## 1. Introduction

This report sets out the key information relating to the work force at Maidstone Borough Council. Where the data suggests that further investigation is required this is noted. Where it is possible to compare the data in a meaningful way to other statistics this has been undertaken to identify whether we are representative of the local area. This information is monitored actively by the Corporate Management Team.

Human Resource is part of the CIPRA benchmarking club and where appropriate references to this data have been made. It should be noted that when benchmarking Maidstone has been compare to other district councils a full list of district council within the benchmarking club is available from HR.

## 2. Work force analysis

Age


The distribution of age across the authority has fluctuated slightly in the past three years. The workforce has shrunk by $25 \%$ since 2008.

In the last three years the percentage of the workforce aged 16-20 has doubled and the percentage of those aged over 71 has been reduced by half.

There have also been an $8 \%$ increase of

| Age <br> Band | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> ONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16-20$ | $3.60 \%$ | $1.48 \%$ | $1.66 \%$ | $7.20 \%$ |
| $21-30$ | $15.83 \%$ | $16.56 \%$ | $18.31 \%$ | $14.74 \%$ |
| $31-40$ | $20.62 \%$ | $21.64 \%$ | $19.82 \%$ | $19.03 \%$ |
| $41-50$ | $30.46 \%$ | $23.28 \%$ | $22.69 \%$ | $17.26 \%$ |
| $51-60$ | $20.38 \%$ | $24.59 \%$ | $24.21 \%$ | $17.27 \%$ |
| $61-65$ | $5.52 \%$ | $9.02 \%$ | $9.08 \%$ | $6.39 \%$ |
| $66-70$ | $3.12 \%$ | $2.30 \%$ | $3.18 \%$ | $5.34 \%$ |
| $71+$ | $0.48 \%$ | $1.15 \%$ | $1.06 \%$ | $12.78 \%$ | workers in the age band 41-50 and a slight increase in those aged 31-40. However, this group does not compare to local picture $13 \%$ more people in this age group than there are in the local community. Both the group aged 21-30 and 31-40 are representative of the local population. Although community figures illustrate higher numbers of 16-25 and over 70's as they include people who are in education and who are retired. The figures suggest more action should be taken to attract younger workers as they are under represented in the work force.

## Disability



The above data represents individuals who consider themselves to be disabled under the definition of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 2005, which is the test applied in law to disability discrimination. The latest figures ${ }^{1}$ from the Department of work and Pensions show that 4\% of the working

|  | No. of <br> workers |
| :--- | ---: |
| Disabled | 25 |
| Not disabled | 545 | age population are claiming disability benefits, which suggests that the council does match the local population. The CIPFA average for districts is $5.6 \%$ and the district with the highest reporting of DDA in the comparator group is Braintree with $10 \%$ and the lowest is Tamworth with $1.8 \%$.

Non-declaration by applicants and employees of a disability is common, even though they are encouraged to declare. Nationally, it has been observed that there remains a fear among many that declaration will result in discrimination in employment. Since the introduction of the ITrent Self Service HR System employees have been encourage to update their details when a lifestyle change occurs and it is accepted that disability is an area which can change during service. It is thought that disability is being under reported in the organisation, action will therefore continue to be taken to encourage reporting.

## Ethnicity



Local Authorities have a duty under the Equality Act 2010 to make appropriate arrangements to ensure their various functions are carried out with due regard to the need to eliminate

[^0]unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between people of different racial groups.

The data shows that $4.32 \%$ of employees come from a BME (Black or Minority Ethnic) group at $31^{\text {st }}$ April 2011 this is an increase of $0.10 \%$ from 2010. The result for 2011 compares favourably with the percentage of economically active people in Maidstone who are from black or minority ethnic communities which is $2.7 \%{ }^{2}$.

| Ethnic <br> origin | No. of <br> workers | \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Asian: Other | 2 | $0.38 \%$ |
| Asian: <br> Chinese | 1 | $0.19 \%$ |
| Asian: Indian | 5 | $0.94 \%$ |
| Asian: <br> Pakistani | 3 | $0.56 \%$ |
| Black: African | 5 | $0.94 \%$ |
| Black: <br> Caribbean | 3 | $0.56 \%$ |
| Mixed: Other | 1 | $0.19 \%$ |
| Mixed: White <br> \& Asian | 1 | $0.19 \%$ |
| Mixed: White <br> \& Black <br> Caribbean | 1 | $0.19 \%$ |
| White: Other | 10 | $1.88 \%$ |
| White: UK | 496 | $93.41 \%$ |
| White: Irish | 3 | $0.56 \%$ |

Based on the 2001 census data, the workforce does not reflect the ethnic profile of Maidstone, with employees from BME communities over represented, although the census data is widely accepted as being out of date and does not, therefore, provide an accurate picture of the County profile today; it is however, the most readily available dataset. A more up-to-date figure will not be available until the Office of National Statistics releases Census 2011 data (normally two years after the census takes place), as the mid-year estimates do not include a figure for the percentage of working-age adults.

The mid-year population estimates suggest that the census data is out of date as the latest available data (2009) shows that Maidstone has a BME population of $6.7 \%$ however it should be noted that this figure covers all ages ranges and not just those classed as economically active ( 16 to 65 ).
$6.7 \%$ of the workforce did not give their ethnicity.

## Gender

The Council has a requirement to report on Gender under the Equality Act 2010 which created a public sector duty to have due regard to eliminating unlawful discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity between men and women.

|  | No. of <br> workers |
| :--- | ---: |
| Male | 276 |
| Female | 294 |

[^1]

The information from the 2010 mid-year population estimates show that in the local area the gender split for economically active people is $50.10 \%$ males and $49.90 \%$ females. The data above compares favourably with the local picture and historic trends within the public sector which traditionally attracting

| Gender | Full- <br> time | Part- <br> time |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Males | 233 | 18 |
| Females | 158 | 99 | more female employees.

Looking at the age spread across the grades, in grades 4 to 8 women are more represented than men up to as much as $156 \%$ (Grade 6). However, at grades 10 to 12 there are up to $60 \%$ less women than men.

Overall $23 \%$ of the workforce works part-time this is slightly higher than the district average of $22.4 \%$. When this is broken down into men and women, $39 \%$ of all women in the workforce work part-time compared to just 7\% of men.
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## Sexual Orientation \& Religion

The majority of employees (77.19\%) did not give details of their sexual orientation or religion, this is not surprising as it is a more recently protected characteristic and therefore data has not been gathered over the same time period from new applicants.

| Sexual <br> orientation | No. of <br> workers |
| :--- | ---: |
| Heterosexual/ <br> Straight | 126 |
| Gay/Lesbian | 3 |
| Bisexual | 1 |
| Not given | 440 |

In the case of sexual orientation there is no data currently available to show if the workforce is representive of the borough as it was only in the 2011 cenus that this question was first introduced, employees will be encouraged to up-date their information on this issue.

Of those who did give details of their religion the latest data for comparrision is the 2001 census data where the question on religion was asked for the first time and was optional. Therefore it should be noted that $7.5 \%$ of residents did not respond to this question in the census, compared to $77.19 \%$ of the workforce where religion was not given.

Where details of religion have been given the data shows that although both Buddhism and Judaism account for $0.2 \%$ of the population in the local area howver no-one in the workforce who has given details of their religion has reported themselves as Jewish or Buddhist. As above it is suggested that employees are encouraged to update this information before the next Annual Workforce Monitoring Report.

It should be noted that in Maidstone's local area a higher proportion of residents say they are Christian or 'all other religions' than the average for England and Wales and that there is higher reporting of

| Religion | No. of <br> workers |
| :--- | ---: |
| Christian | 91 |
| Hindu | 2 |
| Muslim | 3 |
| No |  |
| religion | 29 |
| Other | 3 |
| Sikh | 2 |
| Not given | 440 | Christians, Hindus and 'all other religion' than the Kent average.



## Leavers

The workforce has reduced by 7\% in the year ending March 2011.
The percentage of staff turnover for 2011 was $10 \%$ for $2010 / 11$ this is higher than the average $8 \%$ within the benchmarking group. However, the authority was reorganised during 2010 and some of this work has continued into 2011/12. Out of the comparator group Lincoln had the

| Gender | No. of <br> Leavers |
| :--- | ---: |
| Female | 93 |
| Male | 51 | highest turnover at $50 \%$.

During 2010/11 a total of 144 people left the authority, $64.58 \%$ of leavers were women and $36.8 \%$ were between $21-30$ years old.


| Ethnic Origin | No. of <br> Leavers |
| :--- | ---: |
| Not given | 27 |
| Asian:Indian | 2 |
| Black:African | 1 |
| Black:Caribbean | 1 |
| White:Other | 4 |
| White:UK | 109 |


| Reason for <br> Leaving | No. of <br> Leavers |
| :--- | :---: |
| Career <br> Progression | 2 |
| Died in Service | 4 |
| Dismissal | 4 |
| End of Fixed <br> Term Contract | 13 |
| End of Seasonal <br> Work | 1 |
| End of Temp <br> Contract | 51 |
| Personal <br> Reasons | 1 |


|  | No. of <br> Leaver <br> s |
| :--- | ---: |
| Disabled | 6 |
| Not Disabled | 138 |


| Age <br> Band | No. of <br> Leaver <br> s | \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $16-$ <br> 20 | 17 | $11.8 \%$ |
| $21-$ | 53 | $36.8 \%$ |
| 30 | 17 | $11.8 \%$ |
| $31-$ |  |  |
| 40 | 18 | $12.5 \%$ |
| $41-$ <br> 50 | 21 | $14.6 \%$ |
| $51-$ |  |  |
| 60 | 11 | $7.64 \%$ |
| $61-$ <br> 65 | 17 | $3.47 \%$ |
| $66-$ | 5 | $1.38 \%$ |
| 70 | 2 |  |


| Redundancy | 8 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Resignation | 39 |
| Early Retirement | 1 |
| Retirement - <br> Flexible | 3 |
| Retirement | 12 |
| Retirement - <br> Redundancy | 5 |

## Disciplinary \& Grievance Cases

There were three instances where disciplinary action was taken.

| Stage | Number <br> of <br> cases | Gender | Age <br> band | Ethnic <br> Origin | Disability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st Level <br> Warning | 1 | Female | $51-60$ | White: UK |  |
| 2nd Level <br> Warning | 1 | Male | $31-40$ | White: UK |  |
| Final Warning | 1 | Male | $51-60$ | White: UK |  |

## Grievance Cases

There were no grievances raised during this period.

## Return to work rates

Number of employees whose maternity leave ended in period 1st April 2010 to 31st March 2011
Number of employees who returned to work after maternity leave
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## 3. Equal Pay Analysis

The Council conducts an equal pay analysis annually to check that there are no imbalances within pay grades.

| Grade | Grade <br> average | No. Grade <br> equality <br> report |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $£ 13,509.93$ | 10.216 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $£ 14,316.00$ | 4.00 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $£ 15,275.00$ | 25.19 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $£ 15,976.87$ | 38.92 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $£ 17,448.18$ | 52.03 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | $£ 19,473.75$ | 43.16 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | $£ 22,195.89$ | 67.90 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | $£ 24,441.53$ | 38.84 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | $£ 27,378.46$ | 33.04 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $£ 31,174.73$ | 25.27 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $£ 34,449.35$ | 35.85 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $£ 39,288.86$ | 21.11 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $£ 45,219.13$ | 8.00 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $£ 52,961.67$ | 9.00 |
| Head of <br> Service $\mathbf{2}$ | $£ 63,454.17$ | 6.00 |
| Head of <br> Service 1 | $£ 76,718.00$ | 3.08 |
| Director | $£ 94,419.00$ | 2.00 |
| Chief <br> Executive | $£ 105,766.00$ | 1.00 |
|  |  |  |


| White Groups <br> Average | BME groups <br> Average | Percentage <br> Difference | Number <br> FTE not <br> known |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $£ 13,509.93$ | N/A | N/A | 1.00 |
| $£ 14,316.00$ | N/A | N/A | 0.00 |
| $£ 15,266.46$ | N/A | N/A | 0.00 |
| $£ 16,022.62$ | $£ 16,060.00$ | $-\mathbf{- 0 . 2 3 \%}$ | 0.50 |
| $£ 17,472.13$ | $£ 17,113.00$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 6 \%}$ | 0.00 |
| $£ 19,474.67$ | $£ 19,451.00$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 2 \%}$ | 0.00 |
| $£ 22,169.60$ | $£ 22,656.00$ | -2.19\% | 1.00 |
| $£ 24,440.34$ | $£ 24,631.00$ | -0.78\% | 0.00 |
| $£ 27,345.78$ | $£ 27,727.00$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 3 9 \%}$ | 0.00 |
| $£ 31,155.20$ | N/A | N/A | 1.00 |
| $£ 34,431.39$ | $£ 35,096.00$ | -1.93\% | 0.00 |
| $£ 39,288.86$ | N/A | N/A | 0.00 |
| $£ 45,154.00$ | $£ 45,675.00$ | -1.15\% | 0.00 |
| $£ 52,961.67$ | N/A | N/A | 0.00 |
| $£ 63,454.17$ | N/A | N/A | 0.00 |
| $£ 76,718.33$ | N/A | N/A | 0.00 |
| $£ 94,419.00$ | $£ 94,419.00$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | 0.00 |
| $£ 105,766.00$ | N/A | N/A | 0.00 |

In general equal pay analysis would focus on the differences between males and females as this is where there is a legislative requirement for equality. This analysis is also extended here to disability and ethnicity.

The equal pay analysis will generally focus on areas where there is a difference of more than $5 \%$ and in those cases will turn attention to the 'genuine material factor reasons that might explain the difference. As can be seen from the table above there are no percentage differences above a magnitude of $5 \%$ and indeed the differences are considerably smaller than this.

The gender pay difference is set out below and in only two areas are there differences greater than $5 \%$. At grade 14 there is a difference between males and females which is caused by the incremental points on the scale and the appointment rules in place. Newly appointed
employees are expected to be appointed at the lowest point of the grade and move up each year provided there is satisfactory performance, the difference in the males and females at grade 14 reflect the fact that the females are more recently appointed. At the Head of Service 1 grade the difference reflects the fact that the two males in the group are holding positions of additional responsibility and therefore have access to two additional incremental points.
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Equal Pay Analysis 2010/11 - Gender and Disability

| Grade | Scale | Grade <br> average | Number <br> FTE in <br> grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ |  | $£ 13,509.93$ | 10.216 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ |  | $£ 14,316.00$ | 4.00 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ |  | $£ 15,275.00$ | 25.19 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ |  | $£ 15,976.87$ | 38.92 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ |  | $£ 17,448.18$ | 52.03 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ |  | $£ 19,473.75$ | 43.16 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ |  | $£ 22,195.89$ | 67.90 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ |  | $£ 24,441.53$ | 38.84 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ |  | $£ 27,378.46$ | 33.04 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ |  | $£ 31,174.73$ | 25.27 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ |  | $£ 34,449.35$ | 35.85 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ |  | $£ 39,288.86$ | 21.11 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ |  | $£ 45,219.13$ | 8.00 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ |  | $£ 52,961.67$ | 9.00 |
| Head of <br> Service <br> $\mathbf{2}$ |  | $£ 63,454.17$ | 6.00 |
| Head of <br> Service $\mathbf{1}$ |  | $£ 76,718.00$ | 3.08 |
| Director |  | $£ 94,419.00$ | 2.00 |
| Chief <br> Executive |  | $£ 105,766.00$ | 1.00 |


| Female | Male | Percentage <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $£ 13,459.17$ | $£ 13,548.00$ | $-\mathbf{- 0 . 6 6 \%}$ |
| $£ 14,316.00$ | $£ 14,316.00$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |
| $£ 15,501.00$ | $£ 15,235.83$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7 1 \%}$ |
| $£ 15,939.97$ | $£ 16,059.88$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 7 5 \%}$ |
| $£ 17,388.38$ | $£ 17,526.38$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 7 9 \%}$ |
| $£ 19,461.35$ | $£ 19,506.50$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 2 3 \%}$ |
| $£ 22,217.14$ | $£ 22,154.25$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 8 \%}$ |
| $£ 24,434.10$ | $£ 24,463.80$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 1 2 \%}$ |
| $£ 27,074.65$ | $£ 27,665.39$ | $\mathbf{- 2 . 1 8 \%}$ |
| $£ 31,119.00$ | $£ 31,195.25$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 2 5 \%}$ |
| $£ 33,889.64$ | $£ 34,790.04$ | $\mathbf{- 2 . 6 6 \%}$ |
| $£ 39,650.00$ | $£ 39,153.44$ | $\mathbf{1 . 2 5 \%}$ |
| $£ 44,763.25$ | $£ 45,675.00$ | $\mathbf{- 2 . 0 4 \%}$ |
| $£ 49,611.00$ | $£ 53,919.00$ | $-8.68 \%$ |
| $£ 63,017.00$ | $£ 63,541.60$ | -0.83\% |
| $£ 74,091.00$ | $£ 78,032.00$ | -5.32\% |
| $£ 94,419.00$ | $£ 94,419.00$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |
| $£ 105,766.00$ | N/A | N/A |


| Disabled | Not Disabled | Percentage <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $£ 13,548.00$ | $£ 13,507.00$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 0 \%}$ |
| N/A | $£ 14,316.00$ | N/A |
| $£ 15,500.00$ | $£ 15,266.46$ | $1.51 \%$ |
| $£ 15,734.67$ | $£ 15,991.69$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 6 3 \%}$ |
| $£ 17,633.00$ | $£ 17,434.98$ | $1.12 \%$ |
| $£ 19,840.00$ | $£ 19,458.80$ | $1.92 \%$ |
| $£ 22,656.00$ | $£ 22,176.45$ | $\mathbf{2 . 1 2 \%}$ |
| $£ 24,965.00$ | $£ 24,441.53$ | $\mathbf{2 . 1 0 \%}$ |
| $£ 27,727.00$ | $£ 27,368.21$ | $1.29 \%$ |
| $£ 31,663.00$ | $£ 31,134.04$ | $1.67 \%$ |
| $£ 35,096.00$ | $£ 34,412.40$ | $1.95 \%$ |
| $£ 39,650.00$ | $£ 39,252.75$ | $1.00 \%$ |
| N/A | $£ 45,219.13$ | N/A |
| N/A | $£ 52,961.67$ | N/A |
| N/A | $£ 63,454.17$ | N/A |
| $£ 74,091.00$ | $£ 78,032.00$ | N/A |
| N/A | $£ 94,419.00$ | N/A |
| N/A | $£ 105,766.00$ | N/A |
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There are a higher percentage of males in both the TUPE transfer group, which reflects the largely male manual group of workers, but also in the most senior grades. With a restricted level of recruitment and a reducing headcount it is difficult to quickly address this situation but every effort is made to encourage applicants from under represented groups when recruitment does take place.

## 4. Recruitment Analysis

Since September 2010 the council has used an electronic application process through the web site enable a greater level of data analysis than was previously possible. This means that it is difficult to draw clear comparisons with previous data which was manually collated. The first year of information gathering will give good baseline data.

The recruitment activity at the Council has diminished in the last two or three years during a period when turnover has been used to freeze posts and reduce costs. Of the recruitment that has taken place $37 \%$ of the posts have been for the Hotfoot summer play schemes and these are predominantly for short term play workers during the Easter and Summer school holidays. This is felt to have had an impact on the figures and skewed the usual recruitment profile. Of the 83 Hotfoot applicants only one was received from a candidate from a mixed ethnic origin and none from BME candidates. This indicates that action needs to be taken to attract candidates from a wider ethnic group than currently.

The age analysis suggests that we are positively recruiting younger candidates with an increase in the percentage of those being offered positions compared to those applying, however this is also likely to be skewed due to the age profile of the Hotfoot candidates and this being such a large part of the recruited pool.

An examination of the applications by post suggest that the highest number of applications from those in none white groups are received in the field of customers services and consideration will be given to the profile of the recruitment panel in the future.

In relation to gender it appears that a higher percentage of males are short listed but then fail to succeed to be offered a position, this pattern is even more marked if Hotfoot positions are excluded from the analysis when the percentage of male applicants rises to $34 \%$ whereas the percentage of those offered a position is just $6 \%$ male. This is not representative of the work force profile but may reflect the type of posts that have been recruited this year; it will need to be monitored closely.

| Gender | Applicant <br> Total | Percentage | Shortlisted <br> Total | Percentage | Offer <br> Total | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 458 | $66.18 \%$ | 146 | $61.09 \%$ | 73 | $77.66 \%$ |
| Male | 225 | $32.51 \%$ | 88 | $36.82 \%$ | 20 | $21.28 \%$ |
| Unspecified | 9 | $1.30 \%$ | 5 | $2.09 \%$ | 1 | $1.06 \%$ |
| Total | 692 |  | 239 |  | 94 |  |


| Age | Applicant <br> Total | Percentage | Shortlisted <br> Total | Percentage | Offer <br> Total | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 and under | 25 | $3.61 \%$ | 9 | $3.77 \%$ | 5 | $5.32 \%$ |
| $18-25$ | 280 | $40.46 \%$ | 72 | $30.13 \%$ | 44 | $46.81 \%$ |
| $26-35$ | 139 | $20.09 \%$ | 45 | $18.83 \%$ | 14 | $14.89 \%$ |
| $36-45$ | 87 | $12.57 \%$ | 40 | $16.74 \%$ | 15 | $15.96 \%$ |
| $46-55$ | 97 | $14.02 \%$ | 38 | $15.90 \%$ | 10 | $10.64 \%$ |
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| $56-65$ | 41 | $5.92 \%$ | 26 | $10.88 \%$ | 4 | $4.26 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 65 Plus | 3 | $0.43 \%$ | 2 | $0.84 \%$ |  |  |
| Age Not Revealed | 20 | $2.89 \%$ | 7 | $2.93 \%$ | 2 | $2.13 \%$ |
| Total | 692 |  | 239 |  | 94 |  |


| Ethnicity | Applicant <br> Total | Percentage | Shortlisted <br> Total | Percentage | Offer <br> Total | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 603 | $87.14 \%$ | 212 | $88.70 \%$ | 92 | $97.87 \%$ |
| Mixed | 10 | $1.45 \%$ | 6 | $2.51 \%$ |  | $0.00 \%$ |
| Asian or Asian British | 35 | $5.06 \%$ | 10 | $4.18 \%$ | 1 | $1.06 \%$ |
| Black or Black British | 29 | $4.19 \%$ | 7 | $2.93 \%$ |  |  |
| Chinese | 3 | $0.43 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Gypsy | 3 | $0.43 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Other Ethnic Groups | 2 | $0.29 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Ethnic Group Not <br> Declared | 7 | $1.01 \%$ | 4 | $1.67 \%$ | 1 | $1.06 \%$ |
| Total | 692 |  | 239 |  | 94 |  |
|  | Applicant | Percentage | Shortlisted <br> Total | Percentage | Offer <br> Total | Percentage |
| Disability | 47 | $6.79 \%$ | 14 | $5.86 \%$ | 7 | $7.45 \%$ |
| Yes | 645 | $93.21 \%$ | 225 | $94.14 \%$ | 87 | $92.55 \%$ |
| No | 692 |  | 239 |  | 94 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Sexual Orientation | Applicant <br> Total | Percentage | Shortlisted <br> Total | Percentage | Offer <br> Total | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bisexual | 3 | $0.43 \%$ | 2 | $0.84 \%$ | 1 | $1.06 \%$ |
| Gay/Lesbian | 21 | $3.03 \%$ | 9 | $3.77 \%$ | 3 | $3.19 \%$ |
| Hetrosexual | 597 | $86.27 \%$ | 193 | $80.75 \%$ | 77 | $81.91 \%$ |
| Not Specified | 71 | $10.26 \%$ | 35 | $14.64 \%$ | 13 | $13.83 \%$ |
| Total | 692 |  | 239 |  | 94 |  |


| Religion | Applicant <br> Total | Percentage | Shortlisted <br> Total | Percentage | Offer <br> Total | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Christian | 319 | $46.10 \%$ | 110 | $46.03 \%$ | 49 | $52.13 \%$ |
| Buddhist | 2 | $0.29 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hindu | 9 | $1.30 \%$ | 4 | $1.67 \%$ |  |  |
| Jewish | 2 | $0.29 \%$ | 1 | $0.42 \%$ |  |  |
| Muslim | 10 | $1.45 \%$ | 3 | $1.26 \%$ |  |  |
| Sikh | 7 | $1.01 \%$ | 1 | $0.42 \%$ |  |  |
| No Religion | 231 | $33.38 \%$ | 74 | $30.96 \%$ | 24 | $25.53 \%$ |
| Other | 28 | $4.05 \%$ | 6 | $2.51 \%$ | 4 | $4.26 \%$ |
| Not Specified | 84 | $12.14 \%$ | 40 | $16.74 \%$ | 17 | $18.09 \%$ |
| Total | 692 |  | 239 |  | 94 |  |
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| Marital Status | Applicant <br> Total | Percentage | Shortlisted <br> Total | Percentage | Offer <br> Total | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single (including <br> engaged) | 386 | $55.78 \%$ | 116 | $48.54 \%$ | 59 | $62.77 \%$ |
| Married | 151 | $21.82 \%$ | 72 | $30.13 \%$ | 18 | $19.15 \%$ |
| Civil Partnership | 6 | $0.87 \%$ | 2 | $0.84 \%$ |  |  |
| Seperated/Divorced | 53 | $7.66 \%$ | 20 | $8.37 \%$ | 7 | $7.45 \%$ |
| Partner | 64 | $9.25 \%$ | 15 | $6.28 \%$ | 6 | $6.38 \%$ |
| Widow(ed) | 3 | $0.43 \%$ | 1 | $0.42 \%$ |  |  |
| Not specified | 29 | $4.19 \%$ | 13 | $5.44 \%$ | 4 | $4.26 \%$ |
| Total | 692 |  | 239 |  | 94 |  |
| S. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

5. Conclusion and Action Plan

The work force information indicates that overall the council is matching the local community in relation to most areas of analysis.

The particular areas of action that are indicated in the report are as follows:

| Analysis Indicator | Area of Action / Timescale <br> Outcome | Responsibility |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unknown data in <br> relation to more <br> recent protected <br> characteristics | Employees <br> encouraged to up- <br> date information on <br> HR system | Annually in March | Head of HR |
| Employees under 25 <br> years of age under <br> represented in the <br> work force | Suitable vacancies <br> advertised in local <br> schools | As vacancies arise | HR Manager |
| Employees under 25 <br> years of age under <br> represented in the <br> work force | Apprenticeship <br> programme | On-going |  |
| Low number of <br> applications from BME <br> candidates on Hotfoot <br> Scheme | Consider <br> advertisement of <br> these posts and <br> target higher ethnic <br> areas | March 2012 onwards | HR Manager |
| Low success rate of <br> BME applicants for <br> customer service <br> roles | Examine the activities <br> within <br> assessment centre to <br> identify if there are <br> any areas of bias | As vacancies occur | HR Manager |
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