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## Introduction

This report provides a profile of the Council's workforce as at 31 March 2021. The report focuses on the City Council as an employer, and provides a 'snap shot' of what we look like as a council, data trend analysis for the key protected characteristics and a breakdown of the City Council's staffing for key equalities reporting areas. We have provided data in relation to aspects of the employment lifecycle; recruitment, development, employee relations and retention.

Cambridge City Council is committed to a policy of equality of opportunity in employment and aim to ensure that no job applicant or employee receives less favourable treatment on the grounds of:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

Statutory duties are governed by the Equality Act 2010 and it is a requirement that public-sector organisations with over 150 employees report at least annually on how their policies and practices affect staff with different protected characteristics.

## Background

Our Single Equality Scheme for 2021 to 2024 was approved at Environment and Scrutiny Committee on 7 October 2021 and sets out the Council's priority areas for action and how the Council will meet these.

This Equality in Employment Report provides information on progress related to employment for one of five objectives set:
"To ensure that the City Council's employment and procurement policies and practices are non-discriminatory and to work towards a more representative workforce within the City Council."
The following information sets out the Council's workforce profile in relation to age, disability, ethnicity, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

All the data shown is for the headcount (not full time equivalents). We encourage employees (and applicants) to declare their personal diversity information for statistical monitoring purposes, however, it is at their discretion whether they do so. They are informed that the data provided will only be used in an anonymised way for these purposes. Employees can amend their information at any time.

For those not wishing to disclose their data they have an option to record 'prefer not to say'.

Our workforce includes a wide range of management, professional, specialist, administrative and operational roles. We aim to be an employer of choice and we want to continue to develop our workforce to reflect the diversity of the communities we serve. This diversity will enable us to understand needs and deliver high quality, appropriate services as well as supporting our employees.

## Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Achievements \& Activity 2021/ 22

- Single Equalities Scheme 2021-24 approved at Environment Scrutiny \& Communities Committee.
$\square$ Continued activity and support of key events during the Equality and Diversity Calendar: LGBTQ+ History Month, Mental Health Awareness Week, Race Equality Week, World Mental Health Day, Black History Month).
$\square$ We continued our Investors in People Accreditation.
$\square$ We undertook a staff survey across the Council with all contributions helping shape the future of our organisation through the 'Our Cambridge' Transformation Programme.
$\square$ Our Domestic Abuse Policy has been revised and re-launched in addition to receiving re-accreditation with the White Ribbon Campaign.
$\square$ The number of Internal Promotions within the organisation has increased, there were 32 up from 9 the previous year.
$\square$ There has been a high volume of successful appointments overall, 202 this year compared with 56 in the previous year. 59 of the successful appointments were to our Cultural Services (Corn Exchange).
$\square$ There has been an increase in voluntary leavers and retirements 95 this year compared to 47 in the previous year
$\square$ The number of staff who have identified their sexual orientation as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans or Questioning (LGBTQ) has increased by 8 since last year.
$\square$ There was a significant increase in the number of Males attending corporate training courses, an increase of $14.5 \%$ from the previous year
L Launch of Reward and Recognition Framework for staff, including an Annual Awards Ceremony.
- The Ethnic Minority employee staff group continues to be active and there is interest in a Disabled employee staff group being set up.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Learning and Development Opportunities have been run for staff including: Transgender Awareness and Gypsy, Traveller \& Roma Cultural Awareness.
$\square$ Menopause Café and Menopause Awareness sessions hosted for staff, providing information, support and a safe space to share experiences.
$\square$ Continued accreditation as a Disability Confident Employer.
A series of wellbeing sessions have been run for staff to support mental and physical wellbeing.

- Information session from 'Caring Together' was run for managers to raise awareness and signpost support that is available to staff who may have caring responsibilities.
$\square$ Attendance at and participation in events (giving presentations, Q\&A sessions) hosted by partner organisations to showcase the Council as an inclusive employer.
$\square$ We are awaiting the 2021 Census data so that we may review our targets for Disability (8.5\%) and Ethnicity (9.5\%).


## Workforce Summary Headlines (as at 31 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ March 2022)



Number of staff at Cambridge City Council
45-54
(up 3 from previous year)

Percentage of staff declaring themselves as from an Ethnic Minority
(up from $7.71 \%$ the previous year - target was $9.5 \%$ )

Percentage of staff declaring themselves as disabled
(up from $7.11 \%$ the previous year - target was $8.5 \%$ )
47.98\% (393) of our staff are female and 52.02\% (426) are male

The highest percentage of staff are in the 45 to 54 age group
(this has been consistent since 2010)

Percentage of the workforce with 10 or more years' service
(of that $18 \%$ have $20+$ years' service)

The median gender pay gap for 2021 is $8.37 \%$
(This has increased from 4.75\% in 2021)

Percentage of staff working part time (less than 37 hours a week)
(69.12\% work full time and $7.32 \%$ work on zero hours)

## PAY GRADE BY AGE

Age

- The highest percentage of Council Staff were in the 45 to 54 age group. This has been the case since 2010.
- There were 29 members of staff (3.5\%) aged 24 or under and 30 members of staff (3.7\%) aged 65 or over.
- There has been an increase in staff aged 24 and under from the previous year which can be attributed to roles within the Cultural Services Team.

The following table represents the Pay Grade information for all staff from all age groups:

|  | Band 1 | Band 2 | Band 3 | Band 4 | Band 5 | Band 6 | Band 7 | Band 8 | Band 9 | Senior Management | TUPE \& Other | Total | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 and under | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.2\% |
| 19-24 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 3.3\% |
| 25-34 | 12 | 9 | 26 | 26 | 17 | 19 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 118 | 14.4\% |
| 35-44 | 8 | 1 | 33 | 39 | 50 | 29 | 21 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 198 | 24.1\% |
| 45-54 | 14 | 5 | 40 | 33 | 46 | 40 | 18 | 12 | 11 | 7 | 1 | 227 | 27.8\% |
| 55-64 | 7 | 3 | 52 | 40 | 44 | 25 | 14 | 13 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 217 | 26.5\% |
| 65 and over | 6 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 30 | 3.7\% |
| Total | 62 | 21 | 160 | 150 | 163 | 114 | 57 | 39 | 22 | 23 | 8 | 819 |  |

## RECRUITMENT

Age

- The number of applications received in 2021/ 22 (949) is more than the previous two years (an almost 40\% increase).
- There has been a rise in the number of roles advertised (294) which is the highest it has been in five years, this is down to multiple roles (for example within Cultural Services, Streets and Open Spaces) and also where there have been specific funded projects/ initiatives (for example in Community Services and Housing).
- The age profile for recruitment shows that the majority of applicants span from 19-64 which is a wider spread than the majority of the previous year (25-54)
- Our successful applicants range from 18 or under to over 65, again a wider spread than the previous year (19-64).
- Representation in the aged 24 and below category has increased significantly.

The following table details the age profiles for all applicants, those which were shortlisted and those which were offered a role. For comparison there is data for the previous two years:

| Year | No of Roles <br> Advertised |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1 - 2 2}$ | 294 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 1}$ | 83 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 - 2 0}$ | 140 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 - 1 9}$ | 168 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ | 163 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 - 1 7}$ | 142 |


|  | 2021/22 |  |  | 2020/ 21 |  |  | 2019/20 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Applicant | Shortlisted | Successful | Applicant | Shortlisted | Successful | Applicant | Shortlisted | Successful |
| 18 and under | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| 19-24 | 109 | 65 | 39 | 57 | 10 | 3 | 61 | 31 | 16 |
| 25-34 | 232 | 119 | 47 | 218 | 62 | 17 | 179 | 85 | 19 |
| 35-44 | 245 | 102 | 51 | 164 | 54 | 17 | 180 | 78 | 22 |
| 45-54 | 191 | 85 | 43 | 145 | 55 | 11 | 135 | 72 | 14 |
| 55-64 | 109 | 47 | 14 | 92 | 38 | 8 | 114 | 69 | 15 |
| 65 and over | 8 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Prefer not to say/ not disclosed | 50 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 949 | 436 | 202 | 682 | 224 | 56 | 681 | 339 | 87 |

## LEARNING \& DEVELOPMENT

## AOP

- We held 110 Corporate Training courses during 2021/ 22 with an overall attendance of 840 people.
- In addition to Corporate Training, training arranged and delivered at a service level is not accounted for within this report.
- This year we are providing a breakdown of training attendance into age categories rather than using the under or over 55 measurement.
- The age profile for training shows that staff aged $\mathbf{3 5 - 4 4}$ participated in the most training courses and accounted for 28.81\% of all attendees (this age category accounts for $24.29 \%$ of our workforce).
- The second highest attendee category was the $\mathbf{5 5 - 6 4}$ age group who accounted for $\mathbf{2 4 . 5 2 \%}$ of attendees (this age category accounts for $26.5 \%$ of our workforce).
- The lowest attending age categories were from those aged 19-24 and those aged 65+. These combined accounted for $7.98 \%$ of attendees these age categories account for $7.2 \%$ of our workforce). It is worth noting that the increase in 1924 age category in the workforce took place following recruitment that was undertaken from August 2021.

|  | No. of <br> attendees | of overall <br> course <br> attendance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 - 2 4}$ | 33 | $3.93 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 5 - 3 4}$ | 145 | $17.26 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 5 - 4 4}$ | 242 | $28.81 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 5 - 5 4}$ | 180 | $21.43 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 5 - 6 4}$ | 206 | $24.52 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{6 5}$ and over | 34 | $4.05 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 840 |  |

Increase of 27\% completion of e-learning modules (1662 completed)

65 managers attended a new two-part 'Ways of Working for

Managers' course.

## PAY GRADE BY DISABILITY

## Disability

- We have retained our Disability Confident Employer status, which continues until 2023 when we will undertake and submit another Self-Assessment.
- We continue to monitor and review our Self-Assessment tool as good practice and to keep updated on our related activity and achievements which further support the organisation and our staff

The following table represents the Pay Grade information for staff whether they declared themselves as having a disability, not having a disability or preferred not to say:

|  | \% of workforce declaring themselves as disabled |  | Band 1 | Band 2 | Band 3 | Band 4 | Band 5 | Band 6 | Band 7 | Band 8 | Band 9 | Senior Management | TUPE \& Other | Total | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Staff who declare themselves as having a disability | 2 | 3 | 17 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 64 | 8.15\% |
| Year |  | Staff who declare themselves as not having a disability | 50 | 15 | 139 | 127 | 149 | 101 | 54 | 38 | 20 | 20 | 8 | 721 | 91.85\% |
| 2021/ |  | TOTAL DECLARATIONS | 52 | 18 | 156 | 140 | 160 | 112 | 57 | 38 | 22 | 22 | 8 | 785 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 2020 / \\ 21 \end{gathered}$ | 7.11\% | Unknown/ <br> Unrecorded/ Prefer not to say | 10 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 34 |  |
|  |  | Total | 62 | 21 | 160 | 150 | 163 | 114 | 57 | 39 | 22 | 23 | 8 | 819 |  |


| 20 | $7.13 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2018 /$ |  |
| 19 | $6.37 \%$ |
| $2017 /$ |  |
| 18 | $6.97 \%$ |



Following interest, work is taking place with staff members to set up a Disabled Employee Staff Group

## RECRUITMENT

## Disability

- The number of applications received in 2021/ 22 from candidates declaring themselves as having a disability, as a percentage of all applications received, was $4 \%$ ( 38 individuals). A decrease of $1.42 \%$ from the previous year.
- Shortlisted applicants remains (as the number of individuals) the same (15).
- Successful applicants (as the number of individuals) has increased (8) but is low when considered as part of the total number of offers made.


|  | Total Number of Applications Shortlisted | Number of Applications Shortlisted from Candidates declaring themselves as disabled | \% of all applications Shortlisted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021/ 22 | 436 | 15 | 3.44\% |
| 2020/21 | 224 | 15 | 6.69\% |
| 2019 /20 | 339 | 39 | 11.50\% |
| 2018/19 | 592 | 51 | 8.61\% |
| 2017 /18 | 421 | 26 | 6.17\% |
|  |  | Applications ortlisted from ndidates who d not wish to clare (3.7\% of applications received) |  |


|  | Total Number of Applications Successful | Number of Successful Candidates declaring themselves as disabled | \% of all Successful Applications |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021/22 | 202 | 8 | 3.96\% |
| 2020/21 | 56 | 4 | 7.14\% |
| 2019 /20 | 87 | 7 | 8.05\% |
| 2018/19 | 140 | 9 | 6.43\% |
| 2017 /18 | 135 | 11 | 8.14\% |
|  |  | Applications ccessful from ndidates who not wish to lare (4\% of all applications received) |  |

## LEARNING \& DEVELOPMENT

## Disability

- With an overall attendance of 840 people at our Corporate Training sessions, $\mathbf{8 . 4 5 \%}$ of attendees declared themselves as disabled. This is in line with the percentage of staff in the workforce who have declared a disability ( $8.15 \%$ ).
- This is a decrease of $\mathbf{1 . 5 5 \%}$ from where we saw $10 \%$ of attendees who declared themselves as disabled, attend the courses in $2020 / 21$.
- While overall course attendance did decline by $55 \%$ compared to the previous year, this can largely be accounted for by the comprehensive programme consisting of 174 IT courses that were delivered for the implementation of MS 365 in 2020/ 21 which had been scaled down in 2021/ 22.


| Year | No of Courses |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Held | Overall <br> Corporate L\&D <br> Attendance | Variance from <br> $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1}$ to 21-22 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1 - 2 2}$ | 110 | 840 | $-46 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 1}$ | 204 | 1889 | $-55.5 \%$ |

## PAY GRADE BY ETHNICITY

## Ethnicity

 declaring themselves as from an ethnic22 8.32\%

- Our 2021/ 22 target for staff declaring themselves as being from an ethnic minority was $9.5 \%$. We are awaiting the results of the 2021 Census to review our target.
- Whilst we have not met the target, the profile of the workforce has increased by $1.79 \%$ and $\mathbf{8 . 3 2 \%}$ of staff declare themselves as being from an ethnic minority.

The following table represents the Pay Grade information for staff whether they declared themselves as being from an ethnic minority or not, or , if they preferred not to say:


[^0]
## RECRUITMENT

## Ethnicity

- Analysis shows that we continue to attract applications from people who are from an ethnic minority, in a wide variety of roles and service areas
- The number of applicants declaring themselves as from an ethnic minority has increased from last year, proportionate to the overall number of applications received ( 211 applicants, compared to 167).
- Shortlisted applicants from ethnic minorities (as a percentage) has increased.
- Successful applicants (as the number of individuals) has increased.
- Overall, the actual number of successful candidates from ethnic minorities is the highest it has been in five years though the percentage is low.

|  |  | Number of <br> Applications <br> received from <br> Candidates <br> declaring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | Total Number of Applications Shortlisted | Number of Applications Shortlisted from Candidates declaring themselves as from an ethnic minority | $\%$ of all applications shortlisted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021/ 22 | 436 | 90 | 20.64\% |
| 2020/ 21 | 224 | 42 | 18.75\% |
| 2019 /20 | 339 | 72 | 21.23\% |
| 2018/19 | 592 | 94 | 15.87\% |
| 2017 /18 | 421 | 66 | 15.67\% |
|  |  | Applications ortlisted from dates who did $n$ declare (5.5\% lications receive | not of ed) |


|  | Total Number of Successful Applications | Number of Successful Applications from Candidates declaring themselves as from an ethnic minority | $\%$ of all applications received |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021/22 | 202 | 25 | 12.37\% |
| 2020/ 21 | 56 | 8 | 14.28\% |
| 2019/20 | 87 | 11 | 12.64\% |
| 2018/19 | 140 | 23 | 16.42\% |
| 2017 /18 | 135 | 6 | 4.44\% |
|  |  | offers made to dates who did n to declare(11.8 all applications received) |  |

## LEARNING \& DEVELOPMENT

## Ethnicity

- Our data shows that $8.7 \%$ of staff attending training courses identify from an ethnic minority. This is slightly above the figure of $8.32 \%$ who identify as such in the wider workforce.
- There is a slight increase ( $0.9 \%$ ) in the number of people from ethnic minorities compared to last year.

|  | Number of Attendees | \% of overall Attendees |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| White | 701 | $91.3 \%$ |
| Asian or Asian British | 19 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Black, African, Caribbean or Black British | 15 | $2.0 \%$ |
| Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Background | 20 | $2.6 \%$ |
| Other Ethnic Group | 13 | $1.7 \%$ |
| TOTAL DISCLOSED | $\mathbf{7 6 8}$ |  |
| Not disclosed | 72 | $8.57 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 840 |  |

## Religion or Belief

## WORKFORCE INFORMATION

- $11.84 \%$ of staff have not declared their religion, this is a decrease from the previous year (from 13.7\%).
- $43.9 \%$ of staff have no religion.
- $44.04 \%$ of staff identify as Christian, an increase of $3.48 \%$ since last year.

|  | Number of Staff | \% of Workforce |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buddhist |  |  |
|  | 7 | 0.96\% |
| Christian |  |  |
|  | 318 | 44.04\% |
| Hindu |  |  |
|  | 4 | 0.55\% |
| Jewish |  |  |
|  | 1 | 0.14\% |
| Muslim |  |  |
|  | 16 | 2.21\% |
| None |  |  |
|  | 317 | 43.9\% |
| Other |  |  |
|  | 59 | 8.17\% |
| TOTAL DECLARED | 722 |  |
| Not declared |  |  |
|  | 97 |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |
|  | 819 |  |

## WORKFORCE INFORMATION

## Sex

- The workforce profile is near to 50/50 female and male which has been a trend since 2016.
- Females are represented throughout the pay grades and there has been a significant increase in representation in Band 1 since last year.
- City Pay Band 4 has the greatest representation of Females compared to males (63\%) and City Pay Band 3 has the greatest representation of Males compared to females (58\%).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Band 1 | Band 2 | Band 3 | Band 4 | Band 5 | Band 6 | Band 7 | Band 8 | Band 9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Senior } \\ \text { Management } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TUPE } \\ & \& \text { Other } \end{aligned}$ | Total | Percentage of Workforce |
| Female | 33 | 10 | 62 | 93 | 74 | 53 | 25 | 19 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 393 | 47.98\% |
| Full Time | 0 | 2 | 27 | 62 | 47 | 32 | 20 | 16 | 9 | 11 | 3 | 229 | 27.9\% |
| Part Time | 2 | 3 | 35 | 31 | 27 | 21 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 128 | 15.6\% |
| Zero Hours | 31 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 4.4\% |
| Male | 29 | 11 | 98 | 57 | 89 | 61 | 32 | 20 | 13 | 12 | 4 | 426 | 52.02\% |
| Full Time | 0 | 6 | 63 | 49 | 83 | 59 | 31 | 19 | 11 | 12 | 4 | 337 | 41.1\% |
| Part Time | 8 | 3 | 35 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 8.0\% |
| Zero Hours | 21 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 2.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL STAFF | 62 | 21 | 160 | 150 | 163 | 114 | 57 | 39 | 22 | 23 | 8 | 819 |  |



## LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT

## Sex

- 2021/ 22 saw a significant increase in the number of Males attending corporate training courses, an increase of $14.5 \%$ from the previous year, with Male overall attendance 43.5\% compared to a Female overall attendance of 56.5\%
- The Learning and Development team focused on targeted skills, and Council locations to encourage more men to attend.
- When analysing actual attendance, there were a greater number of individual Males attend training: 51\% Males to $49 \%$ Females during 2021/22. However, individual females attended more than one course more often, making the overall Female attendance higher
- Actual Female/Male training attendance is in line with the workforce Female/ Male breakdown.

|  | 2021/ 22 |  |  | 2020/ 21 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Council Workforce | Overall Courses Attended | Actual Individual Attendance |  | Council Workforce | Overall Courses Attendance |
| Female | 393 | 475 (56.5\%) | 183 (49\%) | Female | 394 (48.2\%) | 79\% |
| Male | 426 | 365 (43.5\%) | 189 (51\%) | Male | 422 (51.7\%) | 29\% |
| TOTAL | 819 | 840 | 372 | TOTAL | 816 |  |

## 'Ways of Working' for Managers Course

- A bespoke two-part training course was delivered for managers in order to support them in managing remote teams. 65 individuals attended; the breakdown is as below:



## RECRUITMENT

## Sex

- Applications received are generally evenly split, mirroring representation in the workforce.
- More females than males were shortlisted.
- Females were more successful in recruitment this year, a change from the previous year.



## WORKFORCE INFORMATION

Sexual Orientation

- The City Council remains signed up to the Safer Spaces campaign.
- 40 members of staff ( $6.19 \%$ ) declare themselves as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans or Questioning (LGBTQ), this is an increase of 8 individuals from last year.
- $93.8 \%$ of the workforce declare themselves as Heterosexual, this is an increase from last year.
- Those individuals who prefer not to declare their sexual orientation remains the same as the previous year

|  | Number of <br> Staff | \% of <br> Workforce |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Bisexual | 13 | $2.0 \%$ |
| Gay | 9 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Heterosexual | 606 | $93.8 \%$ |
| Lesbian | 8 | $1.2 \%$ |
| Other | 6 | $0.9 \%$ |
| Questioning | 4 | $0.7 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{6 4 6}$ | $78.9 \%$ |
| DECLARED | 173 |  |
| Prefer not to say | $\mathbf{8 1 9}$ |  |
| TOTAL STAFF |  |  |

## WORKFORCE INFORMATION (1)

## LEAVERS AND TURNOVER

- There has been an increase in retirement and voluntary leavers, 95 this year compared to 47 the previous year.
- This is a national trend, the "Great Resignation" and we too are seeing this trend.
- We are reviewing our recruitment and retention strategies in light of this and continue to monitor the data.


## LEAVERS



## WORKFORCE INFORMATION (1a)

## LENGTH OF SERVICE



## WORKFORCE INFORMATION (2)

## RECRUITMENT

- All new appointments (whether internal or external) are monitored in terms of age, disability, ethnicity and gender.
- There were 202 successful appointments/ offers made for a total of 294 roles advertised.
- Some roles received no applications, some roles did not result in having candidates who were suitable for shortlisting and others had candidates who withdrew during the pre-employment stage.
- Of all offers made, 54 (26.7\%) were internal appointments with $\mathbf{5 9 . 2 \%}$ of the internal offers (32) being a promotion.
- Of the 148 external appointments, $11.4 \%$ (17) joined the organisation with Continuous Service.

| Total Number of Roles Advertised | Roles with No Applications Received | Roles with No <br> Applicants Shortlisted | Roles with No Offers Made | Roles with Candidates who Withdrew after job offer | No. of Roles Offered | No. of Roles Re-advertised | No of Roles Withdrawn | No. of Roles still progressing/ under review/ awaiting start date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 294 | 18 | 7 | 17 | 13 | 202 | 15 | 7 | 15 |



## WORKFORCE INFORMATION (3)

## PROMOTIONS

- Internal promotions have increased since last year (9). 16\% of all appointments (32) were an internal promotion.
- Promotions were equally split between Female and Male staff and spanned the age range between 25 and 64 , a slightly wider range than the previous year.
- The breakdown of promotions shows that the same number of individuals who declare themselves as being from an ethnic minority received a promotion as the previous year (4). The number of promotions to people who declare themselves as having a disability has increased since last year (1).
- $12.5 \%$ of promotions were to staff who declare themselves as from an ethnic minority.
- $\mathbf{6 . 2 \%}$ of promotions were to staff who declare themselves as having a disability.
- 40.6\% of promotions were to staff aged between 25 and 34 .

Female

- Aged under 24 and over 65 were the least under-represented age groups with promotions.

| Total <br> Number of <br> Promotions <br> (32) | $\%$ of <br> Promotions |
| :---: | :---: |
| 16 | $50 \%$ |
| 16 | $50 \%$ |


|  | Total <br> Number of <br> Promotions <br> $(32)$ | \% of <br> Promotions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff declaring |  |  |
| themselves as from an <br> ethnic minority | $\mathbf{4}$ | $12.5 \%$ |
| Staff declaring <br> themselves as not from <br> an ethnic minority | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $87.5 \%$ |

## Total Number of $\%$ of

 Promotions (32) PromotionsStaff declaring

2
6.2\%

| 18 or under | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 - 2 4}$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 5}-\mathbf{3 4}$ | 13 | $40.6 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 5}-\mathbf{4 4}$ | 10 | $31.2 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 5}-\mathbf{5 4}$ | 6 | $18.7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 5 - 6 4}$ | 3 | $9.5 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{6 5 +}$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |

## WORKFORCE INFORMATION (3a)

## PROMOTIONS (Continued)

- Of all the promotions, $\mathbf{2 8 \%}$ (9) were progression across different departments (staff being successfully appointed into another team).
- 14 of the promotions, $43 \%$, were progression through more than one pay band (this applied to half of the promotions to staff who declared having a disability and to al staff who declared themselves as from an ethnic minority).
- Pay Bands 3, 5 \& 6 saw the highest amount of promotions/ progression from the pay bands.
- Pay Bands 4, 6, \& 8 welcomed the highest number of promotions.
- Community Services and Housing saw the highest number of individuals successfully obtain a promotion.
- Revenues \& Benefits, Housing, Estates \& Facilities and Transformation saw staff join/ remain in these services following a promotion.



## WORKFORCE INFORMATION (4)

## APPRENTICESHIPS

- 2021/ 22 has been another difficult year for Apprenticeships nationally and for the City Council. There has been a notable slowdown in Apprenticeships over the past two years.
- We have enrolled a further 4 people and there have been 7 successful completions.
- 10 people did not complete their apprenticeship, mostly due to covid related service pressures.
- There is a decline in Females taking on an apprenticeship.

25 Apprentices on our Apprenticeship Scheme as at $31^{\text {st }}$ March 2022

- There is no representation from staff who identify as having a disability, on the apprenticeship scheme.
- We have recruited 3 young people on the Government Kick Start Scheme.
- We have recruited 1 individual on the National Graduate Development Programme.

|  | Total Number of Apprentices at 31st March | Number of Enrolments | Male Apprentices | Female Apprentices | Apprentices who declare themselves as from an ethnic minority | Apprentices who identify as having a disability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apprenticeship Standard |  |  | Level |  | Number of Apprentices |  |
| Accountancy or Taxation Professional |  |  | Level 7 |  | 3 |  |
| Building Control Surveyor (Degree) |  |  | Level 6 |  | 7 |  |
| Business Administrator |  |  | Level 3 |  | 1 |  |
| Chartered Surveyor |  |  | Level 6 |  | 1 |  |
| Coaching Professional |  |  | Level 5 |  | 1 |  |
| Operations/ Departmental Manager |  |  | Level 5 |  | 6 |  |
| Team Leader/ Supervisor |  |  | Level 3 |  | 6 |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 25 |  |



## WORKFORCE INFORMATION (5)

## PAYSCALE INFORMATION

- The Council's pay scales for the period of 2021/ 22 are shown below:



## WORKFORCE INFORMATION (6)

## DISCIPLINARY

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { Number of } \\ & \text { Staff } \end{aligned}$ | Female Staff | \% | Male Staff | \% | Number of staff who declare themselves from an ethnic minority | \% | Number of staff who do not declare themselves from an ethnic minority | \% | Number of staff who did not wish to declare | \% | Number of staff who identify as disabled | \% | Number of staff who do not identify as disabled | \% | Number of staff who did not wish to declare | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021/22 | 9 | 2 | 22\% | 7 | 78\% | 1 | 11\% | 8 | 89\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 33\% | 6 | 67\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2020/21 | 6 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 100\% | 1 | 16\% | 5 | 83\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% |
| $2019 / 20$ | 6 | 2 | 33\% | 4 | 67\% | 1 | 16\% | 4 | 66\% | 1 | 16.5\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2018/19 | 5 | 1 | 20\% | 4 | 80\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 20\% | 4 | 80\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2017/18 | 8 | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% |

Disciplinary cases are monitored in terms of equality, however, it is difficult to draw conclusions from relatively low numbers, when considered against the overall workforce.

There has been a slight increase in the number of recorded disciplinary cases this year. Of the 9 reported cases, 3 concluded with an outcome of a formal written warning upward.

6 resulted in further management and/or employee actions with ongoing monitoring, denoting the supportive approach of the Council when taking remedial measures. Of the cases that declared a disability, none of the cases were associated with the disability.

There is no apparent rationale for why men accounted for more of the disciplinary cases.

## WORKFORCE INFORMATION (7)

## CAPABILITY

|  | Number of Staff | Female Staff | \% | Male Staff | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021/22 | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2020/ 21 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| $2019 / 20$ | 3 | 1 | 33\% | 2 | 67\% |
| 2018/19 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2017/18 | 11 | 4 | 36\% | 7 | 64\% |

Capability cases are monitored in terms of equality; however, it is difficult to draw conclusions in comparison with the overall workforce, from such low numbers.

The number of capability cases remains low in comparison to previous years.


## WORKFORCE INFORMATION (8)

## GRIEVANCES

|  | Number of Staff | Female Staff | \% | Male Staff | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021/22 | 10 | 4 | 40\% | 6 | 60\% |
| 2020/21 | 15 | 5 | 33\% | 10 | 67\% |
| $2019 / 20$ | 9 | 4 | 44\% | 5 | 56\% |
| 2018/19 | 7 | 3 | 43\% | 4 | 57\% |
| 2017 /18 | 11 | 4 | 36\% | 7 | 64\% |


| Number of staff who declare themselves from an ethnic minority | \% | Number of staff who do not declare themselves from an ethnic minority | \% | Number of staff who did not wish to declare | \% | Number of identify as disabled | \% | Number of staff who do not identify as disabled | \% | Number of staff who did not wish to declare | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 20\% | 6 | 60\% | 2 | 20\% | 2 | 20\% | 8 | 80\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 13\% | 13 | 87\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 20\% | 12 | 80\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 1 | 11\% | 8 | 89\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 8 | 89\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 1 | 14\% | 6 | 86\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 6 | 86\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 0 | 0\% | 11 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 11 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% |

Grievance cases are monitored in terms of equality, however, it is difficult to draw conclusions from relatively low numbers, when considered against the overall workforce. The Council continues to take every complaint seriously and action appropriately.

Further analysis identified four cases containing elements of perceived Bullying and Harassment and two further cases with elements related to perceived disability discrimination. Following due process there was no evidence to uphold the allegations.

Three of these grievances went to appeal stage.

## 2021/22

| 18 and under | Number of Staff |
| :--- | :---: |
| $19-24$ | 0 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 - 3 4}$ | 0 |
| $35-44$ | 2 |
| $45-54$ | 3 |
| $55-64$ | 4 |
| 65 and over | 1 |
| Prefer not to say/ not disclosed | 0 |
| TOTAL | 10 |

## WORKFORCE INFORMATION (9)

## REDUNDANCY

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Total <br> Number of <br> Staff | Female <br> Staff | $\%$ | Male Staff | $\%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1 / 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | 7 | $87 \%$ | 1 | $13 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 / 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | 5 | $55 \%$ | 4 | $45 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | 1 | $33 \%$ | 2 | $67 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | 2 | $50 \%$ | 2 | $50 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ /18 | $\mathbf{7}$ | 4 | $57 \%$ | 3 | $43 \%$ |

The number of redundancies for 2021/22 represent $0.97 \%$ of the total workforce.

6 of the redundancies in 2021/22 related to the need for Revenues and Benefits to address the decline in workload caused by the gradual transfer of cases from local Authority to DWP administered Universal Credit.

| Number of staff who declare themselves from an ethnic minority | \% | Number of staff who do not declare themselves from an ethnic minority |  | \% | Number of staff who did not wish to declare |  | \% | Number of staff who identify as disabled | \% | Number of staff who do not identify as disabled | \% | Number of staff who did not wish to declare | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 13\% |  | 7 | 87\% | 0 |  | 0\% | 1 | 13\% | 7 | 87\% | 0 | \% |
| 0 | 100\% |  | 9 | 100\% | 0 |  | 0\% | 0 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 0 | 100\% |  | 3 | 100\% | 0 |  | 0\% | 0 | 100\% | 3 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 1 | 25\% |  | 3 | 75\% | 0 |  | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 1 | 14\% |  | 6 | 86\% | 0 |  | 0\% | 0 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Number of } \\ \text { Staff } \end{gathered}$ | Under 55 |  | Over 55 | \% |  | 2021/ 22* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 and under |  |  |  | Number of Staff |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19-24 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | \% |  |  |  | 25-34 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | 2021/22 | 8 | 2 | 25\% | 6 | 75\% |  | 35-44 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
|  | 2020/21 | 9 | 4 | 45\% | 5 | 55\% |  | 45-54 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
|  | 2019/20 | 3 | 0 | 100\% | 3 | 100\% |  | 55-64 |  |  |  |  | 3 |
|  | 2018/19 | 4 | 1 | 25\% | 3 | 75\% |  | 65 and over |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 2017 /18 |  | 7 | 4 | 57\% | 3 | 43\% |  | Prefer not to say/ not disclosed |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 8 |

## FLEXIBLE WORKING

- This year we are reporting on the number of flexible working requests made across the Council.
- There were more flexible working requests from our female than male staff.
- The age range of requests spanned from staff aged 25 to $65+$ years.
- Under the age of 24 had the least representation for requests.
- $7 \%$ of the flexible working requests were from individuals who declared themselves as having a disability.

|  | Total <br> Number of <br> Flexible <br> Working <br> Requests <br> (27) | \% of <br> Flexible |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Working <br> Requests |  |  |
| Female |  |  |
| Male | 16 | $59 \%$ |
|  | 11 | $41 \%$ |

- There were no flexible working requests from staff declaring themselves as from an ethnic minority.
- Further analysis identified that of the 27 Flexible working requests, 19 were made via a formal request; 6 were flexible
adjustments that were made following discussion for either health reasons or upon returning from maternity leave; 1 application
Male $1141 \%$ was withdrawn part way through the process and 1 application was declined on the grounds of service needs/ requirements.

|  | Total Number <br> of Flexible <br> Working <br> Requests <br> $(\mathbf{2 7 )}$ | \% of Flexible <br> working requests |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ or under | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 - 2 4}$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 5 - 3 4}$ | 8 | $30 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 5 - 4 4}$ | 8 | $30 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 5 - 5 4}$ | 3 | $11 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 5 - 6 4}$ | 7 | $25 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{6 5 +}$ | 1 | $4 \%$ |


|  | Total <br> Number of |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Flexible <br> Working <br> Requests <br> (27) | \% of Flexible <br> Working <br> Requests |
| Staff declaring |  |  |
| themselves as from an <br> ethnic minority | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Staff declaring |  |  |
| themselves as not from <br> an ethnic minority | 27 | $100 \%$ |


|  | Total Number of <br> Flexible Working <br> Requests (27) | \% of Flexible <br> Working <br> Requests |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff declaring <br> themselves as having <br> a disability |  |  |
| Staff declaring <br> themselves as not <br> having a disability | $\mathbf{2}$ | $7 \%$ |
|  | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $93 \%$ |

## GENDER PAY REPORTING

| Reported in | Mean Gender Pay Gap | Median Gender Pay Gap | Mean Bonus Gender Pay Gap | Median Bonus Gender Pay Gap | Proportion of males and females receiving a bonus payment | Proportion of males and females in each quartile pay band |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 1.67\% | 8.37\% | N/A | N/A | N/A | See Over |
| 2021 | 1.40\% | 4.75\% | N/A | N/A | N/A | See Over |
| 2020 | 0.26\% | 4.75\% | N/A | N/A | N/A | See Over |
| 2019 | 2.45\% | 5.53\% | N/A | N/A | N/A | See Over |
| 2018 | 3.19\% | 5.91\% | N/A | N/A | N/A | See Over |

Mean Average - adding up all numbers and dividing the result by how many numbers were in the list.
 two central numbers.

Mean and median bonus gender pay gap and proportion of females/ makes receiving a bonus payment is not applicable as we do not pay bonuses

## QUARTILES

## The Council has

 around 800 employees in a wide range of roles and pay bandsAll jobs are evaluated to determine the pay band

Gender balance across
the organisation is $48 \%$ female, $52 \%$ male.

Female and male staff are not represented equally in all pay bands.

There are roles with a higher percentage of male employees and others with higher percentage of female employees.

Distribution of female/ male staff will impact on mean and median averages. This is not a factor of the pay system but the distribution of female and male staff in certain types of roles.

Staff are employed at different points within the pay bands, based on appointment salary, when they were appointed and incremental progression.

Our distribution of males across the pay bands has 2018 but the distribution of females has
been changing more, with more females in Band 4 now than in Band 5 previously. This impacts on the median.

GENDER PAY REPORTING (2)

| N |  | Female | Male | TOTAL | \% Female | $\begin{aligned} & \% \\ & \text { Male } \end{aligned}$ | Quartile | Hourly Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2022 |  | 2021 |  | 2020 |  | 2019 |  | 2018 |  |
|  | Lower Quartile | 91 | 92 | 183 | 50\% | 50\% | 1. Lower Quartile | £ 8.91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lower Middle Quartile | 96 | 96 | 192 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  | £ 13.85 | £ 8.72 | £ 13.74 | £ 7.38 | £ 13.74 | £ 7.37 | $£ 12.36$ | £ 7.04 | £12.12 |
|  | Upper Middle Quartile | 77 | 104 | 181 | 43\% | 57\% |  |  | £13.85 | £ 8.72 | £13.74 | £ 7.38 | £13.74 |  | £ 12.36 | £ 7.04 | £12.12 |
|  | Upper Quartile | 94 | 106 | 200 | 47\% | 53\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | Lower Quartile | 95 | 93 | 188 | 51\% | 49\% | 2. Lower Middle Quartile | £ 13.98 | £ 17.33 | $£ 13.74$ | £ 16.71 | £ 13.74 | £ 16.71 | $£ 12.36$ | £ 15.05 | £12.12 | £15.06 |
|  | Lower Middle Quartile | 101 | 92 | 193 | 52\% | 48\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Upper Middle Quartile | 75 | 104 | 179 | 42\% | 58\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Upper Quartile | 97 | 107 | 204 | 48\% | 52\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lower Quartile | 97 | 100 | 197 | 49\% | 51\% | Quartile | £ 17.35 | £ 21.03 | £ 16.71 | £ 20.67 | $£ 16.71$ | £20.67 | $£ 15.05$ | £ 18.72 | $£ 15.19$ | £18.77 |
|  | Lower Middle Quartile | 106 | 98 | 204 | 52\% | 48\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Upper Middle Quartile | 85 | 114 | 199 | 43\% | 57\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Upper Quartile | 99 | 110 | 209 | 47\% | 53\% | 4. Upper Quartile | £21.03 | $£ 64.97$ | $£ 20.67$ | $£ 52.98$ | £ 20.67 | £65.86 | $£ 18.72$ | £66.02 | £18.84 | $£ 64.72$ |
|  | Lower Quartile | 108 | 88 | 196 | 55\% | 45\% | The tables show the hourly rates for each quartile and the proportions of male and female full-pay relevant employees in the lower, lower middle, upper middle and upper quartile pay bands. <br> Over the five years of data, the biggest changes have been in the lower and lower middle quartiles where there have been fewer females and more males. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\circ}{1}}$ | Lower Middle Quartile | 104 | 92 | 196 | 53\% | 47\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Upper Middle Quartile | 83 | 113 | 196 | 42\% | 58\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Upper Quartile | 94 | 101 | 195 | 48\% | 52\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lower Quartile | 120 | 82 | 202 | 59\% | 41\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | Lower Middle Quartile | 102 | 99 | 201 | 51\% | 49\% | For 2021 and | the lowe | quartile s | ws a m | ore eve | sprea | d of fem | ales and | d males |  |  |
| 산 | Upper Middle Quartile | 94 | 107 | 201 | 47\% | 53\% | We continue to | itor our pay | gap and | take act | ion to m | aintain | and imp | rove our | r perform | mance. |  |
|  | Upper Quartile | 98 |  |  |  |  | We continue to | (or our | gap and | take action | , | aintain | and | ove our | perorma | ance. |  |


| Appendix A: Full breakdown of workforce by ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Workforce } \end{gathered}$ |  | Band 1 | Band 2 | Band 3 | Band 4 | Band 5 | Band 6 | Band 7 | Band 8 | Band 9 | Senior Management | TUPE \& Other | Total | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Workforce } \end{gathered}$ |
| White | 91.5\% | White British/ English/ Northern Irish/ Scottish/ Welsh | 34 | 11 | 128 | 110 | 133 | 92 | 48 | 33 | 17 | 19 | 6 | 631 | 80.7\% |
|  |  | Irish | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 2.3\% |
|  |  | Gypsy or Irish Traveller | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.13\% |
|  |  | Roma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
|  |  | Any other White background | 12 | 3 | 14 | 15 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 66 | 8.4\% |
| Asian or Asian British | 3.8\% | Indian | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1.3\% |
|  |  | Pakistani | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.2\% |
|  |  | Bangladeshi | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0.6\% |
|  |  | Chinese | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.3\% |
|  |  | Any other Asian Background | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1.3\% |
| Black/ African/ Caribbean or Black British | 1.8\% | African | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1.3\% |
|  |  | Caribbean | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.2\% |
|  |  | Any other Black, Black British or Caribbean background | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.2\% |
| $\frac{\text { Mixed/ }}{\text { Multiple Ethnic Background }}$ |  | White \& Black African | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0.5\% |
|  |  | White \& Black Caribbean | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.3\% |
|  |  | White \& Asian | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.2\% |
|  | 1.9\% | Any other mixed/ multiple ethnic background | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | \% |
| Other <br> Ethnic <br> Group | 0.8\% | Arab | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0.5\% |
|  |  | Other ethnic group | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.2\% |
| TOTAL DECLARED |  |  | 56 | 17 | 154 | 140 | 157 | 111 | 56 | 39 | 21 | 22 | 8 | 781 | 95.3\% |
| Not disclosed | 4.6\% | Prefer not to say/ not provided | 6 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 4.6\% |
| Total employees who declare themselves as from an ethnic minority group in pay band |  |  | 9 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 65 | 8.32\% |
| $\%$ of ethnic minority staff in pay band |  |  | 16.0\% | 11.7\% | 6.4\% | 7.8\% | 8.2\% | 9.0\% | 5.3\% | 12.8\% | 4.7\% | 4.5\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Total in Pay Band |  |  | 62 | 21 | 160 | 150 | 163 | 114 | 57 | 39 | 22 | 23 | 8 | 819 |  |
| \% of Workforce in Pay Band |  |  | 7.5\% | 2.5\% | 19.5\% | 18.3\% | 19.9\% | 13.9\% | 6.9\% | 4.7\% | 2.6\% | 2.8\% | 10.0\% |  |  |

Appendix B: Full breakdown of recruitment activity by ethnicity

|  |  | Applications | Shortlisted | Offers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | White British/ English/ Northern Irish/ Scottish/ Welsh | 605 | 283 | 151 |
|  | Irish | 9 | 6 | 3 |
| White | Gypsy or Irish Traveller | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Roma | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Any other White background | 67 | 37 | 23 |
|  |  | 674 | 322 | 175 |
|  | Percentage of all Applications | 71.0\% | 73.8\% | 86.6\% |
|  | Indian | 9 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Pakistani | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| Asian or Asian British | Bangladeshi | 9 | 5 | 2 |
|  | Chinese | 12 | 6 | 1 |
|  | Any other Asian Background | 22 | 11 | 1 |
|  |  | 57 | 25 | 6 |
|  | Percentage of all Applications | 6.0\% | 5.7\% | 3.0\% |
|  | African | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Black/ African/ | Caribbean | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Any other Black, Black British or Caribbean background | 15 | 9 | 1 |
|  |  | 17 | 11 | 3 |
|  | Percentage of all Applications | 1.8\% | 2.5\% | 1.5\% |
|  | White \& Black African | 34 | 12 | 3 |
| Mixed/ | White \& Black Caribbean | 20 | 5 | 1 |
| Multiple Ethnic Background | White \& Asian | 12 | 5 | 2 |
|  | Any other mixed/ multiple ethnic background | 27 | 17 | 4 |
|  |  | 93 | 39 | 10 |
|  | Percentage of all Applications | 9.8\% | 9.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Other Ethnic | Arab | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| Group | Other ethnic group | 38 | 12 | 5 |
|  |  | 44 | 15 | 6 |
|  | Percentage of all Applications | 4.6\% | 3.4\% | 3.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Not disclosed | Prefer not to say/ not provided | 64 | 24 | 2 |
|  | Percentage of all Applications | 6.7\% | 5.5\% | 11.8\% |
| Total Applicants Declaring themselves as from an Ethnic Minority |  | 211 | 90 | 25 |
|  | Percentage of all Applications | 22.2\% | 20.6\% | 12.3\% |
|  | Total | 949 | 436 | 202 |

## Actions for 2022/ 23

$\square$ Review our recruitment and retention strategies in light of the increase in voluntary leavers and retirements and continue to monitor the data. Review recruitment practices to ensure accessibility throughout the process for ethnic minority and disability groups.Continue networking and promotional work with organisations in order to encourage applications and showcase the Council as a Disability Confident employer.We will continue to deliver on actions identified in the Single Equalities Scheme.Review and relaunch of key employment policies to ensure that they remain relevantReview the 2021 Census data so that we may review our targets for Disability ( $8.5 \%$ ) and Ethnicity ( $9.5 \%$ ).Review material on Wellness (Recovery) Action Plans and provide supporting guidance for staff and managers.Continue to monitor internal promotion activity.

- Create Apprenticeship opportunities for new recruits and existing employees within our Employment \& Skills Strategy to address identified skills gaps.Working with the Region of Learning to highlight career pathways to attract, develop and retain younger people to and within the organisation.Continue to monitor our Gender Pay Gap.


[^0]:    * Appendix A provides a full breakdown of the workforce by Ethnicity

