

**WORKFORCE DISABILITY EQUALITY STANDARD**

**2022/2023**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 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 |
| 7927 (data from 31st March 2023) |
| b. Proportion of disabled staff employed within this organisation at the date of the report |
| 8% |
|  | 3. Self-reporting  a. The proportion of total staff who have self-reported their disability status |  |
| 85% |
| 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 2023. |
| 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 2023 |
|  | 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 2023** | **Data for**  **2022** | **Data for**  **2021** | **Data for 2020, 2019, 2018, 2017** | **Narrative – the implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative** |
|  | 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 2022 and 2023 data |  |  |  | There has been an increase in staff recording if they have a disability this year, 15% not declare compared to 16.5% not declared in 2022.  8% of staff have declared having a disability on ESR. |
| 2 | Relative likelihood of staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts. | 1.12 | 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. | likelihood of a non-disabled staff member being appointed compared to a disabled staff member is similar to last years. |
| 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 current year and the previous year. | 1.08 | Disabled staff are 0.64 times more likely to enter capability than non-disabled staff (they are less likely) | Disabled staff are 0 times more likely to enter capability than non-disabled staff (they are less likely) | Disabled staff are 0.78 times more likely to enter capability than non-disabled staff (they are less likely) | This data shows that non disabled staff and disabled staff are almost equally as likely to enter capability processes. |
|  | 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:   1. Patients/service users, their relatives or other members of the public 2. Managers   Other colleagues | 2022  LTHC – 26.7%  Without LTHC – 21.4%  LTHC – 8.5%  Without LTHC – 3.8%  LTHC – 18.8%  Without LTHC – 11.2% | 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 staff with long term health conditions 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 both staff with long term health conditions and those without has improved this year. |
| 5. | Percentage believing that Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. | 2022  LTHC – 57.3%  Without LTHC – 65.3% | 2021  Disabled 55%  Non-disabled 64% | 2020  Disabled 56%  Non-disabled 66% | 2019  Disabled 58%  Non-disabled 64%  2018  Disabled 63%  Non-disabled 70% | The results show that staff with long term health conditions are less likely than staff without long term health conditions to believe the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.  The results for both staff with long term health conditions and those without has improved this year. |
| 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. | 2022  LTHC – 20.9%  Without LTHC – 12.5% | 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 staff with long term health conditions and staff without long term health conditions who have felt pressure to come to work despite not feeling well enough has reduced. There is still an 8% difference, with staff with long term health conditions being more likely to attend work. |
| 7. | Percentage of staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work. | 2022  LTHC – 41.5%  Without LTHC – 49.1% | 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 an increase for both staff with and without long term health conditions There continues to be a difference of 7% with staff with long term health conditions reporting feeling less satisfied with the extent the organisation values their work. |
| 8. | Percentage of staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work. | 2022  75.8% | 2021  72% | 2020  81% | 2019  76%  2018  89% | There has been an increase in disabled staff saying their employer has made adequate adjustments. |
| 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 | LTHC – 6.5  Without LTHC – 7.0 | 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 scores are like last years.  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 | Overall + 8.72%  Difference voting + 6.34%  Difference exec + 2.05% | Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce =  + 2.5%  Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall workforce =  - 6.6% | Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce = -6%  Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall workforce = -6% | Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce = -5%  Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall workforce = -5% | 11% of the board has not declared if they have a disability, this is an improvement to last year when 31.25% of the board had not declared.  The data shows that there is representation on the board. |

**APPENDIX 1**

**DETAILED STAFF DISABILITY 31st March 2022**

**DETAILED STAFF BREAKDOWN DISABILITY 31st March 2023**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Clinical Staff %** | | |
| **Band** | **Disabled** | **Not Disabled** | **Not Declared** |
| **1-4** | 8% (144) | 72% (1362) | 21% (391) |
| **5-7** | 9% (302) | 81% (2738) | 10% (323) |
| **8ab** | 6% (22) | 84% (295) | 10% (35) |
| **8cd** | 6% (6) | 71% (77) | 23% (25) |
| **9** | 0% (0) | 80% (4) | 20% (1) |
| **VSM** | 25% (1) | 50% (2) | 25% (1) |
| **Medics** | 3% (11) | 82% (211) | 15% (37) |
|  | **Non-clinical staff %** | | |
| **Band** | **Disabled** | **Not Disabled** | **Not Declared** |
| **1-4** | 7% (104) | 74% (1035) | 19% (263) |
| **5-7** | 7% (27) | 81% (310) | 12% (48) |
| **8ab** | 10% (10) | 77% (79) | 14% (14) |
| **8cd** | 7% (2) | 60% (18) | 33% (10) |
| **9** | 0 (0%) | 50% (1) | 50% (1) |
| **VSM** | 6% (1) | 71% (12) | 24% (4) |