Workforce Race Equality Standard (WRES) 2021

NHS
Arden and Greater East Midlands
Commissioning Support Unit

Arden&GEM
Health and social care systems support

1. **Name of organisation**
   NHS Arden & GEM CSU

2. **Date of report**
   Month: October
   Year: 2021

3. **Name and title of Board lead for the Workforce Disability Equality Standard**
   Mike Walker, Director of Business Services

4. **Name and contact details of lead manager compiling this report**
   Usman Malik – EDI Lead

5. **This report has been signed off by on behalf of the board on**
   Date: October 2021
   Name: Mike Walker, Director of Business Services

Background narrative

6. **Any issues of completeness of data**
   A comparatively small number of unknown/null data relating to ethnicity of current staff remain (5.48%)

7. **Any matters relating to reliability of comparisons with previous years**
   None

8. **Total number of staff employed within this organisation at the date of the report (March 2021)**
   985

9. **Proportion of BME staff employed within this organisation at the date of the report?**
   18.58%

10. **The proportion of total staff who have self–reported their ethnicity?**
    94.52%

11. **Have any steps been taken in the last reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting by ethnicity?**
    - Fully implemented Employee Self Service
    - Full roll out of the ESR employee portal complete.
    - Bespoke rolling adverts added within the portal to further encourage staff to update their personal information.
    - Greater use of BME staff network to further encourage staff update their personal information

12. **Are any steps planned during the current reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting by ethnicity?**

    Service line specific communications will be developed to encourage uptake of self-reporting by ethnicity.

Workforce data

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

April 2020 - March 2021

Workforce Race Equality Indicators

14. Metric 1 - Percentage of staff in each of the Agenda for Change (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.

Data for reporting year: March 2021 Data (Headcount)

Clinical / Non-Clinical	WRES Banding	Headcount BME	White	Not Stated/Not Given	total staff	% BME	% White	NULL	Not Stated/Not Given
Clinical	Band 5	1	8		9	11.11%	88.89%		
	Band 6	11	15		26	42.31%	57.69%		
	Band 7	5	12	2	19	26.32%	63.16%		10.53%
	Band 8a	4	10	1	15	26.67%	66.67%		6.67%
	Band 8b	1	3	1	5	20.00%	60.00%		20.00%
	Band 8c	2	1		3	66.67%	33.33%		
	Band 8d	2			2	100.00%			
	VSM	1	2		3	33.33%	66.67%		
	Medical & Dental Consultant		1	1	2		50.00%		50.00%
	PERS			1	1				100.00%
	WQ00		1		1		100.00%		
	XR11	1			1	100.00%			
Clinical	**OVERALL WF**	**28**	**53**	**6**	**87**	**32.18%**	**60.92%**		**6.90%**
Non Clinical	Band 2	3	5		8	37.50%	62.50%		
	Band 3	13	54	2	69	18.84%	78.26%		2.90%
	Band 4	18	54	11	83	21.69%	65.06%		13.25%
	Band 5	33	125	3	161	20.50%	77.64%		1.86%
	Band 6	23	86	8	117	19.66%	73.50%		6.84%
	Band 7	22	119	6	147	14.97%	80.95%		4.08%
	Band 8a	20	91	10	121	16.53%	75.21%		8.26%
	Band 8b	14	58	5	77	18.18%	75.32%		6.49%
	Band 8c	3	47	1	51	5.88%	92.16%		1.96%

Continued…

Clinical / Non-Clinical	WRES Banding	Headcount				%		%	
		BME	White	Not Stated/Not Given	total staff	BME	White	NULL	Not Stated/Not Given
	Band 8d	4	23	2	29	13.79%	79.31%		6.90%
	Band 9	2	13		15	13.33%	86.67%		
	VSM		2		2		100.00%		
	GEPG		5		5		100.00%		
	WQ00		13		13		100.00%		
	Non-Clinical overall WF	155	695		48	898	17.26%	77.39%	5.35%

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

Data for reporting year: 1.06

Data for previous year: 1.54

- A figure above "1" would indicate that white candidates are more likely than BME candidates to be appointed from shortlisting.
- Last year white staff were 1.54 times more likely to being appointed from shortlisting across all points. This year that gap has reduced to near parity
- Recruitment processes and diverse interview panels are examples of initiatives that have been undertaken across the organisation.
- There was a change to the WRES reporting for this metric. The requirement was amended and the data request for this indicator changed to a year end figure as opposed to a two-year rolling figure.
- Recruitment data is analysed annually under Trust Public Sector Equality Duty requirements and the Equality Delivery System.

16. Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of staff entering the formal disciplinary process, as measured by entry into a formal disciplinary investigation.

Data for reporting year: 0.5% based on one case being recorded for the organisation.

Data for previous year: 0.78

- A figure above "1" would indicate that BME staff members are more likely than white staff to enter the formal disciplinary process.
- The numbers within the CSU are too small to make any comparison around parity as there is only one recorded case for the year in question.
- There was a change to the WRES reporting for this metric. The requirement was amended, the data request for this indicator changed to a year end figure as opposed to a two-year rolling figure
- Employee Relations data is analysed annually under Trust Public Sector Equality Duty requirements and the Equality Delivery System

17. Metric 4 - Relative likelihood of staff accessing non-mandatory training and CPD

Data for reporting year: - 2.59

Data for previous year: - No data available

- A figure below "1" would indicate that white staff members are less likely to access non-mandatory training and CPD than BME staff.
- The CSU have only just implemented recording of non- mandatory training on ESR and therefore the data for the year in question is incomplete and does not give a reliable picture of the access and take-up of training.
- Further guidance will be produced for hiring managers to accurately record staff training on ESR
- Access to training is analysed annually under Trust Public Sector Equality Duty requirements and the Equality Delivery System

Board representation indicator

18. Metric 9- Percentage difference between the organisation's Board voting membership and its overall workforce
- (i) the organisation's Board voting membership and its overall workforce
- (ii) the organisation's Board executive membership and its overall workforce

Data for reporting year:

White:

• By voting membership of the Board.

The percentage difference between the board voting membership and its overall workforce:

+7.36% difference for white voting board members to overall workforce.

• By Executive membership of the Board.

The percentage difference between the Executive voting membership and its overall workforce:

+24.06% difference for white executive board members to overall workforce.

BME:

• By voting membership of the Board.

-10.28% difference for BME voting board members to overall workforce.

• By Executive membership of the Board.

-18.58% difference for BME executive board members to overall workforce.

19. **Are there any other factors or data which should be taken into consideration in assessing progress?**
None

20. **Organisations should produce a detailed WRES action plan, agreed by its board. It is good practice for this action plan to be published on the organisation's website, alongside their WRES data. Such a plan would elaborate on the actions summarised in this report, 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 provide a link to your WRES action plan in the space below.**

Note** – Data for Metrics 5– 8 is not available this year as the CSU has not undertaken the NHS National Staff Survey last year. Please find attached the [National WRES Metrics](#).

NHS

**Arden and
Greater East Midlands**
Commissioning Support Unit

Arden&GEM
Health and social care systems support