

NHS Bedfordshire CCG 2020 WRES REPORTING TEMPLATE

Introduction

1 Name of organisation

NHS Bedfordshire CCG

2 Date of report

Month/Year:

March/2020

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

Dr Roshan Jayalesh, GP Governing Body Member
Geraint Davies, Director of Performance & Governance

4 Name and contact details of lead manager compiling this report

David King

5 Names of commissioners this report has been sent to

Complete as applicable:

N/A

6 Name and contact details of co-ordinating commissioner this report has been sent to

Complete as applicable:

N/A

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

ADD LINK

8 This report has been signed off by on behalf of the board on

Name:

EDI Committee

Date:

31/9/2020

Background narrative

9 Any issues of completeness of data

Ethnicity was known for the 95.5% of the workforce of 198 employees at the end of March 2019 (excluding non-executive directors).

10 Any matters relating to reliability of comparisons with previous years

None.

Self reporting

11 Total number of staff employed within this organisation at the date of the report:

Workforce of 198 employees at end of March 2019 (excluding non-executive directors and lay members).

12 Proportion of BAME staff employed within this organisation at the date of the report:

13.8% of the 189 employees of known ethnicity were listed as BAME (excluding non-executive directors).

13 The proportion of total staff who have self reported their ethnicity:

95.5% of the workforce of 198 employees at the end of March 2019 (excluding non-executive directors) self-reported their ethnicity.

14 Have any steps been taken in the last reporting period to improve the level of self reporting by ethnicity?

Self service is available for staff. An annual communication was done, asking staff to check and review their ESR data and request any updates required.

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

It is recommended that staff are reminded to check and update their data on ESR. Self Service will be promoted to staff. It is recommended that the Equality Group promote the WRES internally to CCG and staff and reiterate the importance that everyone has entered up to date data. It is hoped this will provide a driver to further raise reporting.

Workforce data

16 What period does the organisation's workforce data refer to:

Staff in post at March 2020

17 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.

Data for reporting year:

Total N refers to those of known ethnicity.

These figures exclude non-executive directors.

OVERALL %BAME

Workforce: 13.8% BAME; (Total N = 189)

Ethnicity was not known for 4.5% of the workforce.

The ethnicity breakdown of staff by pay band has been redacted due to the small numbers of staff within each pay band.

Data for previous year:

Total N refers to those of known ethnicity.

These figures exclude non-executive directors.

OVERALL %BAME

Workforce: 13.2% BAME; (Total N = 189)

Ethnicity was not known for 4.1% of the workforce.

The ethnicity breakdown of staff by pay band has been redacted due to the small numbers of staff within each pay band.

The implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative:

When using the specified WRES scheme for pay band analyses, there were no statistically significant differences in the representation of BAME staff by pay band amongst the non-clinical and clinical Agenda for Change pay bands, compared to their level of representation in the workforce overall (excluding non-executive directors). However, BAME staff were overrepresented amongst "other" Medical staff (primarily general medical practitioner clinical leads).

In a supplementary analysis, pay bands were pooled to account for the small number of employees within each individual pay band. When the workforce was analysed in this fashion, again BAME staff were proportionally represented within each group of pooled pay bands; this was true for the workforce at the end of March 2020 as well as for the workforce at the end of March 2019:

CLINICAL AND NON-CLINICAL POOLED %BAME at March 2020

Workforce overall: 13.8%; (Total N = 189)

Bands 4 and under: REDACTED%; (Total N = 21)

Bands 5 to 7: REDACTED%; (Total N = 85)

Bands 8A to 8B: REDACTED%; (Total N = 46)

Bands 8C to VSM and Medical: REDACTED%; (Total N = 37)

CLINICAL AND NON-CLINICAL POOLED %BAME at March 2019

Workforce overall: 13.2%; (Total N = 189)

Bands 4 and under: REDACTED%; (Total N = 21)

Bands 5 to 7: REDACTED%; (Total N = 84)

Bands 8A to 8B: REDACTED%; (Total N = 47)

Bands 8C to 9, VSM, and Medical: REDACTED%; (Total N = 37)

Action taken and planned including e.g. does the indicator link to EDS2 evidence and/or a corporate Equality Objective:

Staff turnover has been lower due to the work towards a proposed merger across the 3 CCGs. As part of the merger process the CCG will look at the profile of the CCGs and work to ensure that as far as possible a new single CCG is representative of the populations served.

The CCG will review the opportunities offered by national programmes to support staff. Examples could include: Stepping up programmes, Leadership Academy, Ready Now and targeted support for staff groups.

For any future recruitment we will be looking at planning recruitment that is designed to enhance the diversity of the CCG. Consideration for additional training for recruiting managers such as unconscious bias training, values based recruitment and panel representation.

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

Data for reporting year:

3.40

Data for previous year:

1.74

The implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative:

In 2019/20, 34.0% of White people shortlisted were appointed and 10.0% of BAME people shortlisted were appointed. Thus, White people were 3.40 times as likely as BAME people to be appointed from shortlisting. This difference narrowly missed statistical significance due to the small number of BAME people shortlisted; however, the size of the difference in recruitment likelihoods for White and BAME people is a cause for concern.

In 2018/19, 29.0% of White people shortlisted were appointed and 16.7% of BAME people shortlisted were appointed. Thus, White people were 1.74 times as likely as BAME people to be appointed from shortlisting. This difference narrowly missed statistical significance due to the small number of BAME people shortlisted.

Action taken and planned including e.g. does the indicator link to EDS2 evidence and/or a corporate Equality Objective:

The CCG is looking to use the opportunity of forming a single organisation to embed the CCG's values and enhance the training and support to recruiting managers. It is intended that this will positively impact recruitment and shortlisting.

19 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.

Data for reporting year:

No formal disciplinary proceedings

Data for previous year:

6.56

The implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative:

There were no formal disciplinary proceedings in the two-year window 2018/19 to 2019/20.

In the two-year window 2017/18 to 2018/19, BAME staff were 6.56 times more likely than White staff to be subjected to disciplinary proceedings; however, given the small number of staff involved in disciplinary proceedings in the two-year period of interest, this did not represent a statistically significant difference.

Action taken and planned including e.g. does the indicator link to EDS2 evidence and/or a corporate Equality Objective:

The CCG will continue to review any disciplinary incidents to identify if any action is required.

20 Relative likelihood of staff accessing non-mandatory training and CPD.

Data for reporting year:

Data not available

Data for previous year:

0.63

The implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative:

Data on non-mandatory training were not available in 2019/20.

In 2018/19, 17.7% of White staff undertook non-mandatory training compared to 28.0% of BAME staff. Thus, White staff were 0.63 times as likely as BAME staff to undertake non-mandatory training; this did not represent a statistically significant difference due to the small number of staff undertaking non-mandatory training overall.

Action taken and planned including e.g. does the indicator link to EDS2 evidence and/or a corporate Equality Objective:

The CCG will review the opportunities to collect this data centrally. The PDR process will be reviewed as well as consideration given to add relevant question / questions to the annual staff survey.

21 KF 25. Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months.

Data for reporting year:

White:

11.6%

BAME:

16.7%

Data for previous year:

White:

14.3%

BAME:

7.7%

The implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative:

In 2019/20, 11.6% of White staff (15/129) and 16.7% of BAME staff (2/12) who took part in the staff survey reported experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months; due to the small number of BAME staff who took part in the survey, this did not represent a statistically significant difference.

In 2018/19, 14.3% of White staff (14/98) and 7.7% of BAME staff (1/13) who took part in the staff survey reported experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months; due to the small number of BAME staff who took part in the survey, this did not represent a statistically significant difference.

Action taken and planned including e.g. does the indicator link to EDS2 evidence and/or a corporate Equality Objective:

It is recommended that the CCG review the complaints process and support for staff. Milton Keynes CCG has introduced a checklist for staff to handle difficult patients both by phone and in person. The vexatious complaint process has been reviewed. The opportunity to use non-person specific emails and phone numbers is available for staff to handle cases. Security has been enhanced in the CCG reception area with clear posters showing policies.

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

Data for reporting year:

White:

25.6%

BAME:

16.7%

Data for previous year:

White:

24.5%

BAME:

30.8%

The implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative:

In 2019/20, 25.6% of White staff (34/133) and 16.7% of BAME staff (2/12) who took part in the staff survey reported experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other staff in the last 12 months; due to the small number of BAME staff who took part in the survey, this did not represent a statistically significant difference.

In 2018/19, 24.5% of White staff (24/98) and 30.8% of BAME staff (4/13) who took part in the staff survey reported experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other staff in the last 12 months; due to the small number of BAME staff who took part in the survey, this did not represent a statistically significant difference.

Action taken and planned including e.g. does the indicator link to EDS2 evidence and/or a corporate Equality Objective:

The CCG has reviewed the full findings of the staff survey and has in the past used training interventions to address concerns. Examples include lunch and learn and specific training.

With a proposed CCG merger the formation of the single organisation gives an opportunity to review and set a consistent approach across the CCGs. It would also offer an opportunity to engage with staff through small groups to determine which actions they feel would have a positive impact in this area.

23 KF 21. Percentage believing that the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.

Data for reporting year:

White:

85.6%

BAME:

SUPPRESSED

Data for previous year:

White:

77.8%

BAME:

SUPPRESSED

The implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative:

In 2019/20, 85.6% of White staff (77/90) who took part in the staff survey felt that the CCG provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. However, the number of BAME staff who responded to this question was suppressed at source due to small numbers.

In 2018/19, 77.8% of White staff (56/72) who took part in the staff survey felt that the CCG provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. However, the number of BAME staff who responded to this question was suppressed at source due to small numbers.

A smaller number of BAME staff responded to the question behind this indicator than to the questions behind the other staff survey based indicators in the WRES. It would be beneficial to explore and address the reasons behind this discrepancy. At present, it is not possible to assess any inequality in staff feeling that the CCG provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.

Action taken and planned including e.g. does the indicator link to EDS2 evidence and/or a corporate Equality Objective:

This is going to be a consideration for all 3 CCGs and should the merger go ahead the single organisation. In setting values for the new organisation the CCGs need to consider diversity and inclusivity.

24 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.

Data for reporting year:

White:

3.7%

BAME:

8.3%

Data for previous year:

White:

6.1%

BAME:

23.1%

The implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative:

In 2019/20, 3.7% of White staff (5/134) and 8.3% of BAME staff (1/12) who took part in the staff survey reported experiencing discrimination from other staff in the last 12 months; due to the small number of BAME staff who took part in the survey, this did not represent a statistically significant difference.

In 2018/19, 6.1% of White staff (6/98) and 23.1% of BAME staff (3/13) who took part in the staff survey reported experiencing discrimination from other staff in the last 12 months; due to the small number of BAME staff who took part in the survey, this did not represent a statistically significant difference.

Action taken and planned including e.g. does the indicator link to EDS2 evidence and/or a corporate Equality Objective:

This is something that will need to be closely monitored coming into a merger situation as staff may feel particularly vulnerable.

25 Percentage difference between the organisations' Board voting membership and its overall workforce.

Data for reporting year:

Difference (%BAME total board - %BAME overall workforce): +6.2%

Difference (%BAME voting board - %BAME overall workforce): +11.2%

Difference (%BAME executive board - %BAME overall workforce): -13.8%

Data for previous year:

Difference (%BAME total board - %BAME overall workforce): +20.1%

Difference (%BAME voting board - %BAME overall workforce): +20.1%

Difference (%BAME executive board - %BAME overall workforce): -13.2%

The implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative:

In 2019/20, BAME people were proportionately represented amongst all board members, and also amongst voting board members, when compared to their level of representation in the workforce overall. However, there were no BAME people amongst the executive board members. Ethnicity was not known for 25.0% of board members.

In 2018/19, BAME people were overrepresented amongst all board members, and also amongst voting board members, when compared to their level of representation in the workforce overall. However, there were no BAME people amongst the executive board members. Ethnicity was known for all board members.

Action taken and planned including e.g. does the indicator link to EDS2 evidence and/or a corporate Equality Objective:

The CCG is currently going through the process to recruit to the new board for a single organisation. Recruiters have been required to take proactive steps and considerations around diversity and inclusion when recruiting. The impacts of this will be shown once board appointments happen, that will allow the success to be measured.

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

N/A

27 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 workstreams agreed at board level, such as EDS2. You are asked to provide a link to your WRES action plan in the space below.

PROVIDE LINK TO URL WHEN AVAILABLE