WORKFORCE DISABILITY EQUALITY STANDARD

2021/2022

1. Background narrative a. Any issues of completeness of data	
b. Any matters relating to reliability of comparisons with previous years	
2. Total numbers of staff a. Employed within this organisation at the date of the report	
7663 (data from 31st March 2022)	
b. Proportion of disabled staff employed within this organisation at the date of the report	
6.6 %	
3. Self-reporting a. The proportion of total staff who have self-reported their disability status	
83.5%	
b. Have any steps been taken in the last reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting by disability	
We ran a campaign encouraging staff to complete their demographics on ESR during 2021.	
c. Are any steps planned during the current reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting by disability	
Yes	
4. Workforce data a. What period does the organisation's workforce data refer to	
Data as of 31st March 2022	
5. Are there any other factors or data which should be taken into consideration in assessing progress?	
6. Organisations should produce a detailed WRES Action Plan, agreed by its Board. Such a Plan would normally elaborate on the actions summarised in section 5, setting out the next steps with milestones for expected progress against the WRES indicators. It may also identify the links with other work streams agreed at Board level, such as EDS2. You are asked to attach the WRES Action Plan or provide a link to it.	

KEY:

Green = Improvement from the previous year
Amber = Remains the same or similar to previous year
Red = Decline from previous year

WORKFORCE DISABILITY EQUALITY STANDARD

	Indicator	Data for reporting year 2022	Data for previous year 2021	Data for 2020, 2019, 2018, 2017	Narrative – the implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative	Action taken and planned including e.g. does the indicator link to EDS2 evidence and/or a corporate Equality Objective	Target date and person respon sible
	For each of these four workforce indicators, compare the data for disabled and non-disabled staff.						
1	% of staff in each of the AfC pay bands or medical and dental subgroups and VSM (excluding executive board members) compared with the % of staff in the overall workforce.	Please see appendix 1 for 2021/22 data.	Please see appendix 1 for 2020/21 data.		There has been an increase in staff recording if they have a disability this year, 16.5% not declare compared to 20% not declared in 2021 and 24% in 2020. From the staff survey results 31.8% of people who completed the survey said they had a long-term health condition. Therefore, it is likely that the 6.6% of staff with disabilities recorded on ESR is not an accurate reflection.	Deliver a staff mid-career leadership programme for staff from protected characteristics which will include stretch/shadowing/d evelopmental opportunities. Run a campaign to encourage staff to complete their demographic information on ESR.	Q3 22/23 MB SD Q4 22/23 AH

						Analyse leavers information to identify any patterns or trends.	Q4 22/23 LC
2	Relative likelihood of staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.	Non-disabled staff are **1.14 times more likely** to be appointed from shortlisting compared to disabled staff.	Non-disabled staff are 1.29 times more likely to be appointed from shortlisting compared to disabled staff.	Non disabled people are: 2020 = 1.36 2019 = 1.27 more likely to be appointed from shortlisting compared to disabled people.	There has been a decrease in the likelihood of a non-disabled staff member being appointed compared to a disabled staff member.	Pilot a virtual interview platform (AYMMI), removing bias from the recruitment process. Run a pilot project exploring age bias in recruitment, identify learning for bias for other protected characteristic groups such as disability. Compare recruitment data to the 2021 Census data to identify if the organisation is recruiting a diverse workforce that reflects the local communities.	Q4 22/23 LH SD Q4 22/23 LH SD Q3 22/23 LC
3.	Relative likelihood of staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into a formal process. This indicator will be based on data from a two year rolling average of the	Disabled staff are 0.64 times more likely to enter capability than non-disabled staff (they are less likely)	Relative likelihood of staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into a formal process. This indicator	Disabled staff are 0.78 times more likely to enter capability than non-disabled staff (they are less likely)	Relative likelihood of staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into a formal process. This indicator will be based on data from a two year rolling average of the current year and the previous year.		

	current year and the previous year.		will be based on data from a two year rolling average of the current year and the previous year.				
	National NHS Staff Survey indicators (or equivalent). For each of the four staff survey indicators, compare the outcomes of the responses for disabled and non-disabled staff.						
4.	Percentage of staff experiencing harassment/bullying or abuse from: i. Patients/service users, their relatives or other members of the public ii. Managers Other colleagues	2021 Disabled 28% Non-disabled 23% Disabled 13% Non-disabled 6% Disabled 20% Non-disabled 11%	2020 Disabled 29% Non-disabled 22% Disabled 15% Non-disabled 8% Disabled 23% Non-disabled 13%	2019 Disabled 34% Non-disabled 28% Disabled 14% Non-disabled 9% Disabled 22% Non-disabled 13%	The results are similar to the previous years with disabled staff being more likely to experience harassment/bullying or abuse from patients/service users, their relatives or members of the public, managers and other colleagues. The results for harassment/bullying or abuse from managers and other colleagues show that disabled staff report that they are almost twice more likely to experience harassment and bullying than non-disabled staff.	Relaunch the hate campaign. Launch and promote the hate crime checklist to improve prosecution rates. Develop training for staff to raise awareness on issues faced by staff with LTHC's and disabilities.	Q3 22/23 AH Q2 22/23 SD Q4 22/23 HC
5.	Percentage believing that Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.	2021 Disabled 55% Non-disabled 64%	2020 Disabled 56% Non-disabled 66%	2019 Disabled 58% Non-disabled 64% 2018	The results show that disabled staff are less likely than non-disabled staff to believe the Trust provides equal	Run the reverse mentoring programme for staff with LTHCs	Q4 22/23 HC

				Disabled 63% Non-disabled 70%	opportunities for career progression or promotion.		
6.	Percentage of staff saying that they have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties.	2021 Disabled 22% Non-disabled 15%	2020 Disabled 26% Non-disabled 19%	2019 Disabled 26% Non-disabled 17% 2018 Disabled 22.5% Non-disabled 17%	The percentage of disabled staff and non-disabled staff who have felt pressure to come to work despite not feeling well enough has reduced. There is a 7% difference between disabled staff and non-disabled staff.	Include current WDES data & information in leadership and development training.	Q3 22/23 LC
7.	Percentage of staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.	2021 Disabled 36% Non-disabled 47%	2020 Disabled 45% Non-disabled 57%	2019 Disabled 44% Non-disabled 55% 2018 Disabled 46% Non-disabled 57%	There has been a decrease for both disabled and non-disabled staff. There continues to be a large difference of 11% with disabled staff reporting feeling less satisfied with the extent the organisation values their work.	Develop training for staff to raise awareness on issues faced by staff with LTHC's and disabilities. Explore the feasibility of a psychology student supporting further analysis in respect of factors contributing to staff not feeling valued.	Q4 22/23 HC Q4 22/23 HC
8.	Percentage of staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.	2021 72%	2020 81%	2019 76% 2018 89%	There has been a decrease of 9% of disabled staff saying their employer has made adequate adjustments. Meaning, 28% of staff advise that adjustments have not been adequately put in place.	Request a centralised reasonable adjustment. Following the decision actions to be developed. Run a reasonable adjustment	Q2 22/23 HC SD

#	Indicator					Action	Timescale / Lead
						awareness lunch and learn session.	Q4 22/23 HC
9.	a) The staff engagement score for disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation. (out of 10) b) Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? Yes or No	Disabled 6.5 Non-disabled 6.9 Yes Via Staff networks	Disabled 6.8 Non-disabled 7.3	2019 Disabled 6.8 Non-disabled 7.2 2018 Disabled 6.9 Non-disabled 7.4	The engagement scores have reduced for disabled and non-disabled staff. Disabled staff have a lower engagement score. The Trust has a disability/long term health conditions staff network and a neurodivergent network which engages with disabled staff / those with LTHC.		
10.	Percentage difference between (i) the organisations' Board voting membership and its overall workforce and (ii) the organisations' Board executive membership and its overall workforce	Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce = + 2.5% Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall workforce =	Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce = -6% Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership	Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce = -5% Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall workforce = -5%	31.25% of the board has not declared if they have a disability, this is an improvement to last year when 67% of the board had not declared. The data shows that there is some representation on the board.	Request all board members update their demographic data on ESR.	Q3 22/23 SDS

	- 6.6%	and its overall workforce = -6%			

APPENDIX 1

DETAILED STAFF BREAKDOWN DISABILITY 31st March 2022

	Clinical Staff %		
Band	**Disabled**	**Not Disabled**	**Not Declared**
1-4	7% (122)	71% (1275)	23% (406)
5-7	8% (247)	81% (2620)	12% (375)
8ab	5% (18)	83% (275)	11% (38)
8cd	4% (4)	73% (81)	23% (26)
9	0%	100% (1)	0%
VSM	5% (1)	75% (15)	20% (4)
Medics	3% (9)	81% (212)	16% (42)
	Non-clinical staff %		
Band	**Disabled**	**Not Disabled**	**Not Declared**
1-4	5% (75)	73% (1009)	21% (294)
5-7	7% (24)	81% (298)	13% (47)
8ab	7% (6)	71% (65)	22% (12)
8cd	4% (1)	50% (12)	46% (11)
9	0%	0%	0%
VSM	0%	0%	0%

DETAILED STAFF DISABILITY 31st March 2021

	Clinical Staff %		
Band	**Disabled**	**Not Disabled**	**Not Declared**
1-4	6%	69%	25%
5-7	7%	78%	15%
8ab	5%	78%	17%
8cd	5%	68%	27%
9	0%	100%	0%
VSM	0%	100%	0%
Medics	3%	77%	20%
	Non-clinical staff %		
Band	**Disabled**	**Not Disabled**	**Not Declared**
1-4	5%	70%	25%
5-7	6%	78%	16%
8ab	5%	70%	25%
8cd	5%	41%	54%
9	0	0	0
VSM	0%	37%	63%