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)

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

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)

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

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)

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

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:
    - o   i) Patients/Service users, their relatives or other members of the public,
    - o   ii) Managers,
    - o   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)

Harassment, bullying or abuse from patients / service users, their relatives or the public	2018	2019	2020
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	**210 out of 684**
Number non-disabled staff	411 out of 1957	376 out of 1803	**415 out of 2050**

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)

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

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)

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

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)

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

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)

Equal opportunities for career progression or promotion	2018	2019	2020
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)

Pressure from a manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough	2018	2019	2020
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)

Adequate adjustments	2018	2019	2020
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:
    - o 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
    - o Reasonable adjustments
    - o Recruitment process
    - o Health passports
    - o Ability Allies

- Outputs
    - o 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
    - o Policy Reviews
    - o Listening into Action Event
    - o Joint Staff Networks Day with Northamptonshire Healthcare Foundation Trust (our buddy Trust)
    - o 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)

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

Key to colour coding in table: ● Disabled people underrepresented