

## 2.0 Workforce Race Equality Standard

2.1 The 2019 column is colour coded according to whether there has been an improvement (green), no change (amber) or worsening (red) of the results since 2018. The proposed actions follow the table.

WRES Metric	2014 data	2015 data	2016 data	2017 data	2018 data	2019 data	Trends and Comments	Benchmark
Percentage of BAME staff in bands 8 – 9 VSM (Including Executive Board members and Senior Medical Staff) compared with the BAME staff in the overall workforce.	6.76% BAME  19.81% White	6.69% BAME  20.61% White	Metric changed to bands 1-9.  18.7% White	18.7% BAME  <b>10.40% BAME band 8-9 (VSM)</b>	18.65% BAME  <b>8.65% BAME band 8-9 (VSM)</b>	<b>22% BAME</b>  12.6% (Bands 8-9 (VSM))	The % of BME staff in bands 8-9 is 12.6%. 22% of the overall workforce are from a BME background meaning that BME staff are under-represented in bands 8, 9 and VSM.	2017 - Nationally, the proportion of BAME staff in Bands 8a - 9 and VSM was 11.1% compared with 17.7% in the workforce as a whole
Relative likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to that of BAME staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.	10:1 BAME 11:1 White	8:1 BAME 6:1 White	8:1 BAME 6:1 White	0.99	1.15	<b>1.71</b>	The difference in likelihood of BAME and White applicants being appointed to a post after the applicant has been shortlisted has increased since 2017 to 1.71 in favour of White applicants.	2018 - 1.45
Relative likelihood of BAME staff	41:1 BAME	36:1 BAME	45.1 BAME	1.98  Previou	2.00	<b>1.98</b>	The way that this metric is measured was changed in 2016.	2018 – 1.24

WRES Metric	2014 data	2015 data	2016 data	2017 data	2018 data	2019 data	Trends and Comments	Benchmark
entering the formal disciplinary process, compared to that of White staff entering the formal disciplinary investigation.	56:1 White	44:1 White	49:1 White	s metric method: 44:1 BAME 88:1 White  Last 6 months 138:1 BAME 215:1 White			BAME staff are just less than twice as likely to enter a formal disciplinary process.	
Relative likelihood of BAME staff accessing non-mandatory training and CPD as compared to White staff	1:1 BAME  1:1 White	1:1 BAME  1:1 White	1:1 BAME  1:1 White	1.05	1.04	1.00	There is no difference in the likelihood of BAME staff accessing training compared with White staff.	2018 – 1.15
Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the	–	31% BAME  25% White	30% BAME  27% White	27.72% BAME  27.97% White	28.71% BAME  28.13% White	30.1% BAME  25.2% White	The gap between BAME staff and White staff reporting having experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public has reduced over the time period from 6%	2018 - 29% of BAME staff

<b>WRES Metric</b>	<b>2014 data</b>	<b>2015 data</b>	<b>2016 data</b>	<b>2017 data</b>	<b>2018 data</b>	<b>2019 data</b>	<b>Trends and Comments</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>
public in the past 12 months.		6% difference	3% difference	0.25% difference	0.58%	4.9%	more BAME staff having experienced it to 3% and to 0.58 in 2018. However the difference has increased in 2018 to just below the benchmark average at 4.9%	
Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from staff in the past 12 months.	21% BAME	23% BAME	24% BAME	24.16% BAME	24.26% BAME	27.7% BAME	There has been an increase of 2.8% in the gap between BAME and White staff responses to this question in 2018 which is now above the national average.	2018 - 28% BAME
	17% White	19% White	19% White	20.20% White	19.83% White	20.5% White		
	4% difference	4% difference	5% difference	3.96% difference	4.4% difference	7.2% difference		
Percentage believing that Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression and promotion.	70% BAME	78% BAME	68% BAME	66.41% BAME	65.89% BAME	58.4% BAME	The number of BAME staff answering yes to this question has decreased by 7.49% since 2018. The Trust is 17.8% below the national benchmark for BAME staffs' answer to this question. The difference between BAME and White staffs' answer to this question is 16.8% higher than the national benchmarked average.	2018 – 72% BAME
	93% White	87% White	88% White	84.64% White	85.36% White	86.7% White		
	23% difference	9% difference	20% difference	18.23% difference	19.47% difference	28.3% difference		

WRES Metric	2014 data	2015 data	2016 data	2017 data	2018 data	2019 data	Trends and Comments	Benchmark
In the last 12 months have you personally experienced discrimination at work from any of the following? Manager / Team Leader or other colleagues.	41% BAME	25% BAME	16% BAME	15.85% BAME	20.10% BAME	16.1% BAME	The gap has decreased in 2018. The difference between ethnic groups responses is 10.5%. The national benchmark responses were 12.8% for BAME staff and 5.6% for White staff which is a difference in response by ethnic group of 7.2% meaning the Trust is 3.3% above the benchmark.	2018 – 15% BAME
	11% White	9% White	5% White	7.52% White	6.6% White	5.6% White		
	30 % difference	16% difference	11% difference	8% difference	13.5% difference	10.5% difference		
Percentage difference between the organisations' Board voting membership and its overall workforce.	6.25% BAME	7.7% BAME	8.3% BAME	-10.3% BAME -10.5% White	-18.6% BAME -0.1% White -18.6%	-22.8%	13.3% of the Board members have 'ethnicity unknown' within their ethnicity field.	2018 – 7%

## 2.2 Proposed Actions

The following actions are proposed to respond to these findings. Many of them are already agreed and underway as a result of the National WRES Team visit in 2018 and the EDI Workforce Strategy.

	<b>Proposed Action</b>	<b>Timescale for Completion</b>
1.	The positive increase in BAME staff in bands 8a and above should be celebrated. BAME staff in these roles will be encouraged to share their stories as role models throughout the year.	October 2020
2.	Include the updated WRES and WDES data in the recruitment and selection training along with key messages about bias and its impact.	January 2020
3.	Assess the BAME representation on 8a and above recruitment panel pilots and review the impact of that on the appointment after shortlisting figures.	July 2020
4.	Review the disciplinary and grievance data alongside the data collected from Bullying and Harassment Support Officers to identify themes and trends and to look at the impact that the work carried out in 2018 and 2019 to address the data has had. Develop actions as a result of that data.	February 2020
5.	Invite the COO to the Employee Relation weekly review meetings to review the disciplinary cases being raised and support the triaging process.	August 2019
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the work of the Wellbeing @ Work Team to ensure staff are aware of the support that is available to them when experiencing bullying, harassment and abuse.</li> <li>• Respond to the crowdsourcing priorities identified in the last engagement programme.</li> <li>• Triangulate data from bullying and harassment support officers, disciplinary and grievances, Freedom to Speak Up and Risk Reporting to identify bullying and harassment hotspots to target the training and focus groups.</li> </ul>	These actions are ongoing and the effectiveness will be reviewed in May 2020.
7.	Further exploration into the outcome of the metric that asks BAME staff whether they consider the Trust to promote equal opportunities to career progression and promotion is required. This will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff focus groups.</li> <li>• Analysis of what opportunities for career progression have taken place in the last 2 years and what the outcome of that recruitment process has been and develop an appropriate response.</li> </ul>	April 2020
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work to ensure that the number of unknown demographic categories in the Board's ESR profile</li> </ul>	

	<p>is reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="331 236 1693 268">• Promote the upcoming NED positions via the Engaging People's Grant funded organisations.</li></ul>	August 2019
--	--	-------------