



ONE ESSEX COURT

2017 DIVERSITY MONITORING REPORT

1. The Bar Standards Board (**BSB**) requires chambers to publish a summary of a diversity data monitoring exercise carried out every three years (see rC110.3.q-t of the Code of Conduct contained in the BSB Handbook). This report is that summary for One Essex Court (**OEC**) in respect of the data monitoring exercise carried out in 2016-2017.
2. Chambers' Diversity Data Officer (**DDO**) sent out questionnaires on 16 November 2016 to all of OEC's members, staff and pupils. Responses were provided by 16 January 2017 and the data and this report were collated in March 2017.
3. The overall response rate was 52%, although the response rate varied significantly across different groups in Chambers. 21 of 35 Queen's Counsel (**QCs**) in Chambers, or 60%, responded to the questionnaire. 41 of 74 junior members or tenants, or 55%, responded to the questionnaire. This category includes retired judge arbitrators in Chambers, but will be referred to as '**junior members**' in this report for ease of reference. 13 of 37 members of Chambers staff, or 35%, responded to the questionnaire.
4. This report sets out, both as numbers and percentages, the majority of the data collected as a result of this exercise. There are some exceptions, as follows:
 - (1) Chambers' Diversity Data Policy precludes publication about data on religion or belief and sexual orientation (this is related to rC110.3.s.i of the Code of Conduct, which makes it logistically difficult to publish data on these characteristics). No data is therefore published on those characteristics in this report. However, we can confirm that there is a diversity of religious beliefs and a diversity of sexual orientations within Chambers.
 - (2) Where there are fewer than 10 individuals in a given sub-category, OEC does not publish data in relation to that sub-category. This is in line with Chambers'

Diversity Data Policy and the best practice recommended by the BSB. This has led to the amalgamation of certain categories of data and the non-publication of other categories of data.

- (3) As there are only three pupils in Chambers at the moment, we have not published data in relation to them.

Age

QCs

5. 11 respondents said that they were aged under 55. 10 were aged 55 or over. Thus, 31% of QCs in Chambers are aged under 55, 29% are aged 55 or over and we have no data on 40%.

Junior members

6. 21 respondents said that they were aged 35 or older. 20 were aged under 35. Thus, 28% of junior members are aged 35 or older, 27% are aged under 35, and we have no data on 45%.

Staff

7. All staff who responded are aged under 55.

Gender

QCs

8. As OEC has fewer than 10 female QCs, we do not publish data on the gender of QCs as derived from the diversity monitoring exercise. As can be seen from Chambers' website, however, OEC had five female QCs at the time the monitoring exercise was carried out (and has six as at the date of this report).

Junior members

9. 11 respondents were female and 30 male. Thus, 15% of junior members are female, 41% are male, and we have no data on 45%.

Staff

10. The number of female and male staff respondents was each fewer than 10, and therefore we have not published this data.

Ethnicity

11. Fewer than 10 respondents were from an ethnic minority, and therefore we have not published this data.

Disability

12. No respondents (in any category) considered themselves to have a disability according to the definition in the Equality Act 2010. However, a small number of respondents did say that their day-to-day activities are limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months. As this number is fewer than 10, we have not published data in relation to it.

Socio-economic background

QCs

13. 10 respondents were part of the first generation of their families to go to university. 11 were not. Thus, 29% of QCs in Chambers were part of the first generation of their families to go to university, 31% were not, and we have no data on 40%.
14. A slight majority of QC respondents attended UK independent/fee-paying schools, but the number of those who did not (variously, respondents who went to UK state schools, attended school outside the UK, or went to a different type of UK school such as a direct grant grammar) is fewer than 10, and we have therefore not published this data.

Junior members

15. Fewer than 10 respondents in this category were part of the first generation of their families to go to university. We have therefore not published data in this sub-category.
16. 13 respondents went to UK state schools; 15 went to UK independent/fee-paying schools; 13 went to school outside the UK. Thus, 18% of junior members went to state school, 20% went to UK independent/fee-paying schools, 18% went to school outside of the UK, and we have no data on 45%.

Staff

17. As the number of staff respondents who attended UK independent/fee-paying schools is fewer than 10, we have not published this data. Similarly, there are fewer than 10 staff respondents in each category relating to university education (was part of the first generation of their families to go to university; was not; did not attend university), so we have not published that data.

Caring responsibilities

Members of chambers (QCs and juniors)

18. 14 respondents, across both the QC and junior categories, are primary carers for children under 18. 48 are not. (This data has been amalgamated because the number in each sub-category is fewer than 10.) Thus, 13% of members of Chambers are primary carers for children under 18, 44% are not, and we have no data on 36%.
19. As there are fewer than 10 members of Chambers who look after or give support to family or friends due to health or age related problems, we have not published this data.

Staff

20. As the number of staff respondents with caring responsibilities (either as primary carers for children under 18 or as providers of support to family or friends) is under 10, we have not published this data.

15 March 2017