

Tackling Health Inequalities

Key messages from survey
for KENT



Background to the work

- Persistent health inequalities exist in Kent
- Although deprivation is a key determinant, it is not the only one
- CAA/LAA – provides the opportunity to judge the effectiveness of approaches at a Kent-wide level
- Snap survey – 23% response
 - identifies strengths and areas for development
 - provides an agenda for action
- Workshops to help break down barriers to improvement

Health inequalities – strengths of current approach

- There are clear and challenging aims to reduce health inequalities in the area
- PCTs provide good leadership on health inequalities
- Strategies are based on priorities
- It has been clearly identified which particular areas / people are affected by health inequalities
- The reasons behind health inequalities have been clearly understood
- Information is shared by key partners to identify key issues and help determine priorities

Health inequalities – strengths of current approach

- Key stakeholders do receive performance information on progress on reducing health inequalities
- This information is analysed and discussed at panel/ board / LSP group meetings
- Appropriate action is taken as a result of this information
- Good partnership working which generally results in appropriate action.
- The necessary skills and competencies are present at a strategic and operational level.

Health inequalities – developments needed in current approach

- There is a lack of confidence (or clarity) around the accuracy of performance information.
- There is room for improvement in terms of partners being able to challenge under-performance in an open and constructive manner.
- Lack of clarity of leadership from Strategic Health Authority/ County Council / Government Office.
- A large proportion of respondents do not know whether strategies are producing effective outcomes.

Local health challenges

Health profile indicators significantly better than England average

Area	No. of health profile indicators significantly better than England average (out of 30)	Rank (out of 386)	Area	No. of health profile indicators significantly better than England average (out of 30)	Rank (out of 386)
Hampshire CC	29	1	Sevenoaks CD	22	29
Richmond upon Thames LB	27	2	Kent CC	20	66
East Hertfordshire CD	26	3	Tunbridge Wells CD	20	66
Epsom and Ewell CD	25	4	Tonbridge and Malling CD	19	87
Buckinghamshire CC	25	4	Maidstone CD	16	144
Cambridgeshire CC	25	4	Ashford CD	15	154
Chiltern CD	24	7	Canterbury CD	15	154
South Cambridgeshire CD	24	7	Dartford CD	11	218
South Norfolk CD	24	7	Dover CD	10	236
St Albans CD	24	7	Gravesham CD	9	248
Wealden CD	24	7	Medway UA	7	276
Winchester CD	24	7	Shepway CD	7	276
Wokingham UA	24	7	Swale CD	6	287
Devon CC	24	7	Thanet CD	4	320

Local health challenges teenage conceptions

Area	Teenage pregnancy (under 18)- 2004 - 2006	Rank (out of 386)
Rutland UA	12.5	1
Chiltern CD	12.9	2
Waverley CD	15.0	3
Uttlesford CD	15.7	4
Cotswold CD	16.2	5
Brentwood CD	16.6	6
Hart CD	17.0	7
South Norfolk CD	17.7	8
Ryedale CD	17.7	8
Craven CD	17.8	10
Mole Valley CD	18.1	11
South Cambridgeshire CD	18.1	11

Area	Teenage pregnancy (under 18)- 2004 - 2006	Rank (out of 386)
Sevenoaks CD	23.20	46
Tunbridge Wells CD	23.70	56
Canterbury CD	28.90	119
Tonbridge and Malling CD	29.80	125
Kent CC	37.60	220
Maidstone CD	38.20	229
Gravesham CD	38.40	232
Dartford CD	40.50	247
Dover CD	41.10	252
Shepway CD	41.70	258
Medway UA	43.80	268
Ashford CD	44.10	272
Swale CD	47.60	297
Thanet CD	55.40	354

Local health challenges

Obese children

Area	Obese Children (2006/2007)	Rank (out of 386)	Area	Obese Children (2006/2007)	Rank (out of 386)
Teesdale CD	4.90	1	Sevenoaks CD	7.40	49
South Lakeland CD	5.30	2	Tonbridge and Malling CD	7.70	63
Waverley CD	5.30	2	Tunbridge Wells CD	7.80	70
Brentwood CD	5.50	4	Ashford CD	8.30	105
Aylesbury Vale CD	5.60	5	Canterbury CD	8.60	131
Norwich CD	5.60	5	Medway UA	9.00	162
Wycombe CD	5.70	7	Swale CD	9.10	168
Brighton and Hove UA	6.00	8	Maidstone CD	9.30	187
Hart CD	6.00	8	Shepway CD	9.30	187
Hambleton CD	6.00	8	Kent CC	9.40	195
South Northamptonshire CD	6.10	11	Thanet CD	11.00	306
Mid Suffolk CD	6.10	11	Gravesham CD	11.00	306
Wokingham UA	6.10	11	Dartford CD	11.60	336
Daventry CD	6.20	14	Dover CD	11.70	341
Epsom and Ewell CD	6.30	15			
Tynedale CD	6.30	15			

Local health challenges

Obese adults

Area	Obese Adults (2003-2005)	Rank (out of 386)
Tower Hamlets LB	11.9	1
Kensington and Chelsea LB	13.1	2
Camden LB	13.3	3
Wandsworth LB	14.2	4
Richmond upon Thames LB	14.3	5
City of Westminster LB	14.7	6
Hammersmith and Fulham LB	15.4	7
Islington LB	16.0	8
Barnet LB	16.8	9
Kingston upon Thames LB	17.3	10
Merton LB	17.3	10
Elmbridge CD	17.4	12
Hackney LB	17.5	13
Bromley LB	17.6	14
Chiltern CD	17.9	15
Haringey LB	17.9	15

Area	Obese Adults (2003-2005)	Rank (out of 386)
Tunbridge Wells CD	20.20	45
Sevenoaks CD	20.70	60
Canterbury CD	22.10	100
Tonbridge and Malling CD	22.50	120
Maidstone CD	22.80	138
Kent CC	23.40	153
Thanet CD	23.40	153
Ashford CD	24.20	195
Dover CD	24.20	195
Shepway CD	24.20	195
Dartford CD	24.80	236
Medway UA	25.30	255
Gravesham CD	25.70	274
Swale CD	26.50	315

Local health challenges

Deaths from smoking

Area	Deaths from smoking (2004 - 2006)	Rank (out of 386)	Area	Deaths from smoking (2004 - 2006)	Rank (out of 386)
East Dorset CD	139.4	1	Sevenoaks CD	164.30	19
Rutland UA	141.1	2	Tunbridge Wells CD	181.80	78
Christchurch CD	148.1	3	Tonbridge and Malling CD	183.40	82
South Norfolk CD	148.1	3	Ashford CD	189.20	113
Chiltern CD	151.6	5	Maidstone CD	207.20	195
Kensington and Chelsea LB	151.9	6	Gravesham CD	208.50	206
West Somerset CD	155.9	7	Canterbury CD	215.50	224
Winchester CD	156.8	8	Kent CC	216.2	227
West Devon CD	159	9	Shepway CD	234.60	266
Cotswold CD	159.7	10	Dover CD	235.10	270
South Cambridgeshire CD	160.9	11	Dartford CD	239.30	278
Suffolk Coastal CD	161.6	12	Swale CD	247.90	298
New Forest CD	162.9	13	Medway UA	260.10	324
Elmbridge CD	163.1	14	Thanet CD	276.30	341
East Devon CD	163.1	14			
Waverley CD	163.8	16			

Local health challenges

Male Life Expectancy

Area	Male Life Expectancy (2004 - 2006)	Rank (out of 386)
Kensington and Chelsea LB	83.1	1
East Dorset CD	81.4	2
Hart CD	80.7	3
Rutland UA	80.6	4
Elmbridge CD	80.4	5
Christchurch CD	80.3	6
Wokingham UA	80.3	6
City of Westminster LB	80.2	8
South Norfolk CD	80.2	8
Sevenoaks CD	80.1	10
Guildford CD	80.1	10
Horsham CD	80.1	10
Winchester CD	80.1	10
New Forest CD	80.0	14
Fareham CD	80.0	14
Crawley CD	80.0	14

Area	Male Life Expectancy (2004 - 2006)	Rank (out of 386)
Sevenoaks CD	80.10	10
Ashford CD	79.50	39
Tonbridge and Malling CD	79.40	45
Tunbridge Wells CD	78.60	113
Gravesham CD	78.30	143
Maidstone CD	78.10	167
Kent CC	78.00	178
Canterbury CD	77.90	187
Dartford CD	77.60	217
Dover CD	77.60	217
Shepway CD	77.20	258
Swale CD	76.90	271
Medway UA	76.40	299
Thanet CD	75.80	330

Local health challenges

Female Life Expectancy

Area	Female Life Expectancy (2004 - 2006)	Rank (out of 386)	Area	Female Life Expectancy (2004 - 2006)	Rank (out of 386)
South Northamptonshire CD	87.2	1	Sevenoaks CD	84.00	9
Hart CD	84.7	2	Tonbridge and Malling CD	82.80	83
Rutland UA	84.4	3	Tunbridge Wells CD	82.40	135
Ribble Valley CD	84.3	4	Maidstone CD	82.10	174
Wokingham UA	84.2	5	Ashford CD	82.10	174
Harborough CD	84.2	5	Kent CC	81.80	204
Uttlesford CD	84.1	7	Dover CD	81.70	213
Blaby CD	84.1	7	Canterbury CD	81.60	226
Waverley CD	84.0	9	Gravesham CD	81.60	226
West Oxfordshire CD	84.0	9	Shepway CD	81.30	254
Mole Valley CD	84.0	9	Dartford CD	81.20	266
South Cambridgeshire CD	84.0	9	Swale CD	81.00	283
Rushcliffe CD	83.9	13	Medway UA	80.80	291
			Thanet CD	80.50	319

What you said were barriers

- Perceptions of affluence V pockets of deprivation
- Resources – allocation and adequacy
- Commitment/buy-in
- Prioritisation
- Communication with communities
- Transient data/Lack of good quality data
- Silo based funding V cross cutting need