

The case studies outline scenarios where employees have been made to feel uncomfortable about their socioeconomic background and do not promote equal opportunities among all employees or prospective employees to be hired and promoted.

The following are taken from findings of a study entitled Inequality in recruitment outcomes for Black and Minority Ethnic staff within the Care Quality Commission
https://www.cqc.org.uk/sites/default/files/CM121809_Item9_DiversityInclusion_appendix1.pdf.

Numerous examples were given of 1:1 discussions and feedback that were felt to be a “tick box.” One consequence of this was that more than one interviewee reported their line managers had never asked about their skills and experience from previous roles outside the CQC that could have enriched the CQC.

An example was given where a group of staff had sought to put forward constructive, evidenced proposals to improve recruitment because survey findings and workforce data indicated a pattern of less favourable treatment. However, they felt there was a defensive, uncomfortable response rather than a welcome for their attempt to engage, never mind suggest proposals.

There is a widespread view that some managers have low expectations of BME staff.

One member of staff gave details of their abuse for a number of years after becoming BME team leader of a team of white staff who resented their appointment. The then senior manager just advised resilience. After a promotion, further abuse was experienced but the new senior manager was much more supportive.

One member of staff reported that in an interview where she suspected the job was “sown up”, one of the two panel members made no eye contact throughout the entire interview.

One member of staff explained that sadly “I feel more valued outside the CQC than I do inside it”.

A number of staff felt that the development of Executive grade staff (and to a degree A grades) had been repeatedly prioritised over that of staff in middle and junior grades who were disproportionately BME.

Richemont Race Discrimination Case

Cheryl Spragg, an employee of Richemont (UK), which owns luxury brands including Cartier and Montblanc, was spied on by her employer, denied the opportunity to progress within the company and was bullied by HR and other staff members as a result of her skin colour.

Following a back injury, Richemont placed Cheryl under close surveillance for a number of days, following her to a wedding and even receiving images of her home and garden. Undoubtedly, this act was unnerving, intimidating and upsetting for her.

Cheryl was also refused internal progression on the basis that she was black and had applied for the same post on three different occasions, with all three of the recruitment decisions being made by the same people. It was found that the company had a preference for white Europeans and the judge ruling in Cheryl's claim against race discrimination in the workplace agrees that this was an act of direct discrimination since there was a lack of transparency and properly structured processes for scoring, marking and record-keeping as well as a complete absence of interview records. The HR team had no equality and diversity training and there were no black staff members at a senior level or on the HR team.

In addition, Cheryl had been subject to bullying when other staff members refused to enter a lift with her which was found as a violation of her dignity. These employees were said to have laughed and pulled faces when Cheryl held the lift door open for them – they walked straight passed and waited for another lift to come. This incident meets the very definition of harassment under the [Equality Act 2010](#).

When Cheryl complained to the HR department about the various events which she considered to be discriminatory, she was told to look for a new job and was accused of causing her colleagues distress. She was even told in an email from the HR team that she wasn't the only 'black member of staff' within her team and no other racism allegations had been raised in the past.