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**If you need this information summarised in another language or format such as Braille, talking tape or DVD please call the number below**.

Polish:

Jeżeli potrzebujesz streszczenia tych informacji w innym języku lub formacie, np. w Braille’u lub w formie nagrania dźwiękowego, zadzwoń na poniższy numer.

Arabic:



Bengali:

যদি আপনি অন্য একটি ভাষায় এই তথ্যের সংক্ষিপ্তসার চান অথবা ব্রেইল, কথা বলা টেপ অথবা ডি.ভি.ডি. ফরম্যাট-এ এই তথ্য চান, তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে নিচের নম্বরে টেলিফোন করুন।

Farsi:

در صورتی که مایلید خلاصه این اطلاعات را به زبان یا فرمت دیگری مانند بریل، نوار یا دی وی دی دریافت کنید، لطفا با شماره زیر تماس بگیرید.

Hindi:

यदि आप इस सूचना का सारांश किसी अन्‍य भाषा या स्‍वरूप में, जैसे ब्रेल, टाकिंग टेप या DVD में चाहते हों, तो कृपया नीचे दिए गए नंबर पर फोन करें।

Kurdish (Kurmanji):

Heke hun vê agahîyê bi kurtî bi zimanekî din an formateke din a wek Braille (ji bo kêmasîya dîtinê), teypa axaftinê yan jî DVD dixwazin, ji kerema xwe telefonî hejmara jêrîn bikin.

Punjabi:

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਸਾਰ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਜਾਂ ਫਾਰਮੈੱਟ ਜਿਵੇਂ ਬ੍ਰੇਲ, ਟਾਕਿਂਗ ਟੇਪ ਜਾਂ DVD ਵਿੱਚ ਚਾਹੀਦਾ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਹੇਠਾਂ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਨੰਬਰ ਤੇ ਕਾਲ ਕਰੋ।

Simplified Chinese:

如果您需要该条信息用其他语言或格式概述，例如盲文，录音磁带或 DVD。请联系以下号码：

Urdu:

اگر آپ کو ان معلومات کے خلاصہ کی کسی دیگر زبان یا شکل مثلاً بریل، ٹاکنگ ٹیپ یا ڈی وی ڈی میں ضرورت ہو تو برائے مہربانی درج ذیل نمبر پر کال کریں۔

 Telephone 0191 3336267

Introduction

The general equality duty of the Equality Act 2010 requires the Trust in the exercise of its functions to have due regard to the need to:

* + - Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act.
		- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and people who do not share it.
		- Foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it.

The Trust must publish information to demonstrate its compliance with the general equality duty. This information must include information relating to staff who share a relevant protected characteristic who are affected by its policies and practices. The protected characteristics are sex, race, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, disability, religion and belief, marriage and civil partnership, age and pregnancy and maternity.

The Trust has published information to meet its public sector duties for the last eight years.

The information in this report as far as possible replicates the indicators of the Workforce Race Equality standard (WRES). The information in the disability section mirrors the indicators for the Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) and the Sexual Orientation Workforce Equality Standard (SOWES).

Analysis of Trust data has been performed to identify any differences within protected characteristic groups across a number of measures deemed to be important. These measures included: distribution of staff within the Agenda for Change Pay Band structure, recruitment metrics (including shortlisting and subsequent recruitment patterns), capability and disciplinary data, Trust Board membership and staff survey details. Due to the nature of the data properties, the majority of reporting was limited to descriptive analytics. However, where possible, additional analyses were undertaken, and likelihood ratios were calculated. This report aims to track key elements of Trust process, with regard to staff, through a protected characteristic lens.

**Recruitment**

*Relative likelihood of staff from one of the protected characteristic groups compared to the non-protected characteristic groups being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.*

Data: Data was extracted from the trac website (the recruitment management system) and supplied by a HR colleague. The data looks at a 12-month period (April 2022 – March 2023), and analysis tracks protected characteristics amongst successful shortlisting and recruitment practices. Information was recorded for all staff in relation to the following protected characteristics: Disability, Ethnicity, Age, Gender and Sexual Orientation. For the purpose of this report, those who did not have a protected characteristic listed have been removed from the analysis (ie not stated, not disclosed etc).

Analysis: Descriptive statistics were utilised in order to assess the breakdown of the protected groups entering the process. Further to this, likelihood ratios were calculated to evaluate any disparity between protected groups. The ratios were broken down to show comparisons of the following reference groups:

* Disabled compared to non-disabled.
* BAME compared to White.
* Age categories compared to one another.
* Male compared to Female.
* Heterosexual compared to LGB

Understanding the likelihood calculation.

Likelihood ratios are calculated for both recruitment and disciplinary/capability metrics within this report.

For illustrative purposes, a worked example of fictitious data is provided below to aid understanding of likelihood ratio methodology and interpretation:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disability Status | Shortlisted N | Appointed N | Ratio | Relative Likelihood |
| Non-Disabled | 780 | 170 | (170/780) = 0.22 | (0.22/0.14) = 1.57 |
| Disabled | 210 | 30 | (30/210) = 0.14 |

If the relative likelihood figure is above 1, it indicates they are more likely to be appointed, if it is below 1 then it indicates that they are less likely to be appointed. Interpretation of the example provided above would be: non-disabled applicants are 1.57 times more likely to be appointed than applicants with a disability.

Results

**Disability**



The above table demonstrates that applicants without a disability were 1.13 times more likely to be appointed from shortlisting than applicants without a disability.

**BAME**



White applicants are 1.83 times more likely to be appointed from shortlisting than BAME applicants.

**Gender**



It can be seen from the above table that Females are 1.16 more times to be appointed from shortlisting than Males are.

**Sexual Orientation**



Heterosexual applicants were 1.13 more likely to be appointed from shortlisting than Gay, Lesbian or Bi-sexual applicants.

**Age categories**



The above categories show the different age groups and the likelihood of someone from that age category being appointed from shortlisting compared to the other age groupings. It can be seen from the above table that those in the age group 66+ were consistently most likely to be appointed to a job from shortlisting when compared to the other groups. Those who were in the age category of 16-20 were least likely to be appointed from a shortlisting when compared to the other age categories.

**Summary**

It can be seen from all the tables above that there are still some small inequalities when comparing the protected characteristic groups against one another, however the likelihood figures have improved since last year. The likelihood of non-disabled applicants compared to disabled applicants being appointed has slightly improved, with last year’s likelihood being non-disabled being 1.14 times more likely, this is now reduced to 1.13 times more likely. The likelihood of white applicants being appointed compared to BAME applicants has increased, last year white applicants were 1.38 times more likely to be appointed from shortlisting, this is now 1.83 times more likely.

**Disciplinary and Capability**

*Relative likelihood of staff from one of the protected characteristic groups compared to the non-protected characteristic entering the disciplinary or the capability process.*

Data: Data was extracted from a HR spreadsheet which is used to record the Capability and Disciplinary data, it was provided by Workforce and Information. The data covered a 24 month period from April 2021 to March 2023 and contained a list of all staff members who had entered the disciplinary or capability process within that time frame. Information was recorded for all staff in relation to the following protected characteristics: Disability, Ethnicity, Age, Gender and Sexual Orientation. For the purpose of this report, those who did not have a protected characteristic listed have been removed from the analysis (ie not stated, not disclosed etc).

Analysis: Descriptive statistics were utilised in order to assess the breakdown of the protected groups entering the process. Further to this, likelihood ratios were calculated to evaluate any disparity between protected characteristics. The ratios were broken down to show comparisons of the following groups:

* Disabled compared to non-disabled.
* BAME compared to white.
* Age categories compared to one another.
* Male compared to Female.
* Heterosexual compared to LGB

Results:

**Disability**

***Disciplinary***



The above table demonstrates that applicants with a disability were 1.15 times more likely to go through the disciplinary process than those without.

***Capability***



In this table, which looks at capability between disabled and non-disabled staff members, we can see that those without a disability are more likely than those with a disability to enter the capability process. However, it should also be noted there was only 1 person with a disability who entered the capability process in the 2 years that this report was looking at.

***Grievance***



The above table demonstrates that applicants with a disability were twice as likely to go through the grievance process than those without a disability.

**BAME**

***Disciplinary***



There was no notable difference between the likelihood of entering the disciplinary process between the different ethnicities.

***Capability***

No staff who are BAME went through the capability process and therefore likelihood was not calculated.

***Grievance***

No staff who are BAME went through the grievance process and therefore likelihood was not calculated.

**Gender**

***Disciplinary***



It can be seen from the above table that males are more likely to enter the disciplinary process than females are (2.18 times more likely)

***Capability***



Male staff are 1.96 times more likely that female staff to enter the capability process.

***Grievance***



In the above table, it can be seen that Male staff are 1.12 times more likely than female staff to enter the grievance process.

**Sexual Orientation**

***Disciplinary***



Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual staff members are 1.41 times more likely to enter the disciplinary process than what heterosexual staff members are.

***Capability***

No staff who identified as Lesbian/Gay or Bi-sexual went through the capability process and therefore likelihood was not calculated.

***Grievance***

No staff who identified as Lesbian/Gay or Bi-sexual went through the Grievance process and therefore likelihood was not calculated.

**Age categories**

***Disciplinary***



We can see from the above table, that overall, staff members who fall in the age category 16-24 are more likely than any other age category to enter the disciplinary process. However, it is worth acknowledging that there are only 12 people in that age category who had a disciplinary, and that age 16-24 has the lowest total workforce figures out of all the age groupings.

***Capability***

We can see from the above table that those in the 16 – 24 age category and those in the 65+ age category are more likely than any of the other age categories to enter the capability process. The likelihoods are quite significant, with them both being about 10 times more likely than those in the age 35-44 age category.

***Grievance*** 

We can see from the above table that those aged 55 and over are more likely than any of the other age categories to enter the grievance process.

**Staff survey results 2022**

Data: The national staff survey was sent to all staff, and they were asked to respond to questions and to freely declare their long-term health condition status, gender, age, ethnicity and sexual orientation. The data is measured by those that agree with a series of questions and offers a snapshot in time of how people experience their working lives, gathered at the same time each year. Its strength is in capturing a national picture alongside local detail, enabling NHS England and NHS Improvement to explore staff experience across different parts of the NHS and work to bring about the necessary improvements. The data was published on 9th March 2023.

Analysis: The statistics from the staff survey were utilised in order to assess the breakdown of the protected groups completing the staff survey, and these were then compared with the scores provided for the previous year. This enabled a comparison to be made for the trust performance compared to the year before. The scores were broken down to show comparisons of the following groups:

* Disabled compared to non-disabled (with a LTHC compared to without a LTHC)
* BAME compared to white.
* Age categories compared to one another.
* Gender compared to one another
* Sexual orientation compared to one another.

**Question guide**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question Number** | **Question** |
| Q14a | Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months. |
| Q14c | Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues in the last 12 months. |
| Q15 | Percentage believing that Trust acts fairly with regard to career progression/promotion regardless of ethnic background, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability or age? |
| Q16b | In the last 12 months have you personally experienced discrimination at work from manager/team leader or other colleagues. |
| Q11c | Percentage feeling unwell due to work related stress in the last 12 months. |
| Q11e | Percentage pressure from their manager to attend work in the last 3 months despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties |
| Q4b | Percentage of staff satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work |
| Q30b | Percentage of staff with a long-lasting health condition or illness saying their employer has made adequate adjustments to enable them to carry out their work |
| Q14d | Percentage of staff saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying, or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it |
| Q22e | I am able to access the right learning and development opportunities when I need to |
| SE | Staff Engagement – score out of ten |

When looking at the tables of scores a comparison has been made for the % Agree, with the scores in last year’s staff survey. A colour and a directional arrow rating have been used i.e., where that has been an improvement in the score then the box is green and the arrow next to the percentage is pointing up (h), and if the score is worse the box is red, and the arrow is pointing down (i). If the score this year is the same as last year, then an amber colour and a horizontal arrow is used (1). Any percentage box that has no arrow has no comparable category/score in last year’s survey. The logic of the question can sometimes be that a higher percentage is a worse score e.g., Q14a, Q14c, Q16b, Q11c and Q11e, and the direction of the arrow reflects this.

**Disability Breakdown for Trust Staff and question responses**

****

\*This question was only for those staff who had a LTHC and only the percentage was supplied and not the number of responses.

**Note:** Within workforce information it is classed as Disability/Non-Disability and staff with a declared disability total 630. For the survey, Long Term Health Condition (LTHC) was used, and staff completing the survey were asked to self-declare their response to having a LTHC or not. This may offer an explanation into the disparity between the numbers.

**Summary**

* Staff with a LTHC experience a higher level of harassment, bullying and abuse from patients, relatives, or the public, and from colleagues than those without a LTHC. (Q14a & Q14c)
* Staff with a LTHC experienced more discrimination from managers/team leaders or other colleagues. (Q16b)
* Staff with a LTHC are more likely to have received pressure from their manager to attend work in the last 3 months despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties. (Q11e)
* Staff with a LTHC are more likely to have felt unwell due to work related stress in the last 12 months. (Q11c)
* Staff with a LTHC are less satisfied with the extent to which the organisation values their work. (Q4b)
* Staff with a LTHC are less convinced that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. (Q15)
* 72% of staff reported that reasonable adjustments had been made to enable them to carry out their work. (Q30b)
* Staff with a LTHC feel they are less able to access the right learning and development opportunities. (Q22e)
* Staff with a LTHC are less engaged than staff without a LTHC. (SE)

 **Age breakdown for Trust staff and question responses**

****

**Summary**

* Staff aged 66+ experience a lower level of harassment, bullying and abuse from patients, relatives, or the public than all other age groups. (Q14a)
* Staff aged 21-30 experience a lower level of harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues. (Q14c)
* Staff aged 66+ are less likely to have felt unwell due to work related stress in the last 12 months. (Q11c)
* Staff in age group 21-30 are more likely to report an incident of harassment, bullying or abuse if they experience it (Q14d)
* Staff aged 66+ are the least convinced that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. (Q15)
* Staff aged 21-30 are slightly more engaged than other staff age groups. (SE)

**Gender breakdown for Trust staff and question responses**

****

**Summary**

* Male Staff experience a higher level of harassment, bullying and abuse from patients, relatives, or the public. (Q14a)
* Staff that prefer not to say what their gender is experience a higher level of harassment, bullying and abuse from colleagues. (Q14c)
* Staff that prefer not to say what their gender is experienced more discrimination from managers/team leaders or other colleagues. (Q16b)
* Staff that prefer not to say what their gender is are more likely to have received pressure from their manager to attend work in the last 3 months despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties. (Q11e)
* Staff that prefer not to say what their gender is are more likely to have felt unwell due to work related stress in the last 12 months. (Q11c)
* Staff that prefer not to say what their gender is are less satisfied with the extent to which the organisation values their work. (Q4b)
* Staff that prefer not to say what their gender is are the least convinced that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. (Q15)
* Staff that prefer not to say what their gender is are less engaged than other staff. (SE)

**Ethnicity breakdown for Trust staff and question responses**

****

**Summary**

* More BAME staff experience a higher level of harassment, bullying and abuse from patients, relatives, or the public and Colleagues. (Q14a & Q14c)
* More BAME staff than white have experienced discrimination from managers/team leaders or other colleagues. (Q16b)
* More BAME staff have attended work in the last 3 months despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties. (Q11e)
* More White staff have felt unwell due to work related stress in the last 12 months. (Q11c)
* More BAME staff are satisfied with the extent to which the organisation values their work. (Q4b)
* BAME Staff are more convinced that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. (Q15)
* White staff are less engaged than other staff. (SE)

**Sexual Orientation breakdown for Trust staff and question responses**

****

Workforce data has 4 categories; Hetro, LGB, Undecided and Not Declared which do not immediately align with the choices available when completing the staff survey. The ‘other’ and ‘prefer not to say’ choices have been aligned with ‘Undecided’ and ‘Not Declared’ purely to allow comparison of the data.

**Summary**

* Heterosexual staff are less likely to experience harassment, bullying and abuse from colleagues or from patients, relatives, or the public. (Q14a)
* Bisexual Staff experience a lower level of harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues. (Q14c)
* Heterosexual staff experienced less discrimination from managers/team leaders or other colleagues. (Q16b)
* Staff that prefer not to say what their sexuality is are more likely to have received pressure from their manager to attend work in the last 3 months despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties. (Q11e)
* Bisexual staff are more likely to have felt unwell due to work related stress in the last 12 months. (Q11c)
* Bisexual staff are more satisfied with the extent to which the organisation values their work. (Q4b)
* Staff that prefer not to say what their sexuality is are less convinced that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. (Q15)
* Staff that prefer not to say what their sexuality is are less engaged than other staff. (SE)

**Analysis of individual questions compared with last years results**

**Q14a. Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months.**

In general, a slightly better score this year than last. Both genders and all Sexual Orientation characteristics improved.

The largest positive change was the prefer not to say sexuality category last year 34% this year 24.7%. White Irish changed from 23.5% last year to 37.5% this year and as such were the largest negative movement.

**Q14c. Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues in the last 12 months.**

In general, a slightly better score this year than last. Both genders and all disabilities were improved on last year.

The largest changes were seen in: Asian / Asian British Pakistan which was 28.6% last year and 7.7% this year (21% improvement), Bisexual, 20.8% last year and 12.7% this year (8.1% improvement).

All other scores had seen a +/- of <=5.5%

**Q15. Percentage believing that Trust acts fairly with regard to career progression/promotion regardless of ethnic background, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability or age?**

Of all the staff surveyed, only 5 characteristics rated this as worse this year than last (Gender – prefer not to say, Asian/Asian British Pakistan, White Irish, Gay/Lesbian and prefer not to say sexuality).

The largest changes were seen in: Sexual orientation - other, which was 44% last year and 64.7% this year (20.7% better), Bisexual, 49.1% last year and 67.1% this year (18% better).

**Q16b. In the last 12 months have you personally experienced discrimination at work from manager/team leader or other colleagues.**

In general, a better score this year than last. Most characteristics in each of their groups saw improvements. There were two characteristics notably worse than last year (Asian/Asian British Pakistan and White Irish).

**Q11c. Percentage feeling unwell due to work related stress in the last 12 months.**

Most staff rated this better this year than last.

The largest changes were seen in: Staff without LTHC was 58.9% last year and 38.1% this year (20.8% better), Sexual Orientation – other, 32.2% better this year than last. Staff without a LTHC score worsened by 16.3% (57.1% against 40.8% last).

**Q11e. Percentage pressure from their manager to attending work in the last 3 months despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties**

Mostly all staff surveyed said that this had improved since last year.

The largest change was seen in White Irish which was 9.1% last year and 28.6% this year (19.5% worse).

All other scores had seen a +/ - of <=8%.

**Q4b. Percentage of staff satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work**

Again, generally scores were better than last year. Both staff with a LTHC and those without a LTHC scored this better than last year. All age groups scored this better than last year too.

Bisexual scored as 53.5% this year compared to 36.4% last year. The prefer not to say gender were the least satisfied at 27.1%, this was 18.5% last year so there has been an improvement. 64.7% of Black/Black British agreed with the statement.

**Q30b. Percentage of staff with a long-lasting health condition or illness saying their employer has made adequate adjustments to enable them to carry out their work**

The percentage in agreement with the question this year was 75.8%, last year 72.2% agreed.

**Q14d. Percentage of staff saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying, or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it**

All responses were within 10% of the scores form last year. Six characteristics had higher scores this year than last (Male, 41-50 Age group, BAME, Staff without a LTHC, Bisexual and prefer not to say sexual orientation).

**Q22e. I am able to access the right learning and development opportunities when I need to**

Generally, all scores were better than last year for most of the characteristics. The only characteristics to score worse than last year were; Age groups 41-50 and 66+, White Irish and both Gay/Lesbian and other sexualities. The most improvement on last year’s score was Asian/Asian British Indian (87.5% this year and 62.5% last) and Bisexual (73.2% this year and 50.9% last). White Irish score worsened the most by 22.3% from last year (76.5% to 54.2%)

**Staff Engagement**

For all staff (other than Male and gender prefer not to say, 66+, Black/Black British: African, White Irish, other sexual orientation) the engagement score was better or the same as last year. However, all scores were within +/- of <0.5 change.

The largest improvements were seen with Asian/Asian British Indian and Bisexual, both of which score 0.5 higher than last year.

**Board Representation**

*Percentage difference between the organisations’ Board membership and its overall*

*workforce disaggregated.*

Data: Data was provided from Workforce information. The data and analysis was carried out on the 18 board figures, in relation to the total workforce. Information was recorded for all staff in relation to the following protected characteristics: Disability, Ethnicity, Age, Gender and Sexual Orientation.

Analysis: Descriptive statistics were utilised in order to assess the breakdown of the protected groups in respect of Board membership. Further to this, differences between board numbers relative to the workforce were calculated to evaluate any disparity between protected characteristics. The following characteristics were explored.

* Disabled compared to non-disabled.
* BAME compared to white.
* Age categories compared to one another.
* Male compared to Female.
* Heterosexual compared to LGB

**Percentage difference between the organisations’ Board membership and its overall workforce calculation example:**

*Voting board members broken down by ethnicity: BAME = 2(11.11%)*

*Total workforce broken down by ethnicity: BAME = 467(5.88%)*

*Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce for BAME members = +5.23%*

Results:

There are a total of 18 board figures.

 

**BAME**



Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce for BAME members = +8.41%

Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall workforce for BAME members = +4.12%. This has improved since last year. Last year there were no BAME executive members.

**Gender**



Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce for Female members = -29.71%

Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall workforce for Female members = -19.71%.

**Disability**



Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce for Disabled members = +6.35%

Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall workforce for disabled members = +2.06%. This is an improvement on last year’s figures.

**Age**



Percentage difference between the organisations board voting membership and its overall workforce for the different age groups is highest for those aged 51-65. This finding is the same for executive members compared to the overall workforce.

**Sexual Orientation**



There is currently no member of the trust board who identifies as Lesbian, Gay or Bi-sexual.

**Summary:**

Summary:

* BAME Staff have a higher voting membership on the board relative to the workforce population.
* Females are underrepresented on the board relative to the workforce populations for both voting membership and executive membership.
* Staff with a disability have a higher representation of voting members compared to the workforce population of disabled staff.
* Board membership is underrepresented in age ranges from 41-50 but over-represented in age brackets 51-65 and 66+.
* There are currently no board members represented by persons identifying as Lesbian, Gay or Bi-sexual.
*

Agenda for Change Banding Distribution

Data: The data was provided by workforce information and maps the protected characteristics against the agenda for change pay bandings. The information is provided for both the Non-Clinical and Clinical workforce as well as Medical & Dental.

Analysis: The data provided is very high-level count data, for this reason, only descriptive analytics were utilised to summarise the variation and patterns within the data.

Results

* **BAME**



The distribution of BAME staff compared to White staff across the banding structures indicates that significantly high proportions of BAME staff make-up the higher banding structures within the Medical and Dental professional roles. Staff of white ethnicity predominantly make up the figures across the clinical and non-clinical workforce

* **Disability**



Within non-clinical roles 7% of the workforce have a disability, this compares to 8% of staff in clinical roles. The leadership roles between staff with a disability and those without were 20% and 22% respectively. The figures considered for the medical and dental roles are relatively small, however 2% of staff with a disability are employed within these roles, compared to 4% of staff without a disability.

* **Age**



No staff in the age group 16-20 are employed within leadership roles within the organisation. There are also no staff aged 66+ within non-clinical leadership roles. The age group 41- 50 occupy the most non-clinical leadership roles at approximately 22% of the workforce within that age category. Within clinical leadership roles, the age range of 31-40 and 41-50 occupy the highest number of leadership posts (27% and 34% respectively). This compares to only 8% within the age bracket 21-30. The figures across the medical and dental posts are relatively equal across age groups apart from age groups 21-30 and 66+ which are quite low numbers compared to the other age groups.

* **Gender**



There are double the proportion of non-clinical male staff in non-clinical leadership roles compared to females (22% of male workforce compared to 12% female). There are also significant differences with medical and dental. Approximately 8% of the entire male workforce are appointed into medical/dental roles compared to 2% of the entire female workforce. No difference was found in relation to clinical leadership roles between genders.

* **Sexual Orientation**



There were no differences noted between leadership numbers across those who identified as LGB and those who are recorded as being heterosexual.

**Census Comparison**

**Gender**



Compared to census figures TEWV’s work force is disproportionately made up of female members of staff. Within the staff makeup of the trust, DTV&F workforce is made up of 81.30% of females, which is 30.30% higher than census figures. With only 18.70% of the workforce made up by males. This is similar for NYY&S, with 81.44% of their workforce being made up by females.

**Age**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Age Band** | **Trust** | **Census** | **Trust diff % +/-** |
| 0 | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
| DTV&F | **15 to 19** | 11 | 0.23% | 68,500 | 5.71% | -5.48% |
| **20 to 29** | 801 | 16.93% | 140,900 | 11.75% | 5.18% |
| **30 to 39** | 1335 | 28.21% | 147,000 | 12.32% | 15.89% |
| **40 to 49** | 1102 | 23.29% | 140,100 | 11.68% | 11.61% |
| **50 to 64** | 1393 | 29.44% | 252,900 | 21.09% | 8.35% |
| **Over 64** | 90 | 1.90% | 245,000 | 20.43% | -18.53% |
| **DTV&F Total** | **4732** |   | **995,100** |   |   |
| NYYS | **15 to 19** | 0 | 0% | 47,300 | 5.78% | -5.78% |
| **20 to 29** | 308 | 16.38% | 90,900 | 11.11% | 5.27% |
| **30 to 39** | 510 | 27.13% | 92,300 | 11.28% | 15.85% |
| **40 to 49** | 412 | 21.91% | 94,900 | 11.60% | 10.31% |
| **50 to 64** | 601 | 31.97% | 179,000 | 21.87% | 10.10% |
| **Over 64** | 49 | 2.61% | 192,600 | 23.54% | -20.93% |
| **NYYS Total** | **1880** |   | **697,000** |   |   |

The age ranges which have the largest negative difference in staff make up compared to census figures is the over 64 category which is to be expected as well as the 15 to 19 age group. Both DTV&F and NYYS have the highest number of staff members within the 50 to 64 age group.

**Ethnicity**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Trust** | **Census**  | **Trust diff % +/-** |
|  | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
| DTV&F | **White** | 4380 | 92.56% | 1129136 | 94.15% | -1.59% |
| **Mixed** | 40 | 0.85% | 14015 | 1.17% | -0.32% |
| **Asian** | 123 | 2.60% | 37702 | 3.14% | -0.54% |
| **Black or Black British** | 117 | 2.47% | 9170 | 0.76% | 1.71% |
| **Other** | 23 | 0.49% | 9223 | 0.77% | -0.28% |
| **Not Stated**  | 49 | 1.04% |   |   |   |
| **Total** | **4732** |  | **1199246** |  |  |
| NYYS | **White** | 1725 | 91.76% | 783322 | 95.72% | -3.96% |
| **Mixed** | 17 | 0.90% | 10463 | 1.28% | -0.38% |
| **Asian** | 43 | 2.29% | 15954 | 1.95% | 0.34% |
| **Black or Black British** | 37 | 1.97% | 3784 | 0.46% | 1.51% |
| **Other** | 13 | 0.69% | 4797 | 0.59% | 0.10% |
| **Not Stated**  | 45 | 2.39% |   |   |   |
| **Total** | **1880** |  | **818320** |  |  |

For both DTV&F and NYY&S both of their workforces are predominantly made up of staff who classify themselves as White, however the percentage difference compared to the census figures shows that we are below the census make up for the White group.

**Sexual Orientation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Trust** | **Census**  | **Trust diff % +/-** |
|  | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
| DTV&F | **Heterosexual or straight** | 4065 | 85.90% | 894421 | 91.17% | -5.27% |
| **Gay or Lesbian** | 139 | 2.94% | 14158 | 1.44% | 1.50% |
| **Bisexual** | 68 | 1.44% | 10779 | 1.10% | 0.34% |
| **Other (not listed)** | 10 | 0.21% | 2471 | 0.25% | -0.04% |
| **Undecided** | 5 | 0.11% |   |   |   |
| **Not Stated**  | 445 | 9.41% | 59211 | 6.04% | 3.37% |
| **Total** | **4732** |  | **981040** |  |  |
| NYYS | **Heterosexual or straight** | 1598 | 85.00% | 619782 | 90.05% | -5.05% |
| **Gay or Lesbian** | 48 | 2.55% | 9280 | 1.35% | 1.20% |
| **Bisexual** | 45 | 2.39% | 9364 | 1.36% | 1.03% |
| **Other (not listed)** | 10 | 0.53% | 2190 | 0.32% | 0.21% |
| **Undecided** | 5 | 0.27% |   |   |   |
| **Not Stated**  | 161 | 8.56% | 47639 | 6.92% | 1.64% |
| **Total** | **1880** |  | **688255** |  |  |

DTV&F and NYY&S both have workforces which are predominantly made up of staff who classify themselves as Heterosexual or straight. 85% of NYY&S and 85.90% for DTV&F. When compared against the census both show under-representation by around 5%.

**Disability**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Disability** | **Trust** | **Census** | **Trust diff % +/-** |
|  | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
| DTV&F | **Yes** | 369 | 7.80% | 255829 | 21.33% | -13.53% |
| **No** | 4363 | 92.20% | 943371 | 78.67% | 13.53% |
| **DTV&F Total** | **4732** |  | **1199200** |  |  |
| NYYS | **Yes** | 164 | 8.72% | 133178 | 16.28% | -7.56% |
| **No** | 1716 | 91.28% | 685122 | 83.72% | 7.56% |
| **NYYS Total** | **1880** |  | **818300** |  |  |

The workforce for DTV&F is made up of 92.20% of people with no disability which is 13.53% higher than the census figures, NYYS is also made up of 91.28%, which is 7.56% higher than census figures.

**Summary**

*Recruitment*

Some inequalities were apparent when comparing protected characteristic groups across the shortlisting and recruitment process. These differences were as follows:

* Applicants without a disability were 1.13 times more likely to be appointed than applicants with a disability.
* White applicants were 1.83 times more likely to be appointed than BAME applicants.
* Females were 1.16 times more likely to appointed than males.
* Heterosexual applicants were 1.13 times more likely to be appointed than Gay, Lesbian or Bi-sexual applicants.
* Age category 66+appeared to be the most successful in being appointed, whilst the16-20 age group appeared the least likely to be appointed.

It is important to note that, although differences were found in the likelihood of being appointed, the ratios calculated for male and BAME applicants have improved since last year’s report.

*Disciplinary and Capability*

The likelihood figures, compared to last years, have for the majority reduced, meaning that there is less disparity between the different groupings.

For those staff who identified as having a disability, the likelihood of them entering the disciplinary and capability process compared to those without a disability has reduced since last year.

There are also no notable differences to report for BAME compared to white staff for capability and disciplinary, which would indicate that there is less disparity this year compared to last year’s numbers.

 LGB staff are now 1.4 times more likely to enter formal disciplinary than heterosexual staff, last year this likelihood was 1.68, showing that this figuring is slowly decreasing.

For Gender, Males are more likely than females to enter the formal disciplinary, capability and grievances process, by quite a significant amount (2.18, 1.96 and 1.12 respectively).

This finding has stayed consistent with last year’s findings, however the likelihood figure has reduced indicating that the gap between Males and Females is getting smaller.

*Staff Survey*

Inequalities across protected characteristics were found in relation to the staff survey results. These are summarised below:

*Long-Term Health Conditions*

* Staff with a long-term health condition (LTHC) experienced a higher level of:
	+ harassment, bullying and abuse from patients, relatives, the public and colleagues
	+ Discrimination from managers, team leaders and colleagues
	+ Pressure to attend work despite not feeling well enough
	+ Work related stress
	+ Not feeling valued at work
	+ Difficulty finding opportunities for career progression
	+ Feeling unengaged with work

However, a high proportion felt that reasonable adjustments had been made to enable them to work effectively.

*Age*

Within the different age groups, the 66+ group generally experienced lower levels of harassment, bullying and abuse, feeling unwell due to work related stress and felt more engaged with work than other age groups. However, they did feel they had less opportunities for promotion.

*Gender*

The survey results indicated that male staff experience higher levels of harassment, bullying and abuse. However, all other differences were noted only within the group of staff who preferred not to record their gender.

*Ethnicity*

In comparison to white staff, BAME staff reported experiencing higher levels of:

* + Harassment, bullying and abuse
	+ Discrimination from managers and team leaders
	+ Unequal opportunities for career progression
	+ Feeling engaged
	+ Feeling valued

*Sexual Orientation*

In relation to sexual orientation, inequalities included:

* + Higher levels of bullying and harassment in non-heterosexual staff
	+ Heterosexual staff experienced lower levels of discrimination by managers and team leaders.
	+ Bisexual staff are more likely to feel unwell due to work related stress
	+ Bisexual staff feel more valued by the organisation

*Board Membership*

* BAME Staff have a higher voting membership on the board relative to the workforce population, however, there is only one BAME executive member on the board.
* Females are underrepresented on the board relative to the workforce populations for both voting membership and executive membership.
* Staff with a disability have a higher voting member representation compared to the workforce population of disabled staff, and a slightly higher representation in executive membership. However, the number of disabled board members is only three in total.
* Board membership is underrepresented in age ranges from 41-50 but over-represented in age brackets 51-65 and 66+.
* There are currently no board members represented by persons identifying as Lesbian, Gay or Bi-sexual

*Workforce*

These findings echo what was reported last year.

* BAME staff are recruited into medical and dental posts at a significantly higher rate than White staff.
* Staff with a disability are appointed to leadership roles within clinical and non-clinical posts at a similar rate to staff without a disability. However 2% of staff with a disability are employed within medical/dental roles, compared to 4% of staff without a disability.
* No leadership roles are appointed to staff in the age range 16-20. No staff within the 66+ bracket are appointed to non-clinical leadership roles. Within clinical leadership roles, significantly more staff are appointed in the age brackets 31-40 and 41-50 compared to the other age categories.
* There are double the proportion of non-clinical male staff in non-clinical leadership roles compared to females (22% of male workforce compared to 12% female).