

Ethnicity data 2006 to 2009

The ethnicity data below is categorised according to the classification criteria used in the Census 2001 information. This is in accordance with the Code of Practice on Ethnic Monitoring published in May 2002. The classifications are identified as follows:

A: **White** – British, Irish, or any other White background.

B: **Mixed** – White and Black Caribbean, White and Black African, White and Asian, or any other mixed background.

C: **Asian or Asian British** – Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, or any other Asian background.

D: **Black or Black British** – Caribbean, African, or any other Black background.

E: **Chinese or other Ethnic group** – Chinese or any other Ethnic Group.

We also have an ‘Unclassified’ group who have chosen not to tick a box for Ethnicity.

i) Staff in post

Table 1

Ethnic origin classification	2006	2007	2008	2009
White	2072	2036	2002	2201
%	75.48%	76.03%	76.62%	78.27%
Mixed	52	56	53	55
%	1.89%	2.09%	2.03%	1.96%
Asian/Asian British	180	182	192	199
%	6.56%	6.80%	7.35%	7.08%
Black/Black British	91	95	98	107
%	3.32%	3.55%	3.75%	3.81%
Chinese/Other	40	43	42	48
%	1.46%	1.61%	1.61%	1.71%
Unclassified	310	275	226	202
%	11.29%	10.27%	8.65%	7.18%
Total	2745	2678	2613	2812
%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- *Most categories have remained stable across the last four years, with a slight increase in the proportion of those in the White category (up 3%) together with a reduction in the Unclassified group (down 4%).*

ii) Applications for employment

Table 2

Ethnic origin classification	2006	2007	2008	2009
White	5387	2938	3650	5901
%	41.69%	33.59%	32.79%	36.99%
Mixed	295	143	183	372
%	2.28%	1.63%	1.64%	2.33%
Asian/Asian British	1584	835	970	1677
%	12.26%	9.55%	8.72%	10.51%
Black/Black British	809	510	860	891
%	6.26%	5.83%	7.73%	5.59%
Chinese/Other	463	179	184	328
%	3.58%	2.05%	1.65%	2.06%
Unclassified	4384	4142	5283	6783
%	33.93%	47.35%	47.47%	42.52%
Total	12922	8747	11130	15952
%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- *There was a year-on-year reduction in the percentage of applications from White applicants from 2006 to 2008. Although this has increased in 2009, the percentage of White applicants during 2009 remains fewer than in 2006.*
- *Applications from Mixed applicants have remained broadly consistent since 2006.*
- *Applications from Asian or Asian British applicants reduced from 2006 to 2008. Although this increased in 2009, the percentage of Asian or Asian British applicants remains fewer than in 2006.*
- *Applications from Black or Black British applicants have remained broadly consistent since 2006, although we did see a slight increase in Black or Black British applicants in 2008.*
- *Applications from Chinese and any Other Ethnic group decreased in 2007 and have remained broadly consistent since then.*

iii) Promotions

Table 3

Ethnic origin classification	2006	2007	2008	2009
White	68	70	60	165
%	71.58%	89.74%	78.95%	80.49%
Mixed	2	1	2	5
%	2.11%	1.28%	2.63%	2.44%
Asian/Asian British	10	1	5	10
%	10.53%	1.28%	6.58%	4.88%
Black/Black British	5	1	2	3
%	5.26%	1.28%	2.63%	1.46%
Chinese/Other	0	0	2	2
%	0.00%	0.00%	2.63%	0.98%
Unclassified	10	5	5	20
%	10.53%	6.41%	6.58%	9.76%
Total	95	78	76	205
	100%	100%	100%	100%

- *Year-on-year, the greatest number of staff promoted were of White origin.*
- *Promotions made within the Black or Black British origin group have decreased overall since 2006.*
- *Few promotions have been made within the Chinese or any Other Ethnic origin group since 2006.*

iv) Training courses attended and booked via Chrysalis

Table 4

Ethnic origin classification	2006	2007	2008	2009
White	2030	2068	2084	2201
%	71.86%	70.94%	71.05%	78.27%
Mixed	48	59	51	55
%	1.70%	2.02%	1.74%	1.96%
Asian/Asian British	179	185	196	199
%	6.34%	6.35%	6.68%	7.08%
Black/Black British	89	94	108	107
%	3.15%	3.22%	3.68%	3.81%
Chinese/Other	46	45	45	48
%	1.63%	1.54%	1.53%	1.71%
Unclassified	433	464	449	202
%	15.33%	15.92%	15.31%	7.18%
Total	2825	2915	2933	2812
%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- *The numbers attending training from the White ethnic group has increased in 2009 and is in line with their level of representation within the organisation as a whole. In all other groups, levels of training have stayed the same or had very little variance.*

v) Involuntary leavers

Table 5

Ethnic origin classification	2006	2007	2008	2009
White	181	168	93	18
%	66.79%	68.29%	67.39%	54.55%
Mixed	3	4	2	1
%	1.11%	1.63%	1.45%	3.03%
Asian/Asian British	19	15	8	3
%	7.01%	6.10%	5.80%	9.09%
Black/Black British	17	15	6	1
%	6.27%	6.10%	4.35%	3.03%
Chinese/Other	5	3	2	0
%	1.85%	1.22%	1.45%	0.00%
Unclassified	46	41	27	10
%	16.97%	16.67%	19.57%	30.30%
Total	271	246	138	33
%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- *In general, there have been fewer involuntary leavers since 2008 compared to 2006 and 2007, as a result of the timing of restructuring programmes.*
- *The percentage of those leavers who were of White origin was stable from 2006 to 2008 before reducing in 2009.*

vi) Voluntary leavers

Table 6

Ethnic origin classification	2006	2007	2008	2009
White	193	273	298	188
%	64.55%	75.21%	75.06%	73.44%
Mixed	5	9	8	11
%	1.67%	2.48%	2.02%	4.30%
Asian/Asian British	32	23	36	27
%	10.70%	6.34%	9.07%	10.55%
Black/Black British	17	11	15	3
%	5.69%	3.03%	3.78%	1.17%
Chinese/Other	10	6	8	4
%	3.34%	1.65%	2.02%	1.56%
Unclassified	42	41	32	23
%	14.05%	11.29%	8.06%	8.98%
Total	299	363	397	256
%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- *There was an increase in leavers of White origin from 2006 to 2007, but the figure has stabilised since then and is in line with White representation in the wider organisation.*
- *There has been an overall decrease in the proportion of leavers of Black or Black British origin since 2006.*

vii) Involvement in grievances

There were 19 grievances recorded for the period August 2008 to March 2009. Before August 2008, this data was not recorded centrally. The ethnic origin classification of employees raising grievances is White, Mixed, Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British, and Unclassified.

We only provide data for groups of individuals larger than ten, given the real and substantial risk that for such small populations, personal data might be disclosed. As all groups comprise fewer than ten employees, the data has been aggregated.

viii) Disciplinary

Table 7

Ethnic origin classification	2009
White	45
%	71.43%
Mixed; Asian/Asian British; Black/Black British; Unclassified	18
%	28.57%
Total	63
%	100%

The above data shows involvement in grievances for the period August 2008 to March 2009. Before August 2008, this data was not recorded centrally.

We have provided data only for groups of individuals larger than ten, given the real and substantial risk that for such small populations, personal data might be disclosed. Where the data provided corresponds to groups of fewer than ten, these groups have been aggregated and shown as a separate category.

ix) Benefit or detriment as a result of a Performance Assessment Procedures

1) Performance Improvement Plans

There were ten formal Performance Improvement Plans recorded for the period August 2008 to March 2009. Before August 2008, this data was not recorded centrally. The ethnic origin classification of employees on formal Performance Improvement Plans for the period is White, Mixed, Asian or Asian British, and Unclassified.

We only provide data for groups of individuals larger than ten, given the real and substantial risk that for such small populations, personal data might be disclosed. As all groups comprise fewer than ten employees, the data has been aggregated.

2) Appraisal ratings

Table 8

Appraisal Rating (AR)	2006	2007	2008	2009
AR1 (Below standard)	35	44	32	23
%	1.37%	1.74%	1.34%	0.88%
AR2 (Meets standard)	1913	1894	1793	1653
%	74.87%	74.95%	75.02%	63.02%
AR3 (Exceeds standard)	607	589	565	847
%	23.76%	23.31%	23.64%	32.29%
AR4 (Exceptional)				100
%				3.81%
Total	2555	2527	2390	2623
	100%	100%	100%	100%

The total number of appraisal ratings given each year differs from the total staff in post because they do not include those who were on probation or working their notice from the FSA during the appraisal period.

Table 9

AR1 (Below standard)

Ethnic origin classification	2006	2007	2008	2009
White	57%	66%	59%	57%
Mixed	6%	2%	6%	0%
Asian/Asian British	9%	5%	9%	17%
Black/Black British	6%	7%	6%	17%
Chinese/Other	3%	5%	3%	4%
Unclassified	20%	16%	16%	4%

AR 2 (Meets standard)

Ethnic origin classification	2006	2007	2008	2009
White	74%	73%	74%	75%
Mixed	2%	2%	2%	2%
Asian/Asian British	7%	8%	8%	8%
Black/Black British	4%	4%	5%	5%
Chinese/Other	1%	2%	2%	2%
Unclassified	12%	11%	10%	8%

AR3 (Exceeds standard)

Ethnic origin classification	2006	2007	2008	2009
White	82%	83%	84%	83%
Mixed	2%	1%	2%	2%
Asian/Asian British	4%	4%	5%	5%
Black/Black British	2%	2%	2%	2%
Chinese/Other	1%	0%	1%	1%
Unclassified	10%	10%	7%	6%

AR4 (Exceptional)

Ethnic origin	2006	2007	2008	2009

classification				
White	-	-	-	87%
Mixed	-	-	-	1%
Asian/Asian British	-	-	-	2%
Black/Black British	-	-	-	2%
Chinese/Other	-	-	-	2%
Unclassified	-	-	-	6%

NOTES: (1) The 4 rating was introduced in 2009 (2) Where totals do not equal 100%, this is due to rounding

- Overall, the percentage of staff receiving a '1' rating has been broadly consistent over four years.
- There was a peak in '1' ratings given to those of White origin in 2007, a significant increase from the previous year. This dropped to a more consistent level in 2009.
- There has been a consistent level of '2's and '3's awarded to those of all Ethnic origin groups since 2006.
- The number of people receiving a '2' rating was consistent until 2009 when it dropped significantly. This was largely due to the introduction of the 4-tier rating system.

Overall summary

The data presented provides a basic analysis of the FSA's staff profile in relation to the ethnic categories. It has not been possible to analyse the data to further depth in order to link the different elements together because the data has been taken at different times of the year and therefore the totals for each element are different from each other.

For next year's report (2010), we plan to take the data at one point in time, either the end of the calendar year or the end of the financial year (systems permitting). This will enable us to link different elements together to provide data on trends existing or emerging in the organisation.

Along with this analysis, the 2009 Staff Survey results and the Pearn Kandola diversity audit report will enable us to gain a greater understanding on the current situation within the FSA and the actions to be taken to address any issues identified.