



FDA & PROSPECT SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE TO THE SENIOR SALARIES REVIEW BODY

February 2019

Contact: Lucille Thirlby, FDA Assistant General Secretary
Address: Elizabeth House, York Road, London, SE1 7NQ
Tel: 0207 401 5583 Web: www.fda.org.uk
Email: lucille@fda.org.uk

1. SUPPLEMENTARY SUBMISSION ON THE GOVERNMENTS EVIDENCE

ECONOMIC CONTEXT

1.1 In para 49 the Government states, “In July the Government announced the biggest pay rise in almost 10 years for around one million public sector workers across Britain. This Government recognises that public sector workers deserve to be fairly rewarded for the vital work they do, and seeks to ensure the overall package remains fair and competitive.”

1.2 After a decade of pay restraint the unlocking of the pay cap should have resulted in a meaningful pay increases for civil servants in delegated grades and the SCS. It remains a point of discontent for our members that this opportunity ‘for the biggest pay rise’ was not realised in the civil service, especially given the SSRB recommendation 4 was not accepted by the Government. The reality is that amongst public sector workers- the civil service (including the SCS) has been singled out for the harshest of treatment.

1.3 The Government’s evidence on the economic context is too generic and focuses across the public sector, which as the SSRB will appreciate has significant variations with completely different and varying levels of funding, pay and rewards. A blanket context is an unsophisticated response to a very complex and specific set of circumstances that is the civil service and SCS ‘affordability’. It has been used as a smokescreen to seek to hide how differently the SCS and other civil servants have been dealt with on pay in contrast to other public sector workers.

1.4 How out of step SCS pay is in comparison to the wider public sector and private sector is partially shown in the Government’s evidence (Paragraphs 74 -76 and Figure 8). The statement that “The picture is slightly different” for the civil service is an understatement.

1.5 The FDA and Prospect are surprised that there is not more analysis about the actual costs/financial position of the civil service rather than the generic

context of the wider public service. There is a cost attached to fundamental pay reform however there is no indication of how the changes will be delivered. The FDA and Prospect believe the Government needs to make the case for increased funding in order to make the necessary reform to pay in the civil service. It is also clear that there is a cost attached to not reforming the pay system - as highlighted in the recent report by the Institute for Government (IfG). We would be interested in the Government's analysis of this thought-provoking piece of work.

1.6 Similarly, there is no specific information relating to productivity in a civil service context nor how the Government sees this being delivered. In its evidence it states that “while public sector productivity has increased by 0.8% in the last year, continued improvement is essential for meeting growing demands on our world class public services. Public sector pay awards should reward efforts to modernise workforces and delivery models”. We believe our SCS members constantly strive to improve the civil service and we would expect the Government to explain this generic statement and relate it to the SCS and civil service improvements. It should also be recognised that the practical inability to realise potential efficiency savings is often political and not institutional. The lack of clarity or unity from the Government with regard to Brexit and the impact and strain that imposes on the civil service to have to plan and operationalize in relation to a range of potential scenarios is a glaring example.

REFORM STILL TOO SLOW

1.7 The Government evidence states that “the Government has made further steps this year to develop its thinking in a number of areas that support the overall vision”. Whilst we agree that detailed thinking is being undertaken and that is welcomed, there does need to be more urgent action to start to implement change. We do recognise that the right solutions need to be introduced and that the Government acknowledges in some areas there is even more progress to be made and plans for future activity have been set out to accelerate progress in these areas.

THE SYSTEM FOR DETERMINING AWARDS IS STILL OPAQUE

1.8 The Government's vision and principles for SCS are clear and that “long-term ambition remains, as last year, for a future CS pay framework that aligns more closely with the professions, with more structure, efficiency and consistency, incentivising and rewarding SCS who look to build depth as well as breadth of experience”.

1.9 We recognise that the SCS contains a variety of differing roles, some of which are market sensitive. It is also clear that all grades are significantly behind the market. We have not seen the government's full data on pay comparisons, figure 8 clearly demonstrates that the issues relating to SCS pay framework isn't just related to professions but demonstrates how far behind the market the SCS is.

1.10 The FDA and Prospect remain to be convinced that the full equality implications of different responses to and the interplay between specialist, niche or 'civil service wide' have been thought through or examined. The Government's evidence doesn't satisfy that concern and the new framework could inadvertently create a new set of issues for future SCS pay structures.

1.11 A key question that remains unanswered; for pay bands B and C, what does market facing/niche really mean? Market allowances should only be used for temporarily adjusting salaries not as a long-term pay strategy or structure. There is a clear need for the Government to better articulate and evidence what it is seeking to achieve. Is the suggested response tactical or strategic? What labour market information underpins both its analysis and its proposals for the future? Are there models elsewhere they can evidence or wish to build on?

1.12 “The Government believes that specialist pay is best focused on groups of roles (e.g. professions) with their particular skills requirements, rather than being focused on an individual's skills and qualifications that would move with them from role to role. This remains an aspiration and Individuals should be eligible for specialist pay only while they remain in a relevant specialist role and career path,

or are performing a time limited role outside their profession for developmental reasons, before returning to their professional career path.”

1.13 In the detailed explanation it is clear only 2 professions are anywhere near articulating their specialist pay needs. This is of serious concern and we would urge the SSRB to exercise caution in agreeing to the Governments recommendation without all the pieces of the framework being out together and assessed.

1.14 We ask the SSRB to recommend that all the different responses across the proposed 3 groups are considered together and equality assessed.

DIRECTOR GENERAL PAY

1.15 The FDA and Prospect welcome that the Government has reviewed their position and the evidence shows that what is required and the depth of DG roles does not stand up to scrutiny. The approach is again to delay and prevaricate. We cannot see the added value of setting up a DG Committee, which seems to be a consultative body rather than a decision making one and also have a concern around the transparency of their considerations and how that is shared with the trade unions.

HEADLINE FIGURE AND PAY RANGES

1.16 We do not agree with a set policy of “the headline figure for the SCS should be no higher, on average, than that agreed for delegated grades through the annual pay remit guidance” Whilst we understand from the Cabinet Office that this is not a ‘fixed’ policy we believe at this moment in time the issues surrounding SCS pay are significant and that the head line figure will not go anywhere near resolving the structural issues. Clearly, individually, our members in the SCS could be uncomfortable if their pay was to rise at a faster rate than that of delegated grades. However, the considered and evidence led views of the SSRB should not be restrained by an undetermined and some may say arbitrary figure determined elsewhere at some undetermined point in the future. Last year the SSRB

recommended a package costed at 2.5%. This was reduced to 1.5% by the government positing pay coherence as the reason. Whilst the SSRB clearly set out their rationale and evidence in coming to the 2.5% figure- no rationale or open deliberative approach was presented in the coming to the 1.5% figure.

1.17 It cannot go without comment that the notion that the SSRBs recommendations were not accepted in full because of affordability does strain credulity - given the population and the impact on the overall pay bill for the civil service.

1.18 As set out in our substantive submission, the unions are concerned that the Government is getting it wrong in relation to the levels of minima and reducing the maxima. It is evidenced that the minima £70,000 is not competitive now. There is a lack of evidence by the Government for their assertions, in particular, its reasoning behind paragraph 117.

1.19 There is a danger of replacing the current framework with an approach that creates further anomalies and resentment from groups of staff who do not benefit from the targeting of pay supplements. We welcome the fact the Government acknowledges that the issue of fairness is real.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

1.20 Given the extension of pilots and continuing development of a new framework, the FDA and Prospect urge the SSRB to recommend that urgent action is needed and a start can be made by the immediate removal of forced distribution whilst the scheme is developed.

PAY PROGRESSION

1.21 The Government states that “evidence shown in data is reinforced through ongoing feedback from members of the SCS suggesting that the lack of substantial pay progression remains a primary concern and a source of irritation, unfairness

and low morale”. This concurs with our data as well. Again, thinking is being developed but we are a long way from a system of progression being implemented. The SSRB must be advised that the success profiles have only been rolled out across the Departments and only being used in relation to recruitment at the moment. It will require significant work in order to convert the scheme to determine capabilities for pay progression. The unions pushed for and it has been agreed that a full evaluation of the success profiles recruitment implementation will be undertaken because there are genuine equality concerns particularly in relation to the strengths profile.

PENSIONS

1.22 Since making our substantive submission there has been further turbulence to public sector pension schemes by the announcement by the Treasury Secretary of ‘a pause’ to a fundamental element of the valuations, the cost cap mechanism, as a result of a legal judgment on transitional protection due to uncertain financial implications. The public sector unions unanimously opposed this. The FDA and Prospect and the other NTUC unions have made representations within the Scheme Advisory Board on this announcement. The detail is evolving within the CSPS and we will seek to keep the SSRB updated.

CONCLUSION

1.23 More than ever the Government should understand the value of the civil service and senior civil service and face up to the reality that, like the NHS, it’s time to make the case for meaningful investment in pay to address long term problems.

2. FDA-PROSPECT SURVEY RESULTS JANUARY 2019

2.1 262 current members of the SCS completed our survey online during December 2018 to January 2019. Due to the delay in the remit letters this was later than usual and over the Christmas period, however, we are grateful to those who completed the survey and the full quantitative results are set out in this submission. We also asked questions related to equality monitoring and there were free text answers.

2.2 The interplay between poor pay outcomes, increasing workload, recognition and unfairness were repeatedly raised.

2.3 In terms of profile, three quarters of the respondents were in pay band 1. A third of respondents have been in their band for 11- 20 years with 42% being in their pay band for 1-5 years. Two thirds of respondents earn between 65,000 and 80,000.

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

2.4 As in previous years we have asked whether respondents are aware of recruitment and retention difficulties in their organisation, this year 67% report recruitment difficulties and 71% retention difficulties. In addition, 74% of respondents do not believe their organisation has the resources to achieve its objectives in the year ahead, emphasising the need to be more competitive in the recruitment market and not to take actions that will inhibit the mobility of existing staff.

2.5 We asked what type of roles or skills were affected. The answers were similar for recruitment and retention but the range of roles has noticeably increased over the last few years.

2.6 Respondents repeatedly referred to posts in project and programme management, business architecture, finance, digital, policy, commercial, lawyers,

analysts (including economists and statisticians), IT, technical, STEM specialists, tax professionals and Her Majesty’s Inspectors. Brexit related posts were specifically highlighted, as were those with direct competition from the education sector, NHS or local government.

Members’ comments

“All EU Exit areas are understaffed; senior project management and delivery roles are routinely filled with contractors charging excessive day rates and structured so as to reduce tax liability.”

“Similar roles at SCS are not being filled. Our grade 7s and 6s do not want to apply.”

2.7 On 16 January, The Institute for Government published its findings on staff turnover *Moving On: the cost of high staff turnover in the civil service.*

2.8 The report finds that civil servants in UK departments change roles much more quickly than their equivalents in other civil services or the private sector. It argues that this rapid turnover causes a range of problems including reduced productivity, a lack of expertise in policy making, disruption of major projects and weakened oversight of government spending. It recommends that the government needs to reform its pay system to enable managers to award pay increases to high performers and change its culture to place more value on officials who stay in post, develop expertise and see through projects.

MORALE AND MOTIVATION

2.9 Only 4% of respondents to the survey said their morale had improved over the last year with nearly 67% saying it had got worse. The top areas cited as having the most negative impact on respondents were:

- Pay (40% of respondents)
- Pension (13%)

- Workload (12%)
- Inadequate resources (12%)

2.10 Performance management is also a high impact factor for 9% of respondents. Within the commentary other reasons given were a mix of the top four issues as well as working relationships within Departments and across Departments, behaviour and culture of leadership and management and tackling poor performance of both senior and junior staff.

Members' comments

“Imbalance of demands and the resources I have to meet them.”

“Lack of opportunity and lack of feedback when applying for roles.”

2.11 In response to which three areas would have the most positive impact on individuals working lives. The options presented were:

- Pay
- Terms and conditions
- Pensions
- Performance management
- Increased resourcing
- Greater departmental autonomy
- Workload
- Location
- Flexibility of hours or location
- Clarity of leadership
- Other

2.12 The lead area by far was pay, mentioned by over 85% of respondents (unchanged from last year) then came workload (45%) closely followed by the related area of increased resourcing (39%). Pensions followed (30%), then clarity of

leadership (23%). Within the 7% of responses under ‘other’, a number of responses referred to IT and need for improved systems, travel for meetings in London, promotion and working conditions, specifically desk space through to personal autonomy.

Member’s comment

“Workload grows unremittingly (and pay does not).”

2.13 As in previous years the majority of those responding (57%) would not recommend the SCS as a career choice to a friend or relative. Nearly one third (29%) would like to leave the civil service as soon as possible with only 7% (down from 12% in last year’s survey) feeling more optimistic about their job now than they did 12 months ago. This may explain why two thirds of respondents are more inclined to look for a job outside the civil service than they were last year and why 67% have seriously considered leaving in the last 12 months.

2.14 Similar to last year’s responses, 44% of said they would leave the civil service for the private sector while around a third would go to another part of the public sector. More than one in ten would work in the not-for-profit sector while those who stated ‘other’ were generally either looking to international organisations, the judiciary or self-employment.

CURRENT PAY FRAMEWORK

2.15 We have evidenced in the main submission the FDA’s and Prospect’s views and understanding of the current pay framework. The evidence detailed below and the opinion, that we as unions and our members in the SCS continue to hold, should persuade government to take more decisive action on the key elements affecting pay for the SCS.

2.16 99% of the SCS respondents to our survey said they did not consider the current reward framework fit for purpose. With over half (59%) being ‘very dissatisfied’, a further 35% ‘dissatisfied’ and only 2 people said they were ‘very

satisfied' with the overall pay arrangements in the SCS. 97% do not feel that the pay system is fair and equitable.

PAY AND PROGRESSION

2.17 95% are dissatisfied with the pace at which they are progressing in their pay band. These figures are broadly similar to the results last year which is of serious concern. Many of the comments reflect this.

Members' comments

"They negotiate salaries with people entering the SCS from outside. But not internal candidates."

"Pay band 1 and 2 - having to pay new joiners at top of band which leaves us more longstanding civil servants a bit disgruntled. I am about to move department and I am caught up in the anomaly of new starters being about to negotiate but level transfers not."

2.18 We have highlighted previously the issue of SCS members managing staff on a higher salary than themselves. Cabinet Office have now recognised the issue but around a third (39%) of those surveyed said they managed someone on a lower grade who has a higher salary than them.

PAY AND PERFORMANCE

2.19 Only 14% of respondents see a clear link between their performance and their pay outcomes. Of the respondents, 23% were top performers and only 3.5% were low performers according to their last performance marking, aside from 5% who didn't have a marking (due to newness to the SCS or working for the NICS or Scottish Government), the remaining 70% were in the 'achieving' bracket.

Member's comment

“Not told of end year rating or performance deficiencies until seven months into the new reporting year! And no performance 1-2-1 meetings in year!”

COMPARABILITY

2.20 We asked SCS respondents views on how their pay compares to the private sector, 93% said that it was worse and 67% said it was worse than the wider public sector. 75% based their responses on contact with comparable post holders, 65% on job adverts and 57% on published information.

Members' comments

“Benchmarking and information from my professional institute.”

“Direct approaches from recruiters and organisations with job offers (not interviews, actual offers).”

“I recently joined the civil service from the private sector and took a very big pay cut in order to do something I found more rewarding and interesting. Would still be good to be paid the market rate though.”

“My knowledge of the market. NO-ONE in private sector manages the numbers I do or has anything like the responsibility without being on around twice or more my salary.”

TALENT STREAM

2.21 In the main submission we set out the details of the FDA Fast Stream members survey and their views on the SCS roles, workload and pay framework. In our survey of SCS members we also gave the opportunity for the respondents to comment on recruitment issues to the SCS. Some raised specific concerns about the talent stream from where the SCS should be recruiting.

Members' comments

“Very few experienced external recruits.”

“HR has very little experience/resource/or interest in listening to our SCS who want effective basic talent management in this organisation. Any "workforce planning" appears utterly chaotic and random.”

2.22 44% (an increase of 5% since last year's survey) said they did not believe there are sufficiently qualified candidates motivated to seek promotion from delegated grades. Given that 77% of recruits to the SCS that currently come from within the civil service, that should be a major cause for concern. This issue is not the lack of capability but the lack of incentive for talented staff to seek promotion.

Members' comments

“We know that many Grade 6s don't want SCS roles (including specialist roles e.g. economics, legal).”

“People less happy to disrupt their lifestyles to take an overseas posting (the heart and soul of the FCO) as the rewards package is steadily chipped away, with frozen pay.”

“There are many people in delegated grades with the skills to do the SCS role much better than some existing incumbents but they are not motivated to apply because of the way that they see their SCS colleagues being treated.”

2.23 As reported last year, there are clearly still issues with transparency around recruitment into and within the SCS. This year only 51% of respondents to our survey said the processes for promotion into and within the SCS are clear and transparent.

Member's comment

“Clarity over promotion, rather than it being a function of being the PS's special choice.”

PENSIONS

2.24 It is reassuring that 96% of respondents are in the civil service pension scheme with only 8% in the Partnership scheme. This is the first time we have undertaken these questions in the survey so won't be able to identify trends however the commentary given by respondents will need to be taken seriously.

ANNUAL ALLOWANCE AND LIFETIME ALLOWANCE

2.25 22% have reached their annual allowance in previous years. 33% had not used their AA limit in the last 3 years. 21% of those who had reached the limit paid HMRC direct, so it is of concern that scheme members are unaware of the scheme pays mechanisms, however, 5% used mandatory scheme pays and 10% used voluntary scheme pays.

2.26 We asked respondents if they had considered leaving the CSPA in the last year. 87% said no, which is good, however, the remaining 13% had a range of reasons for that consideration, the highest feature was tax and tax liabilities.

Members' comments

“Will exceed AA 2018-19 just; already exceed LA; need the 8.05% contributions for current expenditure after 9 years reduction in real take home pay.”

“It is ridiculous that I cannot reach the pension level I was promised when joining without being subjected to additional punitive tax.”

2.27 A number also expressed concern about promotion and the impact on their pensions and tax liabilities.

Members' comments

"If I am promoted, I will face a huge tax bill, which I can only offset against my pension on very unattractive terms."

"I knew I would incur large tax liabilities on promotion."

2.28 The final band of responses remarked on the reducing 'value' of the current pension scheme and the Government/employer's integrity towards it.

Members' comments

"Pension scheme does not compensate for lower pay than in private sector. Also, will not be able to get payment until at least 68 years old and have no trust that the Government will honour commitment to pay out."

"Had to move to a private pension scheme as part of move to new T&Cs with the Government Commercial Function."

SCS PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

2.29 46% feel they do not have adequate opportunities for personal development to enhance their SCS competencies. 60% state this is due to lack of time, while 15% cite lack of opportunities. 17% responded other and the majority of comments made were that it was a combination of lack of time, lack of opportunities and budgetary constraints. However, the other two key areas identified by respondents were a lack of line management support, a lack of suitable opportunities and concerns of bias and discrimination in selection for development opportunities.

Members' comments

“Lack of guidance from my senior managers. They are so focussed on the ‘day job’ that making time for my development has not happened in the way I (and I’m sure they) would want.”

“Survey does not let me select all that apply: time, budget and lack of opportunities overseas.”

“Ongoing, institutional discrimination against part-time staff.”

NUMERICAL RESULTS OF THE 2018 SCS PAY SURVEY

Question	Response	All Responses (nearest %)	Top Performers (nearest %)
What is your pay band	1	76	62
	1A	3	5
	2	19	28
	3	2	5
How many years have you been in this band?	1	10	12
	2	10	10
	3	7	2
	4	8	12
	5	9	8
	6	4	3

	7	5	3
	8	3	3
	9	5	7
	10	8	7
	11-15	22	20
	16-20	10	12
	21-25	0	2
	26-30	0	0
	31-35	0	0
	More than 35	0	0
What is your annual salary?	Less than £55,000	0	0
	£55,000-£60,000	0	0
	£60,001-£65,000	2	2
	£65,001-£70,000	19	13
	£70,001-£75,000	24	13
	£75,001-£80,000	17	17
	£80,001-£85,000	11	13
	£85,001-£90,000	5	5

	£90,001-£95,000	8	15
	£95,001-£100,000	5	3
	£100,001-£110,000	4	8
	£110,001-£120,000	3	10
	£120,001-£130,000	1	0
	£130,001-£140,000	0	0
	£140,001-£150,000	0	0
	£150,001-£160,000	0	0
	£160,001-£170,000	0	0
	£170,001-£180,000	0	0
	More than £180,000	0	0
When did you last receive a consolidated SCS pay award?	2018	69	73
	2017	16	14
	2016	2	0
	2015	1	0
	2014	1	2
	2013	0	2
	2012	1	2

	Before 2012	9	8
How satisfied are you with the overall pay arrangements in the SCS?	Very satisfied	1	2
	Satisfied	6	3
	Dissatisfied	34	29
	Very dissatisfied	59	66
Have you received a non-consolidated pay award this year?	Yes	28	64
	No	72	36
Do you believe the current reward framework for the SCS is fit for purpose?	Yes	1	0
	No	99	100
Do you see a clear link between your performance this year and the pay outcome for you?	Yes	14	33
	No	86	67
Do you manage anyone on a lower grade who has a higher salary than you?	Yes	39	39
	No	61	61
Are you satisfied with the pace with which you are progressing in your band?	Yes	5	3
	No	95	97
How do you think	Better	0	0

that your pay compares with similar jobs in the private sector?	Similar	3	2
	Worse	93	97
	Don't know	4	2
How do you think that your pay compares with similar jobs elsewhere in the public sector?	Better	5	3
	Similar	20	18
	Worse	67	72
	Don't know	9	7
On what have you based your responses to questions 13 and 14? Please select all that apply.	Job adverts	65	67
	Contacts with comparable post holders	75	78
	Published information	57	60
	Other	15	12
Are you aware of recruitment difficulties in your organisation?	Yes	67	60
	No	33	40
Are you aware of retention difficulties in your organisation?	Yes	71	68
	No	29	32
Do you believe your organisation has sufficient resources to achieve its	Yes	17	23
	No	74	70

objectives in the year ahead?	Don't Know	9	7
Do you consider that the results produced by the pay system are fair and equitable?	Yes	3	2
	No	97	98
Are you aware of any equal pay issues in your organisation?	Yes	48	52
	No	52	48
Which performance group do you fall into this year?	Top	23	100
	Achieving	68	0
	Low	3	0
	Other	6	0
Do you understand the pay and performance management arrangements for the SCS?	Yes	68	75
	No	32	25
Do you consider that you have received adequate opportunities for personal development to enhance your SCS competencies?	Yes	54	60
	No	46	40
If No, what was the reason/s - tick all that apply	Lack of time	60	67
	Budget	5	7

	Lack of opportunities	15	11
	Management refusal	3	4
	Other	17	11
Are the processes for promotion into and within the SCS clear and transparent?	Yes	51	62
	No	49	38
Do you believe there are sufficient qualified candidates motivated to seek promotion to the SCS from delegated grades?	Yes	56	60
	No	44	40
Do you consider that your performance management objectives are sufficiently comprehensive to reflect your performance in the year 2018-19?	Yes	65	75
	No	35	25
Do you believe the current core competencies adequately reflect the main responsibilities of your role?	Yes	58	63
	No	42	37
Does your post require a specialist qualification?	Yes	46	35
	No	54	65

If yes, do you have CPD opportunities in your specialism?	Yes	65	57
	No	35	43
Do you have any contact with your Head of Profession? Please select all that apply.	Yes, nationally	23	30
	Yes, departmentally	47	50
	No	42	39
In the last year has your morale:	Increased	4	5
	Decreased	67	53
	Remained the same	29	42
Change in which area would have the biggest positive impact on your working life (please tick up to three)?	Pay	86	88
	Terms and conditions	13	15
	Pensions	30	43
	Performance management	21	12
	Increased resourcing (staff)	39	30
	Greater departmental autonomy	4	7
	Workload	45	47
	Location	6	10
	Flexibility (hours or location)	7	7

	Clarity of leadership (Ministerial or Civil Service)	23	20
	Other	8	8
Which of the following has had the most negative impact on you? - select one	Pay	41	45
	Pension changes including tax relief	13	18
	Exit payment restrictions	2	0
	Increased working hours	12	17
	Changes to terms and conditions	2	3
	Performance management	9	3
	Inadequate resources	12	12
	Organisational change	3	0
	Other	7	2
Would you recommend the civil service as a career choice to a friend or relative?	Yes	43	38
	No	47	62
Do you agree with the following statement: I would like to leave the civil service as soon as possible	Agree	29	24
	Disagree	39	41
	Neither	32	36

Do you agree with the following statement: I feel more optimistic about my job than I did 12 months ago	Agree	7	7
	Disagree	69	63
	Neither	23	31
Do you agree with the following statement: I am more inclined to look for a job outside the civil service than I was 12 months ago	Agree	66	70
	Disagree	14	15
	Neither	19	15
Have you seriously considered leaving the SCS in the last 12 months?	Yes	68	67
	No	32	33
If you were to leave the civil service, to which sector would you move?	Private sector	44	48
	NHS	4	5
	Education	3	2
	Local Government	5	3
	Other part of the public sector	20	17
	Higher Education	2	2
	Not for profit	9	9
	None (retiring)	8	9

	Other	5	5
From where were you recruited to the SCS?	Within the civil service	77	78
	Wider public sector	9	7
	Private Sector	11	15
	Not for profit	1	0
	Other	2	0