

## EMPLOYEE EQUALITY MONITORING DATA 01/04/23 – 31/03/24

The tables below illustrate equalities profiling (gender, nationality and disability) in respect of:

1. Recruitment – Page 1 - 4
2. [Disciplinarys](#) – Pages 5-7
3. [Leavers](#) - Pages 8-10

Where concerns are identified they will be investigated further and addressed where appropriate.

*NB: Only double-digit sample sizes are considered sufficient to draw any reliable conclusions.*

### 1.1 Recruitment by Gender

Unit/Division	No of Applicants	No of Applicants Interviewed	% of Applicants Interviewed	No of Successful Applicants	% of Total Applicants Employed
<b>CATERING</b>					
M	335	68	20.30%	9	2.69%
F	2213	436	19.70%	63	2.85%
U	19	6	31.58%	1	5.26%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2567</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>19.87%</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>2.84%</b>
<b>CLEANING</b>					
M	840	152	18.10%	27	3.21%
F	2101	426	20.28%	74	3.52%
U	32	16	50.00%	2	6.25%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2973</b>	<b>594</b>	<b>19.98%</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>3.46%</b>
<b>FMS</b>					
M	235	20	8.51%	14	5.96%
F	91	45	49.45%	2	2.20%
U	1	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>20.18%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4.89%</b>
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>					
M	567	64	11.29%	14	2.47%
F	22	5	22.73%	1	4.55%
U	11	1	9.09%	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>11.67%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0.025</b>
<b>SUPPORT</b>					
M	48	12	25.00%	2	4.17%
F	48	23	47.92%	8	16.67%
U	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>36.46%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10.42%</b>
<b>TRANSPORT</b>					
M	102	21	20.59%	4	3.92%
F	5	2	40.00%	0	0.00%
U	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>21.30%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.70%</b>
<b>FACILITIES MANAGEMENT</b>					
M	2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
F	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
U	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

#### Observations:

Very encouraging to see that in almost all areas, applicants were equally likely to be appointed if they were male or female, particularly in Catering and Cleaning jobs which historically have been the preserve of females.

In FMS (janitorial, etc.) whilst encouraging that almost 50% of female applicants were interviewed, it is disappointing that a male was still twice as likely to be appointed.

In Construction, no bias against females who apply. However, the traditional perception of construction work being for males only persists, e.g. 26 times as many males as females applied for jobs in this sector.

In Support Services, the data suggests, on the face of it, that there is a bias towards female candidates who are four times more likely to be appointed than males.

## 1.2 Recruitment by Nationality

Unit/Division	No of Applicants	No of Applicants Interviewed	% of Applicants Interviewed	No of Successful Applicants	% of Total Applicants Employed
<b>CATERING</b>					
PREFERNOT	16	1	6.25%	1	6.25%
LITHUANIAN	7	1	14.29%	1	14.29%
ASIAN	32	2	6.25%	1	3.13%
AFRICAN	32	3	9.38%	1	3.13%
OTHER	90	13	14.44%	3	3.33%
HUNGARIAN	10	5	50.00%	1	10.00%
BRITISH	246	61	24.80%	12	4.88%
POLISH	135	21	15.56%	4	2.96%
SCOTTISH	1714	353	20.60%	51	2.98%
ENGLISH	100	21	21.00%	2	2.00%
BULGARIAN	31	4	12.90%	0	0.00%
BANGLADESH	29	6	20.69%	0	0.00%
INDIAN	23	4	17.39%	0	0.00%
PAKISTANI	23	3	13.04%	0	0.00%
LATVIAN	18	2	11.11%	0	0.00%
SPANISH	10	4	40.00%	0	0.00%
IRISH	7	1	14.29%	0	0.00%
NOTSTATED	7	2	28.57%	0	0.00%
GREEK	5	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
NIRISH	4	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
THAI	4	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
CZECH	3	1	33.33%	0	0.00%
SLOVAKIAN	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
SOUTHAFRIC	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
WELSH	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
AMERICAN	2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
CHINESE	2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
ESTONIAN	2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FRENCH	2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
CARIBBEAN	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
PORTUGUESE	1	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
TURKISH	1	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FOR CATERING</b>	<b>2567</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>19.87%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>3.00%</b>
<b>CLEANING</b>					
PREFERNOT	39	3	7.69%	2	5.13%
NOTSTATED	7	2	28.57%	1	14.29%
LATVIAN	25	5	20.00%	2	8.00%
BRITISH	240	51	21.25%	20	8.33%
AFRICAN	271	18	6.64%	6	2.21%
WELSH	6	3	50.00%	1	16.67%
ENGLISH	66	17	25.76%	4	6.06%
INDIAN	57	5	8.77%	1	1.75%
SCOTTISH	1845	406	22.01%	75	4.07%
POLISH	136	27	19.85%	4	2.94%
OTHER	118	27	22.88%	3	2.54%
ASIAN	38	2	5.26%	0	0.00%
BULGARIAN	33	2	6.06%	0	0.00%
PAKISTANI	27	4	14.81%	0	0.00%
BANGLADESH	13	2	15.38%	0	0.00%
SPANISH	7	1	14.29%	0	0.00%
CZECH	5	2	40.00%	0	0.00%
LITHUANIAN	5	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
SOUTHAFRIC	5	1	20.00%	0	0.00%
THAI	5	2	40.00%	0	0.00%
GREEK	4	1	25.00%	0	0.00%
HUNGARIAN	4	1	25.00%	0	0.00%
CHINESE	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
NIRISH	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
PORTUGUESE	2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
SLOVAKIAN	2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
AMERICAN	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
BRAZILIAN	1	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
ESTONIAN	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FRENCH	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
IRISH	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TURKISH	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FOR CLEANING</b>	<b>2973</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>19.61%</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>4.00%</b>

### Observations:

For the organisation as a whole, it appears concerning, on the face of it, that of 320 African applicants, only 24 were interviewed and only 8 were employed. However, that equates to 2.5% of African applicants being appointed compared to 3.6% of total applicants being appointed. Therefore, a 1.1% difference is not as concerning as the figures may appear at first sight.

However, it is a significant concern that of 274 Asian applicants, only 3 were appointed which means an Asian applicant is almost four times less likely to be appointed compared to applicants in general.

It is also concerning that of 67 Bulgarian applicants, none were appointed.

Unit/Division	No of Applicants	No of Applicants Interviewed	% of Applicants Interviewed	No of Successful Applicants	% of Total Applicants Employed
<b>FMS</b>					
AFRICAN	8	2	25.00%	1	12.50%
POLISH	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%
PREFERNOT	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%
BRITISH	36	3	8.33%	1	2.78%
OTHER	11	3	27.27%	1	9.09%
SCOTTISH	233	48	20.60%	12	5.15%
ENGLISH	11	4	36.36%	1	9.09%
INDIAN	6	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
ASIAN	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
PAKISTANI	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
BRAZILIAN	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
BULGARIAN	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
CANADIAN	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
GREEK	1	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
LATVIAN	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
SOUTHAFRICAN	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
SPANISH	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
WELSH	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FOR FMS</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>19.88%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5.50%</b>
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>					
ENGLISH	17	1	5.88%	1	5.88%
WELSH	4	1	25.00%	1	25.00%
LATVIAN	1	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
NOTSTATED	1	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
BRITISH	57	3	5.26%	2	3.51%
SCOTTISH	479	63	13.15%	11	2.30%
POLISH	11	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
OTHER	6	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
AFRICAN	5	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
ASIAN	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HUNGARIAN	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
IRISH	3	1	33.33%	0	0.00%
SLOVAKIAN	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
PAKISTANI	2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
LITHUANIAN	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
PREFERNOTOSAY	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
SPANISH	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
THAI	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FOR CONSTRUCTION</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>11.83%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2.83%</b>
<b>SUPPORT</b>					
SCOTTISH	64	26	40.63%	9	14.06%
BRITISH	11	5	45.45%	1	9.09%
OTHER	4	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
AFRICAN	3	1	33.33%	0	0.00%
POLISH	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
ASIAN	2	1	50.00%	0	0.00%
BANGLANDESH	2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
BULGARIAN	2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
INDIAN	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
PAKISTANI	1	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
SPANISH	1	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
WELSH	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FOR SUPPORT</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>36.84%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10.53%</b>
<b>TRANSPORT</b>					
SCOTTISH	89	20	22.47%	4	4.49%
BRITISH	10	2	20.00%	0	0.00%
PAKISTANI	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
POLISH	2	1	50.00%	0	0.00%
AFRICAN	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
ENGLISH	1	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
IRISH	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
OTHER	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FOR TRANSPORT</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>22.22%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.70%</b>
<b>FACILITIES MANAGEMENT</b>					
SCOTTISH	3	1	33.33%	1	33.33%
BRITISH	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
PORTUGUESE	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FOR FM</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20.00%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20.00%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>6670</b>	<b>1288</b>	<b>19.31%</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>3.67%</b>

### 1.3 Recruitment by Disability

Unit/Division	No of Applicants	No of Applicants Interviewed	% of Applicants Interviewed	No of Successful Applicants	% of Total Applicants Employed
SUPPORT SERVICES	15	13	87%	3	20.00%
CONSTRUCTION	18	4	22%	1	5.56%
FMS	44	10	23%	2	4.55%
CLEANING	324	72	22%	11	3.40%
CATERING	212	51	24%	6	2.83%
TRANSPORT	6	1	17%	0	0.00%
<b>GRAND TOTAL (APPLICANTS WITH DISABILITIES)</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>3.72%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL (ALL APPLICANTS)</b>	<b>6670</b>	<b>1288</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>3.67%</b>

---

#### *Observations:*

*This shows that people with a disability are just as likely to be appointed as those without a disability. This is hugely encouraging.*

*However, it is a concern that only 12% of applicants were interviewed, as Tayside Contracts Guaranteed Job Interview Scheme commits to interviewing all employees with a disability if they meet essential criteria for a job.*

---

## 2.1 Disciplinary by Gender

Division/Unit/Gender	Total No. of Employees	No of Employees Disciplined	% of Employees Disciplined
<b>CATERING</b>			
F	737	17	2%
M	41	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>778</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>CLEANING</b>			
F	826	10	1%
M	166	5	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>992</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>			
F	15	0	0%
M	322	32	10%
<b>Total</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>FM</b>			
F	97	1	1%
M	206	9	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>ORGANISATION TOTAL</b>	<b>2410</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>3%</b>

---

### Observations:

*There is no cause for concern regarding any bias being shown by managers when applying disciplinary procedures.*

---

## 2.2 Disciplinary by Nationality

Division/Unit Nationality	Total No. of Employees by Unit and Nationality	No of Employees Disciplined	% of Employees Disciplined
<b>CATERING</b>	<b>778</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2%</b>
OTHER	76	6	7.9%
ENGLISH	42	2	4.8%
SCOTTISH	609	9	1.5%
BRITISH	43	0	0.0%
IRISH	5	0	0.0%
WELSH	3	0	0.0%
<b>CLEANING</b>	<b>992</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2%</b>
OTHER	146	4	2.7%
SCOTTISH	768	11	1.4%
BRITISH	43	0	0.0%
ENGLISH	30	0	0.0%
IRISH	2	0	0.0%
WELSH	3	0	0.0%
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>9%</b>
BRITISH	18	2	11.1%
SCOTTISH	269	27	10.0%
ENGLISH	13	0	0.0%
IRISH	1	0	0.0%
WELSH	0	0	0.0%
OTHER	37	0	0.0%
<b>FM</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3%</b>
OTHER	48	3	6.3%
SCOTTISH	225	7	3.1%
BRITISH	15	0	0.0%
ENGLISH	12	0	0.0%
IRISH	1	0	0.0%
WELSH	2	0	0.0%
<b>ORGANISATION TOTAL</b>	<b>2411</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>3%</b>

### Observations:

Although we are working with very small sample sizes, it is notable that non-UK nationals appear more likely to be disciplined than UK nationals. Although in Construction, it is worth noting that of 37 non-UK nationals, none were disciplined.

### 2.3 Disciplinary by Disability

<b>Division/Unit</b>	<b>Total No. of Disabled Within Each Unit</b>	<b>No of Disabled Employees Disciplined</b>	<b>% of Disabled Employees Disciplined</b>	<b>% of Employees who were Disciplined</b>
<b>CATERING</b>	14	0	0%	0.00%
<b>CLEANING</b>	43	0	0%	0.00%
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>	15	1	7%	100.00%
<b>ORGANISATION TOTAL</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	

### 3.1 Leaver by Gender

	Total Number of Employees	No Of Leavers	% of Leavers
<b>Catering</b>			
M	52	10	19.23%
F	906	133	14.68%
U	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>958</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>33.91%</b>
<b>In Catering, males were more likely to leave than females.</b>			
<b>Cleaning</b>			
M	205	33	16.10%
F	1059	199	18.79%
U	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1264</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>34.89%</b>
<b>In Cleaning, females were slightly more likely to leave than males.</b>			
<b>FMS</b>			
M	234	33	14.10%
F	95	11	11.58%
U	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>25.68%</b>
<b>In FMS, males were slightly more likely to leave than females.</b>			
<b>Facilities Management</b>			
M	11	0	0.00%
F	18	1	5.56%
U	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5.56%</b>
<b>In Facilities Management, females were more likely to leave than males.</b>			
<b>Support</b>			
M	24	5	20.83%
F	65	11	16.92%
U	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>37.76%</b>
<b>In Support Services, males were more likely to leave than females.</b>			
<b>Construction</b>			
M	323	36	11.15%
F	9	2	22.22%
U	1	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33.37%</b>
<b>It's disappointing to see 2 female leavers in the already small number of females in Construction.</b>			
<b>Transport</b>			
M	59	8	13.56%
F	8	0	0.00%
U	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13.56%</b>
<b>In Transport, it was encouraging to see no female leavers.</b>			
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3069</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>15.71%</b>
M	908	125	13.77%
F	2160	357	16.53%
<b>Proportionally, females are 1.2 times more likely to leave than males.</b>			



### 3.2 Leavers by Nationality

	Total Number of		
	Employees	No Of Leavers	% of Leavers
<b>CATERING</b>			
OTHER MIXED	1	1	100.00%
PAKISTANI	3	3	100.00%
ASIAN	2	1	50.00%
HUNGARIAN	4	2	50.00%
LITHUANIAN	2	1	50.00%
WELSH	5	2	40.00%
POLISH	19	4	21.05%
BULGARIAN	5	1	20.00%
NOTSTATED	20	4	20.00%
BRITISH	58	11	18.97%
OTHERWHITE	12	2	16.67%
ENGLISH	56	8	14.29%
SCOTTISH	737	103	13.98%
	<b>883</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>16.19%</b>
<b>CLEANING</b>			
ASIAN	2	2	100.00%
FILIPINO	1	1	100.00%
OTHER BLACK	1	1	100.00%
PORTUGUESE	1	1	100.00%
SOUTHAFRICAN	2	2	100.00%
IRISH	4	2	50.00%
AFRICAN	14	6	42.86%
BRITISH	60	14	23.33%
ENGLISH	43	10	23.26%
OTHERWHITE	31	6	19.35%
SCOTTISH	962	174	18.09%
OTHER	6	1	16.67%
NOTSTATED	45	7	15.56%
POLISH	57	5	8.77%
	<b>1,101</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>21.07%</b>
<b>SUPPORT</b>			
NOT STATED	3	3	100.00%
BRITISH	4	1	25.00%
ENGLISH	4	1	25.00%
SCOTTISH	44	11	25.00%
	<b>55</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>29.09%</b>
<b>FMS</b>			
OTHERWHITE	2	1	50.00%
PREFERNOT	5	1	20.00%
BRITISH	18	3	16.67%
ENGLISH	14	2	14.29%
SCOTTISH	267	33	12.36%
NOT STATED	41	5	12.20%
	<b>345</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>13.04%</b>
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>			
OTHERWHITE	4	1	25.00%
NOT STATED	9	2	22.22%
ENGLISH	15	2	13.33%
SCOTTISH	252	32	12.70%
BRITISH	19	1	5.26%
	<b>299</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>12.71%</b>
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
WELSH	1	1	100.00%
NOT STATED	3	1	33.33%
SCOTTISH	54	6	11.11%
	<b>58</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13.79%</b>

*Observations:  
Generally, where there is a large enough sample size to draw any conclusions there is no concern about the profile of leavers from an equalities perspective. However, although the sample size is small, there is a concern about the number of leavers defining themselves as 'African' in the Cleaning Unit, where the percentage number of African employees who left was double the Cleaning Unit average.*

### 3.3 Leavers by Disability

	<b>Total No. of Employees with disabilities</b>	<b>No. of Leavers with a disability</b>	<b>% of Leavers with disabilities</b>	<b>% of Leavers</b>
<b>Cleaning</b>	52	8	15.38%	18.35%
<b>FMS</b>	13	2	15.38%	13.37%
<b>Construction</b>	17	2	11.76%	11.41%
<b>Catering</b>	18	2	11.11%	14.93%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14.00%</b>	<b>15.85%</b>

---

*Observations:  
Encouragingly this data shows that employees in the four units where people with disabilities are employed, are slightly less likely to leave than those with no disabilities.*

---

\*\*\*\*\* END OF REPORT\*\*\*\*\*