Workforce Disability Equality Standard

Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust

March 2019

Introduction to the Workforce Disability Equality Standard

In response to findings which indicate that Disabled staff have a less favourable experience of working for the NHS than their non-disabled colleagues, NHS England have initiated a Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES). The first round of reporting on the WDES began in 2019, based on the 2018/19 financial year.

The WDES comprises ten specific metrics to compare the profile and experiences of Disabled and non-disabled staff within an NHS organisation. The purpose of the metrics is to inform a local action plan that will target specific areas within a given organisation where the treatment or experience of Disabled staff is poor. The WDES metrics will also enable the organisation to demonstrate progress in areas where the treatment of Disabled staff needs to improve; and facilitate challenge where progress is not being made.

By 1st August 2019, NHS Trusts and Foundation Trusts and Foundation Trusts are required to
- complete a pre-populated WDES spreadsheet and submit data to NHS England via the Strategic Data Collection Service
- and complete and submit the WDES online reporting form.

An action plan and the metrics can then be ratified at the next available Board meeting after 1st August, to be published on the Trust's website no later than 30th September 2019.

The WDES metrics

In this report, statistical tests have been used on the WDES indicators to tell us whether any differences between the figures for Disabled and non-disabled staff are a cause for concern. It is unlikely that the figures for Disabled and non-disabled staff will be exactly the same, so it is important to use a reliable method to show whether any differences may need specific focus. Even when the indicators suggest a large difference in terms of the percentages or likelihood ratios, this difference may be unreliable if it is based on a small number of people. A key to the colour-coding used in the tables of analysis is given at the end of this report.

Metric 1. Pay Bands

Description of 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.

Narrative for metric 1:

At March 2019, Disabled staff made up 5.4% of Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust's (LPT) substantive workforce of known disability status (226/4151); however, disability status was not known for 21.8% of the substantive workforce (1156/5307). By comparison, in LPT's 2018 Staff Survey 22.1% of staff who gave their disability status identified as disabled (561/2537), with just 2.4% of respondents withholding the information (63/2600). Thus, data held in the Electronic Staff Record probably underestimates the percentage of disabled staff in the organisation. Notably, the NHS Staff Survey collects equality monitoring information anonymously. By contrast, whilst equality monitoring information held in the Electronic Staff Record is held confidentially, this information is linked to the individual's record in an identifiable manner.

Disabled staff had the highest levels of representation at non-clinical pay bands 5 to 7 (7.8%, 23/293) and amongst career grade medics (R%, R/18). Disabled staff had the lowest levels of representation at non-clinical pay bands 8a to 8b (R%, R/67) and at clinical pay bands 8c and above (0.0%, 0/R). However, there was a trend for the percentages of staff of unknown disability status to be highest in the pay bands where the representation of Disabled staff was lowest. For instance, at non-clinical pay bands 8a to 8b disability status was not known for 29.5% of staff (28/95) and at clinical pay bands 8c and above disability status was not known for 73.7% of staff (14/19). Please refer to Table 1.

Almost all substantive staff for whom there was no information on disability selected the "prefer not to say" option (99.8%, 1154/1156), rather than the record being blank. Before reliable inferences can be drawn about the disability profile of staff based on information held in the Electronic Staff Record, there is a need to address the incompleteness of this equality monitoring information.

Table 1: Metric 1: The disability profile of substantive staff at Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust, by pay band cluster, at March 2019

Pay Band		Disability Status				% of unknown disability status	Grand Total N
		Disabled	Non-disabled	Total n (of known disability status)	% difference (%Disabled staff in Band minus %Disabled staff in workforce overall)		
Non-clinical	Bands 4 and under	6.3%	93.7%	650	+0.9%	17.9%	**792**
	Bands 5 to 7	7.8%	92.2%	293	+2.4%	21.0%	**371**
	Bands 8a and 8b	R%	R%	67	-R%	29.5%	**95**
	Bands 8c, 8d, 9, and VSM	R%	R%	29	-R%	23.7%	**38**
Clinical	Bands 4 and under	4.2%	95.8%	971	-1.2%	21.0%	**1229**
	Bands 5 to 7	5.7%	94.3%	1875	+0.2%	20.8%	**2366**
	Bands 8a and 8b	R%	R%	137	-R%	32.5%	**203**
	Bands 8c, 8d, 9, and VSM	0.0%	100.0%	5	-5.4%	73.7%	**19**
	Medical Trainee	R%	R%	56	+R%	0.0%	**56**
	Career grade	R%	R%	18	+R%	28.0%	**25**
	Consultants	R%	R%	50	-R%	55.8%	**113**
LPT Substantive Workforce Overall		**5.4%**	**94.6%**	**4151**		**21.8%**	**5307**

R – Redacted to prevent the re-identification of individuals from small headcounts

Metric 2. Recruitment

Description of metric 2:

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

Narrative for metric 2:

In 2018/19 non-disabled and Disabled people were similarly likely to be appointed from amongst those shortlisted: relative likelihood = 1.4, 8.0% of people who were not disabled were appointed (477/5952) compared to 5.7% of Disabled people (24/419). Please refer to Table 2.

Table 2: Metric 2: The relative likelihood of non-disabled and Disabled people being appointed from amongst those shortlisted at Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust during 2018/19

Disability Status		Shortlisted	Appointed (% out of number shortlisted)		Relative likelihood of appointment from shortlisting (Non-disabled / Disabled)
		n	n	%	
Disability	Disabled	419	24	5.7%	**1.4**
	Non-disabled	5952	477	8.0%	
	% not known	*2.2%*	*2.5%*		
	Overall	**6517**	**514**	**7.9%**	

Metric 3. Formal capability process

Description of 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.

Narrative for metric 3:

In the two-year window 2017/18 to 2018/19, Disabled staff and non-disabled staff were similarly likely to be subjected to formal capability proceedings: relative likelihood = 2.5, R% of Disabled staff were subjected to formal capability proceedings (R/226) compared to R% of staff who were not disabled (R/3925). However, very small numbers of staff were involved in formal capability proceedings, so this figure is likely to vary considerably year-on-year. Please refer to Table 3.

Table 3: Metric 3: The relative likelihood of Disabled and non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process at Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust during the two-year window 2017/18 to 2018/19

Disability Status		LPT Substantive Workforce Overall (March 2019)	Formal capability (2017/18 - 2018/19) (% of workforce)		Relative likelihood of entering formal capability process
		n	n	%	(Disabled / Non-disabled)
Disability	Disabled	226	R	R%	2.5
	Non-disabled	3925	R	R%	
	% not known	*21.8%*	*31.4%*		
LPT Substantive Workforce Overall		**5307**	**R**	**R%**	

R – Redacted to prevent the re-identification of individuals from small headcounts

Additional information for metric 3:

It was found that Disabled staff were 8.0 times more likely than staff who were not disabled to have been dismissed on the grounds of capability in 2018/19: in terms of turnover, R% of Disabled staff were dismissed on the grounds of capability (R/226) compared to R% of staff who were not disabled (R/3925). Please refer to Table 4. It is not certain why this figure does not match more closely the relative likelihood of Disabled and non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process; potentially, some of those ultimately dismissed on the grounds of capability in 2018/19 will have entered the formal capability process during a different timeframe to that considered for the metric on the relative likelihood of entering the formal capability process. In terms of the trends over time, Disabled staff were 2.2 times more likely than non-disabled staff to be dismissed on the grounds of capability in 2017/18, 8.9 times more likely in 2016/17, and 4.1 times more likely in 2015/16. There is a need to audit and analyse past data on formal capability proceedings and equivalent processes to see how the disproportionately high levels of dismissal on the grounds of capability have arisen for Disabled staff.

Thus, overall, Disabled staff were 2.5 times as likely as non-disabled staff to enter the formal capability process and turnover through dismissal on the grounds of disability was 8.0 times higher amongst Disabled staff than amongst non-disabled staff. Taken together, these findings indicate an association between disability in the workforce and capability proceedings.

Table 4: The relative likelihood of Disabled and non-disabled staff being dismissed from Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust on the grounds of capability during 2018/19

Disability Status		LPT Substantive Workforce Overall (March 2019)	Dismissal on the grounds of capability (2018/19) (% turnover)		Relative likelihood of dismissal on the grounds of capability
		n	n	%	(Disabled / Non-disabled)
Disability	Disabled	226	R	R%	8.0
	Non-disabled	3925	R	R%	
	% not known	*21.8%*	*R%*		
LPT Substantive Workforce Overall		**5307**	**R**	**R%**	

R – Redacted to prevent the re-identification of individuals from small headcounts

Metric 4. Harassment, bullying or abuse

Description of metric 4:

4 a) Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from: i) Patients/Service users, their relatives or other members of the public, ii) Managers, iii) Other colleagues; 4 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.

Narrative for metric 4a, parts i, ii, and iii:

In 2018, Disabled staff were more likely than staff who were not disabled to suffer harassment, bullying or abuse from

- patients / service users, their relatives or other members of the public: Disabled: 32.5% (181/557) vs non-disabled: 21.0% (411/1957),
- managers: Disabled: 15.9% (88/554) vs non-disabled: 7.6% (148/1952),
- and other colleagues: Disabled: 21.0% (115/548) vs non-disabled: 12.5% (242/1934),

Please refer to Table 5.

Further analysis on harassment, bullying or abuse from managers and other colleagues, included in the Annual Workforce Equality Report, indicates that these metrics have been static over the past three years for Disabled staff, but harassment, bullying or abuse from managers has improved since 2017 for staff who were not disabled.

Table 5: Metric 4a: The percentages of Disabled and non-disabled staff who experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from patients / service users, their relatives or other members of the public, managers, and other colleagues, Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust Staff Survey 2018

Source of harassment, bullying or abuse	Disability status of respondents	Overall number of respondents (of known disability status)	Number and percentage who experienced harassment, bullying or abuse	
		n	n	%
Patients / service users, their relatives or other members of the public	Disabled	557	181	32.5%
	Non-disabled	1957	411	21.0%
Managers	Disabled	554	88	15.9%
	Non-disabled	1952	148	7.6%
Other colleagues	Disabled	548	115	21.0%
	Non-disabled	1934	242	12.5%

Narrative for metric 4b:

Disabled staff and staff who were not disabled were similarly likely to say they, or a colleague, reported their last incident of harassment, bullying or abuse: Disabled: 54.4% (118/217) vs non-disabled: 57.6% (260/451). Please refer to Table 6.

Table 6: Metric 4b. The percentages of Disabled and non-disabled staff who reported that they, or a colleague, reported their last incident of harassment, bullying or abuse, Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust Staff Survey 2018

Disability Status	Overall number of respondents (of known disability status)	Number and percentage saying they, or a colleague, reported their last incident of harassment, bullying or abuse	
	n	n	%
Disabled	217	118	54.4%
Non-disabled	451	260	57.6%

Additional information for metric 4:

The WDES technical guidance recommends comparing the WDES metrics on harassment, bullying or abuse with internal records of complaints about such behaviour. The figures quoted above from the staff survey in terms of the numbers who experienced bullying, harassment and abuse, and the numbers reporting these incidents, do not match the overall numbers or patterns observed in the organisation's internal records of formal bullying and harassment cases. Looking at a two-year window (2017/18 to 2018/19), fewer than 10 complainants raised formal complaints of bullying and harassment (less than 0.2% of the substantive workforce at March 2019, 9/5307). According to the organisation's internal records, no Disabled staff raised a complaint of bullying and harassment (0/226) compared to R% of staff who were not disabled (R/3925). Please refer to Table 7.

Table 7: The percentages of Disabled and non-disabled staff at Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust who raised a formal complaint of bullying and harassment during the two-year window 2017/18 to 2018/19

Disability Status		LPT Substantive Workforce Overall (March 2019)	Formal Bullying and Harassment Cases (complainants) (2017/18 - 2018/19)	
		n	n	%
Disability	Disabled	226	0	0.0%
	Non-disabled	3925	R	R%
	% not known	*21.8%*	*R%*	
LPT Substantive Workforce Overall		**5307**	**R**	**R%**

R – Redacted to prevent the re-identification of individuals from small headcounts

Metric 5. Equal opportunities for career progression or promotion

Description of metric 5:

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

Narrative for metric 5

In 2018, Disabled staff were less likely than staff who were not disabled to feel that the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion: Disabled: 81.8% (320/391) vs non-disabled: 89.3% (1248/1397). Further analysis of this metric, which is included in the Annual Workforce Equality Report, indicates that this metric has been static over the past three years.

Table 8: Metric 5. The percentages of Disabled and non-disabled staff who felt that the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion, Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust Staff Survey 2018

Disability Status	Overall number of respondents (of known disability status)	Number and percentage who believed that the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion	
	n	n	%
Disabled	391	320	81.8%
Non-disabled	1397	1248	89.3%

Metric 6. Pressure from a manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough

Description of 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.

Narrative for metric 6:

In 2018, Disabled staff were more likely than staff who were not disabled to have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties: Disabled: 27.8% (110/395) vs non-disabled: 16.7% (159/952). Please refer to Table 9. Further analysis, not presented here, indicates that this metric has remained static over the past three years for Disabled staff, but has improved since 2017 for staff who were not disabled.

Table 9: Metric 6. The percentages of Disabled and non-disabled staff who have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties, Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust Staff Survey 2018

Disability Status	Overall number of respondents (of known disability status)	Number and percentage who have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties	
	n	n	%
Disabled	395	110	27.8%
Non-disabled	952	159	16.7%

Metric 7. Satisfaction with the extent to which the organisation values their work

Description of 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.

Narrative for metric 7:

In 2018, Disabled staff were less likely than staff who were not disabled to be satisfied with the extent to which the organisation valued their work: Disabled: 41.8% (233/558) vs non-disabled: 52.5% (1027/1957). Please refer to Table 10. Further analysis, not presented here, indicates that this metric has remained static over the past three years for Disabled staff, but has improved over the past three years for staff who were not disabled.

Table 10: Metric 7. The percentages of Disabled and non-disabled staff who were satisfied with the extent to which the organisation valued their work, Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust Staff Survey 2018

Disability Status	Overall number of respondents (of known disability status)	Number and percentage who were satisfied with the extent to which the organisation valued their work	
	n	n	%
Disabled	558	233	41.8%
Non-disabled	1957	1027	52.5%

Metric 8. Adequate adjustments

Description of metric 8:

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

Narrative for metric 8:

In 2018, Amongst Disabled staff at LPT, 78.6% (257/327) reported that their employer had made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work – higher than the national average (with LPT staff excluded) of 72.9% (34404/47175). Please refer to Table 11. Further analysis, not presented here, indicates that this metric has improved over the past three years for Disabled staff at LPT.

Table 11: Metric 8. The percentages of Disabled staff reporting that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work, Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust Staff Survey 2018

Organisation	Overall number of disabled respondents	Number and percentage of disabled staff saying their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work	
	n	n	%
Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust	327	257	78.6%
National (except LPT)	47175	34404	72.9%

Metric 9. Staff engagement and facilitating the voices of Disabled staff

Description of metric 9:

9 a) The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation; 9 b) Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (yes) or (no)

Narrative for metric 9a:

In 2018, Disabled staff scored lower than staff who were not disabled on
- the overall engagement score (Disabled staff: 6.7; non-disabled staff: 7.1),
- as well on each of the three subscales:
  - motivation (Disabled staff: 7.1; non-disabled staff: 7.4);
  - ability to contribute to improvements subscale (Disabled staff: 6.6; non-disabled staff: 7.1);
  - recommendation of the organisation as a place to work / receive treatment (Disabled staff: 6.4; non-disabled staff: 6.8)
Please refer to Table 12.

A note on interpreting the staff survey engagement score: The engagement score is a composite score, which is drawn from 9 individual questions in the NHS Staff Survey, each of which contribute to the overall engagement score and to one of three sub-scales as outlined below. The overall engagement score and that on each subscale is standardised to give a value out of 10.
- Motivation subscale:
  - Q2a - "I look forward to going to work."
  - Q2b - "I am enthusiastic about my job."
  - Q2c - "Time passes quickly when I am working."
- Ability to contribute to improvements subscale:
  - Q4a - "There are frequent opportunities for me to show initiative in my role."
  - Q4b - "I am able to make suggestions to improve the work of my team / department."
  - Q4d - "I am able to make improvements happen in my area of work."
- Recommendation of the organisation as a place to work / receive treatment subscale:
  - Q21a - "Care of patients / service users is my organisation's top priority."
  - Q21c - "I would recommend my organisation as a place to work."
  - Q21d - "If a friend or relative needed treatment I would be happy with the standard of care provided by this organisation."

Table 12: The engagement score, overall and on each of the three subscales, for Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust overall, and for Disabled and non-disabled staff separately, Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust Staff Survey 2018

Engagement score: overall and sub-scales	Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust Overall	Disability	
		Non-disabled	Disabled
Engagement Score Overall	**7.0**	**7.1**	**6.7**
Motivation	7.3	7.4	7.1
Ability to contribute to improvements	7.0	7.1	6.6
Recommendation of the organisation as a place to work / receive treatment	6.7	6.8	6.4

Metric 9b. Action taken by the Trust to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in the organisation to be heard:

- Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust has an active support group for disabled staff, which goes by the name MAPLE (Mental and Physical Life Experience). MAPLE drives change within the Trust to improve the experiences of Disabled staff in the workplace. For example, MAPLE identified restrictions in Disabled staff being able to access training; associated with the fact that the Trust has been moving increasingly to eLearning. The group invited the Trust's Enhanced Technology Facilitator to a meeting to discuss alternative ways that staff with disabilities could be supported to access online training. It was agreed that, where a need was identified, a named person from the Learning and Development Team would provide one-to-one support to that individual, making any reasonable adjustments required.

Metric 10. Board representation

Description of metric 10:

Percentage difference between the organisation's Board membership and its organisation's overall workforce, disaggregated: by Voting membership of the Board; by Executive membership of the Board.

Narrative for metric 10:

At March 2019, compared to their level of representation in the workforce overall, Disabled people were proportionally represented amongst board members overall (+2.9% difference in representation), and amongst voting board members (+5.7% difference in representation); however there were no Disabled people amongst executive board members (-5.4% difference in representation). Please refer to Table 13.

Table 13: Metric 10. Differences in the levels of representation of Disabled people amongst board members at Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust (overall, voting members, and executives), relative to the level of representation in the workforce overall, at March 2019

Board or workforce overall		Total of known disability status (March 2019)	Disabled staff or board members		Percentage difference in representation of Disabled people (Board minus Workforce)	% of unknown disability status	Grand Total
		n	n	%			N
LPT Substantive Workforce Overall		4151	226	5.4%		21.8%	5307
Board	All members	12	1	8.3%	+2.9%	14.3%	14
	Executive members	7	0	0.0%	-5.4%	0.0%	7
	Voting members	9	1	11.1%	+5.7%	18.2%	11

Key to colour-coding in tables of analysis:

⬜	Benchmark
🟩	Better to a large degree
🟩	Better to a medium degree
🟩	Better to a small degree
⬜	Equivalent
🟨	Worse to a small degree
🟧	Worse to a medium degree
🟥	Worse to a large degree

Please note: for some questions (e.g., the percentage agreeing that LPT acts fairly with regard to career progression / promotion, regardless of ethnic background, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability or age) "better" was indicated by a higher score and "worse" was indicated by a lower score; whilst for other questions (e.g., the percentage experiencing one or more incident of bullying and harassment from other colleagues in the past 12 months) "better" was indicated by a lower score and "worse" was indicated by a higher score.