

## Workforce report 2016-17

This report looks at the profile of employees and at human resources management activities over financial year 2016-17

## Scope

1. It covers all departments of the council and directly employed substantive employees. It therefore excludes those under the management of schools.
2. All departmental details will relate to organisational structures as at year end 2016-17.
3. All workforce profile data will be at the end of the year 2016-17.
4. All data related to the outcomes of HR activity will cover the period April 2016 - March 2017, unless stated.
5. For completeness, information is given on the numbers of agency workers engaged. They are an important addition to our workforce resources but do not have a direct contractual relationship with the council and therefore details are limited.
6. The data used in this report is rounded up or down. It is for this reason that, on occasions, tables may not add up to $100 \%$. .

## Content

The report -

1. Begins with key data. This includes an overview of employees' profile and some comparative data from previous years.
2. Looks at the profile of the council's employees against each protected characteristic where information is available (gender, ethnic origin, age, disability).
3. Will, for the first time, include gender pay gap data as set out in legislation. Previous reports have included gender data, but new requirements include specified formulas.
4. Will be discussed with the constituent trade unions.

The report will be published on the council's intranet, (the Source), and the Southwark website; www.southwark.gov.uk

## Contents

Please click on the links below

- Key data - Workforce 2016-17
- Workforce Numbers \& Employee Profiles
- Changes in the Workforce
- Performance Management
- Sickness
- Learning \& Development
- Disciplinary Investigations \& Outcomes
- Capability Action \& Outcomes
- Staff Complaints
- Respect at Work
- Recruitment
- Agency Workers

Appendix 1 Information on the community in Southwark \& other London Boroughs

## Key data - Workforce 2016-17

The details below pull out some key information from the report that follows about the workforce. It aims to provide a quick reference and to give context by looking at details from previous years where comparisons can be made.


## Section 1: Workforce Numbers \& Employee Profiles

1. The headcount of employees was 4,150 . This excludes casual workers and others who are not directly employed such as agency workers. A workforce population of 4150 is a reduction of $8.6 \%$ of employee numbers in 2015-16. (Key Data).
2. Southwark has a similar size workforce to boroughs such as Islington, Tower Hamlets, Camden and Hackney who have similarly retained key services inhouse rather than outsourcing. The average size of London boroughs for 2016/17 was 2,666. and 3,119 for inner London boroughs.
3. Employees in the three service departments make up 83\% of the council's workforce (Children's \& Adults; Environment \& Leisure; Housing \& Modernisation). (Reference data 1)
4. The highest percentage of part time employees is in Children's \& Adults' Services (17\%). Overall $13 \%$ of all employees work part time. (Reference data 2)

Reference data 1
Employee numbers by department

|  | Numbers <br> (headcount) | \% of total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chief Executive's Department | 194 | $5 \%$ |
| Children's \& Adults Services | 1146 | $28 \%$ |
| Environment \& Social Regeneration | 1319 | $32 \%$ |
| Finance \& Governance | 553 | $13 \%$ |
| Housing \& Modernisation | 938 | $23 \%$ |
| Total | 4150 | $100 \%$ |

Reference data 2
Distribution of full time \& part time employees per department \& Council wide

|  | Male |  | Female |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Full-time | Part- <br> time | Full-time | Part- <br> time |
| Chief Executive's Department | $51.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $39.7 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ |
| Children's \& Adults Services | $22.4 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $60.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ |
| Environment \& Social Regeneration | $71.0 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ |
| Finance \& Governance | $42.1 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $48.6 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ |
| Housing \& Modernisation | $44.0 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $44.9 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ |
| Total | $46.7 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $40.3 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ |

## Gender

5. The percentages of female and male employees are similar; 51\% of employees are female; $49 \%$ are male. (Reference data 3). The gender split shows a small change (1\%) from the previous year, (Key Data). The gender breakdown in council employment is similar to the female population in Southwark (50.5\%) and is slightly lower than the average across London boroughs (58\%). (Appendix 1)
6. There are greater differences in the gender breakdown when looking at a departmental level. (Reference data 3). In particular, Environment has a high percentage of male staff compared to the rest of the Council largely due to areas such as waste and cleansing and traded/building services.
7. There are higher percentages of male employees than female employees in the grades 1-5, amongst building workers and in the higher grade bands, although the total numbers of employees grade 17 and above are relatively small (Reference data 4)

Reference data 3
Gender breakdown per department as percentages

|  | Female | Male |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chief Executive's Department | $48 \%$ | $52 \%$ |
| Children's \& Adults Services | $76 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| Environment \& Social Regeneration | $24 \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| Finance \& Governance | $57 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Housing \& Modernisation | $54 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| Total | $51 \%$ | $49 \%$ |

Reference data 4
Grade distribution, gender and disability

| Grade band | Total | Female | Male | Disabled staff |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grades 1-5 | 1067 | 320 | 747 | 17 |
| \% | 100\% | 30\% | 70\% | $2 \%^{1}$ |
| Building Workers | 75 | 2 | 73 | 1 |
| \% | 100\% | 3\% | 97\% | $1 \%^{1}$ |
| Grades 6-9 or equivalent | 1568 | 943 | 625 | 51 |
| \% | 100\% | 60\% | 40\% | 3\% ${ }^{1}$ |
| Grades 10-12 + Social Work | 1148 | 689 | 459 | 24 |
| \% | 100\% | 60\% | 40\% | $2 \%^{1}$ |
| Grades 14-16 | 203. | 100 | 103 | 6 |
| \% | 100\% | 49\% | 51\% | $3 \%^{1}$ |
| Grades 17 \& above | 19 | 7 | 12 |  |
| \% | 100\% | 37\% | 63\% |  |
| Teacher conditions | 14 | 11 | 3 |  |
| \% | 100\% | 79\% | 21\% |  |
| Soulbury conditions | 39 | 30 | 9 |  |
| \% | 100\% | 77\% | 23\% |  |
| Other ${ }^{2}$ | 17 | 6 | 11 |  |
| \% | 100\% | 35\% | 65\% |  |
| Total | 4150 | 2108 | 2042 | 99 |

${ }^{1}$ Percentage in that grade band
${ }^{2}$ TUPE conditions (various)
8. The Equality Act 2010 (Gender Pay Gap Information) Regulations 2017 place a new mandatory requirement to report annually on our gender pay gap and publish the following information:

- the mean and median gender pay gap which is the difference between the mean and median hourly rate of pay of male full-pay relevant employees and that of female full-pay relevant employees, expressed as a percentage of the male mean.
- the mean and median gender bonus gap which is the difference between the mean and median bonus pay paid to male relevant employees and that paid to female relevant employees, expressed as a percentage of the male mean.
- the proportions of male and female employees who received bonus pay.
- the proportions of male and female employees in quartile pay bands.

9. Pay includes gross full pay April 2017 pay data for all staff and includes basic pay, certain allowances and shift payments. It does not include overtime payments.
10. Bonus includes gross bonus payments in a 12 month period i.e. 6th April 16 to 5th April 17 includes bonus payments received by building and trades staff in Building Services and Asset Management. They are paid on a productive
pay system (in place since 1994) wherein employees accumulate standard minute values for each task completed. It is based on output for work generated over and above the required level, over a specified period. This accumulates to a bonus payment.
11. Employers must not treat a woman less favourably than a man or a man less favourably than a woman in its pay arrangements on the basis of gender. The gender pay gap is the difference between the average pay of men and women expressed as a percentage.
12. The mean gender pay gap: Southwark council has a mean gender pay gap of $-10.69 \%$. This indicates that on average Southwark male employees are paid lower than Southwark female employees by approximately $10.69 \%$.
13. The median gender pay gap: Southwark council has a median gender pay gap of $-10 \%$ which suggests that typically Southwark male employees are paid at around $10 \%$ lower than Southwark female employees. The hourly median pay for females is $£ 18.23$ compared to $£ 16.58$ for males.
14. The average Bonus Pay: Southwark Council has a mean bonus gender pay gap of $74 \%$. In the period to 6 April 2017, approximately $4.12 \%$ of Southwark male employees were paid a bonus payment compared to $0.04 \%$ of Southwark female employees. The data is based on the only relevant operational bonus scheme for building and trades staff in Building Services and Asset Management. This is a local longstanding scheme (since 1994) rooted in national conditions. A review of how the bonus payments are awarded in this area revealed no issues of inequality or irregularity based on gender. The bonus scheme is under review and is likely to be replaced following consultation.
15. The proportion of male and female employees in each quartile pay band: The distribution of men and women through the pay bands by quartile, as shown above, does not reflect the overall gender composition of the workforce which is $51.7 \%$ male and $48.3 \%$ female. Notably, the proportion of men and women in the lower quartile (shown as quartile1) is the furthest from the overall gender composition of the workforce at $33.46 \%$ female, $66.54 \%$ male. A review of the data highlights that for the quartile, there were 1061 employees, 408 of which were cleaning operatives (a male dominated job role); 394 of the 408 cleaning operatives were male.

Gender pay gap

| Gender Pay Indicator | Percentage Gap |
| :--- | :--- |
| Difference in mean hourly rate of pay | $-10.69 \%$ |
| Difference in median hourly rate of pay | $-10.00 \%$ |
| Difference in mean bonus pay | $73.87 \%$ |
| Difference in median bonus pay | $54.14 \%$ |
| Proportion of male employees who were paid a bonus | $4.12 \%$ |
| Proportion of female employees who were paid a bonus | $0.04 \%$ |


| Gender Pay Indicator - Quartile <br> Distribution | Female | Male |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Quartile 1 | $33.46 \%$ | $66.54 \%$ |
| Quartile 2 | $59.04 \%$ | $40.96 \%$ |
| Quartile 3 | $56.12 \%$ | $43.88 \%$ |
| Quartile 4 | $55.56 \%$ | $44.44 \%$ |

## Disabilities

9. Southwark records actual employee declarations of a disability. Since the introduction of the Disability Discrimination Act when the use of strict externally set criteria to determine "disability" ceased, self declaration is appropriate. It is known that some other boroughs determine the disability average by extrapolating from survey data or use sickness absence rates as a marker. This is not our preferred approach. The average across London boroughs is $5.7 \%$, (Appendix 1).
10. The percentage of people formally declaring a disability, $2.7 \%$ has reduced by $0.6 \%$ compared to the previous year (Key Data). There are differences between departments. (Reference data 5).
11. As part of our biannual employee survey, we ask staff whether they consider themselves to have a disability. 10\% said they do, which is significantly higher than our formal records and indicates that not all disabled staff are formally declaring their disability.
12. The percentages of employees with disabilities are lowest on Building Worker grades. There are some grade bands where there are no staff with a declared disability. This applies to those grade bandings where numbers of staff are few. (Reference data 4)

Reference data 5
Staff with disabilities as percentage of departmental numbers

|  | Disabled |
| :--- | :--- |
| Chief Executive's Department | $2.6 \%$ |
| Children's \& Adults Services | $3.1 \%$ |
| Environment \& Social Regeneration | $1.7 \%$ |
| Finance \& Governance | $3.3 \%$ |
| Housing \& Modernisation | $3.3 \%$ |
| Total | $2.7 \%$ |

## Ethnic Origin

13. There are a small number of employees who do not have an ethnic origin record, 34 employees (less than 1\%), this compares with an average of $11.4 \%$ across London boroughs who do not have an ethnic origin (Appendix 1). Those with no ethnic origin data recorded are predominately people who joined the council under TUPE agreements. (Key data).
14. There is no significant change in the percentages of employees who classify themselves as white (51\%) or from black and minority ethnic groups (49\%) compared to the previous year. (Key Data).
15. When looking at broad ethnic groups the percentages of employees from White and from BME communities are very similar to the percentages in the Southwark community, where $54 \%$ of the population classify themselves as White. (Appendix 1). Across London boroughs those employees who classify themselves as White average 61\%. (Appendix 1).

## Reference data 6

Broad ethnic origin of employees as percentage of departmental numbers

|  | Asian | Black | Mixed | Other | BME <br> employees | White |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Chief Executive's Department | $8 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Children's \& Adults Services | $6 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Environment \& Social Regeneration | $3 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Finance \& Governance | $8 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| Housing \& Modernisation | $7 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Total across the council | $\mathbf{6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 \%}$ |

16. The percentages of White employees compared to BME employees change through the grades. Apart from those in Building Worker grades, up to grade 9 there are higher percentages of BME staff than percentages of White staff. This changes at grades 10-12 and the percentages of BME employees are low in grades 14 and above. (Reference data 7)

Reference data 7
Grade distribution, broad ethnic origin

| Grade band | BME <br> employees | White | Not <br> Stated | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grades 1-5 | 581 | $\mathbf{4 8 2}$ | 4 | 1067 |
| $\%^{1}$ | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ |  |  |
| Building Workers | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 8}$ |  | 75 |
| $\%^{1}$ | $36 \%$ | $64 \%$ |  |  |
| Grades 6-9 or equivalent | $\mathbf{8 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 2}$ | 24 | 1568 |
| $\%^{1}$ | $58 \%$ | $42 \%$ |  |  |
| Grades 10-12 +SW's | $\mathbf{4 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 1}$ | 4 | 1148 |
| $\%^{1}$ | $40 \%$ | $60 \%$ |  |  |
| Grades 14-16 | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 8}$ | 2 | 203 |
| $\%^{1}$ | $16 \%$ | $84 \%$ |  |  |
| Grades 17 \& above | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ |  | 19 |
| $\%^{1}$ | $11 \%$ | $89 \%$ |  |  |
| Teacher conditions | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |  | 14 |
| $\%^{1}$ | $29 \%$ | $71 \%$ |  |  |
| Soulbury conditions | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{3 4}$ |  | 39 |
| $\%^{1}$ | $13 \%$ | $87 \%$ |  |  |
| Other ${ }^{2}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ |  | 17 |
| $\%^{1}$ | $47 \%$ | $53 \%$ |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 5 0}$ |

${ }^{1}$ Excludes those where ethnic origin not supplied.
${ }^{2}$ TUPE conditions (various)

Age
17. The average age of employees is 45.3 years. (Key Data). There is not a significant range (44-48) across London but our average is similar to the median age of 45.8 years and younger than the majority of London boroughs (Appendix 1).
18. The largest staff group is in the 40-54 years banding (44\%) (Reference data 8) although we are in the upper quartile in London for the 25-39 age group, which has increased since last year.

Reference data 8
Employees per age band as percentage of total workforce numbers

|  | $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 to 24 | $3.6 \%$ |
| 25 to 39 | $30.8 \%$ |
| 40 to 54 | $43.8 \%$ |
| $55+$ | $21.9 \%$ |

## Length of Service

19. Employees' length of service is on average 9 years. It must be noted however that the average service will be impacted by the large percentage of employees who have over 10 years' service. (Reference data 9)

Reference data 9
Employees' length of service \& service bandings - total workforce numbers

| Average (mean) length of service | 9 years |
| :--- | :--- |
| Length of service - bands | \% of employees |
| Less than 1 year | $7.5 \%$ |
| 1 to $<2$ years | $8.6 \%$ |
| 2 to <3 years | $8.4 \%$ |
| 3 to $<5$ years | $16.1 \%$ |
| 5 to <10 years | $21.9 \%$ |
| 10 to $<15$ years | $19.6 \%$ |
| 15 to 20 years | $6.5 \%$ |
| $20+$ years | $11.4 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ |

## Gender Reassignment, Religion or belief and Sexual Orientation

20. Whist our employee monitoring data does not currently include gender reassignment, religion or sexual orientation, for the first time, our biannual employee survey asked staff to respond to questions relating to these protected characteristics.
21. Less than $0.5 \%$ of staff indicated that their gender identity does not match the gender assigned at birth.

| Religion | \% |
| :--- | :--- |
| Christian | $44 \%$ |
| Buddhist | $1 \%$ |
| Hindu | $1 \%$ |
| Jewish | $<0.5 \%$ |
| Muslim | $3 \%$ |
| Sikh | $<0.5 \%$ |
| No religion | $27 \%$ |
| Other faith / religion / belief | $4 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | $20 \%$ |
| Not provided | $<0.5 \%$ |


| Sexual orientation | \% |
| :--- | :--- |
| Heterosexual | $77 \%$ |
| Gay woman/ lesbian | $1 \%$ |
| Gay man | $3 \%$ |
| Bisexual | $1 \%$ |
| Other | $1 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | $17 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |

## Section 2: Changes in the Workforce

## Starters

22. There were 269 people who had started work with the council within the year. The table below shows the person's department at the end of the financial year not necessarily the department at commencement. (Reference data 10)
23. Those starting during this period have not resulted in any notable changes to the profile of the workforce in terms of gender, age or ethnic origin (Key data).

Reference data 10
Number of starters \& department

|  | Numbers of starters <br> (headcount) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Chief Executive's Department | 13 |
| Children's \& Adults Services | 83 |
| Environment \& Social Regeneration | 48 |
| Finance \& Governance | 39 |
| Housing \& Modernisation | 86 |
| Total | 269 |

## Leavers

24. This section provides a detailed look at the reasons why people leave the organisation and their profile.
25. The dominant reasons for people leaving were on a voluntary basis, i.e. voluntary redundancy, resignation, career breaks, retirement. Other reasons attracted relatively small numbers of employees.
26. The most common reason for leaving during 2016-17 was voluntary redundancy. The profile of disabled staff leaving on the basis of voluntary redundancy was $5 \%$. This has resulted in a notable reduction of the profile of the percentage of the disabled staff workforce (2.7\%).
27. Further scrutiny of those who left on the basis of dismissal, e.g. disciplinary or capability, appears in the relevant sections later in this report.

Reference data 11
Leavers by reason, gender and disability

| Reason for Leaving | Number | Female $\%$ | Male $\%$ | Total | Of those <br> disabled $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Career Break | 6 | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Deceased | 4 | $75 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Dismissal - Capability | 2 | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Disciplinary Dismissal | 9 | $11 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Expiration of Contract |  |  |  |  |  |
| End of shared service | 28 | $61 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Redundancy | 9 | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Resignation | 283 | $59 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Retirement Age | 25 | $36 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Retirement Early | 6 | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Retirement III Health | 8 | $25 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| Total | 764 | $57 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ |

Reference data 12
Leavers by reason, BME employees, White employees

|  | No. | BME <br> employees <br> $\%$ | White <br> employees <br> $\%$ | Not stated <br> $\%$ | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Career Break | 6 | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Deceased | 4 | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Dismissal - Capability | 2 | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Dismissal | 9 | $33 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Expiration of Contract |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outsourced | 28 | $71 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Redundancy | 9 | $56 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Resignation | 384 | $50 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Retirement Age | 283 | $41 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Retirement Early | 25 | $16 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Retirement III Health | 8 | $33 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total | 764 | $46 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Reference data13
Leavers by reason \& age bands

|  | No. | $\mathbf{1 6 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 - 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 - 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}+$ | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Career Break | 6 | $17 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Deceased | 4 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Dismissal - Capability | 2 | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Dismissal | 9 | $0 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Expiration of Contract ${ }^{1}$ | 28 | $25 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Outsourced | 9 | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Redundancy | 384 | $0 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Resignation | 283 | $7 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Retirement Age | 25 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Retirement Early | 6 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Retirement III Health | 8 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ | $100 \%$ |

[^0]
## Section 3: Performance Management

This monitor looks at incremental awards in 1st April 2017.
28. $73 \%$ of the workforce were eligible for an incremental award in 2017. Figures below relate to the percentage of staff who were eligible for an increment.
29. The awards this year (67\%), higher than the previous two years. (Reference data 14)

Reference data 14
Incremental awards - Council wide position

| Incremental awards | Increment <br> given | No increment <br> given |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2013 \%$ of employees | $56 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| $2014 \%$ of employee | $74 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
| $2015 \%$ of employees | $58 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
| $2016 \%$ of employees | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| $2017 \%$ of employees ${ }^{1}$ | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ |

${ }^{1}$ Data for incremental awards 2017 as at $20^{\text {th }}$ July 2017
Reference data 15
Incremental awards by gender

| Outcomes \& \% of <br> employees | Female | Male |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Increment Given | $68 \%$ | $66 \%$ |
| No Increment Given | $32 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Reference data 16
Incremental awards by disability

| Outcomes \& \% of <br> employees | Not Disabled | Disabled |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Increment Given | $67 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| No Increment Given | $33 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Reference data 17
Incremental awards by broad ethnic origin

| Outcomes \& \% of <br> employees | Asian | Black | Mixed | Other | White | Not Stated |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Increment Given | $69 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| No Increment Given | $31 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Reference data 18
Incremental awards by age band

| Outcomes \& \% of <br> employees | 16 to 24 | 25 to 39 | 40 to 54 | 55 \& over |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Increment Given | $58 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $63 \%$ |
| No Increment Given | $42 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

## Section 4 - Sickness

30. Average sickness per person of 6.20 days, showed a decrease of 0.4 days per person (Reference data 19). This is lower than the average sickness across London boroughs of 7.8 days. (Appendix 1). Of note is the significant proportion of staff who had no sickness absence during the year (56\%).
31. There are multiple recorded reasons for sickness which are grouped as shown (Reference data 20). The "internal disorders" grouping alone covers over a hundred conditions, but will include chronic health disorders such as angina, chest infections, stroke etc.
32. At present a high percentage of sickness absence does not have a recorded reason and it is likely that this is resulting in underreporting of stress, depression and anxiety related absence which we know is the primary cause of sickness absence in the public sector. Changes are being made to our systems to improve data capture.
33. Occupational health data shows us that a high proportion of referrals are related to mental health conditions.

Reference data 19
Annual average days' sickness per person over five years

| Year | Average sickness absence <br> (Excludes schools) |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2010-11$ | 7.74 |
| $2011-12$ | 4.67 |
| $2012-13$ | 7.49 |
| $2013-14$ | 7.77 |
| $2015-16$ | 6.63 |
| $2016-17$ | 6.20 |

Reference data 20
Recorded reasons for sickness absence 2016-176
${ }^{(1)}$ Excludes where not stated

| Reason | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Muscular Skeletal | $26.0 \%$ |
| Internal Disorders | $20.8 \%$ |
| Neurological | $12.9 \%$ |
| Infectious Disease | $9.0 \%$ |
| Stress depression | $8.0 \%$ |
| ENT dental \& Skin | $4.4 \%$ |
| Disability Related | $3.9 \%$ |
| Accident / Injury | $3.9 \%$ |
| Chest respiratory | $3.3 \%$ |
| Pregnancy \& Related | $3.2 \%$ |
| Cancer | $1.6 \%$ |
| Back problems | $1.5 \%$ |
| Heart blood pressure | $1.1 \%$ |
| Mental health | $0.3 \%$ |
| Genito urinary | $0.2 \%$ |

## Section 5 - Learning \& Development

34. It is stressed that the data below shows training activities coordinated by the corporate Organisational Transformation (OT) team and recorded in the council's Learning Management System (LMS). Managers and staff record all other training/ learning and development locally. The OT team have procured a new learning management system which will improved reporting, and this will be introduced in the third quarter of 2017/18.
35. The data suggests that when looking at training events:-

- The proportion of those attending is broadly in line with the proportion of people from different ethnic groups in the workforce, (reference data 21)
- The proportion of people who are disabled attending training events is higher than the proportion of disabled staff (2.7\%) in the workforce. (Reference data 22)
- The proportion of women attending training events is higher than the proportion of women (51\%) in the workforce. (Reference data 23)

Reference data 21
Employees attending training coordinated by OT \& their ethnic origin ${ }^{1}$

|  | Events | \% of those attending |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| BME | 1674 | $43 \%$ |
| White | 1511 | $39 \%$ |
| Not Stated | 734.5 | $19 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 9 1 9 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

## Reference data 22

Employees attending training coordinated by OT \& whether they have a disability ${ }^{1}$

|  | Events | \% of those attending |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled | 182.5 | $5 \%$ |
| Not Disabled | 3737 | $95 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 9 1 9 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Reference data 23
Employees attending training coordinated by OT \& their gender ${ }^{1}$

|  | Events | \% of those attending |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 2798 | $71 \%$ |
| Male | 1121.5 | $29 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 9 1 9 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

36. Southwark is very committed to supporting the development of its workforce. There are two well-established programmes to support this across the organisation. The first, apprentices and first entry training support entry into the council and the second, leadership and management qualifications through the Institute of Leadership and Management. 74 managers have started a new management programme at levels 2, 3 and 5 in 2016/17. Since the inception of the ILM programme in 2014, 234 managers have completed an ILM programme, and 98 are partly through their studies.
37. Southwark has a council plan target to have $3 \%$ of the workforce who are apprentices or first entry trainees. The total of individuals in Southwark over 2016/17 was 98 apprentices and 28 trainees, or a total of 126 which equates to $3.03 \%$ of the workforce.

## Section 6 - Disciplinary Investigations \& Outcomes

38. Note - two separate activities are described in this section; staff subject to disciplinary investigation and the outcomes of disciplinary hearings. The information below is not necessary linked, i.e. some of the cases are captured in "investigations" would not have reached the stage of a completed disciplinary hearing.
39. The number of staff who were subject to disciplinary investigation and/or disciplinary action is a very small percentage of all employees, $0.8 \%$ (Reference data 24 \& Key Data).
40. On 13 occasions disciplinary actions resulted in either a warning or dismissal. (References data 26 \& 27). Those subject to such actions are $0.3 \%$ of all employees, (key data). Where there are such small numbers drawing conclusion based on more detailed levels, e.g. gender, ethnic profile or disability is questionably statistically valid.
41. It is difficult to draw conclusions from relatively low numbers when considered against the overall workforce. However these numbers should be subject to further analysis and monitoring to ascertain whether more detailed action is necessary.

Reference data 24
Investigations by gender \& by disability

|  | Female | Male | Total | Of those - <br> disabled |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disciplinary Action Pursued | 11 | 14 | 25 | 1 |
| In Progress | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| Total $^{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ |

${ }^{1}$ Note in addition 2 investigations resulted in a guidance interview; on 10 occasions there was no further action; on 8 occasions the employee left before the investigation concluded.

Reference data 25
Investigations by broad ethnic origin

|  | BME <br> employees | White <br> employees | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disciplinary Action Pursued | 12 | 13 | 25 |
| In Progress | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Total $^{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ |

${ }^{1}$ Note in addition 2 investigations resulted in a guidance interview; on 10 occasions there was no further action; on 8 occasions the employee left before the investigation concluded.

## Reference data 26

Disciplinary action by gender \& by disability

|  | Female | Male | Total | Of those - <br> disabled |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dismissal | 1 | 8 | $\mathbf{9}$ | 1 |
| Final written warning |  | 1 | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |
| Written warning | 1 | 2 | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |
| Guidance Interview |  | 1 | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |
| No action | 2 |  | $\mathbf{2}$ |  |
| Total $^{2}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |

${ }^{2}$ Note in addition

- On 6 occasions the employee left during a disciplinary process
- 3 still in progress

Reference data 27
Disciplinary action by broad ethnic origin

|  | BME <br> employees | White <br> employees | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dismissal | 3 | 6 | $\mathbf{9}$ |
| Final written warning |  | 1 | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| Written warning | 2 | 1 | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| Guidance Interview | 1 |  | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| No action |  | 2 | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| Total $^{2}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ |

${ }^{2}$ Note in addition

- On 6 occasions the employee left during a disciplinary process
- 3 still in progress


## Section 7 - Capability Action \& Outcomes

42. The numbers subject to capability action are a small percentage of all employees (References data 28 \& 29), 4 concluded cases represents $0.1 \%$ all employees, (key data). Where there are such small numbers drawing conclusion based on more detailed levels, e.g. gender, ethnic profile or disability is questionably valid.

Reference data 28
Capability action by gender \& by disability

|  | Female | Male | Total | Of those - <br> disabled |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dismissal | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| No action | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |

- 0 still in progress

Reference data 29
Capability action by broad ethnic origin

|  | BME <br> employees | White <br> employees | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dismissal | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| No action | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ |

- 0 still in progress


## Section 8 - Staff Complaints

43. Note this data relates to individual employee complaints that require a formal process to resolve. Many complaints can be resolved informally or through mediation; all parties are encouraged to pursue such actions as a first step.
44. The numbers of staff that submit a formal complaint at stage 1 are very few. (Reference data 30 \& 31); 24 employees represent $0.6 \%$ of the workforce. (Key data).
45. Stage 2 complaints are those where the employee is not satisfied with the outcome at stage one and identifies grounds for appeal.
46. Where there are such small numbers drawing conclusions at a more detailed level, e.g. gender, ethnic profile or disability is questionably valid.

Reference data 30

## Stage 1 complaints by gender \& by disability

|  | Female | Male | Total | Of those - <br> disabled |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Informal resolution |  |  |  |  |
| Not upheld | 3 | 3 | 6 |  |
| Partially upheld | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 |
| Upheld |  |  |  |  |
| In progress | 8 | 4 | 12 |  |
| Total $^{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |

${ }^{1}$ In addition 6 stage 1 registered complaints were withdrawn and 1 stage 1 complaint was resolved through mediation.

Reference data 31
Stage 1 complaints by broad ethnic origin

|  | BME employees | White employees | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Informal resolution |  |  |  |
| Not upheld | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Partially upheld | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Upheld | $\mathbf{7}$ |  |  |
| In progress | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | 12 |
| Total $^{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ |  |

[^1]
## Section 9 - Respect at Work

Note; the procedure will cover complaints on all forms of harassment, bullying or victimisation on the basis of someone's profile.
47. The numbers of employees making a formal complaint are few; 18 employees represents than $0.4 \%$ of the workforce.
48. Where there are such small numbers drawing conclusions at a more detailed level, e.g. gender, ethnic profile or disability is questionably valid.

Reference data 32
Complaints by gender \& by disability

|  | Female | Male | Total | Of <br> those- <br> disabled |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Informal resolution |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| Not upheld | 5 | 3 | 8 |  |
| Upheld | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Partially upheld | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| In progress | 2 |  | 2 |  |
| Total $^{1}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |

${ }^{1}$ In addition 5 complaints were withdrawn.
Reference data 33
Complaints by broad ethnic origin

|  | BME <br> employees | White <br> employees | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Informal resolution |  | 1 | 1 |
| Not upheld | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Upheld | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Partially upheld | 4 |  | 4 |
| In progress | 2 |  | 2 |
| Total $^{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ |

${ }^{1}$ In addition 5 complaints were withdrawn.

## Section 10 - Recruitment

49. The following looks at recruitment projects over the year 2016-17. A recruitment project is an advertised job(s) with a defined closing date. More than one media (advertisements) may be used in each project. The following looks at 365 recruitment projects; of these

- There were 26 , each with 50 or more applicants.
- There were 157 each with 5 or less applicants.

50. Some jobs have been the subject of more than one recruitment project. For example, Advanced Practitioner appears several times, each project is counted separately. Only those projects that attracted an applicant response are shown. Applicants who withdrew from the process are excluded completely from the details below.
51. Overall there were 5,992 people who pursued an application.
52. Looking at gender and disability the success of people at the hired stage of the recruitment process are in line with the percentages of people who applied, i.e. female / male, not disabled / disabled, (Reference data 34 \& 35).

## Reference data 34

## Gender

Female applicants, 3,228; Male applicants, 2,530; Not stated, 234

| Status | Female | Male | Not stated | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hired | $50 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Shortlisted | $54 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Applicants | $54 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

* Hired here means an offer of appointment, not that the person has yet started work

Reference data 35
Disability
Disabled applicants, 348; not disabled applicants, 5,417; Not stated, 227.

| Status | Disabled | Not <br> Disabled | Not <br> stated | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hired | $6 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Shortlisted | $6 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Applicants | $6 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

* Hired here means an offer of appointment, not that the person has yet started work

53. When looking at broad ethnic origin, (Reference data 36,) the significant outcomes to note are -

- The percentage of applicants from BME communities $61 \%$ ( 3,632 people).
- The percentage of hires from BME communities 42\%, (205 people).
(Reference data 36).

Reference data 36

## Broad Ethnic Origin

BME applicants, 3,632; White applicants, 2,137; Not stated, 223.

|  | BME | White | Not <br> stated | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hired | $42 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Shortlisted | $55 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Applicants | $61 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

* Hired here means an offer of appointment, not that the person has yet started work


## Section 11 - Agency Workers

54. Agency workers are not employees of the Council. But are an important resource in the delivery of the council's services. On the first working Monday of each month a snapshot is compiled of agency workers in use.
55. Monitors over the financial year 2016-17 show that numbers ranged from 394 to 526. (Reference data 37)

Reference data 37
Agency Workers - numbers via monthly snapshot 2016-17 ${ }^{1}$

|  | No. <br> Headcount |
| :--- | :---: |
| April 16 | 394 |
| May 16 | 438 |
| June 16 | 435 |
| July 16 | 435 |
| August 16 | 413 |
| September 16 | 441 |
| October 16 | 478 |
| November 16 | 518 |
| December 16 | 526 |
| January 17 | 457 |
| February 17 | 480 |
| March 17 | 489 |

${ }^{1}$ The numbers of agency workers in use as at the monitoring date, i.e. first working Monday of each month.
54. The average numbers in use over the year was 458 workers. This is higher than last year with 381 the previous year.

## Information on the community in Southwark \& other London Boroughs

Southwark's workforce is drawn from across London \& the South-east of England approximately $27 \%^{1}$ of our staff were Southwark residents. It is however interesting to look at how the profile of the workforce compares to the Southwark community and where possible across London.
${ }^{(1}$ Borough residency is not an indicator on HR records and this figure has been compiled from home address/ post code information).

This Section provides some basic information about the Borough drawn from the 2011 census.

It also includes key data comparing the council's workforce with other London boroughs, albeit this must viewed with caution. Increasingly the services provided will differ between boroughs. This will, for example, impact on the gender profile where particular services remain male or female dominated. Service type and organisation size is also known to affect how organisations perform, for example sickness absence tends to be higher in large multi functional organisations.

Some key data is as follows.

## Census data - Southwark borough

All data drawn from ONS census 2011 - key statistics

1. Population figures, gender \& economically active comparisons

|  | Southwark <br> borough <br> information | England <br> Country |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2011 Population: All Usual Residents | 288,283 | $53,012,456$ |
|  |  |  |
| 2011 Population: Males | 142618 | 26069148 |
|  | $49.5 \%$ | $49.2 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| 2011 Population: Females | 145665 | 26943308 |
|  | $50.5 \%$ | $50.8 \%$ |
|  | $42 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Economically Active; Employee; Full-Time | $9.9 \%$ | $13.7 \%$ |
| Economically Active; Employee; Part-Time | $10.0 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ |
| Economically Active; Self-Employed | $6.0 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |
| Economically Active; Unemployed | $10.2 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ |
| People aged 16 and over with 5 or more GCSEs grade A- <br> C, or equivalent | $16.3 \%$ | $22.5 \%$ |
| People aged 16 and over with no formal qualifications |  |  |

2. Occupations of all people in employment, March 2011

|  | Southwark | England |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Managers, directors and senior officials | $11 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Professional occupations | $26 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Associate professional and technical occupations | $17 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Administrative and secretarial occupations | $10 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Skilled trades occupations | $7 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Caring, leisure and other service occupations | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Sales and customer service occupations | $7 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Process, plant and machine operatives | $3 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Elementary occupations | $12 \%$ | $11 \%$ |

## 3. Ethnic Origin

|  | Southwark Borough (Numbers) | (\%s) | London - <br> Region <br> (\%s) | England <br> Country <br> (\%s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Usual Residents | 288283 |  |  |  |
| White; English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British | 114534 | 39.7\% | 45\% | 79.8\% |
| White; Irish | 6222 | 2.2\% | 2\% | 1.0\% |
| White; Gypsy or Irish Traveller | 263 | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0.1\% |
| White; Other White | 35330 | 12.3\% | 13\% | 4.6\% |
| White |  | 54.2\% | 59.8\% | 85.4\% |
| Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups; White and Black Caribbean | 5677 | 2.0\% | 1\% | 0.8\% |
| Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups; White and Black African | 3687 | 1.3\% | 1\% | 0.3\% |
| Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups; White and Asian | 3003 | 1.0\% | 1\% | 0.6\% |
| Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups; Other Mixed | 5411 | 1.9\% | 1\% | 0.5\% |
| Mixed |  | 6.2\% | 5.0\% | 2.3\% |
| Asian/Asian British; Indian | 5819 | 2.0\% | 7\% | 2.6\% |
| Asian/Asian British; Pakistani | 1623 | 0.6\% | 3\% | 2.1\% |
| Asian/Asian British; Bangladeshi | 3912 | 1.4\% | 3\% | 0.8\% |
| Asian/Asian British; Chinese | 8074 | 2.8\% | 2\% | 0.7\% |
| Asian/Asian British; Other Asian | 7764 | 2.7\% | 5\% | 1.5\% |
| Asian |  | 9.4\% | 18.5\% | 7.8\% |
| Black/African/Caribbean/Black British; African | 47413 | 16.4\% | 7\% | 1.8\% |
| Black/African/Caribbean/Black British; Caribbean | 17974 | 6.2\% | 4\% | 1.1\% |
| Black/African/Caribbean/Black British; Other Black | 12124 | 4.2\% | 2\% | 0.5\% |
| Black |  | 26.9\% | 13.3\% | 3.5\% |
| Other Ethnic Group; Arab | 2440 | 0.8\% | 1\% | 0.4\% |
| Other Ethnic Group; Any Other Ethnic Group | 7013 | 2.4\% | 2\% | 0.6\% |
| Other |  | 3.3\% | 3\% | 1.0\% |
| Totals |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

## Other Boroughs

The following information relates to year 2016/17. The data that is shown is based on no fewer than submissions from 33 London boroughs although not every borough will have submitted data for every area.

In considering this information -

- The London mean (average) data is shown.
- It must be re-emphasised that there are significant differences in the organisations presenting data, e.g. Newham has around 4,670 directly employed staff (headcount), Sutton 1,100 directly employed staff (headcount).
- Organisations collect and define data in different ways, e.g. some councils extrapolate from survey information others such as Southwark rely on actual declarations.
- Only data which links to Southwark's statistics shown in the body of this report is shown.

1. Headcount of employees

- 2,666 staff


## 2. Average age

- 45.77 years. Across London boroughs those in $16-24$ years age band are $3.26 \%$ of the workforce and those aged 65 and older are $3.93 \%$. (Note there are significant variations in data submitted by boroughs in response to this question, one borough's return being 1.07\%, another 8.29\% and 1.50\% $32.49 \%$ respectively - which is out of step with all other responses)


## 3. Gender profile

- Male 42\%
- Female 58\%


## 4. Disabled staff

- $5.66 \%$ of the workforce


## 5. Broad Ethnic Origin

Not known - 11.44\% of remainder

| Broad Ethnic Origin | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Asian (inc Chinese) | $11.78 \%$ |
| Black | $21.92 \%$ |
| Mixed | $3.33 \%$ |
| White | $61.10 \%$ |
| Other | $1.86 \%$ |

## 6. Length of Service

| Range | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Less than a year | $10.47 \%$ |
| $1-<2$ years | $8.85 \%$ |
| $2-<3$ years | $7.61 \%$ |
| $3-<5$ years | $11.24 \%$ |
| $5-<10$ years | $18.98 \%$ |
| $10-<15$ years | $18.77 \%$ |
| $15-<20$ years | $10.04 \%$ |
| 20 years \& above | $13.99 \%$ |

## 7. Sickness Absences

- Average sickness days per person 7.81 days


## 8. Turnover

- All $18.94 \%$
- Resignations 8.8\%\%
- Leavers with less than 1 years service $12.41 \%$


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Includes staff on apprentice contracts

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ In addition 6 stage 1 registered complaints were withdrawn and 1 stage 1 complaint was resolved through mediation

