

## Public Trust Board – 31st August 2021

### Workforce Disability Equality Standard Metrics Report 2020/21

#### Purpose of the Report

- The Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) was mandated through the NHS standard contract from 2018/19 to address the finding that Disabled staff have a less favourable experience of working for the NHS than their non-disabled colleagues.
- The present report aims to fulfil the Trust's statutory duties in relation to the WDES metrics, which include actions for the Trust's Board:
  - approve the 2020/21 WDES metrics and action plan for submission to NHS England via a reporting portal and publication on the Trust's website, by 31st August 2021 and 31st October 2021, respectively;
  - approve the 2020/21 WDES metrics and action plan for presentation to the lead commissioner.
- Assurance is provided that the Trust's statutory duties in relation to the WDES metrics will be met if the above actions are undertaken.

#### Analysis of the Issue

- Analysis of the WDES metrics indicates that Disabled staff are at a disadvantage or have poorer outcomes when compared to non-disabled staff in terms of
  - entry into formal capability proceedings
  - bully, harassment and abuse from
    - service users,
    - managers,
    - and other colleagues
  - belief that the Trust provides equal opportunities in career progression
  - pressure from a manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties
  - satisfaction with the extent to which the organisation values their work
  - staff engagement scores
  - representation amongst board-level executives
- Additionally, disability status was not known for 18.9% of the substantive workforce, primarily due to staff selecting the "prefer not to say" option. This makes it difficult to use workforce data Rii to inform strategies to improve the experiences of Disabled staff in the workplace. Benchmarking against the staff survey indicates that in-house workforce data may underestimate the percentage of Disabled staff in the workforce by a factor of four.
- These findings reflect long-term trends that are being addressed through the Trust's WDES Action Plan. The WDES action plan was, and continues to be developed in collaboration with

the MAPLE Staff Support Group and senior leaders, including board members. It is a further statutory requirement that the WDES action plan is seen by the Trust's board for approval, and published on the Trust's website by 31st October 2021.

- Please see the report that accompanies this summary for the full analysis of the WDES metrics

## Proposal

- It is asked that the Trust's Board approves the 2020/21 WDES metrics and action plan for two purposes:
  - submission to NHS England via a reporting portal by 31st August 2021,
  - publication of the accompanying WDES metrics report and action plan on the Trust's public-facing website by 31st October 2021.
- These are statutory requirements.
- The requirements above reflect an annual governance cycle.
- The 2020/21 WDES Metrics Report, which is intended for publication on the Trust's public-facing website, is provided below for information.

## Decision required

- Please approve the WDES metrics for submission to NHS England.
- Please approve the accompanying WDES metrics report for publication on the Trust's public-facing website.
- Failure to comply to with the WDES Regulations can result in
  - enforcement action undertaken by the Equality and Human Rights Commission
    - formal investigations and assessments
    - action to ensure that the metrics are produced and published
- Ultimately, a failure to act upon the equality issues indicated by the WDES metrics could result in a failure to deliver workforce equality, diversity and inclusion (item 24 on the Trust's risk register).

## Governance table

For Board and Board Committees: Paper sponsored by:	Public Trust Board 31.8.21	
	Sarah Willis (Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development)	
Paper authored by:	Haseeb Ahmad (Head of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion); Iain Darker (Data Analyst: Equality, Diversity and Inclusion)	
	2nd August 2021	
Date submitted: State which Board Committee or other forum within the Trust's governance structure, if any, have previously considered the report/this issue and the date of the relevant meeting(s): If considered elsewhere, state the level of assurance gained by the Board Committee or other forum i.e. assured/ partially assured / not assured: State whether this is a 'one off' report or, if not, when an update report will be provided for the purposes of corporate Agenda planning	Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Workforce Group, 28th July 2021	
	Assured	
STEP up to GREAT strategic alignment*:	This report is part of an annual governance cycle	
	High Standards Transformation	
	Environments	
	Patient Involvement	
	Well Governed	X
	Single Patient Record	
	Equality, Leadership, Culture	X
	Access to Services	
	Trust Wide Quality Improvement	
	Organisational Risk Register considerations:	List risk number and title of risk
Is the decision required consistent with LPT's risk appetite: False and misleading information (FOMI) considerations:	Na	
	na	
Positive confirmation that the content does not risk the safety of patients or the public	Confirmation provide	
Equality considerations:	Y	

# **Workforce Disability Equality Standard**

**Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust**

**March 2021**

# Introduction to the Workforce Disability Equality Standard

In response to findings that indicate Disabled staff have a less favourable experience of working for the NHS than their non-disabled colleagues, NHS England has initiated a Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES). The WDES was mandated through the NHS standard contract from 2018/19.

The WDES comprises ten 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.

NHS Trusts are required to submit WDES data centrally, to NHS England, by the end of August. An action plan and the metrics must be ratified by the Trust's Board and must be published on the Trust's website by the end of October.

# The WDES metrics

## Metric 1. Pay Bands

### Description of metric 1:

- Percentage of Disabled staff in Agenda for Change pay bands, calculated separately for non-clinical and for clinical staff, 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 2021, Disabled staff made up 5.9% of Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust's (LPT) substantive workforce of known disability status (258/4402); however, disability status was not known for 18.9% of the substantive workforce (1027/5429).
- By comparison, in LPT's 2020 Staff Survey 25.0% of staff who gave their disability status identified as disabled (689/2753), with just 0.9% of respondents withholding the information (24/2777). Thus, data held in the Electronic Staff Record may underestimate the percentage of disabled staff in the organisation, potentially by a factor of 4. 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.
- Amongst staff of known disability status, Disabled staff had the highest levels of representation at non-clinical pay bands 5 to 7 (7.8%, 24/306), whilst Disabled staff had the lowest levels of representation at non-clinical pay bands 8c to VSM (R%, R/28) and amongst Career Grade Medics (R%, R/24). Please refer to Table 1.
- There were no statistically significant variations in the percentages of Disabled staff by pay band. However, disability status was not known for 18.9% of substantive staff overall, and up to 48.0% at clinical pay bands 8c to VSM. Thus, findings related to the distribution of disabled staff across pay bands should be considered unreliable.
- Almost all substantive staff for whom there was no information on disability status selected the "prefer not to say" option in the Electronic Staff Record (98.1%, 1007/1027), 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.
- The incompleteness of equality monitoring information on disability has decreased year-on-year from 45.0% at March 2012 to 21.8% at March 2019, 20.3% at March 2020, and 18.9% at March 2021, but remains too high nonetheless.

**Table 1: Metric 1: The disability profile of substantive staff at Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust, by pay band cluster, at March 2019, March 2020, and March 2021 (staff of known disability status)**

Table in 7 columns by 13 rows (including header row)

<b>Pay Band Cluster</b>	<b>Percent Disabled March 2019</b>	<b>Percent Disabled March 2020</b>	<b>Percent Disabled March 2021</b>	<b>Number Disabled March 2019</b>	<b>Number Disabled March 2020</b>	<b>Number Disabled March 2021</b>
Substantive Staff Overall	5.4%	5.8%	<b>5.9%</b>	226 out of 4151	247 out of 4245	<b>258 out of 4402</b>
Non clinical Cluster 1, Bands 1 - 4	6.3%	6.5%	<b>7.2%</b>	41 out of 650	40 out of 620	<b>45 out of 626</b>
Non clinical Cluster 2, Band 5 - 7	7.8%	7.5%	<b>7.8%</b>	23 out of 293	22 out of 293	<b>24 out of 306</b>
Non clinical Cluster 3, Bands 8a - 8b	R%	R%	<b>R%</b>	R out of 67	R out of 70	<b>R out of 70</b>
Non clinical Cluster 4, Bands 8c - 9 and VSM	R%	R%	<b>R%</b>	R out of 29	R out of 25	<b>R out of 28</b>
Clinical Cluster 1, Bands 1 - 4	4.2%	5.2%	<b>5.4%</b>	41 out of 971	55 out of 1059	<b>59 out of 1090</b>
Clinical Cluster 2, Band 5 - 7	5.7%	6.1%	<b>5.8%</b>	106 out of 1875	114 out of 1877	<b>113 out of 1950</b>
Clinical Cluster 3, Bands 8a - 8b	R%	R%	<b>R%</b>	R out of 137	R out of 157	<b>R out of 172</b>
Clinical Cluster 4, Bands 8c - 9 and VSM	R%	R%	<b>R%</b>	R out of R	R out of R	<b>R out of 13</b>
Clinical Cluster 5, Medical Consultants	R%	R%	<b>R%</b>	R out of 50	R out of 58	<b>R out of 60</b>
Clinical Cluster 6, Medical Non-Consultants	R%	R%	<b>R%</b>	R out of 18	R out of 15	<b>R out of 24</b>
Clinical Cluster 7, Medical Trainee Grades	R%	R%	<b>R%</b>	R out of 56	R out of 63	<b>R out of 63</b>

Key to colour coding in table:

- Disabled staff overrepresented, ○ Disabled staff proportionately represented, ● Disabled staff underrepresented

## Metric 2. Recruitment

### Description of metric 2:

- Relative likelihood of non-disabled staff compared to Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts. The percentage of non-disabled staff appointed from shortlisting divided by the percentage of Disabled staff appointed from shortlisting.

### Narrative for metric 2:

- In 2020/21 non-disabled people and Disabled people were similarly likely to be appointed from amongst those shortlisted (non-disabled people were 1.13 times as likely as Disabled people to be appointed from shortlisting).
- This is similar to the positions observed in 2018/19 and 2019/20 (non-disabled people were 1.40 and 1.39 times as likely as Disabled people to be appointed from shortlisting, respectively by year). Please refer to Table 2.

**Table 2: Metric 2: The relative likelihood of non-disabled people and Disabled people being appointed from amongst those shortlisted at Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust during 2018/19, 2019/20, and 2020/21**

Table in 4 columns by 6 rows (including header row)

<b>Recruitment</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>
Relative likelihood of appointment from shortlisting (non-disabled/Disabled)	1.40	<b>1.39</b>	<b>1.13</b>
Percentage of non-disabled people appointed from shortlisting	8.0%	<b>11.2%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>
Percentage of Disabled people appointed from shortlisting	5.7%	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>9.6%</b>
Number of non-disabled people appointed from shortlisting	477 out of 5952	<b>504 out of 4493</b>	<b>550 out of 5079</b>
Number of Disabled people appointed from shortlisting	24 out of 419	<b>30 out of 371</b>	<b>35 out of 364</b>

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled staff disadvantaged



## 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. The percentage of Disabled staff entering the formal capability process divided by the percentage of non-disabled staff entering the capability process.

### Narrative for metric 3:

- In the two-year window 2019/20 to 2020/21, Disabled staff were 10.22 times more likely than non-disabled staff to enter formal capability proceedings.
- This is similar to the position observed for the two-year window 2018/19 to 2019/20, when Disabled staff were 6.22 times more likely than non-disabled staff to enter formal capability proceedings; and represents a deterioration of the position observed in the two-year window 2017/18 to 2018/19, when Disabled staff were 2.48 times as likely as non-disabled staff to enter formal capability proceedings. Please refer to Table 3.

**Table 3: Metric 3: The relative likelihood of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process at Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust during the two-year windows 2017/18 to 2018/19, 2018/19 to 2019/20, and 2019/20 to 2020/21**

Table in 4 columns by 6 rows (including header row)

<b>Formal capability process</b>	<b>2017/18 to 2018/19</b>	<b>2018/19 to 2019/20</b>	<b>2019/20 to 2020/21</b>
Relative likelihood of entering the formal capability process (Disabled/non-disabled)	2.48	<b>6.22</b>	<b>10.22</b>
Percentage of Disabled staff entering the formal capability process	R%	R%	R%
Percentage of non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process	R%	R%	R%
Number of Disabled staff entering the formal capability process	R out of 226	<b>R out of 247</b>	<b>R out of 258</b>
Number of non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process	R out of 3925	<b>R out of 3998</b>	<b>R out of 4144</b>

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled staff disadvantaged

## 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 2020, Disabled staff were more likely than non-disabled staff to suffer harassment, bullying or abuse from patients / service users, their relatives or other members of the public (30.7%, 210/684 Disabled staff and 20.2%, 415/2050 non-disabled staff); a similar position to that seen in 2018 and 2019. Please refer to Table 4.
- In 2020, Disabled staff were more likely than non-disabled staff to suffer harassment, bullying or abuse from managers (17.7%, 121/682 Disabled staff and 8.9%, 183/2047 non-disabled staff); a similar position to that seen in 2018 and 2019. Please refer to Table 5.
- In 2020, Disabled staff were more likely than non-disabled staff to suffer harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues (22.3%, 150/673 Disabled staff and 13.0%, 262/2020 non-disabled staff); a similar position to that seen in 2018 and 2019. Please refer to Table 6.

**Table 4: Metric 4a i: The percentages of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from patients / service users, their relatives or other members of the public, Staff Survey 2018, 2019, and 2020**

Table in 4 columns by 5 rows (including header row)

<b>Harassment, bullying or abuse from patients / service users, their relatives or the public</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
Percentage Disabled staff	32.5%	30.1%	30.7%
Percentage non-disabled staff	21.0%	20.9%	20.2%
Number Disabled staff	181 out of 557	165 out of 548	<b>210 out of 684</b>
Number non-disabled staff	411 out of 1957	376 out of 1803	<b>415 out of 2050</b>

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled staff disadvantaged

**Table 5: Metric 4a ii: The percentages of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from managers, Staff Survey 2018, 2019, and 2020**

Table in 4 columns by 5 rows (including header row)

<b>Harassment, bullying or abuse from managers</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
Percentage Disabled staff	<b>15.9%</b>	<b>20.5%</b>	<b>17.7%</b>
Percentage non-disabled staff	7.6%	8.1%	8.9%
Number Disabled staff	88 out of 554	111 out of 542	<b>121 out of 682</b>
Number non-disabled staff	149 out of 1952	145 out of 1801	<b>183 out of 2047</b>

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled staff disadvantaged

**Table 6: Metric 4a iii: The percentages of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues, Staff Survey 2018, 2019, and 2020**

Table in 4 columns by 5 rows (including header row)

<b>Harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
Percentage Disabled staff	<b>21.0%</b>	<b>23.6%</b>	<b>22.3%</b>
Percentage non-disabled staff	12.5%	13.5%	13.0%
Number Disabled staff	115 out of 548	126 out of 534	<b>150 out of 673</b>
Number non-disabled staff	242 out of 1934	238 out of 1766	<b>262 out of 2020</b>

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled staff disadvantaged

#### **Narrative for metric 4b:**

- In 2020, Disabled staff and non-disabled staff were similarly likely to say they, or a colleague, reported their last incident of harassment, bullying or abuse (56.3%, 166/295 Disabled staff and 57.6%, 314/545 non-disabled staff); a similar position to that seen in 2018 and 2019. Please refer to Table 7.

**Table 7: Metric 4b. The percentages of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who say they, or a colleague, reported their last incident of harassment, bullying or abuse, Staff Survey 2018, 2019, and 2020**

Table in 4 columns by 5 rows (including header row)

<b>Reporting harassment, bullying or abuse</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
Percentage Disabled staff	54.4%	<b>50.2%</b>	<b>56.3%</b>
Percentage non-disabled staff	57.7%	<b>56.5%</b>	<b>57.6%</b>
Number Disabled staff	118 out of 217	<b>118 out of 235</b>	<b>166 out of 295</b>
Number non-disabled staff	258 out of 447	<b>280 out of 496</b>	<b>314 out of 545</b>

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled staff disadvantaged

## 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 2020, Disabled staff were less likely than non-disabled staff to feel that the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion (79.8%, 375/470 Disabled staff and 88.4%, 1320/1493 non-disabled staff); a similar position to that seen in 2018 and 2019. Please refer to Table 8.

**Table 8: Metric 5. The percentages of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who felt that the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion, Staff Survey 2018, 2019, and 2020**

Table in 4 columns by 5 rows (including header row)

<b>Equal opportunities for career progression or promotion</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
Percentage Disabled staff	81.8%	77.0%	79.8%
Percentage non-disabled staff	89.3%	86.3%	88.4%
Number Disabled staff	320 out of 391	291 out of 378	375 out of 470
Number non-disabled staff	1248 out of 1397	1056 out of 1223	1320 out of 1493

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled staff disadvantaged

## 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 2020, Disabled staff were more likely than non-disabled staff to have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties (26.6%, 119/447 Disabled staff and 18.9%, 154/814 non-disabled staff); a similar position to that seen in 2018 and 2019. Please refer to Table 9.

**Table 9: Metric 6. The percentages of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties, Staff Survey 2018, 2019, and 2020**

Table in 4 columns by 5 rows (including header row)

<b>Pressure from a manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
Percentage Disabled staff	27.8%	26.2%	26.6%
Percentage non-disabled staff	16.7%	17.9%	18.9%
Number Disabled staff	110 out of 395	101 out of 386	119 out of 447
Number non-disabled staff	159 out of 952	161 out of 900	154 out of 814

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled staff disadvantaged

## Metric 7. Satisfaction with the extent to which the organisation values 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 2020, Disabled staff were less likely than non-disabled staff to be satisfied with the extent to which the organisation valued their work (38.7%, 265/685 Disabled staff and 53.1%, 1086/2045 non-disabled staff); an improvement on the position seen in 2019 for non-disabled staff, but similar to the position seen in 2018 and 2019 for Disabled staff. Please refer to Table 10.

**Table 10: Metric 7. The percentages of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who were satisfied with the extent to which the organisation valued their work, Staff Survey 2018, 2019, and 2020**

Table in 4 columns by 5 rows (including header row)

Satisfaction with the extent to which the organisation values work	2018	2019	2020
Percentage Disabled staff	41.8%	37.8%	38.7%
Percentage non-disabled staff	52.5%	47.4%	53.1%
Number Disabled staff	233 out of 558	207 out of 547	265 out of 685
Number non-disabled staff	1027 out of 1957	853 out of 1801	1086 out of 2045

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled staff disadvantaged

## 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 2020, Amongst Disabled staff at LPT, 79.4% (359/452) reported that their employer had made adequate adjustments to enable them to carry out their work – similar to the national average of 76.6% (52444/68509); a similar position to that seen in 2018 and 2019 for LPT, but reflecting an increase in the national average. Please refer to Table 11.

**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, Staff Survey 2018, 2019, and 2020**

Table in 4 columns by 5 rows (including header row)

<b>Adequate adjustments</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
Percentage Disabled staff at LPT	78.6%	80.3%	79.4%
Percentage Disabled staff nationally	73.0%	73.8%	76.6%
Number Disabled staff at LPT	257 out of 327	281 out of 350	359 out of 452
Number Disabled staff nationally	34684 out of 47531	44809 out of 60699	52444 out of 68509

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled staff at LPT at an advantage compared to Disabled staff nationally

## 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

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 contributes 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."
- 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 2020, Disabled staff scored lower than non-disabled staff on the engagement score (6.67 for Disabled staff and 7.14 for non-disabled staff); a similar position to that seen in 2018 and 2019 for Disabled staff, but an improvement on the position at 2019 for non-disabled staff. Please refer to Table 12.

**Table 12: The engagement score for Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust overall, and for Disabled and non-disabled staff separately, Staff Survey 2018, 2019, and 2020**

Table in 4 columns by 4 rows (including header row)

Staff engagement	2018	2019	2020
Disabled staff	6.67	6.56	6.67
Non-disabled staff	7.08	6.96	7.14
LPT overall	6.98	6.87	7.02

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled staff disadvantaged



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

- Channels for voices to be heard:
  - Disabled Staff Support Group: MAPLE (Mental and Physical Life Experience) which feeds into the
    - Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Workforce Group
    - Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Patient Involvement and Experience Group
- Themes identified through the MAPLE group
  - Reasonable adjustments
  - Recruitment process
  - Health passports
  - Ability Allies
- Outputs
  - Ongoing co-production of training packages and tools to include
    - Unconscious bias training
    - Managing ill health (for line managers, including access to work, reasonable adjustment, and stress management)
    - Stress management toolkit and links to the discussion of health and well-being at appraisal
  - Policy Reviews
  - Listening into Action Event
  - Joint Staff Networks Day with Northamptonshire Healthcare Foundation Trust (our buddy Trust)
  - Linking of well-being to the appraisal process through the Leadership Behaviour Framework

## Metric 10. Board representation

### Description of metric 10:

- Percentage difference between Disabled staff representation in the organisation’s Board membership and the organisation’s overall workforce, disaggregated by the Board’s voting membership and executive membership.

### Narrative for metric 10:

- At March 2021, compared to the level of representation in the workforce overall, Disabled people were proportionally represented amongst board members overall (+4.1% difference in representation), and amongst voting board members (+6.6% difference in representation); however there were no Disabled people amongst executive board members (-5.9% difference in representation). The position is similar to that observed in March 2020.
- Disability status was not known for 41% of board members and 19% of the substantive workforce overall. Before reliable inferences can be drawn about the disability profile of the board and staff based on information held in the Electronic Staff Record, there is a need to address the incompleteness of equality monitoring information on disability status.

**Table 13: Metric 10. Differences in the levels of representation of Disabled staff amongst board members (overall, voting members, and executives), relative to the level of representation in the workforce overall, at March 2019, March 2020, and March 2021**

Table in 4 columns by 5 rows (including header row)

<b>Board representation</b>	<b>March 2019</b>	<b>March 2020</b>	<b>March 2021</b>
Percentage Disabled staff in the substantive workforce overall	5.4%	5.8%	<b>5.9%</b>
Difference between percentage Disabled people amongst all board members and the substantive workforce overall	+2.9%	+2.5%	<b>+4.1%</b>
Difference between percentage Disabled people amongst voting board members and the substantive workforce overall	+5.7%	+5.3%	<b>+6.6%</b>
Difference between percentage Disabled people amongst executive board members and the substantive workforce overall	-5.4%	-5.8%	<b>-5.9%</b>

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled people underrepresented

**WDES Action Plan 2021 – 23**

**Objective1: To guarantee Dignity at work for all disabled staff (and those with long-term ill health) by creating a culture free from bullying, harassment and discrimination**

<b>Action Number</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>WDES data 2019/ 2020</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>RAG</b>
1.	To ensure that there is full engagement with the disability agenda, in line with Leadership Behaviours leading to demonstrable culture change in respect of attitudes and approaches	Head of EDI  Chair of MAPLE Group	March 2022	NHS Staff Survey (metrics 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9a)	A series of disability sessions were delivered during 2020 Disability History Month and part of International Day of Disabled People (IDODP). Further sessions are planned for 2021 that will integrate leadership values as part of any education and awareness. Consideration should be given to building in to EDI objectives within appraisals including take up of reverse mentoring opportunities.	Amber
2.	Ensure disability diversity balance on decision making Forums i.e. Review all Boards/ committees/decision making forums. Do staff from protected groups sit on these boards/groups	Deputy Director of Governance and Risk	March 2022	WDES Indicator 9	To be commenced.	Blue
3.	To ensure that policies and Practices	EDI Coordinator and HR Business Partner	November 2021	NHS Staff Survey (metrics	The reasonable adjustments policy is currently under review and will provide an opportunity to	Amber

	accommodate the needs of staff with disabilities	FYPC and Hosted Services		4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9a)	create a revised approach which will improve the experience of employees with disabilities.	
--	--	--------------------------	--	-----------------------	---	--

**Objective 2: Examine and prioritise issues facing disabled staff and have strategies in place to support individuals.**

Action Number	Action	Lead	Date	WDES data 2019/ 2020	Progress	RAG
1.	Give voice to staff with disability using existing MAPLE network	Chair of MAPLE Group, Freedom to Speak Up Guardian, Director of HR and OD	Ongoing	WDES indicator 9	The MAPLE Group has grown and there have been changes in the chair and vice-chair positions. Activity of the group has increased during 2020. A Listening Event was held in December 2020 and plans are in place to continue this positive work in order to ensure that disabled staff continue to have safe spaces where they feel they can speak up.	Green
2.	To promote and communicate a wide range of disability related topics through Team Brief and team meetings. Also use this as a way of getting feedback/ intelligence	Chair of MAPLE, Associate Director of Communications, Head of EDI	March 2022	NHS Staff Survey (metrics 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9a)	The Chair of MAPLE has run a session with finance. It is planned to communicate more information and guidance through channels such as Team Briefs, staff bulletin and where appropriate the FB closed page and awareness	Blue

					sessions Trust Wide and within teams.	
3.	To develop a People Library (volunteers from the MAPLE Group who can share their lived experience and expertise through half hour sessions where colleagues can ask them questions)	The MAPLE Group	December 2021	As above	To be commenced.	Blue
4.	Identify, share, and engage with “hotspot” areas linked to ‘health and wellbeing’ questions in the additional questions part of the NHS staff survey	Chair of MAPLE Group Health & Wellbeing Lead	March 2022	As above	To be commenced.	Blue
5.	Commission access audits LPT Estates and Facilities	Director of Finance Head of EDI Director of Estates	March 2022	Indicator 8	To be commenced.	Blue

**Objective 3: All disabled staff have the confidence to declare their disability on ESR**

<b>Action Number</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>WDES data 2019/ 2020</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>RAG</b>
1.	Develop a communication campaign so that staff feel confident declaring disability on ESR	Communication Lead for MAPLE Network	March 2022	NA	To be commenced	Blue
2.	Increased promotion of Trust as a 'Disability Confident' employer both internally and via recruitment social media sites	Resourcing Manager/ Communication Lead for MAPLE Network	March 2022	Indicator 1	Recruitment literature includes Disability Confident logo and criteria such as guaranteeing an interview to candidates who meet the minimum criteria. Further work required.	Amber
3.	Share Lived Experiences from disabled staff regarding their experiences in the workplace	MAPLE Network, EDI-Coordinator & Communication Lead	March 2022	Indicators 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9.	MAPLE members shared lived experience during 2020 DHM and IDODP. Plans underway to step this up for 2021 activity.	Amber

**Objective 4: Embed Inclusive recruitment practice towards the employment and retention of candidates with disabilities to guarantee fairness throughout the process.**

<b>Action Number</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>WDES data 2019/ 2020</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>RAG</b>
1.	Work with Trust communications to ensure that we present an inclusive picture to potential job applicants	MAPLE Communication Lead Resourcing Manager	March 2022	Indicator 1	Review of recruitment and selection policy and procedure planned.	Blue
2.	Enhance recruitment training so focus is on reducing unconscious bias at all stages of selection	Head of EDI Resourcing Manager	March 2022	As above	As above.	Blue
3.	Expand and mandate diversity of all selection panels	Director HR Resourcing Manager	March 2022	Indicator 1	As above.	Blue
4.	Recruit inclusion Allies	MAPLE Chair	March 2022	Indicator 1	To be commenced.	Blue

**Objective 5: Ensure Career Progression for staff with disabilities through the Talent management and succession planning approach.**

<b>Action Number</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>WDES data 2019/ 2020</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>RAG</b>
1.	Develop a Disability Confident Training Package for managers	Resourcing Manager and Head EDI	March 2023	Indicator 1	To be commenced.	Blue
2.	Develop disability awareness training for all	Head of EDI MAPLE Chair	March 2023	All	Build on the sessions run in 2020.	Amber
3.	Encourage managers (via training, ongoing education and coaching conversations) to have health and well-being discussions with staff about what reasonable Adjustments can be made	Head of OD	March 2023	Indicator 8 and 9.	Health and well Being is included in staff appraisals. Consider further guidance and support to managers to have this discussion.	Blue