
Seek to enable lunch clubs to become sustainable without ASC funding	Phase out funding, rather than ending it all in one go, to help lunch clubs adjust and, if possible find other ways of continuing such as using donations, increasing use of volunteers, charging those who attend the full cost of the meal or asking them to pay what they can; and/or finding other sources		

	of funding. Support for groups to do this is available from Voluntary Action Leicester.		
Seek to enable lunch clubs to become sustainable without ASC funding	<p>Hold a workshop and provide written advice on sources of support: e.g</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. VAL – group support 2. Leicestershire Cares – ProHelp 3. DMU Square Mile <p>Funding opportunities, e.g:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spacehive & CrowdFundLeicester 2. Ward funding 3. Sports funding 	Cathy Carter	July 2019
Monitor lunch clubs during phasing period	Quarterly reports by lunch clubs to ASC Contracts and Assurance Team. This will identify whether any groups are failing, and enable us to offer support.	Neil Lester	Quarterly until funding ends 31 st Dec 2021.
Signpost clubs/ service users to alternative activities. Include food banks	Information leaflets provided for service users	Cathy Carter	July 2019

Advise service users how to have an assessment for eligibility for ASC services	Information leaflets provided for service users	Cathy Carter	July 2019
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------	-----------

Human Rights Articles:

Part 1: The Convention Rights and Freedoms

- Article 2:** Right to Life
- Article 3:** Right not to be tortured or treated in an inhuman or degrading way
- Article 4:** Right not to be subjected to slavery/forced labour
- Article 5:** Right to liberty and security
- Article 6:** Right to a fair trial
- Article 7:** No punishment without law
- Article 8:** Right to respect for private and family life
- Article 9:** Right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion
- Article 10:** Right to freedom of expression
- Article 11:** Right to freedom of assembly and association
- Article 12:** Right to marry
- Article 14:** Right not to be discriminated against

Part 2: First Protocol

Article 1: Protection of property/peaceful enjoyment

Article 2: Right to education

Article 3: Right to free elections

EIA Appendix 1 – Locations of lunch clubs

MAP AVAILABLE

EIA Appendix 2 – data on lunch club users

Lunch Club User Information Q1 - Q3 2017-2018					
No.	Lunch Club Providers	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Total Number
1	Provider A	94	95	93	282
2	Provider B	147	129	No Data	276
3	Provider C	65	95	No Data	160
4	Provider D	273	276	276	825
5	Provider E	28	13	11	52
6	Provider F	26	36	35	97
7	Provider G	269	227	225	721
8	Provider H	164	197	No Data	361
9	Provider I	22	31	35	88
10	Provider J	156	196	210	562
11	Provider K	636	641	595	1872
12	Provider L	70	70	70	210
13	Provider M	123	116	103	342
14	Provider N	37	44	37	118
Total		2110	2166	1690	5966

Lunch club Age Groups Q3 Period 2017-2018			
Group	Male	Female	Total
18-64	8	20	28
65-74	85	119	204
75-84	82	148	230
85+	39	19	58
Total	214	306	520

Lunch club Ethnicity Groups Q3 Period 2017-2018			
Group	Male	Female	Total
Bangladeshi	0	0	0
Indian	172	232	404
Pakistani	3	17	20
Other Asian Background	32	39	71
Caribbean	23	80	103
African	0	0	0
British	16	5	21
Europe	3	0	3
Total	249	373	622

Lunch club Disability Groups Q3 Period 2017-2018			
Group	Male	Female	Total
Dementia	1	18	19
Brain/Head Injury	0	1	1
Hearing Impairment	6	9	15
Learning Difficulty	143	124	267
Long Term Illness/Condition	9	13	22
Mental Health	13	12	25
Mobility	9	31	40
Physical Disability	14	66	80
Visual Impairment	1	1	2
Prefer Not to Say	0	2	2
Other (Specify below)	0	0	0
Total	196	277	473

Lunch club Religion Groups Q3 Period 2017-2018			
Group	Male	Female	Total
Bahai	0	0	0
Buddhist	0	0	0
Christian	13	24	37
Hindu	146	131	277
Jain	0	0	0
Jewish	0	0	0
Muslim	12	86	98
Sikh	41	62	103
Atheist	0	0	0
No Religion	0	0	0
Prefer Not Say	0	5	5
Other (Specify below)	0	0	0
Total	212	308	520