

## Equalities impact assessment

Name of policies	Management of change; redeployment; flexible and phased retirement; voluntary severance (including enhanced voluntary severance); compulsory severance
Faculty / service	Human resources
Policy owners	Rachel Mylrea, Elaine Harris, Ian Apperley
EIA completed by	Ian Apperley, HR Director (contact: <a href="mailto:ian.apperley@uwe.ac.uk">ian.apperley@uwe.ac.uk</a> ).
Date of assessment	May 2008

### About this equality impact assessment

This equality impact assessment covers the following separate but related human resources policies:

- Management of change
- Redeployment
- Flexible and phased retirement
- Voluntary severance (including enhanced voluntary severance)
- Compulsory severance

A joint EIA was selected as the best method of assessing the impact on staff who might be facing or considering action under one or all of these policies at any one time.

This EIA covers the six main equality strands of gender, race, disability, age, sexual orientation and faith.

### Aims of policy, process or function

The aims of these five human resources policies are as follows:

- The purpose of the management of change policy is to provide a fair and transparent method for implementing change.
- The purpose of the redeployment policy is to support the retention of key skills where employees may find themselves at risk of redundancy.
- The purpose of the flexible and phased retirement policy is to provide opportunities for staff in membership of recognised pension schemes to take some or all of their pension entitlements whilst continuing to work for the University.
- The purpose of the voluntary severance policy is to set out the compensation payments and application criteria for staff who wish to volunteer for severance.
- The purpose of the compulsory severance policy is to set out the compensation payments which will be made to staff in those circumstances where compulsory severances are unavoidable.

## **Equality relevance**

Based on initial analysis, the proposed impact assessment level is “medium”.

In the UWE guide to conducting EIAs, policies designated as “medium relevance” are those covering the following circumstances:

- There is some potential for, or evidence of, adverse impact
- The policy is institution wide but not public facing
- The policy has consequences for, or affects, some people
- The policy has the potential to make a contribution to promoting equality

The policies for management of change, redeployment and compulsory severance are expected to apply equally to all staff irrespective of their equality strands.

The policy on flexible and phased retirement applies only to staff aged 50 or over and who are members of a recognised pension scheme.

The policy on voluntary severance applies equally to all staff but may be more attractive to those staff who can access their pensions, and/or staff who have longer service. Both these groups of staff will tend to be in older age categories.

## **Data, evidence and feedback used**

The data set out below was used in assessing the potential impact of these policies on equality groups:

- Staff in post by gender, ethnicity and disability (see appendix 1)
- Staff in post by job, gender, ethnicity and disability (see appendix 2)
- People applying for, being shortlisted, and being appointed to jobs by gender, ethnicity and disability (see appendix 3)

In addition to reviewing UWE employment data, research was also carried out in to EIAs carried out by the following institutions in to redeployment, redundancy and similar management of change policies:

- University of East London – early retirement and severance scheme
- London Borough of Lambeth – redeployment and redundancy
- Calderdale Council – redundancy and redeployment
- Kent County Council – redundancy and redeployment

## **Assessment of impact**

The data shows that women and black and minority ethnic (BME) staff are under represented in the senior pay bands. Staff from these groups would therefore be more likely to receive lower redundancy and pension payments in cash terms.

There is evidence to suggest that women do traditionally better than men in being appointed to UWE jobs. There is similar evidence to suggest that BME staff do traditionally worse than non BME staff in being appointed to UWE roles.

Data for disabled staff is poor, but what evidence there is shows even distribution in salary bands and comparable rates for appointments in relation to applications.

Evidence from the wider public sector shows that younger people are more likely to have higher turnover in employment than older workers. This may mean that in addition to the age factor, a shorter length of service could result in comparatively lower entitlements under severance schemes.

Research in to EIAs carried out by other institutions shows concerns from stakeholders that criteria for approving applications for voluntary severance, and selection criteria for compulsory severances need to be clear, transparent and consistently applied.

Other institutions have schemes related to age and length of service. As these schemes follow the government's statutory scheme, these institutions consider that the schemes can be justified objectively.

External evidence suggests that people in BME groups and disabled people suffer higher levels of unemployment than people in other equality groups.

Evidence suggests that application, selection and redeployment process can raise potential barriers to certain groups of disabled people. Where necessary, adjustments will need to be made to these processes to ensure that people within these groups are not disadvantaged.

### **Promotion of equality**

Where new structures are developed and new posts identified, consideration could be given to using positive action to support people from under represented groups in their applications for these posts.

### **Consideration of alternatives**

The following actions were taken in response to the data review and research exercises:

- A minimum redundancy payment was introduced to help those members of staff who because of their lower age or length of service would otherwise have only been eligible for a limited payment.
- A resettlement grant was introduced in order to help members of staff make the transition from working at UWE to obtaining future employment. This grant can be spent on training, job search skills or similar services. This grant will provide additional support to those people from equality groups where there are traditionally higher levels of unemployment.
- An application form was introduced to clarify the stages in the decision making process, and to provide transparency about which individuals are responsible for what decisions.
- The applications process for voluntary severance was reviewed to ensure that (a) each case was considered on its merits and (b) there was a consistency check at faculty/service level and at a cross University level in order to help achieve equality of consideration and treatment.
- Clear selection criteria were developed for assessing applications for voluntary severance, with these criteria being published openly to all staff.

Alternatives were also considered to having a redundancy payment based on age and length of service. In particular, a flat rate allowance was considered, as was having an allowance based only on length of service. Both of these alternatives were rejected, however, as it was considered that payments based on age and length of service provided the best means of providing appropriate levels of compensation to older workers who (as suggested by evidence) may find it comparatively more difficult to find alternative employment.

### **Formal consultation**

Formal consultation was carried out with UCU, UNISON and UNITE.

Consultation was carried out with human resources staff about the previous experiences of staff applying for redeployment, being dealt with under earlier management of change policies, and being dealt with under the previous scheme for voluntary severance.

Consultation was carried out with the UWE recruitment team on data relating to people from various equality groups applying for, and being appointed to, UWE posts.

### **Decisions and actions**

A number of changes were made as a result of the consultation process. These included:

- Removal on potential barriers to return to work at UWE thereby enhancing future employment opportunities for staff
- Encouragement to managers to respond positively (where possible) to requests for flexible and phased retirement to help older workers to continue in employment whilst accessing some or all of their pension entitlements

In addition to making changes to the scheme, additional measures will be taken at the implementation stage. These include:

- Taking action to ensure that staff groups without access to web based information are able to receive that same information in paper formats
- Ensuring that staff away from the office (for example due to maternity leave or long term sickness absence) or made aware of the options provided by the schemes

### **Monitoring arrangements**

Monitoring is a critical stage in completing the EIA process in to these schemes.

The EIA process to date has focussed on the policies and proposed procedures. Data will be collated for each change exercise to identify whether this particular exercise shows any evidence of adverse impact on particular equality groups.

The following areas will be monitored:

- Applications and approvals for voluntary severance
- Staff considered to be at risk of redundancy, and staff from that group subsequently assimilated, appointed or redeployed
- Staff subject to compulsory severance (if that were to take place)

This data will be collated at each appropriate stage in the use of each of these schemes.

This data will be reported to the trade unions and to the University's senior management team and Board of Governors Committees. The schemes will then be revised if necessary to respond to the findings.

### **Publishing**

This EIA report will be published on the UWE web site.

A copy will be forwarded to the Equality and Diversity Manager for retention.

A copy will be submitted to the Joint Equality Advisory group (or Equality and Diversity Forum) for information.

### **Review**

The policies covered by this EIA are unlikely to be revised significantly in the near future.

When the policies are revised, this EIA will be reviewed and updated.

Major changes to the policy might require a further impact assessment, and this should normally be scheduled to be carried out in no less than three years time.

**Staff in post by gender, disability and ethnicity**

	1993		1994		1995		1996		1997		1998		1999		2000	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
<b>TOTAL STAFF</b>	2051		2066		2125		2507		2395		2397		2441		2449	
<b>MALE</b>	980	47%	993	47%	1013	40%	1124	47%	1044	44%	1067	44%	1069	44%	1103	38%
<b>FEMALE</b>	1071	52%	1073	50%	1112	44%	1383	58%	1351	56%	1330	54%	1372	56%	1346	47%
<b>DISABLED</b>	14	0.68%	12	0.56%	12	0.48%	18	0.75%	15	0.63%	17	0.70%	83	3.39%	71	2.46%
<b>BLACK</b>	53	2.6%	58	2.7%	53	2.1%	57	2.4%	56	2.3%	65	2.7%	76	3.1%	76	2.63%
<b>ETHNIC ORIGIN NOT KNOWN</b>	286	13.8%	180	8.5%	249	9.9%	376	15.7%	334	13.9%	358	14.7%	133	5.4%	157	5.4%

	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005		2006		2007		2008	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
<b>TOTAL STAFF</b>	2467		2517		2545		2666		2692		2746		2825		2885	
<b>MALE</b>	1098	45%	1124	45%	1117	44%	1169	44%	1168	43%	1178	43%	1242	44%	1264	44%
<b>FEMALE</b>	1369	55%	1393	55%	1428	56%	1497	56%	1524	57%	1568	57%	1583	56%	1621	56%
<b>DISABLED</b>	60	2.43%	55	2.19%	49	1.93%	51	1.91%	50	1.86%	55	2.00%	54	1.91%	51	1.77%
<b>BLACK</b>	69	2.80%	75	2.98%	122	4.79%	134	5.03%	134	4.98%	152	5.54%	145	5.13%	162	5.62%
<b>ETHNIC ORIGIN NOT KNOWN</b>	187	7.6%	205	8.1%	171	6.7%	74	2.8%	74	2.7%	71	2.6%	71	2.5%	86	3.0%

## Appendix 2

## Staff in post by job, gender, ethnicity and disability

GRADE	YEAR	TOTAL	MALE		FEMALE		BLACK		DISABLED	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Senior Management (above Grade J)	2008	68	50	74%	18	26%	0	0%	2	2.94%
	2007	56	41	73%	15	27%	0	0%	2	3.57%
	2006	49	38	78%	11	22%	0	0%	2	4.08%
	2005	51	38	75%	13	25%	0	0%	2	3.92%
	2004	53	38	72%	15	28%	1	1.89%	2	3.77%
	2003	55	40	73%	15	27%	2	3.64%	3	5.45%
	2002	58	43	74%	15	26%	1	1.72%	2	3.45%
	2001	58	42	72%	16	28%	1	1.72%	3	5.17%
	2000	57	43	75%	14	25%	1	1.75%	3	5.26%
	1999	59	44	75%	15	25%	1	1.69%	3	5.08%
	1998	55	42	76%	13	24%	0	0%	0	0%
	1997	54	45	83%	9	17%	0	0%	0	0%
	1996	61	51	84%	10	16%	0	0%	0	0%
	1995	55	47	85%	8	15%	0	0%	0	0%
	1994	53	45	85%	8	15%	0	0%	0	0%
	1993	50	42	84%	8	16%	0	0%	1	2.00%
Professor (Grade J)	2008	85	59	69%	26	31%	5	6%	1	1.18%
	2007	80	58	73%	22	28%	5	6%	1	1.25%
	2006	72	51	71%	21	29%	5	6.90%	1	1.39%
	2005	65	48	74%	17	26%	6	9.23%	2	3.08%
	2004	61	47	77%	14	23%	3	4.92%	2	3.28%
	2003	50	39	78%	11	22%	3	6.00%	0	0%
	2002	36	30	83%	6	17%	0	0%	1	2.78%
	2001	30	25	83%	5	17%	0	0%	1	3.33%
	2000	24	20	83%	4	17%	0	0%	1	4.17%
Principal Lecturer (Grade I)	2008	206	131	64%	75	36%	15	7.28%	2	0.97%
	2007	201	127	63%	74	37%	12	5.97%	2	1.00%
	2006	221	142	64%	79	36%	13	5.88%	2	0.90%
	2005	222	143	64%	79	36%	13	6.00%	3	1.39%
	2004	205	139	68%	66	32%	14	6.83%	4	1.95%
	2003	184	125	68%	59	32%	12	6.52%	5	2.72%
	2002	204	145	71%	59	29%	7	3.43%	7	3.43%
	2001	204	144	71%	60	29%	7	3.43%	8	3.92%
	2000	200	143	72%	57	29%	8	4.00%	9	4.50%
	1999	209	155	74%	54	26%	9	4.31%	9	4.31%
	1998	199	149	75%	50	25%	7	3.52%	0	0%
	1997	172	135	78%	37	22%	5	2.91%	0	0%
	1996	188	147	78%	41	22%	6	3.19%	0	0%
	1995	183	150	82%	33	18%	4	2.19%	0	0%
	1994	182	147	81%	35	19%	5	2.75%	0	0%
	1993	179	145	81%	34	19%	5	2.79%	0	0%
	1992	170	133	78%	37	22%	4	2.35%	1	0.59%
Senior Lecturer (Grade H)	2008	779	361	46%	418	54%	41	5.26%	16	2.05%
	2007	736	349	47%	387	53%	37	5.03%	17	2.31%
	2006	693	329	47%	364	53%	37	5.33%	16	2.31%
	2005	651	329	51%	322	49%	33	5.02%	13	1.98%
	2004	646	335	52%	311	48%	31	4.80%	14	2.17%
	2003	613	312	51%	301	49%	27	4.40%	13	2.12%
	2002	613	318	52%	295	48%	18	2.94%	13	2.12%
	2001	607	310	51%	297	49%	16	2.64%	14	2.31%
	2000	614	318	52%	296	48%	21	3.42%	17	2.77%
	1999	615	315	51%	300	49%	20	3.25%	19	3.09%
	1998	614	325	53%	289	47%	18	2.93%	6	0.98%
	1997	625	329	53%	296	47%	18	2.88%	4	0.64%
	1996	690	377	55%	313	45%	20	2.90%	6	0.87%
	1995	490	307	63%	183	37%	11	2.24%	4	0.82%
	1994	485	305	63%	180	37%	12	2.47%	4	0.82%
	1993	476	310	65%	166	35%	9	1.89%	4	0.84%
	1992	467	332	71%	135	29%	6	1.28%	5	1.07%

## Staff in post by job, gender, ethnicity and disability (cont.)

GRADE	YEAR	TOTAL	MALE		FEMALE		BLACK		DISABLED	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
<b>Lecturer (Grade G)</b>	2008	57	26	46%	31	54%	5	8.77%	0	0%
	2007	58	27	47%	31	53%	4	6.90%	0	0%
	2006	72	29	40%	43	60%	10	13.89%	1	1.39%
	2005	89	36	40%	53	60%	8	8.99%	1	1.12%
	2004	97	39	40%	58	60%	9	9.28%	0	0.00%
	2003	88	39	44%	49	56%	8	9.09%	1	1.14%
	2002	85	42	49%	43	51%	2	2.35%	1	1.18%
	2001	91	44	48%	47	52%	2	2.20%	1	1.10%
	2000	81	42	52%	39	48%	2	2.47%	1	1.23%
	1999	85	47	55%	38	45%	4	4.71%	2	2.35%
	1998	106	57	54%	49	46%	4	3.77%	0	0%
	1997	109	59	54%	50	46%	3	2.75%	1	0.92%
	1996	105	57	54%	48	46%	2	1.90%	2	1.90%
	1995	104	53	51%	51	49%	5	4.81%	2	1.92%
	1994	102	51	50%	51	50%	4	3.92%	2	1.96%
	1993	103	52	50%	51	50%	3	2.91%	2	1.94%
<b>Senior Researcher (Grade H)</b>	2008	29	20	69%	9	31%	2	6.90%	0	0%
	2007	31	21	68%	10	32%	2	6.45%	0	0%
	2006	24	16	67%	8	33%	3	12.50%	0	0%
	2005	20	13	65%	7	35%	2	10.00%	0	0%
	2004	18	12	67%	6	33%	1	5.56%	0	0%
	2003	17	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	1	5.88%
	2002	20	18	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%
	2001	21	18	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%
	2000	15	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	1999	13	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Researcher (Grade F &amp; G)</b>	2008	114	58	51%	56	49%	18	15.79%	1	0.88%
	2007	100	48	48%	52	52%	13	13.00%	1	1.00%
	2006	97	45	46%	52	54%	15	15.46%	1	1.03%
	2005	105	48	46%	57	54%	14	13.30%	1	0.95%
	2004	96	47	49%	49	51%	12	12.50%	1	1.04%
	2003	98	51	52%	47	48%	14	14.29%	0	0%
	2002	98	49	50%	49	50%	11	11.22%	0	0%
	2001	89	45	51%	44	49%	10	11.24%	0	0%
	2000	103	56	54%	47	46%	13	12.62%	3	2.91%
	1999	97	62	64%	35	36%	10	10.31%	4	4.12%
	1998	79	52	66%	27	34%	7	8.86%	1	1.27%
	1997	60	40	67%	20	33%	5	8.33%	0	0%
	1996	76	51	67%	25	33%	7	9.21%	0	0%
	1995	85	58	68%	27	32%	4	4.71%	0	0%
	1994	74	54	73%	20	27%	6	8.11%	0	0%
	1993	59	34	58%	25	42%	7	11.86%	1	1.69%
<b>Senior Support (Grade G &amp; above)</b>	2008	340	178	52%	162	48%	5	1.47%	12	3.53%
	2007	205	115	56%	90	44%	5	2.44%	3	1.46%
	2006	194	113	58%	81	42%	8	4.12%	5	2.58%
	2005	175	103	59%	72	41%	5	2.86%	3	1.71%
	2004	167	101	60%	66	40%	5	2.99%	2	1.20%
	2003	158	95	60%	63	40%	5	3.16%	2	1.27%
	2002	141	85	60%	56	40%	4	2.84%	2	1.42%
	2001	129	82	64%	47	36%	4	3.10%	2	1.55%
	2000	119	72	61%	47	39%	4	3.36%	1	0.84%
	1999	92	53	58%	39	42%	2	2.17%	0	0%
	1998	80	45	56%	35	44%	3	3.75%	0	0%
	1997	78	44	56%	34	44%	2	2.56%	0	0%
	1996	77	43	56%	34	44%	1	1.30%	0	0%
	1995	61	33	54%	28	46%	1	1.64%	0	0%
	1994	64	34	53%	30	47%	2	3.13%	0	0%
	1993	70	42	60%	28	40%	0	0%	0	0%



## Staff in post by job, gender, ethnicity and disability (cont.)

GRADE	YEAR	TOTAL	MALE		FEMALE		BLACK		DISABLED	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
<b>Support (Grade A - F)</b>	2008	947	264	28%	683	72%	48	5.07%	20	2.11%
	2007	1065	321	30%	744	70%	46	4.32%	23	2.16%
	2006	1040	301	29%	739	71%	49	4.71%	22	2.12%
	2005	1015	293	29%	722	71%	42	4.14%	21	2.07%
	2004	1001	286	29%	715	71%	42	4.20%	22	2.20%
	2003	940	271	29%	669	71%	35	3.72%	20	2.13%
	2002	926	267	29%	659	71%	23	2.48%	24	2.59%
	2001	896	260	29%	636	71%	23	2.57%	26	2.90%
	2000	879	249	28%	630	72%	21	2.39%	28	3.19%
	1999	896	242	27%	654	73%	21	2.34%	35	3.91%
	1998	877	247	28%	630	72%	24	2.74%	9	1.03%
	1997	908	242	27%	666	73%	20	2.20%	9	0.99%
	1996	906	245	27%	661	73%	18	1.99%	9	0.99%
	1995	755	218	29%	537	71%	23	3.05%	5	0.66%
	1994	751	222	30%	529	70%	23	3.06%	5	0.67%
	1993	710	203	29%	507	71%	21	2.96%	4	0.56%
<b>Senior Manual (Grade C - D)</b>	2008	84	63	75%	21	25%	3	3.57%	0	0%
	2007	94	78	83%	16	17%	2	2.13%	2	2.13%
	2006	84	68	81%	16	19%	1	1.19%	2	2.38%
	2005	85	67	79%	18	21%	1	1.18%	2	2.35%
	2004	96	64	67%	32	33%	3	3.13%	2	2.08%
	2003	97	68	70%	29	30%	2	2.06%	2	2.06%
	2002	96	68	71%	28	29%	0	0%	2	2.08%
	2001	97	70	72%	27	28%	0	0%	2	2.06%
	2000	103	77	75%	26	25%	0	0%	3	2.91%
	1999	99	73	74%	26	26%	0	0%	5	5.05%
	1998	96	76	79%	20	21%	0	0%	1	1.04%
	1997	93	72	77%	21	23%	0	0%	1	1.08%
	1996	97	75	77%	22	23%	0	0%	1	1.03%
	1995	77	65	84%	12	16%	0	0%	1	1.30%
	1994	73	60	82%	13	18%	0	0%	1	1.37%
	1993	70	61	87%	9	13%	0	0%	2	2.86%
<b>Manual (Grade A - B)</b>	2008	176	54	31%	122	69%	13	7.39%	4	2.27%
	2007	199	57	29%	142	71%	19	9.55%	3	1.51%
	2006	200	46	23%	154	77%	11	5.50%	3	1.50%
	2005	214	50	23%	164	77%	10	4.67%	2	0.93%
	2004	226	61	27%	165	73%	13	5.75%	2	0.88%
	2003	245	63	26%	182	74%	14	5.71%	2	0.82%
	2002	240	59	25%	181	75%	8	3.33%	3	1.25%
	2001	245	58	24%	187	76%	6	2.45%	3	1.22%
	2000	254	68	27%	186	73%	6	2.36%	5	1.97%
	1999	276	67	24%	209	76%	9	3.26%	6	2.17%
	1998	291	74	25%	217	75%	2	0.69%	0	0%
	1997	296	78	26%	218	74%	3	1.01%	0	0%
	1996	307	78	25%	229	75%	3	0.98%	0	0%
	1995	315	82	26%	233	74%	5	1.59%	0	0%
	1994	279	72	26%	207	74%	6	2.15%	0	0%
	1993	281	67	24%	214	76%	8	2.85%	0	0%

### GRADE CATEGORIES BEFORE 2008 PAY EQUALITY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Below Principal Officer covers administrative and technical staff: Grades 1 to 6, HS1 to HS7, Scale 1 to S02, ITT1 to ITT3.

Senior Manual Grades cover M4 to M6, P1 and P2, GS2, GS3 and SS.

Manual Grades cover M1 to M3, and GS1. Research Grades are RA/RB/RAS/RF. Senior Research Grades are SRF/RD

## Appendix 3

## People applying for, being shortlisted and being appointed to posts by gender, ethnicity and disability

	TOTAL	MALE		FEMALE		BLACK		UNKNOWN		DISABLED	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
<b>10/94 to 9/95</b>											
Applied	6735	3144	46.7%	3641	54.1%	376	5.6%	632	9.4%	94	1.4%
Shortlisted	2339	1018	43.5%	1321	56.5%	148	6.3%	258	11.0%	13	0.6%
Appointed	294	126	42.9%	168	57.1%	8	2.7%	30	10.2%	2	0.7%
<b>10/95 to 0/96</b>											
Applied	7352	3064	41.7%	4288	58.3%	328	4.5%	479	6.5%	106	1.4%
Shortlisted	936	312	33.3%	624	66.7%	28	3.0%	49	5.2%	14	1.5%
Appointed	264	82	31.1%	182	68.9%	11	4.2%	15	5.7%	3	1.1%
<b>10/96 to 9/97</b>											
Applied	6467	3183	49.2%	3284	50.8%	310	4.8%	537	8.3%	117	1.8%
Shortlisted	1130	453	40.1%	677	59.9%	56	5.0%	81	7.2%	12	1.1%
Appointed	299	122	40.8%	177	59.2%	10	3.3%	20	6.7%	2	0.7%
<b>10/97 to 3/98 only (4/98 - 9/98 not available)</b>											
Applied	3537	1559	44.1%	1978	55.9%	166	4.7%	389	11.0%	52	1.5%
Shortlisted	664	245	36.9%	419	63.1%	18	2.7%	74	11.1%	9	1.4%
Appointed	202	76	37.6%	126	62.4%	17	8.4%	16	7.9%	4	2.0%
<b>10/98 to 9/99</b>											
Applied	5798	2465	42.5%	3323	57.3%	323	5.6%	404	7.0%	51	0.9%
Shortlisted	1250	436	34.9%	814	65.1%	54	4.3%	75	6.0%	8	0.6%
Appointed	301	111	36.9%	190	63.1%	11	3.7%	20	6.6%	0	0.0%
<b>10/99 to 9/00</b>											
Applied	5979	2591	43.3%	3388	56.7%	327	5.5%	372	6.2%	29	0.5%
Shortlisted	1384	517	37.4%	867	62.6%	208	15.0%	106	7.7%	7	0.5%
Appointed	356	122	34.3%	234	65.7%	63	17.7%	28	7.9%	1	0.3%
<b>4/01 to 9/01 only (10/00 - 3/01 not available)</b>											
Applied	2536	955	37.7%	1581	62.3%	125	4.9%	233	9.2%	8	0.3%
Shortlisted	675	223	33.0%	452	67.0%	23	3.4%	51	7.6%	1	0.1%
Appointed	174	57	32.8%	117	67.2%	9	5.2%	5	2.9%	0	0.0%
<b>10/01 to 9/02</b>											
Applied	7138	3845	53.9%	3293	46.1%	743	10.4%	739	10.4%	11	0.2%
Shortlisted*	975	485	49.7%	490	50.3%	60	6.2%	114	11.7%	3	0.3%
Appointed	302	93	30.8%	209	69.2%	26	8.6%	17	5.6%	2	0.7%
<b>10/02 to 9/03</b>											
Applied	6301	3142	49.9%	3159	50.1%	620	9.8%	987	15.7%	24	0.4%
Shortlisted	1360	599	44.0%	761	56.0%	90	6.6%	224	16.5%	5	0.4%
Appointed	409	179	43.8%	230	56.2%	18	4.4%	92	22.5%	1	0.2%
<b>10/03 to 9/04</b>											
Applied	5678	2511	44.2%	3167	55.8%	650	11.4%	512	9.0%	10	0.2%
Shortlisted	1213	509	42.0%	704	58.0%	95	7.8%	117	9.6%	4	0.3%
Appointed	323	131	40.6%	192	59.4%	17	5.3%	37	11.5%	0	0.0%
<b>10/04 to 9/05</b>											
Applied	5689	2734	48.1%	2955	51.9%	754	13.3%	461	8.1%	11	0.2%
Shortlisted	1330	555	41.7%	775	58.3%	126	9.5%	73	5.5%	5	0.4%
Appointed	336	129	38.4%	207	61.6%	18	5.4%	17	5.1%	0	0.0%
<b>10/05 to 9/06</b>											
Applied	4767	2516	52.8%	2251	47.2%	797	16.7%	385	8.1%	13	0.3%
Shortlisted	1316	618	47.0%	698	53.0%	159	12.1%	134	10.2%	3	0.2%
Appointed	344	111	32.3%	195	56.7%	27	7.8%	39	11.3%	0	0.0%
<b>10/06 to 9/07</b>											
Applied	4297	2279	53.0%	2018	47.0%	677	15.8%	406	9.4%	21	0.5%
Shortlisted	1084	537	49.5%	547	50.5%	120	11.1%	74	6.8%	5	0.5%
Appointed	290	151	52.1%	139	47.9%	25	8.6%	18	6.2%	0	0.0%