



Department
for Work &
Pensions

Department for Work and Pensions Equality Information – Employee Data

Report under the Public Sector Equality Duty

July 2015

Contents

List of tables	3
DWP workforce data.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Our overall approach	5
Our approach to providing information relating to our employees	5
Our approach to benchmarking as an employer.....	6
Our approach to engaging with our employees	6
Our approach to developing equality objectives	7
Alternative formats.....	7
Feedback.....	7
Information about our employees	8
1. The DWP workforce	8
2. Disciplinary procedures	18
3. Exits.....	21
4. Working Patterns	28
5. Grievances	31
6. Performance markings	34
7. Promotion	39
8. Recruitment Process	42
9. Pay Gap	46
10. Training Data	52
11. Maternity data.....	56
12. Links to additional information	58

List of tables

DWP workforce data

Table 1.1-1.8: Percentage of DWP workforce by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 2.1-2.4: Percentage of employees disciplined by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 3.1-3.8: Percentage of reason for leaving by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 4.1-4.4: Percentage of employees with a part time working pattern by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 5.1-5.4: Percentage of employees raising a grievance by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 6.1-6.4: Percentage of performance ratings by age, disability, ethnicity and gender to be included in future publication.

Table 7.1-7.4: Percentage of employees promoted by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 8.1-8.4: Percentage of applicants at different stages of the recruitment process by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 9.1-9.4: Pay gap by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 10.1-10.4: Percentage of training applications by age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

Table 11.1-11.3: Percentage of employees returning from maternity leave by age, disability and ethnicity.

Introduction

We aim to build a workforce which reflects the society we serve, and to create an inclusive culture which values and respects diversity. 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](#). We publish information relating to people affected by our policies and practices and employees who share protected characteristics in order to demonstrate 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.

This is our fifth report under this duty. The last report was published in July 2014.

We encourage our employees to voluntarily and confidentially provide information in relation to their: sexual orientation; religion or belief; disability; and ethnicity. 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. 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) databases.

Our overall approach

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 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.

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.

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 2015 we had 90,018 employees (headcount), the declaration rate for ethnicity was 77.1% and for disability 88.4%. 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. The DWP Diversity and Equality team will instigate communications activity to encourage our employees to declare their diversity information, and remind everyone why sharing personal information is important and how it will be used carefully and appropriately.

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 regularly takes part in Stonewall's Top 100 Workplace Equality Index, Race for Opportunity Benchmarking and Business Disability Forums Disability Standard.

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 Civil Service was also awarded the Employers Network for Equality and Inclusion (ENEI) Public Sector Employer of the Year award in 2014.

Our approach to engaging with our employees

The Department understands the importance of engaging our employees and the benefits and value that an engaged workforce brings to 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 provide 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 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. Since 2012 we have 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 developing equality objectives

The [specific duty](#) required 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.

Our approach to Equality Analysis

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.

Alternative formats

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

Health, Wellbeing & Inclusion

Kings Court

80 Hanover Way

Sheffield

S2 7UF

Email: health.wellbeingandinclusion@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.

Links to other information that you may find useful

The supporting data for this report is available on-line and provides comparable figures from the previous reports.

Information about our employees

1. 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. On this occasion, the levels of declaration for sexual orientation and religion or belief are too low for publication.

Compared with the 2014 report, the percentage of the DWP workforce has increased somewhat in all the 50 and above age groups.

Almost 40% of the DWP employees are aged between 45 and 54. Almost 9% are aged over 60.

The results show that the targets for disability representation have been exceeded in the lower grades to SEO, which cover the large majority of staff. Compared with the 2014 report, progress has also been made in the percentages for some of the higher grades. However this can only be based on the data for those who made a declaration. The disability status of 86% of employees is known.

The target for those declared as ethnic minority has been exceeded at the SCS grade although the total number of staff is small. However the targets have not been reached in the grades from HEO to Grade 6. There is no ethnicity target for the AA to EO grades, which cover the bulk of DWP staff, as a consequence of representation at these grades being above the economically active rate when the targets were set. The ethnicity of 77.8% of employees is known.

The gender target for Grade 7 was exceeded. However the targets for Grade 6 and SCS were not achieved. The numbers in these bands are small.

How will an improvement be shown?

A higher percentage under each protected characteristic will suggest that 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. The declaration rates for ethnicity and disability are such that there are smaller numbers of staff actually declared in those groups than the numbers who have not made any declaration. This makes any conclusions less definite.

Table 1.1: Percentage of DWP workforce by age and grade in relation to overall headcount^{1,2,3}

Age	Grade						% Not known/ Other	% of Total headcount
	% Band A/AA to Band C/EO	% Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO	% Band F/Grade 7	% Band G/Grade 6	% SCS (All)			
16-24	1.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	
25-29	3.8	2.1	2.9	*	0.0	0.0	3.5	
30-34	7.8	4.2	7.6	4.6	4.2	0.0	7.4	
35-39	9.9	7.9	10.0	7.7	8.5	*	9.7	
40-44	13.2	13.0	12.3	12.3	14.1	*	13.2	
45-49	18.6	22.2	22.0	21.2	23.0	0.0	19.1	
50-54	20.0	26.6	24.7	28.3	31.5	0.0	20.8	
55-59	15.8	17.8	15.9	19.1	15.5	0.0	16.0	
60-64	7.6	4.8	4.0	6.2	3.3	0.0	7.2	
65+	1.9	0.6	0.6	*	0.0	0.0	1.7	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Equality Information Report

Table 1.2: Percentage of DWP workforce by age and proportion in grade^{1,2,4}

Age	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)			
16-24	93.8	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	
25-29	92.8	5.8	1.3	*	0.0	0.0	100	
30-34	92.2	5.6	1.7	0.4	0.1	0.0	100	
35-39	89.5	8.1	1.7	0.5	0.2	*	100	
40-44	88.0	9.7	1.5	0.6	0.3	*	100	
45-49	85.7	11.4	1.9	0.7	0.3	0.0	100	
50-54	84.4	12.5	1.9	0.8	0.4	0.0	100	
55-59	86.5	10.9	1.6	0.7	0.2	0.0	100	
60-64	92.0	6.5	0.9	0.5	0.1	0.0	100	
65+	96.2	3.2	0.6	*	0.0	0.0	100	
% of Total headcount by grade	87.7	9.8	1.6	0.6	0.2	*	100	

Equality Information Report

Table 1.3: Percentage of DWP workforce by grade and indicated disability in relation to overall headcount^{1,2,3}

Disability	Grade						% Not known/ Other	% of Total headcount
	% Band A/AA to Band C/EO	% Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO	% Band F/Grade 7	% Band G/Grade 6	% SCS (All)			
2014 target	6.0	5.5	5.2	5.2	5.2	N/A	N/A	
Disabled	7.1	5.9	4.7	4.6	3.6	0.0	6.9	
Non-disabled	92.9	94.1	95.3	95.4	96.4	0.0	93.1	
Total	100	100	100	100	100	0.0	100	

Equality Information Report

Table 1.4: Percentage of DWP workforce by indicated disability and proportion in grade^{1,2,3}

Disability	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	
Disabled	89.5%	9.0%	1.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	100%
Non-disabled	87.1%	10.5%	1.6%	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%	100%
% Total indicated by grade	87.2%	10.4%	1.6%	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%	100%

Equality Information Report

Table 1.5: Percentage of DWP workforce by grade and indicated ethnicity in relation to overall headcount^{1,2,3}

Ethnicity	Grade						% Not known/ Other	% of Total headcount
	% Band A/AA to Band C/EO	% Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO	% Band F/Grade 7	% Band G/Grade 6	%SCS (All)			
2014 target	N/A	7.5	5.5	5.5	5.0	N/A	N/A	
Ethnic minority	12.2%	7.0%	4.5%	2.9%	5.6%	0.0%	11.5%	
White	87.8%	93.0%	95.5%	97.1%	94.4%	0.0%	88.5%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0.0%	100%	

Equality Information Report

Table 1.6: Percentage of DWP workforce by indicated ethnicity and proportion in grade^{1,2,3}

Ethnicity	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)			
Ethnic minority	92.8	6.3	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.0	100	
White	86.5	10.9	1.7	0.6	0.2	0.0	100	
% Total indicated by grade	87.2	10.4	1.6	0.6	0.2	0.0	100	

Equality Information Report

Table 1.7: Percentage of DWP workforce by grade and gender in relation to overall headcount^{1,2,3}

Gender	Grade						% Not known/ Other	% of Total headcount
	% Band A/AA to Band C/EO	% Band D/HEO and Band E/SEO	% Band F/Grade 7	% Band G/Grade 6	% SCS (All)			
2014 target	N/A	N/A	47.0	45.0	39.5	N/A	N/A	
Female	70.4	61.7	50.9	41.4	36.6	*	68.9	
Male	29.6	38.3	49.1	58.6	63.4	*	31.1	
Total	100	100	100	100	100	*	100	

Table 1.8: Percentage of DWP workforce by gender and proportion in grade^{1, 2, 4}

Gender	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	
Female	89.5	8.8	1.2	0.4	0.1	*	100
Male	83.7	12.1	2.6	1.2	0.5	*	100
% of Total headcount by grade	87.7	9.8	1.6	0.6	0.2	*	100

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data as at 31 March 2015.
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 who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic, over the total number of employees by grade.
4. 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.

2. Disciplinary procedures

What does this tell us?

The data presented here shows 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 appropriate headcount breakdown by age group, taken from Table 1.1 earlier in this report.

These results show a declining trend in the percentage disciplined by age group up to 54. It can also be noted that the volumes in the 16-24 and over 65 age groups are too small to draw any conclusions.

The percentage of females disciplined is lower than would be expected from the proportion by headcount.

The large volumes of staff not declared in respect of ethnic minority and disabled protected groups are such that they mask any conclusions regarding percentage differences in those protected characteristics.

Compared with the 2014 report, the percentage of staff disciplined has declined for all groups.

How will an improvement be shown?

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

Table 2.1: Percentage of employees by age who were disciplined^{1,2}

Age	% disciplined by age group ³	% of age group disciplined ⁴	% of total headcount by age group ⁵
16-24	0.6	0.5	1.3
25-29	4.3	1.4	3.5
30-34	8.3	1.3	7.4
35-39	10.7	1.3	9.7
40-44	12.8	1.2	13.2
45-49	18.6	1.2	19.1
50-54	17.9	1.0	20.8
55-59	15.3	1.1	16.0
60-64	8.8	1.4	7.2
65+	2.6	1.8	1.7
Total	100	1.2	100

Table 2.2: Percentage of employees by indicated disability who were disciplined^{1,2}

Disability	% disciplined by indicated disability group ³	% of indicated disability group disciplined ⁴	% of total headcount by indicated disability group ⁵
Disabled	7.9	1.3	6.9
Non-disabled	92.1	1.2	93.1
Total	100	-	100

Table 2.3: Percentage of employees by indicated ethnicity who were disciplined^{1,2}

Ethnicity	% disciplined by indicated ethnic group ³	% of indicated ethnic group disciplined ⁴	% of total headcount by indicated ethnic group ⁵
Ethnic minority	14.7	1.5	11.5
White	85.3	1.1	88.5
Total	100	-	100

Table 2.4: Percentage of employees by gender who were disciplined^{1,2}

Gender	% disciplined by gender group ³	% of gender group disciplined ⁴	% of total headcount by gender group ⁵
Female	57.2	1.0	68.9
Male	42.8	1.6	31.1
Total	100	-	100

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015.
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.

3. Exits

What does this tell us?

The data presented here shows 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 early exits, retirement and the Other category. Above age 49, resignation tends to be replaced by early exits and retirement. Early exits concentrate in the 50 to 64 age range.

The largest percentages of dismissals occur in the age groups that also have the largest headcounts.

Those declared as disabled show some differences under dismissals, resignations and the Other category. However the numbers are small and are obscured by those who have not declared (11.6%).

Those declared under ethnicity show some differences under retirement and the Other category. However the numbers are small and are obscured by those who have not declared (22.9%).

Female leavers are a smaller percentage than for the staff headcount. They are also more likely to leave through an early exit.

How will an improvement be shown?

A decrease in the percentage does not necessarily constitute an improvement, as the decision by an individual to leave the organisation is impacted by a range of personal factors. Percentages could also be different where the age distributions of the various groups vary.

Equality Information Report

Table 3.1: Percentage of reason for leaving by age in relation to overall number of leavers^{1,2,3,5,6,7}

Age	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% of Total leavers
16-24	4.9	*	8.2	0.0	14.3	4.9
25-29	4.5	0.9	14.5	0.0	15.6	6.6
30-34	9.6	2.9	15.4	*	16.7	8.0
35-39	10.8	4.7	11.5	*	12.2	7.0
40-44	12.5	7.3	11.7	0.4	10.8	7.7
45-49	14.0	10.4	12.1	1.1	14.6	9.7
50-54	16.4	19.1	8.3	6.6	10.0	12.1
55-59	15.6	33.6	9.9	17.5	4.1	17.8
60-64	9.5	15.3	6.1	47.6	1.5	17.7
65+	2.2	5.8	2.4	26.7	*	8.6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Equality Information Report

Table 3.2: Percentage of reason for leaving by age in relation to total number of leavers in that group^{1,2,4,5,6,7}

Age	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% Total
16-24	9.2	*	31.4	0.0	59.1	100
25-29	6.4	3.8	41.5	0.0	48.3	100
30-34	11.1	10.3	36.1	*	42.4	100
35-39	14.2	19.4	30.9	*	35.3	100
40-44	14.9	27.2	28.4	1.1	28.4	100
45-49	13.3	30.4	23.3	2.7	30.3	100
50-54	12.4	45.2	12.9	12.7	16.7	100
55-59	8.1	54.0	10.4	22.9	4.6	100
60-64	4.9	24.7	6.4	62.3	1.7	100
65+	2.4	19.3	5.3	72.5	*	100
%Total leavers by reason	9.2	28.6	18.8	23.2	20.2	100

Equality Information Report

Table 3.3: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated disability in relation to overall number of leavers^{1,2,3,5,6,7}

Disability	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% of Total leavers
Disabled	13.7	9.7	6.1	10.9	5.9	9.3
Non-disabled	86.3	90.3	93.9	89.1	94.1	90.7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 3.4: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated disability in relation to total number of leavers in that group^{1,2,4,5,6,7}

Disability	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% Total
Disabled	13.1	35.4	9.0	32.3	10.3	100
Non-disabled	8.4	33.7	14.1	27.1	16.7	100
% Total leavers by reason	8.8	33.9	13.6	27.6	16.1	100

Equality Information Report

Table 3.5: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated ethnicity in relation to overall number of leavers^{1,2,3,5,6,7}

Ethnicity	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% of Total leavers
Ethnic minority	12.5	9.2	11.3	6.4	17.4	10.5
White	87.5	90.8	88.7	93.6	82.6	89.5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 3.6: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated ethnicity in relation to total number of leavers in that group^{1,2,4,5,6,7}

Ethnicity	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% Total
Ethnic minority	10.3	28.3	16.7	16.4	28.2	100
White	8.4	32.7	15.4	27.8	15.6	100
% Total leavers by reason	8.6	32.2	15.6	26.7	17.0	100

Equality Information Report

Table 3.7: Percentage of reason for leaving by gender in relation to overall number of leavers^{1,2,3,5,6,7}

Gender	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% of Total leavers
Female	59.6	66.7	63.4	66.1	56.8	63.3
Male	40.4	33.3	36.6	33.9	43.2	36.7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 3.8: Percentage of reason for leaving by gender in relation to total number of leavers in that group^{1,2,4,5,6,7}

Gender	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% Total
Female	8.7	30.1	18.8	24.3	18.2	100
Male	10.1	25.9	18.7	21.5	23.8	100
% Total leavers by reason	9.2	28.6	18.8	23.2	20.2	100

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Equality Information Report

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015.
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 leavers who have chosen to indicate that protected characteristic and reason for leaving, over the total number of employees by reason for leaving.
4. 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.
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.

4. Working Patterns

What does this tell us?

The data presented here shows 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. Compared to the 2014 report, there has been a slight decline in the above 60 part-time percentages.

The percentages of those employees declared as being disabled or ethnic minority who work part-time, are close to the values for the corresponding non-protected groups, suggesting similar behaviour. However the declaration rates for ethnicity and disability are such that there are smaller numbers of staff actually declared in those groups than the numbers who have not made any declaration. This makes any conclusions less definite.

Part time working does show a large difference by gender. The table implies that females are considerably more likely to work part time than males.

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 4.1: Percentage of employees by age with a part-time working pattern^{1,2}

Age	% of total part-time workers by age group ³	% of age group that are part-time ⁴	% of total headcount by age group ⁵
16-24	0.2	7.2	1.3
25-29	2.0	24.6	3.5
30-34	6.7	38.8	7.4
35-39	10.2	45.1	9.7
40-44	14.2	45.9	13.2
45-49	18.7	41.9	19.1
50-54	19.3	39.5	20.8
55-59	15.1	40.4	16.0
60-64	10.4	61.2	7.2
65+	3.1	75.9	1.7
Total	100	42.7	100

4.2: Percentage of employees by indicated disability with a part-time working pattern^{1,2}

Disability	% of total part-time workers by indicated disability group ³	% of indicated disability group that are part-time ⁴	% of total headcount by indicated disability group ⁵
Disabled	6.6	43.9	6.9
Non-disabled	93.4	45.6	93.1
Total	100	-	100

Table 4.3: Percentage of employees by indicated ethnicity with a part-time working pattern^{1,2}

Ethnicity	% of total part-time workers by indicated ethnic group ³	% of indicated ethnic group that are part-time ⁴	% of total headcount by indicated ethnic group ⁵
Ethnic minority	10.5	40.5	11.5
White	89.5	44.7	88.5
Total	100	-	100

Table 4.4: Percentage of employees by gender with a part-time working pattern^{1,2}

Gender	% of total part-time workers by gender group ³	% of gender group that are part-time ⁴	% of total headcount by gender group ⁵
Female	88.2	54.6	68.9
Male	11.8	16.2	31.1
Total	100	-	100

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data as at 31 March 2015.
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.

5. Grievances

What does this tell us?

The data presented here shows 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 numbers of grievances are quite small, the percentages can vary considerably without implying significant differences.

Compared with the 2014 report, the percentages of those declaring a protected characteristic and who raise a grievance are closer to those not protected. However the declaration rates for ethnicity and disability are such that there are smaller numbers of staff actually declared in those groups than the numbers who have not made any declaration. This makes any conclusions less definite.

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 a decision of the individual that takes into account a range of personal factors.

Table 5.1: Percentage of employees by age who raised a grievance^{1,2}

Age	% of grievances by age group ³	% of age group that raised a grievance ⁴	% of total headcount by age group ⁵
16-24	*	*	1.3
25-29	2.5	0.8	3.5
30-34	6.0	0.9	7.4
35-39	10.1	1.2	9.7
40-44	14.2	1.2	13.2
45-49	17.0	1.0	19.1
50-54	21.4	1.1	20.8
55-59	17.5	1.2	16.0
60-64	8.7	1.3	7.2
65+	2.4	1.5	1.7
Total	100	1.1	100

Table 5.2: Percentage of employees by indicated disability who raised a grievance^{1,2}

Disability	% of grievances by indicated disability group ³	% of indicated disability group that raised a grievance ⁴	% of total headcount by indicated disability group ⁵
Disabled	9.7	1.6	6.9
Non-disabled	90.3	1.1	93.1
Total	100	-	100

Table 5.3: Percentage of employees by indicated ethnicity who raised a grievance^{1,2}

Ethnicity	% of grievances by indicated ethnic group ³	% of indicated ethnic group that raised a grievance ⁴	% of total headcount by indicated ethnic group ⁵
Ethnic minority	14.5	1.4	11.5
White	85.5	1.1	88.5
Total	100	-	100

Table 5.4: Percentage of employees by gender who raised a grievance^{1,2}

Gender	% of grievances by gender group ³	% of gender group that raised a grievance ⁴	% of total headcount by gender group ⁵
Female	65.4	1.0	68.9
Male	34.6	1.2	31.1
Total	100	-	100

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015.
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.

6. 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 2014 / 15 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. As data is only shown for those who made a declaration, any conclusions made are less definite. It should also be considered that females represent over two thirds of DWP's current employee headcount and that, if making comparisons to previously published results, relative sizes of the different groups will vary from year to year (including those who required no performance mark).

Equality Information Report

Table 6.1: Percentage of performance mark awarded by age in relation to overall number of performance markings given ^{1, 2, 3, 5}

Age	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	%Total
16-24	0.8	1.1	1.3	9.2	1.3
25-29	4.5	3.1	2.6	10.6	3.5
30-34	9.4	6.9	5.4	20.3	7.6
35-39	11.7	9.2	7.7	21.8	9.9
40-44	15.8	12.9	10.2	14.2	13.3
45-49	22.0	18.9	15.1	10.8	19.0
50-54	20.3	21.4	20.5	6.8	20.7
55-59	12.3	17.0	19.2	4.8	15.9
60-64	2.8	7.7	13.7	1.3	7.1
65+	0.4	1.8	4.4	0.4	1.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.2: Percentage of performance mark awarded by age in relation to total number of employees in that group ^{1, 2, 4, 5}

Age	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	% Total
16-24	13.5	59.8	8.5	18.2	100.0
25-29	25.5	61.2	5.8	7.4	100.0
30-34	24.6	63.1	5.7	6.6	100.0
35-39	23.7	64.6	6.2	5.4	100.0
40-44	23.9	67.3	6.2	2.6	100.0
45-49	23.2	69.0	6.4	1.4	100.0
50-54	19.6	71.6	8.0	0.8	100.0
55-59	15.5	74.0	9.7	0.7	100.0
60-64	7.9	76.0	15.6	0.5	100.0
65+	5.0	73.5	21.0	0.5	100.0
All Age Groups	20.1	69.4	8.0	2.5	100.0

Table 6.3: Percentage of performance mark awarded by indicated disability in relation to overall number of performance markings given ^{1, 2, 3, 5}

Disability	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	% Total
Disabled	4.9	7.0	10.3	4.8	6.9
Non-Disabled	95.1	93.0	89.7	95.2	93.1
Total Declared	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.4: Percentage of performance mark awarded by indicated disability in relation to total number of employees in that group ^{1, 2, 4, 5}

Disability	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	% Total
Disabled	14.6	72.0	12.3	1.1	100.0
Non-Disabled	21.1	69.8	7.8	1.7	100.0
Total Declared	20.6	70.0	8.1	1.6	100.0

Table 6.5: Percentage of performance mark awarded by indicated ethnicity in relation to overall number of performance markings given ^{1, 2, 3, 5}

Minority Ethnic	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	% Total
Ethnic	9.4	11.8	14.2	23.8	11.7
White	90.6	88.2	85.8	76.2	88.3
Total Declared	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.6: Percentage of performance mark awarded by indicated ethnicity in relation to total number of employees in that group ^{1, 2, 4, 5}

Minority Ethnic	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	% Total
Ethnic	16.5	70.4	9.6	3.5	100.0
White	21.2	69.6	7.7	1.5	100.0
Total Declared	20.6	69.7	7.9	1.7	100.0

Table 6.7: Percentage of performance mark awarded by gender in relation to overall number of performance markings given ^{1, 2, 3, 5}

Gender	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	% Total
Female	72.5	69.6	59.1	80.5	69.6
Male	27.5	30.4	40.9	19.5	30.4
Total Declared	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.8: Percentage of performance mark awarded by gender in relation to total number of employees in that group ^{1, 2, 4, 5}

Gender	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	% Total
Female	20.9	69.4	6.8	2.9	100.0
Male	18.2	69.4	10.8	1.6	100.0
Total Declared	20.1	69.4	8.0	2.5	100.0

All data sourced from: DWP's HR Database (Resource Management)

Notes:

1. Latest data as at 23 June 2015
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.

7. Promotion

What does this tell us?

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

Compared with the 2014 report, there has been an increase in all promotion percentages. Also a closing of the gap for those declared as ethnic minority or female. There is little change for those declared as disabled. The percentages for those declared as disabled, ethnic minority or female do remain lower than those outside these protected groups. However these do represent quite small numbers particularly when the declaration rates are taken into account.

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 7.1: Percentage of employees promoted by age^{1,2}

Age	% of promotions by age group ³	% of age group promoted ⁴	% of total headcount by age group ⁵
16-24	1.0	1.3	1.3
25-29	9.7	4.9	3.5
30-34	13.8	3.3	7.4
35-39	15.5	2.9	9.7
40-44	18.1	2.4	13.2
45-49	19.9	1.9	19.1
50-54	14.1	1.2	20.8
55-59	6.1	0.7	16.0
60-64	1.6	0.4	7.2
65+	*	*	1.7
Total	100.0	1.8	100.0

Table 7.2: Percentage of employees promoted by indicated disability^{1,2}

Disability	% of promotions by indicated disability group ³	% of indicated disability group promoted ⁴	% of total headcount by indicated disability group ⁵
Disabled	3.8	0.9	6.9
Non-disabled	96.2	1.7	93.1
Total	100	-	100

Table 7.3: Percentage of employees promoted by indicated ethnicity^{1,2}

Ethnicity	% of promotions by indicated ethnic group ³	% of indicated ethnic group promoted ⁴	% of total headcount by indicated ethnic group ⁵
Ethnic minority	10.3	1.6	11.5
White	89.7	1.8	88.5
Total	100	-	100

Table 7.4: Percentage of employees promoted by gender^{1,2}

Gender	% of promotions by gender group ³	% of gender group promoted ⁴	% of total headcount by gender group ⁵
Female	63.3	1.6	68.9
Male	36.7	2.1	31.1
Total	100.0	-	100.0

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Equality Information Report

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015.
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.

8. 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.

The percentage of unknowns is high in the breakdown for the protected characteristic of disability, so nothing can be concluded. It is noted that the percentage of applicants is reasonably close to the DWP value in Table 1.3.

The percentage of unknowns is quite low in the breakdown for the protected characteristic of ethnicity. The percentage of applicants is somewhat higher than the DWP value in Table 1.5. However the DWP value is subject to uncertainty due to the sizeable percentage of staff not making a declaration.

The percentage of female applicants is rather lower than the percentage already working for the DWP.

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 8.1: Percentage of applicants at different stages of the recruitment process by age^{1,2}

Age	Stage				
	% Application received ³	% Success ⁴	% In progress ⁴	% Withdrawn ⁴	% Un-successful ⁴
16-24	13.7	2.5	15.1	6.9	75.5
25-29	11.6	4.5	12.4	7.9	75.1
30-34	13.3	5.2	11.4	7.2	76.3
35-39	12.3	5.8	10.3	6.5	77.4
40-44	14.0	5.3	9.9	5.5	79.3
45-49	16.0	5.0	8.3	5.3	81.4
50-54	11.5	4.5	8.7	5.2	81.6
55-59	4.8	3.0	8.4	4.1	84.5
60-64	0.9	2.4	9.5	5.1	83.0
65+	0.1	2.8	8.3	5.6	83.3
Prefer not to say / unknown	1.8	2.9	10.7	5.0	81.4
Total	100.0	-	-	-	-

Table 8.2: Percentage of applicants at different stages of the recruitment process by indicated disability^{1,2}

Disability	Stage				
	% Application received ³	% Success ⁴	% In progress ⁴	% Withdrawn ⁴	% Un-successful ⁴
Disabled	5.9	3.1	8.4	6.9	81.6
Non-disabled	80.5	4.8	11.0	6.3	77.9
Prefer not to say / unknown	13.6	3.7	9.9	5.4	81.0
Total	100.0	-	-	-	-

Table 8.3: Percentage of applicants at different stages of the recruitment process by indicated ethnicity^{1,2}

Ethnicity	Stage				
	% Application received ³	% Success ⁴	% In progress ⁴	% Withdrawn ⁴	% Un-successful ⁴
Ethnic minority	14.4	4.8	10.7	6.3	78.2
White	83.7	3.9	10.4	4.6	81.2
Prefer not to say / unknown	1.9	3.2	10.7	5.6	80.5
Total	100.0	-	-	-	-

Table 8.4: Percentage of applicants at different stages of the recruitment process by gender^{1,2}

Gender	Stage				
	% Application received ³	% Success ⁴	% In progress ⁴	% Withdrawn ⁴	% Un-successful ⁴
Female	54.8	5.2	10.9	6.1	77.8
Male	44.7	3.7	10.5	6.2	79.6
Prefer not to say / unknown	0.5	2.8	14.2	7.1	75.8
Total	100.0	-	-	-	-

All data sourced from: Civil Service Resourcing.

Equality Information Report

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015.
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.

9. 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.

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

The 'Pay difference' above is defined as the mean pay of the advantaged group minus the mean pay of the disadvantaged 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).

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

How will an improvement be shown?

Generally the similarity of this indicator in an advantaged and disadvantaged 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. As an example, the 16 to 24 disadvantaged age group only contains 1.3% of the headcount (Table 1.1), so makes robust comparisons difficult.

Equality Information Report

Table 9.1: Pay gap by age^{1,2,3,4}

Age	Band A/ AA	Band B/ AO	Band C/ EO	Band D/ HEO	Band E/ SEO	Band F/ Grade 7	Band G/ Grade 6	All grades
Age 16-24 (mean salary)	£15,150	£16,687	£21,791	£23,635	£33,898	N/A	N/A	£17,652
Age 25-54 (mean salary)	£15,538	£18,215	£23,588	£28,251	£34,033	N/A	N/A	£22,488
Pay gap (percent 16-24 to 25-54)	2.5	8.39	7.62	16.34	0.40	N/A	N/A	21.5

Age	Band A/ AA	Band B/ AO	Band C/ EO	Band D/ HEO	Band E/ SEO	Band F/ Grade 7	Band G/ Grade 6	All grades
Age 55 and above (mean salary)	£15,557	£18,476	£24,271	£29,789	£35,923	£49,771	£62,687	£22,814
Age 25-54 (mean salary)	£15,538	£18,215	£23,588	£28,251	£34,003	£47,364	£59,746	£22,488
Pay gap (percent 55+ to 25-54)	-0.13	-1.43	-2.9	-5.44	-5.55	-5.08	-4.92	-1.45

Equality Information Report

Table 9.2: Pay gap by indicated disability^{1,2,3,4,5}

Disability	Band A/ AA	Band B/ AO	Band C/ EO	Band D/ HEO	Band E/ SEO	Band F/ Grade 7	Band G/ Grade 6	All grades
Disabled (mean salary)	£15,615	£18,558	£24,059	£29,042	£34,706	£47,865	£62,204	£22,627
Non-disabled (mean salary)	£15,591	£18,531	£23,907	£28,703	£34,565	£47,877	£60,527	£22,920
Pay gap (percent disabled to non-disabled)	-0.16	-0.15	-0.64	-1.18	-0.41	0.03	-1.12	1.28

Table 9.3: Pay gap by indicated ethnicity^{1,2,3,4,6}

Ethnicity	Band A/ AA	Band B/ AO	Band C/ EO	Band D/ HEO	Band E/ SEO	Band F/ Grade 7	Band G/ Grade 6	All grades
Ethnic minority (mean salary)	£15,581	£18,527	£23,540	£28,734	£34,354	£47,513	£58,269	£21,776
White (mean salary)	£15,567	£18,388	£23,883	£28,663	£34,561	£47,832	£60,511	£22,901
Pay gap (percent ethnic minority to white)	-0.09	-0.75	1.44	-0.25	0.6	0.67	3.71	4.91

Equality Information Report

Table 9.4: Pay gap by gender^{1,2,3,4}

Gender	Band A/ AA	Band B/ AO	Band C/ EO	Band D/ HEO	Band E/ SEO	Band F/ Grade 7	Band G/ Grade 6	All grades
Female (mean salary)	£15,546	£18,331	£23,787	£28,527	£34,366	£47,223	£59,521	£22,212
Male (mean salary)	£15,522	£18,040	£23,661	£28,523	£34,559	£48,455	£61,120	£23,059
Pay gap (percent female to male)	-0.2	-1.6	-0.5	0	0.6	2.5	2.6	3.7

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Equality Information Report

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015.
2. 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.
3. Mean salary is the total full-time basic salaries for the pay band, divided by the headcount.
4. 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 99.5 percent of DWP employees paid and in post on 31 March 2015.
5. Mean salaries only take into account those who have indicated their disability status.
6. Mean salaries only take into account those who have indicated their ethnicity status.

10. 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 tables suggest similar behaviour for progress or completion for the protected characteristics of disability, ethnicity or gender. This remains the case when those preferring not to say are taken into account.

The percentages of applications are roughly in line with the headcount (Tables 1.3 and 1.5). However there are sizeable percentages of those who prefer not to say for the protected characteristics of disability (11.6%) and ethnicity (22.9%). This does mean that the results for percentages of applications are not conclusive.

The percentages of applications by gender are reasonably in line with the headcount reported in Table 1.7.

Compared with the 2013 report, the percentage of training completed, rather than being in progress, is much larger.

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 10.1: Percentage of training at different stages by age^{1,2}

Stage			
Age	% Application received ³	% In progress ⁴	% Completed ⁴
16-24	4.1	32.3	67.7
25-29	4.5	24.2	75.8
30-34	7.9	23.2	76.8
35-39	9.2	23.8	76.2
40-44	14.0	23.4	76.6
45-49	17.8	23.9	76.1
50-54	19.6	23.8	76.2
55-59	12.7	23.8	76.2
60-64	5.2	25.0	75.0
65+	0.9	27.3	72.7
Prefer not to say / unknown	3.9	24.8	75.2
Total	100.0	-	-

Table 10.2: Percentage of training at different stages by indicated disability^{1,2}

Stage			
Disability	% Application received ³	% In progress ⁴	% Completed ⁴
Disabled	6.6	25.8	74.2
Non-disabled	82.7	24.0	76.0
Prefer not to say / unknown	10.7	24.9	75.1
Total	100.0	-	-

Table 10.3: Percentage of training at different stages by indicated ethnicity^{1,2}

Stage			
Ethnicity	% Application received ³	% In progress ⁴	% Completed ⁴
Ethnic minority	10.4	31.1	68.9
White	81.3	23.2	76.8
Prefer not to say / unknown	8.3	25	75.0
Total	100.0	-	-

Table 10.4: Percentage of training at different stages by gender^{1,2}

Stage			
Gender	% Application received ³	% In progress ⁴	% Completed ⁴
Female	67.9	24.6	75.4
Male	30.0	23.4	76.6
Prefer not to say / unknown	2.1	23.0	77.0
Total	100.0	-	-

All data sourced from: Civil Service Learning.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015.
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.

11. Maternity data

What does this tell us?

These data show 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 percentage distribution by age is reasonably similar to the 2014 report. The disability and ethnic minority groups are also very much the same as the 2014 report. The staff numbers are too small to indicate any significant difference.

How will an improvement be shown?

A change in the percentage when compared to the previous report does not necessarily imply an improvement. An individual decision to return to work after maternity leave is affected by a range of personal and economic factors.

Table 11.1: Percentage of employees returning from maternity leave in period by age^{1,2,3}

Age	% Total
16-24	0.9
25-29	19.0
30-34	39.9
35-39	30.5
40-44	8.7
45-49	0.9
50-54	*
55-59	0.0
60-64	0.0
65+	0.0
Total	100.0

Table 11.2: Percentage of employees returning from maternity leave in period by indicated disability^{1,2,3}

Disability	% Total
Disabled	1.6
Non-disabled	98.4
Total	100.0

Table 11.3: Percentage of employees returning from maternity leave in period by indicated ethnicity^{1,2,3}

Ethnicity	% Total
Ethnic minority	15.9
White	84.1
Total	100.0

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015.
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.

12. Links to additional information

[2014 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.

[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, 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14.

[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 2015

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.

Health, Wellbeing & Inclusion

Kings Court

80 Hanover Way

Sheffield

S2 7UF

health.wellbeingandinclusion@dwpgsi.gov.uk

ISBN: 978-1-78425-759-0

Published by the Department for Work and Pensions

Revised edition April 2016 (section 6 added)

www.gov.uk/dwp