## Workforce Disability Equality Standard Data Submission (as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023)

### Table 1: Snap shot of BTHFT workforce data over a period of 3 years

Metric 1	Percentage of staff in AfC pay-bands or medical and dental subgroups and very senior managers (including Executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce. Organisations should undertake this calculation separately for non-clinical and for clinical staff. Cluster 1: AfC Band 1, 2, 3 and 4 Cluster 2: AfC Band 5, 6 and 7 Cluster 3: AfC Band 8a and 8b Cluster 4: AfC Band 8c, 8d, 9 and VSM (including Executive Board members) Cluster 5: Medical and Dental staff, Consultants Cluster 6: Medical and Dental staff, Non-consultant career grade Cluster 7: Medical and Dental staff, Medical and dental trainee grades							e	
Pay Band	31st Marc	h 2021		31st Marc	h 2022		31st Marc	h 2023	
	Disabled	Non- Disabled	Disability Unknkown/ NULL	Disabled	Non- Disabled	Disability Unknkown/ NULL	Disabled	Non- Disabled	Disability Unknkown/ NULL
1a) Non Clinical Workforce									
Cluster 1 (Bands 1-4)	66 (4%)	1260	161	<b>68</b> (5%)	1259	<b>149</b> (10%)	<b>70</b> (5%)	1274	<b>151</b> (10%)
Cluster 2 (Bands 5-7)	23 (5%)	384	30	<b>21</b> (5%)	402	27 (6%)	<b>26</b> (6%)	415	24 (5%)
Cluster 3 (Bands 8a-									
8b)	1 (1%)	80	3	<b>2</b> (2%)	87	<b>3</b> (3%)	<b>5</b> (5%)	95	<b>2</b> (2%)
Cluster 4 (Bands 8c - 9 & VSM)	1 (2%)	38	2	<b>1</b> (2%)	40	<b>2</b> (5%)	1 (2%)	40	<b>2</b> (5%)
1b) Clinical Workforce of which Non-Medical									
Cluster 1 (Bands 1-4	<b>aa</b> ( <b>aa</b> ()					(			
and other)	33 (3%)	933	84	<b>38</b> (4%)	955	<b>79</b> (7%)	<b>46</b> (4%)	1025	<b>114</b> (10%)
Cluster 2 (Bands 5-7)	84 (4%)	2024	180	<b>84</b> (4%)	2080	<b>158</b> (7%)	<b>90</b> (4%)	2098	<b>142</b> (6%)
Cluster 3 (Bands 8a- 8b)	6 (3%)	171	12	<b>6</b> (3%)	188	17 (8%)	<b>6</b> (3%)	189	<b>13</b> (6%)
Cluster 4 (Bands 8c - 9 & VSM)	0 (0%)	21	3	<b>1</b> (5%)	19	<b>2</b> (9%)	<b>2</b> (8%)	21	<b>1</b> (4%)
Cluster 5 (M&D Staff: Consultants)	5 (1%)	311	32	<b>6</b> (2%)	313	<b>31</b> (9%)	<b>6</b> (2%)	327	<b>27</b> (8%)
Cluster 6 (M&D Non Consultant Career Grade)	0 (0%)	91	7	<b>1</b> (1%)	88	6 (6%)	<b>1</b> (1%)	111	7 (6%)
Cluster 7 (M&D: Trainee Grades)	7 (2%)	323	21	<b>8</b> (3%)	296	<b>19</b> (6%)	<b>12</b> (4%)	307	<b>22</b> (7%)
TOTAL	<b>226</b> (4%)	5636	535 (8%)	<b>236</b> (4%)	5727	<b>493</b> (8%)	<b>265</b> (4%)	5902	<b>505</b> (8%)

### Table 2: BTHFT staffing figures over a 3-year period

Year Number of Staff in overall workforce		Number of Staff in overall workforce who have declared whether they have a disability or not	Number of disabled Staff in overall workforce	Percentage of disabled Staff in overall workforce	
March 2021	6397 🕇	5861	226 🕇	4%	
March 2022	6456 🕇	5961	236 🕇	4%	
March 2023	6672 🕇	6167	265 🕇	4% 👄	

See Appendix 1 (at the end) for key showing the meaning of the arrows in the data tables

#### Table 3

Metric 2		Relative likelihood of non-disabled staff compared to Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.							
		Number of shortlisted applicants		Number appointed from shortlisting		of ht from	The relative likelihood of non-disabled staff being appointed compared to disabled staff		
	Disabled	Non-	Disabled	Non-	Disabled	Non-			
		Disabled		Disabled		Disabled			
March 2021	279	4462	75	1271	27% 🕇	28%	*1.📭		
March 2022	344	6463	73	1723	21% 🖊	27% 🖊	*1.2		
March 2023	275	4729	68	1386	25% 🕇	29% 🕇	1.15		

\*Nb A figure above 1:00 indicates that non-disabled staff are more likely than disabled staff to be appointed from shortlisting (1:00 = equal chances)

#### Table 4

Metric 3	Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure.         Note:       i) This metric will be based on data from a two-year rolling average of the current year and the previous year         ii) This metric applies to capability on the grounds of performance and not ill health or disciplinary. This is different from Indicator 3 of the WRES, which measures entry into the disciplinary process.
Data for <b>metric</b> national WDES	<b>3</b> has not been published as there are 10 or fewer cases (in line with guidance from the team).

## Table 5

Metric 4a	National NHS Staff Survey Metrics For each of the following four Staff Survey Metrics, compare the responses for both Disabled							
	and non-disable	ed staff.	r		T			
	Metric 4a		Metric 4a		Metric 4a			
	Percentage of o	disabled staff	Percentage o	f disabled	Percentage of d	isabled staff		
	compared to no	on-disabled	staff compare	ed to non-	compared to not	n-disabled staff		
	staff experienci	ng	disabled staff	experiencing	experiencing harassment, bully			
	harassment, bullying or abuse from: patients, Service			rassment, bullying or or a		or abuse from colleagues		
			abuse from their manager					
	users or their re	elatives/						
	Disabled	Non- disabled	Disabled	Non- disabled	Disabled	Non-disabled		
March 2021	36.8% 🛉	27.7%	21.75 🔶	11.6%	26.5%	16.9% 🕇		
(2020 survey)	-		-		•	_		
March 2022	34.9% 27.6%		17.7%	11.3%	24.3%	16.6%		
(2021 survey)	•	•	•	•	•	•		
March 2023	34.8%	27.0%	19.4% 🕇	10.7% 📘	27.3% 🕇	17.6% 🛉		
(2022 survey)	•	•				-		

#### Table 6

Metric 4b	National NHS Staff Survey Metrics For each of the following four Staff Survey Met non-disabled staff.	rics, compare the responses for both disabled and					
	Metric 4b						
	Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it.						
	Disabled	Non-disabled					
March 2021	47.4% 🖊	45.1% 🖊					
(2020 survey)							
March 2022	51.0% 🕇	47.7% 🕇					
(2021 survey)	-	-					
March 2023	53.2% 🕇	42.3% 🦊					
(2022 survey)							

#### Table 7

Metrics 5-7	For each of the	National NHS Staff Survey Metrics For each of the following four Staff Survey Metrics, compare the responses for both disabled and non-disabled staff.							
	Metric 5 Percentage of disabled staff compared to non- disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion		Metric 6 Percentage ofdDisabled 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		Metric 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.				
	Disabled	Disabled Non- disabled		Non-disabled	Disabled	Non-disabled			
March 2021 (2020 survey)	53.9% 1	60.0%	37.3% 🕇	25.1%	36.6%	51.4%			
March 2022 (2021 survey)	55.9% 1	59.2%	34.3%	25.0%	27.9%	43.3%			
March 2023 (2022 survey)	55.4%	62.1%	29.8%	23.4%	33.3% 🕇	46.8% 1			

Table 8	
<b>Metric 8</b> (Q26b)	National NHS Staff Survey Metrics Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.
March 2021 (2020 survey)	71.6%
March 2022 (2021 survey)	69.8%
March 2023 (2022 survey)	74.2%

Metric 9	NHS Staff Survey and the engagement of Disabled staff
	9a) compare the staff engagement scores for Disabled and non-disabled staff
	9b) add evidence to the Trust's WDES Annual Report

### Table 9

<b>Metric 9a</b> (Q's: 2a-2c, 4a, 4b, 4d, 21a, 21c, 21d)	National NHS Staff Survey Metrics The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff					
	Disabled	Non-disabled				
March 2021 (2020 survey)	6.6	7.2				
March 2022 (2021 survey)	6.3	6.9				
March 2023 (2022 survey)	6.4	7.1				

#### Table 10

Metric 9b	a) Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard (Yes/No)				
	Yes				
	b) Please provide at least one practical example of current action being taken in the relevant section of your WDES annual report				
Example	We continue to raise the profile of disability equality by showcasing our innovative WDES innovation fund video, booklet and travelling photograph exhibition (locally, regionally and nationally). We are already seeing a positive impact in terms of Enable membership and active involvement in network activity.				

### Table 11

Metric 10	For this Metric, Percentage dif workforce dis • By voting m	ference betwe	fference for Disab <b>en the organisat</b> ne Board	abled and non-disabled staff. ations' Board membership and its overall			
	Voting membe	rship of the Bo	bard	Executive membership of the Board			
	Disabled	Non- disabled	Not declared	Disabled	Non- disabled	Not declared	
March 2021	7% 🖊	71% 📕	22%	0% 🖚	88.89% 🖊	11.11%	
March 2022	13.33% 🔶	73.33% 🛧	13.33%	0% 📥	88.89%	11.11%	
March 2023	14.29% 🕇	71.43%	14.29%	0% 🚗	88.89%	11.11%	

## Summary of WDES data findings

<u>Areas where we have seen Improvement</u>: Although some of these area's still require action, there have also been some definite improvements in our data this year;

- Increase in representation of disabled staff:
  - Non-clinical Bands 5-7 (1% increase)
  - Non-clinical Bands 8a-8b (3% increase)
  - Clinical Bands 8c/9/VSM (3% increase)
  - A further 1% increase for Medical Trainees (bringing them equal to the BTHFT average of 4% declaration)
- Reduction in disadvantage when it comes to appointment from shortlisting (non-disabled staff now 1.19 times more likely to be appointed rather than 1.26 times more likely)
- Slight reduction in experience of harassment & bullying from both patients/ public and from line manager with an increase in the proportion of disabled staff saying they would report it (increase from 51% to 53.2%)
- 4.5% improvement in disabled staff feeling pressure to attend work when unwell (now 29.8%)
- 5.4% increase in disabled staff feeling the organisation values their work (now 33.3%)
- 4.4% (to 74.2%)increase in disabled staff saying BTHFT have provided adequate reasonable adjustments
- Overall improvement in the engagement score for disabled staff from 6.3 to 6.4
- Slight increase in representation of Trust board voting membership

<u>Areas for Further Action</u>: Despite many of the findings reflecting the national picture (particularly in relation to the staff survey) the data above highlights some key area's for action which include:

- Increasing the numbers of disabled staff and increasing confidence to declare a disability or long term health condition
- Continuing to improve the likelihood of shortlisting and likelihood of appointment from shortlisting for disabled candidates
- Continuing to improve support for disabled staff and their managers in implementing adequate reasonable adjustments and developing open and compassionate relationships.
- Improving staff experience in relation to harassment & bullying, particularly from colleagues and from patients/ public and continuing to increase confidence to report it
- Increase confidence in career development opportunities for disabled staff and ensuring disabled staff are feeling engaged and valued.

### Focus for 2023/2024

The 2023/2024 WDES action plan will provide focus on those areas where our data is telling us we need to make an improvement

Next Steps/ Key Areas of Focus for 2023/2024

Work with staff networks and key stakeholders to develop an implementation plan to accompany the recently launched EDI Strategy and engage with CSU/ Department managers on their role and remit as part of the new strategy

Ensure staff networks continue to thrive in line with the national ambitions for staff networks, with support from the EDI team in increasing their membership and further developing their work plans.

Continue to raise the profile of disability/ race equality across the Trust in partnership with our staff equality networks

Continue to share the WDES innovation fund video and travelling photography exhibition with colleagues across the Trust and wider, sharing the learning with other NHS colleagues.

Finalise and launch a new recruitment & selection toolkit with continued focus on reducing bias in recruitment and ensuring our processes are inclusive.

Application process for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Reciprocal Mentoring cohort to be rolled out in the Autumn of 2023.

Increased focus on civility in the workplace (including addressing the issue of harassment & bullying from patients and the public) and raising the profile of disability/ race equality across the Trust.

As part of the Harassment & Bullying policy review;

- Increased focus on ensuring managers are trained in methods of informal resolution, including facilitated conversations and the roll out of the newly developed Workplace Civility toolkit
- Mediation will become an established option for staff experiencing conflict or inappropriate behaviours in the workplace.

Continue to explore barriers and opportunities for Career & Personal Development for our diverse staff at Bands 5-7

As part of the "Outstanding Maternity Services" (OMS) work-stream; engage with Nursing & Midwifery staff to explore their experiences of work in Women's services, including any barriers to progression

Continue to raise awareness and roll out diversity census exercise to improve disability declaration rates, this will be monitored regularly.

Provide training to a number of new Staff Advocates ready for a relaunch. Staff Advocates support the needs of our diverse staff, including advice and guidance around harassment & bullying, disability and the provision of reasonable adjustments.

Enable the provision of safe spaces for open discussions around disability related topics

and encourage our disabled colleagues to share their lived experiences with others so they can effectively influence disability equality across the Trust.

Continue to seek out opportunities to engage with managers and staff to increase understanding and awareness around the provision of reasonable adjustments and what support is available.

Continue to roll out the widely recognised sunflower lanyard scheme for both patients and staff who wish to participate. The <u>Sunflower Lanyard Scheme</u> allows you to indicate to people around you that you need additional support, help or just a little more time due to a 'hidden' disability. To provide guidance and training to our workforce to educate around the purpose of the sunflower lanyard scheme and in how they can help those who choose to wear the lanyard

## Appendix 1:

# Key for symbols used in the data tables:

1	A higher % or score is better and this has shown an increase this year	1	A lower % or score is better and this has shown an increase
+	A lower % or score is better and this has shown a decrease this year	•	The score has stayed the same from the previous year
ŧ	A higher % or score is better and this has shown a decrease this year		

## Appendix 2

## Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES): The 10 Metrics

Metric 1	Percentage of disabled staff in each of the Agenda for Change bands 1-9, medical & dental subgroups and very senior managers (VSM), including executive board members compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce.		
Metric 2	Relative likelihood of disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.		
Metric 3	Relative likelihood of disabled staff entering the formal capability procedure (performance and not-ill health). allowing		
	National Staff Survey Responses (Metrics 4-9 only)		
Metric 4a	Q13a: Percentage of disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public.		
	Q13b: Percentage of disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from their manager.		
	Q13c: Percentage of disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues.		
Metric 4b	(Q13a) Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it.		
Metric 5	Q14: Percentage of disabled staff who believe the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.		
Metric 6	Q11e: Percentage of disabled staff who say they have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties.		
Metric 7	Q5f: Percentage of disabled staff saying they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.		
Metric 8	Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.		
Metric 9	Comparison of the engagement scores for disabled and non-disabled staff.		
Metric 10	Comparison of disabled and non-disabled members of the board (voting membership/ executive membership) against the overall workforce.		