

Patient Carer Race Equality Framework (PCREF) 2025

Meeting of:	Board of Directors
Date:	9 April 2026
Title:	Data publication – Patient Carer Race Equality Framework (PCREF)
Executive Sponsor(s):	Kedar Kale - Executive Medical Director
Report Author(s):	Rachel Nye, Section Head of Research and Analytics Danielle Rome, Lead Information Analyst Catherine Parker, Consultant in Public Health

Report for:

Assurance

X

Decision

x

Consultation

Information

Strategic Goal(s) in Our Journey to Change relating to this report:

1: We will co-create high quality care

X
X
x

2: We will be a great employer

3: We will be a trusted partner

Strategic risks relating to this report:

BAF ref no.	Risk Title	Context
3	Co-creation	There is a risk that if we do not fully embed co-creation caused by issues related to structure, time, approaches to co-creation and power resulting in fragmented approaches to involvement and a missed opportunity to fully achieve OJTC
4	Quality of Care	There is a risk that we will be unable to embed improvements in the quality of care consistently and at the pace required across all services to comply with the fundamental standards of care; caused by short staffing, the unrelenting demands on clinical teams and the lead in time for significant estates actions resulting in a variance in experience and a risk of harm to people in our care and a breach in the Health and Social Care Act
14	Health Inequalities	There is a risk that health inequalities are exacerbated / opportunities to reduce health inequalities are not realised. Caused by differential opportunities for equitable access,

		<p>excellent experience and optimal outcomes. In particular for people living in areas of high deprivation, those from Black, Asian and minority ethnic communities and those from inclusion health groups. Resulting in lack of service reach into underserved communities, increased risk of late/crisis presentation, higher acuity, disengagement, suboptimal outcomes and experience in health inclusion groups.</p>
--	--	---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose:

This paper provides assurance that the Trust is meeting its obligations under the Patient Carer Race Equality Framework (PCREF) data collection and publication.

Proposal:

Board of Directors is asked to:

- Confirm that it has reasonable assurance that the Trust has followed a robust process in producing and analysing the quantitative data required for the PCREF.
- To approve the proposed publication of the PCREF prior to publication on the Trust website.

Overview:

The data is for the period 1st April 2024 to 31st March 2025. The PCREF requirements 2 – 8 were reported on in January 2025 and an update provided on them in January 2026. The PCREF for 2025/26 will go through the governance process again in November 2026 together with our public sector equality duty report for patients so that all the data will be for the same period. The PCREF requirements 2 – 8 will be reported on in detail in the November report.

This paper should be viewed in addition to the paper February 2025, the data published on the trust website in October 2025, and the update provided to Quality Assurance Committee in January 2026 which provided a narrative account of the trust’s response to date in relation to the PCREF domains.

NHS England (NHSE) has developed the PCREF to support Mental Health Trusts to become anti- racist organisations by ensuring they co-produce and implement actions to reduce racial inequalities within their services. It is now part of the CQC inspections. The ICBs are monitoring Trust’s progress with the PCREF.

As a minimum Trusts must publish:

- The number of cases of detention under the Mental Health Act and the cause (section) and duration of these detentions by ethnicity
- Restraint including the type of restraint by ethnicity, age and gender.
- Physical health checks for those adults with Severe Mental Illness by ethnicity. (This data is held by primary care, and we do not currently have access to this data segmented for our trust footprint)
- Improved access rates to Children and Young People’s mental health services for 0 – 17-year-olds

- A sample of locally agreed access, experience and outcome metrics. Information which previously formed part of the patient publication of information has been included under this heading.
- The Trust will report on any deaths in mental health inpatient units to the CQC by protected characteristics. The Trust is compliant with this and currently reports to the CQC on all deaths of patients detained under the Mental Health Act by gender, ethnicity, disability, religion/ belief, sexual orientation and age. This data is not collated centrally, but the Mental Health Legislation office save a copy of the death notification once it is sent to CQC.

The Trust is required to publish the PCREF data annually. The proposal for assurance is based on the information contained in this report and the data in appendix 1.

PCREF data (Data in Appendix 1)

Detention data (Fig 3)

Information has been produced by calculating the expected rates of detention by gender and ethnicity for the Trust based on standardised rates of detention per 100,000 population. The Trust's anticipated rates are based on the 2021 census for ethnicity, sex, age and gender. These have been compared to the Trust's detention rates and NHS Digital rates for 2024/25.

- Compared to the national rates of detention per 100,000 population the Trust detains more White, Asian/ Asian British and Other Ethnicities than the national rates, fewer Mixed people and the same number of Black/ Black British people.(Fig 3) It should be noted that national rates of detention have fallen and that the Trust's rates of detention have also decreased but are still higher than national rates for some groups of people as described above.
- The table in fig 4 which shows that per 100, 000 population those who identify as Black/ Black British are detained 2.03 times more than White People, compared to 2.61 times in 2023/24 and Other Ethnicities are detained 2.33 times more than White people, compared to 1.32 times in 2023/24. Asian/ Asian British, which is the same as 2023/24, and Mixed people are less likely to be detained than White people compared to 1.32 times more likely to be detained in 2023/24.
- Further analysis of relative rates of detention by ethnicity and gender per 100,000 population (Fig 5) show that compared to White women, Black/ Black British women are detained 2.24 times more, compared to 3.39 times more in 2023/24, and are detained at higher rates than any other female ethnic group. Black/ Black British men are 1.65 times more likely to be detained than White men, compared to 1.94 times in 2023/24. Women from other ethnicities are 1.85 times more likely to be detained compared to White women, compared to 0.85 times less likely in 2023/24. Men from other ethnicities are 2.36 times more likely to be detained compared to White men, compared to 1.77 in 2023/24.

Restrictive Practice (Figs 6-12)

- Initial analysis (figures 6 -9) suggests that women are more likely to physically restrained, chemically restrained and be in seclusion compared to men, whereas in 2023/24 men were more likely to be in seclusion. Men are more likely to be mechanically restrained compared to women, but the numbers are very small so caution must be shown in drawing any conclusions from this. Physical interventions are significantly higher for those aged 18 – 29 than for any other age group as was the case in 2023/24. Mechanical

restraint is low across the board but there appears to be an outlier in the 30 – 44 age group as there was in 2023/24.

- Analysis was done which included comparing restrictive intervention data to the number of ward stays (figures 10 – 12). For this, patients were only counted once in the numerator (number of restrictive interventions) and once in the denominator (number of ward stays within the time frame) regardless of how many ward stays or restrictive interventions they may have had.

The analysis showed the following

- Women are slightly more likely (22.7%) to be subject to restrictive interventions compared to men (19.4%).
- Restrictive interventions were used on 23.3% of 18-29 year olds who had a ward stay. The two numerators (the number of interventions) added together divided by the two denominators (the number of ward stays) have been used to reach this figure.
- All ethnicities, except for Mixed, experienced higher levels of restrictive interventions compared to White people. However, it needs to be noted that for 45.3% of restrictive interventions ethnicity is unknown and therefore the figures need to be treated with caution.

CYP Access

Data on CYP access is included at fig 13. The PCREF requires us to report on rates of access, and this has been compared to the 2021 census figures for the under 18s in the local authority areas covered by the Trust. This shows that compared to White people all other ethnicities access CYP services at lower rates with Asian/ Asian British and Black/ Black British having the lowest access rates.

PROMS and CROMS (fig 14 – 17)

For each outcome measure there are two table. The first showing the percentage of patients with a paired outcome measure and the second showing the percentage with measurable improvement.

For adults and older people (figures 14 – 15) as in 2023/24 the percentages of patients with a paired outcome measure are not significantly different. The percentage of discharged patients showing measurable improvement on the CROM tool is higher for all ethnicities than it is for White people.

For CYP (16 – 17) the percentage of Black/ Black British patients with a paired CROM is 15% which is significantly different to the percentage for other ethnicities. The percentage with a paired PROM is 35% for White patients as compared to 18% for Asian/ Asian British patients and 12% for Black/ Black British patients. The percentage showing measurable improvement in CROMS for Other Ethnicities is significantly lower, but for PROMS the greatest level of improvement is shown for those of Other Ethnicities. 0% of Black/ Black British patients report measurable improvement, however the number of responses is <5 caution needs to be applied to this as it does for all ethnicities compared to White due to the significantly lower number of patients.

Access Rates and Admissions (fig 18)

This data compares access rates to services in general per 100,000 population with admissions to hospital per 100 people who accessed services in general. The figures show that all ethnicities access services in general at lower rates than White people and with the exception of Mixed race people all ethnicities have higher levels of hospital admissions compared to White people.

PCREF requirements 2 – 8

These were reported on in January 2025 and an update provided in January 2026. The PCREF for 2025/26 will go through the governance process again in November 2026 together with our public sector equality duty report for patients so that all the data will be for the same period. The PCREF requirements 2 – 8 will be reported on in detail in the November report.

Areas of future focus

While this report details data to support the trust on its journey to become an anti-racist organisation and to address inequalities identified via the data collected as required by the PCREF, we have more to do in response. Areas of focus for the coming year will be as follows:

- National data quality for ethnicity recording is inconsistent with missing, unknown or our dated codes with lack of alignment of systems further reducing overall data reliability. We still have work to do to increase recording of ethnicity data at TEWV. Our current recording (68.2%) is below national average (74.6%) for mental health settings and has fallen. Consultation is taking place as to how best to improve the recording of ethnicity data.
- The Health Inequalities plan sets out the following actions in relation to the PCREF: establish relationships with our community sector partners to grow insights from racialised communities; undertake a detailed exploration into the drivers of mental health act use for ethnically minoritised and racialised communities; use these insights to model service adaptations, increase community reach and improve accessibility and responsiveness of services. Work is currently undergoing to identify specific focuses for this work within clinical services.

Prior Consideration and Feedback:

This paper was approved by Executive Clinical Leaders Subgroup on 18th March 2026. To note this version additionally includes data on the % of matched pairings for clinician and patient reported outcomes which is a discretionary data set and numbers less than 5 have been suppressed in readiness for publication. This paper was subsequently approved by Executive Directors Group on 24th March 2026 and was received by Quality assurance committee on 2nd April 2026.

Implications:

Failure to understand the differences in outcomes and experiences of our ethnically minoritised and racialised communities in accordance with the requirements of the PCREF, and more broadly those with protected characteristics in accordance with our public sector equality duties may have regulatory and reputational consequences. Failure to reduce differences in outcomes and experiences of our service users with protected characteristics may impact on their outcomes and experiences.

Recommendations:

- Board of Directors is asked to:
- Confirm that it has reasonable assurance that the Trust has followed a robust process in producing and analysing the quantitative data required for the PCREF
 - To approve the proposed publication of the PCREF prior to publication on the Trust website.

Appendix 1 – Data required for PCREF Publication

Number of Detentions under the Mental Health Act by cause and duration by ethnicity (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

Figure 1: Number of Detentions by Ethnicity and Section Type

Number of Detentions by Ethnicity & Section Type							
Ethnicity x Section Type	White	Asian/Asian British	Black/Black British	Mixed	Other Ethnicities	Unknown	Grand Total
2	1477	43	13	15	26	208	1782
3	806	18	15	6	13	86	944
37	10	0	0	<5	0	0	11
37/41	6	0	<5	0	0	0	7
37N	<5	0	<5	0	0	0	5
4	8	0	0	<5	0	0	9
47/49	<5	0	0	0	0	0	<5
48/49	<5	0	0	0	0	0	<5
5(2)	271	<5	<5	<5	5	23	304
5(4)	100	<5	0	0	<5	5	107
Grand Total	2686	65	31	24	45	322	3173

Figure 2: Average Duration of Detention by Ethnicity and Section Type (1.4.23 – 31.3.25)

Average Duration in Days by Ethnicity & Section Type							
Ethnicity x Section Type	White	Asian/Asian British	Black/Black British	Mixed	Other Ethnicities	Unknown	Grand Total
2	19	18	18	17	20	19	19
3	69	85	53	19	55	67	69
37	120	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	46	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	113
37/41	184	<i>n/a</i>	116	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	161
37N	165	<i>n/a</i>	183	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	169
4	<5	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<5	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<5
47/49	256	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	256
48/49	96	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	96
5(2)	<5	<5	<5	0	<5	<5	<5
5(4)	0	0	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	0	0	0

Grand Total	32	35	43	17	28	30	32
-------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Figure 3: Actual Detention rates per 100,000 population compared with anticipated detention rates and compared with national rates (2024)

COMPARISON TO NATIONAL RATES OF DETENTION					
Ethnicity	National rates of detention per 100,000 population	Anticipated numbers of detentions in TEWV based on national rates	Actual numbers of detentions in TEWV	TEWV rates of detention per 100,000 population	Relative rate between TEWV detention figures and National Figures
White	66.9	1278	2405	125.8	1.88
Mixed	122	30	22	89.9	0.74
Asian/Asian British	85.7	46	63	117.4	1.37
Black/Black British	256.7	33	33	254.7	0.99
Other Ethnicities	140.8	20	41	292.4	2.08
Unknown	-	-	309	-	-

Figure 4: Relative Ratios of TEWV detention rates by ethnicity (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

The rates are calculated against the row labels so if the figure is greater than 1 the characteristic in the row label shows a higher detention rate than the comparator in the column label, if the figure is less than 1 they show a lower rate of detention.

An example of interpretation would be 'per 100,000 population Black/ Black British people are detained 2.03 times more than White people.'

Ethnicity	White	Mixed	Asian/Asian British	Black/Black British	Other Ethnicities
White		1.40	1.07	0.49	0.43
Mixed	0.71		0.77	0.35	0.31
Asian/Asian British	0.93	1.31		0.46	0.40
Black/Black British	2.03	2.83	2.17		0.87

Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys

NHS Foundation Trust

Other Ethnicities	2.33	3.25	2.49	1.15	
-------------------	------	------	------	------	--

Figure 5: Comparisons of TEWV detention rates by ethnicity and gender (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

The table below shows the highest relative ratios when assessing cross-sectional data between ethnicity and gender.

Ethnicity x Gender	Asian/Asian British - Female	Asian/Asian British - Male	Black/Black British - Female	Black/Black British - Male	Mixed - Female	Mixed - Male	Other Ethnicities - Female	Other Ethnicities - Male	White - Female	White - Male
Asian/Asian British - Female		1.13	0.43	0.60	1.14	1.64	0.51	0.42	0.95	0.99
Asian/Asian British - Male	0.88		0.38	0.53	1.00	1.45	0.45	0.37	0.84	0.87
Black/Black British - Female	2.35	2.67		1.41	2.68	3.85	1.21	0.98	2.24	2.32
Black/Black British - Male	1.67	1.89	0.71		1.90	2.73	0.86	0.70	1.59	1.65
Mixed - Female	0.88	1.00	0.37	0.53		1.44	0.45	0.37	0.84	0.87
Mixed - Male	0.61	0.69	0.26	0.37	0.69		0.31	0.26	0.58	0.60
Other Ethnicities - Female	1.94	2.20	0.83	1.16	2.21	3.18		0.81	1.85	1.92
Other Ethnic	2.39	2.71	1.02	1.43	2.72	3.92	1.23		2.28	2.36

ities - Male										
White - Female	1.05	1.19	0.45	0.63	1.20	1.72	0.54	0.44		1.04
White - Male	1.01	1.15	0.43	0.61	1.15	1.66	0.52	0.42	0.96	

Number of Cases of restrictive practice, including type of restrictive practice by ethnicity, age and gender

Figure 6: Total Number of Restrictive practice interventions by type (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

Total Number of Interventions	No. Physical Interventions	No. Mechanical Interventions	No. Chemical Interventions	No. Isolation Interventions
	5449	31	1775	570

Figure 7: Number of Restrictive interventions by gender (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

Number of Interventions by Gender				
Gender	No. Physical Interventions	No. Mechanical Interventions	No. Chemical Interventions	No. Isolation Interventions
Female (Including Trans Woman)	3439	<5	1197	349
Male (Including Trans Man)	1745	29	513	218
Non-Binary	13	0	<5	<5
Unknown	252	<5	62	<5

Figure 8: Number of Restrictive interventions by ethnicity (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

Number of Interventions by Ethnicity				
Ethnicity	No. Physical Interventions	No. Mechanical Interventions	No. Chemical Interventions	No. Isolation Interventions
Asian/Asian British	265	0	195	<5
Black/Black British	27	<5	11	<5
Mixed	43	0	18	0
White	4644	27	1360	564
Other Ethnicities	43	0	35	0
Unknown	427	<5	156	<5

Figure 9: Number of Restrictive interventions by age (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

Number of Interventions by Age				
Age Groupings	No. Physical Interventions	No. Mechanical Interventions	No. Chemical Interventions	No. Isolation Interventions
<20	1003	<5	251	<5
20-29	1662	<5	512	182
30-44	1082	17	375	358
45-64	788	7	351	25
65+	664	0	225	<5
Unknown	250	<5	61	<5

Figures 10 – 12 show the number of Restrictive Interventions used as a percentage of any open ward stays for the period 1.4.24 – 31.3.25. This only counts patients once in the numerator (number of restrictive interventions) and once in the denominator (open ward stays within the time frame being looked at) regardless of how many restrictive interventions or ward stays they may have had.

Figure 10. Percentage of people with a restrictive intervention by gender (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

Gender			
Gender	Number of ward stays	Number of restrictive interventions used	%
FEMALE (INCLUDING TRANS WOMAN)	1475	335	22.7%
MALE (INCLUDING TRANS MAN)	1750	339	19.4%
NON-BINARY	6	<5	50.0%

Figure 11: Percentage of people with a restrictive intervention by age (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys

NHS Foundation Trust

Age			
Age	Number of ward stays	Number of restrictive interventions used	%
<20	230	36	15.7%
20 - 29 years old	538	143	26.6%
30 - 44 years old	927	189	20.4%
45 - 64 years old	854	157	18.4%
65+	719	153	21.3%

Figure 12: Percentage of people with a restrictive intervention by ethnicity (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

Ethnicity			
Ethnicity	Number of ward stays	Number of restrictive interventions used	%
Asian/Asian British	67	23	34.3%
Black/Black British	36	12	33.3%
Mixed	23	<5	17.4%
White	2419	563	23.3%
Other Ethnicities	28	14	50.0%
Unknown	695	315	45.3%

Improved Access to Children and Young People Services (CYPS) for ages 0 – 17 (1.4.14 – 31.3.25)

Figure 13: CYPS access compared to the 2021 census figures for the under 18 population in the local authority areas covered by the Trust. (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

Ethnicity	Number of Patients	Population	Access rate per 100,000 population
Asian/Asian British	190	13019	1459.41
Black/Black British	77	3706	2077.71
Mixed	356	11643	3057.63
White	24656	361283	6824.57
Other Ethnicities	140	3988	3510.53

Unknown	4470	
---------	------	--

Sample of locally agreed outcome metrics (1.4.24 – 31.3.25)

Clinical Outcome Measures for Adult and Older People’s services by ethnicity
The first tables show the percentage of patients with a paired outcome measure and the second shows the percentage reporting measurable improvement.

Figure 14: Clinician Reported Outcome Measures

AMH / MHSOP - CROM			
Ethnicity	Number of patients discharged in the reporting period (based on the logic mentioned above)	Number who have a paired outcome measure	% who have a paired outcome measure
Asian/Asian British	133	67	50%
Black/Black British	48	26	54%
Mixed	88	43	49%
Other Ethnicities	79	43	54%
White	13180	6882	52%

AMH / MHSOP - CROM			
Ethnicity	Number of patients discharged in the reporting period (based on the logic mentioned above)	Number showing measurable improvement	% showing measurable improvement
Asian/Asian British	82	25	30%
Black/Black British	34	12	35%
Mixed	56	21	38%
Other Ethnicities	56	23	41%
White	8131	1968	24%

Figure 15:

AMH / MHSOP - PROM			
Ethnicity	Number of patients discharged in the reporting period (based on the logic mentioned above)	Number who have a paired outcome measure	% who have a paired outcome measure
Asian/Asian British	147	49	33%
Black/Black British	51	16	31%
Mixed	95	31	33%
Other Ethnicities	94	21	22%
White	13976	4072	29%

AMH / MHSOP - PROM			
Ethnicity	Number of patients discharged in the reporting period (based on the logic mentioned above)	Number showing measurable improvement	% showing measurable improvement
Asian/Asian British	59	22	37%
Black/Black British	22	9	41%
Mixed	41	20	49%
Other Ethnicities	28	10	36%
White	5103	2312	45%

Clinical Outcome measures for Children and Young People by ethnicity
Patient Reported Outcome Measures and the second shows the percentage reporting measurable improvement and the second shows the percentage reporting measurable improvement.

Figure 16: Clinician Reported Outcome Measures

CYP - CROM			
Ethnicity	Number of patients discharged in the reporting period (based on the logic mentioned above)	Number who have a paired outcome measure	% who have a paired outcome measure
Asian/Asian British	36	12	33%
Black/Black British	13	<5	15%
Mixed	88	21	24%
Other Ethnicities	29	8	28%
White	5075	1793	35%

CYP - CROM			
Ethnicity	Number of patients discharged in the reporting period (based on the logic mentioned above)	Number showing measurable improvement	% showing measurable improvement
Asian/Asian British	12	7	58%
Black/Black British	6	<5	50%
Mixed	27	14	52%
Other Ethnicities	10	<5	20%
White	2340	1267	54%

Figure 17: Patient Reported Outcome Measures

CYP - PROM			
Ethnicity	Number of patients discharged in the reporting period (based on the logic mentioned above)	Number who have a paired outcome measure	% who have a paired outcome measure
Asian/Asian British	39	7	18%
Black/Black British	17	<5	12%
Mixed	95	28	29%
Other Ethnicities	32	8	25%
White	5551	1945	35%

Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys

NHS Foundation Trust

CYP - PROM			
Ethnicity	Number of patients discharged in the reporting period (based on the logic mentioned above)	Number showing measurable improvement	% showing measurable improvement
Asian/Asian British	8	5	63%
Black/Black British	<5	0	0%
Mixed	30	14	47%
Other Ethnicities	9	7	78%
White	2331	1181	51%

Figure 18: Access Rates to services in general per 100,000 population (compared to the 2021 census figures) and access rates to hospital per 100 people accessing services.

Ethnicity	Number accessing services	Census data	Crude rate per 100,000	Number who occupied an inpatient bed	Rates of people who spent time in hospital per 100 people accessing services
Asian/Asian British	462	53656	861.0	59	12.8
Black/Black British	193	12954	1489.9	30	15.5
Mixed	530	24478	2165.2	23	4.3
Other Ethnicities	327	14020	2332.4	29	8.9
White	49072	1911131	2567.7	2298	4.7