



Department  
for Work &  
Pensions

# Department for Work and Pensions Equality Information – Employee Data

Report under the Public Sector Equality Duty

July 2014

# Contents

List of tables .....	3
DWP workforce data.....	3
Introduction.....	4
The legal requirements.....	4
Our overall approach .....	5
Changes to our 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 .....	7
Our approach to paying due regard.....	7
Our approach to developing equality objectives .....	8
Alternative formats.....	8
Feedback.....	8
Information about our employees .....	9
1. The DWP workforce .....	9
2. Disciplinary procedures .....	20
3. Exits.....	23
4. Working Patterns .....	31
5. Grievances .....	34
6. Performance markings .....	38
7. Promotion .....	43
8. Recruitment Process .....	46
9. Pay Gap .....	50
10. Training Data.....	56
11. Maternity data.....	59
12. Links to additional information .....	62

# 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

## 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 fourth report under this duty. The last report was published in July 2013.

# 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.

## Changes to our approach

In previous years, we have published both our employee and customer data in a single report, separated into two sections. Following a cross-government steer to ensure a proportionate approach to the publication of employee data, and in order to improve the efficiency of the publication process we have taken a new approach with the 2014 Equality Information Report by separating the customer and employee data into individual publications. This report contains the information regarding our employees. A report containing customer data is published separately.

## 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 2014 we had 95,923 employees (headcount), their declaration rate for ethnicity was 77.8% and for disability 86%. 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 and volunteers from across the Department have developed a communication campaign to help increase declaration rates (ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation and religion and belief). This will be communicated internally in autumn 2014.

We have used data from our HR database and other administrative systems to display information about:

- the make up of our workforce;
- discipline;
- exits;
- working patterns;
- grievances;
- performance management;
- recruitment and promotion;
- gender pay gap;
- training; and
- maternity leave.

As previously, this report includes percentages which show the proportion of employees in particular groups, for example, 9.7% of 16 to 24 year olds working in the Department have part time working patterns and, where relevant, percentages which are relative to the whole group. For example, 0.2% of the total number of part time employees in the Department are 16 to 24 year olds.

## **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 ten years we have ranked within the Top 100 list of gay-friendly employers nine times. In 2014, 369 organisations took part in the index and DWP ranked joint 45<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 Civil Service has also recently been awarded the Recruitment Industry Disability Initiative (RIDI) Disability Confident award for its efforts to improve employment outcomes for disabled people.

### **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. 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 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 Team

Kings Court

80 Hanover Way

Sheffield

S2 7UF

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.



# 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 2013 report, the percentage of the DWP workforce has increased somewhat in all the 50 and above age groups.

The results show that the targets for disability representation have been exceeded in the lower grades, which cover the large majority of staff. Compared with the 2013 report, progress has also been made in the percentages for all the grades up to and including Band G. However this does depend on the declaration rate.

The results indicate that progress has been made towards achieving the target for ethnicity representation in the Band D and E grades. The target has been considerably exceeded at the SCS grade although the total number of staff is small. However the targets have not been reached in the grades from Band D to G. It is noted that there is no ethnicity target for the Band A to C grades, which cover the bulk of DWP staff. This is because representation at these grades was above the economically active rate when the targets were set. Targets may change in light of forthcoming changes proposed by the cross-government Heads of Diversity group. Where appropriate this may include targets currently represented as N/A. All the above observations do need to allow for the declaration rate.

Compared with the 2013 report, there are improvements in female representation in all the grades up to Band F. Although the gender target for Band G was not achieved, the numbers are too small for statistical significance. The female headcount percentage shows an increase when compared with the 2013 report.

### 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.

### 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.

**Table 1.1: Percentage of DWP workforce by age and grade in relation to overall headcount<sup>1,2,4</sup>**

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	1.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
25-29	4.6	2.1	2.8	*	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3
30-34	8.5	4.8	8.7	4.1	*	*	*	8.1
35-39	9.8	7.7	10.2	10.1	8.6	*	*	9.6
40-44	13.8	13.9	13.0	13.7	12.7	*	*	13.8
45-49	19.0	23.7	21.6	21.7	29.5	*	*	19.5
50-54	19.3	26.0	23.6	28.6	29.1	0.0	0.0	20.0
55-59	15.0	16.2	16.3	16.5	15.0	0.0	0.0	15.1
60-64	7.2	4.1	3.4	5.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	6.8
65+	1.9	0.7	0.3	*	*	0.0	0.0	1.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 1.2: Percentage of DWP workforce by age and proportion in grade<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

Grade							
Age	% 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	% Total
16-24	91.9	8.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
25-29	94.2	4.8	1.0	*	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-34	92.3	5.7	1.6	0.3	*	*	100.0
35-39	89.8	7.7	1.6	0.7	0.2	*	100.0
40-44	88.0	9.7	1.4	0.6	0.2	*	100.0
45-49	85.6	11.7	1.7	0.7	0.3	*	100.0
50-54	84.5	12.5	1.8	0.9	0.3	0.0	100.0
55-59	87.1	10.3	1.6	0.7	0.2	0.0	100.0
60-64	92.9	5.8	0.8	0.5	0.1	0.0	100.0
65+	95.9	3.7	0.3	*	*	0.0	100.0
% of Total headcount by grade		9.6	1.5	0.6	0.2	0.0	100.0
88.0							

**Table 1.3: Percentage of DWP workforce by grade and indicated disability in relation to overall headcount<sup>1,2,4</sup>**

Disability	Grade						% 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)	% Not known/ Other	
2013 target	6.0	5.5	5.2	5.2	5.2	N/A	N/A
Disabled	7.0	5.9	4.6	4.0	4.1	0.0	6.8
Non-disabled	93.0	94.1	95.4	96.0	95.9	*	93.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 1.4: Percentage of DWP workforce by indicated disability and proportion in grade<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

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	89.8	8.8	1.0	0.4	0.1	0.0%	100.0
Non-disabled	87.4	10.3	1.5	0.6	0.2	*	100.0
% Total indicated by grade	87.6	10.2	1.5	0.6	0.2	*	100.0

**Table 1.5: Percentage of DWP workforce by grade and indicated ethnicity in relation to overall headcount<sup>1,2,4</sup>**

Ethnicity	Grade						% 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)	% Not known/ Other	
2013 target	N/A	7.5	5.5	5.5	5.0	N/A	N/A
Ethnic minority	12.1	7.2	5.4	4.3	6.8	*	11.4
White	87.9	92.8	94.6	95.7	93.2	0.0	88.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 1.6: Percentage of DWP workforce by indicated ethnicity and proportion in grade<sup>1,2,3</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	92.6	6.4	0.7	0.2	0.1	*	100.0
White	87.0	10.6	1.6	0.6	0.2	0.0	100.0
% Total indicated by grade	87.6	10.1	1.5	0.6	0.2	*	100.0



**Table 1.7: Percentage of DWP workforce by grade and gender in relation to overall headcount<sup>1,2,4</sup>**

Gender	Grade						% 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)	% Not known/ Other	
2013 target	N/A	N/A	47.0	45.0	39.5	N/A	N/A
Female	70.3	61.2	52.0	43.0	39.5	49.6	68.9
Male	29.7	38.8	48.0	57.0	60.5	50.4	31.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 1.8: Percentage of DWP workforce by gender and proportion in grade<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

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	89.8	8.5	1.1	0.4	0.1	*	100.0
Male	84.0	12.0	2.4	1.2	0.4	*	100.0
% of Total headcount by grade	88.0	9.6	1.5	0.6	0.2	0.0	100.0

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data as at 31 March 2014.
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.

## Equality Information Report

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, taken from a table earlier in this report.

These results show a declining trend in the percentage disciplined by age group up to 54. It can be noted that the volumes in the 16-24 and over 65 age groups are too small to draw any conclusions. The large volumes of staff not declared in respect of ethnic minority and disabled protected groups are such that it is not possible to draw conclusions regarding percentage differences in those protected characteristics.

Compared with the 2013 report, the total number of staff disciplined in age groups above 45 has increased. However the increase is small. The numbers of those disciplined who identify as disabled is almost identical to the previous year. The numbers disciplined who identify as ethnic minority show a considerable reduction compared with the previous year, but this is too small to be significant. The gender group breakdown of those disciplined is not significantly different from the 2013 report.

### How will an improvement be shown?

Generally the similarity of this indicator between groups 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<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	1.1	2.2	1.0
25-29	5.7	2.8	4.3
30-34	8.8	2.3	8.1
35-39	9.9	2.1	9.6
40-44	13.6	2.1	13.8
45-49	18.4	2.0	19.5
50-54	18.1	1.9	20.0
55-59	14.3	2.0	15.1
60-64	8.0	2.4	6.8
65+	2.1	2.5	1.7
Total	100.0	2.1	100.0

**Table 2.2: 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	9.8	2.9	6.8
Non-disabled	90.2	1.9	93.2
Total	100.0	-	100.0

**Table 2.3: 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	13.7	2.4	11.4
White	86.3	2.0	88.6
Total	100.0	-	100.0

**Table 2.4: 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	56.8	1.7	68.9
Male	43.2	2.9	31.1
Total	100.0	-	100.0

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.
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 resignation. The resignation percentage broadly declines with increasing age and tends to be replaced by retirement in the 55 and above age groups. Early exits concentrate in the 50 to 59 age range.

The larger percentages of dismissals are found in the 45 to 54 age groups.

Compared with the 2013 report, the percentages of total leavers have increased in the 50 and above age groups. Early exits show a large increase, which has an effect on the values of the other categories of leavers.

#### **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.

**Table 3.1: Percentage of reason for leaving by age in relation to overall number of leavers<sup>1,2,3,5,6,7</sup>**

Age	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% of Total leavers
16-24	3.5	0.3	12.4	0.0	24.4	8.8
25-29	5.4	2.0	17.9	*	16.9	8.6
30-34	9.0	4.6	15.1	*	13.5	8.2
35-39	11.8	4.8	10.1	*	9.7	6.6
40-44	12.6	7.2	10.6	*	10.0	7.4
45-49	15.7	10.6	11.2	0.9	8.7	8.5
50-54	16.0	20.3	7.9	6.5	9.2	11.6
55-59	13.6	29.4	7.5	18.7	5.0	15.3
60-64	9.9	14.6	5.8	49.3	2.1	17.2
65+	2.6	6.3	1.5	24.4	0.6	7.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0



**Table 3.2: Percentage of reason for leaving by age in relation to total number of leavers in that group<sup>1,2,4,5,6,7</sup>**

Age	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% Total
16-24	3.4	0.8	26.8	0.0	69.0	100.0
25-29	5.4	5.6	39.6	*	49.2	100.0
30-34	9.6	13.9	35.1	*	41.1	100.0
35-39	15.7	18.0	29.4	*	36.7	100.0
40-44	14.8	23.9	27.3	*	33.8	100.0
45-49	16.2	30.7	25.3	2.3	25.6	100.0
50-54	12.0	42.9	12.9	12.6	19.7	100.0
55-59	7.7	47.2	9.4	27.5	8.2	100.0
60-64	5.0	20.9	6.5	64.6	3.1	100.0
65+	2.9	20.2	3.6	71.5	1.8	100.0
%Total leavers by reason	8.7	24.6	19.1	22.6	25.0	100.0

**Table 3.3: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated disability in relation to overall number of leavers<sup>1,2,3,5,6,7</sup>**

Disability	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% of Total leavers
Disabled	15.6	7.2	6.1	9.8	5.5	8.3
Non-disabled	84.4	92.8	93.9	90.2	94.5	91.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 3.4: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated disability in relation to total number of leavers in that group<sup>1,2,4,5,6,7</sup>**

Disability	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% Total
Disabled	17.1	28.0	10.2	34.9	9.8	100.0
Non-disabled	8.4	32.7	14.3	29.3	15.4	100.0
% Total leavers by reason	9.1	32.3	13.9	29.8	14.9	100.0

**Table 3.5: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated ethnicity in relation to overall number of leavers<sup>1,2,3,5,6,7</sup>**

Ethnicity	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% of Total leavers
Ethnic minority	13.0	8.6	10.7	6.6	12.5	9.4
White	87.0	91.4	89.3	93.4	87.5	90.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 3.6: Percentage of reason for leaving by indicated ethnicity in relation to total number of leavers in that group<sup>1,2,4,5,6,7</sup>**

Ethnicity	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% Total
Ethnic minority	12.3	27.7	18.1	19.1	22.8	100.0
White	8.6	30.8	15.8	28.2	16.6	100.0
% Total leavers by reason	8.9	30.5	16.0	27.4	17.2	100.0

**Table 3.7: Percentage of reason for leaving by gender in relation to overall number of leavers<sup>1,2,3,5,6,7</sup>**

Gender	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% of Total leavers
Female	58.5	64.9	62.3	65.0	54.3	61.2
Male	41.5	35.1	37.7	35.0	45.7	38.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 3.8: Percentage of reason for leaving by gender in relation to total number of leavers in that group<sup>1,2,4,5,6,7</sup>**

Gender	% Dismissals	% Early exits	% Resignation	% Retirement	% Other	% Total
Female	8.3	26.1	19.4	24.0	22.1	100.0
Male	9.3	22.3	18.5	20.4	29.5	100.0
% Total leavers by reason	8.7	24.6	19.1	22.6	25.0	100.0

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.
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.

## **Equality Information Report**

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. In these groups the percentage approaches double the value for those aged 50 to 59.

The percentages of those employees declared as being disabled or ethnic minority who work part-time, are close to the values for the corresponding groups, suggesting similar behaviour. Part time working does show a large difference by gender. The table implies that females are more likely to work part time than males.

Compared with the 2013 report, there have been slight increases in the percentages of employees working part time in all the age groups. The absolute numbers of staff working part time has increased in the 50 and above age groups.

### 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.

**Table 4.1: 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	0.2	9.7	1.0
25-29	2.4	23.4	4.3
30-34	7.1	37.1	8.1
35-39	10.3	45.1	9.6
40-44	14.7	45.0	13.8
45-49	19.3	41.8	19.5
50-54	18.3	38.5	20.0
55-59	14.3	39.9	15.1
60-64	10.2	62.8	6.8
65+	3.2	76.6	1.7
Total	100.0	-	100.0

**4.2: 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	6.7	43.7	6.8
Non-disabled	93.3	44.9	93.2
Total	100.0	-	100.0



**Table 4.3: 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	10.4	39.4	11.4
White	89.6	44.1	88.6
Total	100.0	-	100.0

**Table 4.4: 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	88.2	54.0	68.9
Male	11.8	16.0	31.1
Total	100.0	-	100.0

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data as at 31 March 2014.
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 2013 report, the percentages of grievances have increased for all groups. A gender difference has also developed with men being more likely to raise a grievance. The increases for those declared as disabled or ethnic minority has roughly maintained the proportions in the 2013 report.

### 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. 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<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	0.6	1.0	1.0
25-29	4.9	1.8	4.3
30-34	8.2	1.6	8.1
35-39	9.1	1.5	9.6
40-44	11.0	1.3	13.8
45-49	18.7	1.5	19.5
50-54	19.4	1.6	20.0
55-59	17.4	1.9	15.1
60-64	8.3	2.0	6.8
65+	2.5	2.3	1.7
Total	100.0	1.6	100.0

**Table 5.2: 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	11.3	2.7	6.8
Non-disabled	88.7	1.6	93.2
Total	100.0	-	100.0

**Table 5.3: 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	14.2	2.1	11.4
White	85.8	1.6	88.6
Total	100.0	-	100.0

**Table 5.4: 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	60.9	1.4	68.9
Male	39.1	2.0	31.1
Total	100.0	-	100.0

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.
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.

## Equality Information Report

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 2013 / 14 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 6.1: 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	1.0	0.9	1.1	4.2	0.9
25-29	5.7	3.9	3.4	14.8	4.2
30-34	9.7	7.6	6.6	32.3	8.0
35-39	11.2	9.3	7.6	20.9	9.6
40-44	16.7	13.4	10.3	13.3	13.8
45-49	22.5	19.3	16.0	3.8	19.7
50-54	19.2	20.6	19.2	4.2	20.2
55-59	11.0	16.1	18.9	4.6	15.2
60-64	2.6	7.3	12.5	1.9	6.7
65+	0.4	1.7	4.4	0.0	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** <sup>1, 2, 4, 5</sup>

Age	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	%Total
16-24	22.2	67.4	9.1	1.3	100.0
25-29	27.8	65.1	6.1	1.0	100.0
30-34	25.1	67.6	6.2	1.1	100.0
35-39	24.4	69.0	6.0	0.6	100.0
40-44	25.1	69.0	5.6	0.3	100.0
45-49	23.7	70.1	6.1	0.1	100.0
50-54	19.8	72.9	7.2	0.1	100.0
55-59	15.1	75.4	9.4	0.1	100.0
60-64	8.0	77.8	14.1	0.1	100.0
65+	5.2	74.7	20.1	0.0	100.0
All Age Groups	20.8	71.4	7.5	0.3	100.0

**Table 6.3: 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	4.9	7.0	10.8	3.8	6.8
Non-Disabled	95.1	93.0	89.2	96.2	93.2
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**<sup>1, 2, 4, 5</sup>

Disability	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	% Total
Disabled	14.8	73.2	11.9	0.1	100.0
Non-Disabled	21.1	71.5	7.2	0.2	100.0
Total Declared	20.6	71.6	7.5	0.2	100.0

**Table 6.5: Percentage of performance mark awarded by indicated ethnicity in relation to overall number of performance markings given**<sup>1, 2, 3, 5</sup>

Minority Ethnic	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	% Total
Ethnic	9.3	11.7	14.5	24.0	11.4
White	90.7	88.3	85.5	76.0	88.6
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**<sup>1, 2, 4, 5</sup>

Minority Ethnic	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	% Total
Ethnic	17.2	72.9	9.4	0.5	100.0
White	21.6	71.0	7.1	0.2	100.0
Total Declared	21.1	71.2	7.4	0.3	100.0

**Table 6.7: 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	72.0	69.4	56.9	90.5	69.1
Male	28.0	30.6	43.1	9.5	30.9
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** <sup>1, 2, 4, 5</sup>

Gender	% Exceeded	% Achieved	% Must Improve	% No Mark required	% Total
Female	21.7	71.8	6.2	0.4	100.0
Male	18.9	70.5	10.5	0.1	100.0
Total Declared	20.8	71.4	7.5	0.3	100.0

All data sourced from: DWP's HR Database

Notes:

1. Data as at 31 March 2014.
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 show employees promoted against their status in relation to each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; ethnicity; and gender.

The results indicate a gradually declining promotion percentage with increasing age group of 25 and above. There are lower percentages for promotion for those declared as disabled or ethnic minority or female. These numbers are too small to represent a significant difference and may be affected by the declaration rate.

Compared with the 2013 report, there has been a considerable decline in the promotion percentage. The percentages for those declared as disabled, ethnic minority or female are lower than those outside these groups. However the numbers are too small to be significant and some have to be interpreted in the light of the applicable declaration rate.

### 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.

**Table 7.1: 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	1.6	1.0	1.0
25-29	11.5	1.6	4.3
30-34	18.9	1.4	8.1
35-39	15.6	0.9	9.6
40-44	16.4	0.7	13.8
45-49	18.3	0.5	19.5
50-54	11.2	0.3	20.0
55-59	6.1	0.2	15.1
60-64	*	*	6.8
65+	0.0	0.0	1.7
Total	100.0	0.6	100.0

**Table 7.2: 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	3.6	0.3	6.8
Non-disabled	96.4	0.6	93.2
Total	100.0	-	100.0

**Table 7.3: 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	7.0	0.3	11.4
White	93.0	0.6	88.6
Total	100.0	-	100.0

**Table 7.4: 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	55.8	0.5	68.9
Male	44.2	0.8	31.1
Total	100.0	-	100.0

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.
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 shows percentages of employees at different stages of the recruitment process for our vacancies opened with Civil Service Resourcing during the period. The percentages are given against their status in relation to each of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; ethnicity; and gender.

The percentage of applications from those indicating disability is similar to the DWP percentage declaring that characteristic. It represents an increase from the 2013 report. The application percentage from those declaring as ethnic minority is higher than the DWP staff value. Although the successful percentage is a little higher than for the corresponding group, the non-declared group could obscure the underlying behaviour. The percentage of applications from females is lower than the DWP headcount split, but remains very close to the value in the 2013 report.

The different stages of the recruitment process are all reasonably similar for disability, ethnic minority and gender. The differences do not look to be significant in these areas.

Compared with the 2013 report, there has been a decline in the percentage of applications from the 16 to 24 age group.

### 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.

**Table 8.1: 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	8.4	2.2	0.1	1.4	4.6
25-29	13.0	3.1	0.1	1.7	8.1
30-34	14.1	2.7	0.1	1.7	9.7
35-39	12.7	2.1	0.3	1.2	9.2
40-44	15.4	2.1	0.4	1.2	11.6
45-49	17.8	2.0	0.4	1.2	14.2
50-54	11.7	1.1	0.1	0.7	9.8
55-59	4.3	0.5	0.0	0.4	3.3
60-64	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.5
65+	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Prefer not to say / unknown	1.9	0.1	0.1	0.1	1.6
Total	100.0	-	-	-	-

**Table 8.2: 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	6.3	0.9	0.0	0.7	4.7
Non-disabled	90.0	14.8	1.5	8.5	65.3
Prefer not to say / unknown	3.6	0.3	0.1	0.4	2.8
Total	100.0	-	-	-	-

**Table 8.3: 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	17.0	3.2	0.0	2.0	11.9
White	80.3	12.5	1.3	7.6	58.8
Prefer not to say / unknown	2.7	0.4	0.1	0.1	2.1
Total	100.0	-	-	-	-



**Table 8.4: Percentage of applicants at different stages of the recruitment process by gender<sup>1,2</sup>**

Gender	Stage				
	% Application received <sup>3</sup>	% Success <sup>4</sup>	% In progress <sup>4</sup>	% Withdrawn <sup>4</sup>	% Un-successful <sup>4</sup>
Female	50.9	8.7	0.8	4.6	36.7
Male	48.8	7.3	0.7	5.0	35.8
Prefer not to say / unknown	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Total	100.0	-	-	-	-

All data sourced from: Civil Service Resourcing.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.
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.

Pay gap =  $\frac{\text{Pay difference}}{\text{Pay of the advantaged group}}$ <sup>1</sup>

(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 2013 report, the gender pay gap shows some changes in percentages for Band E/SEO and hence overall. 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 percent). This analysis informs the Equal Pay Audit, which takes place on a three yearly basis to identify areas for action.

**Table 9.1: Pay gap by age<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>**

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)	£14,732	£16,611	£21,838	£26,434	N/A	N/A	N/A	£18,135
Age 25-54 (mean salary)	£15,335	£18,114	£23,497	£28,387	N/A	N/A	N/A	£22,190
Pay gap (percent 16-24 to 25-54)	3.9	8.3	7.1	6.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	18.3
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)	£15,366	£18,350	£24,160	£29,654	£36,231	£49,541	£62,842	£22,475
Age 25-54 (mean salary)	£15,335	£18,114	£23,497	£28,387	£34,599	£47,621	£59,892	£22,190
Pay gap (percent 55+ to 25-54)	-0.2	-1.3	-2.8	-4.5	-4.7	-4.0	-4.9	-1.3

**Table 9.2: Pay gap by indicated disability<sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup>**

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)	£15,439	£18,417	£23,972	£29,072	£35,253	£47,943	£62,012	£22,360
Non-disabled (mean salary)	£15,414	£18,389	£23,790	£28,729	£34,961	£48,111	£60,682	£22,548
Pay gap (percent disabled to non-disabled)	-0.2	-0.2	-0.8	-1.2	-0.8	0.3	-2.2	0.8

**Table 9.3: Pay gap by indicated ethnicity<sup>1,2,3,4,6</sup>**

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)	£15,372	£18,300	£23,529	£28,563	£34,375	£47,465	£59,476	£21,504
White (mean salary)	£15,382	£18,274	£23,765	£28,729	£34,988	£48,040	£60,746	£22,532
Pay gap (percent ethnic minority to white)	0.1	-0.1	1.0	0.6	1.8	1.2	2.1	4.6

## Equality Information Report

**Table 9.4: Pay gap by gender<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>**

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)	£15,341	£18,231	£23,691	£28,615	£34,756	£47,416	£59,824	£21,905
Male (mean salary)	£15,334	£17,923	£23,570	£28,659	£35,177	£48,640	£61,063	£22,912
Pay gap (percent female to male)	0.0	-1.7	-0.5	0.2	1.2	2.5	2.0	4.4

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.
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 99.6 percent of DWP employees paid and in post on 31 March 2014.
5. Mean salaries only take into account those who have indicated their disability status.

## Equality Information Report

6. Mean salaries only take into account those who have indicated their ethnicity status.

## 10. Training Data

### What does this tell us?

This data shows 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 applicable rate of those preferring not to say or unknown is also shown.

The percentage of received applications, by age group, appears to show a closer match to headcount than was the case in the 2013 report. The percentage of received applications from the 55 and above age groups is improved from the previous report, but does remain below the applicable headcount. However it should be noted that the percentage preferring not to say or unknown has also risen.

The category of those preferring not to say or unknown continues to be greater than the percentage declared disabled. Hence although the percentage of those declared disabled is somewhat below the applicable headcount, the result is not conclusive.

The percentage of received applications from those declared ethnic minority has declined by the same value as the rise in those preferring not to say or unknown. Hence it is not possible to indicate if any change in behaviour has actually taken place.

Compared to the 2013 report, the percentage of received applications from females has increased, but remains below the applicable overall headcount. However the percentages of applications by gender do lie within the corresponding ranges for Bands A/AA to E/SEO. Table 1.7 indicates that these bands are the grades for the majority of employees.

### 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 borne in mind that training needs are specific to each member of staff within the organisation.



**Table 10.1: 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	2.2	31.7	68.3
25-29	5.1	24.7	75.3
30-34	8.4	23.8	76.2
35-39	9.3	22.7	77.3
40-44	14.2	22.2	77.8
45-49	18.9	21.9	78.1
50-54	18.8	21.6	78.4
55-59	12.8	21.6	78.4
60-64	5.2	21.3	78.7
65+	0.9	23.0	77.0
Prefer not to say / unknown	4.1	23.1	76.9
Total	100.0	-	-

**Table 10.2: 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	6.1	22.9	77.1
Non-disabled	83.2	22.4	77.6
Prefer not to say / unknown	10.7	22.7	77.3
Total	100.0	-	-

**Table 10.3: Percentage of training at different stages by indicated ethnicity<sup>1,2</sup>**

Ethnicity	Stage		
	% Application received <sup>3</sup>	% In progress <sup>4</sup>	% Completed <sup>4</sup>
Ethnic minority	8.4	30.2	69.8
White	82.8	21.6	78.4
Prefer not to say / unknown	8.8	23.1	76.9
Total	100.0	-	-

**Table 10.4: Percentage of training at different stages by gender<sup>1,2</sup>**

Gender	Stage		
	% Application received <sup>3</sup>	% In progress <sup>4</sup>	% Completed <sup>4</sup>
Female	64.7	22.8	77.2
Male	32.9	21.8	78.2
Prefer not to say / unknown	2.4	23.2	76.8
Total	100.0	-	-

All data sourced from: Civil Service Learning.

Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.
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?

This 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 percentage distribution by age is quite similar to the 2013 report. Compared to the 2013 report, the disability group shows a percentage decline while the ethnic minority increases somewhat. However the staff numbers are too small to indicate a 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<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

Age	% Total
16-24	1.9
25-29	19.1
30-34	38.6
35-39	28.9
40-44	10.3
45-49	1.0
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<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

Disability	% Total
Disabled	1.7
Non-disabled	98.3
Total	100.0

**Table 11.3: Percentage of employees returning from maternity leave in period by indicated ethnicity<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

Ethnicity	% Total
Ethnic minority	16.7
White	83.3
Total	100.0

All data sourced from: DWP's HR database.

## Equality Information Report

### Notes:

1. Data period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.
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

[2013 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, 2011-12 and 2012-13.

[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 2014**

### **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  
Kings Court  
80 Hanover Way  
Sheffield  
S2 7UF

---

#### Contact Information:

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

978-1-78425-223-6

Published by the  
Department for Work  
and Pensions

11 July 2014

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