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## HR Metrics and Data Sourcing

NB: The following points provide an explanation of the methodology and definitions by which the data in this report are formed.

All data reported excludes schools and casuals, unless specified.
Counts of 10 or less are anonymised with '\#' to protect individuals' identities.
All data is as at $31^{\text {st }}$ March of the reporting year, unless otherwise specified.
Unless specified, employees are counted in every post they hold, and therefore may be counted more than once.

Equalities data is captured during recruitment and can be amended later by employees through MyView.

2010 data is used as a base point due to council service reviews beginning at this time. Children, Adults \& Health (CAH) and Environment \& Community Services (ECS) departments were formed through the amalgamation of former departments during 2012/13 and therefore the data prior to March 2013 has been merged for these departments.

## Full-Time vs. Part-Time

Full-time is typically 37 hours per week.

## Disability

Staff within the council are asked to declare if they consider themselves to be disabled.

## Grade Group

The number of departments reduced after 2010/11 and therefore the number of staff in Chief Officer grades also reduced. Public Health transferred into SGC after 2010/11 and therefore related data is not available for 2010/11.

Other grades include staff on non-standard grades such as Community Learning Tutors, Associate Music Teachers, Family Learning Tutors, Fitters/Erectors and Assistants to Political Groups

## Turnover

Turnover is the percentage of total headcount whose employment ended during the financial year. Voluntary turnover includes only individuals whose permanent employment ended due to resignation or retirement.

Voluntary turnover excludes casual workers, variable-hours employees and employees on limited term contracts.

Redundancy turnover excludes casual workers, variable-hours employees and employees on limited term contracts.

Permanent employees are counted once in their main post, no matter how many posts they hold.

## Apprentices

Apprentice numbers include employees who joined the council as apprentices but excludes employees who are undertaking an apprenticeship as part of their substantive role with the council.

Employees are only counted once, no matter how many posts they hold.

## Applicants for Employment

Includes vacancies, applicants and new starters.
Vacancy data is taken from the council's recruitment system TAS. All 'vacant' or new posts are advertised even if these are for internal only or expression of interest applications. The data will not include those appointments via TUPE or transfer in via any other means.

A vacancy may be used to advertise more than one post, which could lead to multiple appointments per advert. Advertised casual roles are also included in the vacancies data.

Total applicants include internal and external applicants. An applicant is counted once for each role they apply for. For example, an applicant may have applied for several posts or may have applied for the same post multiple times within the reporting period.

New starters only include external applicants who have joined the council in permanent or limited term posts. Each starter is counted once in every post they start in.

## Grievances

Includes grievance cases recorded in our HR case management system (CRM), including informal grievances. Integra data is not stored in CRM and is therefore not included. This will be possible from September 2020 (part year) and then going forwards from 2021.

Data for 2010/11 is not available and therefore 2011/12 has been provided as the earliest benchmarking year for this section.

Percentages are of the total grievances received.

## Written Warnings and Dismissals

Includes the number of written warnings (first and final) given, and the number of performance or capability related dismissals as held on the HR case management system (CRM). Integra data is not stored in CRM and is therefore not included.

Percentages are of the total written warnings and dismissals recorded.

## Length of service in years of permanent staff

Years are rounded to the nearest whole year.
Employees are only counted once, no matter how many posts they hold.

## Number of employees taking maternity leave and returning to work following maternity leave

The number of permanent employees who commenced maternity leave during the year and the number of employees who returned to work during the year. The returners for the year may not have commenced their maternity leave in the same year.

Employees are only counted once, no matter how many posts they hold.

## Executive Summary and Progress

The HR Annual Equalities in Employment report is one of a series of annual reports outlining the current status of the workforce and outlining any changes over the previous financial year. More detail around workforce data and sickness absence are available in the Annual Workforce Data report and Annual Sickness Absence report respectively.

This report contains a review of the action plan for the period 2016-20. A new action plan will be co-produced with staff groups, aligned to council plan priorities. The new plan will utilize data in this report as an evidence base.

There is relevant commentary within the body of this report against data set. Key points arising from the data this year include:

- The gender distribution within departments and council wide remains consistent with previous years.
- The age profile of the council has remained consistent with minimal changes across all age groups of less than $1 \%$. The biggest age group is still 50-59 ( $30.6 \%$ of the workforce) with $44 \%$ being $50+$ years of age.
- Apprentices increased slightly again this year by almost $1 \%$ which will support our aim of encouraging younger workers into our workforce and our 'grow your own' approach to talent and succession planning.
- The percentage of staff who have not disclosed their data for all equalities groups fell this year. Despite small improvements in disclosed data, data completeness remains a challenge to enable better analysis and insight to support equality plans. This is particularly true for the Transgender Status, Sexual Orientation and Religion/Belief protected characteristics where data disclosed is especially low. With the current coronavirus pandemic, a more accurate ethnicity data set would help us better support this group where there is emerging evidence of vulnerability, or 'risk factor' in relation to COVID-19 health outcomes:

Summary of progress against the action plan:
The Council has continued to support employee equalities groups including the Disabled Employees Group, the BME Staff Network, the Women's Staff Network and the LGBTQ+ Staff Network.

Council-wide promotion of apprenticeships has continued this year and the opportunity for using the apprentice levy to fund training for new staff and existing staff has resulted an increase in apprentices within the council and inclusion of apprenticeships as a 'grow your own' approach within divisional workforce plans.

We continue to share in a programme for senior women leaders with partners across the region. This is a programme run by Springboard Development Plus (a national organisation) and participants include Avon Fire \& Rescue, B\&NES, North Somerset, Bristol CC, and Curo Housing. The aim of this programme is to prepare senior women managers for the next steps in their careers towards Service Manager/Heads
of Service positions. This is the third year of the programme, which is being delivered over Zoom, following its delay from running in April this year. We have also continued with our in-house programme - Women in Leadership - which aims to encourage the career development of women at all levels within the organisation.

As required by legislation the council's gender pay gap report was published in March of this year. Actions to address the gap can be found in the report but include the positive action initiatives stated above as well as, support for flexible working practices, childcare vouchers, and continuation of a robust job evaluation process.

## Review of Equalities Action Plan 2016-2020

| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Protected } \\ \text { Characteristic }\end{array}$ | Issue | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Summary of progress and actions over } \\ \text { plan period }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gender | $\begin{array}{l}\text { There has been a 4\% proportional } \\ \text { increase in women in Hay grade 3 and } \\ \text { senior manager grades this year } \\ \text { meaning that 58\% of staff in these } \\ \text { grades are now women. This remains } \\ \text { broadly representative of the South } \\ \text { Gloucestershire area population. } \\ \text { However, we continue to aspire to move } \\ \text { towards a leadership profile that } \\ \text { represents the workforce composition, } \\ \text { which would see more women in } \\ \text { leadership positions. }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Tailored training and development } \\ \text { programmes aimed at increasing the } \\ \text { number (\%) of women in management } \\ \text { roles have been put in place. } \\ \text { The Staff Women's Equality Group will } \\ \text { continues to be supported. } \\ \text { Gender Pay Gap and Equal Pay Reports } \\ \text { have been produced during the period of } \\ \text { this plan and will be utilized to inform } \\ \text { future action plans. }\end{array}$ |
| Age | $\begin{array}{l}\text { The number of younger age groups } \\ \text { (aged under 30) in employment has } \\ \text { remained very low, with staff in the } \\ \text { under 20 group falling this year to less } \\ \text { than 1\% of the workforce. }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Good progress has been made across the } \\ \text { council with introducing apprenticeships } \\ \text { and the council has invested in an } \\ \text { Apprenticeship Co-ordinator. (see annual } \\ \text { workforce report for data) The council as }\end{array}$ |
| an employer of young people will be a |  |  |
| theme for future action and promotion. |  |  |$\}$


| Protected Characteristic | Issue | Summary of progress and actions over plan period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | with the lowest known group being Asian at $3.8 \%$ this year. <br> Turnover rates are highest within 'White Irish' and 'Mixed' groups this year. |  |
| Sexual Orientation | Overall, the known numbers of gay women and men working for us remain small, combined they make up less than $1 \%$ of the workforce. The proportion of bisexual staff is also less than $1 \%$. The "unknown" data reporting category is high in this area at just under $50 \%$. | The council continues to support equalities groups across the council. We have continued to promote the need for staff to complete equalities data to help us better understand our workforce and this will continue. |
| All | Continue to enhance the working environment and culture to make SGC a welcoming employer. <br> Anecdotal evidence suggests that managers may require a greater understanding in order to proactively understand and support the needs of staff, particularly in relation to diversity and equality issues. <br> Comparison data may not reflect the geographical locations where our employees live and commute from. | Progress has been made over the period of this plan, particularly with the first tranche of unconscious bias training and the launch of the council's values and behaviours. This work will continue and clear actions included in the refreshed equalities action plan. |
| Support for those returning from Maternity/ Adoption/ <br> Parental Leave and extend this to cover those returning from Long Term Sick leave. | To assist with confidence building and smooth transition/return to the workplace. | Coaching offer available to all staff and has been particularly promoted during the COVID period. |

## Equalities Data

## Staff in Post

## Staff in post by Department

| Department | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chief Executive \& Corporate Resources (CECR) | 542 (13.0\%) | 1007 (29.3\%) | 956 (27.5\%) |
| Environment and Community Services (ECS) | 1032 (24.8\%) | 965 (28.1\%) | 1018 (29.3\%) |
| Children, Adults and Health (CAH) | 2589 (62.2\%) | 1460 (42.5\%) | 1501 (43.2\%) |
| Total | 4163 | 3432 | 3475 |

- Occupied posts within South Gloucestershire Council (SGC) have increased slightly by $1 \%$ compared with last year.
- A reduction in occupied posts can be seen within CECR due to team moves from CECR into ECS.
- CAH remains the biggest of the 3 departments.

Minimal changes of between $1 \%$ and $2 \%$ can be seen across all departments.

## Staff in Post by Gender

|  | 2010/11 |  | 2018/19 |  | 2019/20 |  | South Glos Population - ONS Mid-Year Population Estimates $2019{ }^{1}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Chief Executive \& Corporate Resources (CECR) | $\begin{gathered} 206 \\ (38.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 336 \\ (62.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 260 \\ (25.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 747 \\ (74.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 246 \\ (25.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 710 \\ (74.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Environment and Community Services (ECS) | $\begin{gathered} 498 \\ (48.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 534 \\ (51.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 468 \\ (48.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 497 \\ (51.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 482 \\ (47.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 536 \\ (52.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]|  | 2010/11 |  | 2018/19 |  | 2019/20 |  | South Glos Population - ONS Mid-Year Population Estimates $2019{ }^{1}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Children, Adults and Health (CAH) | $\begin{gathered} 452 \\ (17.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2137 \\ (82.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 352 \\ (24.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1108 \\ (75.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 345 \\ (23.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1156 \\ (77.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Total | $\begin{gathered} 1156 \\ (27.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3007 \\ (72.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1080 \\ (31.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2352 \\ (68.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1076 \\ (30.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2402 \\ (69.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 112338 \\ (49 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 116370 \\ (51 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

- The gender distribution within the council remains consistent with the previous year.
- Very minimal department changes can be seen with the overall result continuing to show more female than male employees across all departments, with a near equal gender split within ECS.

For comparison, the most recent local government employment data for England from the Local Government Association² (LGA) dated February 2020, indicates a spilt of $25 \%$ Male employees and $75 \%$ female employees. This is comparable to last year's data and to SGC. However, the ONS ${ }^{3}$ mid-2019 population estimates show the population of South Gloucestershire split more equally ( $49 \%$ male $-51 \%$ female).
Staff in Post by Gender Reassignment

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Transgender employees | 0 | 0 |
|  | 55 | 113 |
| Prefer not to answer | $(1.6 \%)$ | $(3.3 \%)$ |
|  | $\#$ | $\#$ |
|  | $(0.03 \%)$ | $(0.2 \%)$ |

The council began capturing employee's transgender status during Q4 18/19, and the proportion of responses remains low. The percentage of not known responses has decreased by almost $2 \%$ this year but the number of staff who responded that they prefer not to answer has increased slightly this year (less than 1\%). The council will continue to focus on capturing this, along with other equalities data, which optimistically may lead to a more accurate representation in next year's report.

[^1]Staff in Post by Gender (Full-time vs. Part-time)

|  | 2010/11 |  | 2018/19 |  | 2019/20 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Total number of full-time staff | $\begin{gathered} 936 \\ (48.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 985 \\ (51.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 757 \\ (48.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 803 \\ (51.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 731 \\ (46.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 833 \\ (53.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total number of part-time staff | $\begin{gathered} 220 \\ (9.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2022 \\ (90.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 323 \\ (17.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1549 \\ (82.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 342 \\ (17.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1569 \\ (82.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

- This year, as per last year, there has again been a slight shift in the parttime split towards men, and in full-time towards women (around 2\% change in full-time and $1 \%$ in part-time).
- The number of both male and female part-time post holders has increased again this year.
- Also, as per last year, the number of female full-time post holders has increased alongside a simultaneous fall in male full-time post holders.

The majority (55\%) of male occupied full-time posts reside in ECS, whereas female occupied full-time posts mainly ( $58 \%$ ) sit within CAH. This is consistent with the previous year.

All departments saw a decrease in male full-time post holders this year, with the biggest decrease ( $11 \%$ ) primarily in CECR. Within CECR, the highest reduction in male full-time post-holders was within Finance \& Customer Services. This is most likely related to the establishment change whereby Customer Services teams moved into ECS.

ECS and CAH saw increases in female full-time post holders this year, with the biggest increase within ECS (16\%). This increase, along with an $18 \%$ reduction in female full-time post holders within CECR would suggest that these changes are again related to the establishment changes cited above.

The majority of both male (50\%) and female (43\%) occupied part-time posts are within CAH. Percentages of part-time females across all departments have remained the same as last year, despite small changes in numbers, with minor changes in the percentage of male part-time post holders seen across departments.

The majority of CAH part-time posts for both male and females sit within Integrated Children's Services (31\% of all part-time posts), with the majority of these (59\%) being within Vinney Green Secure Unit where most part-time posts are Night Care Assistants/Residential Care Officers.
$48 \%$ of male part-time posts are variable-hours compared to $16 \%$ of female part-time posts. This is a minimal increase for both male and female variable-hour posts when compared to last year.

Staff in Post by Age Group

| Age Group | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | South Glos PopulationONS Mid-Year Population Estimates $2019^{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <20 | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (1.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15367 \\ & (6.5 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| 20-29 | $\begin{gathered} 433 \\ (10.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 365 \\ (10.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 376 \\ (10.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35938 \\ (15.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 30-39 | $\begin{gathered} 761 \\ (18.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 680 \\ (19.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 696 \\ (20.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38456 \\ (16.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 40-49 | $\begin{gathered} 1362 \\ (32.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 864 \\ (25.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 846 \\ (24.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36326 \\ (15.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 50-59 | $\begin{gathered} 1135 \\ (27.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1063 \\ (31.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1065 \\ (30.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39804 \\ (17.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 60-64 | $\begin{gathered} 337 \\ (8.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 296 \\ (8.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 315 \\ (9.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15066 \\ & (6.4 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| 65+ | $\begin{gathered} 114 \\ (2.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 130 \\ (3.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 155 \\ (4.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53697 \\ (22.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

- At the end of FY 19/20 the average post holder age within the council is 48, an increase of 1 year compared with last year.
- Most post holders (30.6\%) still sit within the 50-59 age group, although this has decreased slightly this year by $0.3 \%$.
- The percentage of post holders aged 60+ has increased this year by just over 1\%.
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- The percentage of post holders aged less than 20 years has decreased this year from $1 \%$ to $0.6 \%$ and the application rate within this age group continues to be low.

The SGC workforce age groups have remained stable this year when compared to last year, with changes of less than $1 \%$ seen across all age groups.

Most posts are filled by staff in the 50-59 year age group, of which $36 \%$ sit within CAH and an additional $31 \%$ in ECS. Over half (68\%) of CE, Chief Officers \& Senior Manager grade group post holders are aged 50-59 (rising to $82 \%$ and $53 \%$ when looking at post holders aged 50+) and post holders in the 50-59 age group also account for around $30 \%$ of all other grade groups, except for apprentices. Therefore, the large proportion of 50-59 year old post holders needs to be considered, as this may lead to significant skills loss over time, and may impact future workforce planning.

The proportion of posts held by employees aged below 20 has decreased slightly this year by $0.4 \%$. Most posts held by under 20 year olds are in CAH ( $41 \%$ ) with a further $36 \%$ within ECS. The final $23 \%$ sit within Integra; there are no employees aged under 20 within CECR this year.

Decreases in posts held by under 20 year olds were seen across all departments, except for Integra where there was a $25 \%$ increase (one additional post holder). TUPE transfer of the youth service accounted for $9 \%$ of post holders in this age group and a further $41 \%$ reduction in under 20 post holders in the HAY10-14 grade group. These post holders were mostly from ECS, Libraries and CECR, Finance \& Customer Services.

The majority (50\%) of under 20 year olds in the council hold apprentice graded posts this year, which has increased by $15 \%$ on last year. These apprentice roles are split between ECS, the majority being highways maintenance roles, and CAH, care and business support roles.

Staff in Post by Disability

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | South Glos Population 2011 Census |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled employees | $\begin{gathered} 191 \\ (4.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 126 \\ (3.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 130 \\ (3.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40914 \\ (15.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Nondisabled employees | $\begin{gathered} 3504 \\ (84.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2021 \\ (58.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2067 \\ (59.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Prefer not to say | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Not known | $\begin{gathered} 456 \\ (11.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1277 \\ (37.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1260 \\ (36.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |

- There is no change to the percentage of the workforce that identified as being disabled this year when compared to last year.
- The number of post holders who declared their disability status also remained the same as last year - 63\%.
$3.7 \%$ of post holders in the council identify as disabled. FY 18/19 data from the Department of Work and Pensions ${ }^{5}$ find that $19 \%$ of working age adults identify as disabled, and $44 \%$ of state pension age adults. This again has seen very little change from the previous year. The percentage of the SGC workforce who have disclosed a disability falls below both the Department of Work and Pensions report and the South Gloucestershire population 2011 census data.

CECR have the highest percentage of post holders that identify as disabled (6.1\%), which is an increase of $1.3 \%$ on last year. Integra saw a $1.5 \%$ reduction on post holders disclosing their disability status whilst CAH and ECS saw very little/no change compared with last year. CAH and ECS remain the departments with the largest percentage of staff who have not disclosed their disability status ( $42.9 \%$ and $38.5 \%$ ), although all departments have seen a reduction in the percentage of nondisclosures this year of between $0.1 \%$ and $2.2 \%$.

## Staff in Post by Sexual Orientation

| Sexual Orientation | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 / 1 1}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / \mathbf { 2 0 }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Bisexual | $\#$ |  | 22 | 25 |
|  | $(0.2 \%)$ |  | $(0.6 \%)$ | $(0.7 \%)$ |
| Gay man | $\#$ |  | $\#$ | $\#$ |
|  | $(0.1 \%)$ |  | $(0.2 \%)$ | $(0.3 \%)$ |
| Gay woman | 11 |  | 14 | 16 |

[^2]| Sexual Orientation | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 / 1 1}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / \mathbf { 1 9 }}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / \mathbf { 2 0 }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | $(0.3 \%)$ |  | $(0.4 \%)$ | $(0.5 \%)$ |
| Heterosexual/straight | 838 <br> $(20.1 \%)$ |  | 1633 <br> $(47.6 \%)$ | 1802 <br> $(51.9 \%)$ |
| Prefer to self- <br> describe | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\#$ <br> $(0.0 \%)$ |
| Other | $\#$ <br> $(0.0 \%)$ |  | $\#$ | $\#$ <br> $(0.2 \%)$ |
| Prefer not to say | 58 <br> $(1.4 \%)$ |  | 84 <br> $(2.4 \%)$ | 96 <br> $(2.8 \%)$ |
| Not known | 3244 <br> $(77.9 \%)$ |  | 1667 <br> $(48.6 \%)$ | 1518 <br> $(43.7 \%)$ |

- The proportion of post holders who have not declared their sexual orientation has reduced by nearly $5 \%$ this year.
- Increases can be seen across all sexual orientation category groups with the largest increase ( $4.3 \%$ ) seen in post holders identifying as heterosexual/straight.

Although the percentage of post holders who have not disclosed their sexual orientation has decreased this year, it remains that almost half of all post holders (46.4\%) have chosen not to disclose.

A new category - prefer to self-describe was introduced this year.
The most recent ONS ${ }^{6}$ data (2018) suggests around $95 \%$ of the South West of England identify as heterosexual, $1.6 \%$ identify as gay or lesbian, $0.6 \%$ as bisexual with a further $2.3 \%$ in a refuse to specify/don't know category. SGC data shows the highest proportion of post holders (51.9\%) in the heterosexual/straight category and at $0.7 \%$ around the same proportion as the south west for bisexual. However, gay or lesbian post holders appear to be underrepresented in SGC, accounting for only $0.8 \%$ of post holders, half of the south west area percentage. The percentage of SGC post holders not declaring is $46.4 \%$, much higher that the south west region.

[^3]Staff in Post by Religion/Belief

| Religion/Belief | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | South Glos Population - 2011 Census |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buddhist | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 708 \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Christian | $\begin{gathered} 482 \\ (11.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 717 \\ (20.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 772 \\ (22.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 156504 \\ & (59.6 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hindu | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1681 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Jewish | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 145 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Muslim | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2176 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Sikh | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 623 \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Any Other Religion | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 888 \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No religion | $\begin{gathered} 349 \\ (8.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 881 \\ (25.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 989 \\ (28.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80607 \\ (30.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Prefer not to say | $\begin{gathered} 56 \\ (1.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 116 \\ (3.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 136 \\ (3.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Not known | $\begin{gathered} 3242 \\ (77.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1670 \\ (48.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1516 \\ (43.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19435 \\ & (7.4 \%) \end{aligned}$ |

- The proportion of post holders who have not declared their religion/belief has reduced by nearly $5 \%$ this year.
- Those who identify as having no religion/belief have increased by almost 3\%.

Although the percentage of post holders who have not disclosed their religion/belief has decreased this year, it remains that almost half of all post holders (47.5\%) have chosen not to disclose.

The most recent ONS ${ }^{7}$ data (2018) indicates that $60 \%$ of the South Gloucestershire population are Christian, $5 \%$ other religion/belief and $1 \%$ or less for Hindu, Muslim or Sikh. They also have a 'none \& not stated' category accounting for $33 \%$ of the population. SGC data shows a much lower percentage of Christians (22\%) but a much higher none/not known percentage of $76 \%$.

All departments have around half of their post holders not declaring their religion/belief and the highest, known category being no religion, around 30\%. However, all religion/belief categories have increased this year, except for Buddhist and Hindu where there have been slight decreases in percentages. Small numbers can affect percentages.

Staff in Post by Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | South Glos Population - 2011 Census | Combined Area Population - 2011 Census ${ }^{8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arab | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 366 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2461 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Asian British (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Other) | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5128 \\ (2.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78942 \\ & (4.8 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Black/Black British (African, Caribbean, Other) | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (1.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ (1.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (1.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2218 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66796 \\ & (4.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Mixed Ethnicity (White \& Asian, White \& Black African, White \& Black Caribbean, Other) | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52 \\ (1.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ (1.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3667 \\ (1.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61640 \\ & (3.7 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Chinese | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (2.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1312 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9132 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Gypsy Roma/Traveller of Irish Heritage | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 271 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1678 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| White British | $\begin{gathered} 3545 \\ (85.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2515 \\ (73.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2578 \\ (74.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 241611 \\ & (91.9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1470987 \\ & (89.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| White - Irish | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1223 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10305 \\ & (0.6 \%) \end{aligned}$ |

[^4]| Ethnicity | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | South Glos Population - 2011 Census | Combined Area Population - 2011 Census ${ }^{8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White - Other | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (1.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63 \\ (1.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ (2.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6469 \\ (2.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55142 \\ & (3.3 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Any Other ethnic group | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 502 \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11491 \\ & (0.7 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Prefer not to say | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Not Known | $\begin{gathered} 349 \\ (8.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 646 \\ (18.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 598 \\ (17.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |

- The proportion of post holders who have not declared their ethnicity has reduced slightly by $1.4 \%$ this year.
- There has been little change in the proportional representation of different ethnicities within the SGC workforce when compared to the previous year, although most categories have seen a slight increase.
- $7.9 \%$ of post holders identify as part of the BAME group, an increase of 0.7\% on last year.
- White British remains the largest category post holders identify with, $\mathbf{7 4 . 2 \%}$, an increase of $1.8 \%$ compared with last year.

The percentage of post holders who have not disclosed their ethnicity has decreased this year by $1.4 \%$ meaning that $17.9 \%$ of post holders have not disclosed their ethnicity. Although this is lower than the non-disclosure rates for disability, religion/belief and sexual orientation, it is still likely to have an impact on the accuracy of the proportional representation within the other groups.

CAH has the highest departmental proportion of post holders who identify as BAME at $10 \%$ but also the highest proportion of non-disclosures at 20.7\%. ECS has the lowest level of post holders who identify as BAME at $5.8 \%$. ECS, CECR and Integra all have lower departmental BAME percentages than the overall council rate of $7.9 \%$.

Looking at the benchmarking data of the South Gloucestershire population and the Combined Area data where $94 \%$ of our workforce live, the majority of the population are White British and the minority are in Arab and Gypsy Roma/Traveller of Irish Heritage groups, which is the same as the council's post holder data. The SGC workforce has slightly higher proportions of White-Irish post holders (less than 1\%) than both benchmarking groups and has slightly higher proportions of Black/Black British, Mixed Ethnicity and Any Other Ethnic group percentages (less than 1\%) than the South Gloucestershire population. The biggest difference in ethnicity is within the

Asian/Asian British group whereby SGC post holders are $1 \%$ less than the South Gloucestershire population and $3.8 \%$ less that the combined area data.

The proportion of the SGC workforce who are White British on average 16\% less than both benchmarking groups. However, the percentage of staff who are BAME are less in the council (7.9\%) than in the South Gloucestershire population (8.1\%) and the Combined Area population (17.9\%).

Staff in post by Grade Group

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chief Officer/Senior Manager Grades | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| HAY01-HAY03 | $\begin{gathered} 144 \\ (3.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 135 \\ (3.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 136 \\ (3.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| HAY04-HAY06 | $\begin{gathered} 546 \\ (13.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 564 \\ (16.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 567 \\ (16.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| HAY07-HAY09 | $\begin{gathered} 1227 \\ (29.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1143 \\ (33.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1174 \\ (33.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| HAY10 - HAY14 | $\begin{gathered} 1893 \\ (45.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1333 \\ (38.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1374 \\ (39.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Apprentice Grades | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Other Grades | $\begin{gathered} 325 \\ (7.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 209 \\ (3.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 174 \\ (5.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

- Proportionately the grade groups are consistent this year with the previous, with the majority of filled posts by grade group being HAY1014 posts.
- $5 \%$ of post holders sit in the higher-grade groups (CE, Chief Officers \& Senior Managers and HAY01 - 03) whereas most post holders (95\%) sit within HAY04 and below.
- The biggest proportional change this year is within the other grades group, an increase of $1.9 \%$ on last year, although the number of post holders in this group has decreased by 17\% due to the TUPE of youth workers.
- Compared with the previous year, the council's mean gender pay gap has increased by $0.1 \%$ to $11.8 \%$ whereas the median has reduced by $1 \%$ to $13.6 \%$.

Filled apprentice graded posts have again increased this year by 8\%. However, the proportion of filled apprentice post when compared with the other groups remains low at less than $1 \%$. The main increase was within ECS, an additional 4 apprentice posts (+29\%) and where apprentice numbers continue to account for more than half of all apprentices within the council ( $64 \%$ ).

In March 2020 the council's third Gender Pay Gap report was published. Compared with the previous year, the mean gender pay gap has increased slightly by $0.1 \%$ to $11.8 \%$ whereas the median decreased by $1 \%$ to $13.6 \%$. CIPFA gender pay gap benchmarking ${ }^{9}$ finds the public sector mean is $7 \%$ and the median is $6.4 \%$. For English Unitary Authorities, this changes to a mean of $6.7 \%$ and a median of 5.0\%. This is comparable with the Local Government Association (LGA) where latest data shows the mean gender pay gap for councils as $6.1 \%$ and the median as $4 \%$, however the LGA notes there is considerable variations between councils.
The report Gender Pay Gap report (March 2019), including the council's action plan, is available here.

More detailed analysis around pay by protected characteristics is contained within the Equal Pay Audit.

## Apprentices

| Apprentice starters | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of apprentices who started during the year | \# | 22 | 21 |
| Number of apprentices in post as at end March | \# | 28 | 29 |
| Average age of apprentices | 18.5 | 21 | 21 |

- As at the end of the year the council has 29 apprentices (about $1 \%$ of headcount), up 4\% from the end of FY 18/19.
- The average age of apprentices within the council remains the same as last year at 21.

21 individuals were employed by the council as Apprentices during FY 19/20. Of those apprentices in post at the end of FY 19/19, nearly half (46\%) are still in post, $38 \%$ are in limited term or substantive posts within the council and $15 \%$ have left the council.

The average age of apprentices within the council has stabilised at 21.

[^5]The council's apprentices in post as at end FY 19/20 are split between 3 departments: ECS (66\%), CAH (21\%) and CECR (14\%).

Apprentices within the council are analysed further in the Annual Workforce Data report.

## Applicants for Employment

Please note that applicant numbers may differ within each protected characteristic group due to the anonymisation of applicants' records and the ability of staff to update their equalities information once employed by the council.

Number of Applicants and New Starters

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of vacancies advertised | 287 | 765 | 623 |
| No of applicants via recruitment website | 4712 | 2888 | 4878 |
| No. of new starters | 249 | 437 | 460 |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 5.3\% | 15.1\% | 9.4\% |

- Compared to the same period last year the data shows a significant increase in the number of applicants to vacancies (40\%) ${ }^{10}$

It is difficult to identify the exact cause of the increase in applicants, but it is an encouraging trend and could be an early indication of the changes brought in to how we attract candidates and the changing style of our advertisements. This data is largely pre-COVID where the impact of furlough has been quite profound on our application rates.

In addition to this we have also seen very positive results with a further 162 applications to roles via Indeed. These roles were boosted (promoted) by additional budget, with the average spend totalling $£ 1.84$ per application across all roles. A variety of roles have attracted applications with a total of 51 offers made, this represents a return of $31.48 \%$ (applications to offers). These have been included as part of the narrative but have not been included in the breakdown across protected characteristics as it is not yet possible to identify the applicant to starter. Future reports will include a breakdown of these applications.

[^6]Applicants and New Starters by Gender

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 1792 \\ (38.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 853 \\ (29.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 974 \\ (20.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 89 \\ (35.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 144 \\ (33.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 137 \\ (30.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 5.0\% | 16.9\% | 14.1\% |
| Female |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 2874 \\ (61.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2035 \\ (70.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2330 \\ (47.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 160 \\ (64.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 293 \\ (67.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 323 \\ (70.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 5.6\% | 14.4\% | 13.9\% |
| Unknown Gender |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 46 \\ (1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 1574 \\ (32.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| \% of new starters to applicants | $\begin{gathered} 91 \\ (2.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0\% | 0\% |

- Compared to the same period last year the data shows an increase in the number of applicants for both male and female
- Unknown gender applicants have increased due to the system anonymising records
- Appointment rate of both genders has dropped, with males seeing a slightly larger decrease (-2.8\%) than females (-0.5\%).


## Applicants and New Starters by Age Group

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <20 |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 184 \\ (3.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 93 \\ (3.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42 \\ (0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (6.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (4.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (5.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 8.2\% | 20.4\% | 54.8\% |
| 20-29 |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 1775 \\ (37.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 893 \\ (30.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1079 \\ (22.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 84 \\ (33.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 105 \\ (24.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 122 \\ (26.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 4.7\% | 11.8\% | 11.3\% |
| 30-39 |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 1068 \\ (22.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 777 \\ (26.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 854 \\ (17.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 53 \\ (21.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 115 \\ (26.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 101 \\ (22.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 5.0\% | 14.8\% | 11.8\% |
| 40-49 |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 1025 \\ (21.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 578 \\ (20.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 660 \\ (13.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ (21.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 94 \\ (21.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 105 \\ (22.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 5.3\% | 16.3\% | 15.9\% |


|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50-59 |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 524 \\ (11.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 448 \\ (15.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 497 \\ (10.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (10.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ (17.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 84 \\ (18.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 5.2\% | 17.2\% | 16.9\% |
| 60+ |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 99 \\ (3.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 95 \\ (1.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (6.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (6.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (5.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 29.6\% | 27.3\% | 26.3\% |
| Unknown Age |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 82 \\ (1.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 1651 \\ (33.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |

- The data shows an increase of applicants across all age categories, except for <20 and 60+ age groups.
- The highest reduction in applicants is within the <20 age bracket (-55\%), however this group has the highest success rate (55\%).
- Success rate of applicants remains broadly similar to last year, although an increase is seen in the <20 group of just over 30\%.

One possible reason for the reductions in applicants aged <20 could be the increase in apprenticeship opportunities (nationally and regionally) that have attracted this relatively small pool of applicants. Whilst the number of applicants remains low, this group does experience a high success rate at interview with 55\% starting employment.

## Applicants and New Starters by Disability

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 164 \\ (3.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 129 \\ (4.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 222 \\ (4.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (2.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (3.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (2.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 4.3\% | 10.9\% | 4.5\% |
| Non-Disabled |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 4503 \\ (95.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2717 \\ (94.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4539 \\ (93.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 166 \\ (66.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 130 \\ (29.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 225 \\ (48.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 3.7\% | 4.8\% | 5.0\% |
| Prefer not to disclose disability status |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (1.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 95 \\ (1.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | N/A | 5.7\% | 1.1\% |
| Unknown disability status |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ (1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 75 \\ (30.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 291 \\ (66.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 224 \\ (48.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | N/A | N/A | N/A |

- The percentage of applicants declaring a disability is broadly aligned with last year (4.6\%).
- The success rate of disabled applicants has decreased when compared with last year but is comparable with the success rate of non-disabled applicants. We will further explore the reason for this decline with the Disabled Employees Group as we co-produce the equalities action plan.
- Only 2.2\% of new starters declared a disability.


## Applicants and New Starters by Sexual Orientation

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bisexual |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 42 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ (1.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 89 \\ (1.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (1.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (2.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 7.1\% | 8.9\% | 11.2\% |
| Gay man |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 5.3\% | 7.7\% | 7.3\% |
| Gay woman |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 64 \\ (0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63 \\ (1.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (1.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (1.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 6.3\% | 0\% | 11.1\% |
| Heterosexual/Straight |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 6284 \\ (93.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2599 \\ (88.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4326 \\ (88.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters |  |  |  |


|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 162 \\ (65.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 303 \\ (75.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 354 \\ (77.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 2.6\% | 11.7\% | 8.2\% |
| Other Sexual Orientation |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | N/A | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | N/A | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | N/A | 3.3\% | 7.4\% |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 278 \\ (4.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 157 \\ (5.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 282 \\ (5.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (4.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (5.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (2.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 4.3\% | 12.7\% | 3.9\% |
| Unknown Sexual Orientation |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63 \\ (2.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 66 \\ (26.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 72 \\ (17.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 71 \\ (15.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | N/A | N/A | N/A |

- The number of applicants declaring their sexual orientation is broadly similar to last year, where the variance is less than $2 \%$.
- Gay Women has the highest appointment rate increase this year; there were no appointments made in this group last year.


## Applicants and New Starters by Religion/Belief

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buddhist |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (1.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 10.8\% | 0\% | 11.1\% |
| Christian |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 1921 \\ (40.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 948 \\ (32.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1554 \\ (31.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 68 \\ (27.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 109 \\ (24.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 125 \\ (27.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 3.5\% | 11.5\% | 8.0\% |
| Hindu |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 3.8\% | 0\% | 4.3\% |
| Jewish |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (1.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 14.3\% | 100\% | 50.0\% |
| Muslim |  |  |  |


|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ (1.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61 \\ (2.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 81 \\ (1.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 1.3\% | 3.3\% | 6.2\% |
| Sikh |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 0\% | 13.3\% | 3.8\% |
| No Religion |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 2206 \\ (46.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1607 \\ (55.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2749 \\ (56.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 88 \\ (35.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 186 \\ (42.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 222 \\ (48.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 4.0\% | 11.6\% | 8.1\% |
| Any other religion |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 91 \\ (1.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (1.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (1.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (2.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 3.3\% | 13.8\% | 13.8\% |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 284 \\ (6.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 198 \\ (6.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 329 \\ (6.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |


|  | 2010/11 |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ | 2019/20 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of new starters | 15 <br> $(6.0 \%)$ |  | 24 <br> $(5.5 \%)$ | 24 <br> $(5.2 \%)$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | $5.3 \%$ |  | $12.1 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ |
| Unknown religion/belief | 47 <br> $(1.0 \%)$ |  | \# <br> $(0.1 \%)$ | 27 <br> $(0.6 \%)$ |
| No. of applicants | 68 <br> $(27.3 \%)$ |  | 108 <br> $(24.7 \%)$ | 69 <br> $(15.0 \%)$ |
| No. of new starters | N/A |  | N/A | N/A |

- The percentage of applicants within each group have remained broadly similar.
- Applicants identifying as 'no religion' remains the highest group which mirrors the national trend.

Applicants and New Starters by Ethnicity

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arab |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% of new starters to applicants | N/A | 0\% | 0\% |
| Asian/Asian British (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Other) |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ (2.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 105 \\ (3.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 131 \\ (2.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (1.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |


|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 0.8\% | 6.7\% | 3.8\% |
| Black/Black British (African, Caribbean, Other) |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 174 \\ (3.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 92 \\ (3.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 161 \\ (3.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (4.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (2.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (2.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 6.3\% | 9.8\% | 6.2\% |
| Mixed (White \& Asian, White \& Black African, White \& Black Caribbean, Other) |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 112 \\ (2.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 87 \\ (3.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 152 \\ (3.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (1.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (3.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (2.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 2.7\% | 14.9\% | 8.6\% |
| Chinese |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
| \% of new starters to applicants | N/A | N/A | 0\% |
| Gypsy Roma/Traveller of Irish Heritage |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% |
| White British |  |  |  |


|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 3932 \\ (83.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2334 \\ (80.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3911 \\ (80.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 159 \\ (63.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 282 \\ (64.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 336 \\ (73.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 4.0\% | 12.1\% | 8.6\% |
| White Irish |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (1.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 8.1\% | 15.8\% | 8.3\% |
| White Other |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 213 \\ (4.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 168 \\ (5.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 299 \\ (6.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (4.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (3.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (4.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 5.2\% | 8.3\% | 7.0\% |
| Any other ethnic group |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (0.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 10.0\% | 0\% | 2.8\% |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (2.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 99 \\ (2.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |


|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (2.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | 10.0\% | 0\% | 3.0\% |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| No. of applicants | $\begin{gathered} 51 \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (0.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of new starters | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ (21.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 108 \\ (24.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67 \\ (14.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of new starters to applicants | N/A | N/A | N/A |

- It is encouraging that applications are received from all different ethnic groups, but rates of applications vary quite significantly.
- Application numbers have increased within all groups but percentages of applications remain broadly similar.
- Appointment rates have fallen across most groups, most likely due to the increase in application numbers and the reduction in advertised vacancies.


## Grievances

Number of Grievances received

|  | 2011/12 |  | $2018 / 19$ | 2019/20 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of grievances received | 6 |  | 15 | 34 |
| No. of appeals received against formal <br> grievance decisions | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |

- The number of grievances recorded by HR Casework \& Change has increased significantly this year and had trended upwards since FY 15/16.

Last year, the majority of grievances logged (47\% each) were within CAH and ECS. This year, most logged grievances (71\%) are within ECS with much lower percentages within CAH and CECR. ECS grievances were largely related to a group of staff in one area of the business.

When considering grievances by protected characteristic, it is important to consider any changes relevant to the sample pool.

Grievances by Gender

|  | 2011/12 |  | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male: | $\#$ <br> $(17 \%)$ |  | $\#$ <br> $(33 \%)$ | 13 <br> $(38 \%)$ |
| No. of grievances received | 0 |  | 0 | $\#$ <br> $(100 \%)$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal <br> grievance decisions | Female: <br> No. of grievances received <br> (83\%) |  | $\#$ <br> $(67 \%)$ | 21 <br> $(62 \%)$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal <br> grievance decisions | $\#$ <br> $(100 \%)$ |  | 0 | 0 |

Grievances by Age Group

|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <20 |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \# \\ (7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20-29 |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30-39 |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (17 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (13 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (15 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40-49 |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (26 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | 0 | 0 |


|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | $\begin{gathered} \hline \# \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 50-59 |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (17 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (41 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 60-64 |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (15 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 65+ |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |

- The upward trend in grievances raised by 50-59 year old employees continues, with $41 \%$ of all grievances raised this year being from this age group.
- A very small percentage of grievances are raised by under 30 year olds $3 \%$ of grievances raised this year.

Most grievances are received by staff in the 50-59 age group with $82 \%$ of all grievances raised by staff aged 40+. There were no grievances raised by staff in the highest or lowest age groups: under 20 or 65+.

Grievances by Disability

|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (17 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| Non-Disabled |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (59 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (17 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (60 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (35 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Grievances by Sexual Orientation

|  | $2011 / 12$ |  | $2018 / 19$ | $2019 / 20$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bisexual | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. of grievances received | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal <br> grievance decisions | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Gay Man | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. of grievances received | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal <br> grievance decisions | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Gay Woman |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Heterosexual |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (17 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (47 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (38 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (83 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (47 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (56 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Grievances by Religion/Belief

|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buddhist |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Christian |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (21 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | \# | 0 | 0 |


|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | (100\%) |  |  |
| Hindu |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jewish |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Muslim |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sikh |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No Religion |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (17 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (26 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Any other Religion |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | \# | \# | 17 |


|  | 2011/12 |  | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $(83 \%)$ |  | $(47 \%)$ | $(50 \%)$ |
|  |  |  | 0 | $\#$ <br> $(100 \%)$ |

## Grievances by Ethnicity

|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arab |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| Asian/Asian British (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Other) |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Black/Black British (African, Caribbean, Other) |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gypsy Roma/Traveller of Irish Heritage |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mixed (White \& Asian, White \& Black African, White \& Black Caribbean, Other |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White British |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (83 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (73 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (71 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| White Irish |  |  |  |


|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Other |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Ethnic Group |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| No. of grievances received | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (17 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (27 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (27 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of appeals received against formal grievance decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Written warnings and dismissals

## Number of written warnings and dismissals

|  | 2011/12 |  | $2018 / 19$ | $2019 / 20$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of first written warnings | 13 |  | 0 | 5 |
| No. of final written warnings | 3 |  | 1 | 3 |
| No. of dismissals | 5 |  | 12 | 10 |

- The number of written warnings has increased this year whereas dismissals have decreased slightly.
- However, numbers of warnings issued and dismissals have remained low.

The increase in the number of first and final written warnings issued this year was due to the associated increase in performance management cases relating to conduct/behaviour.

Small numbers can give high percentages as shown in the tables below.
Written warnings and dismissals by Gender

|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male: |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (31 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (40 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (58 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (70 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female: |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (69 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (60 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of dismissals | \# | \# | \# |


|  | $2011 / 12$ |  | $2018 / 19$ | $2019 / 20$ |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | $(80 \%)$ |  | $(42 \%)$ | $(30 \%)$ |

- Dismissals between genders have changed this year by over $10 \%$ but the balance is still more male than female dismissals.
- Conversely, written warnings are both showing more female than male warnings.

Written warnings and dismissals by Age Group

|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <20 |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20-29 |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (15 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (25 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (10 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 30-39 |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (15 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (40 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (25 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (10 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 40-49 |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (38 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | \# | 0 | 0 |


|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (33\%) |  |  |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (25 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (50 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 50-59 |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (15 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (60 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (10 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 60-64 |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (15 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
| 65+ |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

- Most noticeable change this year is the increase in the proportion of dismissals of employees aged 40-49 and 65+ with a decrease in the 2039 age groups.

Written warnings and dismissals by Disability

|  | $2011 / 12$ |  | $2018 / 19$ | 2019/20 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Disabled |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (40 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (17 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
| Non-Disabled |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (85 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (40 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (60 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (42 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (50 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (42 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (50 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

Written warnings and dismissals by Sexual Orientation

|  | $2011 / 12$ |  | $2018 / 19$ | $2019 / 20$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bisexual | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. of first written warnings |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gay Man |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gay Woman |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Heterosexual |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (15 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (40 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (58 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (80 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Other |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | \# |


|  | 2011/12 |  | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of dismissals |  |  |  | $(33 \%)$ |  |
|  | $\#$ <br> $(20 \%)$ |  |  |  | 0 |

## Written warnings and dismissals by Religion/Belief

|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buddhist |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Christian |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (40 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (25 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (50 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hindu |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jewish |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Muslim |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sikh |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No Religion |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (40 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Any other Religion |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (85 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (60 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (42 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (30 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

Written warnings and dismissals by Ethnicity

|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arab |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| Asian/Asian British (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Other) |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Black/Black British (African, Caribbean, Other) |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | \# | 0 | 0 |


|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (8\%) |  |  |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
| Gypsy Roma/Traveller of Irish Heritage |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mixed (White \& Asian, White \& Black African, White \& Black Caribbean, Other |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White British |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (85 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (60 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (60 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (58 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (90 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| White Irish |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Other |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  | 2011/12 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
| Other Ethnic Group |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| No. of first written warnings | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (40 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. of final written warnings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of dismissals | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (25 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ (10 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

## Employees who cease employment

## Permanent Workforce Voluntary Turnover

|  | 2010/11 |  | $2018 / 19$ | $2019 / 20$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average no. of permanent <br> employees | 3653 |  | 2751 | 2917 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary <br> leavers | 249 |  | 259 | 308 |

- Voluntary turnover has increased by $1 \%$ this year after remaining around 9\% for the previous 4 years.


## Voluntary Turnover by Gender

|  | 2010/11 |  | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male: |  |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 1028 |  | 851 | 890 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 69 |  | 94 | 104 |
| Turnover | $6.7 \%$ |  | $11.1 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ |
| Female: |  |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 2625 |  | 1901 | 2025 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 180 |  | 165 | 204 |
| Turnover | $6.9 \%$ |  | $8.7 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ |

- Turnover by gender has increased by less than $1.5 \%$ for both male and female employees when compared to last year, the biggest increase seen in female turnover of $1.4 \%$.


## Voluntary Turnover by Age Group

| Age group | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than 20 |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 16 | 14 | 12 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 56.3\% | 29.6\% | 52.2\% |
| 20-29 |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 333 | 243 | 274 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 23 | 28 | 54 |
| Turnover | 6.9\% | 11.5\% | 19.7\% |
| 30-39 |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 669 | 548 | 575 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 49 | 70 | 61 |
| Turnover | 7.3\% | 12.8\% | 10.6\% |
| 40-49 |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 1189 | 694 | 720 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 62 | 54 | 63 |
| Turnover | 5.2\% | 7.8\% | 8.8\% |
| 50-59 |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 1036 | 902 | 932 |


| Age group | 2010/11 |  | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 39 |  | 56 | 72 |
| Turnover | $3.8 \%$ |  | $6.2 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ |
| $60-64$ |  |  | 241 | 271 |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 312 |  | 24 | 34 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 39 |  | $10.0 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ |
| Turnover |  |  |  |  |
| $65+$ | $12.5 \%$ |  | 112 | 133 |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 99 |  | 23 | 18 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 28 |  | $20.6 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ |
| Turnover |  |  |  |  |

- Permanent Voluntary Turnover has increased in all age groups this year, except for the 30-39 and 65+ age groups.
- The biggest increase is again within the under 20 post holders group and remains the group with the highest turnover rate.
- The 65+ aged employees group previously had one of the highest levels of voluntary turnover, trending upwards since FY 15/16, but this year saw a reduction of $7 \%$.

There are small numbers within the under 20 age group which can give rise to bigger percentages. There were 2 additional leavers when compared to last year in this age group, with the majority of leavers this year (67\%) coming from Integra Catering and Cleaning part time roles.

Voluntary turnover in the 65+ group is to be somewhat expected due to the pension eligibility of many in this group, evidenced by $78 \%$ of voluntary leavers in this group leaving through retirement. However, the headcount of staff within this age group increased this year whilst the number of leavers decreased, meaning that turnover fell.

Most staff in the 65+ age group (54\%) sit within ECS, with the majority of these (59\%) employed as Guide Escort where the average length of service is 9 years.
Guide escorts are part time roles with a small number of contracted hours per week.
The 30-39 age group was the only other group to see a reduction in turnover this year, $2.2 \%$ less than last year. The average headcount increased this year whereas the number of leavers decreased which gave rise to the reduction in turnover. The proportion of staff in this group remain largely in CAH (54\% this year), with the majority of these (42\%) sitting within Integrated Children's Services.

## Voluntary Turnover by Disability

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 164 | 113 | 116 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 6.1\% | 6.2\% | 8.6\% |
| Non-disabled |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 3154 | 1819 | 1816 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 209 | 160 | 157 |
| Turnover | 6.6\% | 8.8\% | 8.6\% |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 11 | \# | 11 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | 0 | 0 |
| Turnover | 28.6\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 325 | 814 | 972 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 27 | 92 | 141 |
| Turnover | 8.3\% | 11.3\% | 14.5\% |

- Turnover amongst disabled and non-disabled staff is equal at 8.6\%


## Voluntary Turnover by Sexual Orientation

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bisexual |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | \# | 13 | 17 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 0 | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 0\% | 24.0\% | 17.6\% |
| Gay man |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | \# | \# | \# |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 66.7\% | 46.2\% | 26.7\% |
| Gay woman |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | \# | 13 | 14 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 0 | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 0\% | 15.4\% | 21.4\% |
| Heterosexual/Straight |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 592 | 1298 | 1449 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 57 | 135 | 175 |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 / 1 1}$ |  |  |  |

- Most sexual orientation groups saw a decrease in turnover this year, with the biggest decrease seen in the Gay Man group (down 19.5\%). However, this is the group with the largest turnover rate this year of 26.7\%.
- The biggest increase in turnover this year can be seen in the Gay Women group (+6.0\%).

Within most groups, the numbers of leavers changed very little when compared to last year, with an increase or decrease of one leaver and leaver numbers standing at 5 or less. The exception to this is within the Heterosexual/Straight and Unknown groups where leave numbers increased by 10+.

## Voluntary Turnover by Religion/Belief

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2010 / 11$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Buddhist |  |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | $\#$ |  | $\#$ | $\#$ |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | $\#$ |  | $\#$ | $\#$ |
| Turnover | $20.0 \%$ |  | $13.3 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ |
| Christian |  |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 348 |  | 583 | 636 |


|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 32 | 60 | 65 |
| Turnover | 9.2\% | 10.3\% | 10.2\% |
| Hindu |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | \# | \# | \# |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 0 | 0 | \# |
| Turnover | 0\% | 0\% | 18.2\% |
| Jewish |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | \# | \# | \# |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turnover | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Muslim |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | \# | \# | \# |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | 0 | \# |
| Turnover | 33.3\% | 0\% | 11.8\% |
| Sikh |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | \# | \# | \# |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 0 | \# | 0 |
| Turnover | 0\% | 40.0\% | 0\% |
| No religion |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 238 | 693 | 779 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 25 | 81 | 109 |
| Turnover | 10.5\% | 11.7\% | 14.0\% |
| Any other religion |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 11 | 15 | 23 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 0 | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 0\% | 6.7\% | 4.4\% |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 41 | 81 | 101 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 4.9\% | 7.5\% | 9.9\% |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 3004 | 1357.5 | 1349 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 188 | 109 | 120 |
| Turnover | 6.3\% | 8.0\% | 8.9\% |

- Turnover has increased in 6 groups this year with the largest increase seen in Hindu ( $18.2 \%$ ), due to there being $0 \%$ turnover in this group last year and this is the group with the highest turnover rate this year.
- The largest reduction is seen in Sikh turnover which has decreased to $0 \%$ this year due to no leavers within this group.

Voluntary Turnover by Ethnicity

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arab |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turnover | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Asian/Asian British (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Other) |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 33 | 26 | 29 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 3.1\% | 11.8\% | 10.5\% |
| Black/Black British (African, Caribbean, Other) |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 48 | 42 | 47 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 2.1\% | 9.5\% | 10.8\% |
| Mixed (White \& Asian, White \& Black African, White \& Black Caribbean, Other) |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 22 | 37 | 43 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 4.5\% | 13.5\% | 18.6\% |
| Chinese |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | \# | \# | \# |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | 0 | 0 |
| Turnover | 13.3\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Gypsy Roma/Traveller of Irish Heritage |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 0 | 0 | \# |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turnover | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| White - English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 3185 | 2154 | 2217 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 214 | 185 | 211 |
| Turnover | 6.7\% | 8.6\% | 9.5\% |
| White - Irish |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 33 | 23 | 24 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 9.2\% | 8.7\% | 21.3\% |
| White - Other |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 46 | 53 | 62 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 13.0\% | 13.2\% | 11.3\% |


|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Other ethnic group |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | \# | \# | \# |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 0 | \# | 0 |
| Turnover | 0\% | 18.2\% | 0\% |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 22 | \# | 16 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | \# | \# | \# |
| Turnover | 4.5\% | 33.3\% | 6.3\% |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 248 | 398 | 468 |
| No. of permanent, voluntary leavers | 21 | 49 | 68 |
| Turnover | 8.5\% | 12.3\% | 14.5\% |

- Most ethnicity groups saw an increase in turnover this year, with the largest increase being within White-Irish, an increase of $12.6 \%$ and this is the group with the largest turnover rate this year.
- The Prefer not to say group saw the largest decrease, 27.1\% decrease on last year with a turnover rate this year of 6.3\%.


## Permanent Workforce Redundancy Turnover

|  | 2010/11 |  | $2018 / 19$ | $2019 / 20$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average no. of permanent employees | 3653 |  | 2751 | 2917 |
| No. of permanent employees who were <br> made redundant | 73 |  | 12 | $\#$ |
| Turnover | $2.0 \%$ |  | $0.4 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |

- There was a very slight reduction in redundancy turnover this year.


## Length of service in years of permanent staff

Permanent Workforce Length of Service

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 / 1 1}$ |  | $2018 / 19$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average length of service | 9 |  | 10 | 10 |
| Headcount of permanent staff | 3544 |  | 2749 | 3080 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Length of Service by Gender

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male average length of service | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Female average length of service | 9 | 10 | 10 |

## Length of Service by Disability

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled average length of service | 10 | 12 | 11 |
| Non-disabled average length of service | 10 | 13 | 13 |
| Prefer not to disclose disability average length of service | 8 | 11 | 8 |
| Unknown disability average length of service | 4 | 4 | 5 |

## Length of Service by Age Group

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0} / \mathbf{1 1}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / \mathbf { 1 9 }}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 4 |  | 3 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 9}$ | 12 |  | 6 | 6 |
| $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 9}$ | 9 |  | 10 | 9 |
| $\mathbf{4 0 - 4 9}$ | 6 |  | 13 | 13 |
| $\mathbf{5 0 - 5 9}$ | 13 |  | 13 | 13 |
| $\mathbf{6 0 +}$ |  |  |  |  |

## Length of Service by Sexual Orientation

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bisexual | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Gay man | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| Gay woman | 4 | 7 | 6 |
| Heterosexual/Straight | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| Prefer to self-describe | N/A | N/A | 10 |
| Other | 25 | 10 | 9 |
| Prefer not to say | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| Unknown | 10 | 14 | 14 |

## Length of Service by Religion/Belief

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buddhist | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| Christian | 6 | 8 | 7 |
| Hindu | 15 | 7 | 7 |
| Jewish | 5 | 8 | 4 |
| Muslim | 6 | 9 | 5 |
| Sikh | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Any other religion | 6 | 7 | 6 |
| No religion | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Prefer not to say | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Unknown | 10 | 14 | 14 |

- Notable changes this year were the reductions within Jewish and Muslim length of service. This is due to a numbers of new post holders within each of these religion/belief groups with low length of service, resulting in a reduced average.
Length of Service by Ethnicity

|  | 2010/11 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arab | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian/Asian British (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Other) | 7 | 9 | 8 |
| Black/Black British (African, Caribbean, Other) | 8 | 11 | 10 |
| Gypsy Roma/Traveller of Irish Heritage | N/A | N/A | 1 |
| Mixed (White \& Asian, White \& Black African, White \& Black Caribbean, Other | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| White British | 10 | 11 | 11 |
| White Irish | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| White Other | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| Chinese | 8 | 10 | 9 |
| Other Ethnic Group | 9 | 13 | 8 |


|  | 2010/11 |  | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prefer not to say | 4 |  | 10 | 8 |
| Unknown | 4 |  | 6 | 6 |

- The notable change this year from last year is the reduction in average length of service of employees of 'other ethnic group'.


## Employees commencing and returning from maternity leave

|  | 2010/11 |  | $2018 / 19$ | $2019 / 20$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of employees commencing <br> maternity leave | 29 |  | 47 | 65 |
| No. of employees returning from <br> maternity leave | 32 |  | 35 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

- There was a large increase in employees commencing maternity leave this year when compared to last year
- Employees returning from maternity remains fairly consistent when compared to last year.

The consistency of employees returning from maternity leave could reflect the family friendly policies the council offers, including flexible working arrangements.

## Flexible working

The council recognises the potential benefits of flexible working, (in terms of recruitment/retention, reduced travel and its role in meeting the work life balance demands of its employees) and operates a range of measures to support this, including:

- flexible working hours for most office-based staff;
- part-time and/or term-time working;
- job share;
- home working;
- flexible retirement; and/or
- other flexible working arrangements either on a permanent or temporary basis.

It is important that flexible working arrangements are balanced against service needs and have regard to potential effects on other staff and costs.

Statutory and informal requests from all staff to work more flexibly are considered sympathetically and on their merits. The policy fully embraces equalities principles
and ensures that all protected characteristic groups can make and have considered flexible working requests.

The council also made some temporary changes to HR policies and procedures to enable staff to work more flexibly with the onset of the coronavirus epidemic, including homeworking to comply with government guidance. There were also changes implemented to allow staff with caring responsibilities more flexibility to accommodate the needs of their personal responsibilities alongside work.


[^0]:    1
    https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestima tesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland - ONS data for population benchmarking aged 17+

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ https://www.local.gov.uk/our-support/research/statistical-alert
    https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestima tesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment data/file/874507/family-resources-survey-2018-19.pdf

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/sexuality/bulletins/sexualidentityuk/2012to2018

[^4]:    7
    https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationcharac teristicsresearchtables
    ${ }^{8}$ Combined Area = South Gloucestershire, Bristol, Stroud, BANES, North Somerset and Wiltshire - 94\% of our workforce live in these areas

[^5]:    ${ }^{9}$ https://www.cipfa.org/cipfa-thinks/cipfa-thinks-articles/gender-pay-gap-benchmarking

[^6]:    ${ }^{10}$ These figures represent applications via the council's recruitment website only

