

Employees' Consultative Forum

AGENDA

DATE: Thursday 12 November 2015

TIME: 7.30 pm

VENUE: Committee Rooms 1 & 2,
Harrow Civic Centre

PRE-MEETINGS: [Council Side - 7.00 pm - Committee Rooms 1&2
Employees' Side - 6.30 pm - Committee Room 3]

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum: 3 from the Council Side and 3 from the Employees' Side of the permanent membership)

Chair: Councillor Kiran Ramchandani

Councillors:

Jeff Anderson
Graham Henson
David Perry

Paul Osborn
Ms Mina Parmar
Pritesh Patel

Employee Representatives:

Representatives of HTCC: Ms L Snowdon (2 vacancies)

Representatives of UNISON: Mr D Butterfield Mr J Royle
Mr S Compton Mr D Searles
Mr G Martin

Representatives of GMB: Ms P Belgrave

(Reserve Council Side Members overleaf)

Reserve Council Side Members:

- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Ms Pamela Fitzpatrick | 1. John Hinkley |
| 2. Keith Ferry | 2. Mrs Camilla Bath |
| 3. Sachin Shah | 3. Susan Hall |
| 4. Aneka Shah | |

Contact: Manize Talukdar, Democratic & Electoral Services Officer
Tel: 020 8424 1323 E-mail: manize.talukdar@harrow.gov.uk

AGENDA - PART I

1. ATTENDANCE BY RESERVE MEMBERS

To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.

Reserve Members may attend meetings:-

- (i) to take the place of an ordinary Member for whom they are a reserve;
- (ii) where the ordinary Member will be absent for the whole of the meeting; and
- (iii) the meeting notes at the start of the meeting at the item 'Reserves' that the Reserve Member is or will be attending as a reserve;
- (iv) if a Reserve Member whose intention to attend has been noted arrives after the commencement of the meeting, then that Reserve Member can only act as a Member from the start of the next item of business on the agenda after his/her arrival.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR

To appoint a Vice-Chair for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive declarations of disclosable pecuniary or non pecuniary interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:

- (a) all Members of the Forum;
- (b) all other Members present.

4. MINUTES (Pages 5 - 12)

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2015 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

5. PETITIONS

To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 48 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

6. DEPUTATIONS

To receive deputations (if any) under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 49 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS *

To receive any public questions received in accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 50 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

Questions will be asked in the order notice of them was received and there be a time limit of 15 minutes.

[The deadline for receipt of public questions is 3.00 pm, Monday 9 November

2015. Questions should be sent to publicquestions@harrow.gov.uk

No person may submit more than one question].

8. **TRADE UNION BILL** (Pages 13 - 18)

Report from the Harrow Unison LG Branch.

9. **PART 1 OF ANNUAL EQUALITY IN EMPLOYMENT MONITORING REPORT (DATA AND CORPORATE EQUALITIES ACTION PLAN UPDATE) FOR 1 APRIL 2014 - 31 MARCH 2015** (Pages 19 - 40)

Report of the Director of Human Resources and Organisation Development.

AGENDA - PART II - NIL

*** DATA PROTECTION ACT NOTICE**

The Council will audio record item 6 (Public Questions) and will place the audio recording on the Council's website, which will be accessible to all.

[**Note:** The questions and answers will not be reproduced in the minutes.]

EMPLOYEES' CONSULTATIVE FORUM MINUTES

13 JANUARY 2015

Chair:	* Mr G Martin	
Councillors:	* Jeff Anderson	* Ms Mina Parmar
	* Mrs Camilla Bath (2)	* Pritesh Patel
	* Graham Henson	* David Perry
	* Barry Kendler	
Representatives of HTCC:	Ms L Snowdon	
Representatives of UNISON:	* Mr D Butterfield	* Mr J Royle
	* Mr S Compton	* Mr D Searles
Representatives of GMB:	* Ms P Belgrave	
In Attendance	Sachin Shah	Minute 7

* Denotes Member present
(2) Denotes category of Reserve Member

1. Appointment of Chair

RESOLVED: To note that Gary Martin be appointed Chair of the Forum for the 2014/15 Municipal Year.

2. Attendance by Reserve Members

RESOLVED: To note the attendance of the following duly constituted Reserve Members:

Ordinary Member

Councillor Paul Osborn

Reserve Member

Councillor Camilla Bath

3. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Items 9 & 10 – Draft Revenue Budget 2015/16, Medium Term Financial Strategy 2015/16 to 2018/19 and Capital Programme 2015/16 to 2018/19 & Part 2 of Annual Equality in Employment Report for 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2014

Councillor Jeff Anderson declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a member of Unison. He would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

Councillor Graham Henson declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a member of the Communication Workers' Union, Unison and his cousin was an employee of the Council. He would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

Councillor Barry Kendler declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a retired member of GMB and was sponsored by GMB. He would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

4. Appointment of Vice Chair

RESOLVED: To note the appointment of Councillor Graham Henson as Vice-Chair of the Forum for the Municipal Year 2014/15.

5. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2014 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

6. Petitions, Deputations & Public Questions

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions, deputations or public questions were received.

RESOLVED ITEMS

7. INFORMATION REPORT - Draft Revenue Budget 2015/16, Medium Term Financial Strategy 2015/16 to 2018/19 and Capital Programme 2015/16 to 2018/19

The Forum received a report of the Director of Finance and Assurance which set out the Council's proposals for the draft Revenue Budget and Medium

Term Financial Strategy 2015/16 to 2018/19 and the Draft Capital Programme 2015/16 to 2018/19.

Following a question from a Representative regarding the Council Tax Freeze Grant of £1.068m, an officer advised that the current Medium Term Financial Strategy was based on the implementation of a Council Tax increase of 1.99% in 2015/16 which would generate an estimated income of £1.922m and therefore the Freeze Grant would no longer be applicable.

A Representative commented that charging residents for the disposal of organic waste would deter residents from recycling, which would impact on the landfill charges the Council paid. He added that the new 23 litre caddies supplied to households had caused injuries to staff and would lead to increased sickness absence and personal injury claims. He suggested that households should be charged for additional residual bins. Another Representative asked whether residents had been consulted about the charge and stated that those residents who chose not to pay for this service would still need to dispose of their waste. The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Major Contracts stated that the introduction of a charge for organic waste had been a difficult decision, made only after extensive discussions and was part of the overall savings the Council was required to make over coming years. It was anticipated that the scheme would require a 40% take up rate to make it viable and those residents who did not pay the charge had the alternative of composting or taking their waste to the Civic Amenity Site (CAS). Savings could be made by separating organic waste from dry waste and disposing of them separately and officers would continue to monitor the situation. He added that he would welcome further discussions with the Representative regarding the supply of a second bin to all households.

The Director of Finance and Assurance stated that comparable London boroughs had a similar 40% target and that, in his view, this was achievable and would deliver savings. A Representative added that the CAS saw a high volume of use by residents at weekends, often with long queues building up.

The Chair asked what plans were in place to reduce the funding gap and how this fitted into the Council's overall commercialisation agenda. The Director of Finance and Assurance stated that he anticipated that savings planned for future years would help reduce the funding gap and he would be working closely with the Portfolio for Finance and Major Contracts on this issue.

The Chair asked about the Council's contribution to West London Waste (WLW). Harrow residents were actively engaged in recycling and 50% of all waste was recyclable. However, this had not led to a reduction in the £7m figure. The Portfolio Holder advised that there was a 'pay as you throw' element to the charge which meant lower charges for less waste.

A Representative queried whether there was any data regarding the gradings of the posts which would be lost as part of the efficiency and managements savings. The Director of Finance and Assurance advised that the 'management savings' would be made through a reduction in the number of posts. However, not all the 'efficiency savings' related to loss of posts and not all of these posts were lower grade posts. Some proposals were still at the

consultation stage and therefore data relating to the grading of posts identified for deletion was not available.

The Chair asked how many of the identified FTEs (full time equivalent) were senior posts and how many were agency staff. The Director of Finance and Assurance advised that the posts were a mixture of permanent, agency-filled and vacant posts.

A Representative asked why the £10m reserve was not being used to save jobs under threat. The Portfolio Holder advised that Harrow was in the lowest quartile in London in terms of its reserves and using this to save jobs would not be a permanent solution as the savings would still need to be made in subsequent years.

The Chair asked whether there was a contingency fund for the commercialisation agenda and how far it was reliant on government funding. The Portfolio Holder advised that the sum of £3m per annum had been allocated for this from the Transformation Fund. He added that the aim of the Council's commercialisation agenda was to make it less reliant on government funding.

The Chair queried whether there were robust procurement and management procedures in place for the Council's procurement contracts to ensure these were value for money and cited the recent example of issues with the timely sign-off for the dry recyclables contract. The Portfolio Holder advised that the procurement team was highly skilled in contract management and that delivering value for money was central to its function.

A Representative expressed his concern regarding the impact of reduced staff and resources on frontline services and asked how the commercialisation agenda would help mitigate against this. The Portfolio Holder advised that the Council would need to make £75m worth of savings over coming years. With this in mind, the administration had identified areas of efficiency, such as loss of posts and areas of priority, such as supporting the borough's vulnerable residents, employing more social workers and tackling homelessness.

A Representative queried the £100k savings to be made from Occupational Health Service (OHS), the review of the time and facilities afforded to the Unions and the re-tendering of the Communications contract. The Director of HRD and Shared Services advised that the OHS assessment of pre-employment health questionnaires would be replaced by a declaration of fitness by applicants and management referrals would be more tightly controlled. Staff and their family members would continue to have access to the Employee Assistance Programme (EAP). The amount of administration time and facilities afforded to the Unions would be reviewed. The Director of Finance and Assurance added that the Communications contract was being re-tendered following a full review of the service area.

The Leader advised that the Communications section were responsible for producing the Harrow People and Homing In magazines, disseminated internal council communiqués, and had facilitated a number of recent consultations, for example, the Take Part initiative, the School Expansion

Programme and had encouraged resident participation and engagement with these. He added that £30k had already been invested in sports and the Council, local sports organisations, health providers and other stakeholders were working collaboratively in this area.

He further added that the council depended on its Reserves to deal with un-anticipated expenses, for example, homelessness. With regard to commercialisation, he was in close communication with the new Chief Executive regarding the Council's future challenges and priorities.

The Chair asked about the non-renewal of the Council's contract with Wiseworks printing. The Director of Finance and Assurance advised that the Council was committed to reducing its printing costs and all Councillors had been issued with IPADs as part of this drive. The Council followed a strict procurement process that was designed to be open and transparent and the bidding process was open to all.

A Representative stated that the establishment of Business Support services was a fairly recent initiative that had received a considerable start-up investment. He advised that a very large proportion of the BS workforce was female and asked about the anticipated savings from this service area the likely impact of job losses. The Director of Finance and Assurance stated that the savings in BS equated to the loss of 12 posts, and that there were changes planned to the service provided by the print unit and the mail room.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

8. INFORMATION REPORT - Part 2 of Annual Equality in Employment Report for 1 April 2013 - 31 March 2014

The Forum received a report of the Divisional Director of HRD & Shared Services which set out the key issues identified from the 2013/14 equalities in employment data, a revised Action Plan for addressing priority issues highlighted by the data and a review of the Conduct and Dignity at Work cases and equalities workforce data.

Following comments from a Representative, an officer advised that lack of IT facilities available to staff at the Depot was a long standing issue, which management were seeking to address. This included plans to develop a staff Extranet, which would enable staff to access employment information online.

Following a question from the Chair, an officer advised that it was important to build up a more complete picture of the workforce profile and often staff with disabilities did not declare this on monitoring forms. The Council's recruitment process was designed to be open and transparent and it had an adjustments policy in relation to disabled staff.

Following a question from a Member, the Divisional Director of HRD and Shared Services advised that the Council was increasingly moving to online modes of communication but would ensure alternative modes of access for those residents without access to IT.

A Representative stated that, in his view, there was a social divide in Britain that had been increasing steadily as a result of policies implemented by successive administrations on both a national and local level. Efficiencies and cuts implemented by the council in recent years inevitably had a greater impact on those staff on lower grades. These efficiencies and cuts had not been implemented in an open and transparent manner and their implications had not been fully explored. Furthermore, the Council operated a covert pay structure, in that highly paid interims and agency staff received higher salaries than those on permanent contracts. This was not an isolated incident and these discrepancies impacted on Council services. The officer report should therefore have included a socio-economic impact assessment. The only way to address these issues would be to instigate a change in culture and institutional behaviours at the Council.

The Divisional Director stated that the report concerned itself with the protected characteristics set out in Equalities legislation and did not therefore include a socio-economic impact assessment. He added that he would be pleased to discuss this further with the representative outside the meeting. The Leader added that such an impact assessment would be difficult to measure and quantify, however, the issues raised by the Representative were of great concern and he would be looking into this further and would welcome further discussions with the Representative.

A Representative asked why a review of the Conduct and Dignity at Work cases in 2013/14 had not been carried out as in the previous year. The Divisional Director advised that his service would continue to record and report on employment procedures on the basis of protected characteristics, to both the Corporate Equalities Group and to the Forum. However, it would not be in a position to resource an annual, in-depth review as in 2012/13.

A Representative asked why large sums of money were being spent on engaging agency staff, when permanent jobs were being cut. The Leader stated that the numbers of temps and interims had been significantly reduced following a review. However, some difficult to fill posts providing essential services, such as social workers and staff in Public Realm, had been retained.

A Member stated that the Council was moving away from duplication of services and silo management and advised that since 2012, a total of 212 posts had been lost and 68 new posts filled. There were benefits associated with the use of agency workers. The number of agency staff in Access Harrow and Business Support, and the number of interims and consultants generally had been reduced. However, those with specialist skill sets, such as IT contract negotiation, the Corporate Director of Children and Families had been engaged. The Council was focussing on staff training and development to build up the skills sets of staff.

Following a question from a Member, the Divisional Director advised that schools were able to advertise posts through using the Council's recruitment service but that they carried out the applicant administration, short listing and interview process themselves, and data relating to the schools workforce was reported separately from data relating to the rest of the workforce.

A Member emphasised the importance of helping staff to understand the importance of completing monitoring forms and providing personal data and how this data would be used to plan the future workforce strategy and support disabled staff. He added that cultural and linguistic differences may be the reason why a high proportion of BAME staff were involved in employment procedures.

The Chair requested that the next Equalities report should provide data about the number of retirements due to ill health. The Divisional Director undertook to provide this information and stated that retirement on the grounds of ill health was likely to increase as the Council had an ageing workforce.

Following a question from a Representative regarding apprenticeships, an officer advised that this initiative was in its early stages and that there was a strategy and action plan in place. Eight directly employed apprentices had been appointed under the scheme. The Council was working with organisations undertaking work for the Council to encourage them to take on apprentices, and with colleges, to increase the number of apprentices across Harrow. The Chair advised that 3 previous apprentices, had now secured full-time positions in the Housing section.

A Representative asked why the Council did not attract applications from younger people. The Divisional Director advised that this was a long-standing issue and was due to a number of factors. There was no longer a compulsory retirement age and recruitment had slowed. The recruitment process put an emphasis on qualifications and experience, as there was a legislative requirement to appoint staff on the basis of merit, which potentially disadvantaged younger applicants and discouraged younger people from applying. He added that Harrow had one of the lowest numbers of NEETs in London (young people not in employment or education).

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.22 pm).

(Signed) GARY MARTIN
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

EMPLOYEES' CONSULTATIVE FORUM: NOVEMBER 2015

UNISON REPORT ON THE TRADE UNION BILL (2015) AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF REMOVAL OF CHECK OFF (DOCAS) AND POTENTIAL RESTRICTIONS/REMOVAL OF TRADE UNION FACILITY TIME

SUMMARY AND DECISION REQUESTED

This report places on record Harrow UNISON Local Government Branch's deep concerns about the draconian measures contained in the Trade Union Bill which, if enacted, will dramatically impact industrial relations on a national level and will detrimentally impact existing arrangements at Harrow Council. The report focuses on the recently added measures by central Government which seek to scrap check-off arrangements in the public sector and which seek to control/remove facility time agreements that are agreed locally between Harrow Council and its recognised trade unions. The report recognises the supportive and positive approach adopted by the Leader of the Council and seeks to further this support at Council level when the Trade Union Bill Motion (a Motion submitted by the Branch in October) is debated at Full Council in November or December 2015. Given the positive contributions that trade unions and union members make across the Council and the detrimental financial impact if check off is removed (evidenced in the Chronology), this report requests ECF to agree and endorse a recommendation to Cabinet/Full Council to enter into an urgent local agreement with the recognised trade unions that seeks to continue Harrow Council's self-determination of facility time agreements and the existing check off arrangements of trade union membership fees.

CHRONOLOGY

DATE	ACTION	OUTCOME
13 th October 2015	'Drop the Trade Union Bill' Motion and letter sent to Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder. The letter highlighted the measures impacting facility time arrangements and the removal of 'check off' payroll deductions for union subscriptions. The motion called on the Leader of the Council to submit a formal response to the Committee of MP's considering the Trade Union Bill raising concerns about measures contained in the Bill. It also calls on the Motion to be debated at the next Full Council.	The Leader of the Council submitted written evidence to the House of Commons Public Bill Committee on 26 th October 2015 expressing his concern about the measures in the Trade Union Bill relating to check off and facility time. He also made it clear that the Council would want to continue locally agreed industrial relations strategy and would take measures to maintain Council autonomy with regard to facility time and continuing check off in efforts to maintain good industrial relations.
13 th October 2015	Trade Union Bill raised as a concern during 'AOB' at ECF	UNISON representatives were advised to raise the issue at the next

	Sub Group in October.	Corporate Joint Committee (CJC).
14 th October 2015	Email from HRD Divisional Director to UNISON clarifying fees administering check off for UNISON and GMB in year 2014/15 and the revenue earned.	Email from HRD Divisional Director confirmed that Council revenue for administering check off for UNISON and GMB members in 2014/15 is approx. £6,000 per annum.
21 st October 2015	Trade Union Bill discussed as an agenda item at CJC.	HR representatives listened to UNISON and the concerns expressed about the Trade Union Bill. UNISON informed the Committee about the Motion submitted by the Branch concerning the negative effects of the Bill. HR representatives were supportive of this approach and expressed concern about the additional responsibilities the Trade Union Bill places on the Council in terms of recording and reporting facility time undertaken in the conduct of trade union duties.

REPORT

Background of the Trade Union Bill

At time of writing the Trade Union Bill is continuing its passage through the Westminster Parliament, with MPs and Peers discussing the Bill in the House of Commons (third reading in the House of Commons is on 10th November 2015) and in the Bill's Parliamentary Committee which has now ended. The Bill could become law by February 2016 and will apply in England, Scotland and Wales (Northern Ireland decides its own employment law matters).

Given the content of measures contained within the Bill (as mentioned below) the Trade Union movement have described the Trade Union Bill – or TU Bill - as the most draconian and aggressive anti-trade union laws ever proposed in the western world.

Criticism of the Bill has not just come from the trade union movement, as one would expect. On the contrary, academics have rounded on the Bill and have termed some of the measures, such as those relating to strikes, as 'perverse' and unwarranted given the dramatic reduction of working days lost through strike action since the 1980's (a fact the Government chose to ignore in a point made by the TUC in their submission response to Government).

The Chartered Instituted of Personnel and Development (CIPD), on their website, described the TU Bill has 'outdated' and the controversial measures on strike action as 'counterproductive' to good industrial relations. Further, even Conservative MP's (David Davis) compare the TU Bill to something emanating from 'Franco's (despotic) Spain'.

It is without question that the TU Bill will damage trade unions ability to organise and will fundamentally impact their collective bargaining and negotiating rights with employers across the country. In turn, this will contravene fundamental human rights e.g. Article 11 (Freedom of Assembly and Association) as defined in the Human Rights Act (1998) and as enshrined in Convention Rights enjoyed by all UK citizens leading civil rights groups to term the TU Bill as a 'major attack on civil liberties'.

Below is a summary of the draconian measures contained in the TU Bill.

What is in the TU Bill;

- Impose a 50% turnout threshold on industrial action ballots
- Requires a 40% yes vote in 'important public services' abolishing the simple majority vote decision as used in Britain's Parliamentary Election (including health and education implicating many services provided by local authorities)
- Lifts the ban on agency workers to replace striking workers (this practice has been unlawful since 1973)
- Extends the notice that trade unions must give of strike action to employers from 7 days to 14 days
- Imposes a new time limit of 4 months of strike ballots and industrial disputes that could mean employers will refuse to negotiate and sit out of disputes in efforts to run the clock down
- Creates 'Picket Line Supervisors' to carry letters of authorisation wearing special armbands under threat of a £20,000 fine and legal action if measures not met
- ASBO orders introduced in the regulation of the activities of strike pickets (thereby criminalising a previously lawful industrial dispute issue)
- Trade unions must publish picket, campaign and protest plans to employers, police, and the Certification Officer including use of websites, blogs and media, and inform what they will say and have to discipline union members who fall foul of the new laws thereby undermining the right to protest
- New affirmation requirements on trade unions Political Fund membership
- Remove check off arrangements of trade union members membership fees
- Require public sector employers (e.g. Harrow Council) to publish information and record the amount of money used for trade union facilities, including paid time off for local representatives. The Government is authorised to cap arbitrarily at will money a public employer spends on facility arrangements across a range of Trade Union duties e.g. health and safety, workplace learning and member representation

Whilst the impact of all of the above measures is damaging, it is the final two measures listed above that are of particular relevance to this report and of the decision required. The check off and facility time measures are expanded below;

1. Removal of Check Off membership fees

The Branch is sure that ECF is aware of the valuable role that trade union facility time plays in maintaining industrial relations across Harrow Council workplaces. Facility time allows trained trade union representatives time to spend some or all of

their working day supporting members with individual problems, working with managers to head-off possible disputes, working on allocated and cross-council projects, making workplaces safer and promoting learning opportunities, all of which benefits both the Council and the employee.

The TU Bill places additional burdens on public sector employers by requiring the Council to report on how much facility time it has agreed with trade unions. The Bill also contains a reserve power that would allow a Minister to cap arbitrarily the level of facility time that the Council is permitted to agree. This could be done at any time, without a debate in Parliament, and without any reference to your views as the employer or local circumstances.

It is our belief that good relationships between employers and workers are built on collectively negotiated and local agreements (e.g. the Modernising Collective Agreement) that match the needs of the workforce to the needs of the employer. Agreed time-off for union duties is an investment made by the employer and the union in good industrial relations arrangements. It is simply unreasonable that the Government plans to disrupt these relationships, which play an essential role in maintaining the good quality public services that exist here in Harrow.

2. Check-off: Payroll deductions for union subscriptions

The Bill allows the Government to outlaw the use of check-off or Deduction of Contributions at Source (DOCAS) systems for trade union subscriptions which are currently in operation across much of the public sector. Similar to the case of facility time, this will be a decision taken by the Government without reference to local circumstances or the views of public sector employers or workers.

Good industrial relations mean close relationships between unions and employers for the benefit of union members and other workers. It is right that employees should be able to ask their employer to deduct their union dues at source. It is easy, efficient and very cheap to administer, and creates a transparent relationship between the employer and the union.

Payroll deductions are used in a variety of ways by employers, with the consent of their employees, and can include deductions for charitable giving, pension contributions and bike loans. At present the Government is proposing only to prevent union subscriptions being paid through the payroll. Their justification for this is the cost of administering check-off. Given that many other deductions from source are also being made for employees and that these pay-roll systems are already in place, it seems unlikely that any significant saving will be achieved through the removal of check-off.

In fact, as the Branch has evidenced in the report's Chronology, removal of check off in Harrow Council will result in a significant financial detriment of approximately £6,000 per annum due to the Council charging administration fees for check off deductions (as determined via email by the HRD Divisional Director). In his submission to the Parliamentary Committee, the Leader of the Council expressed his concern regarding this point and of the detrimental financial impact that removal

of check off to Harrow Council would create. Harrow UNISON LG Branch places on record its appreciation of the Leader of the Council's position on this matter and we urge him to continue to support the Motion in its progression and support at Full Council in November/December 2015.

Harrow UNISON believes that these issues are serious, not simply due to the disruptive nature of the changes to agreed ways of working, but due to the anti-democratic nature of applying from Central Government a one size fits all approach to industrial relations. It is also without precedence that the UK Government would seek to intervene in the internal running of payroll systems or seek to cut across locally negotiated agreements.

CONCLUSION & DECISION REQUIRED

Given the positive contributions that trade unions and union members make across the Council and the detrimental financial impact if check off is removed, this report requests ECF to agree and endorse a recommendation to Cabinet/Full Council to enter into an urgent local agreement with the recognised trade unions that seeks to continue Harrow Council's self-determination of facility time agreements and the existing check off arrangements.

AUTHOR: HARROW UNISON LG BRANCH

CONTACT DETAILS:

*Harrow UNISON L.G. Branch
The UNISON Office
Station Rd, Civic 7,
Harrow, Middlesex
HA1 2XY*

Tel: 020 8424 1795

Fax: 020 8424 1835

Email: info@harrow-unison.org.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

**REPORT
FOR:**

**EMPLOYEES' CONSULTATIVE
FORUM**

**Date of
Meeting:**

12 November 2015

Subject:

INFORMATION REPORT

Part 1 of Annual Equality in Employment
Monitoring Report (Data and Corporate Equalities
Action Plan update) for 1 April 2014 - 31 March
2015

**Responsible
Officer:**

Jon Turner
Director of Human Resources and Organisation
Development

Exempt:

No

Enclosures:

Appendix 1 - Data on Employment analysed by
Protected Characteristic:

Workforce Profile

Recruitment

Employment Procedures

Redeployment

Maternity - Return to Work rates

Leavers

Take Up of Training Opportunities

Directorate Reports

Agency Workers (Pertemps)

Appendix 2 - Workforce Profiles for
Partner Organisation - Pertemps
Council Paybands

Section 1 – Summary

This report sets out data, presented by protected characteristic, related to a range of employment matters as listed above. A further report to be submitted to January 2016 ECF, will include analysis of the data (and by directorate) and actions to address any issues arising.

Publishing the data meets the Council's statutory responsibility under the Equalities Act 2010.

FOR INFORMATION

Section 2 - Report

2.1. Introduction and format

This report sets out information on Harrow Council's performance on equalities and the impact of its policies and practices on its employees, to comply with the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty set out in the Equality Act 2010 and the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) Regulations 2011.

This first report comprises of the equalities data for the year ending 31 March 2015, for consideration. The data is presented in a similar format to 2014/15.

In accordance with the approach taken in the previous year, it will be followed by a second report to ECF in January 2016. This report will contain a further analysis of the data (and by directorate) and any issues arising, update on progress against the Corporate Equalities Plan, and set out any new actions identified from the 2013/14 data.

Further analysis of the data relating to maternity is necessary and as a result is not shown in this report. The data relating to maternity will therefore be published in the second report.

2.2. Content

Appendix 1 of this report contains an overview of the workforce profile as at 31 March 2014 across the whole Council and the available information from Pertemps, as our key partner organisation in hiring workers to fill Council positions, analysed by protected characteristic. Comparisons of the workforce profile against previous years and the local community are made where available and appropriate.

In addition, data is supplied for the complete year ending 31 March 2015 on recruitment, employment procedures, redeployment rates, leavers and take up of training opportunities.

As in last year's report although this is the third year that data on the protected characteristics of Religion or Belief, Sexual Orientation, Pregnancy and Maternity and Gender Reassignment is available, much of this data continues to be very limited, reflecting a continued pattern of employees choosing not to state or declare their religion or belief and sexual orientation. This year again, in relation to gender reassignment, the numbers are very low that it might be possible to identify individuals who have provided information, and therefore, the decision has been taken not to report on this protected characteristic.

2.3. Corporate Equalities Action Plan for January 2016

We have made progress to address some of the issues in the last Corporate Equalities Action Plan. The Council still faces challenges in addressing these issues given the limited resources available. The Council's equalities agenda is best addressed through perhaps a

smaller number of objectives to achieve good, outcome focused actions for the benefit of its staff. Recommendations were also made in April 2014 following the external investigation into allegations of institutional racism, and additional actions agreed, which need to be progressed and continuously monitored.

As reported in last year's report the Corporate Equalities Group (CEG) is considering how the Council can approach equalities more widely, and a revised single Corporate Action Plan will be developed for 2015/16. Any issues identified from the analysis of the 2014/15 data, to be presented in the January 2016 report to ECF, will be highlighted to CEG and incorporated into the revised Action Plan moving forward.

This report has been provided to the Corporate Equality Group for information.

ECF members are asked to consider and comment on the data and provide any feedback on issues to prioritise for action from January 2016.

Section 3 - Further Information

A further analysis report, as part of the Annual Equality in Employment Report, is to be considered by ECF in January 2016, which will include actions the Council will take in response to issues highlighted by the data in this report.

Section 4 - Financial Implications

There are no financial implications relating to this report.

Section 5 - Equalities implications

None. This information report sets out information captured on equalities in employment.

Section 6 - Corporate Priorities

The report relates to employment for Council employees and as such supports delivery of all corporate priorities.

Name: Steve Tingle

on behalf of the
Chief Financial Officer

Date: 2.11.15

Section 7 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Nicholas Toko, Interim Employee Relations Manager

Annual Equality in Employment Monitoring Report

Employment Data

Appendix 1

1. How information is presented	6
2. Workforce Profile as at 31 March 2015 analysed by:	7
2.1 Race (ethnicity)	7
2.2 Sex	7
2.3 Disability	7
2.4 Age	8
2.5 Religion or Belief	8
2.6 Sexual Orientation	8
2.7 Pregnancy and Maternity	9
2.8 Workforce - Payband	10
2.9 Workforce - Part-time	11
3. Recruitment Monitoring Whole Council	12
4. Employment Procedures	13
5. Redeployments	15
6. Maternity Leave - Return to Work rates	16
7. Leavers	17
8. Take Up of Training Opportunities	18
8.1 By Headcount	18
8.2 Number of attendances	18

Appendix 2

9. Workforce Profiles for Partner Organisation - Pertemps	19
2014/15 Paybands	21

1. How information is presented

Workforce Profile Data

The Workforce Profile is a snapshot of the workforce as at 31 March 2015, broken down by 7 of the 9 protected characteristics, and by Payband and whether Full or Part-time. There is no requirement to report on Marital Status and the decision has been taken not to report on Gender Reassignment in this report as the figures are so low that it may be possible to identify individuals.

The report is based on headcount, therefore, an employee who holds jobs in more than one directorate will be counted only once in the whole council report but will appear in each of the Directorate reports. In determining which job to count for the whole council report, the job with the highest number of working hours is used.

Data Sources and Comparison with the Community

Data used for comparison with the community was obtained from 2011 Census Briefing Note 11: May 2013 - Gender, Age, Religion and Health, by Ethnic Group 2011 Census Third Release (3.1). Gender and Age data has been updated in line with 2014 Mid Year Estimates.

Recruitment

These figures cover recruitment for posts where processed by Pertemps. As Schools do not use Pertemps, data relating to their recruitment is not available in this report.

2. Workforce Profile as at 31 March 2015

2.1 Race (Ethnicity)

	Whole Council			Excluding Schools			Harrow Community Data 2011 Census
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	
	5,125	5,093	4,798	2,375	2,192	2,042	
Asian	24.08%	23.44%	27.34%	21.60%	21.58%	22.33%	42.59%
Black	9.00%	8.50%	9.44%	14.11%	14.37%	15.03%	8.24%
Mixed	2.15%	2.02%	2.33%	1.89%	2.05%	2.06%	3.97%
Any other ethnic group	0.86%	0.73%	1.06%	0.80%	0.68%	0.73%	2.95%
Total BAME	36.08%	34.69%	40.18%	38.40%	38.69%	40.16%	57.75%
White	52.08%	47.52%	52.17%	54.44%	52.14%	51.42%	42.25%
Unknown/Unclassified	11.84%	17.79%	7.65%	7.16%	9.17%	8.42%	0.00%

2.2 Sex

	Whole Council			Excluding Schools			Harrow Community Data 2014 Mid Year Estimates (ONS)
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	
	5,125	5,093	4,798	2,375	2,192	2,042	
Male	22.36%	21.58%	21.72%	37.68%	38.28%	38.05%	49.70%
Female	77.64%	78.42%	78.28%	62.32%	61.72%	61.51%	50.30%

2.3 Disability

	Whole Council			Excluding Schools			Harrow Community Data 2011 Census
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	
	5,125	5,093	4,798	2,375	2,192	2,042	
Yes	1.81%	1.59%	1.44%	3.33%	3.10%	2.94%	*Not collected in this format

*In the 2011 census, 16.4% of Harrow residents self classified their health to be not good, which is clearly not the same definition as the definition for disability.

2.4 Age

	Whole Council			Excluding Schools		
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
	5,125	5,093	4,798	2,375	2,192	
16 to 24	3.34%	3.49%	3.83%	1.47%	1.19%	1.37%
25 to 34	17.39%	17.26%	17.22%	14.15%	13.46%	12.93%
35 to 44	22.67%	22.76%	23.59%	21.68%	21.44%	21.89%
45 to 54	32.76%	31.73%	31.20%	33.14%	32.53%	32.62%
55 to 64	21.15%	21.66%	21.05%	25.81%	26.69%	26.25%
65+	2.69%	3.10%	3.11%	3.75%	4.70%	4.95%

2.5 Religion or Belief

	Whole Council			Excluding Schools			Harrow Community Data 2011 Census
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	
	5,125	5,093	4,798	2,375	2,192	2,042	
Christianity	9.17%	11.00%	8.13%	13.09%	12.09%	11.41%	37.30%
Hinduism	3.83%	4.12%	3.48%	4.00%	4.11%	4.31%	25.30%
Islam	1.16%	1.44%	0.90%	1.64%	1.46%	1.37%	12.50%
Judaism	0.47%	0.57%	0.35%	0.59%	0.50%	0.49%	4.40%
Jainism	0.47%	0.51%	0.42%	0.42%	0.41%	0.44%	2.17%
Sikh	0.37%	0.39%	0.35%	0.51%	0.50%	0.49%	1.20%
Buddhism	0.20%	0.20%	0.17%	0.25%	0.27%	0.24%	1.10%
Zoroastrian	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0%	0%	0.00%	0.07%
Other	0.75%	0.86%	0.73%	0.97%	1.00%	0.98%	0.26%
No Religion/Atheist	1.81%	2.09%	1.71%	2.78%	2.78%	2.89%	9.60%
Unknown	81.76%	78.81%	83.74%	75.75%	76.87%	77.38%	6.20%

2.6 Sexual Orientation

	Whole Council			Excluding Schools		
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
	5,125	5,093	4,798	2,375	2,192	2,042
Heterosexual	15.92%	14.55%	14.17%	18.11%	18.57%	20.47%
Gay Woman/ Lesbian	0.06%	0.06%	0.06%	0.08%	0.09%	0.10%
Gay Man	0.08%	0.08%	0.17%	0.08%	0.14%	0.34%
Bi-sexual	0.14%	0.14%	0.17%	0.21%	0.27%	0.34%
Prefer not to say	1.07%	0.92%	1.00%	1.18%	1.14%	1.52%
Other	0.04%	0.04%	0.04%	0%	0%	0.00%
Unknown	82.69%	84.21%	84.39%	80.34%	79.79%	77.23%

2.7 Pregnancy and Maternity

	Whole Council			Excluding Schools		
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
Year	5,125	5,093	4,798	2,375	2,192	2,042
Total Workforce	4.02% (206)	3.83% (195)	3.79% (182)	4.13% (98)	4.01% (88)	4.01% (82)

2.8 Gender Reassignment

The decision has been taken not to report on this protected characteristic as the low level of data available may identify individuals.

2.9 Workforce Profile by Payband and Protected Characteristic (see Appendix 2 for information on the Council Paybands)

		Paybands						Whole Council 4,798	Harrow Community Data 2011 Census
		1 1819	2 1565	3 1020	4 299	5 84	6 11		
Ethnicity	BAME	44.77%	39.17%	34.51%	27.42%	14.29%	0.00%	40.18%	57.75%
	White	44.75%	54.31%	56.18%	63.55%	79.76%	81.82%	52.17%	42.25%
	Unknown	7.48%	6.52%	9.31%	9.03%	5.95%	18.18%	7.65%	0.00%
Sex	Male	15.94%	26.84%	21.27%	25.75%	38.10%	54.55%	21.72%	49.70%
	Female	84.06%	73.16%	78.73%	74.25%	61.90%	45.45%	78.28%	50.30%
Disability	Yes	1.26%	1.79%	1.67%	0.00%	1.19%	0.00%	1.44%	Not collected in this format
Age	16 to 24	4.67%	6.20%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.83%	not relevant
	25 to 34	11.21%	23.26%	22.45%	9.36%	1.19%	0.00%	17.22%	
	35 to 44	24.57%	18.15%	28.14%	30.77%	23.81%	18.18%	23.59%	
	45 to 54	32.88%	30.48%	26.76%	35.45%	45.24%	45.45%	31.20%	
	55 to 64	22.43%	18.85%	20.98%	22.07%	27.38%	36.36%	21.05%	
	65+	4.23%	3.07%	1.47%	2.34%	2.38%	0.00%	3.11%	
Religion/Belief	Christianity	5.99%	8.95%	9.22%	12.71%	7.14%	27.27%	8.13%	37.30%
	Hinduism	4.34%	3.77%	1.96%	3.01%	0.00%	0.00%	3.48%	25.30%
	Islam	0.93%	1.15%	0.69%	0.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.90%	12.50%
	Judaism	0.05%	0.38%	0.69%	0.67%	1.19%	0.00%	0.35%	4.40%
	Jainism	0.38%	0.51%	0.49%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.42%	2.17%
	Sikh	0.22%	0.26%	0.39%	1.34%	1.19%	0.00%	0.35%	1.20%
	Buddhism	0.11%	0.13%	0.29%	0.00%	1.19%	0.00%	0.17%	1.10%
	Zoroastrian	0.00%	0.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	0.07%
	Other	0.77%	0.70%	0.88%	0.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.73%	0.26%
	No Religion/Atheist	0.93%	1.73%	2.06%	4.35%	4.76%	0.00%	1.71%	9.60%
Unknown	86.26%	82.36%	83.33%	77.26%	84.52%	72.73%	83.74%	6.20%	
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual	9.51%	15.78%	16.76%	20.40%	27.38%	45.45%	14.17%	Not available
	Gay Woman/Lesbian	0.00%	0.06%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.06%	
	Gay Man	0.00%	0.19%	0.20%	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.17%	
	Bi-sexual	0.16%	0.13%	0.10%	0.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.17%	
	Prefer not to say	0.77%	1.15%	0.98%	2.01%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%	
	Other	0.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	
	Unknown	89.44%	82.68%	81.76%	75.92%	72.62%	54.55%	84.39%	
Pregnancy/Maternity	Yes								
	No								

2.10 Workforce Profile - Full and Part time

		Full Time	Part Time	Whole Council
		2,396	2,402	4,798
Ethnicity	BAME	37.23%	43.13%	40.18%
	White	54.80%	49.54%	52.17%
	Unknown	7.97%	7.33%	7.65%
Sex	Male	35.73%	7.74%	21.72%
	Female	64.27%	92.26%	78.28%
Disability	Yes	1.71%	1.17%	1.44%
Age	16 to 24	4.76%	2.91%	3.83%
	25 to 34	24.67%	9.78%	17.22%
	35 to 44	22.33%	24.85%	23.59%
	45 to 54	28.21%	34.18%	31.20%
	55 to 64	18.16%	23.94%	21.05%
	65+	1.88%	4.33%	3.11%
Religion or Belief	Christianity	8.47%	7.79%	8.13%
	Hinduism	2.46%	4.50%	3.48%
	Islam	0.90%	0.92%	0.90%
	Judaism	0.46%	0.25%	0.35%
	Jainism	0.29%	0.54%	0.42%
	Sikh	0.42%	0.29%	0.35%
	Buddhism	0.25%	0.08%	0.17%
	Zoroastrian	0.00%	0.04%	0.02%
	Other	0.71%	0.75%	0.73%
	No Religion/Atheist	2.29%	1.12%	1.71%
Unknown	83.76%	83.72%	83.74%	
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	15.98%	12.36%	14.17%
	Gay Woman/ Lesbian	0.04%	0.08%	0.06%
	Gay Man	0.25%	0.08%	0.17%
	Bi-sexual	0.17%	0.17%	0.17%
	Prefer not to say	1.13%	0.87%	1.00%
	Other	0.00%	0.08%	0.04%
	Unknown	82.43%	86.34%	84.39%
Pregnancy/ Maternity in last 2 years				

3. Recruitment Whole Council (Schools not included)

This data relates only to recruitment carried out through Pertemps

		Applied	Shortlisted	Appointed	Council excluding Schools	Whole Council
		2378	482	163	2,042	4,798
Ethnicity	BAME	68.42%	59.65%	57.06%	40.16%	40.18%
	White	27.96%	36.65%	41.1%	51.42%	52.17%
	Unknown	3.62%	3.7%	1.84%	8.42%	7.65%
Sex	Male	48.86%	43.47%	48.16%	38.05%	21.72%
	Female	51.13%	56.54%	51.84%	61.51%	78.28%
Disability	Yes	2.57%	3.53%	3.68%	2.94%	1.44%
Age	16 to 24	11.40%	9.96%	12.27%	1.37%	3.83%
	25 to 44	56.31%	53.94%	58.90%	12.93%	40.81%
	45 to 64	28.64%	33.61%	26.38%	21.89%	52.25%
	65+	0.84%	0.62%	1.23%	32.62%	3.11%
	Unknown	2.82%	1.87%	1.23%	26.25%	0.00%
Religion Or Belief	Christianity	42.09%	45.85%	46.01%	11.41%	8.13%
	Hinduism	15.05%	12.24%	14.72%	4.31%	3.48%
	Islam	11.69%	6.02%	5.52%	1.37%	0.90%
	Judaism	0.71%	1.04%	1.23%	0.49%	0.35%
	Jainism	0.76%	0.21%	-	0.44%	0.42%
	Sikh	2.31%	2.49%	3.07%	0.49%	0.35%
	Buddhism	1.77%	1.66%	-	0.24%	0.17%
	Zoroastrian	-	-	-	0.00%	0.02%
	Other	2.1%	2.90%	-	0.98%	0.73%
	No Religion/Atheist	15.52%	19.71%	23.93%	2.89%	1.71%
Unknown	7.99%	7.88%	5.52%	77.38%	83.74%	
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	86.59%	89.00%	92.02%	20.47%	14.17%
	Gay Woman/ Lesbian	0.50%	0.62%	-	0.10%	0.06%
	Gay Man	1.05%	1.24%	1.84%	0.34%	0.17%
	Bi-sexual	2.69%	2.28%	1.23%	0.34%	0.17%
	Prefer not to say	-	-	-	1.52%	1.00%
	Other	1.51%	0.21%	-	0.00%	0.04%
	Unknown	7.65%	6.64%	4.91%	77.23%	84.39%
Pregnancy/ Maternity in last 2 years	Yes	2.90%	2.70%	2.45%		

4. Employment Procedures 2014/15

		Conduct			Capability			Grievance		Whole Council Workforce 4,798
		Cases ⁴ ₂	Warnings ⁹	Dismissals ³	Cases ⁶	Warning ¹	Dismissals ³	Cases ¹ ₄	Appeals ²	
Ethnicity	BAME	38.10%	N/A	N/A	63.88%	N/A	N/A	35.71%	N/A	40.18%
	White	52.38%	N/A	N/A	30.56%	N/A	N/A	57.15%	N/A	52.17%
	Unknown	9.52%	N/A	N/A	4.35%	N/A	N/A	7.14%	N/A	7.65%
Sex	Male	57.14%	N/A	N/A	36.11%	N/A	N/A	42.86%	N/A	21.72%
	Female	42.86%	N/A	N/A	63.89%	N/A	N/A	57.14%	N/A	78.28%
Disability	Disabled	4.76%	N/A	N/A	2.78%	N/A	N/A	7.14%	N/A	1.44%
Age	16 to 24	9.52%	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	3.83%
	25 to 34	19.05%	N/A	N/A	8.33%	N/A	N/A	7.14%	N/A	17.22%
	35 to 44	9.52%	N/A	N/A	22.22%	N/A	N/A	14.28%	N/A	23.59%
	45 to 54	21.43%	N/A	N/A	25.00%	N/A	N/A	35.71%	N/A	31.20%
	55 to 64	28.57%	N/A	N/A	41.67%	N/A	N/A	42.86%	N/A	21.05%
	65+	11.90%	N/A	N/A	2.78%	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	3.11%
Religion or Belief	Christianity	7.14%	N/A	N/A	11.11%	N/A	N/A	14.28%	N/A	8.13%
	Hinduism	2.38%	N/A	N/A	2.78%	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	3.48%
	Islam	0	N/A	N/A	2.78%	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0.90%
	Judaism	2.38%	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0.35%
	Jainism	0	N/A	N/A	2.78%	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0.42%
	Sikh	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0.35%
	Buddhism	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0.17%
	Zoroastrian	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0.02%
	Other	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0.73%
	No Religion/ Atheist	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	1.71%
Unknown	88.10%	N/A	N/A	80.55%	N/A	N/A	85.72%	N/A	83.74%	
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	14.29%	N/A	N/A	16.67%	N/A	N/A	7.14%	N/A	14.17%
	Gay Woman/ Lesbian	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0.06%
	Gay Man	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0.17%
	Bi-sexual	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0.17%
	Prefer not to say	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	7.14%	N/A	1.00%
	Other	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0.04%
	Unknown	85.71%	N/A	N/A	83.33%	N/A	N/A	85.72%	N/A	84.39%
Pregnancy/ maternity in last 2 yrs	Yes									
	No									

Notes:

- The Grievance Procedure was previously known as Dignity At Work until 31st March 2015.
- No percentage figures have been calculated for data relating to fewer than 10 instances. This is to preserve confidentiality (i.e. avoid the identification of the one or two employees who have a particular characteristic) and prevent the reader from forming the illusion of the data having any statistical significance (the lack of statistical significance had been highlighted in previous versions of this report, but the presence of percentage figures led to queries which resulted in discussions about individual cases, essentially compromising the anonymity of the report and the privacy of the employees in question).
- 20 cases were in progress as at 31.03.2015 (6 conduct, 8 capability, and 6 grievance ones).
- There is a lack of clarity arising from the previous report with regards to the number of cases ongoing as at 31st March 2014 - the total mentioned is 20, but when the data is broken down by type, it comes to 29 cases (5, 11 and 13 respectively).

5. Redeployments 2014/15 (administered through Pertemps)

		Redeployment sought (all reasons) 73 employees	Successful Redeployments 19 employees	Not Redeployed 54 employees	Whole Council
Ethnicity	BAME	41.10%	42.11%	40.74%	40.18%
	White	53.42%	52.63%	53.70%	52.17%
	Unknown	5.48%	5.26%	5.56%	7.65%
Sex	Male	38.36%	36.84%	38.89%	21.72%
	Female	61.64%	63.16%	61.11%	78.28%
Disability	Yes	5.48%	5.26%	5.56%	1.44%
Age	16 to 24	0%	0.00%	0.00%	3.83%
	25 to 34	2.94%	5.56%	2.00%	17.22%
	35 to 44	17.65%	16.67%	18.00%	23.59%
	45 to 54	36.76%	55.56%	30.00%	31.20%
	55 to 64	36.76%	22.22%	42.00%	21.05%
	65+	5.88%	0.00%	8.00%	3.11%
	Unknown	0%	0.00%	0.00%	8.13%
Religion or Belief	Christianity	12.50%	21.05%	9.43%	3.48%
	Hinduism	11.11%	5.26%	13.21%	0.90%
	Islam	2.78%	0.00%	3.77%	0.35%
	Judaism	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.42%
	Jainism	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.35%
	Sikh	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.17%
	Buddhism	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%
	Zoroastrian	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.73%
	Other	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.71%
	No Religion/Atheist	4.17%	5.26%	3.77%	83.74%
Unknown	69.44%	68.42%	69.81%		
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	22.22%	11.11%	25.93%	14.17%
	Gay Woman/ Lesbian	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.06%
	Gay Man	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.17%
	Bi-sexual	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.17%
	Prefer not to say	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%
	Other	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%
	Unknown	77.78%	88.89%	74.07%	84.39%
Pregnancy/ Maternity in last 2 years	Yes	1.37%	0.00%	1.85%	
	No	6.85%	0.00%	9.26%	
	Unknown	91.78%	100.00%	88.89%	

6. Maternity - Return to Work Rates - by Protected Characteristic

		Women due to return between 1 April 2014 - 31 March 2015	Women who returned to work for longer than 4 months	Women who returned to work but left within 4 months	Non returners following maternity leave
Number and Percentage					
Ethnicity	BAME				
	White				
	Unknown				
Disability	Yes				
	No				
	Not stated				
Age	25 to 34				
	35 to 44				
Religion or Belief	Christianity				
	Hinduism				
	Islam				
	Judaism				
	Jainism				
	Sikh				
	Buddhism				
	Zoroastrian				
	Other				
	No Religion/Atheist				
Unknown					
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual				
	Gay Woman/				
	Lesbian				
	Bi-sexual				
	Prefer not to say				
	Other				
Unknown					

7. Leavers - by Protected Characteristic

		Ill Health Dismissal 14	Redundancy – compulsory 29	Redundancy – voluntary 29	Dismissals (including probation) 8	Resignations and other leavers 681	All leavers 761	Whole Council 4798
Ethnicity	BAME	42.86%	48.28%	20.69%	25.00%	31.57%	31.93%	40.18%
	White	50.00%	41.38%	68.97%	50.00%	58.00%	57.56%	52.17%
	Unknown	7.14%	10.34%	10.34%	25.00%	10.43%	10.51%	7.65%
Sex	Male	42.86%	37.93%	34.48%	50.00%	23.20%	24.84%	21.72%
	Female	57.14%	62.07%	65.52%	50.00%	76.80%	75.16%	78.28%
Disability	Yes	7.14%	3.45%	3.45%	0.00%	0.88%	1.18%	1.44%
Age	16-24	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	4.55%	4.34%	3.83%
	25-34	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	23.94%	21.81%	17.22%
	35-44	7.14%	20.69%	17.24%	0.00%	20.12%	19.58%	23.59%
	45-54	0.00%	31.03%	17.24%	37.50%	21.59%	21.55%	31.20%
	54-64	57.14%	44.83%	55.17%	12.50%	19.82%	22.73%	21.05%
	65+	21.43%	3.45%	10.34%	12.50%	9.99%	9.99%	3.11%
Religion or Belief	Christianity	0.00%	0.00%	20.69%	0.00%	7.64%	7.62%	8.13%
	Hinduism	0.00%	3.45%	3.45%	0.00%	2.94%	2.89%	3.48%
	Islam	0.00%	6.90%	0.00%	0.00%	1.47%	1.58%	0.90%
	Judaism	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.44%	0.39%	0.35%
	Jainism	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.15%	0.13%	0.42%
	Sikh	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.29%	0.26%	0.35%
	Buddhism	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.29%	0.26%	0.17%
	Zoroastrian	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%
	Other	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.44%	0.39%	0.73%
	No religion/ Atheism	0.00%	0.00%	3.45%	0.00%	1.91%	1.84%	1.71%
Unknown	100.00%	89.66%	72.41%	100.00%	84.43%	84.63%	83.74%	
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	0.00%	3.45%	24.14%	12.50%	14.68%	14.32%	14.17%
	Gay Woman/ Lesbian	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.06%
	Gay Man	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.17%
	Bi-sexual	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.29%	0.26%	0.17%
	Prefer not to say	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.44%	0.39%	1.00%
	Other	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%
	Unknown	100.00%	96.55%	75.86%	87.50%	84.58%	85.02%	84.39%
Pregnancy and Maternity	Yes							
	No							

8. Take Up of Training Opportunities 2014/15

Attendance on Learning and Development Programme recorded on “My Learning” management system, by Headcount, 2015/15.

Training comprises of core skills training eg health and safety, IT, customer care, assertiveness, coaching, project management, recruitment and selection, and also includes equalities and diversity training. All Adults’ safeguarding training is also included.

Schools do not access training via “My Learning” and therefore are not included.

		Attendance on Learning & Development Programme	Council Workforce excluding Schools
		994 delegates	2,042
Ethnicity	BAME	42.45%	40.16%
	White	45.37%	51.42%
	Unknown	12.17%	8.42%
Sex	Male	30.68%	38.05%
	Female	69.32%	61.51%
Disability	Yes	3.32%	2.94%
Age	16 to 24	1.31%	1.37%
	25 to 34	13.08%	12.93%
	35 to 44	21.43%	21.89%
	45 to 54	34.10%	32.62%
	55 to 64	24.45%	26.25%
	65+	2.52%	4.95%
	Unknown	3.12%	1.37%

Appendix 2

9. Workforce Profile - Agency Workers engaged through Pertemps

		Pertemps Headcount during March 2015 624 placements	Council Workforce Excluding Schools 2042 employees	Harrow Community
Ethnicity	BAME	36.76%	40.16%	40.18%
	White	32.26%	51.42%	52.17%
	Prefer not to say	23.92%	8.42%	7.65%
	Incomplete/Unknown	7.06%	0	21.72%
Sex	Male	38.52%	38.05%	78.28%
	Female	46.55%	61.51%	1.44%
	Prefer not to say	7.87%	0	3.83%
	Incomplete/Unknown	7.06%	0	40.81%
Disability	Yes	1.13%	2.94%	Not relevant
	No	78.39%	0	
	Prefer not to say	13.39%	0	
	Incomplete/Unknown	7.10%	0	
Age	16 to 24	8.41%	1.37%	Not relevant
	25 to 34	23.36%	12.93%	
	35 to 44	19.78%	21.89%	
	45 to 54	26.01%	32.62%	
	55 to 64	18.54%	26.25%	
	65+	3.89%	4.95%	
	Unknown	0	0	
	Prefer not to say	0	0	
Religion or Belief	Christianity	31.25%	11.41%	37.30%
	Hinduism	7.47%	4.31%	25.30%
	Islam	-	1.37%	12.50%
	Judaism	1.04%	0.49%	4.40%
	Jainism	0.87%	0.44%	2.17%
	Sikh	0.52%	0.49%	1.20%
	Buddhism	0.52%	0.24%	1.10%
	Zoroastrian	0.17%	0.00%	0.07%
	Other	-	0.98%	0.26%
	No Religion/Atheist	9.90%	2.98%	9.60%
	Prefer not to say	40.63%	0	0
	Incomplete/Unknown	7.64%	77.38%	6.20%
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	64.40%	20.47%	Not collected
	Gay Woman/ Lesbian	0.16%	0.10%	
	Gay Man	0.32%	0.34%	
	Bi-sexual	0.32%	0.34%	
	Prefer not to say	27.67%	1.52%	
	Other	-	0	
	Incomplete/Unknown	7.12%	77.23%	
Pregnancy/ maternity in last 2 Years	Yes	1.93%		
	No	64.85%		
	Prefer Not To Say	26.16%		
	Incomplete/Unknown	7.06%		

2014/15 Paybands

Payband	Salary in £s	Broadly equivalent to and will include
Band 1	Up to 19,182	G1 to G3
Band 2	19,183 - 31,059	G4 to G8
Band 3	31,060 - 42,525	G9 to G11
Band 4	42,526 - 61,377	MG1 - MG3
Band 5	61,378 - 94,929	MG4 and D1
Band 6	94,930 and above	D2 and above

G grades - Harrow pay spine

This page is intentionally left blank