

## Workforce Disability Equality Standard Report for Trust Board August 2022

<b>1.0</b>	<b>PURPOSE OF THE REPORT</b>
1.1	To update the Trust Board on progress against the Workforce Disability Equality Standard Indicators. <a href="https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/wdes-2021-metrics.pdf">https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/wdes-2021-metrics.pdf</a>
1.2	To update the Trust Board on our submission and the data, as per our contractual requirements.
1.3	To highlight key priorities and actions required to make improvements against the Workforce Disability Equality Standard.
<b>2.0</b>	<b>BACKGROUND/CONTEXT</b>
2.1	As set out in the NHS Long Term Plan, respect, equality and diversity are central to changing culture and will be at the heart of our People Strategy. The NHS draws on a remarkably rich diversity of people to provide care to our patients. But we fall short in valuing their contributions and ensuring fair treatment and respect. NHS England, with its partners, is committed to tackling discrimination and creating an NHS where the talents of all staff are valued and developed – not least for the sake of our patients and the delivery of high-quality healthcare.
2.2	The NHS Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) is designed to improve workplace experience and career opportunities for Disabled people working, or seeking employment, in the NHS. The WDES follows the NHS Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) as a tool and an enabler of change.
2.3	The Workforce Disability Equality Standard is a set of ten specific measures (metrics) that will enable NHS organisations to compare the experiences of disabled and non-disabled staff. This information will then be used by the relevant NHS organisation to develop a local actions to enable them to demonstrate progress against the indicators of disability equality.
2.4	The WDES is mandated through the NHS Standard Contract and as of the 1st April 2019, it forms part of the standard NHS contract and it is highly likely to form part of future Care Quality Commission inspections under the 'Well Led' domain.
2.5	It was restricted to NHS Trusts and Foundation Trusts for the first two years of implementation.
2.6	The implementation of the WDES will enable us to better understand the experiences of disabled staff. It will support positive change for existing employees and enable a more inclusive environment for our disabled staff.
The report must be published by 31 August 2022 and based on the data from the 2021-22	

financial year.

A key component to making progress against this standard is staff engagement and involvement.

### 3.0 DATA ANALYSIS – METRICS

#### 3.1 Metric 1

Metric 1 shows the percentage of NLaG staff who have classified themselves as having a disability compared to those staff who do not have a disability using Agenda for Change (AfC) pay bands or medical and dental subgroups and Very Senior Managers (VSMs), (including Executive Board members). The percentages are clustered into 4 groups for non-clinical staff and 7 groups for clinical staff. This is due the small numbers of staff in each pay band.

This data was collected from ESR as at 31 March 2021 and 31 March 2022.

Metric 1a Non-Clinical Workforce							Mar-21	
	Disabled		Non-Disabled		Unknown or Null		Total Number of Staff	
	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%
Cluster 1: AfC Bands 1 – 4	52	3.00%	1519	86.70%	181	10.30%	1752	81.20%
Cluster 2: AfC Band 5 – 7	8	2.70%	264	89.20%	24	8.10%	296	13.70%
Cluster 3: AfC Band 8a – 8b	4	6.50%	56	90.30%	2	3.20%	62	2.90%
Cluster 4: AfC Band 8c, 8d, 9 & VSM (inc Exec Board)	1	2.10%	45	95.70%	1	2.10%	47	2.20%
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>3.01%</b>	<b>1884</b>	<b>87.34%</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>9.64%</b>	<b>2157</b>	

Metric 1a Non-Clinical Workforce							Mar-22	
	Disabled		Non-Disabled		Unknown or Null		Total Number of Staff	
	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%
Cluster 1: AfC Bands 1 – 4	55	3.17%	1519	87.50%	162	9.33%	1736	80.48%
Cluster 2: AfC Band 5 – 7	10	3.28%	272	89.18%	23	7.54%	305	14.14%
Cluster 3: AfC Band 8a – 8b	5	7.14%	62	88.57%	3	4.29%	70	3.25%
Cluster 4: AfC Band 8c, 8d, 9	1	2.17%	45	97.83%	0	0.00%	46	2.13%

& VSM (inc Exec Board)								
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>3.29%</b>	<b>1898</b>	<b>87.99%</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>8.72%</b>	<b>2157</b>	

Metric 1b Clinical Workforce							Mar-21	
	Disabled		Non-Disabled		Unknown or Null		Total Number of Staff	
	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%
Cluster 1: AfC Bands 1 – 4	39	2.50%	1351	86.50%	172	11.00%	1562	32.40%
Cluster 2 : AfC Band 5 – 7	75	3.00%	2108	85.60%	281	11.40%	2464	51.10%
Cluster 3 : AfC Band 8a – 8b	1	0.90%	101	90.20%	10	8.90%	112	2.30%
Cluster 4: AfC Band 8c, 8d, 9 & VSM (inc Exec Board)	0	0.00%	31	96.90%	1	3.10%	32	0.70%
Cluster 5: Medical and Dental staff, Consultants	2	0.90%	180	83.30%	34	15.70%	216	4.50%
Cluster 6: Medical and Dental staff, Non-consultant career grade	1	0.60%	126	81.80%	27	17.50%	154	3.20%
Cluster 7: Medical and Dental staff, Medical and Dental trainee grades	3	1.10%	225	78.90%	57	20.00%	285	5.91%
<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>2.51%</b>	<b>4122</b>	<b>85.43%</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>12.06%</b>	<b>4825</b>	

Metric 1b Clinical Workforce							Mar-22	
	Disabled		Non-Disabled		Unknown or Null		Total Number of Staff	
	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%	Number of Staff	%
Cluster 1: AfC Bands 1 – 4	51	3.51%	1269	87.22%	135	9.28%	1455	30.21%
Cluster 2: AfC Band 5 – 7	86	3.43%	2195	87.45%	229	9.12%	2510	52.12%
Cluster 3: AfC Band 8a – 8b	3	2.48%	109	90.08%	9	7.44%	121	2.51%
Cluster 4: AfC Band 8c, 8d, 9 & VSM (inc Exec Board)	1	3.23%	29	93.55%	1	3.23%	31	0.64%
Cluster 5: Medical and Dental staff, Consultants	2	0.90%	192	86.10%	29	13.00%	223	4.63%
Cluster 6: Medical and Dental staff,	1	0.57%	152	86.36%	23	13.07%	176	3.65%

Non-consultant career grade								
Cluster 7: Medical and Dental staff, Medical and Dental trainee grades	2	0.67%	246	82.00%	52	17.33%	300	6.23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>3.03%</b>	<b>4192</b>	<b>87.04%</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>9.93%</b>	<b>4816</b>	

In the tables, metric 1a and metric 1b clearly show that the percentage of disabled staff in both the non-clinical and clinical workforce is very low standing at 3.11% of the total (combined non clinical and clinical workforce). This percentage has increased slightly by 0.45% from 2021. This is comparable to what is reported nationally across NHS trusts (3.7% disabled staff worked within NHS in 2021). The tables above highlight that there is a high proportion of the workforce which record their disability status as either unknown or a null response, although there are fewer unknown recordings when compared to last year (a reduction of 1.8%). Medical and dental staff have a higher number of unknown and null responses as well as lower disability declaration rates when compared to the non-clinical and clinical workforce.

3.2

### Metric 2

The table below shows the relative likelihood of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts for 2020-21 and 2021-22.

	Indicator	2020-21			2021-22		
		Descriptor	Disabled Staff	Non-Disabled Staff	Descriptor	Disabled Staff	Non-Disabled Staff
<b>Metric 2</b>	Relative likelihood of non-Disabled staff compared to Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.	Number of shortlisted applicants	698	14081	Number of shortlisted applicants	287	4337
		Number appointed from shortlisting	33	1147	Number appointed from shortlisting	42	1080
		Ratio shortlisted/ appointed Likelihood candidates are appointed from shortlisting	$33/698=0.05$	$1147/14081=0.08$	Ratio shortlisted / appointed Likelihood candidates are appointed from shortlisting	$42/287=0.15$	$1080/4337=0.25$
		The Relative likelihood of Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to Non-Disabled staff is 1.6			The Relative likelihood of Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to Non-Disabled staff is 1.67		

*Note: This refers to both external and internal posts.*

*\*If the organisation implements a guaranteed interview scheme, the data may not be comparable with organisations that do not operate such a scheme. This information will be collected on the WDES online reporting form to ensure comparability between organisations.*

The data shows that the likelihood of disabled staff and non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting in 2020-21 was that non-disabled staff were 1.6 times more likely to be appointed from shortlisting compared to disabled staff, in 2021-22 the ratio remained largely unchanged to show that non-disabled staff were 1.67 times more likely to be appointed from shortlisting.

\*It should also be noted that NLaG as part of the Department of Work and Pensions scheme are a Disability Confident Employer, and therefore operate a guaranteed interview scheme for disabled applicants who meet the minimum person specification.

### 3.3 Metric 3

Metric 3 explores the relative likelihood of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process. Data is based on the number of staff entering the formal capability procedure from a two-year rolling average of the current year and the previous year and includes capability cases with and without underlying health reasons (UHR).

Metric 3	Indicator	No UHR				UHR			
	The relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure. This has been split by UHR and No UHR.	Average number of <b>Disabled staff</b> entering the formal capability process 2020 - 2022	Average number of <b>Non-Disabled staff</b> entering the formal capability process 2020 - 2022	Average number of <b>Unknown/Null</b> staff entering the formal capability process 2020 - 2022	Average number of staff entering the formal capability process 2020 - 2022	Average number of <b>Disabled staff</b> entering the formal capability process 2020 - 2022	Average number of <b>Non-Disabled staff</b> entering the formal capability process 2020 - 2022	Average number of <b>Unknown/Null</b> staff entering the formal capability process 2020 - 2022	Average number of staff entering the formal capability process 2020 - 2022
		1	4	1	5*	1	22	5	27*

	No UHR	UHR
Relative likelihood of Disabled staff entering the formal capability process compared to Non-Disabled staff	7.02	1.28

Note: A figure above 1:00 indicates that Disabled staff are more likely than Non-Disabled staff to enter the formal capability process.

\*Please note these totals are a two year average of all staff entering a formal capability process.

Due to small number of disabled staff in the Trust (217) compared to non-disabled staff (6090), with 666 unknowns. Disabled staff with an Underlying Health Reason (UHR) are 1.28 times more likely to enter the formal capability process than non-disabled staff. Disabled staff without a UHR are 7.02 times more likely to enter a capability process than non-disabled staff. The figure for No UHR is significantly higher than the figure for UHR due to the low number of disabled staff in the organisation compared to non-disabled staff.

3.4

### 2021 NHS Staff Survey Results Analysis Metrics 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9a

The metrics 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9a overleaf represent unweighted question level responses to key findings in the NHS for NLaG staff. The staff survey results surrounding the disabled workforce between 2020 and 2021 are similar, with slight improvements to some of the metrics.

	Metric	2020 Staff Survey Result		2021 Staff Survey Result	
<b>Metric 4.1</b>	Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients/service users, their relatives, or other members of the public in the last 12 months	Disabled	29.60%	Disabled	28.00%
		Non-disabled	19.90%	Non-disabled	21.00%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		Disabled	30.90%	Disabled	32.40%
		Non-disabled	24.50%	Non-disabled	25.20%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
<b>Metric 4.2</b>	Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in last 12 months	Disabled	26.50%	Disabled	22.50%
		Non-disabled	13.10%	Non-disabled	11.90%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		Disabled	19.30%	Disabled	18.00%
		Non-disabled	10.80%	Non-disabled	9.80%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
<b>Metric 4.3</b>	Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in last 12 months	Disabled	34.50%	Disabled	30.70%
		Non-disabled	19.90%	Non-disabled	20.30%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		Disabled	26.90%	Disabled	26.60%
		Non-disabled	17.80%	Non-disabled	17.10%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
<b>Metric 4.4</b>	Percentage of staff saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it in the last 12 months	Disabled	50.20%	Disabled	42.90%
		Non-disabled	43.20%	Non-disabled	44.00%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	

		Disabled	47.00%	Disabled	47.00%
		Non-disabled	45.80%	Non-disabled	46.20%

**Metric 4**

Staff feel harassment, bullying or abuse in the last 12 months from:

- Patient's, relatives or the public is 7% higher for disabled staff than non-disabled staff. However, this remains below the national NHS average
- Managers is 10.6% higher for disabled staff than non-disabled staff. There is a reduction from 21 to 22 of 4%. This remains above the national average score
- Other colleagues are 10.4% higher for disabled staff than non-disabled staff. Similar to 21 and still above the national average
- Disabled staff are less likely to report harassment, bullying or abuse at work than non-disabled staff.

<b>Metric 5</b>	Percentage believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion	Disabled	45.70%	Disabled	47.20%
		Non-disabled	53.30%	Non-disabled	53.90%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		Disabled	51.60%	Disabled	51.40%
		Non-disabled	57.40%	Non-disabled	56.80%

**Metric 5**

Disabled staff are 6.7% less likely to believe that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion compared to non-disabled staff. This has slightly increased from 21.

<b>Metric 6</b>	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.	Disabled	36.90%	Disabled	35.80%
		Non-disabled	23.40%	Non-disabled	26.40%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		Disabled	33.00%	Disabled	32.20%
		Non-disabled	23.40%	Non-disabled	23.70%

**Metric 6**

Disabled staff felt 9.4% more pressured to attend work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties compared to non-disabled staff.

<b>Metric 7</b>	Percentage of staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.	Disabled	28.00%	Disabled	26.70%
		Non-disabled	42.30%	Non-disabled	36.80%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		Disabled	37.40%	Disabled	32.60%
		Non-disabled	49.30%	Non-disabled	43.30%

**Metric 7**



Disabled staff felt 10.1% less satisfied that the organisation valued their work compared to non-disabled staff.

<b>Metric 8</b>	Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.	Disabled	72.00%	Disabled	70.50%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		Disabled	75.50%	Disabled	70.90%
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	

**Metric 8**

70.5% of disabled staff from the staff survey feel we have made adequate adjustments to enable them to carry out their work. A 1.5% reduction compared to the previous year, but in line with the national average.

<b>Metric 9 Part a</b>	The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation.	Disabled	6.1	Disabled	6.0
		Non-disabled	6.7	Non-disabled	6.6
		Organisation Score	6.6	Organisation Score	6.4
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	
		Disabled	6.7	Disabled	6.4
		Non-disabled	7.1	Non-disabled	7.0
		NHS Average Score		NHS Average Score	

**Metric 9a**

The engagement score for disabled staff is 0.6 less than that of non-disabled staff therefore disabled staff feel less engaged with compared to non-disabled staff.

<b>Metric 9 Part b</b>	Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (Yes) or (No) If no what actions are planned?	Yes As part of the Trust's Equality Objectives plans the Trust has developed a Disability Network to give disabled staff a voice.	Yes As part of the Trust's Equality Objectives plans the Trust has developed a Disability Network to give disabled staff a voice.
------------------------	--	--	--

**Metric 10**

<b>Metric 10</b>	The percentage of NLaG Board and Executive Team who classify themselves as having a disability or long-term condition at 31 March 22.	<b>31-Mar-21</b>			
		Trust Board and Executive Team	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Not Declared
			7.14%	85.71%	7.14%
		<b>31-Mar-22</b>			
		Trust Board and Executive Team	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Not Declared
			6.25%	93.75%	0.00%

The NLaG Board and Executive Team members who classify themselves as having a disability is very similar to last year, 7.14% in 2021 and 6.25% in 2022.

## 4.0 PROGRESS AND ACTIONS

### 4.1 Reporting and Assurance

- **Progress 2021/2022**

The Trust Equality and Diversity Strategy and Equality Objective (2018 – 2022) are in place. An Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) two-year action plan is now under development which will set out our commitments to actions required, progress, timescales and supporting evidence including actions for WDES.

- We are continuing to work closely with and support the Trust's Freedom to Speak Up Guardian.
- All existing staff and managers, as part of their mandatory training, receive equality, diversity and inclusion training which has a focus on inclusive behaviours and exploring unconscious bias.
- All new staff receive equality, diversity and inclusion training which has a focus on inclusive behaviours and exploring unconscious bias.
- The Trust's CEO has been appointed as the joint chair of the NHS CEO National Disability Forum and actively supports this agenda.

- **Further Actions 2022/2023**

- To ensure that all WDES actions are monitored through the EDI two-year action plan and included in the wider engagement and culture transformation work and plans.
- Ensure the EDI two-year action plan is regularly up dated and new actions are developed as required.
- To provide reports on progress against the EDI two-year action plan.
- As part of strengthening culture awareness ensure that our staff equality networks (Disability Network) are represented and actively involved in the EDI Working Group, and the Culture Transformation Working Group.
- To look are breaking down data (where this is possible) to identify hotspot areas and take more bespoke action.

### 4.2 Workforce and Recruitment

- **Progress 2021/2022**

All recruitment panels now include an equality representative. The Trust's Head of Recruitment has worked with the Trust EDI Lead to ensure that all stages of the recruitment processes are fair and free from discrimination. We continue to promote the values of disability and be a disability confident employer.

- **Further Actions 2022/2023**

- To monitor recruitment and retention of staff and particularly, explore reasons staff leave the Trust by protected characteristic, and to identify any outliers.
- To develop a Trust training package to strengthen cultural awareness and to recognise, understand and effectively manage unconscious bias within the recruitment process.
- We have recently been approved and are entering into DFN Project SEARCH helping young people with learning disabilities to transition from education into employment.

### 4.3 Capability and Staff Experience

- **Progress 2021/2022**

A key focus has been to engage with our staff and increase the visibility of EDI support in the workplace. Therefore, to give all staff an opportunity to openly discuss their

concerns and experience we have held at least two face to face EDI engagement events each month. We have had over 800 conversations with a diverse range of staff this year. As part of these conversations we had also included Health and Wellbeing support as we recognise that staff from minority groups often have additional challenges in accessing this type of support. We have appointed a disability staff equality network and have grown our membership of our Disability Facebook Group to over 35 members. In addition, to expand a reach out to our minority staff further we have launched an equality Twitter account @nlag4inclusion and the followers of the account are quickly growing. To support our new overseas nursing recruits we have introduced a face to face Equality, Diversity and Inclusion awareness session as part of their induction programme.

- **Further Actions 2022/2023**

We are continuing to grow our Disability staff equality network and to ensure the network is able to influence decision making which shapes and influences their employee experience. We will shortly form an EDI working group which will inform the Trust's new Culture Transformation and Leadership Strategy.

4.4 **Trust Board and Senior Leadership**

- **Progress 2021/2022**

We recognise that Trust Board and the senior leadership community has some elements of diversity. However, due to the small numbers these percentages are very fragile therefore, we are conducting a deep dive into our data.

- **Further Actions 22022/2023**

To interrogate in more detail the diversity within the senior leadership community to understand areas of under-represented and consider what positive actions are required to address the gaps.

5.0 **Recommendations.**

5.1 To note the contents of this report against the NHS Workforce Disability Equality Standard.

5.2 Approve the data content which we are required to share with NHS England and our commissioners.

5.3 To note the actions proposed for 22/23 and to monitor progress of those actions and wider culture transformation programme through the Workforce Committee.