

If you are reading this electronically, the Council has saved **£xx.xx** on printing. For more information on the Modern.gov paperless app, contact Democratic Services

# Merton Council

## Joint Consultative Committee with Ethnic Minority Organisations Agenda

### Membership

**Councillors:** Marsie Skeete (Chair), Eloise Bailey, Omar Bush, Joan Henry, Agatha Akyigyina

**Substitute Members:** Adam Bush

Hina Bokhari

Caroline Cooper-Marbiah

### Ethnic Minority Organisations

African Educational Cultural & Health Organisation (AECHO)

Deputy

Ahmadiyya Muslim Association

Asian Diabetic Support & Awareness Group

Elderly Group of Merton

Asian Youth Association

BAME Voice

Bangladeshi Association of Merton

Deputy

Bengali Association of Merton

Deputy

Bengali Women's Association of Merton

British Muslim Association of Merton

Ethnic Minority Centre

Euro Bangla Federation

Deputy

London South West Chinese Community Association

Merton African Organisation

Merton Somali Community

Mitcham Filipino British Association

Deputy

Merton and Lambeth Citizen's Advice Bureau

Pakistan Cultural Association of Merton & Wandsworth

Pakistan Welfare Association

Deputy

Positive Network

Polish Family Association

South London Somali Community Association

South London Tamil Welfare Group

Victim Support Merton and Sutton

Wimbledon Mosque

Revd Mrs H Neale

Mr .H.Nawaz

Mrs N. Shah Asian

Mr M S Sheikh

Revd Mrs H Neale

Mr. N. Islam

Mr J Choudhury

Mr Rahman

Mrs M Ahmed

Mr B. Afridi

Mrs Sabitri Ray

Dr Haque

Mr Q Anwar

Ms L Saltoon

Mr C J Lusack

Mr A. Ali

Ms Colquhoun

Ms C Batallones

Ms S Hudson

Mr M A Shah

Mr S U Sheikh

Mr Rizvi

Ms G Salmon

Mr S Szczepanski

Mr A Musse

Dr P Arumugaraasah

Ms J Davidson

Mr Z Khan

**Date:** Wednesday 9 June 2021

**Time:** 7.15 pm

**Venue:** The meeting will be held via Zoom. This is a public meeting and attendance by the public is encouraged and welcomed. For more

If you are reading this electronically, the Council has saved **£xx.xx** on printing. For more information on the Modern.gov paperless app, contact Democratic Services

information about the agenda please contact: [diversity@merton.gov.uk](mailto:diversity@merton.gov.uk) or telephone [020 8545 4637](tel:02085454637). All Press contacts: [communications@merton.gov.uk](mailto:communications@merton.gov.uk), 020 8545 3181

## **Joint Consultative Committee with Ethnic Minority Organisations Agenda**

### **9 June 2021**

- 1 Declaration of Interest
- 2 Apologies for Absence
- 3 Minutes of previous meeting 1 - 8
- 4 Findings of the BAME Voice Covid-19 Community Resilience research
- 4a BAME Voice presentation - Hannah Neale, Chair BAME Voice
- 4b Next steps and the Local Outbreak Management Plan (LOMP) - LBM Dagmar Zeuner, Director of Public Health
- 5 Human Resources update - Liz Hammond, Interim Head of Human Resources 9 - 48
- 6 Community Engagement - Superintendent Roger Arditti, Neighbourhoods Lead, South West BCU, Metropolitan Police Service
- 7 Any Other Business

#### **Note on declarations of interest**

Members are advised to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered at the meeting. If a pecuniary interest is declared they should withdraw from the meeting room during the whole of the consideration of that matter and must not participate in any vote on that matter. For further advice please speak with the Managing Director, South London Legal Partnership.

# Agenda Item 3

## JOINT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE WITH ETHNIC MINORITY ORGANISATIONS 2 DECEMBER 2020

(Time Not Specified - Time Not Specified)

PRESENT Councillors Councillor Marsie Skeete (in the Chair),  
Councillor Eloise Bailey, Councillor Omar Bush,  
Councillor Joan Henry and Councillor Agatha Mary Akyigyina,  
  
Councillor Allison, Councillor Edith Macauley, Councillor Laxmi Attawar,  
Mr Sivapragasam Shivaranjith, Ms Aman Nathan, Ms Elda Rouse, Rev. Hannah Neale, Chief Inspector Bob Whitehead, Ms Marilyn Watkins-Massiah, Ms Stella Akintan, Mr Kaz Obuka, Rev. E Copeland, Mr Jerry Hall, Ms Seema Shah, Ms Sharon Scott, Mr Logie Lohendran, Ms Beau Fadahunsi, Ms Felica Alicia, Raghavi, Mr Abayeh Savage, Mr Fitzroy Dawson, Mr Jason Charles, Ms Liz Hammond, Ms Evereth Willis, Ms Debbie Allen, Ms Carol Bruce-Gordon, Ms Grace Oyerinde

### 1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Agenda Item 1)

None.

### 2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies were received from Mr Saleem Sheikh, Mr Slawek Szczepanski, Dr Arumugaraasah and Mr Islam.

### 3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

Cllr Skeete gave an introduction, she has been a councillor for six years and was the Mayor in 2017/18. She is committed to addressing issues of concern for the BAME community and working collaboratively to solve them.

The minutes were agreed.

### 4 STAY WELL IN WINTER 2020 - AMAN NATHAN, PATIENT AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT MANAGER (MERTON), NHS SOUTH WEST LONDON CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP (Agenda Item 4)

Aman Nathan gave an overview of Stay Well in Winter and keeping Warm and Well in Merton.

*Q: COVID can be silent, you have to have symptoms to get a test, why are there restrictions?*

*Q: The egg allergy has put people off getting the vaccine, it was suggested that the publicity should explain more clearly that allergy sufferers may be affected by the vaccination.*

A: Aman will take back the queries and report back to the JCC.

*Q: People are scared to go their G.P.*

A: Community Clinics have been set up to offer vaccinations

**Resolved: Aman's presentation to be shared with the councillors.**

## 5 POLICE UPDATE - INSP BOB WHITEHEAD, METROPOLITAN POLICE (Agenda Item 5)

Chief Inspector (CI) Whitehead presented an update on the crime statistics for Merton. Burglaries are down and theft of vehicles have gone up. New officers have been moved from Earlsfield to Wimbledon so the borough has increased resources.

Seema Shah updated the meeting with the Mayor of London's targets for increasing diversity in the police force. The Mayor set targets to increase diversity by 20% by 2024 and 28% by 2030. She gave details of the Outreach Recruitment programme being undertaken by the Police. A 3 year Apprenticeship is being offered and the only entry requirements are grade C GCSE English and Maths. The programme is comprised of an 80:20 split between the class room and placement and is being run by 4 London universities. The salary is £30K per annum.

*Q: What plans are there to give support to stop BAME communities being targeted like criminals?*

A: The BAME recruits will be given support and assistance.

*Q: What is stopping people from joining the Police? What are their fears and the support available?*

A: Support will be provided to get qualifications. It is too early to say and assumptions can't be made.

*Q: Young Black boys are still getting harassed by the Police, how will the Police change the narrative? Officers need to treat young people with respect.*

*Q: Details were given of community events that the Police had been invited to but did not attend. It was suggested that the Police needs to use another approach, e.g. using Carnival to do a recruitment drive.*

A: The Police do use carnival to recruit, but there is concern about those who get injured.

*Q: Is there an upper age limit for the recruitment and selection?*

A: The age limit is 57, applications can be made at 17 and applicants may be employed as PCs at 18. There is a target to recruit 40% BAME women and it is a good opportunity for women who are career transitioning.

*Q: To what extent will the initiative help to smash gangs and improve the effectiveness of tackling County Lines?*

A: These are two huge problems and making improvements in trust through better communication could help to improve matters. Better communication and recruitment and selection will improve trust.

*Q: Why has violence against the person gone up so much? What is being done to employ more senior BAME people? A real change is needed from the top down.*

A: It depends on how change is quantified. The Police service does need to be more inclusive, there is a working group looking at the top level.

A: The crime statistics are not broken down by BAME categories. The increase in Domestic Violence during the pandemic is part of the reason for the increase in violence against the person.

*Q: How can noise nuisance and anti-social behaviour be dealt with?*

A: Ward Officers can try to sort out such problems. The Safer Neighbourhood Team and Noise Nuisance Team may also provide support.

*Q: What support is there for officers in the line of duty? What is the relationship between the Regulars and Specials? Why do officers move so regularly?*

A: The officers move on for promotion or to get experience in a new area. There are 68 staff in Merton and recruitment and retention is being looked at, but for development people move on. You can't make people stay in the same role for too long. Every effort is being made to keep people in roles for some time.

*Q: The increase in Domestic Violence is definitely the reason for the increase in violence against the person. Due to the pandemic, the courts have been shut and cases not listed. Wimbledon has a special Domestic Violence court, however, the court is struggling to hear all the cases.*

*Q: Stop and Search is still a problem and has not eased up for Black people.*

A: The Police could do better. If people have concerns they can contact the Stop and Search panel. Body worn camera is also reviewed. It is not always possible to fully explain the reasons for stop and search because the Police have to take control.

*Q: What are we doing to stop knife crime and protect people?*

A: Stop and Search is the main way of detecting knife carrying – young Black people are 8 times more likely to be a victim of knife crime.

*Q: Is there any data on Hate crime and the level of mental health cases?*

A: CI Whitehead did not have the data and encouraged representatives to join the borough's Independent Advisory Group (IAG).

*Q: Representatives have not heard of the Stop and Search panel, so it needs to be advertised to schools and colleges.*

*Q: How will the relationship be improved? More interventions could be done to see the Police in a positive light.*

*Q: What is the percentage retention of BAME Officers?*

A: No statistics are available on retention rates. In November 15.3% of PCs are from a BAME background.

6 UPDATE ON THE COVID-19 COMMUNITY RESILIENCE RESEARCH -  
HANNAH NEALE, CHAIR BAME VOICE (Agenda Item 6)

Hannah Neale and Raghavi gave an update on the Covid-19 Resilience research being conducted by BAME Voice.

The council recognised the need to do additional work to better understand the impact of the pandemic on the BAME community and commissioned BAME Voice to conduct research into the lived experience of BAME residents. The aim of the research was also to find a framework to build resilience.

A bottom up approach was used with respondents telling the researcher how they have been affected by the pandemic.

Hannah stressed that in the past BAME community contributed to reports but there had been no recognition of the role they played. She hoped that the findings of the report will be used to contribute to making a positive change. Hannah hoped that in the future the term 'Hard to reach' is no longer used, because it has been the methods previously used to get to the BAME community that was problematic.

The research has identified the issue of council staff feeling hurt because of their experience of bullying and not have the issues that they raise dealt with satisfactorily.

The research has also found that the BAME community is not weak, but in fact there are strong and determined residents, who are angry that they've been the focal point of negative publicity. Many felt stigmatised by media headlines and found them to be upsetting.

Residents want to work with the statutory agencies. The research heard voices that have never been heard before maybe because they have never been approached or were reluctant to give information.

The aim was to search out more voices and challenge the BAME community and the council.

The interviewers were trained in August and included young interviewers. An extensive sample included Taxi and Mini Cab drivers (part of the business cohort). 2 outdoor events were held and 3 Resilience workshops for staff. In homes where English was not the first language, young people explained the issues to older members of the household.

To date the research found that respondents felt that nothing has changed and people want to see a real change.

BAME Voice is represented on some of the partnership board. Hannah congratulated the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) for the community medical facilities.

Hannah ended the presentation by thanking Councillors Stephen Alambritis and Edith Macauley for their support.

*Q: It is important to get members of the BAME community to attend the JCC and improve attendance levels. Councillors are encouraged to get their constituents involved.*

*Q: How may the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) keep residents engaged? Is there anything that was heard that could be taken back to the NHS? What do people need from the NHS to work as leaders and connectors?*

A: An interim report has been produced and given to Barry Causer in Public Health. Messages are not getting through, e.g. not everyone can access Zoom or Teams. Hannah suggested that simply using a mega-phone in public places could be used as a means of getting messages out to the public.

*Q: The story of disproportionality is a problem. The narrative was that it was harder for people to catch. Is data available showing the percentage of Merton's BAME residents affected by the pandemic? The disproportionate impact is not across all regions and the borough. 13% is not disproportionate and should be highlighted. The impact is now shifting to the Caribbean and African communities.*

*Q: How are the statistics broken down by BAME – the term is not homogenous and the data should reflect the different groups include in the term 'BAME'? BAME organisations need more support to contribute to the research. BAME Voice needs to contact BAME organisations and offer support to gather data from their membership to get more depth. WIFFA would like to assist in the data gathering to get the voice of the Caribbean community heard.*

**Resolved: Evereth to share the BAME demographics with the JCC.**

## 7 EMPLOYMENT UPDATE - LIZ HAMMOND, INTERIM HEAD OF HUMAN RESOURCES (Agenda Item 7)

Liz Hammond gave an overview of the measures the council is putting in place to improve the diversity profile and ensure that the organisation is free from any racial bias. She gave an example of the recent recruitment for the Assistant Director of Public Protection, where 30% of applicants were BAME, 30% of longlisted candidates were BAME and 50% were shortlisted. However, the successful applicant is white. The panel members included a senior BAME officer. The council will be implementing initiatives to look internally at itself.

Q: *What was the ethnicity of the panel?*

A: White Male and Female and one BAME officer.

Q: *Have they had Unconscious Bias training?*

A: Liz didn't know if they had Unconscious Bias but they have received Recruitment and Selection training.

Q: *What colour was the BAME officer?*

A: Black.

**Resolved: the Liz will get clarity for the next meeting.**

Q: *There has been a systematic failing for BAME staff. 34.4% of staff are BAME but only 13.9% were 5% of the top earners in the council. There are no BAME employees earning in excess of £80,000 in the council. There seems to be a ceiling as BAME staff are struggling to progress. BAME staff are needed at all levels and the failings need to be addressed. There needs to be a breakdown of the percentages.*

A: The figures below 10 cannot be reported on as it would potentially identify individuals.

Q: *What action is being taken to retain staff?*

A: BAME staff are being recruited faster, but they are not being retained- often BAME staff leave for career progression. Exit interviews need to be done.

Q: *It is important to provide career progression in the council, staff should not have to go elsewhere.*

Q: *Do you have exit interview data?*

A: There is an exit interview process but staff don't want to do exit interviews.

Q: *Succession planning should be in place, Head Hunting is sending the wrong message.*

Q: *There needs to be succession planning. There are capable people internally.*

A: HR's work plan includes putting talent management in place.

Q: *The council has institutional racism. What percentage of staff have had Unconscious Bias training and what is the plan to roll it out across the council? Creativity gets stunted when there is no diversity. The council needs to look at how it is recruiting – candid honesty is needed.*

A: Not a large number are leaving the council

Councillor Allison, Leader of the council informed the meeting that half of the cabinet are BAME and the council is committed to change. In terms of recruitment the council needs to work to making a change. It is important to get staff reflective of the community.

Q: *How does the local authority ensure the recruitment agency has the same standard for equality and diversity as the council?*

A: The recruitment agency have to give data in their proposals about ethnicity etc.

Q: *is Unconscious Bias mandatory?*

A: Yes.

Q: *There is a 100% record of attaining white candidates at the top. When will that change?*

A: There has been little change in the directors, so there has been little opportunity to appoint BAME staff at the top of the organisation.

## 8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 8)

The Census is taking place on 21March 2021 and the JCC is encouraged to promote completing the census.

Concern was expressed about how the BAME data would be used. Beau Fadahunsi informed the meeting that the census is going to be totally digital. Merton Voluntary Service Council (MVSC) is going to have Census centres to assist residents. The centres will be in Pollards Hill, MVSC and Wimbledon.

The meeting finished at 9.50

This page is intentionally left blank

### ANNUAL EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IN EMPLOYMENT REPORT

1 APRIL 2020 TO 31 MARCH 2021

#### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. Against the backdrop of the COVID-19 pandemic, the death of George Floyd in the US and the resurgence of the Black Lives Matter movement, many of Merton's BAME staff expressed their concerns about the COVID-19 risks they may be exposed to in the course of their work for the council. They shared their thoughts and emotional responses to the wider structural injustices they were subjected to through racism in society. They saw those injustices and that racism reflected in their experience of working for the Council and challenged the Council to do better.
- 1.2. CMT decided on a range of measures and initiatives in August 2020, amongst which was a more in-depth Annual Equalities & Diversity in Employment Report
- 1.3. CMT considered a paper written by the Chair of the Corporate Equality Steering Group in which the BAME forum suggested that Merton should adopt the NHS's Workforce Race Equality Standards (WRES), which offer a set of objective measures (Indicators 1-9) which could be adapted and adopted for the council to measure and monitor.
- 1.4. The Chief Executive also received a letter from the recognised trade union, Unison that contained a list of requests, similar to those outlined in the WRES above.

CMT agreed new quarterly and annual metrics in addition to the quarterly Diversity reporting that HR currently already provide. HR will publish this report in April/May each year, covering the previous financial year.

#### 2. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- 2.1. The main findings are set out below, the summary is not inclusive of all findings and further information is contained in the relevant data sections.

##### 2.2. Ethnicity

- The proportion of BAME staff in the workforce continues to increase, yet there remain no BAME staff with salaries over £80k per annum, and BAME staff constitute a low proportion of our top 5% earners. This is consistent with the last reported BAME pay gap compared to White employees where pay was 12.5% lower (mean) and 9.5% lower (median), primarily due to the concentration of BAME staff in lower grades.
- Whilst the Council is able to recruit BAME staff at a higher rate than presently in the workforce, BAME staff were less likely to remain over time than their white colleagues i.e. their retention rates were consistently lower. The reason the overall proportion of BAME staff is still increasing is because recruitment outstrips exits

- BAME staff were more likely to be promoted (regraded or appointed to higher graded posts) than white staff
- Although caution is needed due to the low numbers when broken down by case type, it is clear that overall BAME employees (42% were BAME compared to 35% in the workforce) were more likely to reach formal stages of our employment procedures. Black or Black British staff featured heavily in Capability (57%), Disciplinary (50%) and Grievance cases (44%) compared to a workforce profile of 22%. Casework tends to concentrate in the lower grades, where there is a higher proportion of BAME staff.
- BAME staff were more likely to attend Learning and Development events than white staff but were less likely to attend Leadership and Management training (with the exception of Community and Housing where 80% attending were BAME). White staff were less likely to attend Diversity training.

## 2.5 Gender

- Whilst female staff make up 47% of the top 5% of earners, they were less represented in the management grades above £60,000 per annum than they were in the workforce as a whole.
- Female staff make up a higher percentage of new appointments at MGA and above
- Overall and voluntary turnover rates for Females were greater than for Males although stability rates (how long they remain employed) were similar.
- Females had a lower “promotion” rate than males, noting however that this may be influenced by factors such as the staff profile in areas where reorganisations have taken place in a given year.
- The proportions of male and female staff undergoing casework broadly reflect the workforce profile, although overall females are slightly higher at 72% compared to a profile of 68%. The exception is Capability where all staff were female.
- Female staff were more likely to take part in Learning and Development than their male colleagues

## 2.6 Disability

- Although there were some variations, the percentage of staff who had declared they were disabled has been decreasing for several years.
- Disabled staff had similar turnover rates to non-Disabled colleagues however their stability rates were lower, being less likely to remain in post after 2 years
- Disabled staff constituted 9% of sickness cases, 17% of Grievance cases and 10% of overall cases compared to a workforce profile of 5%.
- Disabled staff were more likely to undertake Learning and Development courses than Non-Disabled colleagues

## 2.7 Age

- The proportion of staff age 16-24 has changed little over the last 5 years, whilst the proportion of staff age over 50 (and over 65) is increasing with possible impacts on future resourcing and succession planning as older staff eventually retire.
- Candidates aged 16-24 made up 25% of applicants, but only 16% of those shortlisted and 13% of those offered a job. Candidate's age 35-49 made up 26% of applicants, 29% of those shortlisted and 34% of those offered a job.
- Resignation rates were highest for the 25-39 age band.
- Staff aged 16-39 saw a higher proportion of promotions than their workforce profile; those aged 50 and above had less.
- Staff between 25 and 49 are less likely to be involved in casework. Staff aged 50-64 are much more likely to be involved in casework than the workforce profile (63% compared to a profile of 48%). This pattern is similar for Attendance Sickness, Capability, Disciplinary and Grievance.
- Young People age 16-24 were more likely to take part in Learning and Development; this is consistent with the high proportion of apprentices in that age band.

## 2.8 Religion/Belief

- 40% of staff have not declared their religion belief. Although the percentage of these unknowns has decreased year on year, it still means that analysis only covers 60% of the workforce and this needs to be considered in reviewing the findings.
- There were only Christian and "no religion/belief" staff over £80,000 per annum.
- Due to the small numbers, care is needed when considering percentage variations, however Hindu and Muslim applicants show decreasing representation at the shortlisted and offered stages.
- Overall Turnover rates were higher for those with no religion/belief
- Resignation rates were higher for non-Christian religions/beliefs in two of the three years, although caution is needed due to the small size of the data set.
- Muslim staff had a lower stability than staff of other religions/beliefs i.e. were likely to remain employed for a shorter period of time, although again the numbers were small so some caution is needed in interpreting the data.
- A higher proportion of staff with no religion or belief were promoted compared to their workforce profile (37% compared to workforce profile of 27%) with all other religions/beliefs being below workforce profile.
- The proportions of staff who underwent casework overall are broadly consistent with the workforce profile, however Muslim staff represent 17% of attendance/sickness casework compared to a workforce profile of 6% and those with "Any other religion/belief" represent 33% of those in disciplinary cases compared to a profile of 4%.
- 56% of Employment Tribunal cases involved Black or Black British staff.

- There is no significant variation between the religion/belief workforce profile and the profile of those undertaking learning and development.

## 2.9 Sexual Orientation

- 32% of staff have not provided details of their sexual orientation. Although the percentage of these unknowns has decreased year on year, it still means that analysis only covers 2/3 of the workforce and this needs to be considered in reviewing the findings.
- The number of staff who have declared they are Gay Men, Gay/Lesbian Women, Bisexual and “Other” is low. Care therefore needs to be taken when considering percentage variations when further broken down.
- There is a higher proportion of Gay and Lesbian staff in the middle salary bands.
- Gay men had lower stability rates, followed by Bisexuals.
- Other than Gay Women/Lesbians where there no promotions (compared to 1% in the workforce), staff with non-Heterosexual orientations had a higher promotion rate.
- Just one Gay Man and one Gay Woman/Lesbian were involved in casework with all others involved (where sexual orientation was known) being Heterosexual.

## 3. DETAILED DATA AND ANALYSIS – CONTENTS

<b>Page</b>	<b>Analysis by Protected Characteristic</b>	
6 - 11	Ethnicity	4.1 – 4.12
12 - 17	Gender	5.1 – 5.12
18 - 23	Disability	6.1 – 6.12
24 - 29	Age	7.1 – 7.12
30 - 33	Religion/Belief	8.1 – 8.11
33 - 38	Sexual Orientation	9.1 – 9.11

## 4. DETAILED DATA AND ANALYSIS – ETHNIC ORIGIN

### 4.1 Percentage of BAME staff in the workforce

% ethnic minorities	31-Mar-17	31-Mar-18	31-Mar-19	31-Mar-20	31-Mar-21	Current not known
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	28.6%	31.0%	31.2%	33.6%	35.4%	6.9%
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	42.2%	44.0%	45.4%	48.1%	47.5%	8.3%
CORPORATE SERVICES	26.1%	28.3%	27.4%	28.7%	29.0%	9.7%
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	18.2%	22.0%	21.6%	23.1%	26.3%	16.3%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>27.8%</b>	<b>31.5%</b>	<b>31.5%</b>	<b>33.7%</b>	<b>34.7%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>
<i>London Councils Median Benchmark</i>	<i>39.2%</i>	<i>38.8%</i>	<i>40.0%</i>	<i>44.00%</i>		

The percentage of BAME staff in the workforce increased each year, and overall was 34.7% as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021.

### 4.2. Percentage of BAME staff amongst top 5% of earners

% ethnic minorities	31-Mar-17	31-Mar-18	31-Mar-19	31-Mar-20	31-Mar-21	Current not known
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	15.4%	5.9%	14.3%	4.6%	9.5%	4.6%
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	15.4%	11.1%	11.1%	25.0%	20.0%	16.7%
CORPORATE SERVICES	12.5%	18.5%	17.1%	16.7%	15.4%	18.8%
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>11.4%</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>14.9%</b>
<i>London Councils Median Benchmark</i>	<i>15.0%</i>	<i>17.0%</i>	<i>17.0%</i>	<i>18.0%</i>		

This measure enables us to benchmark with other councils in London. The percentage of BAME staff amongst the top 5% of earners has varied over the period but at 12.2% at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021 remains well below the overall workforce percentage of 34.4%, and below latest available average (median) for London.

### 4.3 Current workforce profile by salary band and ethnic origin

As at 30 September 2020

Basic Salary Band	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Mixed	Other Ethnic Groups	White	BAME Overall
Up to £19,999 per annum	28.57%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%	42.86%	57.14%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	8.40%	23.98%	4.06%	1.04%	62.51%	37.49%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	7.91%	20.47%	2.33%	0.47%	68.84%	31.16%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	10.53%	3.51%	0.00%	1.75%	84.21%	15.79%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>8.38%</b>	<b>22.06%</b>	<b>3.45%</b>	<b>0.90%</b>	<b>65.22%</b>	<b>34.78%</b>

There is a larger proportion of BAME employees on salaries up to £59,999 per annum. There were no BAME employees earning above £80,000 per annum. It should be noted that the bottom salary band mainly covers a relatively small number of entry level Apprentices on London Living Wage.

#### 4.4 Joiners by salary band and ethnic origin

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Basic Salary Band	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Mixed	Other Ethnic Groups	White	BAME overall
Up to £19,999 per annum	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	1.90%	34.29%	3.81%	0.00%	60.00%	40.00%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	10.81%	37.84%	2.70%	0.00%	48.65%	51.35%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4.03%</b>	<b>34.23%</b>	<b>3.36%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>58.39%</b>	<b>41.61%</b>

“Joiners” here includes staff who were new to the borough, as well as agency conversions to perm, but will exclude internal promotions. BAME employees made up a larger proportion (42%) of new starters in the rolling year than the overall workforce profile (35%). Data covers those employees with known ethnicity.

#### 4.5 Leavers by Salary Band and ethnic origin

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Basic Salary Band	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Mixed	Other Ethnic Groups	White	BAME overall
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	7.25%	18.84%	4.35%	1.45%	68.12%	31.88%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	6.67%	20.00%	4.44%	0.00%	68.89%	31.11%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	11.11%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Up to £19,999 per annum	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6.98%</b>	<b>21.71%</b>	<b>4.65%</b>	<b>0.78%</b>	<b>65.89%</b>	<b>34.11%</b>

BAME staff made up 34% of leavers in the rolling year, slightly lower than the percentage of BAME employees in the workforce (35%).

**4.6 Recruitment - overall**  
**1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021**

3,355 applications were received during this period, of which:-

	<b>BAME</b>	<b>White background</b>	<b>Prefer not to say</b>
CSF (34% of applications)	60%	40%	3%
C&H (14% of applications)	61%	39%	3%
CS (48% of applications)	57%	43%	4%
E&R (6% of applications)	36%	64%	5%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>4%</b>

602 applications were shortlisted during this period, of which:-

	<b>BAME</b>	<b>White background</b>	<b>Prefer not to say</b>
CSF (46% of those shortlisted)	47%	53%	2%
C&H (13% of those shortlisted)	52%	48%	2%
CS (29% of those shortlisted)	50%	50%	4%
E&R (12% of those shortlisted)	21%	79%	3%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>3%</b>

176 offers were made during this period, of which:

	<b>BAME</b>	<b>White background</b>	<b>Prefer not to say</b>
CSF (48% of offers)	41%	59%	1%
C&H (18% of offers)	53%	47%	0%
CS (20% of offers)	25%	75%	3%

E&R (13% of offers)	22%	78%	0%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>1%</b>

Recruitment will include internal staff who applied for and secured jobs, but not agency conversions or reorganisation direct assimilations.

57% of applicants were BAME, 45% of those shortlisted were BAME and 37% of those offered posts were BAME.

### Recruitment – positions above grade MGA

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

	BAME	White background		Prefer not to say
110 applications	41%	59%		6%
49 shortlisted	43%	57%		0%
17 offers	29%	71%		0%

The table provides a further analysis focussing on recruitment for posts graded MGA and above

As there were only 17 offers, there is a risk individuals (and hence whether or not they were BAME) could be identified if further broken down by Department. 41% of applicants of known ethnicity were BAME, 43% of those shortlisted were BAME and 29% of those appointed were BAME.

#### 4.7 Overall Turnover rates by year and ethnic origin

	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Mixed	Other Ethnic Groups	White	Grand Total	BAME Overall
01.04.18 to 31.03.19	11.57%	11.17%	13.95%	14.29%	8.34%	10.35%	11.72%
01.04.19 to 31.03.20	7.00%	10.85%	18.33%	0.00%	13.68%	12.87%	11.58%
01.04.20 to 31.03.21	6.82%	8.36%	11.11%	6.90%	8.32%	8.32%	8.22%

The table compares overall turnover rates (leavers for all reasons) for the last three rolling years. In the first of the three years, overall turnover for BAME staff was higher than for White staff. BAME turnover has been lower than for White staff in the last two years.

#### 4.8 Voluntary Turnover rates by year and ethnic origin

	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Mixed	Other Ethnic Groups	White	Grand Total	BAME Overall
01.04.18 to 31.03.19	7.44%	8.12%	7.75%	14.29%	6.35%	7.72%	8.08%
01.04.19 to 31.03.20	5.45%	7.02%	16.67%	0.00%	9.31%	9.15%	8.24%
01.04.20 to 31.03.21	4.55%	5.67%	5.56%	6.90%	5.09%	5.26%	5.42%

This table compares Voluntary turnover rates (resignations) for the last three rolling years. In the first and third years, BAME turnover was higher than that for White staff. Overall turnover in the year 2020/2021 was likely lower than normal due to the economic and job market effects of Coronavirus.

#### 4.9 Stability (Retention) by ethnic origin

	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Mixed	Other Ethnic Groups	White	Overall
Over one years service	95.42%	87.25%	92.59%	100.00%	92.55%	92.16%
Over two years service	84.73%	75.94%	88.89%	100.00%	85.29%	84.09%
Over three years service	77.10%	65.51%	74.07%	78.57%	78.63%	76.31%
Over five years service	64.12%	53.33%	55.56%	64.29%	65.00%	61.33%

Stability measures the number of staff still in post after a period, in this case after 1 year, 2 years, 3 years and 5 years. This provides an indication of our ability to retain staff.

- 93% of White staff remain after 1 year, Black or Black British staff were lower at 87%
- 85% of White staff remain after 2 years, Black or Black British staff were lower at 75%
- 79% of White staff remain after 3 years, Black or Black British staff were lower at 65%
- 65% of White staff remain after 5 years, Black or Black British staff were lower at 53% and Mixed ethnic groups staff lower at 56%.

#### 4.10 Promotions by Department and ethnic origin

	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Mixed	Other Ethnic Groups	White	BAME Overall	Unknown
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	9.52%	23.81%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	15.38%	30.77%	0.00%	7.69%	46.15%	53.85%	7.14%
CORPORATE SERVICES	13.33%	10.00%	3.33%	0.00%	73.33%	26.67%	11.76%
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	0.00%	31.25%	0.00%	0.00%	68.75%	31.25%	50.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>10.00%</b>	<b>21.25%</b>	<b>1.25%</b>	<b>1.25%</b>	<b>66.25%</b>	<b>33.75%</b>	<b>20.79%</b>

The Council does not have a formal definition in our HR system to identify succession arrangements or promotions as such, so this metric covers existing staff who moved to a higher graded post (a post with a higher maximum salary) in the course of the year. This includes staff who applied for and secured a higher graded post, instances where posts were re-evaluated and regraded, and staff who were assimilated to higher graded posts in reorganisations.

BAME staff made up 34% of those “promoted” compared to the workforce profile of 35%.

The high percentage of unknown ethnicities in Environment and Regeneration represents staff TUPE transferred from Wandsworth, where protected characteristic did not form part of the data transfer.

#### 4.11 Employee Relations Cases by ethnic origin

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Mixed	Other Ethnic Groups	White
Attendance/Sickness	4.76%	9.52%	9.52%	0.00%	76.19%
Capability	0.00%	57.14%	0.00%	0.00%	42.86%
Disciplinary	16.67%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%
Grievance	16.67%	44.44%	5.56%	0.00%	33.33%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>9.62%</b>	<b>32.69%</b>	<b>5.77%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>51.92%</b>

Casework is shown where cases had reached a formal stage. Monitoring data is not available for cases resolved at an informal stage as line managers resolve these locally. Grievance includes employees raising dignity at work/discrimination issues.

The figures represent cases where the Ethnicity was known. Due to the small dataset staff could be identified if broken down by Department therefore an overall summary is provided.

Although caution is needed due to the low numbers when broken down by case type, it is clear that overall BAME employees (42% were BAME compared to 35% in the workforce) were more likely to reach formal stages of our employment procedures. Black or Black British staff featured heavily in Capability (57%), Disciplinary (50%) and Grievance cases (44%) compared to a workforce profile of 22%.

56% of Employment Tribunal cases involved staff who were Black/Black British (noting one employee brought more than one case).

#### 4.12 Training/Learning and Development by Department, Course Type and ethnic origin 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Department	Ethnicity					
	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Mixed	Other Ethnic Groups	White	BAME Overall
Adults social care	22.2%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	55.6%	44.4%
Diversity	1.9%	32.7%	3.8%	0.0%	61.5%	38.5%
Essential Skills	14.0%	20.9%	0.0%	0.0%	65.1%	34.9%
Health and Safety	8.2%	28.6%	6.1%	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%
Induction	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	77.8%	22.2%
IT	0.0%	26.3%	0.0%	0.0%	73.7%	26.3%
Leadership and Management	0.0%	11.4%	9.1%	0.0%	79.5%	20.5%
Supporting Staff	6.3%	28.8%	1.3%	0.0%	63.8%	36.3%
<b>CHILDREN SCHOOLS &amp; FAMILIES</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>24.6%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>65.6%</b>	<b>34.4%</b>
Adults social care	12.4%	45.8%	1.8%	1.8%	38.2%	61.8%
Diversity	21.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Essential Skills	12.0%	40.0%	8.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
Health and Safety	20.0%	15.6%	0.0%	4.4%	60.0%	40.0%
Induction	33.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
IT	30.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Leadership and Management	16.7%	27.8%	0.0%	2.8%	52.8%	47.2%
Supporting Staff	19.2%	27.4%	0.0%	8.2%	45.2%	54.8%
<b>COMMUNITY &amp; HOUSING</b>	<b>15.6%</b>	<b>36.7%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>43.6%</b>	<b>56.4%</b>
Adults social care	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%
Diversity	14.9%	14.9%	6.4%	2.1%	61.7%	38.3%
Essential Skills	50.0%	18.8%	6.3%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%
Health and Safety	9.1%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	63.6%	36.4%
Induction	0.0%	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%
IT	33.3%	13.3%	6.7%	0.0%	46.7%	53.3%
Leadership and Management	11.0%	8.3%	1.8%	0.9%	78.0%	22.0%
Supporting Staff	21.1%	20.0%	4.0%	1.1%	53.7%	46.3%
<b>CORPORATE SERVICES</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>60.8%</b>	<b>39.2%</b>
Adults social care	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Diversity	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
Essential Skills	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
Health and Safety	5.9%	29.4%	0.0%	0.0%	64.7%	35.3%
Induction	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
IT	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	87.5%	12.5%
Leadership and Management	2.7%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	91.9%	8.1%
Supporting Staff	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	97.6%	2.4%
<b>ENVIRONMENT &amp; REGENERATION</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>88.3%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>
Adults social care	12.8%	44.1%	1.7%	1.7%	39.7%	60.3%
Diversity	11.3%	25.2%	3.3%	0.7%	59.6%	40.4%
Essential Skills	19.5%	26.4%	3.4%	0.0%	50.6%	49.4%
Health and Safety	12.0%	24.1%	2.3%	1.5%	60.2%	39.8%
Induction	12.5%	12.5%	8.3%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
IT	17.3%	17.3%	1.9%	0.0%	63.5%	36.5%
Leadership and Management	8.4%	11.5%	2.7%	0.9%	76.5%	23.5%
Supporting Staff	15.2%	21.4%	2.2%	2.2%	59.1%	40.9%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>13.1%</b>	<b>25.4%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>57.7%</b>	<b>42.3%</b>

Overall, BAME staff undertook more Learning and Development courses than White colleagues (42% attended compared to 35% in the workforce), however less attended Leadership and Management development (24% attended compared to 35% in the workforce).

White staff attended less Diversity courses (60% compared to 65% in the workforce).

## 5. DETAILED DATA AND ANALYSIS – GENDER

### 5.1 Percentage of Female staff in the workforce

% female	31-Mar-17	31-Mar-18	31-Mar-19	31-Mar-20	31-Mar-21	Current not known
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	83.9%	84.3%	83.8%	83.3%	82.5%	0.0%
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	78.5%	78.9%	78.9%	79.6%	80.0%	0.0%
CORPORATE SERVICES	63.6%	62.6%	60.6%	59.5%	59.3%	0.0%
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	30.3%	44.7%	45.8%	46.5%	45.7%	0.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>62.9%</b>	<b>68.7%</b>	<b>68.2%</b>	<b>68.1%</b>	<b>67.9%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<i>London Councils Median Benchmark</i>	<i>62.9%</i>	<i>63.1%</i>	<i>62.4%</i>	<i>61.6%</i>		

The percentage of Female staff in the workforce varies from year to year, but is typically around 68%.

### 5.2. Percentage of Female staff amongst top 5% of earners

% female	31-Mar-17	31-Mar-18	31-Mar-19	31-Mar-20	31-Mar-21	Current not known
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	75.8%	68.2%	80.5%	62.5%	59.1%	0.0%
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	56.3%	53.8%	53.9%	52.9%	55.6%	0.0%
CORPORATE SERVICES	45.9%	53.3%	43.6%	50.0%	46.9%	0.0%
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	10.0%	11.1%	37.5%	21.4%	21.4%	0.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>49.5%</b>	<b>48.2%</b>	<b>57.3%</b>	<b>48.8%</b>	<b>47.1%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<i>London Councils Median Benchmark</i>	<i>51.0%</i>	<i>51.0%</i>	<i>53.0%</i>	<i>50.0%</i>		

This measure enables us to benchmark with other councils in London. The percentage of Female staff amongst the top 5% of earners at 47% was just below the all-London figure of 50%.

### 5.3 Current workforce profile by salary band and gender

#### As at 30 September 2020

Basic Salary Band	Female	Male
Up to £19,999 per annum	57.14%	42.86%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	69.71%	30.29%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	67.65%	32.35%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	41.94%	58.06%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	42.86%	57.14%
Over £100,000 per annum	54.55%	45.45%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>67.90%</b>	<b>32.10%</b>

There was a lower proportion of female staff in the higher salary bands, particularly between £60,000 and £99,999 per annum.

## 5.4 Joiners by salary band and gender

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Basic Salary Band	Female	Male
Up to £19,999 per annum	0.00%	100.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	70.80%	29.20%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	72.97%	27.03%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	66.67%	33.33%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	100.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>70.89%</b>	<b>29.11%</b>

“Joiners” here includes staff who were new to the borough, as well as agency conversions to perm, but will exclude internal promotions. The percentage of Female new starters broadly reflected that in the workforce (71% compared to 68%).

## 5.5 Leavers by Salary Band and gender

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Basic Salary Band	Female	Male
Up to £19,999 per annum	33.33%	66.67%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	71.62%	28.38%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	71.15%	28.85%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	77.78%	22.22%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	100.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	100.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>70.83%</b>	<b>29.17%</b>

Female staff made up 71% of leavers in the rolling year, slightly higher than the percentage of Female employees in the workforce (68%). Leavers above £80,000 total just 3 employees.

## 5.6 Recruitment – overall by Department and Gender

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

3,355 applications were received during this period, of which:-

	Male	Female	Prefer not to say
CSF (34% of applications)	24%	76%	1%
C&H (14% of applications)	26%	74%	1%
CS (46% of applications)	38%	62%	1%
E&R (6% of applications)	56%	44%	2%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>1%</b>

602 applications were shortlisted during this period, of which:-

	Male	Female	Prefer not to say
CSF (46% of those shortlisted)	21%	79%	1%
C&H (13% of those shortlisted)	28%	72%	0%
CS (29% of those shortlisted)	42%	58%	1%
E&R (12% of those shortlisted)	60%	40%	2%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>1%</b>

176 offers were made during this period, of which:

	Male	Female	Prefer not to say
CSF (48% of offers)	16%	84%	2%
C&H (18% of offers)	22%	78%	0%
CS (20% of offers)	64%	36%	0%
E&R (13% of offers)	52%	48%	0%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>1%</b>

Recruitment will include internal staff who applied for and secured jobs, but not agency conversions or reorganisation direct assimilations.

67% of applicants were Female, 67% of those shortlisted were Female and 68% of those offered posts were Female. Overall, there was no difference between the proportions of females at each stage of the appointment process.

### Recruitment – positions above grade MGA by gender

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

	Male	Female	Prefer not to say
110 applications	48%	52%	1%
49 shortlisted	43%	57%	0%
17 offers	41%	59%	0%

The table provides a further analysis focussing on recruitment for posts graded MGA and above

As there were only 17 offers, there is a risk individuals (and hence whether or not they were BAME) could be identified if further broken down by Department. 52% of applicants of known ethnicity were female, 57% of those shortlisted were female and 59% of those appointed were female.

### 5.7 Overall Turnover rates by year and gender

	Female	Male	Overall
01.04.18 to 31.03.19	10.45%	10.14%	10.45%
01.04.19 to 31.03.20	13.44%	11.65%	12.87%
01.04.20 to 31.03.21	8.66%	7.58%	8.32%

The table compares overall turnover rates (leavers for all reasons) for the last three rolling years. In all three years, Male employees had a lower turnover rate than Female employees.

### 5.8 Voluntary Turnover rates by year and gender

	Female	Male	Overall
01.04.18 to 31.03.19	7.78%	7.60%	7.72%
01.04.19 to 31.03.20	9.83%	7.71%	9.15%
01.04.20 to 31.03.21	5.86%	3.97%	5.26%

This table compares Voluntary turnover rates (resignations) for the last three rolling years. Voluntary turnover rates for Males were consistently lower than for Females in each of the three years.

### 5.9 Stability (Retention) by Department and gender

	Female	Male	Overall
Over one years service	91.94%	92.64%	92.16%
Over two years service	84.13%	84.02%	84.09%
Over three years service	76.57%	75.76%	76.31%
Over five years service	63.41%	56.91%	61.33%

Stability measures the number of staff still in post after a period, in this case after 1 year, 2 years, 3 years and 5 years. This provides an indication of our ability to retain staff.

There was little difference in stability rates for Male and for Female staff, the one discrepancy was Males having lower stability after 5 years' service - this being due to the TUPE transfer of waste and green spaces staff in 2017.

### 5.10 Promotions by Department and Gender

	Female	Male	Grand Total
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	85.71%	14.29%	21
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	71.43%	28.57%	14
CORPORATE SERVICES	38.24%	61.76%	34
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	40.63%	59.38%	32
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>53.47%</b>	<b>46.53%</b>	<b>101</b>

The Council does not have the ability in the HR system to formally record succession arrangements or promotions as such, so this metric covers existing staff who moved to a higher graded post (a post with a higher maximum salary) in the course of the year. This includes staff who applied for and secured a higher graded post, instances where

posts were re-evaluated and regraded, and staff who were assimilated to higher graded posts in reorganisations.

Female staff made up 54% of those “promoted” compared to the workforce profile of 68%.

## 5.11 Employee Relations Cases by Gender

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

	Female	Male
Attendance/Sickness	75.00%	25.00%
Capability	100.00%	0.00%
Disciplinary	66.67%	33.33%
Grievance	61.90%	38.10%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>71.67%</b>	<b>26.67%</b>

Casework is shown where cases had reached a formal stage. Monitoring data is not available for cases resolved at an informal stage as line managers resolve these locally. Grievance includes employees raising dignity at work/discrimination issues.

Due to the small dataset staff could be identified if broken down by Department therefore an overall summary is provided.

The proportions of male and female staff undergoing casework broadly reflect the workforce profile, although overall females are slightly higher at 72% compared to a profile of 68%. The exception is Capability where all staff were female.

## 5.12 Training/Learning and Development by Department, Course Type and Gender

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Department	Gender	
	Female	Male
<b>Course Type</b>		
Adults social care	78.6%	21.4%
Diversity	84.6%	15.4%
Essential Skills	80.0%	20.0%
Health and Safety	86.8%	13.2%
Induction	70.0%	30.0%
IT	80.0%	20.0%
Leadership and Management	77.3%	22.7%
Supporting Staff	89.4%	10.6%
<b>CHILDREN SCHOOLS &amp; FAMILIES</b>	<b>83.6%</b>	<b>16.4%</b>
Adults social care	87.3%	12.7%
Diversity	83.7%	16.3%
Essential Skills	90.3%	9.7%
Health and Safety	81.6%	18.4%
Induction	50.0%	50.0%
IT	76.9%	23.1%
Leadership and Management	65.1%	34.9%

Supporting Staff	84.5%	15.5%
<b>COMMUNITY &amp; HOUSING</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>15.8%</b>
Adults social care	0.0%	100.0%
Diversity	80.8%	19.2%
Essential Skills	76.5%	23.5%
Health and Safety	56.0%	44.0%
Induction	55.6%	44.4%
IT	75.0%	25.0%
Leadership and Management	68.5%	31.5%
Supporting Staff	72.4%	27.6%
<b>CORPORATE SERVICES</b>	<b>70.7%</b>	<b>29.3%</b>
Adults social care	50.0%	50.0%
Diversity	72.7%	27.3%
Essential Skills	100.0%	0.0%
Health and Safety	55.0%	45.0%
Induction	100.0%	0.0%
IT	87.5%	12.5%
Leadership and Management	44.4%	55.6%
Supporting Staff	87.2%	12.8%
<b>ENVIRONMENT &amp; REGENERATION</b>	<b>67.6%</b>	<b>32.4%</b>
Adults social care	85.8%	14.2%
Diversity	82.3%	17.7%
Essential Skills	83.3%	16.7%
Health and Safety	75.5%	24.5%
Induction	64.3%	35.7%
IT	78.9%	21.1%
Leadership and Management	65.2%	34.8%
Supporting Staff	79.8%	20.2%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>78.5%</b>	<b>21.5%</b>

Overall, Female staff undertook more Learning and Development courses than Male colleagues (79% attended compared to 68% in the workforce). The proportion of female staff attending Leadership and Management development broadly reflects the workforce profile (65% compared to 68%). Male staff were less likely to attend a Diversity course (18% compared to 32% in the workforce).

## 6. DETAILED DATA AND ANALYSIS – DISABILITY

### 6.1 Percentage of Disabled staff in the workforce

% disabled	31-Mar-17	31-Mar-18	31-Mar-19	31-Mar-20	31-Mar-21	Current not known
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	4.5%	4.9%	4.0%	5.4%	5.0%	13.3%
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	5.3%	4.7%	4.3%	4.4%	4.1%	15.0%
CORPORATE SERVICES	9.6%	9.3%	8.7%	8.8%	8.6%	16.5%
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	7.6%	4.2%	3.9%	3.4%	3.3%	10.6%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>
<i>London Councils Median Benchmark</i>	<i>4.7%</i>	<i>4.8%</i>	<i>5.2%</i>	<i>5.6%</i>		

The percentage of known Disabled staff in the workforce has varied from year to year. At 5.4% as at 31 March 2020, it was slightly below the latest available all London authorities median of 5.6%.

### 6.2 Percentage of Disabled staff amongst top 5% of earners

% disabled	31-Mar-17	31-Mar-18	31-Mar-19	31-Mar-20	31-Mar-21	Current not known
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	4.6%	7.1%	3.5%	5.3%	0.0%	18.2%
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.8%
CORPORATE SERVICES	11.1%	13.6%	9.7%	14.3%	13.6%	31.3%
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	5.6%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>24.1%</b>
<i>London Councils Median Benchmark</i>	<i>3.2%</i>	<i>4.0%</i>	<i>3.6%</i>	<i>4.4%</i>		

This measure enables us to benchmark with other councils in London. The percentage of Disabled staff amongst the top 5% of earners at 4.6% was just above the all-London median of 4.4%.

### 6.3 Current workforce profile by salary band and disability

As at 31 March 2021

Basic salary band	Not Disabled	Disabled	% unknown
Up to £19,999 per annum	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	95.00%	5.00%	13.05%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	93.61%	6.39%	14.50%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	94.23%	5.77%	16.13%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	100.00%	0.00%	14.29%
Over £100,000 per annum	100.00%	0.00%	72.73%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>94.65%</b>	<b>5.35%</b>	<b>13.89%</b>

There were no staff known to be disabled in the top two salary bands.

## 6.4 Joiners by salary band and disability

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Basic Salary Band	No	Yes	% unknown
Up to £19,999 per annum	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	98.00%	2.00%	11.50%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	97.30%	2.70%	0.00%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>97.92%</b>	<b>2.08%</b>	<b>8.86%</b>

“Joiners” here includes staff who were new to the borough, as well as agency conversions to perm, but will exclude internal promotions. Disabled staff made up only 2.1% of joiners, compared to a workforce profile of 5.4%.

## 6.5 Leavers by Salary Band and Disability

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Basic Salary Band	Not Disabled	Disabled	% unknown
Up to £19,999 per annum	75.00%	25.00%	33.33%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	94.12%	5.88%	8.11%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	97.67%	2.33%	17.31%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	87.50%	12.50%	11.11%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>94.35%</b>	<b>5.65%</b>	<b>13.89%</b>

Disabled staff made up 5.7% of leavers in the rolling year, slightly higher than the percentage of disabled employees in the workforce (5.4%). There were only 4 leavers below £20,000

## 6.6 Recruitment – overall by Department and disability

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

3,355 applications were received during this period, of which:-

	Disabled	Not disabled
CSF (34% of applications)	8%	92%
C&H (14% of applications)	6%	94%
CS (46% of applications)	6%	94%
E&R (6% of applications)	4%	96%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>94%</b>

602 applications were shortlisted during this period, of which:-

	<b>Disabled</b>	<b>Not disabled</b>
CSF (46% of those shortlisted)	8%	92%
C&H (13% of those shortlisted)	8%	92%
CS (29% of those shortlisted)	9%	91%
E&R (12% of those shortlisted)	3%	97%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>92%</b>

176 offers were made during this period, of which:

	<b>Disabled</b>	<b>Not disabled</b>
CSF (48% of offers)	8%	92%
C&H (18% of offers)	6%	94%
CS (20% of offers)	3%	97%
E&R (13% of offers)	0%	100%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>94%</b>

Recruitment will include internal staff who applied for and secured jobs, but not agency conversions or reorganisation direct assimilations.

6% of applicants were Disabled, 8% of those shortlisted were Disabled and 6% of those offered posts were Disabled. Overall, there was no significant difference between the proportions of disabled candidates at each stage of the appointment process.

### **Recruitment – positions above grade MGA by disability**

**1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021**

	<b>Disabled</b>	<b>Not Disabled</b>
110 applications	8%	92%
49 shortlisted	0%	100%
17 offers	0%	100%

The table provides a further analysis focussing on recruitment for posts graded MGA and above

8% of applicants were disabled but none were shortlisted or received an offer.

## 6.7 Overall Turnover rates by disability

	Disabled	Not Disabled	Overall
<b>01.04.18 to 31.03.19</b>	8.79%	10.14%	10.35%
<b>01.04.19 to 31.03.20</b>	8.05%	12.42%	12.87%
<b>01.04.20 to 31.03.21</b>	8.54%	8.33%	8.52%

The table compares overall turnover rates (leavers for all reasons) for the last three rolling years. In the first two years, overall turnover rates were lower for Disabled staff. In the last year they had been close to (marginally higher than) non-disabled staff although this seems to be due to a decrease in non-disabled turnover rates with disabled turnover rates varying only slightly.

## 6.8 Voluntary Turnover rates by disability

	Disabled	Not Disabled	Overall
<b>01.04.18 to 31.03.19</b>	7.69%	7.47%	7.72%
<b>01.04.19 to 31.03.20</b>	3.45%	8.80%	9.15%
<b>01.04.20 to 31.03.21</b>	4.88%	5.34%	5.36%

This table compares Voluntary turnover rates (resignations) for the last three rolling years. Voluntary turnover rates for Disabled staff have been lower than for Non-Disabled staff in the last two years.

## 6.9 Stability (Retention) by disability

	Not Disabled	Disabled	Grand Total
<b>Over one years service</b>	91.16%	97.50%	92.16%
<b>Over two years service</b>	82.67%	95.00%	84.09%
<b>Over three years service</b>	74.47%	88.75%	76.31%
<b>Over five years service</b>	58.56%	75.00%	61.33%

Stability measures the number of staff still in post after a period, in this case after 1 year, 2 years, 3 years and 5 years. This provides an indication of our ability to retain staff.

Stability is higher for Disabled staff.

## 6.10 Promotions by Department and Disability

	Disabled	Not disabled
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	0.00%	100.00%
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	0.00%	100.00%
CORPORATE SERVICES	7.41%	92.59%
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	6.67%	93.33%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4.65%</b>	<b>95.35%</b>

The Council does not have the ability in the HR system to formal record succession arrangements or promotions as such, so this metric covers existing staff who moved to a higher graded post (a post with a higher maximum salary) in the course of the year. This includes staff who applied for and secured a higher graded post, the re-evaluation

and regrading of occupied posts, and staff assimilated to higher graded posts in reorganisations.

Disabled staff were less likely to be promoted, although percentages need to be treated with caution due to the low cohort of staff.

## 6.11 Employee Relations Cases by Disability

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

	Disabled	Not Disabled
Attendance/Sickness	9.09%	90.91%
Capability	0.00%	100.00%
Disciplinary	0.00%	100.00%
Grievance	16.67%	83.33%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>9.62%</b>	<b>90.38%</b>

Casework is shown where cases had reached a formal stage. Monitoring data is not available for cases resolved at an informal stage as line managers resolve these locally. Grievance includes employees raising dignity at work/discrimination issues.

Due to the small dataset staff could be identified if broken down by Department therefore an overall summary is provided.

Disabled staff constituted 9% of sickness cases, 17% of Grievance cases and 10% of overall cases compared to a workforce profile of 5%.

4 Industrial Tribunal cases involved an employee who declared themselves disabled.

## 6.12 Training/Learning and Development by Department, course type and disability

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Department	Consider Disabled	
	No	Yes
Course Type		
Adults social care	87.5%	12.5%
Diversity	87.5%	12.5%
Essential Skills	92.7%	7.3%
Health and Safety	87.2%	12.8%
Induction	88.9%	11.1%
IT	72.2%	27.8%
Leadership and Management	87.5%	12.5%
Supporting Staff	91.2%	8.8%
<b>CHILDREN SCHOOLS &amp; FAMILIES</b>	<b>88.2%</b>	<b>11.8%</b>
Adults social care	90.0%	10.0%
Diversity	94.9%	5.1%
Essential Skills	100.0%	0.0%
Health and Safety	85.7%	14.3%
Induction	100.0%	0.0%
IT	100.0%	0.0%

Leadership and Management	90.3%	9.7%
Supporting Staff	94.2%	5.8%
<b>COMMUNITY &amp; HOUSING</b>	<b>91.5%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>
Adults social care	100.0%	0.0%
Diversity	83.8%	16.2%
Essential Skills	88.2%	11.8%
Health and Safety	89.5%	10.5%
Induction	100.0%	0.0%
IT	100.0%	0.0%
Leadership and Management	92.3%	7.7%
Supporting Staff	93.2%	6.8%
<b>CORPORATE SERVICES</b>	<b>91.9%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>
Adults social care	50.0%	50.0%
Diversity	90.9%	9.1%
Essential Skills	100.0%	0.0%
Health and Safety	86.7%	13.3%
Induction	100.0%	0.0%
IT	100.0%	0.0%
Leadership and Management	95.1%	4.9%
Supporting Staff	95.7%	4.3%
<b>ENVIRONMENT &amp; REGENERATION</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>
Adults social care	89.8%	10.2%
Diversity	88.9%	11.1%
Essential Skills	94.2%	5.8%
Health and Safety	87.0%	13.0%
Induction	96.0%	4.0%
IT	89.4%	10.6%
Leadership and Management	91.6%	8.4%
Supporting Staff	93.4%	6.6%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>91.1%</b>	<b>8.9%</b>

Overall, Disabled staff were more likely to undertake Learning and Development courses than Non-Disabled colleagues (9% attended compared to 5% in the workforce).

## 7. DETAILED DATA AND ANALYSIS – AGE

### 7.1 Percentages of staff under 24.

% age 16-24 *	31-Mar-17	31-Mar-18	31-Mar-19	31-Mar-20	31-Mar-21	Current not known
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	2.8%	2.2%	2.5%	2.5%	3.2%	
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	0.5%	2.6%	2.6%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%
CORPORATE SERVICES	5.1%	4.7%	5.4%	6.3%	4.8%	0.0%
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	1.9%	0.8%	1.3%	1.4%	0.8%	0.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<i>London Councils Median Benchmark</i>	2.6%	3.0%	3.2%	3.1%		
<i>* including apprentices</i>						

The percentage of staff age under 24 varies from year-to-year, and with the timing of entry-level apprenticeship assignments. The proportion of the workforce age 50 and above has increased year on year with possible impacts on future resourcing and succession planning as older staff eventually retire.

### 7.2 Percentage of staff age over 50

% age 50+	31-Mar-17	31-Mar-18	31-Mar-19	31-Mar-20	31-Mar-21	Current not known
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	36.7%	38.3%	41.6%	43.6%	43.1%	0.0%
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	48.9%	48.8%	52.1%	56.1%	59.6%	0.0%
CORPORATE SERVICES	48.2%	49.5%	51.1%	51.4%	52.6%	0.0%
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	57.5%	57.8%	57.7%	59.8%	60.6%	0.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>47.8%</b>	<b>47.9%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>52.1%</b>	<b>53.1%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<i>London Councils Median Benchmark</i>	48.1%	43.7%	46.4%	44.7%		

The proportion of the workforce age 50 and above has increased year on year with possible impacts on future resourcing and succession planning as older staff eventually retire. The data set of top 5% earners is too small for a meaningful breakdown by age and department though they will predominantly be over 40 (section 4.3 provides a breakdown by salary band).

**7.3 Current workforce profile by salary band and age band  
As at 31 March 2021**

Basic Salary Band	16-24	25-39	40-49	50-64	65+
Up to £19,999 per annum	57.14%	42.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	3.67%	22.53%	19.80%	47.95%	6.06%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	0.00%	22.06%	29.20%	44.75%	3.99%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	0.00%	8.06%	22.58%	64.52%	4.84%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	57.14%	42.86%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	90.91%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2.71%</b>	<b>21.79%</b>	<b>22.42%</b>	<b>47.72%</b>	<b>5.36%</b>

Most 16-24 year olds were in the “up to £19,999” pay band; these mainly being entry-level apprentices paid the National Living Wage. Most of the higher earners were aged 40 and above. 5% of the workforce is aged over 65.

**7.4 Joiners by age band**

**1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021**

Salary Band	16-24	25-39	40-49	50-64	65+
Up to £19,999 per annum	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	8.85%	48.67%	20.35%	20.35%	1.77%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	0.00%	32.43%	29.73%	35.14%	2.70%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	0.00%	33.33%	16.67%	50.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6.96%</b>	<b>43.67%</b>	<b>22.15%</b>	<b>25.32%</b>	<b>1.90%</b>

“Joiners” here includes staff who were new to the borough, as well as agency conversions to perm, but will exclude internal promotions. The number of joiners is low when broken down by salary and age band so some caution is needed in interpreting the figures – for example the 100% joiners age 16-24 below £20,000 per annum represents just one person.

**7.5 Leavers by age band**

**1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021**

16-24	25-39	40-49	50-64	65+
4.17%	29.17%	21.53%	30.56%	14.58%

The number of leavers is too low for a meaningful breakdown by both salary band and age band so an overall breakdown is provided. Staff under age 40 make up a greater proportion of leavers than those age 40 to 64.

**7.6 Recruitment – overall by Department and Age Band  
1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021**

3,355 applications were received during this period, of which:-

<b>Total applications</b>	<b>18-24</b>	<b>25-34</b>	<b>35-49</b>	<b>50-64</b>	<b>65+</b>	<b>Prefer not to say</b>
3355	24.49%	36.73%	26.53%	12.24%	0.00%	2%

602 applications were shortlisted during this period, of which:-

<b>Shortlisted</b>	<b>18-24</b>	<b>25-34</b>	<b>35-49</b>	<b>50-64</b>	<b>65+</b>	<b>Prefer not to say</b>
602	16.16%	38.38%	29.29%	16.16%	0.00%	1%

176 offers were made during this period, of which:

<b>Offered</b>	<b>18-24</b>	<b>25-34</b>	<b>35-49</b>	<b>50-64</b>	<b>65+</b>	<b>Prefer not to say</b>
176	13.13%	37.37%	34.34%	15.15%	0.00%	1%

Recruitment will include internal staff who applied for and secured jobs, but not agency conversions or reorganisation direct assimilations.

The age bands used in these tables are those available from our recruitment system, and differ slightly from the age bands used for other measures. Numbers were too small at the shortlisted and offered stages to break down by department so overall totals are shown.

Candidates aged 16-24 make up 25% of applicants, but only 16% of those shortlisted and 13% of those offered a job. Candidates age 35-49 make up 26% of applicants, 29% of those shortlisted and 34% of those offered a job.

Numbers were too small when refined to MGA and above and then broken down by age group to provide a meaningful analysis.

## 7.7 Overall Turnover rates by year and age band

	16-24	25-39	40-49	50-64	65+	Overall
01.04.18 to 31.03.19	29.09%	18.23%	10.11%	5.94%	14.81%	10.36%
01.04.19 to 31.03.20	16.44%	23.18%	11.01%	8.48%	17.96%	12.87%
01.04.20 to 31.03.21	14.29%	11.54%	8.01%	5.28%	19.91%	8.32%

The table compares overall turnover rates (leavers for all reasons) for the last three rolling years. Turnover rates were higher below age 40, and above age 65 (noting the latter will include retirements).

## 7.8 Voluntary Turnover rates by year and age band

	16-24	25-39	40-49	50-64	65+	Overall
01.04.18 to 31.03.19	18.18%	16.52%	8.78%	3.85%	4.44%	7.73%
01.04.19 to 31.03.20	8.22%	19.27%	9.96%	5.18%	4.90%	9.15%
01.04.20 to 31.03.21	2.38%	10.16%	7.49%	2.40%	3.79%	5.26%

This table compares Voluntary turnover rates (resignations) for the last three rolling years. Resignation rates were highest for the 25-39 age band.

## 7.9 Stability (Retention) by age band

	16-24	25-39	40-49	50-64	65+	Overall
Over one years service	76.60%	84.66%	91.26%	96.14%	98.92%	92.16%
Over two years service	51.06%	71.16%	83.29%	91.30%	92.47%	84.09%
Over three years service	29.79%	58.73%	73.78%	86.84%	88.17%	76.31%
Over five years service	29.79%	58.73%	73.78%	86.84%	88.17%	76.31%

Stability measures the number of staff still in post after a period, in this case after 1 year, 2 years, 3 years and 5 years. This provides an indication of our ability to retain staff.

Younger people had lower stability, linked of course to the fact it is less likely they will have acquired as three of five years' service. The 25-39 age band has lower stability than older age bands, the strongest stability being over the age of 50.

## 7.10 Promotions by Department and age band

Department	16-24	25-39	40-49	50-64	65+
CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES	0.00%	66.67%	19.05%	14.29%	0.00%
COMMUNITY & HOUSING	0.00%	35.71%	14.29%	50.00%	0.00%
CORPORATE SERVICES	20.59%	47.06%	8.82%	23.53%	0.00%
ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION	3.13%	15.63%	31.25%	50.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>7.92%</b>	<b>39.60%</b>	<b>18.81%</b>	<b>33.66%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

The Council does not have the ability in the HR system to formally record succession arrangements or promotions as such, so this metric covers existing staff who moved to a higher graded post (a post with a higher maximum salary) in the course of the year. This includes staff who applied for and secured a higher graded post, the

re-evaluation and regrading of occupied posts, and staff assimilated to higher graded posts in reorganisations.

There was no correlation between promotions and the proportions of staff by age band in the workforce as a whole. Staff in aged 16-39 saw a higher proportion of promotions than their workforce profile; those aged 50 and above had less.

## 7.11 Employee Relations Cases by age band

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

	16-24	25 to 39	40-49	50-64	65+
Attendance/Sickness	4.17%	12.50%	12.50%	66.67%	4.17%
Capability	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	25.00%
Disciplinary	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	66.67%	0.00%
Grievance	4.76%	9.52%	23.81%	52.38%	9.52%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.39%</b>	<b>10.17%</b>	<b>15.25%</b>	<b>62.71%</b>	<b>8.47%</b>

Casework is shown where cases had reached a formal stage. Monitoring data is not available for cases resolved at an informal stage as line managers resolve these locally. Grievance includes employees raising dignity at work/discrimination issues.

Due to the small dataset, staff could be identified if broken down by Department therefore, an overall summary is provided.

Staff between 25 and 49 are less likely to be involved in casework. Staff aged 50-64 are much more likely to be involved in casework than the workforce profile (63% compared to a profile of 48%). This pattern is similar for Attendance Sickness, Capability, Disciplinary and Grievance.

## 7.12 Training/Learning and Development by age band

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Department	Age					
	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
<b>Course Type</b>						
Adults social care	0.0%	50.0%	28.6%	14.3%	7.1%	0.0%
Diversity	3.8%	19.2%	15.4%	28.8%	32.7%	0.0%
Essential Skills	8.9%	20.0%	6.7%	28.9%	33.3%	2.2%
Health and Safety	1.9%	15.1%	17.0%	49.1%	15.1%	1.9%
Induction	0.0%	20.0%	10.0%	30.0%	40.0%	0.0%
IT	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	55.0%	20.0%	5.0%
Leadership and Management	0.0%	9.1%	13.6%	56.8%	20.5%	0.0%
Supporting Staff	3.5%	17.6%	17.6%	35.3%	25.9%	0.0%
<b>CHILDREN SCHOOLS &amp; FAMILIES Total</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>14.9%</b>	<b>38.7%</b>	<b>24.8%</b>	<b>0.9%</b>
Adults social care	4.1%	14.4%	13.2%	38.2%	28.5%	1.5%
Diversity	2.0%	10.2%	20.4%	44.9%	22.4%	0.0%
Essential Skills	6.5%	6.5%	11.8%	32.3%	35.5%	9.7%
Health and Safety	4.1%	14.3%	10.2%	38.8%	30.6%	2.0%
Induction	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%
IT	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	38.5%	46.2%	0.0%
Leadership and Management	0.0%	14.0%	23.3%	39.5%	23.3%	0.0%
Supporting Staff	4.8%	13.1%	23.8%	23.8%	33.3%	1.2%

<b>COMMUNITY &amp; HOUSING Total</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>13.2%</b>	<b>16.1%</b>	<b>36.3%</b>	<b>29.1%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>
Adults social care	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Diversity	1.9%	19.2%	23.1%	32.7%	21.2%	1.9%
Essential Skills	0.0%	35.3%	11.8%	35.3%	17.6%	0.0%
Health and Safety	0.0%	12.0%	16.0%	44.0%	28.0%	0.0%
Induction	0.0%	11.1%	44.4%	11.1%	33.3%	0.0%
IT	0.0%	37.5%	18.8%	6.3%	37.5%	0.0%
Leadership and Management	0.8%	15.3%	29.0%	20.2%	34.7%	0.0%
Supporting Staff	7.6%	16.7%	22.4%	25.2%	24.8%	3.3%
<b>CORPORATE SERVICES Total</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>23.9%</b>	<b>25.4%</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
Adults social care	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Diversity	0.0%	18.2%	18.2%	45.5%	18.2%	0.0%
Essential Skills	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%
Health and Safety	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	15.0%	25.0%	10.0%
Induction	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%
IT	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	12.5%	50.0%	0.0%
Leadership and Management	0.0%	4.4%	37.8%	37.8%	20.0%	0.0%
Supporting Staff	0.0%	10.6%	23.4%	27.7%	38.3%	0.0%
<b>ENVIRONMENT &amp; REGENERATION Total</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>28.1%</b>	<b>30.9%</b>	<b>29.5%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>
Adults social care	3.9%	15.8%	13.9%	37.8%	27.2%	1.4%
Diversity	2.4%	16.5%	19.5%	36.0%	25.0%	0.6%
Essential Skills	6.3%	17.7%	9.4%	30.2%	32.3%	4.2%
Health and Safety	2.0%	15.6%	15.6%	40.1%	23.8%	2.7%
Induction	0.0%	14.3%	32.1%	21.4%	32.1%	0.0%
IT	3.5%	10.5%	17.5%	31.6%	35.1%	1.8%
Leadership and Management	0.4%	12.1%	27.0%	32.8%	27.7%	0.0%
Supporting Staff	5.4%	15.5%	21.8%	27.2%	28.2%	1.9%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>15.1%</b>	<b>19.2%</b>	<b>33.1%</b>	<b>27.7%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>

Young People age 16-24 were more likely to take part in Learning and Development; this is consistent with the high proportion of apprentices in that age band.

## 8. DETAILED DATA AND ANALYSIS – RELIGION AND BELIEF

### 8.1 Percentages of staff by department and religion/belief

	Any other religion / belief	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion / belief	Sikh	Not known
31 March 2017	3.64%	0.79%	60.43%	2.17%	0.00%	4.13%	28.84%	0.00%	45.32%
31 March 2018	3.76%	0.71%	59.96%	2.24%	0.00%	4.88%	27.54%	0.91%	43.22%
31 March 2019	3.62%	0.78%	59.94%	2.64%	0.10%	5.39%	26.74%	0.78%	41.41%
31 March 2020	3.61%	0.76%	59.30%	2.66%	0.19%	5.69%	26.94%	0.85%	39.29%
31 March 2021	3.72%	0.76%	59.16%	2.39%	0.19%	5.82%	27.19%	0.76%	39.59%

Religion/Belief when broken down by department results in low numbers for some categories, noting religion/belief is unknown for 40% of staff (30% preferred not to say); therefore, a corporate breakdown is provided. There has been a small change in the proportion of staff of each religion/belief over the last five years with a gradual small increase in the percentage of Muslim staff and small decrease in Christian staff.

### 8.2 Current workforce profile by salary band and religion/belief

As at 31 March 2021

Basic Salary Band	Any other religion / belief	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion / belief	Sikh
Up to £19,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	66.67%	0.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	4.07%	0.56%	60.45%	2.38%	0.28%	6.45%	25.25%	0.56%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	2.82%	1.41%	58.45%	2.82%	0.00%	4.58%	28.87%	1.06%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	5.41%	0.00%	45.95%	2.70%	0.00%	2.70%	40.54%	2.70%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3.72%</b>	<b>0.76%</b>	<b>59.10%</b>	<b>2.48%</b>	<b>0.19%</b>	<b>5.82%</b>	<b>27.17%</b>	<b>0.76%</b>

There were no known religions/beliefs for staff over £80,000 per annum other than Christian and “no religion/belief”.

### 8.3 Joiners by salary band and religion/belief

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Basic Salary Band	Any other religion / belief	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion / belief
Up to £19,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	2.67%	0.00%	57.33%	0.00%	0.00%	5.33%	34.67%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	4.55%	0.00%	63.64%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	27.27%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3.96%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>57.43%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>4.95%</b>	<b>33.66%</b>

“Joiners” here includes staff who were new to the borough, as well as agency conversions to perm, but will exclude internal promotions. The number of joiners was

low when broken down by salary and religion/belief so some caution is needed in interpreting the figures – for example the 100% joiners with no religion/belief below £20,000 per annum represents just one person.

#### 8.4 Leavers by salary band and religion/belief

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Basic Salary Band	Any other religion / belief	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion / belief	Sikh
Up to £19,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	2.22%	0.00%	53.33%	4.44%	0.00%	6.67%	33.33%	0.00%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	57.58%	0.00%	0.00%	6.06%	33.33%	3.03%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	57.14%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	0.00%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1.11%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>55.56%</b>	<b>3.33%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>5.56%</b>	<b>33.33%</b>	<b>1.11%</b>

The proportion of staff leaving from each religion/belief broadly reflected the workforce profile, whilst noting that this is a smaller dataset of 90 leavers for with known religion/belief.

#### 8.5 Recruitment – overall by Religion/Belief

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021 \* part year

3,355 applications were received during this period, of which 2,483 had religion/belief recorded:-

Total applications	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion	Other	Sikh	Not known
2483	1%	41%	7%	1%	9%	34%	5%	1%	13%

602 applications were shortlisted during this period, of which 511 had religion/belief recorded:-

Shortlisted	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion	Other	Sikh	Not known
511	1%	39%	5%	1%	7%	40%	6%	1%	13%

176 offers were made during this period, of which 137 had religion/belief recorded:

Offered	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion	Other	Sikh	Not known
137	0%	41%	2%	1%	2%	47%	6%	1%	12%

Recruitment will include internal staff who applied for and secured jobs, but not agency conversions or reorganisation direct assimilations.

Data is not for a full year due to a change in recording religion/belief during the year. Numbers were too small at the shortlisted and offered stages to break down by department so overall totals are shown. Due to the small numbers, care is needed when considering percentage variations, however Hindu and Muslim applicants show decreasing representation at the shortlisted and offered stages.

Numbers were too small when refined to MGA and above and then broken down by religion/belief to provide a meaningful analysis.

## 8.6 Overall Turnover rates by year and religion/belief

Year	Any other religion / belief	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion / belief	Sikh	Overall
01.04.18 to 31.03.19	2.70%	0.00%	7.36%	4.08%	0.00%	17.48%	12.52%	23.53%	9.11%
01.04.19 to 31.03.20	10.67%	12.50%	10.57%	14.81%	0.00%	8.70%	13.38%	0.00%	11.25%
01.04.20 to 31.03.21	2.60%	0.00%	8.09%	11.11%	0.00%	8.26%	10.58%	11.76%	8.60%

The table compares overall turnover rates (leavers for all reasons) for the last three rolling years where religion/belief is known. Turnover rates were higher for those with no religion/belief. Due to the small size of the data set care needs to be taken, for example, the 23.53% turnover rate for Sikh staff in 2018/19 represents just one employee.

## 8.7 Voluntary Turnover rates by year and religion/belief

Year	Any other religion / belief	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion / belief	Sikh	Overall
01.04.18 to 31.03.19	2.70%	0.00%	4.85%	4.08%	0.00%	9.71%	9.94%	23.53%	6.51%
01.04.19 to 31.03.20	10.67%	0.00%	6.83%	14.81%	0.00%	5.22%	10.49%	0.00%	7.95%
01.04.20 to 31.03.21	2.60%	0.00%	4.69%	7.41%	0.00%	6.61%	7.76%	11.76%	5.64%

This table compares Voluntary turnover rates (resignations) for the last three rolling years where religion/belief is known. Resignation rates were higher for non-Christian religions/beliefs in two of the three years, although caution is needed due to the small size of the data set.

## 8.8 Stability (Retention) by Religion/Belief

	Any other religion / belief	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion / belief	Sikh	Overall
Over one years service	89.74%	100.00%	92.26%	96.15%	100.00%	91.80%	90.18%	100.00%	92.16%
Over two years service	82.05%	87.50%	83.39%	80.77%	50.00%	78.69%	76.84%	100.00%	84.09%
Over three years service	82.05%	75.00%	74.84%	73.08%	0.00%	63.93%	69.47%	87.50%	76.31%
Over five years service	61.54%	75.00%	61.77%	61.54%	0.00%	52.46%	55.09%	75.00%	61.33%

Stability measures the number of staff still in post after a period, in this case after 1 year, 2 years, 3 years and 5 years. This provides an indication of our ability to retain staff.

Muslim staff had a lower stability than staff of other religions/beliefs.

## 8.9 Promotions by religion/belief

Any other religion / belief	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion / belief
6.12%	0.00%	46.94%	4.08%	0.00%	6.12%	36.73%

The Council does not have formal succession arrangements or promotions as such, so this metric covers existing staff who moved to a higher graded post (a post with a higher maximum salary) in the course of the year. This includes staff who applied for and secured a higher graded post, the re-evaluation and regrading of occupied posts, and staff assimilated to higher graded posts in reorganisations.

Due to the small size of this data set, the data when broken down by department results in small numbers (often less than 5) so an overall corporate summary is provided. A higher proportion of staff with no religion of belief were promoted compared to their workforce profile (37% compared to workforce profile of 27%) with all other religions/beliefs being below workforce profile.

## 8.10 Employee Relations Cases by Religion/Belief

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

	Any other religion / belief	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	No religion / belief
Attendance/Sickness	0.00%	0.00%	58.33%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	25.00%
Capability	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Disciplinary	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%
Grievance	8.33%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>6.67%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>60.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>6.67%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>26.67%</b>

Casework is shown where cases had reached a formal stage. Monitoring data is not available for cases resolved at an informal stage as line managers resolve these locally. Grievance includes employees raising dignity at work/discrimination issues.

The figures represent cases where the Religion/Belief was known. Due to the small dataset staff could be identified if broken down by Department therefore an overall summary is provided.

The proportions of staff who underwent casework overall are broadly consistent with the workforce profile, however Muslim staff represent 17% of attendance/sickness casework compared to a workforce profile of 6% and those with "Any other religion/belief" represent 33% of those in disciplinary cases compared to a profile of 4%.

One Employment Tribunal case involved employee of Any other religion / belief.

**8.11 Training/Learning and Development by religion/belief  
1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021**

Department/ Course Type	Any other religion / belief	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion / belief	Sikh
Adults social care	3.88%	0.00%	75.24%	1.94%	0.00%	7.28%	11.65%	0.00%
Diversity	4.03%	0.00%	47.58%	1.61%	0.00%	3.23%	42.74%	0.81%
e-learning	1.49%	0.00%	59.48%	4.46%	0.00%	6.69%	26.02%	1.86%
Essential Skills	2.70%	0.00%	51.35%	10.81%	0.00%	9.46%	20.27%	5.41%
Health and Safety	3.85%	0.00%	56.73%	0.96%	0.00%	9.62%	26.92%	1.92%
Induction	16.67%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%	27.78%	0.00%
IT	2.27%	4.55%	45.45%	11.36%	0.00%	4.55%	31.82%	0.00%
Leadership and Management	4.44%	0.56%	58.33%	1.67%	0.00%	3.89%	30.00%	1.11%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3.55%</b>	<b>0.29%</b>	<b>58.79%</b>	<b>3.55%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>6.24%</b>	<b>26.13%</b>	<b>1.44%</b>

This table provides an overall corporate summary as, when broken down by Department and religion belief, the numbers become small (less than 5) and individuals could potentially be identified. There was no significant variation between the religion/belief workforce profile and the profile of those undertaking training and development.

**9. DETAILED DATA AND ANALYSIS – SEXUAL ORIENTATION**

**9.1 Percentages of staff by department and sexual orientation**

	Bisexual	Gay Man	Gay woman/ Lesbian	Heterosexual/ Straight	Other	Not known
<b>31 March 2017</b>	0.54%	2.42%	1.35%	95.61%	0.09%	40.47%
<b>31 March 2018</b>	0.47%	1.69%	1.03%	96.62%	0.19%	38.60%
<b>31 March 2019</b>	0.52%	1.57%	0.96%	96.77%	0.17%	35.31%
<b>31 March 2020</b>	0.69%	1.39%	1.04%	96.61%	0.26%	33.64%
<b>31 March 2021</b>	0.68%	1.79%	1.02%	96.25%	0.26%	32.45%

Sexual orientation when broken down by department results in low numbers for some categories, noting religion/belief is unknown for 32% of staff (23% preferred not to say); therefore, a corporate breakdown is provided. There have been small changes in the proportion of staff in each category from year to year but no clear pattern or trend.

## 9.2 Current workforce profile by salary band and sexual orientation

As at 31 March 2021

Basic Salary Band	Bisexual	Gay Man	Gay woman/ Lesbian	Heterosexual/ Straight	Other
Up to £19,999 per annum	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	85.71%	0.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	0.77%	1.67%	0.39%	96.79%	0.39%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	0.30%	0.90%	2.39%	96.42%	0.00%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	0.00%	9.09%	2.27%	88.64%	0.00%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	80.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>0.68%</b>	<b>1.79%</b>	<b>1.02%</b>	<b>96.25%</b>	<b>0.26%</b>

There was a higher proportion of Gay and Lesbian staff in the middle salary bands.

## 9.3 Joiners by salary band and sexual orientation

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Basic Salary Band	Bisexual	Gay Man	Gay woman/ Lesbian	Heterosexual/ Straight	Other
Up to £19,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	1.00%	5.00%	0.00%	94.00%	0.00%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	0.00%	2.86%	2.86%	94.29%	0.00%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>0.70%</b>	<b>4.20%</b>	<b>0.70%</b>	<b>94.41%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

“Joiners” here includes staff who were new to the borough, as well as agency conversions to perm, but will exclude internal promotions. The number of joiners is low when broken down by salary and religion/belief so some caution is needed in interpreting the figures.

## 9.4 Leavers by salary band and sexual orientation

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Basic salary band	Bisexual	Gay Man	Heterosexual/ Straight	Gay Woman/ Lesbian	Other
Up to £19,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
£20,000 to £39,999 per annum	1.75%	1.75%	96.49%	0.00%	0.00%
£40,000 to £59,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
£60,000 to £79,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
£80,000 to £99,999 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Over £100,000 per annum	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>0.93%</b>	<b>0.93%</b>	<b>98.15%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

Heterosexual/straight staff were slightly more likely to leave (98% of leavers compared to 96% of the workforce with known sexual orientation, whilst noting that this is a small dataset of 108 leavers with known sexual orientation.

**9.5 Recruitment – overall by Department and Sexual Orientation  
1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021**

3,355 applications were received during this period, of which:-

	LGBT	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
CSF (34% of applications)	5%	95%	7%
C&H (14% of applications)	5%	95%	6%
CS (46% of applications)	4%	96%	8%
E&R (6% of applications)	3%	97%	9%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>7%</b>

602 applications were shortlisted during this period, of which:-

	LGBT	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
CSF (46% of those shortlisted)	7%	93%	8%
C&H (13% of those shortlisted)	9%	91%	20%
CS (29% of those shortlisted)	5%	95%	9%
E&R (12% of those shortlisted)	0%	100%	9%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>10%</b>

176 offers were made during this period, of which:

	LGBT	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
CSF (48% of offers)	8%	92%	4%
C&H (18% of offers)	6%	94%	3%
CS (20% of offers)	8%	92%	6%
E&R (13% of offers)	0%	100%	13%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>5%</b>

Recruitment will include internal staff who applied for and secured jobs, but not agency conversions or reorganisation direct assimilations.

Numbers were too small at the shortlisted and offered stages to break down by department so overall totals are shown. 8% of those applied were LGBT and 8% of those offered a job were LGBT.

## 9.6 Overall Turnover rates by year and sexual orientation

	Bisexual	Gay Man	Gay woman/ Lesbian	Heterosexual / Straight	Other	Overall
01.04.18 to 31.03.19	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%	11.01%	0.00%	10.23%
01.04.19 to 31.03.20	14.29%	23.53%	17.39%	13.56%	0.00%	12.87%
01.04.20 to 31.03.21	12.50%	5.41%	0.00%	9.49%	0.00%	8.32%

The table compares overall turnover rates (leavers for all reasons) for the last three rolling years where sexual orientation is known. Due to the small size of the data set care needs to be taken, 14.29% turnover for Bisexuals in 2019/2020 represents just one person and the turnover rates in 2019/20 for Gay men and Gay Women/Lesbians represent just 4 and 2 staff respectively.

## 9.7 Voluntary Turnover rates by year and sexual orientation

	Bisexual	Gay Man	Gay woman/ Lesbian	Heterosexual / Straight	Other	Overall
01.04.18 to 31.03.19	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.30%	0.00%	7.63%
01.04.19 to 31.03.20	14.29%	17.65%	8.70%	10.12%	0.00%	9.15%
01.04.20 to 31.03.21	12.50%	5.41%	0.00%	6.27%	0.00%	5.26%

The table compares voluntary turnover rates (resignations) for the last three rolling years where sexual orientation is known. Due to the small size of the data set care needs to be taken, 14.29% turnover for Bisexuals in 2019/2020 represents just one person and the turnover rates in 2019/20 for Gay men and Gay Women/Lesbians represent just 4 and 2 staff respectively..

## 9.8 Stability (Retention) by Sexual Orientation

	Bisexual	Gay Man	Gay woman/ Lesbian	Heterosexual/ Straight	Other	Overall
<b>Over one years service</b>	100.00%	76.19%	91.67%	89.55%	100.00%	92.16%
<b>Over two years service</b>	75.00%	71.43%	83.33%	79.01%	66.67%	84.09%
<b>Over three years service</b>	62.50%	61.90%	83.33%	68.29%	66.67%	76.31%
<b>Over five years service</b>	50.00%	47.62%	83.33%	51.64%	33.33%	61.33%

Stability measures the number of staff still in post after a period, in this case after 1 year, 2 years, 3 years and 5 years. This provides an indication of our ability to retain staff.

Gay men had lower stability rates, followed by Bisexuals.

## 9.9 Promotions by sexual orientation

Bisexual	Gay Man	Gay woman/ Lesbian	Heterosexual/ Straight	Other
2.90%	5.80%		89.86%	1.45%

The Council does not have formal succession arrangements or promotions as such, so this metric covers existing staff who moved to a higher graded post (a post with a higher maximum salary) in the course of the year. This includes staff who applied for and secured a higher graded post, the re-evaluation and regrading of occupied posts, and staff assimilated to higher graded posts in reorganisations.

Due to the small size of this data set, the data when broken down by department results in small numbers (often less than 5) so an overall corporate summary is provided. Other than Gay Women/Lesbians where there no promotions (compared to 1% in the workforce), staff with non-Heterosexual orientations had a higher promotion rate.

## 9.10 Employee Relations Cases

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Just one Gay Man and one Gay Woman/Lesbian were involved in casework with all others involved (where sexual orientation was known) being Heterosexual. A data table is therefore not provided as the numbers are too small for meaningful statistical analysis.

One Employment Tribunal case involved a Bisexual employee.

## 9.11 Training/Learning and Development by sexual orientation

1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021

Course Type	Bisexual	Gay Man	Gay woman/ Lesbian	Heterosexual/ Straight	Other
Adults social care	0.00%	0.53%	0.00%	99.47%	0.00%
Diversity	1.82%	0.91%	0.91%	94.55%	1.82%
e-learning	0.00%	1.93%	1.16%	96.14%	0.77%
Essential Skills	4.82%	0.00%	0.00%	92.77%	2.41%
Health and Safety	0.91%	1.82%	0.91%	96.36%	0.00%
Induction	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	95.00%	0.00%
IT	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	95.45%	4.55%
Leadership and Management	1.11%	2.22%	2.22%	94.44%	0.00%
(blank)	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%	94.74%	0.00%
<b>All Course Types</b>	<b>0.99%</b>	<b>1.38%</b>	<b>0.89%</b>	<b>95.95%</b>	<b>0.79%</b>

This table provides an overall corporate summary as, when broken down by Department and religion belief, the numbers become small (less than 5) and individuals could potentially be identified. There was no significant variation between the sexual orientation workforce profile and the profile of those undertaking working and development.

## Human Resources

May 2021

**Question**

Q09.A.1. I received a good induction when I started the job -

Q09.A.1. I received a good induction when I started the job -

Q09.A.3. Merton Council gives me the chance to develop new skills as part of my job -

Q09.A.3. Merton Council gives me the chance to develop new skills as part of my job -

Q12.A.3. I receive good benefits (e.g. pension/holidays) -

Q12.A.3. I receive good benefits (e.g. pension/holidays) -

Q15.A.3. When we implement changes, they make us more effective as an organisation -

Q15.A.3. When we implement changes, they make us more effective as an organisation -

Q17.A.3. In my experience Merton Council employees are treated equally irrespective of...? Race -

Q17.A.3. In my experience Merton Council employees are treated equally irrespective of...? Race -

Q17.A.8. In my experience Merton Council employees are treated equally irrespective of...? Gender reassignment -

Q17.A.8. In my experience Merton Council employees are treated equally irrespective of...? Gender reassignment -

Q17.A.10. In my experience Merton Council employees are treated equally irrespective of...? Trade union activity -

Q17.A.10. In my experience Merton Council employees are treated equally irrespective of...? Trade union activity -

Q:Q18B. Did you feel any of these were motivated in relation to...?

Q:Q18B. Did you feel any of these were motivated in relation to...?

	Ethnicity	
Overall Respondents	444	209
Response	White British	BAME
NET: Agree	27%	42%
NET: Disagree	4%	4%
NET: Agree	63%	73%
NET: Disagree	13%	10%
NET: Agree	84%	73%
NET: Disagree	3%	7%
NET: Agree	36%	47%
NET: Disagree	17%	11%
NET: Agree	79%	67%
NET: Disagree	2%	10%
NET: Agree	66%	56%
NET: Disagree	1%	2%
NET: Agree	65%	55%
NET: Disagree	3%	5%
Race	5%	29%
Sex/gender	5%	17%