

Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) 2020

Introduction:

The Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) is a set of ten specific measures (metrics) that enable NHS organisations to compare the experiences of Disabled and non-disabled staff. Research has shown that Disabled staff have poorer experiences in areas such as bullying and harassment and attending work when feeling ill, when compared to non-disabled staff. The metrics are measured using a combination of data from ESR and other HR databases including responses from the national NHS Staff Survey.

This information is then used to develop a local action plan, and enable the Trust to demonstrate progress against the indicators of disability equality.

The WDES first came into force on 1st April 2019 is mandated through the NHS Standard Contract. This report outlines the findings for the Trusts second WDES submission.

Data quality

All of the data required for WDES reporting is already collected through ESR, the NHS National Staff Survey, NHS Jobs or via the HR Employee Relations databases. The reporting of disability on ESR is low as noted below:

MCHFT staff	ESR March 2019	ESR March 2020
Disabled - Yes	2.6%	2.78%
Disabled - No	79.7%	81.23%
Not declared/prefer not to answer/unspecified	17.7%	15.99%

Reasons for this may include:

- New starters not feeling confident to report during the recruitment process.
- ESR not being updated when staff becoming disabled in service.
- Staff fear of disability reporting affecting their work /career
- Staff not understanding the legal definition of disability & what it includes, which may cause many hidden disabilities and mental health issues to be unreported.

The WDES Metrics

The 10 Metrics are confirmed as follows:

Metric Number	Data source	Metrics
1	ESR data	Percentage of staff in AfC paybands or medical and dental subgroups and very senior managers (including Executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce.
2	NHS Jobs data	Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.
3	Local HR database	Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure.
4	Staff survey	<p>Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Patients/service users, their relatives or other members of the public ii. Managers iii. Other colleagues <p>b) 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.</p>
5	Staff survey	Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.
6	Staff survey	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.
7	Staff survey	Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.
8	Staff survey	Percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.
9	Staff survey Local information	<p>a) The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation.</p> <p>b) Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (Yes) or (No)</p>
10	ESR	Percentage difference between the organisation's Board voting

		membership and its organisation's overall workforce, disaggregated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By voting membership of the Board. • By Executive membership of the Board
--	--	--

Note: For the 2020 reporting period, only metrics 1-3 and 9b - 10 are required for submission to NHS England as part of the data collection process. The results from metrics 4-9a are still included in this report, however for comparison purposes, it is noted that the 2019 NHS Staff Survey was issued to all Trust staff, rather than a sample as seen in previous years. Any NHS Staff Survey comparisons are made from the 2018 survey results.

WDES findings against the metrics

Metric 1- Percentage of staff in AfC paybands or medical and dental subgroups and very senior managers (including Executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce

Non-clinical (AfC)

Banding	Disabled	Non-disabled	Not known
Cluster 1 (Band 1-4)	5.2%	80.8%	14%
Cluster 2 (Band 5-7)	3.2%	82.7%	14.1%
Cluster 3 (Band 8a-8b)	1.6%	92.1%	6.3%
Cluster 4 (Band 8c-8d and VSM)	3.2%	83.9%	12.9%

Clinical (AfC and Medical & Dental grades)

Banding	Disabled	Non-disabled	Not known
Cluster 1 (Band 1-4)	2.84%	83.03%	14.13%
Cluster 2 (Band 5-7)	3.48%	80.94%	15.57%
Cluster 3 (Band 8a-8b)	1.44%	76.26%	22.30%
Cluster 4 (Band 8c-8d and VSM)	0%	100%	0%
Cluster 5 Consultant	1.32%	81.58%	17.11%
Cluster 6 Non-consultant career grade	0%	59.38%	40.63%
Cluster 7 Trainee grades	2%	84%	14%

Key findings

- The largest proportion of staff with a disability are in cluster 1 for non-clinical staff and cluster 2 for clinical staff. These groups have the largest staffing numbers.
- Staff in cluster 4 for clinical staff do not report any disabilities, however it is the small headcount of staff in this cluster is noted.
- Over 40% of staff in non-consultant career posts chose not to confirm whether or not they have a disability. This trend remains the same as seen in the previous year.
- Over 14% of staff in both clinical and non-clinical roles bands 1 to 7 chose not to confirm whether or not they have a disability.
- The findings indicate that non-clinical managers in bands 8a and 8b are more likely to report whether or not they have a disability than those in clinical posts of the same band.

Metric 2 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.

3.80% of all applications received for Trust positions during 2019/20 were from candidates who indicated that they had a disability. 3.70% of candidates who were shortlisted for interview reported that they had a disability and 2.30% of those appointed to post had a disability.

The findings show that **non-disabled staff are 1.63 times more likely** to be appointed from shortlisting than disabled staff. This is compared to 1.26 times more likely in the previous year.

The Trust offer the guaranteed interview scheme for staff who self-report that they are disabled. In addition, the Trust are also recognised as being a 'Disability Confident' employer.

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

This metric was voluntary in the first year of WDES completion however was made compulsory during 2020. This metric is based on a 2 year rolling average for the period 1st April 2018 to 31st March 2020 and uses the performance management procedure to constitute capability procedures rather than ill health capability. Findings are therefore calculated as such.

The findings show that **disabled staff are no more likely** to be subjected to formal capability procedures than non-disabled staff. This metric has seen no change since the previous year.

It is noted that a low number of capability procedures are undertaken across the Trust in comparison to other types of employment relations casework.

Metric 4 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse.

From patients /public – disabled staff reported a higher percentage of harassment bullying and abuse from patients, service users or the public at 30% compared to 22% of non-disabled staff. Both disabled and non-disabled staff have seen a slight decrease since the previous year; 34% and 23% respectively.

Patient/public Score	Disabled staff	Non-disabled staff
Staff Survey 2019	30%	22%
Staff Survey 2018	34%	23%

From their manager – This metric has seen a decline in the experience of disabled staff. 15% of disabled staff reported that they had experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from their manager, compared to 9% of non-disabled staff. This is compared to 10% of disabled staff and 8% of non-disabled staff in the previous year.

Manager Score	Disabled staff	Non-disabled staff
Staff Survey 2019	15%	9%
Staff Survey 2018	10%	8%

From colleagues – A higher proportion of disabled staff reported experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from a colleague (28%) compared to their non-disabled

counterparts (14%), and therefore double. This is compared to 25% for disabled staff with no change for non-disabled staff (14%) in the previous year.

Colleagues Score	Disabled staff	Non-disabled staff
Staff Survey 2019	28%	14%
Staff Survey 2018	25%	14%

Reporting – This metric has seen a significant decline for disabled staff who have reported incidents of bullying, harassment or abuse where such an incident occurred. Only 37% of disabled staff confirmed that they reported the incident, compared to 55% in the previous year.

This metric has also seen a reduction in non-disabled staff reporting incidents of harassment, bullying or abuse, 47% this year, compared to 52% in the previous year.

Reporting Score	Disabled staff	Non-disabled staff
Staff Survey 2019	37%	47%
Staff Survey 2018	55%	52%

Metric 5 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.

Equal Opportunities	Disabled staff	Non-disabled staff
Staff Survey 2019	80%	90%
Staff Survey 2018	85%	92%

The staff survey results showed that 80% of disabled staff felt the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion compared to 90% of non-disabled staff. This is compared to 85% for disabled staff and 92% for non-disabled staff in the previous year, and therefore a decline across both groups of staff.

Metric 6 - 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.

Pressure Score	Disabled staff	Non-disabled staff
Staff Survey 2019	28%	18%
Staff Survey 2018	29%	20%

28% of disabled staff felt under pressure from their managers to attend work when they were not well enough to perform their duties. This significantly reduces to 18% for non-disabled staff. This is a very slight improvement on the previous year's data for both staff groups (29% of disabled staff and 20% of non-disabled staff).

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

Sense of being valued Score	Disabled staff	Non-disabled staff
Staff Survey 2019	40%	53%
Staff Survey 2018	43%	50%

40% of disabled staff reported that they were satisfied with the extent to which their work was valued compared to 53% of non-disabled staff.

Whilst this metric has seen a decline for disabled staff when compared to the previous reporting period (43% in the 2018 staff survey), a 3% improvement has been noted for non-disabled staff in the 2019 staff survey results when compared to the previous year (50%).

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

72% of all disabled staff respondents who required adjustments felt that these were adequately made to enable them to carry out their work. This is compared to 70% in the previous year.

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

Engagement Score	Disabled staff	Non-disabled staff
Staff Survey 2019	6.7	7.4
Staff Survey 2018	6.9	7.3

The staff survey highlighted that non-disabled staff reported higher levels of engagement (score of 7.4 out of 10) than disabled staff (6.7). When compared to the previous year, disabled staff have recorded a slight decrease in the engagement score, with a slight improvement recorded for non-disabled staff.

Metric 9 b) Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard?

A staff focus group took place in 2019 to further explore staff experiences of having a disability at work. As a result of discussions and feedback received, a health passport has been produced to support staff with disabilities in their role and this is currently in the process of being rolled out across the Trust.

Following the recent successful launch of a BAME staff network in July 2020 following a series of forums and Schwartz Rounds as a direct response to issues highlighted by Covid, a similar approach is being taken to explore launching a disability staff network. It is anticipated that the first disability forum to share staff experiences will take place in September 2020, with the longer term view of forum members engaging to develop a staff network.

Metric 10 - Percentage difference between the organisation's Board voting membership and its organisation's overall workforce

2.78% of the total workforce report that they have a disability, a slight increase from 2.60% the previous year. When reviewing Trust Board members, no disabilities are reported. 54% of Board members report that they do not have a disability and 46% have not declared or prefer not answer. This outcome remains the same as noted in the previous WDES report.

Conclusion, data reporting and action planning

The below conclusions have been drawn from metric indicators 2 to 9a and 10 (including metrics 4a – 4d), a total of 12 areas.

It is disappointing to note that a decline in outcomes has been identified against eight areas including all areas relating to staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse.

Two indicators found static outcomes where no overall improvements or changes were measured (relative likelihood of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process and the percentage difference between the organisation's Board voting membership and its organisation's overall workforce).

The Trust has measured improved outcomes against just two of the WDES indicators (percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they have felt pressure from their manager to come to work and the percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work).

These findings from the WDES data will be reported to the Workforce and Digital Transformation Committee and Trust Board and will be published on the Trust website.

Whilst some improvements have been noted, the findings still evidence that in some areas disabled staff still experience a poorer experience at work than non-disabled staff. An action plan is being developed to address the areas where improvements are required. This action plan will be regularly monitored and reviewed by the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Group with input from staff feedback from planned disability staff forums.

Natalie Wallace
Workforce Business Partner/ Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Lead
August 2020