

# Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) Report May 2024

<b>Trust Board Leads for the WRES</b>	Angela Doak - Director of Human Resources
<b>Lead manager compiling this report</b>	Victoria Parsons, Associate Director of Corporate Governance – Lead for Equality and Diversity
<b>Date this report was reported to the Executive</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> May 2024

## Introduction and Background

National NHS research indicates that less favourable treatment of Disabled staff can and does occur. National annual NHS staff survey results show that Disabled staff consistently report higher levels of bullying and harassment and less satisfaction with appraisals and career development opportunities.

The national Workforce Disability Equality Standard (**WDES**) was devised by NHS England and the NHS Equality and Diversity Council to help NHS organisations to address this. The WDES has **10 specific evidence based metrics**, to measure and benchmark local and national NHS disability equality performance.

These metrics enable the Trust to compare the experiences of Disabled with non-disabled staff, develop a local action plan and demonstrate progress against the metrics. This is to help improve the experiences of Disabled staff and to ensure their equal access to career opportunities and fair treatment in the workplace.

# Workforce Disability Equality Standards Indicator Results

Total staff and Declaration of Disability

Staff declaration	2021		2022		2023		2024	
<b>Total Staff numbers</b>	8022		8106		8206		8998	
<b>Disabled staff -</b>	181	2.2%	170	2.1%	216	2.63%	292	3.2%
<b>Non-disabled staff -</b>	6130	78.7%	6472	79.9%	6715	81.83	7395	82.2%
<b>Non- declaration by staff</b>	1531	19.1%	1462	18%	1275	15.54%	1311	14.6%

For each of these workforce indicators, we compare the data for Disabled and Non-disabled staff. If we are reviewing relative likelihood, a score of less than one is more favourable to Disabled Staff.

## INDICATOR 1 - Percentage of staff in AfC paybands or medical and dental subgroups and very senior managers compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce.

- There has been a significant increase in the representation at senior bands of disabled staff from 2023 to 2024. However, there remains under representation at medical grades.

Grades Bands	Clinical							NON Clinical							Grand	
	D		ND		NR		Total	D		ND		NR		Total	Total	
Band 1	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	1	4.3%	17	73.9%	5	21.7%	23	25	
Band 2	26	2.7%	803	83.8%	129	13.5%	958	20	4.9%	329	80.6%	59	14.5%	408	1366	
Band 3	29	5.4%	427	80.1%	77	14.4%	533	19	4.3%	363	82.9%	56	12.8%	438	971	
Band 4	18	4.9%	301	81.8%	49	13.3%	368	24	5.0%	396	82.5%	60	12.5%	480	848	
Band 5	32	2.4%	1136	85.7%	158	11.9%	1326	12	5.5%	180	82.9%	25	11.5%	217	1543	
Band 6	46	3.4%	1151	85.0%	157	11.6%	1354	8	6.5%	101	81.5%	15	12.1%	124	1478	
Band 7	33	3.8%	696	80.6%	134	15.5%	863	7	5.5%	111	87.4%	9	7.1%	127	990	
Band 8a	4	2.0%	154	78.2%	39	19.8%	197	3	4.1%	59	80.8%	11	15.1%	73	270	
Band 8b	1	1.7%	48	81.4%	10	16.9%	59	0	0.0%	33	86.8%	5	13.2%	38	97	
Band 8c	0	0.0%	13	100.0%	0	0.0%	13	2	5.9%	26	76.5%	6	17.6%	34	47	
Band 8d	0	0.0%	9	81.8%	2	18.2%	11	2	16.7%	8	66.7%	2	16.7%	12	23	
Band 9	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	4	1	10.0%	8	80.0%	1	10.0%	10	14	
VSM	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	0	0.0%	6	85.7%	1	14.3%	7	9	
Ad hoc	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	0.0%	6	6	
Junior	0	0.0%	382	77.8%	109	22.2%	491									
Middle	1	0.3%	235	77.6%	67	22.1%	303									
Consultant	3	0.6%	398	77.0%	116	22.4%	517									
	193		5758		1050		7001	99		1637		261		1997	8998	

Grades Bands	Clinical							NON Clinical							Grand	
	D		ND		NR		Total	D		ND		NR		Total	Total	
Band 1-4	73	3.9%	1533	82.4%	255	0.137	1861	64	4.7%	1105	81.9%	180	13.3%	1349	3210	
Band 5-7	111	3.1%	2983	84.2%	449	0.127	3543	27	5.8%	392	83.8%	49	10.5%	468	4011	
Bands 8a – 8b	5	2.0%	202	78.9%	49	0.191	256	3	2.7%	92	82.9%	16	14.4%	111	367	
Bands 8c-VSM	0	0.0%	25	83.3%	5	0.167	30	5	7.9%	48	76.2%	16	25.4%	63	93	
Junior	0	0.0%	382	77.8%	109	0.222	491								0	
Middle	1	0.3%	235	77.6%	67	0.221	303								0	
Consultant	3	0.6%	398	77.0%	116	0.224	517								0	
	193		5758		1050		7001	99		1637		261		1997	8998	

2023															
Grades Bands	Clinical							NON Clinical							Grand
	D		ND		NR		Total	D		ND		NR		Total	Total
Band 1	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	1	3.8%	20	76.9%	5	19.2%	26	28
Band 2	22	2.5%	732	82.7%	131	14.8%	885	11	2.8%	312	79.6%	69	17.6%	392	1277
Band 3	14	3.2%	351	79.6%	76	17.2%	441	18	4.4%	331	81.7%	56	13.8%	405	846
Band 4	15	4.4%	279	81.3%	49	14.3%	343	14	3.1%	385	84.1%	59	12.9%	458	801
Band 5	28	2.3%	1038	84.5%	162	13.2%	1228	8	3.9%	171	84.2%	24	11.8%	203	1431
Band 6	41	3.4%	983	82.5%	168	14.1%	1192	6	4.8%	104	83.9%	14	11.3%	124	1316
Band 7	18	2.3%	624	79.5%	143	18.2%	785	9	8.3%	92	85.2%	7	6.5%	108	893
Band 8a	2	1.1%	143	77.7%	39	21.2%	184	1	1.7%	50	83.3%	9	15.0%	60	244
Band 8b	1	1.9%	41	75.9%	12	22.2%	54	1	2.4%	36	87.8%	4	9.8%	41	95
Band 8c	0	0.0%	14	93.3%	1	6.7%	15	1	4.5%	19	86.4%	2	9.1%	22	37
Band 8d	0	0.0%	9	90.0%	1	10.0%	10	0	0.0%	13	81.3%	3	18.8%	16	26
Band 9	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	4	1	8.3%	9	75.0%	2	16.7%	12	16
VSM	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	0	0.0%	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	6	8
Ad hoc	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Junior	3	0.7%	355	84.3%	63	15.0%	421								
Middle	0	0.0%	226	80.4%	55	19.6%	281								
Consultant	1	0.2%	367	75.5%	118	24.3%	486								
	145		5168		1020		6333	71		1547		255		1873	8206

Grades Bands	Clinical							NON Clinical							Grand
	D		ND		NR		Total	D		ND		NR		Total	Total
Band 1-4	51	3.1%	1364	81.6%	256	0.153	1671	44	3.4%	1048	81.8%	189	14.8%	1281	2952
Band 5-7	87	2.7%	2645	82.5%	473	0.148	3205	23	5.3%	367	84.4%	45	10.3%	435	3640
Bands 8a – 8b	3	1.3%	184	77.3%	51	0.214	238	2	2.0%	86	85.1%	13	12.9%	101	339
Bands 8c-VSM	0	0.0%	27	87.1%	4	0.129	31	2	3.6%	46	82.1%	8	14.3%	56	87
Junior	3	0.7%	355	84.3%	63	0.15	421								0
Middle	0	0.0%	226	80.4%	55	0.196	281								0
Consultant	1	0.2%	367	75.5%	118	0.243	486								0
	145		5168		1020		6333	71		1547		255		1873	8206

**INDICATOR 2 - Relative likelihood of staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts**

Year	2021	2022	2023	2024
Relative likelihood	1.09	0.74	0.45	0.58

Relative likelihood of non-disabled staff compared to Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts 0.58

- The data shows that disabled staff are more likely to be appointed than non-disabled staff following shortlisting.

**INDICATOR 3 - Relative likelihood of staff entering the formal capability process,**

	At Y/E March 2023	At Y/E March 2024
Number	12	27
Declared disability	0	4
Declared no disability	12	17
Not recorded	0	6

Year	2023	2024
Relative likelihood	0.00	2.98

- There are four declared cases of a disability going through the performance management process. The data this year report that, disabled staff are more likely to experience the performance management process compared to non-disabled staff. There is small number variation in this figure.

**INDICATOR 4 a (Staff Survey) - Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months. (Lower score better)**

Category	Patients, public etc.			
	2021	2022	2023	2024
Disabled	32.6%	36.5%	36.9%	32.06%
Non-disabled	26.5%	27.4%	29.4%	25.50%
<b>Acute Trust Averages</b>				
Disabled	30.9%	32.4%	33%	30.35%
Non-disabled	24.3%	25.2%	26.2%	23.76%

The proportion of staff experiencing bullying and harassment from patients etc. has dropped for all staff which is an improvement

**INDICATOR 4 b (Staff Survey) - Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in last 12 months. (Lower score better)**

Category	Managers			
	2021	2022	2023	2024
Disabled	22.0%	18.0%	23.3%	17.22%
Non-disabled	12.2%	9.5%	10.9%	10.66%
<b>Acute Trust Averages</b>				
Disabled	19.3%	18.0%	17.1%	15.87%
Non-disabled	10.8%	9.8%	9.9%	8.74%

The proportion of staff experiencing bullying and harassment from managers has dropped by 6.22% which is an improvement but still less equitable compared with the results for non-disabled staff.

**INDICATOR 4 b (Staff Survey) - Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues in last 12 months. (Lower score better)**

Category	Colleagues			
	2021	2022	2023	2024
Disabled	29.2%	25.3%	26.1%	24.48%
Non-disabled	18.1%	16.7%	17.4%	18.00%
<b>Acute Trust Averages</b>				
Disabled	26.9%	26.6%	26.9%	25.86%
Non-disabled	17.8%	17.1%	17.7%	16.60%

The proportion of staff experiencing bullying and harassment from colleagues has dropped slightly for disabled staff. However, this is slightly higher for non disabled staff and sits below the D national average (26.9%)

**INDICATOR 4 b (Staff Survey) - Percentage of staff saying that they reported the last experiences of bullying and harassment. (Higher score better)**

Category	Colleagues			
	2021	2022	2023	2024
Disabled	46.4%	51.4%	44.7%	47.97%
Non-disabled	45.9%	49.1%	47.6%	47.47%
<b>Acute Trust Averages</b>				
Disabled	47%	47%	48.4%	50.44%
Non-disabled	45.8%	46.2%	47.3%	49.33%

The proportion staff reporting issues has risen for disabled staff and non-disabled staff. However, there is not a large difference between the two groups but both are below the national average of 50.44% which is not positive.

**INDICATOR 5 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. The higher the percentage the better the result. (Higher score better)**

	2021	2022	2023	2024
Disabled	47.8%	51.7%	50.7%	54.79%
Non-disabled	54.7%	55.1%	56.9%	58.03%
<b>Acute Trust Averages</b>				
Disabled	57.6%	51.4%	51.4%	51.54%
Non-disabled	57.4%	56.8%	57.3%	57.52%

The proportion of disabled staff reported progression has increased, but is still less than non-disabled staff. This sits above the D national average (51.54%)

**INDICATOR 6 – the Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties. (Lower score better)**

	2021	2022	2023	2024
Disabled	41.5%	34.9%	37.8%	29.31%
Non-disabled	27.4%	26.8%	25.6%	21.37%
<b>Acute Trust Averages</b>				
Disabled	33.0%	32.2%	30%	28.55%
Non-disabled	23.4%	23.7%	20.8%	19.46%

This indicator has decreased slightly and is significantly more than for non-disabled staff. However, it is still above the national average of 28.55%.

**INDICATOR 7 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.**

	2021	2022	2023	2024
<b>Disabled</b>	35.5%	31.3%	27.4%	35.13%
<b>Non-disabled</b>	50.7%	43.1%	41.6%	47.62%
<b>Acute Trust Averages</b>				
<b>Disabled</b>	37.4%	32.6%	32.5%	35.66%
<b>Non-disabled</b>	49.3%	43.3%	43.6%	47.19%

This indicator has increased greatly for both groups. However, the % increase is still below that for non-disabled staff and sits slightly below the D national average of 35.66%.

**INDICATOR 8 - Percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.**

	2021	2022	2023	2024
<b>Disabled</b>	72.5%	72.0%	65.9%	73.11%
<b>Acute Trust Averages</b>				
<b>Disabled</b>	75.5%	70.9%	71.8%	73.38%

There has been an increase in reasonable adjustments being reported, however, this is remains slightly below the national average of 73.38%

**INDICATOR 9a - The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation.**

	2021	2022	2023	2024
<b>Disabled</b>	6.4	6.3	6.1	6.45
<b>Non-disabled</b>	7.1	7	6.9	7.02
<b>Org average</b>	-	7	6.8	6.91
<b>Acute Trust Averages</b>				
<b>Disabled</b>	6.7	6.4	6.4	6.46
<b>Non-disabled</b>	7.1	7	6.9	7.04

There has been an increase in the engagement score for disabled staff. This sits slightly below the D national average (6.46%) and below the organisational average of 6.91

**INDICATOR 9b – Has your organisation taken action to facilitate the voices of your disabled staff to be heard?**

Yes – we have in place the Disability Staff Network. Two co-chairs were recruited during 2023/24.

## **INDICATOR 10 - Board representation indicator**

Percentage difference between the organisations' Board voting membership and its overall workforce and Executive membership to overall workforce.

Numbers	2022		2023		2024	
	Non-Disabled	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Disabled
<b>TOTAL Board</b>	19	0	19	0	21	0
<b>Voting member</b>	15	0	15	0	15	0
<b>Non-voting member</b>	4	0	4	0	6	0
<b>Executive</b>	7	0	7	0	7	0
<b>Non-Executive</b>	8	0	8	0	8	0
<b>Workforce Disabled %</b>	79.9%	2.1%	81.3%	2.63%	82.2%	3.2%
<b>Voting Board Representation</b>	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%
<b>Voting gap in representation</b>	20.1%	-2.1%	18.17%	-2.63%	17.8%	-3.2%
<b>Executive gap in representation</b>	20.1%	-2.1%	18.17%	-2.63%	17.8%	-3.2%

### **Questionnaire Submission Report**

This year the Trust was required to complete a questionnaire as part of the submission. There were 29 questions focussed on the Trust approach to supporting staff with a disability.

The Trust did well on questions focussed on recruitment. We are a Level 1 'Committed' Disability Confident employer and have processes in place to support disabled applicants. However, with some of the other questions around tackling bullying and harassment and action taken is focussed on all staff not targeting particular issues from our disabled staff.

### **The focus moving forward for the Trust:**

- Develop a BEDSFT Inclusion Passport
- Provide bespoke training to managers to develop knowledge and understanding relating to the management of disability in the workplace.
- Focus on career progression for disabled staff

## Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) Metrics Comparator Table 2020-2024: Summary Trustwide Data

WRES Indicator	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2024/25	Commentary	Performance
1. 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 (Workforce Data)	2.2%	2.1%	2.63%	3.2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The WDES clusters the bandings - There has been an increase in representation across most of the clusters and it is largely equitable</li> <li>Disability remains under represented in the medical staff</li> </ul>	<p><b>LARGELY EQUITABLE</b></p>
2. Relative likelihood of staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts. (Workforce Data)	1.09	0.74	0.45	0.58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The data shows that you are more likely to be appointed if you have a disability.</li> <li>This is demonstrating that our approach to recruitment does not discriminate against our disabled colleagues</li> </ul>	<p><b>IMPROVEMENT BUT INEQUALITIES ARE STILL EVIDENT</b></p>
3. Relative likelihood of staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into a formal disciplinary	0	0	0	2.98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are 27 staff in a performance management process (12 last year).</li> <li>Four individuals identified as having a disability with two of these have been identified as ill health only.</li> <li>In previous years there were no staff declaring a disability. There is small number variation in this figure.</li> </ul>	<p><b>LESS EQUITABLE</b></p>
4. A) Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months. *	32.6% (D) 26.5% (ND)	36.5% (D) 27.4% (ND)	36.9% (D) 29.4% (ND)	32.06% (D) 25.50% (ND)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proportion of staff experiencing bullying and harassment from patients etc. has dropped for all staff</li> <li>This sits above the D national average (30.35%)</li> </ul>	<p><b>LARGELY EQUITABLE BUT SOME INEQUALITIES ARE EVIDENT</b></p>
4 B) Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in last 12 months. *	22% (D) 12.2% (ND)	18% (D) 9.5% (ND)	23.3% (D) 10.9% (ND)	17.22% (D) 10.7% (ND)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proportion of staff experiencing bullying and harassment from managers has dropped by 6.22%.</li> <li>This sits above the D national average (15.87%)</li> </ul>	<p><b>IMPROVEMENT BUT INEQUALITIES ARE STILL EVIDENT</b></p>

WRES Indicator	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2024/25	Commentary	Performance
4 B) Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in last 12 months. *	29.2% (D) 18.1% (ND)	25.3% (D) 16.7% (ND)	26.1% (D) 17.4% (ND)	24.48% (D) 18.00% (ND)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proportion of staff experiencing bullying and harassment from colleagues has dropped slightly for disabled staff.. However, this is slightly higher for non disabled staff.</li> <li>This sits below the D national average (26.9%)</li> </ul>	 <b>IMPROVEMENT BUT INEQUALITIES ARE STILL EVIDENT</b>
4 B) Percentage of staff saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it. *	46.4% (D) 45.9% (ND)	51.4% (D) 49.1% (ND)	44.7% (D) 47.6% (ND)	47.97% (D) 47.47% (ND)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proportion staff reporting issues has risen for disabled staff and non disabled staff. However, . there is not a large difference between the two groups but both are below the national average which is not positive.</li> <li>This sits below the D national average (50.44%)</li> </ul>	 <b>LARGELY EQUITABLE</b>
5. Percentage believing that trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.*	47.8% (D) 54.7% (ND)	51.7% (D) 55.1% (ND)	50.7% (D) 56.9% (ND)	54.79% (D) 58.03% (ND)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proportion of disabled staff reported progression is less than non disabled staff.</li> <li>This sits above the D national average (51.54%)</li> </ul>	 <b>IMPROVEMENT BUT INEQUALITIES ARE STILL EVIDENT</b>
6. Percentage of staff who felt pressure from their manager to come into work despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties. *	41.5% (D) 27.4% (ND)	34.9% (D) 26.8% (ND)	37.8% (D) 25.6% (ND)	29.31% (D) 21.37% (ND)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proportion of disabled staff reporting pressure has decreased and is above the national average. It is significantly more than for non-disabled staff</li> <li>This sits above the D national average (28.55%)</li> </ul>	 <b>IMPROVEMENT BUT INEQUALITIES ARE STILL EVIDENT</b>
7. Percentage saying they are satisfied with the extent to which the organisation values their work*	35.5% (D) 50.7% (ND)	31.3% (D) 43.1% (ND)	27.4% (D) 41.6% (ND)	35.13% (D) 47.62% (ND)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-disabled staff report feeling valued than disabled staff which has increased but is still less than non disabled staff..</li> <li>This sits slightly below the D national average (35.66%)</li> </ul>	 <b>IMPROVEMENT BUT INEQUALITIES ARE STILL EVIDENT</b>
8. Percentage of staff saying their employer has made adequate reasonable adjustments to enable them to carry out their work. *	72.5% (D)	72% (D)	65.9% (D)	73.11% (D)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been an increase in reasonable adjustments being reported, however, this is slightly below the national average.</li> <li>This sits below the D national average (73.38%)</li> </ul>	 <b>MORE REPORTED</b>

WRES Indicator	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2024/25	Commentary	Performance
9. A) The staff engagement score and overall engagement score	6.4% (D) 7.1% (ND)	6.3% (D) 7% (ND)	6.1% (D) 6.9% (ND)	6.45% (D) 7.02% (ND)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been an increase in the engagement score for disabled staff.</li> <li>This sits slightly below the D national average (6.46%) and below the organisational average of 6.91</li> </ul>	 <b>IMPROVEMENT BUT INEQUALITIES ARE STILL EVIDENT</b>
9. B) Has your organization taken action to facilitate the voices of disabled staff to be heard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disability Staff Network</li> </ul>	 <b>EQUITABLE</b>
10. Percentage difference between the organisations' Board voting membership and its overall workforce. (Workforce Data)	0% -2.2%	0% -2.1%	0% -2.63%	0% -3.2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Trust does not have any disabled staff on the Board.</li> </ul>	 <b>LESS EQUITABLE</b>

\* Annual Staff Survey