



Department  
for Work &  
Pensions

# Department for Work and Pensions Equality Information

Report under the Public Sector Equality Duty

July 2013

# Contents

- List of tables ..... 4
  - Employment ..... 4
  - Poverty and social mobility ..... 4
  - Pensions..... 4
  - Fraud and error ..... 4
  - Operational working of the Department ..... 5
  - Additional customer data ..... 5
  - DWP workforce data..... 5
  
- Introduction..... 6
  - The legal requirements..... 6
  - Our overall approach ..... 7
    - Section One: our approach to providing information about our policies, practices and services ..... 7
    - Section Two: our approach to providing information relating to our employees 8
    - Our approach to benchmarking as an employer ..... 9
    - Our approach to engaging with our employees ..... 9
    - Our approach to engaging with our service users ..... 10
    - Our approach to paying due regard..... 10
    - Our approach to developing equality objectives ..... 11
    - Alternative formats..... 11
    - Feedback..... 11
  
- Section 1: Information about our policies and services ..... 12
  - Data sources and availability ..... 12
  - Employment related impact indicators..... 16
    - 1. Rates of people moving from out of work benefits into employment..... 16
    - 2. Numbers on key out of work benefits ..... 20
    - 3. Proportion of children living in workless households ..... 25
    - 4. Young people not in employment or full-time education ..... 30
    - 5. Gap between the employment rates for disabled people and the overall population..... 34
    - 6. Average age people stop working<sup>2</sup> ..... 38
  - Poverty and social mobility related impact indicators ..... 42
    - 7. Rate of disability poverty ..... 42
    - 8. Rate of pensioner poverty ..... 48
    - 9. Social mobility in adulthood ..... 53

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Pensions-related impact indicators.....                                 | 56  |
| 10. Number of employees in a pension scheme sponsored by their employer | 56  |
| Operational working of the Department related impact indicators .....   | 59  |
| 11. Monetary value of fraud and error in the benefit system.....        | 59  |
| 12. Public opinion of DWP service levels .....                          | 69  |
| 13. Additional customer data .....                                      | 75  |
| Section 2: Information about our employees .....                        | 78  |
| 14. The DWP workforce .....   | 78  |
| 15. Disciplinary procedures .....                                       | 88  |
| 16. Exits.....  | 91  |
| 17. Working Patterns .....  | 98  |
| 18. Grievances .....  | 101 |
| 19. Performance markings .....  | 104 |
| 20. Promotion .....   | 108 |
| 21. Recruitment Process .....   | 111 |
| 22. Pay Gap .....   | 115 |
| 23. Training Data .....   | 120 |
| 24. Maternity data.....   | 123 |
| 25. Links to additional information .....                               | 125 |

# List of tables

## Employment

Table 1.1-1.4: Number and rates of people moving from out-of-work benefits by age and gender.

Table 2.1-2.3: Number of people on key out-of-work benefits by age, ethnicity and gender.

Table 3.1-3.3: Percentage of children in each economic activity status of household category by age, gender, and ethnic origin of child.

Table 4.1-4.4: Percentage of young people not in full-time education who are workless by disability, ethnicity, religion and gender.

Table 5.1-5.4: Gap between employment rates for disabled people and the overall population by age, ethnicity, gender and religion.

Table 6.1-6.3: Average age of withdrawal from the labour market by ethnicity and gender, gender overall and by gender and religion or belief.

## Poverty and social mobility

Table 7.1-7.4: Poverty rate for families by presence of disabled members and age, disabled members overall, disabled members and ethnicity and disabled members and gender.

Table 8.1-8.4: Poverty rate for pensioners by age, disability, ethnic group of head of household and gender.

Table 9.1: Percentage in the bottom income quintile that have progressed in the distribution of earnings.

## Pensions

Table 10.1-10.2: Numbers of employees in a pension scheme sponsored by their employer by age and gender.

## Fraud and error

Table 11.1–11.4: Estimates for fraud and error by client group, error type, gender and age group – overpayments

Table 11.5–11.8: Estimates of fraud and error by client group, error type, gender and age group – underpayments

## **Operational working of the Department**

Table 12.1-12.8: Customers' reported overall satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus and the Pension, Disability and Carers Service by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

## **Additional customer data**

Table 13.1: Percentage of employment gaps for various protected characteristics.

## **DWP workforce data**

Table 14.1-14.8: Percentage of DWP workforce by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 15.1-15.4: Percentage of employees disciplined by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 16.1-16.8: Percentage of reason for leaving by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 17.1-17.4: Percentage of employees with a part time working pattern by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 18.1-18.4: Percentage of employees raising a grievance by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 19.1-19.4: Percentage of performance ratings by age, disability, ethnicity and gender to be included in future publication.

Table 20.1-20.4: Percentage of employees promoted by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 21.1-21.4: Percentage of recruitment process at different stages by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 22.1-22.4: Pay gap by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 23.1-23.4: Percentage of training applications by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 24.1-24.3: Percentage of employees returning from maternity leave by age, disability and ethnicity.

# Introduction

## The legal requirements

As a public body the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) has a specific duty to publish relevant proportionate information annually to demonstrate our compliance with the [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) (PSED), part of the [Equality Act 2010](#).

This means that we have to publish information to show that we have paid 'due regard' to the three aims of the general Equality Duty:

- **eliminate unlawful discrimination**, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act;
- **advance equality of opportunity** between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it; and
- **foster good relations** between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.

The protected characteristics covered by the Equality Duty are:

- age;
- disability;
- gender reassignment;
- pregnancy and maternity;
- race – this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality;
- religion or belief – this includes lack of belief;
- sex;
- sexual orientation; and
- marriage and civil partnership – in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination only.

We must publish:

- information relating to people who are affected by our policies and practices who share protected characteristics, for example, our service users; and
- information relating to our employees who share protected characteristics.

We can use this information to ensure that genuine consideration is given to the likely and actual effects of what we do on people with protected characteristics and this informs our decision making and policy-development processes.

This is our third report under this duty. We first published our information in [January 2012](#) and then again in [July 2012](#), to ensure integration of this work into our annual business reporting cycle.

## Our overall approach

This report is divided into two sections:

- **Section One** shows information and data relating to our policies, practices and service users; and
- **Section Two** shows information and data relating to our employees.

Transparency is a key operating principle for the Department, we want the information we provide to be fully accessible and easy to understand and use. To help with this, where possible and relevant, for each chapter we have provided:

- tables of **data** for all protected characteristics where data is available;
- a brief explanation of **what this tells us** and **how an improvement will be shown**;
- a description of **how each table compares** to previous years;
- information on **statistical significance** where available and relevant;
- **links to previous years data tables** for comparison; and
- **links to other information** that you may find useful.

Where possible the data sets included cover the same time period as previous publications so that annual comparisons can be made.

## Section One: our approach to providing information about our policies, practices and services

In section one we have used the existing Impact Indicators included in our Departmental [Business Plan](#). They show key data which is designed to help demonstrate our compliance with the Equality Duty in everything we do. We have broken the impact indicator data down by as many protected characteristics as we currently have available.

The information is grouped under four main areas:

- employment;
- poverty and social mobility;
- pensions; and
- the operational working of the Department.

It is important to note that the service user data sets within section one come from a variety of different sources. Given this, the periods they cover and the frequency by which they are collected and analysed are not all the same. To aid understanding we

have embedded an explanation of the data sources in a table at the beginning of each section. We have included brief analytical narrative offering a data comparison with previous years. Where possible, information is also provided as to whether differences among protected groups are statistically significant, though this is not relevant to all indicators.

## **Section Two: our approach to providing information relating to our employees**

DWP offers a variety of services and everyone, at some point in their lives, will come into contact with the Department. As a result, our customer base is wide and diverse. We aim to build a workforce which reflects the society we serve, and to create an inclusive culture which values and respects diversity. We monitor the effectiveness of our policies and processes in relation to these principles primarily by analysing information collected by our internal Human Resources (HR) database called Resource Management (RM).

We encourage our employees to voluntarily and confidentially provide information in relation to their: sexual orientation; religion or belief; disability; and ethnicity. Following Cabinet Office consultation with the Government Equalities Office (GEO) and [a:gender](#) (a support network for staff in Government Departments) we do not currently plan to include questions on gender identity. However, we do use other methods, such as consulting with staff network groups and participating in the a:gender Trans Equality Index, that allows us to monitor our progress on transgender equality in a more appropriate and proportionate way.

As at 31 March 2013 we had 104,889 employees (headcount), their declaration rate for ethnicity was 75.4% and for disability 84.7%. Unfortunately, at this time the levels of declaration for sexual orientation and religion or belief are too low for publication. Having robust data is vital in measuring progress on equality and to ensure that we can accurately assess the impact of our policies on those with protected characteristics. DWP are part of a cross-Government group that has been established to share best practice and find new and innovative ways to improve declaration rates. The findings will be available later this year in a new Civil Service wide resource pack titled 'Recording Personal Information'.

In section two we have used data from RM and other administrative systems to display information about:

- the make up of our workforce;
- discipline;
- exits;
- working patterns;
- grievances;
- performance management;
- recruitment and promotion;

## Equality Information Report

- gender pay gap;
- training; and
- maternity leave.

As previously, this report includes percentages which show the proportion of employees in particular groups, for example, 9.1% of 16-24 year olds working in the Department have part time working patterns. However, responding to feedback where relevant it now includes percentages which are relative to the whole group, for example, 0.4% of the total number of part time employees in the Department are 16-24 year olds.

It should also be noted that in August 2012 the Child Maintenance Group (CMG) was integrated into the Department. The data in section two represents our combined workforce and this should be noted when making comparisons with previous publications.

### **Our approach to benchmarking as an employer**

The Department participates in a number of external benchmarking exercises that compare our performance with other public and private sector organisations. For example, DWP has taken part in Stonewall's Top 100 Workplace Equality Index since it was first introduced in 2005. In those nine years we have ranked within the Top 100 list of gay-friendly employers eight times. In 2013, 376 organisations took part in the index and DWP ranked 76<sup>th</sup>.

We have also received recognition from a number of external bodies that highlight our best practice as an employer. For example, the Civil Service Fast Stream is ranked in the top ten [Times Top 100 Graduate Employers](#). The Fast Stream Summer Diversity Internship Programme also won the 'Best Diversity in Work Experience' award as part of [The National Placement and Internship Awards 2012](#).

### **Our approach to engaging with our employees**

The Department understands the importance of engaging our employees and the benefits that having an engaged workforce brings for the organisation, individuals and the communities we serve. We use a wide range of engagement tools and techniques for example, every month employees are offered the opportunity to talk to our Permanent Secretary, Robert Devereux in a conference call known as 'Robert's question time'. They are encouraged to ask questions, raise issues and offer up ideas or suggestions, with each receiving a response.

We also operate 'on the road' discussions where senior leaders visit different locations and facilitate open conversations with employees.

We use a structured approach to staff diversity network groups, recognising the valuable role they play in terms of communicating the views of our employees. We have a corporate Equality Group which looks at all of the protected characteristics. Network representatives exist to champion diversity and equality of opportunity across the Department in relation to both staff and customers. The group is

supported by an intranet based equality hub involving on-line communities which provides a route for dialogue and a range of resources about each of the protected characteristics. Topical themes emerging from the on-line communities are escalated by the Equality Group and discussed with the Permanent Secretary at regular quarterly meetings.

The Department runs an employer sponsored volunteering scheme where we offer our employees the opportunity to spend a day working for a local voluntary or community organisation in their area. In 2012 we committed to giving 10,000 volunteering days annually via our 'Community 10,000' scheme.

We also recognise the importance of working alongside our Departmental Trade Unions as a method of employee engagement. Representatives from across the Department meet our Trade Unions on a regular basis, at both a national and regional level to discuss and progress relevant issues

### **Our approach to engaging with our service users**

We understand the need to involve customers in diversity issues and to consult them in relation to our proposals for implementing equality legislation and discharging our responsibilities under the Public Sector Equality Duty.

In 2007 the Department established the [DWP Customer Equality Reference Group](#) to help embed a strong customer perspective on diversity issues and to act as a channel for consultation. We engaged the group on our overall approach to the Public Sector Equality Duty and this included getting feedback on the structure and content of our information reporting and the development of our equality objectives.

On a wider level the Department has a variety of measures in place to engage with claimants and their representative groups. These include traditional formal policy consultation routes but also more informal methods. For example, we publish several newsletters such as the [DWP Stakeholder Bulletin](#) which provides a monthly update on what is happening in our Department.

As part of the Department, the Office for Disability Issues (ODI) works closely with the [Minister for Disabled People](#) and leads the Government's vision to enable disabled people to fulfill their potential. The Department also operates an Employer Engagement Strategy Group which consists of employers who are at the forefront of delivering excellent practice and innovation in supporting disabled people in employment.

### **Our approach to paying due regard**

Following the introduction of the PSED we worked closely with stakeholders and the GEO to reduce bureaucracy. We have embedded and mainstreamed equality analysis into the processes we use to develop, deliver and evaluate our policies, practices and services. It ensures that we continue to give genuine and proportionate consideration to the likely and actual effects of what we do and this, in turn, informs our decision making processes.

## Our approach to developing equality objectives

The [specific duty](#) requires the Department to set measurable equality objectives by 6 April 2012 and refresh them at intervals of not less than 4 years. Our objectives look at addressing key equality issues for both our customers and employees. They are embedded within our organisational aims and align with our [Departmental Business Plan](#). We undertake regular reviews of our objectives to check on progress and they will be formally reviewed in April 2016.

## Alternative formats

If you would like a copy of this report in an alternative format, please contact:

Diversity and Equality Directorate

Porterbrook House

7 Pear Street

Sheffield

South Yorkshire

S11 8JF

Email: [Adelphi.diversityandequality@dwp.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Adelphi.diversityandequality@dwp.gsi.gov.uk)

## Feedback

Thank you for taking the time to read this report, we welcome your feedback. Please write to us using the details above.

# Section 1: Information about our policies and services

## Data sources and availability

| Number | Indicator  | Data source             | Time period and availability  |
|--------|--|-------------------------|---|
| 1      | Rates of people moving from out-of-work benefits     | DWP administrative data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latest data available for claimants that have flowed off Jobseekers Allowance was from January-March 2012 and March 2013. Whereas, latest data for claimants flowing off Employment and Support Allowance was from October-December 2011 and March 2013.</li> <li>• Breakdowns currently available by age and gender.</li> </ul>   |
| 2      | Numbers on key out-of-work benefits                  | DWP administrative data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Splits currently available by age and gender, and ethnicity.</li> <li>• Latest data available at May 2013 covered November 2012.</li> <li>• Produced four times a year covering the months of February, May, August and November. Data are available with six months delay.</li> </ul>   |
| 3      | Proportion of children living in workless households | Labour Force Survey     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latest data available at July 2013 covers Quarter 4 2012</li> <li>• New data are released twice a year, for Quarter 2 and Quarter 4 each year, typically 2-4 months after the reference period.</li> <li>• Splits currently available by age, ethnicity and gender of child.</li> <li>• Splits are not currently available by disability or religion, because these</li> </ul> |

## Equality Information Report

| Number | Indicator   | Data source         | Time period and availability   |
|--------|---|---------------------|--|
|        |   |                     | <p>questions are only asked of LFS respondents aged 16 years or over.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only respondents aged 16 years or over are asked their sexual orientation, but in any case this information is only available on a separate version of the data, the Integrated Household Survey.</li> <li>• The LFS does not record whether or not respondents are pregnant or have undergone gender reassignment, so it is not possible to provide separate estimates for these groups.</li> </ul>  |
| 4      | Young people not in employment or full-time education                       | Labour Force Survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact indicator covers age. Splits currently available by disability, ethnicity, religion and gender.</li> <li>• Information on sexual orientation is only made available on a separate version of the data, the Integrated Household Survey, so it is not possible to provide estimates for this group.</li> <li>• The LFS does not record whether or not respondents are pregnant or have undergone gender reassignment, so it is not possible to provide separate estimates for these groups.</li> <li>• Latest data available at July 2013 covered Quarter 1 2013.</li> <li>• Produced monthly approximately six weeks after the period referred to. Three months of data are combined for the indicator.</li> </ul> |
| 5      | Gap between employment rates for disabled people and the overall population | Labour Force Survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact indicator covers disability. Splits currently available by age, ethnicity, gender and religion or belief.</li> <li>• Latest data available at July 2013 covered Quarter 1 2013.</li> <li>• Produced quarterly approximately six weeks after the period referred to. Three months of data are combined for the indicator.</li> </ul>  |

## Equality Information Report

| Number | Indicator                       | Data source             | Time period and availability   |
|--------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 6      | Average age people stop working | Labour Force Survey     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Splits currently available by age, ethnicity, gender and religion or belief.</li> <li>• Latest data available at July 2013 covered Quarter 1 2013 for gender, and 4 quarter averages (to increase data reliability for these groups) from Quarter 2 2012 to Quarter 1 2013 for ethnicity and religion or belief.</li> <li>• Produced quarterly approximately six weeks after the period referred to.</li> </ul>                               |
| 7      | Rate of disability poverty      | Family Resources Survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator covers disability. Splits currently available by age, ethnicity and gender.</li> <li>• Latest data available at July 2013 covered 2011/12.</li> <li>• Produced once a year covering a financial year, with a delay of just over a year after the end of the period referred to.</li> <li>• Data do not include care home residents due to the sample for the survey used consisting of the private household population.</li> </ul> |
| 8      | Rate of pensioner poverty       | Family Resources Survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Splits currently available by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.</li> <li>• Latest data available at July 2013 covered 2011/12.</li> <li>• Produced once a year covering a financial year, with a delay of just over a year after the end of the period referred to.</li> <li>• Data do not include care home residents due to the sample for the survey used consisting of the private household population.</li> </ul>                  |
| 9      | Social mobility in adulthood    | To be determined        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likelihood of progression of 25-30 year olds by gender. Data for other protected characteristics are not currently available.</li> <li>• Latest data available at July 2013 covered 2003-2012.</li> </ul>   |

## Equality Information Report

| Number | Indicator   | Data source                         | Time period and availability   |
|--------|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| 10     | Number of employees in a pension scheme sponsored by their employer | Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Splits currently available by age and gender. This will be supplemented by data from the Family Resources Survey for religion or belief and sexual orientation which has been collected from April 2011. Results will be included in future reports.</li> <li>Latest data available at July 2013 covered 2012.</li> </ul>                                   |
| 11     | Monetary value of fraud and error in the benefit system             | DWP administrative data             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preliminary estimates for 2012/13 were released on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2013. This covers the period from October 2011 – September 2012.</li> <li>Splits currently available by age and gender.</li> </ul>  |
| 12     | Public opinion of DWP service levels                                | DWP administrative data             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Splits currently available by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.</li> <li>The latest data available at July 2013 covered December to May 2012.</li> </ul>   |
| 13     | Employment gap  | Labour Force Survey                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This indicator provides GB employment rates and gaps for women, disabled people, ethnic minorities, young adults and older workers in comparison to the overall population.</li> <li>Data available approximately six weeks after the end of each quarter.</li> <li>Data are seasonally unadjusted so only year on year comparisons can be made.</li> </ul> |

Note: Estimates are based on a variety of data and are therefore subject to uncertainty. Small differences should be treated with caution as these will be affected by sampling error and variability in the data source.

# Employment related impact indicators

## 1. Rates of people moving from out of work benefits into employment

### What does this tell us?

This indicator reports off-flow rates for cohorts of customers who flow onto each benefit in a given period. For example: across all ages 90% of those starting to receive Jobseekers Allowance between January and March 2012 had stopped receiving the benefit 52 weeks later; across all ages 53% of those who claimed Employment Support Allowance between October and December 2011 had stopped receiving the benefit 65 weeks later.

This measure is included because Jobcentre Plus adds value by reducing the time it takes for a customer to move off benefits. The Jobseekers Allowance portion of the measure directly affects the claimant count, and the measure as a whole will provide useful information as to whether the Department's spending review settlement is being implemented.

### How will an improvement be shown?

An increase in the indicator will demonstrate whether an improvement has been achieved. However, the indicator level will be affected by benefit conditionality and operational changes, seasonal variation and the economic cycle. For example, in a recession, even if Jobcentre Plus is performing well, the off-flow rate is likely to fall. Also, as Incapacity Benefit claims are re-assessed for Employment and Support Allowance the off-flow rate will fall.

Off-flow rates vary naturally over time, and will be impacted by policy changes, as well as changes in the economy. Over the time period covered by the Indicator, the Department has enacted Welfare Reform changes that have changed the composition of both of these benefits. The Department has also stopped some employment programmes and introduced new programmes. Therefore any comparison with previous years' figures must be made in this context.

### Links to other information that you may find useful

A one off [Destination Survey](#) was undertaken by the Department in 2011 which provides data on the rate of people moving from key out of work benefits into employment.

## Equality Information Report

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

**Table 1.1: Jobseekers Allowance off-flow rate within 52 weeks, for claims received between January-March 2012 by Age**

| Age   | Total On-flow | Total Off-flow | Rate |
|-------|---------------|----------------|------|
| 16-17 | 5,430         | 5,060          | 93%  |
| 18-24 | 304,940       | 284,010        | 93%  |
| 25-49 | 424,210       | 375,550        | 89%  |
| 50+   | 112,860       | 98,790         | 88%  |
| Total | 847,450       | 763,410        | 90%  |

Since last year there have been small movements in off-flow rates across age groups, and there has been a slight increase in the overall rate from 87% to 90%.

**Table 1.2: Jobseekers Allowance off-flow rate within 52 weeks, for claims received between January-March 2012 by Gender**

| Gender | Total On-flow | Total Off-flow | Rate |
|--------|---------------|----------------|------|
| Male   | 565,950       | 509,810        | 90%  |
| Female | 281,500       | 253,600        | 90%  |
| Total  | 847,450       | 763,410        | 90%  |

This table was not available in previous years so no comparison can be made.

**Table 1.3: Employment and Support Allowance off-flow rate within 65 weeks, for claims received between October-December 2011 by Age**

| Age   | Total On-flow | Total Off-flow | Rate |
|-------|---------------|----------------|------|
| 16-17 | 1,200         | 510            | 42%  |
| 18-24 | 28,890        | 19,740         | 68%  |
| 25-49 | 154,290       | 82,250         | 53%  |
| 50+   | 95,300        | 45,040         | 47%  |
| Total | 279,690       | 147,540        | 53%  |

Since last year's report there has been a decrease in the overall off-flow rate from 74% to 53% and this has been reflected across all age groups.

**Table 1.4: Employment and Support Allowance off-flow rate within 65 weeks, for claims received between October-December 2011 by Gender**

| Gender | Total On-flow | Total Off-flow | Rate |
|--------|---------------|----------------|------|
| Male   | 154,680       | 84,430         | 55%  |
| Female | 125,010       | 63,110         | 50%  |
| Total  | 279,690       | 147,540        | 53%  |

This table was not available in previous years so no comparison can be made.

Source: Work and Pensions Warehouse, provided by Information, Governance and Security Directorate sourced from JSAPS Legacy Data.

Notes:

1. The On Flow Cohort Period corresponds to the Cycle. A reporting month, beginning on the Saturday after the final Friday of the previous month and ending on the final Friday of the current month. This data covers three On Flow cohort periods.
2. The Rate is calculated as The total number of Off Flows from an On Flow Cohort Period, divided by the number of on flows within the On Flow Cohort Period, multiplied by 100 (to 1.d.p).
3. On-flow and off-flow figures rounded to the nearest 10.
4. Off-flow measure for JSA is based on claims ending within 52 weeks of on-flow.

## Equality Information Report

5. Off-flow measure for ESA is based on claims ending within 65 weeks of on-flow.
6. Totals do not sum due to a small minority of cases having an incorrect date of birth recorded on the JSAPS systems.
7. Due to seasonal movements in benefit claiming it is appropriate to compare year on year.

## 2. Numbers on key out of work benefits

### What does this tell us?

This indicator looks at the number of people on the following key out-of-work benefits:

- Jobseekers Allowance;
- Incapacity Benefits/Employment and Support Allowance;
- Lone parents receiving Income Support; and
- Others receiving income-related benefits. These are mainly Pension Credit recipients for men aged under state pension age. The remainder are in receipt of Income Support.

### How will an improvement be shown?

This indicator will show an improvement if the number of people in receipt of key out-of-work benefits decreases, reflecting the Department's economic and social objective of helping more people into employment.

### Links to other information that you may find useful

Further information about a variety of benefits and customer groups is available on the [DWP tabulation tool](#), where user defined tables can be created.

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

**Table 2.1: Number on key out of work benefits by age, Great Britain, working age population, November 2012 <sup>1,2</sup>**

| Age         | Jobseeker's Allowance (claimant count) <sup>5</sup> | Employment and Support Allowance and incapacity benefits <sup>6,9</sup> | Lone Parents on Income Support <sup>6</sup> | Other (Income Support, others and Pension Credit) <sup>7,8</sup> |
|-------------|---|---|---|--|
| Unknown Age | -   | 100   | -   | 300  |
| Under 18    | 3,900   | 4,400   | 4,200                                       | 9,100  |
| 18-24       | 403,700   | 154,800   | 160,700                                     | 24,400   |
| 25-34       | 375,900   | 333,300   | 217,400                                     | 5,900  |
| 35-44       | 299,600   | 516,000   | 101,400                                     | 3,800  |
| 45-49       | 148,100   | 367,600   | 17,700                                      | 2,200  |
| 50-54       | 121,300   | 396,900   | 6,400                                       | 2,400  |
| 55-59       | 91,100  | 428,100   | 2,100                                       | 2,900  |
| 60-64       | 26,700  | 298,800   | 200   | 105,000  |

Since last year there has been a general fall in claimant numbers across all benefit types. There has been a considerable fall for JSA aged 18-24, for most age groups on ESA and Income Support, and for the 60-64 age group on Other Benefits.

**Table 2.2: Number on key out of work benefits by ethnicity, Great Britain, working age population, November 2012 <sup>1,2</sup>**

| Ethnicity   | Jobseeker's Allowance (claimant count) <sup>5</sup> | Lone Parents on Income Support <sup>6</sup> |
|---|---|---|
| White: British                                    | 1,084,300   | 380,900                                     |
| White: Irish                                      | 8,100   | 2,900                                       |
| White: Other white                                | 50,200  | 8,800                                       |
| Mixed: White & Black Caribbean                    | 13,600  | 6,600                                       |
| Mixed: White & Black African                      | 3,800   | 1,600                                       |
| Mixed: White & Asian                              | 3,100   | 1,000                                       |
| Mixed: Other Mixed                                | 8,600   | 2,700                                       |
| Asian or Asian British: Indian                    | 22,100  | 2,900                                       |
| Asian or Asian British: Pakistani                 | 34,100  | 9,300                                       |
| Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi               | 14,900  | 3,300                                       |
| Asian or Asian British: Other Asian               | 12,300  | 2,600                                       |
| Black or Black British: Black Caribbean           | 43,500  | 12,700                                      |
| Black or Black British: Black African             | 45,100  | 20,500                                      |
| Black or Black British: Other Black               | 11,100  | 3,500                                       |
| Chinese or Other Ethnic Group: Chinese            | 2,900   | 1,000                                       |
| Chinese or Other Ethnic Group: Other Ethnic Group | 29,600  | 8,300                                       |
| Prefer not to say                                 | 62,300  | 24,300                                      |
| Missing/old values/no personal contact            | 19,400  | 17,400                                      |

There have been very small movements in the claimant counts across each ethnic group. Compared to November 2011 data, a decrease in JSA claimants was recorded for the 'White British' and 'Prefer not to Say' groups, while an increase in JSA claims was recorded for 'Other White' group. For income support, there was a general decrease across all groups, the highest decrease being for the 'White British' group.

**Table 2.3: Number on key out of work benefits by gender, Great Britain, working age population, November 2012** <sup>1,2,3</sup>

| Gender | Jobseeker's Allowance (claimant count) <sup>4</sup> | Jobseeker's Allowance (claimant count) <sup>5</sup> | Employment and Support Allowance and incapacity benefits <sup>6,9</sup> | Lone Parents on Income Support <sup>6</sup> | Other (Income Support others and Pension Credit) <sup>7,8</sup> |
|--------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male   | 1,026,900   | 952,300   | 1,370,100   | 12,900                                      | 120,000   |
| Female | 541,000   | 516,400   | 1,129,900   | 497,100                                     | 36,000  |

There has been an increase in the number of females claiming Jobseeker's Allowance since November 2011. However, in the other key out-of-work benefits reported here the number of male and female claimants has fallen.

All tables sourced from: DWP Administrative Data; Columns 1 and 2 from the Jobseeker's Allowance (JSA) Claimant Count.

Notes:

1. This table includes the key out-of-work client group categories, with the exception of carers who are not subject to activation policies in the same way as other groups.
2. All final figures are rounded to the nearest 100.
3. This table presents just one Jobseeker's Allowance (JSA) series. The United Kingdom (UK) seasonally adjusted series is not broken down by age, but is available by gender. The JSA series presented covers Great Britain (GB) and is not seasonally adjusted. This second series is presented as it allows comparisons with the other key out of work benefits published by DWP which also cover GB and are not seasonally adjusted. This JSA series differs slightly from the JSA numbers presented elsewhere for this indicator as it excludes non-computerised clerical cases (approx 1 percent of cases).
4. UK figures (seasonally adjusted) published by the ONS. This series is the most reliable and up-to-date source for claimant unemployment.
5. GB figures (not seasonally adjusted) published by the ONS. This series is the most reliable and up-to-date source for claimant unemployment.
6. GB figures (not seasonally adjusted). Published by DWP as part of the 100 per cent working age client group analysis. A consistent series for the UK as a whole is not readily available.

## Equality Information Report

7. GB figures (not seasonally adjusted). Published by DWP as part of the 100 per cent working age client group analysis. A consistent series for the UK as a whole is not readily available. This group has been reasonably stable over time.
8. Excludes claimants in receipt of Income Support and Carers Allowance.
9. The "Incapacity Benefits group" includes Employment and Support Allowance (ESA). ESA replaced Incapacity Benefit and Income Support paid on the grounds of incapacity for new claims from 27 October 2008.
10. DEFINITIONS AND CONVENTIONS: "-" Nil or Negligible; ".." Not available. Caseload figures are rounded to the nearest ten. Some additional disclosure control has also been applied. Totals may not sum due to rounding.
11. STATE PENSION AGE: The age at which women reach state pension age is gradually increasing from 60 to 65 between April 2010 and April 2016 to November 2018. From December 2018, the state pension age for both men and women will start to increase to reach 66 in October 2020. This will introduce a small increase to the number of working age benefit recipients and a small reduction to the number of pension age recipients. Figures from May 2010 onwards reflect this change. For more information see <https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/reviewing-the-state-pension-age>

### 3. Proportion of children living in workless households

#### What does this tell us?

This indicator looks at the proportion of children living in workless households in the UK. A workless household is a household that includes at least one person aged 16 to 64 where no-one aged 16 or over is in employment.

This indicator reflects the Department's core aims around employment and preventing worklessness.

#### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally, an improvement would be demonstrated by a fall in the indicator. Such a change would imply a rise in the proportion of children living in a household with at least one working adult.

However other factors, for example, changes in household types over time may also influence estimates.

#### Links to other information that you may find useful

Further information can be found on the Office of National Statistics [website](#), available online.

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

**Table 3.1: Percentage of children in each household economic activity category by age of child, October-December 2012<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

| Age of child | Combined economic activity status of household |   |                     | All children |
|--------------|--|---|---------------------|--------------|
|              | Working households                             | Households containing both working and workless members | Workless households |              |
| Under 1      | 55   | 30  | 15                  | 100          |
| 1            | 52   | 32  | 16                  | 100          |
| 2            | 52   | 34  | 14                  | 100          |
| 3            | 53   | 31  | 17                  | 100          |
| 4            | 51   | 31  | 18                  | 100          |
| 5            | 53   | 31  | 16                  | 100          |
| 6            | 54   | 31  | 15                  | 100          |
| 7            | 53   | 32  | 16                  | 100          |
| 8            | 60   | 27  | 13                  | 100          |
| 9            | 57   | 30  | 14                  | 100          |
| 10           | 58   | 29  | 13                  | 100          |
| 11           | 56   | 31  | 13                  | 100          |
| 12           | 54   | 33  | 13                  | 100          |
| 13           | 52   | 37  | 11                  | 100          |
| 14           | 48   | 41  | 11                  | 100          |
| 15           | 51   | 38  | 11                  | 100          |
| All          | 53   | 32  | 14                  | 100          |

Although none of the differences between consecutive age groups is statistically significant, there is a general pattern of the indicator decreasing with age (after the age of around 4 years), such that the differences between the youngest and eldest age groups are statistically significant. For example, the indicator for those aged 15 years is significantly lower than for each group aged under 8 years. Likewise, the indicator for those aged under 1 year is significantly higher than for each group aged 13 years or more.

## Equality Information Report

The central estimates shown in the table suggest that the indicator has decreased since 2010 for each of the age groups shown. Although the decrease for all ages combined was statistically significant, the decrease was not statistically significant for any single age group, at least partly due to the smaller sample sizes involved in estimating these changes. There is no evidence of a significant change over time in the pattern of the indicator across different age groups.

**Table 3.2: Percentage of children in each household economic activity category by gender of child, October-December 2012<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

| Gender of child | Combined economic activity status of household |   |                     | All children |
|-----------------|--|---|---------------------|--------------|
|                 | Working households                             | Households containing both working and workless members | Workless households |              |
| Male            | 53   | 32  | 14                  | 100          |
| Female          | 54   | 32  | 14                  | 100          |
| All             | 53   | 32  | 14                  | 100          |

Although the indicator is slightly higher for male children than female, the difference between the two groups is not statistically significant.

For both male and female children, the indicator has fallen by a statistically significant amount on the year and since 2010.

**Table 3.3: Percentage of children in each household economic activity category by ethnic origin of child, October-December 2012<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

| Ethnic origin of child                      | Combined economic activity status of household |   |                     | All children |
|---|--|---|---------------------|--------------|
|   | Working households                             | Households containing both working and workless members | Workless households |              |
| White                                       | 58   | 29  | 13                  | 100          |
| Mixed / Multiple ethnic groups              | 48   | 31  | 21                  | 100          |
| Indian                                      | 49   | 46  | 5                   | 100          |
| Pakistani / Bangladeshi                     | 15   | 67  | 18                  | 100          |
| Black / African / Caribbean / Black British | 37   | 36  | 27                  | 100          |
| Chinese / Other ethnic group                | 31   | 48  | 21                  | 100          |
| All <sup>4</sup>                            | 53   | 32  | 14                  | 100          |

The indicator was lowest for the Indian group, followed by the White group, in each case by a statistically significant margin. The indicator was highest for the Black group (including Black, African, Caribbean and Black British), and the gap was statistically significant compared with all other groups except those from mixed / multiple ethnic groups.

The central estimates shown in the table suggest that the indicator has decreased since 2011 for all ethnic groups except the 'Chinese / Other' group, although this covers a wide range of different ethnic groups. However, the only changes that were statistically significant were the decreases experienced by the White group and Black group (including Black, African, Caribbean and Black British). Ethnicity questions in the Labour Force Survey were changed in 2011, in line with the 2011 Census. The impact of these changes is under assessment by the Office for National Statistics. Therefore, comparisons with 2011 estimates should be treated with caution, and direct comparisons with earlier periods are not possible. There is no evidence of a significant change since 2011 in the pattern of the indicator across different ethnic groups.

Source: LFS household datasets.

## Equality Information Report

### Notes:

1. 'Children' refers to children under 16.
2. Households including at least one person aged 16 to 64.
3. Data is rounded to the nearest percentage point.
4. Total includes children with unknown ethnic origin.

## 4. Young people not in employment or full-time education

### What does this tell us?

This indicator shows of the 18-24 year olds not in full time education, what proportion are also not in employment and is measured by dividing the number of 18-24 year olds who are not in employment or full time education by the total number of 18-24 year olds who are not in full time education. The indicator will measure the Department's success in improving the percentage of young people engaged in a positive activity such as employment, education or training. It recognises the importance of raising participation in education and improving labour market outcomes for young people not in full-time education.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally, a decrease in the indicator will demonstrate an improvement in the labour market position of young people. However, economic conditions will also need to be taken into account.

### Links to other information that you may find useful

Further information about the Department's [business plan transparency measures](#), are available online.

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

**Table 4.1: Percentage of young people not in full-time education who are workless by disability, UK, Quarter 1 2013 (January 2013-March 2013)<sup>1,2,9</sup>**

| Disability status          | Proportion |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Those with a disability    | 58         |
| Those without a disability | 27         |
| All <sup>5,8</sup>         | 30         |

The proportion of young people not in full time education who are not in employment is higher for those with a disability compared to those without by a statistically significant amount.

None of the changes in the proportions of young people not in full time education who are workless in either the disabled or the non-disabled groups are statistically significant compared to previous years.

**Table 4.2: Percentage of young people not in full-time education who are workless by ethnicity, UK, quarterly average Quarter 2 2012 to Quarter 1 2013 (April 2012-March 2013)<sup>1,3,9</sup>**

| Ethnic group of individual            | Proportion |
|---------------------------------------|------------|
| White                                 | 29         |
| Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups          | 35         |
| Indian                                | 34         |
| Pakistani/Bangladeshi                 | 53         |
| Chinese or other ethnic group         | 44         |
| Black/African/Caribbean/Black British | 51         |
| All <sup>6,8</sup>                    | 30         |

The indicator is lower for the 'White' group than any other group, except the 'Indian' group, by a statistically significant margin. The next lowest values of the indicator are for the 'Mixed' and 'Indian' groups. These indicators are lower than the 'Pakistani/Bangladeshi', 'Chinese and other ethnic group' and the 'Black/African/Caribbean/Black British' groups by a statistically significant amount.

Although the central estimates in 2013 are lower compared to 2011 for all ethnic groups except the 'Indian' and 'Chinese or other' groups, only the fall for the 'White' group was statistically significant.

Ethnicity questions in the Labour Force Survey were changed in 2011, in line with the 2011 Census. The impact of these changes is under assessment by the Office for National Statistics. Comparisons over time should be treated with caution.

**Table 4.3: Percentage of young people not in full-time education who are workless by gender, UK, Quarter 1 2013 (January 2013-March 2013)<sup>4,9</sup>**

| Gender           | Proportion |
|------------------|------------|
| Male             | 26         |
| Female           | 34         |
| All <sup>8</sup> | 30         |

The indicator for male young people not in full time education or work is lower than the female group and the difference between the two groups is statistically significant.

The female indicator has increased marginally since last year and 2011. The male indicator has fallen since last year and 2011. None of the changes in the proportions of young people not in full time education who are workless in either the female or male groups are statistically significant compared to previous years.

**Table 4.4: Proportion of young people not in full time education who are workless by religion, UK, quarterly average Quarter 2 2012 to Quarter 1 2013 (April 2012-March 2013)<sup>1,3,9</sup>**

| Religion           | Proportion |
|--------------------|------------|
| No religion        | 32         |
| Christian          | 26         |
| Buddhist           | 32         |
| Hindu              | 27         |
| Jewish             | 37         |
| Muslim             | 55         |
| Sikh               | 32         |
| Any other religion | 30         |
| All <sup>7,8</sup> | 30         |

Estimates broken down by religion are based on small sample sizes and should be treated with caution. The indicator is higher for the 'Muslim' group than any other group by a statistically significant margin. The 'Christian' group is lower

## Equality Information Report

than any other group, but only lower than the 'Muslim' and 'No religion' groups by a statistically significant amount.

Compared to last year only the 'No religion' group showed a statistically significant decrease.

Estimates by religion are not available on a consistent basis prior to 2011, due to a change in the relevant Labour Force Survey question, in line with the 2011 Census.

Source: Labour Force Survey

Notes:

1. As with the overall measure of young people not in full time education who are workless, this breakdown uses LFS data. However, unlike the overall measure, this data is seasonally unadjusted and only released quarterly. Therefore it is not fully comparable with the overall measure.
2. Disability includes those who are disabled under the Equality Act definition. It covers the individual rather than the household.
3. This looks at the rate of the total of the four quarters from Quarter 2 2012 to Quarter 1 2013 (April 2012-March 2013) inclusive. Individual quarters are not given due to sample sizes.
4. This data is fully comparable with the overall measure using the ONS seasonally adjusted data.
5. Total includes young people with unknown disability
6. Total includes young people with unknown ethnic origin
7. Total includes young people with unknown religion
8. Totals may differ depending on whether or not the data are seasonally adjusted, and whether figures are given over one quarter or as an average over four quarters.
9. Data is rounded to the nearest percentage point.

## 5. Gap between the employment rates for disabled people and the overall population

### What does this tell us?

This indicator is measured by comparing the seasonally unadjusted employment rate for disabled people with the unadjusted working-age employment rate for Great Britain. This uses the ONS Headline Rate definition of the employment rate which is for people aged between 16 and 64.

These data allow the Department to monitor progress towards employment equality for disabled people. It allows the public to assess how well the Department is performing against its aim of promoting high levels of employment by helping people move into work.

The indicator is based on data from the Labour Force Survey, which does not record whether or not respondents are pregnant or have undergone gender reassignment, so it is not possible to provide separate estimates for these groups. Respondents are asked their sexual orientation, but this data is only made available on a separate version of the data, the Integrated Household Survey.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally a decrease in the indicator will demonstrate that an improvement has been achieved. However, economic conditions will also need to be taken into account. For example, recent research indicates that employment prospects for disabled people are less sensitive to economic conditions than the overall population<sup>1</sup>. This may mean that as the economy improves and overall rates increase, the gap between the disabled and the overall employment rates will increase, which would represent a negative outcome for this indicator.

### Links to other information that you may find useful

A full description of indicators towards disability equality by 2025 is available on the [Independent Living and Office for Disability Issues](#) website.

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

The overall employment gap for disabled people and the whole population is provided in chapter 13, which also provides employment gap information for other protected groups.

**Table 5.1: Gap between employment rates for disabled people and the overall population by age, Great Britain, Quarter 1 2013 (January 2013-March 2013)**

| Age   | Gap compared to same age group in the general population (percentage points) |
|-------|--|
| 16-17 | 6  |
| 18-24 | 18   |
| 25-34 | 27   |
| 35-44 | 24   |
| 45-54 | 28   |
| 55+   | 22   |

Since previous reports there has been no significant change in the employment rate gap by age. There is a statistically significant difference in the employment rate gap between those aged under 25 and the over 25 age groups.

**Table 5.2: Gap between employment rates for disabled people and the overall population by ethnicity, Great Britain, Quarter 2 2012 to Quarter 1 2013 (April 2012-March 2013)<sup>3,6</sup>**

| Ethnicity                                   | Gap compared to the same ethnicity group in the general population (percentage points) |
|---|--|
| White                                       | 26   |
| Mixed / Multiple ethnic groups              | 23   |
| Indian                                      | 21   |
| Pakistani/Bangladeshi                       | 21   |
| Chinese/Other ethnic group                  | 18   |
| Black / African / Caribbean / Black British | 18   |

There is a statistically significant difference in the employment rate gap between the White and Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups and the remaining ethnic groups.

## Equality Information Report

Since previous reports there has been no significant change in the employment rate gap by ethnicity.

Ethnicity questions in the Labour Force Survey were changed in 2011, in line with the 2011 Census. The impact of these changes is under assessment by the Office for National Statistics. Comparisons over time should be treated with caution.

**Table 5.3: Gap between employment rates for disabled people and the overall population by gender, Great Britain, Quarter 1 2013 (January 2013-March 2013)**

| Gender | Gap compared to the same gender group in the general population (percentage points) |
|--------|---|
| Male   | 27  |
| Female | 22  |

There is a statistically significant difference in the employment rate gap between males and females.

Since previous reports there has been no significant change in the employment rate gap by gender.

**Table 5.4: Gap between employment rates for disabled people and the overall population by religion, Great Britain, Quarter 2 2012 to Quarter 1 2013 (April 2012-March 2013)<sup>3,7</sup>**

| Religion           | Gap compared to the same religion group in the general population (percentage points) |
|--------------------|---|
| No religion        | 24  |
| Christian          | 26  |
| Buddhist           | 20  |
| Hindu              | 17  |
| Jewish             | 12  |
| Muslim             | 21  |
| Sikh               | 24  |
| Any other religion | 26  |

There is a statistically significant difference in the employment rate gap between those whose religion is Jewish, when compared to all of the other religions.

Since previous reports there has been no significant change in the employment rate gap by religion.

Estimates by religion are not available on a consistent basis prior to 2011, due to a change in the relevant Labour Force Survey question, in line with the 2011 Census.

All tables sourced from: Labour Force Survey.

Notes:

1. An example of this is research available at: [http://www.iza.org/conference\\_files/EcCrRiUnEm2010/berthoud\\_r281.pdf](http://www.iza.org/conference_files/EcCrRiUnEm2010/berthoud_r281.pdf)
2. Data is rounded to the nearest percentage point
3. Data is subject to sampling variation and is not seasonally adjusted
4. Data covers GB only, not UK
5. Accuracy of data is limited by small sample sizes for all tables.
6. Ethnicity is self-reported
7. Religion or Belief is self-reported

## 6. Average age people stop working<sup>1,2</sup>

### What does this tell us?

This indicator is measured using the 'average age of withdrawal from the labour market – static indicator'. High level figures which are not broken down for equality groups are published by ONS annually in the [Pension Trends](#) series.

This indicator measures the ages at which people withdraw from the labour market and become inactive; data are not seasonally adjusted. Due to the nature of the indicator, year on year changes tend to be small and are not typically statistically significant. The focus should not be on the short-term changes but on the long-term trend.

Extending working life is an important part of the response to demographic ageing and ensuring pensions sustainability. Monitoring changes in average age of withdrawal will provide an indication of how the Department's policies are encouraging longer working.

### How will an improvement be shown?

An increase in the age of withdrawal from the labour market would constitute an improvement. However, economic conditions also need to be taken into account as increased financial constraints can lead to people working longer. There may be a number of other contributing factors including: changing attitudes around working longer among individuals and employers; private pension incentives; and the effect of state pension age changes.

### Links to other information that you may find useful

Further information on the labour market and retirement is available in the [ONS report on Pension Trends](#), available online.

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

**Table 6.1: Average age of withdrawal from the labour market by ethnicity and gender, United Kingdom, Quarter 2 2012 to Quarter 1 2013 (April 2012 to March 2013)** <sup>4, 5, 6, 9, 10</sup>

| Ethnic group of individual | Men  | Women |
|----------------------------|------|-------|
| White                      | 64.8 | 62.8  |
| Non-White                  | 64.0 | 61.8  |

The only group for whom year-on-year changes can be compared is white people – which has shown a small increase of 0.3 years for both men and women. The increases appear to be consistent with the increases in the top-level male and female figures. The sample size for non-white group is insufficient to detect small year-on-year changes.

**Table 6.2: Average age of withdrawal from the labour market by gender, United Kingdom, Quarter 1 2013 (January to March 2013)** <sup>4, 10</sup>

| Age of withdrawal from labour market | Men  | Women |
|--------------------------------------|------|-------|
| Age                                  | 64.7 | 63.0  |

There has been a small increase of 0.1 years for men and a larger statistically significant one of 0.6 years for women since last year. This means that the gender gap has narrowed down by 0.4 years from last year. This is consistent with evidence that the increase in Women’s State Pension age, which is increasing from 60 in 2010 to 65 in 2018, has led to more older women in the workforce – and hence higher retirement ages. A recent publication by the Institute for Fiscal Studies<sup>3</sup> has studied this in more detail.

**Table 6.3: Average age of withdrawal from the labour market by gender and religion or belief, Great Britain, Quarter 2 2012 to Quarter 1 2013 (April 2012 to March 2013)** <sup>4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10</sup>

| Religion   | Men  | Women |
|--|------|-------|
| No religion  | 64.7 | 62.9  |
| Christian  | 64.8 | 62.7  |
| Any other religion (inc Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Sikh, Muslim, Others) | 64.4 | 62.9  |

## Equality Information Report

Christian (the largest group) has shown a small increase of 0.4 for men and 0.3 for women since last year. The increases appear to be consistent with the increases in the top-level male and female figures. The sample size for no religion and any other religion group are insufficient to detect small year-on-year changes.

All data sourced from: Labour Force Survey

### Notes:

1. The 2011 Equality Information Report contained a breakdown for disabled people versus non-disabled people (Table 6.1). From the 2012 report onwards we have dropped this table. Our investigations into the data quality have identified that the methodology used does not support a breakdown by disability status as the prevalence of disability in the population increases with age, and an individual becoming disabled is associated with withdrawal from the labour market, meaning that the calculation is biased. A more detailed note explaining the calculation of the “static” exit age indicator is available at:  
<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/pensions/average-age-of-withdrawal-from-the-labour-market/2010/index.html>
2. In previous editions of the Equalities report we have published more detailed breakdowns of ethnicity and religion. However, work has recently been carried out to understand the impact of sample size on data validity and the data have been found to be extremely sensitive to small sample sizes, and can become biased. We have decided to publish breakdowns only if the unweighted sample size from four quarters of LFS data is around 3,000 or greater. We have therefore further combined some of the smaller ethnic or religious groupings resulting in more robust estimates, but this does mean that we are unable to detect what may be real differences in average exit age between some of the smaller groups.
3. Incentives, shocks or signals: labour supply effects of increasing the female state pension age in the UK – Mar 2013  
(<http://www.ifs.org.uk/wps/wp1303.pdf>)
4. Data are subject to sampling variation and is not seasonally adjusted.  
Breakdowns with an unweighted sample size of less than 3,000 are not shown as sampling variation is very high, and a small sample can bias the results.
5. Accuracy of data is limited due to small sample size
6. Ethnicity is self-reported
7. Data covers Great Britain only
8. Religion or Belief is self-reported

## Equality Information Report

9. Due to the complicated methodology involved for this indicator, statistical significance cannot be reliably estimated unless sample sizes are exceptionally high. For this reason, information on statistical significance has not been provided for this indicator.
10. Data is rounded to the nearest 0.1 years.

# Poverty and social mobility related impact indicators

## 7. Rate of disability poverty

### What does this tell us?

This indicator measures the percentage of individuals in families containing someone who is disabled with incomes below 60 per cent of equivalised contemporary median income<sup>1</sup>, Before Housing Costs, meaning they are in relative low income. Tackling disability poverty is a priority as families with a disabled member have a higher rate of relative low-income poverty than average. Using 60 per cent of equivalised contemporary median income as a poverty threshold is a historical and international benchmark. These data do not include care home residents due to the sample for the survey used consisting of the private household population. No adjustment is made to disposable household income to take into account any additional costs that may be incurred due to the illness or disability in question, and disability benefits have been included in the equivalised household income used. This means that the position in the income distribution of these groups, as shown here, may have some upward bias. Results based on incomes excluding disability benefits are available on request.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally a decrease in the indicator will demonstrate that an improvement has been achieved. However, economic conditions also need to be taken into account.

### Links to other information that you may find useful

For further information, a full description of indicators towards disability equality by 2025 can be found on the [Office for Disability Issues](#) website. Further analysis of Households Below Average Income (HBAI) data are shown in the [annual HBAI publication](#).

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

**Table 7.1: Poverty rate for individuals by presence of disabled member in the family and age, 2011/12, United Kingdom** <sup>2, 3, 4, 5, 6</sup>

| Group              | Age of individual              | Poverty rate (%)                |                                  |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|                    |                                | Families with a disabled member | Families with no disabled member |
| Children           | 0-4                            | 22                              | 17                               |
|                    | 5-10                           | 18                              | 16                               |
|                    | 11-15                          | 21                              | 15                               |
|                    | 16-19 dependent children       | 25                              | 18                               |
| Working-age adults | 16-19 adults                   | ..                              | 23                               |
|                    | 20-24                          | 29                              | 18                               |
|                    | 25-29                          | 21                              | 12                               |
|                    | 30-34                          | 17                              | 11                               |
|                    | 35-39                          | 18                              | 13                               |
|                    | 40-44                          | 23                              | 12                               |
|                    | 45-49                          | 19                              | 11                               |
|                    | 50-54                          | 19                              | 11                               |
|                    | 55-59                          | 20                              | 14                               |
|                    | 60-State Pension Age           | 19                              | 17                               |
| Pensioners         | State Pension Age-64 (females) | 12                              | 13                               |
|                    | 65-69                          | 13                              | 14                               |
|                    | 70-74                          | 13                              | 18                               |
|                    | 75-79                          | 15                              | 19                               |
|                    | 80-84                          | 17                              | 30                               |
|                    | 85+                            | 18                              | 39                               |

Source: Households Below Average Income 2011/12

The proportion of children in families with a disabled member who are in relative low income slightly decreased between 2010/11 and 2011/12, except for dependent children between 16 and 19 who experienced a small increase.

## Equality Information Report

There was a mixed picture for working-age adults with most working-age categories in families with a disabled member experiencing a slight decrease in the proportion in relative low income between 2010/11 and 2011/12, except for the 20-24 and the 40-44 groups who saw increases.

There was a slight decrease in the proportion of pensioners in relative low-income families across the age categories between 2010/11 and 2011/12.

In 2011/12, the proportion of individuals in families with no disabled member who are in relative low income remained similar to 2010/11, except for the 85+ group who have seen a large increase.

**Table 7.2: Poverty rate for individuals by presence of disabled member in the family, 2011/12, United Kingdom** <sup>2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8</sup>

| Group            | Families with a disabled member | Families with no disabled member |
|------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Poverty rate (%) | 19                              | 15                               |

Source: Households Below Average Income 2011/12

There has been a fall in the proportion of individuals in families with a disabled member who are in relative low income between 2010/11 and 2011/12 after remaining constant between 2009/10 and 2010/11. The proportion of individuals in families with no disabled member who are in relative low income has remained level between 2010/11 and 2011/12, after a statistically significant fall between 2009/10 and 2010/11.

**Table 7.3: Poverty rate for individuals by presence of disabled member in the family and ethnicity, 2009/2010-2011/12, United Kingdom**<sup>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10</sup>

| Ethnic group of head (3-year average) | Poverty rate (%)                |                                  |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|                                       | Families with a disabled member | Families with no disabled member |
| White                                 | 18                              | 14                               |
| Mixed / Multiple ethnic groups        | ..                              | 22                               |
| Asian / Asian British                 | 38                              | 27                               |
| Indian                                | 30                              | 18                               |
| Pakistani                             | 51                              | 42                               |
| Bangladeshi                           | 44                              | 39                               |
| Chinese                               | ..                              | 27                               |
| Any other Asian background            | ..                              | 22                               |
| Black or Black British                | 27                              | 23                               |
| Other ethnic group                    | 36                              | 26                               |

Source: Households Below Average Income 2011/12

**Table 7.4: Poverty rate for individuals by presence of disabled member in the family and gender, 2011/12, United Kingdom**<sup>2, 3, 4, 6, 11</sup>

|                          | Poverty rate (%)                |                                  |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|                          | Families with a disabled member | Families with no disabled member |
| Male child               | 21                              | 16                               |
| Female child             | 20                              | 17                               |
| Male Working-age adult   | 21                              | 14                               |
| Female Working-age adult | 20                              | 13                               |
| Male Pensioner           | 13                              | 16                               |
| Female Pensioner         | 16                              | 20                               |

## Equality Information Report

Source: Households Below Average Income 2011/12

Generally, there was a fall in the proportion of individuals in families with a disabled member who are in relative low income across gender categories between 2010/11 and 2011/12, except for male children who experienced a slight increase.

### Notes:

1. In order to allow comparisons of living standards between different household types, income is adjusted to take into account variations in the size and composition of the household in a process known as equivalisation. This adjustment reflects the notion that a household of several people requires a higher income than a single person in order for both households to have an equivalent standard of living.
2. This indicator is measured using Household Below Average Income statistics sourced from the Family Resources Survey. The indicator measures the percentage of individuals in families containing someone who is disabled with incomes below 60 per cent of contemporary equivalised median income, Before Housing Costs. Data are annual with approximately a 12-month time lag after the end of the survey period.
3. All estimates are based on survey data and are therefore subject to uncertainty. Small differences should be treated with caution as these will be affected by sampling error and variability in non-response.
4. Proportions of individuals in low-income households have been rounded to the nearest percentage point.
5. Data is unavailable due to small sample sizes and is indicated as suppressed by (..)
6. Pensioners are defined as adults above State Pension Age (SPA). Prior to 6 April 2010, women reached SPA at 60, since then the qualifying age for women has been gradually increasing.
7. Disability is defined as having any long-standing illness, disability or impairment that leads to a substantial difficulty with one or more areas of the individual's life. Everyone classified as disabled under this definition would also be classified as disabled under the Equality Act 2010. However, some individuals classified as disabled under the Equality Act 2010 would not be captured by this definition.
8. The changes in poverty rate for families with a disabled member and families with no disabled member are not statistically significant between 2010/11 and 2011/12.
9. Statistics reported are on a three year average basis, due to the small sample sizes related to breakdown by ethnicity.

## Equality Information Report

10. The ethnicity figures reflect the new harmonised standards published in August 2011 which has resulted in changes. For more information please see the HBAI 2011/12 publication Appendix 2.
11. Households Below Average Income (HBAI) statistics assume that both partners in a couple benefit equally from the household's income, and will therefore appear at the same position in the income distribution. Research has suggested that, particularly in low income households, the assumption with regard to income sharing is not always valid as men sometimes benefit at the expense of women from shared household income. This means that it is possible that HBAI results broken down by gender could understate differences between the two groups.

## 8. Rate of pensioner poverty

### What does this tell us?

The indicator measures the percentage of pensioners in households with incomes below 60 per cent of equivalised contemporary median income, After Housing Costs, meaning they are in relative low income.

The Government wants all pensioners to have a decent and secure income in retirement. Key strategies include the “triple guarantee” that the basic State Pension will increase by the highest of earnings growth, price increases or 2.5 per cent. In addition, Government is protecting key benefits for older people, including Winter Fuel Payments, free prescriptions, and free TV licences for those aged 75 and over. Automatic enrolment is being introduced into workplace pensions to reinvigorate private pension savings, and it was announced in the Budget 2012 that the Government will reform the State Pensions system to introduce a single tier pension for future pensioners, which will lead to a simpler and fairer system that reduces the need for means testing and supports saving.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally, a decrease in this indicator will demonstrate that an improvement has been achieved, but external factors such as wider economic conditions also need to be taken into account.

### Links to other information that you may find useful

Further analysis of Households Below Average Income (HBAI) data are shown in the [annual HBAI publication](#).

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

**Table 8.1: Poverty rate for pensioners by age, UK, 2011/12<sup>1,2,3,7</sup>**

| Age      | Poverty rate (percentage of pensioners in low income households) |
|----------|--|
| Under 65 | 14   |
| 65-69    | 12   |
| 70-74    | 13   |
| 75-79    | 13   |
| 80-84    | 15   |
| 85+      | 16   |

The rates of pensioner poverty have fallen slightly across age groups since 2009/10, though these small changes should be treated with caution as they are not necessarily statistically significant.

**Table 8.2: Poverty rate for pensioners by disability, UK, 2011/12<sup>1,2,3,4,5,7</sup>**

| Disability status                                  | Poverty rate (percentage of pensioners in low income households) |
|--|--|
| Those living in families where no-one is disabled  | 14   |
| Those living in families where someone is disabled | 13   |

Since 2009/10 the rates of pensioner poverty have fallen for both those living in families where someone is disabled and those where no-one is disabled, though these small changes should be treated with caution as they are not necessarily statistically significant.

**Table 8.3: Poverty rate for pensioners by ethnic group of head of household, UK, 2009/10-2011/12<sup>1,2,3,6,7,8</sup>**

| Ethnic group of head (3-year average)    | Poverty rate (percentage of pensioners in low income households) |
|--|--|
| White                                    | 14   |
| Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups             | ..   |
| Asian or Asian British                   | 31   |
| Indian                                   | 27   |
| Pakistani                                | 37   |
| Bangladeshi                              | ..   |
| Chinese                                  | ..   |
| Any other Asian background               | ..   |
| Black/ African/ Caribbean/ Black British | 20   |
| Other Ethnic Group                       | 23   |

Ethnicity classifications have changed since previous reports; the data presented here is based on the new output classification.

**Table 8.4: Poverty rate for pensioners by gender, UK, 2011/12<sup>1,2,3,7,11</sup>**

| Gender | Poverty rate (percentage of pensioners in low income households) |
|--------|--|
| Male   | 13   |
| Female | 14   |

The rates of pensioner poverty have fallen slightly for both males and females since 2009/10, though these small changes should be treated with caution as they are not necessarily statistically significant.

All data sourced from: Households Below Average Income 2011/12.

Notes:

## Equality Information Report

1. This indicator is measured using Households Below Average Income statistics sourced from the Family Resources Survey. The indicator measures the percentage of pensioners with incomes below 60 per cent of contemporary equivalised median income, After Housing Costs. Data are annual with approximately a 12 month time lag after the end of the survey period.
2. All estimates are based on survey data and are therefore subject to uncertainty. Small differences should be treated with caution as these will be affected by sampling error and variability in non-response. Estimates showing ethnic breakdowns are presented as three-year averages because of small sample sizes. However, the figures must still be treated with some caution, as the sample sizes are still small for certain ethnic minority groups.
3. Proportions of individuals in low-income households have been rounded to the nearest percentage point.
4. Pensioners are defined as all those adults above State Pension age. Prior to 6th April 2010 women reached SPa from age 60. From 6th April 2010 the qualifying age for women is gradually increasing, therefore the age groups included have changed over time. The changes do not affect men whose SPa is currently 65.
5. Disability is defined as having any long-standing illness, disability or impairment that leads to a substantial difficulty with one or more areas of the individual's life. Everyone classified as disabled under this definition would also be classified as disabled under the Equality Act 2010. However, some individuals classified as disabled under the Equality Act 2010 would not be captured by this definition.
6. No adjustment is made to disposable household income to take into account any additional costs that may be incurred due to the illness or disability in question, and disability benefits have been included in the equivalised household income used. This means that the position in the income distribution of these groups, as shown here, may be somewhat upwardly biased. Results based on incomes excluding disability benefits are available on request.
7. '.' means data are not available due to small sample size.
8. Results cover the financial year 2011/12, i.e. April 2011 to March 2012.
9. Ethnicity figures reflect the new harmonised standards published in August 2011.
10. As the HBAI is derived from sample data all the figures are subject to sampling error. Different figures in HBAI are subject to widely differing levels of sampling error. For changes in the overall pensioner group to be statistically significant they would need to be in the order of 1.3

## Equality Information Report

percentage points or around 130-140,000 pensioners. Statistical significance is not provided for these particular breakdowns.

11. Households Below Average Income (HBAI) statistics assume that both partners in a couple benefit equally from the household's income, and will therefore appear at the same position in the income distribution. Research has suggested that, particularly in low income households, the assumption with regard to income sharing is not always valid as men sometimes benefit at the expense of women from shared household income. This means that it is possible that HBAI results broken down by gender could understate differences between the two groups.

## 9. Social mobility in adulthood

### What does this tell us?

This indicator measures the percentage of people aged 25-30 who started out in the bottom quintile and that have moved up the earnings distribution by twenty or more percentiles in a ten-year period.

The Social Mobility Strategy committed DWP to developing an indicator of wage progression, whilst acknowledging that other indicators of labour market success will also form part of a wider suite of indicators of social mobility in adulthood.

### How will an improvement be shown?

An increase in the percentage of the group that progressed in the labour market will demonstrate an improvement in social mobility. However, the percentage with no data available in 2012 will also need to be taken into account<sup>6</sup>.

### Links to other information that you may find useful

Further information on this [indicator](#) is available online.

Additional indicators of [social mobility in adulthood](#) are available on the Cabinet Office website.

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

**Table 9.1: Proportion of people aged 25-30 that experienced wage progression from the bottom earnings quintile, by gender, Great Britain, 2003-2012** <sup>3, 4, 5, 6</sup>

|                   | <b>All (%)</b> | <b>Male (%)</b> | <b>Female (%)</b> |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Progressed        | 12%            | 14%             | 11%               |
| Did not progress  | 39%            | 38%             | 40%               |
| No data available | 49%            | 49%             | 49%               |
| Total             | 100%           | 100%            | 100%              |

There has been no statistically significant change in the proportion of either men or women who experienced wage progression compared to data from 2011. Comparison with data from earlier years is not available.

For the 2012 data, the difference between the proportion of males and women who experienced wage progression is statistically significant.

All data sourced from: DWP analysis of the Office for National Statistics Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE)

Notes:

1. This indicator is measured using ASHE and the earnings variable of interest is gross hourly earnings excluding overtime where earnings are not affected by absence. For individuals with more than one job (about 2% of employees in the sample) only their 'main job' is included in the analysis; as defined by the job with the greatest gross weekly pay and then the greatest total hours.
2. ASHE does not contain information on disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sexual orientation or marriage and civil partnership.
3. This indicator uses unweighted data as the weighting variables within the dataset are intended for cross-sectional rather than longitudinal analysis, consistent with other longitudinal ASHE outputs within DWP. This may bias estimates as data are not necessarily representative of the employee population (calibrated to the Labour Force Survey) or adjusted for differences in response rates across firms.
4. Progression is defined by a move up the earnings distribution by 20 or more percentiles between 2003 and 2012.
5. "Did not progress" is defined by not increasing along the earnings distribution by 20 or more percentiles.

## Equality Information Report

6. "No data available" is due to those who were in the bottom quintile in 2003 but had no earnings recorded in 2012.

## Pensions-related impact indicators

### **10. Number of employees in a pension scheme sponsored by their employer**

#### **What does this tell us?**

This indicator measures the number of employee jobs (including those affected by absence) who are aged at least 22 years of age, under state pension age, earning above the earnings threshold for automatic enrolment, and who are participating in a pension scheme sponsored by their employer. The indicator excludes the self-employed and it should be noted that an individual may have more than one job.

#### **How will an improvement be shown?**

Generally, an improvement in the indicator will be demonstrated if an increase has been achieved. From 2010 to 2012 there has been a small decrease in overall membership continuing the recent downward trend.

#### **Links to other information that you may find useful**

Further information on this [indicator](#) is available online.

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

**Table 10.1: Numbers of employees in a pension scheme sponsored by their employer by age, 2012, Great Britain<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>**

| Age              | Number (millions) |
|------------------|-------------------|
| 22-24            | 0.3               |
| 25-29            | 1.0               |
| 30-34            | 1.3               |
| 35-39            | 1.4               |
| 40-44            | 1.7               |
| 45-49            | 1.9               |
| 50-54            | 1.6               |
| 55-59            | 1.2               |
| 60-64 males only | 0.3               |
| Total            | 10.8              |

There have been small movements in the number of employees in a pension scheme sponsored by their employer across age groups, reflecting the continuing decline in pension scheme membership overall. The 35-44 age groups accounted for around half of the total fall in membership between 2010 and 2012 but only around 30% of all members in 2012. In general, participation in workplace pensions increases with age.

**Table 10.2: Numbers of employees in a pension scheme sponsored by their employer by gender, 2012, Great Britain<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>**

| Gender | Number (millions) |
|--------|-------------------|
| Male   | 5.7               |
| Female | 5.1               |
| Total  | 10.8              |

There have been similar falls in the number of male and female employees in a pension scheme sponsored by their employer, both falling by 0.3 million between 2010 and 2012. Although more men than women are saving in a workplace pension, participation is higher amongst women than men.

All tables sourced from: DWP analysis of the Office of National Statistics Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE).

## Equality Information Report

### Notes:

1. This indicator is measured using the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings and includes all employee jobs (including those affected by absence) with an employer-sponsored pension where the individual is aged at least 22 and less than state pension age (up to 2011/12 this was 65 for men and 60 for women) and where annual gross earnings is above the earnings threshold of £8,105 in 2012/13 earnings terms.
2. Numbers of employee jobs have been rounded to the nearest 0.1 million. Totals may not sum due to rounding.
3. ‘.’ means data is not available
4. Tests to identify statistically significant differences in the level of pension membership among protected characteristics are not relevant as this indicator is based on absolute numbers.

# Operational working of the Department related impact indicators

## 11. Monetary value of fraud and error in the benefit system

### What does this tell us?

This is the primary Departmental indicator for levels of fraud and error in the benefit system. The Fraud and Error National Statistics published for this indicator include global estimates for fraud and error in the benefit system. In addition there are more detailed estimates for Income Support, Jobseeker's Allowance, Pension Credit and Housing Benefit, and for types of error. This indicator is important for Departmental assurance on the effect of anti-fraud and error activity across the businesses.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally, a decrease in the indicator will demonstrate if an improvement has been achieved but economic conditions and overall expenditure will also need to be taken into account.

Details of this indicator were released by age and gender for the first time in Autumn 2012 and this is the first update to those figures. It is therefore not possible to compare these figures to previous years, as no data was available at the time of the previous Equality Information Reports.

### Links to other information that you may find useful

Reports on the monetary value of [fraud and error in the benefits system](#) are available online.

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online.

Equality Information Report

**Table 11.1: Estimates of Fraud and Error Overpayments for Income Support<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup>**

| Income Support Totals |                | All Ages | Under 25 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-49 | 50-64 |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| All Claimants         | Fraud          | £140m    | £30m     | £30m  | £30m  | £20m  | £30m  |
|                       | Claimant Error | £70m     | £10m     | £10m  | £20m  | £10m  | £20m  |
|                       | Official Error | £40m     | £10m     | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £10m  |
|                       | Total          | £250m    | £50m     | £60m  | £60m  | £30m  | £60m  |
| Female Claimants      | Fraud          | £100m    | £30m     | £30m  | £20m  | £10m  | £10m  |
|                       | Claimant Error | £40m     | £10m     | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £10m  |
|                       | Official Error | £30m     | £10m     | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Total          | £170m    | £40m     | £50m  | £40m  | £20m  | £20m  |
| Male Claimants        | Fraud          | £50m     | £0m      | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £20m  |
|                       | Claimant Error | £20m     | £0m      | £0m   | £10m  | £0m   | £10m  |
|                       | Official Error | £10m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Total          | £80m     | £0m      | £10m  | £20m  | £10m  | £30m  |

Equality Information Report

**Table 11.2: Estimates of Fraud and Error Overpayments for Jobseeker's Allowance<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup>**

| Jobseeker's Allowance |                | All Ages | Under 25 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-64 |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| All Claimants         | Fraud          | £150m    | £40m     | £40m  | £40m  | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  |
|                       | Claimant Error | £30m     | £10m     | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £10m  |
|                       | Official Error | £40m     | £10m     | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Total          | £220m    | £50m     | £60m  | £50m  | £10m  | £20m  | £20m  |
| Female Claimants      | Fraud          | £30m     | £10m     | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Claimant Error | £10m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Official Error | £10m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Total          | £50m     | £20m     | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £10m  |
| Male Claimants        | Fraud          | £120m    | £30m     | £40m  | £40m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   |
|                       | Claimant Error | £20m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £10m  |
|                       | Official Error | £30m     | £10m     | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Total          | £170m    | £40m     | £50m  | £40m  | £10m  | £10m  | £20m  |

Equality Information Report

**Table 11.3: Estimates of Fraud and Error Overpayments for Pension Credit**<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup>

| Pension Credit   |                | All Ages | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85-89 | 90 and over |
|------------------|----------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|
| All Claimants    | Fraud          | £150m    | £50m  | £40m  | £20m  | £30m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m         |
|                  | Claimant Error | £140m    | £30m  | £30m  | £20m  | £30m  | £20m  | £10m  | £20m        |
|                  | Official Error | £130m    | £20m  | £20m  | £20m  | £20m  | £20m  | £20m  | £10m        |
|                  | Total          | £420m    | £100m | £90m  | £60m  | £70m  | £50m  | £30m  | £30m        |
| Female Claimants | Fraud          | £50m     | £10m  | £20m  | £10m  | £20m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m         |
|                  | Claimant Error | £80m     | £10m        |
|                  | Official Error | £70m     | £0m   | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £10m        |
|                  | Total          | £200m    | £20m  | £40m  | £30m  | £40m  | £30m  | £20m  | £20m        |
| Male Claimants   | Fraud          | £100m    | £40m  | £20m  | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m         |
|                  | Claimant Error | £60m     | £20m  | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m         |
|                  | Official Error | £50m     | £20m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m         |
|                  | Total          | £220m    | £70m  | £50m  | £30m  | £30m  | £20m  | £10m  | £0m         |

Equality Information Report

**Table 11.4: Estimates of Fraud and Error Overpayments for Housing Benefit<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup>**

| Housing Benefit  |                | All Ages | Under 25 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60-64 | Over 65 |
|------------------|----------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| All Claimants    | Fraud          | £350m    | £40m     | £60m  | £130m | £30m  | £20m  | £20m  | £20m  | £20m    |
|                  | Claimant Error | £790m    | £70m     | £180m | £220m | £100m | £60m  | £30m  | £20m  | £110m   |
|                  | Official Error | £130m    | £10m     | £20m  | £30m  | £10m  | £0m   | £10m  | £10m  | £40m    |
|                  | Total          | £1270m   | £120m    | £270m | £380m | £130m | £80m  | £60m  | £50m  | £170m   |
| Female Claimants | Fraud          | £220m    | £30m     | £40m  | £80m  | £20m  | £10m  | £10m  | £20m  | £10m    |
|                  | Claimant Error | £500m    | £50m     | £120m | £150m | £70m  | £30m  | £20m  | £10m  | £50m    |
|                  | Official Error | £70m     | £10m     | £10m  | £20m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £10m    |
|                  | Total          | £790m    | £90m     | £170m | £250m | £90m  | £50m  | £20m  | £40m  | £70m    |
| Male Claimants   | Fraud          | £130m    | £10m     | £20m  | £50m  | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £10m    |
|                  | Claimant Error | £290m    | £20m     | £60m  | £70m  | £30m  | £30m  | £10m  | £0m   | £60m    |
|                  | Official Error | £70m     | £0m      | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £10m  | £0m   | £30m    |
|                  | Total          | £480m    | £30m     | £90m  | £130m | £40m  | £40m  | £30m  | £10m  | £100m   |

## Equality Information Report

**Table 11.5: Estimates of Fraud and Error Underpayments for Income Support<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup>**

| Income Support Totals |                | All Ages | Under 25 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-49 | 50-64 |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| All Claimants         | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Claimant Error | £30m     | £0m      | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £10m  |
|                       | Official Error | £20m     | £0m      | £0m   | £10m  | £0m   | £10m  |
|                       | Total          | £60m     | £0m      | £10m  | £20m  | £10m  | £20m  |
| Female Claimants      | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Claimant Error | £20m     | £0m      | £0m   | £10m  | £0m   | £10m  |
|                       | Official Error | £20m     | £0m      | £0m   | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Total          | £40m     | £0m      | £10m  | £20m  | £10m  | £10m  |
| Male Claimants        | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Claimant Error | £10m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Official Error | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Total          | £20m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £10m  |

Equality Information Report

**Table 11.6: Estimates of Fraud and Error Underpayments for Jobseeker's Allowance<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup>**

| Jobseeker's Allowance |                | All Ages | Under 25 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-64 |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| All Claimants         | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Claimant Error | £10m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Official Error | £10m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Total          | £10m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
| Female Claimants      | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Claimant Error | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Official Error | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Total          | £10m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
| Male Claimants        | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Claimant Error | £10m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Official Error | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |
|                       | Total          | £10m     | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   |

Equality Information Report

**Table 11.7: Estimates of Fraud and Error Underpayments for Pension Credit<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup>**

| Pension Credit   |                | All Ages | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85-89 | 90 and over |
|------------------|----------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|
| All Claimants    | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m         |
|                  | Claimant Error | £90m     | £10m  | £10m  | £20m  | £20m  | £20m  | £0m   | £10m        |
|                  | Official Error | £70m     | £10m        |
|                  | Total          | £160m    | £10m  | £20m  | £30m  | £30m  | £40m  | £20m  | £20m        |
| Female Claimants | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m         |
|                  | Claimant Error | £60m     | £0m   | £0m   | £10m  | £10m  | £20m  | £0m   | £10m        |
|                  | Official Error | £40m     | £0m   | £0m   | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m         |
|                  | Total          | £90m     | £10m  | £0m   | £20m  | £10m  | £30m  | £10m  | £10m        |
| Male Claimants   | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m         |
|                  | Claimant Error | £30m     | £0m   | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m         |
|                  | Official Error | £30m     | £0m   | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m         |
|                  | Total          | £60m     | £10m  | £10m  | £20m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m         |

Equality Information Report

**Table 11.8: Estimates of Fraud and Error Underpayments for Housing Benefit<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup>**

| Housing Benefit  |                | All Ages | Under 25 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60-64 | Over 65 |
|------------------|----------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| All Claimants    | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m     |
|                  | Claimant Error | £240m    | £10m     | £90m  | £60m  | £20m  | £20m  | £10m  | £0m   | £20m    |
|                  | Official Error | £60m     | £0m      | £10m  | £20m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £10m    |
|                  | Total          | £300m    | £20m     | £100m | £80m  | £30m  | £20m  | £10m  | £10m  | £30m    |
| Female Claimants | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m     |
|                  | Claimant Error | £160m    | £10m     | £60m  | £40m  | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £10m    |
|                  | Official Error | £40m     | £0m      | £10m  | £20m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m     |
|                  | Total          | £200m    | £20m     | £70m  | £60m  | £20m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £10m    |
| Male Claimants   | Fraud          | £0m      | £0m      | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m     |
|                  | Claimant Error | £80m     | £0m      | £20m  | £20m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £10m    |
|                  | Official Error | £30m     | £0m      | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £0m   | £10m    |
|                  | Total          | £100m    | £0m      | £30m  | £20m  | £10m  | £10m  | £10m  | £0m   | £20m    |

## Equality Information Report

### Notes:

1. All expenditure values in the table are rounded to the nearest 10m.
2. Some estimates may not sum due to rounding.
3. Some lower level age group breakdowns may not be available due to small sample sizes.
4. Estimates are subject to sampling uncertainty – data is sourced from a stratified sample of administrative data from the DWP benefit systems.
5. Proportions for each age group are also available in the supporting data spreadsheets.
6. Statistical significance is not available for this indicator.

## 12. Public opinion of DWP service levels

### What does this tell us?

This measure shows the overall levels of reported satisfaction of people who have had meaningful contact with the Department as a whole in the six months prior to fieldwork from the DWP Claimant Service and Experience Survey (2012).

The indicator provides an overview of the Department's service to its customers and claimants, allowing performance to be reviewed and service improvements to be made accordingly.

For this report we have included results from The DWP Claimant Service and Experience Survey (2012) to give some information on Claimant and Customer satisfaction levels broken down by key demographics. The survey found that 83 per cent of claimants were satisfied overall with the service they received with 15 per cent reporting dissatisfaction.

The tables are different from last year's report in that they are no longer broken down for Jobcentre Plus and PDCS centres, but instead give overall figures for customer and claimant satisfaction broken down by working age and pension customers<sup>1</sup>. This reflects the operational changes that the Department has undergone, and this format will continue in future reports.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally, a higher score will indicate greater level of reported customer satisfaction.

Satisfaction levels have broadly fallen since last year, though given the operational changes that the Department is undergoing the performance should be considered over a longer period. Differences in satisfaction levels across protected groups remain broadly similar to last year<sup>2</sup>.

### Links to other information that you may find useful

Information on the [Customer and Claimant Opinion of Departmental Service Levels indicator](#) is available online.

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

The DWP Claimant Service and Experience [Survey 2012](#) is available online.

The following tables look at overall satisfaction according to protected characteristics.

**Table 12.1: Overall satisfaction by Age for Working-age adults<sup>2,3</sup>**

| Group              | Age   | Claimant's reported satisfaction                                    |  |
|--------------------|-------|---|--|
|                    |       | Percentage of customers who are either 'fairly' or 'very' satisfied | Percentage of customers who are either 'fairly' or 'very' dissatisfied |
| Working-age adults | 16-24 | 88  | 12   |
|                    | 25-49 | 82  | 17   |
|                    | 50-59 | 79  | 20   |
|                    | 60-64 | 78  | 21   |

The 2012 data show 16-24 year olds are significantly more satisfied and less dissatisfied than all other ages. In 2011 the 16-24 group were also more satisfied than all others and less likely to be dissatisfied than 50-59. There has been a small decrease in satisfaction levels and increase in dissatisfaction across all age groups since last year except 16-24.

**Table 12.2: Overall satisfaction by Age for Pension Customers<sup>2,3</sup>**

| Group             | Age   | Customer's reported satisfaction                                    |  |
|-------------------|-------|---|--|
|                   |       | Percentage of customers who are either 'fairly' or 'very' satisfied | Percentage of customers who are either 'fairly' or 'very' dissatisfied |
| Pension Customers | 60-65 | 91  | 9  |
|                   | 66-74 | 87  | 9  |
|                   | 75+   | 89  | 5  |

The 2012 data show there are no differences in terms of satisfaction but there are in terms of dissatisfaction. People aged 75 plus are less likely to be dissatisfied. For 2011 there were no statistically significant differences for either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. There has been a small decrease in satisfaction levels across all age groups since last year except 75+. Those aged 60-65 are also more dissatisfied in 2012.

**Table 12.3: Overall satisfaction by Disability for Working-age adults<sup>2,3</sup>**

| Group              | Long-standing illness or disability that limited daily activities or work | Claimant's reported satisfaction                                     |   |
|--------------------|---|--|---|
|                    |   | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' satisfied | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' dissatisfied |
| Working-age adults | Yes   | 79   | 20  |
|                    | No  | 85   | 14  |

The 2012 data show there is a statistically significant difference between those with disability and those without for both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This was also the case for 2011. Overall satisfaction levels have fallen and dissatisfaction increased on the year both for those with a disability and those without.

**Table 12.4: Overall satisfaction by Disability for Pension Customers<sup>2,3</sup>**

| Group             | Long-standing illness or disability that limited daily activities or work | Customer's reported satisfaction                                     |   |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
|                   |   | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' satisfied | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' dissatisfied |
| Pension Customers | Yes   | 87   | 9   |
|                   | No  | 92   | 6   |

The 2012 data show there is a statistically significant difference between those with a disability and those without for both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This was also the case for 2011. There has been a fall in satisfaction levels on the year for those without a disability.

**Table 12.5: Overall satisfaction by Ethnicity for Working-age adults<sup>2,3</sup>**

| Group              | Ethnicity   | Claimant's reported satisfaction                                     |   |
|--------------------|-------------|--|---|
|                    |             | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' satisfied | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' dissatisfied |
| Working-age adults | White       | 83   | 16  |
|                    | Asian       | 86   | 13  |
|                    | Black       | 78   | 21  |
|                    | Mixed/Other | 82   | 16  |

The 2012 data show there is no statistically significant difference in levels of satisfaction by ethnicity. In 2011 White and Asian were both more likely to be satisfied than mixed/other and less likely to be dissatisfied. In 2011 Asian were less likely to be dissatisfied than white and more likely to be satisfied. Satisfaction has fallen along with an increase in dissatisfaction for all groups with the exception of mixed/other between 2011 and 2012.

**Table 12.6: Overall satisfaction by Ethnicity for Pension Customers<sup>2,3</sup>**

| Group             | Ethnicity   | Customer's reported satisfaction                                     |   |
|-------------------|-------------|--|---|
|                   |             | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' satisfied | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' dissatisfied |
| Pension Customers | White       | 90   | 8   |
|                   | Asian       | 79   | 17  |
|                   | Black       | 78   | 5   |
|                   | Mixed/Other | 87   | 13  |

The 2012 data show there is no statistically significant difference in levels of satisfaction or dissatisfaction by ethnicity. This was also the case in 2011. Since last year, satisfaction levels have fallen and dissatisfaction levels increased for the White ethnic group. When interpreting satisfaction levels by ethnicity it is important to consider the base sizes as these are low for certain groups as shown in the tables.

**Table 12.7: Overall satisfaction by Gender for Working-age adults<sup>2,3</sup>**

| Group              | Gender             | Claimant's reported satisfaction                                     |   |
|--------------------|--------------------|--|---|
|                    |                    | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' satisfied | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' dissatisfied |
| Working-age adults | Male (age 16-64)   | 82   | 17  |
|                    | Female (age 16-59) | 84   | 15  |

The 2012 data show there is no statistically significant difference in satisfaction levels between males and females. In 2011 men were significantly less satisfied and more dissatisfied than women. There has been a decrease in satisfaction levels and increase in dissatisfaction since last year for both genders.

**Table 12.8: Overall satisfaction by Gender for Pension Customers<sup>2,3</sup>**

| Group      | Gender           | Customer's reported satisfaction                                     |   |
|------------|------------------|--|---|
|            |                  | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' satisfied | Percentage of customer's who are either 'fairly' or 'very' dissatisfied |
| Pensioners | Male (Age 65+)   | 92   | 6   |
|            | Female (Age 60+) | 88   | 9   |

The 2012 data show that males are statistically more satisfied and less dissatisfied than females. In 2011 there were no significant differences between males and females. There has been a decrease in satisfaction levels and increase in dissatisfaction since last year for Females.

Source: DWP Claimant Service and Experience Survey (2012). DWP Research Report 831.

Notes:

1. For the purpose of comparing results between the 2011 and 2012 survey waves, age categories were kept constant and the following convention is used in this

## Equality Information Report

report: Working age adults are defined as – male aged 16-64 and female 16-59. Pension age customers are defined as – male aged 65+ and female aged 60+.

2. Significance testing is conducted using independent samples t-test at the 95% level. Where mention is made of a difference between groups this is based on significance testing.
3. The DWP Claimant Service and Experience Survey (2012) was commissioned to provide the Department with strategic information for the key areas identified in the DWP customer charter, and in the DWP Delivery Plan 2012-2013. The research involved 7,022 telephone interviews during May through July 2012 with customers and claimants who were identified as having had a meaningful contact with the Department in the six months prior to the survey. Customers and claimants from the following benefits were included: Jobseekers Allowance (JSA), Employment and support allowance (ESA), Income Support (IS), Disability Living Allowance (DLA), Carers Allowance (CA), Attendance Allowance (AA), Pension Credit (PC), and State Pension (SP).

## 13. Additional customer data

### Employment gap information

#### What does this tell us?

The employment rate gap compares the overall employment rate in Great Britain for 16 to 64 year olds with the employment rate for 16 to 64 year olds with the characteristics described in the table.

A positive employment rate gap means that the overall Great Britain employment rate is higher than the employment rate for the group described.

#### How will an improvement be shown?

A reduction in the employment gap would generally show an improvement. However, economic conditions will also need to be taken into account.

The supporting [datasheets](#) for this chapter are also available online and provide comparable figures from the previous reports.

**Table 13.1: Employment rates and gaps for various protected characteristics, Quarter 1 2013 (January-March 2013)<sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup>**

| Disadvantaged Group           | Employment rate gap (percentage points) |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Female                        | 5                                       |
| Disabled People               | 24                                      |
| Ethnic Minorities             | 12                                      |
| Young People (aged 18 to 24)  | 14                                      |
| Older Workers (aged 50 to 64) | 4                                       |

Source: Labour Force Survey

There have been no statistically significant changes in the employment rate gap since last year.

Notes:

1. Data are rounded to the nearest percentage point
2. Data are subject to sampling variation and is not seasonally adjusted
3. Data covers GB only, not UK

## Equality Information Report

4. The groups described by this indicator reflect the disadvantaged groups described within the former Public Service Agreement (PSA) 8 'Maximise employment opportunity for all'. Although PSAs are no longer used, information on the employment rates for the disadvantaged groups continues to be provided for the purposes of consistency over time.
5. Ethnic Minority represents all non-white ethnicities.

**Links to additional information:**

[National and Official Statistics products](#) – the Department produces a number of National and Official Statistics products.

Employment and Support Allowance – [Work Capability Assessment](#) and [Sanctions](#)

[Income Related Benefits Estimate of Take-Up](#) – includes details on age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

[Household Below Average Income Series](#) – includes details on age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

[Low-Income Dynamics](#) – includes details on age and gender.

[Pensioner Incomes Series](#) – includes details on age, ethnicity and gender.

[Family Resources Survey](#) – includes details on age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

[Access to Work](#) – includes details about the programme that helps fund reasonable adjustments for disabled workers.

[Lone parents on Jobseekers Allowance](#) – includes details on age, gender, disability and ethnicity.

[Second tier pension provision](#) – includes details on age and gender.

[DWP tabulation tool](#) – includes a range of benefit data with details on age and gender and some splits available by disability and ethnicity.

[Life Opportunities Survey](#) – a detailed survey looking at life opportunities for disabled and non-disabled people.

[Pre-Work Programme and Get Britain Working Official Statistics](#) – includes details on age, disability and ethnicity:

Independent Living and Office for Disability Issues [indicators on disability equality issues](#)

Please email [general.statistics@dwp.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:general.statistics@dwp.gsi.gov.uk) if you are interested in any of these data sources or want to enquire about the feasibility of any analysis of DWP data by a protected characteristic that is not included here.

# Section 2: Information about our employees

## 14. The DWP workforce

As part of our commitment to achieving a workforce representative of the society we serve and providing equality of opportunity, we monitor representation of protected characteristics by grade across the Department. We have also set representation targets for staff at senior grades for ethnicity, disability and gender.

The Civil Service grading structure indicates level of seniority within the organisation and covers a range of roles:

Senior Civil Service (SCS):

Pay Band 3 Director General

Pay Bands 2 and 1 Director and Deputy Director

Senior Management:

Grade 6/Band G

Grade 7/Band F

Managerial:

SEO/Band E

HEO/Band D

EO/Band C

Administrative:

AO/Band B

AA/Band A

### What does this tell us?

The data presented here show the Department's employees by grade as percentages against each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; ethnicity; and gender. As at 31 March 2013 we had 104,889 employees (headcount), their declaration rate for ethnicity was 75.4% and 84.7% for disability. Unfortunately, at this time, the levels of declaration for sexual orientation and religion or belief are too low for publication.

The figures in this report indicate a slight decline in the declaration rate for disability (-0.5%) and ethnicity (-2.7%) from the 2012 figures which increases the uncertainty around the relevant data. However, it should be noted that in August 2012 the Child Maintenance Group (CMG) was integrated into the Department. The data in this section represents our combined workforce figures, and this has impacted the declaration rates. This should be taken into account when making direct comparisons with previous publications.

Compared with the 2012 report the percentage of the DWP workforce has increased slightly in the 50 and above age groups. The results also show that the 2013 targets for disability representation have been exceeded in the lower grades, which cover the large majority of staff. Compared with the 2012 report progress has also been made in the higher grades. The 2013 ethnicity targets are more difficult to compare with 2012 due to the change in declaration rate. The results show that the gender targets have been exceeded for the grades where a target has been set. However, the numbers in the higher grades are small so are subject to greater variability.

### How will an improvement be shown?

A higher percentage under each protected characteristic will show we employ a greater proportion of people with that protected characteristic. However other factors, such as the declaration rate, will need to be taken into account.

### Links to other information that you may find useful

The supporting [data](#) for this chapter and the whole of section two is available online and provides comparable figures from the previous reports.

**Table 14.1: Percentage of DWP workforce by age and grade in relation to overall headcount<sup>1,3</sup>**

| Age   | Grade                    |                             |                  |                  |             |                    | % of Total |
|-------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------|
|       | % Band A/AA to Band C/EO | % Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO | % Band F/Grade 7 | % Band G/Grade 6 | % SCS (All) | % Not known/ Other |            |
| 16-24 | 1.9                      | 0.8                         | 0.0              | 0.0              | 0.0         | 0.0                | 1.7        |
| 25-29 | 5.8                      | 2.3                         | 2.2              | 0.0              | 0.0         | 6.9                | 5.4        |
| 30-34 | 9.0                      | 5.3                         | 9.3              | 2.9              | 2.2         | 22.1               | 8.6        |
| 35-39 | 10.1                     | 8.2                         | 9.5              | 9.1              | 7.1         | 20.6               | 9.9        |
| 40-44 | 14.1                     | 14.8                        | 14.5             | 14.9             | 12.9        | 18.3               | 14.2       |
| 45-49 | 18.8                     | 24.6                        | 23.2             | 23.7             | 31.6        | 16.8               | 19.5       |
| 50-54 | 18.3                     | 24.4                        | 23.3             | 26.5             | 26.7        | 9.2                | 19.0       |
| 55-59 | 13.6                     | 14.9                        | 15.2             | 19.1             | 16.9        | 5.3                | 13.8       |
| 60-64 | 6.7                      | 4.2                         | 2.5              | 3.7              | 2.7         | *                  | 6.3        |
| 65+   | 1.7                      | 0.5                         | *                | *                | 0.0         | 0.0                | 1.5        |
| Total | 100.0                    | 100.0                       | 100.0            | 100.0            | 100.0       | 100.0              | 100.0      |

Table 14.2: Percentage of DWP workforce by age and proportion in grade<sup>2,3</sup>

| Age                           | Grade                    |                             |                  |                  |             |                    |       | % Total |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------|---------|
|                               | % Band A/AA to Band C/EO | % Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO | % Band F/Grade 7 | % Band G/Grade 6 | % SCS (All) | % Not known/ Other |       |         |
| 16-24                         | 95.4                     | 4.6                         | 0.0              | 0.0              | 0.0         | 0.0                | 100.0 |         |
| 25-29                         | 95.1                     | 4.1                         | 0.6              | 0.0              | 0.0         | 0.2                | 100.0 |         |
| 30-34                         | 91.9                     | 6.0                         | 1.6              | 0.2              | 0.1         | 0.3                | 100.0 |         |
| 35-39                         | 89.6                     | 8.1                         | 1.4              | 0.5              | 0.2         | 0.3                | 100.0 |         |
| 40-44                         | 87.4                     | 10.2                        | 1.5              | 0.6              | 0.2         | 0.2                | 100.0 |         |
| 45-49                         | 84.8                     | 12.4                        | 1.7              | 0.7              | 0.3         | 0.1                | 100.0 |         |
| 50-54                         | 84.6                     | 12.5                        | 1.8              | 0.8              | 0.3         | 0.1                | 100.0 |         |
| 55-59                         | 86.8                     | 10.5                        | 1.6              | 0.8              | 0.3         | 0.0                | 100.0 |         |
| 60-64                         | 92.6                     | 6.4                         | 0.6              | 0.3              | 0.1         | *                  | 100.0 |         |
| 65+                           | 96.3                     | 3.4                         | *                | *                | 0.0         | 0.0                | 100.0 |         |
| % of Total headcount by grade | 87.9                     | 9.8                         | 1.4              | 0.6              | 0.2         | 0.1                | 100.0 |         |

**Table 14.3: Percentage of DWP workforce by grade and indicated disability in relation to overall headcount<sup>1,3</sup>**

| Disability   | Grade                    |                             |                  |                  |             |                    | % of Total |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------|
|              | % Band A/AA to Band C/EO | % Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO | % Band F/Grade 7 | % Band G/Grade 6 | % SCS (All) | % Not known/ Other |            |
| 2013 target  | 6.0                      | 5.5                         | 5.2              | 5.2              | 5.2         | N/A                | N/A        |
| Disabled     | 6.6                      | 5.7                         | 4.3              | 3.6              | 4.2         | *                  | 6.5        |
| Non-disabled | 93.4                     | 94.3                        | 95.7             | 96.4             | 95.8        | 97.2               | 93.5       |
| Total        | 100.0                    | 100.0                       | 100.0            | 100.0            | 100.0       | 100.0              | 100.0      |

Equality Information Report

Table 14.4: Percentage of DWP workforce by indicated disability and proportion in grade<sup>2,3</sup>

| Disability                 | Grade                    |                             |                  |                  |             |     | % Not known/ Other | % Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|-----|--------------------|---------|
|                            | % Band A/AA to Band C/EO | % Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO | % Band F/Grade 7 | % Band G/Grade 6 | % SCS (All) |     |                    |         |
| Disabled                   | 89.0                     | 9.5                         | 1.0              | 0.3              | 0.1         | *   | 100.0              |         |
| Non-disabled               | 86.9                     | 10.8                        | 1.5              | 0.6              | 0.2         | 0.0 | 100.0              |         |
| % Total indicated by grade | 87.0                     | 10.7                        | 1.5              | 0.6              | 0.2         | 0.0 | 100.0              |         |

**Table 14.5: Percentage of DWP workforce by grade and indicated ethnicity in relation to overall headcount<sup>1,3</sup>**

| Ethnicity       | Grade                    |                             |                  |                  |            |                    | % of Total |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
|                 | % Band A/AA to Band C/EO | % Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO | % Band F/Grade 7 | % Band G/Grade 6 | %SCS (All) | % Not known/ Other |            |
| 2013 target     | N/A                      | 7.5                         | 5.5              | 5.5              | 5.0        | N/A                | N/A        |
| Ethnic minority | 11.9                     | 6.9                         | 5.5              | 4.8              | 5.2        | 11.9               | 11.2       |
| White           | 88.1                     | 93.1                        | 94.5             | 95.2             | 94.8       | 88.1               | 88.8       |
| Total           | 100.0                    | 100.0                       | 100.0            | 100.0            | 100.0      | 100.0              | 100.0      |

**Table 14.6: Percentage of DWP workforce by indicated ethnicity and proportion in grade<sup>2,3</sup>**

| Ethnicity                  | Grade                    |                             |                  |                  |             |                    | % Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------------|---------|
|                            | % Band A/AA to Band C/EO | % Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO | % Band F/Grade 7 | % Band G/Grade 6 | % SCS (All) | % Not known/ Other |         |
| Ethnic minority            | 92.4                     | 6.5                         | 0.7              | 0.2              | 0.1         | 0.1                | 100.0   |
| White                      | 86.5                     | 11.1                        | 1.5              | 0.6              | 0.2         | 0.1                | 100.0   |
| % Total indicated by grade | 87.2                     | 10.6                        | 1.4              | 0.6              | 0.2         | 0.1                | 100.0   |

**Table 14.7: Percentage of DWP workforce by grade and gender in relation to overall headcount<sup>1,3</sup>**

| Gender      | Grade                    |                             |                  |                  |             |       | % Not known/ Other | % of Total |
|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|-------|--------------------|------------|
|             | % Band A/AA to Band C/EO | % Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO | % Band F/Grade 7 | % Band G/Grade 6 | % SCS (All) |       |                    |            |
| 2013 target | N/A                      | N/A                         | 47.0             | 45.0             | 39.5        | N/A   | N/A                |            |
| Female      | 69.7                     | 60.9                        | 51.6             | 45.3             | 39.6        | 49.6  | 68.3               |            |
| Male        | 30.3                     | 39.1                        | 48.4             | 54.7             | 60.4        | 50.4  | 31.7               |            |
| Total       | 100.0                    | 100.0                       | 100.0            | 100.0            | 100.0       | 100.0 | 100.0              |            |

**Table 14.8: Percentage of DWP workforce by gender and proportion in grade<sup>2,3</sup>**

| Gender                        | Grade                    |                             |                  |                  |             |     | % Not known/ Other | % Total |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|-----|--------------------|---------|
|                               | % Band A/AA to Band C/EO | % Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO | % Band F/Grade 7 | % Band G/Grade 6 | % SCS (All) |     |                    |         |
| Female                        | 89.6                     | 8.7                         | 1.1              | 0.4              | 0.1         | 0.1 | 100.0              |         |
| Male                          | 84.2                     | 12.0                        | 2.2              | 1.0              | 0.4         | 0.2 | 100.0              |         |
| % of Total headcount by grade | 87.9                     | 9.8                         | 1.4              | 0.6              | 0.2         | 0.1 | 100.0              |         |

All data sourced from: Resource Management.

Notes:

1. Percentages shown are the number of employees who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic, over the total number of employees by grade.
2. Percentages shown are the number of employees who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic, over the total number of employees in that particular group.
3. Data as at 31 March 2013.

## 15. Disciplinary procedures

### What does this tell us?

The data presented here show the percentage of employees who have been subject to formal disciplinary procedures against their status in relation to each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; ethnicity; and gender. For ease of comparison the tables include a column illustrating the relevant headcount breakdown taken from Section 14.

These results show a declining trend in the percentage disciplined by age group up to 64. Please note that the volumes in the 16-24 and 65 and above age groups are too small to draw valid conclusions. The volumes not declared in respect of ethnic minority and disabled protected groups are also such that it is not possible to draw conclusions regarding percentage differences.

Comparing the figures with the 2012 report indicates that broadly the percentage has declined across age groups, gender and overall. The ethnic minority, disabled and female groups all have results close to those reported last year. However, the differences in all such comparison volumes are too small to interpret as indicating significant changes.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally the similarity of this indicator in a protected and non-protected group will indicate equivalent behaviour. However, this will require a reasonably complete declaration rate and sufficiently large volumes to be precise.

**Table 15.1: Percentage of employees by age who were disciplined<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Age   | % disciplined by age group <sup>3</sup> | % of age group disciplined <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by age group <sup>5</sup> |
|-------|---|---|--|
| 16-24 | 3.4                                     | 3.8                                     | 1.7  |
| 25-29 | 8.6                                     | 3.1                                     | 5.4  |
| 30-34 | 10.1                                    | 2.3                                     | 8.6  |
| 35-39 | 10.1                                    | 2.0                                     | 9.9  |
| 40-44 | 13.2                                    | 1.8                                     | 14.2   |
| 45-49 | 17.2                                    | 1.7                                     | 19.5   |
| 50-54 | 16.1                                    | 1.7                                     | 19.0   |
| 55-59 | 13.3                                    | 1.9                                     | 13.8   |
| 60-64 | 6.2                                     | 1.9                                     | 6.3  |
| 65+   | 1.9                                     | 2.4                                     | 1.5  |
| Total | 100.0                                   | 2.0                                     | 100.0  |

**Table 15.2: Percentage of employees by indicated disability who were disciplined<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Disability   | % disciplined by indicated disability group <sup>3</sup> | % of indicated disability group disciplined <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by indicated disability group <sup>5</sup> |
|--------------|--|--|---|
| Disabled     | 9.7  | 2.7  | 6.5   |
| Non-disabled | 90.3   | 1.8  | 93.5  |
| Total        | 100.0  | -  | 100.0   |

**Table 15.3: Percentage of employees by indicated ethnicity who were disciplined <sup>1,2</sup>**

| Ethnicity       | % disciplined by indicated ethnic group <sup>3</sup> | % of indicated ethnic group disciplined <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by indicated ethnic group <sup>5</sup> |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| Ethnic minority | 16.1   | 2.7  | 11.2  |
| White           | 83.9   | 1.8  | 88.8  |
| Total           | 100.0  | -  | 100.0   |

**Table 15.4: Percentage of employees by gender who were disciplined <sup>1,2</sup>**

| Gender | % disciplined by gender group <sup>3</sup> | % of gender group disciplined <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by gender group <sup>5</sup> |
|--------|--|--|---|
| Female | 55.2                                       | 1.6  | 68.3  |
| Male   | 44.8                                       | 2.8  | 31.7  |
| Total  | 100.0                                      | -  | 100.0   |

All data sourced from: Resource Management.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013.
2. \* - Level of data too low for publication and percentages are rounded to 1 decimal place, given this totals may not sum due to rounding.
3. Percentages shown are the number of employees disciplined by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees disciplined who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic.
4. Percentages shown are the number of employees disciplined by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees that have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic. Please note the total indicates the percentage of the total headcount disciplined.
5. Percentages shown are the number of employees by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic.

## 16. Exits

### What does this tell us?

The data presented here show the reasons why employees leave the Department against their status in relation to each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; ethnicity; and gender.

The results indicate that the main reasons for leaving are due to retirement or resignation. The resignation percentage broadly declines with increasing age. However, in the 55 and above age range this tends to be superseded by retirement. Early exits concentrate in the 50 to 59 age range. The percentages of retirements by gender are close to the corresponding headcount values.

The percentage of Early Exits has almost halved when compared with the 2012 report. This has a consequent adjustment to the percentages of other reasons for leaving shown in this report. The volumes not declared in respect of ethnic minority and disabled groups are such that it is not possible to draw conclusions regarding percentage differences.

### How will an improvement be shown?

A decrease in the percentage does not necessarily constitute an improvement, as an individual's decision to leave the organisation is impacted by a range of personal factors.

Equality Information Report

**Table 16.1: Percentage of reason for leaving by age in relation to overall number of leavers<sup>1,3,4,5,6,7</sup>**

| Age   | % Dismissals | % Early exits | % Resignation | % Retirement | % Other | % of Total leavers |
|-------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|
| 16-24 | 6.0          | *             | 15.3          | 0.0          | 16.6    | 10.3               |
| 25-29 | 7.3          | 3.8           | 19.3          | *            | 15.1    | 11.2               |
| 30-34 | 10.6         | 4.0           | 12.6          | 0.0          | 13.2    | 9.1                |
| 35-39 | 12.0         | 4.7           | 10.3          | *            | 9.2     | 7.4                |
| 40-44 | 14.8         | 9.9           | 10.5          | 0.5          | 10.0    | 8.4                |
| 45-49 | 14.5         | 11.2          | 9.0           | 0.8          | 13.0    | 9.2                |
| 50-54 | 12.2         | 18.6          | 8.1           | 6.6          | 10.1    | 9.5                |
| 55-59 | 11.7         | 26.5          | 8.0           | 16.6         | 8.9     | 11.8               |
| 60-64 | 7.3          | 15.7          | 5.3           | 48.6         | 3.3     | 15.6               |
| 65+   | 3.5          | 4.9           | 1.8           | 26.7         | 0.7     | 7.6                |
| Total | 100.0        | 100.0         | 100.0         | 100.0        | 100.0   | 100.0              |

Equality Information Report

**Table 16.2: Percentage of reason for leaving by age in relation to total number of leavers in that group<sup>2,3,4,5,6,7</sup>**

| Age                      | % Dismissals | % Early exits | % Resignation | % Retirement | % Other | % Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------|---------|
| 16-24                    | 6.1          | *             | 37.5          | 0.0          | 56.1    | 100.0   |
| 25-29                    | 6.8          | 2.2           | 43.6          | *            | 47.1    | 100.0   |
| 30-34                    | 12.1         | 2.8           | 34.8          | 0.0          | 50.3    | 100.0   |
| 35-39                    | 16.9         | 4.0           | 35.2          | *            | 43.5    | 100.0   |
| 40-44                    | 18.3         | 7.4           | 31.5          | 1.3          | 41.4    | 100.0   |
| 45-49                    | 16.5         | 7.7           | 24.7          | 2.0          | 49.2    | 100.0   |
| 50-54                    | 13.4         | 12.3          | 21.4          | 16.2         | 36.8    | 100.0   |
| 55-59                    | 10.3         | 14.1          | 16.9          | 32.7         | 26.0    | 100.0   |
| 60-64                    | 4.9          | 6.4           | 8.5           | 72.8         | 7.4     | 100.0   |
| 65+                      | 4.8          | 4.1           | 6.0           | 81.9         | 3.2     | 100.0   |
| %Total leavers by reason | 10.4         | 6.3           | 25.2          | 23.3         | 34.8    | 100.0   |

Equality Information Report

**Table 16.3: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated disability in relation to overall number of leavers<sup>1,3,4,5,6,7</sup>**

| Disability   | % Dismissals | % Early exits | % Resignation | % Retirement | % Other | % of Total leavers |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|
| Disabled     | 13.0         | 10.1          | 7.3           | 11.4         | 4.9     | 9.2                |
| Non-disabled | 87.0         | 89.9          | 92.7          | 88.6         | 95.1    | 90.8               |
| Total        | 100.0        | 100.0         | 100.0         | 100.0        | 100.0   | 100.0              |

**Table 16.4: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated disability in relation to total number of leavers in that group<sup>2,3,4,5,6,7</sup>**

| Disability                | % Dismissals | % Early exits | % Resignation | % Retirement | % Other | % Total |
|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------|---------|
| Disabled                  | 16.0         | 10.8          | 14.8          | 45.6         | 12.8    | 100.0   |
| Non-disabled              | 10.8         | 9.6           | 18.8          | 35.7         | 25.1    | 100.0   |
| % Total leavers by reason | 11.3         | 9.7           | 18.5          | 36.6         | 23.9    | 100.0   |

Equality Information Report

**Table 16.5: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated ethnicity in relation to overall number of leavers**<sup>1,3,4,5,6,7</sup>

| Ethnicity       | % Dismissals | % Early exits | % Resignation | % Retirement | % Other | % of Total leavers |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|
| Ethnic minority | 15.5         | 4.6           | 12.0          | 5.7          | 10.8    | 9.3                |
| White           | 84.5         | 95.4          | 88.0          | 94.3         | 89.2    | 90.7               |
| Total           | 100.0        | 100.0         | 100.0         | 100.0        | 100.0   | 100.0              |

**Table 16.6: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated ethnicity in relation to total number of leavers in that group**<sup>2,3,4,5,6,7</sup>

| Ethnicity                 | % Dismissals | % Early exits | % Resignation | % Retirement | % Other | % Total |
|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------|---------|
| Ethnic minority           | 18.3         | 4.4           | 27.1          | 20.6         | 29.6    | 100.0   |
| White                     | 10.2         | 9.3           | 20.4          | 34.9         | 25.3    | 100.0   |
| % Total leavers by reason | 11.0         | 8.8           | 21.0          | 33.6         | 25.7    | 100.0   |

## Equality Information Report

**Table 16.7: Percentage of reason for leaving by gender in relation to overall number of leavers<sup>1,3,4,5,6,7</sup>**

| Gender | % Dismissals | % Early exits | % Resignation | % Retirement | % Other | % of Total leavers |
|--------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|
| Female | 60.2         | 72.4          | 60.9          | 66.2         | 58.2    | 61.8               |
| Male   | 39.8         | 27.6          | 39.1          | 33.8         | 41.8    | 38.2               |
| Total  | 100.0        | 100.0         | 100.0         | 100.0        | 100.0   | 100.0              |

**Table 16.8: Percentage of reason for leaving by gender in relation to total number of leavers in that group<sup>2,3,4,5,6,7</sup>**

| Gender                    | % Dismissals | % Early exits | % Resignation | % Retirement | % Other | % Total |
|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------|---------|
| Female                    | 10.1         | 7.4           | 24.8          | 24.9         | 32.7    | 100.0   |
| Male                      | 10.9         | 4.6           | 25.9          | 20.7         | 38.1    | 100.0   |
| % Total leavers by reason | 10.4         | 6.3           | 25.2          | 23.3         | 34.8    | 100.0   |

All data sourced from: Resource Management.

### Notes:

1. Percentages shown are the number of leavers who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic and reason for leaving, over the total number of employees by reason for leaving.

## Equality Information Report

2. Percentages shown are the number of leavers who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic and reason for leaving, over the total number of leavers in that particular group.
3. Data period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013.
4. \* - Level of data too low for publication and percentages are rounded to 1 decimal place, given this totals may not sum due to rounding.
5. Dismissal – dismissal and discharged probation.
6. Early exits – approved early retirement, voluntary early release, early retirement, early severance.
7. Other – death in service, transfer to other Government department, transfer of function, retirement at/above minimum age, ill health retirement, end of temporary contract, blank reason for leaving.

## 17. Working Patterns

### What does this tell us?

The data presented here show the percentage of employees with a part-time working pattern against their status in relation to each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; ethnicity; and gender.

The table indicates that the majority of employees in the groups aged 60 and above work part-time. The percentage of the employees that work part-time almost doubles in the 60 and above age groups compared with 50 to 59.

The percentage of people working part-time shows a very slight increase in all ages, ethnic minority, disabled and gender groups compared with the 2012 report. Please note that numbers in the 16 to 24 age group are rather small to enable useful comparisons to be made. The percentages of disabled or ethnic minority employees working part-time are close to those for the corresponding non-protected groups, suggesting similar behaviour.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally the similarity of this indicator in a protected and non-protected group will indicate equivalent behaviour. However, this will require a reasonably complete declaration rate and sufficiently large volumes to be precise.

**Table 17.1: Percentage of employees by age with a part-time working pattern<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Age   | % of total part-time workers by age group <sup>3</sup> | % of age group that are part-time <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by age group <sup>5</sup> |
|-------|--|--|--|
| 16-24 | 0.4  | 8.9  | 1.7  |
| 25-29 | 2.9  | 21.7   | 5.4  |
| 30-34 | 7.8  | 36.1   | 8.6  |
| 35-39 | 10.8   | 43.6   | 9.9  |
| 40-44 | 15.7   | 44.0   | 14.2   |
| 45-49 | 19.6   | 40.2   | 19.5   |
| 50-54 | 17.6   | 36.9   | 19.0   |
| 55-59 | 12.5   | 36.2   | 13.8   |
| 60-64 | 9.8  | 61.7   | 6.3  |
| 65+   | 2.8  | 71.9   | 1.5  |
| Total | 100.0  | 39.8   | 100.0  |

**17.2: Percentage of employees by indicated disability with a part-time working pattern<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Disability   | % of total part-time workers by indicated disability group <sup>3</sup> | % of indicated disability group that are part-time <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by indicated disability group <sup>5</sup> |
|--------------|---|---|---|
| Disabled     | 6.2   | 41.7  | 6.5   |
| Non-disabled | 93.8  | 43.2  | 93.5  |
| Total        | 100.0   | -   | 100.0   |

**Table 17.3: Percentage of employees by indicated ethnicity with a part-time working pattern**<sup>1,2</sup>

| Ethnicity       | % of total part-time workers by indicated ethnic group <sup>3</sup> | % of indicated ethnic group that are part-time <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by indicated ethnic group <sup>5</sup> |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| Ethnic minority | 10.2  | 38.0  | 11.2  |
| White           | 89.8  | 42.5  | 88.8  |
| Total           | 100.0   | -   | 100.0   |

**Table 17.4: Percentage of employees by gender with a part-time working pattern**<sup>1,2</sup>

| Gender | % of total part-time workers by gender group <sup>3</sup> | % of gender group that are part-time <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by gender group <sup>5</sup> |
|--------|---|---|---|
| Female | 88.5  | 51.6  | 68.3  |
| Male   | 11.5  | 14.5  | 31.7  |
| Total  | 100.0   | -   | 100.0   |

All data sourced from: Resource Management.

Notes:

1. Data as at 31 March 2013.
2. \* - Level of data too low for publication and percentages are rounded to 1 decimal place, given this totals may not sum due to rounding.
3. Percentages shown are the number of employees working part-time by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees working part-time who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic.
4. Percentages shown are the number of employees working part-time by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees that have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic. Please note the total indicates the percentage of the total headcount working part-time.
5. Percentages shown are the number of employees by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic.

## 18. Grievances

### What does this tell us?

The data presented here show the percentage of employees who have raised a grievance against their status in relation to each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; ethnicity; and gender.

As the total number of grievances are quite small, the percentages can vary considerably without implying significant differences. However, the percentage of employees by gender who raise a grievance is close to the corresponding headcount indicating similar behaviour.

Comparison with the 2012 report shows that the overall percentage of people raising a grievance has declined and this has been reflected across all age groups.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally the similarity of this indicator in a protected and non-protected group will indicate equivalent behaviour. However, this will require a reasonably complete declaration rate and sufficiently large volumes to be precise. In addition, it should also be borne in mind that raising a grievance is an individual's decision impacted by a range of personal factors.

**Table 18.1: Percentage of employees by age who raised a grievance<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Age   | % of grievances by age group <sup>3</sup> | % of age group that raised a grievance <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by age group <sup>5</sup> |
|-------|---|---|--|
| 16-24 | 1.4                                       | 0.7   | 1.7  |
| 25-29 | 6.0                                       | 0.9   | 5.4  |
| 30-34 | 10.5                                      | 1.0   | 8.6  |
| 35-39 | 10.4                                      | 0.8   | 9.9  |
| 40-44 | 14.4                                      | 0.8   | 14.2   |
| 45-49 | 18.9                                      | 0.8   | 19.5   |
| 50-54 | 16.5                                      | 0.7   | 19.0   |
| 55-59 | 13.6                                      | 0.8   | 13.8   |
| 60-64 | 6.9                                       | 0.9   | 6.3  |
| 65+   | 1.3                                       | 0.7   | 1.5  |
| Total | 100.0                                     | 0.8   | 100.0  |

**Table 18.2: Percentage of employees by indicated disability who raised a grievance<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Disability   | % of grievances by indicated disability group <sup>3</sup> | % of indicated disability group that raised a grievance <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by indicated disability group <sup>5</sup> |
|--------------|--|--|---|
| Disabled     | 12.3   | 1.6  | 6.5   |
| Non-disabled | 87.7   | 0.8  | 93.5  |
| Total        | 100.0  | -  | 100.0   |

**Table 18.3: Percentage of employees by indicated ethnicity who raised a grievance<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Ethnicity       | % of grievances by indicated ethnic group <sup>3</sup> | % of indicated ethnic group that raised a grievance <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by indicated ethnic group <sup>5</sup> |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| Ethnic minority | 16.4   | 1.2  | 11.2  |
| White           | 83.6   | 0.8  | 88.8  |
| Total           | 100.0  | -  | 100.0   |

**Table 18.4: Percentage of employees by gender who raised a grievance<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Gender | % of grievances by gender group <sup>3</sup> | % of gender group that raised a grievance <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by gender group <sup>5</sup> |
|--------|--|--|---|
| Female | 69.0   | 0.8  | 68.3  |
| Male   | 31.0   | 0.8  | 31.7  |
| Total  | 100.0  | -  | 100.0   |

All data sourced from: Resource Management.

## Equality Information Report

### Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013.
2. \* - Level of data too low for publication and percentages are rounded to 1 decimal place, given this totals may not sum due to rounding.
3. Percentages shown are the number of employees raising a grievance by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees raising a grievance who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic.
4. Percentages shown are the number of employees raising a grievance by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees that have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic. Please note the total indicates the percentage of the total headcount raising a grievance.
5. Percentages shown are the number of employees by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic.

## 19. Performance markings

### What does this tell us?

The data presented here shows the proportion of employees awarded each performance marking against their status in relation to each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; ethnicity; and gender.

In the current performance management marking system employees are categorised as 'Exceeded', 'Achieved' and 'Must Improve'. Employees who were not awarded a marking for the 2012 / 13 performance year have been omitted from this data.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally the similarity of this indicator between groups will indicate equivalent behaviour. However, this will require a reasonably complete declaration rate and sufficiently large volumes to be precise. It should also be considered that females represent over two thirds of DWP's current employee headcount.

**Table 19.1: Percentage of performance mark awarded by age in relation to overall number of performance markings given** <sup>1, 2, 3, 5</sup>

| Age   | % Exceeded | % Achieved | % Must improve | % No mark required | %Total |
|-------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|--------|
| 16-24 | 1.2        | 1.1        | 1.7            | 9.4                | 1.2    |
| 25-29 | 5.7        | 4.5        | 4.2            | 14.4               | 4.7    |
| 30-34 | 9.9        | 8.0        | 6.2            | 23.6               | 8.3    |
| 35-39 | 11.2       | 9.6        | 7.9            | 21.8               | 9.9    |
| 40-44 | 17.4       | 14.0       | 10.8           | 12.4               | 14.4   |
| 45-49 | 22.7       | 19.4       | 17.5           | 9.7                | 19.9   |
| 50-54 | 18.6       | 20.0       | 19.2           | 2.7                | 19.6   |
| 55-59 | 10.5       | 14.8       | 17.8           | 3.6                | 14.1   |
| 60-64 | 2.6        | 7.0        | 11.5           | 1.8                | 6.4    |
| 65+   | 0.4        | 1.7        | 3.3            | *                  | 1.5    |
| Total | 100.0      | 100.0      | 100.0          | 100.0              | 100.0  |

**Table 19.2: Percentage of performance mark awarded by age in relation to total number of employees in that group** <sup>1, 2, 4, 5</sup>

| Age            | % Exceeded | % Achieved | % Must improve | % No mark required | % Total |
|----------------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|---------|
| 16-24          | 19.2       | 68.1       | 9.2            | 3.6                | 100.0   |
| 25-29          | 23.4       | 69.5       | 5.7            | 1.4                | 100.0   |
| 30-34          | 23.4       | 70.4       | 4.9            | 1.3                | 100.0   |
| 35-39          | 22.3       | 71.5       | 5.2            | 1.0                | 100.0   |
| 40-44          | 23.6       | 71.1       | 4.9            | 0.4                | 100.0   |
| 45-49          | 22.4       | 71.7       | 5.7            | 0.2                | 100.0   |
| 50-54          | 18.6       | 74.9       | 6.4            | 0.1                | 100.0   |
| 55-59          | 14.6       | 77.0       | 8.2            | 0.1                | 100.0   |
| 60-64          | 8.1        | 80.0       | 11.8           | 0.1                | 100.0   |
| 65+            | 4.6        | 81.3       | 13.9           | *                  | 100.0   |
| All Age Groups | 19.6       | 73.4       | 6.5            | 0.5                | 100.0   |

**Table 19.3: Percentage of performance mark awarded by indicated disability in relation to overall number of performance markings given** <sup>1, 2, 3, 5</sup>

| Disability     | % Exceeded | % Achieved | % Must improve | % No mark required | % Total |
|----------------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|---------|
| Disabled       | 4.6        | 6.6        | 10.2           | 5.4                | 6.4     |
| Non-Disabled   | 95.4       | 93.4       | 89.8           | 94.6               | 93.6    |
| Total Declared | 100.0      | 100.0      | 100.0          | 100.0              | 100.0   |

**Table 19.4: Percentage of performance mark awarded by indicated disability in relation to total number of employees in that group** <sup>1, 2, 4, 5</sup>

| Disability     | % Exceeded | % Achieved | % Must improve | % No mark required | % Total |
|----------------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|---------|
| Disabled       | 14.2       | 75.4       | 10.2           | 0.3                | 100.0   |
| Non-Disabled   | 20.0       | 73.5       | 6.1            | 0.3                | 100.0   |
| Total Declared | 19.6       | 73.6       | 6.4            | 0.3                | 100.0   |

**Table 19.5: Percentage of performance mark awarded by indicated ethnicity in relation to overall number of performance markings given <sup>1, 2, 3, 5</sup>**

| Ethnicity       | % Exceeded | % Achieved | % Must improve | % No mark required | % Total |
|-----------------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|---------|
| Ethnic minority | 9.0        | 11.4       | 15.4           | 24.6               | 11.2    |
| White           | 91.0       | 88.6       | 84.6           | 75.4               | 88.8    |
| Total Declared  | 100.0      | 100.0      | 100.0          | 100.0              | 100.0   |

**Table 19.6: Percentage of performance mark awarded by indicated ethnicity in relation to total number of employees in that group <sup>1, 2, 4, 5</sup>**

| Ethnicity       | % Exceeded | % Achieved | % Must improve | % No mark required | % Total |
|-----------------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|---------|
| Ethnic minority | 16.0       | 74.7       | 8.6            | 0.7                | 100.0   |
| White           | 20.5       | 73.3       | 6.0            | 0.3                | 100.0   |
| Total Declared  | 20.0       | 73.4       | 6.3            | 0.3                | 100.0   |

**Table 19.7: Percentage of performance mark awarded by gender in relation to overall number of performance markings given <sup>1, 2, 3, 5</sup>**

| Gender         | % Exceeded | % Achieved | % Must improve | % No mark required | % Total |
|----------------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|---------|
| Female         | 71.8       | 69.1       | 55.8           | 80.9               | 68.8    |
| Male           | 28.2       | 30.9       | 44.2           | 19.1               | 31.2    |
| Total Declared | 100.0      | 100.0      | 100.0          | 100.0              | 100.0   |

**Table 19.8: Percentage of performance mark awarded by gender in relation to total number of employees in that group** <sup>1, 2, 4, 5</sup>

| Gender         | % Exceeded | % Achieved | % Must improve | % No mark required | % Total |
|----------------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|---------|
| Female         | 20.5       | 73.7       | 5.3            | 0.5                | 100.0   |
| Male           | 17.7       | 72.7       | 9.2            | 0.3                | 100.0   |
| Total Declared | 19.6       | 73.4       | 6.5            | 0.5                | 100.0   |

All data sourced from: DWP's HR Database

Notes:

1. Data as at 31 March 2013.
2. \* - Level of data too low for publication and percentages are rounded to 1 decimal place, given this totals may not sum due to rounding.
3. Percentages shown are the number of employees awarded a performance marking by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees awarded a performance marking who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic.
4. Percentages shown are the number of employees awarded a performance marking by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees that have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic.
5. This data does not include the SCS or employees who have not been awarded a marking.

## 20. Promotion

### What does this tell us?

The data presented here show employees promoted against their status in relation to each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; ethnicity; and gender.

The percentage of promotions for ethnic minority employees and women are close to the corresponding overall proportions, suggesting similar behaviour. The percentage of promotions for disabled employees are distorted by the declaration rate and the associated volumes which mean the results must be treated with caution.

Compared with the 2012 report, promotion percentages have increased overall and in all age groups.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Broadly, an increase in the percentage of group promoted will constitute an improvement. However, other factors will need to be considered such as: staff volumes; declaration rates; and organisational changes.

**Table 20.1: Percentage of employees promoted by age<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Age   | % of promotions by age group <sup>3</sup> | % of age group promoted <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by age group <sup>5</sup> |
|-------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| 16-24 | 3.0                                       | 3.1                                  | 1.7  |
| 25-29 | 16.6                                      | 5.4                                  | 5.4  |
| 30-34 | 19.3                                      | 3.9                                  | 8.6  |
| 35-39 | 14.5                                      | 2.6                                  | 9.9  |
| 40-44 | 15.2                                      | 1.9                                  | 14.2   |
| 45-49 | 15.7                                      | 1.4                                  | 19.5   |
| 50-54 | 10.1                                      | 0.9                                  | 19.0   |
| 55-59 | 4.2                                       | 0.5                                  | 13.8   |
| 60-64 | 1.1                                       | 0.3                                  | 6.3  |
| 65+   | *   | *                                    | 1.5  |
| Total | 100.0                                     | 1.8                                  | 100.0  |

**Table 20.2: Percentage of employees promoted by indicated disability<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Disability   | % of promotions by indicated disability group <sup>3</sup> | % of indicated disability group promoted <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by indicated disability group <sup>5</sup> |
|--------------|--|---|---|
| Disabled     | 4.3  | 1.0   | 6.5   |
| Non-disabled | 95.7   | 1.5   | 93.5  |
| Total        | 100.0  | -   | 100.0   |

**Table 20.3: Percentage of employees promoted by indicated ethnicity<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Ethnicity       | % of promotions by indicated ethnic group <sup>3</sup> | % of indicated ethnic group promoted <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by indicated ethnic group <sup>5</sup> |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
| Ethnic minority | 10.9   | 1.7   | 11.2  |
| White           | 89.1   | 1.7   | 88.8  |
| Total           | 100.0  | -   | 100.0   |

**Table 20.4: Percentage of employees promoted by gender<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Gender | % of promotions by gender group <sup>3</sup> | % of gender group promoted <sup>4</sup> | % of total headcount by gender group <sup>5</sup> |
|--------|--|---|---|
| Female | 63.9   | 1.6                                     | 68.3  |
| Male   | 36.1   | 2.0                                     | 31.7  |
| Total  | 100.0  | -                                       | 100.0   |

All data sourced from: Resource Management.

Notes:

## Equality Information Report

1. Data period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013.
2. \* - Level of data too low for publication and percentages are rounded to 1 decimal place, given this totals may not sum due to rounding.
3. Percentages shown are the number of employees promoted by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees promoted who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic.
4. Percentages shown are the number of employees promoted by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees that have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic. Please note the total indicates the percentage of the total headcount promoted.
5. Percentages shown are the number of employees by protected characteristic, over the total number of employees who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic.

## 21. Recruitment Process

### What does this tell us?

The data show percentages of employees at different stages of the recruitment process for our vacancies opened with Civil Service Resourcing during the period, against their status in relation to each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; ethnicity; and gender.

Application percentages are relatively evenly spread over an age range of 16 to 54. The success percentage for all protected groups is smaller than the percentage of prefer not to say / unknowns, making conclusions uncertain.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally the similarity of this indicator in a protected and non-protected group will indicate equivalent behaviour. However, this will require a reasonably complete declaration rate and sufficiently large volumes in each category to be able to draw firm conclusions.

**Table 21.1: Percentage of applicants at different stages of the recruitment process by age<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Age                         | Stage                               |                        |                            |                          |                              |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
|                             | % Application received <sup>3</sup> | % Success <sup>4</sup> | % In progress <sup>4</sup> | % Withdrawn <sup>4</sup> | % Un-successful <sup>4</sup> |
| 16-24                       | 12.1                                | 3.6                    | 10.5                       | 16.4                     | 69.5                         |
| 25-29                       | 12.4                                | 5.0                    | 6.3                        | 14.6                     | 74.1                         |
| 30-34                       | 13.6                                | 5.7                    | 4.8                        | 12.8                     | 76.7                         |
| 35-39                       | 13.0                                | 6.4                    | 4.8                        | 12.4                     | 76.3                         |
| 40-44                       | 14.9                                | 5.4                    | 5.4                        | 11.8                     | 77.5                         |
| 45-49                       | 16.6                                | 5.7                    | 5.0                        | 9.6                      | 79.7                         |
| 50-54                       | 11.4                                | 5.2                    | 4.3                        | 9.1                      | 81.5                         |
| 55-59                       | 4.0                                 | 4.3                    | 4.2                        | 8.4                      | 83.1                         |
| 60-64                       | 0.8                                 | 5.5                    | 6.9                        | 7.6                      | 80.0                         |
| 65+                         | 0.1                                 | 0.0                    | 7.1                        | 21.4                     | 71.4                         |
| Prefer not to say / unknown | 1.2                                 | 5.1                    | 6.5                        | 12.1                     | 76.3                         |
| Total                       | 100.0                               | -                      | -                          | -                        | -                            |

**Table 21.2: Percentage of applicants at different stages of the recruitment process by indicated disability<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Disability                  | Stage                               |                        |                            |                          |                              |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
|                             | % Application received <sup>3</sup> | % Success <sup>4</sup> | % In progress <sup>4</sup> | % Withdrawn <sup>4</sup> | % Un-successful <sup>4</sup> |
| Disabled                    | 5.8                                 | 3.7                    | 4.3                        | 13.3                     | 78.7                         |
| Non-disabled                | 91.6                                | 5.4                    | 5.7                        | 12.1                     | 76.8                         |
| Prefer not to say / unknown | 2.6                                 | 4.3                    | 8.8                        | 9.8                      | 77.1                         |
| Total                       | 100.0                               | -                      | -                          | -                        | -                            |

**Table 21.3: Percentage of applicants at different stages of the recruitment process by indicated ethnicity<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Ethnicity                   | Stage                               |                        |                            |                          |                              |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
|                             | % Application received <sup>3</sup> | % Success <sup>4</sup> | % In progress <sup>4</sup> | % Withdrawn <sup>4</sup> | % Un-successful <sup>4</sup> |
| Ethnic minority             | 16.0                                | 3.2                    | 3.7                        | 11.6                     | 81.4                         |
| White                       | 82.1                                | 5.7                    | 6.1                        | 12.2                     | 76.1                         |
| Prefer not to say / unknown | 2.0                                 | 4.8                    | 7.5                        | 12.0                     | 75.7                         |
| Total                       | 100.0                               | -                      | -                          | -                        | -                            |

**Table 21.4: Percentage of applicants at different stages of the recruitment process by gender<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Gender                      | % Application received <sup>3</sup> | Stage                  |                            |                          |                              |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
|                             |                                     | % Success <sup>4</sup> | % In progress <sup>4</sup> | % Withdrawn <sup>4</sup> | % Un-successful <sup>4</sup> |
| Female                      | 51.0                                | 6.0                    | 5.8                        | 11.9                     | 76.3                         |
| Male                        | 48.8                                | 4.5                    | 5.6                        | 12.3                     | 77.6                         |
| Prefer not to say / unknown | 0.1                                 | 11.1                   | 33.3                       | 7.4                      | 48.1                         |
| Total                       | 100.0                               | -                      | -                          | -                        | -                            |

All data sourced from: Civil Service Resourcing.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013.
2. \* - Level of data too low for publication and percentages are rounded to 1 decimal place, given this totals may not sum due to rounding.
3. Percentages shown are the number of applicants at that stage who indicated that protected characteristic, over the total number of applicants at that stage.
4. Percentages shown are the number of applicants by protected characteristic, over the total number of applicants relative to that protected characteristic group

## 22. Pay Gap

The Department analyses data to identify any differences in pay on the grounds of gender, race, age and disability.

The pay gap is calculated by adding together the pay of all of the members of the potentially disadvantaged group in the Department who are in grades below the Senior Civil Service (SCS) and then working out an average salary. This is then compared to the average salary of the potentially advantaged group. The gap is the difference between the two averages divided by the average pay of the advantaged group.

$$\text{Pay gap} = \frac{\text{Pay difference}}{\text{Pay of the advantaged group}}^1$$

(Pay of the advantaged group)

Therefore, in the case of the gender pay gap, the average salary of women in grades below SCS is calculated and then compared to the average salary of men in grades below SCS. The difference is expressed as a percentage and is presented by grade.

### What does this tell us?

The table below shows which group is considered to be advantaged or disadvantaged for the purposes of expressing the pay gap for that protected characteristic. In the case of age, the majority age group (25-54) is shown against both the younger group (16-24) and the older age group (55 and above).

On comparing with the 2012 report, the gender pay gap shows minor change. The non-declaration rate directly impacts any potential differences between the two years for the remaining protected characteristics.

### Comparison table by protected characteristic for pay gap data

| Protected characteristic | Disadvantaged group | Advantaged group |
|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Age                      | 16-24               | 25-54            |
|                          | 55 and above        | 25-54            |
| Disability               | Disabled            | Non-disabled     |
| Ethnicity                | Ethnic minority     | White            |
| Gender                   | Female              | Male             |

<sup>1</sup> Pay difference is the mean pay of the advantaged group minus the mean pay of the disadvantaged group.

**How will an improvement be shown?**

Where the potentially disadvantaged group, for example women, have a higher average salary than their male counterparts, it is expressed as a negative percentage (for example -0.5%). This analysis informs the Equal Pay Audit, which takes place on a three yearly basis to identify areas for action.

## Equality Information Report

**Table 22.1: Pay gap by age<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

| Age                              | Band A/<br>AA | Band B/<br>AO | Band C/<br>EO | Band D/<br>HEO | Band E/<br>SEO | Band F/<br>Grade 7 | Band G/<br>Grade 6 | All grades |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Age 16-24 (mean salary)          | £14,624       | £16,481       | £21,606       | £25,180        | N/A            | N/A                | N/A                | £17,070    |
| Age 25-54 (mean salary)          | £15,194       | £17,920       | £23,289       | £28,125        | N/A            | N/A                | N/A                | £21,623    |
| Pay gap (percent 16-24 to 25-54) | 3.8           | 8.0           | 7.2           | 10.5           | N/A            | N/A                | N/A                | 21.1       |

  

| Age                            | Band A/<br>AA | Band B/<br>AO | Band C/<br>EO | Band D/<br>HEO | Band E/<br>SEO | Band F/<br>Grade 7 | Band G/<br>Grade 6 | All grades |
|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Age 55 and above (mean salary) | £15,225       | £18,157       | £23,934       | £29,439        | £35,745        | £49,454            | £61,824            | £22,040    |
| Age 25-54 (mean salary)        | £15,194       | £17,920       | £23,289       | £28,125        | £33,928        | £46,853            | £59,377            | £21,623    |
| Pay gap (percent 55+ to 25-54) | -0.2          | -1.3          | -2.8          | -4.7           | -5.4           | -5.6               | -4.1               | -1.9       |

## Equality Information Report

**Table 22.2: Pay gap by indicated disability<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>**

| Disability                                 | Band A/<br>AA | Band B/<br>AO | Band C/<br>EO | Band D/<br>HEO | Band E/<br>SEO | Band F/<br>Grade 7 | Band G/<br>Grade 6 | All grades |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Disabled (mean salary)                     | £15,300       | £18,311       | £23,805       | £28,817        | £34,510        | £47,867            | £60,001            | £22,094    |
| Non-disabled (mean salary)                 | £15,267       | £18,219       | £23,580       | £28,456        | £34,322        | £47,443            | £60,186            | £22,115    |
| Pay gap (percent disabled to non-disabled) | -0.2          | -0.5          | -1.0          | -1.3           | -0.5           | -0.9               | 0.3                | 0.1        |

**Table 22.3: Pay gap by indicated ethnicity<sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup>**

| Ethnicity                                  | Band A/<br>AA | Band B/<br>AO | Band C/<br>EO | Band D/<br>HEO | Band E/<br>SEO | Band F/<br>Grade 7 | Band G/<br>Grade 6 | All grades |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Ethnic minority (mean salary)              | £15,235       | £18,152       | £23,332       | £28,320        | £33,834        | £46,911            | £58,707            | £21,222    |
| White (mean salary)                        | £15,239       | £18,112       | £23,565       | £28,480        | £34,362        | £47,454            | £60,261            | £22,099    |
| Pay gap (percent ethnic minority to white) | 0.0           | -0.2          | 1.0           | 0.6            | 1.5            | 1.1                | 2.6                | 4.4        |

## Equality Information Report

**Table 22.4: Pay gap by gender<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

| Gender                           | Band A/<br>AA | Band B/<br>AO | Band C/<br>EO | Band D/<br>HEO | Band E/<br>SEO | Band F/<br>Grade 7 | Band G/<br>Grade 6 | All grades |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Female (mean salary)             | £15,200       | £18,024       | £23,465       | £28,409        | £34,182        | £46,828            | £59,260            | £21,438    |
| Male (mean salary)               | £15,179       | £17,686       | £23,333       | £28,387        | £34,455        | £48,012            | £60,675            | £22,078    |
| Pay gap (percent female to male) | -0.1          | -1.9          | -0.6          | -0.1           | 0.8            | 2.5                | 2.3                | 2.9        |

All data sourced from: Resource Management.

### Notes:

1. Salary totals are total full-time salaries in the pay band, excluding allowances and overtime. However, to prevent skews in diversity analyses due to different pay zones, all salaries here are treated as though they are on DWP National pay scales. That is, salaries on pay scales for inner London, outer London and special location pay zones have been placed on their equivalent position on the National pay scale. ERNIC and employer's superannuation (Civil Service Pension) contributions are excluded from these figures.
2. Mean salary is the total full-time basic salaries for the pay band, divided by the headcount.
3. Records excluded from this analysis include SCS employees and specialists (accountants, lawyers etc) whose salaries are on separate pay scales. Casual and fixed-term appointments are included. The population used in the analysis therefore represents 98.1 percent of DWP employees paid and in post on 31 March 2013.
4. Mean salaries only take into account those who have indicated their disability status.
5. Mean salaries only take into account those who have indicated their ethnicity status.

## 23. Training Data

### What does this tell us?

These data show percentages of our employees who are at different stages of completing e-learning applied for with Civil Service Learning in the period, against their status in relation to each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; ethnicity; and gender.

The results suggest that a greater percentage of applications are received from the 25 to 39 age range compared to the overall headcount (Table 14.1). The percentage of applications received from females looks to be lower than the equivalent overall headcount of Table 14.7. However, the percentages of applications by gender do lie within the corresponding ranges for Bands A/AA to E/SEO. Table 14.2 indicates that these bands are the grades for the majority of employees.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Broadly an increase in the percentage would constitute an improvement as it would indicate an increase in the amount of training applied for and completed. However, this needs to be considered alongside relative headcount, relevant declaration rates and volumes, so is not precise. In addition, it should also be borne in mind that training needs are unique to each individual within the organisation.

**Table 23.1: Percentage of training at different stages by age<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Stage                       |                                     |                            |                          |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Age                         | % Application received <sup>3</sup> | % In progress <sup>4</sup> | % Completed <sup>4</sup> |
| 16-24                       | 5.3                                 | 60.7                       | 37.5                     |
| 25-29                       | 9.6                                 | 57.1                       | 42.9                     |
| 30-34                       | 10.4                                | 61.8                       | 38.2                     |
| 35-39                       | 11.2                                | 65.2                       | 34.8                     |
| 40-44                       | 15.5                                | 62.6                       | 37.4                     |
| 45-49                       | 17.2                                | 61.6                       | 38.4                     |
| 50-54                       | 15.6                                | 63.9                       | 36.1                     |
| 55-59                       | 8.6                                 | 57.9                       | 42.1                     |
| 60-64                       | 2.8                                 | 60.1                       | 39.9                     |
| 65+                         | 0.4                                 | 55.6                       | 44.4                     |
| Prefer not to say / unknown | 3.3                                 | 61.5                       | 38.5                     |
| Total                       | 100.0                               | -                          | -                        |

**Table 23.2: Percentage of training at different stages by indicated disability<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Stage                       |                                     |                            |                          |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Disability                  | % Application received <sup>3</sup> | % In progress <sup>4</sup> | % Completed <sup>4</sup> |
| Disabled                    | 6.2                                 | 64.6                       | 35.4                     |
| Non-disabled                | 84.1                                | 61.7                       | 38.3                     |
| Prefer not to say / unknown | 9.7                                 | 59.6                       | 40.4                     |
| Total                       | 100.0                               | -                          | -                        |

**Table 23.3: Percentage of training at different stages by indicated ethnicity<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Stage                       |                                     |                            |                          |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Ethnicity                   | % Application received <sup>3</sup> | % In progress <sup>4</sup> | % Completed <sup>4</sup> |
| Ethnic minority             | 9.4                                 | 74.9                       | 25.1                     |
| White                       | 82.7                                | 60.3                       | 39.7                     |
| Prefer not to say / unknown | 7.8                                 | 60.3                       | 39.7                     |
| Total                       | 100.0                               | -                          | -                        |

**Table 23.4: Percentage of training at different stages by gender<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Stage                       |                                     |                            |                          |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Gender                      | % Application received <sup>3</sup> | % In progress <sup>4</sup> | % Completed <sup>4</sup> |
| Female                      | 62.2                                | 62.8                       | 37.2                     |
| Male                        | 35.8                                | 60.0                       | 40.0                     |
| Prefer not to say / unknown | 2.0                                 | 56.8                       | 43.2                     |
| Total                       | 100.0                               | -                          | -                        |

All data sourced from: Civil Service Learning

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013.
2. \* - Level of data too low for publication and percentages are rounded to 1 decimal place, given this totals may not sum due to rounding.
3. Percentages shown are the number of applicants at that stage who indicated that protected characteristic, over the total number of applicants at that stage.
4. Percentages shown are the number of applicants by protected characteristic, over the total number of applicants relative to that protected characteristic group.

## 24. Maternity data

### What does this tell us?

These data shows the percentage of employees returning from maternity leave against their status in relation to each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; and ethnicity.

The results show a slight increase in percentage in the age range 30-39 when compared with the 2012 report however the difference is very small.

### How will an improvement be shown?

An increase in the percentage does not necessarily constitute an improvement, as an individual’s decision to return to work after maternity leave is impacted by a range of personal factors.

**Table 24.1: Percentage of employees returning from maternity leave in period by age<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

| Age   | % Total |
|-------|---------|
| 16-24 | 2.6     |
| 25-29 | 20.7    |
| 30-34 | 37.1    |
| 35-39 | 28.3    |
| 40-44 | 10.2    |
| 45-49 | 1.1     |
| 50-54 | 0.0     |
| 55-59 | 0.0     |
| 60-64 | 0.0     |
| 65+   | 0.0     |
| Total | 100.0   |

**Table 24.2: Percentage of employees returning from maternity leave in period by indicated disability<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

| Disability   | % Total |
|--------------|---------|
| Disabled     | 2.7     |
| Non-disabled | 97.3    |
| Total        | 100.0   |

**Table 24.3: Percentage of employees returning from maternity leave in period by indicated ethnicity<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

| Ethnicity       | % Total |
|-----------------|---------|
| Ethnic minority | 16.2    |
| White           | 83.8    |
| Total           | 100.0   |

All data sourced from: Resource Management.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013.
2. \* - Level of data too low for publication and percentages are rounded to 1 decimal place, given this totals may not sum due to rounding.
3. Percentages shown are the number of employees returning from maternity leave in the period by indicated protected characteristic, over the total number of employees returning from maternity leave.

## 25. Links to additional information

[2012 People Survey results](#) – includes details of the DWP People Survey which is part of the Civil Service People Survey. It contains 57 questions to help determine employee engagement throughout the Civil Service.

[Top 100 Employer](#) – DWP is one of Britain's Top 100 Employers for lesbian, gay and bisexual staff.

[Performance Related Pay](#) – includes details of non-consolidated performance-related pay by DWP, our agencies and executive Non-Departmental Public Bodies (NDPBs) for the performance year 2010-11 and 2011-2012.

[Business Plan Quarterly Data Summary](#) – provides a quarterly snapshot on how each Department is spending its budget, the results it has achieved and how it is deploying its workforce.

## **DWP Equality Information 2013**

### **Report under the Public Sector Equality Duty**

Under the Public Sector Equality Duty, part of the Equality Act 2010, as a public body the Department for Work and Pensions has a specific duty to publish relevant proportionate information to demonstrate our compliance. Information showing that we have paid due regard to the aims of the Equality Duty is contained in this report.

Diversity and Equality  
Directorate

Porterbrook House,  
7 Pear Street,  
Sheffield,  
South Yorkshire,  
S11 8JF.

---

Contact Information:

[Adelphi.diversityandequality@dwp.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Adelphi.diversityandequality@dwp.gsi.gov.uk)

978-1-78153-550-9

Published by the  
Department for Work  
and Pensions

12 July 2013

[www.dwp.gov.uk](http://www.dwp.gov.uk)