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## Internal Staff

## General

## About Internal Staff

Internal staff include academic, academic-related and support staff. In December 2016 the University had around 5,109 staff in these categories. Around $78 \%$ of OU staff are based at Walton Hall in Milton Keynes with the remaining staff based at centres in Scotland, Wales, Ireland and England. The recruitment pool is local, national and international for some job categories.

## Notes on the data

The 2016 reporting period is from 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016. In several areas, where data was available, the previous five years' or aggregated data for a number of years is reported.

Staff on unpaid leave as at the $31^{\text {st }}$ December of each year have been included in the headcounts. Consultants and Agency temporary staff are reported separately.

## Workforce Composition

Data for five years is included for the entire workforce including staff in the most senior job roles, which is defined as Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Deans, Professors and Heads of Units. Data by location, by unit, by staff category, by grade and by contract type for the most recent year is available for staff to download in Excel format.

## Recruitment

There are three stages to the internal staff recruitment process (application, short listing and appointment) and monitoring data is provided for each. Data for the most recent year is provided and data for previous years is available for staff to download in Excel format. Charts include data for five years.

## Promotion

In the context of this report, promotion is defined as an improvement in the job grade of an individual. This change to a higher grade could happen for several reasons and thus, four different categories of promotions are included in this section: (1) internal transfer, when an individual moves to a different unit; (2) internal promotion, when an individual is appointed to a different post within the same unit; (3) Job regrade, when an individual's position is re-evaluated (i.e. increase of responsibilities) and (4) Secondment \& Placement, when an individual moves to a different post temporarily for development purposes.

## Training and Development

The average number of courses undertaken by staff is taken from the Staff Learning Management System (LMS). This system advertises OU training courses and allows staff to enrol for these courses and check their training records. It is estimated that LMS records currently cover between $70 \%$ and $90 \%$ of the training and development activities undertaken by OU staff, although this varies according to the practice of each unit in recording courses.

Data for the previous year and aggregated data for the previous five years is included.

## Staff taking parental leave

The maternity data has been taken from the ResourceLink system used by the Payroll department.

## Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment

Due to the decreasing use of monitoring forms and the increasing reliability of the database systems used to capture and monitor Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment cases for this year's report will no
longer include monitoring forms and only report on the number of cases reported through the HR caseload database.

## Internal Staff

## Age <br> Workforce Composition

Table 1 shows the number and percentage of overall internal staff workforce by age across five years.

In 2016, there were 5,109 internal staff employed at the OU. Nearly one third (29.97\%) were aged between 46 and 55. This trend seems to continue when compared to the data from previous years.

Table 1: Overall workforce composition, by age, 2012-2016

|  | 2012 |  | 2013 |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total |
| 25 and under | 122 | 2.36\% | 115 | 2.19\% | 118 | 2.24\% | 97 | 1.89\% | 142 | 2.78\% |
| 26-35 | 866 | 16.73\% | 923 | 17.60\% | 972 | 18.44\% | 917 | 17.89\% | 928 | 18.16\% |
| 36-45 | 1386 | 26.78\% | 1379 | 26.29\% | 1391 | 26.38\% | 1374 | 26.80\% | 1418 | 27.75\% |
| 46-55 | 1616 | 31.23\% | 1610 | 30.70\% | 1604 | 30.42\% | 1556 | 30.36\% | 1531 | 29.97\% |
| 56 and over | 1185 | 22.90\% | 1218 | 23.22\% | 1187 | 22.52\% | 1182 | 23.06\% | 1090 | 21.33\% |
| Total | 5175 | 100.00\% | 5245 | 100.00\% | 5272 | 100.00\% | 5126 | 100.00\% | 5109 | 100.00\% |

Chart 1: Workforce composition, by age, 2012-2016


## Internal Staff

## Age

## Senior Staff Composition

Table 2 shows the number and percentage of senior staff by age across five years. Senior Staff include Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Executive Deans, Head of Units and Staff on Grade 10 below Head of Units.

In 2016, the majority of senior staff ( $86.86 \%$ ) were aged 46 and over. There has been a similar pattern since 2012. There appears to be a correlation between staff on senior roles and age.

Table 2: Senior staff composition, by age, 2012-2016

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | $\%$ of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | 1 | $0.42 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 1 | $0.42 \%$ | 2 | $0.80 \%$ | 1 | $0.43 \%$ | 3 | $1.24 \%$ | 1 | $0.40 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 31 | $13.03 \%$ | 22 | $8.76 \%$ | 17 | $7.30 \%$ | 26 | $10.79 \%$ | 32 | $12.75 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 82 | $34.45 \%$ | 91 | $36.25 \%$ | 91 | $39.06 \%$ | 92 | $38.17 \%$ | 102 | $40.64 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 123 | $51.68 \%$ | 136 | $54.18 \%$ | 124 | $53.22 \%$ | 120 | $49.79 \%$ | 116 | $46.22 \%$ |
| Total | 238 | $100.00 \%$ | 251 | $100.00 \%$ | 233 | $100.00 \%$ | 241 | $100.00 \%$ | 251 | $100.00 \%$ |

## Academic Staff Composition

Table 3 shows the number and percentage of academic staff by grade and age in 2016.
In 2016, the majority of academic staff ( $63.67 \%$ ) were aged 46 and over. Similarly, the majority of senior staff members were also aged 46 and over.

There appears to be a correlation between academic staff age and grade.
Table 3: Academic staff composition, by age and grade, 2016

|  | AC1 |  | AC2 |  | AC3 |  | AC4 |  | PB1 |  | PB2 |  | PB3 |  | total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% |
| 25 and under | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 26-35 | 13 | 8.4\% | 86 | 55.5\% | 53 | 34.2\% | 3 | 1.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 155 | 100.0\% |
| 36-45 | 4 | 1.4\% | 52 | 18.8\% | 137 | 49.5\% | 78 | 28.2\% | 5 | 1.8\% | 1 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 277 | 100.0\% |
| 46-55 | 3 | 0.8\% | 13 | 3.4\% | 126 | 33.4\% | 181 | 48.0\% | 26 | 6.9\% | 24 | 6.4\% | 4 | 1.1\% | 377 | 100.0\% |
| 56 and over | 1 | 0.3\% | 12 | 3.2\% | 113 | 29.7\% | 167 | 43.9\% | 34 | 8.9\% | 39 | 10.3\% | 14 | 3.7\% | 380 | 100.0\% |
| Total | 21 | 1.8\% | 163 | 13.7\% | 429 | 36.1\% | 429 | 36.1\% | 65 | 5.5\% | 64 | 5.4\% | 18 | 1.5\% | 1189 | 100.0\% |

## Internal Staff

## Age <br> Recruitment

Table 4 shows the number and percentage of applicants shortlisted and appointed by age.
In 2016, applicants aged 36 and over were most likely to be shortlisted. In terms of actual appointments, shortlisted applicants aged between 26 and 45 were most likely to be appointed whereas shortlisted applicants aged $46-55$ were least likely to be appointed. It is interesting to see that whilst applicants 25 and under are least likely to be shortlisted, once they are shortlisted, they are likely to be appointed.

Table 4: Applications and appointments, by age, 2016

|  | applicants | shortlisted | \% applicants <br> shortlisted | appointed | \% shortlisted <br> appointed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | 866 | 188 | $21.7 \%$ | 107 | $56.9 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 2767 | 797 | $28.8 \%$ | 365 | $45.8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 2353 | 768 | $32.6 \%$ | 318 | $41.4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 1755 | 619 | $35.3 \%$ | 236 | $38.1 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 625 | 196 | $31.4 \%$ | 78 | $39.8 \%$ |
| Total | 8366 | 2568 | $30.7 \%$ | 1104 | $43 \%$ |

## Promotions

Table 5 shows the number and percentage of promotions by age, whilst table 6 shows aggregated data for five years.

The number of promotions increased from 6.7\% (343) in 2015 to $8.9 \%$ (453) in 2016. The promotions increased for all age groups, however it was the staff aged between 26 and 35 who were most likely to be promoted in 2016. Of the 928 staff in that age group 149 ( $16.1 \%$ ) were promoted. The least likely staff to be promoted were the staff aged 56 and over. There appears to be a correlation between staff age and promotions when looking at the last three years data.

Table 5: Promotions, by age, 2016

|  | promotions | headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | 16 | 142 | $11.3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 149 | 928 | $16.1 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 131 | 1418 | $9.2 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 115 | 1531 | $7.5 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 42 | 1090 | $3.9 \%$ |
| Total | 453 | 5109 | $8.9 \%$ |

Table 6: Promotions, by age, 2012-2016

| promotions | avg. headcount | $\%$ of avg. headcount |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | 76 | 118.8 | $64 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 560 | 921.2 | $60.8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 523 | 1389.6 | $37.6 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 461 | 1583.4 | $29.1 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 159 | 1172.4 | $13.6 \%$ |
| Total | 1779 | 5185.4 | $34.3 \%$ |

Internal Staff

## Age

## Training and Development

Table 7 shows the number of staff that attended training courses in 2016 by age, whilst table 8 shows aggregated data for five years.

The total number of courses taken by staff in 2016 was 1,784 . The number of courses staff taking for the most recent year has significantly declined since 2015 where the number of courses taken by staff was 4,425 . The average number of courses taken by staff in the most recent year was 0.3 which is 0.6 lower than in 2015.

All staff except those aged 56 and over took a higher than average number of courses.
Table 7: Training, by age and type of training, 2016

|  | $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coaching \& Mentoring |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Equality \& Diversity | 3 | 12 | 36 | 25 | 12 | 88 |
| Health \& Safety | 2 | 18 | 30 | 31 | 19 | 100 |
| Leadership \& Management |  |  | 2 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Other* | 61 | 341 | 445 | 430 | 251 | 1528 |
| Skills Development |  | 15 | 21 | 17 | 7 | 60 |
| Total | 66 | 386 | 536 | 506 | 290 | 1784 |

*Please note that the type of course is not consistently captured across all training and development initiatives within the OU and as such a large proportion of the courses fall under 'Other'.

Table 8: Training, by age, 2012-2016

|  | courses | avg headcount | avg per avg headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | 886 | 118.8 | 7.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 7640 | 921.2 | 8.3 |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 11097 | 1389.6 | 8.0 |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 11741 | 1583.4 | 7.4 |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 6782 | 1172.4 | 5.8 |
| Total | 38146 | 5185.4 | 7.4 |

## Internal Staff

## Age

## Leavers

Table 9 shows the number and percentage of leavers by age, whilst table 10 shows aggregated data for five years. Table 11 shows reasons for staff leaving the university.

The turnover rate for 2016 was $9.5 \%$ which is notably lower when compared to 2015 data where turnover rate was $14.3 \%$. The highest voluntary turnover rate of internal staff is within age band 25 and under which is different when compared to the previous year data where the highest voluntary turnover rate was within age band 56 and over.

Table 9: Leavers and turnover, by age, 2016

|  | Involuntary |  | Voluntary |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | leavers | turnover | leavers | turnover | leavers | turnover |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | 4 | 2.82 | 20 | $14.08 \%$ | 24 | $16.90 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 28 | $3.02 \%$ | 82 | $8.84 \%$ | 110 | $11.85 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 30 | $2.12 \%$ | 72 | $5.08 \%$ | 102 | $7.19 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 34 | $2.22 \%$ | 75 | $4.90 \%$ | 109 | $7.12 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 47 | $4.31 \%$ | 94 | $8.62 \%$ | 141 | $12.94 \%$ |
| Total | 143 | $2.80 \%$ | 343 | $6.70 \%$ | 486 | $9.50 \%$ |

Table 10: Leavers, by age, 2012-2016

|  | Involuntary |  | Voluntary |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | leavers | \% of total | leavers | \% of total | leavers | \% of total |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | 32 | $3.21 \%$ | 79 | $4.26 \%$ | 111 | $3.89 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 189 | $18.98 \%$ | 392 | $21.12 \%$ | 581 | $20.37 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 193 | $19.38 \%$ | 384 | $20.69 \%$ | 577 | $20.23 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 259 | $26.00 \%$ | 326 | $17.56 \%$ | 585 | $20.51 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 323 | $32.43 \%$ | 675 | $36.37 \%$ | 998 | $34.99 \%$ |
| Total | 996 | $100.00 \%$ | 1856 | $100.00 \%$ | 2852 | $100.00 \%$ |

Chart 2: Retirees, by age, 2012-2016


Table 11: Leavers, by age and reason for leaving, 2016

|  |  | 25 and under |  | 26-35 |  | 36-45 |  | 46-55 |  | 56 and over |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | leavers | \% of total | leavers | \% of total | leavers | \% of total | leavers | \% of total | leavers | \% of total | leavers | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { of } \\ & \text { total } \end{aligned}$ |
| Involuntary | Deceased |  |  |  |  | 1 | 33.3\% | 2 | 66.7\% |  |  | 3 | 100\% |
|  | Dismissal | 1 | 14.3\% | 2 | 28.6\% | 1 | 14.3\% | 2 | 28.6\% | 1 | 14.3\% | 7 | 100\% |
|  | End of Temporary Contract | 2 | 2.8\% | 23 | 31.9\% | 20 | 27.8\% | 11 | 15.3\% | 16 | 22.2\% | 72 | 100\% |
|  | III Health Retirement |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 40\% | 3 | 60\% | 5 | 100\% |
|  | Offer Withdrawn |  |  |  |  | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 100\% |
|  | Redundancy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% |
|  | Severance |  |  | 2 | 3.9\% | 6 | 11.8\% | 17 | 33.3\% | 26 | 51\% | 51 | 100\% |
|  | Unconfirmed Probation | 1 | 33.3\% | 1 | 33.3\% | 1 | 33.3\% |  |  |  |  | 3 | 100\% |
|  | Total | 4 | 2.8\% | 28 | 19.6\% | 30 | 21\% | 34 | 23.8\% | 47 | 32.9\% | 143 | 100\% |
| Voluntary | Enhanced early retirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% |
|  | Normal Retirement |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.1\% | 47 | 97.9\% | 48 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation Other | 7 | 6.7\% | 36 | 34.6\% | 27 | 26\% | 23 | 22.1\% | 11 | 10.6\% | 104 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation Personal Reasons | 8 | 10.8\% | 19 | 25.7\% | 15 | 20.3\% | 18 | 24.3\% | 14 | 18.9\% | 74 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation Work-related | 5 | 5.3\% | 26 | 27.7\% | 28 | 29.8\% | 24 | 25.5\% | 11 | 11.7\% | 94 | 100\% |
|  | Settlement Agreement |  |  | 1 | 5.3\% | 2 | 10.5\% | 9 | 47.4\% | 7 | 36.8\% | 19 | 100\% |
|  | Total | 20 | 5.8\% | 82 | 23.9\% | 72 | 21\% | 75 | 21.9\% | 94 | 27.4\% | 343 | 100\% |

## Internal Staff

## Age

## Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment

Table 12 shows the number of Grievances, Bullying and Harassment cases by age in 2016, whilst table 13 shows aggregated data for five years.

The number of Grievances, Bullying and Harassment cases increased from 2 in 2015 to 4 in 2016.
Looking at the last five years data, $0.6 \%$ of all internal staff raised Grievance or Bullying and Harassment cases, which is $0.2 \%$ lower than last year, where the overall figure between 2011 and 2015 was $0.8 \%$.

There were no disability-related tribunal cases in 2016.
Table 12: Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment, by age, 2016

|  | cases | headcount | $\%$ of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 1 | 928 | $0.1 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 1 | 1418 | $0.1 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 1 | 1531 | $0.1 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 1 | 1090 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Total | 4 | 5109 | $0.1 \%$ |

Table 13: Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment, by age, 2012-2016

|  | cases | avg headcount | \% of avg headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $26-35$ | 1 | 921.2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 9 | 1389.6 | $0.6 \%$ |


| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 8 | 1583.4 | $0.5 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 15 | 1172.4 | $1.3 \%$ |
| Total | 33 | 5185.4 | $0.6 \%$ |

## Reasonable Adjustments

Table 14 shows the number and percentage of reasonable adjustments by age.
There were 8 reasonable adjustment cases in 2016, which is one more when compared to 2015 data. The low number of reasonable adjustment cases in 2016 makes it difficult to make a meaningful comparison.

Table 14: Reasonable Adjustment cases, by age, 2016

|  | cases | average headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | 1 | 118.8 | $0.8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 1 | 921.2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 1 | 1389.6 | $0.1 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 3 | 1583.4 | $0.2 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 2 | 1172.4 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Total | 8 | 5185.4 | $0.2 \%$ |

## Internal Staff

## Age

## Disciplinary cases

Table 15 shows the number of Disciplinary cases by age in 2016, whilst table 16 shows aggregated data for five years.

The number of disciplinary cases decreased by almost half from $0.8 \%$ (39) in 2015 to $0.4 \%$ (22) in 2016 across all age groups.

Table 15: Disciplinary cases, by age, 2016

|  | cases | headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | 1 | 142 | $0.7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 3 | 928 | $0.3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 3 | 1418 | $0.2 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 9 | 1531 | $0.6 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 6 | 1090 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Total | 22 | 5109 | $0.4 \%$ |

Table 16: Disciplinary cases, by age, 2012-2016

|  | cases | avg headcount | \% of avg headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | 3 | 118.8 | $2.5 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 38 | 921.2 | $4.1 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 48 | 1389.6 | $3.5 \%$ |


| $46-55$ | 66 | 1583.4 | $4.2 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56 and over | 51 | 1172.4 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Total | 206 | 5185.4 | $4 \%$ |

## Agile Working

Table 17 shows the number of agile working requests made in 2016 by age.
The total number of agile working requests made in 2016 was 182 . The majority $36.81 \%$ of agile working requests were made by staff aged between 36 and 45 . All agile working requests made by staff were approved.

Table 17: Agile working requests, by age, 2016

|  | agile working <br> requests | requests <br> granted | requests <br> refused | appeals for <br> denied requests | appeals <br> successful | appeals <br> unsuccessful |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and under | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 - 3 5}$ | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 5}$ | 67 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{4 6 - 5 5}$ | 39 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ and over | 41 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 182 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Internal Staff

## Disability

Workforce Composition
Table 18 shows the number and percentage of overall internal staff, by disability, across five years.
In 2016 the percentage and number of staff with a declared disability decreased from 5.6\% in 2015 to $5.1 \%$ in 2016. It can be observed that decreasing trend remains stable over the past five years.

Table 18: Overall workforce composition, by disability, 2012-2016

|  | 2012 |  | 2013 |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |  | 2016 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total |
|  | 324 | $6.3 \%$ | 318 | $6.1 \%$ | 299 | $5.7 \%$ | 288 | $5.6 \%$ | 262 | $5.1 \%$ |
| Non-disabled | 4838 | $93.5 \%$ | 4907 | $93.6 \%$ | 4945 | $93.8 \%$ | 4805 | $93.7 \%$ | 4790 | $93.8 \%$ |
| Unknown | 13 | $0.3 \%$ | 20 | $0.4 \%$ | 28 | $0.5 \%$ | 33 | $0.6 \%$ | 57 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Total | 5175 | $100 \%$ | 5245 | $100 \%$ | 5272 | $100 \%$ | 5126 | $100 \%$ | 5109 | $100 \%$ |

Chart 3: Workforce composition, by disability, 2012-2016


## Internal Staff

## Disability

Senior Staff Composition
Senior Staff include Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Executive Deans, Head of Units and Staff on Grade 10 below Head of Units.

The percentage of senior staff with a declared disability increased from $2.5 \%$ in 2015 to $2.8 \%$ in 2016.

Table 19: Senior staff composition, by disability, 2012-2016

|  | 2012 |  | 2013 |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total |
| Disabled | 9 | 3.8\% | 8 | 3.2\% | 7 | 3\% | 6 | 2.5\% | 7 | 2.8\% |
| Non-disabled | 227 | 95.4\% | 241 | 96\% | 225 | 96.6\% | 234 | 97.1\% | 242 | 96.4\% |
| Unknown | 2 | 0.8\% | 2 | 0.8\% | 1 | 0.4\% | 1 | 0.4\% | 2 | 0.8\% |
| Total | 238 | 100\% | 251 | 100\% | 233 | 100\% | 241 | 100\% | 251 | 100\% |
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## Academic Staff Composition

Table 20 shows the number and percentage of academic staff by grade and disability.
In 2016, $5.6 \%$ of academic staff had a declared disability. The majority (61.19\%) of academic staff with a declared disability were employed on AC3 grade.

Table 20: Academic staff composition, by grade and disability, 2016

|  | AC1 |  | AC2 |  | AC3 |  | AC4 |  | PB1 |  | PB2 |  | PB3 |  | total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% |
| Disabled | 0 | 0.00\% | 7 | 10.45\% | 41 | 61.19\% | 18 | 26.87\% | 1 | 1.49\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 67 | 100.00\% |
| Non-disabled | 20 | 1.79\% | 155 | 13.86\% | 388 | 34.70\% | 410 | 36.67\% | 63 | 5.64\% | 64 | 5.72\% | 18 | 1.61\% | 1118 | 100.00\% |
| Unknown | 1 | 25.00\% | 1 | 25.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 25.00\% | 1 | 25.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 4 | 100.00\% |
| Total | 21 | 1.77\% | 163 | 13.71\% | 429 | 36.08\% | 429 | 36.08\% | 65 | 5.47\% | 64 | 5.38\% | 18 | 1.51\% | 1189 | 100.00\% |

## Internal Staff

## Disability

## Recruitment

Table 21 shows the number and percentage of applicants shortlisted and appointed by disabled status.

In 2016, $37.5 \%$ of applicants with a declared disability were shortlisted. This figure is lower when compared to 2015 data where $44.1 \%$ of disabled applicants were shortlisted. However, the percentage of staff appointed with declared disability was nearly $50 \%$ higher in 2016 (45.5\%) than it was observed in 2015 24.8\%.

Table 21: Applications and appointments, by disability, 2016

|  | applicants | shortlisted | \% applicants <br> shortlisted | appointed | \% shortlisted <br> appointed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |


| Disabled | 269 | 101 | $37.50 \%$ | 46 | $45.50 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-disabled | 7982 | 2437 | $30.50 \%$ | 1029 | $42.20 \%$ |
| Unknown | 115 | 30 | $26.10 \%$ | 29 | $96.70 \%$ |
| Total | 8366 | 2568 | $30.70 \%$ | 1104 | $43 \%$ |

## Promotions

Table 22 shows the number and percentage of promotions by disability, whilst table 23 shows aggregated data for five years.

In 2016, staff with a declared disability were as likely to be promoted as staff with no disability. The percentage of staff promoted with a declared disability in 2016 was $8.8 \%$ which is higher than it was observed in 2015 where the percentage of staff promoted was $4.6 \%$.

Table 22: Promotions, by disability, 2016

|  | promotions | headcount | $\%$ of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled | 23 | 262 | $8.8 \%$ |
| Non-disabled | 426 | 4790 | $8.9 \%$ |
| Unknown | 4 | 57 | $7 \%$ |
| Total | 453 | 5109 | $8.9 \%$ |

Table 23: Promotions, by disability, 2012-2016

|  | promotions | avg. headcount | \% of avg. headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled | 76 | 298.2 | $25.5 \%$ |
| Non-disabled | 1696 | 4857 | $34.9 \%$ |
| Unknown | 7 | 30.2 | $23.2 \%$ |
| Total | 1779 | 5185.4 | $34.3 \%$ |

## Internal Staff

## Disability

## Training and Development

Table 24 shows the number of staff attending training courses in 2016 by type of training and disability, whilst table 25 shows aggregated data for five years.

The total number of courses taken by staff was 1,784 , of which ( $4.82 \%$ ) were courses taken by staff with a declared disability.

The average number of courses taken by staff in 2016 was 0.3 , with staff with a declared disability taking on average of 0.3 courses.

Table 24: Training, by disability and type of training, 2016

|  | Disabled | Non-disabled | Unknown | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coaching \& Mentoring | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Equality \& Diversity | 8 | 80 | 0 | 88 |
| Health \& Safety | 7 | 93 | 0 | 100 |
| Leadership \& Management | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Other* | 67 | 1433 | 28 | 1528 |
| Skills Development | 3 | 57 | 0 | 60 |
| Total | 86 | 1669 | 29 | 1784 |

*Please note that the type of course is not consistently captured across all training and development initiatives within the OU and as such a large proportion of the courses fall under 'Other'.

Table 25: Training, by disability, 2012-2016

|  | courses | avg headcount | avg per avg <br> headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled | 1718 | 298.2 | 5.8 |
| Non-disabled | 26099 | 4857 | 5.4 |
| Unknown | 123 | 30.2 | 4.1 |
| Total | 27940 | 5185.4 | 5.4 |

## Internal Staff

## Disability

## Leavers

Table 26 shows the number and percentage of leavers by disability, whilst table 27 shows aggregated data for five years. Table 28 shows reasons for staff leaving the university.

For the university as a whole, $3.8 \%$ of staff with a declared disability left voluntarily in 2016. This figure is lower when compared to 2015 where $10.2 \%$ of staff with a declared disability left the
university voluntarily. The percentage of staff with a declared disability who left involuntarily has also decreased from $9.5 \%$ in 2015 to $3.8 \%$ in 2016.

One of the main reasons for staff with a declared disability leaving the university was Retirement for voluntary and III Health Retirement for involuntary in the last year.

Table 26: Leavers and turnover, by disability, 2016

|  | Involuntary |  | Voluntary |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | leavers | turnover | leavers | turnover | leavers | turnover |
| Disabled | 10 | $3.8 \%$ | 10 | $3.8 \%$ | 20 | $7.6 \%$ |
| Non-disabled | 131 | $2.7 \%$ | 329 | $6.9 \%$ | 460 | $9.6 \%$ |
| Unknown | 2 | $3.5 \%$ | 4 | $7 \%$ | 6 | $10.5 \%$ |
| Total | 143 | $2.8 \%$ | 343 | $6.7 \%$ | 486 | $9.5 \%$ |

Table 27: Leavers, by disability, 2012-2016

|  | Involuntary |  | Voluntary |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | leavers | $\%$ of total | leavers | $\%$ of total | leavers | $\%$ of total |
| Disabled | 81 | $8.1 \%$ | 84 | $4.5 \%$ | 165 | $5.8 \%$ |
| Non-disabled | 904 | $90.8 \%$ | 1756 | $94.6 \%$ | 2660 | $93.3 \%$ |
| Unknown | 11 | $1.1 \%$ | 16 | $0.9 \%$ | 27 | $0.9 \%$ |
| Total | 996 | $100 \%$ | 1856 | $100 \%$ | 2852 | $100 \%$ |

Table 28: Leavers, by disability and reason for leaving, 2016

|  |  | Disabled |  | Non-disabled |  | Unknown |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | leavers | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { total } \end{aligned}$ | leavers | \% of total | leavers | \% of total | leavers | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { total } \end{aligned}$ |
| Involuntary | Deceased |  |  | 3 | 100\% |  |  | 3 | 100\% |
|  | Dismissal |  |  | 7 | 100\% |  |  | 7 | 100\% |
|  | End of Temporary Contract | 4 | 5.6\% | 67 | 93.1\% | 1 | 1.4\% | 72 | 100\% |
|  | III Health Retirement | 3 | 60\% | 2 | 40\% |  |  | 5 | 100\% |
|  | Offer Withdrawn |  |  | 1 | 100\% |  |  | 1 | 100\% |
|  | Redundancy |  |  | 1 | 100\% |  |  | 1 | 100\% |
|  | Severance | 3 | 5.9\% | 48 | 94.1\% |  |  | 51 | 100\% |
|  | Unconfirmed Probation |  |  | 2 | 66.7\% | 1 | 33.3\% | 3 | 100\% |
|  | Total | 10 | 7\% | 131 | 91.6\% | 2 | 1.4\% | 143 | 100\% |
| Voluntary | Enhanced early retirement |  |  | 4 | 100\% |  |  | 4 | 100\% |
|  | Normal Retirement | 3 | 6.3\% | 45 | 93.8\% |  |  | 48 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation - Other | 3 | 2.9\% | 100 | 96.2\% | 1 | 1\% | 104 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation - Personal Reasons | 1 | 1.4\% | 72 | 97.3\% | 1 | 1.4\% | 74 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation Work-related | 3 | 3.2\% | 89 | 94.7\% | 2 | 2.1\% | 94 | 100\% |
|  | Settlement Agreement |  |  | 19 | 100\% |  |  | 19 | 100\% |
|  | Total | 10 | 2.9\% | 329 | 95.9\% | 4 | 1.2\% | 343 | 100\% |
| Total |  | 20 | 4.1\% | 460 | 94.7\% | 6 | 1.2\% | 486 | 100\% |

## Internal Staff

## Disability

## Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment

Table 29 shows the number of Grievances, Bullying and Harassment cases by disability, in 2016 whilst table 30 shows aggregated data for five years.

There were no Grievance or Bullying and Harassment cases raised by staff with a declared disability in 2016 therefore it is not possible to make a comparison.

The historical data over the past five years indicates that on average staff with a declared disability are more likely to file a Grievance or Bullying and Harassment case (2\%) as compared to staff without a declared disability (0.6\%).

There were no disability-related tribunal cases in 2016.
Table 29: Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment, by disability, 2016

|  | cases | headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-disabled | 4 | 4790 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Total | 4 | 5109 | $0.1 \%$ |

Table 30: Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment, by disability, 2012-2016

|  | cases | avg headcount | \% of avg headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled | 6 | 298.2 | $2 \%$ |
| Non-disabled | 27 | 4857 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Total | 33 | 5185.4 | $0.6 \%$ |

## Reasonable Adjustments

Table 31 shows the number and percentage of reasonable adjustments by disability.
The data shows that disabled staff were much more likely to request adjustments to be made in the past year ( $1.1 \%$ ) in comparison to non-disabled staff ( $0.1 \%$ ). However the low number of reasonable adjustment cases in 2016 makes it difficult to make a meaningful comparison.

Table 31: Reasonable Adjustment cases, by disability, 2016

|  | cases | average headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled | 3 | 262 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Non-disabled | 5 | 4790 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Total | 8 | 5109 | $0.2 \%$ |

## Internal Staff

## Disability

## Disciplinary cases

Table 32 shows the number of Disciplinary cases by disability in 2016, whilst table 33 shows aggregated data for five years.

There were no disciplinary cases for staff with declared disabilities in 2016. However, the historical data over the past five years does indicate that on average staff with a declared disability are more likely to be involved in a disciplinary case (7.7\%) as compared to staff without a declared disability (3.7\%).

Table 32: Disciplinary cases, by disability, 2016

|  | cases | headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-disabled | 22 | 4790 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Total | 22 | 5109 | $0.4 \%$ |

Table 33: Disciplinary cases, by disability, 2012-2016

|  | cases | avg headcount | \% of avg headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled | 23 | 298.2 | $7.7 \%$ |
| Non-disabled | 182 | 4857 | $3.7 \%$ |
| Unknown | 1 | 30.2 | $3.3 \%$ |
| Total | 206 | 5185.4 | $4 \%$ |

## Agile Working

Table 34 shows the number of agile working requests made in 2016 by disability.
The total number of agile working requests made in 2016 was 182 . The majority $95.6 \%$ of agile working requests were made by staff without a declared disability and only $4.4 \%$ of agile working request were made by staff with a declared disability. All the agile working requests made by staff were approved.

Table 34: Agile working requests, by disability, 2016

|  | agile working <br> requests | requests <br> granted | requests <br> refused | appeals for <br> denied requests | appeals <br> successful | appeals <br> unsuccessful |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-disabled | 174 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 182 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Internal Staff

## Ethnicity

## Workforce Composition

Table 35 shows the number and percentage of overall internal staff workforce by ethnicity across five years.

In 2016, 10.1\% of internal staff with a known ethnicity were from an ethnic minority background, up from $9.3 \%$ in 2015 . Over the past five years the percentage of staff from an ethnic minority background has gradually increased.

Table 35: Overall workforce composition, by ethnicity, 2012-2016

|  |  | 2012 |  | 2013 |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | total | \% of known | total | \% of known | total | \% of known | total | \% of known | total | \% of known |
| Ethnic Minorities | Asian | 196 | 3.8\% | 217 | 4.1\% | 235 | 4.5\% | 245 | 4.8\% | 260 | 5.1\% |
|  | Black | 92 | 1.8\% | 96 | 1.8\% | 99 | 1.9\% | 97 | 1.9\% | 123 | 2.4\% |
|  | Mixed | 85 | 1.6\% | 91 | 1.7\% | 96 | 1.8\% | 92 | 1.8\% | 95 | 1.9\% |
|  | Other | 47 | 0.9\% | 43 | 0.8\% | 43 | 0.8\% | 41 | 0.8\% | 40 | 0.8\% |
|  | Total | 420 | 8.1\% | 447 | 8.5\% | 473 | 9.0\% | 475 | 9.3\% | 518 | 10.1\% |
| White |  | 4627 | 89.4\% | 4668 | 89.0\% | 4663 | 88.4\% | 4507 | 87.9\% | 4420 | 86.5\% |
| Unknown |  | 128 | 2.5\% | 130 | 2.5\% | 136 | 2.6\% | 144 | 2.8\% | 171 | 3.3\% |
| Total |  | 5175 | 100.0\% | 5245 | 100.0\% | 5272 | 100.0\% | 5126 | 100.0\% | 5109 | 100.0\% |

Chart 4: Workforce composition, by ethnicity, 2012-2016


## Internal Staff

## Ethnicity

## Senior Staff Composition

Senior Staff include Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Executive Deans, Head of Units and Staff on Grade 10 below Head of Units.

The percentage of senior staff from an ethnic minority background has slightly decreased from $7.47 \%$ in 2015 to $7.17 \%$ in 2016.

Table 36: Senior staff composition, by ethnicity, 2012-2016

|  |  | 2012 |  | 2013 |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | total | \% of known | total | \% of known | total | \% of known | total | $\%$ of known | total | \% of known |
| Ethnic Minorities | Asian | 7 | 2.94\% | 7 | 2.79\% | 8 | 3.43\% | 10 | 4.15\% | 10 | 3.98\% |
|  | Black | 1 | 0.42\% | 1 | 0.40\% | 1 | 0.43\% | 1 | 0.41\% | 1 | 0.40\% |
|  | Mixed | 5 | 2.10\% | 5 | 1.99\% | 5 | 2.15\% | 5 | 2.07\% | 4 | 1.59\% |
|  | Other | 2 | 0.84\% | 2 | 0.80\% | 2 | 0.86\% | 2 | 0.83\% | 3 | 1.20\% |
|  | Total | 15 | 6.30\% | 15 | 5.98\% | 16 | 6.87\% | 18 | 7.47\% | 18 | 7.17\% |
| White |  | 213 | 89.50\% | 227 | 90.44\% | 209 | 89.70\% | 214 | 88.80\% | 222 | 88.45\% |
| Unknown |  | 10 | 4.20\% | 9 | 3.59\% | 8 | 3.43\% | 9 | 3.73\% | 11 | 4.38\% |
| Total |  | 238 | 100.00\% | 251 | 100.00\% | 233 | 100.00\% | 241 | 100.00\% | 251 | 100.00\% |

## Academic Staff Composition

Table 37 shows the number of academic staff by grade and ethnicity.
In 2016, $9.31 \%$ of academic staff were from an ethnic minority background.
Table 37: Academic staff composition, by grade and ethnicity, 2016

|  | AC1 |  | AC2 |  | AC3 |  | AC4 |  | PB1 |  | PB2 |  | PB3 |  | total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% |
| Asian | 1 | 1.69\% | 17 | 28.81\% | 20 | 33.90\% | 15 | 25.42\% | 3 | 5.08\% | 2 | 3.39\% | 1 | 1.69\% | 59 | 100.00\% |
| Black | 0 | 0.00\% | 4 | 28.57\% | 8 | 57.14\% | 2 | 14.29\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 14 | 100.00\% |
| Mixed | 0 | 0.00\% | 4 | 30.77\% | 2 | 15.38\% | 2 | 15.38\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 3 | 23.08\% | 2 | 15.38\% | 13 | 100.00\% |
| Other | 0 | 0.00\% | 6 | 28.57\% | 6 | 28.57\% | 8 | 38.10\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 4.76\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 21 | 100.00\% |
| White | 19 | 1.82\% | 123 | 11.80\% | 382 | 36.66\% | 390 | 37.43\% | 60 | 5.76\% | 53 | 5.09\% | 15 | 1.44\% | 1042 | 100.00\% |
| Unknown | 1 | 2.50\% | 9 | 22.50\% | 11 | 27.50\% | 12 | 30.00\% | 2 | 5.00\% | 5 | 12.50\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 40 | 100.00\% |
| Total | 20 | 1.74\% | 154 | 13.40\% | 418 | 36.38\% | 417 | 36.29\% | 63 | 5.48\% | 59 | 5.13\% | 18 | 1.57\% | 1149 | 100.00\% |

## Internal Staff

## Ethnicity

## Recruitment

Table 38 shows the number and percentage of applicants shortlisted and appointed by ethnicity.
Ethnic minority applicants continue to be less likely to be shortlisted (23.41\%) in comparison to staff from a white ethnicity ( $33.57 \%$ ). A similar pattern can be seen in relation to the percentage of shortlisted applicants being appointed, where shortlisted applicants from an ethnic minority background are less likely to be appointed (35.188\%) compared to applicants from a white ethnic background (44.77\%).

Table 38: Applications and appointments, by ethnicity, 2016

|  |  | applicants | shortlisted | \% applicants shortlisted | appointed | \% shortlisted appointed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnic Minorities | Asian | 889 | 208 | 23.40\% | 73 | 35.10\% |
|  | Black | 493 | 109 | 22.11\% | 40 | 36.70\% |
|  | Mixed | 265 | 78 | 29.43\% | 27 | 34.62\% |
|  | Other | 126 | 20 | 15.87\% | 6 | 30.00\% |
|  | Total | 1773 | 415 | 23.41\% | 146 | 35.18\% |
| White |  | 6036 | 2026 | 33.57\% | 907 | 44.77\% |
| Unknown |  | 557 | 127 | 22.80\% | 51 | 40.16\% |
| Total |  | 8366 | 2568 | 30.70\% | 1104 | 42.99\% |

## Internal Staff

## Ethnicity

## Promotions

Table 39 shows the number and percentage of promotions by ethnicity, whilst table 40 shows aggregated data for five years.

In 2016 staff from ethnic minority backgrounds were on average most likely to be promoted (11.4\%). Looking at the data for the past five years, all ethnic minority groups (except for 'Other') were more likely to be promoted when compared with staff from White ethnic background, with Mixed Race staff being most likely to be promoted (41.4\%).

Table 39: Promotions, by ethnicity, 2016

|  |  | promotions | headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnic <br> Minorities | Asian | 39 | 260 | $15 \%$ |
|  | Black | 7 | 123 | $5.70 \%$ |
|  | Mixed | 10 | 95 | $10.50 \%$ |
|  | Other | 3 | 40 | $7.50 \%$ |
|  | Total | 59 | 518 | $11.40 \%$ |
| White | 386 | 4420 | $8.70 \%$ |  |
| Unknown |  |  |  | 8 |
| Total |  |  | 453 | 5109 |

Table 40: Promotions, by ethnicity, 2012-2016

|  |  | promotions | avg. headcount | \% of avg. <br> headcount |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnic <br> Minorities | Asian | 92 | 230.6 | $39.90 \%$ |
|  | Black | 37 | 101.4 | $36.50 \%$ |
|  | Mixed | 38 | 91.8 | $41.40 \%$ |
|  | Other | 12 | 42.8 | $28 \%$ |
|  | Total | 179 | 466.6 | $38.40 \%$ |
| White | 1566 | 4577 | $34.20 \%$ |  |
| Unknown | 34 | 141.8 | $24 \%$ |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

## Internal Staff

## Ethnicity

## Training and Development

Table 41 shows the number of staff that attended training courses in 2016 by type of course and ethnicity, whilst table 42 shows aggregated data for five years.

The total number of courses taken by staff in 2016 was 1,784 , with 165 were taken by staff from ethnic minority backgrounds.

Over the past five years, staff from a Mixed Race ethnic background on average took the most courses, whilst staff from Asian ethnic backgrounds took the fewest.

Table 41: Training, by ethnicity and type of training, 2016

|  | Asian | Black | Mixed | Other | White | Unknown | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coaching \& Mentoring |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Equality \& Diversity | 4 | 2 | 2 |  | 80 |  | 88 |
| Health \& Safety | 5 | 4 | 2 |  | 87 | 2 | 100 |
| Leadership \& Management |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Other* | 70 | 32 | 27 | 10 | 1345 | 44 | 1528 |
| Skills Development | 4 | 1 | 2 |  | 52 | 1 | 60 |
| Total | 83 | 39 | 33 | 10 | 1571 | 48 | 1784 |

*Please note that the type of course is not consistently captured across all training and development initiatives within the OU and as such a large proportion of the courses fall under 'Other'.

Table 42: Training, by ethnicity, 2012-2016

|  | courses | avg headcount | avg per avg <br> headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian | 997 | 230.6 | 4.3 |
| Black | 491 | 101.4 | 4.8 |
| Mixed | 542 | 91.8 | 5.9 |
| Other | 221 | 42.8 | 5.2 |
| Unknown | 670 | 141.8 | 4.7 |
| White | 25019 | 4577 | 5.5 |


| Total | 27940 | 5185.4 | 5.4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Internal Staff

## Ethnicity

## Leavers

Table 43 shows the number and percentage of leavers by ethnicity, whilst table 44 shows aggregated data for five years. Table 45 shows reasons for staff leaving the university.

Overall, voluntary turnover was higher for ethnic minority staff (7.5\%) than it was for staff from a nonminority ethnic background (6.5\%).

Table 43: Leavers and turnover, by ethnicity, 2016

|  |  | Involuntary |  | Voluntary |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | leavers | turnover | leavers | turnover | leavers | turnover |
| Ethnic <br> Minorities | Asian | 5 | $1.90 \%$ | 23 | $8.80 \%$ | 28 | $10.80 \%$ |
|  | Black | 7 | $5.70 \%$ | 8 | $6.50 \%$ | 15 | $12.20 \%$ |
|  | Mixed | 3 | $3.20 \%$ | 7 | $7.40 \%$ | 10 | $10.50 \%$ |
|  | Other |  |  | 1 | $2.50 \%$ | 1 | $2.50 \%$ |
|  | Total | 15 | $2.90 \%$ | 39 | $7.50 \%$ | 54 | $10.40 \%$ |
| White | 118 | $2.70 \%$ | 286 | $6.50 \%$ | 404 | $9.10 \%$ |  |
| Unknown | 10 | $5.80 \%$ | 18 | $10.50 \%$ | 28 | $16.40 \%$ |  |
| Total | 143 | $2.80 \%$ | 343 | $6.70 \%$ | 486 | $9.50 \%$ |  |

Table 44: Leavers, by ethnicity, 2012-2016

|  |  | Involuntary |  | Voluntary |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | leavers | \% of total | leavers | \% of total | leavers | \% of total |
| Ethnic Minoriti es | Asian | 47 | 4.70\% | 80 | 4.30\% | 127 | 4.50\% |
|  | Black | 24 | 2.40\% | 35 | 1.90\% | 59 | 2.10\% |
|  | Mixed | 17 | 1.70\% | 37 | 2\% | 54 | 1.90\% |
|  | Other | 13 | 1.30\% | 12 | 0.60\% | 25 | 0.90\% |
|  | Total | 101 | 10.10\% | 164 | 8.80\% | 265 | 9.30\% |
| White |  | 857 | 86\% | 1636 | 88.10\% | 2493 | 87.40\% |
| Unknown |  | 38 | 3.80\% | 56 | 3\% | 94 | 3.30\% |
| Total |  | 996 | 100\% | 1856 | 100\% | 2852 | 100\% |

Table 45: Leavers, by ethnicity and reason for leaving, 2016

|  |  | Asian |  | Black |  | Mixed |  | Other |  | White <br> leavers | Unknown |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | leavers | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { total } \end{array}$ | leavers | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { of } \\ & \text { total } \end{aligned}$ | leavers | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { of } \\ & \text { total } \end{aligned}$ | leavers | \% of total |  | \% of total | leavers | \% of total | leavers | $\begin{array}{l}\text { \%of } \\ \text { total }\end{array}$ |
| Involuntary | Deceased |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 100\% |  |  | 3 | 100\% |
|  | Dismissal |  |  | 2 | 28.6\% |  |  |  |  | 5 | 71.4\% |  |  | 7 | 100\% |
|  | End of Temporary Contract | 3 | 4.2\% | 3 | 4.2\% | 1 | 1.4\% |  |  | 56 | 77.8\% | 9 | $\left.\begin{gathered} 12.5 \\ \% \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | 72 | 100\% |
|  | III Health Retirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 100\% |  |  | 5 | 100\% |
|  | Offer Withdrawn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 100\% |  |  | 1 | 100\% |
|  | Redundancy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 100\% |  |  | 1 | 100\% |
|  | Severance | 2 | 3.9\% | 1 | 2\% | 2 | 3.9\% |  |  | 46 | 90.2\% |  |  | 51 | 100\% |
|  | Unconfirmed Probation |  |  | 1 | 33.3\% |  |  |  |  | 1 | 33.3\% | 1 | $\begin{gathered} 33.3 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 3 | 100\% |
|  | Total | 5 | 3.5\% | 7 | 4.9\% | 3 | 2.1\% |  |  | 118 | 82.5\% | 10 | 7\% | 143 | 100\% |
| Voluntary | Enhanced early retirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 100\% |  |  | 4 | 100\% |
|  | Normal Retirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47 | 97.9\% | 1 | 2.1\% | 48 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation Other | 10 | 9.6\% | 2 | 1.9\% | 5 | 4.8\% | 1 | 1\% | 80 | 76.9\% | 6 | 5.8\% | 104 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation Personal Reasons | 8 | 10.8\% | 6 | 8.1\% |  |  |  |  | 58 | 78.4\% | 2 | 2.7\% | 74 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation Work-related | 5 | 5.3\% |  |  | 2 | 2.1\% |  |  | 79 | 84\% | 8 | 8.5\% | 94 | 100\% |
|  | Settlement Agreement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 | 94.7\% | 1 | 5.3\% | 19 | 100\% |
|  | Total | 23 | 6.7\% | 8 | 2.3\% | 7 | 2\% | 1 | 0.3\% | 286 | 83.4\% | 18 | 5.2\% | 343 | 100\% |
| Total |  | 28 | 5.8\% | 15 | 3.1\% | 10 | 2.1\% | 1 | 0.2\% | 404 | 83.1\% | 28 | 5.8\% | 486 | 100\% |

## Internal Staff

## Ethnicity

## Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment

Table 46 shows the number of Grievances, Bullying and Harassment cases by ethnicity in 2016, whilst table 47 shows aggregated data for five years.

The number of staff filing a Grievance or Bullying and Harassment case is too low to allow for any meaningful comparison for 2016.

The historical data over the past five years indicates that on average, staff from ethnic minority backgrounds are more likely to file a Grievance or Bullying and Harassment case when compared to staff from a White ethnic background. Staff from a Mixed Race ethnic background were most likely to file a Grievance or Bullying and Harassment case (6.5\%).

There were no ethnicity-related tribunal cases in 2016.
Table 46: Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment, by ethnicity, 2016

|  | cases | headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian | 1 | 260 | $0.4 \%$ |
| White | 3 | 4420 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Total | 4 | 5109 | $0.1 \%$ |

Table 47: Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment, by ethnicity, 2012-2016

|  | cases | avg headcount | \% of avg headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian | 4 | 230.6 | $1.7 \%$ |
| Mixed | 6 | 91.8 | $6.5 \%$ |
| White | 23 | 4577 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Total | 33 | 5185.4 | $0.6 \%$ |

## Reasonable Adjustments

Table 48 shows the number and percentage of reasonable adjustments by ethnicity.
The number of reasonable adjustment cases during 2016 was too small to allow for any meaningful comparison and no requests were made by staff from ethnic minority backgrounds.

Table 48: Reasonable Adjustment cases, by ethnicity, 2016

|  | cases | average headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 8 | 4577 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Total | 8 | 5109 | $0.2 \%$ |

## Internal Staff

## Ethnicity

## Disciplinary cases

Table 49 shows the number of Disciplinary cases by ethnicity in 2016, whilst table 50 shows aggregated data for five years.

There were 6 disciplinary cases involving staff from an ethnic minority background in 2016, although this number is too low to make a meaningful comparison. The historical data over the past five years does indicate that on average staff from ethnic minority backgrounds are more likely to be involved in a disciplinary case ( $30.1 \%$ ) when compared to staff of white ethnic background ( $3.6 \%$ ).

Table 49: Disciplinary cases, by ethnicity, 2016

|  | cases | headcount | $\%$ of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian | 4 | 260 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Black | 2 | 123 | $1.6 \%$ |
| White | 16 | 4420 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Total | 22 | 5109 | $0.4 \%$ |

Table 50: Disciplinary cases, by ethnicity, 2012-2016

|  | cases | avg headcount | \% of avg headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian | 16 | 230.6 | $6.9 \%$ |
| Black | 11 | 101.4 | $10.8 \%$ |
| Mixed | 5 | 91.8 | $5.4 \%$ |
| Other | 3 | 42.8 | $7 \%$ |
| Unknown | 8 | 141.8 | $5.6 \%$ |


| White | 163 | 4577 | $3.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 206 | 5185.4 | $4 \%$ |

## Agile Working

Table 51 shows the number of agile working requests made in 2016 by ethnicity.
The total number of agile working requests made in 2016 was 182. 13.2\% of agile working requests were made by staff from ethnic minority backgrounds. All the agile working requests made by these staff were approved.

Table 51: Agile working requests, by ethnicity, 2016

|  | agile working <br> requests | requests <br> granted | requests <br> refused | appeals for <br> denied requests | appeals <br> successful | appeals <br> unsuccessful |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Black | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mixed | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White | 157 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 182 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Internal Staff

## Gender

## Workforce Composition

Table 52 shows the number and percentage of overall internal staff by gender across five years.
The balance between male and female staff has remained relatively unchanged over the past five years, with 2016 showing a distribution of $65 \%$ female staff against $35 \%$ male staff.

Table 52: Overall workforce composition, by gender, 2012-2016

|  | 2012 |  | 2013 |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total |
| Female | 3341 | $64.6 \%$ | 3377 | $64.4 \%$ | 3402 | $64.5 \%$ | 3308 | $64.5 \%$ | 3322 | $65 \%$ |
| Male | 1834 | $35.4 \%$ | 1868 | $35.6 \%$ | 1870 | $35.5 \%$ | 1818 | $35.5 \%$ | 1787 | $35 \%$ |
| Total | 5175 | $100 \%$ | 5245 | $100 \%$ | 5272 | $100 \%$ | 5126 | $100 \%$ | 5109 | $100 \%$ |

Chart 5: Workforce composition, by gender, 2012-2016


## Internal Staff

## Gender

## Senior Staff Composition

Senior Staff include Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Executive Deans, Head of Units and Staff on Grade 10 below Head of Units.

The gender distribution of senior staff shows the opposite pattern of the overall gender distribution, with $41 \%$ of senior staff being female and $59 \%$ being male. The percentage of female senior staff increased from $36.1 \%$ in 2015 to $41 \%$ in 2016.

Table 53: Senior staff composition, by gender, 2012-2016

|  | 2012 |  | 2013 |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% of total | total | $\%$ of total | total | $\%$ of total | total | $\%$ of total | total | $\%$ of total |
| Female | 80 | $33.6 \%$ | 89 | $35.5 \%$ | 84 | $36.1 \%$ | 87 | $36.1 \%$ | 103 | $41 \%$ |
| Male | 158 | $66.4 \%$ | 162 | $64.5 \%$ | 149 | $63.9 \%$ | 154 | $63.9 \%$ | 148 | $59 \%$ |
| Total | 238 | $100 \%$ | 251 | $100 \%$ | 233 | $100 \%$ | 241 | $100 \%$ | 251 | $100 \%$ |

## Academic Staff Composition

Table 54 shows the number of academic staff by grade and gender.
The gender distribution of academic staff shows the opposite pattern of the senior staff distribution, with $53.9 \%$ of academic staff being female and $46.1 \%$ being male.

The data suggests that male academic staff are nearly twice as likely to work in a professorial role than female equivalents.

Table 54: Academic staff composition, by grade and gender, 2016

|  | AC1 |  | AC2 |  | AC3 |  | AC4 |  | PB1 |  | PB2 |  | PB3 |  | total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% | total | \% |
| Female | 8 | 1.25\% | 83 | 12.95\% | 260 | 40.56\% | 236 | 36.82\% | 29 | 4.52\% | 21 | 3.28\% | 4 | 0.62\% | 641 | 100.00\% |
| Male | 13 | 2.03\% | 80 | 14.60\% | 169 | 30.84\% | 193 | 35.22\% | 36 | 6.57\% | 43 | 7.85\% | 14 | 2.55\% | 548 | 100.00\% |
| Total | 21 | 3.28\% | 163 | 13.71\% | 429 | 36.08\% | 429 | 36.08\% | 65 | 5.47\% | 64 | 5.38\% | 18 | 1.51\% | 1189 | 100.00\% |

## Internal Staff

## Gender

## Recruitment

Table 55 shows the number and percentage of applicants shortlisted and appointed by gender.
In 2016, female staff were more likely to be shortlisted (33\%) than male staff (27.3\%) and of all shortlisted staff, females were more likely to be appointed (45.2\%) in comparison to male staff (39.1\%).

Table 55: Applications and appointments, by gender, 2016

|  | applicants | shortlisted | \% applicants <br> shortlisted | appointed | \% shortlisted <br> appointed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 5002 | 1649 | $33 \%$ | 745 | $45.2 \%$ |
| Male | 3364 | 919 | $27.3 \%$ | 359 | $39.1 \%$ |


| Total | 8366 | 2568 | $30.7 \%$ | 1104 | $43 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Promotions

Table 56 shows the number and percentage of promotions by gender, whilst table 57 shows aggregated data for five years.

In 2016, male staff were more likely on average to be promoted than female staff. However, looking at the last five years, men and women were equally as likely to be promoted.

Table 56: Promotions, by gender, 2016

|  | promotions | headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 291 | 3322 | $8.8 \%$ |
| Male | 162 | 1787 | $9.1 \%$ |
| Total | 453 | 5109 | $8.9 \%$ |

Table 57: Promotions, by gender, 2012-2016

|  | promotions | avg. headcount | \% of avg. headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 1143 | 3350 | $34.1 \%$ |
| Male | 636 | 1835.4 | $34.7 \%$ |
| Total | 1779 | 5185.4 | $34.3 \%$ |

## Internal Staff

## Gender

## Training and Development

Table 58 shows the number of staff that attended training courses in 2016 by age, whilst table 59 shows aggregated data for five years.

The total number of courses taken by staff in 2016 was 1,784 , of which 1,117 were taken by female staff and 667 by male staff.

The average number of courses taken by staff in the most recent year was 0.3 , with female staff on average taking less courses ( 0.3 ) than male staff ( 0.4 ). This pattern is apparent in the 5 -year historical data where female staff on average took 5.8 courses against 4.6 courses for males.

There were 12 applicants for the Aspire programme, which began in February 2016. All applicants were accepted on to the programme but 3 have since dropped out. The remaining 9 are due to complete the programme at the end of March 2017.

There were 86 applicants in summer 2016 for the Aurora, the LFHE's women's leadership programme, of which 15 ( $17.44 \%$ ) were accepted onto the programme. As the programme runs from Oct 2016 to June 2017 it is difficult to provide with any meaningful analysis.

Table 58: Training, by gender and type of training, 2016

|  | Female | Male | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coaching \& Mentoring | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Equality \& Diversity | 72 | 16 | 88 |
| Health \& Safety | 66 | 34 | 100 |
| Leadership \& Management | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Other | 921 | 607 | 1528 |
| Skills Development | 50 | 10 | 60 |
| Total | 1117 | 667 | 1784 |

Table 59: Training, by gender, 2012-2016

|  | courses | avg headcount | avg per avg <br> headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 19502 | 3350 | 5.8 |
| Male | 8438 | 1835.4 | 4.6 |
| Total | 27940 | 5185.4 | 5.4 |

## Internal Staff

## Gender

## Leavers

Table 60 shows the number and percentage of leavers by gender, whilst table 61 shows aggregated data for five years. Table 62 shows reasons for staff leaving the university.

In 2016, voluntary turnover was slightly higher for female staff (6.9\%) in comparison to male staff ( $6.3 \%$ ). The opposite pattern can be seen for involuntary turnover where turnover for male staff was higher ( $3.1 \%$ ) than turnover for female staff ( $2.6 \%$ ).

Over the last five years voluntary turnover was higher for female staff (63.7\%) in comparison to male staff (36.3\%).

The main reasons for female staff leaving the university voluntarily in 2016 were Enhanced Early Retirement and Resignation due to personal reasons, whereas for male staff it was Settlement Agreement.
80.4\% of female staff left the university involuntarily due to severance, whereas $42.13 \%$ of male members of staff left due to Redundancy and Unconfirmed probation.

Table 60: Leavers and turnover, by gender, 2016

|  | Involuntary |  | Voluntary |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | leavers | turnover | leavers | turnover | leavers | turnover |
| Female | 87 | $2.6 \%$ | 230 | $6.9 \%$ | 317 | $9.5 \%$ |
| Male | 56 | $3.1 \%$ | 113 | $6.3 \%$ | 169 | $9.5 \%$ |
| Total | 143 | $2.8 \%$ | 343 | $6.7 \%$ | 486 | $9.5 \%$ |

Table 61: Leavers, by gender, 2012-2016

|  | Involuntary |  | Voluntary |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | leavers | $\%$ of total | leavers | $\%$ of total | leavers | $\%$ of total |
| Female | 616 | $61.8 \%$ | 1182 | $63.7 \%$ | 1798 | $63 \%$ |
| Male | 380 | $38.2 \%$ | 674 | $36.3 \%$ | 1054 | $37 \%$ |
| Total | 996 | $100 \%$ | 1856 | $100 \%$ | 2852 | $100 \%$ |

Table 62: Leavers, by gender and reason for leaving, 2016

|  |  | Female |  | Male |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | leavers | \% of total | leavers | \% of total | leavers | \% of total |
| Involuntary | Deceased | 1 | 33.3\% | 2 | 66.7\% | 3 | 100\% |
|  | Dismissal | 5 | 71.4\% | 2 | 28.6\% | 7 | 100\% |
|  | End of Temporary Contract | 38 | 52.8\% | 34 | 47.2\% | 72 | 100\% |
|  | III Health Retirement | 2 | 40\% | 3 | 60\% | 5 | 100\% |
|  | Offer Withdrawn |  |  | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% |
|  | Redundancy |  |  | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% |
|  | Severance | 41 | 80.4\% | 10 | 19.6\% | 51 | 100\% |
|  | Unconfirmed Probation |  |  | 3 | 100\% | 3 | 100\% |
|  | Total | 87 | 60.8\% | 56 | 39.2\% | 143 | 100\% |
| Voluntary | Enhanced early retirement | 4 | 100\% |  |  | 4 | 100\% |
|  | Normal Retirement | 32 | 66.7\% | 16 | 33.3\% | 48 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation - Other | 67 | 64.4\% | 37 | 35.6\% | 104 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation - Personal Reasons | 55 | 74.3\% | 19 | 25.7\% | 74 | 100\% |
|  | Resignation Work-related | 61 | 64.9\% | 33 | 35.1\% | 94 | 100\% |
|  | Settlement Agreement | 11 | 57.9\% | 8 | 42.1\% | 19 | 100\% |
|  | Total | 230 | 67.1\% | 113 | 32.9\% | 343 | 100\% |
| Total |  | 317 | 65.2\% | 169 | 34.8\% | 486 | 100\% |

## Internal Staff

## Gender

## Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment

Table 63 shows the number of Grievances, Bullying and Harassment cases by gender in 2016, whilst table 64 shows aggregated data for five years.

The number of staff filing a Grievance or Bullying and Harassment case is too low to make a meaningful comparison for 2016.

The historical data over the past five years shows female staff ( $0.7 \%$ ) on average being more likely to file a Grievance or Bullying and Harassment case when compared to male staff ( $0.5 \%$ ), however the difference is marginal.

Table 63: Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment, by gender, 2016

|  | cases | headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 2 | 3322 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Male | 2 | 1787 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Total | 4 | 5109 | $0.1 \%$ |

Table 64: Grievances, Bullying \& Harassment, by gender, 2012-2016

|  | cases | avg headcount | \% of avg headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 23 | 3350 | $0.7 \%$ |
| Male | 10 | 1835.4 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Total | 33 | 5185.4 | $0.6 \%$ |

## Reasonable Adjustments

Table 65 shows the number and percentage of reasonable adjustments by gender.
There were 8 reasonable adjustments cases in 2016, which is one more when compared to 2015 data. Of the 8 reasonable adjustments cases in 2016, 7 were made by female staff. However the low number of reasonable adjustment cases in 2016 makes it difficult to make a meaningful comparison between genders.

Table 66: Reasonable Adjustment cases, by gender, 2016

|  | cases | average headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 7 | 3350 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Male | 1 | 1835.4 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Total | 8 | 5185.4 | $0.1 \%$ |

## Internal Staff

## Gender

## Disciplinary cases

Table 67 shows the number of Disciplinary cases by gender in 2016, whilst table 68 shows aggregated data for five years.

Male staff were more likely ( $0.7 \%$ ) to be involved in a disciplinary case during 2016 when compared to female staff ( $0.3 \%$ ). The historical data over the past five years shows a similar pattern, with $5.2 \%$ of male staff having been involved in a disciplinary case against $3.3 \%$ of female staff.

Table 67: Disciplinary cases, by gender, 2016

|  | cases | headcount | \% of headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 9 | 3322 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Male | 13 | 1787 | $0.7 \%$ |
| Total | 22 | 5109 | $0.4 \%$ |

Table 68: Disciplinary cases, by gender, 2012-2016

|  | cases | avg. headcount | \% of avg. headcount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 110 | 3350 | $3.3 \%$ |
| Male | 96 | 1835.4 | $5.2 \%$ |
| Total | 206 | 5185.4 | $4 \%$ |

## Agile Working

Table 69 shows the number of agile working requests made in 2016 by gender.
The majority $79.1 \%$ of agile working requests in 2016 were made by female staff members with $20.9 \%$ made by male staff. All the agile working requests made by staff were approved.

Table 69: Agile working requests, by gender, 2016

|  | agile working <br> requests | requests <br> granted | requests <br> refused | appeals for <br> denied requests | appeals <br> successful | appeals <br> unsuccessful |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 144 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Male | 38 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 182 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Internal Staff

## Gender

## Staff taking parental leave

The number of women taking maternity leave in 2016 was 85 , which is more than in 2015. Men taking paternity leave was considerably higher than it was observed in previous years.

The number of staff taking adoption leave was relatively low for both years, with two female and one male staff member taking adoption leave in 2016. Shared Parental Leave was also very low, with only three members of staff taking shared parental leave in 2016.

Table 70: Staff taking maternity leave, 2014-2016

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 2015 | 2016 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Maternity | Maternity | Maternity |
| Total | 89 | 73 | 85 |

Table 71: Staff taking paternity leave, 2014-2016

|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Paternity | Paternity | Paternity |
| Total | 34 | 39 | 51 |

Table 72: Staff taking adoption, by gender, 2014-2016

|  | 2014 | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Adoption | Adoption | Adoption |
| Female | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Male | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 5 | 1 | 3 |

Table 73: Staff taking shared parental leave, by gender, 2014-2016

|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Shared <br> Parental <br> Leave | Shared <br> Parental <br> Leave | Shared <br> Parental <br> Leave |
| Female | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Male | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Total | 1 | 3 | 3 |

## Internal Staff

## Gender

## Parental Leave returners

Of the women who returned from maternity leave, the majority ( $90.9 \%$ ) returned for more than three months. $4.7 \%$ of women returned for 3 months and $6.3 \%$ either returned for less than three months or did not return at all. The individuals who did not return or returned from maternity leave for less than three months within the period are required to pay back the difference between statutory maternity pay and the university scheme.
Overall there were less women returning from maternity leave when comparing 2016 to 2015 returners.
The number of staff taking Adoption and Shared Parental leave was too low to make meaningful comparisons for 2016.

Table 74: Women returning from maternity, 2014-2016

|  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total |
| Did not return from maternity | 5 | $4.8 \%$ | 5 | $6.5 \%$ | 1 | $1.6 \%$ |
| Returned for less than 3 months | 2 | $1.9 \%$ | 2 | $2.6 \%$ | 3 | $4.7 \%$ |
| Returned for 3 months | 2 | $1.9 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 3 | $4.7 \%$ |
| Returned for more than 3 <br> months | 96 | $91.4 \%$ | 70 | $90.9 \%$ | 57 | $89.1 \%$ |
| Total | 105 | $100 \%$ | 77 | $100 \%$ | 64 | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 75: Staff returning from adoption, 2014-2016

|  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total |
| Did not return from adoption | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 1 | $33.3 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Returned for more than 3 <br> months | 2 | $100 \%$ | 2 | $66.7 \%$ | 3 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total | 2 | $100 \%$ | 3 | $100.0 \%$ | 3 | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 76: Staff returning from shared parental leave, 2014-2016

|  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | \% of total | total | \% of total | total | \% of total |
| Returned for more than 3 <br> months | 2 | $100.0 \%$ | 2 | $100.0 \%$ | 3 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total | 2 | $100.0 \%$ | 2 | $100.0 \%$ | 3 | $100.0 \%$ |

