

## WORKFORCE RACE EQUALITY STANDARD (WRES)

### 1. Staff in Post 5 Year comparison BME v White staff

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).

Ethnicity	2016		2015		2014		2013		2012	
	Headcount	Headcount %	Headcount	Headcount %	Headcount	Headcount %	Headcount	Headcount %	Headcount	Headcount %
<b>BME</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>1,040</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>983</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>12%</b>
Band 1	32	0%	31	0%	30	0%	31	0%	25	0%
Band 2	196	3%	175	2%	167	2%	140	2%	121	2%
Band 3	103	1%	95	1%	91	1%	78	1%	82	1%
Band 4	37	0%	40	1%	36	0%	28	0%	27	0%
Band 5	257	3%	252	3%	237	3%	214	3%	204	3%
Band 6	132	2%	119	2%	110	1%	98	1%	95	1%
Band 7	31	0%	23	0%	19	0%	17	0%	15	0%
Band 8a	9	0%	11	0%	8	0%	7	0%	8	0%
Band 8b	4	0%	2	0%	5	0%	4	0%	2	0%
Band 8c	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%
Band 8d	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Band 9	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
M&D/Not Assimilated	298	4%	291	4%	279	4%	257	4%	259	4%

The headcount of staff reported as Black, Minority and Ethnic increased by 261. Overall a 2% increase in the 5 year period, as detailed in the table above. While there has been an increase in the percentage of staff from minority ethnic groups this percentage is well below the government target of the local population which is 20%.

Ethnicity	2016		2015		2014		2013		2012	
	Headcount	Headcount %	Headcount	Headcount %	Headcount	Headcount %	Headcount	Headcount %	Headcount	Headcount %
<b>WHITE</b>	<b>6,580</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>6,519</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>6,459</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>6,125</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>6,011</b>	<b>86%</b>
Band 1	131	2%	139	2%	126	2%	118	2%	125	2%
Band 2	1,349	17%	1,371	18%	1,342	18%	1,177	17%	1,087	16%
Band 3	989	13%	1,001	13%	1,012	13%	993	14%	1,014	15%
Band 4	532	7%	502	7%	484	6%	466	7%	473	7%
Band 5	1,413	18%	1,404	18%	1,385	18%	1,291	18%	1,213	17%
Band 6	1,138	15%	1,094	14%	1,081	14%	1,056	15%	1,066	15%
Band 7	504	6%	494	6%	511	7%	521	7%	522	7%
Band 8a	161	2%	156	2%	154	2%	146	2%	145	2%
Band 8b	48	1%	47	1%	43	1%	53	1%	50	1%
Band 8c	21	0%	18	0%	21	0%	17	0%	18	0%
Band 8d	12	0%	10	0%	9	0%	9	0%	8	0%
Band 9	9	0%	7	0%	8	0%	5	0%	7	0%
M&D/Not Assimilated	273	3%	276	4%	283	4%	273	4%	283	4%
<b>Undefined / Not Stated</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>7,818</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7,717</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7,613</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7,129</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6,988</b>	<b>100%</b>

The headcount of staff reported as White increased by 569. Overall a 2% decrease in the 5 year period, as detailed in the table above.

## 1b. Benchmarking against local organisations

Workforce		East Lancs make up	ELHT	Lancashire make up	Lancashire Care Trust	Lancs Fire & Rescue	Lancs County Council	Lancs Police
Ethnicity	White	80%	84%	90 %	86.3%	87%	96.1%	94.4%
	BME	20%	14% <b>-4%</b>	10%	7.2% <b>-2.8%</b>	13% <b>+3%</b>	3.9% <b>-6.1%</b>	5.6% <b>-4.4%</b>

The data in table above show BME: White staffing ratio is 4 percentage point lower (14%) than that of the population of East Lancashire (20%). Based on March 2016 figures, this translates as follows:

- Trust headcount: **7818**
- Ideal BME headcount: **1564** (if reflecting 20% profile of East Lancashire)
- Actual BME headcount: **1100**
- **6% short of being reflective of the local population.**

**\*\*\*We are thus 464 individuals short of our ideal BME headcount target that the government has stipulated.**

Compared with the population of Lancashire as a whole, however, we are doing better than other county-wide organisations see table below:

	<b>BME Make up</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Lancashire County</b>	<b>10%</b>	-
<b>East Lancashire Hospitals (ELHT)</b>	14%	<b>+4%</b>
Lancashire Fire & Rescue	13%	<b>+3%</b>
Lancashire Care Trust	7.2%	<b>-2.8%</b>
Lancashire Police	5.6%	<b>-4.4%</b>
Lancashire County Council	3.9	<b>-6.1%</b>

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

Table 1 2012/13

White			BME			Total	
2410	Applications		1444	Applications		BME % Applications	37.47%
945	% Short listed	39.21%	314	% Short listed	21.75%	BME % Short listed	24.94%
200	% Appointed	21.16%	34	% Appointed	10.83%	BME % Appointed	14.53%

- Applicants from BME backgrounds had a 1:42 chance of being appointed, compared to a 1:12 chance if you are white.

Descriptor	White	BME
Number of Shortlisted Applicant	945	314
Number of appointed Applicants	200	34
Ratio Shortlisting/Appointed	0.211	0.108

- Likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting  $(200/945) = 0.211$
- Likelihood of BME staff being appointed from shortlisting  $(34/314) = 0.108$
- Relative likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to BME staff  $(0.211/0.108)$  is therefore **1.95 times greater**.

**Table 2- 2013/14**

Equal ops category	Answer	Non-medical						Medical					
		Applied	Shortlisted	Appointed	Applied %	Shortlisted %	Appointed %	Applied	Shortlisted	Appointed	Applied %	Shortlisted %	Appointed %
Ethnic Origin	Not stated	14	8	7	1.32	57.14	87.5	18	12	0	13.33	66.67	0
	TOTAL WHITE	732	261	61	69.12	76.99	82.43	15	8	1	11.11	17.39	100.00
	TOTAL BME	313	70	6	29.56	20.65	8.11	102	26	0	75.56	56.52	0.00
<b>Total</b>		1059	339	74	100	32.01	21.83	135	46	1	100	34.07	2.17

Descriptor	White	BME
Number of Shortlisted Applicant	261	70
Number of appointed Applicants	61	6
Ratio Shortlisting/Appointed	0.234	0.086

- Likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting (61/261) = 0.234
- Likelihood of BME staff being appointed from shortlisting (6/70) = 0.086
- Relative likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to BME staff ( 0.234/0.086 ) is therefore **2.72 times greater.**

**Table 3- 2014/15**

		Non-medical						Medical					
Equal ops category	Answer	Applied	Shortlisted	Appointed	Applied %	Shortlisted %	Appointed %	Applied	Shortlisted	Appointed	Applied %	Shortlisted %	Appointed %
Ethnic Origin	Not stated	162	36	31	1.57	22.22	86.11	37	37	27	5.1	100	72.97
	TOTAL WHITE	7504	3225	790	72.66	79.20	83.42	151	49	23	20.80	22.69	31.08
	TOTAL BME	2662	811	126	28.97	21.97	14.88	538	130	24	83.02	80.75	61.54
<b>Total</b>		10328	4072	947	100	39.43	23.26	726	216	74	100	29.75	34.26

Descriptor	White	BME
Number of Shortlisted Applicant	3225	811
Number of appointed Applicants	790	126
Ratio Shortlisting/Appointed	0.245	0.155

- Likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting (790/3225) = 0.245
- Likelihood of BME staff being appointed from shortlisting (126/811) = 0.155
- Relative likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to BME staff (0.245/0.155) is therefore **1.58 times greater**.

**Table 4- 2015/16**

	All BME	Undisclosed	White	Total			
Applicants	4594	304	11830	16728			
	27%	2%	71%	100%			
Shortlisted	2947	57	6016	9020			
	33%	1%	67%	100%	Higher shortlist rate for BME		
Interviewed	1031	18	3589	4638			
	22%	0%	77%	100%	Lower BME for interview		
Offered	126	122	641	889			
	14%	14%	72%	100%	Significantly lower BME offers		
Started	52	17	342	411			
	13%	4%	83%	100%	Significantly lower BME in post		

Of **16728** received applications for employment in this period these, **11830** [70.73%] were from White applicants, **3983** [23.8%] were from Asian applicants, **285** [1.7%] were from Black applicants, **233** [1.39%] were from a mixed background, **93** [0.56%] people declared their ethnic origins as 'other' and **304** [1.82%] of applicants declined to identify their ethnicity.

Descriptor	White	BME
Number of Shortlisted Applicant	9020	2947
Number of appointed Applicants	889	126
Ratio Shortlisting/Appointed	0.096	0.043

- Likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting (889/9020) = 0.096
- Likelihood of BME staff being appointed from shortlisting (126/2947) = 0.043
- Relative likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to BME staff (0.096/0.043) is therefore **2.23 times greater.**



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

*Employee Relations by ethnicity April 2011 - March 2016*

<b>Bullying and harassment</b>					
<b><i>Ethnicity</i></b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
White British	10	11	3	11	14
Other white background	1	0	0	0	0
Other ethnic group	0	1	0	0	0
Indian	0	2	0	0	0
African	0	0	1	0	0
Asian British Pakistani	0	0	0	3	1
White other European	0	0	0	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>

<b>2011/12</b>	Totals	White 11	BME 0
<b>2012/13</b>	Totals	White 11	BME 3
<b>2013/14</b>	Totals	White 03	BME 1
<b>2014/15</b>	Totals	White 11	BME 0
<b>2015/16</b>	Totals	White 11	BME 0

<b>Grievance</b>					
<b><i>Ethnicity</i></b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
White British	10	2	12	11	15
Other Asian background	2	0	0	0	0
Pakistani	1	0	0	0	0
Indian	1	0	0	0	0
Asian British Indian	0	1	1	0	1
Any other ethnic	0	0	1	0	1
Asian British	0	0	1	0	0
White other European	0	0	1	1	0
Not specified	0	0	0	0	1
Asian British Pakistani	0	0	0	0	1
Any other mixed background	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>20</b>

<b>2011/12</b>	Totals	White 10	BME 2
<b>2012/13</b>	Totals	White 02	BME 1
<b>2013/14</b>	Totals	White 12	BME 4
<b>2014/15</b>	Totals	White 11	BME 1
<b>2015/16</b>	Totals	White 15	BME 5

<b>Disciplinary</b>					
<b><i>Ethnicity</i></b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
White British	26	51	55	43	42
Asian and white	1	0	0	0	0
British	2	0	0	0	0
White other European	1	0	0	0	0
Other black background	1	0	0	0	0
Bangladesh	1	0	0	0	0
Other Asian background	1	0	0	0	0
Filipino	1	0	1	1	1
Caribbean	1	0	0	0	0
Indian	1	3	0	0	0
Asian	0	1	0	0	0
Asian British	0	1	2	0	1
Mixed white and Asian	0	0	2	0	0
Asian British Pakistani	0	0	5	2	7
Not specified	0	0	2	1	1
Mixed any other mixed	0	0	1	1	1
Any other ethnic	0	0	0	2	2
White any other white	0	0	0	1	1
Asian British any other	0	0	0	0	1
Black British Caribbean	0	0	0	0	1
Other specified	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>59</b>

## Disciplinary totals

<b>2011/12</b>	Totals	White 30	BME 6	<b>1.4 times greater chance of BME staff compared to white</b>
<b>2012/13</b>	Totals	White 51	BME 5	<b>0.75 times greater chance of BME staff compared to white</b>
<b>2013/14</b>	Totals	White 55	BME 13	<b>1.4 times greater chance of BME staff compared to white</b>
<b>2014/15</b>	Totals	White 43	BME 8	<b>1.0 times greater chance of BME staff compared to white</b>
<b>2015/16</b>	Totals	White 42	BME 17	<b>2.5 times greater chance of BME staff compared to white</b>

### 2011/12

Descriptor	White	BME
Number of staff in workforce	6011	839
Number of staff entering the formal disciplinary process (closed cases)	30	6

- Likelihood of White staff entering the formal disciplinary process  $(30/6011) = 0.005$
- Likelihood of BME staff entering the formal disciplinary process  $(6/839) = 0.007$
- The relative likelihood of BME staff entering the formal disciplinary process compared to White staff is therefore  $0.007/0.005 = 1.4$  **times greater.**

### 2012/13

Descriptor	White	BME
Number of staff in workforce	6125	875
Number of staff entering the formal disciplinary process (closed cases)	51	5

- Likelihood of White staff entering the formal disciplinary process  $(51/6125) = 0.008$
- Likelihood of BME staff entering the formal disciplinary process  $(5/875) = 0.006$
- The relative likelihood of BME staff entering the formal disciplinary process compared to White staff is therefore  $0.006/0.008 = 0.75$  **times greater.**

### 2013/14

Descriptor	White	BME
Number of staff in workforce	6459	983
Number of staff entering the formal disciplinary process (closed cases)	55	13

- Likelihood of White staff entering the formal disciplinary process ( $55/6459$ ) = 0.009
- Likelihood of BME staff entering the formal disciplinary process ( $13/983$ ) = 0.013
- The relative likelihood of BME staff entering the formal disciplinary process compared to White staff is therefore  $0.013/0.009 = 1.44$  times greater.

### 2014/15

Descriptor	White	BME
Number of staff in workforce	6519	1040
Number of staff entering the formal disciplinary process (closed cases)	43	8

- Likelihood of White staff entering the formal disciplinary process ( $43/6519$ ) = 0.007
- Likelihood of BME staff entering the formal disciplinary process ( $8/1095$ ) = 0.007
- The relative likelihood of BME staff entering the formal disciplinary process compared to White staff is therefore  $0.007/0.007 = 1.0$  times greater.

### 2015/16

Descriptor	White	BME
Number of staff in workforce	6580	1100
Number of staff entering the formal disciplinary process (closed cases)	42	17

- Likelihood of White staff entering the formal disciplinary process ( $42/6580$ ) = 0.006
- Likelihood of BME staff entering the formal disciplinary process ( $17/1100$ ) = 0.015
- The relative likelihood of BME staff entering the formal disciplinary process compared to White staff is therefore

0.015/0.006 = 2.5 times greater.

<b>Maintaining High Professional Standards</b>					
<b><i>Ethnicity</i></b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
White British	0	1	7	1	2
Not Specified	1	0	2	3	0
Asian British Indian	1	0	2	0	1
Any other ethnic	0	1	1	0	0
Any other white	0	2	0	1	0
Black British African	0	1	1	0	0
Asian British Pakistani	0	2	1	1	0
Asian British	0	0	1	0	0
Asian British any other	0	0	0	0	1
Asian British Bangladeshi	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>2011/12</b>	Totals	White 00	BME 1
<b>2012/13</b>	Totals	White 01	BME 6
<b>2013/14</b>	Totals	White 07	BME 6
<b>2014/15</b>	Totals	White 01	BME 2
<b>2015/16</b>	Totals	White 02	BME 3

## 4. Staff Survey indicators

	Indicator (National NHS Staff Survey indicators (or equivalent) For each of the four staff survey indicators, <b><u>compare the outcomes of the responses for White and BME staff</u></b> )	2015	2014	2013	2012
<b>iv</b>	Relative likelihood of staff accessing non-mandatory training and CPD.	Relative likelihood of White staff accessing non mandatory training/CPD is <b>1.079 times greater.</b>	No data available, previous ATL system has been replaced by Learning Hub. Data has not been migrated to the new system		
<b>v</b>	KF 25. Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months.	White 25% BME 21%	White 28% BME 32%	White 28% BME 35%	White 16% BME 8%
<b>vi</b>	KF 26. Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from staff in last 12 months	White 23% BME 25%	White 23% BME 31%	White 23% BME 27%	White 3% BME 3%
<b>vii</b>	KF 21. Percentage believing that trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.	White 85% BME 71%	White 81% BME 73%	White 9% BME 17% (Does not act fairly)	White 90% BME 73%

<b>viii</b>	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	White 6% BME 14%	White 6% BME 18%	White 6% BME 9%	White 8% BME 17%
<b>viii</b>	Percentage difference between the organisations' Board voting membership and its overall workforce.	White 100% BME 0%	White 100% BME 0%	White 100% BME 0%	White 100% BME 0%

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

*Between 1st April 2015 – 31st March 2016*

Access to training	Accessed	%	Not accessed	%	Total
White	5654	86.0%	923	14.0%	6577
BME	871	81.6%	197	18.4%	1068
Undefined & Other	148	79.1%	39	20.9%	187

Descriptor	White	BME
Number of staff in workforce	6586	1095
Number of staff accessing non mandatory training and CPD	5654	871

- Likelihood of White staff accessing non-mandatory training and CPD is (5654/6586) 0.858



- Likelihood of BME staff accessing non mandatory training and CPD is (871/1095) 0.795
- Relative likelihood of White and BME staff accessing non mandatory training/CPD (0.858/0.795) is therefore **1.079 times greater**.

## 6. Star Awards four years comparison

<b>STAR Awards short-lists</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
Named individuals short-listed	24	20	32	37
Teams with no ID's name	4	6	13	11
BME individuals. on short-list	1	1	1	5
<b>% BME v all individuals. short-listed</b>	<b>4.20%</b>	<b>5.00%</b>	<b>3.10%</b>	<b>13.50%</b>
Named individuals winning	8	9	11	15
BME winners	1	1	0	3
<b>% BME v individuals. winners</b>	<b>12.50%</b>	<b>11.10%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>20.00%</b>

## 7. Clinical Excellence Awards

<b>2012 Applicants</b>	
Ethnic Origin	Total
Any other Ethnic Group	4
Asian - or Asian British	1
Asian or Any other Asian Background	2
Asian or Asian British	23
Chinese	1
Not stated	1
White	21
White - Any other White Background (blank)	2
Grand Total	55

### **TOTAL AWARDS GIVEN = 41**

<b>Ethnic Origin</b>	
Any other Ethnic Group	3
Asian or any other Asian Background	2
Asian or Asian British	19
Chinese	1
Not Stated	1
White	15

<b>2013 Applicants</b>	
Ethnic Origin	Total
Any other ethnic group	3
Asian or Asian British	16
White	23
White - Any other white background (blank)	4
Other specified	1
Mixed - Other/Unspecified	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>48</b>

**TOTAL AWARDS GIVEN = 34**

<b>Ethnic Origin</b>	
Any other Ethnic Group	2
Asian or Asian British	14
White	13
White - any other White Background	4
Other Specified	1

<b>2014 Applicants</b>	
Ethnic Origin	Total
A White - British	24
C White - Any Other White Background	2
F Mixed - White and Asian	1
G Mixed - Any Other Mixed Background	1
H Asian or Asian British - Indian	17
J Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	8
L Asian or Asian British - any Other Asian Background	2
S any Other Ethnic Group	4
Grand Total	59

**TOTAL AWARDS GIVEN = 19**

<b>Ethnic Origin</b>	
Any other Ethnic Group	1
Asian or Asian British	8
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	2
White - British	5
White - any other White Background	1
Mixed - White & Asian	1
Mixed - Any other mixed background	1