



MINISTER OF STATE, PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE

PRIME MINISTER

PERSONNEL WORK IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

You will recall that Patrick Jenkin minuted you in July suggesting that there might be a gross disparity in the number of people employed on personnel work in the civil service compared with similar private sector organisations. I then suggested, and you agreed, that before taking the point any further we should ask officials from the Cabinet Office (MPO), the Efficiency Unit and Mr Jenkin's department to conduct a preliminary factual survey as a basis for later discussion.

... I now attach the report of the survey team. It shows that the significant differences in the size of the personnel function and effort appear to lie not between the civil service and the private sector as a whole but between individual private firms and individual government departments. In other words the factors at work do not appear to be inherent in the nature of public or private sector operations as such but to lie deeper in such matters as management style and the nature of the business activity being carried on.

This does not mean that there are not very useful lessons to be learned from detailed comparison of individual government departments and comparable private firms and I propose to invite a few key departments to pursue this on the lines recommended in paragraph 25(a) of the report. I am, however, even more interested in the possibility opened up by the report that closer comparison of apparent discrepancies between departments themselves could open up ways of achieving really worthwhile savings. My officials are therefore asking the departments which seem to be the highest spenders on personnel management to scrutinise their expenditure in the light of the report, comparing it with that of some of the lower spenders, and to report results within, say, 6 months. This way of proceeding ties in well with the work which is already going forward on the Financial Management Initiative and with the trend to increase delegation of personnel work - a trend, incidentally, which I believe is in itself likely to lead to reductions in the central personnel function in departments, quite apart from what I hope will result from the special exercise.

If you are content I could pursue this without the need for you to hold a meeting. If however you prefer to discuss the report then I think it would be helpful if the circle of ministers

involved were widened to include the main civil service employers like Nigel Lawson, Michael Heseltine, Norman Fowler and Tom King.

At this stage I am copying this minute and enclosure only to Patrick Jenkin, Sir Robin Ibbs and Sir Robert Armstrong.

g.g.

LORD GOWRIE
8 November 1983



10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

14 November, 1983

PERSONNEL WORK IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Prime Minister was grateful for Lord Gowrie's minute of 8 November about Personnel Work in the Civil Service.

The Prime Minister agrees that Lord Gowrie should now pursue his proposals for examining apparent discrepancies between Departments. She would be grateful for a further report in six months time, covering in particular the MOD exercise to which Lord Gowrie refers.

I am copying this letter to John Ballard (Department of the Environment), Sir Robin Ibbs and to Richard Hatfield (Cabinet Office).

(David Barclay)

Mrs Mary Brown
Lord Gowrie's Office

PRIME MINISTER

Personnel Work in the Civil Service

The attached minute by Lord Gowrie reports on his initial examination of Mr. Jenkin's criticism of personnel work in the Civil Service. You will recall that Mr. Jenkin suggested that disproportionate resources were being devoted to personnel management, as compared with best practice in the private sector.

If you have time, you may like to glance at the high-lighted passages in the report by officials as well as at Lord Gowrie's minute. The report leaves some quite important questions unanswered. Why is it, for example, that personnel staff are 3% of total staff managed in the Employment Group departments, whereas the highest private sector figure found (Marks & Spencer, with an impeccable reputation for personnel management) is only 2.2%?

Nonetheless, Lord Gowrie's conclusions are that:

- (i) The Civil Service as a whole is not greatly out of line with the private sector in the resources it devotes to personnel matters, although efforts vary widely between departments, and there are a number of individual cases which merit further investigation.
- (ii) An exercise commissioned by Mr. Heseltine in the Ministry of Defence should shed further light on the effects of aligning the Civil Service more closely with private sector practice. This study will look in particular at the effects of greater delegation of personnel work - to individuals in terms of responsibility for their own careers, and to line managers.

You originally thought in terms of holding a meeting with colleagues once this initial report had been received. Would you

/ like

*Amend
ms*

like to proceed with this (it would be difficult to fit in before December), or would you like to accept Lord Gowrie's offer to pursue a case by case investigation on your behalf? He suggests asking departments to report in 6 months.

If you decide in favour of a meeting, do you agree that the papers should be circulated to other Ministers with large numbers of staff (Lord Gowrie suggests the Chancellor and the Secretaries of State for Defence, Social Services and Employment)?.

Dms

10 November 1983

MANAGEMENT IN CONFIDENCE

NUMBERS EMPLOYED ON PERSONNEL WORK: A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CIVIL SERVICE AND PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS

REPORT OF SURVEY TEAM

REMIT

1. This Report summarises the results of an examination commissioned by Ministers into comparative numbers and costs of staff engaged in personnel work as between the Civil Service and outside organisations. The Secretary of State for the Environment had suggested that there was a gross disparity between the numbers of personnel people employed in the Civil Service compared with similar private sector organisations; that the number of personnel staff required to administer the system because of the increasing over elaboration of staff management policies was wholly disproportionate to the size of the Civil Service as a whole; and that this could be in part the result of too much central prescription. We were asked to report quickly, so that Ministers could consider next steps informed by some prima facie evidence.

2. We have interpreted our remit as covering:-

a. An examination of the ratio of personnel managers to staff managed in a number of private sector firms, as compared with the situation in selected Government Departments.

b. An analysis of the movement of the non industrial staffing figures since 1979 in these Departments, to check whether the overall reductions have been matched by changes in the numbers of staff engaged in personnel work.

c. A check on work currently in hand to reduce excessive central prescription, in matters which unnecessarily complicate Departments' personnel work.

METHODOLOGY

3. We took as a working definition a fairly broad interpretation of personnel work, (details at Annex A). However, in many Departments the Principal Establishment Officer's command covers a wider field, including Office Services, (e.g. typists, messengers), Organisation and Methods, Staff Inspection, and various other matters. In the private sector much of this falls under line managers. One result of the Financial Management Initiative will be to bring this type of Civil Service activity more within line managers' budgets.

4. We wrote to 28 firms in the private sector, mainly those on the list earlier prepared by Mr Patrick Jenkin. 19 firms provided useable information, some of which did not arrive until early October. A number of firms explained they were unable to reply because they lacked the information required: many of those who did supply information stressed that it was given in confidence and strictly for the purpose of this particular survey. We also wrote to

10 Government Departments who in total account for about 75% of the non-industrial Civil Service. (Details of firms and Government Departments at Annex B.)

5. The survey was undertaken by a team of three, all of whom had significant other duties at the time. The opportunity cost of the survey was therefore small, and limited essentially to modest photocopying, telephone and postage expenditure.

COMPARISON WITH PRIVATE SECTOR FIRMS: THE NUMBERS AND COSTS

6. The number of personnel managers per 100 staff managed in the private sector varied from 0.3 to 2.2. Most were under 2.0. Figures in Government Departments were 1.4 to 3.0 with over half in the range 2.2-2.5. The percentage of the staff budget spent on personnel management effort in the private sector ranged from 0.6% to 5.1%, with about half above 2%. The Government Departments' figures were 1.7% to 3.6%, about half above 2.2%. A complete breakdown is at Tables 1 and 2.

7. The Civil Service figures covered all the personnel functions identified for each Department, plus an allocation to each of their proportionate share of central overheads (e.g. training, recruitment). Almost all Departments succeeded in providing the required breakdown, though they stressed that the allocation was necessarily somewhat rough and ready. Many private sector companies however were not able to provide a detailed breakdown: and an equally large number did not supply details of some functions which were paralleled by Civil Service personnel effort. They stated that a significant proportion of this work was done by their line managers. Because of these two factors, many of the private sector figures understate their overall personnel effort compared with the Government Department ones.

PRIVATE SECTOR COMMENTS ON PROBLEMS OF COMPARISON

8. There are thus major definitional problems (given the wide and varied nature of personnel work) in making comparisons of like with like. Indeed the Institute of Personnel Management wrote to us stating that "efficiency is associated with arrangements tailored to suit particular circumstances comparisons between a chunk of the private sector and the Civil Service are likely to be based on invalid and unreliable data an overall figure would be meaningless". The TI Group stated specifically that, "our work orientation is so different that comparison could be more misleading than helpful". One Company refused to supply data on the grounds that the differences with the Civil Service were so great as to render this meaningless. Despite all this, we were able to elicit information which enables some crude comparisons to be made, on the basis of some pretty heroic assumptions.

MAJOR FACTORS AFFECTING COMPARISON

9. We concluded from the replies that there were three linked factors which were significant in determining the effort devoted to personnel matters:-

a. The actual nature of the business activity itself. Shell pointed out, as far as their main operating divisions were concerned, that the personnel function 'reflects their own unique business requirements'. Other companies, e.g. the brewers, drew attention to the particular nature of their own retail establishments. Austin Rover commented that there was 'very little alignment between the organisation of the ARG personnel staff and the Civil Service functional structure'. In short, the effort devoted to personnel work is crucially dependent on the business and structure of the company it supports.

b. The broad philosophy a company selects on how to approach its operations. Marks and Spencer who believe in the importance of strong and effective centralised personnel management spend 2.2% of their staff effort (or 5.1% of their staff budget) on personnel functions: others with a different approach and whose type of operations lend themselves to decentralisation spend much less. (Boots for example with 1200 Stores, have a staff manager in only 107 Departmental Stores - in the others the line manager performs all the functions).

c. The amount of authority in the personnel field delegated to line management. The majority of companies delegated considerably more authority than is the case in the Civil Service. For example, ICI stated that "the broad involvement of line managers in staff management could well be of the order of 40% of total management time". BP expect their line managers to settle recruitment, pay, and much of the career development of their staff.

10. We consider accordingly that the very wide variety of institutional practice shown by the survey does not permit any single conclusion to be drawn, though it does illuminate some interesting divergences. We doubt therefore whether very broad brush comparisons of this nature can of themselves yield particularly focussed lessons.

THE CIVIL SERVICE AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR

11. In reaching a view on proportionate effort on personnel work, we had to recognise that personnel work does not exist as an end in itself. Its function is to provide an essential service to the front line in the pursuit of the organisation's objectives; to help optimise the use of a vital asset, people; and to provide in a cost effective manner a wide variety of support services.

12. The Civil Service has its own individual characteristics. It employs some half-million non-industrial staff, over half of whom are at clerical level, and three-quarters of whom are employed outside London. It has 28 general service classes, and over 2,500 Departmental grades, performing a very wide variety of tasks. Government personnel management has to operate against this background, adapt to a changing world (e.g. a smaller better qualified staff) and face a variety of constraints, some of its own making, e.g.:-

- a. The Service remains for the most part a career service: with a 'cradle to grave' approach to staff management, including succession planning and long term career development, particularly for the more able staff.
 - b. A large number of matters are determined Service wide and are implemented with a high degree of uniformity e.g. pay, pensions, leave, travel and subsistence.
 - c. There is a highly developed Trade Union system at national, Departmental and local level. This has some benefits and some disadvantages, notably the amount of consultation required and the problems of introducing change.
 - d. There is a long tradition of "overt fairness". This in turn leads to certain types of procedures, e.g. "fair and open" recruitment policies and promotion and disciplinary procedures with built in appeals systems. There is a significant degree of wider accountability.
 - e. Promotion in most cases is to a grade not to a post.
13. Per contra, in the private sector very broadly:-
- a. Line managers have more responsibility for personnel decisions: there is less stress on uniformity and "fairness".
 - b. The individual has more responsibility for developing his own career, and is expected to apply for specific advertised vacancies inside (and outside) the company, as the main avenue for promotion.
 - c. Personnel staff are usually more specialist; and act in an advisory, supportive and monitoring role, rather than taking the initiative in postings, promotions etc.
 - d. Appointments are made to specific jobs: there is less use made of a pool of generalist talent.
 - e. Staff appraisal tends to be less elaborate.
 - f. There is less concern in avoiding mistakes and with checking, and also less detailed worry about "proper use of public monies": e.g. commercial considerations can lead to tolerance of a controlled amount of pilferage, or of unchecked entertainment claims etc.

LESSONS FROM PRIVATE SECTOR FIGURES

14. There are already a number of efforts (following the Review of Personnel Work and the Financial Management Initiative) to graft good private sector practice onto Civil Service procedures - greater delegation to line management, more open reporting and so on, but taking account of many of the present constraints. If radical alterations in the organisation and numbers of personnel staff in the Civil Service were desired so as to align the position more closely with the slimmest private sector practice, then equally radical changes would be needed over many other existing Civil Service policies and procedures.

15. Relevant here is that arising out of a MINIS examination in MOD, the Secretary of State for Defence has asked that a detailed in depth study be undertaken of the implications of an alternative approach to personnel management. This would entail giving individuals more responsibility for planning their careers, and delegating much more of the personnel management function to line managers. This study is due to report by the end of the year. It should illuminate the consequence of radical changes in the balance between line and personnel, and the role of the individual over 'self posting'. It will thus be looking at issues we have identified. It too will consider private sector practice.

16. There is considerable variety in private sector practice, and significant differences in the way they organise their personnel functions as compared with the Civil Service. Nevertheless we consider that effective comparisons can fruitfully be made, but on the basis of a case by case examination of specific and defined functions. This could be between firms and parts of the Civil Service engaged in like activities. The identification of "twins" could yield positive results - e.g. the contacts already built up between Nat West and the Inland Revenue. Broad brush comparisons are of limited use. Those we have made would appear to indicate that Civil Service effort on personnel work is not markedly out of line with those companies with a similar approach.

COMPARATIVE MOVEMENTS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE STAFF NUMBERS SINCE 1979

17. The figures we have elicited show the pattern below (fuller details are at Table 1).

	Non Industrials	Numbers engaged in their personnel work
1979	418,601	9,301
1983	381,825	8,017
%tage reduction 1983/1979	8.8%	13.8%

18. These figures show that overall the personnel function has borne over 50% more than its proportionate share of staff cuts, and this at a time when personnel commands have been under pressure to cope both with the effects of the run down of the Service, and with various new central initiatives. But there are interesting differences between Departments, and (as significantly) between different aspects of the personnel function. In the final analysis it is of course up to Departments, subject to collective Ministerial agreement over the overall numbers, to decide how best they should allocate their staff. There may well be reasons for differential amounts of staff time on personnel: e.g. the mix of staff, the changing nature of the Departmental function, and ad hoc exercises (for example major privatisations are particularly demanding of personnel effort).

19. Nevertheless, further effort could be made by Departments and Cabinet Office (MPO) to explore the value of these comparisons in particular areas. Departments could check the allocation of their personnel resources as against their priorities over time, building on their existing management information systems. Further investigation of apparent discrepancies of effort between Departments (see Table 3) might reveal points where action could be taken to secure greater value for money. If the results were promising, a more systematic series of key ratios which might illuminate comparative performance could be built up.

TOO MUCH CENTRAL PRESCRIPTION

20. Some Departments have claimed they are bound too tightly by detailed rules and procedures laid down by the Centre in the personnel field. There is a need for balance: uniform rules across the Service can avoid separate negotiations, leapfrogging and duplication of work and thus save cost. On the other hand unnecessary bureaucratic centralisation inhibits sensible management freedom and leads to time consuming referring back.

21. We noted that a number of initiatives have been set in hand to look at the potential for increased delegation. In the context of the Financial Management Initiative and the Review of Running Costs, Treasury and MPO have invited Departments' specific suggestions about relaxing existing rules. The MPO is also mounting a special review of the Civil Service Pay and Conditions of Service Code and Establishment Officers' Guide with a view to keeping prescription to the minimum and making clear what is mandatory and what is guidance.

22. This is an area which needs detailed examination case by case. Whilst it may not throw up staff savings in the personnel area, it could well permit effort to be deployed more effectively.

SCOPE FOR STREAMLINING

23. Moreover, it would be wrong to overlook the areas where central intervention can be effective in assisting in staff savings in the personnel field. For example, in the field of Superannuation Treasury has been able to use centralised expertise to take on board assessment work from some other Departments at an overall saving, and to give advice about the optimal methods of computerisation. In this field, a saving of 409 staff is expected by 1986 on the 1979 figure of 721 staff - a massive reduction. This is an example of what can be achieved: the RPW identified further scope for streamlining of existing Civil Service practice.

CONCLUSIONS

24. We conclude that:-

- a. There is a wide range of effort on personnel matters within and between private sector firms and Government Departments. The amount of this effort is crucially dependent on the nature of the operation and the organisation's management style.

- b. Many firms devoted fewer resources to the personnel function than Government Departments, others devoted more. These broad brush comparisons would not however appear to indicate that the Civil Service has got the scale of its total effort quite wrong.
- c. In the period 1979-83, personnel staff in the Departments reduced by over 50% more than their proportionate share of staff cuts.
- d. Work is in hand on the examination of central regulations, prescriptions etc.
- e. Efforts are being made to graft cost effective private sector personnel practice on to Civil Service procedures: in addition a more radical study is being mounted in MOD into the possibility of delegating more personnel work to line management.

25. We believe that there is scope for further work by MPO and Departments:-

- a. to pursue comparisons of personnel practice with suitable private sector "twins" where particular problems appear to warrant such comparisons;
- b. to investigate whether apparent discrepancies of effort on different aspects of personnel work between Departments in particular areas reveal points on which cost effective action should be taken;
- c. to pursue vigorously the relaxation of unnecessary central prescription;
- d. and to see whether the MOD exercise yields anything of more general application.

N Gurney
E Bowman
T R Hornsby

18 October 1983

NUMBERS EMPLOYED ON PERSONNEL WORK: COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CIVIL SERVICE AND OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS

FUNCTIONS TO BE INCLUDED

1. Policy

Reviewing and updating personnel policies and procedures, both at department's discretion and in response to central initiatives. Includes any general consultations with staff unions and overall manpower planning.

2. Staff Management

Covers support by personnel staff to line managers and staff in the development and deployment of staff. Includes matching the jobs to be done as closely as possible to the abilities of the staff available to do them; planning the careers of staff through a succession of jobs to develop their potential; interviewing them on a fairly regular basis; and liaising with line managers on their needs for staff. This function also includes involvement by personnel staff in secondments to other employers; in retirements, resignations, redundancies and dismissals; and in conduct and discipline cases.

3. Training

All training and support staff, but excluding student costs and non-staff items, such as the cost of equipment, lecture rooms, residential facilities etc.

4. Recruitment and probation

Covering personnel staff effort across whole range of recruitment undertaken by the organisation (but excluding such non-staff items as advertising) and subsequent involvement in probation, if used.

5. Promotion

The personnel effort involved in operating the promotion system used in the organisation.

6. Administration of pay and maintenance of staff records

Calculating and notifying changes of pay and implementing centrally negotiated pay settlements. Maintenance and development of information records for staff, including details of new entrants and departures and changes of job, grade or location. This does not include operation of the payroll computer system, or specialised programming staff or computer operation.

7. Administration of travel and subsistence rules and claims

8. Administration of leave and attendance

Maintaining attendance and leave records, including in particular sick and special leave; review of cases of long sick absence; approval and monitoring of overtime and other pay-related allowances.

9. Superannuation

Work on pensions policy and administration of superannuation schemes, including calculation and payment of pension and other benefits and arrangements for transfer of pension rights for staff moving to and from other employers.

10. Welfare

Any separate provision for helping staff with personal or domestic difficulties which affect work performance, eg providing private counselling; assisting staff subject to redundancy, relocation or disciplinary measures.

NUMBERS EMPLOYED ON PERSONNEL WORK: COMPARISON BETWEEN THE
CIVIL SERVICE AND OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONSI Firms approached for informationa. Those which replied

Austin Rover Group Ltd
Allied Breweries Ltd
Barclays Bank plc
The Boots Company plc
British Gas Corporation
BP Oil
Delta Metal Co Ltd
Guardian Royal Exchange Assurance
Halifax Building Society
ICI plc
The Littlewoods Organisation plc
Lucas Industries plc
Marks and Spencer plc
Mars Confectionery
Midland Bank plc
Rowntree Mackintosh plc
Shell UK Ltd
Tube Investments Group plc
Whitbread and Co plc

b. Those which did not reply or provided unuseable information

Abbey National Building Society
Bass Mitchells and Butlers Ltd
Courtaulds Ltd
Dunlop Holdings plc
GEC Electrical Projects Ltd
The Goodyear Tyre and Rubber Co (GB) Ltd
Prudential Assurance Co Ltd
Rank Xerox (UK) Ltd
Reckett and Colman plc

II Government Departments

Ministry of Defence
Department of Health & Social Security
Inland Revenue
Department of Employment Group
Department of the Environment & Department of Transport
Department of the Environment - Property Services Agency
Department of Trade & Industry
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries & Food
Department of Energy
Royal Mint

TABLE 1

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS - PERSONNEL STAFF: ALL STAFF (NUMBERS AND COSTS); REDUCTION IN PERSONNEL AND TOTAL STAFF NUMBERS 1979-83

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS	INLAND REVENUE	PSA	DHSS			MINT	DOE/DTP ex DLVC	DVLC	DTI	DEFENCE			ENERGY	MAFF	DE GROUP			
			HQ	NEW-CASTLE	TOTAL					(non ind)	ROFs (ind)	RDkyds			HQ	EMPLOYMENT REGIONS	MSC	GROUP TOTAL
NUMBERS																		
TOTAL STAFF MANAGED	72000	16197	5999	11483	91888	1016	15821	4796	14317	105600	13715	17760	1101	10979	3560	29998	21823	59771
PERSONNEL STAFF	898	333	95	96	1883	21	335	108	322	2452	187	200	29	304	96	690	754	1679
DEPARTMENTAL RATIO PERSONNEL STAFF/STAFF MANAGED	1.2	2.1	(1.6)	(0.8)	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.3	(1.4)	(1.1)	2.6	2.8	(2.7)	(2.3)	(3.5)	2.8
PRO-RATA ALLOCATION OF CENTRAL ACTIVITIES	109	24	9	17	138	2	24	7	21	159	20	27	2	16	5	46	33	91
OVERALL RATIO PERSONNEL STAFF/STAFF MANAGED	1.4	2.2	(1.7)	(1.0)	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.5	(1.5)	(1.3)	2.8	2.9	(2.8)	(2.4)	(3.6)	3.0
COSTS (Salary only) £000s																		
TOTAL STAFF COSTS	530000	140000	67249	71000	639000	7866	136170	-	116868	900000	75750	98300	11303	92646	25718	147309	149509	541109
PERSONNEL COSTS	8081	2800	881	600	13016	152	3357	810	2916	16850	1500	1650	286	2432	762	5254	5575	18830
DEPARTMENTAL RATIO PERSONNEL COSTS/TOTAL STAFF COSTS	1.5	2.0	(1.3)	(0.8)	2.1	1.9	2.5	-	2.5	1.9	(2.0)	(1.7)	2.5	2.6	(3.0)	(3.6)	(3.7)	3.5
PRO-RATA ALLOCATION OF CENTRAL ACTIVITIES COSTS	839	188	70	131	108	156	185	55	165	1241	156	210	16	126	39	359	260	720
OVERALL RATIO PERSONNEL COSTS/TOTAL STAFF COSTS	1.7	2.1	(1.4)	(1.0)	2.2	2.1	2.6	-	2.6	2.0	(2.2)	(1.9)	2.7	2.8	(3.1)	(3.8)	(3.9)	3.6
REDUCTION 1979-83																		
%REDUCTION: ALL STAFF	14.8	16.9	19.8	13.0	5.5	26.7	17.8	31.1	13.0	12.4	18.4	NK	13.1	13.0	12.3	+51.4	7.0	+14.0
%REDUCTION: PERSONNEL STAFF	8.4	30.2	22.1	11.9	12.1	34.4	17.3	31.2	18.9	17.0 ²	24.9	NK	19.6	13.0 ¹	3.0	+20.6	16.9	3.5

Footnotes

¹ Figures not available. Policy has been to secure proportionately equal cuts in all areas of the Department "MAFF Personnel has contributed its full share!"

² Exact figure not available. Based on reductions in 2 under secretary commands dealing with personnel work for non-industrials.

COMPANIES	BOOTS*	TUBE INVESTMENTS*	DELTA METAL*	GRE	BP*	LUCAS	WILTTHREADS*	ALLIED BREWERIES*	BARCLAYS*	HALIFAX	LITTLEWOODS	AUSTIN ROVER	MIDLAND	ICI*	MARS	BRITISH GAS	ROWNTREE MACKINTOSH	SHELL	HQ	MARKS & SPENCER	TOTAL
NUMBERS																					
TOTAL STAFF MANAGED	68562	26500	13,000	7700	7142	29759	10,000	10380	66500	10800	32215	38249	45239	56600	3029	101200	2473	18000	3474	47934	51408
PERSONNEL STAFF	207	123	79	53	60	272	100	123	776	127	397	518	649	836	51	1980	50	370	161	945	1106
FUNCTIONS																					
1. Policy				(2)		23		22	25				61	71	3	700	8		20	/	
2. Staff Management				30		132		18	122				247	501	1	(1)	23		63	945	
3. Training				8		95		21	280				279	228	4	1050	12		34	(2)	
4. Recruitment/ Probation				(2)		(2)		28	110				(2)	(2)	3	(1)	7		17	(2)	
5. Promotion				(2)		(2)		7	(2)				5	(2)	1	(1)	(2)		(2)	(2)	
6. Pay and Records				15		22		27	175				1/4	(2)	5	(1)	(2)		13	(2)	
7. T&S				/		/		/	57				/	(2)	/	/	/		/	/	
8. Leave and Attendance				/		/		/	(7)				(2)	(2)	15	/	(2)		(2)	(2)	
9. Superannuation				/		/		/	7				13	36	4	/	/		14	/	
10. Welfare				/		(2)		/	(7)				(2)	(2)	15	230	(2)		(2)	(2)	
RATIO OF PERSONNEL STAFF TO STAFF MANAGED																					
	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.1	4.6	2.0	2.2
COSTS Salary £000s																					
TOTAL STAFF COSTS	263600	164300	88000	56500	21300	167055	NA	90769	450000	68660	115000	377000	330000	472600	55000	800,000	21284	224000	44320	168988	213308
PERSONNEL COSTS	1500	1400	581	475	880	2107	NA	1289	8209	1147	1928	4379	6637	9875	1137	19,500	483	4604	2636	8336	10972
RATIO OF PERSONNEL COSTS TO STAFF COSTS																					
	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.8	4.1	1.3	-	1.4	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.2	2.0	2.1	2.1 ^{2.}	2.4	2.3	2.1 ^{3.}	5.9	4.9	5.1

Brackets indicate function in which included

/ indicates function not included in return

* companies which specifically mentioned significant line management personnel responsibility

Footnotes

1. Covers central function only.

2. Based on 'total remuneration' of personnel staff rather than 'salary'.

3. Based on average salary of £12,400. Likely to be an underestimate as all personnel staff are white collar.

% OF PERSONNEL STAFF/FUNCTION

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS	INLAND ^{1.} REVENUE	DOE/DTP (excl DVLC)	PSA	ENERGY	DE	MSC	DHSS	DTI	MAFF	MOD
1. Policy	2	6	11	7	2	4	3	2	6	3
2. Staff management	5	41	23	28	43	29	7	49	18	56
3. Training	58	18	23	10	44	41	34	15	10	17
4. Recruitment and Probation	7	5	4	17	(2)	(2)	4	2	7	(2)
5. Promotion	3	4	6	7	(2)	(2)	3	3	10	(2)
6. Pay and Records	8	5	9	14	5	23	25	10	20	14
7. T & S	7	2	6	3	1	(1)	7	4	12	6
8. Leave and Attendance	0	6	5	7	(6.2)	(6)	5	1	5	(2)
9. Superannuation	(6)	7	7	3	(6.2)	(6)	4	7	5	3
10. Welfare	9	6	4	7	5	3	7	6	7	2

COMPANIES	LUCAS	GRE	BARCLAYS	ALLIED BREWERIES	ICI	MARS	ROWNTREE MACKINTOSH	BRITISH GAS	M&S	MIDLAND
1. Policy	8	(2)	3	18	8	6	16	35	2	9
2. Staff management	28	57	16	15	60	2	46	(1)	91	38
3. Training	35	15	36	18	27	8	24	53	3(2)	43
4. Recruitment and Probation	(2)	(2)	14	23	(2)	6	14	(1)	1(2)	(2)
5. Promotion	(2)	(2)	(2)	6	(2)	2	(2)	(1)	(2)	1
6. Pay and Records	8	28	22	22	(2)	10	(2)	(1)	1	7
7. T & S	/	/	7	/	(2)	/	/	/	/	/
8. Leave and Attendance	/	/	(7)	/	(2)	29	(2)	/	(2)	(2)
9. Superannuation	/	/	1	/	4	8	/	/	1	2
10. Welfare	(2)	/	(7)	/	(2)	29	(2)	12	(2)	(2)

Brackets include function in which included
/ function not included in return

Footnote

1. Covers central function only

Unit / Sense /
Long term
pt 14

NONO

6 11 12 1
8 9 10
3 4 5 6 7