# Staffing compendium

## December 2010

**Produced by Human Resources** 



University of the West of England

bettertogether

#### Introduction

This is the third annual staffing compendium to be produced for the University.

The compendium is based on data held in the University's HR payroll system (SAP). The SAP database is populated with information supplied by employees on their application for employment form; the database is then updated with information supplied by employees in response to periodic data surveys. The latest data survey was carried out in December 2010. The next data survey will take place in 2012/13.

Around one third of staff updated their personal profile in the 2010 data survey. For those staff who did not respond to the survey, we have used the equality and diversity data already held in SAP from previous surveys for this compendium.

I hope this compendium will be useful and informative in understanding the current workforce profile of the University, and in highlighting areas where we need to make improvements.

This compendium also provides a rich source of data for managers carrying out equality impact assessments.

If you have any ideas for how the compendium might be improved or have any queries relating to the data and its analysis then please contact Lesley Donnithorne in the Systems Administration Team (Lesley2.Donnithorne@uwe.ac.uk) or Andrew Mclean in the Equality and Diversity Unit (Andrew2.Mclean@uwe.ac.uk) within Human Resources.

lan Apperley HR Director

May 2011

#### Index

#### Section 1 – Staff employment

- TABLE 1 STAFF IN POST
- TABLE 2 GENDER / ETHNICITY / DISABILITY STATUS BY EMPLOYEE GROUP

   AND GRADE
- TABLE 3 AGE
- TABLE 4 SEXUAL ORIENTATION
- TABLE 5 RELIGION AND BELIEF
- TABLE 6 ETHNIC ORIGIN
- TABLE 7 NATIONALITY
- TABLE 8 CONTRACT TYPE
- TABLE 9 MODE OF EMPLOYMENT

#### Section 2 – Staff recruitment

- TABLE 10 RECRUITMENT BY GENDER / ETHNICITY / DISABILITY STATUS
- TABLE 11 RECRUITMENT TO THE TEMPORARY STAFF UNIT

#### Section 3 – Leavers

- TABLE 12 LEAVERS
- TABLE 13 REASONS FOR LEAVING

#### Section 4 – Staff development and career progression

- TABLE 14 INTERNAL TRAINING COURSE ATTENDANCES
- TABLE 15 CAREER PROGRESSION
- TABLE 16 TYPES OF CAREER PROGRESSION

#### Section 5 – Formal procedures

- TABLE 17 STAFF GRIEVANCES
- TABLE 18 STAFF DISCIPLINARY CASES

#### Section 6 – Sickness absence

- TABLE 19 SICKNESS RATES
- TABLE 20 REASONS FOR SICKNESS ABSENCE

#### Section 7 – Employee assistance programme

TABLE 21 - USE OF SERVICES

#### **Section 8 – Benchmark performance indicators**

TABLE 22 - COMPARISONS WITH OTHER UNIVERSITIES

#### Section 1 – Staff employment

#### TABLE 1 – STAFF IN POST AT 31/12/2010

FACULTY/SERVICE	HEADS	FTE*	HEADS 2009	FTE* 2009	HEADS 2008	FTE* 2008
Business and Law	338	307				
САНЕ	500	410				
Environment & Technology	472	434	-			
Health & Life Sciences	586	508				
Faculty totals	1896	1659	1872	1665	1838	1651
Academic Registry	32	28				
Admissions & International Dev.	31	28				
Business Intelligence & Planning	15	15				
Centre for Performing Arts	5	5				
Directorate	23	20				
Dean of Students	5	5				
Development and Alumni	4	4				
Facilities	488	374				
Finance	63	57				
Human Resources	60	54				
IT Services	188	178				
Library Services	150	119				
Marketing and Communications	29	23				
Research, Business & Innovation	53	47				
Schools & Colleges Partnership	13	12				
Student Services	87	71				
Service totals	1246	1040	1124	937	1080	901
Faculty and service sub total	3142	2699	2966	2602	2919	2552
Hourly paid lecturers	392	111**	454	97**	472	113**
Temporary staff (in assignment)	276	159	336	184	273	163
All staff	3810	2969	3786	2904	3664	2828

\* FTE = full time equivalent

\*\* HPL FTE relates to the total for the previous academic year.

In 2010, 62% of all staff were in faculties and 38% in services. This represents a small change from 2009, when 64% of staff were in faculties and 36% in services. This reflects the move of some IT support staff from faculties to IT Services.

The increase in staff numbers from 2009 to 2010 is mainly attributable to the employment of 36 additional researchers, taking on employment responsibilities for 20 resident wardens, and 15 interns in technical roles; this was offset by reductions in numbers of hourly paid lecturers and temporary staff.

#### TABLE 2 – GENDER / ETHNICITY / DISABILITY STATUS BY EMPLOYEE GROUP AND GRADE

EMPLOYEE GROUP/ GRADE	YEAR	ALL	MA	LE	FEM	FEMALE BME WHITE		IITE	N	NICITY OT OWN	DISABLED		NOT DISABLED*		DISABILITY STATUS NOT KNOWN*			
		Heads	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%
Senior																		
Management	2010	82	58	71%	24	29%	0	0%	81	99%	1	1.2%	6	7.3%	75	92%	1	1.2%
	2009	62	47	76%	15	24%	0	0%	61	98%	1	1.6%	6	9.7%	55	88%	1	1.6%
	2008	62	45	73%	17	27%	0	0%	61	98%	1	1.6%	5	8.1%	55	88%	2	3.2%
Academic																		
Grade J	2010	107	67	63%	40	37%	5	4.6%	97	91%	5	4.6%	4	3.7%	102	95%	1	0.9%
	2009	133	83	62%	50	38%	6	4.5%	126	95%	1	0.8%	2	1.5%	129	97%	2	1.5%
	2008	134	87	65%	47	35%	6	4.5%	125	93%	3	2.2%	3	2.2%	127	95%	4	3.0%
Grade I	2010	206	111	54%	95	46%	15	7.3%	181	88%	10	4.8%	9	4.3%	193	94%	4	1.9%
	2009	212	113	53%	99	47%	15	7.0%	193	91%	4	1.9%	6	2.8%	203	96%	3	1.4%
	2008	209	112	54%	97	46%	16	7.7%	189	90%	4	1.9%	5	2.4%	196	94%	8	3.8%
Grade H	2010	785	365	46%	420	54%	53	6.7%	703	90%	29	3.7%	35	4.5%	742	95%	8	1.0%
	2009	748	357	48%	391	52%	49	6.6%	669	89%	30	4.0%	22	2.9%	724	97%	2	0.3%
	2008	730	352	48%	378	52%	44	6.0%	664	91%	22	3.0%	26	3.6%	677	93%	27	3.7%
Grade G	2010	38	17	45%	21	55%	6	16%	29	76%	3	7.8%	1	2.6%	37	97%	0	0%
	2009	62	28	45%	34	55%	9	15%	48	77%	5	0.6%	1	1.6%	61	98%	0	0%
	2008	45	19	42%	26	58%	5	11%	36	80%	4	8.9%	1	2.2%	44	98%	0	0%
Hourly Paid																		
Lecturers	2010	392	138	35%	254	65%	27	6.9%	342	87%	23	5.9%	13	3.3%	374	95%	5	1.2%
	2009	454	173	38%	281	62%	35	7.7%	389	85%	30	6.6%	18	4.0%	432	95%	4	0.9%
	2008	472	189	40%	283	60%	38	8.1%	367	77%	67	14%	19	4.0%	432	92%	21	4.4%

EMPLOYEE GROUP/ GRADE	YEAR	ALL	MA	LE	FEM	ALE	В	ME	Wł	IITE	N	NICITY OT OWN	DISA	BLED		OT BLED*	ST	BILITY ATUS (NOWN*
		Heads	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%
Research																		
Grade H	2010	40	26	65%	14	35%	4	10%	35	88%	1	2.5%	1	2.5%	38	95%	1	2.5%
	2009	34	23	68%	11	32%	4	12%	30	88%	0	0%	0	0%	33	97%	1	3.9%
	2008	28	20	71%	8	29%	3	11%	25	89%	0	0%	0	0%	26	93%	2	7.1%
Grade F&G	2010	137	66	48%	71	52%	21	15%	109	80%	7	5.1%	5	3.6%	128	93%	4	2.9%
	2009	107	48	45%	59	55%	14	13%	89	83%	4	3.7%	3	2.8%	102	95%	2	1.9%
	2008	100	50	50%	50	50%	17	17%	81	81%	2	2.0%	5	5.0%	93	93%	2	2.0%
Admin & Prof																		
G & above	2010	334	141	42%	193	58%	23	6.9%	299	89%	12	3.6%	19	5.7%	310	93%	5	1.5%
	2009	306	132	43%	174	57%	18	5.9%	283	93%	5	1.6%	12	3.9%	291	95%	3	1.0%
	2008	282	121	43%	161	57%	11	3.9%	266	94%	5	1.8%	15	5.3%	258	92%	9	3.2%
Grade A to F	2010	847	205	24%	642	76%	51	6.0%	774	91%	22	2.6%	46	5.4%	791	93%	10	1.2%
	2009	801	185	23%	616	77%	44	5.5%	746	93%	11	1.4%	43	5.4%	749	94%	9	1.1%
	2008	800	169	21%	631	79%	43	5.4%	744	93%	13	1.6%	44	5.5%	716	90%	40	5.0%
Technical																		
G & above	2010	69	56	81%	13	19%	2	2.9%	63	91%	4	5.8%	2	2.9%	67	97%	0	0%
	2009	74	58	78%	16	22%	2	2.7%	68	92%	4	5.4%	2	2.7%	72	97%	0	0%
	2008	70	55	79%	15	21%	2	2.9%	64	91%	4	5.7%	0	0%	69	99%	1	1.4%
Grade A to F	2010	216	136	63%	80	37%	13	6.0%	191	88%	12	5.6%	16	7.4%	296	91%	4	1.9%
	2009	195	127	65%	68	35%	13	6.7%	170	87%	12	6.2%	7	3.6%	185	95%	3	1.5%
	2008	202	131	65%	71	35%	10	5.0%	168	83%	24	12%	9	4.5%	188	93%	5	2.4%

EMPLOYEE GROUP/ GRADE	YEAR	ALL	MA	LE	FEMALE		BME		WHITE		ETHNICITY NOT KNOWN		DISABLED		NOT DISABLED*		DISABILITY STATUS NOT KNOWN*	
		Heads	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Head s	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%
Manual																		
Grade C to E	2010	96	72	75%	24	25%	4	4.2%	88	92%	4	4.2%	6	6.3%	89	93%	1	1.0%
	2009	84	64	76%	20	24%	3	3.6%	77	92%	4	4.8%	4	4.8%	80	95%	0	0%
	2008	88	67	76%	21	24%	3	3.4%	82	93%	3	3.4%	7	8.0%	78	89%	3	3.4%
Grade A&B	2010	174	45	26%	129	74%	12	6.9%	152	87%	10	5.7%	12	6.9%	160	92%	2	1.1%
	2009	178	46	26%	132	74%	13	7.3%	157	88%	8	4.5%	13	7.3%	163	92%	2	1.1%
	2008	169	50	30%	119	70%	12	7.1%	149	88%	8	4.7%	12	7.1%	143	85%	14	8.3%
								1.001										
TSU Temps	2010	347	112	32%	235	68%	40	12%	279	80%	28	8%	11	3.2%	332	96%	4	1.2%
	2009 2008	429 324	132	31%	297	69%	34 23	7.9%	359	84%	36	8.4%	10	2.3%	417	97%	2 15	0.5%
	2008	324	103	32%	221	68%	23	7.1%	269	83%	32	9.9%	9	2.8%	300	93%	15	4.6%
ALL STAFF																		
(excluding	2010	3131	1365	44%	1766	56%	209	6.7%	2802	89%	120	3.8%	162	5.2%	2928	94%	41	1.3%
HPLs &TSU)	2009	2996	1311	44%	1685	56%	190	6.0%	2717	91%	89	3.0%	121	4.0%	2847	95%	28	0.9%
	2008	2919	1278	44%	1641	56%	172	5.9%	2654	91%	93	3.2%	132	4.5%	2670	91%	117	4.0%
ALL STAFF																		
	2010	3870	1615	42%	2255	58%	276	7.1%	3423	88%	171	4.4%	186	4.8%	3634	94%	50	1.3%
	2009	3879	1616	42%	2263	58%	259	6.7%	3465	89%	155	4.0%	149	3.8%	3696	95%	34	0.9%
	2008	3715	1570	42%	2145	58%	233	6.3%	3290	87%	192	5.1%	160	4.3%	3402	92%	153	4.1%

\* Figures for "Not Disabled" include "not known" for staff who did not respond to the survey. The "Disability Status Not Known" figure is the number of staff that responded to the survey but preferred not to provide information about disability status.

The overall male/female ratio remained constant in 2010, though some staff groups showed further increases in the proportion of women, in particular, in senior management grades, the senior research grade, senior administrative/professional grades and senior manual grades.

#### TABLE 3 – AGE

AGE BAND	HEADS 2010	PERCENTAGE 2010	PERCENTAGE 2009	PERCENTAGE 2008
Under 24	163	4.2%	4.5%	4.2%
25-34	760	20%	20%	20%
35-44	965	25%	24%	24%
45-54	1074	28%	28%	29%
55-64	859	22%	22%	22%
65 +	49	1.3%	1.2%	0.8%

The average age of a UWE employee is 44 years; this is unchanged since 2007.

#### TABLE 4 – SEXUAL ORIENTATION

GROUP	HEADS 2010	PERCENTAGE 2010	PERCENTAGE 2009	PERCENTAGE 2008
Bisexual	25	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%
Gay man	31	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%
Gay woman/lesbian	45	1.2%	0.7%	0.8%
Heterosexual/straight	2161	56%	45.9%	42.9%
Other	10	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Not declared/prefer not to say	217	5.6%	4.5%	4.0%
No data held	1381	36%	47.5%	51.0%

Table 4 shows that UWE has 2.7% of staff declaring as lesbian, gay or bisexual (LGB) – up from 1.9% in 2009.

#### TABLE 5 – RELIGION AND BELIEF

GROUP	HEADS 2010	PERCENTAGE 2010	PERCENTAGE 2009	PERCENTAGE 2008
Buddhist	35	0.9%	0.6%	0.5%
Christian	992	26%	22.2%	21.4%
Hindu	20	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%
Jewish	9	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Muslim	34	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%
Sikh	5	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Another faith/religion	80	2.1%	2.0%	1.8%
No faith/religion	1021	26%	20.5%	18.2%
Not declared/prefer not to say	284	7.3%	5.8%	5.7%
No data held	1390	36%	47.6%	51.0%

Table 5 shows 31% of staff declaring as having a religion or belief – up from 26% in 2009.

Tables 4 and 5 show an increasing proportion of staff providing information on their sexual orientation and faith.

#### TABLE 6 – ETHNIC ORIGIN

GROUP	HEADS	PERCENTAGE		
Asian Danaladaahi	2010	2010	2009	2008
Asian – Bangladeshi	9	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%
Asian – Indian	34	0.9%	0.3%	0.9%
Asian – Pakistani	15	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%
Asian – Other	29	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%
Black – African	34	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%
Black – Caribbean	31	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%
Black – Other	4	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Chinese	36	0.9%	1.0%	1.0%
Mixed – White/African	6	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Mixed – White/Asian	15	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%
Mixed – White/Caribbean	6	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Mixed – Other	21	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%
Other Ethnic background	36	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%
Sub total	276	7.1%	6.7%	6.3%
White – British	3120	81%	82.0%	81.5%
White – Irish	47	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%
White – Other	256	6.6%	6.3%	6.1%
Sub total	3423	88%	89.3%	88.6%
Prefer not to say	19	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%
No data held	152	3.9%	3.9%	5.0%
Sub total	171	4.4%	4.0%	5.1%
All staff	3870	100%	100%	100%

Table 6 shows that UWE's declared BME staffing population is 7.1% compared to 6.7% in 2009.

#### TABLE 7 – NATIONALITY

GROUP	HEADS 2010	PERCENTAGE 2010
British	3387	88%
German	34	0.9%
Irish	25	0.7%
American	21	0.5%
Italian	19	0.5%
Spanish	16	0.4%
Chinese	16	0.4%
French	15	0.4%
Canadian	12	0.3%
Indian *	11	0.3%
Australian *	11	0.3%
Sub total	3567	92%

Table 7 shows UWE's top ten nationalities at 2010 (\* joint 10<sup>th</sup> place).

#### TABLE 8 – GENDER / ETHNICITY / DISABILITY STATUS BY CONTRACT TYPE

CONTRACT TYPE	YEAR	ALL	MA	LE	FEM	ALE	BME		WHITE		ETHNICITY NOT KNOWN				NOT DISABLED*		DISABILITY STATUS NOT KNOWN*	
		Heads	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%
Permanent	2010	3063	1307	43%	1756	57%	178	5.8%	2764	90%	121	4.0%	158	5.2%	2869	94%	36	1.2%
	2009	3124	1342	43%	1782	57%	182	5.8%	2834	91%	108	3.5%	130	4.2%	2965	95%	29	0.9%
Fixed Term	2010	460	196	43%	264	57%	58	13%	380	83%	22	4.8%	17	3.7%	433	94%	10	2.2%
	2009	322	140	43%	182	57%	42	13%	270	84%	10	3.1%	9	2.8%	310	96%	3	0.9%
Temporary	2010	347	112	32%	235	68%	40	12%	279	80%	28	8.1%	11	3.2%	332	96%	4	1.2%
	2009	433	134	31%	299	69%	35	8.1%	361	83%	37	8.5%	10	2.3%	421	97%	2	0.5%

\* Figures for "Not Disabled" include "not knowns" for staff who did not respond to the survey. The "Disability Status Not Known" figure is the number of staff that responded to the survey but preferred not to provide information about disability status.

#### TABLE 9 - GENDER / ETHNICITY / DISABILITY STATUS BY MODE OF EMPLOYMENT

MODE	YEAR	ALL	MA	LE	FEM	FEMALE		BME		IITE	ETHNICITY NOT KNOWN				NOT DISABLED*		DISABILITY STATUS NOT KNOWN	
		Heads	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%
Full-time	2010	2283	1161	51%	1122	49%	159	6.9%	2028	89%	96	4.2%	107	4.7%	2144	94%	32	1.4%
	2009	2254	1159	51%	1095	49%	137	6.1%	2040	91%	77	3.4%	79	3.5%	2157	96%	18	0.8%
Part-time	2010	1587	454	29%	1133	71%	117	7.3%	1395	88%	75	4.7%	79	5.0%	1490	94%	18	1.1%
	2009	1532	436	28%	1096	72%	111	7.2%	1352	88%	69	4.5%	69	4.5%	1447	95%	16	1.0%

\* Figures for "Not Disabled" include Not Knowns for staff who did not respond to the survey. The "Disability Status Not Known" figure is the number of staff that responded to the survey but preferred not to provide information about disability status. Excludes TSU temps not in assignment.

#### Section 2 – Staff recruitment

	ALL	MA	MALE FEMALE		BN	ΛE	WH	ITE	ETHN	ICITY	DISA	BLED	NOT		
										NOT K	NOWN			DISAE	BLED*
	Heads	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%
2010															
Applied	5340	3223	60%	2117	40%	888	17%	4107	77%	345	6.5%	254	4.8%	5086	95%
Shortlisted	1221	597	49%	624	51%	126	10%	1027	84%	68	5.6%	57	4.7%	1164	95%
Appointed	357	164	46%	193	54%	35	10%	309	87%	13	3.6%	14	3.9%	343	96%
2009															
Applied	9343	4262	46%	5081	54%	1,539	17%	7232	77%	572	6.1%	139	1.5%	9204	99%
Shortlisted	1469	693	47%	776	53%	166	11%	1212	83%	91	6.2%	16	1.1%	1453	99%
Appointed	385	175	45%	210	55%	37	10%	323	84%	25	6.5%	7	1.8%	378	98%
2008															
Applied	5989	2683	45%	3306	55%	919	15%	4445	74%	625	10.4%	23	0.4%	5966	99%
Shortlisted	1473	661	45%	812	55%	149	10%	1194	81%	130	8.8%	5	0.3%	1468	99%
Appointed	367	173	47%	194	53%	25	6.8%	314	86%	28	7.6%	0	0%	367	100%

#### TABLE 10 - RECRUITMENT BY GENDER / ETHNICITY / DISABILITY STATUS

\* Figures for "Not Disabled" include applicants who did not provide data.

Data relates to the period October to September each year.

In 2010 the number of job applicants decreased by 43% over 2009; the number in 2009 was exceptionally high due to the impact of the economic downturn on the labour market. The reduction in 2010 is attributable to a policy change where jobs are advertised internally first.

The figures show that the success rate for female applicants through the recruitment process is generally the same or better than for male applicants. The proportion of male applicants in 2010 was affected by a very high number of male applicants for two manual jobs.

In 2009 increase in the proportion of BME applicants has been maintained in 2010 despite the internal recruitment policy, as has the increased proportion of BME applicants being appointed, although BME applicants still have a lower rate of success through the recruitment process than non-BME staff.

In 2010 there has been a further increase in applicants declaring as disabled.

#### TABLE 11 - RECRUITMENT TO THE TEMPORARY STAFF UNIT BANK

	ALL	MAI	LE	FEM/	ALE	BN	ΛE	WH	ITE	ETHN NOT K	ICITY NOWN	DISA	BLED	NC DISAE	
	Heads	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%
<u>2010</u>															
Applied	462	174	38%	288	62%	89	19%	352	76%	21	4.5%	26	5.6%	436	94%
Shortlisted	180	62	34%	118	66%	22	12%	149	83%	9	5.0%	7	3.9%	173	96%
Appointed	83	24	29%	59	71%	7	8.0%	72	87%	4	4.8%	5	6.0%	78	94%
2009															
Applied	718	265	37%	453	63%	88	12%	573	80%	57	7.9%	16	2.2%	702	98%
Shortlisted	262	88	34%	174	66%	16	6.1%	219	84%	27	10%	5	1.9%	257	98%
Appointed	113	38	34%	75	66%	9	8.0%	95	84%	9	8.0%	2	1.8%	111	98%
2008															
Applied	718	238	33%	480	67%	80	11%	590	82%	48	6.7%	7	1.0%	711	99%
Shortlisted	352	96	27%	256	73%	26	7.4%	299	85%	27	7.7%	1	0.3%	351	99%
Appointed	138	36	26%	102	74%	9	6.5%	116	84%	13	9.4%	0	0%	138	100%

\* Figures for "Not Disabled" include applicants who did not provide data; data relates to the period October to September each year.

Table 11 shows that the number of applicants has declined and fewer appointments have made because fewer temporary staff left the bank and the University had less need to open the bank to new applicants.

The proportion of BME applicants and disabled applicants has increased significantly in 2010. The proportion of appointees declaring as disabled has also increased from 1.8% in 2009 to 6% in 2010.

#### **Section 3 – Leavers**

#### TABLE 12 – LEAVERS BY CATEGORY: 2010

LEAVER CATEGORY	HEADS	MALE	FEMALE	BME	WHITE	ETHNICITY NOT KNOWN	DISABLED	NOT DISABLED*
Resignation	106	38	68	9	94	3	4	102
Voluntary Severance	22	11	11		22		1	21
End of fixed term contract	43	19	24	6	34	3	3	40
Age 65 retirement	21	14	7	3	16	2		21
Early retirement	15	5	10		15		1	14
Maternity leave non-return	2		2		2			2
III Health	4	1	3		4			4
Death	2	2			2			2
Dismissal	2	1	1		2			2
Redundancy	9	6	3	2	7			9
ALL LEAVERS - 2010	226	97 (43%)	129 (57%)	20 (8.8%)	198 (88%)	8 (3.5%)	9 (4.0%)	217 (96%)
ALL LEAVERS - 2009	276	116 (42%)	160 (58%)	20 (7.2%)	247 (89.5%)	9 (3.3%)	10 (3.6%)	269 (97.5%)
ALL LEAVERS – 2008	321	143 (45%)	178 (55%)	19 (5.9%)	297 (92.5%)	5 (1.6%)	9 (2.8%)	312 (97.2%)

\* Figures for "Not Disabled" include staff who have not provided data

The analysis excludes hourly paid and temporary staff.

The UWE workforce is 56% female, 6.7% BME and 5.2% disabled. In 2010 the rate of leaving by gender is broadly in proportion to the population; a slightly higher proportion of BME staff were leavers and a slightly lower proportion of disabled staff.

The data shows an annual turnover rate of 6.1% (excluding fixed term contract expiry) compared to 7.9% for 2009

#### TABLE 13 – REASONS FOR LEAVING UWE: 2010

REASON	ACADEMIC + SENIOR MANAGEMENT	PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT STAFF	TOTALS 2010	TOTALS 2009	TOTALS 2008
Moving from area	2	4	6	2	14
Return to education	1	4	5	2	3
Giving up employment	1	1	2	4	13
Personal/domestic	2	6	8	7	14
Promotion/career development	6	4	10	9	25
Travel problems	3	2	5	5	10
Physical work environment	1	0	1	2	2
Organisational culture	4	2	6	10	13
Management style	0	4	4	6	13
Working relations	1	1	2	3	5
Workload/stress	3	4	7	5	13
Conditions of service	0	0	0	0	2
Discrimination	0	0	0	0	1
Retirement	9	4	13	13	27
Redundancy	0	0	0	12	14
III health	0	1	1	3	4
End of fixed term contract	3	2	5	8	9
Greater job satisfaction	4	6	10	14	20
Personal satisfaction	5	4	9	14	20
More training and development	1	1	2	4	7
Better career prospects	4	6	10	10	17
Better service conditions	0	0	0	2	5
Higher salary	2	5	7	5	18
Change of work pattern	2	3	5	6	14
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	17	26	43	51	105

Notes: Data is taken from exit questionnaires completed by staff leaving the University. Respondents can indicate more than one reason for leaving.

#### Section 4 – Staff development and career progression

Year	ALL	MA	LE	FEM	ALE	BN	ИE	WH	ITE	ETHNI NOT KN	-	DISA	BLED		OT BLED*
	Heads	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%
2010	3359	999	30%	2360	70%	263	7.8%	3009	90%	87	2.6%	201	6.0%	3158	94%
2009	3582	1141	32%	2441	68%	244	6.8%	3239	90%	99	2.8%	165	4.6%	3417	95%
2008	2861	808	28%	2053	72%	148	5.2%	2615	91%	98	3.4%	49	1.7%	2812	98%

#### TABLE 14 – INTERNAL TRAINING ATTENDANCES [2010 DATA TO FOLLOW]

Table 14 shows that female staff, BME staff and disabled staff are proportionately more likely to take up internal training places (note: UWE workforce is: 58% female, 7.1% BME and 4.8% disabled).

#### TABLE 15 - CAREER PROGRESSION ANALYSIS

YEAR	TO	ΓAL	MA	LE	FEM	ALE	BN	ΛE	WH	IITE	ETHN NOT K	-	DISA	BLED		OT BLED *
	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%								
2010	205	6.5%	80	5.9%	125	7.1%	13	6.2%	186	6.6%	6	5.0%	4	2.5%	197	6.6%
2009	185	6.2%	67	5.1%	118	7.0%	8	4.2%	171	6.3%	6	6.7%	2	1.7%	183	6.4%
2008	312	11%	134	11%	178	11%	10	5.8%	294	11.1%	8	9.1%	13	9.8%	299	10.8%

% indicates the proportion of the particular group having career progression, not the proportion of all the progression occurrences.

\* Figures for "Not Disabled" include staff who have not provided data.

Career progression opportunities have been taken up in slightly higher proportion by female staff compared to male staff and in lower proportion by known disabled staff. The data analysed by each type of career progression opportunity (promotion, regrading, secondment, and temporary up-grade) is shown in table 13 below.

#### TABLE 16 – CAREER PROGRESSION ANALYSIS BY TYPE

TYPE	YEAR	TO	TAL	M	ALE	FEN	IALE	В	ME	WH	IITE		IICITY NOWN	DISA	BLED		OT BLED*
		Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%
Promotion	2010	71	2.3%	28	2.1%	43	2.4%	3	1.4%	68	2.4%	0	0%	1	0.6%	70	2.4%
	2009	49	1.6%	17	1.3%	32	1.9%	2	1.1%	43	1.6%	4	4.5%	0	0%	49	1.7%
	2008	63	2.2%	23	1.8%	40	2.5%	0	0%	61	2.3%	2	2.3%	2	1.5%	61	2.3%
Regrading	2010	57	1.8%	22	1.6%	35	2.0%	8	3.8%	45	1.6%	4	3.3%	2	1.2%	55	1.9%
	2009	46	1.5%	19	1.4%	27	1.6%	1	0.5%	43	1.6%	2	2.2%	1	0.8%	45	1.6%
	2008	47	1.6%	26	2.0%	21	1.3%	6	3.5%	40	1.5%	1	1.1%	3	2.3%	44	1.7%
Secondment	2010	27	0.9%	9	0.7%	18	1.0%	0	0%	27	1.0%	0	0%	0	0%	27	0.9%
	2009	43	1.4%	16	1.2%	27	1.6%	1	0.5%	42	1.5%	0	0%	0	0%	43	1.5%
	2008	138	4.8%	60	4.7%	78	4.8%	3	1.7%	131	5.0%	4	4.5%	4	3.0%	134	5.0%
Temporary Upgrade	2010 2009 2008	50 47 64	1.6% 1.6% 2.2%	21 15 25	1.5% 1.1% 2.0%	29 32 39	1.6% 1.9% 2.4%	2 4 1	1.0% 2.1% 0.6%	46 43 62	1.6% 1.6% 2.3%	2 0 1	1.7% 0% 1.1%	1 1 4	0.6% 0.8% 3.0%	49 46 60	1.6% 1.6% 2.2%

% indicates the proportion of the particular group having career progression, not the proportion of all the progression occurrences. \* Figures for "Not Disabled" include staff who have not provided data.

#### **Section 5 – Formal procedures**

TABLE 17 – STAFF GRIEVANCES

YEAR	ALL	MA	LE	FEM	ALE	BN	ИE	WH	IITE	ETHN NOT K	-	DISA	BLED	NO DISAE	OT BLED*
	Heads	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%
2010	6	4	67%	2	33%	-	-	5	83%	1	17%	-	-	6	100%
2009	**21	13	72%	5	28%	-	-	18	100%	-	-	3	16.7%	15	83.3%
2008	13	5	38%	8	62%	1	7.7%	12	92.3%	0	0%	3	23.1%	10	76.9%

\* Figures for "Not Disabled" include staff who have not provided data. \*\* Includes 3 group grievances not included in equality analyses.

The number of new formal grievances in 2010 has decreased significantly from 2009. The UWE workforce (including HPLs and TSU) is: 58% female, 7.1% BME and 4.8% disabled, therefore in 2010 staff grievances were brought by a higher proportion of male staff, non-BME staff, and staff not declaring as disabled. However it is difficult to ascribe statistical significance to the data due to low numbers.

#### TABLE 18 – STAFF DISCIPLINARIES

YEAR/TYPE	ALL	MA	LE	FEM	ALE	BN	ΛE	WH	IITE			DISA	BLED	NC DISAE	OT BLED*
	Heads	Heads	%	Head s	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%	Heads	%
2010				3											
Conduct	8	7	88%	1	12%	-	-	8	100%	-	-	1	12%	7	88%
Capability	2	2	100%	-	-	1	50%	-	-	1	50%	-	-	2	100%
Performance	1	1	100%	-	-	-	-	1	100%	-	-	1	100%	-	-
Total 2010	11	10	91%	1	1%	1	1%	9	82%	1	1%	2	18%	9	82%
Total 2009	17	12	71%	5	29%	1	5.9%	12	70.6%	4	23.5%	1	5.9%	16	94.1%
Total 2008	14	9	64%	5	36%	3	21.4%	11	78.6%	-	-	2	14.3%	12	5.7%

\* Figures for "Not Disabled" include staff who have not provided data.

The UWE workforce (including HPLs and TSU) is: 58% female, 7.1% BME and 4.8% disabled. Therefore in 2010 formal procedures were initiated for a significantly lower proportion of female staff and BME staff, and for a higher proportion of disabled staff. However it is difficult to ascribe statistical significant to the data due to low numbers.

#### Section 6 – Sickness absence

TABLE 19 - SICKNESS ABSENCE RATES BY FACULTY / SERVICE	(January 2010 to December 2010)

FACULTY/SERVICE	DAYS LOST	INCIDENTS	ABSENCE	ABSENCE	ABSENCE
	2010	2010	<b>RATE 2010</b>	<b>RATE 2009</b>	<b>RATE 2008</b>
Business and Law*	1345	243	1.6%	2.2%	1.8%
CAHE*	2415	469	1.9%	1.4%	1.2%
Environment and Technology	1968	376	1.6%	1.5%	1.8%
Health and Life Sciences	2206	446	1.5%	1.6%	2.5%
Faculty sub total			1.7%	1.6%	1.9%
Academic Registry	200	68	2.1%	3.9%	2.1%
Admissions and International Dev.	285	61	3.1%	3.7%	1.8%
Business Intelligence & Planning	221	56	1.8%	1.1%	3.4%
Directorate*	218	56	1.7%	3.3%	1.2%
Facilities	1794	381	3.4%	4.3%	5.5%
Finance	415	96	2.8%	2.8%	2.0%
Human Resources	347	85	2.5%	2.4%	2.6%
IT Services	1190	403	2.5%	1.9%	2.8%
Library Services	906	306	2.5%	2.1%	2.7%
Marketing and Communications	116	64	1.4%	1.2%	1.1%
Research, Business and Innovation	231	94	1.7%	1.8%	1.3%
Schools and Colleges Partnerships	88	21	3.0%	3.6%	1.2%
Student Services	458	159	2.1%	3.1%	2.1%
Service sub total			3.2%	3.2%	3.7%
All services excluding manual staff			2.5%	2.5%	2.6%
Manual staff only			5.3%	5.2%	6.9%
All staff	18153	3932	2.2%	2.2%	2.5%

\*Includes Dean of Students and Development & Alumni. Excludes hourly paid and temporary staff.

In 2010 sickness in both Faculties and Services has not changed significantly compared to 2009...

#### TABLE 20 - REASONS FOR SICKNESS ABSENCE (January 2010 to December 2010)

#### Proportion of days lost

Proportion	of	incidents
------------	----	-----------

REASON	2010 (%)	2009 (%)	2008 (%)
Stress/Depression	17.6%	15.2%	15.8%
Cold/Flu/Virus	16.7%	19.2%	14.5%
Hospital Admittance	15.5%	14.7%	13.2%
Injury	9.1%	7.2%	8.4%
Infection	8.7%	10.3%	11.1%
Disease	5.2%	7.1%	6.5%
Back/Sciatica	4.6%	4.1%	5.7%
Stomach Complaint	3.8%	3.6%	3.9%
Sickness/Diarrhoea	3.1%	3.1%	2.6%
Muscular/Rheumatic	2.3%	2.4%	3.5%
Fatigue	2.3%	1.4%	3.4%
Heart/Blood pressure	2.1%	1.2%	2.0%
Headache/Migraine	2.0%	2.3%	2.3%
Maternity related	1.2%	1.1%	<1%
Not known	1.1%	1.6%	<1%
Dizzy spells	1.0%	<1%	1.0%
Pain			
Arthritis			
Dental/Oral			
Gynae/Menstral			
Allergy		Less than	Less than
Hospital appointment		1%	1%
Eye problems			
Asthma			
Diabetes			
Skin complaint			

REASON	2010 (%)	2009 (%)	2008 (%)
Cold/Flu/Virus	35.9%	36.3%	33.4%
Infection	11.4%	10.1%	11.0%
Stomach Complaint	8.5%	9.8%	10.2%
Sickness/Diarrhoea	8.5%	8.0%	7.9%
Headache/Migraine	6.6%	7.7%	8.0%
Hospital Admittance	4.2%	3.7%	3.9%
Stress/Depression	3.7%	3.2%	3.2%
Injury	3.5%	3.2%	3.5%
Back/Sciatica	2.9%	2.8%	3.8%
Not known	2.7%	3.7%	2.0%
Fatigue	1.5%	<1%	<1%
Muscular/Rheumatic	1.5%	1.8%	1.9%
Dental/Oral	1.3%	1.2%	1.6%
Pain	1.1%	1.2%	1.5%
Dizzy spells	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%
Maternity related	1.0%	<1%	<1%
Hospital appointment Allergy Eye problems Gynae/Menstral Heart/Blood pressure Asthma Arthritis Diabetes Skin complaint Disease		Less than 1%	Less than 1%

In 2010 stress/depression was the illness causing the most days lost, with 3,305 working days lost in the year compared to 2,761in 2009. In the previous year cold/flu/virus was the highest cause of days lost. As in 2009, in 2010 cold/flu/virus was the illness with the highest incident rate at 1,441 incidents in the year, compared to 1,445 in 2009.

#### Section 7 – Use of employee assistance programme (EAP)

#### TABLE 21 – USE OF SERVICES

ТҮРЕ		2010		2009			2008		
	HEADS	MALE	FEMALE	HEADS	MALE	FEMALE	HEADS	MALE	FEMALE
Helpline advice / information	54			37			22		
Telephone counselling	4			3			14		
Face-to-face counselling	78			73			78		
Legal information	48			130			97		
TOTAL USAGE	184	52	132	243	49	194	211	60	151
		28%	72%		20%	80%		28%	72%

Data relates to the period October to September

The number of staff accessing the services of the Employee Assistance Programme in 2010 has decreased by 24% compared to 2009. The UWE workforce (including HPLs and TSU) is 58% female therefore the data shows that a significantly higher proportion of female staff use the service compared to male staff.

### Section 8 – Benchmark performance indicators

TABLE 22 – COMPARISONS WITH OTHER UNIVERSITIES

Category			HEIs <sup>1</sup>		
		Average	Upper / lower quartile	UW	E
HR staff : all em	ployees	1:73	1:84	1:82	1
HR staff cost per employee		£489	£381	£416	1
HR cost as % of University pay bill		1.7%	1.3%	1.7%	1
Staff costs as % of total UWE costs				60.6%	
Training: days p		1.9	2.9	<b>_</b> 2	
Training: spend		£315	£490	<b>_</b> 2	
Staff having an a	annual PDR			42%	
Female staff	All	46%	50.2%	57%	$\uparrow\uparrow$
	In top 5% of earners	28%	34%	34%	$\uparrow\uparrow$
BME staff		8.5%	15.2%	6.7%	$\downarrow$
Disabled staff		3.3%	4.2%	3.5%	$\uparrow$
Staff aged over	55	21.0%		25.7%	
Staff on fixed te	rm/ temporary contracts	22.1%	31.5%	13% <sup>3</sup>	
Part time staff		25.4%	34.6%	38%	
Voluntary staff turnover		6.7%	7.4%	3.8%	
Grievances (per 1,000 employees)		3.6	1.1	5.6	$\downarrow$
Disciplinaries (per 1,000 employees)		5.6	6.7	3.8	
Tribunal applications (per 1,000 employees)		1.4	0.6	0.8	$\uparrow$
Sickness: per er	Sickness: per employee per annum		4.8 days	6.1 days	$\uparrow$
Sickness: % of working days lost		2.7%	1.8%	2.3%	$\uparrow$
Sickness: avera	ge duration	5.4 days	4.3 days	4.7 days	<b>↑</b>
Sickness: % of total over 20 days duration		46.9%	42.6%	44.1%	$\uparrow$
Sickness: days lost to colds/viruses		19.5%		19.2%	
Sickness: days lost to stress		14.5%		16.6%	
Workplace injuries per 1,000 employees		2.9	1.8	2.2	$\uparrow$
Recruitment: cost per new recruit		£1,018	£657	TBA	
Recruitment: working days to fill vacancy		52.1	39.8	TBA	

#### <u>Key:</u>

- $\uparrow\uparrow$  = in highest quartile
- $\uparrow$  = above average
- ↓ = below average

21

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> All data taken from the annual DLA Piper HR Benchmarker reports for 2010. The DLA Piper reports are based on data from around 80 higher education institutions (HEIs).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> UWE training data only exists for centrally funded programmes

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> UWE data excludes temporary staff unit temps