## Civilian Performance Management Outcomes

Ministry of Defence 2017-18 Reporting Year

```
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```

This statistical release provides figures on the Performance Management outcomes for civilian personnel employed by Top Level Budgetary Areas (TLBs) within the Ministry of Defence. These results are provided for each protected characteristic allowing comparisons to be made across groups.

## Key points for 2017-18

## Box marking distribution

## Box markings by Gender

## Box markings by Ethnicity

| Partially met $/$ <br> Not met <br> $5.8 \%$ | Box marking | Male | Female | Box marking | White |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Exceeded <br> $40.5 \%$ | Exceeded | $37.5 \%$ | $44.4 \%$ | Exceeded |
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## Introduction

In 2017/18 the MOD introduced a new performance management framework that enables performance differentiation. It is the responsibility of the line manager to assign performance ratings and to ensure that they place equal emphasis on both WHAT the job holder has done (the task completed) and HOW they have done it (the knowledge, skills and behaviours they have used/demonstrated). Any ratings will be reviewed and validated by the countersigning officer. The four ratings that can be assigned are as follows:

- Exceeded
- Met
- Partially Met
- Not Met

Due to the small numbers who received either a Partially met or Not Met box marking, these two categories have been combined for outputs in this publication.

## Coverage

MOD Main total

- Includes: Top Level Budgetary Areas (TLBs)
- Excludes: DE\&S Bespoke Trading Entity, Royal Fleet Auxiliary, Trading Fund, Executive Agencies and Locally engaged civilians.


## Symbols and conventions

~ fewer than five or figure suppressed

- zero or rounded to zero
* not applicable

All percentages are calculated from raw figures.

Where rounding has been used, totals and sub-totals have been rounded separately and so may not equal the sums of their rounded parts. When rounding to the nearest 10 , numbers ending in ' 5 ' have been rounded to the nearest multiple of 20 to prevent systematic bias.

## Summary

The 2017-18 appraisal process for MOD civilian personnel covered 31,980 staff, of which:

Table 1 - Number of Job Holders by Performance Management Outcome, 2017-18

| Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number |
| 12,960 | $40.5 \%$ | 17,160 | $53.7 \%$ | 1,860 | $5.8 \%$ | 31,980 |

Figure 1- Distribution of Performance Management Outcomes, 2017-18


The majority of staff (53.7\%) received a Met box marking in their 2017-18 performance report, with $40.5 \%$ receiving an Exceeded box marking and 5.8\% receiving a Partially met or Not met box marking (this comprised of $2.3 \%$ who received a Partially met and $3.5 \%$ who received a Not met box marking).

Due to the small numbers who received either a Partially met or Not met box marking, these two categories have been combined for outputs in this publication.

## Top Level Budgetary Areas (TLBs)

Table 2-Number of Job Holders by Top Level Budget and Outcome, 2017-18

|  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met | Total |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Top Level Budget | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| Navy Command | 1,290 | $45.8 \%$ | 1,360 | $48.2 \%$ | 170 | $6.0 \%$ | 2,810 | $100 \%$ |
| Army TLB | 4,080 | $44.9 \%$ | 4,660 | $51.3 \%$ | 340 | $3.8 \%$ | 9,080 | $100 \%$ |
| HQ Air Command | 2,120 | $44.7 \%$ | 2,110 | $44.5 \%$ | 510 | $10.8 \%$ | 4,750 | $100 \%$ |
| Head Office \& Corporate Services | 1,740 | $34.8 \%$ | 2,990 | $59.7 \%$ | 280 | $5.6 \%$ | 5,010 | $100 \%$ |
| Joint Forces Command | 2,180 | $40.1 \%$ | 2,950 | $54.3 \%$ | 300 | $5.5 \%$ | 5,430 | $100 \%$ |
| Defence Infrastructure Organisation | $\mathbf{1 , 5 1 0}$ | $31.5 \%$ | 3,050 | $63.4 \%$ | 250 | $5.1 \%$ | 4,810 | $100 \%$ |
| Total* | $\mathbf{1 2 , 9 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 , 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

* Total includes DG Nuclear and unknown TLBs.
- The proportion of staff who received an Exceeded box marking ranged from:
$31.5 \%$ for staff in the Defence Infrastructure Organisation, to $45.8 \%$ for staff in Navy Command.
A difference of 14.3 percentage points.
- The proportion of staff who received an Partially met or Not met box marking ranged from: $3.8 \%$ for staff in the Army TLB, to $10.8 \%$ for staff in HQ Air Command.
A difference of 7.0 percentage points.
- The differences between the proportion of TLBs who staff received either an Exceeded box marking or Partially / Not met box markings were both statistically significant.


## Top Level Budgetary Areas (TLBs)

Figure 2-Distribution of Exceeded Box Markings by Top Level Budgetary Areas (TLBs), 2017-18


Figure 3 - Distribution of Partially / Not Met Box Markings by Top Level Budgetary Areas (TLBs), 2017-18


## Important Groups

Table 3-Number of Job Holders by Important groups and Outcome, 2017-18


1. In the reporting year.

* A member of staff may belong to one or more of the important groups.


## Important Groups

Figure 4 - Distribution of Exceeded Box Markings by Important Groups, 2017-18


Lowest: Employment ended (10.3\%)

Highest: Period on temporary promotion (50.8\%)

Figure 5 - Distribution of Partially / Not Met Box Markings by Important Groups, 2017-18


Lowest: Period on temporary promotion
(2.0\%)

Highest:
Employment ended (27.6\%)

Table 4 - Number of Job Holders by Gender and Outcome, 2017-18

|  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met | Total |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Gender | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| Female | 6,220 | $44.4 \%$ | 7,020 | $50.1 \%$ | 770 | $5.5 \%$ | 14,010 | $100 \%$ |
| Male | 6,740 | $37.5 \%$ | 10,140 | $56.4 \%$ | 1,100 | $6.1 \%$ | 17,970 | $100 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 , 9 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 7} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 , 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

- The proportion of females who received an Exceeded box marking was $44.4 \%$, compared with $37.5 \%$ for males, a difference of 6.9 percentage points.
- The proportion of females who received a Partially / Not met box was $5.5 \%$, compared with $6.1 \%$ for males, a difference of 0.6 percentage points.
- The differences between females and males were statistically significant for both Exceeded and Partially/Not met box markings.


## Table 5 - Number of Job Holders by Grade and Outcome, 2017-18

|  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| B1 | 180 | 45.6\% | 200 | 49.1\% | 20 | 5.2\% | 400 | 100\% |
| B2 | 460 | 39.7\% | 640 | 55.1\% | 60 | 5.2\% | 1,170 | 100\% |
| C1 | 1,380 | 42.0\% | 1,760 | 53.6\% | 140 | 4.3\% | 3,280 | 100\% |
| C2 | 2,430 | 41.9\% | 3,100 | 53.5\% | 270 | 4.6\% | 5,800 | 100\% |
| D | 2,530 | 42.4\% | 3,140 | 52.5\% | 300 | 5.1\% | 5,980 | 100\% |
| E1 | 3,300 | 45.1\% | 3,560 | 48.6\% | 460 | 6.3\% | 7,320 | 100\% |
| E2 | 970 | 28.0\% | 2,260 | 65.3\% | 230 | 6.7\% | 3,460 | 100\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skill Zone 4 | 60 | 31.7\% | 110 | 51.7\% | 30 | 16.6\% | 200 | 100\% |
| Skill Zone 3 | 540 | 39.3\% | 700 | 51.1\% | 130 | 9.6\% | 1,360 | 100\% |
| Skill Zone 2 | 600 | 37.2\% | 900 | 56.1\% | 110 | 6.7\% | 1,600 | 100\% |
| Skill Zone 1 | 260 | 30.0\% | 550 | 62.2\% | 70 | 7.8\% | 880 | 100\% |
| Total ${ }^{*}$ | 12,960 | 40.5\% | 17,160 | 53.7\% | 1,860 | 5.8\% | 31,980 | 100\% |

1. The grade used is the grade as at 31 st March 2018. Staff may have been promoted, or may have been on temporary promotion during the reporting year.

* Total includes other industrial and unknown grades.
- The proportion of staff who received an Exceeded box marking ranged from:
$28.0 \%$ for Band E2 staff, to $45.6 \%$ for Band B1, a difference of 17.6 percentage points.
- The proportion of staff who received an Partially met or Not met box marking ranged from:
$4.3 \%$ for Band C1 staff, to $16.6 \%$ for Skill Zone 4 staff, a difference of 12.3 percentage points.
- The differences between grades were statistically significant for both Exceeded and Partially/Not met box markings.

Grade and Gender

Table 6 - Number of Job Holders by Grade, Gender and Outcome, 2017-18

|  |  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Gender | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| B1 | Female | 70 | 52.4\% | 50 | 42.1\% | 10 | 5.6\% | 130 | 100\% |
|  | Male | 120 | 42.5\% | 140 | 52.4\% | 10 | 5.1\% | 280 | 100\% |
| B2 | Female | 170 | 39.3\% | 240 | 55.2\% | 20 | 5.5\% | 440 | 100\% |
|  |  | 290 | 39.9\% | 400 | 55.0\% | 40 | 5.1\% | 730 | 100\% |
| C1 | Female | 500 | 41.4\% | 650 | 54.1\% | 50 | 4.4\% | 1,200 | 100\% |
|  | Male | 890 | 42.4\% | 1,120 | 53.3\% | 90 | 4.3\% | 2,090 | 100\% |
| C2 | Female | 1,040 | 43.5\% | 1,250 | 52.4\% | 100 | 4.1\% | 2,390 | 100\% |
|  | Male | 1,390 | 40.8\% | 1,850 | 54.2\% | 170 | 5.0\% | 3,410 | 100\% |
| D | Female | 1,270 | 46.4\% | 1,340 | 49.0\% | 120 | 4.5\% | 2,730 | 100\% |
|  | Male |  | 39.0\% | 1,800 | 55.5\% | 180 | 5.5\% | 3,250 | 100\% |
| E1 | Female | 2,450 | 47.9\% | 2,370 | 46.3\% | 300 | 5.8\% | 5,120 | 100\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | 54.0\% | 160 | 7.5\% | 2,200 | 100\% |
| E2 | Female | 450 | 39.0\% | 620 | 53.0\% | 90 | 8.1\% | 1,160 | 100\% |
|  | Male | 520 | 22.4\% | 1,650 | 71.6\% | 140 | 6.0\% | 2,300 | 100\% |


| Skill Zone 4 | Female |  |  |  |  |  |  | ~ | 100\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | 60 | 31.9\% | 100 | 51.5\% | 30 | 16.7\% | 200 | 100\% |
| Skill Zone 3 | Female | 40 | 52.6\% | 30 | 37.2\% | 10 | 10.3\% | 80 | 100\% |
|  | Male | 490 | 38.5\% | 670 | 52.0\% | 120 | 9.5\% | 1,280 | 100\% |
| Skill Zone 2 | Female | 100 | 28.9\% | 220 | 64.9\% | 20 | 6.1\% | 340 | 100\% |
|  |  |  | 39.4\% | 680 | 53.7\% | 90 | 6.9\% |  | 100\% |
| Skill Zone 1 | Female | 90 | 28.6\% | 200 | 61.3\% | 30 | 10.1\% | 320 | 100\% |
|  | Male | 170 | 30.7\% | 350 | 62.7\% | 40 | 6.6\% | 560 | 100\% |
| Total ${ }^{*}$ |  | 12,960 | 40.5\% | 17,160 | 53.7\% | 1,860 | 5.8\% | 31,980 | 100\% |

[^1]Table 7 - Number of Job Holders by Ethnicity and Outcome, 2017-18

|  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnicity | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| White | 10,560 | 42.1\% | 13,190 | 52.6\% | 1,320 | 5.2\% | 25,070 | 100\% |
| BAME | 370 | 30.6\% | 740 | 61.4\% | 100 | 8.0\% | 1,200 | 100\% |
| Undeclared | 2,020 | 35.5\% | 3,230 | 56.6\% | 450 | 7.9\% | 5,710 | 100\% |
| Total | 12,960 | 40.5\% | 17,160 | 53.7\% | 1,860 | 5.8\% | 31,980 | 100\% |

- There was a 11.5 percentage point difference in the proportion of staff who declared as White ( $42.1 \%$ ) who received an Exceeded box marking compared with staff who declared as BAME (30.6\%).
- There was a 2.8 percentage point difference in the proportion of staff who declared as White (5.2\%) who received a Partially / Not met box marking compared with staff who declared as BAME (8.0\%).
- The differences between staff who declared as White and BAME were statistically significant for both Exceeded and Partially/Not met box markings.


## Sexual Orientation

Table 8 - Number of Job Holders by Sexual Orientation and Outcome, 2017-18

|  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met | Total |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sexual Orientation | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| Heterosexual/Straight | 8,670 | $41.8 \%$ | 11,050 | $53.3 \%$ | 1,000 | $4.8 \%$ | 20,720 | $100 \%$ |
| LGB \& Other | 160 | $35.2 \%$ | 260 | $57.9 \%$ | 30 | $6.8 \%$ | 450 | $100 \%$ |
| Undeclared | 4,120 | $38.2 \%$ | 5,840 | $54.1 \%$ | 830 | $7.7 \%$ | 10,800 | $100 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 , 9 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 , 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

- There was a 6.6 percentage point difference in the proportion of staff who declared Heterosexual/Straight staff ( $41.8 \%$ ) who received an Exceeded box marking compared with staff who declared as LGB \& Other staff ( $35.2 \%$ ).
- There was a 2.0 percentage point difference in the proportion of staff who declared as Heterosexual/Straight (4.8\%) who received a Partially / Not met box marking compared with staff who declared as LGB \& Other staff (6.8\%).
- The differences between staff who declared as Heterosexual/Straight compared with staff who declared as LGB \& Other staff were statistically significant for both Exceeded box markings, but not for Partially/Not met box markings.


## Religion or Belief

Table 9 - Number of Job Holders by Religion/Belief and Outcome, 2017-18

|  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met | Total |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Religion or Belief | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| Christian | 5,990 | $42.3 \%$ | 7,480 | $52.9 \%$ | 680 | $4.8 \%$ | 14,140 | $100 \%$ |
| Non Christian | 380 | $35.0 \%$ | 640 | $58.9 \%$ | 70 | $6.1 \%$ | 1,090 | $100 \%$ |
| Secular | 2,440 | $41.8 \%$ | 3,110 | $53.3 \%$ | 290 | $4.9 \%$ | 5,830 | $100 \%$ |
| Undeclared | 4,150 | $38.0 \%$ | 5,930 | $54.4 \%$ | 830 | $7.6 \%$ | 10,910 | $100 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 , 9 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 , 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Note:
Non Christian refers to all those declaring religious beliefs other than Christian denominations.
Secular refers to all those declaring that they have no religious beliefs.

- There was a 7.3 percentage point difference in the proportion of staff who declared as Christian (42.3\%) who received an Exceeded box marking compared with staff who declared as Non-Christian (35.0\%).
- There was a 1.3 percentage point difference in the proportion of staff who declared as Christian (4.8\%) who received a Partially / Not met box marking compared with staff who declared as Non-Christian (6.1\%).
- The differences between staff who declared as Christian compared with staff who declared Non-Christian were statistically significant for both Exceeded and Partially/Not met box markings.

Table 10 - Number of Job Holders by Disability status, 2017-18

|  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disability status | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| No Disability | 7,580 | 43.7\% | 9,030 | 52.0\% | 740 | 4.3\% | 17,350 | 100\% |
| Disabled | 820 | 31.5\% | 1,550 | 59.7\% | 230 | 8.8\% | 2,590 | 100\% |
| Undeclared | 4,560 | 37.9\% | 6,580 | 54.7\% | 890 | 7.4\% | 12,040 | 100\% |
| Total | 12,960 | 40.5\% | 17,160 | 53.7\% | 1,860 | 5.8\% | 31,980 | 100\% |

- There was a 12.2 percentage point difference in the proportion of staff who declared as having No disability ( $43.7 \%$ ) who received an Exceeded box marking compared with staff who declared as having a Disability ( $31.5 \%$ ).
- There was a 4.5 percentage point difference in the proportion of staff who declared as having No disability ( $4.3 \%$ ) who received a Partially / Not met box marking compared with staff who declared as having a Disability ( $8.8 \%$ ).
- The differences between staff who declared as having No disability compared with those who declared as having a Disability were statistically significant for both Exceeded and Partially/Not met box markings.


## Table 11 - Number of Job Holders by Age group and Outcome, 2017-18

|  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group (years) | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| 16 to 24 | 180 | 24.3\% | 510 | 67.6\% | 60 | 8.1\% | 750 | 100\% |
| 25 to 29 | 490 | 32.8\% | 880 | 59.2\% | 120 | 8.0\% | 1,490 | 100\% |
| 30 to 34 | 830 | 38.9\% | 1,150 | 54.1\% | 150 | 7.0\% | 2,130 | 100\% |
| 35 to 39 | 1,030 | 39.6\% | 1,420 | 54.6\% | 150 | 5.8\% | 2,600 | 100\% |
| 40 to 44 | 1,090 | 41.6\% | 1,380 | 52.8\% | 150 | 5.6\% | 2,610 | 100\% |
| 45 to 49 | 2,130 | 45.9\% | 2,290 | 49.3\% | 230 | 4.9\% | 4,640 | 100\% |
| 50 to 54 | 2,880 | 44.4\% | 3,300 | 51.0\% | 300 | 4.6\% | 6,470 | 100\% |
| 55 to 59 | 2,580 | 41.9\% | 3,270 | 53.2\% | 300 | 4.9\% | 6,150 | 100\% |
| 60 to 64 | 1,360 | 36.7\% | 2,100 | 56.7\% | 250 | 6.6\% | 3,700 | 100\% |
| 65 and over | 400 | 28.1\% | 860 | 60.4\% | 160 | 11.5\% | 1,430 | 100\% |
| Total | 12,960 | 40.5\% | 17,160 | 53.7\% | 1,860 | 5.8\% | 31,980 | 100\% |

- The proportion of staff who received an Exceeded box marking ranged from:
$24.3 \%$ for staff aged 16 to 24 years, to $45.9 \%$ for staff aged 45 to 49 years.
- The proportion of staff who received an Partially met or Not met box marking ranged from:
$4.6 \%$ for staff aged 50 to 54 years, to $11.5 \%$ for staff aged 65 years or more.
- The differences in the proportions for length of service were statistically significant for both Exceeded and Partially/Not met box markings.


## Age Group



Figure 7 - Distribution of Partially / Not Met Box Markings by Age Group, 2017-18


Lowest: 16 to 24 years (24.3\%)

Highest: 45 to 49 years (45.9\%)

Lowest: 50 to 54 years (4.6\%)

Highest: 65 years or more
(11.5\%)

## Length of Service

Table 12 - Number of Job Holders by Length of Service and Outcome, 2017-18

|  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Length of Service (years) | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number |
| 0 to 4 | 2,990 | $36.0 \%$ | 4,800 | $57.9 \%$ | 510 | $6.2 \%$ | 8,300 |
| 5 to 9 | 1,560 | $44.5 \%$ | 1,740 | $49.5 \%$ | 210 | $6.0 \%$ | 3,520 |
| 10 to 14 | 2,170 | $40.1 \%$ | 2,960 | $54.6 \%$ | 290 | $5.4 \%$ | 5,420 |
| 15 to 19 | 2,120 | $40.8 \%$ | 2,780 | $53.4 \%$ | 300 | $5.8 \%$ | 5,210 |
| 20 to 24 | 1,300 | $42.9 \%$ | 1,570 | $51.5 \%$ | 170 | $5.6 \%$ | 3,040 |
| 25 to 29 | 1,260 | $43.7 \%$ | 1,470 | $50.9 \%$ | 160 | $5.4 \%$ | 2,890 |
| 30 to 34 | 890 | $43.8 \%$ | 1,030 | $50.6 \%$ | 110 | $5.6 \%$ | 2,030 |
| 35 to 39 | 460 | $43.8 \%$ | 530 | $50.4 \%$ | 60 | $5.8 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| 40 or more | 200 | $37.6 \%$ | 290 | $54.4 \%$ | 40 | $8.0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 , 9 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 8} \%$ | $\mathbf{3 1 , 9 8 0}$ |

- The proportion of staff who received an Exceeded box marking ranged from:
$36.0 \%$ for staff with 0 to 4 years of service, to $44.5 \%$ for staff with 5 to 9 years of service.
- The proportion of staff who received an Partially met or Not met box marking ranged from:
$5.4 \%$ for staff with 10 to 14 years of service, to $8.0 \%$ for staff with 40 or more years of service.
- The differences between the length of service groups were statistically significant.


## Working Patterns

Table 13 - Number of Job Holders by Full-time / Part-time status and Outcome, 2017-18

|  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not met |  | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Full-time / Part-time | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| Full-time | 11,800 | $41.3 \%$ | 15,130 | $52.9 \%$ | 1,660 | $5.8 \%$ | 28,590 | $100 \%$ |
| Part-time | 1,160 | $34.3 \%$ | 2,030 | $59.8 \%$ | 200 | $5.9 \%$ | 3,390 | $100 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 , 9 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 7}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 , 8 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 , 9 8 0}$ |

- There was a 7.0 percentage point difference between Full-time staff ( $41.3 \%$ ) who received an Exceeded box marking and Part-time staff (34.3\%).
- There was a 0.1 percentage point difference Full-time staff ( $5.8 \%$ ) who received a Partially or Not met box marking and Part-time staff (5.9\%).

Table 14 - Number of Job Holders by Weekly Hours and Outcome, 2017-18

|  | Exceeded |  | Met |  | Partially met \& Not Met |  | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Hours per week | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| $0-23$ | 330 | $25.2 \%$ | 870 | $66.6 \%$ | 110 | $8.2 \%$ | 1,300 | $100 \%$ |
| $24-30$ | 630 | $40.4 \%$ | 860 | $55.1 \%$ | 70 | $4.5 \%$ | 1,570 | $100 \%$ |
| $31-35$ | 200 | $38.7 \%$ | 300 | $57.0 \%$ | 20 | $4.2 \%$ | 520 | $100 \%$ |
| $36+$ | 11,800 | $41.3 \%$ | 15,130 | $52.9 \%$ | 1,660 | $5.8 \%$ | 28,590 | $100 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 , 9 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 , 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

- Exceeded box marking ranged from:
- Partially / Not met box marking ranged from: $4.2 \%$ for staff who worked 31 to 35 hours per week, to $8.2 \%$ for staff who worked 0 to 23 hours


## 2017-18 Performance Framework

In 2017/2018, the MoD introduced a new Performance Management framework. The objective of the review was to introduce a new Performance Management process which was fairer, more effective and more motivating.

The introduction of the new process saw the removal of guided distribution and relative assessment as the primary means of assigning performance ratings. Instead, managers and countersigning officers* have been empowered to assign performance ratings based solely on their view of a job holder's performance, against their objectives, throughout the year.

Under the new process, there continues to be an equal focus on both WHAT the job holder has done (the outcomes they have achieved) and HOW they have done so (the knowledge, skills and behaviours which they have demonstrated). Performance assessments cannot be weighted towards one element at the expense of the other and all staff are expected to demonstrate positive behaviours throughout the performance year. Where staff have not been able to demonstrate positive behaviours (even when they have achieved the desired outcome(s)) managers are expected to reflect this in their performance assessment.
The four performance ratings which can be assigned under the new framework are as follows:

## 1. Exceeded

2. Met
3. Partially Met
4. Not Met

No expectation for the distribution of performance ratings was set prior to the end of the year, either centrally or within the MoD's top-level business units (TLBs) and the distribution of performance ratings result solely from the decisions taken by individual management chains.

There is no longer a relationship between performance ratings and performance awards (under the previous framework, staff who received the highest rating ('Box 1') were guaranteed an award). Instead, the MoD introduced an In-Year Reward Scheme as part of the new framework which allows managers to reward staff for high performance against their objectives throughout the performance year. Where individuals receive either a Partially Met or Not Met rating, they are required to work with their managers to agree ways of improving performance.
Line managers and countersigning officers must undertake Equality \& Diversity and Unconscious Bias training. The MOD and its senior leaders are committed to understanding and tackling issues relating to Diversity and Inclusion.
This report on Performance Management outcomes is consistent with the intent to be open and transparent with the data collected. It will continue to be published on a regular basis after each performance year.
*Individuals senior to the manager who are responsible for providing senior level oversight and assurance of the performance management process

All figures presented in tables in this publication meet the standards of quality and integrity demanded by the Code of Practice for Official Statistics.

Data for MOD Main civilian personnel performance are taken from the personnel system - Human Resources Management System (HRMS) and are shown on a Headcount basis. These data include voluntary fields such as Ethnicity, Sexual Orientation, Religion/Belief or Disability status. Civilian personnel complete these fields based on their self-perceptions, but are under no obligation to complete these fields. It is not possible for Defence Statistics to assess the accuracy or consistency of the declarations made by individuals within these fields.

The Chi-square test has been applied to validate the assumption that there is no difference in the box marking allocation with respect to an individual's characteristics. This test compares the observed number of box markings with the number that would be expected if they were allocated proportionally across the groups being compared. The differences between the observed and the expected values are used to calculate a statistic. This statistic is compared to a defined threshold value. If the statistic is higher than the threshold, a statistically significant difference exists - a difference that is unlikely to have occurred by chance.

Since 1 April 1996 all departments and agencies have had delegated responsibility for the pay and grading of their employees, except for those in the Senior Civil Service (SCS). The MOD grades are shown here against levels broadly equivalent (in terms of pay and job weight) to the former service wide grades.

| MOD grades | Former service-wide grades |
| :--- | :---: |
| Senior Management | Senior Management |
| SCS - Senior Civil Service | SCS - Senior Civil Service |
| Other Management Grades | Other Management Grades |
| B1 \& equivalents | Grade 6 |
| B2 \& equivalents | Grade 7 |
| C1 \& equivalents | SEO - Senior Executive Officer |
| C2 \& equivalents | HEO - Higher Executive Of- |
| D \& equivalents | ficer |
| Administrative Grades | EO - Executive Officer |
| E1 \& equivalents | Administrative Grades |
| E2 \& equivalents | AO - Administrative Officer |
|  | AA - Administrative Assistant |

## Core MOD Total :

Includes: Top Level Budgetary Areas (TLBs)
Excludes: DE\&S Bespoke Trading Entity, Royal Fleet Auxiliary, Trading Fund, Executive Agencies and Locally engaged civilians (LECs)

Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME): BAME is now the widely used terminology, as a collective descriptor for non-white citizens, across Whitehall, other public sector bodies and the third sector, as well as among civil service race staff networks and their cross-Whitehall umbrella body, the Civil Service Race Forum. See also Ethnic Origin.

Christian: includes personnel who self identify their religion as any Christian denomination or following a religion which follows a Christian tradition.

Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO): established on 01 April 2011, it replaced Defence Estates and includes TLB property and facilities management functions previously situated within other TLBs.

Ethnic origin: is the ethnic grouping to which a person has indicated that they belong. The classifications used were revised for the 2001 Census of Population when a classification of nationality was also collected. These revised definitions were also used to re-survey members of the Armed Forces and the Civil Service in 2001-02, see Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic.

Full-time: civil servants are those working 37 hours a week ( 36 hours or over in London), excluding meal breaks.

Full Time Equivalence (FTE): is a measure of the size of the workforce that takes account of the fact that some people work part-time. Prior to 1 April 1995 part-time employees were assumed to work 50 per cent of normal hours, but since then actual hours worked has been the preferred methodology. The average hours worked by part-time personnel is about 68 per cent of full-time hours.

Head Office \& Corporate Services (HO\&CS): was established as at 1 April 2012. Lead areas of activity include Senior Finance Office (SFO) are responsible for ensuring that decisions are taken with due regard to affordability and value for money, acting as Head of Establishment for London HO Buildings and associated support requirements, Production of the Department's Resource Accounts and Governance support for MOD Trading Funds.

HQ Air Command: incorporates the RAF's Personnel and Training Command and Strike Command with a single fully integrated Headquarters, which equips the RAF to provide a coherent and coordinated single Air focus to the other Services, MOD Head Office, the Permanent Joint Headquarters and the rest of MOD.

Joint Forces Command (JFC): was established at 1 April 2012 to ensure that a range of military support functions covering medical services, training and education, intelligence and cyber are organised in an efficient and effective manner to support success on operations, supporting investment in joint capabilities, strengthening the links between operational theatres and top level decision making. Joint Forces Command achieved Full Operational Capacity as at 1 April 2013, absorbing additional support roles from lead service TLBs.

Army TLB: performs a similar role to Navy Command within the context of trained Army formations and equipment.

Lesbian, Gay \& Bisexual (LGB): the term referring to those who self-identify their sexual orientation as being other than Heterosexual, including, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and other orientations including Transgender.

Ministry of Defence (MOD): this United Kingdom Government department is responsible for implementation of government defence policy and is the headquarters of the British Armed Forces. The principal objective of the MOD is to protect the United Kingdom and its values and interests abroad. The MOD manages day to day running of the Armed Forces, contingency planning and defence procurement.

Navy Command: is the TLB for the Naval Service. As at 1 April 2010 Fleet TLB was renamed to Navy Command. Fleet TLB was formed on 1 April 2006 by the merger of the Commander-in-Chief Fleet and the Chief of Naval Personnel/ Commander-in-Chief Naval Home Command.

## Glossary (cont)

Non-Christian: includes all personnel who self identify their religion, belief or faith as any which is not Christian. This includes those who have selfidentified as Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Kirati, Muslim, Sikh or any other religious belief which is not Christian.

Part-time: civil servants are those working fewer than 37 hours a week ( 36 hours in London), excluding meal breaks.

Secular: includes personnel who have self-identified as having no religion or any other beliefs (e.g. humanist).

Top Level Budgetary Area (TLB): are the major organisational groupings of the MOD directly responsible for the planning, management and delivery of departmental capability.

## Background Quality Report

The background quality report provides more detailed information about the quality of data used to produce this publication and any statistics derived from that data.
https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/mod-civilian-personnel-quarterly-report-background-quality-report

## Further Information

## Contact Us

Defence Statistics welcome feedback on our statistical products. If you have any comments or questions about this publication or about our statistics in general, you can contact us as follows:

## Defence Statistics (Civilian Personnel)

Email: mailto:DefStrat-Stat-CivEnquiries@mod.gov.uk
If you require information which is not available within this or other available publications, you may wish to submit a Request for Information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 to the Ministry of Defence. For more information, see:
https://www.gov.uk/make-a-freedom-of-information-request/the-freedom-of-information-act

Other contact points within Defence Statistics are:

| Defence Expenditure Analysis | 03067934531 | DefStrat-Econ-ESES-DEA-Hd@mod.gov.uk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Price Indices | 03067932100 | DefStrat-Econ-ESES-PI-Hd@mod.gov.uk |
| Naval Service Manpower | 02392547426 | DefStrat-Stat-Navy-Hd@mod.gov.uk |
| Army Manpower | 01264886175 | DefStrat-Stat-Army-Hd@mod.gov.uk |
| RAF Manpower | 01494496822 | DefStrat-Stat-Air@mod.gov.uk |
| Tri-Service Manpower | 02078078896 | DefStrat-Stat-Tri-Hd@mod.gov.uk |
| Civilian Manpower | 02072181359 | DefStrat-Stat-Civ-Hd@mod.gov.uk |
| Health Information | 03067984423 | DefStrat-Stat-Health-Hd@mod.gov.uk |
| If you wish to correspond by mail, our postal address is: |  |  |
| Defence Statistics (Civilian Personnel) |  |  |
| Ministry of Defence, Main Building |  |  |
| Floor 3 Zone M |  |  |
| Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB |  |  |
| For general MOD enquiries, ple | 02072189000 |  |


[^0]:    Responsible Statistician: Civilian Personnel Head of Branch
    Tel: 02072181359
    Email: DefStrat-Stat-CivEnquiries@mod.uk
    Background quality report: https:////www.gov.uk/government/statistics/mod-civilian-personnel-quarterly-report-background-quality-report
    Would you like to be added to our contact list so that we can inform you about updates to these statistics and consult you if we are thinking of making changes? You can subscribe to updates by emailing DefStrat-Stat-CivEnquiries@mod.uk

[^1]:    * Total includes other industrial grades and unknown grades

