

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

TO:	PERSONNEL COMMITTEE		
DATE:	8 DECEMBER 2016	AGENDA ITEM: 7	
TITLE:	EQUALITY AUDIT 2015/16		
LEAD OFFICER:	ROGER MORRIS	TEL: 01189 372348	Ext: 72348
JOB TITLE:	HR PARTNER	E-MAIL	Roger.morris@reading.gov.uk

1. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF REPORT

- 1.1. To present a statistical summary of equal opportunities monitoring under the Council's Equality Monitoring Framework for the financial year 2015/16.
- 1.2. The report is a component of the Council's Equal Opportunity and Fair Treatment Policy. The report takes the form set out in the Equality Monitoring Framework endorsed by CMT, the Personnel Committee and the (then) Black Communities Forum in September 2004.
- 1.3. The framework contains key employment profiles which the Council has to measure by law ('protected characteristics' under Equality Act 2010) and also includes other profile data based on previous national performance indicator (PIs) outturns where relevant.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 The Committee is asked to NOTE the report and next steps.

3 SUMMARY OF STATISTICS & KEY ISSUES

- 3.1 Data gathered is based on the current Council structures as of April 2015¹. Where relevant, data as per the previous structure is included for comparison purposes.
- 3.2 When compared to the 2015 data, the overall proportion of females employed in all directorates has remained almost the same despite an overall fall in 2016 figures.
- 3.3 An increase in proportion of BME staff employed has been observed across all directorates. Overall, a considerable increase from 14.8% to 21.7%; compared to a 23% BME economically active population (excluding white Irish and other) within the borough boundaries².
- 3.4 The proportion of staff with a disability in the Council is around 2.9%; and 3.2% when excluding school based staff, compared to a 6% economically active population within the borough boundaries².

¹ Directorates of Environment & Neighbourhood Services (DENS), Adult Care & Health Services (DACHS), Children, Education & Early Help Services (DCEEHS), Corporate Support Services (CSS) and Schools

² Census 2011 data

- 3.5 Table 9 shows the 8 appointments for Grade RG10 or above posts 50% were male and 50% female (an analysis requested by CMT in June 2015).
- 3.6 Total turnover was 14.5% in 2015/16. Tables 12(a)-(e) show that staff with 'protected characteristics' are generally being retained.
- 3.7 A significant increase in formal casework e.g disciplinary, capability, from 69 in 2014/15 to 146 in 2015/16, but there is no indication that procedures were applied and / or accessed disproportionately to any particular group profiled in the report.
- 3.8 Appendix 1 provides a full summary of the statistics.

4 NEXT STEPS

Disability

- 4.1 Although the level of disabled staff has shown a small increase, from 2.6% to 2.9%, this compares to a 6% economically active population in Reading. Actions below have been agreed by CMT for increasing the profile of disability within the Council.
 - a) Discontinue membership with Business Disability Forum (£3,500 plus VAT p/a) and instead join the Government's 'Disability Confident' Employer scheme which is a 'free' service. As a Two-Tick employer, the Council could be awarded the level 2 - Disability Confident Employer Badge. The Council will be supported to complete the self-assessment process, enabling the Council to raise its profile as a disability-inclusive employer.
 - b) A named senior disability sponsor or champion from CMT to show the Council's strong commitment in disability related performance.
 - c) Introduction of a virtual Steering Group comprising operational leads from across the Council to develop an organisational wide plan, promote and monitor its progress.

Gender

- 4.2 Tackling the gender pay gap is an increasingly key and topical issue. A recent Briefing Note³ states that differences in hourly wages between men and women remain substantial, despite some convergence.
- 4.3 Having consulted on the issue, the Government aims to introduce mandatory reporting for organisations in larger private and voluntary sectors with 250 or more employees from 2017 onwards. This is aimed to be extended to public sector organisations in England of similar size (250+ employees) on a similar timescale.
- 4.4 Under the proposals, public authorities with 250+ employees will be required to publish details of the mean and median gender pay gap and information on the proportion of male and female employees in each salary quartile.
- 4.5 To report on the gender pay gap as part of the Equality Audit 2016/17.
- 4.6 That a draft report be submitted on the Council's current gender pay gap status to CMT prior to publication of the next Equality Audit.

³ The Gender Wage Gap, Institute of fiscal Studies Briefing Note BN186

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS

- 1.1. We use old National Best Value Performance Indicator (NBVPI) return methodology to compile the statistics, unless stated otherwise. This includes all full time and part time permanent staff and school based staff (unless otherwise stated). Casual staff or those on fixed term contracts of less than 12 months duration are excluded.
- 1.2. The non-declaration (ND) data in tables reflects those employees who have made a positive decision not to declare their ethnicity or a disability or where information is not available.

Comparisons of 'Protected Characteristics' Within Directorates

- 1.3. Table 1 shows employees at 31 March 2016 by gender compared with those at 31 March 2015. The proportion of women employed by the Council has remained almost static at 78.2%. The lowest percentage are employed in DENS at 45.4% where there are a larger number of traditionally male occupations. This is a slight decrease compared to the previous year's 50.1%. The largest percentages are in Schools (92.2%) and DCEEHS, where the proportion remains at around 87% which is the same as in the previous year. CSS are at 69.4%. Overall, the proportion of females employed in all directorates has remained almost the same as the last year reported. There has been a small fall in total 2016 figures when compared to total 2015 figures.
- 1.4. Table 2 shows employees at 31 March 2016 by ethnic origin within Directorates compared with those at 31 March 2015. The numbers of black and minority ethnic (BME) employees are shown as a proportion of employees who have made a positive declaration. The non-declaration (ND) data in the table reflects those employees who have made a positive decision not to declare their ethnicity or where information is not available.
- 1.5. The proportion of BME staff employed by the Council has increased considerably from 14.8% to 21.7%. The reduction in overall staffing (from 4275 to 4191), however, does not appear to have disproportionately affected BME staff groups. Its proportion, on the contrary, has increased. The highest proportion of BME staff is in DCEEHS (27.4%), followed by Schools (21.4%) and CSS (20.4%). The CSS and Schools have shown significant increase, while DENS has shown a slight increase.
- 1.6. The number of the staff who declined to declare their ethnicity has shown an increase from 452 to 558, overall. Of those, the largest number was employed in schools, whereas the smallest number was employed in CSS. All directorates have shown an increase in the proportion of BME staff. These outturns compare with a 23% BME economically active population (excluding white Irish and other) within the borough boundaries⁴.
- 1.7. Table 3 above shows the profile of employees who have declared a disability within Directorates at 31 March 2016 compared with those at 31 March 2015. The overall percentage has increased from 2.6% to 2.9%.
- 1.8. The proportion of staff with a disability in the Council is around 2.9%. The highest proportion of staff with a disability is DACHS (5.3%), followed by CSS (5.0%). The

⁴ 2011 census data

lowest proportion of the staff with a disability is employed in Schools (0.4%). Overall, CSS has shown a significant increase (from 3.7% to 5.0%), while Schools and DENS have shown a small decrease in percentages. If school based staff are taken out of the calculation, the proportion of staff in the Council with a disability would be 3.2%. This outturn compares with a 6% economically active population within the borough boundaries¹.

- 1.9. Table 4 shows the data of employee religion within Directorates at 31 March 2016. We are unable to make comparison with 2014/2015 in relation to religion as the data was not collected then. Percentages are of a total of those who have declared their religion.
- 1.10. In total, among the people with a particular religion, the dominant group employed within the borough boundaries were Christians (47%). Among those, the highest percentage was employed in Schools (55.2%) and DCEEHS (52.8%). The people with no religion have the second-highest proportion among those employed in the Council (28.1%), of those the highest percentage is employed in DACHS (32.1%) and DENS (31.8%). The people holding Jewish (0.4%) and Sikh (0.9%) beliefs have the lowest proportion among those employed in the Council, of which the highest number is employed in CSS (1.8% and 3.5%, respectively).
- 1.11. Table 5 shows the data of employee sexual orientation within Directorates at 31 March 2016. We are unable to make comparison with 2014/2015 in relation to sexuality as the data did not start to be collected then.
- 1.12. Of all staff employed (4191), the vast majority (3520) provided no information about their sexual orientation. However, of the remaining number almost 95% declared themselves as heterosexual, while 4.2% were LGBT. With the exception of people who preferred not to declare their sexuality, all staff employed at schools were heterosexual, and 93.6% employed in DENS and CSS stated that they were heterosexual, the remaining proportion (almost 6%) employed there stated that they were LGBT.
- 1.13. Table 6 shows the data of employee marital status within Directorates at 31 March 2016. We are unable to make comparison with 2014/2015 in relation to sexuality as the data was not collected then. In summary, among the staff members employed in all directorates, there is a slight difference in the proportion of married and single staff (51.5% as opposed to 40.9%). Alongside those, 7% were in a partner relationship and 0.6% were in a civil relationship.
- 1.14. Among the staff employed in schools, more than a half (55.1%) were married, whereas 38.7% were single. DACHS, DCEEHS and CSS follow the same pattern with more than half being married and less than half being single. The only exception is DENS where the proportion of married and single employees remained almost equal (48.0% versus 43.4%, respectively). In addition, the lesser number (6-8%) of those employed in all directorates were in partner relationship, overall, while the smallest proportion (less than 1%) were in civil relationship.

Progress of Applicants Through Recruitment

- 1.15. Table 7 and 8 compares the attrition rate of applicants through the recruitment process in order to better understand the dynamics of the process as it rolls forward. The figures in brackets are 2014/15 figures,

- 1.16. In 2015/16 the Council received 4716 (5774) applications for 426 (396) appointments. Of these, 2883 (3467) were from women - 61.1% (60%), 1995 (1581) from BME applicants - 42.3% (27%) and 216 (238) from people with a declared disability - 4.6% (4%). These headline figures are consistent with a slight increase in the number of posts recruited to across the Council and there has been a significant increase in the number of BME groups applying for employment.
- 1.17. Of the successful applicants, 65.1% (69%) were women, 25.1% (16%) were BME and 3.8% (4%) were applicants with a disability.
- 1.18. In relation to religious belief the largest percentage of applicants (41.52) and appointments (34.7%) are Christian. It is noted that Muslim's represented 6.17% of the applicants, however, a reduced percentage (3.1%) of the appointments.
- 1.19. In relation to sexual orientation headline figures shows consistency between applications and appointments.
- 1.20. CMT have further requested an analysis of applicants / appointments by gender for posts graded RG10 and above. Table 9 provides this analysis. Of the 8 appointments 50% were male and 50% female.

Comparisons of 'Protected Characteristics' Across Salary Bands

- 1.21. Table 10(a), 10(b), 10(c), 10(d), 10(e) & 10(f) shows employees at 31 March 2016 by salary band and then by gender, ethnic origin, disability, religion, sexuality and marital status. Salary bands are based on the RG pay scales introduced in May 2011.
- 1.22. Female employees continue to form the greater percentage across the majority of salary bands with the exception of salary band 1 and above 10. With the exception of salary band 1 and band over 10, each band has around 63% - 75% of female employees. Overall, the level of female employees in the higher earnings bands have remained almost the same, in the lower salary bands their proportion varies compared to the previous year.
- 1.23. This analysis shows that the level of BME staff in the higher earnings bands have remained static since the previous report (around 5% in the highest earnings band) which is lower than the percentage of BME staff in the Council as a whole. In total, this is a decrease compared to 2015 with the exception of the lowest salary band where it decreased from 48% to 33% and highest salary bands where it remained static.
- 1.24. The overall number of employees who have declared a disability across salary bands ranges between 0% and 5.0%. The proportion of people with a disability is relatively even across most of the bands with the exception of band 10.
- 1.25. The totals for staff are different from those in tables 1, 2 and 3, which show all employees as this data is drawn from the old NBVPI 11 earnings profile which excludes school based staff in its methodology.
- 1.26. Female employees continue to form the greater percentage across the majority of salary bands with the exception of Grade band 1 and those within Reading Senior Management Grades. With these exceptions each grade has over 55% women, with the proportion reaching around 65% - 70% in band 2, 3, 8, 9 and 10.
- 1.27. Salary band 1 consists mainly of apprentices.

- 1.28. Council Employees in salary bands by religion (Table 10c and 10d), Sexuality (Table 10e) and Marital Status (Table 10f) show no significant discrepancies to the proportion of staff across the Council.

Access to Corporate Training

- 1.29. Tables 11(a), 11(b), 11(c) and 11(d) show access to Training by Directorate and by type of training for employees from the different groups during 2015/16.
- 1.30. Table 11 (a) shows only people who have made a positive declaration under ethnicity and disability. Generally, the data reflects the proportions of these groups of employees in the workforce.
- 1.31. Overall a much larger percentage (71%) of women than men undertook training during last year. This is a decrease from 83% during the year the statistics were last reported.
- 1.32. BME employee access to training has slightly decreased from 17% to 16%.
- 1.33. Employees, who had declared themselves as having a disability, formed 4% of the total employees on corporate training, which is a slight increase (3%) on last year's report.
- 1.34. Tables 11 (a), 11 (b), 11 (c) and 11 (d) data reflects the proportions of these groups in the workplace.

Turnover and Attrition

- 1.35. Tables 12 (a), 12 (b), 12 (c), 12 (d) and 12 (e) shows a profile of 'leavers' from the Council divided between 'voluntary' and 'involuntary' forms of exit.
- 1.36. Total turnover for the Council was 14.5% in 2015/16. The tables shows that for most forms of exit, staff with 'protected characteristics', did not leave the Council in higher than expected proportions - that is to say, the level of exit indicates that these staff are generally being retained.

Involvement in Council Procedures

- 1.37. Table 13 (a) and 13 (b) shows a breakdown of those involved in the Council's formal procedures: capability ill health, capability performance, discipline and grievance. The levels of formal casework significantly increased in 2015/16 (from 69 in 2014/15 to 146 in 2015/16), but whilst the absolute numbers are relatively small, they do not indicate that procedures were applied and / or accessed disproportionately by any particular group profiled in the report.

Employee Profiles by Directorate at 31.03.16 compared to 31.03.15

Table 1 Employee Gender

Directorate 2014/15	31/03/2015			Directorate 2015/16	31/03/2016		
	All Staff	Women	% Women		All Staff	Women	% Women
DENS	1036	519	50.1%		952	442	46.4%
DEACS	993	855	86.1%		938	799	85.2%
				<i>DACHS</i>	424	352	83.0%
				<i>DCEEHS</i>	514	447	87.0%
CSS	366	257	70.2%		379	263	69.4%
SCHOOLS	1880	1734	92.2%		1922	1772	92.2%
TOTALS	4275	3365	78.7%		4191	3276	78.2%

Table 2 - Employee Ethnicity

Directorate 2014/15	31/03/2015				Directorate 2015/16	31/03/2016			
	All Staff	BME	% BME	ND		All Staff	BME	% BME	ND
DENS	1036	128	13.0%	50		952	151	15.2%	42
DEACS	993	183	19.3%	47		938	212	22.3%	43
					<i>DACHS</i>	424	80	19.3%	10
					<i>DCEEHS</i>	514	132	27.4%	33
CSS	366	53	15.0%	12		379	72	20.4%	13
SCHOOLS	1880	203	13.2%	343		1922	313	21.4%	460
TOTALS	4275	567	14.8%	452		4191	748	21.7%	558

Table 3 - Employee Disability

Directorate 2014/15	31/03/2015				Directorate 2015/16	31/03/2016			
	All Staff	Dis	% Dis	ND		All Staff	Dis	% Dis	ND
DENS	1036	24	2.6%	124		952	19	2.0%	100
DEACS	993	36	4.2%	135		938	37	4.2%	105
					<i>DACHS</i>	424	21	5.33%	30
					<i>DCEEHS</i>	514	16	3.64%	75
CSS	366	13	3.7%	19		379	17	5.0%	27
SCHOOLS	1880	4	0.5%	1016		1922	3	0.4%	1226
TOTALS	4275	77	2.6%	1294		4191	76	2.9%	1458

-
1. *Includes all permanent employees, teachers & school based employees; does not include those on temporary contracts for less than a year*
 2. *As a proportion of employees who have made a positive declaration*

Table 4 - Employee Religion

(No data as at 31st March 2015)

Directorate	31/03/2016																					
	All Staff	Agnostic		Atheist		Buddhist		Christian		Hindu		Jewish		Muslim		Sikh		Other		None	ND	
DENS	952	16	6.6%	21	8.7%	1	0.4%	107	44.2%	4	1.7%	0	0.0%	4	1.7%	0	0.0%	12	5.0%	77	31.8%	710
DACHS	424	5	3.6%	12	8.8%	1	0.7%	61	44.5%	2	1.5%	1	0.7%	3	2.2%	0	0.0%	8	5.8%	44	32.1%	287
DCEEHS	514	7	4.0%	16	9.1%	0	0.0%	93	52.8%	4	2.3%	0	0.0%	6	3.4%	2	1.1%	3	1.7%	45	25.6%	338
CSS	379	8	7.0%	14	12.3%	0	0.0%	51	44.7%	2	1.8%	2	1.8%	6	5.3%	4	3.5%	4	3.5%	23	20.2%	265
SCHOOLS	1922	1	3.4%	1	3.4%	0	0.0%	16	55.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.4%	0	0.0%	3	10.3%	7	24.1%	1893
TOTALS	4191	37	5.3%	64	9.2%	2	0.3%	328	47.0%	12	1.7%	3	0.4%	20	2.9%	6	0.9%	30	4.3%	196	28.1%	3493

Table 5 - Employee profile by their sexual orientation

Directorate	31/03/2015	31/03/2016									
		All Staff	Bisexual		Gay/Lesbian		Heterosexual		Other		ND
DENS		952	2	0.9%	11	4.7%	219	93.6%	2	0.9%	718
DACHS		424	0	0.0%	5	3.8%	125	94.0%	3	2.3%	291
DCEEHS		514	1	0.6%	3	1.8%	161	97.6%	0	0.0%	349
CSS		379	1	0.9%	6	5.5%	103	93.6%	0	0.0%	269
SCHOOLS		1922	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	29	100.0%	0	0.0%	1893
TOTALS	NO DATA	4191	4	0.6%	25	3.7%	637	94.9%	5	0.7%	3520

Table 6 - Employee profile by their marital status

Directorate	31/03/2015	31/03/2016									
		All Staff	Civil Partnership		Married		Partner		Single		ND
DENS		952	5	0.6%	431	48.0%	72	8.0%	390	43.4%	54
DACHS		424	2	0.6%	175	48.2%	36	9.9%	150	41.3%	61
DCEEHS		514	2	0.4%	226	49.9%	36	7.9%	189	41.7%	61
CSS		379	3	0.9%	176	50.0%	22	6.3%	151	42.9%	27
SCHOOLS		1922	10	0.6%	873	55.1%	88	5.6%	614	38.7%	337
TOTALS	NO DATA	4191	22	0.6%	1881	51.5%	254	7.0%	1494	40.9%	540

Table 7 - Recruitment Profile April 2014 - March 2015

	Male	Female	Unspecified	BME	White	Not Dec	Disabled	Not Disabled	Not Dec
Applied	2170	3467	137	1581	3578	615	238	4981	555
5774	38%	60%	2%	27%	62%	11%	4%	86%	10%
Appointed									
396	123	273	0	64	309	23	14	350	32
	31%	69%	0%	16%	78%	6%	4%	88%	8%

Table 8 - Recruitment Profile April 2015 - March 2016

	Male	Female	Unspecified	BME	White	Not Declared	Disabled	Not Disabled	Not Declared
Applied	1815	2883	18	1995	2620	101	216	4383	117
4716	38.5%	61.1%	0.4%	42.3%	55.6%	2.1%	4.6%	92.9%	2.5%
Interview	547	943	5	498	966	31	76	1376	43
1495	36.6%	63.1%	0.3%	33.3%	64.6%	2.1%	5.1%	92.0%	2.9%
Appointed	149	277	0	107	312	7	16	394	16
426	35.0%	65.0%	0.0%	25.1%	73.2%	1.6%	3.8%	92.5%	3.8%

	Agnostic	Atheist	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Other	None	ND
Applied	202	356	47	1958	178	6	291	44	140	1143	351
4716	4.28%	7.55%	1.00%	41.52%	3.77%	0.13%	6.17%	0.93%	2.97%	24.24%	7.44%
Interview	82	129	13	595	33	3	75	15	36	391	123
1495	5.5%	8.6%	0.9%	39.8%	2.2%	0.2%	5.0%	1.0%	2.4%	26.2%	8.2%
Appointed	19	44	2	148	4	0	13	5	10	137	44
426	4.5%	10.3%	0.5%	34.7%	0.9%	0.0%	3.1%	1.2%	2.3%	32.2%	10.3%

	Bisexual	Gay/Lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Not Declared
Applied	73	112	4142	45	344
4716	1.5%	2.4%	87.8%	1.0%	7.3%
Interview	18	39	1297	10	131
1495	1.2%	2.6%	86.8%	0.7%	8.8%
Appointed	1	11	359	1	54
426	0.2%	2.6%	84.3%	0.2%	12.7%

Table 9 - Recruitment by Gender RG10 and above April 2015 - March 2016

	Male	Female	Unspecified
Applied	22	18	0
40	55.0%	45.0%	0.0%
Interview	13	13	0
26	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%
Appointed	4	4	0
8	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%

Table 10 (a) - Council Employees in Salary Bands as at 31.3.15

Grade Bandings		Total Staff	Women		BME			Disability		
			No	%	No	ND	%	No	ND	%
RG1	Up to 15,207	23	8	35%	10	2	48%	1	3	5%
RG2	16,572	194	141	73%	54	21	31%	4	57	3%
RG3	19,742	339	251	74%	54	22	17%	11	56	4%
RG4	24,472	572	389	68%	95	15	17%	19	60	4%
RG5	29,558	446	286	64%	65	26	15%	18	46	5%
RG6	33,857	304	198	65%	37	9	13%	13	25	5%
RG7	39,267	224	149	67%	28	9	13%	5	16	2%
RG8	44,794	156	109	70%	15	2	10%	2	9	1%
RG9	50,324	70	42	60%	11	2	16%	2	4	3%
RG10	54,080	28	22	79%	2	0	7%	0	2	0%
Above 54080		57	33	58%	3	1	5%	1	6	2%

1. Based on 2014/15 pay bands and earnings
2. As a proportion of employees who have made a positive declaration
3. Excludes schools

Table 10(b) - Council Employees in Salary Bands by gender, ethnicity, disability as of 31.3.16

Grade Bandings	Total Staff	Women		BME			Disability		
		No	%	No	ND	%	No	ND	%
RG1 Up to 15,207	27	12	44.44%	8	3	33.33%	1	4	4.35%
RG2 16,572	145	96	66.21%	46	14	35.11%	3	42	2.91%
RG3 19,742	376	277	73.67%	76	22	21.47%	12	44	3.61%
RG4 24,472	599	411	68.61%	116	17	19.93%	21	51	3.83%
RG5 29,558	398	251	63.07%	70	17	18.37%	18	37	4.99%
RG6 33,857	268	164	61.19%	57	10	22.09%	13	23	5.31%
RG7 39,267	195	132	67.69%	31	6	16.40%	2	8	1.07%
RG8 44,794	121	77	63.64%	16	4	13.68%	2	7	1.75%
RG9 50,324	68	42	61.76%	11	2	16.67%	1	5	1.59%
RG10 54,080	29	22	75.86%	2	1	7.14%	0	4	0.00%
Above 54,080	43	20	46.51%	2	2	4.88%	0	6	0.00%

1. Based on 2014/15 pay bands and earnings
2. As a proportion of employees who have made a positive declaration
3. Excludes schools

Table 10 (c) - Council Employees in Salary Bands by religion as of 31.3.16

Grade Bandings	Total Staff	Agnostic		Atheist		Buddhist		Christian		Hindu		Jewish		Muslim		Sikh		Other		None		ND	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
RG1 Up to 15,207	27	1	7.7%	2	15.4%	0	0.0%	6	46.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	23.1%	14	51.9%
RG2 16,572	145	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	33.3%	13	91.7%
RG3 19,742	376	7	6.5%	15	14.0%	0	0.0%	42	39.3%	3	2.8%	1	0.9%	5	4.7%	1	0.9%	4	3.7%	29	27.1%	26	71.5%
RG4 24,472	599	11	5.9%	15	8.0%	1	0.5%	88	46.8%	3	1.6%	0	0.0%	6	3.2%	1	0.5%	7	3.7%	56	29.8%	41	68.6%
RG5 29,558	398	5	3.7%	14	10.4%	1	0.7%	60	44.8%	1	0.7%	1	0.7%	2	1.5%	1	0.7%	10	7.5%	39	29.1%	26	66.3%
RG6 33,857	268	4	4.5%	7	7.9%	0	0.0%	42	47.2%	3	3.4%	0	0.0%	3	3.4%	2	2.2%	4	4.5%	24	27.0%	17	66.8%
RG7 39,267	195	4	6.3%	3	4.7%	0	0.0%	36	56.3%	3	4.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	1	1.6%	2	3.1%	14	21.9%	13	72.3%
RG8 44,794	121	2	6.7%	3	10.0%	0	0.0%	11	36.7%	0	0.0%	1	3.3%	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	40.0%	91	75.2%
RG9 50,324	68	1	5.9%	3	17.6%	0	0.0%	8	47.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	29.4%	51	75.0%
RG10 54,080	29	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	24	82.8%
Above 54,080	43	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	70.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	33	76.7%

Table 10 (d) - Council Employees in Salary Bands by religion as of 31.3.2016

Grade Bandings	Total Staff	No Religion or Belief		Religion or Belief		ND	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
RG1 Up to 15,207	27	6	46.2%	7	53.9%	14	51.9%
RG2 16,572	145	4	33.3%	8	66.7%	133	91.7%
RG3 19,742	376	51	47.6%	56	46.7%	269	71.5%
RG4 24,472	599	82	43.7%	106	56.3%	411	68.6%
RG5 29,558	398	58	34.2%	76	56.6%	264	66.3%
RG6 33,857	268	35	39.4%	54	60.7%	179	66.8%
RG7 39,267	195	21	32.9%	43	67.3%	131	72.3%
RG8 44,794	121	17	56.7%	13	43.3%	91	75.2%
RG9 50,324	68	9	52.9%	8	47.1%	51	75.0%
RG10 54,080	29	1	20.0%	4	80.0%	24	82.8%
Above 54,080	43	3	30.0%	7	70.0%	33	76.7%

Table 10 (e) - Council Employees in Salary Bands by sexuality as of 31.3.2016.

Grade Bandings	Total Staff	Bisexual		Gay/Lesbian		Heterosexual		Other		Not Declared	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
RG1 Up to 15,207	27	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	100.0%	0	0.0%	13	48.1%
RG2 16,572	145	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	133	91.7%
RG3 19,742	376	0	0.0%	5	4.8%	99	94.3%	1	1.0%	271	72.1%
RG4 24,472	599	2	1.1%	4	2.2%	171	95.5%	2	1.1%	420	70.1%
RG5 29,558	398	1	0.8%	5	4.0%	117	93.6%	2	1.6%	273	68.6%
RG6 33,857	268	0	0.0%	4	4.7%	81	95.3%	0	0.0%	183	68.3%
RG7 39,267	195	1	1.6%	1	1.6%	61	95.3%	1	1.6%	131	67.2%
RG8 44,794	121	0	0.0%	2	7.4%	25	92.6%	0	0.0%	94	77.7%
RG9 50,324	68	0	0.0%	3	17.6%	14	82.4%	0	0.0%	51	75.0%
RG10 54,080	29	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	22	75.9%
Above 54,080	43	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	35	81.4%

Table 10 (f) - Council Employees in Salary Bands by Marital Status as of 31.3.2016

Grade Bandings	Total Staff	Civil Partnership		Married		Partner		Single		Not Declared	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
RG1 Up to 15,207	27	0	0.0%	3	12.0%	1	4.0%	21	84.0%	2	7.4%
RG2 16,572	145	1	0.8%	60	49.2%	6	4.9%	55	45.1%	23	15.9%
RG3 19,742	376	1	0.3%	142	42.6%	19	5.7%	171	51.4%	43	11.4%
RG4 24,472	599	1	0.2%	248	45.3%	52	9.5%	247	45.1%	51	8.5%
RG5 29,558	398	2	0.5%	172	45.9%	34	9.1%	167	44.5%	23	5.8%
RG6 33,857	268	5	2.0%	131	52.4%	15	6.0%	99	39.6%	18	6.7%
RG7 39,267	195	0	0.0%	102	57.0%	26	14.5%	51	28.5%	16	8.2%
RG8 44,794	121	1	0.9%	64	60.4%	3	2.8%	38	35.8%	15	12.4%
RG9 50,324	68	1	1.6%	36	59.0%	8	13.1%	16	26.2%	7	10.3%
RG10 54,080	29	0	0.0%	20	76.9%	1	3.8%	5	19.2%	3	10.3%
Above 54,080	43	0	0.0%	30	73.2%	1	2.4%	10	24.4%	2	4.7%

Table 11(a) shows Individual Employee Access to Corporate Training by Directorate for gender, ethnic origin and disability.

		Gender		Ethnic Origin			Disability		
Directorate	Total	Female	Male	BME	White	Data not available	No	Yes	Data not available
DACHS	1244	82%	18%	17%	80%	3%	90%	4%	6%
DCEEHS	1956	86%	14%	24%	71%	5%	83%	5%	12%
CSS	356	71%	29%	18%	78%	4%	82%	11%	7%
DENS	1813	37%	63%	10%	86%	4%	89%	3%	8%
SCHOOLS	1064	86%	14%	11%	70%	19%	46%	0%	54%
TOTALS	6433	71%	29%	16%	77%	7%	80%	4%	16%

Table 11(b) - shows Individual Employee Access to Corporate Training by Directorate for religion

Religion type	Grand Total	Agnostic	Atheist	Buddhist	Christian	Do Not Wish To Declare	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	None	Other	Sikh	No data
DACHS	1244	2%	5%	0%	19%	3%	0%	1%	1%	10%	4%	0%	55%
DCEEHS	1956	3%	4%	0%	23%	2%	1%	0%	1%	9%	1%	0%	56%
CSS	356	6%	2%	0%	11%	3%	0%	1%	3%	15%	1%	2%	56%
DENS	1813	3%	5%	0%	14%	2%	1%	0%	1%	13%	1%	0%	60%
SCHOOLS	1064	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	94%
TOTALS	6433	3%	4%	0%	16%	2%	1%	0%	1%	10%	2%	0%	61%

Table 11(c) shows Individual Employee Access to Corporate Training for Directorate

Sexual Orientation	Grand Total	Do Not Wish To Declare	Heterosexual	LGB	Other	Data not available
DACHS	1244	4%	37%	2%	1%	56%
DCEEHS	1956	2%	39%	1%	1%	57%
CSS	356	4%	37%	3%	0%	56%
DENS	1813	3%	33%	2%	0%	62%
SCHOOLS	1064	1%	6%	0%	0%	93%
TOTALS	6433	2%	31%	1%	0%	67%

Table 11(d) shows Individual Employee Access to Corporate Training by Directorate for marital status.

Marital Status	Grand Total	Civil Partnership	Married	Partner	Single	Data not available
DACHS	1244	1%	39%	12%	34%	14%
DCEEHS	1956	0%	42%	9%	39%	9%
CSS	356	0%	37%	7%	49%	6%
DENS	1813	1%	42%	8%	43%	5%
SCHOOLS	1064	1%	47%	6%	34%	13%
TOTALS	6433	1%	42%	9%	39%	9%

Data not available - for some fields the data has not been supplied by the delegate accessing training. This is particularly high regarding religion and sexual orientation, as these fields has not historically been collected for reporting purposes.

Table 12 (a) - Turnover / Leavers 2015/2016 by gender, ethnicity and disability

Reason	All	Female	BME	DISAB
Involuntary Exit				
Death	3	2	67%	0
Dismissal	13	6	46%	5
Ill Health Dismissal	3	3	100%	0
Ill Health Retirement	4	3	75%	1
Redundancy	12	7	58%	1
Redundancy / ER	3	2	67%	1
End of Fixed term/ Temp Contract	34	25	74%	8
Other (Not Known/TUPE)	4	4	100%	0
Total	76	52	68%	16
Voluntary Exit				
Retirement	34	20	59%	5
Mutual Agreement	21	13	62%	4
Efficiency Termination /Retire	6	5	83%	1
Resignation	474	399	84%	95
Total	535	437	82%	105
Total All	611	489	80%	121

Table 12 (b(i)) - Turnover/Leavers 2015/2016 by religion

Reason	All	Agnostic	Atheist	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu
	Involuntary Exit					
Death	3					
Dismissal	13					
Ill Health Dismissal	3					
Ill Health Retirement	4					1 100%
Redundancy	12				1 100.00%	
Redundancy / ER	3					
End of Fixed term/ Temp Contract	34				3 42.90%	
Other (Not Known/TUPE)	4					
Total	76	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0 0.00%
	Voluntary Exit					
Retirement	34				2 100.00%	
Mutual Agreement	21		1 25.00%		3 75.00%	
Efficiency Termination /Retire	6				1 50.00%	
Resignation	474	4 7.40%	6 11.10%		26 48.10%	1 1.90%
Total	535	4	6.50%	7	11.30%	0 0.00%
Total All	611	4	5.30%	7	9.30%	0 0.00%

Continue to Table 12 (b(ii))

Table 12 (b(ii)) - Turnover/Leavers 2015/2016 by religion

Reason	All	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Other	None	ND						
	Involuntary Exit												
Death	3		1	50.00%		1	33.30%						
Dismissal	13		1	50.00%	1	50.00%	84.60%						
Ill Health Dismissal	3						100.00%						
Ill Health Retirement	4						75.00%						
Redundancy	12						91.70%						
Redundancy / ER	3						100.00%						
End of Fixed term/ Temp Contract	34					4	79.40%						
Other (Not Known/TUPE)	4						100.00%						
Total	76	0	0.00%	2	15.40%	0	0.00%	1	7.70%	5	38.50%	63	82.90%
	Voluntary Exit												
Retirement	34										32	94.10%	
Mutual Agreement	21										17	81.00%	
Efficiency Termination /Retire	6					1	50.00%				4	66.70%	
Resignation	474		2	3.70%		2	3.70%	13	24.10%		420	88.60%	
Total	535	0	0.00%	2	3.20%	0	0.00%	2	3.20%	14	22.60%	473	88.40%
Total All	611	0	0.00%	4	5.30%	0	0.00%	3	4.00%	19	25.30%	536	87.70%

Table 12 (c) - Turnover/Leavers 2015/2016 by religion or belief categories

Reason	All	No Religion or Belief	Religion or Belief	ND
	Involuntary Exit			
Death	3	1	50%	33.3%
Dismissal	13			84.6%
Ill Health Dismissal	3			100.0%
Ill Health Retirement	4			75.0%
Redundancy	12			91.7%
Redundancy / ER	3			100.0%
End of Fixed term/ Temp Contract	34	4	57.14%	79.4%
Other (Not Known/TUPE)	4			100.0%
Total	76	5	38.5%	82.9%
	Voluntary Exit			
Retirement	34			94.1%
Mutual Agreement	21	1	25.0%	81.0%
Efficiency Termination /Retire	6	1	50.0%	66.7%
Resignation	474	23	42.6%	88.6%
Total	535	25	40.4%	88.4%
Total All	611	30	40%	87.7%

Table 12 (d) - Turnover/Leavers 2015/2016 by sexuality

Reason	All	Bisexual	Gay/Lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Not Known	ND						
	Involuntary Exit												
Death	3			2	100.0%		1	33.3%					
Dismissal	13			2	100.0%		11	84.6%					
Ill Health Dismissal	3						3	100.0%					
Ill Health Retirement	4						4	100.0%					
Redundancy	12			1	100.0%		11	91.7%					
Redundancy / ER	3						3	100.0%					
End of Fixed term/ Temp Contract	34			6	100.0%		28	82.4%					
Other (Not Known/TUPE)	4						4	100.0%					
Total	76	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	65	85.5%
	Voluntary Exit												
Retirement	34			1	100.0%		33	97.1%					
Mutual Agreement	21			4	100.0%		17	81.0%					
Efficiency Termination /Retire	6			2	100.0%		4	66.7%					
Resignation	474		1	1.9%	52	98.1%	421	88.8%					
Total	535	0	0.0%	1	1.7%	59	98.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	475	88.8%
Total All	611	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	70	98.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	540	88.4%

Table 12 (e) - Turnover/Leavers 2015/2016 by marital status

Reason	All	Civil Partnership	Married	Partner	Single	ND	
	Involuntary Exit						
Death	3		2	66.7%	1	33.3%	
Dismissal	13		5	45.5%	6	54.5%	
III Health Dismissal	3		2	100.0%		33.3%	
III Health Retirement	4		3	75.0%	1	25.0%	
Redundancy	12		7	58.3%	5	41.7%	
Redundancy / ER	3		2	66.7%	1	33.3%	
End of Fixed term/ Temp Contract	34		15	45.5%	5	15.2%	
Other (Not Known/TUPE)	4		0	0.0%	1	50.0%	
Total	76		36	51.4%	6	8.57%	
	Voluntary Exit						
Retirement	34		18	78.3%	1	4.3%	
Mutual Agreement	21		10	58.8%	7	41.2%	
Efficiency Termination /Retire	6		3	60.0%	2	40.0%	
Resignation	474	1	0.2%	193	47.1%	27	6.6%
Total	535	1	0.2%	224	49.2%	28	6.2%
Total All	611	1	0.2%	260	49.5%	34	6.5%

Table 13 (a) - Completed HR Casework - Use of Formal Procedures - April 2014 to March 2015 - Analysis by Employee Profile

Case Type	All Cases	Gender		BME		Disability	
		Female	%	No	%	No	%
Capability IH	25	16	64.0%	3	12.0%	2	8.0%
Capability - Performance	4	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%
Disciplinary	23	3	13.0%	7	30.4%	2	8.6%
Grievance	16	7	43.7%	5	31.2%	3	18.7%
Bullying / Harassment	1	1	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTALS	69	28	40.5%	16	23.1%	8	11.5%

Table 13 (b) - Completed HR Casework - Use of Formal Procedures - April 2015 to March 2016 - Analysis by Employee Profile

Case Type	All Cases	Gender		BME		Disability	
		Female	%	No	%	No	%
Capability IH	62	32	51.6%	12	19.4%	11	17.8%
Capability - Performance	7	2	28.6%	1	14.2%	2	28.6%
Disciplinary	60	23	38.3%	9	15.0%	2	3.3%
Grievance	17	11	64.7%	8	47.0%	4	23.5%
Bullying / Harassment	0	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTALS	146	68	46.6%	30	20.5%	19	13.0%

DISABILITY ACTION PLAN - Previous 12 months

In the previous 12 months the Council has:

- a) Revitalised the Council's disability awareness training programme to increase understanding, skills and awareness.
- b) Developed further guidance on 'reasonable adjustments' Included in a new Guide& FAQ for Managers and staff.
- c) Overhauled the Council's guidance / support to managers on the recruitment of staff with a disability.
- d) Completed and promoted the Council's 'Two Tick' accreditation.
- e) Worked with individual staff who have a disability to discover more about their direct experience of recruitment and assimilation into the Council's workforce.
- f) Became a member of the Business Disability Forum to obtain examples of good practice in the private and public sector and reviewing the Council's current procedures.