

# 2010 Census of Local Government Employees

## Report on Findings



August 2011

## **ACCESS TO SERVICES**

The Division of Local Government, Department of Premier and Cabinet is located at:

Levels 1 and 2  
5 O'Keefe Avenue  
NOWRA NSW 2541

Locked Bag 3015  
NOWRA NSW 2541

Phone 02 4428 4100  
Fax 02 4428 4199  
TTY 02 4428 4209

Level 9, 323 Castlereagh Street  
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Locked Bag A5045  
SYDNEY SOUTH NSW 1235

Phone 02 9289 4000  
Fax 02 9289 4099

Email [dlg@dlg.nsw.gov.au](mailto:dlg@dlg.nsw.gov.au)  
Website [www.dlg.nsw.gov.au](http://www.dlg.nsw.gov.au)

## **OFFICE HOURS**

Monday to Friday  
8.30am to 5.00pm

(Special arrangements may be made if these hours are unsuitable)

All offices are wheelchair accessible.

## **ALTERNATIVE MEDIA PUBLICATIONS**

Special arrangements can be made for our publications to be provided in large print or an alternative media format. If you need this service, please contact our Executive Branch on 02 9289 4000.

## **DISCLAIMER**

The material contained in this publication is based upon information provided to the Division by councils. While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information in this publication, the Division of Local Government expressly disclaims any liability to any person in respect of anything done or not done as a result of the contents of the publication or the data provided.

© NSW Division of Local Government, Department of Premier and Cabinet 2011  
ISBN 1 920766 98 7

Produced by the Division of Local Government



[www.dlg.nsw.gov.au](http://www.dlg.nsw.gov.au)

# Table of Contents

Summary of findings .....	4
1. Introduction.....	7
2. Methodology .....	8
3. Findings.....	10
3.1 Part One: Staff Profile.....	10
3.1.1 Total number of local government employees.....	10
3.1.2 Diversity.....	10
3.1.3 Age.....	13
3.1.4 Hours Worked .....	14
3.1.5 Position Type.....	16
3.1.6 Employment status.....	18
3.2 Part Two: EEO and diversity initiatives.....	21
3.2.1 Council flexible/family-friendly initiatives .....	21
3.2.2 Diversity targets.....	24
3.2.3 Other diversity programs/initiatives .....	25
Appendix 1 - Councils' response to the Census .....	35

## Tables

Table 1: Information source(s) for staff profile data .....	9
Table 2: Total number of local government employees .....	10
Table 3: Gender of local government employees .....	11
Table 4: Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders employed in local government .....	11
Table 5: People from a culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) <sup>1</sup> background employed in local government.....	12
Table 6: People with a disability <sup>1</sup> employed in local government.....	13
Table 7: Age of people employed in local government .....	13
Table 8: Hours worked by local government employees .....	14
Table 9(a): Comparison of hours worked by women and men.....	14
Table 9(b): Gender breakdown of hours worked.....	15
Table 10: Position type .....	16
Table 11: Comparison between women and men for position type .....	17
Table 12: Employment status of local government employees .....	18
Table 13(a): Comparison of employment status for women and men.....	19
Table 13(b): Gender breakdown of employment status .....	20
Table 14: Flexible/family-friendly initiatives offered by councils .....	21
Table 15: Take-up of flexible/family-friendly initiatives.....	22
Table 16: Diversity group targets .....	24
Table 17: Targets by diversity group.....	25
Table 18: Other diversity programs/initiatives .....	25
Table 19: Number of staff participating in diversity programs .....	27
Table 20: Characteristics of staff participating in leadership development programs .....	28
Table 21: Characteristics of staff participating in traineeships .....	29
Table 22: Characteristics of staff participating in apprenticeships .....	30
Table 23: Characteristics of staff participating in mentoring programs .....	31
Table 24: Characteristics of staff in identified positions .....	32
Table 25: Characteristics of staff participating in scholarships.....	33

## Summary of findings

This report presents findings from the Census of Local Government Employees completed by 140 (92%) general purpose and 9 (64%) county councils as at 21 July 2010. The findings need to be interpreted with caution as not all councils completed the Census and many councils were not able to complete all Census questions, particularly in relation to the diversity of their employees.

## Staff Profile

### All councils

- The total number of local government staff employed by 142 general purpose and county councils in NSW is 49,023. About half are employed by 37 metropolitan councils, one-third by 36 regional councils and one-fifth by 69 rural councils.
- Women make up nearly half (46%) of the local government workforce in NSW.
- Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people make up 1.3%, people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds make up 4.7% and people with a disability make up 1.2% of the local government workforce in NSW.
- Over half (52%) of local government employees are aged between 35 and 54 years.
- Two-thirds (67%) of the local government workforce in NSW is full-time, followed by less than one-fifth who are casual (18%) or part-time (15%). More than three-quarters (85%) of men employed in local government work full-time compared to less than half (46%) of women.
- More than three-quarters (83%) of local government employees hold non-supervisory positions. Executive positions are held by 1% of local government employees; Manager positions are held by 4% of employees; and Other Supervisor positions are held by 12% of employees. More than three-quarters (84%) of Executive positions, two-thirds (67%) of Manager positions and nearly two-thirds (62%) of Other Supervisor positions are held by men.
- Almost three-quarters (74%) of positions in the local government workforce are permanent. A significant proportion (nearly one-fifth) of positions are casual. More than three-quarters of men employed in local government hold a permanent position, compared to about two-thirds of women. About one-quarter of women hold a casual position.

## Geographic differences

The staff profiles of metropolitan, regional and rural councils differ to some extent. The main differences are:

- While men and women are represented equally in metropolitan councils, women make up just over two-fifths (43%) of staff at regional councils and just over a third (37%) of staff at rural councils.

- Given culturally and linguistically diverse communities tend to settle in more urbanised areas, metropolitan councils have the highest percentage of employees from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (6.7%), followed by regional councils (3.3%) and rural councils (1.1%). As Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people tend to settle in less urbanised areas, not unexpectedly the reverse is the case for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees who make up 3.9% of rural council staff, 1.2% of regional council staff and 0.6% of metropolitan council staff.
- Metropolitan councils have a higher proportion of younger workers (15-34 years) than regional and rural councils (31%, 25% and 27% respectively).

There were also some differences in relation to employment status and hours worked between metropolitan, regional and rural councils.

## **EEO and Diversity Initiatives**

### **All councils**

- The most common family-friendly/flexible initiatives offered by more than four-fifths of councils were rostered/accrued days off, regular part-time work and a 9 day fortnight/compressed hours. These were also the initiatives that had the highest take-up rate by all staff.
- The least common family-friendly/flexible initiatives offered by councils were career break schemes, facilities such as a breastfeeding or family room and school term rostering or alternate core hours. These were also the initiatives that had the lowest take-up rate by all staff.
- While not required to, just under a quarter (23%) of councils have diversity targets, including for EEO groups. Councils that reported having diversity targets were most likely to have them for Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders (91%) followed by women (71%).
- The most common other diversity programs/initiatives implemented by councils were traineeships, apprenticeships and leadership development programs. The diversity programs/initiatives least commonly implemented by councils were scholarships and identified positions.
- Women made up the highest proportion of participants from diversity groups in mentoring programs, traineeships and leadership development programs; and the second highest proportion of participants in all other programs. Younger people made up the highest proportion of participants in apprenticeships and scholarships and the second highest proportion of participants in traineeships and mentoring programs.
- Participation in programs by diversity groups was generally lower than their representation in the local government workforce. The main exceptions were in relation to women's participation in mentoring programs and younger people's participation in all programs apart from leadership development programs.

## **Geographic differences**

The EEO and diversity initiatives offered by metropolitan, regional and rural councils and the participation of diversity groups within diversity programs/initiatives differed to some extent. The main differences were:

- Rural councils were usually less likely to offer family-friendly/flexible initiatives than metropolitan and regional councils, except in relation to 9 day fortnight/compressed hours which they were more likely to offer than the other council types.
- Regional councils were more likely to have diversity targets and implement other diversity programs/initiatives than rural and metropolitan councils.
- In leadership development programs, women were under-represented in metropolitan and regional councils but similarly represented in rural councils. In scholarship programs, women were under-represented in metropolitan and rural councils but over-represented in regional councils. However, the number of female participants in scholarships was relatively low.
- In mentoring programs, younger people were under-represented in metropolitan and regional councils but over-represented in rural councils. In scholarship programs, younger people were similarly represented in metropolitan councils but over-represented in regional and rural councils.

Due to the relatively low numbers of participants from other diversity groups in programs/initiatives, it is not possible to draw conclusions about differences between metropolitan, regional and rural councils in relation to the representation of these groups in these programs.

# **1. Introduction**

## **1.1 Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to provide information about staff employed in NSW councils. The information in the report was collected in the inaugural local government staff Census conducted in July 2010. It therefore forms a set of 'baseline' data from which future comparisons can be made.

The findings are in two parts:

- the first part provides a broad demographic profile, or snapshot of staff employed in councils and the pattern of their employment
- the second part provides information about EEO and diversity initiatives in place in councils.

## **1.2 Objectives**

The objectives of the Census were to:

- gain an initial snapshot of the demographic profile of local government employees and to update this four-yearly to identify trends over time
- assess the diversity of council staff, including quantifying the representation of women, Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Island people, culturally and linguistically diverse people and people with a disability in local government, particularly in management positions
- identify the strategies councils are currently using to improve their diversity (eg. identified positions and availability of flexible and family-friendly work practices)
- determine appropriate strategies to address skills shortages and to assist councils generally with workforce planning issues.

## **1.3 Integrated Planning and Reporting framework**

As part of the Integrated Planning and Reporting framework councils are required to prepare a minimum 4 year workforce management strategy which addresses the human resources requirements of the council's 4 year Delivery Program. The Delivery Program details the principal activities to be undertaken to achieve the objectives established in the Community Strategic Plan.

The data requested in the 2010 Census includes much of the information that councils will need to collect and analyse if they are to develop an appropriate workforce management strategy.

## **2. Methodology**

A small advisory group of HR representatives from Brewarrina, Griffith, Holroyd, Jerilderie, Lismore, Marrickville, Warringah and Wingecarribee Councils was formed to assist with developing the Census, including finalising the questions and its timing, and to pilot the draft Census form. As a result of stakeholder feedback from the pilot some minor changes were made to the Census form prior to its release to councils in late May 2010. The form was distributed early to give councils time to collect the information needed to complete it if it was not already being gathered.

All general purpose and county councils were asked to complete the Census form as at 21 July 2010 and return it to the Division by 28 July 2010. Reminder emails were sent to councils on 14 July 2010, one week prior to the Census date and on 28 July 2010, one week following the Census date. To maximise the response rate, and optimise data quality, follow-up calls were made to a number of councils.

The survey was divided into two parts: the first part asked questions about the council's staff profile; the second part asked questions about the implementation of EEO and diversity initiatives within the council.

### **2.1 Response rate and data limitations**

A total of 140 general purpose councils (92%) and 9 county councils (64%) completed the Census. A list of councils which completed the Census is attached at Appendix 1.

While this is a fairly high response rate, particularly for general purpose councils, the findings need to be interpreted with some caution as they do not include all staff in all NSW councils. Also, as this was the first time the Census was undertaken, a number of councils reported experiencing some problems completing it.

In relation to the gender comparisons, the number of men was calculated by subtracting the number of women from the number of total staff employed by councils where provided.

Many Census returns were only partially completed. Some included data for women but not total staff, some did not include any data for any of the diversity groups, some did not provide any staff profile data at all and some provided some data in relation to some questions but not others. All usable data provided by councils was incorporated into the analysis to give the fullest picture possible. However, it means that the figures in some tables may not be the same as figures provided in other tables.

To obtain an indication of the reliability of the data provided by councils in response to the Census, the total number of staff employed was compared with the total number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff provided by general purpose councils, which responded to the Census, for the Division's Comparative Information on NSW Local Government Councils 2009/10 (unpublished). The total number of FTE staff was 40,414. This compares with the total number of staff of 48,582, as provided in response to the Census which represents a difference of 17%.

The number of staff employed in each council category (see 2.3), excluding county councils, was also compared. The comparison of total FTE staff to total staff numbers provided in response to the Census was 19,890 and 25,231 in metropolitan councils (a difference of

21%); 13,603 and 16,185 in regional councils (a difference of 16%); and 6,921 and 7,607 in rural councils (a difference of 9%).

The numbers provided in response to the Census are higher because they do not represent FTE. Each part-time staff member was counted as a single staff member for the purposes of the Census. Based on information about numbers of full-time, part-time and casual staff provided by councils (see Table 8), it appears that there is at least some consistency between the two sources of data.

## 2.2 Information source for staff profile

Councils were asked what source or sources of information they used to complete the staff profile section of the Census. Table 1 shows their responses.

**Table 1: Information source(s) for staff profile data**

Data source	Number (n = 144)	%
Payroll/HR	140	97
Staff survey	2	1
Payroll/HR and staff survey	20	14
Other <sup>1</sup>	21	15
Unknown	2	1

<sup>1</sup> Comments made by councils under the "other" category were in addition to the use of payroll and HR records and included use of information from the organisational structure chart, as well as noting the limitations of the council's existing HR database or payroll system, for example that staff diversity information is not currently recorded.

Table 1 shows that almost all councils (97%) relied on payroll and HR records to complete the Census.

## 2.3 Council categories

For the purpose of analysis, councils that responded to the Census have been classified as Metropolitan, Regional or Rural based on the Australian Classification of Local Government and DLG group numbers as follows:

- 37 metropolitan councils (DLG groups 1-3 and 6-7)
- 36 regional councils (DLG groups 4-5)
- 71 rural councils (DLG groups 8-11)

County councils that responded to the Census were categorised as Regional or Rural based on the classification of the majority of their constituent councils.

A list of the councils and county councils in each category is attached at Appendix 1.

### 3. Findings

#### 3.1 Part One: Staff Profile

Some councils were not able to provide some staff profile and diversity data, particularly regarding Aboriginality, cultural diversity and disability. Therefore, the findings in this part of the report do not accurately reflect the profile of all staff in those councils that completed the Census.

##### 3.1.1 Total number of local government employees

**Table 2: Total number of local government employees**

<b>Councils</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Average</b>
Metropolitan (n = 37)	25,231	51	682
Regional (n = 36)	16,185	33	450
Rural (n = 69)	7,607	16	110
<b>Total (n = 142)</b>	<b>49,023</b>	<b>100</b>	

Table 2 shows that:

- Metropolitan councils employ just over half of all NSW local government employees, followed by regional councils (33%) and rural councils (16%). This is despite almost half of all councils being in the rural category.
- On average, metropolitan councils employ six times more and regional councils employ four times more employees than rural councils.

In addition:

- The number of employees ranged from a minimum of 8 employed by one county council to a maximum of 1,887 employed by one metropolitan council.
- The total number of employees in local government represents about 1.5% of the total NSW workforce (source: ABS [NSW State and Regional Indicators December 2010](#)). This figure is likely to under-represent the true percentage because, as previously mentioned, not all councils completed the Census, including some that did not provide the total number of employees.

##### 3.1.2 Diversity

The tables presented in this section show the number and percentage of various diversity groups employed in local government in NSW - namely women, Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders, people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and people with a disability. Information about the number and percentage of young people employed in local government may be found in the following section 3.1.3 - Age.

## Gender

Information in Table 3 below was calculated by subtracting the number of women from the number of total staff employed by councils.

**Table 3: Gender of local government employees**

Gender	Metropolitan councils (n = 37)		Regional councils (n = 36)		Rural councils (n = 69)		All councils (n = 142)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Women	12,699	50	6,879	43	2,842	37	22,381	46
Men	12,532	50	9,306	57	4,804	63	26,642	54

Table 3 shows that:

- Overall, women make up 46% of the local government workforce in NSW. This is similar to the 45% of women that make up the NSW workforce (source: [ABS Labour force 6202.0](#)).
- While men and women are represented equally in metropolitan councils, women make up just over two-fifths of staff at regional councils and just over a third of staff at rural councils.

In addition:

- The percentage of women employees ranged from 13% (one county council staff member) to 55% (891 women at one metropolitan council).
- The average number of women employed by each metropolitan council is 343, which is nearly twice the average number of women employed by each regional council (191) and nearly nine times the average number of women employed by rural councils (41).

## Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders

**Table 4: Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders employed in local government**

	No.	%	% representation in local population
Metropolitan councils (n = 37)	147	0.6	0.9 <sup>1</sup>
Regional councils (n = 35)	208	1.2	3.6 <sup>1</sup>
Rural councils (n = 69)	304	3.9	7.4 <sup>1</sup>
All councils (n = 141)	659	1.3	2.2 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Comparative Information on NSW Local Government Councils 2009/10 (unpublished)

<sup>2</sup> ABS National Regional Profile NSW 2006

Table 4 shows that:

- Overall, Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders make up 1.3% of the local government workforce in NSW. This is less than their representation in the NSW population.

- While rural councils employ a higher percentage of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders than metropolitan and regional councils, representation is closest in metropolitan councils, followed by rural then regional councils.

In addition:

- The number of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander employees ranged from none employed by 55 councils to 39 employed by one rural council (32% of all employees).
- The average number of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders employed by each metropolitan and rural council is 4, compared to 6 for each regional council.

*People from a culturally and linguistically diverse background*

**Table 5: People from a culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD)<sup>1</sup> background employed in local government**

	No.	%	% representation in local population
Metropolitan councils (n = 37)	1,687	6.7	24 <sup>2</sup>
Regional councils (n = 35)	539	3.3	4.6 <sup>2</sup>
Rural councils (n = 69)	88	1.1	2.5 <sup>2</sup>
All councils (n = 141)	2,314	4.7	20.1 <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Culturally and linguistically diverse" was defined on the Census form as speaking a language other than English at home.

<sup>2</sup> Comparative Information on NSW Local Government Councils 2009/10 (unpublished)

<sup>3</sup> 2006 Census

Table 5 shows that:

- Overall, people from a culturally and linguistically diverse background make up 4.7% of the local government workforce in NSW. This is significantly less than their representation in the NSW population.
- As would be expected, given culturally and linguistically diverse communities tend to settle in more urbanized areas, metropolitan councils have the highest percentage of workers from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, followed by regional councils and rural councils.
- While metropolitan councils employ a higher percentage of people from a culturally and linguistically diverse background than regional and rural councils, representation is closest in regional councils, followed by rural then metropolitan councils.

In addition:

- The number of culturally and linguistically diverse employees in local government ranged from none employed by 76 councils to 334 employed by one regional council (24% of all employees).
- The average number of culturally and linguistically diverse employees in each metropolitan council is 46 compared to 15 in each regional council and 1 in each rural council.

## People with a disability

**Table 6: People with a disability<sup>1</sup> employed in local government**

Metropolitan councils (n = 37)		Regional councils (n = 35)		Rural councils (n = 69)		All councils (n = 141)		
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	% <sup>2</sup>
215	0.8	186	1.1	41	0.5	442	1.2	18.6

<sup>1</sup> Disability was defined as per the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Commonwealth)

<sup>2</sup> Percentage representation in the NSW population (ABS 2009 Disability, Ageing and Carers Australia)

Table 6 shows that:

- Overall, people with a disability make up 1.2% of the local government workforce in NSW. This is significantly less than their representation in the NSW population.
- Metropolitan, regional and rural councils all employ similar percentages of people with a disability.

In addition:

- The number of people with a disability employed in local government ranged from none employed by 78 councils to 54 employed by one regional council (4% of all employees).
- The average number of employees with a disability in each metropolitan council is 6 and 5 in each regional council, compared with less than 1 in each rural council.

### 3.1.3 Age

**Table 7: Age of people employed in local government**

Age (years)	Metropolitan councils (n = 36)		Regional councils (n = 35)		Rural councils (n = 69)		All councils (n = 140)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
15-24	2,859	11	1,444	9	594	8	4,897	10
25-34	4,931	20	2,507	16	1,128	15	8,566	17
35-44	5,824	23	3,948	24	1,781	23	11,553	24
45-54	6,465	26	4,920	30	2,269	30	13,654	28
55-64	4,289	17	2,796	17	1,496	20	8,581	18
65+	601	2	279	2	247	3	1,127	2

Table 7 shows that:

- Overall, over half of the local government workforce in NSW is aged between 35 and 54 years.
- There is little difference between metropolitan, regional and rural councils. The main difference is that metropolitan councils have a higher proportion of younger workers aged 15-34 years (about one-third) than regional and rural councils (about one-quarter).

### 3.1.4 Hours Worked

**Table 8: Hours worked by local government employees**

Hours worked	Metropolitan councils (n = 37)		Regional councils (n = 36)		Rural councils (n = 69)		All councils (n = 142)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Full-time	16,312	65	11,000	67	5,603	73	32,915	67
Part-time	3,798	15	2,376	15	1,060	14	7,234	15
Casual <sup>1</sup>	5,096	20	2,763	17	940	12	8,799	18

<sup>1</sup> Casual was defined as day to day employment with no fixed hours

Table 8 shows that:

- Overall, about two-thirds of the local government workforce in NSW is full-time followed by less than one-fifth who are casual or part-time.
- There is little difference between metropolitan, regional and rural councils. The main difference is that rural councils employ a higher percentage of full-time employees than metropolitan and regional councils, and metropolitan and regional councils employ a higher percentage of casual employees than rural councils.

*Hours worked by gender*

**Table 9(a): Comparison of hours worked by women and men**

Hours worked	Full-time		Part-time		Casual <sup>1</sup>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Metropolitan councils (n = 37)</b>						
Women	5,865	46	3,097	25	3,673	29
Men	10,447	83	701	6	1,423	11
<b>Regional councils (n = 36)</b>						
Women	3,060	45	1,877	27	1,913	28
Men	7,940	86	499	5	850	9
<b>Rural councils (n = 69)</b>						
Women	1,221	44	912	33	659	23
Men	4,382	91	148	3	281	6
<b>Total Women</b>	10,146	46	5,886	26	6,245	28
<b>Total Men</b>	22,769	85	1,348	5	2,554	10

<sup>1</sup> Casual is defined as day to day employment with no fixed hours

Table 9(a) shows that:

- Overall, more than three-quarters of men employed in local government work full-time compared to less than half of women. About one-quarter of women work part-time and about one-quarter are casual.

- There is little difference between metropolitan, regional and rural councils in terms of the hours worked by men and women. The main difference is that women in rural councils are more likely than their metropolitan and regional counterparts to work part-time and less likely to be casual.

**Table 9(b): Gender breakdown of hours worked**

Hours worked	Full-time		Part-time		Casual <sup>1</sup>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Metropolitan councils (n = 37)</b>						
Women	5,865	36	3,097	82	3,673	72
Men	10,447	64	701	18	1,423	28
<b>Regional councils (n = 36)</b>						
Women	3,060	28	1,877	79	1,913	69
Men	7,940	72	499	21	850	31
<b>Rural councils (n = 69)</b>						
Women	1,221	22	912	86	659	70
Men	4,382	78	148	14	281	30
<b>Total Women</b>	<b>10,146</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>5,886</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>6,254</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Total Men</b>	<b>22,769</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>1,348</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2,554</b>	<b>29</b>

<sup>1</sup> Casual is defined as day to day employment with no fixed hours

Table 9(b) shows that:

- Overall, women make up nearly one-third of all full-time local government employees, more than three-quarters of part-time employees and nearly three-quarters of casual employees.
- There is little difference between metropolitan, regional and rural councils in terms of the proportion of full-time, part-time and casual employees who are women. The main difference is that women make up a greater proportion of full-time employees in metropolitan councils (more than one-third) compared to regional and rural councils (about one-quarter).

### 3.1.5 Position Type

**Table 10: Position type**

Position type	Metropolitan councils (n = 37)		Regional councils (n = 34)		Rural councils (n = 66)		All councils (n = 137)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Executive <sup>1</sup>	173	1	160	1	211	3	544	1
Manager <sup>2</sup>	847	3	667	4	398	6	1,912	4
Other Supervisor <sup>3</sup>	3,101	13	1,599	10	707	10	5,407	12
Non-supervisory	19,878	83	13,284	85	5,626	81	38,788	83

<sup>1</sup> "Executive" was defined as General Managers, Assistant/Deputy General Managers and Directors

<sup>2</sup> "Manager" included section or department heads

<sup>3</sup> "Other Supervisor" included team leaders and coordinators

Table 10 shows that:

- Overall, more than three-quarters of local government employees hold non-supervisory positions and this is similar across metropolitan, regional and rural councils.
- Metropolitan, regional and rural councils are also similar in relation to the proportions of Executive, Manager and Other Supervisor positions.

In addition:

- The number of Executive positions ranged from 1 (15 rural councils) to 11 (1 metropolitan council).
- The average number of Executive positions was 5 for both metropolitan and regional councils and 3 for rural councils.

**Table 11: Comparison between women and men for position type**

Council type	Executive		Manager		Other Supervisor		Non-supervisory	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Metropolitan councils (n = 37)</b>								
Women	37	21	296	36	1,355	45	8,807	51
Men	133	79	530	64	1,654	55	8,591	49
<b>Regional councils (n = 36)</b>								
Women	27	17	166	25	500	31	5,924	43
Men	133	83	501	75	1,112	69	7,698	57
<b>Rural councils (n = 69)</b>								
Women	26	12	162	39	191	26	2,388	41
Men	185	88	253	61	532	74	3,462	59
<b>Total Women</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>2,046</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>17,119</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Total Men</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>1,284</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>3,298</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>19,751</b>	<b>54</b>

Table 11 shows that:

- Overall, more than three-quarters of Executive positions, two-thirds of Manager positions and nearly two-thirds of Other Supervisor positions are held by men.
- While men are much more likely than women to hold Executive, Manager and Other Supervisor positions in metropolitan, regional and rural councils there are some differences between councils. Women generally make up the greatest proportion of these positions in metropolitan councils followed by regional then rural councils. The exception to this is that women make up a lower proportion of managers in regional councils compared to rural councils.

### 3.1.6 Employment status

**Table 12: Employment status of local government employees**

Employment status	Metropolitan councils (n = 37)		Regional councils (n = 36)		Rural councils (n = 69)		All councils (n = 142)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Permanent	18,546	71	11,632	76	6,049	81	36,227	74
Casual	5,441	21	2,637	17	922	12	9,000	18
Temporary	949	2	506	4	173	2	1,628	3
Contract	646	4	153	1	96	1	895	2
Apprentice <sup>1</sup>	192	1	191	1	77	1	460	1
Trainee	338	1	218	1	197	3	753	2

<sup>1</sup> Includes apprentices employed by councils and other organisations

Table 12 shows that:

- Overall, about three-quarters of positions in the local government workforce in NSW are permanent. Casual is the next most common employment status.
- There is little difference between metropolitan, regional and rural councils. The main differences are that a higher proportion of positions in rural councils are permanent compared to metropolitan and regional councils while a higher proportion of positions in metropolitan and regional councils are casual compared to rural councils.

**Table 13(a) Comparison of employment status for women and men**

Employment status	Women		Men	
	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Metropolitan councils (n = 37)</b>				
Permanent	8,076	62	10,470	80
Casual	3,911	30	1,530	12
Temporary	625	5	324	3
Contract	222	2	424	3
Apprentice	26	0.1	166	1
Trainee	186	1	152	1
<b>Regional councils (n = 34)</b>				
Permanent	4,315	66	7,317	83
Casual	1,749	27	888	10
Temporary	283	4	223	3
Contract	46	1	107	1
Apprentice	14	0.2	177	2
Trainee	122	2	96	1
<b>Rural councils (n = 66)</b>				
Permanent	1,972	70	4,077	87
Casual	661	23	261	6
Temporary	87	3	86	2
Contract	10	0.3	86	2
Apprentice	8	0.3	69	1
Trainee	95	3	102	2
<b>All councils (n = 137)</b>				
Permanent	14,363	64	21,864	82
Casual	6,321	28	2,679	10
Temporary	995	4	633	2
Contract	278	1	617	2
Apprentice	48	0.2	412	2
Trainee	403	2	350	2

Table 13(a) shows that:

- Overall, more than three-quarters of men employed in local government hold a permanent position compared to about two-thirds of women. About one-quarter of women hold a casual position.
- There is little difference between metropolitan, regional and rural councils in terms of the employment status of men and women. The main difference is that both women and men in rural councils are more likely than their metropolitan and regional counterparts to hold a permanent position and less likely to hold a casual position.

**Table 13(b): Gender breakdown of employment status**

Employment status	Women		Men	
	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Metropolitan councils (n = 37)</b>				
Permanent	8,076	44	10,470	56
Casual	3,911	72	1,530	28
Temporary	625	66	324	34
Contract	222	34	424	66
Apprentice	26	14	166	86
Trainee	186	55	152	45
<b>Regional councils (n = 34)</b>				
Permanent	4,315	37	7,317	63
Casual	1,749	66	888	34
Temporary	283	56	223	44
Contract	46	30	107	70
Apprentice	14	7	177	93
Trainee	122	56	96	44
<b>Rural councils (n = 66)</b>				
Permanent	1,972	33	4,077	67
Casual	661	72	261	28
Temporary	87	50	86	50
Contract	10	10	86	90
Apprentice	8	10	69	90
Trainee	95	48	102	52
<b>All councils (n = 137)</b>				
Permanent	14,363	40	21,864	60
Casual	6,321	70	2,679	30
Temporary	995	61	633	39
Contract	278	31	617	69
Apprentice	48	10	412	90
Trainee	403	54	350	46

Table 13(b) shows that:

- Overall, women make up two-fifths of all permanent employees in local councils but more than two-thirds of casual employees and more than half of temporary employees. Women also make up less than one-tenth of apprentices but more than half of all trainees.
- There is little difference between metropolitan, regional and rural councils in terms of the gender breakdown of employment status. The main difference is that women hold a greater proportion of permanent and temporary positions in metropolitan councils compared to regional and rural councils.

### 3.2 Part Two: EEO and diversity initiatives

Councils were asked which EEO and diversity initiatives, from a pre-determined list, they implemented in the past 12 months, or they are currently implementing. Councils were able to identify other initiatives not included in the pre-determined list. Initiatives were divided into family friendly/flexible initiatives and other diversity programs/initiatives.

#### 3.2.1 Council flexible/family-friendly initiatives

Table 14 shows the number of councils that offered certain initiatives. All councils indicated offering more than one initiative.

**Table 14: Flexible/family-friendly initiatives offered by councils**

Initiative	Metropolitan councils (n = 37)		Regional councils (n = 39)		Rural councils (n = 73)		Total councils (n = 149)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Rostered/accrued days off	36	97	38	97	69	95	143	96
Regular part-time work	36	97	38	97	62	85	136	91
9 day fortnight/ compressed hours	28	76	33	85	66	90	127	85
Flexible start/finish times	34	92	34	87	48	66	116	78
Flexible leave arrangements	31	84	30	77	49	67	110	74
Work from home	34	92	31	79	37	51	102	68
Job sharing	33	89	35	90	32	44	100	67
Flexible rostering/scheduling	26	70	25	64	39	53	90	60
Unpaid leave for carers	22	59	17	44	24	33	63	42
Part year employment	15	41	14	36	27	37	56	38
Part-time leave without pay	16	43	15	38	24	33	55	37
School term rostering/ alternative core hours	6	16	5	13	13	18	24	16
Facilities (eg breastfeeding/family room)	11	30	8	21	4	5	23	15
Career break schemes	3	8	2	5	1	1	6	4
Other <sup>1</sup>	9	24	8	21	7	10	24	16

<sup>1</sup> Included phased retirement, healthy lifestyle programs, prayer rooms and salary sacrifice options for gym fees and child care.

Table 14 shows that:

- The most common flexible/family friendly initiatives offered by more than four-fifths of councils were rostered/accrued days off, regular part-time work and a 9 day fortnight/compressed hours. Over half of all councils also offered flexible start/finish

- The least common flexible/family friendly initiatives offered by councils (less than one-fifth) were career break schemes, facilities such as a breastfeeding or family room and school term rostering or alternate core hours.
- Rural councils were usually less likely to offer flexible/family friendly initiatives than metropolitan and regional councils. The main exception to this was that rural councils were more likely to offer a 9 day fortnight/compressed hours than metropolitan and regional councils.

#### *Take-up of flexible/family-friendly initiatives by staff*

Councils were asked to indicate the percentage of staff who have taken-up the various flexible/family friendly initiatives offered from a pre-determined list of percentage ranges as shown in Table 15 below.

**Table 15: Take-up of flexible/family-friendly initiatives**

Initiative	Take-up rate (No. and % of councils)					
	0% all staff	1-25% all staff	26-50% all staff	51-75% all staff	76-99% all staff	100% all staff
<b>Rostered/accrued days off</b> <b>All councils (n = 142)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12 (8%)</b>	<b>21 (15%)</b>	<b>22 (15%)</b>	<b>62 (44%)</b>	<b>25 (18%)</b>
Metro councils (n = 36)	0	5 (14%)	9 (25%)	7 (19%)	13 (36%)	2 (6%)
Regional councils (n = 37)	0	4 (11%)	8 (22%)	6 (16%)	14 (38%)	5 (14%)
Rural councils (n = 69)	0	3 (4%)	4 (6%)	9 (13%)	35 (51%)	18 (26%)
<b>Regular part-time work</b> <b>All councils (n = 134)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>114 (85%)</b>	<b>13 (10%)</b>	<b>6 (4%)</b>	<b>1 (1%)</b>	<b>0</b>
Metro councils (n = 36)	0	31 (86%)	3 (8%)	2 (6%)	0	0
Regional councils (n = 36)	0	30 (83%)	5 (14%)	1 (3%)	0	0
Rural councils (n = 62)	0	53 (85%)	5 (8%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	0
<b>9 day fortnight/ compressed hours</b> <b>All councils (n = 125)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17 (14%)</b>	<b>30 (24%)</b>	<b>31 (25%)</b>	<b>35 (28%)</b>	<b>12 (10%)</b>
Metro councils (n = 28)	0	9 (32%)	12 (43%)	4 (14%)	3 (11%)	0
Regional councils (n = 31)	0	5 (16%)	11 (35%)	4 (13%)	10 (32%)	1 (3%)
Rural councils (n = 66)	0	3 (5%)	7 (11%)	23 (35%)	22 (33%)	11 (17%)
<b>Flexible start/finish times</b> <b>All councils (n = 114)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47 (41%)</b>	<b>39 (34%)</b>	<b>17 (15%)</b>	<b>6 (5%)</b>	<b>5 (4%)</b>
Metro councils (n = 34)	0	9 (26%)	11 (32%)	9 (26%)	4 (12%)	1 (3%)
Regional councils (n = 32)	0	7 (22%)	18 (56%)	4 (13%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)
Rural councils (n = 48)	0	31 (65%)	10 (21%)	4 (8%)	0	3 (6%)
<b>Flexible leave arrangements</b> <b>All councils (n = 109)</b>	<b>1 (1%)</b>	<b>25 (23%)</b>	<b>9 (8%)</b>	<b>6 (6%)</b>	<b>24 (22%)</b>	<b>44 (40%)</b>
Metro councils (n = 31)	0	6 (19%)	4 (13%)	1 (3%)	9 (29%)	11 (35%)
Regional councils (n = 29)	0	9 (31%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	4 (14%)	12 (41%)
Rural councils (n = 49)	1 (2%)	10 (20%)	3 (6%)	3 (6%)	11 (22%)	21 (43%)
<b>Work from home</b> <b>All councils (n = 100)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>96 (96%)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Metro councils (n = 34)	0	32 (94%)	2 (6%)	0	0	0
Regional councils (n = 29)	0	29 (100%)	0	0	0	0

Initiative	Take-up rate (No. and % of councils)					
	0% all staff	1-25% all staff	26-50% all staff	51-75% all staff	76-99% all staff	100% all staff
Rural councils (n = 37)	2 (5%)	35 (95%)	0	0	0	0
<b>Job sharing</b> <b>All councils (n = 98)</b>	<b>8 (8%)</b>	<b>88 (90%)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Metro councils (n = 33)	2 (6%)	30 (91%)	1 (3%)	0	0	0
Regional councils (n = 33)	1 (3%)	32 (97%)	0	0	0	0
Rural councils (n = 32)	5 (16%)	26 (81%)	1 (3%)	0	0	0
<b>Flexible rostering/ scheduling</b> <b>All councils (n = 89)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>51 (57%)</b>	<b>19 (21%)</b>	<b>10 (11%)</b>	<b>3 (3%)</b>	<b>4 (4%)</b>
Metro councils (n = 26)	0	18 (69%)	4 (15%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	0
Regional councils (n = 24)	0	11 (46%)	7 (29%)	5 (21%)	0	1 (4%)
Rural councils (n = 39)	2 (5%)	22 (56%)	8 (21%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)	3 (8%)
<b>Unpaid leave for carers</b> <b>All councils (n = 63)</b>	<b>17 (27%)</b>	<b>39 (62%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2 (3%)</b>	<b>5 (8%)</b>
Metro councils (n = 22)	4 (18%)	16 (73%)	0	0	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
Regional councils (n = 17)	5 (28%)	12 (71%)	0	0	0	0
Rural councils (n = 24)	8 (33%)	11 (46%)	0	0	1 (4%)	4 (17%)
<b>Part year employment</b> <b>All councils (n = 56)</b>	<b>2 (4%)</b>	<b>54 (96%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Metro councils (n = 15)	0	15 (100%)	0	0	0	0
Regional councils (n = 14)	0	14 (100%)	0	0	0	0
Rural councils (n = 27)	2 (7%)	25 (93%)	0	0	0	0
<b>Part-time leave without pay</b> <b>All councils (n = 55)</b>	<b>10 (18%)</b>	<b>39 (71%)</b>	<b>2 (4%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1 (2%)</b>	<b>3 (5%)</b>
Metro councils (n = 16)	3 (19%)	11 (69%)	1 (6%)	0	0	1 (6%)
Regional councils (n = 15)	1 (7%)	13 (87)	0	0	0	1 (7%)
Rural councils (n = 24)	6 (25%)	15 (63%)	1 (4%)	0	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
<b>School term rostering/alt core hours</b> <b>All councils (n = 24)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24 (100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Metro councils (n = 6)	0	6 (100%)	0	0	0	0
Regional councils (n = 5)	0	5 (100%)	0	0	0	0
Rural councils (n = 13)	0	13 (100%)	0	0	0	0
<b>Facilities (eg breastfeeding/ family room)</b> <b>All councils (n = 23)</b>	<b>5 (22%)</b>	<b>17 (74%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1 (4%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Metro councils (n = 11)	2 (18%)	8 (73%)	0	1	0	0
Regional councils (n = 8)	1 (13%)	7 (88%)	0	0	0	0
Rural councils (n = 4)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0	0	0	0
<b>Career break schemes</b> <b>All councils (n = 6)</b>	<b>4 (67%)</b>	<b>2 (33%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Metro councils (n = 3)	3 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
Regional councils (n = 2)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0
Rural councils (n = 1)	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0
<b>Other</b> <b>All councils (n = 24)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17 (71%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2 (8%)</b>	<b>1 (4%)</b>	<b>4 (17%)</b>
Metro councils (n = 9)	0	6 (67%)	0	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)
Regional councils (n = 8)	0	7 (88%)	0	1 (13%)	0	0
Rural councils (n = 7)	0	4 (57%)	0	0	0	3 (43%)

Note - a small number of councils that indicated they offer flexible/family-friendly initiatives did not complete the information about the percentage take-up by their staff so the figures in this table do not necessarily reflect the figures in Table 14.

Table 15 shows that:

- Of the initiatives that were offered by the councils that responded, most councils reported a low take-up rate among all staff (1-25%).
- The initiatives that had the highest take-up rate among all staff were:
  - Flexible leave arrangements (40% of councils had a take-up rate of 100%);
  - Rostered/accrued days off (44% of councils had a take-up rate of 76-99%); and
  - 9 day fortnight/compressed hours (28% of councils had a take-up rate of 76-99% and 25% of councils had a take-up rate of 51-75%).
- The initiatives that had the lowest take-up rate among all staff were:
  - Career break schemes (67% of councils had no take-up and 33% of councils had a take-up rate of 1-25%);
  - Facilities such as a breastfeeding/family room (22% of councils had no take-up and 74% of councils had a take-up rate of 1-25%); and
  - School term rostering/alternative core hours (all councils had a take-up rate of 1-25%).
- Generally, the take-up rate of initiatives across metropolitan, regional and rural councils was similar. The main differences were that there was a much higher take-up rate of rostered/accrued days off and 9 day fortnights and a much lower take-up rate of flexible start/finish times in rural councils compared with metropolitan and regional councils. Generally, the initiatives most commonly offered by councils had the highest take-up rates while the initiatives least commonly offered had the lowest take-up rates.

### 3.2.2 Diversity targets

Councils were asked whether they have targets in relation to the employment of certain groups of employees, including diversity groups. Councils are not required by legislation to have targets.

**Table 16: Diversity group targets**

Diversity group targets	Metropolitan councils (n = 37)		Regional councils (n = 39)		Rural councils (n = 72)		All councils (n = 148)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	6	16	16	41	13	18	35	24
No	31	84	23	59	59	82	113	76

Table 16 shows that:

- Three-quarters of councils do not have targets for certain groups of employees.
- Regional councils were much more likely than rural and metropolitan councils to have targets for certain groups of employees.

Councils that indicated having targets for certain groups of employees were asked to specify which groups were included.

**Table 17: Targets by diversity group**

Diversity group	Metropolitan councils (n = 6)		Regional councils (n = 16)		Rural councils (n = 13)		All councils (n = 35)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander	5	83	16	100	11	85	32	91
Women	4	67	11	69	10	77	25	71
Disability	5	83	11	69	8	62	24	69
Young people	4	67	9	56	9	69	22	63
Culturally and Linguistically Diverse	4	67	7	44	8	62	19	54
Older people	2	33	6	38	7	54	15	43
Other <sup>1</sup>	1	17	0	0	0	0	1	1

<sup>1</sup> This was a target for women at management level.

Table 17 shows that of the councils that had targets for certain groups of employees:

- Councils were most likely to have targets for Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders followed by women.
- Due to the relatively low numbers of councils that have targets, it is not possible to draw conclusions about differences between metropolitan, regional and rural councils.

### 3.2.3 Other diversity programs/initiatives

**Table 18: Other diversity programs/initiatives**

Program/initiative	Number and % of councils					
	Yes	%	No	%	No response	%
<b>Traineeships</b>						
<b>All councils (n = 149)</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>
Metropolitan councils (n = 37)	31	84	4	11	2	5
Regional councils (n = 39)	38	97	1	3	0	0
Rural councils (n = 73)	51	70	12	16	10	14
<b>Apprenticeships</b>						
<b>All councils (n = 149)</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>

Program/initiative	Number and % of councils					
	Yes	%	No	%	No response	%
Metropolitan councils (n = 37)	25	68	7	19	5	14
Regional councils (n = 39)	36	92	2	5	1	3
Rural councils (n = 73)	42	58	19	26	12	16
<b>Leadership development</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>All councils (n = 149)</b>						
Metropolitan councils (n = 37)	24	65	10	27	3	8
Regional councils (n = 39)	24	62	14	36	1	3
Rural councils (n = 73)	15	21	41	56	17	23
<b>Mentoring</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>All councils (n = 149)</b>						
Metropolitan councils (n = 37)	15	41	18	49	4	11
Regional councils (n = 39)	18	46	21	54	0	0
Rural councils (n = 73)	12	16	43	59	17	23
<b>Identified positions</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>All councils (n = 149)</b>						
Metropolitan councils (n = 37)	15	41	16	43	6	16
Regional councils (n = 39)	16	41	18	46	5	13
Rural councils (n = 73)	10	14	43	59	20	27
<b>Scholarships</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>All councils (n = 149)</b>						
Metropolitan councils (n = 37)	6	16	22	59	9	24
Regional councils (n = 39)	9	23	19	49	11	28
Rural councils (n = 73)	12	16	36	49	25	34
<b>Other<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>All councils (n = 149)</b>						
Metropolitan councils (n = 37)	3	8	0	0	34	92
Regional councils (n = 39)	6	15	0	0	33	85
Rural councils (n = 73)	9	12	0	0	64	88

<sup>1</sup> Included cadetships, existing worker traineeships, school based traineeships, paid work experience, WELL (literacy) program, tertiary assistance, student positions.

Table 18 shows that:

- The most common diversity programs implemented by more than two-thirds of councils were traineeships and apprenticeships.
- The programs least commonly implemented by less than one-third of councils were scholarships, identified positions and mentoring.

- Regional councils were generally most likely to implement programs, followed by metropolitan, then rural councils.

*Number and characteristics of participants*

Councils were asked about the number and demographic characteristics of staff participating in diversity programs they had implemented in the past 12 months or were currently implementing.

**Table 19: Number of staff participating in diversity programs**

Program	Total number of participants	% of all staff
<b>Leadership development (n = 63)</b>	<b>1,503</b>	<b>3</b>
Metropolitan councils (n = 21)	726	3
Regional councils (n = 22)	623	4
Rural councils (n = 13)	154	2
Unknown (n = 7)		
<b>Traineeships (n = 120)</b>	<b>954</b>	<b>2</b>
Metropolitan councils (n = 30)	396	2
Regional councils (n = 35)	264	2
Rural councils (n = 51)	295	4
Unknown (n = 4)		
<b>Apprenticeships (n = 103)</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>1</b>
Metropolitan councils (n = 22)	136	1
Regional councils (n = 31)	214	1
Rural councils (n = 42)	107	1
Unknown (n = 8)		
<b>Mentoring Program (n = 45)</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>1</b>
Metropolitan councils (n = 14)	127	0.5
Regional councils (n = 18)	228	1
Rural councils (n = 11)	57	1
Unknown (n = 2)		
<b>Scholarships (n = 27)</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>0.2</b>
Metropolitan councils (n = 6)	44	0.2
Regional councils (n = 5)	33	0.2
Rural councils (n = 9)	18	0.2
Unknown (n = 7)		
<b>Identified Positions (n = 48)</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>0.2</b>
Metropolitan councils (n = 15)	41	0.2
Regional councils (n = 16)	30	0.2
Rural councils (n = 10)	17	0.2
Unknown (n = 7)		

Table 19 shows that:

- The diversity programs with the highest number of participants were leadership development and traineeships.
- Overall, a very low proportion of all local government employees participated in diversity programs. As a result, there was little difference in participation between metropolitan, regional and rural councils.

### Leadership Development Programs

**Table 20: Characteristics of staff participating in leadership development programs**

Group	Metropolitan councils (n = 21)	Regional councils (n = 22)		Rural councils (n = 13)		All councils (n = 56)						
		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>	% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>	% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>					
Women	305	42	50	173	28	43	58	38	37	536	35	46
Older people <sup>1</sup>	85	12	19	31	5	19	20	13	23	136	9	20
CALD <sup>2</sup>	35	5	6.7	4	1	3.3	7	5	1.1	46	3	4.7
Younger people <sup>3</sup>	21	3	11	12	2	9	6	4	8	39	3	10
ATSI	2	0.3	0.6	6	1	1.2	6	4	3.9	14	1	1.3
Disability <sup>4</sup>	3	0.4	0.8	1	0.2	1.1	0	0	0.5	4	0.3	1.2

<sup>1</sup> "Older people" was defined as aged over 55 for non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and over 45 for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders

<sup>2</sup> "Culturally and linguistically diverse" was defined as speaking a language other than English at home

<sup>3</sup> "Younger people" was defined as aged between 15-24 years

<sup>4</sup> "Disability" was defined as per the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Commonwealth)

<sup>5</sup> Percentages are calculated from the total number of staff participating (see Table 19)

<sup>6</sup> Percentages are the representation of each group in the local government workforce (see Tables 3 to 7)

Table 20 shows that:

- Women made up the greatest proportion of staff from diversity groups participating in leadership development programs, followed by older people.
- Overall, the proportion of each diversity group participating in leadership development programs was less than their representation in the local government workforce.
- This was also the case within metropolitan and regional councils, most notably for women and older people in regional councils. Within rural councils women's participation was equivalent to their representation in the workforce. It is not possible to draw conclusions about the representation of other diversity groups in metropolitan, regional and rural councils because the number of participants was very low.

**Table 21: Characteristics of staff participating in traineeships**

Group	Metropolitan councils (n = 30)			Regional councils (n = 35)			Rural councils (n = 51)			All councils (n = 116)		
		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>
Women	187	47	50	112	42	43	114	39	36	413	43	46
Younger people <sup>1</sup>	134	34	11	112	42	9	77	26	8	323	34	10
ATSI	18	5	0.6	18	7	1.2	22	7	3.9	58	6	1.3
Older people <sup>2</sup>	9	2	19	21	8	19	25	8	23	55	6	20
CALD <sup>3</sup>	37	9	6.7	1	0.4	3.3	2	1	1.1	40	4	4.7
Disability <sup>4</sup>	6	2	0.8	0	0	1.1	1	0.3	0.5	7	1	1.2

<sup>1</sup> "Younger people" was defined as aged between 15-24

<sup>2</sup> "Older people" was defined as aged over 55 for non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and over 45 for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders

<sup>3</sup> "Culturally and linguistically diverse" was defined as speaking a language other than English at home

<sup>4</sup> "Disability" was defined as per the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Commonwealth)

<sup>5</sup> Percentages are calculated from the total number of staff participating (see Table 19)

<sup>6</sup> Percentages are the representation of each group in the local government workforce (see Tables 3 to 7)

Table 21 shows that:

- Women made up the greatest proportion of staff from diversity groups participating in traineeships followed by young people. Although the diversity groups are not mutually exclusive, it is likely that almost all staff in traineeships were from a diversity group.
- The proportion of younger people and Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders participating in traineeships was significantly greater than their representation in the local government workforce. The reverse was true for older people. This is not unexpected given that traineeships are aimed at younger people.
- The same pattern also applied within each type of council, except that traineeship participants in regional councils were as likely to be held by younger people as by women. It is not possible to draw conclusions about the representation of other diversity groups in metropolitan, regional and rural councils because the number of participants was very low.

**Table 22: Characteristics of staff participating in apprenticeships**

Group	Metropolitan councils (n = 22)			Regional councils (n = 31)			Rural councils (n = 42)			All councils (n = 95)		
		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>
Younger people <sup>1</sup>	79	58	11	137	64	9	61	57	8	277	61	10
Women	12	9	50	11	5	43	18	17	37	41	9	46
ATSI	0	0	0.6	5	2	1.2	6	6	3.9	11	2	1.3
CALD <sup>2</sup>	2	1	6.7	0	0	3.3	1	1	1.1	3	1	4.7
Disability <sup>3</sup>	2	1	0.8	1	0.5	1.1	0	0	0.5	3	1	1.2
Older people <sup>4</sup>	0	0	19	0	0	19	2	2	23	2	0.4	20

<sup>1</sup> "Younger people" was defined as aged between 15-24

<sup>2</sup> "Culturally and linguistically diverse" was defined as speaking a language other than English at home

<sup>3</sup> "Disability" was defined as per the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Commonwealth)

<sup>4</sup> "Older people" was defined as aged over 55 for non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and over 45 for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders

<sup>5</sup> Percentages are calculated from the total number of staff participating (see Table 19)

<sup>6</sup> Percentages are the representation of each group in the local government workforce (see Tables 3 to 7)

Table 22 shows that:

- Younger people made up the greatest proportion of staff from diversity groups participating in apprenticeships followed by women.
- The participation rate of younger people was significantly higher than their representation in the local government workforce. This is not unexpected given that apprenticeships are usually aimed at younger people. While women were the second largest diversity group participating in apprenticeships, they comprised a significantly lower proportion of participants than their representation in the local government workforce. Again, this is not unexpected as apprenticeships are usually offered in male-dominated trades.
- The same pattern also applied within metropolitan, regional and rural councils. It is not possible to draw conclusions about the representation of other diversity groups in metropolitan, regional and rural councils because the number of participants was very low.

**Table 23: Characteristics of staff participating in mentoring programs**

Group	Metropolitan councils (n = 14)	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		Regional council (n = 18)	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		Rural councils (n = 11)	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		All councils (n = 43)	% Representation <sup>6</sup>	
		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>
Women	106	83	50	107	47	43	22	39	37	235	59	46
Younger people <sup>1</sup>	10	8	11	10	4	9	10	18	8	30	8	10
Older people <sup>2</sup>	6	5	19	11	5	19	6	11	23	23	6	20
CALD <sup>3</sup>	5	4	6.7	1	0.4	3.3	5	9	1.1	11	3	4.7
ATSI	0	0	0.6	4	2	1.2	3	5	3.9	7	2	1.3
Disability <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0.8	1	0.4	1.1	1	2	0.5	2	1	1.2

<sup>1</sup> "Younger people" was defined as aged between 15-24

<sup>2</sup> "Older people" was defined as aged over 55 for non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and over 45 for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders

<sup>3</sup> "Culturally and linguistically diverse" was defined as speaking a language other than English at home

<sup>4</sup> "Disability" was defined as per the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Commonwealth)

<sup>5</sup> Percentages are calculated from the total number of staff participating (see Table 19)

<sup>6</sup> Percentages are the representation of each group in the local government workforce (see Tables 3 to 7)

Table 23 shows that:

- Women made up the greatest proportion of staff from diversity groups participating in mentoring programs followed by younger people.
- The participation rate of women is greater than their representation in the local government workforce. By contrast, a smaller proportion of older people participated in mentoring programs than were represented in the local government workforce.
- The same pattern also applied within metropolitan, regional and rural councils. The main difference was that younger people were over-represented in rural councils and under-represented in metropolitan and regional councils. It is not possible to draw conclusions about the representation of other diversity groups in metropolitan, regional and rural councils because the number of participants was very low.

**Table 24: Characteristics of staff in identified positions**

Group	Metropolitan councils (n = 14)	% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>	Regional councils (n = 14)	% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>	Rural councils (n = 10)	% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>	All councils (n = 38)	% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>
ATSI	30	53	0.6	30	68	1.2	19	73	3.9	79	62	1.3
Women	11	19	50	10	23	43	5	19	37	26	20	46
Younger people <sup>1</sup>	8	14	11	2	5	9	1	4	8	11	9	10
Disability <sup>2</sup>	8	14	0.8	1	2	1.1	1	4	0.5	10	8	1.2
Older people <sup>3</sup>	0	0	19	1	2	19	0	0	23	1	1	20
CALD <sup>4</sup>	0	0	6.7	0	0	3.3	0	0	1.1	0	0	4.7

<sup>1</sup> "Younger people" was defined as aged between 15-24 years

<sup>2</sup> "Disability" was defined as per the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Commonwealth)

<sup>3</sup> "Older people" was defined as aged over 55 for non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and over 45 for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders

<sup>4</sup> "Culturally and linguistically diverse" was defined as speaking a language other than English at home

<sup>5</sup> Percentages are calculated from the total number of staff participating (see Table 19)

<sup>6</sup> Percentages are the representation of each group in the local government workforce (see Tables 3 to 7)

Table 24 shows that:

- Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders made up the greatest proportion of staff from diversity groups in identified positions, followed by women. All staff in identified positions in councils were from a diversity group.
- For Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders this is much higher than their representation in the local government workforce. The reverse was true for women.
- The same pattern also applied within metropolitan, regional and rural councils. It is not possible to draw conclusions about the representation of other diversity groups in metropolitan, regional and rural councils because the number of participants was very low.

**Table 25: Characteristics of staff participating in scholarships**

Group	Metropolitan councils (n = 6)	Metropolitan councils		Regional councils (n = 5)	Regional councils		Rural councils (n = 9)	Rural councils		All councils (n = 20)	All councils	
		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>		% Participation <sup>5</sup>	% Representation <sup>6</sup>
Younger people <sup>1</sup>	6	14	11	13	39	9	9	50	8	28	29	10
Women	5	11	50	17	52	43	3	17	37	25	26	46
CALD <sup>2</sup>	0	0	6.7	1	3	3.3	0	0	1.1	1	1	4.7
Older people <sup>3</sup>	0	0	19	1	3	19	0	0	23	1	1	20
ATSI	0	0	0.6	0	0	1.2	0	0	3.9	0	0	1.3
Disability <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0.8	0	0	1.1	0	0	0.5	0	0	1.2

<sup>1</sup> "Younger people" was defined as aged between 15-24 years

<sup>2</sup> "Culturally and linguistically diverse" was defined as speaking a language other than English at home

<sup>3</sup> "Older people" was defined as aged over 55 for non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and over 45 for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders

<sup>4</sup> "Disability" was defined as per the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Commonwealth)

<sup>5</sup> Percentages are calculated from the total number of staff participating (see Table 19)

<sup>6</sup> Percentages are the representation of each group in the local government workforce (see Tables 3 to 7)

Table 25 shows that:

- Women and younger people made up the greatest proportion of staff from diversity groups participating in scholarships.
- The proportion of younger people participating in scholarships was greater than their representation in the workforce, particularly in regional and rural councils. By contrast, the proportion of women participating in scholarships was less than their representation in the workforce, except in regional councils. It is not possible to draw conclusions about the representation of other diversity groups in metropolitan, regional and rural councils because the number of participants was very low.

### *All programs*

Overall, tables 20-25 show that:

- Women made up the highest proportion of participants in mentoring programs, traineeships, and leadership development programs and the second highest proportion of participants in all other programs. Despite this, the proportion of women participating in the programs was generally lower than their representation in the local government workforce, except in relation to mentoring.

- Younger people made up the highest proportion of participants in apprenticeships and scholarships and the second highest proportion of participants in traineeships and mentoring. Younger people's participation in the programs was generally higher or similar to their representation in the local government workforce, except in relation to leadership development for which it was lower.
- Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders made up by far the highest proportion of participants in identified positions, particularly in rural and regional areas. Participation by Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders in identified positions and in traineeships was higher than their representation in the workforce. For all other programs, participation was similar to their overall representation in the local government workforce, except for scholarships in which no Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders participated.
- The participation of older people in all programs was generally low, apart from leadership development programs where they made up the second highest proportion of participants. Their participation in all programs was significantly lower than their representation in the workforce.
- The participation of people from a culturally and linguistically diverse background in traineeships, leadership development programs and mentoring programs was slightly higher than their representation in the workforce. Their participation in other diversity programs was lower than their representation in the workforce, including in identified positions where there were none.
- Apart from identified positions, people with a disability made up 1% or less of participants. This is reflective of their overall representation in the workforce.

It is not possible to make conclusions about the proportion of participants from diversity groups within each program as the diversity groups are not mutually exclusive. However, comparing the number of participants from diversity groups with the total number of participants indicates that a very high proportion, if not all, participants in identified positions and traineeships are from diversity groups.

## Appendix 1 - Councils' response to the Census

### *Metropolitan Councils (DLG groups 1-3 and 6-7)*

#### **Responded (38)**

Ashfield  
 Auburn  
 Bankstown  
 Blacktown  
 Blue Mountains  
 Botany Bay  
 Camden  
 Campbelltown  
 Canterbury  
 Fairfield  
 Gosford  
 Hawkesbury  
 Holroyd  
 Hornsby  
 Hunters Hill  
 Hurstville  
 Kogarah  
 Ku-ring-gai  
 Lane Cove

Leichhardt  
 Manly  
 Marrickville  
 Mosman  
 North Sydney  
 Penrith  
 Pittwater  
 Randwick  
 Rockdale  
 Ryde  
 Strathfield  
 Sutherland  
 Sydney  
 Warringah  
 Waverley  
 Willoughby  
 Wollondilly  
 Woollahra  
 Wyong

#### **Did not respond (5)**

Burwood  
 Canada Bay  
 The Hills  
 Liverpool  
 Parramatta

### *Metropolitan County Councils*

#### **Responded (0)**

#### **Did not respond (1)**

Hawkesbury River County Council

### *Regional Councils (DLG groups 4-5)*

#### **Responded (36)**

Albury  
 Armidale Dumaresq  
 Ballina  
 Bathurst Regional  
 Bega Valley  
 Broken Hill  
 Byron  
 Cessnock  
 Clarence Valley  
 Coffs Harbour  
 Deniliquin  
 Dubbo  
 Eurobodalla  
 Goulburn Mulwaree  
 Great Lakes  
 Greater Taree  
 Griffith  
 Kempsey

Kiama  
 Lismore  
 Lithgow  
 Maitland  
 Mid-Western Regional  
 Newcastle  
 Orange  
 Port Macquarie-Hastings  
 Port Stephens  
 Richmond Valley  
 Shellharbour  
 Shoalhaven  
 Singleton  
 Tamworth Regional  
 Tweed  
 Wagga Wagga  
 Wingecarribee  
 Wollongong

#### **Did not respond (2)**

Lake Macquarie  
 Queanbeyan

### **Regional County Councils**

#### **Responded (2)**

MidCoast County Council  
Rous County Council

#### **Did not respond (3)**

Upper Macquarie County Council  
Far North Coast County Council  
Richmond River County Council

### **Rural Councils (DLG groups 8-11)**

#### **Responded (66)**

Balranald  
Bellingen  
Berrigan  
Bland  
Blayney  
Bogan  
Bombala  
Boorowa  
Bourke  
Cabonne  
Carrathool  
Central Darling  
Cobar  
Conargo  
Coolamon  
Cooma-Monaro  
Coonamble  
Cootamundra  
Corowa  
Cowra  
Dungog  
Forbes  
Gilgandra  
Glen Innes Severn  
Gloucester  
Greater Hume  
Gundagai  
Gunnedah  
Guyra  
Harden  
Hay  
Inverell  
Jerilderie

Junee  
Kyogle  
Lachlan  
Leeton  
Lockhart  
Moree Plains  
Murray  
Murrumbidgee  
Muswellbrook  
Nambucca  
Narrabri  
Narrandera  
Oberon  
Palerang  
Parkes  
Snowy River  
Temora  
Tumbarumba  
Tumut  
Upper Hunter  
Upper Lachlan  
Uralla  
Urana  
Wakool  
Walcha  
Walgett  
Warren  
Warrumbungle  
Weddin  
Wellington  
Wentworth  
Yass Valley  
Young

#### **Did not respond (5)**

Brewarrina  
Gwydir  
Liverpool Plains  
Narromine  
Tenterfield

### **Rural County Councils**

#### **Responded (7)**

Castlereagh Macquarie County Council  
Central Murray County Council  
Central Tablelands County Council  
Goldenfields Water County Council  
New England Tablelands County Council  
Riverina Water County Council  
Southern Slopes County Council

#### **Did not respond (1)**

Upper Hunter County Council