

## Annual Workforce Equalities Monitoring Report 2009 – 2010

### 1. Introduction

Current equality and diversity legislation obliges public bodies to report on a range of workforce domains by disability, ethnicity and gender for staff in post and applications for jobs, promotion and training. In addition disciplinary and grievance procedures, appraisal and those leaving the employment of the Trust are also monitored.

Detailed diversity profiles for each domain are attached as appendix 1.

### 2. Purpose of the report

This report sets out the key findings of employment monitoring between April 2009 – April 2010 and enables us to meet the statutory duty to publish this information on the external pages of the Trust's website. It also enables us to understand trends and review policy, practice and implementation where this is appropriate.

### 3. Staff in post - ethnicity

The Trust employed 7990 staff on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010. 6221 (77.9%) were White British and 1768 (22.1%) were of Black or minority ethnic (BME) origin.

Ethnicity	2009-10 Head count	%
White British	6221	77.9
White Others	482	6.0
Black	417	5.2
Asian	616	7.7
Mixed	105	1.3
Chinese/other	148	1.8
<b>BME total</b>	<b>1768</b>	<b>22.1</b>

### 4. Staff in post – disability

69 staff (0.86%) identified themselves as having a disability while 6625 (82.9%) did not answer and 1296 (16.2%) positively identified as not. The figure for declared disability is up slightly on previous years – 0.54% in 2008, 0.71% in 2009.

Figures of close to 1% are commonly reported in larger acute NHS Trusts and are acknowledged as representing widespread under-reporting. The 2009 Staff Survey reports 13% of UH Bristol Trust staff as reporting a disability. This is close to the average (14%) for larger acute Trusts. UH Bristol's figure of 13% equates to 1039 members of staff. (The staff survey response rate

was 52% in 2009). More work will be undertaken by the Trust to examine why there may be under-reporting of disability and to encourage staff to identify disability where this is needed.

### 5. Leavers profile – January 1<sup>st</sup> – March 31<sup>st</sup> 2010

61 male leavers and 125 female leavers are recorded. Given the staff in post gender balance this indicates a higher turnover of male staff – 33% of leavers compared to 23% of staff in post. A higher rate of leavers among BME staff is also recorded at 30% of those leaving employment with the Trust.

### 6. Grievance and Disciplinary Records – by ethnicity

Ethnicity	Staff in post %	Grievances		Disciplinary	
White British	77.9	22	66.7%	81	62.3%
White others	6.0	2	6.1%	2	1.5%
Black	5.2	4	12.1%	34	26.5%
Asian	7.7	4	12.1%	5	3.8%
Mixed	1.3	0	0%	3	2.3%
Chinese/other	1.8	0	0%	3	2.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>100%</b>

The number of staff involved in grievances is low and may therefore be statistically unreliable. However a concentration of Black staff in receipt of disciplinary action is very noticeable. Moreover in terms of Trust staff groups there is also a clear concentration in certain areas. Almost half (48%) of disciplinaries and 45% of grievances originate in one staff group: estates and ancillary. Nursing and midwifery and administrative and clerical staff groups were also represented by above average numbers.

Work will be undertaken to evaluate the record on disciplinaries in particular to enable an assessment of the causes of these high numbers.

**Grievance and Disciplinary - by staff group**

<b>Staff group</b>	<b>Disciplinary</b>		<b>Grievance</b>		<b>Totals</b>	
<b>Admin &amp; Clerical</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>Additional Clinical Services</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>Healthcare Scientists</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>Allied Health professionals</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
<b>Professional &amp; Technical</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.6%</b>
<b>Nursing &amp; Midwifery</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>19.6%</b>
<b>Estates &amp; Ancillary</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>Medical &amp; Dental</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>

**7. Appraisals undertaken – by ethnicity**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Compliant</b>	<b>% Compliant</b>	<b>% Non compliant</b>
<b>White British</b>	<b>5419</b>	<b>88.2</b>	<b>11.8</b>
<b>White others</b>	<b>409</b>	<b>90.2</b>	<b>9.8</b>
<b>Black</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>87.2</b>	<b>12.8</b>
<b>Asian</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>89.2</b>	<b>10.8</b>
<b>Mixed</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>90.8</b>	<b>9.2</b>
<b>Chinese/other</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>90.6</b>	<b>9.4</b>
<b>BME total</b>	<b>1500</b>	<b>89.2</b>	<b>10.8</b>

Overall the data gives assurance that there are not widespread variations between broadly-defined ethnic groups in the take up of appraisals. One caveat to that however is that for Black Caribbean staff the non-compliance figure is at 16%, a significant variation which may need more detailed examination. There was no significant difference between the proportions of women and men having had a successful appraisal. Disabled staff also fared well in this domain. (The data on appraisals is now based (2010) on roles rather than individuals. Thus one employee may undertake more than one appraisal if this is required by their work).

### 8. Promotion profile – January 1<sup>st</sup> – March 31<sup>st</sup> 2010

Numbers of staff promoted during this period were low – 44 in total. It is difficult to draw reliable conclusions from such a small sample.

### 9. Applications, shortlisting and appointments

A very large volume of job applications continues to be received by the Trust. A significant number of applications were received from BME applicants who formed 45.5% of applicants. This is broadly in line with the last two years (56% - 2008; 45% - 2009). Particularly large volumes of applications were received for nursing and midwifery (51.9%) and in medical and dental groups (96.4%) where BME applicants formed a majority. Those progressing to shortlist were fewer in number indicating less success for these applicants in the process. People from BME backgrounds accounted for 45.5% of all job applications.

Some extreme examples are visible from the data – for example more than 2000 Black (Africans) applied for posts in medical and dental while only 16 were shortlisted. There may well be issues of appropriate qualification or professional registration which explain this high failure rate. More work can be done to unpack the reasons for the figure.

#### Applications by staff group – ethnicity

Staff group	White British	White Others	Black	Asian	Mixed	Chinese Other	Other	Total BME
Admin & Clerical	7241	720	653	1018	216	103	113	2823 28%
Additional Clinical Services	2110	239	54	408	18	32	18	769 26.7%
Healthcare Scientists	n/a							
Allied Health Professionals	644	125	161	220	26	22	76	630 49.4%
Professional & Technical	468	116	43	149	12	5	10	335 41.7%
Nursing & Midwifery	1090	179	95	709	46	25	123	1177 51.9%
Estates & Ancillary	1569	269	681	209	70	27	45	1301 45.3%
Medical & Dental	155	272	2031	729	451	271	436	4190 96.4%

**Shortlisting by staff group - ethnicity**

Staff group	White British	White Others	Black	Asian	Mixed	Chinese Other	Other	Total BME
Admin & Clerical	1168	108	77	88	30	8	14	325 21.8%
Additional Clinical Services	743	61	70	82	13	20	12	258 25.6%
Healthcare Scientists	n/a							
Allied Health Professionals	189	24	10	14	3	1	1	53 21.9%
Professional & Technical	161	32	8	22	2	8	8	80 33.2%
Nursing & Midwifery	705	71	58	271	10	7	30	447 38.8%
Estates & Ancillary	372	54	144	37	16	7	12	288 43.6%
Medical & Dental	69	54	16	144	14	9	31	268 79.5%

**11. Total starters – by ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Head Count	%
White British	1056	69.3
White Others	127	8.3
Black	95	6.2
Asian	172	11.3
Mixed	27	1.8
Chinese/others	47	3.0
<b>BME Total</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>30.7</b>

**11. Applicants – Shortlisted - Starters – by ethnicity**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Applicants</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Shortlisted</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Starters</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>White British</b>	<b>13441</b>	<b>60.1</b>	<b>3444</b>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>1056</b>	<b>69.3</b>
<b>White Others</b>	<b>1952</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>8.3</b>
<b>Black</b>	<b>2031</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>6.2</b>
<b>Asian</b>	<b>3563</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>673</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>11.3</b>
<b>Mixed</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1.8</b>
<b>Chinese/others</b>	<b>707</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>3.0</b>
<b>BME Total</b>	<b>8704</b>	<b>39.3</b>	<b>1732</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>30.7</b>

The pattern of applications through the shortlisting and appointment process reveals that White British candidates fare best and Black and Asian candidates fare least well - in terms of the proportions of those applying and those appointed. However the disparities between different ethnic groups are not that great. The total proportion of BME appointments for this year (30.7%) exceeds significantly the staff in post figure for the Trust overall (22.1%).

There may be a case for tracking some Black or Asian candidates' applications through the system but overall the Trust can be assured that there is no statistical evidence that the appointment process is producing systemic discriminatory results.