

# SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY PANEL – 28TH MAY 2015

SUBJECT: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STAFF SURVEY, MARCH 2015

REPORT BY: CHIEF EXECUTIVE

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To make Members of the Sustainable Development Advisory Panel aware of the findings of the staff survey of sustainable development, health and wellbeing, undertaken between November 2014 and January 2015.

### 2. SUMMARY

The staff survey was sent out electronically to all staff with access to e mail. Additional work was done to ensure that employees in depots, canteens and in service where they did not have access to the intranet were engaged in the process. In total 1,014 people responded to the survey.

## 2.1 Sustainable Development Indicators

Overall the average level of understanding of sustainable development was 2.37. This was down from 2.5 in 2008 and further down from 2.6 in October 2007.

78% of respondents said that they travelled to work in a car on their own.

Only 3% of the respondents in 2014/15 said that took part in vigorous physical activity (sport, running, cycling) at least 5 times per week.

### 3. LINKS TO STRATEGY

- 3.1 The staff survey provides data to monitor the sustainable development.
- 3.2 The work of the sustainable development team supports the following strategies:
  - "Living Better, Using Less", Sustainable Development Strategy, 2008.
  - "Caerphilly Delivers" Single Integrated Plan, 2013 2017.
  - Education for Sustainable Development & Global Citizenship Strategy, 2009.
  - CCBC Corporate Improvement Plan.

#### 4. THE REPORT

4.1 The staff SD, health and wellbeing survey was developed by the SD and Health Improvement Teams to update indicators that both teams use to monitor understanding and progress in their areas. It was agreed that a combined questionnaire providing information for the Employee Health & Wellbeing Group would be the best use of resources and provide the best response rate. Questionnaires were sent electronically to all staff with access to the intranet. Additional work was done to ensure that employees in depots, canteens and in service where they did not have access to the intranet were engaged in the process. This was done by using the team meeting structures or by visiting depots to talk directly to staff.

This report looks at the SD indicators. A separate assessment will be undertaken to look at the responses to the health related questions

4.2 In total 1,014 responses to the 2014/15 survey were received. Of the respondent 7% were school based and 51% mostly office based.

The staff survey undertaken in November 2008 was sent out in the post to the homes of 1,000 staff randomly selected using the payroll system. 248 responses were received to that survey. In the 2008 survey 52.8% of respondents were based within a school, 25.7% were mostly office based.

The staff survey undertaken in October 2007 was sent out to all staff using the payroll system. Out of the 9,000 employees, 8.6% of staff (777 employees) completed and returned the survey. Of these 23% were based within a school and 55% mostly office based.

Reorganisation of Services has also taken place. Leisure Services have moved from Education to Community & Leisure, Corporate Services and Chief Executives have combined.

This difference in the break down of the groups of respondents from the 3 surveys may mean that it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions from direct comparisons of responses. The changes to the structure make it difficult to compare the results from the 3 surveys by Directorate.

# 4.3 Sustainable Development Indicators

As part of the survey, questions were included to obtain data on 4 SD indicators.

## Level of understanding of sustainable development

To assess levels of understanding of SD, respondents were asked to identify their level (1-5) using a flow chart (see Appendix 1). The higher the level the greater the understanding. Level 1 indicates that they have never heard of the term sustainable development. Level 5 indicates that the respondent understands the term, and the implication on their life.

 Overall the average level of understanding of sustainable development from the 14/15 survey was 2.37. This was down from 2.5 in 2008 and further down from 2.6 in October 2007.

# Levels of understanding by Directorate

| Directorate                       | Number of responses | Average level of understanding of SD |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Corporate Services                | 269                 | 2.61                                 |
| Education & Lifelong Learning     | 198                 | 1.98                                 |
| Social Services                   | 160                 | 2.11                                 |
| The Environment                   | 293                 | 2.59                                 |
| Caerphilly County Borough Council | 920                 | 2.37                                 |

### The percentage of staff that drive to work in a car on their own

In 2014/15, 78% of respondents said that the travelled to work in a car on their own. This compares to 66.9% of respondents in 2008 and 79% in Oct 2007.

- 7% car share compared to 10.4% in 2008 and 7.2% in October 2007.
- 18% walk to work compared to 17% in 2008 and 10% in October 2007.

# The percentage of staff who take 30 minutes or more of exercise 5 or more times per week

Thirty minutes of exercise 5 times per week is the recommended minimum amount of exercise to remain fit and healthy. Vigorous physical activity is more beneficial.

- Only 3% of the respondents in 2014/15 said that took part in 30 minutes or more of vigorous physical activity (sport, running, cycling) at least 5 times per week. 10% said that took part in moderate physical activity at least 5 times each week.
- 22.5% of respondents in 2008 took part in 30 minutes or more of exercise 5 or more times per week up from 18% in October 2007.
- 60% in 2014/15 never took part in any vigorous physical activity. 44% never took part in moderate physical activity and 16% never took part in light physical activity.
- Of those surveyed in 2014/15, 65% felt that they were physically active.

# The percentage of staff who engage in voluntary activity in their local area

- In 2014/15, 8% engaged in voluntary activity between 1 and 3 hours per month compared to 10% in 2008.
- In 2014/15, 5% volunteered more than 10 hours per month compared to 9% in 2008.
- In 2014/15, 69% never volunteered, compared to 67% in 2008.

### 5. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

5.1 No Equalities Impact Assessment has been done on this report, however Sustainable Development and Equalities interact on many levels and work done in one area often supports the other. Creating sustainable communities, employment and transport for example, is of benefit to all the residents of Caerphilly county borough, regardless of their individual circumstances or backgrounds.

### 6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no financial implications.

# 7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no personnel implications.

### 8. CONSULTATIONS

8.1 See list below.

### 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 That the panel note the findings of the survey set out in this report.

### 10. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 As set out in the report.

Author Paul Cooke, Team Leader, Sustainable Development & Living Environment

cookepa@caerphilly.gov.uk

Consultees: Cllr Ken James - Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning and Sustainable

Development

Cllr Derek Havard - Vice Chair, Sustainable Development Advisory Panel

Chris Burns - Interim Chief Executive

Pauline Elliott – Head of Regeneration & Planning Paul Rossiter – Energy & Water Conservation Officer Alison Palmer – Community Planning Co-ordinator Wayne Turner – Network Development Officer.

Tracy Evans – Education for Sustainable Development Officer

Ian Raymond – Performance Management Unit Alison Palmer – Community Planning Co-ordinator.

Natasha Ford – Supplier Relationship Officer Procurement Svs.

Steve Martin – Principal Contracts Officer (Energy)

### **List of Appendices**

Appendix 1: Flow Chart for level of understanding of sustainable Development

Appendix 2: Staff survey responses