

Workforce Race Equality Standard

REPORTING TEMPLATE (Revised 2017)

Name of organisation

Date of report: month/year

Arden and Greater East Midlands Commissioning Support Unit

August

2017

Name and title of Board lead for the Workforce Race Equality Standard

Mike Walker

Name and contact details of lead manager compiling this report

Lucie Carrington, Head of Corporate Communications

Names of commissioners this report has been sent to (complete as applicable)

N/A

Name and contact details of co-ordinating commissioner this report has been sent to (complete as applicable)

N/A

Unique URL link on which this Report and associated Action Plan will be found

This report has been signed off by on behalf of the Board on (insert name and date)

Mike Walker 23.04.18

1. Background narrative

a. Any issues of completeness of data

At March 2017, ethnicity was known for 93.7% of the workforce (headcount = 1116, excluding non-executive board members).

b. Any matters relating to reliability of comparisons with previous years

Where the methods for calculating an indicator have changed since the previous year, the previous year's indicator has been recalculated to the latest standard to facilitate comparison.

2. Total numbers of staff

a. Employed within this organisation at the date of the report

1116 substantive staff (including executive board members, but excluding non-executive board members of which there were 4).

b. Proportion of BME staff employed within this organisation at the date of the report

19.5% (using the total number of staff of known ethnicity as the base, n = 1046).

3. Self reporting

a. The proportion of total staff who have self-reported their ethnicity

93.7%

b. Have any steps been taken in the last reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting by ethnicity

There is a high level of reporting already and, due to change major organisational review and changing shape of our workforce, it would not have been appropriate but plan below sets out next steps in ensure robust WRES data.

c. Are any steps planned during the current reporting period to improve the level of self reporting by ethnicity

See comment above

4. Workforce data

a. What period does the organisation's workforce data refer to?

Staff in post at the end of March 2017
Recruitment in the 16/17 financial year
Disciplinary cases opened in the 15/16 and 16/17 financial years
Non-mandatory training undertaken in the 16/17 financial year
Local Staff Survey 2017

5. Workforce Race Equality Indicators

A key to the colour-coding used in the tables of analysis is given at the end of this report.

For each of these four workforce indicators, compare the data for White and BME staff								
16/17			15/16			Narrative	Action	
1. Percentage of staff in each of the AfC Bands 1-9 and VSM (including executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce. Organisations should undertake this calculation separately for non-clinical and for clinical staff.								
R – Redacted to mitigate the risk of identifying individuals			R – Redacted to mitigate the risk of identifying individuals			<p>There were no statistically significant differences in the representation of BME staff by pay band compared to their level of representation in the workforce overall (excluding non-executive directors). There was a trend for BME staff to be overrepresented at lower pay bands in non-clinical roles; however, this trend did not achieve statistical significance. This was the case at the end of March 2017 as well as at the end of March 2016.</p> <p>The figures given here for the end of March 2016 differ slightly from those published last year. The WRES technical guidance for 2017 has an updated definition of very senior managers such that non-executive directors are no longer included in this category or within indicator 1; the ethnicity profile of non-executive directors is considered in indicator 9.</p>	<p>The WRES data for 2016/17 does not suggest the CSU has a significant problem in attracting and retaining BME staff. However, we need to use our refreshed OD plans to attract or promote more BME colleagues to senior roles.</p> <p>Due to the major organisational review taking place during 2017/18, there was limited opportunity to use take significant action to further this. However, the CSU is in a more stable position as at April 2018 and expects to take significant action during the coming 12 months.</p> <p>Actions to promote BME talent within the organisation will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> internal development opportunities – including mentoring and coaching - identified via our appraisal and objective setting systems external development opportunities including national programmes such as the Mary Seacole 	
Pay band	Total n*	% BME	Pay band	Total n*	% BME			
Non-clinical	Under Band 1	R	R%	Under Band 1	R			0.0%
	Band 1	0		Band 1	0			
	Band 2	21	R%	Band 2	35			R%
	Band 3	120	24.2%	Band 3	121			12.4%
	Band 4	105	26.7%	Band 4	116			17.2%
	Band 5	142	25.4%	Band 5	134			22.4%
	Band 6	119	22.7%	Band 6	110			17.3%
	Band 7	129	20.9%	Band 7	107			18.7%
	Band 8A	109	14.7%	Band 8A	100			16.0%
	Band 8B	59	20.3%	Band 8B	50			R%
	Band 8C	41	R%	Band 8C	41			R%
	Band 8D	15	R%	Band 8D	16			R%
	Band 9	10	R%	Band 9	R			R%
VSM	11	R%	VSM	R	R%			
Clinical	Under Band 1	0		Under Band 1	0			
	Band 1	0		Band 1	0			
	Band 2	0		Band 2	0			
	Band 3	0		Band 3	0			
	Band 4	R	R%	Band 4	0			
	Band 5	R	R%	Band 5	25	R%		
	Band 6	84	R%	Band 6	107	R%		
	Band 7	41	R%	Band 7	36	R%		
	Band 8A	20	R%	Band 8A	26	R%		
	Band 8B	R	R%	Band 8B	R	R%		
	Band 8C	R	R%	Band 8C	R	R%		
	Band 8D	R	R%	Band 8D	R	R%		
	Band 9	R	R%	Band 9	R	R%		
VSM	R	R%	VSM	R	R%			
Medical	Consultant (not senior medical manager)	R	R%	Consultant (not senior medical manager)	R	R%		
	Senior medical manager (consultant)	0		Senior medical manager (consultant)	0			
	Non-consultant career grade	0		Non-consultant career grade	0			
	Trainee grade	0		Trainee grade	0			
	Other	0		Other	0			
Overall 1046 19.5%			Overall 1058 14.5%					
* total of known ethnicity			* total of known ethnicity					

leadership programme.

2. Relative likelihood of staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.

Relative likelihood = 1.57

White people were 1.57 times more likely than BME people to be appointed if shortlisted†.

Ethnicity	n shortlisted*	% appointed
White	640	18.6%
BME	514	11.9%
Overall	1154	15.6%

* total of known ethnicity

White > BME†

Relative likelihood = 1.22

White people and BME people were equally likely to be appointed if shortlisted†.

Ethnicity	n shortlisted*	% appointed
White	1869	8.8%
BME	791	7.2%
Overall	2660	8.3%

* total of known ethnicity

White ≈ BME

In 16/17, 18.6% of White people were appointed from shortlisting, compared to 11.9% of BME people - this represented a statistically significant difference with White people more likely to be appointed from shortlisting than BME people. Overall number of appointments in 16/17: 180 (of known ethnicity).

In 15/16, 8.8% of White people were appointed from shortlisting, compared to 7.2% of BME people - this did not represent a statistically significant difference. Overall number of appointments in 15/16: 221 (of known ethnicity).

WRES data for 2017/18 will confirm whether this is a disappointing trend in recruitment practice or a deviation from the norm. Either way, the CSU is committed to taking action on two fronts to readjust the balance between shortlisting and recruiting BME candidates:

- Recruiting managers: review recruitment guidance provided; review the training available via the Academy and sign poster recruiting managers accordingly
- BME candidates: provide external candidates guidance around interview skills; provide interview skills training as part of the development package for BME colleagues (see 1 above).

3. Relative likelihood of staff entering the formal disciplinary process, as measured by entry into a formal disciplinary investigation. This indicator will be based on data from a two year rolling average of the current year and the previous year.

Please refer to the narrative

Please refer to the narrative

No BME staff entered the formal disciplinary process in either the two-year window 15/16 to 16/17 or in the two-year window 14/15 to 15/16.

The CSU will continue to monitor disciplinary data via the WRES and other workforce analysis as appropriate.

The number of disciplinary

		proceedings in the two-year window 15/16 to 16/17 and in the two-year window 14/15 to 15/16 were too small to draw statistically robust conclusions about the relative likelihood of White and BME staff entering the formal disciplinary process.	
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

4. Relative likelihood of staff accessing non-mandatory training and CPD.																											
Relative likelihood = 1.09	Relative likelihood = 1.07																										
White staff and BME staff were equally likely to access non-mandatory training.	White staff and BME staff were equally likely to access non-mandatory training.	In both 16/17 and 15/16, White staff and BME staff were equally likely to access non-mandatory training.	While white and BME colleagues appear to have equal access to non-mandatory training, actions identified in 1 are focused on providing BME colleagues with more focused non-mandatory development to help readjust the ethnic profile at a more senior level in the CSU.																								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ethnicity</th> <th>workforce overall*</th> <th>% non-mandatory training</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>842</td> <td>31.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BME</td> <td>204</td> <td>28.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>1046</td> <td>30.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ethnicity	workforce overall*	% non-mandatory training	White	842	31.1%	BME	204	28.4%	Overall	1046	30.6%	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ethnicity</th> <th>workforce overall*</th> <th>% non-mandatory training</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>906</td> <td>26.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BME</td> <td>153</td> <td>24.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>1058</td> <td>26.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ethnicity	workforce overall*	% non-mandatory training	White	906	26.5%	BME	153	24.8%	Overall	1058	26.3%		
Ethnicity	workforce overall*	% non-mandatory training																									
White	842	31.1%																									
BME	204	28.4%																									
Overall	1046	30.6%																									
Ethnicity	workforce overall*	% non-mandatory training																									
White	906	26.5%																									
BME	153	24.8%																									
Overall	1058	26.3%																									
* total of known ethnicity	* total of known ethnicity																										
White ≈ BME	White ≈ BME																										

National NHS Staff Survey indicators (or equivalent). For each of the four staff survey indicators, compare the outcomes of the responses for White and BME staff.

16/17	15/16	Narrative	Action												
5. KF 25. Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months.															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ethnicity</th> <th>respondents overall*</th> <th>% experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>36</td> <td>5.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BME</td> <td>R</td> <td>SUPPRESSED%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>R</td> <td>SUPPRESSED%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ethnicity	respondents overall*	% experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months	White	36	5.6%	BME	R	SUPPRESSED%	Overall	R	SUPPRESSED%	Please refer to the narrative	In 2016/17, Arden GEM CSU undertook its own staff survey to address WRES indicators 5 to 8. The number of BME respondents was too small to draw statistically robust conclusions about the relative levels of harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public,	The staff survey was suspended during the organisational review. It was relaunched in March 2018 to provide a benchmark for development our employee engagement programme. Our key action against this indicator is to develop the survey so that it can be used to ensure we
Ethnicity	respondents overall*	% experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months													
White	36	5.6%													
BME	R	SUPPRESSED%													
Overall	R	SUPPRESSED%													
* total of known ethnicity															
R – Redacted to mitigate the risk of identifying individuals															

		experienced by White and BME staff. In 2015/16, Arden GEM CSU did not take part in the 2015 NHS Staff Survey; nor did it conduct its own survey addressing WRES indicators 5 to 8.	capture this information in a robust manner.
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------

6. KF 26. Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from staff in last 12 months.

<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ethnicity</th> <th>respondents overall*</th> <th>% experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from staff in last 12 months</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>35</td> <td>22.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BME</td> <td>R</td> <td>SUPPRESSED%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>R</td> <td>SUPPRESSED%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* total of known ethnicity R – Redacted to mitigate the risk of identifying individuals</p>	Ethnicity	respondents overall*	% experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from staff in last 12 months	White	35	22.9%	BME	R	SUPPRESSED%	Overall	R	SUPPRESSED%	<p>Please refer to the narrative</p>	<p>In 2016/17, Arden GEM CSU undertook its own staff survey to address WRES indicators 5 to 8. The number of BME respondents was too small to draw statistically robust conclusions about the relative levels of harassment, bullying or abuse from other staff, experienced by White and BME staff.</p> <p>In 2015/16, Arden GEM CSU did not take part in the 2015 NHS Staff Survey; nor did it conduct its own survey addressing WRES indicators 5 to 8.</p>	See indicator action above
Ethnicity	respondents overall*	% experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from staff in last 12 months													
White	35	22.9%													
BME	R	SUPPRESSED%													
Overall	R	SUPPRESSED%													

7. KF 21. Percentage believing that trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.

<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ethnicity</th> <th>respondents overall*</th> <th>% believing that the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>23</td> <td>91.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BME</td> <td>R</td> <td>SUPPRESSED%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>R</td> <td>SUPPRESSED%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* total of known ethnicity R – Redacted to mitigate the risk of identifying individuals</p>	Ethnicity	respondents overall*	% believing that the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion	White	23	91.3%	BME	R	SUPPRESSED%	Overall	R	SUPPRESSED%	<p>Please refer to the narrative</p>	<p>In 2016/17, Arden GEM CSU undertook its own staff survey to address WRES indicators 5 to 8. The number of BME respondents was too small to draw statistically robust conclusions about the relative levels of White and BME staff believing that the organisation provides equal opportunities</p>	See indicator above
Ethnicity	respondents overall*	% believing that the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion													
White	23	91.3%													
BME	R	SUPPRESSED%													
Overall	R	SUPPRESSED%													

		for career progression or promotion. In 2015/16, Arden GEM CSU did not take part in the 2015 NHS Staff Survey; nor did it conduct its own survey addressing WRES indicators 5 to 8.	
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

8. Q17. In the last 12 months have you personally experienced discrimination at work from any of the following? b) Manager/team leader or other colleagues

<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ethnicity</th> <th>respondents overall*</th> <th>% experienced discrimination at work from Manager/team leader or other colleague</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>36</td> <td>19.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BME</td> <td>R</td> <td>SUPPRESSED%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>R</td> <td>SUPPRESSED%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* total of known ethnicity R – Redacted to mitigate the risk of identifying individuals</p>	Ethnicity	respondents overall*	% experienced discrimination at work from Manager/team leader or other colleague	White	36	19.4%	BME	R	SUPPRESSED%	Overall	R	SUPPRESSED%	<p align="center">Please refer to the narrative</p>	<p>In 2016/17, Arden GEM CSU undertook its own staff survey to address WRES indicators 5 to 8. The number of BME respondents was too small to draw statistically robust conclusions about the relative levels of discrimination from other staff, experienced by White and BME staff.</p> <p>In 2015/16, Arden GEM CSU did not take part in the 2015 NHS Staff Survey; nor did it conduct its own survey addressing WRES indicators 5 to 8.</p>	<p>See indicator above</p>
Ethnicity	respondents overall*	% experienced discrimination at work from Manager/team leader or other colleague													
White	36	19.4%													
BME	R	SUPPRESSED%													
Overall	R	SUPPRESSED%													

Board representation indicator. For this indicator, compare the difference for White and BME staff

16/17	15/16	Narrative	Action
<p>9. Ethnicity profile of the Board's Executive, Non-executive, Voting, and Non-voting membership. Percentage difference between the organisations' Board membership and its overall workforce.</p>			
<p>Percentage differences: %BME total board - %BME workforce = -19.5% %BME voting board - %BME workforce = -19.5% %BME executive board - %BME workforce = -19.5%</p>	<p>Percentage differences: %BME total board - %BME workforce = -14.5% %BME voting board - %BME workforce = -14.5% %BME executive board - %BME workforce = -14.5%</p>	<p>In both 16/17 and 15/16, BME people were underrepresented on the board relative to their level of representation in the workforce overall.</p> <p>This was true in terms of Board's overall membership, as</p>	

		<p>well as in terms of its voting membership and its executive membership.</p> <p>In 16/17, ethnicity was not known for 20.0% of Board members; whilst in 15/16 ethnicity was not known for 28.6% of Board members.</p>	
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

6. Are there any other factors or data which should be taken into consideration in assessing progress?

Given that the CSU workforce largely reflects the populations we serve, the organisational review is likely to have had a significant impact on the makeup of that workforce as we lost colleagues in certain areas of the country but gained them in others. This is unlikely to be reflected in the data for 2017/18 and the CSU may need to consider running a workforce survey later in the current financial year once we have completed mobilisation of services in Norfolk and Essex.

7. Organisations should produce a detailed WRES Action Plan, agreed by its Board. Such a Plan would normally elaborate on the actions summarised in section 5, setting out the next steps with milestones for expected progress against the WRES indicators. It may also identify the links with other work streams agreed at Board level, such as EDS2. You are asked to attach the WRES Action Plan or provide a link to it.

The actions included within this template constitute the CSU's current WRES action plan. However, given the changes in workforce that have taken place over the past 12 months, this must be seen as a dynamic document that we will revisit through the year as our business objectives and associated OD plan develop. To this end we are looking to set up a CSU-wide equalities working group/virtual network that will enable us to tap into

colleagues with a particular interest in and knowledge of equalities and inclusion, using this group/network to co-produce our WRES action plan and other equalities initiatives.

Key to colour-coding in tables of analysis:

	Benchmark
	Better than benchmark to a large degree (statistically significant*)
	Better than benchmark to a medium degree (statistically significant*)
	Better than benchmark to a small degree (statistically significant*)
	Equivalent to benchmark (no statistically significant difference*)
	Worse than benchmark to a small degree (statistically significant*)
	Worse than benchmark to a medium degree (statistically significant*)
	Worse than benchmark to a large degree (statistically significant*)

* based on odds ratios (Bonferroni correction applied); the degrees of underrepresentation or overrepresentation (small, medium, large) follow the standards for effect sizes applied in the social sciences

Please note: for some questions (e.g., the percentage agreeing that LPT acts fairly with regard to career progression / promotion, regardless of ethnic background, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability or age) “better than the benchmark” was indicated by a higher score and “worse than the benchmark” was indicated by a lower score; whilst for other questions (e.g., the percentage experiencing one or more incident of bullying and harassment from other colleagues in the past 12 months) “better than the benchmark” was indicated by a lower score and “worse than the benchmark” was indicated by a higher score.